PARENTING STYLES EFFECT ON CAREER EXPLORATION BEHAVIOR IN ADOLESCENCE: CONSIDERING PARENTS AND ADOLESCENT GENDER
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ABSTRACT

In facing the industrial 4.0 era, adolescents, especially high school students, need to complement their knowledge and skills learnt from school with behaviors that can help their career journey, namely the career exploration behavior (CEB). Referring to the triadic reciprocal determinism theory and gender role in Indonesian culture, this study aimed to examine the effect of parenting styles and gender on CEB. Specifically, this study examined the effect of paternal and maternal parenting styles on CEB in adolescent and compared its effect on boys and girls. Participants in this study were 427 boys and 397 girls with an average age of 17 from nine high schools. Career Exploration Survey and Parental Authority Questionnaire were used to assess participants’ CEB, and paternal and maternal parenting styles. Regression analysis showed different patterns effect of paternal and maternal parenting styles on CEB between boys and girls. For boys, parenting that was found to improve CEB were paternal authoritative parenting and maternal authoritarian parenting, while for girls, parenting that was found to improve CEB were paternal authoritarian parenting and maternal authoritative parenting. These results indicated that boys and girls need different parenting factors from father and mother. Limitation and suggestion are discussed.

Keywords: parenting styles, career exploration behavior, adolescence, gender

INTRODUCTION

In the last 20 years, the rapid development of technology has brought humans to the stage of the 4.0 industrial revolution. This revolution is characterized by the transition or shift of manual work that is usually done by humans to technology (such as machines, robots, or artificial intelligence). With this transition, many jobs that was done by humans began to disappear and was replaced by many new jobs that used technology (Xu, David, & Kim, 2018). As a result, many adolescents, especially adolescents who will soon graduate from school, have difficulty in getting a job. This was evidenced from Central Bureau of Statistics (Badan Pusat Statistik, BPS) data which showed that senior high school and vocational school were the highest contributor to unemployment rate since Februari 2017 to this date (BPS, 2017; 2018; 2019). Therefore, adolescents need to arm themselves with factors that not only help in finding and choosing a career, but also factors that could produce the expected career outcome.

In Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT) and Career Self-Management models (Lent & Brown, 2013), among the many factors that contribute to better career outcomes, adaptive career behavior has more immediate contribution than other factors. When linked to the theory of career development proposed by Patton and Porfeli (in Patton & McMahon, 2014), the main task of adolescents related to careers is to explore many career possibilities. Thus, adaptive career behavior that is needed and appropriate in adolescence is the career exploration behavior (CEB).

CEB is intentional behavior to find out about oneself and the world of work to get a better understanding of oneself and potential career choices (Stumpf, Colarelli, & Hartman, 1983; Porfeli & Lee, 2012). The more often individuals seek information about themselves and careers, the more information that can be considered in making career decisions and also help in finding potential career choices. Based on SCCT, that was developed from the theory of reciprocal determinism (Bandura, in Lent & Brown, 2013), as a behavior, CEB is influenced by environmental factors and personal factors. The two factors tested in this study were parental styles, and gender of parents and adolescents. The relationship between CEB, parenting styles, and parents’ and their adolescent child’s gender are explained in the next paragraph.

Parenting style is a collection of attitudes that
parents communicate to children, that create an emotional climate where parenting behavior is expressed (Darling & Steinberg, in Park, Kim, Chiang, & Ju, 2010). In short, there were three types of parenting style that distinguished by two dimensions: demandingness/control and responsiveness/warmth. Authoritative parents are characterized by a balance between the demandingness/control and responsiveness/warmth; authoritarian parents give a lot of demands and direction, but show less warmth, while permissive parents show a lot of warmth and affection but lack demands for maturity (Baumrind, 2013; Uji, Sakamoto, Adachi, & Kitamura, 2014; Hibbard & Walton, 2014).

Previous research has examined how the influence of paternal and maternal parenting styles on CEB of Vocational students through mediation of career decision self-efficacy (Salim & Preston, 2019). The study found that paternal and maternal authoritative parenting directly and indirectly influenced CEB through career decision self-efficacy, but the direct influence was greater than the indirect effect. In addition, paternal and maternal authoritarian parenting directly influenced the CEB. However, the study did not take into account the gender factors of adolescents that were found to be influential on parenting applied by fathers and mothers, and their effects on boys and girls (McKinney & Renk, 2008; Lease & Dahlbeck, 2009; Uji et al., 2014; Hibbard & Walton, 2014; Gilli, 2016).

Shek (in Uji et al., 2014) strongly advice to analyze parenting applied by fathers and mothers separately between boys and girls. The type of parenting style applied by father and mother can be different in a family. This difference is related to the traditional role of man and woman that is defined and socialized by culture (Garcia, 2017; Uji et al., 2014). People expect boys to have seriousness and stiffness, while girls are expected to be warm and sensitive. From these expectations, the father is expected to play a role as a disciplinary and provider, while mothers are expected to spend more time nurturing and showing affection for children. Based on this role, therefore, the father applied more authoritarian parenting while the mother applied permissive parenting. This difference in parenting is also perceived differently by boys and girls. McKinney and Renk (2008, in Uji et al., 2014) found that boys perceive their mothers as overprotective and warm, and perceive their fathers as fathers who are distant and less warm. Girls perceive their mothers as providers of mutually supportive relationships and perceive their fathers as authorities and spend less time with children.

Many studies have shown the positive influence of authoritative parenting on various aspects of child development, such as perfectionism (Hibbard & Walton, 2014), mental health (Barton & Kirtley, 2012; Uji et al., 2014), prosocial tendencies (Davis, Carlo, & Knight, 2015), and academic achievement (Heaven, 2008). Previous research also shows the influence of authoritative parenting on career development, such as career decision self-efficacy, career decision-making difficulties, CEB (Sovet & Metz, 2014; Sianipar & Sawitri, 2015; Salim & Preston, 2019). Some of these studies showed a pattern of the influence of authoritative parenting that differs based on the gender of parents and children (Barton & Kirtley, 2012; Davis et al., 2015), but the other studies find similar patterns of influence between genders (Hibbard & Warton, 2014; Uji et al., 2014). With the results of previous studies that vary, the first hypothesis of this study is paternal and maternal authoritative parenting significantly influences adolescent’s CEB, and these influences will differ between parent’s and adolescent’s gender.

The influence of authoritarian parenting on career variables was found to be quite varied in previous studies. Research from Lease and Dahlbeck (2009) showed that paternal authoritarian parenting has a positive effect on girls’ career decision self-efficacy, while maternal authoritarian parenting have no effect on career decision self-efficacy for boys and girls. Sovet & Metz (2014) found a positive effect of parenting which characterizes authoritarian parenting on career decision self-efficacy for boys and girls in Korea but has a negative effect on boys and girls in France. Therefore, the second hypothesis in this study is paternal and maternal authoritarian parenting significantly influences adolescent’s CEB, and these influences will differ between parent’s and adolescent’s gender.

In contrast to the two previous parenting styles, paternal and maternal permissive parenting was often found to have no effect on the career development of girls and boys (Lease & Dahlbeck, 2009; Salim & Preston, 2019). In another aspect, permissive fathers were found to have a negative effect on children’s mental health, while permissive mothers did not affect children’s mental health in Japan (Uji et al., 2014). Based on these studies, the third hypothesis in this study is paternal and maternal permissive parenting did not influence adolescent’s CEB.

**METHODS**

Participant in this study were 824 students (51.8% boys and 48.2% girls) from nine high schools, with age ranged from 16 to 20 years old (M = 17 years old, SD = 1 years old). The convenience sampling technique was used to sampling the participants. Data was collected in October 2018 after obtaining the schools’ permission and participants’ agreement by filling in an informed consent. Participant filled in the questionnaire that consisted of two measure instruments used in this study in their classrooms.

The two instruments used in this study were the Career Exploration Survey (CES) and Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) that have been adapted to Bahasa through the process of translate-back translate and the expert judgment process. The validity of the instruments was tested using the Corrected Item-Total Correlation, while the reliability was tested using the Cronbach’s Alpha.

CES in this study was originally designed by Stumpf et al. (1983) to measure CEB conducted in the last three months. This study used two subscales from the CES, the environmental exploration (6 items) and self-exploration (5 items). Responses made on a Likert scale ranging from 1 = Never to 5 = Always. Higher score means the more frequent exploration done by participants in the last three months. The corrected item-total correlation coefficient of the two subscales ranging from 0.268 to 0.659 and the Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient were 0.799 for environmental exploration and 0.678 for self-exploration. These validity and reliability scores showed that CES is valid and reliable to measure CEB.

PAQ (Buri, 1991) is composed of three subscales which represent three types of parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive. Each subscale is consisted of 10 items and used to measure paternal and maternal parenting style separately from the participant’s perception. Therefore, the total item was 60 items in which 30 items per parent. Responses made on a Likert scale ranging from 1 = Strongly disagree to 6 = Strongly agree. The corrected
item-total correlation coefficient for paternal parenting styles ranged from 0.325 to 0.666 with Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient ranged from 0.769 to 0.863. For maternal parenting styles, the correlated item-total correlation ranged from 0.248 to 0.645 with Cronbach’s Alpha ranged from 0.763 to 0.841. These validity and reliability scores showed that PAQ is valid and reliable to measure each type of parenting style in father and mother.

In preliminary analysis, data was analyzed using the Independent Sample T-Test to examine the differences between boys’ and girls’ perception of their father and mother parenting styles, and Pearson Correlation to examine the correlation between variables. To test the hypothesis, data was analyzed using the regression analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1 shows the differences between boys and girls in perceiving their father and mother parenting style and CEB.

Table 1 Means, Standard Deviation, and Differences between Boys and Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATN</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATV</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPER</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATN</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATV</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPER</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEB</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PATN = Paternal Authoritarian; PATV = Paternal Authoritative; PPER = Paternal Permissive; MATN = Maternal Authoritarian; MATV = Maternal Authoritative; MPER = Maternal Permissive; CEB = Career Exploration Behavior.

As we can see from the table, boys and girls tend to perceive their father as more authoritative (M = 4.54, SD = 0.79 for girls) than their mother to be more authoritarian (M = 4.68, SD = 0.76). However, boys perceived their mother to be more permissive (M = 4,68, SD = 0.76) and authoritative (M = 4,67, SD = 0.76) than authoritarian, while girls perceived their mother to be more authoritarian (M = 4,77, SD = 0.71) than authoritarian and permissive.

Independent Sample T-Test showed that boys and girls are significantly different in perceiving their father and mother parenting style, specifically in authoritarian parenting style (t = 3.65, p = 0.00 for father; t = 3.65, p = 0.00 for mother). Compared to the girls (M = 3.93, SD = 0.87), boys perceived their father to be more authoritarian (M = 4.15, SD = 0.86). This study also found that boys perceived their mother to be more authoritarian (M = 4.27, SD = 0.78) than the girls (M = 4.15, SD = 0.75). In addition, significant CEB difference was also found between the boys and the girls (t = 3.31, p = 0.00), in which the boys CEB were higher (M = 3.35, SD = 0.55) than the girls (M = 3.23, p = 0.55).

The correlation among variables was analyzed specifically to investigate the correlation patterns for participants with their same and opposite gender parents. As we can see from Table 2, all paternal and maternal parenting styles were significantly correlated to CEB. However, for boys, CEB correlated strongest to paternal authoritative parenting and maternal authoritarian parenting; while for girls, CEB correlated strongest to paternal authoritarian parenting and maternal authoritative parenting.

Those t-test and correlation results served as an indication of the different pattern between boys and girls. To understand better about this pattern and to test the hypotheses, the regression analysis results was conducted separately based on participant’s gender.

As we can see in Table 3, there was different pattern effect of paternal and maternal parenting style on CEB between boys and girls. First, paternal authoritative parenting significantly influenced boys’ CEB, but it did not influence girls’ CEB. Meanwhile, maternal authoritative parenting was found to influence girls’ CEB but not to boys’ CEB. Based on these results, the first hypothesis in this study was supported.

Second, paternal authoritarian parenting was found to significantly influenced girls’ CEB but not to boys’ CEB, while maternal authoritarian parenting was found to influence boys’ CEB but not to girls’ CEB. These results support the second hypothesis of this study. Third, as we expected, the paternal and maternal permissive parenting neither influence boys’ CEB nor girls’ CEB. Therefore, the third hypothesis in this study was supported.

Table 2 Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation among Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATN</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATV</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
<td>0.36**</td>
<td>0.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPER</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.35**</td>
<td>0.52**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATN</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.22**</td>
<td>0.14**</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.45**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATV</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPER</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEB</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scores above the diagonal are for boys and below the diagonal are for girls.

PATN = Paternal Authoritarian; PATV = Paternal Authoritative; PPER = Paternal Permissive; MATN = Maternal Authoritarian; MATV = Maternal Authoritative; MPER = Maternal Permissive; CEB = Career Exploration Behavior.

* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01
Table 3 Regression Analyses of Paternal and Maternal Parenting Styles Effect on Boys and Girls CEB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boys (n = 427)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Girls (n = 397)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATN</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATV</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPER</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATN</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATV</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPER</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Paternal Authoritarian; PATV = Paternal Authoritative; PPER = Paternal Permissive; MATN = Maternal Authoritarian; MATV = Maternal Authoritative; MPER = Maternal Permissive.
* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01

In short, this study found that paternal authoritative parenting and maternal authoritarian parenting increased boys’ CEB boys, while maternal authoritative parenting and paternal authoritarian parenting increased girls’ CEB. The results of this study are consistent with the results of previous studies mentioned above. Authoritative parenting has been found to positively influence adolescent’s career development because authoritative parents demand maturity and encourage autonomy, so children are also encouraged to explore themselves and their environment, which in turn will be very useful in planning and making career decisions.

Meanwhile, authoritarian parenting could increase adolescent’s CEB because the high demands of maturity encourage them to immediately fulfill these demands by doing the career exploration, so that in time, they will have an answer to the demands of maturity in terms of their career choices. Authoritarian parenting can also encourage CEB through direct career direction given by parents, so that exploration of careers undertaken by children is more focused on things related to the career field determined by parents.

Gender patterns in the results of this study are also similar to those found in previous studies. As mentioned, Sovet and Metz (2014) found that girls get more positive benefits than boys from the parents’ strictness, which characterizes authoritarian parenting, even though the father or mother are not specified. Lease and Dahlbeck (2009) also found that girls have greater positive benefits from authoritarian fathers rather than authoritarian mothers.

There are several factors that might play a role in the results of this study. First, the personality differences between boys and girls. Weisberg (2011) and Rashid and Rafaqi (2016) found that boys are more assertive while girls are more obedient. Second, the role of fathers and mothers is perceived differently by boys and girls (Holmbeck et al., in McKinney & Renk, 2008); a) boys view fathers as individual who spend time with them and give advice or directives, but not warm; b) boys see their mothers as overprotective and intrusive, but still warm than their fathers; c) girls view their mothers as providers of mutually supportive relationships, and d) girls view their fathers as authority figures and spend less time together. Third, a combination of paternal and maternal parenting that might facilitate each other.

There is a possibility that because of the compatibility between the obedient personality possessed by girls and their perception of fathers as authority figures, they are more positive in perceiving the direction and compliance demands related to careers from their fathers. Whereas, with the personality of boys who tends to be assertive, they will get more positive benefits if their father can become a friend to discuss with, which continues to provide direction, advice and assistance when needed, rather than the total compliance demands applied by an authoritarian father.

Girls got more positive benefits from authoritative mothers because of the combination of their perception on mothers as a support provider (McKinney & Renk, 2008; Uji et al., 2014) and the characteristic of authoritative parenting style itself. Authoritative mothers can provide the support and warmth needed to be able to develop girls’ autonomy (not the total and unconditional support as in permissive parents) that is not obtained from an authoritarian father. In other words, it might be that maternal authoritative parenting facilitates paternal authoritarian parenting.

This study also found an interesting: Only boys’ CEB was positively influence by maternal authoritarian parenting. This might be related to boys’ perception on mothers as overprotective and intrusive but also warm figure which combined with the characteristic of authoritarian parenting style itself. The intrusive characteristic that in line with the characteristic of authoritarian mother combined with the warmth characteristic might push them to fulfill their mother demands on their career decisions, and the career exploration behavior is one of the ways to fulfill the demands. Therefore, boys showed higher career exploration behavior.

Overall, the results of this study confirm the importance to examine parents influence on children separately based on the gender of parents and children, especially in the context of adolescent career development. In addition, this study has an implication in the career counseling field and the intervention to help high school students career development. This study showed the need for counselor to reconsider the role of father and mother in helping boys’ and girls’ career development.

CONCLUSIONS

This study examined the differences in the influence of paternal and maternal parenting on boys’ and girls’ CEB. Broadly speaking, the results of the analysis indicate a difference patterns of influence between boys and girls. Boys got more benefit from paternal authoritative parenting...
and maternal authoritarian in improving their CEB. Whereas, girls benefit more from authoritarian fathers and authoritative mothers in improving CEB. Last of all, neither boys’ nor girls’ CEB were influenced by paternal or maternal permissive parenting. With these differences, an effort to improve CEB and other aspects of career development in adolescents should consider the role of each parent. Thus, the results of parents’ effort will be more effective in helping vocational students in finding and getting jobs with an expected outcome.

There are several suggestions based on some limitations of this study. First, the concept of parenting style was distinguished by two dimensions, which are the demandingness/control and responsiveness/warmth (Baumrind, 2013). However, parenting also carried other characteristics that could play a role in the way parents affect their adolescents, such as communication patterns (Baumrind, 2013). Some studies also examined parenting style by the dimensions or aspects that determined different parenting styles (Sovet & Metz, 2014). Therefore, it is suggested to clarify the specific aspects of paternal and maternal parenting style that enhance adolescent’s CEB and its different effect between boys and girls in further research.

This study conducted in urban society and therefore, the results cannot be generalized to other society considering the diverse ethnicities and cultures in Indonesia that influence the dynamic of father, mother, and children in family. Lastly, longitudinal study is very recommended since career development start from early childhood and parenting style applied by parents could change as the child develop (Riany, Meredith, & Cuskelly, 2017).
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