

A Counselor's Guide to Career Assessment Instruments

2nd Edition

Edited by

Jerome T. Kapes
Marjorie Moran Mastie

12N



National Career Development Association

A COUNSELOR'S GUIDE TO CAREER ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

Second Edition

EDITED BY:

Jerome T. Kapes

Texas A & M University

and

Marjorie Moran Mastie

Washtenaw Intermediate School District, Michigan

The National Career Development Association
1988

A Publication of The National Career Development Association

Copyright 1988 by The National Career Development Association, A Division of
The American Association for Counseling and Development

ISBN 1-55620-040-4 (hardcover) 1-55620-050-1 (softcover)

Copies may be ordered from

Publication Sales

The American Association for Counseling and Development

5999 Stevenson Avenue

Alexandria, Virginia 22041

(Order 72212 hardcover; 72204 paper cover)

About the Editors

Jerome T. Kapes is Professor of Vocational Education and Educational Psychology at Texas A&M University where he teaches courses in vocational guidance, measurement, evaluation and research. His professional experience includes faculty positions at Penn State and Lehigh University before coming to Texas A&M in 1978. He is a graduate of Penn State with a B.S. and Ph.D. in Vocational-Industrial Education and M.Ed. in Counselor Education. Dr. Kapes has been a member of AACD (APGA) since 1967 with divisional membership in NCDA and AMECD. He is a Nationally Certified Counselor (NCC) and a Nationally Certified Career Counselor (NCCC). Additionally he holds membership in the American Vocational Association (AVA), the American Educational Research Association (AERA), the American Vocational Education Research Association (AVERA), and the National Association for Industrial and Technical Teacher Educators (NAITTE). He is an author or co-author of over 50 articles, books and monographs, and has presented papers at over 40 national and state professional association meetings. Much of his research and publication activity has been in the area of career development and related measurement topics.

Marjorie M. Mastie is the Consultant in Measurements and Guidance at Washtenaw Intermediate School District in Ann Arbor, Michigan. Her extensive experience in career guidance measurement has included positions as Assistant to the Director at the National Assessment of Educational Progress, in which she guided the preparations for NAEP's Career and Occupational Development Assessment; as developer of Michigan's Career Development Assessment; and as a nationally recognized consultant in assessment and career guidance. She has taught at both Eastern Michigan University and The University of Michigan, from which she holds a B.A. and M.A. and is a candidate for the Ph.D. in Guidance and Counseling with specialization in the measurement of career development. A member of AACD since 1961, AVA and AERA, Mrs. Mastie is President of Michigan CDA and has been a Presidential candidate, Trustee, and Newsletter Editor of NCDA, Secretary of AMECD, and a Director of NCME. She is author or co-author of five books and dozens of chapters and articles focusing on vocational assessment, assessment as a counseling tool, and appropriate uses of measurement in career guidance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Even though in tackling this second edition of the *Counselor's Guide*, the editors benefited from the experiences gained from the first edition, the task was no less demanding. As editors we want our readers to know about the many individuals who worked with us and in other ways made the project possible.

Those closest to the project were members of our advisory committee, whose continuous efforts are described in Chapter I. Several of these individuals were with us for the first edition and unselfishly agreed to serve again even with the knowledge of the work involved. These faithful colleagues include Chris Borman, Dave Jepsen, Dale Prediger and Bert Westbrook. Joining the group were George Grisdale, Joe Kandor and Frank Womer from AMECD and Karl Botterbusch, Linda Parrish and Michael Peterson who were particularly helpful with the special populations sections.

The most important staff function was carried out by the project assistant, Nanciann Frazier, who completed her Master's Degree in Counseling at Texas A&M University while working 50% time on the *Counselor's Guide*. She was responsible for production and mailing of all forms and correspondence, much of the library research that went into discovering instruments and reviews and the extensive chapter of brief descriptions of additional instruments. If anyone was indispensable to the project it was Nanciann. A second staff person who contributed from the central office was Niel Carey, NCDA Executive Director. Niel handled all matters requiring NCDA input and regularly communicated with both editors offering advice and support. A third staff position which we requested and received from NCDA was our Production Editor, Ed Whitfield. Ed was responsible for the production editing for the first edition as Chair of the Publications Committee and graciously consented to convert our many pieces of manuscripts into a polished finished product. Other members of NCDA who supported the project in many ways associated with their roles included three consecutive presidents, Sunny Hansen, Linda Pfister, and Duane Brown; Media Committee Chair, Roger Aubrey, and NCDA Trustee, Dennis Engels. Also important to the creation of the *Counselor's Guide* were the Buros Institute and especially James Mitchell, Director, and the Test Corporation of America in the persons of Clark Smith, Chief Executive Officer, and Jane Guthrie, Senior Editor.

The institutions that employ us have also provided much support. At Texas A&M we are especially indebted to Daniel Householder, Head of the Department of Industrial, Vocational and Technical Education, where the project was housed, and Michael Ash, Head of the Department of Educational Psychology. Departmental secretaries Sally Leshner, who handled our bookkeeping and Carla Heinchen who typed much of our correspondence have also helped greatly. Also, Educational Psychology graduate students Timothy Vansickle and Charlotte Kimmel donated much time to the project with nothing in return but good experiences.

At Wastenaw Intermediate School District we are grateful to Michael Emlaw, Superintendent, and John Bowen, Deputy Superintendent, for their support of the project, and to several secretaries in the Instruction Department for their assistance.

There were, of course, many others who contributed and without whom there would be no *Counselor's Guide*. These include the many reviewers, authors and publishers who contributed directly by writing reviews, chapters or other sections of the *Guide*. While they have the pleasure of an important job well done, our readers may want to thank them directly when the occasion arises.

While so many have given so much to make this second edition of the *Counselor's Guide* a reality, we are particularly grateful to our families from whom we borrowed the time to devote to this task. To Evelyn, Becky, David, Scott, Lynn and Andy, we dedicate this book and promise to be home in time for supper.

JTK
MMM

Preface

When *A Counselor's Guide to Vocational Guidance Instruments* was first published in 1982, the Board of Directors of the National Vocational Guidance Association (NVGA) and the editors, Jerome Kapes and Marjorie Mastie, believed the handbook would be an invaluable tool to counselors in a wide range of settings. They were right—as has been evidenced by the large number of copies distributed since that time.

The needs met by this demand, as well as the changes that have occurred in assessment practices, led to the decision to publish a second edition. The astute observer will notice that the names of both the publisher and the volume are different. NVGA has become the National Career Development Association (NCDA) and the publication has been retitled *A Counselor's Guide to Career Assessment Instruments*. These are not the only differences; this edition has been expanded to include new instruments and additional text material.

The NCDA Board deeply appreciates the willingness and enthusiasm (and hard work) that Jerome Kapes and Marjorie Mastie have exerted to make this second edition a reality. Our thanks also to the many individuals who contributed as authors and reviewers.

Linda A. Pfister, Past President
Duane Brown, President
National Career Development Association

Table of Contents

	Page
Preface	xi
<i>Linda A. Pfister and Duane Brown</i>	
I. THE COUNSELOR'S GUIDE: WHY, WHAT AND HOW	1
<i>Jerome T. Kapes and Marjorie M. Mastie</i>	
II. THE COUNSELOR'S ROLE IN CAREER ASSESSMENT	13
<i>Edwin L. Herr</i>	
III. SELECTING AN INSTRUMENT: CHORE OR CHALLENGE?	25
<i>Frank B. Womer</i>	
IV. INTERPRETATION OF PSYCHOMETRIC INSTRUMENTS IN CAREER COUNSELING	37
<i>Howard E.A. Tinsley and Richard W. Bradley</i>	
V. TESTING COMPETENCIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES: A CHECKLIST FOR COUNSELORS	47
<i>Dale J. Prediger and Nancy Garfield</i>	
VI. MAJOR CAREER ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS: DESCRIPTIONS AND REVIEWS OF FORTY-THREE INSTRUMENTS	55
MULTIPLE APTITUDE BATTERIES	57
Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery	58
<i>Arthur R. Jensen, reviewer</i>	
Differential Aptitude Tests	63
<i>Maria Pennock-Román, reviewer</i>	
USES General Aptitude Test Battery	69
<i>J. Ward Keesling and Charles C. Healy, reviewers</i>	
INTEREST INVENTORIES	75
Career Assessment Inventory-The Enhanced Version	76
<i>Sheridan P. McCabe, reviewer</i>	
Career Occupational Preference System	81
<i>Robert H. Bauernfeind, reviewer</i>	

Harrington-O'Shea Career Decision-Making System	86
<i>Robert C. Droege, reviewer</i>	
Interest Determination, Exploration and Assessment System	91
<i>M. O'Neal Weeks, reviewer</i>	
Jackson Vocational Interest Survey	95
<i>Charles O. Davidshofer, reviewer</i>	
Kuder General Interest Survey—Form E	100
<i>Jole A. Williams and John Delane Williams, reviewers</i>	
Kuder Occupational Interest Survey—Form DD	105
<i>David A. Jepsen, reviewer</i>	
Ohio Vocational Interest Survey—Second Edition	110
<i>John O. Crites, reviewer</i>	
Self-Directed Search	116
<i>N. Jo Campbell, reviewer</i>	
Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory	121
<i>Fred H. Borgen, reviewer</i>	
USES Interest Inventory	127
<i>Brian Bolton, reviewer</i>	
Vocational Interest, Experience and Skill Assessment	132
<i>William A. Mehrens, reviewer</i>	
Vocational Interest Inventory	137
<i>John D. Krumboltz, reviewer</i>	
MEASURES OF WORK VALUES	143
Minnesota Importance Questionnaire	144
<i>Philip G. Benson, reviewer</i>	
Salience Inventory	150
<i>Donald G. Zytowski, reviewer</i>	
Values Scale	155
<i>Lenore W. Harmon, reviewer</i>	
CAREER DEVELOPMENT/MATURITY INSTRUMENTS ..	159
Adult Career Concerns Inventory	160
<i>Edwin L. Herr and Spenser G. Niles, reviewers</i>	
Assessment of Career Decision Making	165
<i>Dale J. Prediger, reviewer</i>	
Career Decision Scale	170
<i>Robert B. Slaney, reviewer</i>	
Career Development Inventory	175
<i>Don C. Locke, reviewer</i>	
Career Maturity Inventory	180
<i>Robert B. Frary, reviewer</i>	
My Vocational Situation	186
<i>Bert W. Westbrook, reviewer</i>	

COMBINED ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS	191
ACT Career Planning Program	192
<i>Alan G. Robertson, reviewer</i>	
Apticom	198
<i>Karl F. Botterbusch, reviewer</i>	
Career Survey	203
<i>Christopher Borman, reviewer</i>	
Occupational Aptitude Survey and Interest Schedule	208
<i>Rory Remer, reviewer</i>	
Planning Career Goals	213
<i>Dean Nafziger, reviewer</i>	
System for Assessment and Group Evaluation/Compute-A-Match	218
<i>Regis J. Jacobs and Bernard A. Gucwa, reviewers</i>	
World of Work Inventory	223
<i>Wilbur L. Layton, reviewer</i>	
PERSONALITY MEASURES	227
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	228
<i>Carl G. Willis and Tom L. Ham, reviewers</i>	
Personal Skills Map	234
<i>Roger D. Carlson, reviewer</i>	
Sixteen PF Personal Career Development Profile	238
<i>Brent E. Wholeben, reviewer</i>	
Temperament and Values Inventory	243
<i>Kenneth G. Wheeler, reviewer</i>	
INSTRUMENTS FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS	248
Career Evaluation Systems	249
<i>Randall S. McDaniel and Renée Middleton, reviewers</i>	
McCarron-Dial Evaluation System	254
<i>Michael Peterson, reviewer</i>	
Pictorial Inventory of Careers	260
<i>Linda H. Parrish and Patricia S. Lynch, reviewers</i>	
Program for Assessing Youth Employment Skills	265
<i>J. Paul Tonetti, reviewer</i>	
Reading-Free Vocational Interest Inventory—Revised	270
<i>George Domino, reviewer</i>	
Social and Prevocational Information Battery—Revised	275
<i>Randall M. Parker, reviewer</i>	
Valpar-17—Pre-Vocational Readiness Battery	280
<i>John R. Nicholson, reviewer</i>	
VII. ADDITIONAL CAREER ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS	285
<i>Nanciann Frazier</i>	

APPENDIX A: Sources of Information About Tests and Testing 313
Robert P. Jordan and David A. Jepsen
APPENDIX B: Addresses of Publishers 325
APPENDIX C: User’s Matrix 331
Edwin A. Whitfield, Jerome T. Kapes and Marjorie M. Mastie
Index 347

the responses. The survey has a forced-choice triad format and is partially ipsative in character. The limited sense in which it is ipsative is that some triads are scored for more than one scale.

The Kuder General Interest Survey has evolved from a series of Kuder vocational interest inventories published over a period of more than forty years. Its various forms, versions, and editions may be regarded as a family of related instruments that approach the measurement of interests from different perspectives and are designed for somewhat different purposes. Data from each part of the long series of experimental and published inventories became part of the foundation for later inventories. The earliest and the best known of these inventories is the Kuder Vocational Preference Record.

The KGIS, a revision and downward extension of the Kuder Vocational Preference Record, was developed in response to a need for an instrument to tap the measurable interests of young people, particularly at the junior high level. Designed for grades 6-12 it employs simpler language and an easier vocabulary than the earlier form, and requires comprehension of only a sixth-grade vocabulary.

ADMINISTRATION AND SCORING

The survey can be administered on a group or classroom basis. Although it is untimed, the manual (Kuder, 1975) indicates that students generally complete the Kuder in 45–60 minutes. A classroom teacher can administer the test, and no specialized skills are required, although familiarity with the manual would be helpful. Form E has both a hand-scorable and a machine-scorable version. The directions for the two versions differ slightly, principally because the hand-scorable version uses pins and corrugated paper. One possible area of difficulty with this version is the changing of answers, which is more cumbersome with pins than pencils and erasers. Students are told that if they want to change an answer, they must punch two more holes as close as possible to the undesired answer, then punch the new answer in the usual way. The novel use of the pin and difficulty of instructions might intimidate a sixth-grader (if not an adult), resulting in several unchanged, but inaccurate, answers.

Another problem area can be the hand-scoring process when scoring amounts to counting the number of circles with pin pricks through them, not including those with three pin pricks (changes). While this process is fairly routine, it may be too much of a challenge for younger examinees. Where it is financially feasible the machine-scoring version would seem to be preferable.

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

The studies reported in the manual are those done by the research staff. In all, they tested 9,819 students in grades 6-12, reporting information by socioeconomic level, region, and sex. Test-retest correlations are separately recorded for grades 6-8 and 9-12, together with means and standard deviations by sex. Although all (except one) test-retest reliabilities for the ten subscales are equal to or greater than .70, generally the older students achieved somewhat higher reliabilities. The Persuasive Scale may be somewhat problematical for younger students, showing test-retest reliabilities of .69 and .73 respectively for boys

and girls in grades 6–8 on a six-week retesting. The Kuder Richardson 20 (KR 20) internal consistency reliabilities in grades 6–8 were between .72 and .89 for boys and .76 and .90 for girls. For grades 9–12, KR 20 reliabilities were between .86 and .92 for boys and between .80 and .90 for girls. Also reported are grade-by-grade reliabilities on each scale.

In general, the manual is very complete regarding reliability data. However, the very completeness might seem confusing to a person unaccustomed to evaluating reliabilities that are reported variously for four-week, six-week and four-year intervals. This poses no problem for sophisticated users, but may be confusing to beginning counselors. However, of more concern is that the manual does not have a separate section on validity. While the manual reports studies that clearly fall under this rubric, users looking for a specific section on validity will not find it. Problems concerning validity have also been addressed by earlier reviewers of other versions of the Kuder (Arnold, 1959; Layton, 1965). Additional validity concern of a middle class bias has been voiced by Husek (1965) and Kirk (1971). Because most students who take this survey are years away from an actual entry into a career, predictive validity is harder to assess; the other forms of the survey (Forms B and C) have shown some degree of acceptable validation, and by influence, Form E *should* also show validity. This does point to an area for longitudinal research regarding interests and occupational choices of adults in a comparison with their much earlier measured interests. Such research would best be explicatory if it were truly longitudinal and open ended; career choices would seem to be much more likely a continuous process in adulthood rather than a single event.

A BROADER CONCERN

If one conceptualizes future occupational success as a combination of interest, ability, and opportunity, it is clear that many measures of the first two constructs exist and that the Kuder is among the most respected among measures of interest. In addition, many different types of measures exist to measure many different aspects of ability. But careers cannot be made out of interest and ability alone if opportunities do not exist. Put another way, for those specifically looking for a measure of interest, the Kuder is definitely an acceptable measure. But interest is only one prong in the triumvirate of interest-ability-opportunity. Perhaps the most important prong, opportunity, has generated the least psychometric interest. That this would be so is not surprising. Opportunity is by far the hardest construct to define, but those who deal in career counseling should not ignore it, regardless of the difficulty of measurement and definition.

Even though the Kuder General Interest Survey most typically would be used by school counselors and classroom teachers working with students in grades 6–12, very little research has been done on the KGIS. Studies looking at its use with a variety of populations would seem to be most necessary. Some potential new applications might be (a) successful use with the developmentally disabled population—clients with mild to moderate levels of retardation—because of the simple language and easy vocabulary; and (b) use in rehabilitation counseling—usually with clients who have experienced change in physical and/or mental functioning—and are in need of thorough exploration of interests to reassess what is of interest to them in relation to their current capability.

REFERENCES

- Arnold, D. L. (1959). Review of Kuder Preference Record—Personal. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), *The Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook*. Highland Park, NJ: The Gryphon Press.
- Harmon, L. W. (1978). Review of Kuder Preference Record—Vocational. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), *The Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook*. Highland Park, NJ: The Gryphon Press.
- Husek, T. R. (1965). Kuder General Interest Survey, Form E. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 2, 231–233.
- Kirk, B. A. (1971). A Review of the Kuder General Interest Survey. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), *Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook* (p. 1024). Highland Park, NJ: Gryphon Press.
- Kuder, G. F. (1975). *General Interest Survey (Form E)—Manual*. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Layton, W. L. (1965). Kuder Preference Record—Personal. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), *The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook*. Highland Park, NJ: The Gryphon Press.

NOTE: Significant portions of this review were abridged from the author's original review in Volume II of *Test Critiques* with permission of Test Corporation of America.

Kuder Occupational Interest Survey, Form DD (KOIS)

G. Frederic Kuder

Science Research Associates, Inc.
155 N. Wacker Drive, Chicago, IL 60606

Target Population: Students (from grade 10 through college) and adults (all ages).

Statement of the Purpose of the Instrument: Measurement of occupational and college major interests, for use in counseling and occupational exploration.

Titles of Subtests, Scales, Scores Provided: 104 occupational scales, 39 college-major scales, 10 vocational interest estimates, and eight experimental scales. Scores on all scales reported, regardless of norm group, sex.

Forms and Levels Available, with Dates of Publication/Revision of Each: Form DD. Copyright 1956 with revision in 1964 and 1985.

Date of Most Recent Edition of Test Manual, User's Guide, Etc.: 1979 for General Manual, 1985 for Manual Supplement.

Language in Which Available: English only.

Time: Actual Test Time—approx 30 minutes.
Total Administration Time—approx 40 minutes.

Norm Group(s) on Which Scores Are Based: Men and women in specific occupational and college-major criterion groups.

Manner in Which Results are Reported for Individuals

Types of Scores: Lambda correlations and percentile ranks, verification scale score.

Report Format/Content

Basic Service: Semi-narrative report form (2 copies) contains lists of occupations and college majors ranked by degree of similarity to criterion groups (ranking of vocational interests areas); interpretive information presented on reverse side of report form.

Options: Audiocassette for interpretation.

Report Format/Content for Group Summaries: Not available.

Scoring

Machine Scoring Service

Cost of basic service per counselee: \$3.50 (1986 price) (Package of 20 = \$70.00; price includes materials).

Cost of options: Audio cassette—\$15.95 (1986 price).

Time required for scoring and returning (maximum): 48 hours excluding mail time.

Hand Scoring: Not available.

Local Machine Scoring: Not available.

Computer Software Options Available: Not available.

Cost of Materials: (1986 prices).

Specimen Set: \$6.50 (includes one complimentary survey and scoring/reporting).

Counselee Materials: \$70 for 20 counselees (price includes scoring) Consumable machine-scored answer sheet.

Additional Comments of Interest to Users: Additional scales and revision of manual due by end of 1988. FastFax about occupations and college majors reported in KOIS due in 1988.

Published Reviews

Brown, F. G. (1982). Kuder Occupational Interest Survey, Form DD. In J. T. Kapes & M. M. Mastie (Eds.), *A Counselor's Guide to Vocational Guidance Instruments* (pp. 77–80). Falls Church, VA: National Vocational Guidance Association.

Brown, F. G. (1971). Kuder Occupational Interest Survey, Form DD. *Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance*, 4, 122–125.

Dolliver, R. H. (1972). In O. K. Buros (Ed.), *Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook, Vol. II*. Highland Park, NJ: Gryphon Press.

Hunt, T. (1984). Review of the *Kuder Occupational Interest Survey, Form DD*. In D. J. Keyser & R. C. Sweetland (Eds.), *Test Critiques: Volume I* (pp. 406–410). Kansas City, MO: Test Corporation of America.

Jepsen, D. P. (1985). Kuder Occupational Interest Survey, Form DD. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 17(4), 217–219.

Stahmann, R. F. (1971). Kuder Occupational Interest Survey, Form DD. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 18, 191–192.

Reviewed By

David A. Jepsen

**Professor, Division of Counselor Education
The University of Iowa**

The Kuder Occupational Interest Survey, (KOIS) Form DD, is designed for use with high school and college students for two purposes: (a) to help identify occupational options consistent with a student's interest patterns, and (b) to help this student choose occupations for exploration or commitment to entry. Students mark their most preferred and least preferred activity for each of 100 triads written in sixth grade reading vocabulary.

The *General Manual* (Kuder & Diamond, 1979) includes clear descriptions of the rationale for using an interest inventory, interest measurement innovations introduced in the KOIS, and score interpretation procedures. The book, *Activity Interests and Occupational Choice* (Kuder, 1977) and Kuder's earlier article stating his principles of interest measurement (Kuder, 1970) are helpful supplements because they delineate the rationale for KOIS construction and score interpretation. There are disappointingly few technical data included in the *General Manual* and *Manual Supplement* (Zytowski, 1985) considering the 30-year history of the item pool and the 20 years since Form DD was released.

NORMS AND SCORES

The 1985 revision of the KOIS Report Form is divided into four sections, each designed to explain, in plain language, one of the four different types of scales: Dependability, Vocational Interest Estimates (VIE), the College Major scales, and the Occupational scales.

Dependability of the scale scores is reported to the student in a narrative statement which is based on Verification scores, frequency of unreadable responses, and magnitude of the highest ranking College Major or Occupational scale score. Scores on ten VIE scales added to the 1985 KOIS Report Form are reported as percentile ranks compared with both male and female groups. Since KOIS items are derived from the early Kuder forms, it is theoretically possible to score KOIS items for the same scales, e.g., Persuasion, Outdoor, Mechanical. Scores on the College Major and Occupational scales are reported in rank order on male and female norms for 39 College Major scales and 104 Occupational scales. The numerical score is a Lambda coefficient representing the degree to which the student's responses are similar to the responses of each criterion group. Scores on all scales regardless of norm group gender are reported for all inventory takers. Thirty-nine occupational scales and 17 college major scales were developed on women subjects.

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

The reliability data are, appropriately, of the test-retest type covering the consistency of VIE, College Major, and Occupational profiles and consistency of differences between scale pairs for the latter two profiles. The VIE scales are quite short, and this may explain the modest test-retest reliabilities which range from .70 to .84. The data reported for the College Major and Occupational scale scores support claims for score consistency, but there are serious gaps. A few small samples were used and only four occupational scales were involved in studying the consistency of scale differences. Kuder's rationale for evaluating interests represents an important advancement. The comparison of a student's interest pattern to those of various college major and occupational groups (without using a general reference group) has improved the differentiation among occupational groups over previous inventories. The primary form of validity reported is that of concurrent validity. Groups of 100 persons each representing only 30 of the 143 College Major and Occupational scales were selected for study. The 30 were selected as most representative of "fields for which OIS scores are reported" (Kuder & Diamond, 1979 p. 29) rather than any reference to the general occupational structure. Consequently, the concurrent validity reported, substantial though it may be, must be considered selective.

The predictive validity data reported, most of which are supportive, use as criteria occupational *membership* rather than occupational *satisfaction*. Clearly the KOIS rests its case for validity largely on concurrent associations between scores and group memberships (Kuder & Diamond, 1979) and predictive associations with later occupational entry but *not* satisfaction (Zytowski, 1976). Despite its many advantages, the Kuder will have limited value in helping students choose occupations on the basis of satisfying outcomes until supporting predictive validity data are forthcoming.