

Effect Of Parental Encouragement On Career Decision-Making And Self-Efficacy Of Adolescents

DR. RAJAN SETHI
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR,
MUKTSAR, PUNJAB.

Abstract

Career decision-making self-efficacy is a pivotal construct in understanding individuals' career behaviors (Betz, 2007). Family, as a primary source of social support, exerts a substantial influence on adolescents' career development and decision-making process (Whiston & Keller, 2004). This study examined the role of selected family variables in predicting 100 secondary school students' career decision-making self-efficacy. Parental encouragement variables that reflected family members' socioeconomic status and parental encouragement variables, especially, parental career-related behaviors, were examined. Results showed that parental general psychosocial encouragement was a statistically significant factor in predicting career decision-making self-efficacy, explaining 39.3% of the variance of this construct for secondary school students.

Significance of the Study

In Indian culture where social norms value affiliation, interdependence, and respect for elders, individuals rely strongly on parental encouragement throughout their lifetime. Adolescents are more likely to consider family expectations and obligations when choosing a career, especially a career that enhances the social status and brings glory to their family (Hannum, An, & Cherng, 2011; Liu, McMahon, & Watson, 2015).

In Indian families the influence of parents may be more prominent for adolescents (Rodríguez et al., 2015). Despite the cultural norms of high parent-child interdependence in India, the literature on Parental encouragement on Indian adolescents' career decision-making, self-efficacy is still limited. Even fewer studies focus on Indian Adolescent students who are at an important stage of making career decisions and transit to workforce. The purpose of this study was to examine the Parental encouragement variables on the career decision-making self-efficacy of secondary school students in India. Parental encouragement variables were categorized as structural variables reflecting parents socioeconomic status, and process-oriented variables referring to family members' interaction and support (Lindstrom et al., 2007). Parental encouragement and parents' residence (rural or urban) represented family structural variables. Parental career-related behaviors, including general psychosocial support and parental career-specific behaviors represented family process-oriented variables. Two research questions were answered in this study:

1. What is the career decision-making self-efficacy of Adolescents?
2. What is the best set of selected variables to explain the variance found in the career decision-making self-efficacy of Adolescents?

Review of Literature

Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy

Derived from Bandura's (1986) social cognitive theory, career decision-making self-efficacy has been demonstrated to be a salient construct in individuals' career development (Betz, 2007). From a social cognitive perspective, individuals are agents of their lives. They intentionally exercise influence on their functioning and life circumstances instead of simply being witnesses (Bandura, 2001). Self-efficacy beliefs are considered to be the foundation and the most influential predictor of exercising control over one's behavior, thought, learning, and decisional processes (Chong, 2007). Self-efficacy refers to an individual's convictions about (or confidence in) his/her ability to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998). Unless individuals believe they have the ability to achieve certain goals, they have little motivation to act or to persevere in the face of obstacles (Bandura et al., 2001). Self-efficacy gained through engagement in activities also builds self-knowledge and overall self-perception, and helps individuals positively cope with stress and depression to remain emotionally stable and healthy (Taylor & Betz, 1983). Individuals with a high level of self-efficacy are likely to objectively analyze situations, including success and failure, and be able to explain their successes and failures by self-reflection and an examination of external factors. Even when the worst situation occurs, individuals with a high level of self-efficacy can still maintain a positive attitude and take initiatives.

Method

Descriptive survey was conducted for this study.

Sample

The present study consists of 100 students including boys and girls studying in 12th class drawn from two Government Senior Secondary schools of Chandigarh. The sample was taken using random sample techniques.

TOOLS USED

1. Career Decision Self-Efficacy scale (Betz, Klein, & Taylor, 1996)
2. Parental Encouragement Career Behaviour Checklist (PCBC) (Keller & Whiston, 2008)

STATISTICAL TECHNIQUES

To analyse the data in the present study Descriptive statistics (e.g., mean, standard deviation, and range) were calculated using SPSS 16.

Results

Research Question 1. What is the career decision-making self-efficacy of Adolescents?

The scores on the CDSE-SF indicated more than a moderate to nearly a high level of career decision-making self-efficacy among Adolescents. The total scores of the CDSE-SF ranged from 61 to 118, with the mean score of 92.07 (SD=11.76) and the item mean score of 3.83 (SD=.46). Approximately 94% of the CDSE-SF scores fell between the range of 72 and 119, indicating the distribution of scores was concentrated. In other

words, variations between levels of career decision-making self-efficacy were small among these students. The highest score for the five career choice competencies was self-appraisal ($M=3.80$, $SD=.58$), followed by career planning ($M=3.68$, $SD=.56$), goal selection ($M=3.63$, $SD=.56$), gathering occupational information ($M=3.71$, $SD=.55$), and problem solving ($M=3.62$, $SD=.56$).

The scores on the 22-item PCBC showed that there were relatively large variations among students' perceived parental career-related behaviors. The total scores ranged from 32 to 110, with the mean score of 79.79 ($SD=12.23$) and the item mean score of 3.63. Approximately 95% of the PCBC scores fell between the range of 56 and 104. Meantime, there were also a few students reported they barely perceived any type of Parental Encouragement career-related behaviors that had occurred. The subscale PCBC-Support consisted of 17 items with total scores ranging from 25 to 85 with a scale Family Influence on Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy 57 mean score of 63.04 ($SD=9.41$) and an item mean score of 3.71 ($SD=.55$), indicating that Parental Encouragement (parental general psychosocial support) behaviors occurred, on average, more than sometimes and nearly often according to students' perceptions. The subscale PCBC-Action consisted of five items with total scores ranging from 5 to 25, with a scale mean score of 16.74 ($SD=3.91$), and an item mean score of 3.35 ($SD=.78$), indicating that parental career-specific behaviors occurred, on average, between sometimes and often according to students' perceptions. The correlations indicated that the score of adolescents career decision making self-efficacy had significant correlations with Parental Encouragement (parental general psychosocial support) ($r=.61$, $p<.05$, 36% of variance explained), and parental career-specific behaviors ($r=.42$, $p<.05$, 16% of variance explained), but not with other independent variables. Parental Encouragement (Parental general psychosocial support) had significant correlations with parental career-specific behaviors ($r=.64$, $p<.05$, 41% of variance explained). Parental Encouragement held small, yet significant, correlations with family residence status (6.8% variance explained), parental general psychosocial support (3% variance explained), parental career-specific behaviors (3% variance explained), Means, standard deviations, and variable correlations were shown in Table 1.

Table 1.
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations of Study Variables

Variable	2	3	4	5	6	7	Mean	SD
1.CDSE-SF	.61*	.42*	.01.	-.02	.00	.07	92.07	11.76
2. PCBC-Support	-	.64*	.04	-.08*	-.05	.17*	63.04	9.41
FAS II							1.80	1.63

Note. CDSE-SF=Career Decision Self-Efficacy scale-Short Form. PCBC-Support=Parent Career Behavior Checklist-Support Scale. PCBC-Action=Parent Career Behavior Checklist-Action Scale. FAS II=Family Affluence Scale II. * $p < .05$

Research Question2. What is the best set of selected variables to explain the variance found in the career decision-making self-efficacy of Adolescents?

F statistics showed that multiple linear regression represented the data well ($F=59.96$, $p<.05$), denoting a significant improvement in explaining the dependent variable, career decision-making self-efficacy, with selected independent variables. The squared multiple correlation, R^2 , was .383, which indicates that 38.3% of the variance of students' career decision-making self-efficacy was explained by selected independent variables in this study. The adjusted R^2 value, which considers sample size, was calculated to be .376. Test of partial coefficients revealed that only one independent variable was statistically significant in explaining students' career decision-making self-efficacy, viz., parental general psychosocial support (see Table 3). Family residence and affluence, as well as student age and gender, did not have significant influence on Chinese vocational students' career decision-making self-efficacy. When controlling for all other variables, one unit of change in the score on PCBC-Support resulted in .72 unit of change on the score of students' career decision-making self-efficacy. This indicated that parental general psychosocial (e.g., expression of interests and love, and verbal encouragement) had substantial influence on Chinese vocational students' career decision-making self-efficacy.

Table 3. Regression Coefficients and Collinearity Statistics of Regression Analysis

				Collinearity Statistics	
	B	SE B	β	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	51.61*	9.80			
PCBC-Support	.72*	.05	.59	.61	1.65
PCBC-Action	.19	.12	.07	.61	1.64
Age	-.48	.61	-.03	.98	1.02
Gender	1.04	.82	.04	.96	1.04
Residence	.80	1.21	.02	.92	1.10
FAS II	-.32	.25	-.04	.89	1.02

Note. PCBC-Support=Parent Career Behavior Checklist-Support scale. PCBC-Action=Parent Career Behavior Checklist-Action scale. FAS II=Family Affluence Scale II. * $p < .05$

It is interesting to notice that parental career-specific behaviors had significant correlations with the career decision-making self-efficacy but was not a significant predictor for career decision-making self-efficacy in my sample. This might be due to the 41% of the variance that parental career-specific behaviors shared with parental general psychosocial support. Because in multiple regression, the second most significant independent variable explains the incremental variance of the dependent variable above and beyond the variance explained by the first most significant independent variable (Green & Salkind, 2008). With the 41% of the shared variance that had contributed to explaining the career decision-making self-efficacy, it seems that parental career-specific behaviors had no more unique incremental contribution to the variance of the career decision-making self-efficacy of this group of Adolescents. Despite the substantial variance shared, no multicollinearity was found between all independent variables in our study (see Table 2), viz., all correlation coefficients were below .80 (Sweet & Grace-Martin, 2008) and the collinearity tolerance was larger than .10 (Dormann et al., 2013). In other words, parental general psychosocial support and parental career-specific behaviors can serve as two independent variables in one regression model to predict students' career decision-making self-efficacy.

Discussion

1. It can be concluded from the results that parents who are very less demanding and accepting the adolescents' views i.e. authoritative parents lead to decided career of the adolescents than the more demanding and strict parents i.e. authoritarian.
2. The adolescents who think positively and highly of themselves are more decided about their future than the adolescents with low self-efficacy which concludes that high self-efficacy enhances career decidedness.
3. It can be said that interaction between locale and Parental Encouragement and Parental Encouragement and self-efficacy of adolescents collaboratively effect the career decision maturity among adolescents means the attitude and behaviour of parents, their residential area and Parental Encouragement and self-efficacy jointly affect the decision making process. But their gender and locale, gender and Parental Encouragement, gender and self-efficacy and locale and self-efficacy collaboratively do not affect the decision making of adolescents. The locality and pattern of parents' behaviour affect the career indecision among adolescents.
4. Career decision making can be predicted on the basis of Parental Encouragement and self- efficacy. Self- efficacy, authoritarian and authoritative Parental Encouragement contributes 38.549% to CDM among adolescents. The result indicates that these variables are significant predictors of CDM.
5. In this study, Adolescents displayed a high level of career decision-making self-efficacy, indicating that they felt decent confidence when coping with career decision-making-related tasks, especially on identifying influential resources (self-appraisal) and making career plans (planning).
6. Choosing a focused area of specialty determines the curriculum and learning experiences that students will commit to during their programs of study, and furthermore, determines their future Maintaining a high level of career decision-making self-efficacy is a positive indicator that these adolescents were taking initiatives in career exploration and planning activities (action) to identify and further refine their career interests and career goals (Lent et al., 2000). Self-efficacy gained through those activities will build on their knowledge about the self and the work, and help them positively cope with challenges and obstacles during the career decision-making process (Bandura et al., 2001; Rogers & Creed, 2011).

This finding advances our knowledge on specific parental behaviors related to adolescents' career development and the influence of those behaviors on their career decision-making self-efficacy. Both family structural and process-oriented variables were examined, but only parental general psychosocial support (a process-oriented variable) revealed significant influence on the career decision-making self-efficacy of this group of students. This indicates that the mechanism behind how family influences career constructs and adolescents' career development is complex.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of any research work is, to aware the authorities about the hidden facts and to provide suggestions on the basis of the findings of the research work. The results of the research studies have suggestions for implications for the government, school administrators, society, peers, parents as well as students. Therefore, the present study also provides some suggestions on the basis of its findings to various sections of the society for improvement in the career decision making process of the adolescents.

References

- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52(1), 1-26. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (2001). Self-efficacy beliefs as shapers of children's aspirations and career trajectories. *Child Development*, 72(1), 187–206. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00273
- Blustein, D. L., Chaves, A. P., Diemer, M. A., Gallagher, L. A., Marshall, K. G., Sirin, S., & Bhati, K. S. (2002). Voices of the forgotten half: The role of social class in the school-to-work transition. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 49(3), 311–323. doi:10.1037//00220167.49.3.311
- Chong, W. H. (2007). The role of personal agency beliefs in academic self-regulation: An Asian perspective. *School Psychology International*, 28(1), 63–76. doi:10.1177/0143034307075681
- Conger, K. J., & Martin, M. J. (2010). Socioeconomic status, family processes, and individual development. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72(3), 685–704. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00725.x
- Creed, P. A., Wong, O. Y., & Hood, M. (2009). Career decision-making, career barriers and occupational aspirations in Chinese adolescents. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 9(3), 189–203. doi:10.1007/s10775-009-9165-0
- Currie, C. E., Molcho, M., Boyce, W., Holstein, B., Torsheim, T., & Richter, M. (2008). Researching health inequalities in adolescents: The development of the health behaviour in school-aged children (HBSC) Family Affluence Scale. *Social Science and Medicine*, 66(6), 1429–1436. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.11.024
- Ferry, T. R., Fouad, N. A., & Smith, P. L. (2000). The role of family context in a social cognitive model for career-related choice behavior: A math and science perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 57(3), 348–364. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1999.1743
- Gati, I., Gadassi, R., Saka, N., Hadadi, Y., Ansenberg, N., Friedmann, R., & Asulin-Peretz, L. (2011). Emotional and personality-related aspects of career decision-making difficulties: Facets of career indecisiveness. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 19(1), 3–20. doi:10.1177/1069072710382525
- Gaudron, J. P. (2011). A psychometric evaluation of the Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale-Short Form among French university students. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 19(4), 420–430. doi:10.1177/1069072711409713
- Green, S. B., & Salkind, N. J. (2008) *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hampton, N. Z. (2006). A psychometric evaluation of the Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale Short Form in Chinese high school students. *Journal of Career Development*, 33(2), 142–155. doi:10.1177/0894845306293540