THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTAL EXPECTATIONS AND
POST-SECONDARY CHOICES OF HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS

by
Katherine Marie Latour Clophus
Liberty University

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education
Liberty University
2018
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTAL EXPECTATIONS AND POST-SECONDARY CHOICES OF HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS

by Katherine Marie Latour Clophus

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment Of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Education

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

2018

APPROVED BY:

Rebecca Lunde, Ed.D, Committee Chair

Wesley Scott, Ed.D, Committee Member

Jason VanMetre, Ed.D, Committee Member
ABSTRACT

Parental involvement is a driving force in guiding the post-secondary plans of high school students. Although there are current studies that examine the link between parental involvement and the choice of secondary students to pursue college as well as parental involvement and students’ future career choice decisions, little research is available addressing whether parental involvement influences students to pursue careers contrary to the students’ wishes. Research shows that as students move into middle and high school, parental involvement in the form of parental expectations becomes important and often guides much of students’ decision making. This correlational study sought to determine if parental involvement could predict the post-secondary choices of high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish. The study examined if a predictive relationship existed using data collected from 153 high school seniors from two high schools located in a Southwest Louisiana parish. The Career Related Parent Support scale was used to measure the amount of perceived parental support, and the My Vocational Identity scale was used to measure students’ overall satisfaction and assurance of their career choices. The intended method of data analysis was the Pearson’s Product Moment $r$, but the dataset did not meet the assumption of bivariate normal distribution, therefore Spearman’s rho correlation coefficient was the method of data analysis.

Keywords: parental expectations, social cognitive career theory, post-secondary choice, career satisfaction
Dedication

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, who without constant conversations, guidance, and the peace only He can provide, this would not have been possible. I would also like to dedicate dissertations to my grandmothers, Lille Mae Guillory LaTour and Marion LeMelle Jourdan. They both grew up in a time when education, especially education for an African American woman was more often than not only a dream. They would be over the moon proud.
Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my husband, Thomas, and our two daughters Emily and Victoria Grace. Thank you for the sacrifices you all made for me to pursue a doctorate. You are my personal cheering squad, and I am forever grateful. I love you more than I could ever express. Thank you to my parents, Felix and Emma Latour for instilling in me the value and importance of education and teaching me I can accomplish anything; I only need to provide the hard work. You’ve provided me with every opportunity in the world to be successful; I promise you it has not gone unnoticed, and it was not in vain. I would also like to thank my sister, Karen Evans and her family for cheering Nanny on through this process. Karen, you’ve always had more faith in me than I’ve had in myself, your encouragement became my courage, thank you from the bottom of my soul. I would like to thank my second parents, Thomas and Vicki Clophus for your support and prayers. The encouragement and love you have for me, your daughter-in-law, is incredible, thank you. My prayers warriors, Pastor Agnes Ceaser and Pastor Eale and Merinda Malveaux, thank you for going to God on my behalf. Principal Robert Barrentine who allowed me the time I needed to work. My counselor office cheerleaders, your excitement was a great encouragement to me. Ms. Joyce Ardoin, thank you for the prayers, the talks, the guardian angel, and your quiet presences, you always came around with words of encouragement just when I needed them, thank you. I would like to thank Dr. Rebecca Lunde, you were Heaven sent, and your help and guidance is greatly appreciated. Also, to Dr. Jason Van Metre and Dr. Wesely Scott, thank you for chairing and your valuable input.
# Table of Contents

ABSTRACT .....................................................................................................................................3

Dedication ........................................................................................................................................4

Acknowledgments............................................................................................................................5

List of Tables ................................................................................................................................10

List of Figures ................................................................................................................................11

List of Abbreviations .....................................................................................................................12

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION ............................................................................................13

  Overview ............................................................................................................................13

  Background ........................................................................................................................13

    Historical Context .................................................................14

    Social Context ........................................................................16

    Theoretical Framework ................................................................17

  Problem Statement ........................................................................19

  Purpose Statement ........................................................................20

  Significance of the Study ...........................................................21

  Research Question ........................................................................22

  Definitions ....................................................................................22

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW ................................................................................24

  Overview ............................................................................................................................24

  Theoretical Framework ................................................................24

    Social Cognitive Theory Interest Model ........................................25
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS.....................................................................................................69

Overview..................................................................................................................................69
Research Question ......................................................................................................................69
Null Hypotheses..........................................................................................................................69
Descriptive Statistics..................................................................................................................69
  Demographics .........................................................................................................................69
  Data Collection Variables ...................................................................................................70
Results.......................................................................................................................................73
  Assumption Tests ...................................................................................................................73
  Null Hypothesis One .............................................................................................................74
  Null Hypothesis Two ...........................................................................................................75
  Null Hypothesis Three .......................................................................................................77

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS .............................................................................................80

Overview..................................................................................................................................80
Discussion .................................................................................................................................80
  Null Hypothesis One .............................................................................................................80
  Null Hypothesis Two ...........................................................................................................82
  Null Hypothesis Three .......................................................................................................83
  Gender and Self-Efficacy .................................................................................................83
Implications ..............................................................................................................................84
Limitations ...............................................................................................................................86
Recommendations for Future Research ...................................................................................87

REFERENCES ............................................................................................................................89
# List of Tables

Table 1: Gender ..................................................................................................................70

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics..........................................................................................71

Table 3: Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistic for the Vocational Identity Scale.....................73

Table 4: Spearman’s rho for Null Hypothesis One.............................................................75

Table 5: Spearman’s rho for Null Hypothesis Two.............................................................77

Table 6: Spearman’s rho for Null Hypothesis Three.........................................................79
List of Figures

Figure 1: Histogram of the Career Related Parent Support Scale………………………………………71

Figure 2: Histogram of the Vocational Identity Scale………………………………………………72

Figure 3: Histogram of the Vocational Identity Scale for Male Participants………………….76

Figure 4: Histogram of the Vocational Identity Scale for Female Participants…………………78
List of Abbreviations

Career-Related Parent Support Scale (CRPSS)
Institutional Review Board (IRB)
No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)
Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT)
Southwest Louisiana (SWLA)
Vocational Identity Scale (VIS)
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Overview

This study explored whether a predictive relationship existed between parental expectations and planned post-secondary choices of high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish. This chapter reviews the historical, social, and theoretical backgrounds and provides the problem and purpose statements of the study, introduces the research question, gives the significance of the study, and defines terms.

Background

For students across America, senior year brings a lot of emotions. Elation, fear, anxiety, pride, all can be a part of the emotional rollercoaster students are experiencing in a year’s time. As students are wading through this emotional soup, they are also making decisions about their futures. Should they begin work, go to college, or learn a trade? What should they study and where do they see themselves in ten years? The decisions students make during senior year can have long-term implications. Who or what influences those decisions may vary, and some influences could carry more weight than others.

According to research, of the influences on students’ academic success and future aspirations, parental involvement has the greatest impact. The advantages of parental involvement in school seem to occur early in a child’s education, namely in grades one to five (Harris & Robinson, 2016). Froiland, Peterson, and Davison (2012) suggested children are more successful in school if parents become involved early in their academic careers. At the elementary level, school-specific parental involvement is the most common form of parental involvement, such as helping with homework and attending parent/teacher conferences. Once students reach high school, the need for autonomy along with more complex school systems...
create barriers that prevent day to day school-specific parental involvement at the secondary level. Research has noted that despite the decline in the day-to-day involvement, parents are still vital to the academic success of students. Wang, Hill, and Hofkens (2014) noted as students mature, communication between home and school declined, and academic socialization in the form of encouraging independence and linking the importance of education to future success became important. Despite the desire for independence, high school students need the structure of parental involvement to be successful as an open parent/child relationship becomes significant. Although parents are reducing their presence in school-based activities, there is an increase in activities that allow students to learn independence and decision making (Bhargava & Witherspoon, 2015). As students move through high school, parental involvement in the form of parental expectations becomes more important than just checking grades (Froiland & Davison, 2014). Parental expectations of their child’s abilities, performance, or future can derive from many sources. Research suggests parents often develop expectations that are gender-related and these expectations typically begin early in the development of the child (Halpern & Perry-Jenkins, 2016). The idea of what is “men’s work” or “women’s work” is developed through the interactions and experiences children have with their parents, and these expectations could alter post-secondary choices as adolescents fear their choices do not align with parental expectations of gender work roles. For high school students preparing to make decisions about post-secondary life, the expectations conveyed by parents become paramount in making those decisions.

**Historical Context**

Parental involvement in the education of children is not a new concept. Before national, state, and local education authorities became responsible for education, parents were the primary educators in the lives of children (Watson, Sanders-Lawson, & McNeal, 2012). For the most
part, education was the responsibility of home and church. For those who were able, such as wealthy planters and merchants, children of a certain age were shipped to England for formal education. Providing school in the home was still the primary practice to educate students, which was of little use to children of parents who lacked the education needed to provide their children with basic learning (Urban & Wagoner, 2014). As colonies began to establish themselves, faith-based schools and colleges began to emerge, and education became available to more people in an out of the home setting. This form of education continued until the introduction of modern schooling, with the help of Horace Mann. Mann pushed for state-run systems with a common curriculum, teacher training, and religious-free state-approved textbooks (Peterson, 2010). Education was turned over to outside sources and parents slowly began to lose control over the influence they once held on their children's learning (Jeynes, 2010). It was not long before educators began to see the ill effects of a lack of parental involvement in children’s education.

Research soon began to emerge concerning the need for parental involvement in schools. As more and more students began to attend school outside of the home, the basic social skills once taught at home were no longer taught and the need to involve parents in education became evident. Not only were parents not teaching professional skills such as reading, writing, and arithmetic, but lessons such as work ethic, pride in a job well done, and responsibility were not being transmitted as before (Coleman, 1991). For the most part, much of the research focused on elementary-age children. The need for parental involvement caught the attention of governing bodies and legislation such as Project Headstart (1964), Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Handicap Act of 1974, and the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, which all included provisions for parental involvement as it was deemed vital to the success of students. In the late 1990’s, research focusing on parental involvement in the lives of adolescent students started to
make an appearance. Research, however, pinpointed a difference in the type of parental involvement that was most effective for adolescents. Parental expectations were deemed to have the greatest influence on middle and high school students (Chabra & Kumari, 2011; Fan & Williams, 2009). Furthermore, research indicates that the influence of parental expectations reached beyond the high school years into post-secondary choices of students (Ambrosino & Sciarra, 2011).

**Social Context**

The need to have a post-secondary plan seems wise in this era. Students cannot wait until the day of graduation to determine what they plan to do the days, weeks, or months after graduation. For most, a college degree is a key to success and wealth (Kirk, Lewis-Moss, Nilsen, & Colvin, 2011). Students who are not interested in pursuing a four-year college degree have the option of attending community college or vocational school. Still, other students enter directly into the workforce and undergo on-the-job training. Today’s students are fortunate in that they have a variety of options. Parents influence the choices their students make when deciding their post-secondary paths (Plank & Jordan, 2001). In deciding the next steps in life, every consideration must be taken to ensure students are making choices that are in their best interests.

A concern with the impact of parental influence on post-secondary choices is the degree to which student wishes conflict with parent expectations and how the student responds to parental expectations. Positive parental support builds student self-efficacy and allows students to feel free to make decisions regarding their futures. Conversely, students who feel controlled by parents struggle with making post-secondary decisions and moving forward with their goals (Dietrich & Salmela-Aro, 2013). Students who are forced into a career or pursue careers out of a desire to please parents could experience life-long implications of their decisions in the form of
career regret and job dissatisfaction. Southwest Louisiana (SWLA) is a community bursting at the seams with career opportunities. Historically, the community relied heavily on mining as well as oil, gas, and other industrial refineries for steady employment and income. In recent years, this type of industrial employment has grown. Currently, there are around 55 industrial refineries, 40 of which are within a 10-mile radius. With an increase in the number of industrial jobs, there is also an increase in the number of employment opportunities in the medical field, restaurant and service industry, and legal and law enforcement fields. The community is also home to three large casinos that provide a variety of career options in the gaming industry. Jobs, whether right out of high school or after post-secondary training, are readily available for every skill set. Students have the opportunity to pursue a plethora of careers choices from industry to medicine, but students may be making career choices out of a desire to please parents and not out of personal interest.

**Theoretical Framework**

Social cognitive career theory (SCCT), developed by Lent, Brown, and Hackett in 1994 as a means of integrating theories that explain the process of academic and career development, suggests there are three key aspects that work together to guide the career choices of students: self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). Parents are children’s first educators. As children grow, they are exposed to career-related activities through personal experiences or through the experiences of others, such as parents or relatives. Feedback from the important figures in the life of the child either reinforce the career activities or discourage children from pursuing a particular career. SCCT suggests that career behaviors that receive positive reinforcement are the behaviors children develop and begin to form a positive sense of self-efficacy regarding the behavior or task. Children then develop outcome
expectations and goals for activities they feel they can perform. Parental expectations can shape the self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals of children because, as the theory suggests, the career-related activities children are exposed to and receive positive feedback for can be a product of the context and culture in which they are raised (Lent et al., 1994).

Children learn and continue to learn the behaviors and ideas their parents find pleasing and those that will result in disapproval from parents, developing a storehouse of the behaviors, attitudes, desires, and choices that coincide with their parents’ behaviors, attitudes, desires and choices (Howell, 2005). Parents can impact choices of children by articulating the desire they have for their children’s futures. Parents demonstrate their expectations in a variety of ways. By providing or not providing learning experiences or by displaying positive or negative attitudes about learning or the need for education, parents are inadvertently teaching their children the same values. These lessons may impact students’ immediate decisions, such as post-secondary plans, as well as impact life-long success and aspirations.

It is evident parental expectations directly impact student choices. History shows parental involvement to be a mainstay in education. Social cognitive career theory (SCCT) explains how parental expectations can influence students’ post-secondary choices. SCCT suggests students learn new things through experiences and observed behaviors. Parents teach children what is valuable through actions; the value parents place on education and careers will be the value children place on education and careers. Over time, children begin to accept the values taught to them by their parents and work to cultivate the skills needed to pursue career choices positively reinforced by parents. Motivation to become a doctor, lawyer, teacher or welder is fueled by a desire to please and meet parental expectations. Ideally, parental expectations should motivate and encourage students to achieve the goals of the students’ choice. The concern of this study is
how parental expectations could influence students to pursue post-secondary paths that could lead to dissatisfaction later in life.

**Problem Statement**

Parental involvement has been found to have a profound impact on the academic success of students. Bempechat and Shernoff (2012) found a direct link between parental involvement processes and student motivation in elementary school. As students move through middle school and high school, parental involvement in the form of parental expectations becomes important. In late adolescence, parental expectations and goals become the expectation and goals of the student (Cheung & Pomerantz, 2013). Students begin to internalize the goals their parents set for their futures, and those goals become their own.

Parental expectations continue to guide students’ choices in high school. Parental expectations are a strong determining factor in whether students will pursue post-secondary education (Ross, 2016). Furthermore, research by Ginevra, Nota, and Ferrari (2015) noted the degree of parental support and expectations could dictate career choices of students. Research identifies parental expectations as a driving force in students’ academic success and future choice (Fan & Williams, 2010; Ginevra, Nota, & Ferrari, 2013; Kirk et al., 2011), but gaps in the research exist examining if student choices are parental choices and not the desire of the student. Some research suggests that when not allowed to freely express their interests, individuals may make career choices based on what is within their range of ability, what is available, and what will bring some modicum of success (Lent et al., 1994).

In Southwest Louisiana, there are numerous career opportunities. This study sought to examine if parental expectations of students’ choices are encouraging students, either through immediate entry into the workforce or through college or vocational training, to pursue careers
not of their choice. Research illustrates a clear connection between parental expectations and student performance (Ambrosino & Sciarra, 2011; Chabra & Kumari, 2011; Froiland & Davison, 2014). Research is also available demonstrating how parental expectations guide post-secondary choices (Dietrich & Salmela-Aro, 2013; Ginevra, Nota, & Ferrari, 2015). Studies of collectivist cultures and Asian cultures demonstrate that parental expectations of career choices can force students to make choices based on parental expectations (Guan et al., 2016; Sawitri, Creed, & Zimmer-Gembeck, 2014). There is little research available exploring the relationship between parental pressures on career choices and the long-term impact such as career regret and job dissatisfaction later in life. The problem researched in this study was if parents in Southwest Louisiana may be pressuring students to enter careers contrary to their interests, which could lead to long-term implications such as career regret and job dissatisfaction later in life.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this correlational study was to determine if there was a predictive relationship between parental expectations as perceived by the student and post-secondary choices of high school seniors at two high schools in Southwest Louisiana. The predictor variable, parental expectations, was defined as students’ perceptions of their parents’ goals and aspirations for their futures (Yamamoto & Holloway, 2010). The criterion variable, post-secondary choices, was defined as entering the workforce, attending vocational school, or attending college with the intention of pursuing a career with employment readily available in the parish (Ali & McWhirter, 2006). The study also examined if parental expectations could better predict the post-secondary choices of students based on gender, determining if parental expectations influenced decisions greater based on the gender of the child. Participants for this
study came from a convenience sample of 12th-grade students at two high schools in a Southwest Louisiana parish.

**Significance of the Study**

Parental expectations are essential to building academic self-efficacy and career choices as students move through adolescence. While research is present discussing the impact of parental expectations on students’ academic success (Froiland & Davison, 2014; Cheung & Pomerantz, 2012; Wang, Hill, & Hofkens, 2014), the relationship between parental expectations and post-secondary choices deserve further study. More specifically, the relationship between parental expectations and how those expectations impact the post-secondary choices of high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana (SWLA) parish is an area that warrants further study. Wilder’s (2014) research provided continued evidence of the strong relationship between parental expectations and academic success, usually because children tend to share the same attitudes and beliefs as parents; thus, parent goals become student goals. Cheung and Pomerantz (2012) echoed this assertion in research identifying parents as a motivating factor in student success. The current study sought to determine if parental expectations are influencing high school seniors in SWLA to pursue one particular career path to the exclusion of all other career choices. While research is available suggesting that parental expectations guide student goals, little research focuses on how those expectations influence and in some cases pressure students to pursue work or degrees contrary to students’ wishes. While this research focused on students in a small community in SWLA, the results could be beneficial to schools, parents, and students in other communities where long-standing industry dominates the workforce (e.g., mining towns or fishing villages). This research could also be beneficial to families where a career such as medicine or teaching is an expectation of graduating seniors.
Research Question

The research question for this study is as follows:

**RQ1:** Can parental expectations predict the post-secondary choices of high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish?

Definitions

1. *Career adaptability* – the ability one has to successfully manage career development and challenges (Fiori, Bollmann, & Rossier, 2015).

2. *Career compromise* – adjustment to career goals as a result of career or academic barriers (Gottsfredson, 2002).

3. *Career distress* – negative feelings such as stress, lack of purpose, anxiety, blame, or helplessness that relate to compromises in career or academic path (Creed, Hood, Praskova, & Makransky, 2016).

4. *Choice Model* – the intention to pursue actions required to prepare for a career or academic path (Lent et al., 1994).

5. *Context influences* – the limits to people’s free agency in making career choices (Lent et al., 2002).


7. *Gender socialization roles* – the transformation from parents or society to children of the norms, behaviors, or skills needed to be a successful man or woman (Lawson, Crouter, & McHale, 2015).

8. *Employment demands* – refers to an individual’s self-efficacy regarding the skills they possess that would be deemed necessary by an employer (Creed & Gagliardi, 2015).
9. *Employment confidence* – the level of confidence one has in being employed in the desired field (Creed & Gagliardi, 2015).


11. *Parent-orientated motivation* – children’s motivation is driven by a concern with meeting parents’ expectations in the academic arena so as to gain their approval (Cheung & Pomerantz, 2012).

12. *Parish* – derives from the French, Spanish, and Catholic Church influence. The state of Louisiana is divided into 64 sections similar to counties.

13. *Performance Model* – the level of accomplishments and manifestations of persistence in pursuit of interest and goals (Lent et al., 1994).


15. *Self-efficacy* – self-efficacy is the belief one has in his or her ability to perform a task (Bandura, 1997).


17. *Vocational Interest Model* – the feeling one has regarding career and related activities (Lent et al., 1994).

18. *Work Volition* - the perception that one can freely make career decisions despite constraints (Duffy, Diemer, Perry, Laurenzi, & Torrey, 2012).
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

This study examined how accurately parental expectations of post-secondary choices could predict the career choices of high school seniors in Southwest Louisiana. Chapter Two discusses and provides supporting evidence of the social cognitive career theory as the basis of the study. Chapter Two also presents related literature and identifies evidence and arguments of previous studies that guided this study in the goal of closing a gap in existing literature.

Theoretical Framework

Social cognitive career theory (SCCT), developed by Lent, Brown, and Hackett in 1994, is derived from Bandura’s social cognitive theory (1986). SCCT also has roots in Krumboltz’s social learning theory of career decision making (Krumboltz, Mitchell, & Jones, 1979) and the self-efficacy construct used by Hackett and Betz’s (1981) study of women’s career development (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 2002). Keeping in line with the constructivist point of view regarding human’s ability to influence their development and surroundings, SCCT’s goal was to integrate similar theories into one that could be used to explain the process of academic and career development. SCCT builds on three variables with roots in social cognitive theory: self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals that are critical to career development. Lent et al. (1994) utilized Bandura’s (1986) definition of self-efficacy. Bandura defined self-efficacy as the belief one has in his or her ability to perform a particular task. According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy beliefs are created and modified through four learning experiences: (a) personal performance, (b) learning from the experiences of others, (c) social persuasion, and (d) physiological and affective states. Researchers of SCCT view self-efficacy as a fluid set of beliefs that can be altered based on performance and interactions with others (Lent et al., 2002).
Lent et al. (1994) suggested that although all four components play a role in building self-efficacy, personal performance has the greatest impact on how an individual will view his or her abilities and success on future tasks. Outcome expectations refer to a person’s belief concerning the outcome of a particular behavior and develop through experiences similar to those that drive self-efficacy. These beliefs can stem from extrinsic reinforcement, self-directed consequences, and the performance of a task itself. Through experiences, people develop outcome expectations. Expectations can change depending on the nature of the experience, whether it is positive or negative (Lent et al., 2002). Goals refer to a person’s intent to participate in a particular activity (Lent et al., 1994). The authors suggested that although behavior to some degree is shaped by environmental events and personal history, personal goals are a means of managing future career or academic aspirations without relying on external forces (Lent et al., 2002). Goals aid in organizing and guiding personal behavior over a period of time and are a method by which people direct purposeful personal action. The type of goals and the effort one expends in reaching his or her goals is often dictated by self-efficacy and outcome expectations. Conversely, the development of a strong self-efficacy and outcome expectations can be influenced by the success or failures of personal goals (Lent et al., 1994). As first suggested by Bandura (1986), goals, self-efficacy, and outcome expectations work in conjunction to control behavior. Lent et al. (1994) determined all three social cognitive mechanisms collaborate to form the SCCT models of educational and vocational interest development, choice making, and performance attainment.

**Social Cognitive Theory Interest Model**

The Interest Model defines vocational interest as the feelings one has regarding career and related activities (Lent et al., 1994). During childhood and adolescence, children are exposed
to a wide array of careers or career-related activities, either through direct experiences such as performing science experiments in class or creating an architectural model, or through the experiences of others such as a parent, teacher, or family friend. It is during this time children, based on varying circumstances, are either encouraged or discouraged from pursuing a particular career or activity. Over time, repeated interaction, modeling, and feedback from others aid in the honing of skills, which allows children to develop performance standards, self-efficacy for tasks, and expectations of the outcome of their performance (Lent et al., 1994). Lent et al. posited that interest development is a dynamic process and tends to settle around adolescence. However, changes in interest can occur throughout life and are often a result of life-changing events. Essentially, the interest model suggests that for children/adolescents to develop interests in a particular career or academic pursuit, they must have exposure to those interests through positive direct or indirect experiences, which in turn builds their self-efficacy and expectations of positive outcomes. Career or academic interest for a particular activity, career, or academic path finds foundation in self-efficacy or belief one has in his or her abilities and the perceived expectations of the resultant outcome of the activity, career, or academic path.

**Social Cognitive Career Theory Choice Model**

The choice model defines choice goals as the intention to pursue actions required to prepare for a career or academic path (Lent et al., 1994). Building on interest fostered by self-efficacy and outcome expectations, individuals develop choice goals such as deciding at a young age to become a doctor and making a goal of attending medical school. The creation of goals increases the probability of choice actions such as enrolling in medical school or pursuing a career related to one’s interest. Subsequent performance experiences such as grades of courses taken in high school impact self-efficacy and one’s perception of the outcome of choices (Lent et
Like the interest model, the choice model is a dynamic process and can be altered directly through outcome expectations and self-efficacy. Lent et al. (1994) asserted that individuals are more likely to pursue careers if the perceived outcome is greater, such as a larger salary, greater prestige, or helping others. Self-efficacy impacts choice both directly through career goals, actions, and performance attainment and indirectly through outcome expectations. Lent et al. (1994) described the choice model as working in a “feedback loop,” meaning the results of earlier career-related behaviors mediated by self-efficacy and outcome expectations confirm or redirect future career choices.

Social Cognitive Career Theory Performance Model

The performance model is defined as the level of accomplishments and manifestation of persistence in pursuit of interests and goals (Lent et al., 1994). Various factors impact performance attainment. Self-efficacy directly impacts performance through the role it plays in the belief in one’s skills. Individuals who are confident with their math skills will perform better in a trigonometry class than those who feel they struggle in math class. Self-efficacy also has an indirect impact on performance attainment through goals and actions. If a student determines math is not his or her strong suit, he or she may change the goal of becoming an engineer and the actions he or she takes in pursuing that career or academic path because of undesirable outcome expectations. As with the previous models, the authors identified a loop between performance and subsequent choices (Lent et al., 1994). Performance in trigonometry class altered the choices of the student. In addition to self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and performance goals, ability also plays a role in performance. Ability impacts performance directly through the development of mastery skills. Some students are just naturally good at math and can grasp complex concepts with ease. Indirectly, ability impacts perceived efficacy and outcome expectations. There are
cases where students may feel they are better at a particular subject than they are, and this can lead to the formation of unrealistic outcome expectations. Lent et al. (1994) determined the performance model indicates a relationship between outcome expectations and self-efficacy and identifies a connection between performance and resulting self-efficacy and outcome expectations.

**Barriers to Career Choice**

Social cognitive career theory (SCCT) operates under the assumption that all children are free to make choices concerning their academic and career options, possessing the necessary support needed to be successful; however, this is not always the case. Many adolescents are unable to pursue careers in a field of their choice due to what Lent et al. (2002) referred to as context influences. Context influences are the limits to people’s free agency in making career choices (Lent et al., 2002). Influences such as financial constraints, unsupportive family, the pressure to pursue other careers, gender roles, or cultural or religious institutions all have the potential to impact interest and career choice of adolescents (Lent et al., 1994).

Drawing on the work of Vondracek, Lerner, and Schulenburg (1986), Astin (1984), and Mitchell and Krumoltz (1996), the SCCT theorists identified two subgroups of opportunity structure factors that affect career behavior. Distal or background factors like opportunities for skill development, cultural and gender-role socialization processes and emotional and financial support shape social cognition and interest. Proximal influences such as job availability and social structural barriers are considered when making career choices (Lent et al., 2002). When applied to the SCCT model, Lent et al. (2002) posited that opportunity structures impact students’ ability or willingness to turn their career interests into goals and their goals into the action of pursuing a career related to their interests. Adolescents who have the support of family,
financial backing, and exposure to interest-based learning experiences can operate through the SCCT model as the theorist intended. Conversely, adolescents who face many obstacles and receive less support face challenges and sometimes opposition to their career choices. The result is choosing a career, not because of interest, but because the chosen career is pleasing to others or fulfills some other need in the life of the adolescent (Lent et al., 1994; Lent et al., 2000; Lent et al., 2002).

Social cognitive career theory (SCCT) describes career development as a fluid process with several interlocking parts and contextual factors impacting career and academic choices. A clear tenant of the SCCT is that experiences either directly or indirectly aid in shaping academic self-efficacy and outcome expectations. Rogers, Creed, and Glendon (2008) discovered self-efficacy and goals to be the two determining factors associated with career planning and career exploration. Students who are more secure in deciding on career choice (i.e., have greater self-efficacy) are better able to take steps to set goals and explore the available options of pursuing a career or academic choice of interest. Komarraju and Nadler (2013) found self-efficacy to be important in predicting academic achievement. Students who were more confident were less likely to ask for help, were able to regulate their behavior, and were able to maintain their motivation in a variety of learning environments. Self-efficacy and outcome expectations were found to be strong predictors of career and academic choices for high school students in rural communities (Ali & McWhirter, 2006) and students with disabilities (Ochs & Roessler, 2004). First-generation and prospective first-generation college students (Gibbons & Borders, 200) and students enrolled in a college program (Diegelman & Subich, 2001) also have a strong relationship between self-efficacy and outcome expectations and career and academic choices.
Nonetheless, as SCCT suggests, the interactions between self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals do not occur in a vacuum and are subject to outside influences.

Contextual influences such as family support, financial worries, and educational experiences impact the formation of academic and career self-efficacy. Contextual influences also impact the expectations students have of the outcomes of pursuing a career or academic pathways of interest. Ginevra, Nota, and Ferrari (2015) determined adolescents’ perceptions of parental support predicted career choice through the impact on career self-efficacy. Students who feel supported and are given educational experiences in line with their interests are free to set goals and pursue careers of their choice. Conversely, students who feel pressure from parents to pursue other careers either directly or indirectly may feel pressured to enter into professions contrary to their interest. The current study seeks to determine if parental support or a lack of parental support is influencing high school seniors in Southwest Louisiana to pursue careers, not of their choice.

During the interest model phase of career development, parents may be providing educational experiences and positive reinforcement, not necessarily harming the student, but that is inconsistent with their children’s abilities and interests. Students are somewhat groomed to pursue careers that may be outside the realm of their interest due to a number of possible factors, such as a long history of readily available work in a particular field, a long family history of working in a field, or a current boom in the job market, resulting in an override of student choice later in adolescence. Goals and actions may be influenced less by interest and outcome expectations and more by job availability and the belief a student has about his or her ability to perform the job (Lent et al., 2002). Research is present suggesting parental support can shape career and academic self-efficacy and predict career choices, but research looks at this
phenomenon from the parents’ point of view. This study sought to determine if student perception of parental support could predict their post-secondary choices.

**Related Literature**

**Parental Involvement**

Parental involvement in the education of children is important to the formation of positive attitudes towards learning and solid development of career goals. Parental involvement in school has always been a part of the landscape of education in the United States in some form. The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB; 2001) somewhat mandated schools and parents work together in the education of children. The NCLB defined parental involvement as the participation of parents in meaningful two-way communication with the school regarding academics and other school activities. The purpose was to ensure parents were playing a key role in their children’s learning. Parents were encouraged to be actively involved in their children’s education at school as they are stakeholders in their children’s education and should be included in decision-making regarding their children’s schools. As a result of the guidelines set forth by NCLB, the United States Department of Education reports greater parental involvement in schools around the country (Choi, Chang, Kim, & Reio, 2015).

The type and extent of parental involvement activities varies depending on age and grade level of the student. Pomerantz, Moorman, and Litwack’s (2007) divided parental involvement into two categories. *School-based* involvement refers to activities that require parents to make contact with the school. *Home-based* activities are school-related activities parents and children participate in at home. Parents of elementary-age children typically participate in more school-based involvement, such as attending parent/teacher conferences, going on field trips, and attending PTA meetings. Although these types of involvement activities are more common for
elementary-age students, the importance of parents of elementary-age children to participate in home-based activities are equally if not more important to building a strong academic foundation in children. Research strongly suggests children of parents who participate in home-based activities early in the academic careers of their children and have high expectations for academic success not only perform better in elementary school, but that level of performance is lifelong (Chabra & Kumari, 2011; Froiland, Peterson, & Davison, 2012). These home-based activities such as helping with homework, discussing school-related events, and providing outside learning experiences, especially those that encourage a child’s interest along with high expectations, begin to build students’ self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is the belief one has in their ability to complete a task (Bandura, 1986). These self-building processes will guide students to adolescence where the dynamics of parental involvement change and have a greater impact on the academic and career development of students through middle school, high school, and beyond.

**Parental involvement with adolescents.** As students enter middle and high school, the face of parental involvement changes from school-based activities to more covert involvement. Parental strategies to motivate students that once worked in elementary school are no longer successful with middle and high school students. As parents participate less in daily school activities, the expectations they have for their children’s performance and the values they transmit about the importance of education become vital (Bempechat & Shernoff, 2012). Hill and Wang (2015), using data from a longitudinal sample of 1,452 African American and European American adolescents and their parents, examined the impact of parenting practices, such as monitoring, warmth, and autonomy support on the achievement of their students. The study showed that all three practices influenced students’ aspirations and engagement. Hill and
Wang (2015) determined that parents are vital through adolescence and into adulthood in guiding adolescents’ current endeavors and future goals through monitoring activities, showing interest, and allowing students to grow and make decisions.

Students who recognize their parents’ value of education and have higher perceived parental expectations for their academic success are more interested, engaged, and confident towards their academic undertaking. As such, parents’ educational values (meaning parents’ educational values and aspirations communicated through involvement) shape their children’s motivation to achieve academically (Fan & Williams, 2009). Parental expectations should mirror their values, beliefs, attitudes toward the school, teachers, goals, and future aspirations because children typically adopt the values, beliefs, and attitudes of their parents (Wilder, 2014). Wang and Shelkh-Khalil (2014) described this as academic socialization. Parents who communicated the importance and value of education and discussed plans with their child led to an increase in their child’s motivation, which in turn led to better overall school performance and higher achievement (Gniewosz & Noack, 2012; Wilder, 2014).

Parental expectations are an important form of parental involvement in adolescence. Parental expectations for their children play a significant role for students from all backgrounds graduating from high school and entering college (Ross, 2016). Gordon and Cui (2012) used data from a longitudinal sample to examine the role of the three dimensions of parenting processes in the academic life of their children and how these processes in adolescence impact academic achievement in young adulthood. Researchers measured the impact of school-specific involvement, general parental support, and parental expectations and determined that not only were parenting processes associated with GPA and adolescent academic performance, but there was also a positive association between parenting process and achievement in young adulthood.
School-specific involvement, general parental support, and parental expectations in a child’s formative and adolescent years serve as a strong foundation of academic and general success as children move into adulthood (Gordon & Cui, 2012).

Benner, Boyle, and Sadler (2016) investigated the association between four aspects of parent education involvement by collecting data from 15,240 10th-grade students collected during the Educational Longitudinal study of 2002 to understand the long-term effects of parental involvement on student success. The researchers concluded that greater parental involvement in school and academic socialization led to higher educational attainments. Furthermore, the influence of parental involvement continued to impact the success of students 10 years later. Despite the overwhelming evidence of the positive nature of parental expectations and the transmission of value systems, gaps in the literature exist discussing the possibility that parents could be less supportive and more controlling in their expectations of student interest or future goals.

**The Formation and Importance of Self-Efficacy**

Self-efficacy, or the belief one has in his or her abilities, plays a key role in the academic and career development of the adolescent. Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) suggests self-efficacy is formed through positive learning experiences in supportive environments (Lent et al., 1994; Lent et al., 2000; Lent et al., 2002). A student who finds art interesting and who is encouraged to draw and receives positive reinforcement experiences that expose the student to art builds a strong self-efficacy regarding his or her art skills. A positive self-efficacy can potentially lead to the development of outcome expectations and goals of pursuing art as a possible career. Ideally, this should occur for all students as they choose an academic pathway or career. However, some students may not have supportive environments and exposure to positive
experiences related to their interests, resulting in possible interference in the building of academic pathways and career development for students.

**Adolescence self-efficacy.** Adolescence is a time of uncertainty and change that can be difficult to navigate if an individual does not possess the skills, but more importantly, the belief in their skills. The building of a positive self-efficacy during adolescence is important as they discover their strengths and weakness and work toward making life-long goals. Self-efficacy is the building block of motivation, satisfaction, health, and accomplishment (Bandura, 2006). This is especially true of adolescents in a 21st century digital society. Adolescents must feel there is some benefit to their action, otherwise there is little incentive to pursue that action. Self-efficacy has power over whether an individual thinks positively or negatively, in a manner that foster self-esteem or is self-deprecating, how well they stay the course in adverse situations, and how they manage stress, depression, their thoughts, and behavior (Pajares & Urdan, 2006).

Self-efficacy is also a determining factor in the life choices of an individual. Individuals will make choices congruent with beliefs about their abilities. Bandura (2006) cited that efficacy beliefs shape an individual’s outcome expectations. Adolescents will pursue activities they believe will end positively and avoid those activities they believe will result in negative outcomes (Schunk & Meece, 2006). As individuals move from task to task, they are constantly interpreting the results of their actions and develop choices, behaviors, and competencies they will use when approaching a new task (Pajares & Urdan, 2006). When adolescents are successful at a particular task, it builds confidence for a similar task in the future. As suggested in SCCT, outcome expectations and self-efficacy are interwoven. Self-efficacy guides an individual’s beliefs about the results or outcome of a task. Once the task is complete, the results or outcome of the task alters or strengthens the self-efficacy of the individual. During adolescence, this give
and take between self-efficacy and outcome expectations guides future academic and career choices. Although they may possess the skills, adolescents who are not given the opportunity or discouraged from engaging in tasks aligned with their interests are not able to make a positive connection between outcome expectations and self-efficacy, thus encountering a barrier to academic and career formation.

**Academic and career self-efficacy.** An adolescent’s belief in his or her ability to perform certain tasks extends in academics and career decisions. Self-efficacy shapes cognitive development and accomplishment as well as regulates learning activities, aids in the mastery of content, motivates, guides the reactions to the perception of others, and encourage or discourages future learning (Bandura, 2006). As with personal development, academic self-efficacy has the power to enhance or hinder academic pursuit and performance. Research suggests that social, but more so academic, self-efficacy can play a key role in the formation of career decision self-efficacy (Komarraju & Nadler, 2013). Like social and academic self-efficacy, career decision self-efficacy can have long-term influences on the life of an individual.

Academic self-efficacy is one of the most powerful predictors of academic achievement (DiGiunta et al., 2013; McGeown et al., 2014). Academic self-efficacy formation occurs through formal education, which equips adolescents with the intellect, self-belief, and regulatory capabilities needed to be life-long learners (Bandura, 2006). Students who are organized, tenacious, persistent, and satisfied with themselves believe they can master complex concepts and ideas, can remain motivated, and can regulate learning (Giunta et al., 2013).

McGeown, Putwain, Simpson, Boffey, Markham, and Vince (2014) examined factors that predicted intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of 455 secondary students. Students were given a questionnaire that measured personality, self-efficacy, and motivation. Results of the study found
that self-efficacy, along with personality, significantly impacts intrinsic motivation. Students who possess strong self-belief are more likely to pursue challenging tasks without the help of an adult (McGeown et al., 2014). In some cases, despite lower skill levels, adolescents who positively view their abilities can perform at higher skill sets.

Schunk and Meece (2006) posited that adolescents who experience learning difficulty or cannot perform a certain task could experience a decrease or increase in self-efficacy based on performance feedback. Adolescents who are more self-efficacious can manage outcome feedback and adapt to difficult circumstances. These adolescents have an increased chance of being successful despite struggling to achieve their goals (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006). Komarraju and Nadler (2013) suggested training adolescents to strengthen their self-efficacy in their ability to perform academically regardless of their skill level. As adolescents begin to value effort and working hard to meet their goals, they will begin to seek out more knowledge and greater challenges. Conversely, adolescents who doubt their abilities to perform academically face greater difficulty in being successful. Adolescents with low self-efficacy develop insecurities about their academic abilities and success.

Unfortunately, adolescents with low academic self-efficacy see intelligence as a fixed trait that cannot change. This belief decreases motivation and the likelihood of pursuing new knowledge and learning experiences (Komarraju & Nadler, 2013). Adolescents who doubt their ability to do well reduce their academic aspirations. These adolescents may experience depression, are less social, and exhibit more problem behaviors. As their doubts about their intellectual abilities grow and their academic skills decrease, adolescents with low academic self-efficacy have fewer career choices available and experience greater dissatisfaction later in life (Zimmerman & Cleary, 2006). The strength of an adolescent’s social and academic efficacy can
influence the type of occupations and thus academic pursuit because it shapes career self-efficacy and the type of careers adolescents choose (Bandura, 2006). Adolescents with high perceived academic self-efficacy progress academically and have a high aspiration to pursue careers in fields that require advanced educational development (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 2001).

Social efficacy, although not having a direct impact on the occupational choices adolescents make, does impact academic self-efficacy, which is the most pervasive direct influence on adolescents’ judgments about their career self-efficacy (Bandura et al., 2001). Academic self-efficacy is developed through formal education and learning experiences. The SCCT suggests learning through formal education, hands-on learning, and learning experiences provided by parents build adolescents’ self-efficacy. Parents who do not provide outside of school learning or encourage adolescents to explore a variety of career options run the risk of raising adolescents who lack the social, academic, or career self-efficacy needed to be successful later in life.

Parental influence on self-efficacy. Parents have a significant role in the development of adolescents’ self-efficacy. SCCT suggests that by the time most children reach adolescence they have a firm grasp on who they are and their academic and career choices. The development of this identity takes place over time and includes several components. The self-efficacy belief of adolescents is not enough to support adolescents in achieving goals. The self-efficacy required to achieve goals beyond talent or skill level comes from sharing knowledge and responsibility, multiple connections, mutual obligations, and concerted actions with others (Caprara, Scabini, & Regalia, 2006). Individual self-efficacy is built through the experiences people have as they grow and through positive interactions with people in the life of adolescents.
No role is more important in the lives of adolescents than that of a parent or caring adult. The interaction between parent and child in various ways and in response to a variety of situations builds an adolescent’s knowledge base. Parenting style can alter self-efficacy formation in adolescents. Parents who are over-involved in the life of their adolescent, who impose their will upon their child, make decisions and take care of every need raise children who possess a strong sense of entitlement. These adolescents often have a lower self-efficacy as they expend little of their own effort in completing important tasks and have not developed a strong sense of their abilities (Givertz & Segrin, 2014). When adolescents are not allowed to handle life for themselves, they cannot develop as individuals. Because learning experiences are vitally important to the formation of self-efficacy, allowing adolescents the freedom to learn, make decisions, and grow from consequences helps adolescents develop outcome expectations and goals that are attainable and within the realm of their interests and ability levels.

In conjunction with providing adolescents the room to develop a sense of self, parental encouragement is also critical to adolescent self-efficacy formation. Ferry, Fouad, and Smith (2000) discovered that perceived parental encouragement resulted in better performance in math and science. The research demonstrates the importance of parental verbal suggestions, support, and domain-specific encouragement in the academic and career development of children. The value parents place on education along with high aspirations and expectations for adolescents’ success fosters a feeling of interest, engagement, and confidence towards academic endeavors (Fan & Williams, 2009). Perceived parental support lends itself to the building of career self-efficacy much the same way it bolsters academic self-efficacy.

Although perceived parental support may not have a direct impact on adolescents’ interest, it does influence career self-efficacy (Turner & Lapan, 2002). Adolescents with access
to caring adults have high career search self-efficacy and can develop high capacity goals, resulting in positive vocational identity (Chen & Solberg, 2017). Support allows adolescents to identify a career choice and pursue goals of their choice. Qualities developed as a result of access to supportive parents or other caring adults allow adolescents to make decisions and feel confident in their choices, resulting in greater life satisfaction (Yap & Baharudin, 2016). When faced with pressure to conform to a pre-set notion of their futures, adolescents are at risk of living a less fulfilled life as they try to accommodate others’ ideas of their interests and skills.

**Academic and Career Development Barriers**

**Contextual variable.** Lent et al. (2002) identified two subgroups of opportunity structure that could impede career development. These structures are (a) distal contextual influences such as skill, culture, parental support, and expectations; and (b) proximal contextual influences such as job availability and sociostructurally barrier. Contextual influences can greatly influence career decisions. For high school students, parental support and expectations serve as the social support used to guide career interests and their goals for the future. Parental support in the form of career-based learning experiences, advice, and both overt and covert encouragement allows students to develop outcome expectations and goals, thereby solidifying their career self-efficacy (Ginevra, Nota, & Ferrari, 2015). Wright, Perrone-McGovern, Boo, and White (2012) used two subscales, anxiety and avoidance, of the Experiences in Close Relationships scale to determine the extent to which perception of support and career barriers influence academic and career self-efficacy. The instrument was given to 486 undergraduate psychology students. Results indicated that students who feel more support have higher levels of academic and career decision self-efficacy beliefs. Conversely, students who feel they do not have support and report more career barriers have lower levels of academic and career decisions self-efficacy beliefs.
Adolescents who perceive parental support feel respected in their career choices and persist towards their career goals with confidence (Ginevra, Nota, & Ferrari, 2015). Social support can foster what Gracia et al. (2015) referred to as career optimism. Social support increases confidence in the ability to perform tasks related to career decisions. As parents provide opportunities for students to enhance job-related skills while providing positive feedback, students are developing confidence in their career self-efficacy (Garcia et al., 2015). Research by Rogers and Creed (2011) discovered Grade 10 to be a critical time in career development. It is during this time support from parents, and other important persons in the life of the student allow students the time and information needed to make decisions for the 11th and 12th grade that will shape career pathways. Hirschi, Niles, and Akos (2011) noted that despite the overwhelming evidence that parental support positively impacts career self-efficacy, it is also important for students to actively engage in their career development.

**Parental expectations.** Parental expectations are the realistic beliefs or judgments parent have about their children’s future achievements (Yamamoto & Holloway, 2010). Parental expectations can be a driving force in academic achievement in school. Parental expectations are contextual influences that can aid or become a barrier to career development. Kirk, Lewis-Moss, Nilsen, and Colvin (2011) surveyed 171 parents and their adolescent children ranging in ages of 11 to 19 to determine the role of parent expectations on adolescents’ education aspirations. Using regression analysis and independent sample t-test to predict and compare groups, researchers noted that parental expectations could in part predict adolescence educational aspirations. Parents are in a position to provide ongoing support to students as they transition from secondary school to post-secondary training or the workforce. Parents who communicate their expectations build
students’ self-efficacy that influences the career and life expectations of the students (Kim, 2014).

Conversely, research suggests parental expectations sometimes takes the form of parental pressures. Research focusing on Asian Americans indicates culturally relevant and contextual factors (i.e., parental pressure and support, living up to parental expectations, outcome expectations, and internalized stereotypes) correlate with self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and interest in stereotypical careers (Shen, Liao, Abraham, & Weng, 2014). Guan et al. (2016), studying the role of traditionalist beliefs in career self-efficacy, parental support, and career adaptability among Chinese university students, concluded that parental expectations associate positively with career decisions and self-efficacy. The authors also noted career self-efficacy was stronger in students with low traditionalist beliefs. Students who strongly believe in the importance of tradition did not feel secure in making career choices outside of traditions. Sawitri, Creed, and Zimmer-Gembeack’s (2014) study of an Indonesian collectivist cultural society asserted that parental expectations have a direct association with career choice. Also, it was determined that in a collective society where parents shape the adolescents’ self-efficacy beliefs, parental expectations and congruence are a source of self-efficacy information and subsequent outcome expectations and career aspirations (Sawitri et al., 2014). Little research exists exploring the role parental pressures may have on the academic and career decisions in the United States. Although the U.S. culture does not generally exhibit these sort of familial and cultural norms, there may be instances where students are feeling pressure to conform to the career opportunities readily available in a community.

Cheung and Pomerantz’s (2012) research into parent-orientated motivation determined that parent-orientated motivation occurs when children are motivated to do well in school out of
a need to please parents. Parental expectations are a strong indicator of children’s motivation. The values and expectations parents teach their children are internalized, and parental expectations become the goals and expectations of the student. Children begin to internalize the goals their parents set for their lives and are often unable to distinguish their personal goals from the goals their parents set for them (Suizzo et al., 2016). Children act on these expectations usually to avoid guilt and anxiety, out of a sense of pride and self-worth, or out of a need to please parents (Cheung & Pomerantz, 2012). As with parental expectations in the form of parental pressure to pursue a certain academic or career path, parent-orientated motivation could play a role in the choice students make regarding future careers. Students in Southwest Louisiana may pursue careers such as work in local industrial refineries, the medical or education fields, or in the gaming industry as a result of internalized parental expectations or out of a desire to please parents.

**Gender barriers.** In addition to contextual influences such as parental expectations, other barriers to academic and career development exist. Gender roles have the potential to negatively impact self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals. The social cognitive career theory suggests gender roles and socialization may impede the development of academic and career self-efficacy.

Gender socialization refers to the transference from parents or society to children the norms, behaviors, or skills needed to be a successful man or woman (Lawson, Crouter, & McHale, 2015). In modern society, despite the advances made in equal rights for men and women, gender still has a significant impact on career and academic choices. Traditional female careers such as teaching and nursing are still largely represented by women. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2017), as recent as 2012, 76% of public school teachers
are women. The American Nurses Association (2015) reports that between the year 2010 and 2013, only 11% of nurses licensed in the United States were male. Careers such as construction and engineering, which are traditionally dominant male careers, have similar results. The United States Department of Labor’s Bureau of Labor Statistics (2018) reports that in 2017, only 9.1% of women were employed in the construction industry. The American Society of Engineering (2018) reports that in 2015, of the students enrolled in engineering programs, only 21.4% were women and only 19.9% of bachelor’s degrees in engineering were awarded to women.

Children are exposed in the home and in society to gender roles that have been traditionally assigned to males or females. Women are typically seen as nurturers, working in hospitals, schools, offices, or staying home to raise families. Men, on the other hand, are expected to be “breadwinners,” working as engineers and physicians or in more hands-on work such as electricians or contractors. This type of divide in gender roles in the world of work is known as gendered occupational segregation. Lawson, Crouter, and McHale (2015) cited that gendered occupational segregation can inhibit individuals from choosing careers of interest or one an individual would excel in due to gender socialization roles. The discrepancies seen in the number of men and women pursuing careers in various fields may not be all by individual choice. Gender socialization roles could play a role in stifling the number of men or women who pursue a career choice due to societal and possibly familial ideas of what is acceptable men or women occupations. Parental expectations could carry greater influence on career decisions, pushing students to pursue careers not only based on gender roles but the tighter control parents may have on a female child as opposed to a male child.

*Parental influence on gender socialization roles.* Gender socialization begins early in the life of a child and can be predictive of life choices as children move into adolescence and on
to adulthood. Theories such as social cognitive theory identify parents as a key influence in the development of children’s values and ideals. As a child grows, parents teach, model, accept or disapprove of behaviors traditionally belonging to men or women. These values apply to everything from how people should wear their hair to how to walk, sit, or stand. Using longitudinal data collected from 109 working-class couples, Halpern and Perry-Jenkins (2016) examined if the roles developed through parents’ gender ideologies and gender behaviors predict the development of gender-role attitudes of their six-year old children. Halpern and Perry-Jenkins (2016) determined that parental behaviors more than ideology could predict children’s gender-role attitudes, concluding that parents are the source of knowledge about gender stereotypes. Children pick up on the social cues of their parents and begin to develop values as they grow into adulthood that resembles those of their parents. These values also become a part of the development of career and academic choices and can become barriers to the future aspirations of an individual.

Social cognitive career theory defines career barriers or context influences as anything that limits a person’s free agency in making a career or academic pathway choices. During career choice development, interactions between parents and adolescents and the feedback adolescents receive dictates the visions of their future. If the feedback a student receives from their parents is negative, students are less likely to pursue that goal (Li & Kerpelman, 2007). If parents react negatively to their daughter working in the local oil refinery because they consider it not to be “girls work,” their reaction could have a negative impact on their daughters’ choices. Even if a female possesses the skills to be successful, she may be less inclined to pursue the career of interest because of feedback from parents. Barriers to this process due to the influence parents
have on gender socialization could interfere with the choices of students to pursue career or academic pathways that align with their interests.

**Differences in male and female career choices.** The decision to choose a particular career or field of study varies between men and women. Research indicated that parental gender socialization of their children and the gender roles parents fill in the home can dictate career choices. Busch-Heizmann (2015) surveyed 1,750 male and 1,697 female 17-year-old students to examine if supply-side mechanisms of occupational-gender segregation and analyzed work value affected adolescents gender-(a)typical occupational aspiration. Supply-side theory suggests women develop preferences in work/life balances in their youth while men develop higher extrinsic work values. The theory assumes that gender typicality in work values affects aspirations for gender-typed occupations. The research also explores how parent gender role behaviors may determine the development of gender-(a)typical occupation aspirations.

Adolescents who have positive relationships with their parents and identify their parents as role models are more likely to pursue gender-typical occupations (Busch-Heizmann, 2015). More specifically, males who grew up in an environment where mom took care of the children and performed household chores and dad worked outside the home are more likely to seek gender-typical occupations. Lawson, Crouter, and McHale (2015) determined that mothers’ traditional attitudes as well as time spent with both parents can predict men choosing more gender-type careers. Research concluded that when men and women spend more time with their fathers, they are more inclined to choose male-typed occupations.

For the most part, as individuals move from high school into college and careers, the gender-related attitudes and self-concepts play a role in career decisions. Males at this point typically embrace more traditional roles and hold less egalitarian attitudes towards women.
pursuing typically male careers, while females are more likely to reject gender roles to improve their position in life (Freund, Weiss, & Wiese, 2013). DiDonato and Strough (2013) wanted to determine the extent to which United States college students, ages 18-23, have gender-typed attitudes about occupations. Administered as an online instrument, the questionnaire measured students’ attitudes about gender typical occupations for self and others and how much those attitudes determine academic major and intended occupations. DiDonato and Strough’s (2013) results mirrored previous research, determining that men and women both agree men should hold masculine occupations, but women should hold both masculine and feminine occupations.

Women face more challenges in pursuing careers of choice. Women often feel they face more barriers than do men. Despite having higher career aspirations, these barriers can predict the occupational aspirations of women as they move through college (Watts, Frame, Moffett, Van Hein, & Hein, 2015). Research by Raque-Bogdan, Klingaman, Martin, and Lucas (2013), in support of Watts et al. (2015), documented more perceived career barriers in females, but ironically reports these barriers were of little consequence to the women in the study as these women’s self-efficacy and outcome expectations were not negatively affected by perceived barriers. Adolescents who choose careers based on interest but outside the realm of what is considered male or female occupations may feel pressure to conform to gender socialization norms, which could impact long-term career satisfaction.

**Other barriers.** Financial barriers can serve as a barrier to adolescents’ academic and career planning. The cost of college is at an all-time high; adolescents are often burdened with how to cover the cost while pursuing academic pathways and careers of their choice. Poynton, Lapan, and Marcotte (2014) focused on how 12th-grade students planned to finance their post-secondary education. The research also examined how career development and college and
career readiness influence financial plans. Data from 744 students from 16 different high schools who intended to pursue post-secondary education were collected using an online survey. Results of the research indicated that almost half of the graduating seniors in the sample had limited financial planning strategies. At the point of transition from high school to college, some adolescents may find themselves on their own to finance school, often resorting to student loans to pay the bills. Other students may depend on others such as parents or scholarships or just have no inclination of how to fund their education. It is important to provide financial planning strategies for high school students, noting that it is important to provide plans that meet the needs of a diverse population of students (Poynton, Lapan, & Marcotte, 2014).

A lack of financial resources can impact adolescents in several ways. Adolescents from poverty or low socioeconomic status while having self-efficacy beliefs similar to their peers from middle to high socioeconomic statuses feel less career-related parental support (Raque-Bogdan, & Lucas, 2016). This may be due to parents needing to work for the family to survive or lacking the skills and knowledge to provide the type of support the adolescent needs to be successful. Adolescents facing uncertainty regarding how they will fund their academic and career choices may alter their decisions to match their circumstances. Parents who strongly encourage one profession or school over another may be concerned with covering the cost or lack the knowledge needed to prepare their students to obtain other forms of funding. Finances become a barrier because it can not only prevent adolescents from pursuing academic pathways and careers of their choice, but it puts a damper on self-efficacy belief throughout life. Dahling, Melloy, and Thompson (2013) discovered not only does financial strain negatively impact self-efficacy, but the negative impact is greater in areas with high unemployment rates. Individuals living in communities devastated by a crash in the economy or with very little employment options are at
greater risk of facing negative consequences of financial barriers. Adolescents and parents must find ways to overcome financial barriers for adolescents to be successful.

**Career Choice, Adaptability, and Satisfaction**

**Work volition.** Work volition is the perception of choice in one’s career decision making (Duffy, Diemer, Perry, Laurenzi, & Torrey, 2012). The concept is from the Psychology of Work Framework (Blustein, 2008). Work volition operates under the concept that most individuals experience a variety of barriers that interfere with their career decisions (Duffy, Bott, Allan, & Autin, 2014). Individuals who exhibit low work volition feel they have no control over their career choices as opposed to those who score high in work volition and feel greater satisfaction with their career choices. People who perceive high levels of choice in their career are more content at work because they are doing a job they enjoy (Duffy, Autin, & Bott, 2014).

As seen in the social cognitive career theory, barriers to career development have the potential of decreasing self-efficacy, which in turn impacts outcome expectations and goals of the individual (Lent et al., 2002). Research shows a link between work volition and self-efficacy, outcome expectations and self-efficacy and goals. These links are stronger between self-efficacy outcome expectations and goals among those with low work volition (Duffy et al., 2012). Jadidian and Duffy (2012) asserted that work volition strongly correlated with career decision self-efficacy and moderately correlated with academic satisfaction, meaning students who possessed greater confidence in their abilities to make career decisions also had more satisfaction in their academic pursuits. Duffy, Bott, Torrey, and Webster (2013) examined the extent to which work volition moderated the relationship between positive affect, core-self-evaluation, perceived organizational support and work self-efficacy to job satisfaction. Research sampled 206 employed adults and found that as work volition increased, the relation of self-efficacy to
job satisfaction increased as well (Duffy, Bott, Torrey, & Webster, 2013). Individuals who are forced into careers may experience less satisfaction in their careers, not because of their lack of ability to do their jobs, but from the career itself. In fact, knowing their talents are not being used in a career of their choice may lead to even less career satisfaction. Students who are making career decisions outside of their realm of interest are in danger of choosing careers that would later lead to career dissatisfaction due to the lack of control they experience or the realization they are using their skills in a profession not of their choice.

Career compromise. A concern facing students who are coerced into pursuing academic or career pathways and have little-perceived control over their career choices is the impact of career compromise. Students who do not have the freedom to choose their future will sometimes have to compromise their aspiration to fit into a mold created for them. Compromise occurs when students must adjust their goals in the face of career or academic barriers (Gottsfredson, 2002). Social career cognitive theory identifies compromise as a common occurrence in career and academic development. Lent et al. (1994) posited that when faced with barriers to academic or career choices, such as negative self-efficacy, lack of support from others, or financial constraints, people will alter their goals to match their circumstances. Gottfredson’s (2002) theory of compromise suggests there are degrees of compromise based on how far the compromise deviates from the original choice of the individual. Essentially, when faced with the realization of a compromise, individuals who have acceptable alternative choices are better able to make the compromise because the options feel more like choices instead of a compromise. Conversely, as individuals run out of available, acceptable choices, compromises become more difficult because individuals feel they have no control over their choices. Gottfredson (1996) asserted that while minor compromises can limit one’s career self-efficacy, major compromises,
especially those that greatly deviate from interest, can have a significant impact on the career self-efficacy of an individual.

The impact of compromise on the academic and career self-efficacy or the belief in one’s ability to perform a job, advance in a career, or earn a degree necessary to pursue a desired career is well documented. Most notably, career compromise seems to have a great impact on career-related well-being and satisfaction as well as a contributor to career distress. Research indicates the degree of desirability to pursue an occupation affects positive and negative emotional states and work satisfaction in individuals. Tsaousides and Jome (2008) discovered that even in hypothetical situations, as career options become less desirable, negative affects increased and positive affect and work satisfaction decreased. Creed and Blume (2013) noted career compromise as being negatively associated with career-related well-being and career satisfaction. Individuals reported less satisfaction in their career directions, progress, and futures when required they make compromises in their goals, which results in career distress and difficulty with settling on a career path.

**Career adaptability and satisfaction.** Students who abandon career and academic pathways of interest due to external factors must learn how to adapt to their new choices. Career adaptability is the ability one has to successfully manage career development and challenges (Fiori, Bollmann, & Rossier, 2015). Adaptability occurs in all areas of career and academic development, but plays a major role in career compromise. Hirschi and Vondracek (2009) posited that when adolescents compromise goals dues to environmental (e.g., social support) or achievement (e.g., scholastic ability), the adjustment to new goals can be a more difficult process compared to those who adapt to new goals out of a change in interest. Adapting to new goals due to a lack of support or the discovery of a lack of skill does not feel like a choice to adolescents.
When adolescents compromise their career or academic choices, they must be able to adapt and construct new goals that align with their new situations. Academically, adaptability is related to greater levels of academic satisfaction. Adolescents feel greater control and confidence in their career decision making when they can face challenges associated with their career choices (Duffy, Douglass, & Autin, 2015). As adolescents move through school, they begin to prioritize their goals. Adolescents who have a firm grasp on their future and have engaged in career planning tend to perform better in school and have a positive outlook on their vocational future (Negru-Subtirica & Pop, 2016).

Adaptability, when applied to career choices, can have immediate and long-term influences on the life of an individual. Adaptability, in some cases, is a result of a compromise in career choice. Research indicates that career compromise has the potential of negatively impacting the well-being and job satisfaction of an individual (Creed & Blume, 2013; Tsaouside & Jome, 2008). Individuals who then are not able to adapt to the compromise may experience further distress and job dissatisfaction. Fiori, Bollmann, and Rossier (2015) noted that individuals with higher career adaptability experienced less negative effects, which translated into less stress and higher levels of job satisfaction. Zacher (2015) suggested career adaptability can even impact daily career confidence and satisfaction. Individuals who daily can adapt to their careers feel confident and in control. These individuals are better able to perform daily tasks and are more eager to perform their daily job duties. Adolescents who feel coerced into a career choice, compromising a career of interest for one that will please others, may battle with a life of career distress and dissatisfaction.

**Career distress.** One of the more distinguishing impacts of career compromise is career distress. Career distress is the negative feelings such as stress, lack of purpose, anxiety, blame, or
helplessness that relate to compromises in career or academic path (Creed et al., 2016). Career compromise has been found to positively link to career distress. Individuals who compromise their goals experience more stress as they progress in their career or academic development (Creed & Gagliardi, 2015). Career compromise not only led to career distress, but impacted individuals’ perceptions of their employability.

Employment demands refer to an individual’s self-efficacy regarding the skills he or she possess that would be deemed necessary by an employer. Employment confidence is the level of confidence one has in being employed in the desired field. Creed and Gagliardi (2015) asserted that when people must compromise their careers, their confidence in their abilities to do the job may not be affected but their perceptions of what employers will think of their abilities are greatly impaired.

While the impact of career distress and employability perceptions can negatively affect individuals, Creed and Hughes (2012) found that career guidance strategies can moderate the relationship between career compromise and career distress. Individuals who seek career guidance and self-presentation strategies had lower levels of distress when facing a career compromise. This would suggest that individuals would need to be taught coping skills and strategies to help them adjust to changes in their career choice. In order to compromise on goals, individuals must have the ability to disengage from desired goals and re-engage in the compromise goals. Creed and Hood (2014) surveyed 181 first-year students using six-point Likert scales to measure goal disengagement and re-engagement, career distress, career planning, career exploration, career self-efficacy, and career barriers. The instruments were designed to measure if career self-efficacy and career barriers moderate a relationship between disengagement and re-engagement and career distress, planning, and exploration. Hierarchical
regression analysis determined disengagement and re-engagement can be associated with career distress. Individuals who struggle with disengagement or letting go of their desired career, or academic choice reported more stress in reengaging in the compromised choice. In contrast, individuals who were able to disengage effectively were better able to re-engage in a new career and academic pathways. Disengagement and reengagement are moderated by self-efficacy, meaning students with high levels of self-efficacy are better able to adjust to career compromise (Creed & Hood, 2013). Senior students who are subject to strong encouragement to pursue career paths contrary to their desires may not be getting the support from parents or learning the necessary skills one would need to adjust to unfavorable career compromises. Making compromise to career choices due to external pressures by parents or out of an internal need to please parents increases the likelihood of experiencing the negative effects of career distress and job dissatisfaction that comes from making a compromise to the desired career or academic pathways.

**Summary**

Parental involvement in the lives of children takes on many forms. As children move through childhood and into adolescence, parental involvement activities that impact student achievement changes from school-based activities to parental expectations and value transmission. The Social Cognitive Theory (SCCT) hypothesizes an interweaving connection of students’ self-efficacy beliefs, outcome expectations, and goals built on positive and supportive experiences in areas of student interests and assistance in academic and career development decisions (Lent et al., 1994).

Learning experiences and positive interactions aid in building student self-efficacy and outcome expectations. Self-efficacy refers to the belief one has in his or her ability to perform a
task. Academic self-efficacy is viewed as one of the single greatest predictors of academic success. Research suggests that academic self-efficacy also influences career self-efficacy and future endeavors of adolescents. Students are most successful when academic and career development takes place under the umbrella of a supportive environment. Parents or caring adults in the life of an adolescent provide the support needed to build self-efficacy and foster positive outcome expectations that allow adolescents to make academic and career choices to their satisfaction.

Contextual influences, such as parental expectations or culture or parental pressures to conform to academic or career paths hinder academic and career development (Lent et al., 2002). Evidence shows that other barriers such as financial burdens and gender may play a role in career choice. Research of Asian cultures indicates parental pressure can lead to obligatory career choices by students; however, little research exists examining if such practices are taking place in the United States. Research also indicates the level of work volition or the sense of choice regarding career choices are directly related to self-efficacy, outcome expectations, goals, and career satisfaction (Duffy et al., 2012). Adolescents who are encouraged to pursue careers outside their interest will compromise their career choices, which may not impact their ability to perform but will influence their careers and life satisfaction. Once adults, those who agree to compromise must learn to adapt to a new career, often experiencing career distress and require coping skills to learn to adjust to their new reality. Those who can make the adjustments experience greater career satisfaction than those who do not. Research suggests career satisfaction or lack of career satisfaction can carry a life-long impact.

Using the SCCT construct, this study aimed to determine if in Southwest Louisiana the contextual influence of parental expectations in the form of parental pressures play a role in high
school seniors pursuing careers that may be contrary to their interest. Pressures from parents may force career compromises, which in turn negatively impact career self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals of students, leading to obligatory career choices and job dissatisfaction. This study contributes to the existing body of knowledge by adding to the limited research focusing on the impact of parental pressure on academic and career decisions. This study could also assist in career counseling and parental education on how to prepare children for making career and academic decisions that best suit the children, as well as teaching children coping skills and career guidance strategies that would be beneficial as they make decisions about their futures.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

Overview

This study examined if parental expectations of post-secondary choices could predict the career choices of high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana. Chapter Three provides the research design and question, hypothesis, and gives details regarding participants and the setting. Chapter Three also provides the instruments that used in the study and the procedures and methods of data analysis.

Design

This study was conducted using a predictive correlation design. This design was appropriate because the aim of the study was to determine if the criterion variable, post-secondary choices defined as entering the workforce, attending vocational school, or attending college with the intention of pursuing a career with employment readily available in the parish (Ali & McWhirter, 2006), could be predicted by the predictor variable, parental expectations, defined as students’ perception of their parents’ support, goals, and aspirations for their future (Yamamoto & Holloway, 2010). The study used a correlation prediction research design because the study aimed to determine “the extent to which a criterion variable can be predicted” (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007, p. 342). Numerous studies (e.g., Guerra & Braungart-Rieker, 1999; Hays et al., 2016; Rogers, Creed, & Praskova, 2016) indicate a predictive relationship between parental expectations and involvement in the post-secondary choices and career aspirations of high school and college students. This study utilized the results of previous research and aimed to add to the existing body of knowledge concerning adolescents’ and college students’ career and vocational development.
Research Question

The research question for this study is as follows:

**RQ1**: Can parental expectations predict the post-secondary choices of high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish?

Hypotheses

The following are the null hypotheses for this study:

**H01**: There is no significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish.

**H02**: There is no significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of male high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish.

**H03**: There is no significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of female high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish.

Participants and Setting

The participants for this study came from a convenience sample of 12th-grade students from the class of 2018 at two high schools located in Southwest Louisiana. The school district is the fifth largest in the state of Louisiana, educating approximately 32,623 students. Demographics of the district are as follows: 48.9% female, 51.1% male, 60.9% Caucasian, 34.2% African American, and 4.9% classified as other. Of the students enrolled in the district, 14% classified as special education, and 63.52% were economically disadvantaged. The school district has an 80.4% graduation rate.

The sample came from two high schools in the center of the district. Within the sampling area, there are several industrial factories, casino gaming, medical offices, legal offices, and law enforcement agencies. There is also a university, community college, a trade school, and
vocational schools located within the sampling area. The two high schools in this study provided a well-rounded sample of students from a variety of ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds.

For this study, the number of participants sampled was 153, which exceeds the required minimum for a medium effect size of 66 with a statistical power of 0.7 at the 0.05 alpha level (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). The sample came from a population of 58 male and 95 female 12th-grade students from the class of 2018, enrolled at one of the two sampling high schools. Population age was 18 and students came from a variety of ethnic, socioeconomic backgrounds, and ability levels.

The setting for the study was two high schools located in the center of the parish. The instruments for the study were administered during a special assembly for senior students 18 years of age or older. This method was an appropriate choice because it provided a sample of students who could give consent in one location which made data collections convenient and efficient.

Lake City High School is a large high school located in the eastern portion of the parish. The high school has a student population of 1,993. Population age is 14 to 22. The school is 60% Caucasian, 32% African American, and 8% classified as other. Of the students included in the population, 8% classified as special education, and 44% classified as economically disadvantaged. The socioeconomic demographics of the school is a mix of upper middle class to wealthy professional residents. Recently an influx of students transferring in from failing schools has drastically changed the diversity of the school. According to the course offerings registration packet created by Lake City High School, the curriculum at Lake City High School prepares students to enter college with more emphasis placed on preparing students for professional degrees as opposed to trade and vocational careers.
Industry City High School is a large high school in the western portion of the parish. The school has a student body of 2,059, making it the largest in the parish. Population age is 14 to 22. The school is 84% Caucasian, 10% African American, and 6% classified as other. Of the students included in the population, 12% classified as special education, and 49% classified as economically disadvantaged. Socioeconomic demographics of the school vary from poverty to wealthy residents with a range of careers from blue collar to professional. According to the course offerings registration packet created by Industry City High School, the curriculum at Industry City High School is designed to prepare students to enter professional careers as well as trade and vocational based careers.

**Instrumentation**

This study used two instruments, the Career-Related Parent Support Scale and the Vocational Identity Scale.

**Career-Related Parent Support Scale (CRPSS)**

The predictor variable, parental expectations were measured using the Career-Related Parent Support Scale (CRPSS). The CRPSS was developed by Turner, Alliman-Brissett, Lapan, Udipi, and Ergun in 2003. Researchers designed the instrument to measure parental support for adolescents’ educational and vocational development. The basis of the scale is Bandura’s (1977, 1997) four learning sources of self-efficacy (Turner, Alliman-Brissett, Ergun, Lapan, & Udipi, 2003). Numerous studies (e.g., Michael, Cinamon, & Most, 2015; Michael, Most, & Cinamon, 2013; Raque-Bogdan, Klingaman, Martin, & Lucas, 2013) used the CRPSS to measure career development among adolescents. The scale assesses students’ perceptions of parental emotional support, verbal encouragement, career modeling, and instrumental assistance in their career choice and planning (Turner et al., 2003).
The CRPSS consists of 27 questions and uses a five-point Likert scale that ranges from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Responses are as follows: Strongly Agree = 5, Agree = 4, Neutral = 3, Disagree = 2, and Strongly Disagree = 1. The scale can be used as a whole with a score ranging from 27 to 135 points. The CRPSS can also divide into four subscales (Instrumental Assistance [IA], Career-Related Modeling [CM], Verbal Encouragement [VE], and Emotional Support [ES]) with scores ranging from 7 to 35 points for scales IA, CM, and ES, and 6 to 30 points for scale VE. This study used the entire scale as one instrument. A score of 27 points is the lowest score, meaning students did not feel career support from parents. A score of 135 points means students felt educational and vocational support from parents.

Validity and reliability of the scale as a whole and the four subscales were tested and found to be both valid and reliable. Internal consistency estimates for the four subscales ranged from 0.78 to 0.85 with the total scale score at an alpha level of 0.92 (Turner et al., 2003). Two-week test-retest reliability for CRPSS total score was $r = 0.79$ with subscales scoring as follows: $r = 0.75$ IA, $r = 0.87$ CM, $r = 0.76$ VE, and $r = 0.77$ ES (Turner et al., 2003). All scales were deemed reliable with an alpha of 0.70 and above for reliability (Warner, 2013).

The CRPSS construct validity, when compared with other measures of educational and career development, self-efficacy, and outcome scales, maintained its validity. Item sub-scores were $\geq 0.45$ with each subscale correlating more highly with the total instrument than with each other (IA $r = 0.85$, $p < 0.001$; CM $r = 0.68$, $p < 0.001$; VE $r = 0.73$, $p < 0.001$; and ES $r = 0.85$, $p < 0.001$; Turner et al., 2003). Dr. Sherri Turner granted permission to use the instrument in this study through email correspondence (see Appendix F).

**Vocational Identity Scale (VIS)**

The criterion variable, post-secondary choice, was determined by measuring students’
confidence in their career choice and overall satisfaction. This study used the Vocational Identity Scale (VIS) developed by Holland, Gottfredson, and Power in 1980. The scale was developed as a tool for career planning and counseling among high school and college students. Researchers theorized that vocational identity, which they define as a clear and stable picture of personal goals, interest, and talents, is an important component in making decisions regarding career choices (Holland, Gottfredson, & Power, 1980). Numerous studies (e.g., Fretz and Leong, 1982; Yamehak, Lease, Strauser, 2005; Toporek & Pope-Davis, 2001) used the VIS to measure the vocational identity of high school students, students with disabilities, and as a means of predicting career intervention outcomes.

For this study, the VIS was used to determine the overall satisfaction and strength of vocational identity high school seniors have with their career choice to pursue careers in local refineries. Students who were more satisfied with their decisions and have always identified with a career choice had a stronger vocational identity. Conversely, students who were not satisfied had a weaker vocational identity. The VIS consists of 18 true/false questions. After a 10-minute administration time, the scale is scored by adding the number of false responses with a range of 0 to 18 points. Higher scores indicate stronger vocational identity and lower scores indicate students are confused about their vocational identities and may not be satisfied with their choices of careers (Tinsley, Bowman, & York, 1989).

Validity and reliability for the VIS were tested, and it was found to be both a valid and reliable instrument for assessing the strength of vocational identity in high school seniors. Due to the dichotomous nature of the test, the Kuder-Richardson formula (K-R 20) was used to measure internal consistency (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). Based on the K-R 20, the VIS was found to be reliable with a score of 0.86 for male high school seniors (Holland et al., 1980). The construct
validity for the VIS was determined by the process used to develop the scale and hypotheses testing related to vocational identity and age, education level, vocational aspiration, external rating, and other criteria (Holland et al., 1980). Permission to use the Vocational Identity Scale was free for non-commercial use in research with the understanding the scale is properly cited, each copy bears the copyright notice, and no changes or adaptations are made to the scale.

The Career-Related Parent Support Scale and the Vocational Identity Scale were used in this study to determine how accurately parental expectations can predict the post-secondary choice of high school seniors. The CRPSS measured students’ perceptions of parental support for career choices and development while the VIS measured students’ strength of vocational identity and satisfaction of their career choices. The two instruments worked together to determine if students are choosing a career because of parental expectations and a desire to please parents. This would be evident by students who scored in the high range of the CRPSS but scored low on the VIS. Conversely, students who pursued a career of interests as a personal goal could score high or low in the CRPSS but scored score high in vocational identity.

**Procedures**

Permission to research district schools was obtained from the district superintendent through email correspondence in the spring of 2018 (see Appendix B). Face-to-face meetings to explain the nature of the research and seeking permission to research in their schools took place with the principals of each of the two schools and permission to research both high schools was granted in the spring of 2018 (see Appendix C).

Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was granted in late spring of 2018 (see Appendix A). The researcher scheduled with the administration at each school a convenient time and location to hold the senior assembly of students 18 years of age or older. On the day of the
assembly, the researcher gave a brief presentation of the nature and purpose of the research as well as assurance of the confidentiality of the data collected. Students of consenting age were presented with consent forms (see Appendix D), the contact information of the researcher, and the 27-question Career-Related Parent Support Scale (see Appendix E) and the 18-question Vocational Identity Scale (see Appendix F) during the assembly. After a 20-minute administration time, the surveys were collected and sorted. The surveys began with a question to determine a student’s gender and intent upon graduation. Students did not use their names or other identifying information when they filled out the survey. The surveys were printed on either side of one sheet of letter size paper to ensure student responses remain together. In early summer of 2018, the surveys were sorted by gender and organized into an Excel spreadsheet that consisted of numeric scores for both variables for each participant. All data were scanned for inconsistencies and checked for outliers. Data were analyzed using methods that are appropriate for a correlation research design. Data were stored on a password-protected computer as well as on a password-protected external data storage device, and once the study is complete, all data will be stored for the required five years.

**Data Analysis**

Once all surveys were collected, the scores were tallied and recorded for the predictor and criterion variables. The tallied scores for each participant were entered into an Excel electronic spreadsheet in preparation for statistical analysis. Data were checked for assumptions that are consistent with the required statistical analysis for the research. The Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) software, Version 21, was used to analyze the data.

To determine if parental expectations can predict post-secondary choices of high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana Parish, bivariate linear regression was used to analyze data.
This method of analysis was most appropriate because the researcher sought to express the magnitude of the relationship between two continuous variables which would allow a prediction of the score of the criterion variable based on the value of the predictor variable score (Gall et al., 2007).

The data were processed through SPSS using Pearson product-moment correlation, coefficient $r$, because the researcher sought to determine the degree of relationship between two continuous variables (Gall et al., 2007). The predictor variable, parental expectation was measured using a Likert scale with scores ranging from 27 to 135 points. The scores were treated as interval continuous scores. The criterion variable, post-secondary choice of high school seniors, was measured using a tally of false responses from a true/false questionnaire and has a scoring range of 0 to 18. These scores were treated as continuous ratio scores.

**Null Hypothesis One**

Data screening to determine the predictive nature of parental expectations on post-secondary choices of high school students began by checking for outliers using a Box and Whisker’s plot. Bivariate linear regression has six assumptions that must be tested to determine if a linear predictive relationship exists between variables. First, the level of measurement assumption was satisfied because both the predictor variable and the criterion variable were treated as interval and ratio continuous data, respectively. Secondly, independence of observation was tested using the Durbin-Watson Statistic. Third, the assumption of normality was tested using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test because the sample size exceeded 50 students. Fourth, a scatter plot between the predictor variable (x) and the criterion variable (y), looking for extreme outliers was used to test the assumption of bivariate outliers. Fifth, a scatterplot was used to determine the assumption of linearity. Lastly, a scatter plot between the predictor variable (x) and the
criterion variable (y), looking for the classic “cigar shape,” tested the assumption of bivariate normal distribution. A statistical power analysis for Pearson’s product moment correlation suggests a sample size of 66 for a medium effect size at the statistical power of 0.7 and with an alpha level of 0.05 (Gall et al., 2007). Linear regression was used to evaluate the predictive nature of parental expectations on post-secondary choices of high school seniors. Changes to the statistical analysis of a non-parametric measure of correlation were necessary as the dataset did not meet the assumptions of linearity and normality required to utilize Pearson’s $r$ correlations. A Spearman’s rho correlation had to be utilized. A 95% confidence interval with an alpha of .05 was utilized to determine if the hypotheses were rejected or accepted using the Spearman’s rho correlation (Gall et al., 2007).

**Null Hypothesis Two**

Data screening to determine the predictive nature of parental expectations on post-secondary choices of high school students began by checking for outliers using a Box and Whisker’s plot. Bivariate linear regression has six assumptions that must be tested to determine if a linear predictive relationship exists between variables. First, the level of measurement assumption was satisfied because both the predictor variable and the criterion variable were treated as interval and ratio continuous data, respectively. Secondly, independence of observation was tested using the Durbin-Watson Statistic. Third, the assumption of normality was tested using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test because the sample size exceeded 50 students. Fourth, a scatter plot between the predictor variable (x) and the criterion variable (y), looking for extreme outliers was used to test the assumption of bivariate outliers. Fifth, a scatterplot was used to determine the assumption of linearity. Lastly, a scatter plot between the predictor variable (x) and the criterion variable (y), looking for the classic “cigar shape,” tested the assumption of bivariate
normal distribution. A statistical power analysis for Pearson’s product moment correlation suggests a sample size of 66 for a medium effect size at the statistical power of 0.7 and with an alpha level of 0.05 (Gall et al., 2007). Linear regression was used to evaluate the predictive nature of parental expectations on post-secondary choices of male high school seniors. Changes to the statistical analysis of a non-parametric measure of correlation were necessary as the dataset did not meet the assumptions of linearity and normality required to utilize Pearson’s \( r \) correlations. A Spearman’s rho correlation had to be utilized. A 95% confidence interval with an alpha of .05 was utilized to determine if the hypotheses were rejected or accepted using the Spearman’s rho correlation (Gall et al., 2007).

**Null Hypothesis Three**

Data screening to determine the predictive nature of parental expectations on post-secondary choices of high school students began by checking for outliers using a Box and Whisker’s plot. Bivariate linear regression has six assumptions that must be tested to determine if a linear predictive relationship exists between variables. First, the level of measurement assumption was satisfied because both the predictor variable and the criterion variable were treated as interval and ratio continuous data, respectively. Secondly, independence of observation was tested using the Durbin-Watson Statistic. Third, the assumption of normality was tested using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test because the sample size exceeded 50 students. Fourth, a scatter plot between the predictor variable (x) and the criterion variable (y), looking for extreme outliers was used to test the assumption of bivariate outliers. Fifth, a scatterplot was used to determine the assumption of linearity. Lastly, a scatter plot between the predictor variable (x) and the criterion variable (y), looking for the classic “cigar shape,” tested the assumption of bivariate normal distribution. A statistical power analysis for Pearson’s product moment correlation
suggests a sample size of 66 for a medium effect size at the statistical power of 0.7 and with an alpha level of 0.05 (Gall et al., 2007). Linear regression was used to evaluate the predictive nature of parental expectations on post-secondary choices of female high school seniors.

Changes to the statistical analysis of a non-parametric measure of correlation were necessary as the dataset did not meet the assumptions of linearity and normality required to utilize Pearson’s $r$ correlations. A Spearman’s rho correlation had to be utilized. A 95% confidence interval with an alpha of .05 was utilized to determine if the hypotheses were rejected or accepted using the Spearman’s rho correlation (Gall et al., 2007).
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Overview

This chapter includes a review of the findings of this study. Descriptive statistics along with statistical analysis for each of the three research questions are presented in Chapter Four.

Research Question

The research question for this study is as follows:

RQ1: Can parental expectations predict the post-secondary choices of high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish?

Null Hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish.

H₀₂: There is no significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of male high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish.

H₀₃: There is no significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of female high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish.

Descriptive Statistics

Demographics

A sample of 182 graduating seniors of the class of 2018 who were 18 years of age or older was recruited for this study. Out of the 182 surveys given, 153 students responded to both parts of the survey, resulting in an 84% participation rate. The surveys were printed on either side of a sheet of paper. Twenty-nine students failed to complete both surveys, and therefore those responses could not be used in data analysis. Of the surveys completed, 37.9 % (n = 58) were male and 62.0 % (n = 95) were female (see Table 1).
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection Variables**

Participants’ perceptions of parental expectations was the independent variable, and it was measured using the Career Related Parent Support Scale (CRPSS). The CRPSS takes 10 minutes to complete and consists of 27 items scored on a five-point Likert scale. The five-point scale consists of the following responses: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral (acceptable), 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree (Turner et al., 2003). Scores for the scale range from 27 to 135, with 27 being the lowest score and 135 being the highest score (see Appendix E).

The mean total for the Career Related Parent Support Scale was 99.34 with a median score of 103.0. The standard deviation for the Career Related Parent Support Scale was 20.77 with a minimum score of 27 and a maximum score of 135. Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the Career Related Parent Support Scale (CRPSS). Figure 1 displays the histogram for the Career Related Support Scale (CRPSS).
Table 2

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>CRPSS</th>
<th>VIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>99.34</td>
<td>11.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>20.77</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>27 to 135</td>
<td>0 to 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Histogram of the Career Related Parent Support Scale.
The participants’ confidence and satisfaction in their post-secondary choices was the dependent variable, and it was measured using the Vocational Identity Scale. The VIS scale takes 10 minutes to complete and consists of 18 items scored true or false. The score range for the VIS is 0 to 18, with 0 being the lowest score and 18 being the highest score. The score was calculated by adding the number of false responses (see Appendix G).

The mean total for the Vocational Identity Scale was 11.12 with a median score of 11.0. The standard deviation for the Vocational Identity Scale was 5.13 with a minimum score of zero and a maximum score of 18. Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the Vocational Identity Scale (VIS). Figure 2 displays the histogram for the Vocational Identity Scale (VIS).
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*Figure 2. Histogram of the Vocational Identity Scale.*
Results

Assumption Tests

Before analyzing data, data screening and assumption testing were conducted to determine if the dataset met the required assumptions needed to utilize Pearson’s $r$ correlation. The assumption test included analyzing data for bivariate normal distribution, linearity, and bivariate outliers. Upon completion, it was determined that not all data met the assumptions required to use Pearson’s $r$ correlation. The dependent variable, Vocational Identity Scale (VIS), did not meet the assumption of bivariate normal distribution. Figure 2 displays a histogram of the Vocational Identity Scale. Further testing for normal distribution was done using the Kolmogorov Smirnov test because the population size exceeded 50 participants. Results of the test confirm the evidence presented in the VIS histogram as the statistic was .149 with a $p$-value of .000. Table 3 shows the statistics for Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

Table 3

*Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistic for the Vocational Identity Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the criterion variable failed to meet the assumption of bivariate normal distribution for each hypothesis, a Spearman’s rho correlation was used for each hypothesis to determine if a correlation exists between perceived parental expectations and post-secondary choices of high school seniors. Spearman’s rho is a non-parametric measure of correlations that
can be used when there is a violation of the assumption of bivariate normal distribution (Lund & Lund, 2018).

**Null Hypothesis One**

H01: There is no significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish.

The Spearman’s rho correlation was used due to a violation of the assumption of bivariate normal distribution by the criterion variable (see Figure 2 and Table 1). The data analysis compared the criterion variable measured by the Vocational Identity Scale to the predictor variable measured by the Career Related Parent Support Scale. Results of the data collected from 153 participants show a $r_s$ of -.006 with a $p$-value of .943, which indicates there was not a statistically significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choice of high school seniors; therefore, the researcher failed to reject null hypothesis one. Table 4 displays the results of the Spearman’s rho correlation for null hypothesis one.
Table 4

*Spearman’s rho for null hypothesis one*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRPSS</th>
<th>VIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPSS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (two-tailed)</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (two-tailed)</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Null Hypothesis Two**

**H₀₂**: There is no significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of male high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish.

The Spearman’s rho correlation was used due to a violation of the assumption of bivariate normal distribution by the criterion variable for male high school seniors. Figure 3 shows the histogram for Vocational Identity Scale for male participants.
Figure 3. Histogram for the Vocational Identity Scale for Male Participants.

The data analysis compared the male responses of the criterion variable measured by the Vocational Identity Scale to the predictor variable measured by the Career Related Parent Support Scale. Results of the data collected from 58 participants show a $r_s$ of -.093 with a $p$-value of .486, which indicates there was not a statistically significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choice of male high school seniors; therefore, the researcher failed to reject null hypothesis two. Table 5 displays the results of the Spearman’s rho correlation for null hypothesis two.
Table 5  

*Spearman’s rho for null hypothesis two*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRPSS</th>
<th>VIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRPSS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (two-tailed)</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>0.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null Hypothesis Three  

**H₀₃:** There is no significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of female high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish.

The Spearman’s rho correlation was used due to a violation of the assumption of bivariate normal distribution by the criterion variable for female high school seniors. Figure 4 shows the histogram for Vocational Identity Scale for female participants.
Figure 4. Histogram for the Vocational Identity Scale for Female Participants.

The data analysis compared the female responses of the criterion variable measured by the Vocational Identity Scale to the predictor variable measured by the Career Related Parent Support Scale. Results of the data collected from 95 participants show a $r_s$ of .038 with a $p$-value of .712, which indicates there was not a statistically significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choice of female high school seniors; therefore, the researcher failed to reject null hypothesis three. Table 6 displays the results of the Spearman’s rho correlation for null hypothesis three.
Table 6

*Spearman’s rho for null hypothesis three*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CRPSS</th>
<th>VIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (two-tailed)</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (two-tailed)</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

Overview

This chapter includes a discussion about the results of this study and how it compares to the existing body of knowledge. This chapter includes a discussion about the implication of this study as well as the limitations of the study. Lastly, this chapter includes a review of possible future research topics that can further the existing body of knowledge based on the results learned from this research.

Discussion

The purpose of this correlational study was to determine if a predictive relationship exists between perceived parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of high school seniors. Graduating high school seniors at two high schools in Southwest Louisiana were surveyed using the Career-Related Support Scale, which measured their perceptions of parental expectations, and the Vocational Identity Scale used to measure the students’ satisfaction and confidence in their post-secondary choices. The information gleaned from each survey was used to determine if a predictive relationship exists between parental expectations and post-secondary choices of high school seniors.

Null Hypothesis One

Null hypothesis one proposed the following: There is no significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish. Due to the non-normal distribution of the criterion variable, Spearman’s rho correlation was used to determine if a correlation existed. The results showed there was not a significant predictive relationship between students perceived parental expectations and the satisfaction and confidence they felt with their post-secondary choices.
Therefore, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

The results of this study are inconsistent with the current literature regarding the role of parental expectations in the choices of their students. This study would suggest that students make a choice independent of their parents’ influence. Research on the impact of parental expectations on not only high school success but post-secondary choices and career choices indicate a direct link between parental expectations and student achievement. Parents are not only a key factor in whether or not students will graduate high school and enter college, but are a significant influence in helping students transform their current endeavors into long-term goals (Ross, 2016; Wang & Hill, 2014).

There is a positive association between parental expectations and achievement well into adulthood (Benner, Boyle, & Sadler, 2016; Gordon & Cui, 2012). Parents also have a direct impact on the building of their children’s self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is formed in positive learning experiences in supportive environments allowing students to develop interest and create goals that are attainable (Lent et al., 1994; Lent et al., 2000; Lent et al., 2002). A strong self-efficacy fostered by parental support aids in building a strong career self-efficacy. Students can develop high capacity goal setting, making decisions with confidence that led to greater satisfaction later in life (Chen & Solberg, 2017, Yap & Baharudin, 2016).

The results of this study seem to suggest parental expectations are not an important aspect in the decision making of today’s students. Recent but very limited research into the thought processes of Generation Z, those born between 1995 and 2012, suggests children are becoming more independent in their thinking and with making life choices (Hampton & Keys, 2016). “Gen Z, iGen, or Post-Millennials” are described as more independent, responsible, and pragmatic than millennials. Parents of Gen Z students are more willing to allow students to create futures for
themselves while still setting expectations for student performance and behaviors. Gen Z students start high school with the goal of attending college, and 81% believe college is necessary for a successful future. Gen Z students are more interested in creating their own education plans and are more career minded than the generation before (Hampton & Keys, 2016). Results of this research could indicate Gen Z students are in fact who they are described to be, and students are confident and satisfied with the decisions they have made regarding their futures.

**Null Hypothesis Two**

Null hypotheses two proposed the following: There is no significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of male high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish. Parents are instrumental in developing gender socialization and the perpetuation of gender roles as it applies to career choices. Research shows gender socialization begins early in life and is guided by parental influence and expectations. Parents are where children learn about gender roles and stereotypes (Halpern & Perry-Jenkins, 2016). Adolescents who have positive relationships with their parents are more likely to pursue gender-typical occupations (Busch-Heizmann, 2015). The connection between parental expectations and career choice is more typical in males. Males are more likely to embrace traditional occupational roles and are less likely to believe females can pursue typical male careers (Freund, Weiss, & Weiss, 2013). As with the previous research question, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis as no correlations were found between parental expectation and post-secondary choices of male high school seniors, which is inconsistent with the current research regarding the role parental expectations play in the decisions of students.
Null Hypothesis Three

Null hypothesis three proposed the following: There is no significant predictive relationship between parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of female high school seniors in a Southwest Louisiana parish. As previously stated, parents are the teachers of gender socialization; children learn acceptable male and female behavior and gender roles in the home and in society. This socialization extends into academic achievement and career choices, and could in some cases inhibit students from pursuing a career or academic pathways of interest because it fails to fall into what is considered typical for that gender (Lawson et al., 2015). As individuals move into college and career choice, gender roles play a large part in their choices. Women often experience more barriers to making a career choice despite often having higher career aspirations than men (Watts et al., 2015). As with the previous null hypotheses, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis as there was no correlation found between parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of female high school seniors. Again, these results do not align with a large body of literature that states parental expectations guide future choices.

Gender and Self-Efficacy

Regarding gender, research shows a direct connection between parental expectations and parent/child relationships and gender roles. While this research did not specifically look at how parents influence of gender roles impacts future choices, it does contradict data that suggest parents are major players in the decisions their children make regarding their futures. Despite the apparent contradictions, the results may inadvertently confirm the ideas expressed in most available research. The social cognitive career theory operates on the premise of self-efficacy, goals, and outcome expectations work together to determine future behaviors and choices. As children, parents expose children to activities and gender norms that either support or discourage
children’s interest (Lent et al., 1994). Children build a positive self-efficacy for those activities or gender expectations that receive the most support from parents. A positive self-efficacy leads to children developing goals and positive outcomes to pursue their interests. Some research suggests children often internalize the wishes of parents transmitted during those formative years and once they reach adolescence are often unable to identify their interests from their parents’ wishes (Cheung & Promantez, 2012; Suizzo et al., 2015). The results of this study possibly suggest students are in fact not pursuing interests of their own but instead may be prescribing to the preconceived ideas instilled in them from a very young age.

**Implications**

The results of the study have contrasting implications and, in some ways, despite failing to reject the null hypotheses, research still suggests parental expectations are a driving force in the decisions students make regarding their post-secondary pathways. Social cognitive career theory states that children are encouraged or discouraged from pursuing an interest through interaction, modeling, and feedback from parents. This ebb and flow of information builds their self-efficacy for an interest. Over time, children internalize what is acceptable and what is not acceptable and have a hard time distinguishing their thoughts from parental expectations ingrained in their personality (Cheung & Pomerantz, 2012; Lent et al., 1994; Suizzo et al., 2015). The results of this study showed no correlation between parental expectations and student choices, but it is worth noting that students may be unwittingly expressing their parents’ expectations through the acceptance of their post-secondary choice. Parents must be careful to provide children with experiences in various activities as well as be a source of support as children express their interests.
For educators, the study suggests much of the same. Students should be provided with more opportunities to explore their interests in the classroom. As education slowly moves to project-based learning, students should be provided with more hands-on, real-world experiences in a variety of career choices. By providing children with a variety of experiences and fostering their interests, while allowing them to take the risk, builds students’ decision-making abilities (Garcia et al., 2015; Ginevra, Nota, & Ferrari, 2013; Wright et al., 2012). Training students to build their academic, social, and career self-efficacy allows them to see more opportunities for themselves, which in turn influences the type of academic pathways and occupations they successfully pursue (Bandura, 2006; Komarraju & Nadler, 2013).

The results of this study could also suggest a shift in the current way of thinking regarding the role parents play in student success and future choices. Most available research indicates a strong relationship between parental involvement and parental expectations and their children’s academic and career success. This study, by showing no correlation between parental expectations and post-secondary choices of high school seniors, could be a sign of a change in the parent/child dynamic of parents and Generation Z students, those born between 1995 and 2012. Limited scholarly research exists discussing the nuances of generation Z students. What is known is that “Gen Z” students are moving into the world of adulthood at a much faster rate, having more maturity than the generation before them. Parents of “Gen Z” students, taking a lesson of what not to do from the over-involved parents of millennials, encourage more independence and push “Gen Z” to forge their own paths (Lolarga, 2016). Generation Z wants to have a say in their education and are more concerned with making a difference than having a job (Swanzen, 2018).
For educators, Generation Z students will be a challenge if education does not make a faster move away from traditional methods. Gone are the days of sitting and listening to lectures of indisputable facts with little to no input from the student. The result of this study implies students are making their own choices. Educators must be prepared for students who are more self-reliant, self-motivating, confident and more willing to challenge the status quo. This change in ideology, along with Generation Z access to the world at their fingertips from birth, could result in students who are more involved in their futures and are more willing to take risks to pursue their interests. While parental expectations and lessons taught in the classroom are considered, Generation Z may be more inclined to follow pathways that interest them and not what is expected.

**Limitations**

The limitations of this study included self-reporting, timing factor, sample size, response rate, and lack of bivariate normal distribution. First, the study relied on the self-reporting response of high school seniors near the end of the school year. At that point in the school year, senior students may have a comfort with their post-secondary choices that may not have been present at the beginning or middle of the school years. Second, the study relied on volunteers from only two of the 10 high schools located in the parish, resulting in a low response rate that was majority female. While the sample size exceeded 60% and met the required population of 66 for a medium effect size with a statistical power of 0.7 at a 0.05 alpha level (Gall et al., 2003), it still was not an adequate representation of the entire parish. Lastly, the research did not meet the assumption of bivariate normal distribution. The data were analyzed using Spearman’s rho correlation coefficient. Although this method is widely used to analysis non-normal distributed
data and can provide useful information regarding a relationship between variables, it rearranges the data, which could affect the results and the study.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Further study into the impact of parental expectations on post-secondary choices should be considered. Research of the following could provide greater insight into the role parental expectation play in their children’s decisions about the future:

1. A longitudinal study that follows students from high school to adulthood to determine if students become unsatisfied with the post-secondary decisions they made in high school. The research could focus on the number of adults who are in careers they are not satisfied with because they made a decision based on parental expectations.

2. Research focused on how parental expectations influence the decision-making processes of adults in all areas of their lives.

3. Mixed-methods or qualitative research focusing on millennials and “Gen Z” students’ perceptions of parental expectations and have the importance of what parents think changed.

4. The impact helicopter parenting has on the decision-making process of students.

5. Breakdown the current research by socioeconomic status and ethnicity. Will there be a difference in how a student’s willingness to pursue parental expectations based on these two factors?

6. Research examining how parental expectations influence student choices based on gender roles.

Research into these additional topics would aid in furthering the body of knowledge regarding parental expectations and the post-secondary choices of high school seniors. Each year, as high
school students prepare to make decisions that greatly impact their futures, the need to understand how decisions are made becomes important. It is critical that students are making the best possible choices, ones that match their interests with their intended futures.
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May 2, 2018

Katherine Marie Latour Clohus
IRB Exemption 3249.050218: The Relationship Between Parental Expectations and Post-
Secondary Choices of High School Seniors

Dear Katherine Marie Latour Clohus,

The Liberty University Institutional Review Board has reviewed your application in accordance
with the Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP) and Food and Drug Administration
(FDA) regulations and finds your study to be exempt from further IRB review. This means you
may begin your research with the data safeguarding methods mentioned in your approved
application, and no further IRB oversight is required.

Your study falls under exemption category 46.101(b)(2), which identifies specific situations in
which human participants research is exempt from the policy set forth in 45 CFR 46:101(b):

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement),
survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
(i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified,
directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Please note that this exemption only applies to your current research application, and any
changes to your protocol must be reported to the Liberty IRB for verification of continued exemption status. You may report these changes by submitting a change in protocol form or a
new application to the IRB and referencing the above IRB Exemption number.

If you have any questions about this exemption or need assistance in determining whether possible changes to your protocol would change your exemption status, please email us at irb@liberty.edu.

Sincerely,

G. Michele Baker, MA, CIP
Administrative Chair of Institutional Research
The Graduate School
February 23, 2018

Katherine Clophus

Dear Mrs. Clophus,

Check the following boxes, as applicable: After careful review of your research proposal entitled “The relationship between parental expectations and post-secondary choices of high school seniors”, I have decided to grant you permission to conduct your study at both Barbe and Sulphur High Schools pending approval of the principals.

☐ Data will be provided to the researcher stripped of any identifying information.

☐ We are requesting a copy of the results upon study completion and/or publication.

Sincerely,

Karl Bruchhaus, Superintendent
Calcasieu Parish School Board
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February 21, 2018

Katherine Clophus

Dear Mrs. Clophus

After careful review of your research proposal entitled “The relationship between parental expectations and post-secondary choices of high school seniors”, I have decided to grant you permission to conduct your study at Sulphur High School.

Check the following boxes, as applicable:

☑ Data will be provided to the researcher stripped of any identifying information.

☐ We are requesting a copy of the results upon study completion and/or publication.

Sincerely,

Robert Barrentine
Principal
Sulphur High School

Home of the Golden Tornado
02/22/2018

Katherine Clophus

Dear Mrs. Clophus

After careful review of your research proposal entitled "The relationship between parental expectations and post-secondary choices of high school seniors", I have decided to grant you permission to conduct your study at Barbe School.

Check the following boxes, as applicable:

☑ Data will be provided to the researcher stripped of any identifying information.

☐ If we are requesting a copy of the results upon study completion and/or publication.

Randy Yelloff
Principal
Barbe High School
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CONSENT FORM

"THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTAL EXPECTATIONS AND POST-SECONDARY CHOICES OF HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS"

Katherine Marie Latour Clophus
Liberty University
School of Education

You are invited to be in a research study examining if seniors’ perceived parental support can predict post-secondary choices. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a 12th grade student 18 years of age or older. Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Katherine Clophus, a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at Liberty University, is conducting this study.

**Background Information:** The purpose of this study is to determine if parental expectations can predict the post-secondary choices of high school seniors.

**Procedures:** If you agree to be in this study, I would ask you to do the following things:

1. Complete two questionnaires totaling about 20-25 minutes of your time.

**Risks:** The risks involved in this study are minimal, which means they are equal to the risks you would encounter in everyday life.

**Benefits:** Participants should not expect to receive a direct benefit from taking part in this study. However, your participation may benefit future parents and students as it may provide insight into how parental expectations impact students choices. The knowledge gained through the study will lay the groundwork for future studies that may focus on how parental pressure dictates student choices.

**Compensation:** Participants will not be compensated for participating in this study.

**Confidentiality:** The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report I might publish, I will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely, and only the researcher will have access to the records.

- Participants will not include their name on the questionnaires, so responses will be anonymous.
- Data will be stored on a password locked computer. Per federal regulations, after three years, all electronic records will be deleted.

**Voluntary Nature of the Study:** Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Liberty University with the school district, or with your high school. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time prior to submitting the survey.
How to Withdraw from the Study: If you choose to withdraw from the study, please—inform
the researcher that you wish to discontinue your participation prior to submitting your study
materials. Your responses will not be recorded or included in the study.

Contacts and Questions: The researcher conducting this study is Katherine Clophus. You may
ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you are encouraged to contact her
at kclophus@liberty.edu. You may also contact the researcher’s faculty advisor, Rebecca Lunde
at rmftch@liberty.edu.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, and would like to talk to someone
other than the researcher, you are encouraged to contact the Institutional Review Board, 1971
University Blvd., Green Hall Ste. 1887, Lynchburg, VA 24515 or email at irb@liberty.edu.

Please notify the researcher if you would like a copy of this information for your records.

Statement of Consent: I have read and understood the above information. I have asked
questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.
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Career-Related Parent Support Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: Consider each item separately and rate each item independently of all others. Circle the rating that indicates the extent to which you agree with each statement. Please do not skip any rating.

5 = Strongly Agree  4 = Agree  3 = Neutral (acceptable)  2 = Disagree  1 = Strongly Disagree

1. My parents/guardian reward me for doing my schoolwork well.
2. My parents/guardian teach me things that I will someday be able to use at my job.
3. My parents/guardian help me pick out classes that will help me in my career.
4. My parents/guardian give me chores that teach me skills I can use in my future career.
5. My parents/guardian help me do my homework.
6. My parents/guardian let me do activities outside of school that teaches me future job-related skills.
7. My parents/guardian talk to me about how what I am learning will someday be able to help me on the job.
8. My parents/guardian help me take pride in my work.
9. My parents/guardian tell me about their jobs.
10. My parents/guardian show me the kind of things they do at work.
11. My parents/guardian have taken me to their work.
12. My parents/guardian have had me meet someone they work with.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>My parents/guardian have shown me where they work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>My parents/guardian tell me about things that happened to them at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My parents/guardian tell me about the kind of work they do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>My parents/guardian praise me when I learn job-related skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>My parents/guardian encourage me to learn as much as I can at school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>My parents/guardian encourage me to make good grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>My parents/guardian encourage me to go to a technical school or college or get a job after I graduate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>My parents/guardian told me they expect me to finish school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>My parents/guardian talk to me about what kind of job they would like me to have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>My parents/guardian talk to me when I am worried about my future career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>My parents/guardian say things that make me happy when I learn something I might use in a job sometime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>My parents/guardian talk to me about what fun my future job could be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>My parents/guardian tell me they are proud of me when I do well in school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Sometimes my parents/guardian and I get excited when we talk about what a great job I might have someday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>My parents/guardian know I am worried about my future career.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Permission to use the Career-Related Parent Support Scale

Sherri Turner, Ph.D. <omit>

Reply all|
Wed 3/15, 11:06 PM
Clophus, Katherine;
(omit)
Action Items
Dear Katherine,

Hello Liberty!!!

Your study sounds fascinating. I would love to see the results. Is this for your Ph.D. Thesis?

You have my permission to use the scale.

Best Wishes with your research,

Sherri Turner
Sherri Turner, Ph.D.
Counseling and Student Personnel Psychology
University of Minnesota
156 Ed. Sci. Bldg., 56 E. River Road
Minneapolis, MN  55455

Phone: (omit)
Fax: (omit)
Appendix G
My Vocational Situation

Name ________________________________ Date _________ M ___ F ___ Age _____

Education completed ______________________ Other _____________________________

List all the occupations you are considering right now.

Try to answer each of the following statements as mostly TRUE or mostly FALSE. Circle the answer that best represents your present opinion.

In thinking about your present job or in planning for an occupation or career:

1. I need reassurance that I have made the right choice of occupation.    T F
2. I am concerned that my present interests may change over the years.    T F
3. I am uncertain about the occupations I could perform well.     T F
4. I don’t know what my major strengths and weaknesses are.     T F
5. The jobs I can do may not pay enough to live the kind of life I want.     T F
6. If I had to make an occupational choice right now, I’m afraid I would
make a bad choice.                      T F
7. I need to find out what kind of career I should follow.       T F
8. Making up my mind about a career has been a long and difficult problem
for me.                        T F
9. I am confused about the whole problem of deciding on a career.                    T F
10. I am not sure that my present occupational choice or job is right for me.     T F
11. I don’t know enough about what workers do in various occupations.     T F
12. No single occupation appeals strongly to me.                           T F
13. I am uncertain about which occupation I would enjoy.                     T F
14. I would like to increase the number of occupations I could consider.    T F
15. My estimates of my abilities and talents vary a lot from year to year.    T F
16. I am not sure of myself in many areas of life.                         T F
17. I have known what occupation I want to follow for less than one year.     T F
18. I can’t understand how some people can be so set about what they want
to do.                             T F

Score: