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ABSTRACT

AN ANTI-DEFICIT APPROACH TO EXAMINING THE CAREER CHOICE OF AFRICAN AMERICAN MEN IN COLLEGE

by

Gary Young

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2018
Under the Supervision of Professor Nadya Fouad

Awareness of congruence and discrepancies within an individual’s pathway from career interest to occupational choice offers significant insight into the process of conciliation and foreclosure (i.e., psychological disposition toward a circumscription of career options). Given the significant role of careers, understanding the career developmental process is of particular importance. Career interests to occupational choice mediated by self-efficacy are key components in the process of attaining career related goals. Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994) proposed in the social cognitive career theory (SCCT) that under optimal conditions, career interests give rise to congruent occupational choice goals. Altogether, this leads to goal action planning and achievement (Lent & Brown, 2012; Lent, Hung-Bin, Sheu, & Brown, 2010). Many researchers have identified the anticipatory nature of college as a significant precipitant for desired career outcomes. College has also been identified as a place of afforded opportunity; however, rates of persistence and retention indicate a harbinger of premature career development with greater disparity among marginalized populations. Original hypotheses of SCCT indicated that contextual barriers have a direct relation to interest/occupational choice; however, later research indicated an indirect relation suggesting a greater surrounding milieu of the person. Lent et al.
Lent et al. (2000, 2005) later revised the SCCT to include Astin’s (1984) concept of perceived “opportunity structure” and Vondracek, Lerner, and Schulenberg’s (1986) “contextual affordance” construct. Lent et al. (2000, 2005) conceptualized contextual affordances as two types: distal or earlier than occupational choice and proximal affordances closer to occupational choice (Swanson & Fouad, 2010). It has also been proposed that self-efficacy related to coping with barriers, or coping efficacy, may moderate the barrier-goal relation (Lent et al., 2000). In other words, there may be a direct correlation between barriers and goals only when coping efficacy is low. It has also been suggested that contextual barriers may moderate the relation of interests to goals; the relation of interest to goals will be stronger when perceived barriers are low. As a result, vocational researchers in the area of college persistence and retention have placed more emphasis on the contextual affordances and barriers of college students to improve, especially the greater disparity rates with ethnic minorities. However, the cross-racial research methods employed to examine the disparities have served only to amplify the deficits as global and composite comparisons without consideration of greater within-group variance. Moreover, a counter-balanced approach of disparities and achievement within a self-identified ethnic/racial group would magnify career development process. It is the purpose of this study to extend existing SCCT research on the career development of African American males beyond known deficits into examining contextual factors related to congruence for African American male college students. Therefore, this study examined distal and proximal factors of African American males with high and low congruence of interest/choice in under- and postgraduate full-time studies. Specifically, this study examined (a) to what extent are the within group differences, (b) if barriers moderate the relation of career interests to career goals, and (c) if coping efficacy moderates the relation of barriers to career goals.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

African American males face significantly more challenges than any other major population group in navigating the road of career development (Lundy-Wagner & Gasman, 2011; Palmer & Young, 2009; Strayhorn, 2010). From career aspirations to occupational choice, African American males’ career choice are incongruent with earlier aspirations (Arbona & Novy, 1992; Evans & Herr, 1994; Metz, Fouad, & Ihle-Helley, 2009; Perry, Pryzbysz, & Al-Sheikh, 2009; Richardson, 2000; Spokane & Richardson, 1992). Specifically, this refers to the “aspiration-expectation gap,” which is foreclosure of higher occupational prestige for specific occupational areas described initially as “protected” and later as “traditional” careers or occupations of African Americans (Littig, 1968; Perry et al., 2009). According to Spokane and Richardson (1992), the career choice of Black men is based on aspirations as a process of “search and compromise” (as cited in Richardson, 2000, p. 35). They indicated that the compromise of aspirations may be due to perceptions of life circumstances beyond their control (Spokane, 1992; Spokane & Richardson, 1992).

Past research of this gap reveals that Black males encounter many barriers of racial discrimination and occupational stereotypes, which in turn may limit their perception of opportunity (Arbona, 1990; Cornileus, 2013; Harrington, 1998; Perry et al., 2009; Richardson, 2000; Rollins & Valdez, 2006). However, regarding career aspirations and interests, there are no significant differences across major demographic groups (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005; Metz et al., 2009; Richardson, 2000; Spokane, 1992; Spokane & Richardson, 1992). Fouad and Byars-Winston’s (2005) study of career aspirations of racial/ethnic minorities and women found that there was no difference of career aspirations and interests in comparison to White Americans and
other ethnic groups. Metz et al.’s (2009) replication of previous research studies confirmed the findings of Fouad and Byars-Winston’s earlier study. But, as African American males travel from career aspirations to career expectations, there are significant ethnic and gender differences that narrow their perceptions of career possibilities to overrepresented occupations, such as education or law enforcement (Evans & Herr, 1994). The mileage needed to traverse education and career development continues to increase for African American males due to the growing knowledge and skills needed for rapidly expanding knowledge-based economy (Cornileus, 2013; Jackson & Neville, 1998; Casserly, Lewis, Simon, Uzzell, & Palacios, 2012).

The aforementioned pressing problems warranted additional research and aggressive intervention across the pipeline from education to the workforce. However, what about the Black males who have succeeded despite challenges and barriers? Nationally, the U.S. high school drop-out rate has decreased from 12% in 2000 to 7% in 2013. This steady decline parallels the declining drop-out rate of Hispanic and Black youth (United States Census Bureau, 2013). There is some controversy about the reporting of African American male drop-rate, but using the “event drop-out rate” as defined in the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) report from 1972-2008, their drop-out rate is 8.7%. Since 2000, there has been a steady increase of Black enrollment in postsecondary education from 700,000 in 2000 to over 1.3 million in 2010 (Chapman, Laird, Ifill, & KewalRamani, 2012).

*Alarm* and *crisis* are terms often used to describe issues affecting low-income Black men, which in turn are problems experienced throughout the Black community (Grundy, 2012). Cokley (2005) further stated that “Arguably, no other ethnic or racial group has received as much negative press about its educational struggles as African American students” (Cokley, 2006 as cited in Cokley, Jones, & Johnson, 2011). Oftentimes socioeconomic status is confounded with
ethnic minority status, which diminishes the problems and experiences of Black men across the socioeconomic spectrum and obscures the gender-specific problems and experiences of Black women (Cokley, 2005; Cabrera, 2013; Foley, 1997; Grundy, 2012; Smith, Yosso, & Solorzano, 2007). Additionally, previous research on the masculinity of Black males has been narrowly examined with virtually no studies highlighting the definitions of masculinity in high achieving Black males (Harper, 2004). So, Black masculinity has been relegated to a deficit oriented framework focusing only on problematic behaviors of aggression and violence.

Many of the extant research studies used a deficit perspectives and examined what variables are lacking in African American male career development, such as Black male college graduation rates are lowest among sexes and all racial/ethnic populations in the U.S. post-secondary education (Cokley, McClain, Jones, & Johnson, 2011; Grundy, 2012; Harper, 2012). Adding to the now extensive body of research literature serves to amplify what has gone wrong without considering the question of what has gone right (Cabrera, 2013; Cokley et al., 2011; Grundy, 2012; Harper, 2005; Harper, 2009; Harper & Griffin, 2010). The career development of Black males should be examined as a diverse and heterogeneous population, which includes data of persistence and attainment despite racism, discrimination, and other road barriers on the road of career development. Grundy’s (2012) qualitative research study illuminated the need to examine the hidden mechanisms through which Black men navigate their social worlds (e.g., the overlooked middle class of Black men). While the parameters of her study were not defined in socioeconomic terms, she included the equally important cultural markers of social mobility for African Americans. Historically for African Americans, college education has been the definitive marker of social advancement and mobility, as well as improving social conditions (Grundy,
In the pipeline of career development, there are Black men who upwardly mobilize from within mainstream society not just at the outside fringes of society (Grundy, 2012).

Harper (2012) also focused on the positive aspect of African American male success. His study examined 219 Black male undergraduates’ socioeconomic status and demonstrated variability within the sample population: low income (17.8%), working class (38.9%), middle class (39.5%), and affluent (3.8%). Nearly half were middle class or above, but a deficit model approach would have glossed over the heterogeneity of Black men in socioeconomic status. In other words, the population of Black males needs to be treated as heterogeneous to understand and learn from those who have succeeded in educational and career goals.

Researchers in counseling psychology initially addressed demographic disparities in career entry across different vocational domains by examining race and gender differences. Betz and Hackett (1983) examined the role of self-efficacy regarding persistence and retention in STEM related careers. Bandura’s (1977, 1986) Theory of Social Cognition in learning experiences served as the theoretical framework to this early research with constructs such as domain specific (e.g., mathematics, science, etc.) self-efficacy and the triadic interplay of personal, environmental, and behavioral influences. Later, the social cognitive career theory (SCCT) expanded Bandura’s research to include outcome expectations as contributing to the development of interests, goals, and actions. The SCCT model seen in Figure 1 explores distal (e.g., “Person Inputs” variables) and proximal (e.g., “Contextual Influences Proximal to Choice Behavior”) factors related to an individual’s beliefs concerning his or her level of success in pursuing of various vocational domains. The SCCT conceptualizes individuals not as simply reacting to environmental factors, but as actively seeking out information to interpret his or her environment developmentally (Lent et al., 1994; Nevid, 2009). The SCCT will be used in this
study to capture these significant contextual factors from a strength based approach (Cokely, 2005; Harper, 2012; Lent et al., 1994).


**Problem Statement**

Why the emphasis on African American males’ career development and congruence of interest and choice in college? In the coming decades, the United States will encounter dramatic changes to the current demographics (Toossi, 2012). The U.S. work force needs a diverse work force that is educated and productive to adapt to the changing and growing knowledge-based economy. Much of the U.S. economic needs will rely on a younger demographic that is becoming more heterogeneous in racial and ethnic composition. The ethnic minority population under age 18 is projected to reach majority status by 2023 (Jacobsen & Mather, 2010).

President Obama created a goal for the United States that by 2020 America would regain the former title of having the highest proportion of college graduates worldwide “Education: Knowledge and skills for the jobs of the future.” (2015). At the present juncture, the U.S. is ranked 12th in 4-year degree attainment. The reason for this initiative is the higher stakes in
competing and obtaining employment. Earning a college degree is now a prerequisite to qualify for the growing jobs in today’s economy with college graduates earning twice as much as high graduates. According to the NCES, young adults in 2012 who had a bachelor’s degree earned 57% more than young adults with only a high school diploma—$46,900 vs. $30,000 (IES, 2015). Altogether, there has been a 48% increase of undergraduate enrollment in postsecondary institutions; 12.0 million students in 1990 to 17.7 million in fall 2012 (American Institute for Research, 2010 as cited in Demski, 2011), a trend reflected in the numbers for African American males, as mentioned enrollment has increased from 700,000 to over 1.3 million (Department of Education, NCES, Integrated Postsecondary Education System, Enrollment Survey 2000-2010; Harper, Harris, Frank, & Institute for Higher, 2012; Smith et al., 2007).

However, a recent study of the labor market by Byars-Winston, Fouad, and Wen (2015) revealed a market pattern, which confirmed that there are barriers to equal employment. This is more than just perceptions of African American male college students. The reality is these barriers do exist and inform their career choices (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005). With many Black males congregating towards service-oriented careers or occupations with low prestige (Byars-Winston et al., 2015), the permutations of career interests and career choice may be not congruent for African American males. It is also not congruent with the growing occupational needs of a vast and complex labor market. With all things being equal, one can surmise an even distribution of careers that reflect the current needs of the labor force for African American males. A current review of the vocational literature for African American men indicates that the relationships of the following constructs may be critical in career choice: self-concept, racial/ethnic identity, barriers, parenting style, and career interest (Byars-Winston, 2010; Evans & Herr, 1994; Harper & Griffin, 2010; Lent et al., 1994; Lent & Sheu, 2010; Metheny &
McWhirter, 2013; Myrberg & Rosen, 2008; Okech & Harrington, 2002). Oftentimes the research studies examining career disparities employ between group racial comparisons that amplify deficits. Thus, a simplistic picture of a complex problem is presented. “When there are differences, there are more within-group than between differences” (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005, p. 247).

Nevertheless, there is a population of African American males who persist and navigate the road to non-traditional and unprotected occupations. This means they could acquire the coping efficacy needed and overcome perceived barriers encountered towards their goals. Harper’s (2012) sample had African American male college students in the following breakdown of undergraduate majors, which again reveals a diverse selection of majors: business (20.7%), education (2.6%), humanities (12.9%), social/behavioral sciences (32.7%), science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) (23.3%), and other (7.8%). So, what can be learned from African American men who persist in the pipeline of career development?

It is the purpose of this study to extend existing SCCT research in career development of African American males beyond known deficits into examining contextual factors related to congruence for African American male college students. Therefore, this study examined the proximal distal contextual factors that shape career choice self-efficacy of African American men who have successfully navigated the road of career development in entering college. The study addressed the need for greater understanding of within group differences in congruence (e.g., goal) and proximal contextual factors. The model to be tested in this study is displayed in Figure 2.
Figure 2. Hypothesized SCCT structural model for the path analyses. The dotted path indicates a moderator effect on the interest-choice goals relation.

Definition of Terms

While the gestalt of this research study aims beyond the fragmented picture of African American males, it is important to define the theoretical and conceptual parts that when summed together will provide more clarity. SCCT is a major theoretical framework that researchers have used frequently to attend to important contextual factors, such as gender, racial/ethnic identity, and barriers (Lent et al., 1994). Lent et al. (2000) and Fouad and Byars-Winston (2005) argued the importance of exploring sources of supports and barriers across cultural perspectives in SCCT. So, this study defines the terms of population, SCCT, and contextual factors examined including parental influences. However, some researchers have varied or overlapping definitions for several constructs that will be discussed. For example, several studies have given varying
definitions to race/ethnicity and self-efficacy. When those studies are referenced, the authors’ conceptualization will be used. For this study, the following constructs are defined below.

**African American or Black.** What is in a name or in this case, a label? “Names are only conventional signs for identifying things. Things are the reality that counts” (DuBois, 1928, p. 96-97; Hall, Phillips, & Townsend, 2015). Over the years, the collective terms used to define Americans of African descent have evolved to reflect a shared destiny—the American dream (Philogene, 1999). Over a century ago, *colored* was the common term, which by mid-century gave way to the term *Negro*. During the American Civil Rights movement of the 1960s, the term gave way to variations of *black*, *Black African*, and *Afro-American*. In the 1980s, a newer collective term of African American represented a “a shift from race to ethnicity or culture as the defining characteristic of the group and consequently… evoke[d] the notion of similarities between this group and other ethnic groups” (Grant & Orr, 1996, p. 138 as cited by Sigelman, Tuch, & Martin, 2005 p. 429). The zeitgeist of the 21st century shows no overwhelming preference of the terms *African American* and *Black*, which is reflected in the research literature by the interchangeable use of the terms such as the *Journal of Black Psychology* or the *Journal of African American Males in Education*. While these terms are used interchangeably, especially with the U.S. Black population, it is important to note the possible varied valence of the terms. Philogene’s (2001) study examined all different types of stereotypes associated with the terms; Black carried more negative connotations than African American. In a recent study that examined White Americans’ attributions of both terms, researchers found that this negative perception of the term Black may derive from a perceived difference in socioeconomic status (Hall et al., 2015). Herein this study will reflect the current conventions of the terms
interchangeably. This study does not attend to the variation of multinational, bi/multiracial, and bi/multiethnic of the U.S. African diaspora (Byars-Winston, 2010).

**Self-concept.** Although not directly assessed in this study, self-concept is an important aspect of racial identity. Evans and Herr (1994) defined self-concept as internalized feelings about self in relation to others. Super, Starishevsky, Matlin, and Jordaan (1963) suggested a process where self-concept was created through a process of self-awareness and interactions with other people within the environment. Self-concept is an integral part in formation of identity and therefore is not a separate entity (Evans & Herr, 1994). Evans and Herr also recognized, along with Super et al. (1963), a connection between self-concept and career aspirations.

**Race and ethnicity.** Race and ethnicity catalyze racial and ethnic identity throughout the life of an ethnic minority and are significant factors in their career development (Byars-Winston, 2010). These terms are separate, but have interrelated definitions. How the constructs are operationalized and researched are varied, which is discussed in further detail in the literature review. Before the evolutionary theory, the term race was defined for the most part by political and geographical designations such as the English and Irish (Gutin, 1994). In the early 20th century, psychology in the United States embraced the school of functionalism in protest over Titchener’s school of structuralism (Schultz & Schultz, 2008). The central interest of functionalism was to understand how the organism uses the mind to adapt to the environment (Schultz & Schultz, 2008). Darwin’s evolutionary theory provided a means to examine the organisms function in the environment through animal study comparisons (Schultz & Schultz, 2008). Galton took research in functionalism further by examining individual differences using intelligence testing (Schultz & Schultz, 2008). His poor interpretation of natural selection from the evolution theory in his research led to the founding of eugenics Schultz & Schultz, 2008),
which is that some people are mentally and physically inferior to others. Therefore, one could improve inherited human traits through artificial selection. This injected eugenic thinking fed into the worldview of race as a biological concept, which missed the central points of evolution—diversity and adaptation (Schultz & Schultz, 2008). It is not the smartest or strongest organism that survives; it is the one that adapts most to the environment at the moment. So, the diversity of species to adapt to the many types of environment is the most important characteristic (Schultz & Schultz, 2008).

The racial-genetic model has historically been used to categorize human beings. However, there is no empirical evidence to support this theory/model (Collins, 2004). From a biological standpoint, there is only one race of humans with basic genetic differences typically around 0.2% (Cameron & Wycoff, 1998). Phenotypical differences between human beings (i.e., skin color, eye shape, etc.) account for only 0.012% of variability in human biology (Collins, 2004; Gutin, 1994; Ham & Ware, 2011). In an article from the *Journal of Counseling and Development* (Cameron & Wycoff, 1998), researchers posited that the construct of race is basically meaningless and offers no real tangible utility. In other words, “race is a social construct derived mainly from perceptions conditioned by events of recorded history” (Ham & Ware, 2011, p. 114).

Ethnicity or ethnic group is a synthesis of distinctive customs, language, religion, geography, history, ancestry, dress, or physical traits (Abizadeh, 2001; Peoples & Bailey, 2010). Ethnicity is a dynamic concept that entails fluid cultural markers, identities, and statuses. From a hermeneutical perspective, it is the experience of shared physical and cultural characteristics that is concomitant with a sense of belonging. Most Americans fail to differentiate race and ethnicity with some assuming ethnicity to be a politically correct term for race such as African American
for Black (Ham & Ware, 2011). Byars-Winston’s (2010) provided historical insight over the varied use of the terms. The historical context reveals “erased ethnic identities” that were hegemonically assigned to racial identity “vis-à-vis de jure laws and related social practices” (Byars-Winston, 2010, p. 3).

**Parenting styles.** This term is defined primarily by the seminal work of Baumrind’s (1966, 1968, 1991) classification of parenting styles. Her early work classified three parenting styles with a fourth style added later: *authoritarian*—parents are focused on discipline and obedience less warmth; *permissive*—parents set no clear or appropriate boundaries on child’s behavior; *authoritative*—parents provide a balanced approach to child’s behavior, which is firm, but flexible; and *neglecting*—parents are uninvolved with child and child’s behavior (Brenner & Fox, 1999). Altogether, parenting style is a “stable complex of attitudes and beliefs that form the context in which parenting behaviors occur” (Brenner & Fox, 1999, p. 344).

**Congruence.** This term is a construct in Holland’s theory of career choice. Holland postulated six types of personalities and how those personalities reflected work environments (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005a). Theses six types are: realistic, investigative, artistic, social, enterprising, and conventional (RIASEC). He spatially arranged these types into a hexagon shape, which provides a point of reference when matching RIASEC type personalities to RIASEC type work environments. So, people interested (e.g., career interests) in occupations that are similar or congruent to their personality will be more likely successful and satisfied with their career choice (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005; Swanson & Fouad, 2010) (Figure 1).
Self-efficacy. This construct is defined primarily as a cognitive self-appraisal of one’s ability to prospectively perform a task or action. The efficacy expectations are moderated by three factors—magnitude, strength, and generality (Bandura, 1977, 1986). The magnitude of self-efficacy is an individual’s assessment of how difficult it is to perform a given task. Self-efficacy strength is the amount of persistence to complete a given task at various degrees of difficulty, and the generality of self-efficacy is how broadly the expectation can be applied across situations. Bandura (1977) identified four sources of self-efficacy that individuals use to evaluate their efficacy: performance outcomes, vicarious experience, physiological feedback, and verbal persuasion. Out of these sources of self-efficacy,

Mastery experiences are the most influential source[s] of efficacy information because they provide the most authentic evidence of whether one can muster whatever it takes to succeed. Success builds a robust belief in one’s personal efficacy. Failures undermine it, especially if failures occur before a sense of efficacy is firmly established. (Bandura, 1977, p. 80)
Educational and career-related barriers are defined from the basis of an individual’s perception of negative conditions, which may moderate the career decision-making process from career aspirations to career expectations (Kirkland, 2011; Lent et al., 2000; Luzzo & McWhirter, 2001). According to Lent et al.’s (1994) SCCT, they posited that these contextual barriers are instrumental in the career development of women and ethnic minorities. Unfortunately, many Black men encounter contextual barriers, such as racism and discrimination concomitantly with typical barriers individuals face in career development (Cokley, 2005; Kirkland, 2011; Lent et al., 2000).

**Career interest.** Vocational interests have been conceptualized as a cognitive appraisal of perceived activities, expected outcome success, and anticipated satisfaction from engaging in career-relevant activities (Betsworth & Fouad, 1997; Lent et al., 1994). According to Lent et al. (1994), this cognitive appraisal of three areas were significant in predicting emerging interests (Betsworth & Fouad, 1997).

**Career choice.** Per the SCCT, this term is defined as a two-part temporal process (Lent et al., 2000). The first part is the distal factors such as background contextual factors, which are further away from the actual career choice decision. The second part, proximal factors (e.g., barriers), is closer and very influential during active career choice decision process (Lent et al., 2000). It is important to note that Holland (1997) conceptualized career choice as manifestation of one’s personality (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005; Lent, Lopez, Lopez, & Sheu, 2008).

**Perceived career barriers and supports.** These terms are defined as proximal and distal factors that may impede or foster career choice (Swanson & Fouad, 2010).
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the following review of the literature, there are several areas of research determined to be critical for the formulation and investigation of the current study. The first section considers literature on the anti-deficit approach to ethnic minority research. From there on the chapter builds upon the underlying premise of this study—the axiomatic influences of identity, and perception of barriers on the congruence of career outcome expectation of Black males. A discussion on identity development follows and includes research on self-concept, racial/ethnic identity, ethnic/racial socialization, and masculinity. Finally, SCCT is discussed as a framework that integrates the preceding contextual factors and its relevance to African American male career development entering college. This chapter ends with a summary and hypotheses based on the extant literature.

The Anti-Deficit Approach

The following vignette from a report on Black male student success higher education exemplifies a growing urgency in ethnic minority research studies to promote an anti-deficit approach to examine ethnic minorities:

I am tired of seeing so many people around me, as far as like family and friends, fall by the wayside. I think me succeeding is not only good for me because I can do things I like to do, such as travel and have nice things, but it would also help somebody else who is in the same environment that I came from realize success is possible. (Harper, 2012)

This research agenda of promoting anti-deficit approach ethnic minority research is the results of collective efforts across academic disciplines for renewed attention to contextual factors, and
racial and ethnic identity development (Cokley et al., 2011; Cabrera, 2013; Grundy, 2012; Harper, 2012; McLoyd, 1990; Tovar-Murray, Jenifer, Andrusyk, D'Angelo, & King, 2012). Quintana et al. (2006) went a step further by arguing for the consideration of intergroup processes of racial and ethnic development.

The purpose of the anti-deficit approach is to replace the deficit model employed in many of the previous and extant studies of ethnic minorities (Harper, 2004, 2012). Valencia (1997) further identified the deficit model as “deficit thinking.” Menchaca’s (1997) account of deficit thinking began with the pilgrims’ arrival to North America in 1620. In Menchaca’s (1997) review, she stated that her intent was not to label the pilgrims as racists, but explain how early racial 17th century racial beliefs shaped the later racial beliefs of the United States. In the beginning, much of the pilgrims observed racial and cultural differences from the Indians were based on Biblical hermeneutics. The pilgrims were rewarded by their financial supporters, the Crown and the Mercantile Capitalists from Britain, for the conquest and settlement of America.

The Crown made claim to America, because the British law did not recognize the Native Americans as legal owners (Menchaca, 1997). This served as the basis for further usurping land from the Native Americans to meet the growing economic interest from Britain (Takaki, 1990 as cited by Menchaca, 1997). The pilgrims and later the colonizers perceived this land usurpation as a “sorrowful yet unavoidable practice God had destined them to enact, in order to salvage America from paganism” (Menchaca, 1997, p.14). This same rationale was transmitted from the pilgrims to later White generations as a way of proselytizing based on the religious missive identifying them as “God’s chosen people” (Feagin, 2006; Menchaca, 1997). However, the early religious views were just a reflection of the zeitgeist from Britain and scientific community of Europe (Menchaca, 1997). Moreover, the recorded travel accounts of European explorers,
government officials, and scientists viewed encounters of non-Christian people around the world as savages or “venerating demonic gods” (Said, 1979; Weinberg, 1977 as cited in Menchaca, 1997). This gave credence to a common opinion that dark races were cursed descendants of a Biblical character named Cain from the account of Cain and Abel, who was cursed by God after murdering his brother Abel. The curse was life-long sentence as a restless wanderer, so God gave Cain a designated ‘mark’ to prevent other people from killing him due to his crime. Many believed that God’s curse on Cain turned his skin to black, which in turn was passed on to his descendants (Valencia, 1997; Menchaca, 1997).

In the colonial America period, disease and oppressive relocation practices decimated the population of Native Americans, the rapidly growing economic needs of the wealthy land owners acquired from the Native Americans needed to import slaves farming and harvesting the crops. So, the nexus of economic needs, “moral upgrading of salvages,” and the “mark of Cain” teaching were used as justifications for the peculiar institution of slavery (Valencia, 1997; Menchaca, 1997).

Although there were published scientific studies from Francois Bernier in 1684 and Carlos Linnaeus in 1730 that challenged common and popular beliefs depicting Africans as animals, those views persisted (Blum, 1978; Gossett, 1953 as cited by Menchaca). In the 18th century, the emergence of the scientific method and natural science had usurped the Biblical explanations as the primary school of thought. Within natural science, there were growing debates concerning the origins of humankind. This debate became known as monogenist versus polygenist debate (Stocking, 1968 as cited by Menchaca, 1997). The monogenists posited human beings had common ancestry, while polygenists noted the phenotypes of human beings as the basis for divergent origins. The school of polygenists were led by craniologists, also known as
phrenologists, who evidenced various sizes of craniums as support of hierarchical classification of humankind. Therefore, non-White people were not considered human due to the pseudoscientific evidence (Valencia, 1997; Menchaca, 1997).

Once the United States successfully claimed independence from England, the new republic outlined and protected the rights of all people. The founding fathers in the American Declaration of Independence stated that all men were created equal, but this only applied only to White population, because non-White population were inferior and less than human. So, from the late 1700s into 1800s, the new republic legislated various laws to maintain and promote the economic interest of White Americans and keeping non-White Americans subordinate. Deficit thinking and economic interest were often the basis of the rationale for this hegemonic social arrangement.

Later in the 19th century, the scientific findings and publications of Darwin’s theory of evolution dispelled the postulations of polygenists. Darwin demonstrated that human beings did, in fact, have a common ancestry. However, Darwin’s evolutionary theory did little to refute racial disparities. The new line of demarcation was intelligence. As stated before in Chapter One, evolution led to the school of functionalism in psychology. Galton used intelligence testing to explain racial differences in intelligence and promote eugenics (Schultz & Schultz, 2008).

In 1865, President Abraham Lincoln emancipated slaves after slavery was found in opposition of the U.S. Constitution by Congress. Although, this monumental event guaranteed the rights of Black Americans and other racial minorities, this new status did not mean equality. For example, employment for racial minorities were color-coded for specific menial occupations. Black and Mexican people were aggregated to the occupational fields of agriculture and service, while Chinese immigrants were sent to work on the transatlantic railroad (Barrera, 1979;
Blauner, 1994; Highman, 1994; Takaki, 1990 as cited in Menchaca, 1997). With exception of self-employment, racial minorities were relegated to these occupational areas (Menchaca, 1997). Public educational opportunities were available to White Americans, but virtually non-existent for racial minorities (Menchaca, 1997). It was not until the 20th century that segregated public education was offered to racial minorities through federal funding (Menchaca, 1997).

At the heart of deficit thinking model is the endogenous conceptualizations of ethnic minorities in the areas of “intellectual abilities, linguistic shortcomings, lack of motivation to learn and immoral behavior” (Valencia, 1997, p. 1). Valencia (1997) further depicted deficit thinking in the context of education as another form of oppression:

In light of the long-standing existence of deficit thinking and its powerful influence on educational practice, it is incongruous that very little has been that deficit thinking is a form of oppression—that is, the cruel and unjust use of authority and power to keep a group of people in their place…the history of deficit thinking in education is filled with examples of how economically disadvantaged students of color were kept in their place by macro- and micro level educational policies/practices fueled by class and racial prejudice. (Valencia, 1997, p. 3)

In sum, the roots of deficit thinking evolved from the early colonial history of America to modern-day United States. Throughout this period, racial minorities were assessed as inferior to White people beginning with religious missives (e.g., God’s chosen people), physiology (e.g., craniology), and, later, with intelligence and culture (Menchaca, 1997). The preceding was used to deny and justify the denial of social and political rights of racial minorities. It was not until the research in the later 20th century that research revealed that the intellectual disparities of
racial/ethnic minorities (e.g., bell curve controversy) were not due to innate genetic determinants, but a reflection of racist and discriminatory practices of society at every level. Deficit thinking’s evolution was dynamic. It was shaped by the influences of the temporal climate and zeitgeist “rather than shaping the shaping the climates,” which is a key point in moving from deficit thinking model to an anti-deficit model (Valencia, 1997, p. 6).

Recent efforts to advance research on ethnic minorities have attended to the research frameworks and approaches that integrate bioecological, and cultural models that exemplify strength and positive adaptations across the life span (Cabrera, 2012). This strength-based approach offers a more nuanced contextual understanding than merely examining the challenges faced by ethnic minorities (Cabrera, 2012; Dodge, 2011). Cabrera (2012) noted around development for minority children that the renewed attention to contextual factors highlight multiple pathways for positive development and a variety of conceptions of well-being. According to Cabrera (2012) extant research is increasingly attending “to adaptation rather than on risk” (e.g., APA Task Force on Resilience and Strength in Black Children and Adolescents, 2008, Cabrera, 2012, p. 4). The Social Policy Report on the positive development of minority children highlights what is lacking in previous research studies. The findings from the studies are mostly based on low-income families, which are often incorrectly equated with race and ethnicity. While there is good understanding about problems in academics and behaviors for minority children, little is known about adaptation. Even less is known when within-group variation concerning familial education, socioeconomic status, cultural beliefs and values exists (Cabrera, 2012; Quintana et al., 2006).

These efforts have extended to the research areas of ethnic minority students in secondary and post-secondary education. However, African American students have received much of the
attention concerning achievement gap (Cokley, 2005; Cokley et al., 2011). Reasons referenced to explicate the academic underachievement of African Americans are a milieu of psychological factors that emphasizes between race differences in motivation, levels of engagement, dissonance in environment, poverty, and underachievement (Cokley et al., 2011; Harper, 2012). Moreover, Cokley et al. (2011) referenced a report by the Council of the Great City Schools that depicted African American male achievement as a national catastrophe (Lewis, Simon, Uzzell, Horwitz, & Casserly, 2010 as cited by Cokley et al., 2011). Many of reasons outlined in Chapter One act as the premise of many of the previous and extant research studies (Harper, 2004, 2012).

Harper (2008, 2012) proposed an anti-deficit approach to reconceptualize Black male college achievement. Emphasis was placed on what can be learned from African American male achievers who could overcome barriers typical of disadvantaged peers and acquired social and cultural capital needed to compete for educational experiences that furthers their career development (Harper, 2012). While Harper offered an anti-deficit achievement framework, he also suggested ways research questions can be reframed to an anti-deficit approach in Figure 4 below.
Deficit-Oriented Questions | Anti-Deficit Reframing
--- | ---
Why do so few Black male students enroll in college? | How were aspirations for postsecondary education cultivated among Black male students enrolled in college?
Why are Black male undergraduates so disengaged in campus leadership positions and out-of-class activities? | What compels Black undergraduate men to pursue leadership and engagement opportunities on their campuses?
Why are Black male students’ rates of persistence and degrees attainment lowest among both sexes and all racial/ethnic groups in higher education? | How do Black male collegians manage to persist and earn their degrees, despite transition issues, racist stereotypes, academic under-preparedness, and other negative forces?
Why are Black male students’ grade point averages often the lowest among both sexes and all racial/ethnic groups on many campuses? | What resources are most effective in helping Black male achievers earn GPAs above 3.0 in a variety of majors, including STEM fields?
Why are Black men’s relationships with faculty and administration so weak? | How do Black men go about cultivating meaningful, value-added relationships with key institutional agents?

Figure 4. Deficit-oriented questions and anti-deficit reframing. Adapted with permission from “Men of color: A role for policymakers in improving the status of Black male students in U.S. higher education,” by S. R. Harper, I. Harris, & N. Frank, 2012, Institute for Higher Education Policy. Copyright 2012.

In order to examine and better understand the proposed within group variations of the African American male, one must review and examine the research literature on racial/ethnic identity development and masculinity.

Racial/Ethnic Identity Development

Although racial/ethnic identity has been defined as separate, but interrelated constructs, how the constructs have been operationalized has been inconsistent in research (Cokley, 2005). The instruments to measure racial/ethnic identity development has in some cases used the constructs interchangeably or worst yet, in the wrong context (Cokley, 2005; Elmore, Mandara,
& Gray, 2012). A more in-depth discussion on differences is presented after introducing the primary theories. These differences also extended to racial/ethnic socialization, which is an important component that gives rise to identity (Paasch-Anderson & Lamborn, 2013; Peck, Brodish, Malanchuk, Banerjee, & Eccles, 2014). Due to the interrelated relationship of racial/ethnic identity and socialization, some researchers have combined the concepts into an integrated conceptualization (Umaña-Taylor, 2015; Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014).

The field of vocational psychology has increasingly attended to the impact of cultural variables within empirically validated frameworks (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005; Ihle-Helledy et al., 2005). Specifically, in career development research, the focus on racial/ethnic identity has been driven by differences not in career aspiration, but in expectations and perceptions of barriers and opportunities (Byars & Hackett, 1998; Hackett & Byars, 1996; Ihle-Helledy et al., 2005; Swanson & Fouad, 2010). Ihle-Helledy et al. (2005) reviewed empirical literature concerning culture and different aspects of career development in relation to the stages of Fouad and Bingham’s (1995) model—culturally appropriate career counseling model (CACCM). Part of the criteria for inclusion of the research articles that identified race and/or ethnicity as an independent variable using college students as samples for most the studies (Ihle-Helledy et al., 2005). In the CACCM is a seven-step process to identify and address critical aspects of career development in a cultural context (Ihle-Helledy et al., 2005). The research articles for step two, in particular, demonstrated two clear lines of research concerning career issues—perceptions of career opportunities and barriers; and aspirations and expectations in career and education (Ihle-Helledy et al., 2005). In both lines of research, racial/ethnic identity was demonstrated to have significant effect. Specifically, five of the studies where “career aspirations, career expectations, educational aspirations, educational expectations, occupational prestige, and occupational sex
type” and racial/ethnic identity as the dependent variables (Ihle-Helledy et al., 2005, p. 271). With racial/ethnic identity as the independent variable, the studies found that “occupational opportunities might be circumscribed due to race, whereas White students were less likely to perceive that restriction in opportunity for themselves or students of color” (Ihle-Helledy et al., 2005, p. 272). This study seeks to empirically extend the review findings of Ihle-Helledy et al. (2005) by examining the cultural variables (e.g., racial/ethnic identity) of high-achieving African American males within the empirically support frame-work SCCT.

Many of the primary theories and models have conceptualized racial/ethnic identity and socialization as a complex interaction of personal, social, and collective identities within self-concept (Evans & Herr, 1994; Richardson et al., 2010). How these factors influence the career development of Black males is the concern of this study. Byars-Winston’s (2010) article illustrated the importance of examining the attitudes of racial/ethnic identity as possible indicators and predictors of career choice. Furthermore, in her review of the literature, she highlighted that integration of racial/ethnic identity may provide improved enhancement of perception in the areas of career possibilities, career interest, and career outcome expectations. So, this warrants further exploration of the primary theories of racial/ethnic identity.

Erikson’s (1968) stages of identity development, also known as psychosocial identity, served as the basis for many of the early formal theories of racial/ethnic identity such as Cross et al. (1991), Parham and Helms (1981), Phinney (1992), and Elmore et al. (2012). Erikson (1968) defined identity as partly conscious, but mostly unconscious sense of self within society, which harkened back to his earlier influences from Freud’s psychosexual development theory (Schultz & Schultz, 2008). His theory was built upon Freud’s concept of “ego-identity” where he proposed a sequential eight stage developmental process that was advanced by a crisis (Schultz
Erikson suggested that the elements of self, societal roles, and collective culture were the bedrock foundation for identity (Richardson, 2000). Moreover, Erikson posited that human beings are shaped through the experiences within a specific cultural context (Richardson, 2000). While, race or ethnicity were not explicitly discussed, it provided the conceptual bones to flesh out the development of racial/ethnic identity as intimated in by Erikson:

There is a human propensity in each of us, traceable to the tribal origins of the species, to lift one’s own confidence in identity, competence and uniqueness by grouping, prejudging and excluding entire groups of people. This early evolutionary need to believe that all who were not members of their tribe must be a gratuitous invention of some irrelevant deity made outsiders minimally useful as a screen onto which the in tribe could project antipathic tendencies and negative identities. (Erikson, 1968, p. 41)

The seminal work of Cross’s (1971, 1991), *Nigrescence* (French for becoming Black), conceptualized racial identity as a five-stage developmental model similar to Erikson’s theory of development (Richardson et al., 2010). Cross’s model was rooted in sociopolitical realities of racism and racial discrimination (Richardson et al., 2010). The preliminary hypothesis of Cross’s (1971) model identified points where African Americans transformed from a hegemonic schema to a Black collective schema through sequential stages contingent on the person’s response to social and environmental pressures. His model was later revised to the following four stages:

1. Pre-encounter stage is marked by racial and cultural dissonance along the lines of favoring a White schema over a Black schema.
2. Encounter stage is the clash of worldviews for an African American prompting the person reassess his or her identity with Black culture.

3. Immersion/emersion is the inverse proportion favoring a Black schema from a White schema with intense Black involvement.

4. Internalization is the acceptance of a secure Black worldview that also takes into consideration other racial schemata (Byars-Winston, 2010; Vandiver, Cross, Worrell, & Fhagen-Smith, 2002).

Parham (1989) extended Cross’s model with the concept of lifespan. He posited that Nigrescence was not terminal cycle, but a process across the lifespan beginning in late adolescence (Richardson et al., 2010). Parham (1989) also reified the stage transition process that added the following dynamism: stagnation, stage wise linear progression, and recycling. So, depending on the encounter experience (e.g., racial challenge or discriminatory event), this precipitant could lead to recycling to an earlier stage of development previously experienced. Parham’s lifespan concept reflects the necessary conflict resolution needed before transitioning to the next stage (Richardson et al., 2010). Examples of the Cross’s scale and items are available in Figure 3.

Phinney’s (1992) racial identity model is also based on Erikson’s model of identity. Phinney’s ethnic identity model focused on self and reference group orientation as core elements. This introspection approach is necessary resource for African American people, because their identities are not accessible in mainstream society (Elmore et al., 2012). The main components of the ethnic identity model are: “self-identification and ethnicity, ethnic behaviors and practices, affirmation and belonging, ethnic identity achievement, and attitudes toward other groups” (Elmore et al., 2012, p. 91). This earlier model led to Phinney developing the Multigroup Ethnic
Identity Measure (MEIM), which has four subscales that implement the components of ethnic identity model. Examples of the scale and the items are available in Figure 3.

Helms’s (1994) model attempted cultural dimensions by attending to cultural patterns and overall cultural experiences. This contrasted with Cross’s model, because it diverted attention away from stage development progressions to more focus on subjective experience (Richardson et al., 2010). Helm’s model and Cross’s (1971) model shared common assumptions critical to one’s psychosocial identity and also shared the same naming conventions for differentiations of ego. However, Helms referred to the ego differentiations in the developmental process as statuses rather than stages. Helms argued for a better schematic representation for the individual and proposed a multilayered circumplex (symbolizing the ego) of racial dynamics and functioning in the environment (Helms & Piper, 1994). Examples of the scale are available in Figure 3.

Along with Helms, Sellers and colleagues’ (1998) viewed racial/ethnic identity theory not as single sequential state, but that the person experiences multiple aspects of identity development simultaneously. They created the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI) to capture those multiple aspects and dynamism of an African American individual’s development over previous theories uniformed stage progressions. Examples of the scale and the items are available in Figure 5.

While, racial/ethnic identity theories and models have been beneficial in explicating a “racinated and deracinated identity development process among African Americans,” the discussed frameworks do not account for racial/ethnic socialization (Richardson et al., 2010, p. 232). In particular, the initial racial/ethnic consciousness. Umaña -Taylor, Cross, and other colleagues (2014) argued for a synthesis of existing racial/ethnic identity development and
recommendations to advance conceptualization of these constructs (Umaña-Taylor et al., 2014). The researchers also argued that racial and ethnic identity should be combined as a construct stating, “the distinctions that North American researchers have historically made between racial identity and ethnic identity may be outdated overly parochial relative to new generations of youth whose experiences regarding their identities may reflect a more global perspective” (p. 23). Umaña -Taylor et al. used a meta-construct approach to integrate ethnic/racial identity (ERI) and racial socialization the ERI model.

The ERI development model (2014) is an attempt to synthesize the current continuum of theoretical work in ethnic and racial identity within normative youth development for ethnic minorities. This integrative model combines racial/ethnic across cognitive milestones, physiological and social/environmental contexts, and components. As evidenced in Umaña-Taylor et al.’s (2014) review, racial/ethnic identity studies indicate support for their integrative approach to racial and ethnic identity and socialization. Some of the examples given were the MIBI model, which examines the extent of race as part of self-concept in particular context. Another example used was MEIM model that examined ethnic identity statues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Encounter</td>
<td>I believe that large numbers of Blacks are untrustworthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>I am determined to find my Black identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion-Emersion</td>
<td>White people can’t be trusted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>I feel good about being Black but I don’t limit myself to Black activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Encounter</td>
<td>Assimilation: I am not so much a member of a racial group as I am an American/Miseducation: Blacks place more emphasis on having a good time than on hard work/Hatred: I sometimes have negative feelings about being Black.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion-Emersion</td>
<td>Anti-White: I have a strong feeling of hatred and disdain for all White people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>Black Nationalist: As Black Nationalists, we must work on empowering ourselves and not on hating others/Inclusive: I believe it is important to have both a Black identity and a multicultural perspective, which is inclusive of everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-group Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmation and Belonging</td>
<td>I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Identity Achievement</td>
<td>I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Behaviors</td>
<td>I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Group Orientation</td>
<td>I like meeting and getting to know people from ethnic groups other than my own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Centrality  
In general, being Black is an important part of my self-image.

Private Regard  
I am proud to be Black.

Public Regard  
Overall, Blacks are considered good by others.

Nationalist  
Black people must organize themselves into a separate Black political force.

Assimilation  
Blacks should view themselves as being Americans first and foremost.

Oppressed Minority  
Black people should treat other oppressed people as allies.

Humanist  
Blacks should judge Whites as individuals and not as members of the White race.

Figure 5. Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI). Adapted with permission from Elmore et al., 2010, p. 92-93.

However, perfunctory use of conceptual terms race and ethnicity in identity and socialization in academia and research has contributed to the current preparadigmatic state of varying operationalization of the terms. The models of Cross (1991), Helms (1995), Phinney (1992) focused more on the psychological adaptations in hegemonic society than on the labels of race and ethnicity (Cokley, 2005). While, there is conceptual overlap between racial and ethnic identity, how each construct is defined makes them distinct. Cokley (2005) gave an example of the interchangeable use with Phinney’s (1992) ethnic identity model in the following:

Phinney (1992) frequently used the terms interchangeably. Direct comparisons of the number of racial identity versus ethnic identity studies are prohibitive because, as evidence in Phinney’s review, some studies that claim to be examining ethnic identity are in actuality examining racial identity, and vice versa. (Cokley, 2005, p. 517)
Cokley’s (2005) study examined the components of racial identity and ethnic identity in comparison to the subscales of primary racial/ethnic identity models. Using a canonical correlation approach to examine the criterion variables, the results of his study indicated that depending on what aspect is examined “racial identity may or may not be related to ethnic identity” (Cokley, 2005, p. 524). The conceptual map of Cokley’s study is available in Figure 6.

Paasch-Anderson and Lamborn (2013) posited that ethnic and racial conceptualization are two distinct but related processes for cultural message transmissions within ethnic minority families. The researchers argued their proposed model would disentangle the forms of socialization in race and ethnicity revealing more dynamism in the process. Paasch-Anderson and Lamborn (2013) used the existing dimensions of the triple quandary framework for extending their proposal of a separate model for racial and ethnic socialization. To capture multidimensionality, the researchers added separate dimensions of ethnic and race neutral with cultural markers. For ethnic socialization, the markers used were in the category of Black cultural content including ethnic group identification, cultural markers, and ethnic family relations. For racial socialization, the specific markers used were in the category of minority content, including racial group identification, racism awareness, and diversity awareness.

In their empirical study, the African American adolescents self-identified those specific markers within each construct reflected in their perceptions. The similarities across these two concepts are the contributions to the individual’s overall normative development. Racial socialization process is more deductive in nature where awareness is a key component. While, ethnic socialization is more inductive in nature with key informants such as the mother provided Black cultural messages. In the Hughes et al. (2005) article, the researchers conceptualized racial and ethnic socialization as a bidirectional synergistic process that is shaped by parents and adolescents (p. 765). Their description suggests a distinct and separate approach, which is in-line with Paasch-Anderson and Lamborn’s proposal. However, the cursory exchanges of the cultural socialization model proposed by Hughes et al. (2005) diminish their conceptualization that racial and ethnic socialization is multidimensional and has a separate dynamic.
In Flores and Bike’s (2014) review of ethnic identity development and career counseling, they argued that racial identity development does not appear to be significantly related to educational and career development constructs. Flores and Bike (2014) posited that ethnic identity better captures the sense of identification and attitudes associated with ethnic group membership. They referenced Fouad and Bingham’s (1995) article, which noted the level of ethnic identity may moderate some ethnic minorities’ perceptions of opportunity and barriers.

At the core is the methodological issue of construct validity of racial identity and ethnic identity (Cokley, 2005). The interchangeable use and arguments are factors contributing to a preparadigmatic state in racial and ethnic identity. The implication here is that dialogue and more research is needed to evidence and establish paradigmatic conceptualization of race and ethnicity. As it stands, continued research in this state will only amplify the confusion and not magnify the dynamism of race and ethnicity. Replication of empirical studies like Cokley (2005) and Paasch-Anderson and Lamborn (2013) will lead to more fruitful discussion on the future direction of racial/ethnic identity constructs.

Despite lacking a common consensus, the need for empirical studies on racial/ethnic identity is significant to advance research and understanding of African American male career choice and development evidenced by the racial/ethnic disparity across the labor market mentioned before. Thus, this study examined racial/ethnic identity as one of the distal contextual variables that influence the congruency of career interest and choice in the SCCT framework.

**Masculinity**

While this construct was not measured, it is important to define Black masculinity beyond the negative and deficit characterization, which is not representative of all African American males and their career development (Cokley et al., 2011; Grundy, 2012; Harper, 2004;
Lawson, 1999; Palmer & Young, 2009). Characterizing Black males as an “endangered species” is reflective of many studies that focused only on deficits and/or disparities in education, academic achievement, and employment (Palmer & Young, 2009). While there is no specific theory of Black masculinity, it is often compared to hegemonic masculinity of White males (Lawson, 1999; Mutua, 2006). Bush (1999), in answering the question of how a boy becomes a man in his review of Black manhood, conceptualized the perplexing problem of defining masculinity in the following, “answering the opening question becomes more obfuscated by the hegemonic dynamics in the United States that deny some men the social ability to be viewed by society as men despite their biological sex” (p. 49). Mutua (2006) proposed a multidimensional understanding of the bifurcated nature of Black masculinity. On the one hand, African American males are oppressed by racism, but on the other hand privileged due to gender (Mutua, 2006). What, then, is Black masculinity?

The proverbial “man-code” expresses the dynamic and active social construction of masculinity involving many facets (Harper, 2004). Commonly in research, masculinity is not essentialist-based or biologically determined, but rather behaviorally taught (Martin & Harris, 2014). The “man-code” is a societal standard where all men must be measured in areas of power, competitiveness, toughness, autonomy, sportsmanship indoor/outdoor (Harper, 2004; Martin & Harris, 2014). The mainstream expressions of masculinity are often enacted in the pursuit of power, wealth, and high social status (Martin & Harris, 2014). The hegemonic masculine behaviors of aggressiveness and other stereotypic behaviors are constructed and reinforced behaviorally from traditional standards of masculinity and serves as a hegemonic canon. Engagement in these types of activities affords approval from other male peers.
Along these same lines, Bush’s (1999) review of literature concerning the Black manhood in the United States argued the following reasons from a sociohistorical dynamic perspective:

(a) slavery caused a situation where many Black men could not protect themselves or their families; (b) a “matriarchal system” within Black communities, caused by an absent father or an "overpowering Black woman" emerge within the context of a patriarchal U.S. society that expects men to be the heads of households; and (c) economic oppression rendered Black men unable to provide for their families in a society where manhood and the provider role are inextricable. (p. 49)

Due to the liminal nature of racism and discrimination African American males encounter in the United States, they are limited in power and privilege to express mainstream masculinity (Martin & Harris, 2014). Therefore, some African American males seek alternate ways of expressing masculinity (Harper, 2004). Harris (1995) elucidated the alternate expression of masculinity for Black males in the following:

Pressures to meet European American standards of manhood as provider, protector, and disciplinarian are representative of such a dilemma for African American men… Inequities in earning potential and employment and limited access to educational opportunities prevent the expression of these behaviors... To compensate for feelings of powerlessness, guilt, and shame that result from the inability to enact traditional masculine roles, some African American male youth have redefined masculinity to emphasize sexual promiscuity, toughness, thrill
seeking, and the use of violence in interpersonal interactions (Oliver, 1989, p. 279-280;)

Oliver (1989) posited that alternate expressions of masculinity are orientated in two problematic cultural adaptations of the “tough guy” and the “player of women” (p. 18). Majors and Billson (1992) described these maladaptive behaviors as survival strategies to buffer against effects of oppression and racial discrimination. However, Oliver argued that racial oppression and discrimination theories tend to overgeneralize and predict African American men who engage in this maladaptive expression of masculinity. He gave the following example: “all Blacks are directly or indirectly affected by American racism; however, only a minority actively participate in activities that cause social problems” (p. 17).

Harper (2004) and Martin and Harris (2014) extended Oliver’s (1989) argument by examining the within-group variability of African American masculinity exploring wider array of masculinity. Their studies examined high-achieving African male undergraduates and student-athletes that confirmed and supported expressions of masculinity that promoted strong self-concept and positive outcomes (Harper, 2004; Martin & Harris, 2014).

**Parenting Style and Career Development**

Parents are important distal antecedents for career development (Blustein, 1997; Lent et al., 1994). The dyadic parent-child relationship facilitates risk taking and exploration depending on the quality of the parental attachment (Altman, 1997; Blustein, 1997; Sovet & Metz, 2014). The parental moderation of the bedrock behaviors of risk taking and exploration is needed for identity development and ultimately vocational identity. For example, a child exclaiming “I want to be an astronaut when I grow up,” provides an opportunity to the parents to facilitate interpretation about the world and the child’s abilities (Altman, 1997; Blustein, 1997; Hall,
Kelly, Hansen, & Gutwein, 1996). However, when parents fail to facilitate opportunities for growth, adolescents may prematurely diffuse or stunt areas of identity (Schultheiss & Blustein, 1994). Conversely, some researchers have suggested that parental styles that exhibit moderate degrees of warmth and emotional closeness may encourage identity achievement (Josselson, 1989; Schulthesis & Blustein, 1994). Moreover, Blustein, Walbridge, Friedlander, and Palladino (1991) posited that most adaptive familial relationships have a strong influence on vocational identity when there are factors of emotional parental attachments and psychological separation (e.g., autonomy). In other words, their findings indicate that commitment to career choice is most likely due to their desire for independence from their parents, but yet are also securely attached to them (Blustein et al., 1991).

Vondracek et al.’s (1986) study also supported that career development is optimally examined and understood in relation to the developing person’s dynamic context (Whiston & Keller, 2004). They described career development as an interactive process between the person-environment influenced by social, cultural, and physical factors (Whiston & Keller, 2004, p. 493). Furthermore, Vondracek et al. (1986) suggested, “perhaps the most important way in which roles and role expectations link the family microsystem and children’s career development entails the roles children learn in the context of the family setting” (p. 53 as cited in Whiston & Keller, 2004).

Roe (1956, 1957), an early theorist and researcher in the theory of personality and theory of career choice on career development, and Roe and Lunneborg (1990) posited that the dyadic parent-child relationship and early childhood experiences indirectly moderate the later stages of career behavior (Brown, Lum, & Voyle, 1997). She argued that the parents help facilitate and influence personality appraisals (e.g., needs, values, interests) and psychological need structure
of the person orienting towards or not towards people, which described this concept in more
detail with the following: “the patterns of psychic energy, in terms of attention-directness (e.g.,
needs), determine the field or fields in which persons will choose to apply themselves” (Roe,
1957, p. 213 as cited in Brown et al., 1997, p. 285). Moreover, she postulated “I then
hypothesized that there are two basic orientations, either toward or not toward persons; that these
orientations are related to early childhood experiences; and that they can be related in turn to
occupational choice” (Roe & Lunneborg, 1990, p. 78 as cited in Brown et al., 1997).
Furthermore, Roe believed her concept of interpersonal interactions could then be correlated
with occupational categorizations (Roe & Klos, 1969). These distal factors of person orientation
and occupational selections influenced by personality and parenting style was reflected by
previous study by Kriger (1972). The finding indicated that women’s achievement needs were
related to perceptions of parental treatment and child-rearing practices (Brown et al., 1997).
Thus, career interest and choices are some of the ways a person can meet their psychological
needs.

It is important to note that early empirical studies failed to demonstrate relationship
between personality development and career choice due to a misconception of Roe’s theory.
Brown et al. (1997) addressed this misconception by providing a reappraisal of the theory of
personality development and career choice. Figure 7 displays the contrast of the correct and
incorrect conceptualization of the theory. However, there is emerging empirical research that
indicate indirect relationship between parenting styles and career choices (Altman, 1997,
Blustein, 1997; Brown et al., 1997; Ketterson & Blustein, 1997; Osipow, 1997).
The primary founders and investigators of parenting styles have been Becker (1964), Baumrind (1967), Maccoby and Martin (1983), and Steinberg and Lamborn (1992). Becker (1964) examined a parent’s disciplinary style as a way of deducing type of parenting styles associated with various expressions of affection. His review of previous research studies and his factor analysis of parenting characteristics related to discipline distilled to three universal dimensions of parenting styles (Becker, 1964). These dimensions were anchored as followed: warmth versus hostility, restrictiveness versus permissiveness, and anxious emotional involvement versus calm-detachment. Becker removed the third-dimension due lack of research.

Figure 7. Correct and incorrect conceptualization. Adapted with permission from Brown et al. (1997), p. 285.
support. So, his founding work categorized parenting styles into four areas: warm/restrictive, hostile/restrictive, warm/permissive, and hostile/permissive (Becker, 1964).

Baumrind’s (1966, 1968, 1991) seminal work further refined parenting styles by integrating a child’s social competence as dependent on parental control exerted (Slicker, 1996). The parenting styles were defined as follows: authoritarian—parents are focused on discipline and obedience; permissive—parents set no clear or appropriate boundaries on child’s behavior; authoritative—parents provide a balanced approach to child’s behavior, which is firm, but flexible; and neglecting—parents are uninvolved with child and child’s behavior (Brenner & Fox, 1999). She later added another style that she characterized as neither responsive nor demanding (Baumrind, 1991).

Maccoby and Martin (1983) extended Baumind’s conceptual parenting style framework even further by dividing permissive parenting style into sub-categories of permissive-indulgent and permissive-indifferent (Slicker, 1996). They conceptualized measuring varying degrees of parenting style based on how the child perceives responsiveness and demandingness from his or her parents. Figure 8 displays the constructs of responsiveness and demandingness in a 2 x 2 matrix used to distinguish parenting styles (Slicker, 1996). Responsiveness is operationalized as how parents differentially address adaptive and maladaptive behaviors. Demandingness identifies the type of boundaries or demands made by parents (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). According to their matrix model, authoritative parenting style had high responsiveness and demandingness qualities, while on the other end of the spectrum neglectful parenting had at minimal or neither of those qualities. In-between, authoritarian parenting had high demandingness, but minimal or low responsiveness. Indulgent parenting had high responsiveness, but virtually no demandingness. So Maccoby and Martin (1983) focused more
on the responsiveness and demandingness of parents rather than the characteristics of warmth and other characteristics as first defined by Becker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demandng</th>
<th>Responsive</th>
<th>Not Responsive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUTHORITATIVE</td>
<td>AUTHORITARIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Demandng</td>
<td>INDULGENT</td>
<td>NEGLECTFUL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 8. Maccoby and Martin’s model. Adapted from Georges (2003).*

Steinberg et al.’s (1994) matrix model defined the terms as convergent around acceptance and not centered on responsiveness as in Maccoby and Martin’s (1983) earlier model (Figure 8). In comparison, Steinberg and Lamborn (1992) more recent extension of Maccoby and Martin’s (1983) matrix model also measurement of parenting style (Figure 9; Slicker, 1996). They also added an additional third dimension of autonomy with the original two dimensions from Becker’s earlier work—acceptance/involvement and strictness/supervision. Steinberg and colleagues posited that autonomy played a central role in authoritative parenting, because the measure differentiated the types of authoritative parenting (Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strict</th>
<th>Accepting</th>
<th>Not Accepting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUTHORITATIVE</td>
<td>AUTHORITARIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Strict</td>
<td>INDULGENT</td>
<td>NEGLECTFUL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 9. Steinberg and Lamborn (1992) more recent extension of Maccoby and Martin’s matrix model. Adapted with permission from Georges (2003).*
Researchers have studied the interconnected links of parenting styles on a child’s career choice and development (Altman, 1997; Blustein, 1997; Steinberg et al., 1992). Moreover, the findings from the studies indicated that parenting style may be a predictor for a variety of outcomes in childhood, adolescence, and even college aged (Sovet & Metz, 2014; Young & Valach, 1997). Researchers have a positive relationship with certain styles of parenting (Silva et al., 2008; Steinberg et al., 1992). For example, Steinberg et al. (1992) study investigated the relationship between authoritative parenting and academic achievement adolescents. They found a positive relationship between those variables. Adolescents who reported that their parents provided them with following authoritative parenting characteristics of warmth, autonomy, and high demands were able to achieve higher academically (Steinberg et al., 1992).

Additionally, some researchers have examined authoritative parenting predicting academic achievement and career choice in college students (Joshi, Ferris, Otto, & Regan, 2003; Silva et al., 2008; Thieke, 1994; Turner et al., 2009). According to Chickering (1999), “acquiring autonomy and independence from parents is a necessary component of emotional adjustment to college,” which allows further development of personal efficacy to make career choices. Overall, parents’ support and guidance can help facilitate a necessary context for college students with specific career or educational experiences (Altman, 1997). However, there were some inconsistencies across the studies concerning the relationship between authoritative parenting, academic achievement, and career choice with different populations.

Due to these inconsistencies, there has been some controversy over the generalizability of authoritative parenting as a predictive factor with other ethnic minorities (Lamborn et al., 1991; Mandara, 2006; Steinberg, Dornbush, & Brown, 1992). Much of the authoritative parenting research demonstrates the benefits on White children and adolescents (Silva et al., 2008;
Steinberg et al., 1992). In general, authoritative parenting in research studies has been presented as the gold standard in best child-rearing practices. Since authoritative parenting is considered the proximal zone for children and adolescents, some of the cognitive and behavioral benefits exhibited are better mental health, mental state awareness (e.g., mental state communication), and self-reliance to govern social situations (Baumrind, 1991; McClun & Merrell, 1998; Myrberg & Rosen, 2008; Steinberg, Dornbusch, & Brown, 1992). However, studies like Park and Bauer (2002) and Steinberg et al. (1994) did not confirm the benefits of authoritative parenting with other ethnic minorities. Furthermore, Park and Bauer’s (2002) study indicated no significant differences between authoritative and authoritarian parenting utilizing a large sample size of Asian American and African American high school students. Moreover, there are studies that indicated African American adolescents raised according to authoritarian parenting using corporal punishment and hostile/restrictive interactions were more likely to hinder autonomy resulting in dependence (Pardeck & Pardeck, 1990). Authoritarian parenting has also been typically associated with lower academic achievement among African American adolescents (Baumrind, 1991; Becker, 1964; Dornbusch et al., 1987; McClun & Merrell, 1998).

Contrary to aforementioned findings, Lamborn et al.’s (1991) study found no differences in positive and negative effects (e.g., academic achievement) of adolescents raised in authoritarian homes or authoritative homes. Mandara’s (2006) review of empirical literature on African American family focused on additional inconsistencies and limitations that have contributed to further confusion. Regarding parenting styles and academic achievement, Mandara highlighted the basic logic that “because authoritative parenting styles are associated with higher achievement in European Americans, and because African American males have the lowest academic achievement of all major American groups, they must receive the least amount
of authoritative parenting” (p. 208). She leveraged several arguments against this premise. Firstly, many of the empirical sample sizes used small percentages of African Americans to test the effects of parenting styles on academic achievement. Next, the earliest studies indicated no relationship between academic achievement and African American high school students (Dornbusch et al., 1987). Other studies indicated there was a connection, but that African American children raised by authoritative parents succeed on well-being variables excluding academic achievement variables (Mandara, 2006; Steinberg et al., 1991).

Altogether, Mandara identified the critical flaw with many of those studies was that African American parenting styles were not examined separately from other racial/ethnic groups. More recent studies utilizing larger African American only samples such as Mandara and Murray’s study found similar, but qualitative examples compared to White parenting styles (Mandara, 2006). For example, authoritative African American parents’ perception tended to be more domain specific and not across all child-rearing practices (e.g., less likely to acquiesce to a child’s demand). In comparison to White authoritative parenting, the above example would have been classified as authoritarian parenting (Mandara, 2006). Tamis-LeMonda et al. (2008) identified an additional methodological flaw to studying African American parenting; that is, the disproportional attention given to deficits of African American parenting and viewing African Americans as one monolithic cultural group. They argued that researchers need to focus on the heterogeneity of Black parenting and unique experiences to yield a dynamic understanding. Tamis-LeMonda and her colleagues (2008) reflected the premise of this study, which is to better understand the within-group dynamics of African American males’ career development from an anti-deficit approach.
Summarily, the review of the literature on parenting styles indicated some convergence such as neglectful parenting’s negative effects on children (Baumrind, 1991; Lamborn et al., 1991). However, some of the findings have been inconsistent across racial/ethnic groups. Some of reasons for the inconsistencies may be due to methodological issues as outlined in Mandara’s and Tamis-LeMonda et al.’s (2008) articles. Despite some of these inconsistencies, the overall findings from the literature is clear; authoritative parenting has the most positive consequences and benefits for across the lifespan. Parenting with the characteristics of warmth and love along with supportive responsiveness and firm demandingness provided the optimal environment children to develop. More specific to this study, authoritative parenting provided the necessary autonomy for children to explore and take-risk. The autonomous behavior of children builds personal efficacy to shape their own lives and by extension their future career choices.

Tracey et al.’s (2006) study went a step further in examining career exploration using Holland’s (1997) code types RIASEC in relation to parenting styles. Given the benefits of authoritative parenting style, they focused solely on authoritative parenting characteristics. They expected more career exploratory activities and better congruency regarding the “individual’s occupational percepts conform to the circular RIASEC structure (e.g., hexagon arrangement of career types). Their findings indicated that the middle school and high school students who were raised in an authoritative home had the secure base for greater career exploration and better congruency to the RIASEC structure (Lent et al., 2008; Tracey et al., 2006).

Career Development and Interest of African American Men

In vocational literature, many of the issues involving the career development of African Americans are derivatives of maintaining the status quo of the American sociopolitical system
(McCollum, 1998). The cost and false security of having this system has resulted in a structure that limits the career possibilities for African Americans (McCollum, 1998).

The literature also suggests that African Americans have traditionally chosen specific careers and occupations (Byars-Winston, 2006; Cheatham, 1990; Harrington, 1998; Littig, 1968; Mays, Coleman, & Jackson, 1996; McCollum, 1998; Richardson, 2000). Historically, many of those careers and occupations have been community-related services in the areas of education, government, law, medicine, religion, and mortuary science (Evans & Herr, 1994 as cited by Harrington, 1998). Some researchers have suggested that the social perceptions of “acceptable” occupations and careers may narrow African American career interests (Evans, 2008). Littig (1968) first introduced the term protected careers as a way to describe the pathways African Americans used to obtain career aspirations/interests and goals for moderate success (as cited by Richardson, 2000). So, racial segregation and perception of opportunity may be factors in the lack congruence in career interests and career choice (e.g., personality and work environment; Holland, 1994). Conjointly, racial identity development may be a crucial and unexplored variable in congruence of career interests and career choice of African Americans.

Even with African Americans congregating to protected careers, they experienced the highest unemployment rate over other ethnic minority groups. The results from the February 2015 Bureau of Labor Statistics report revealed an unemployment rate of 11.4% and 5.3% for White Americans (Jacobsen & Mather, 2010). Since January 1972, the unemployment rate for African American has been 115% more than White Americans (Jacobsen & Mather, 2010). African Americans are disproportionately under-represented in jobs with high occupational prestige and status. Byars-Winston and Fouad (2015) examined the patterns and trends of disparities in the labor market and Black men were overrepresented in “low skilled, low status,
or low wage occupations, like food serve preparation” (p. 62). Moreover, in the few representations in professional status occupations, Black men were consistently overrepresented in the occupational clusters of police and law enforcement (Byars-Winston, Fouad, & Wen, 2015). It is because of the aforementioned reasoning that this study examined African American men who have persisted congruently to their career choices and meet the critical needs of the U.S. labor force in a knowledge-based economy.

**Career Barriers and Supports**

Lent et al. (2000) posited that perceived career barriers and supports, the respective corollaries of person and environment, help shape the arc of career development. According to the SCCT, the interplay of environmental factors, both objective and subjective (e.g., gender, ethnicity, social support, and barriers), and person variables (e.g., self-efficacy and goals) influence career development (Lent et al., 2000). The SCCT’s conceptualization of barriers and supports are derived from Astin’s (1984) perception of opportunity and from Vondracek et al.’s (1986) environmental affordances, which are important factors in a person’s interpretation (Lent et al., 2000). There is a temporal aspect to the variables of barriers and supports. Distal barriers and supports are seen as factors (e.g., background contextual affordances) that impede or foster the constructs of learning experiences and self-efficacy (Swanson & Fouad, 2010). Much in the same way, proximal barriers and supports impede or foster application of career decisions that are temporally nearer to the choice such as racial discrimination or parental support (Lent et al., 2000; Quimby, Wolfson, & Seyala, 2007; Swanson & Fouad, 2010).

**Social Cognitive Career Theory and Holland—Congruence**

Holland’s (1973) theory of vocational personalities and work environments examined the congruency of one’s internal motivation with external environmental factors (Swanson & Fouad,
Fouad and Swanson (2010) further operationalized congruence as a match between person and environment in terms of six specific types according to the theory (Figure 10). Holland noted that the four constructs of congruence, differentiation, consistency, and identity could describe the intra/inter-relationships of person and environment in useful ways. For example, this person-fit conceptualization gives insight into the reciprocal social interactions and purposive— “people search for environments that will let them exercise their skills and abilities, express their attitudes and values, and take on agreeable problems and roles” (Holland, 1997, p. 4 as cited in Swanson & Fouad, 2010). He postulated that career aspirations and interests could be predicted based on the congruency of these factors (Holland, 1973; Holland 1997).

Conceptually, Holland’s theory is supported by Bandura’s (1986) causal relationship between internal motivation factors and external environmental components, which serve to motivate or hinder a person’s career choice. This trait-factor fit approach complements developmental theories of career by providing interest/choice structural insight into what factors may influence an African American male’s congruence.

While the SCCT is relatively new in comparison to other career theories, it has grown immensely in application to career interest and career choice as demonstrated in keyword search of SCCT and interests in PsycINFO database. SCCT is derived from in part from Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory. Hackett and Betz (1981) were first to use the critical construct of self-efficacy from Bandura’s theory to examine career choices (Swanson & Fouad, 2010). The motivation for Hackett and Betz’s conceptual application to vocational psychology was due to the potential for explaining vocational behavior such as gender discrepancies in male dominated fields (Lent & Sheu, 2010; Sheu et al., 2010). However, it was Lent et al. (2010) who later further developed SCCT to conceptualize and explicate vocational behavior (Swanson & Fouad, 2010).

The utility of the SCCT is the illustrated interplay of personal, environmental, and behavioral influences concerning career development (Lent & Brown, 2013; Quimby et al., 2007). Specifically, SCCT focuses on the pathways academic/occupational interests, academic/occupational goals, and academic/occupational attainment and performance (Quimby et al., 2007). Moreover, SCCT is segmented into three-parts of interest, choices, and performances; the segments complement and extend previous and existing theories to career development (Lent & Brown, 2013; Swanson & Fouad, 2010). Lent and Brown (2013) gave the example of SCCT’s purposive design to expand Holland’s (1997) theory via antecedents of interests and predictors like career self-efficacy beliefs on occupational choice. Additionally, SCCT’s purposive design explicitly considers contextual factors such as “gender, culture and other aspects of human diversity within the context of career development” (Lent & Brown, 2013, p. 557).
However, there have been arguments raised concerning social justice and the implied privilege that the term *career* may carry in comparison to terms like *work* or *occupation* (Butler, 2012; Lent & Brown, 2013). Fouad and Brown (2000) introduced differential status identity (DSI) as a critical lens to look beyond socioeconomic status. DSI was developed from the earlier works of Rossides (1990, 1997); his model added a multidimensional understanding to the nature of social class (Fouad & Brown, 2000; Thompson & Subich, 2011). The DSI has interlinked components of social stratification, social prestige, race/ethnicity, gender, and identity (Thompson & Subich, 2011). According to Fouad and Brown’s (2000) conceptualization of DSI, people across the same income bracket may be perceived or treated differently based occupational prestige, such as a commercial plumber and attorney. Those same people may have different opportunities and access due to social and political capital (Thompson & Subich, 2011). So, power, privilege, and subjugation are significant factors in career development (Butler, 2012). Due to this emergent awareness, Fouad, Gerstein, and Toporeck (2006) argued for social advocacy and engagement to address these factors and conditions across various levels of DSI. While, this is not the focus of this study, it is important to note the possible implications of social justice, privilege and DSI concerning career development of African American males.

Sheu’s et al.’s (2010) meta-analysis indicated a predictive pattern testing the SCCT interest-choice model across Holland’s RIASEC themes. The meta-analytic path analyses synthesized research studies from 1981 to 2008 based on SCCT’s interest and choice models. The literature was organized according to Holland’s (1997) RIASEC themes (Sheu et al. 2010). Their investigation revealed the following interpretation:

outcome expectations and self-efficacy each contribute usefully to the prediction of interests and, along with interests, help to explain variation in choice goals.
across Holland themes. Although self-efficacy sometimes accounts for more predictive variance than do outcome expectations in individual studies, the current meta-analysis suggests that outcome expectations constitute a worthy conceptual partner when results are aggregated over studies. (Sheu et al., 2010)

Armstrong and Vogel’s (2009) meta-analytic research and study, which is the basis for this study to examine the congruence of career expectations of African American males, went a step further in interpreting interest-efficacy association from Holland’s RIASEC perspective. Even though Holland did not explicitly use the term self-efficacy, they proposed an implicit association via reciprocal interest-efficacy links consistent with the predications in Holland’s (1959, 1997) theory (Armstrong & Vogel, 2009; Bonitz, Larson, & Armstrong, 2010). Armstrong and Vogel noted that while academic and career-related interest are derived from self-efficacy beliefs and outcome expectations, there other studies that have suggested interest-efficacy links are reciprocal. The researchers tested hypotheses concerning interest-efficacy association through evaluating their RIASEC model in comparison with the SCCT model using a combination of three structural statistical methods. They found significant interest and efficacy measures can be accounted for with a Holland RIASEC model (Armstrong & Vogel, 2009; Bonitz, Larson, & Armstrong, 2010; Lent et al., 2010).

The reaction of Lent and Sheu (2010) and Lubinski (2010) found fault with the theoretical and methodological approaches used by Armstrong and Vogel (2009) to evidence their proposed RIASEC interest-efficacy model. Lent et al.’s (2010) critique focused on construct validity in comparing RIASEC type and interest and self-efficacy. They suggested Armstrong and Vogel (2009) misinterpreted the function of self-efficacy in their model and that interest and efficacy were being used interchangeably. Lubinski’s (2010) criticisms weighed in
on the need to incorporate cognitive ability scores in both the SCCT model and their proposed model. Lubinski believed this is especially important regarding incremental validity, and levels of cognitive ability in regards to occupational prestige (Armstrong & Vogel, 2009; Lubinski, 2010). Although Armstrong and Vogel disagreed, they agreed with Lent et al.’s position that highlighting and debating methodological and theoretical considerations will improve future research. They also agreed with Lubinski’s assessment of considering incremental validity of new constructs before incorporating them into career counseling interventions. However, for the purpose of this study, Armstrong and Vogel’s theoretical conceptual arguments and postulations along with the methodological approaches employed to establish validity and reliability has demonstrated its usefulness as an alternative theoretical perspective to complement career interest and choice in the SCCT.

In sum, the overarching purpose of the present study is to take an anti-deficit approach to extend previous findings in which significant associations have been found between contextual variables and career choice goal. The literature review indicates that African American men in college is a heterogeneous population where within group investigation will provide a more meaningful research results than a between group comparison. Therefore, this study seeks to extend existing SCCT research in career development of African American males beyond known deficits into examining contextual factors related to career congruence for African American male college students. As indicated by the review, this involves examining the career-related self-efficacy and contextual factors of parenting style, racial/ethnic identity, career interests, and occupational choice of African American males who have successfully navigated the road of career development in college.
Research Questions and Hypotheses

The primary purpose of the study was to simultaneously test distal and proximal contextual factors and relationships related to career choice goals within the SCCT theoretical framework with a diverse sample of African American men in college. The following research questions and hypotheses are based on SCCT propositions within a diverse sample:

1. What are the relationships between the distal and proximal contextual factors within the observed data?
   a. Hypothesis 1a: Proximal variables of coping efficacy is negatively correlated with education and career barriers with the observed data.
   b. Hypothesis 1b: Distal variables of perceived parenting style and ethnic identity is positively correlated with coping efficacy with the observed data.

2. What are the differences between the distal and proximal contextual factors within the observed data?
   a. Hypothesis 2a: Significant perceived parenting style group differences exist within the observed data.
   b. Hypothesis 2b: Significant ethnic identity group differences exist within the observed data.

3. Does this theoretical model of distal and proximal variables and relationships fit the observed data based on SCCT propositions?
   a. Hypothesis 3a: The theoretical model of distal and proximal variables fit the present data based on SCCT propositions.
   b. Hypothesis 3b: This model of proximal distal variables is statistically significant.
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

This chapter outlines the methodology, participants, procedures, instruments, and preliminary analysis in the present study. Specifically, this non-experimental, quantitative study investigated the theoretical relationship of ethnic identity, parenting style, perceptions of barriers, RIASEC performance self-efficacy, RIASEC interest, and coping efficacy of African American men enrolled in 2- or 4-year secondary institutions. Structural equation modeling (SEM) was suggested to assess model fit and explore direct and indirect effects of theoretical path models (Field, 2013; Hays, 2013; Kline, 2012). Thus, SEM analyses are used to assess model fit as well as direct and indirect pathways. Additionally, a series of regression analyses were done to test for a possible moderator effect of coping efficacy.

Research Questions

The present dissertation tested a theoretical model of relationships that involve both distal and proximal contextual factors and RIASEC theme goals based on SCCT propositions from an anti-deficit perspective. In doing so, the following research questions were examined:

1. What are the overall relationships of the distal and proximal contextual factors with the observed data?
2. What are differences of the distal and proximal contextual factors with the observed data?
3. Does this theoretical model of distal and proximal variables and relationships fit the observed data based on SCCT propositions?

Participants and Procedure

The present sample consisted of 293 self-identified African American male undergraduate students, ranging from 18 to 54 years \( (M = 22.95, SD = 6.83) \) recruited primarily
at a public university and community college. Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained from both the university and community college (see Appendix E). The public university (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; UWM) was in an urban setting in the Midwest. The community college (The Community College of Baltimore County; CCBC) was in an urban setting in the East. Emails and phone calls were used to connect with relevant department heads at the university and community college with multiple African American student associations. The basis of the communications described the study’s purpose to understand and promote the diverse experiences of African American male students and how they cope with various environmental barriers. Students wishing to participate were directed to a website by the respective administrators and directors.

The website provided informed consent and a description of the study. Additionally, several groups posted information for the study via social media that users could respond to; such as “African American Male Initiative,” “Student African American Brotherhood,” and “Brothers of the Academy.” All participation in the study was voluntary and no personally identifying information of the participants was provided. It was estimated that the total survey completion would not exceed 30 minutes, but it usually took most participants approximately 20 minutes to complete. It was explained in the IRB-approved recruitment email that the survey’s aim was to explore positively the counterbalance of achievement and career development issues of African American undergraduate men. During informed consent, participants were offered an incentive choice to receive a $2.00 Amazon.com eGift card or to have $2.00 donated to charitable organization. More than 80% of the participants who completed the second survey to receive an incentive elected to donate their incentive to a non-profit organization of their choice.
The survey was distributed and administered by Qualtrics using the “anonymize” setting, which does not collect participant data such as the IP address. To maintain anonymity for participants a redirect action to a second survey was used specifically to collect their contact information to keep response data separate from the contact data. All students in the study were enrolled full-time during the spring semester of 2016.

**Instruments**

**Demographic Questionnaire**

The researcher-generated demographic questionnaire included items concerning participants’ gender, racial/ethnic background, age, family composition, number of people in the household, primary community, parental educational/occupational level, socioeconomic status, family income, GPA, classification in college, educational goals, current academic major, and future career choice.

**Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure—Revised (MEIM—R)**

The MEIM is a brief measure that assesses an individual’s affiliation or membership with one’s ethnic group (Phinney & Ong, 2007). This instrument measures the following two dimensions of ethnic identity: exploration and commitment, which are equally weighted in analyses. The scale consists of 6 items with responses on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). An item example of the Exploration subscale is “I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs” (Phinney & Ong, 2007, p. 276). An example of the Commitment subscale is “I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group” (Phinney & Ong, 2007, p. 276). The reported Cronbach’s alphas were 0.76 for exploration and 0.78 for commitment. Altogether, the full-scale alpha was 0.81 (Phinney & Ong, 2007). Confirmatory factor analyses of ethnic identity
items were conducted to evaluated construct validity. The indices of fit for their two-factor correlated model suggest it was a good representation of the latent structure of ethnic identity (Phinney & Ong, 2007).

**Parental Authority Questionnaire**

The Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ; Buri, 1991) was used to measure the independent variable of perceived parenting style of the African American male college students. This self-report instrument is designed to investigate how the participants perceived parenting in their childhood. Buri developed the PAQ to measure Baumrind’s (1968) conceptual styles of parenting—authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive. The scale consists of 30-items with 10 questions each measuring the three parenting styles according to the participants’ perception of their parents’ child-rearing behaviors.

Possible total scores will range from 10 to 50 for each parenting style. For each parenting style, mean scores were computed by dividing the total scores by 10. The items on the scale were scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 representing “Strongly disagree” to 5 representing “Strongly agree.” PAQ resulted in 3 separate scores for each: parental permissiveness, parental authoritarianism, and parental authoritativeness. Altogether, the higher the score, the greater the respondent’s perceived parental style measured. Item examples are as follows, “As I was growing up, my parents seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior” and “Whenever my parents told me to do something as I was growing up, they expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.” The reported test-retest reliability ranged from 0.77 to 0.92 with a mean of 0.85. The reported internal consistency reliability, Cronbach’s alpha, ranged from 0.74 to 0.87 with a mean of 0.81. Lastly, the
discriminant validity was evidenced by each parenting style being inversely related to the other two styles.

**RIASEC Interests and Performance Self-efficacy**

Armstrong, Allison, and Rounds (2008) created an alternate forms public-domain RIASEC markers scale (AFPD) as an alternative to commercially developed interests measures and improve research utility with a reduced number of items. This scale purports to measure both interest and self-efficacy (e.g., confidence themes). The researchers developed the two sets of 8-item RIASEC scales (e.g., factor-loading on each code type) using based RIASEC activities and 30 occupational job titles from the O*NET database according to each RIASEC type. Altogether, the sets of brief activity- and occupation-based RIASEC scales were tested for structural and convergent validity, and test-retest reliability and internal-consistency reliability. They used three different samples and recruited over 1,600 college students from a psychology department at a large Midwestern university with a course credit incentive, which suggests a convenience sampling method. Much of the demographics of the participants self-identified as female, White/Caucasian with a mean-age of 19.7.

Both scales used a 5-point Likert scale with 1 representing “Strongly dislike” and 5 representing “Strongly like.” For the brief activity-based scales, the reported internal-consistency reliability ranged from 0.93 to 0.97 with a mean of 0.95, which is markedly better than the Interest Profiler from O*NET (0.79 to 0.94; mean of 0.88; Armstrong, Allison, & Rounds, 2008). Convergent validity was evidenced by the strong correlations of the participants’ rating of interests in occupations with a range of 0.72 to 0.87.

For the occupation-based scales, the reported internal-consistency reliabilities ranged from 0.92 to 0.95 with a mean of 0.94. Convergent validity is evidenced by the strong correlation
of occupation scales with the brief activity-based scales; the range was 0.73 to 0.86 and a mean of 0.78. In all four subscales, structural analyses used a circular unidimensional scaling technique to test the fit of the proposed RIASEC short form measures to Holland’s (1991) structural model. The structural validity was evidenced by the consistent inter-correlations with the order predictions of Holland’s (1959, 1997) model (Armstrong, Allison, & Rounds, 2008).

**Choice Goal Congruence**

To measure choice goal, congruence scores were calculated between career interests and occupational choice, three-letter Holland code types was assigned to both interests and declared career goal (e.g., psychologist—IES for interests and astronomy—IRE for career). There were 12% of the participants ($n = 33$) who did not identify their career goal. For those cases, their college major was used in place of career goal. The C-Index (Brown & Gore, 1994) was used to determine how close of match or congruence there is between interests’ code type and choice code type. Brown and Gore (1994) created a weighted formula for C-Index (e.g., congruence) to index the level of congruence. C-Index calculates the person’s three-letter code type with use of weights giving more importance to the first-letter position than the second-letter position and followed by the third-letter in following formula $C = 3(X_i) + 2(X_i) + 1(X_i)$ (Bowles, 2009; Donohue, 2006). Congruence scores range from 0 (no congruence) to 18 (complete congruence). So, $X_i$ are scores (3, 2, 1, and 0) assigned to each comparison based on the hexagonal distance between the letters (e.g., 3 = identical hexagonal positions, 2 = adjacent hexagonal positions, 1 = alternative hexagonal positions, 0 = opposite hexagonal positions. The C-score is the weighted sum of the $X_i$ scores. This selected congruence measure accounts for position and distance of the letters by using different relative congruence weights and because it is relatively easy to calculate. For example, interest-major psychology (Holland code-type—ISA) and astronomer
(Holland code-type—IAR) equates into C-Index as follows 3(3) + 2(1) + 2 = 13 (congruence score). Ties concerning the 3-point RIASEC code for interest and self-efficacy were managed by assigning the average ranking to each of the tied ranks (Strahan & Severinghaus, 1992).

**Perceptions of Barriers (POB)**

The Perception of Barriers (POB) instrument measures the perceptions that African American male college students’ have of their likelihood of experiencing barriers to attaining educational and career goals. This instrument was designed to investigate the participant’s estimated or assessed level of difficulty of educational- and career-related obstacles to a specific goal oriented behavior. The POB consists of 32-items that represent various barriers including racial and gender discrimination. Luzzo and McWhirter (2001) modified the original educational barriers subscale from 21 items to 11 items. Those barriers are arranged around the areas of social barriers, family, limited financial resources, and personal characteristics such as confidence level. Examples of items include the following: “If I didn’t go to college, it would be because of money problems” and “In my future job, I will probably experience discrimination because of my ethnic/racial background” (Luzzo & McWhirter, 2001). In Luzzo and McWhirter’s (2001) study, they examined differences by gender and ethnicity concerning perception of barriers and levels of coping efficacy pertaining to academic and career development. External development of the scale was demonstrated with a diverse sample pool of African American, Native American, Asian American, and Hispanic students. Additionally, there have been several studies that indicated external validity with African American male college students (Irving, 2005; Shepard, 2006; Townsel, 2012). Respondents from the study rated each barrier on a 5-point Likert scale that ranged from 1 representing “Strongly disagree” to 5 representing “Strongly agree” (Luzzo & McWhirter, 2001). Higher scores indicate the
expectation of experiencing multiple educational and career barriers. The reported Cronbach’s alpha was 0.86 for Luzzo and McWhirter’s (2001) study.

**Coping with Barriers (CWB)**

The Coping with Barriers instrument was used as a measure of coping efficacy. The CWB is a scale of 28 items that parallels the above POB scale in terms of content and two subscales (i.e., Coping with Career-Related Barriers and Coping with Educational Barriers; Luzzo & McWhirter, 2001). Luzzo and McWhirter (2001) modified the Coping with Educational Barriers subscale of CWB, which paralleled POB respective subscale. In a counterbalanced order of the POB and CWB scales, the respondents used a 5-point Likert scale that ranged from 1, representing “Not at all confident,” to 5, representing “Highly confident” for item response. The sum of the responses on each subscale indicates the level of coping efficacy (e.g., higher scores indicate higher coping efficacy). Examples of items include the following: “rate your degree of confidence in overcoming money problems, family problems, and negative family attitudes about college.” Luzzo and McWhirter (2001) reported a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of 0.93 for the Coping with Educational Barriers coping scale (21-items) and 0.88 for Coping with Career Related Barriers subscale (7-items) of the CWB. The test-retest reliability over a 2-month period of a randomly selected subsample of 55 participants yielded stability coefficients of 0.49 and 0.55 Coping with Career Related Educational Barriers and Coping with Career Related Barriers respectively.

**Preliminary Analysis**

For the present study, structural equation model was used as the primary analysis for the proposed modified SCCT path models. For data to converge using maximum likelihood (ML) estimation on the model in Figure 2, Jackson (2003; as cited in Kline, 2012, p. 12) was consulted.
and offered the $N:q$ rule, which indicates sample size according to number of model complexity. “$N$” is the sample size, or number of cases, and “$q$” represents the number of model parameters. Alternatively, Ding, Velicer, and Harlow’s (1995; as cited in Byars-Winston, Estrada, Howard, Davis, & Zalapa, 2010) suggested 100 to 150 participants for SEM models based on a review of several studies. Bentler (2006; as cited in Byars-Winston et al., 2010) indicated that a saturated model (accounting for all parameters) is estimated with the following formula $p(p + 1)/2$ with $p$ represents the variable. The model estimated in the current research consists of $7(7 + 1)/2 = 28$ free parameters. Extant research indicated a ratio that ranged from 5 to 10 participants per parameter (Bentler & Chou, 1987 as cited in Byars-Winston et al., 2010; Kline, 2010). According to Bentler and Chou, a ratio of 5 participants per estimated parameter is recommended, which is a minimum of 140 participants ($28 \times 5 = 140$).

To test for mediation, G-Power calculator software using the a priori setting was used to determine the sample size needed for multiple regression analysis based on anticipated effect size desired statistical power level (e.g., 1-β), the number of predictors, and probability level (Cohen, 1988, 1992; Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang, 2009; Frazier, Tix, & Barron, 2004). It suggested that for sufficient power (.80) to detect mediation and moderation effects, sampled groups should consist of approximately 120 participants.

Once collected, all surveys were examined for missing values. A total number of 293 surveys were initially collected for inclusion in this study. However, 14 respondents identified as female college students and were excluded from data analysis since the research questions concerned African American men’s experiences. Additionally, nine were eliminated from subsequent analyses because they contained more than 5% total missing items. Missing values on the remaining inventories were imputed based on mean scores for that individual, within that
particular scale. Missing values on the surveys ranged from 1 \( (n = 23) \) to five \( (n = 7) \). In terms of descriptive statistics, frequencies were computed for the nominal variables, and the means and standard deviations were computed for continuous variables.

**Main Analysis**

**Hypothesis 1a:** According to the review of the literature, the proximal variable of coping efficacy is negatively correlated with education and career barriers within the observed data. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients \( (r) \) were conducted to test Hypothesis 1a. Additionally, the intercorrelations between distal and proximal variables based on SCCT propositions were examined to assess for any significant correlations before beginning SEM analysis.

**Hypothesis 1b:** The distal variables of perceived parenting style and ethnic identity is positively correlated with coping efficacy within the observed data. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients \( (r) \) were conducted to test Hypothesis 1b. SCCT propositions were used to examine the intercorrelations between distal and proximal variables for any significance prior to SEM analysis.

**Hypothesis 2a:** Significant perceived parenting style group differences was predicted within the observed data. Subscale responses defined groups greater or smaller than 1 standard deviation from the mean. For perceived parenting style, as stated previously in the chapter, PAQ resulted in 3 separate scores for parental permissiveness, parental authoritarianism, and parental authoritativeness. The higher the score, the greater the respondent’s perceived parental style was measured. If there was a tie in the overall score or a nonresponse, the case was not included in the grouping process. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to examine group differences.
**Hypothesis 2b:** Significant ethnic identity group differences was predicted within the observed data. As stated earlier, ethnic identity has two subscales of commitment and exploration in which two groups were categorized based on their standardized responses that measured greater or smaller than 1 standard deviation. Cases less than 1 standard deviation were not included. ANOVA was used to examine the criterion variable type and levels.

**Hypothesis 3a:** The theoretical model of distal and proximal variables fit the present data based on SCCT propositions. SEM analysis was used to explore direct and indirect effects of the seven variables. Overall fit was assessed by the four indices outlined in Hayes (2013) and Kline (2012): chi-square goodness of fit, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR). Chi-square is a null model test statistic, that is the smaller the chi-square statistic the lower the probability reported, chi-square is also referenced as a ‘badness-of-fit statistics’ (Kline, 2012, p. 199).

**Hypothesis 3b:** This model of proximal distal variables in this model VAF is statistically significant. With regards to SEM analysis, a chi-square statistic needs to be non-significant to indicate model fit. Additional recommendations for chi-square allow the researcher to explore model specification to improve chi-square results and the statistic can be used as a comparison fit with competing models. Like the chi-square, the RMSEA is a badness-of-fit statistic. It is estimated on approximations of a noncentral chi-square distribution and the $df$ for a specified model. RMSEA estimates with a p-value of 0.05 or less are a good fitting models. The Bentler Comparative Fit Index (CFI) measures the relative improvement of fit compared to a baseline model. As CFI approaches 1.0 the fit of the model improves (1.0 being perfect model fit). Ideal values for the CFI are greater than or equal to 0.95 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Finally, the SRMR is
based on covariance residuals. An ideal value would be zero, as the differences between predicted and observed covariance would be non-existent. In practice, Hu and Bentler (1999) suggest a threshold of SRMR less than or equal to 0.08. In SEM, tests of mediation effects between predictor and outcome variables conducted. Direct effects and indirect effects were estimated and interpreted using Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) 24 for SPSS 24 software (Arbuckle, 2012).
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of this dissertation. First, a summary of the descriptive statistics is presented (Table 1). Second, the results of proximal distal variable relationships are discussed. Third, the results regarding the differences between perception of parenting styles and ethnic identity are offered. Lastly, the SEM analyses of the proposed modified model using SCCT propositions are examined and presented.

As previously stated, participants included 279 African American male students in college, ranging in age from 18 to 54 years ($M = 22.37; SD = 6.95$). Missing values were collected from 3% ($n = 9$) of the participants; those participants were excluded from the present sample, leaving 270 participants remaining for data analysis. Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, and alpha coefficient of reliability for the variables and scales are presented in Tables 2 and 3, respectively.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior (including 5th year seniors)</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Major or Field of Study</td>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health related</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided major</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Institution</td>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public (4-year)</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private (4-year)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5-4.0</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0-3.5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5-3.0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 or less</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Goals</td>
<td>Earn Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earn Master’s degree</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earn Doctoral or other</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>advanced degree (i.e., M.D./J.D./Ph.D.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons in Household</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Community</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>8.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic class or</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background of family</td>
<td>Lower middle class</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper middle class</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Caregiver</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-parents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparent</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education your Caregiver has</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/professional degree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 1a**

To assess the possible inverse relationship between coping efficacy and proximal variables according to SCCT propositions, zero-order intercorrelations calculated. A correlation matrix of the study variables is displayed in Table 3. As expected, proximal variables—perceptions of education and career related barriers—were significantly and negatively correlated with coping efficacy with barriers ($r = -0.82$) indicating that the more participants
perceived specific barriers would interfere with education and career progress, the less self-efficacy beliefs they had related to completing the educational and work-related tasks for the occupations (Armstrong & Vogel, 2009).

**Hypothesis 1b**

It was expected that distal variables of Parenting style and Ethnic identity positively correlated relationship. With regards to parenting style, it was positively correlated with coping efficacy \((r = 0.23)\). More specifically, this relationship was found for authoritative and authoritarian parenting \((r = 0.41 \text{ and } r = 0.14, \text{ respectively})\). Coping efficacy was also positively correlated with the efficacy-based RIASEC measures. This result indicates higher coping efficacy scores were associated with higher efficacy-based RIASEC. The authoritative parenting was significantly and negatively correlated with perceptions of barriers \((r = -0.23)\); however, the authoritarian parenting group was not significant \((r = -0.06)\).

In regard to ethnic identity, it was negatively correlated with coping efficacy \((r = -0.61)\). Upon closer inspection, it was expected that commitment ethnic identity would have a significant and positive relationship with coping efficacy, which it did not \((r = -0.58)\), but exploration ethnic identity did have a negative relationship \((r = -0.60)\). Additionally, coping efficacy was significantly and positively correlated with interest-based RIASEC measures; however, correlations with the self-efficacy-RIASEC measures were not significant.

**Hypothesis 2a**

To assess group differences regarding perceptions of parenting style and ethnic identity, a series of univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) were performed. An examination of the ANOVA indicated some significant differences using criterion variables. With regard to perception of parenting style, as stated previously the highest sum total of the respondent’s
perceived parental style was measured. If there were a tie in the overall score or nonresponse, the
cases were not included in the grouping process (authoritarian group 89; authoritative group 131;
and permissive 2). Authoritarian and authoritative perceived parenting groups markedly differed
with regard to congruence, $F(1, 268) = 5.48, p = .003$; career barriers, $F(1, 268) = 19.221, p < .001$; education barriers, $F(1, 268) = 14.373, p < .001$; education coping efficacy, $F(1, 268) = .19.251, p < .001$; and ethnic identity, $F(1, 268) = 9.094, p < .001$. There were no significant
differences regarding career coping efficacy. Authoritative parenting style participants were
more congruent with their RIASEC interest inventory results ($M = 12.59, SD = 3.4$) than the
authoritarian parenting style participants in this sample ($M = 10.33, SD = 3.07$). The observed
effect size was $\eta^2 = 0.31$. Regarding barriers, authoritative parenting style participants perceived
more career barriers ($M = 3.43, SD = 1.79$); however, they perceived less education barriers than
authoritarian parenting style participants ($M = 1.64, SD = .89$) than authoritarian parenting
participants ($M = 3.1, SD = 1.2$). The observed effect sizes ranged from $\eta^2 = 0.23$ to $\eta^2 = 0.38$.

**Hypothesis 2b**

With respect to ethnic identity (exploration and commitment), as previously stated, cases
were aggregated into groups 1 standard deviation or greater than the mean (commitment 113 and
exploration 43). There were only marked differences in coping efficacy with educational
barriers, $F(1, 268) = 20.45, p < .001$; and with career barriers, $F(1, 268) = 6.243, p = .013$. The
commitment group perceived less coping efficacy with career barriers ($M = 3.9, SD = 1.09$) than
the exploration ($M = 4.3, SD = .87$). However, the commitment perceived more coping efficacy
with education barriers ($M = 4.5; SD = .76$) than the exploration ($M = 3.9, SD = .85$). For choice
goals, the exploration participants were more congruent with their RIASEC interest inventory
results ($M = 14.01; SD = 3.49$) than the commitment ($M = 11.27, SD = 2.96$). The observed effect sizes ranged from $\eta^2 = 0.33$ to $\eta^2 = 0.49$.

In terms of choice goal congruence, there were significant differences regarding perceptions of career barriers, $F (1, 268) = 10.503, p = .001$; educational coping efficacy, $F (1, 268) = 7.376, p = .007$; and ethnic identity, $F (1, 268) = 92.483, p < .001$. The lower congruence of choice goal associated with higher perceptions of career barriers ($M = 3.21; SD = .68$) than the high congruence group ($M = 2.92; SD = .86$). The observed effect sizes ranged from $\eta^2 = 0.14$ to $\eta^2 = 0.36$.

Table 2

Percentage of Participants in First Letter Holland Codes for Interest Inventory and Occupational Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive Parenting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Parenting</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration—Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment—Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Congruence</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Congruence</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive Parenting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Parenting</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration—Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment—Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Congruence</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Congruence</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive Parenting</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parenting Style</th>
<th>Exploration—Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>Commitment—Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>High Congruence</th>
<th>Low Congruence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Parenting</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration—Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment—Ethnic Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Congruence</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Congruence</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Confidence</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
<th>Permissive Parenting</th>
<th>Authoritarian Parenting</th>
<th>Authoritative Parenting</th>
<th>Exploration—Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>Commitment—Ethnic Identity</th>
<th>High Congruence</th>
<th>Low Congruence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive Parenting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Parenting</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative Parenting</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration—Ethnic Identity</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment—Ethnic Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Congruence</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Congruence</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

**Means, Standard Deviation, and Bivariate Pearson Correlations Among Study Variables for Entire Sample**

|     | M     | SD    | n  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  |
|-----|-------|-------|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1 AP| 3.4   | 1.0   | .89|     |     | 2.3 | .58 | .89 | - .05| .05 | .05 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 2 FP| 3.4   | .91   | .89|     |     |     |     | .75 | .96 | - .13*| .46**| .02 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 3 EID| 3.9   | 1.0   | .94| .08 | -.06|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 4 POB| 2.3   | .58   | .89| - .05| .05 | .05 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 5 CE| 4.3   | .75   | .96| - .13*| .46**| .02 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 6 IOC| 11.9  | 3.3   | N/A| .06 | -.04| -.07 | -.07|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 7 RI| 2.2   | .73   | .75|     |     | .18**| .07 | - .12*| .15* | .09 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 8 II| 2.4   | .97   | .92|     |     | .07 | -.17**| -.21**| .04 | .32**|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 9 AI| 2.5   | .71   | .74| .21**| .06 | -.12*| .29**| -.02 | .26**| .89**|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 10 SI| 2.9   | .98   | .89| -.05| .17**| .14 |     | .25**| .00 | .20**| .76**| .71**|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 11 EI| 2.0   | .70   | .82| .46**| -.03| -.11 | -.02 | .02 | .16**| .11 | .35**| .22**|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 12 CI| 2.5   | .72   | .68| .30**| -.14*| -.11| -.08 | .04 | .06 | .35**| .16**| .59**| .26**| .53**|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 13 RC| 2.1   | 1.1   | .94|     |     | .47**| .05 | -.13*| .24**| .02 | .52**| .41**| .11 | .27**| -.12 | -.01 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 14 IC| 2.2   | 1.1   | .93|     |     | .39**| .07 | -.13*| .13* | -.02 | .36**| .47**| .17**| .24**| .07 | .07 | .88**|     |     |     |     |     |
| 15 AC| 2.2   | 1.0   | .91|     |     | .26**| .07 | -.13*| .22**| -.04 | .28**| .63**| .51**| .54**| .10 | .30**| .78**| .82**|     |     |     |     |
| 16 SC| 2.4   | 1.0   | .87|     |     | .24**| .07 | -.13*| .22**| -.04 | .28**| .63**| .51**| .54**| .10 | .30**| .78**| .82**|     |     |     |     |
| 17 EC| 2.5   | 1.0   | .89| -.04| .15* | -.11 | -.24**| -.03 | .25**| .64**| .67**| .65**| .29**| .53**| .68**| .64**| .90**| .89**|     |     |     |     |
| 18 CC| 2.2   | 1.0   | .92|     |     | .28**| .04 | .23**| -.01 | .31**| .55**| .52**| .54**| .12 | .42**| .73**| .74**| .95**| .87**| .94**|     |     |

**Note.** AP= Authoritarian Parenting; FP= Authoritative Parenting; EID= Ethnic Identity; POB= Perceptions of Barriers; CE= Coping Efficacy; IOC= Interest/Occupational Congruence; RI= Realistic Interest; II= Investigative Interest; AI= Artistic Interest; SI= Social Interest; EI= Enterprising Interest; CI= Conventional Interest; RC= Realistic Confidence; IC= Investigative Confidence; AC= Artistic Confidence; SC= Social Confidence; EC= Enterprising Confidence; CC= Conventional Confidence. *p < .05, two-tailed, **p < .01, two-tailed.
Hypothesis 3a

A SEM analysis was conducted using the maximum likelihood method in version 24 of AMOS (Arbuckle, 2012) with raw data imported from SPSS (version 24). Global model fit indices produced by AMOS were computed with the assumption of joint multivariate normality. Meaning, these values will remain unchanged whether you use resampling strategies such as bootstrapping or not (Arbuckle, 2012). The model analysis indicated adequate to good fit for the model ($\chi^2 (28, N = 279) = 14.78, p < .05; \text{CFI} = .98; \text{NNFI} = .97; \text{SRMR} = .03; \text{RMSEA} = .062$). Counterintuitive to hypothesis testing, the chi-square should be non-significant in model testing (Brown, 2006; Lei & Wu, 2007). However, the overall chi-square significant value indicated the proposed model should be rejected. Not rejecting the null hypothesis is difficult to achieve due to the required large sample sizes (Schumacker & Lomax, 2004). Lei and Wu (2007) suggested inclusion of common fit indices to evidence goodness of fit. More specifically, the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) value of .06 suggested “reasonably close fit” to the data (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). According to the criteria of Hu and Bentler (1998), the model demonstrated acceptable fit to the data since the Standardized Root Mean Residual (SRMR) value was below .08 and the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI) values were all greater than .95.

Hypothesis 3b

Direct and indirect effects according to SCCT propositions were examined in the proposed modified model used in this study fit past research on SCCT on goals. First, the direct effects of perception of parenting and ethnic identity on coping efficacy and self-efficacy were assessed. Past research suggested that distal variables would positively relate to coping efficacy and self-efficacy (Lent & Brown, 2013; Sheu et al. 2010). Second, consistent with original
SCCT propositions, it was hypothesized that self-efficacy beliefs would relate to interests and choice goals, but that the path to interests would be larger than the path to choice goals. In addition, it was hypothesized that interests would relate to choice goals. Lastly, the total effect of each predictor in the model on choice goals was evaluated.

The goodness-of-fit indicated that most of the hypothesized relationships of the variables paralleled the SCCT propositions. The findings indicated that the relation of social cognitive variables to goals is fully mediated. The paths from perception of parenting style and ethnic identity was positive and statistically significant (standardized $\beta = .26$ and standardized $\beta = .19$). In addition, the path to coping efficacy was larger than the path to self-efficacy. Consistent with extant research using SCCT, the relation of perceived parenting style and ethnic identity was partially mediated by coping efficacy. Greater coping efficacy, was associated with higher self-efficacy beliefs. A Sobel test indicated that the indirect effect of distal variables on self-efficacy via coping efficacy was statistically significant, $Z = 2.47$, $p = .014$, unstandardized path coefficient $=0.83$, $SE = .034$. The path from self-efficacy beliefs to interests was positive and significant (standardized $\beta = .23$); however, the path from self-efficacy to choice goals was nonsignificant (standardized $\beta = .04$). Therefore, contrary to past research, the relation of self-efficacy beliefs to choice goals was fully, not partially mediated by interests. A Sobel test indicated that the indirect effect of self-efficacy on choice goals via interests (while controlling for the influence of self-efficacy beliefs on choice goals, which highly consistent with past research on the primacy of interest in the prediction of choice goal.

Altogether, the standardized total effect of each variable on choice goals was: perception of parenting style, 09; ethnic identity, .13; perception of barriers, -0.15; coping efficacy, 0.07;
RIASEC self-efficacy, .31; and RIASEC interests, .62. The SCCT variables included in the model accounted for approximately 56% of the total variance in choice goals.

*Figure 11. Modified Theoretical Model.*
CHAPTER FIVE

Introduction and Summary of the Findings

Toossi (2012) stated that the United States will encounter dramatic changes to the current demographics in the coming decades. The United States needs a diverse work force that is educated and productive to adapt to the changing and growing knowledge-based economy. The economic needs of the United States will rely on a younger demographic that is becoming more heterogeneous in racial and ethnic composition. The ethnic minority population under age 18 is projected to reach majority status by 2023 (Jacobsen & Mather, 2010).

Earning a college degree is a prerequisite to qualify for the growing jobs in today’s economy as college graduates earn twice as much as high school graduates. The tertiary education enrollment for African American males has increased from 700,000 to over 1.3 million (Department of Education, NCES, Integrated Postsecondary Education System, Enrollment Survey 2000-2010). Furthermore, a recent study of the labor market reveals a pattern, confirming the barriers to equal employment. This is not only the perceptions of African American male college students, it is the reality that these barriers exist and inform their career choices (Fouad & Byars-Winston, 2005). With many of the Black males congregating towards service-oriented careers or occupations with low prestige, the permutations of career interests and career choice is not congruent for African American males, as well as the growing occupational needs of a vast and complex labor market. With career equality, one can surmise an even distribution of careers that reflect the current needs of the labor force for African American males.

This non-experimental, quantitative study examined the relationship of distal and proximal variables within the SCCT to predict career interest/choice congruence and career-related self-efficacy. Specifically, this study investigated the relationship of ethnic identity,
parenting style, social/cultural capital, perceptions of barriers, and coping with barriers of African American men enrolled in 2-year or beyond secondary institutions. It was the purpose of this study to extend existing SCCT research in career development of African American males beyond known deficits through the examination of contextual factors related to congruence for African American male college students. This study examined the sources of self-efficacy and contextual factors of African American males who have successfully navigated the road of career development to college. The study used SCCT measures to investigate career interests, career choice, and career self-efficacy in relation to racial/ethnic identity development and contextual variables.

The primary purpose of the study was to simultaneously test distal and proximal contextual factors and relationships related to career choice goals within the SCCT theoretical framework within a diverse observed sample of African American men in college. The following research questions were based on SCCT propositions: (1) What are the overall relationships of the distal and proximal contextual factors with the observed data? (2) What are differences of the distal and proximal contextual factors with the observed data? (3) Does this theoretical model of distal and proximal variables and relationships fit the observed data based on SCCT propositions?

Demographic statistics, including distal information such as household, primary community, socioeconomic status of family, family composition, parents’ education, GPA, and classification in college, were taken into account. Participants included 279 African American male students in college, ranging in age from 18 to 54 years. Incomplete data were excluded from the present sample, leaving 270 participants remaining for data analysis.
ANOVA Analysis

Differences across parenting style, ethnic identity, and interest/occupational choice congruence were analyzed through a series of univariate ANOVA. Authoritarian and authoritative perceived parenting groups showed significant differences with regard to congruence, career barriers, education barriers, education coping efficacy, and ethnic identity. There were no significant differences regarding career coping efficacy. Authoritative parenting participants were more congruent with their Holland interest inventory results than the authoritarian parenting style participants in this sample. With regards to barriers, authoritative parenting participants perceived more career barriers but fewer educational barriers than authoritarian parenting style participants.

With respect to ethnic identity groups (e.g., exploration and commitment), there were only marked differences in coping efficacy with educational barriers, and with career barriers. The Commitment group perceived less coping efficacy with career barriers than the Exploration group. The Commitment group perceived more coping efficacy with educational barriers than the Exploration group. The Exploration group was more congruent with their Holland interest inventory results than the Commitment group. In terms of high and low interest/occupational congruence groups, there were significant differences regarding perceptions of career barriers, educational coping efficacy, and ethnic identity. The low congruence group perceived more career barriers than the high congruence group.

Relationships Among Variables in the Study

For the total sample, educational and career barriers were significantly and negatively correlated with coping efficacy, indicating that the more participants felt specific barriers would interfere with education and career progress, the less self-efficacy beliefs they had related to
completing the educational and work-related tasks for the occupations (Armstrong & Vogel, 2009). This trend was apparent in the separate analyses for perceptions of parenting style.

As expected, parenting style was positively correlated with coping efficacy for the total sample. This was found for authoritative and authoritarian parenting. Coping efficacy was also positively correlated with the efficacy-based RIASEC measures. The results indicate that participants who showed higher coping efficacy scores were associated with higher efficacy-based RIASEC. The authoritative parenting group was significantly and negatively correlated with perceptions of barriers as well as the authoritarian parenting group, but the correlation was not significant.

Congruence was negatively correlated with ethnic identity. It was expected that commitment ethnic identity would have a significant and positive relationship with congruence, which was disconfirmed. Exploration ethnic identity had a negative relationship with congruence as expected. Additionally, congruence was significantly and positively correlated with interest-based RIASEC measures, although correlations with the efficacy-based RIASEC measures were not significant.

**SEM Analysis**

The results of this study were consistent with SCCT propositions and extant research regarding partially mediated relationship of perception of barriers to Choice goals (Byars-Winston & Fouad, 2008; Lent et al., 2005). The relation of barrier precepts to Choice goals is partially mediated (i.e., barrier precepts also have a direct relationship with Choice goals). The findings from this dissertation were also consistent with Bandura’s hypothesis that contextual influences affect choice goals both indirectly and directly through career-related self-efficacy beliefs in this study. Distal variables of ethnic identity and parenting style precepts were found to
positively influence self-efficacy beliefs. This finding has several implications for career
counseling which will discussed later in this chapter. Barrier precepts were found to negatively
influence coping efficacy beliefs, which in turn, were found to negatively influence career-
related self-efficacy beliefs.

**Interpretation of the Findings**

Promoting anti-deficit approach ethnic minority research is the result of collective efforts
across academic disciplines for renewed attention to contextual factors, and racial and ethnic
identity development. The purpose of the anti-deficit approach is to replace the deficit model
employed in many of the previous and extant studies of ethnic minorities (Harper, 2004, 2012).
Altogether, the roots of deficit thinking evolved from the early colonial history of America to
modern-day United States. It was not until the research in the latter 20th century revealed that the
intellectual disparities of racial/ethnic minorities (e.g., bell curve controversy) was not due to
innate genetic determinants, but a reflection of racist and discriminatory practices of society at
every level.

**Proximal and Distal Variables**

The Social Policy Report on the positive development of minority children highlights the
gaps in previous research studies. The findings from the studies are mostly based on low-income
families which are incorrectly equated with race and ethnicity. While there is a thorough
understanding about problems in academics and behaviors for minority children, little is known
about adaptation. Even less is known about within-group variation concerning familial
education, socioeconomic status, cultural beliefs, and values.

African American students have received the majority of attention concerning
achievement gap (Cokley, 2005; Cokley et al., 2011). Reasons referenced to explicate the
academic underachievement of African Americans are a milieu of psychological factors that emphasizes between race differences in motivation, levels of engagement, dissonance in environment, poverty, and underachievement (Cokley et al., 2011; Harper, 2012). Harper (2008, 2012) proposed an anti-deficit approach to conceptualize Black male college achievement. Emphasis is placed on what can be learned from African American male achievers who were able to overcome barriers typical of disadvantaged peers and acquired social and cultural capital needed to compete for educational experiences that furthers their career development (Harper, 2012). This research proofs that the underachievement of African American males is of high importance to the country, and finding the source of the problem can definitely expand the current body of literature.

Many of the primary theories and models have conceptualized racial/ethnic identity and socialization as a complex interaction of personal, social, and collective identities within self-concept. How these factors influence the career development of Black males was the concern of this study. Byars-Winston’s (2010) article illustrated the importance of examining the attitudes of racial/ethnic identity as possible indicators and predictors of career choice. Furthermore, she highlights from her review of the literature that integration of racial/ethnic identity may provide improved enhancement of perception in the areas of career possibilities, career interest, and career outcome expectations. These warrants further exploration of the primary theories of racial/ethnic identity.

Perfunctory use of conceptual terms race and ethnicity in identity and socialization in academia and research has contributed to the current state of varying operationalization of the terms. While there is conceptual overlap between racial and ethnic identity, how each construct
is defined makes them distinct. Cokley’s (2005) study indicated that depending on what aspect is examined “racial identity may or may not be related to ethnic identity” (Cokley, 2005, p. 524).

The racial socialization process is more deductive in nature where awareness is a key component, while ethnic socialization is more inductive in nature with key informants such as the mother provided Black cultural messages. The interchangeable use and arguments are factors contributing to a pre-paradigmatic state in racial and ethnic identity. More research is needed to evidence and establish paradigmatic conceptualization of race and ethnicity. Continued research in this state will only amplify the confusion and not magnify the dynamism of race and ethnicity.

Despite lacking a common consensus, the need for studies on racial/ethnic identity is significant to advance research and understanding of African American male career choice and development evidenced by the racial/ethnic disparity across the labor market mentioned before. Thus, this study examined racial/ethnic identity as one of the distal contextual variables that influence the congruency of career interest and choice in the SCCT framework.

Parents are important distal antecedents for career development (Blustein, 1997). The dyadic parent-child relationship facilitates risk taking and exploration depending on the quality of the parental attachment (Altman, 1997; Blustein, 1997). However, when parents fail to facilitate opportunities for growth, adolescents may prematurely diffuse or stunt areas of identity (Blustein, 1994). Findings indicate that commitment to career choice is most likely due to children’s desire for independence from their parents, but yet are also securely attached to them.

Career development is an interactive process between the person-environment influenced by social, cultural, and physical factors (Whiston & Keller, 2004, p. 493). Career interest and choices are some of the ways a person can meet their psychological needs.
However, there is emerging empirical research that indicates indirect relationship between parenting styles and career choices (Altman, 1997, Blustein, 1997). The findings from the studies indicated that parenting style may be a predictor for a variety of outcomes in childhood, adolescents, and even for college students (Young & Valach, 1997). Steinberg et al.’s (1992) study investigated the relationship between authoritative parenting and academic achievement adolescents. They found a positive relationship between those variables. However, there were some inconsistencies across the studies concerning the relationship between authoritative parenting, academic achievement, and career choice with different populations.

Due to these inconsistencies, there has been some controversy over the generalizability of authoritative parenting as a predictive factor with other ethnic minorities (Steinberg et al., 1992). The majority of the authoritative parenting research demonstrates the benefits on White children and adolescents (Steinberg et al., 1992). However, studies like Steinberg et al. (1994) did not confirm the benefits of authoritative parenting with other ethnic minorities. Studies indicated African American adolescents rose according to authoritarian parenting using corporal punishment and hostile/restrictive interactions were more likely to hinder autonomy resulting in dependence. Authoritarian parenting has also been typically associated with lower academic achievement among African American adolescents.

Contrary to aforementioned findings, Lamborn et al.’s (1991) study found no differences in positive and negative effects (e.g., academic achievement) of adolescents raised in authoritarian homes or authoritative homes. A review of empirical literature on African American family focused on additional inconsistencies and limitations that have contributed to further confusion.
Despite some of these inconsistencies, the overall findings from the literature are clear; authoritative parenting has the most positive consequences and benefits for across the lifespan. Parenting with the characteristics warmth and love along with supportive responsiveness and firm demandingness provided the optimal environment children to develop. More specific to this study, authoritative parenting provided the necessary autonomy for children to explore and take-risk. The autonomous behavior of children builds personal efficacy and shape their future career choices.

**Perceptions of Barriers**

Although racial/ethnic identity has been defined as separate constructs, how the constructs have been operationalized has been inconsistent in research (Cokley, 2005). In career development research, the focus on racial/ethnic identity has been driven by differences not in career aspiration, but in expectations and in perceptions of barriers and opportunities (Ihle-Helledy et al., 2005). The research articles demonstrated two clear lines of research concerning career issues—that, is perceptions of career opportunities and barriers; aspirations and expectations in career and education (Ihle-Helledy et al., 2005). In both lines of research, racial/ethnic identity was demonstrated to have significant effect career development. With racial/ethnic identity as the independent variable, the studies found that “occupational opportunities might be circumscribed due to race, whereas White students were less likely to perceive that restriction in opportunity for themselves or students of color” (Ihle-Helledy et al., 2005, p. 272). The study at hand sought to extend the findings of Ihle-Helledy et al. (2005) through the examination of the cultural variables (e.g., racial/ethnic identity) of high-achieving African American males within the support frame-work of SCCT.
The literature suggests that African Americans have traditionally chosen specific careers and occupations (Byars-Winston, 2006; Harrington, 1998; Littig, 1968; Mays et al., 1996; McCollum, 1998). Historically, many of those careers and occupations have been community-related services in the areas of education, government, law, medicine, religion, and mortuary science (Evans & Herr, 1994 as cited by Harrington, 1998). Some researchers have suggested that the social perceptions of acceptable occupations and careers may narrow African American career interests. Yet, even with African Americans congregating to protected careers, they experienced the highest unemployment rate over other ethnic minority groups. African Americans are disproportionately under-represented in jobs with high occupational prestige and status. Moreover, in the few representations in professional status occupations, Black men were consistently overrepresented in the occupational clusters of police and law enforcement. It is because of the aforementioned reasoning that this study examined African American men who have persisted congruently to their career choices and meet the critical needs of the U.S. labor force in a knowledge-based economy.

Perceived career barriers and support and the respective corollaries of person and environment, help shape the arc of career development. According to the SCCT, the interplay of environmental factors, both objective and subjective (e.g., gender, ethnicity, social support, and barriers), and person variables (e.g., self-efficacy and goals) influence career development. Distal barriers and supports are seen as factors (e.g., background contextual affordances) that impede or foster the constructs of learning experiences and self-efficacy. Proximal barriers and supports impede or foster application of career decisions that temporally nearer to the choice such as racial discrimination or parental support (Quimby et al., 2007).
Social Cognitive Career Theory and Holland’s Theory

Holland’s (1973; 1997) theory of vocational personalities and work environments examined the congruency of one’s internal motivation with external environmental factors. Holland noted that four constructs of congruence, differentiation, consistency, and identity could describe the intra/inter-relationships of person and environment in useful ways. He postulated that career aspirations and interests could be predicted based on the congruency of these factors (Holland 1997). Conceptually, Holland’s theory is supported by Bandura’s (1986) causal relationship between internal motivation factors and external environmental components, which serve to motivate or hinder a person’s career choice. This trait-factor fit approach complements developmental theories of career by providing interest/choice structural insight into what factors may influence an African American male’s congruence. While the SCCT is relatively new in comparison to other career theories, it has grown immensely in application to career interest and career choice. SCCT is derived from in part from Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory. The utility of the SCCT is the illustrated interplay of personal, environmental, and behavioral influences concerning career development (Quimby et al., 2007). Specifically, SCCT focuses on the pathways academic/occupational interests, academic/occupational goals, and academic/occupational attainment and performance (Quimby et al., 2007).

Armstrong and Vogel’s (2009) meta-analytic research and study, was the basis for this study to examine the congruence of career expectations of African American males, and added the interpretation of interest-efficacy association from Holland’s RIASEC perspective.

In sum, the overarching purpose of the present study was to take an anti-deficit approach to extend previous findings in which significant associations have been found between contextual variables and career choice. The literature review indicates that African American
men in college is a heterogeneous population where within group investigation will provide a more meaningful research results than a between group comparison.

With regards to the lack of concrete evidence in the literature, and taking into account several contradictions; this quantitative study was appropriate to examine the career choices of African American men in college.

**Implications of the Findings**

Given the mixed results concerning barriers relations, longitudinal research is needed to examine how barriers fit into this aspect of the theory. The results of the study cannot have an immense impact on society as the results were contradictory, and more research is needed. It has also been recommended that relation of barriers in the SCCT model may be moderated mediation. Another possibility is that barriers may have a greater effect on occupational choice behavior the further along in the process especially in college.

Given the counterbalance of the present study, counselors and universities may benefit from the results through encouraging clients and students to develop mentoring relationships with professionals who have overcome similar barriers, such as discrimination and low coping efficacy. These mentors could serve as sources for vicarious learning as well as sources of coping efficacy to overcoming barriers.

Gender and ethnic discrimination have been identified as significant barriers in career development, which are the result of sociopolitical, cultural environments, and institutional racism. Counselors are encouraged to consider political activism as a way of bringing awareness to these barriers.
Limitations of the Study

There are three limitations to the present study. With respect to sampling method, maximum variation purposive sampling method was employed, but this non-probability sampling method does not allow for generalizing the results or findings of this study. Another limitation for this study was the sample size, which restricted variance and possible errors for some of the statistical tests. A third limitation of the study was the participants’ low levels of interests and occupation. Participants with low interest in a particular theme may have suppressed higher scores for other participants. Therefore, future research should focus on groups of individuals who already have expressed interests in various areas.

Recommendations for Future Research

It is suggested that future research focus on African American individuals whom have already expressed their interest in various areas, for higher statistical relevance. Bentley-Edwards and Stevenson (2016) research study offers multidimensional construct of racial/ethnic socialization of African American men that may better account for the social cognitive strategy to manage career interest and ultimately career choice. Although the study at hand has expanded the current literature, more research must be done to further define the transmission and acquisition of career related self-efficacy and coping efficacy variables. A qualitative study might prove more evident regarding the upbringing of African American males and the influences that shape their career choices. Furthermore, a quantitative study of a larger sample may also provide more consistent results.

Summary and Conclusions

This non-experimental, quantitative study examined the relationship of distal and proximal variables within the SCCT to predict career interest/choice congruence and career-
related self-efficacy. Specifically, this study investigated the relationship of ethnic identity, parenting style, social/cultural capital, perceptions of barriers, and coping with barriers of African American men enrolled in 2-year or beyond secondary institutions. It was the purpose of this study to extend existing SCCT research in career development of African American males beyond known deficits through the examination of contextual factors related to congruence for African American male college students. This study examined the sources of self-efficacy and contextual factors of African American males who have successfully navigated the road of career development to college. The study used SCCT measures to investigate career interests, career choice, and career self-efficacy in relation to racial/ethnic identity development and contextual variables. For the total sample, educational and career barriers were significantly and negatively correlated with coping efficacy, indicating that the more participants felt specific barriers would interfere with education and career progress, the less self-efficacy beliefs they had related to completing the educational and work-related tasks for the occupations. This trend was apparent in the separate analyses for perceptions of parenting style. Mixed results were found in the current study, which related to the contradictory results of the literature review. More research is definitely needed in order to provide a concrete outcome to all the research questions. This discussion in Chapter 5 concludes the study.
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APPENDIX A: Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure—Revised

1 I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs.

2 I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group.

3 I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me.

4 I have often done things that will help me understand my ethnic background better.

5 I have often talked to other people in order to learn more about my ethnic group.

6 I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.

Note. In administering the measure, these items should be preceded by an open-ended question that elicits the respondent’s spontaneous ethnic self-label. It should conclude with a list of appropriate ethnic groups that the respondent can check to indicate both their own and their parents’ ethnic backgrounds (see Phinney, 1992). Items 1, 4, and 5 assess exploration; Items 2, 3, and 6 assess commitment. The usual response options are on a 5-point scale, from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5), with 3 as a neutral position.
APPENDIX B: Parental Authority Questionnaire

For each of the following statements, circle the number on the 5-point scale that best indicates how that statement applies to you and your parents. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your parent(s) (both mother and father together or one parent or guardian) during your years growing up at home.

There are no right or wrong answers, so don’t spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Be sure not to omit any items.

1. While I was growing up, my parents felt that in a well run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.

2. Even if their children didn’t agree with them, my parents felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what they thought was right.

3. Whenever my parents told me to do something as I was growing up, they expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.

4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my parents discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family.

5. My parents have always encouraged verbal give-and take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable.

6. My parents have always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want.

7. As I was growing up, my parents did not allow me to question any decision that they had made.

8. As I was growing up, my parents directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline.
9. My parents have always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.

10. As I was growing up, my parents did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.

11. As I was growing up, I knew what my parents expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my parents when I felt that they were unreasonable.

12. My parents felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.

13. As I was growing up, my parents seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.

14. Most of the time as I was growing up, my parents did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions.

15. As the children in my family were growing up, my parents consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways.

16. As I was growing up, my parents would get very upset if I tried to disagree with them.

17. My parents feel that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children’s activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up.

18. As I was growing up, my parents let me know what behaviors they expected of me, and if I didn’t meet those expectations, they punished me.

19. As I was growing up, my parents allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from them.
20. As I was growing up, my parents took the children’s opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but they would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it.

21. My parents did not view themselves as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up.

22. My parents had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but they were willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family.

23. My parents gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and they expected me to follow their direction, but they were always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.

24. As I was growing up, my parents allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and they generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do.

25. My parents have always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don’t do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.

26. As I was growing up, my parents often told me exactly what they wanted me to do and how they expected me to do it.

27. As I was growing up, my parents gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but they were also understanding when I disagreed with them.

28. As I was growing up, my parents did not direct the behaviors, activities, and desires of the children in the family.
29. As I was growing up, I knew what my parents expected of me in the family and they insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for their authority.

30. As I was growing up, if my parents made a decision in the family that hurt me, they were willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if they had made a mistake.
APPENDIX C: Interests and Self-efficacy scale


**Scoring:**

R: 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31, 37, 43  
I: 2, 8, 14, 20, 26, 32, 38, 44  
A: 3, 9, 15, 21, 27, 33, 39, 45  
S: 4, 10, 16, 22, 28, 34, 40, 46  
E: 5, 11, 17, 23, 29, 35, 41, 47  
C: 6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36, 42, 48

**Activities – Set A**

The following is a list of work-related activities. Please rate how much interest you have in performing each task using the following scale:

1 = Strongly Dislike  
2 = Dislike  
3 = Neutral  
4 = Like  
5 = Strongly Like

1 Test the quality of parts before shipment  
2 Study the structure of the human body  
3 Conduct a musical choir  
4 Give career guidance to people  
5 Sell restaurant franchises to individuals  
6 Generate the monthly payroll checks for an office
7 Lay brick or tile
8 Study animal behavior
9 Direct a play
10 Do volunteer work at a non-profit organization
11 Sell merchandise at a department store
12 Inventory supplies using a hand-held computer
13 Work on an offshore oil-drilling rig
14 Do research on plants or animals
15 Design artwork for magazines
16 Help people who have problems with drugs or alcohol
17 Manage the operations of a hotel
18 Use a computer program to generate customer bills
19 Assemble electronic parts
20 Develop a new medical treatment or procedure
21 Write a song
22 Teach an individual an exercise routine
23 Operate a beauty salon or barber shop
24 Maintain employee records
25 Operate a grinding machine in a factory
26 Conduct biological research
27 Write books or plays
28 Help people with family-related problems
29 Manage a department within a large company
30 Compute and record statistical and other numerical data
31 Fix a broken faucet
32 Study whales and other types of marine life
33 Play a musical instrument
34 Supervise the activities of children at a camp
35 Manage a clothing store
Operate a calculator
Assemble products in a factory
Work in a biology lab
Perform stunts for a movie or television show
Teach children how to read
Sell houses
Handle customers’ bank transactions
Install flooring in houses
Make a map of the bottom of an ocean
Design sets for plays
Help elderly people with their daily activities
Run a toy store
Keep shipping and receiving records

Occupations – Set A

The following is a list of occupational titles. Please rate how much interest you have in each occupation using the following scale:

1 = Strongly Dislike
2 = Dislike
3 = Neutral
4 = Like
5 = Strongly Like

1 Farmers and Ranchers
2 Biochemists
3 Musicians, Instrumental
4 Physical Therapist Aides
5 Purchasing Managers
6 Auditors
7 Electronics Engineering Technicians
8 Dentists, General
9 Professional Photographers
10 Mental Health Counselors
11 Sales Agents, Financial Services
12 Payroll and Timekeeping Clerks
13 Fish and Game Wardens
14 Veterinarians
15 Singers
16 Athletic Trainers
17 Food Service Managers
18 Shipping and Receiving Clerks
19 Chemical Technicians
20 Biologists
21 English Language College Teachers
22 Child Care Workers
23 Telemarketers
24 Meter Readers, Utilities
25 Nuclear Equipment Operation Technicians
26 Epidemiologists
27 Art, Drama, and Music College Teachers
28 Secondary School Teachers
29 Retail Salespersons
30 Accountants
31 Fishery Workers Supervisor
32 Surgeons
33 Set Designers
34 Personal and Home Care Aides
35 Insurance Sales Agents
36 Mail Clerks
37 Petroleum Engineers
38 Orthodontists
39 Curators
40 Speech-Language Pathologists
41 Lawyers
42 Actuaries
43 Civil Engineers
44 Animal Scientists
45 Music Directors
46 Middle School Teachers
47 Real Estate Sales Agents
48 Tellers
APPENDIX D: Perceptions of Barriers

PERCEIVED BARRIERS

Each of the statements below begins with, "In my future career, I will probably...", or a similar phrase. Please respond to each statement according to what you think (or guess) will be true for you.

"In my future career, I will probably...."

1. ... be treated differently because of my sex.
2. ...be treated differently because of my ethnic/racial background.
3. ... experience negative comments about my sex (such as insults or rude jokes).
4. ... experience negative comments about my racial/ethnic background (such as insults or rude jokes).
5. ...have a harder time getting hired than people of the opposite sex.
6. ...have a harder time getting hired than people of other racial/ethnic backgrounds.
7. ... experience discrimination because of my sex.
8. ... experience discrimination because of my racial/ethnic background.
9. ... have difficulty finding quality daycare for my children.
10. ...have difficulty getting time off when my children are sick.
11. ... have difficulty finding work that allows me to spend time with my family.

For each item below, finish the sentence with: "... currently a barrier to my educational aspirations.

"For example, Item 14 would read: "Money problems are ... currently a barrier to my educational aspirations."

12. Money problems are…”...currently a barrier to my educational aspirations"
13. Family problems are...
14. Not being smart enough is...
15. Negative family attitudes about college are...
16. Not fitting in at college is...
17. Lack of support from teachers is...
18. Not being prepared enough is...
19. Not knowing how to study well is...
20. Not having enough confidence is...
21. Lack of support from friends to pursue my educational aspirations is...
22. My gender is...
23. People's attitudes about my gender are...
24. My ethnic background is...
25. People's attitudes about my ethnic background are...
26. Childcare concerns are...
27. Lack of support from my "significant other" to pursue education is...
28. My desire to have children is...
29. Relationship concerns are…
30. Having to work while I go to school is...
31. Lack of role models or mentors is...
32. Lack of financial support is...
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**Rogers Memorial Hospital—Child & Adolescent Day Treatment** Brown Deer, WI  
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**Rogers Memorial Hospital—PTSD Partial Hospitalization** West Allis, WI  
August 2014 – June 2015  
**Advanced Doctoral Practicum Student**  
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**Clement J. Zablocki VA Medical Center**, Milwaukee, WI  
August 2013 – June 2014  
**Advanced Doctoral Practicum Student**  
Conducted psychosocial intakes and provide individual counseling services to clients who resided in the Palliative Care Unit. Collaborated on an interdisciplinary palliative care consult team for clients’ progress in therapy, treatment planning, and recommendations for future care. Provided psychosocial and spiritual support to veterans and families. Helped veterans and families with end-of-life planning. Provided psychoeducation about end-of-life issues to veterans, families, and healthcare providers.
Consulted and collaborated with a multi-disciplinary of physicians and nurses for treatment planning, progress in therapy, and future recommendations for patients in palliative care, Bone Marrow Transplant, and Cancer Courage Clinic. Assessed how psychological, behavioral and cultural factors are involved in physical health and illness from a biopsychosocial perspective. Support inpatients and families as well as palliative care team members in the referral process. Attended Grand Rounds presentations in Palliative care medicine on topics such as pain medications, pain management, code status, Power of Attorney, guardianship, and living wills. Charting, treatment planning, and writing case notes for every patient.

Conducted psychosocial intakes with medical students primarily and other referrals. Treated outpatients diagnosed with depression, anxiety, adjustment disorder, PTSD, and ADHD in the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Medicine. Consulted with doctors and psychiatrists on direction of treatment and psychopharmacology prescription. Attended Psychiatry Grand Rounds and give feedback on presentations. Charted, developed treatment planning, and writing case notes for every patient.
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**Wisconsin Lutheran College** – Milwaukee, WI  
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Research Assistant  
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*Principal Investigator: Dr. Chad Wetterneck, Ph.D.*  
Assist the researcher in a longitudinal study that examines the effectiveness of a novel combination of treatments for individuals with severe PTSD and high comorbidity. Helped create and currently managing the database that include statistical analysis of missing data values. Ran several types of reliability statistical analyses of the scales and help evidence the internal validity of the study.

**Medical College of Wisconsin** – Milwaukee, WI  
2015 – Present  
Research Assistant & Medical Education Specialist  
*Principal Investigators: Gary Young, M.Div., Dawn Bragg, Ph.D., and Robert Treat, Ph.D.*  
Design and develop studies to inform the development or revision of the medical school curriculum and educational experiences. Apply best evidenced-based practices in education, psychology cognition, curriculum, and adult learning in alignment with LCME accreditation standards.
University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI
2014 – August 2015
Research Assistant
NSF General Engineering Attraction & Retention Study (GEARS)
Principal Investigators: Nadya A. Fouad, Ph.D., A.B.P.P. and Dr. Romila Singh
Served as a project manager for a National Science Foundation (NSF) funded 3-year longitudinal study. The position entailed active recruitment and follow-up of Universities that agreed to participate in the multi-phase study. The position also involved managing databases, creating meeting agendas, meeting summations recounting assigned tasks and helped prioritize tasks to move the project forward. The purpose of this longitudinal research study examines the contextual environment engagement and empowerment of male and female engineers based on career choices, experiences, and other critical areas.

University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI
February 2013 – Present
Independent Research Study
Career Exploration and Identity Development of Adolescent Black Males
Student Principal Investigator: Gary Young, M.Div.
Developed a quantitative independent research proposal that has been submitted to IRB for approval. The study focuses on the correlation of ethnic identity development, career interest, and career exploration with adolescent African American male students. An incentive for participating in this study is that the student will receive a personalized career interest profile and list of occupations based on his responses in the questionnaire.

University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee & Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI
October 2012 – May 2014
Research Team Member
Career Choices of Student Veterans
Co-Principal Investigators: Nadya A. Fouad, Ph.D., A.B.P.P. and Dr. Kevin Tate, Ph.D.
Used SPSS to perform reliability tests such as the Cronbach’s alpha to examine the reliability of the subscales and to evidence validity in the areas of content, construct, and external. Altogether, these tests were part of the overall evaluative process to examine the efficacy of the McNair program for undergraduate student participants transitioning to graduate school.

University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI
November 2011 – May 2012
Research Team Member
Milwaukee Police Suicide Project
Principal Investigator: Leah Arndt, Ph.D.
Transcribed and coded several interviews for this qualitative study that examines the coping themes and risk factors among cases of employee completed suicides within a Midwestern law enforcement agency.
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Young, G., Treat, R., & Bragg, D. (2016, April). Hitting the Mark: Examining the Effectiveness of First-Year Residents’ Self-Assessments. Poster will be presented to the Medical College of Wisconsin Innovations in Medical Education Conference in Milwaukee, WI.


### CONSULTATION, OUTREACH AND VOLUNTEERING

**Spirituality Committee at Froedtert/MCW, Milwaukee, WI**

**2013 – Present**

- **Member**

Consult and help on an ad-hoc committee created by Dr. Jo Weis to better serve the spiritual needs of patients on the palliative care unit at Froedtert Hospital.
**Jewish Family Services**, Milwaukee, WI  
2012 – Present  
Board Member  
Help provide services that will strengthen families, children, and individuals throughout the life cycle within the context of their unique needs and traditions. I also serve on a multidisciplinary ethics committee that helps protect the interests of patients. The committee addresses any moral and ethical issues within JFS.

**Jewish Family Services Ethics Committee**, Milwaukee, WI  
2013 – Present  
Chair  
Facilitate a forum for the discussion and analysis of and recommendations regarding ethical issues that arise in social services, philanthropy and non-profit organizations, including issues related to Jewish individuals and the Jewish community in accordance with ethical parameters.

**PROFESSIONAL TRAININGS**

**Medical College of Wisconsin – Lake Geneva**, Lake Geneva, WI  
April 2016  
*5th Annual Midwest Regional Palliative Care Conference*  
Learning objectives for this conference will describe and address opportunities for hospital systems change to improve palliative care services for all patients. Will attend three breakout sessions in the following areas: honoring diversity during the dying process; understanding the concept of maternalism in inpatient medicine; and understanding ethical, legal, and professional issues in determinations of futility.

**Medical College of Wisconsin – Milwaukee**, Milwaukee, WI  
April 2014  
*Challenging Topics in Palliative Care: Beyond the Basics*  
Addressed complex issues across various domains including pharmacotherapy, research findings regarding quality of life at the end of life, advanced heart failure, and radiological interventions for the palliative patient from a multidisciplinary perspective in the field of palliative medicine. A mix of plenary and breakout sessions promise to provide recommendations for effective treatment options for the most complicated cases and to evoke questions that expand research horizons. Throughout the conference, topics for future research and clinical consideration will be generated and disseminated to participants as together we all help move the discipline of palliative medicine forward.

**University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee**, Milwaukee, WI  
March 2013  
*Center for Deployment Psychology (CDP)*  
Examined military/service member/veteran psychology as an area of multicultural diversity in order to provide competent outreach and treatment. Develop campus-focused clinical case conceptualizations incorporating deployment-related experience. Demonstrate the basic behavioral etiology/framework and risk/prevalence of PTSD and gain knowledge of evidence-based treatments of PTSD including Prolonged Exposure Therapy (PE) and Cognitive Processing Therapy (CPT).

**University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee**, Milwaukee, WI,  
January 2013  
*Campus Connect Suicide Prevention Tips for Gatekeepers*
Gathering information related to the risk factors for suicide, gathering information related to the patient's suicidal ideation and planning, and 3) the clinical decision making that is subsequently applied to these two databases.

**Milwaukee County Sheriff Training Academy**, Franklin, WI,  
February 2012  
**Suicide Risk/PTSD and Excited Delirium Workshops**  
Biopsychosocial formulations and assessments of suicide risk and PTSD in the law enforcement community. The second segment of the workshop placed special emphasis on dealing with excited delirium and the principals of de-escalation when working with someone in crisis.

**Aurora St. Luke Hospital**, Wauwatosa, WI,  
January 2011  
**Critical Incidence Stress Management (CISM) certification**  
Workshop that incorporated role play and lectures according to the Mitchell Model of CISM in preparation for debriefing and critical incidents. Goal was to help alleviate any symptoms of PTSD or depression within 24 hours of incident.
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</tr>
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| **2015 Phi Lambda Theta [International Honor Society and Professional Association in Education]**  
The Beta Epsilon Chapter of Pi Lambda Theta at University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee |
| **2014 Psi Chi [International Honor Society in Psychology]**  
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Chapter |
| **2015-2016 Robert Kuehnesien Teachers for a New Era Scholarship**  
Family of Robert Kuehnesien |
| **2014-2015 Robert Kuehnesien Teachers for a New Era Scholarship**  
Family of Robert Kuehnesien |
| **2014-2015 Singer Scholarships**  
Dean Barb Daley, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee |
| **2013 School of Education Travel Award**  
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIVERSITY SERVICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee**, Milwaukee, WI  
2012 – Present  
Student Member **Counseling Psychology Student Association**  
Attend monthly meetings to organize social justice and fundraising activities. Assist with department’s doctoral applicant interview day by leading tours of campus to prospective students, answering questions regarding program, and co-facilitating interviews with faculty members. |
Mentor
Counseling Psychology Student Association
Mentor first-year doctoral Counseling Psychology students.
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American Psychological Association of Graduate Students (APAGS)
Division 17
Division 36
Division 38

Wisconsin Psychology Association
Student Affiliate

Milwaukee Area Psychology Association
Student Affiliate
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