

Report on the Canadian Career Counsellor Education Survey

Sharon Kalbfleisch and Rebecca Burwell

Abstract

In Canada, as in most other countries, there is currently no clear educational model that outlines how one can enter into or progress within the field of career development. Yet having such a model could lead to a stronger professional identity and to greater consistency and quality in the services that clients receive. Understanding how career practitioners have come to enter and progress within the field to date is one step towards designing such an educational model. Using a nationwide, web-based survey, the authors surveyed career practitioners to determine: their educational background; how closely they identify with the field of career development; how they perceive the importance of specific skill and knowledge areas related to the field of career development; how they rate their level of ability within these same skill and knowledge areas; and, to what extent employers in the field seek out and encourage career development specific education. Survey results and implications for the career development community are discussed.

This article provides a summary of the results of a nationwide, web-based survey of career practitioners carried out in April/May of 2006. The survey was conducted as Phase II of the research project "The Advancement of Career Counsellor Education in Canada", whose overarching purpose is to begin a process to develop a collective vision of Canadian career counselling/career development education for the future. This research project is funded by the Canadian Education and Research Institute for Counselling (CERIC).

The survey was conducted specifically to:

- identify career paths leading to, and progression within, the field of career development, including the

educational backgrounds of career practitioners;

- understand with what field career practitioners identify professionally (for example, career development, social work, adult education), and what job titles they utilize (for example, career counsellor, career navigator, employment specialist);
- determine how career practitioners perceive the importance of specific skill and knowledge areas relevant to the practice of career counselling/career development, and their perceived ability within these same skill and knowledge areas;
- learn to what extent employers within the field support career development specific education; and,
- provide data to support discussions at a think tank session of career practitioner educators being held in October, 2006, as Phase III of the aforementioned research project.

The survey was administered online by the University of Waterloo Survey Research Centre in April and May 2006 using a questionnaire available in French and English. In order to solicit career practitioners to complete the survey, provincial and national associations within the field of career development were contacted with a request to help disseminate the survey. Those that agreed to inform their members of the survey are listed in Appendix A. Career practitioners were also informed of the survey through the web sites and bulletins of Contact Point and OrientAction.

The survey was completed by 1,180 individuals, 91% of whom were working in the field of career development. Key statistics and demographics of the sample appear in Appendix B. The regional distribution of the sample is relatively representative of the nation (refer to Table B3 in Appendix B),

though the Territories were insufficiently represented to be included in the regional analysis. There was also low representation in some employment sectors, and therefore, in order to conduct the analysis, the corporate and private sectors were combined, as were the two non-profit sectors.

The survey findings have been organized thematically into four areas:

- Practitioners' Backgrounds
- Professional Identity
- Practitioners' Skills and Knowledge
- Employers' Perspective of Career Practitioner Education

The presentation of survey findings is followed by a discussion of implications for the career development community.

Practitioners' Backgrounds

Gender, Entry into Field, Age, Educational Background, and Years Experience in the Field

Gender

The ratio of women to men in the sample was 4:1 (refer to Table B-1 in Appendix B). This ratio remained consistent by region, city size, and employment sector. Women and men in the sample also did not differ significantly in terms of educational aspirations, primary job functions, or skills self-assessment.

Entry into Field

Respondents were asked, "How did you come to enter the field of career development?" Responses to this question were varied and, while they were not quantifiable, the majority of respondents indicated that they had entered the field by one of two paths. Either they had entered the field by accident (for example, "I am employed by a municipal office which won HRSDC contracts to provide employment support servic-

es”), or had entered it through a related profession (for example, “I started out teaching life skills, then moved into employment counselling”). Very few indicated an intentional decision to enter the field.

Following up on this line of inquiry, respondents were asked: “Did you make a career change into the field of career development? In other words, have you worked previously in another field?” Seventy percent of the sample stated that they had made a career change into the field (refer to Table I-1). It appears that career development work tends not to be an identifiable career option early in life. This is not unexpected given that there are so few early academic entry points into the profession, with the exception of Quebec.

Those respondents who had made a change into the field of career development were asked to indicate from which field they had entered (refer to Table I-2). Forty-seven percent of these respondents stated that they came from a closely related field (counselling, social work, human resources, or teaching), while 53% indicated they had come from a less related field (for example, business, health care, or journalism).

Respondents from Quebec answered these questions quite differently. When asked how they came to enter the field of career development, the majority indicated that it was their desire to help others that led them to the field. Respondents from Quebec were far less likely to have made a career change into the field of career development than respondents from any other region (refer to Table I-1). This is likely due to the availability of undergraduate programs within the field, allowing students to make an earlier decision to enter the profession.

Age

The average age of respondents was 43 (refer to Table I-3). This is significantly higher than the average age of workers in Canada, which is 39 ($t=14.1, p<.001$). Only 12% of those in the field are under age 30, 30% are aged 31 to 40, and 58%, a clear majority, are over 40 (refer to Table B-2 in Appendix B).

The average age is lower for

respondents from Quebec (refer to Table I-3), with a significantly higher percentage of respondents in the age 35 and under category, and a smaller percentage in the over 55 category. Again, this is likely attributable to the existence of undergraduate programs in Quebec that make it possible for students to enter the field at a younger age.

Educational Background

Overall, the education level of career practitioners is high. Forty-six percent had completed a certificate or diploma, 83% had completed an undergraduate degree, and 45% had completed a graduate degree (refer to Tables I-4 to I-6). Only 3% of respondents had no formal post-secondary education (refer to Table I-7 below). Sixty-three percent of respondents had completed two or more of a certificate/diploma, undergraduate degree, or graduate degree (refer to Table I-7). This indicates a highly educated group of individuals.

The survey asked respondents to provide the name of the programs they had completed. Some respondents did not provide full details of their programs, indicating simply “B.A.,” for example, without identifying their major. Judging by those who were precise, one third of the certificates/diplomas completed were studies directly in the field of career development. The undergraduate degrees most often brought to the field, outside of Quebec, were in Education (152), Psychology (150), Sociology (76), English (46), and Social Work (31). The master’s degrees reported outside of Quebec were most often in Counselling Psychology (82), Education (58), Guidance/School Counselling (15), Educational Counselling (14), and Social Work (13).

Quebec respondents, once again, differed significantly from those in other regions (refer to Tables I-4 to I-6). While respondents were less likely to have a certificate or diploma, they were more likely to have an undergraduate degree, and far more likely to have a graduate degree. Further, when asked to provide details of their programs of study, the majority reported undergraduate and graduate degrees directly in the field of career development. Consequently, they were least likely to be considering further formal education

in the field of career development (refer to Table I-8).

Years Experience in Field

A median for years of experience worked within the field of career development was calculated using a linear interpolation. In the sample, the median length of time respondents had been working in the field was eight years. Only 37% of respondents had been in the field over ten years (refer to Table I-9).

Age and years of experience are strongly related, as in other professions. In other words, younger workers generally have fewer years of experience than older workers. However, because so many respondents reported making a career change into the field, age and experience do not correspond as closely as one would expect (refer to Table I-9). For example, 32% of respondents over the age of 55 possess ten or fewer year’s experience.

There is no significant difference in years of experience reported by respondents of each region.

Professional Identity

Work Titles and Professional Alliances

Work Titles

The survey asked respondents to provide their current or most recent job title. A choice of 13 common position titles within the field of career development was offered. Sixty-three percent of respondents selected one of these titles (refer to Table II-1)

Significantly, 37% of respondents did not fit into one of these 13 titles. The words ‘career’ and ‘employment’ get attached to a variety of labels including: coach, specialist, navigator, support worker, educator, worker, and coordinator.

It should be noted that in Quebec there is less confusion with respect to job titles. Sixty-nine percent of respondents to the French version of the survey (94% of whom were from Quebec) use just one term: ‘conseiller d’orientation’ (refer to Table II-2).

Professional Alliances

The survey asked respondents to

indicate the fields with which they identify professionally. When given the option to indicate more than one field, 76% of respondents indicated that they identify, at least to some degree, with the field of career development (refer to Table II-3 below). However, when respondents were asked to indicate with which field they identify primarily, only 47% indicated that they identified primarily with the field of career development (refer to Table II-4). This can likely be explained by the fact that career development work is encompassed in so many disciplines, including Human Resources, Psychology, Social Work, and Counselling.

Practitioners' Skills and Knowledge

Perceived Importance and Level of Ability

Respondents were asked to rate on a scale of one to three the perceived importance and their perceived level of ability within 21 skill and knowledge areas related to career development. Calculating Z scores for the average ratings of skill/knowledge areas allows a ranking in order of importance and self-assessed competency. Table III-1 presents the list of skills and knowledge in order of ranking, from most perceived importance to least perceived importance, while Table III-2 presents the list in order of ranking from most perceived ability to least perceived ability. Larger Z scores, whether they are positive or negative, indicate a mean farther from the average overall (more of an outlier item).

Table III-1 indicates that respondents rate macro career development skills (such as new program development, program promotion, project management, program administration, addressing social justice issues, and lobbying government) as having less importance than skills and knowledge related to direct client work (such as one-to-one interviewing skills, group facilitation, and career counselling techniques). Table III-2 indicates that respondents also rate their level of ability within each of these macro areas as lower than those related to direct client work.

Quebec respondents repeatedly differ from other regions in both their rat-

ings of the perceived importance and their level of ability within each of these skill and knowledge areas (refer to Tables III-3 and III-4). Table III-3 indicates practitioners in Quebec rate 13 scales as less important than other provinces, and two scales as more important.

Table III-4 indicates that practitioners in Quebec rate their competence in 14 scales as lower than those in other provinces, and one scale as higher. Practitioners in Quebec are, on average, younger than in the rest of Canada, and young people (age 35 or under) in the sample did tend to have significantly lower self-assessments of skill and knowledge than older age groups, thus potentially explaining why they generally rated their competence as lower. Another possible explanation for these lower ratings of ability is that in Quebec practitioners are more highly educated, and have more career development specific education. It is then possible that the respondents rate their skills lower on the Socratic grounds that "the more you know, the more you realize what you do not know".

Employers' Perspective of Career Counsellor Education

Hiring, Encouragement, and Funding

Respondents were asked whether their organization, where relevant, sought to hire individuals with education specifically within the field of career development. Seventy-three percent of respondents stated that their organization sought to hire those with education specifically in the field of career development (refer to Table IV-1).

In terms of education and accreditation, Quebec stands out with 93% of the respondents identifying that their organizations seek specific career development education. Quebec's regulation of the field no doubt accounts for this figure.

Table IV-2 shows that many employers are seeking undergraduate or graduate level education over certificate or diploma level programs.

Encouragement

Next, respondents were asked to

indicate if their organization encouraged further career development specific education (refer to Table IV-3 below). Sixty-nine percent indicated that their organization encouraged career development specific education to some extent or a great deal. Differences in results were significant by sector, not region. Those respondents in the post-secondary education sector, for instance, indicated that 81% of their organizations encouraged continuing education in the field to some extent or a great deal.

Funding

The subsequent questions addressed the number of organizations that provide funding for further education for their employees and the amount allocated for funding (refer to Tables IV-4 and IV-5). While 88% of all respondents indicated that their organizations funded further education, 73% of that number indicated that they received \$1,000 or less annually to pursue this education or training. Viewed by sector, the corporate/private and post-secondary sectors give the most support. The primary and secondary education sector is the least likely to receive more than \$1,000.

Respondents who are currently enrolled in an education program report higher levels of encouragement from the organizations where they work than those not currently in school (refer to Table IV-6 below). As well, respondents who report plans to further their education in the field, also report higher levels of encouragement than those not planning to continue their education (refer to Table IV-7 below). There is no difference in the reported presence of funding, nor in the amount of funding provided for education, by either those currently enrolled, or those considering future enrolment. It appears that encouragement, and not funding, is the key factor influencing whether employees are enrolled or plan to enroll in a program.

Discussion

Practitioners' Backgrounds

Survey results related to career practitioners' backgrounds revealed sev-

eral points of interest. First, the data revealed that most practitioners outside of Quebec did not enter the field through an intentional decision making process. Many enter the field as a second career and possess a variety of educational backgrounds, including education in Social Work, Psychology, Education, and Sociology. While this diversity in backgrounds does lend a certain richness to the field, it also raises the possibility that many may be practicing without the requisite skills and knowledge to be effective career practitioners. They may lack, for example, knowledge of the labour market, career counselling techniques, or career development theory.

Second, the data showed that the average age of respondents was higher than the average age of workers in Canada. This raises two important concerns. There is first the issue of whether we will be able to meet consumer demand for career practitioners in the coming years. When this age factor is considered alongside the fact that most entered the profession as a second career, there is also the issue of whether some practitioners simply do not have the years of experience required to gain the expert status in the field that they might have achieved had they entered the profession earlier.

Third, the data also revealed that on average career practitioners have spent fewer years working in the field than have those in other occupations. With a median of only eight years experience in the field, practitioners perhaps do not possess the level of expertise that is common to other fields. For example, within the teaching profession, the median for years of experience within the field in Ontario is approximately 15 years (Ontario Teachers' Pension Plan, June 2006). Again, the authors wonder if facilitating earlier entry into the field would allow for greater levels of expertise to be developed within the field.

Professional Identity

Survey results related to professional identity also reveal some interesting points of discussion. The vast number of different job titles, and the fact that relatively few respondents identified primarily with the field of career

development, are suggestive of a weak professional identity. The authors suggest the field strive to establish a limited set of meaningful titles to describe the work we do. In other professions, such as nursing, job titles often reflect the education level, level of responsibility, and duties that are performed by the individual. For example, the term 'nurse practitioner' implies post-graduate diploma or degree training, the term 'registered nurse' implies undergraduate level training, and the term 'registered practical nurse' implies diploma level training. This would help the general public and the field to better understand what different practitioners offer. As well, this could lead to an enhanced professional identity.

Further, while the issue of whether the career counselling/development field should become regulated across the nation is beyond the scope of this paper, we do live in a time of 'creeping credentialism.' It seems prudent to position the profession to deal with potential self, public, and government interest in regulating the profession. If this field were to become more organized or regulated in some fashion, a necessary first step would be to agree upon a consistent and descriptive set of job titles. It would be difficult or impossible to organize any credential or license with the current array of titles.

This professional identity issue is further complicated by the fact that most career practitioners graduate from other disciplines such as Psychology, Sociology, or English. Our challenge then is to develop a process through which career development can evolve to be the primary work identity of more practitioners and through which career development can become known as a clearly defined professional specialty. We might look at the evolution of other disciplines to help address this challenge. For example, statistics was initially viewed as a branch of mathematics, but as it evolved and the usefulness of statistical ideas and concepts became more apparent, it was able to define itself clearly as a discipline in its own right. University departments of statistics are now typically separate from mathematics; they develop statistical theory and play a key role in defining the discipline, and are often involved

with the teaching of statistics to other disciplines like Economics, Psychology, Sociology, and Engineering.

Practitioners' Skills and Knowledge

The next part of the survey examined practitioners' perceptions of the importance of specific skill and knowledge areas relevant to the field of career development, as well as their perceived ability within these same skill and knowledge areas. An interesting finding is that macro skills appeared to be less important to practitioners. The authors believe this can lead to an interesting discussion on the appropriate curriculum for career practitioners.

In Phase I of this research project, a review of the areas of curriculum covered in career counselling/career development programs revealed that macro issues received significantly less attention than skills and knowledge related directly to client work. The lack of a macro viewpoint is detrimental, even when one's job involves mostly one-on-one interactions. Without a sense of these issues (the big picture, as it were), career practitioners can become too focused on the idea of pathologies or problems as residing in the individual; they may ignore broader cultural factors. For example, knowledge of macro issues is crucial when writing proposals for funding. Without an appreciation for the political environment and how to approach government, it is difficult to get and maintain funding. We wonder, then, if it would be prudent to include more macro area skills and knowledge into career counselling/career development programs so that students at minimum have a beginning awareness of 'big picture' issues. While client-based knowledge and skills may be what students are initially seeking, helping students gain a macro perspective will aid them in their work with individuals by broadening their lens as well as helping them as they advance in their careers.

It is interesting how high so many of the respondents rated their skills and knowledge. The authors wonder if this is because so many career practitioners enter the field without career development specific education, making it possible that they do not realize the extent of the theory base behind the profession, and as a result feel they hold all or

most of the required skills to work in the field. Many practitioners do come into the field with related human service and counselling experience, and indeed, these skills go a long way in enriching their work. However, we believe that without a comprehensive knowledge of career development theory and career counselling techniques, for example, a career practitioner cannot practice in the field to full advantage. The vast number of certificate and diploma programs that have been developed in the past fifteen years does speak at least in part to some employers' and practitioners' recognition of the need for career development specific skills and knowledge.

Employers' Perspective of Career Practitioner Education

The survey results on the employers' perspective of career counsellor education were particularly interesting in terms of hiring practices. Respondents were asked whether their organization, where relevant, sought to hire individuals with education specifically within the field of career development. Seventy-three percent of respondents stated that their organization sought to hire those with education specifically in the field of career development. On the one hand this seemed encouraging. In other professions; however, we suspect that this number would be closer to 100%. For example, within the field of social work, it is currently uncommon for someone to obtain a position without the requisite education. In some professions, it is impossible to obtain a position without the professional education and accreditation. For example, a person could not obtain a position as a nurse unless they had received the required education to become a registered nurse, practical nurse, or nurse practitioner.

Given the relative youthfulness and complexity of the field of career development we were encouraged by many of the survey findings. The field has a clear strength in that the educational level of practitioners is high and in that many are considering further career development specific education. The more traditionally organized career development programs in Quebec are a particular strong point in that they pro-

vide a Canadian educational model that can help shape an educational model for all of Canada. As well, the large number of career practitioners (1,180) who completed the survey is indicative of the commitment and enthusiasm of those working in the field and of their interest in the field's advancement.

The authors are pleased with the richness of the data that the survey has produced. We would like to acknowledge the effort made by the many career practitioners who took the time to complete this survey, as well as to thank the University of Waterloo Survey Research Centre for their assistance in developing the survey and in analyzing the data.

¹A note about the cited statistics for cross tabular tables: all significant relationships have the Chi-square statistic reported, as well as the significance level (p), and a measure of the strength of the relationship (Φ). The significance level (p) can be interpreted as the probability of a difference at least as large as the one observed, from what would be expected under independence (no relationship). A small value of p is evidence that the observed difference is not due to chance, but instead, a result of a relationship between the row and column classifications. The Φ measure can be interpreted as follows: a low Φ (less than .25) indicates a weaker relationship; higher values, between .3 and .6, indicate a moderate relationship.

Table I-1: Worked Previously in Another Field by Region

	BC	Prairies	Ontario	Quebec	Maritimes	Total
Worked previously in another field?	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	88	77	78	41	82	70
No	12	23	22	59	18	30
Total N	(127)	(106)	(355)	(308)	(200)	(1096)

$X^2 = 168.1$ $p < .001$, $\Phi = .39^1$

Table I-2: Previous Fields of Work

	Count	%
Teaching	168	22
Business	89	12
Counselling	68	9
Social work	64	8
Human resources	63	8
Clerical	47	6
Clergy work	3	0
Other	267	35
Total	(769)	100

Table I-3: Age by Region

	BC	Prairies	Ontario	Quebec	Maritimes	Total
Age	%	%	%	%	%	%
35 and under	16	17	25	41	27	28
36 to 45	31	28	28	25	29	28
46 to 55	35	37	32	26	32	31
Over 55	18	18	15	8	12	13
Average	46	46	44	40	43	43
Total N	(129)	(112)	(380)	(320)	(206)	(1147)

$X^2 = 50.4$ $p < .001$, $\Phi = .21$

Table I-4: Education (Certificate or Diploma) by Region

	BC	Prairies	Ontario	Quebec	Maritimes	Total
Certificate or Diploma	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	61	35	55	36	44	46
No	39	65	45	64	56	54
Total N	(126)	(108)	(358)	(309)	(197)	(1098)

$X^2 = 39.2$ $p < .001$, $\Phi = .19$

Table I-5: Education (Undergraduate Degree) by Region

Undergraduate Degree	BC %	Prairies %	Ontario %	Quebec %	Maritimes %	Total %
Yes	65	89	74	97	87	83
No	35	11	26	3	13	17
Total N	(126)	(108)	(358)	(309)	(197)	(1098)

$X^2 = 98.5$ $p < .001$, $\Phi = .30$

Table I-6: Education (Graduate Degree) by Region *

Graduate Degree	BC %	Prairies %	Ontario %	Quebec %	Maritimes %	Total %
Yes	30	42	25	83	35	45
No	70	58	75	17	65	55
Total N	(125)	(103)	(354)	(307)	(198)	(1087)

$X^2 = 261.0$ $p < .001$, $\Phi = .50$

* 96% of these are master's degrees; 4% are doctoral degrees

Table I-7: Education Completed

Education	Count	%
No formal education	37	3
Certificate or diploma only	144	13
Undergraduate degree only	233	21
Certificate/diploma & undergraduate degree	192	17
Undergraduate & graduate degrees	332	30
Certificate & undergraduate & master's degrees	165	15
All levels of education achieved	7	1
Total	1110	100

Table I-8: Considering (Further) Career Development Education by Region

Are you considering (further) education in the field of career development?	BC %	Prairies %	Ontario %	Quebec %	Maritimes %	Total %
Yes	51	47	44	29	50	42
No	49	53	56	71	50	58
Total N	(133)	(116)	(386)	(324)	(210)	(1169)

$X^2 = 34.0$ $p < .001$, $\Phi = .17$

Table I-9: Years Experience in Field of Career Development by Age

Years of experience in field of career development	35 and under %	36 to 45 %	46 to 55 %	Over 55 %	Total %
Less than 3	38	12	6	6	17
Between 3 and 5	34	20	14	8	20
Between 6 and 10	25	31	26	18	26
Over ten years	3	37	54	68	37
Total N	(300)	(308)	(331)	(147)	(1086)

$X^2 = 331.4$ $p < .001$, $\Phi = .55$

Table II-1: Current Job Title (English)

	Count	%
Guidance counsellor	113	14
Employment counsellor	103	13
Career counsellor	68	8
Program coordinator	57	7
Facilitator	30	4
Career development practitioner	23	3
Employment consultant	21	3
Career consultant	21	3
Career advisor	19	2
Career information specialist	19	2
Case manager	16	2
Job developer	9	1
Vocational rehabilitation counsellor	8	1
Other	317	37
Total	(824)	100

Table II-2: Current Job Title (French)

	Count	%
Conseiller d'orientation	210	69
Conseiller en emploi	15	5
Conseiller en information scolaire et professionnelle	10	3
Conseiller en ressources humaines	9	3
Conseiller en carrière	7	2
Coordonnateur de programmes	6	2
Gestionnaire de projets	3	1
Conseiller en recrutement du personnel	1	0
Animateur ou formateur	1	0
Conseiller en réadaptation	1	0
Prospecteur d'emplois	0	0
Autre	41	15
Total	(304)	100

Table II-3: Fields Identified With Professionally

	Count	%
Career development	897	76
Counselling	705	60
Adult education	340	29
Teaching (elementary and secondary)	242	21
Human resources	234	20
Teaching (post-secondary)	140	12
Vocational rehabilitation	131	11
Social work	130	11
Psychology	114	10
Other	221	19
Total	(on 1180)	

Table II-4: Primary Field of Identification

	Count	%
Career development	448	47
Counselling	209	23
Teaching (elementary and secondary)	60	6
Adult education	52	5
Human resources	42	4
Vocational rehabilitation	30	3
Social work	18	2
Teaching post-secondary	17	2
Psychology	8	1
Other	64	7
Total	(948)	100

Table III-1: Importance Ratings in Order of Rank

	Average Rating	Z Score
Ethics	2.9	1.44
One-to-one interviewing	2.9	1.44
Career/labour market information	2.8	1.08
Career counselling techniques	2.8	1.08
General counselling theory	2.7	0.72
Work search strategies	2.7	0.72
Career assessment	2.7	0.72
Career development theory	2.6	0.36
Local & global work trends	2.6	0.36
Group facilitation	2.6	0.36
Working with diverse populations	2.6	0.36
Working collaboratively with community partners	2.6	0.36
Advocating on behalf of clients	2.5	0
Developing new programs	2.4	-0.36
Job development	2.3	-0.72
Proposal/report writing	2.2	-1.08
Program promotion	2.2	-1.08
Project management	2.1	-1.44
Program administration	2.1	-1.44
Addressing social justice issues	2.1	-1.44
Lobbying government	2.1	-1.44

Table III-2: Ability Ratings in Order of Rank

	Average rating	Z Score
One-to-one interviewing	2.7	1.51
Ethics	2.6	1.15
Work search strategies	2.6	1.15
Group facilitation	2.6	1.15
Career/labour market information	2.5	0.78
Career counselling techniques	2.5	0.78
General counselling theory	2.4	0.42
Working with diverse populations	2.4	0.42
Working collaboratively with community partners	2.4	0.42
Career development theory	2.3	0.05
Local & global work trends	2.3	0.05
Career assessment	2.3	0.05
Proposal/report writing	2.3	0.05
Advocating on behalf of clients	2.3	0.05
Developing new programs	2.1	-0.31
Project management	2.1	-0.68
Job development	2.0	-1.04
Program administration	2.0	-1.04
Program promotion	2.0	-1.04
Addressing social justice issues	1.9	-1.41
Lobbying government	1.6	-2.5

Table III-3: Average Importance Ratings by Region

Knowledge or Skill	BC	Prairies	Ontario	Quebec	Maritimes	F sig p value
General counselling theory	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.8*	2.7	.001
Ethics	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8*	2.9	<.001
Career development theory	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.6	.02
Career/labour market information	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.6*	2.8	<.001
Local & global work trends	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.5*	2.7	<.001
Work search strategies	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.4*	2.7	<.001
One-to-one interviewing	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	Not sig
Group facilitation	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.5*	2.6	.001
Career counselling techniques	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	Not sig
Career assessment	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.7	Not sig
Proposal/report writing	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.3*	2.2	<.001
Job development	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.4	Not sig
Project management	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.0	2.1	Not sig
Program administration	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.7*	2.2	<.001
Program promotion	2.3	2.4	2.3	1.8*	2.2	<.001
Working with diverse populations	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.3*	2.7	<.001
Advocating on behalf of clients	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.2*	2.7	<.001
Addressing social justice issues	2.1	2.3	2.2	1.8*	2.3	<.001
Working collaboratively with community partners	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.2*	2.7	<.001
Developing new programs	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.1*	2.5	<.001
Lobbying government	2.2	2.3	2.1	1.8*	2.2	<.001

*Significant Post Hoc Scheffe comparison tests – region differs from most or all other regions.

Table III-4: Average Ability Ratings by Region

Knowledge or Skill	BC	Prairies	Ontario	Quebec	Maritimes	F Sig p value
General counselling theory	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.5	Not sig
Ethics	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.5*	2.7	<.001
Career development theory	2.5	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	.04
Career/labour market information	2.6	2.4	2.6	2.4*	2.5	<.001
Local & global work trends	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.2*	2.2	<.001
Work search strategies	2.7	2.5*	2.7	2.5*	2.6	<.001
One-to-one interviewing	2.7	2.6*	2.7	2.8	2.8	.01
Group facilitation	2.7	2.6	2.7	2.4*	2.6	<.001
Career counselling techniques	2.6	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.5	Not sig
Career assessment	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.3	Not sig
Proposal/report writing	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.4*	2.3	.006
Job development	2.0	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	Not sig
Project management	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.9*	2.1	<.001
Program administration	2.2	2.2	2.1	1.6*	2.1	<.001
Program promotion	2.3	2.2	2.2	1.7*	2.0	<.001
Working with diverse populations	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.2*	2.4	<.001
Advocating on behalf of clients	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.1*	2.6	<.001
Addressing social justice issues	1.8	1.9	2.0	1.7*	2.1	<.001
Working collaboratively with community partners	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.1*	2.5	<.001
Developing new programs	2.2	2.3	2.3	1.8*	2.2	<.001
Lobbying government	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.3*	1.7	<.001

*Significant Post Hoc Scheffe comparison tests – region differs from most or all other regions.

Table IV-1: Employer Seeks Career Development Specific Education by Region

Does organization hire individuals with career development specific education?	BC %	Prairies %	Ontario %	Quebec %	Maritimes %	Total %
Yes	78	55	63	93	61	73
No	22	45	37	7	39	27
Total N	(110)	(86)	(303)	(276)	(164)	(939)

$X^2 = 97.4$ $p < .001$, $\Phi = .32$

Table IV-2: Education Levels Sought

	Count	%
Certificate	148	16
Diploma	216	23
Undergraduate degree	362	38
Master's degree	385	41
Doctorate	29	3
Total	(on 948)	*

* Respondents could select more than one level.

Table IV-3: Employer Encourages (Further) Career Development Education by Employment Sector

To what extent does organization encourage (further) education in field?	Government %	Education %	Post-Sec. Education %	Corporate or Private %	Non-Profit %	Total %
A great deal	27	18	41	40	34	31
To some extent	39	43	40	28	36	38
A little	27	28	15	24	22	23
No at all	7	11	4	8	8	8
Total N	(162)	(206)	(165)	(83)	(342)	(958)

$X^2 = 40.5$ $p = .001$, $\Phi = .21$

Table IV-4: Provision of Funding for Further Education by Employment Sector

Does employer provide funding to you for further education?	Government %	Education %	Post-Sec. Education %	Corporate or Private %	Non-Profit %	Total %
Yes	86	85	98	84	88	88
No	14	15	2	16	12	12
Total N	(166)	(213)	(168)	(81)	(345)	(973)

$X^2 = 18.9$ $p = .001$, $\Phi = .14$

Table IV-5: Amount of Funding Provided by Employment Sector

How much funding is provided?	Government %	Education %	Post-Sec. Education %	Corporate or Private %	Non-Profit %	Total %
Under \$500	33	61	27	34	45	42
\$500 and \$1,000	32	27	35	26	31	31
Over \$1,000	35	12	38	40	24	27
Total N	(114)	(169)	(146)	(61)	(254)	(744)

$X^2 = 55.7$ $p < .001$, $\Phi = .27$

Table IV-6: Encouragement from Employer by Current Enrolment

Currently Enrolled in Education Program	A great deal %	To some extent %	A little %	Not at all %	Total N
Yes	48	25	24	3	119
No	29	41	21	9	857

$X^2 = 24.4$ $p < .001$, $\Phi = .16$

Table IV-7: Encouragement from Employer by Future Enrolment

Considering Future Enrolment in Education Program	A great deal %	To some extent %	A little %	Not at all %	Total N
Yes	38	35	22	5	373
No	26	41	23	10	614

$X^2 = 20.5$ $p < .011$, $\Phi = .15$

Appendix A: Table of Participant Associations

Table A-1: Participant Associations

Association of Career Professionals International
 Canadian Association of Career Educators and Employers
 Canadian Career Information Association
 Canadian Counselling Association
 Career Development Association of Alberta
 Career Education Society
 Career Management Association of BC
 Guidance Council of the Alberta Teachers Association
 Manitoba School Counsellors' Association
 New Brunswick Career Development Action Group
 New Brunswick Teachers' Association
 Newfoundland and Labrador Counsellors' and Psychologists' Association
 Nova Scotia Career Development Association
 Ontario Association of Youth Employment Centres
 Ontario School Counsellors Association
 L'Ordre des conseillers et conseillères d'orientation et des psychoéducateurs et psychoéducatrices du Québec
 Prince Edward Island Teachers' Federation
 Saskatchewan Career Work Education Association

Appendix B: Respondent Demographics

Table B-1: Gender

	Count	%
Male	237	20
Female	943	80
Total	(1180)	100

Table B-2: Age Groups in 5-Year Intervals

	Count	%
16 to 20	5	0
21 to 25	24	2
26 to 30	112	10
31 to 35	182	16
36 to 40	159	14
41 to 45	163	14
46 to 50	177	15
51 to 55	184	16
56 to 60	114	10
Over 60	38	3
Total	(1158)	100

Table B-3: Province or Territory of Residence

	Count	Count as % of Survey Sample	Population as % of National Population*
Alberta	72	6	10.1
British Columbia	133	11	13.2
Manitoba	29	3	3.6
New Brunswick	57	5	2.3
Newfoundland and Labrador	52	4	1.6
Northwest Territories	2	0.2	0.1
Nova Scotia	85	7	2.9
Nunavut	1	0.1	0.1
Ontario	386	33	38.9
Prince Edward Island	16	1	0.4
Quebec	324	28	23.5
Saskatchewan	15	1	3.1
Outside Canada	7	1	N/A
Total	(1179)	100	100

* Source: Statistics Canada

Table B-4: Population of Town/City Where Employed

	Count	%
10,000 or less	198	17
Between 10,000 and 50,000	206	18
50,001 to 100,000	152	13
Above 100,000	594	51
Not currently working	16	1
Total	(1166)	100

Table B-5: Employment Sector

	Count	%
Not in field	42	4
Government	180	16
Secondary education	235	21
Post-secondary education	186	16
Corporate	23	2
Private or independent	92	8
Not for profit (charities)	79	7
Not for profit (other than charities)	298	26
Total	(1135)	100

Table B-6: Primary Functions of Work

	Count	%
Providing direct service to clients, one-to-one or in a group	861	76
Managing or supervising a program or department	334	30
Writing and developing career related tools or resources	366	33
Designing new programs and services	351	31
Developing/analyzing public policy related to career development	74	7
Teaching and/or conducting research in career development	206	18
Other function	63	6
Total	(on 1128)	*

*Does not sum to 100 as respondents could select more than one function.