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Students with disabilities often have difficulties transitioning from high school to employment. Many students lack the self-determination skills needed to make this transition. Self-determination involves students implementing strategies that enable them to modify and regulate their own behavior; and utilizing strategies that support them to track progress toward goals. The research literature has shown that self-determination instruction can facilitate positive transition outcomes. Collaboration between districts and outside agencies has also been shown to improve transition outcomes, according to existing research. This study examines the effects of self-determination training, taught by Vocational Rehabilitation counselors, on self-determination skills of students with disabilities. Participants included 11 students, ages 15-18, who have been identified as having a specific learning disability, intellectual disability, other health impairment, or autism. The target behavior will be increased self-determination scores on two instruments: a formal rating scale and curriculum-based assessment. The effects of the
lessons will be measured by the AIR Self-Determination Scale and a Curriculum Based Assessment. Ten lessons were taught by a Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor. The researcher found that student self-determination scores did not substantially increase after receiving “Job Club” instruction taught by the Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor, but that participants showed an increased knowledge surrounding disability disclosure in the workplace and increased self-determination scores in the area of self-monitoring of progress towards a goal. The research also showed that participants who had been previously or were currently employed showed greater progress on a curriculum based assessment than those with no employment history.
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PUBLIC ABSTRACT

Self-Determination Training: A Collaboration Model for Schools and Vocational Rehabilitation

Shannon M. Williams

Transitioning from high school to postsecondary education and employment is often difficult for students with disabilities. Research has shown that students with increased self-determination skills have a greater likelihood of being successful in a postsecondary setting and in obtaining employment.

Students with disabilities often receive extensive specialized instruction in the areas of English and math, but their teachers have not historically been given training in teaching self-determination. Vocational Rehabilitation counselors are trained to give career guidance and encourage self-determination skills, but are not experienced teachers.

The purpose of this thesis was to determine whether or not a self-determination curriculum created by Vocational Rehabilitation, taught in a high school by the Vocational Rehabilitation counselor with the support of a special education teacher would increase the self-determination skills of students with disabilities.

The research showed that the self-determination scores of the students did not show significant improvement, but showed gains in student knowledge of self-disclosure in the workplace and self-monitoring while working towards a goal. The research also indicated that those with previous work experience showed greater gains than those with no work experience.
# CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC ABSTRACT</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>PREVIOUS WORK-LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>PURPOSE STATEMENT AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>METHOD</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent Variables and Response Measurement</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIR Self-Determination Scale</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum Based Assessment</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental Design</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inter-Scorer Agreement</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment Integrity</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>RESULTS</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum Based Assessment Results</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIR Self-Determination Scale Results</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Reflections</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPENDICES</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Tables and Figures ................................................................. 25
Appendix B: Job Club Workshop: Curriculum Based Assessment .......... 32
Appendix C: Post Assessment Questions .................................................. 35
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Means, Gain Scores, and Standard Deviations for Students With/Without Employment Experience</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Comparison of pretest and posttest scores answered correctly on a curriculum based assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Comparison of pretest and posttest mean gains from least to most by individual concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Comparison of pretest and posttest scores in section one of the AIR Self-Determination Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Comparison of pretest and posttest scores in section two of the AIR Self-Determination Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Percentage of increase/decrease of total student responses on Sections 1 and 2 of the AIR Self-Determination Scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Research has shown that skills related to self-determination (SD) correlate with positive academic, transition (Roffman, Herzog, & Wershba-Gershon, 1994), and employment outcomes (Gragoudas & Stelios, 2014) for students with disabilities. Students who are self-determined, “implement strategies that enable them to modify and regulate their own behavior; and utilize strategies that support them to track their progress toward the goal and to modify either the goal or the action plan as needed” (Wehmeyer et al., 2012, p. 136).

Despite the benefits of SD, not all students with disabilities have access to SD training. Secondary special education teachers are required to teach in core areas such as reading and math which may limit time for SD instruction. Additionally, many of these teachers have not received training to teach this topic (Dowdy, 1996). Teachers often rely upon adult agencies such as Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) to provide SD training, but VR counselors have an average caseload of 112 clients (Hayward & Schmidt-Davis, 2005), and thus, limited time available to work with individual clients on SD skills. Collaboration between VR and special education teachers can be difficult due to scheduling and funding issues. Despite these challenges, it is vital that key stakeholders work together to provide SD training to students with disabilities (Agran, Cain, & Cavin, 2002).

Linking VR and special education services prior to graduation is imperative (Dowdy, 1996). As agencies team together, they can assist students in achieving adult
outcomes by (a) career planning and counseling, (b) career preparation experiences, (c) collaborative partnerships, and (d) program improvement activities (Plotner, Trach, & Shogren, 2012). Representatives from each agency have unique skills and knowledge that can benefit the student. VR counselors understand the needs of employers and their value on workers who can advocate for themselves and portray high self-esteem. Teachers are skilled in methods of instruction and student learning styles. When a VR counselor and special educator work together, they are strategically positioned to assist youth in developing SD skills. Research is needed to show the efficacy of collaboration between special education teachers and VR in teaching SD skills.
A review of the literature was conducted for articles relating to SD, SD instructional curriculum, and the efficacy of interagency collaboration. The following are search terms used and results obtained from each search: special education/transition curriculum (1,443), secondary transition curriculum (2,395), self-advocacy curriculum/special education (75), vocational rehabilitation/transition (2,253), vocational rehabilitation/transition/collaboration (130), and self-determination/employment/disabilities (397). The articles were located in the EBSCO host database (psychINFO, ERIC, Educational Full Text and the Educational Source). I limited my choices to articles that addressed the topics of SD (3 articles), collaboration of schools and adult services (3 articles), and SD curriculum (4 articles). I have chosen three articles for my literature review (Noonan, Morningstar, & Erickson, 2008; Wehmeyer et al., 2012; Zhang, 2001) because they most closely relate to collaborative training across agency representatives in teaching SD to students with disabilities.

High-performing districts and communities (Noonan et al., 2008) use skills that foster improved outcomes for students with disabilities. A study done by Noonan et al., (2008) focused on improving interagency collaboration. The researchers chose to define interagency collaboration as, “a broad concept that encompasses formal and informal relationships between schools and adult agencies in which resources are shared to achieve common transition goals” (p. 133). The Transition Outcomes Project database was used to identify high-performing districts from six different states. Representatives from these
districts completed a 20-question survey to determine compliance with the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA; 2004). Five of these questions related to interagency requirements from IDEA. The data from 198 rural, urban and suburban districts were analyzed. Forty-nine districts fell into the top quartile. Thirty-three of the districts were chosen as high performers, and 29 chose to participate in the study. Participants consisted of transition coordinators, special education teachers, administrators, assistant special education directors, special education directors, and blended staff, each of which participated in a 35 to 60 min interview. Interview results were transcribed, coded, and analyzed. Inter-rater reliability was 94%. The information was emailed to a smaller group of participants and the group agreed that, “the summarized results were a reasonable interpretation of (their) perspective” (p. 135). The results revealed 11 categories identifying collaborative activities of high-performing districts. They were not listed in the order of importance, but included:

(a) flexible scheduling and staffing (b) follow-up after transition (c) administrative support for transition (d) using a variety of funding sources © state-supported technical assistance (f) ability to build relationships (g) agency meetings with students and families (h) training students and families (i) joint training of staff (j) meetings with agency staff and transition councils (k) dissemination of information to a broad audience (pp. 136-141).

Results indicated that collaboration between state education agencies, at the local and state levels, was an important indicator of success. Data also indicated the importance of having a flexible schedule for transition coordinators that would allow
them to maximize contact with families and other agencies. Noonan et al. (2008) concluded that training students and families was a key element of high performing districts. Noonan et al., (2008) demonstrated that high-performing districts possessed high levels of collaboration. Research is needed to determine whether district representatives could collaborate to teach self-determination skills.

Wehmeyer et al. (2012) researched the impact of SD instruction on students with disabilities. The purpose of their study was to determine levels of SD after exposure to the Self-Determined Learning Model of Instruction (SDLMI; Wehmeyer, Palmer, Agran, Mithaug, & Martin, 2000). Participants were 312 high school students with intellectual disability (30%) and learning disabilities (70%) recruited from 20 districts across three states. Researchers chose a group-randomized, modified equivalent control group time series design. The study used a “treatment” and “control” group with participants randomly assigned. Teachers were instructed to use the SDLMI to support students in setting two goals: one academic goal and one transition goal. Instruction on the model occurred in various settings such as a special education classroom and regular education classroom. Students were required to “(a) identify the problem, (b) identify potential solutions to the problem, (c) identify barriers to solving the problem, and (d) identify consequences of each solution.” Assessments to determine SD ability were the Arc’s Self-Determination Scale (Wehmeyer, 1995) and the AIR Self-Determination Scale (Wolman, Campeau, Dubois, Mithaug, & Stolatski, 1994). Results showed that the intervention groups made significant improvements on both of the SD assessments.

As a result of the research on SD instruction, curricula have been developed to teach skills to students with disabilities. As of 2001, 35 such curricula had been
developed, 19 lacked field testing, 12 reportedly field tested with no results, and four were field tested with results (Zhang, 2001). Of those four, only one used a research design allowing for a causal inference to investigate program efficacy. Zhang studied the effect of the Next S.T.E.P. program (Halpern, Herr, Doren, & Wolf, 2000) and its effect on SD skills of high school students with learning disabilities. This curriculum consists of 19 lessons that teach: (a) self-evaluation of important skills needed for the transition; (b) choosing goals and activities in four important transition areas, including personal life, education and training, jobs, and living on your own; (c) taking charge of their personal transition planning meeting; and (d) following through on choices and keeping track of progress” (Halpern, et al., 2000, pp. 123-124).

The study included 71 ninth grade students with learning disabilities whose ages ranged from 14-19 years. All the instruction was held in the resource classrooms. The Arc’s Self-Determination Scale (Wehmeyer & Kelchner, 1995) was used to measure self-report SD. Teachers were given a 3-hr training to learn how to administer the instrument. Data were taken on a control group and a treatment group. The control group scored 95.2 % on the pretest and 93.4 % on the posttest while the treatment group scored 89.1 % on the pretest and 98.8 on the posttest. The treatment group showed significant improvement after the instruction, while the control group dropped nearly two percentage points. Results showed that the self-directed curriculum positively impacted the student’s SD scores on the Arc Self-Determination Scale (Zhang, 2001).

The literature review shows the importance of SD skills and the positive impact those skills can have in a students’ life. SD skills are needed as students access adult services, enter college, and enter the workforce. However, the students need support to
obtain those skills while in high school before they are faced with many of the decisions and responsibilities that come with adulthood. The literature has shown that students with disabilities have improved outcomes when agencies collaborate together (Noonan et al., 2008) and when students are taught SD skills with curriculum designed to promote those skills (Wehmeyer et al., 2012). Additional research needs to be conducted to find ways for agencies to collaborate and use SD to bring about improved outcomes in SD for students with disabilities.
CHAPTER III

PURPOSE STATEMENT AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The purpose of this study is to determine whether a new, untested SD curriculum (Anderson, R., personal communication) taught by a VR counselor and supported by a special education classroom teacher, will improve SD outcomes in students who have been identified as having a disability and have either an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or Section 504 Plan. This study will address the following research questions:

1. Given instruction of a curriculum on self-advocacy, will students with mild/moderate disabilities ages 16-18 show increased self-advocacy skills on a curriculum-based assessment (CBA)?

2. To what extent does self-advocacy training delivered by a VR counselor increase scores as measured by the AIR Self-Determination Scale?
CHAPTER IV

METHOD

Participants

Participants for this study included 11 students, ages 15-18, who have been classified as having one of the following disabilities: autism, specific learning disabilities, other health impairment, or intellectual disability. Participants were Caucasian and lived in one or two-parent/grandparent, low to middle-class families, residing in a small community of approximately 7,000 residents in the southwestern United States. Five of 11 participants were currently employed or had been employed within the previous year. Criteria for the participants included (a) enrollment in a special education transition class, (b) a current Individual Education Program, (c) no prior or concurrent transition instruction, and (d) a signed parent permission form allowing participation in the study. This study began with 20 participants. Nine participants were disqualified due to the following reasons: two because of excessive absenteeism, two for having previous SD instruction, three for data retrieval errors, and two for being concurrently enrolled in a regular education course that taught SD concepts.

Setting

SD instruction was conducted in a 28 x 17 ft high school classroom that contained 13 student desks, three file cabinets, one small table which holds a microwave and toaster oven, one refrigerator, one teacher desk, one kidney table, one teacher podium, and two 3 X 8 ft tables each of which holds three computers. The room was equipped with two
large white boards in the front of the room, sink and water fountain, closet, overhead projector, 13 Chromebooks, document camera, video camera, DVD player, and sound system.

**Dependent Variables and Response Measurement**

The dependent variables were SD scores of participants with disabilities and perceived usefulness of the VR curriculum. The measures in a pre/posttest design included two measurement tools: AIR Self-Determination Scale (Wolman et al., 1994) and a CBA, Appendix B. At the conclusion of the 10-lesson SD instruction, the first two sections of the AIR Self-Determination Scale were administered.

**AIR Self-Determination Scale (Wolman et al., 1994)**

The AIR scale consisted of self-reflection statements in which the participant rated him/herself on numerous variables as “Never, Almost Never, Sometimes, Almost Always, or Always”. The first section was entitled “Things I do”. This section included questions about their present levels of goal setting activity. An example question from this section was, “I set goals to get what I want or need. I think about what I am good at when I do this.” The second section is entitled “How I feel”. This section evaluated the student’s perceptions of their sense of SD ability in the areas of goal setting. A sample question from this section was, “I believe that I can set goals to get what I want.” Each rating was associated with a point value. The point values were tallied.

**Curriculum Based Assessment**

A Curriculum Based Assessment (CBA) measures the knowledge that the
participants have on concepts taught in the curriculum. The participants completed a CBA that assessed knowledge of specific lesson objectives taught from the curriculum. The pretest was administered prior to instruction and the posttest was administered within one week of the conclusion of the instruction of the 10 lessons. The CBA consisted of 15 questions, some requiring multiple answers. Points were assigned to each short answer question which required subjective interpretation. Total points on the pretest were compared to total points on the posttest. Percentage of increase/decrease was calculated by dividing the number of points received by the number possible, then subtracting the pretest percentage score from the posttest percentage score.

The tests were administered in the classroom where the participants were receiving the intervention. Pre and posttest scores were compared to assess the student’s SD growth in regards to the skills taught. The tests assessed the student’s ability to: (a) identify external and internal factors that motivate a person to go to work, (b) name personal motivators for work, (c) name personal strengths and how they transfer to the workplace, (d) identify employment options that match their interests and strengths, (e) write measurable employment goals, (f) name behaviors relative to hygiene and body language that promote success in the workplace, (g) create a resume, (h) complete an application, (i) identify methods to find job opening that match their interests or skill set, (j) name critical components to successful interviewing, (k) identify different communication styles, (l) identify common accommodations used in an employment setting, and (m) identify the pros and cons of disclosing a disability.
Experimental Design

This study used a one-group pretest posttest design (Martella, Nelson, Morgan, & Marchand-Martella, 2013, p. 157) to analyze student responses and to answer research questions 1 and 2. Posttest scores were compared to pretest scores to determine if differences existed. Pretest/posttest comparisons were made for both the AIR Self-Determination Scale and the CBA. No control group was configured because all participants needed to receive the SD instruction.

Procedures

Each student used a unique alpha-numeric identifier to code both pre and post test instruments. Pretests were given to assess prior knowledge of the questions to be researched and self-determination skills. Posttests were given after the last lesson to assess knowledge gain and increased SD scores and perceived effectiveness of the curriculum.

The VR transition curriculum was taught by a local VR counselor and her supervisor. The VR counselor was trained by the state transition VR counselor at a group training prior to the study. In addition to the training, a supervisor provided supervision to the VR counselor for 3 sessions. Participants of the training included VR transition counselors from the entire state and VR trainers.

Intervention Procedures

The VR transition counselor presented 35-45 min instructional lessons taken from the Job Club Workshop VR curriculum. Ten lessons were presented over a 10 week
period, Lessons contained materials that promoted SD. Participants were provided materials to complete assignments. Lessons included the following topics: (a) The value of work, (b) Why work?, (c) Career exploration, (d) My skills and goals, (e) Making a good impression, (f) Applications and resumes, (g) Searching for a job, (h) Understanding the interview (i) Work ethic, (j) ADA and staying motivated.

**Inter-Scorer Agreement**

The pre and posttests of the CBA were scored by the researcher. A second special educator, who had participated in the SD instruction, was trained as a data collector to score a randomly selected sample of 90.9% of student responses to questions. Inter-scorer agreements was obtained on each question by dividing scoring agreements by scoring agreements plus disagreements and multiplying by 100%. Inter-scorer agreement was 89.09%.

**Treatment Integrity**

Treatment integrity was examined by the researcher by the use of a checklist consisting the following yes/no questions:

1. Did the VR counselor state the learning objective at the beginning of the lesson?
2. Was the objective taught during the lesson time?
3. Did the participants have opportunities to ask questions?
4. Did the VR counselor provide a learning activity for the participants?

Observational data for treatment were collected on 62.6% of the training sessions by the researcher. For each treatment integrity session, the number of questions marked
as “yes” was divided by the total number of questions on the checklist. The results were multiplied by 100 to generate a percentage score. Treatment integrity, performed on 62.50% of total sessions, was 90.71%. All areas were above 80% except one, “reviewing the previous lesson”, which was at 75%.

**Data Analysis**

The AIR Self-Determination scale and CBA pretest and posttest scores were tallied. Individual pretest and posttest scores were compared to detect differences on each measure. The researcher calculated difference scores between the pretest and the posttest on both assessments.
CHAPTER V
RESULTS

Curriculum Based Assessment Results

Figure 1 presents SD scores on the pretests. The overall mean of the student’s scores on the pretest assessment was 52.55%, with a standard deviation of 22.52. After receiving SD instruction, the mean on the posttest was 74.55%, with a standard deviation of 15.04. There was an increase of 22 percentage points from the pre and posttest.

Variability due to previous experience in the workplace by participants was calculated. The pretest score mean for those with previous work experience and those without work experience were 55.2% and 48.67%, respectively, showing a 6.53 percentage point difference between the two groups and a standard deviation of 6.61 and 5.19 respectively. The CBA posttest mean of participants with previous work experience and no work experience were 80.8% and 69.33% respectively, showing a difference of 11.47 percentage points, and a standard deviation of 3.70 and 3.72 respectively. The overall percentage gains for participants with previous work experience and no work experience were 25.8% and 20.65% respectively, showing a difference of 5.15%.

Figure 2 displays the pretest and posttest data broken down by increase of scores on each individual question. Difference scores ranged from -2.78 % to 41.67%. Twelve of the 15 questions evidenced increases on the posttest. The participants showed the greatest improvement on the following four questions:
1. “Name 1 common accommodation in the workplace? (41.67%)
2. What are some concerns about disclosing a disability in the workplace? (41.67%)
3. When might it be important to disclose a disability in the workplace? (33.33%)

4. Name two ways you can find a job.” (33.33%)

   The following two questions showed the least improvement, “What are 3 questions that might be asked on a job application?” and “What is 1 thing that motivates YOU to go to work?”

**AIR Self-Determination Scale Results**

The researcher administered two sections of the AIR Self-Determination Scale. The first section evaluated the participant’s perception of their involvement in SD activities. The second section asked the participant to share their feelings about SD topics such as personal ability and goal setting.

The following data showed the following effects on the SD scores of the participants when excluding one outlier (L1). Figure 3 displays scores for section one, “Things I do”, showed a mean difference of -.022% from the pretest scores. Figure 4 presents scores for section two, “How I feel” showed a mean difference of -.46% from the pretest scores. When including the outlier (L1), the mean difference scores on Sections 1 and 2 were 2.83% and 1.47% respectively.

**Student Reflections**

To determine the effectiveness and future direction of the Job Club training, the researcher requested written feedback, Appendix C, by all participants at the conclusion of the CBA. The following lists include all of the feedback provided by participants.
The participants were asked what they enjoyed about the curriculum. The following are their responses:

The discussions were fun. How engaged the teacher was and how the teacher used examples to help explain. The activities. Some activities and the communication we had. Everyone was willing to lesson (sic) and we worked together.

The participants were asked to indicate the things that they didn’t like about the curriculum. The following are their responses:

Add a few college things. How to explain and go in depth of what your interests are. I wanna learn what I wanna do. I didn’t like the Powerpoints and the workbook was busy work. How to be more efficient at getting a job. How to not be so awkward and anti-social or nervous to apply for a job. More about what you do after you get the job and how to do my job with my disability.
CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of a curriculum taught by a VR transition counselor on SD scores and its perceived usefulness. The researcher found that although the participants showed progress on the CBA, the AIR Self-Determination Scale did not show a positive impact in self-determination skills. It is noteworthy that the CBA scores for those with current/previous employment were similar to those with no employment experience on the pretest, however the posttest scores of those with current/previous employment slightly exceeded those with no employment experience as shown in Table 1, Appendix A. This could be due to the opportunity of the participants with employment to apply the concepts they learned during the course. Future research should explore the impact of providing additional real-life application of the concepts learned in the Job Club curriculum on SD.

Although the SD scores showed a negative increase, this could be attributed to participants having a better understanding of what they needed to do to be more self-determined and therefore scored themselves more accurately on the posttest. Figure 5 shows the greatest increase in SD occurred on the questions that indicated the participants liked to begin their plans, check on their progress, and adjust if needed. The least increase in SD occurred in the areas of knowing what they are good at, and how to set personal goals. This may correlate with the CBA results which showed lower increases in the areas of knowing how to set a goal and identifying external motivators for work.
The lack of increased SD scores may be attributed to the fact that AIR Self-Determination Scale is not entirely sensitive to changes in one’s knowledge as taught in this curriculum. It should also be noted that there are no employment questions on the AIR Self-Determination Scale. It is recommended that future research be conducted on SD instruments relating to career vision, exploration, and vocational plans. Measurement on SD requires understanding the context within situations requiring SD behavior.

The participants’ reflections indicated that although the curriculum was helpful, they wanted to apply the concepts learned to their own situations. The SD scores suggested participants needed more practice applying the concepts taught before their SD skills increased.

The following are this researcher’s recommendations to the Job Club curriculum that may result in increased SD in participants with disabilities.

1. Advocating for accommodations in the workplace: Have participants identify their current IDEA accommodations and determine those accommodations are necessary in the workplace and whether they are covered under the American with Disabilities Act (ADA).

2. Interviewing and disability disclosure: Participants could benefit from extra role-playing opportunities in the areas of interview skills and disability disclosure. These opportunities could be over two or three sessions. Participants could write down their sample responses, practice responses independently, role-play with a peer, role-play in front of class, and participate in a mock interview with an employer.

3. Identifying personal strengths, interests, and career goals: Extra sessions could be added to allow participants to use online interest inventories to help guide them
towards potential careers. Once a participant has chosen a career, time should be spent on writing a measurable short term and long-term career goal under the guidance of the VR counselor.

4. Resumes and job applications: Participants indicated that they would prefer shorter instruction on these topics and more time to practice these concepts with the support of the VR counselor.

5. Letters of reference: It is recommended that participants learn SD skills by being required to ask for letters of recommendation, follow up to obtain the letters, and write thank you notes for the letters. Asking for a letter of recommendation requires a great deal of SD, and yields a very positive outcome in most situations. The participants can gain increased confidence upon reading the positive traits others see in them and assist them in recognizing how their efforts at school and in the workplace are taken note of, and may affect the willingness of others to help them obtain their career goals.

6. Differentiating instruction: It is recommended that the counselor differentiate instruction by paying attention to the pretest data on certain items to create ability groups, naming teacher assistants, sending students out on assignments, etc. This provides an opportunity to individualize the curriculum and make it more relevant to the student.

Many school districts have limited resources and are not able to devote 10 weeks of their curriculum to a VR counselor. It is recommended that research be conducted on the effectiveness of incorporating lessons from the Job Club curriculum into an English curriculum that is team taught by the special education teacher and VR counselor.
English coursework generally includes reading, researching, and writing for various purposes. The participant reading material and researching activities could be employment related. Writing skills curriculum could be incorporated in the reporting of findings about various employment subjects. Increased participant learning is likely by using the teaching expertise of the special education teacher and the content knowledge of the VR counselor.

Four limitations to this research are noteworthy. First, the duration of the study was short. Future research should be based on longer periods of greater content. Second, generalization of effects of SD were not assessed. Future research should be conducted to show generalization on long term effects of the VR self-determination curriculum. Third, this study involved a small sample size. Research should be conducted with increased sample size to facilitate generalization of effects. Lastly, the AIR Self-Determination Scale may not have been sensitive to the self-determination skills researched. Other measurement tools should be explored in future research. Future research should also examine the effectiveness of the training that VR counselors receive prior to teaching the SD curriculum.

Implications of this study include the expansion of the program to be delivered by all VR counselors with transition caseloads in school districts state-wide. Implications may also include the efficacy of after-school “Job Club” training that includes SD training and its positive effects on transition-aged students. Lastly, weekly interaction through the Job Club curriculum may increase motivation for transition-aged students to apply for VR services due to relationships built with the VR counselor during the instruction sessions.


Plotner, A., Trach, J., & Shogren, K. (2012, June). Identifying a transition competency domain structure: assisting transition planning teams to understand roles and
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Appendix A

Tables and Figures
Table 1

*Means, Gain Scores, and Standard Deviations for Students With/Without Employment Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Pretest Stdev</th>
<th>Posttest Stdev</th>
<th>Gain Score Mean</th>
<th>Percentage Increase Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Experience</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>20.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>80.81</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Comparison of pretest and posttest scores answered correctly on a CBA.
Figure 2. Comparison of pretest and posttest mean gains from least to most by individual concept.
Figure 3. Comparison of pretest and posttest scores in section one of the AIR Self-Determination Scale.
Figure 4. Comparison of pretest and posttest scores in section two of the AIR Self-Determination Scale.
Figure 5. Percentage of increase/decrease of total student responses on Sections 1 and 2 of the AIR Self-Determination Scale.
Appendix B

Job Club Workshop: Curriculum-Based Assessment
Job Club Workshop: Curriculum-Based Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification Number</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Name 1 EXTERNAL motivation to go to work:

2. Name 1 INTERNAL motivation to go to work:

3. What is 1 thing that motivates YOU to go to work:

4. Name 2 employment options that match your interests and strengths:
   a. 
   b.

5. Write 1 personal employment goal that can be measured (something can be measured by how long you do it, how many times you do it, or if you accomplish it by a certain time).

6. Name 3 important hygiene or body language behaviors to be successful in the workplace.
   a. 
   b. 
   c.

7. Name any 2 parts of a resume
   a. 
   b.

8. What are 3 questions that might be asked on a job application?
   a. 
   b. 
   c.

9. Name 2 ways that you can find a job
   a. 
   b.

10. Name 2 things you **should do** to have a successful interview.
    a. 
    b.
11. Name 2 things that you **should never do** in an interview
   a.
   b.

12. Identify 2 different ways people communicate
   a.
   b.

13. Name 1 common accommodation in the workplace

14. When might it be important to disclose a disability in the workplace?

15. Name one concern about disclosing a disability in the workplace?
Appendix C

Post Assessment Questions
Post Assessment Questions
(leave blank when taking the preassessment)

1. Name two things you liked about the lessons.

2. Name two things that you didn’t like about the lessons.

3. What else would you like to learn about as it relates to career readiness?

4. How likely are you to apply for VR (Vocational Rehabilitation) services?
   Very Likely_____ Possibly _____ Not Likely_____

AIR Self-Determination Scale