

Vocational Interests of Australian High School Students

Vocational interest questionnaires that elicit preferences for a number of activities have a long tradition in the psychology of individual differences - dating at least from the development of the *Strong Vocational Interest Blank* in 1923 - and have now become a mainstay of professional services. They embody an idea of which content areas are important to assess and how the categories might or might not be related. A hypothesised structure of vocational interests is embodied in the implicit or explicit framework that underlies their everyday use in guidance and counselling. A notion that has come to prevail in practice is that vocational interests are organised in a two-dimensional space usually represented as a circumplex arrangement. The purpose of this report is to examine individual differences in the dimensions underlying high school students' interest preferences.

The implications for two-dimensional views of interests, such as those of Prediger (1982) and Holland (1996), are examined in this paper. For instance, Prediger has proposed that two bipolar dimensions of work tasks (Things vs People and Data vs Ideas – see Figure 1) account for interests and that occupations can be plotted on a world of work map (see Athanasou, 1990). On the other hand, Rounds (1995, p.190) contended that "...the circular structure of interests is a poor representation of the complexity of the interest space...". More recently, a spherical representation of vocational interests with a prestige component has been proposed (Tracey & Rounds, 1996). This study used the vocational typology of Holland as a starting point for analysing the underlying structure in career interests of young people. The outcomes of such studies have major implications for the ways in which occupations are categorised and also for the perceived closeness or proximity of interests when decisions are being made about the directions of one's interests. The following sections describe briefly the vocational typologies used in this study and provides specific details of the sample.

Holland's Personality and Vocational Typology

Holland (1973, 1985, 1996) has proposed that there are six fundamental personality and vocational types based on general interests and these are arranged in a hexagonal fashion (see Figure 1). This typology has a major influence on vocational research dominating it worldwide. Holland's vocational typology has also influenced vocational research in Australia (see Ainley, Robinson, Harvey-Beavis, Elsworth & Fleming, 1994; Athanasou, O'Gorman & Meyer, 1981; Lokan & Taylor, 1986); Naylor & Care, 1997). It casts interests and preferences within the sphere of personality

types and describes the types in order as Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising and Conventional. Holland's formulations achieved prominence because of their practical application to careers guidance and counselling. Both people and environments were classified in the same manner allowing users to search a variety of potentially suitable occupations within a coherent and meaningful framework.




Figure 1. Holland's hexagonal ordering of occupational types and Prediger's work-task dimensions

Unlike earlier workers in the field of vocational interests, Holland viewed occupational preferences largely as multi-attribute expressions of personality and he went on to specify an overarching relationship between types (or general interests) that added considerably to the utility of his model. He indicated that the personality types were ordered in a two-dimensional circumplex format (see Holland, Whitney, Cole & Richards, 1969). Moreover, he specified a number of related theoretical constructs such as (a) the differentiation of interests (e.g., the difference between the highest and lowest scores and the overall pattern of the profile of the six interests); (b) congruence (e.g., the relationship between interest scores and occupational or educational membership); and (c) consistency or the calculus of the circumplex which specified that some interests were more closely related than others. The closeness of the relationship was that adjacent interest types were thought to be more consistent than alternate interests, which were thought to be more consistent than opposite interests on the hexagon.

Some indication of the popularity of his theory is that in its catalogue, the publisher Psychological Assessment Resources, has announced that over 21 million copies of the *Self-Directed Search* have been sold. More importantly the Holland classification has been incorporated within other major interest inventories such as

the *Strong Interest Inventory*, the American College Testing Program's *Uniact Inventory*, the *Career Assessment Inventory* and the *Career Decision Making Inventory* as well as forming a basis for the classification of occupations (Gottfredson & Holland, 1996). This brief description hardly does justice to Holland's contributions to vocational behaviour and the reader is referred to the latest exposition of his theory (Holland, 1996).

For the purposes of the practitioner and the theorist, Holland's model encompassed three key assumptions: (i) a simple circular arrangement of six key interests, (ii) the hexagonal ordering along two dimensions that gave the field of vocational interests some structure and (iii) the calculus or consistency arrangements between the categories which assist in the provision of guidance. These assumptions are examined in this paper using an Australia-wide stratified probability sample. Interest configurations have been affected by the composition of groups studied (see Hanson, Collins, Swanson & Fouad, 1993, p.202) and in previous studies most of the analyses have been generated from non-probability samples (Rounds, 1995, pp. 194-198). Moreover, there has been some but often less support for the RIASEC scales in cross-cultural analyses (see Tracey & Rounds, 1996, p. 4).

Youth in Transition

This study used the *Youth in Transition* data that investigated the vocational, educational and social pathways of young Australians after high school (Australian Council for Educational Research, no date (a) (b)). It was part of the Longitudinal Surveys of Australian Youth conducted on behalf of the Federal Government. The surveys are made up of four cohorts of young people born in 1961, 1965, 1970 or 1975, that evolved from the nationwide literacy and numeracy tests of the Australian Studies in School Performance project. The objective of the surveys was to indicate the main factors that affect personal outcomes and the surveys encompassed school experiences, socio-economic background, educational attainment, extent of schooling, post-compulsory education and employment. This study used a nationwide two-stage stratified probability sample from government, independent and Catholic school systems, with 25 students randomly selected from each school. The data fields that were used in this study comprised: demographic data and responses to a 24-item interest questionnaire. Participants were first contacted in schools and further data collection was by an annual mail survey over a ten-year period. The 1970 cohort is used in this study and was first assessed in 1980 and then followed up at yearly intervals from 1985-1994. Lamb, Polesel and Teese (1995, p. 27) went so far as to say "...it represents one of the most substantial long-term studies of outcomes undertaken in Australia". This study addressed the key research question

of the number of dimensions required to account for vocational interest amongst this nationwide sample of Australian youth.

Method

Participants

The participants in this study comprised 2,709 students (males=1436; female=1273) from the 1970 Youth in Transition study cohort, who were first tested as part of the Australian Studies of School Performance in 1980. When contacted in 1985, some 2,709 out of 3,294 responded completely to every item in the interest questionnaire and were included in this study. The mean age of the sample was 15.5 years (SD=0.3).

Instrument

The interest inventory used in this study was a 24-item questionnaire of the Holland typology of interests developed especially for administration by mail. It formed one of the twelve sections of the larger survey. Students were asked 'How do you feel about each of these activities?' and responded on a four point scale from 'like very much' (1) to 'like somewhat' (2) through to 'dislike somewhat' (3) and 'dislike very much' (4) for items such as: bushwalking, working with machines and tools (R), doing all kinds of experiments (I), acting in plays (A), helping others (S), managing other people (E) and doing office work (C), (see Australian Council for Educational Research, Longitudinal Surveys of Australian Youth, Technical Paper Number 5 for a complete copy of the survey and Appendix A of this paper provides a copy of the interest questionnaire). Due to restrictions of both space and response time the questionnaire was limited to four items per scale and designed for moderate levels of internal consistency with alpha coefficients for the six RIASEC scales of 0.802, 0.602, 0.636, 0.545, 0.641, and 0.704 respectively. The questionnaire has been used subsequently in other large-scale studies and validated against subject choice (Ainley, Robinson, Harvey-Beavis, Elsworth & Fleming, 1994).

Analysis

A Rasch model item analysis of each of the six scales was undertaken and the resultant scores for each person are logit values that represent a true interval scale. These were used in all subsequent analyses. The infit mean squares for each RIASEC scale were respectively: 1.01, 0.98, 0.99, 1.00, 1.00, 0.99.

Multidimensional scaling was used to analyse the structure of interests. This approach has a long pedigree in interest analyses (see for example Day & Rounds, 1998; Hansen et al., 1993; Rounds, 1995; Rounds & Zevon, 1983), especially in the area of gender differences. The underlying structure is based on similarity data such as intercorrelations and the proximity of variables is represented graphically. The

goodness of fit between the dimensions obtained and the original matrix is reported in terms of stress values, with the lower the stress values the better the fit. Solutions with stress values 0.05 to 0.10 are recommended (see Kruskal & Wish, 1978) with a value of zero representing a perfect fit between the intercorrelations and the multidimensional scaling. Non-metric multi-dimensional scaling was used for analysis of the correlations of the six interest scores (logit values) and comparisons were made with the expected structure from Prediger's (1982) work-tasks dimensions.

In addition to examining the dimensions underlying the Holland vocational types, a randomisation test (Tracey, 1997) can be used to test the hypothesised ordering of relationship in the RIASEC hexagonal model. This compared the relationship between categories such as RI with RA RS RE RC IA IS IE IC AS AE AC SE SC and EC resulting in 72 predicted hexagonal relations. A correspondence index ranging from -1 through 0 to +1 indicates the extent of agreement. Further details of the analysis are contained in the results section.

Results

Circular Arrangement of Interests

The correlations between all six scales are indicated in Table 1 and ranged from -0.129 (Realistic and Social) to 0.440 (Artistic and Social). Table 2 shows the RIASEC stimulus coordinates from the three-dimension solution with stress values of 0.28, 0.11 and 0.04. Ideally a solution in two-dimensions would have been preferred in order to be consistent with Prediger's arrangement and Holland's model but three dimensions accounted for 73.95% of the variance and more adequately represented the relations among the scales. The coordinates are plotted in Figure 2. The arrangement of the Holland scales in Figure 2 is circular but does not conform to the RIASEC ordering completely. The multidimensional scaling maps for Dimensions 1 and 3 offer the neatest circular ordering with a six sided polygon, and this is mainly because it appears to represent the underlying Things-People (Dimension 1) and Data-Ideas (Dimension 3).

Table 1
Pearson Correlations (N=2709)

| | R | I | A | S | E | C | Scale scores Mean (SD) |
|------------|------|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|---------------------------|
| R | - | 0.412 | -0.075 | -0.129 | 0.161 | 0.045 | 7.5 (2.6) |
| I | | - | 0.333 | 0.207 | 0.292 | 0.413 | 7.9 (2.2) |
| A | | | - | 0.440 | 0.278 | 0.295 | 9.5 (2.8) |
| S | | | | - | 0.269 | 0.348 | 6.5 (1.8) |
| E | | | | | - | 0.247 | 8.5 (2.3) |
| C | | | | | | - | 10.1 (2.7) |
| Mean logit | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | |
| SD logit | 1.06 | 0.08 | 0.27 | 1.12 | 0.41 | 0.23 | |

Table 2
Three-dimensional non-metric solution

| Variables | Dim1 | Dim2 | Dim3 | Data/Ideas ¹ | Things/People ¹ |
|-----------|---------|---------|---------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| R | -0.5050 | 0.0264 | -0.1424 | 0.00 | -0.66 |
| I | -0.1785 | -0.2166 | -0.0534 | -0.57 | -0.33 |
| A | 0.2890 | 0.0706 | -0.2366 | -0.57 | +0.33 |
| S | 0.4196 | 0.0253 | -0.0314 | 0.00 | +0.66 |
| E | -0.0750 | 0.3625 | 0.2083 | +0.57 | +0.33 |
| C | 0.0499 | -0.2683 | 0.2555 | +0.57 | -0.33 |
| Stress | 0.171 | 0.001 | 0.000 | | |


¹Dimension weights follow Prediger (1982) but signs reversed and adjusted for the range of the MDS dimensions.

The Hexagonal Ordering

The weights in Dimension 1 correlated (Spearman rank correlation) 0.853 with Prediger's People-Things notional dimension weights and 0.00 with the notional Data-Ideas dimension weights. Dimension 2 correlated 0.323 with People-Things but 0.00 with Data-Ideas. Dimension 2 represents a weak dimension of gender in which the ordering of the categories approximates the magnitude of the correlations between gender (categorised as 0/1) and the RIASEC scales. Dimension 3, however, more adequately represents the Data-Ideas continuum with which the weights correlated 0.836 and only 0.117 with the Things-People dimension.

The Calculus or Consistency Arrangements

Application of the randomisation test showed that 44 of the 72 predicted hexagonal relations were met and one was tied, resulting in a correspondence index of 0.23 ($p=0.18$, ns). A major problem arose with the location of the Conventional category.






Figure 2. Two-dimensional representations for the RIASEC correlation matrix

Discussion

The findings from the multidimensional scaling were consistent with a quasi-circular arrangement of interests for Australian high school students. The first and third dimensions mapped onto the RIASEC categories and matched Prediger's theory-based People versus Things and Ideas versus Data connection but the findings did not provide complete support for a two-dimensional arrangement of general interests. The interest configuration was not consistent with Holland's structural model of order and for his hypothesised calculus. The Conventional category departed sufficiently from the RIASEC ordering to lessen the circular ordering of interests. In another context, Rounds also noted that the "...conventional theme was not well represented by the basic interest scales..." (1995, p.223).

The charts in Figure 2 do no justice to a three-dimensional view. When the RIASEC scales are plotted in a three-dimensional arrangement (see Figure 3) the Realistic and Social scales maintain a polarity at the edge of the sphere (almost like

an east-west equator of interests). Investigative is closer towards the core of the sphere but Enterprising is located on the edge of the sphere and on the opposite side to Artistic. The results do support a quasi-spherical conception of interests but without the prestige dimension that Tracey and Rounds (1996) advocated. In this case one reason for the absence of prestige may be that the items reflected activities which were of a reasonably neutral status and in which low status activities have been partialled out.




Figure 3. Three-dimensional (scatter plot and surface plot) representations for the RIASEC correlation matrix

The current results suggest that some theoretical modifications of Holland's model and typology may be necessary to account for the interests of Australian high school students. Firstly, the six categories of general interests may need to be supplemented because there are large areas of the three dimensional space which are not represented by general interest themes. This is easiest to visualise in the three-dimensional surface plot. Secondly, there is a suggestion in these results that there are underlying gender differences not accounted for in a universal hexagonal ordering. Thirdly, the calculation of the construct of consistency by counsellors for the purposes of guidance or interpretation of results may well be in error given that only 45 out of the 72 intercorrelations were in the predicted order.

The advantage of the present study is related largely to the unique sample, its representativeness and its size. Limitations, however, relate to the survey non-response rate and also include the low internal consistency of the 4-item questionnaire for each of the six categories. Reliance on internal consistency as an explanation is not always helpful, however, as there are instances in which moderate levels of internal consistency are acceptable when there is evidence for validity, or there are practical reasons or the scale is less than 10 items (see Loewenthal, 1996, p.48). Moreover the troublesome Conventional category had the second highest internal consistency reliability of 0.704 after Realistic.

The available evidence indicated some underlying dimensions for the vocational interests of Australian high school students that have theoretical potential and meaning. The structure is elusive but the preferences of the sample were not random and many of the expected relationships between categories were supported. The next phase in this program of research is to consider the dimensions at the level of more specific interests as well as across different populations and with different instruments. A tentative hypothesis is that many more dimensions are required to account for vocational preferences.

Acknowledgement

I am indebted to the Australian Council for Educational Research for making the Youth in Transition data available to me as well as allowing me to work at the ACER. Preparation of this paper was supported financially by the Australian National Training Authority through the Research Centre for Vocational Education and Training. Part of this work was completed while I was a visiting fellow at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and I am grateful to Professors Terry Tracey and James Rounds.

References

- Ainley, J., Robinson, L., Harvey-Beavis, A., Elsworth, G. & Fleming, M. (1994). *Subject choice in years 11 and 12*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Athanasou, J.A. (1990). A framework for the assessment of career interests, *International Journal of Career Management*, 2, 28-31.
- Athanasou, J.A., O'Gorman, J., & Meyer, E. (1981). Factorial validity of the vocational interest scales of the Holland Vocational Preference Inventory for Australian high school students. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 41, 523-527.
- Australian Council for Educational Research (no date). *Overview of the longitudinal surveys of Australian youth program. Technical Paper Number 2*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Australian Council for Educational Research (no date). *The Youth in Transition 1970 cohort questionnaires: 1980, 1985-1994. Technical Paper Number 5*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Day, S.X. & Rounds, J. (1998). Universality of vocational interest structure among racial and ethnic minorities. *American Psychologist*, 53, 728-736.
- Gottfredson, G.D. & Holland, J.L. (1996). *Dictionary of Holland occupational codes*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Hansen, J.C., Collins, R.C., Swanson, J.L. & Fouad, N.A. (1993). Gender differences in the structure of interests. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42, 200-211.
- Holland, J.L. (1973). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments*. Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Holland, J.L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments*. (2nd edition). Englewood-Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Holland, J.L. (1996). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments*. (3rd edition). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Holland, J.L., Whitney, D.R., Cole, N.S. & Richards, J.M. Jr. (1969). *An empirical occupational classification derived from a theory of personality and intended for practise and research*. (ACT Research Report No. 29). Iowa City, IA: The American College Testing Program.
- Kruskal, J.B., & Wish, M. (1978). *Multidimensional scaling*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lamb, S. Polesel, J., & Teese, R. (1995). *'Where do they go?' An evaluation of sources of data used for the monitoring of students' destinations and other educational outcomes in Australia*. Commissioned Report No. 40. National

Board of Employment, Education and Training. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

- Loewenthal, K.M. (1966). *An introduction to psychological tests and scales*. London: UCL Press.
- Lokan, J.J. & Taylor, K.F. (1986). *Holland in Australia. A vocational choice theory in research and practice*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Naylor, F.D. & Care, E. (1997). The Australian Interest Measure (AIM): A report. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 49, 115.
- Prediger, D.J. (1982). Dimensions underlying Holland's hexagon: Missing link between interests and occupations? *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 21, 259-287.
- Rounds, J.B. (1995). Vocational interests. Evaluating structural hypotheses. In D.Lubinski & R.V. Dawis (Eds.), *Assessing individual differences in human behavior. New concepts, methods and findings*. Palo Alto, Ca: Davies-Black, pp. 177-232.
- Rounds, J.B. & Zevon, M.A. (1983). Multidimensional scaling research in vocational psychology. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 7, 491-510.
- Tracey, T.J.G. (1997). RANDALL: A Microsoft FORTRAN program for a randomization test of hypothesised order relations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57, 164-168.
- Tracey, T.J.G. & Rounds, J. (1996). The spherical representation of vocational interests. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 48, 3-41.

APPENDIX: Interest Survey Questionnaire

| How do you feel about each of these activities? | Holland category |
|---|------------------|
| Bushwalking | I |
| Going shopping | S |
| Typing | C |
| Acting in plays | A |
| Talking with friends | S |
| Organising things | E |
| Solving problems and puzzles | I |
| Working with machines and tools | R |
| Selling things to people | E |
| Helping other people | S |
| Going to live theatre (e.g. plays) | A |
| Managing other people | E |
| Doing all kinds of experiments | I |
| Driving cars | R |
| Cooking | S |
| Recording facts and figures | C |
| Doing handcrafts | A |
| Getting other people to do things your way/influencing others | E |
| Repairing things | R |
| Building things | R |
| Working with figures | C |
| Thinking your way through problems | I |
| Writing stories, poems, plays etc. | A |
| Doing office work | C |