

THE ROLE OF THINKING STYLES AS MEDIATORS BETWEEN PERMISSIVE PARENTING STYLES AND CAREER DECISION SELF-EFFICACY OF INDONESIAN GEN Z YOUTHS

¹Dominikus David Biondi Situmorang, ²Rose Mini Agoes Salim

Abstract: Career decision self-efficacy (CDSE), which alludes to an individual's capacity to effectively make imperative career-related choices, is emphatically affected by two components: parenting styles and thinking styles. Hence, this non-experimental quantitative consider analyzes the effects of parenting styles and thinking styles on the CDSE of gen Z youths. The members comprised of 617 gen Z students (11th and 12th grades) from three driving schools in Jakarta, Indonesia, whereas the measuring disobedient included the Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale – Short Form, the Parental Authority Questionnaire, and the Thinking and Styles Inventory - Revised II. Based on the discoveries, CDSE was altogether affected by the permissive parenting styles as well as the Type I, Type II, and Type III Thinking Styles. Besides, the intervention investigation found that the thinking style intervened the relationship between the permissive parenting styles and CDSE.

Keywords: career decision self-efficacy; permissive parenting styles; thinking styles; gen z

I. INTRODUCTION

In common, graduating high school seniors are gone up against with individual choices that have a noteworthy affect on their future. Such choices are more often than not between entering the workforce and proceeding on to higher education. Past ponders have appeared that numerous understudies encounter disarray and hesitation with respect to their career improvement (Albion & Fogarty, 2002; Julien, 1999). In Indonesia, career uncertainty is predominant among tall school understudies (Sawitri, 2009; Sawitri, Creed, & Zimmer-Gembeck, 2015; Situmorang, 2019), which has not as it were caused stretch, but moreover superfluous delays and, in a few cases, evasion. Alternately, victory in deciding a career can lead to expanded self-esteem, progressed well-being,

¹ Inter Faculty of Education and Language, Atma Jaya Catholic University of Indonesia

² Faculty of Psychology, University of Indonesia

and more prominent career fulfillment (Kunnen, Sappa, van Geert, & Bonica, 2008).

Various factors related to career hesitation have been found, and these incorporate compulsiveness, self-consciousness, fear of commitment, uneasiness, judicious decision-making, and career decision self-efficacy (Guay, Senecal, Gauthier, & Fernet, 2003). Of these predecessors, career uncertainty among high school students as gen Z is fundamentally based on their level of career decision self-efficacy (CDSE), which is an individual's conviction that he/she can effectively make career-related choices (Betz, Klein, & Taylor, 1996). Agreeing to Lewis (1981, in Gati & Saka, 2001), in case the level of CDSE is low, at that point, one's career uncertainty will be high. Generally, CDSE incorporates the taking after categories: self-appraisal, occupational information, goal selection, planning, and problem solving (Betz, Klein, & Taylor, 1996; Taylor & Betz, 1983).

Based on past thinks about on the social cognitive career hypothesis, CDSE plays a key part in career arranging and advancement (Gushue & Whitson, 2006; Loaned et al., 2001, 2003, 2005). Additionally, in both Western and Eastern societies, it was found that CDSE is unequivocally impacted by parenting styles. Fouad et al. (2010, in Soviet & Metz, 2014) certified that the family influences one's career-related choices through the arrangement of data as well as enthusiastic and monetary back. Hence, the primary speculation is as takes after: H1: CDSE is unequivocally affected by permissive parenting styles.

Baumrind (1991) portrayed three sorts of child rearing styles: 1) authoritarian (high control and low warmth); 2) authoritative (high control and high warmth); and 3) permissive (low control and high warmth). In spite of the fact that parenting styles have been appeared to impact CDSE, the discoveries have been conflicting (Rent & Dahlbeck, 2009; Trusty, 1998, in Soviet & Metz, 2014; Vignoli et al., 2005). For case, gender contrasts were found between the three sorts of parenting styles and the CDSE of a test of Greek youngsters (Koumoundourou, Tsaousis, & Kounenou, 2011). In specific, for the male students, permissive and authoritarian parenting styles essentially connected with troubles in making career-related choices, while for the female students, as it were the authoritarian parenting style was altogether related to such troubles. So also, Soviet and Metz (2014) found that there was no noteworthy sexual orientation impact of parenting styles on the CDSE of male and female Korean students, though there was a directing impact among a test of French male and female students.

Based on the previously mentioned writing audit, it can be concluded that parenting styles (as outside variables) decide the degree to which people make career-related choices. Be that as it may, Fan (2016) shown that thinking styles (as inner variables) significantly influence such choices. Subsequently, the moment theory is as takes after: H2: Thinking styles intervene the relationship between permissive parenting styles and CDSE. In addition, the impact of diverse parenting styles on young ladies and boys by implication influence their person thinking styles (Fan & Zhang, 2014; Fan, 2016). Hence, the third speculations are as takes after: H3: Permissive parenting styles anticipate person thinking styles.

Moreover, Fan and Zhang (2014) uncovered that child parenting styles have a solid impact on thinking styles, whereas Fan found that thinking styles have a critical impact on CDSE. For occurrence, the Type I thinking styles (e.g., authoritative, legal, worldwide, and magnanimous styles, etc.) have a positive and critical impact on CDSE, while the Type II thinking styles are not essentially related to CDSE. In the interim, the Type III thinking styles have a fractional and positive impact on CDSE. Hence, the fourth speculation is as takes after: H4: Thinking styles are indicators of CDSE.

At last, Fan (2016) appeared that the Type I thinking styles have a positive relationship with CDSE. Moment, the Type II thinking styles are not essentially related to CDSE, which proposes that their impacts are not

as solid as those of the Type I thinking styles. It is critical to note that the Type III thinking styles are not examined in this think about, due to the setting in which it centers on sexual orientation and its impact on thinking styles and CDSE.

II. METHODS

Research Design

This research about utilized a non-experimental quantitative approach to look at the relationship between CDSE, permissive parenting styles, and thinking styles.

Research Participants

The subjects comprised of 617 gen Z students (11th and 12 grades) from three driving schools in Jakarta (211 males, 406 females; age range 15-17 years ($M = 16.40$, $SD = 0.650$). The purposive inspecting method was utilized to choose the participants.

Research Instruments

Three instruments were utilized for the information collection: 1) the Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale – Short Form; 2) the Parental Authority Questionnaire; and 3) the Thinking Style Inventory – Revised II.

Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale – Short Form

This instrument, adjusted by Betz, Klein, and Taylor (1996) from the first Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale (Taylor & Betz, 1983), incorporates 25 items, with five items apportioned to each of the five subscales. The scoring is based on a five-point Likert scale, extending from 1 (no certainty) to 5 (exceptionally certain). The five subsets incorporate: self-appraisal, occupational information, goal selection, planning, and problem solving. In this consider, a measuring instrument that was adjusted by past analysts (Sawitri, 2009) was utilized. For the purposes of the display consider, four items were prohibited, after which the instrument illustrated amazing inner consistency unwavering quality (Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.901 for the 21 substantial items). Additionally, to avoid the members from choosing the mid-point, this consider adjusted a six-point Likert scale, extending from 1 (no certainty) to 6 (exceptionally certain).

Parental Authority Questionnaire

This instrument, created by Buri (1991) and based on Baumrind's (1978, 1991) three sorts of parenting styles, incorporates 30 items (10 items for each parenting fashion). The scoring is based on a five-point Likert scale, extending from 1 (emphatically oppose this idea) to 5 (emphatically concur). In any case, in this consider, to avoid the members from choosing the mid-point the instrument was adjusted for cross-cultural purposes and was adjusted into a six-point Likert scale, extending from 1 (emphatically oppose this idea) to 5 (emphatically concur).

After the adjustment handle, field trials with 188 students were conducted and the comes about were analyzed by utilizing confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to guarantee that each item's t-value was over 1.96 and the stack calculate was over 0.40 (Anderson & Gerbing, 1984; Marsh, Balla, & McDonald, 1988). Thus, 20 substantial items were recognized for the paternal parenting styles, whereas 21 substantial items were recognized for the maternal parenting styles. All of the substantial items had stack components extending from 0.40 to 0.88.

This instrument too appeared great inside consistency unwavering quality, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.885 for the paternal authoritative parenting style, 0.710 for the paternal authoritarian parenting style, 0.648 for the paternal permissive parenting style, 0.842 for the maternal authoritative parenting style, 0.802 for the maternal authoritarian parenting style, and 0.749 for the maternal permissive parenting style.

Thinking Style Inventory—Revised II

This instrument, initially created by Sternberg and Wagner (1992), incorporates 104 items (eight items for each of the 13 thinking styles). The primary amendment (TSI-R) by Sternberg et al. (2003) was utilized in a few considers and it appeared great legitimacy. The moment and most later modification (Sternberg, Wagner, & Zhang, 2007) decreased the stock to 65 items, with five items for each of the 13 thinking styles. Within the display think about, the instrument was adapted for cross-cultural purposes and was altered by employing a six-point Likert scale, extending from 1 (emphatically oppose this idea) to 5 (emphatically concur). After the adjustment handle, field trials with 188 students were conducted and the comes about were analyzed by utilizing CFA to guarantee that the each item's t-value was over 1.96 and the stack components were between 0.40 and 0.81. This estimation appeared changing inside consistency unwavering quality. For occasion, the anarchic thinking style had destitute inside consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of as it were 0.538, while the magnanimous considering fashion had the most excellent inner consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.756.

Research Procedure and Data Analysis

The test of gen Z students from the three driving schools in Jakarta were inquired to total all the three disobedient as well as to supply statistic data. All of the students gotten a report on their test comes about as well as stationary for their cooperation. The comes about were analyzed by conducting direct relapse and numerous relapse examinations with Hayes's Model 4 and SPSS IBM 23 program (Hayes, 2013). Besides, graphic measurements and relationship examination were performed to uncover the connections between the variables.

III. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Preliminary Analyses

Table 1 gives the expressive measurements for all of the factors in this consider as well as the relationship between them. Based on Pearson's relationship investigation, there were a few noteworthy affiliations between CDSE and each thinking style as well as between each parenting styles. More particularly, the CDSE factors were emphatically connected with the the permissive paternal style, the permissive maternal style, and the taking thinking styles: legislative, executive, judicial, monarchic, hierarchical, anarchic, global, local, internal, external, and liberal. Only the gender variables had a negative correlation with the other variables.

Hypothesis Testing

To test the inquire about speculations, Hayes's Model 4 as well as Hayes's (2013) macro PROCESS Handle were utilized. Table 2 gives a outline of the results.

Parenting Styles and CDSE (path c')

Based on the relapse investigations of the paternal parenting styles, it was found that CDSE was essentially and emphatically impacted by the permissive maternal style ($F(5.611) = 32.80, p < .01, R^2 = .21$; $F(5.611) = 16.16, p < .01, R^2 = .11$; $F(5.611) = 17.23, p < .01, R^2 = .12$).

Parenting Styles and Thinking Styles (path a)

From the relapse investigations, it was found that the Type III thinking styles were altogether and emphatically affected by the permissive paternal style ($F(3.613) = 19.35, p < .01, R^2 = .08$).

Thinking Styles and CDSE (path b)

Based on the different straight relapse examinations, it was found that CDSE was altogether and emphatically affected by the Sort I considering styles ($F(5.607) = 35.32, p < .01, R^2 = .22$), Type II thinking styles ($F(5.607) = 19.61, p < .01, R^2 = .13$), and the Type III thinking styles ($F(5.607) = 20.64, p < .01, R^2 = .14$).

Thinking Styles as the Mediators between Parenting Styles and CDSE

From the four primary factors and their individual measurements (i.e., permissive parenting styles, the thinking styles, and gender), 6 models were utilized to look at the impact of thinking styles, as the go mediators between the permissive parenting styles and CDSE.

Based on Model 1, it was found that Path a, Path b, and Path c' were critical. Moreover, as Tables 4 and 5 appear, the coefficient of Path c' diminished. This shows that the variable x diminishes when foreseeing the variable y, which the mediation variable features a more noteworthy impact. Hence, the Type II thinking styles mostly intervene the impact of the permissive maternal style on the students' CDSE in Model 5.

From Model 7, it was found that Path a, Path b, and Path c' were critical. Based on Path c', it was found that, among the female students, it was critical. This implies that the variable x not predicts the variable y, which the go between variable includes a more prominent impact. In this way, it can be concluded that the Type I thinking styles completely intercede the impact of the permissive paternal style on the female students' CDSE. Comparable comes about were found in Models 3, 5, and 6.

IV. Discussion

This think about inspected the relationship between CDSE, parenting styles, and thinking styles. Based on the primary theory test, it was found that both the paternal and maternal permissive parenting styles essentially anticipated CDSE. These comes about are in line with those of past considers (White, 2009) in which the permissive parental style had a more noteworthy impact on CDSE (Baumrind, 1991). In other words, permissive parents by and large permit equitable discourses inside the family. In the interim, permissive parents tend to be more liberated in their approach with their children.

With respect to the moment theory test, it was found that the authoritative parenting style essentially anticipated the Type I thinking styles, which is steady with past discoveries (Fan & Zhang, 2014). From the comes about of the relationship investigation, it was found that the paternal and maternal authoritative styles were emphatically related with the legislative, judicial, hierarchical, global, and liberal thinking styles. This shows that

parents who are strong and majority rule tend to deliver children with Type I thinking styles in which they are willing to confront unused circumstances.

The Type II thinking styles were moreover essentially and emphatically anticipated by the definitive authoritative paternal style and the authoritative/authoritative maternal styles. The comes about of the relationship examination too appeared that the definitive paternal style and the authoritative/authoritative maternal styles were emphatically related with the executive, monarchic, local, and conservative styles that characterize the Type II thinking styles. This recommends that children raised by authoritative/authoritarian parents tend to take after the rules and center on one assignment at a time.

Based on the third speculation test, it was found that Type II thinking styles somewhat intervened the impact of the permissive maternal style on the students' CDSE in Model 5. Though, the Type I thinking styles completely intervened the impact of the permissive paternal style fashion on the CDSE of the female students (Models 2, 3, 5, and 6). The discoveries of this think about are in line with those of Fan and Zhang (2014) and Fan (2016), who found that parenting styles have a critical impact on considering styles as well as career arranging and advancement.

With respect to the fourth theory test, it was found that the Type I thinking styles altogether anticipated CDSE, which is reliable with past investigate (Fan, 2016). In spite of the fact that the Type II thinking styles moreover anticipated CDSE, the impact was not as critical. With respect to the Type III thinking styles, they altogether anticipated CDSE, which is in line with Fan (2016), who found that Type III thinking styles were more noteworthy indicators of CDSE than Type II thinking styles.

V. CONCLUSION

This ponder found that CDSE was altogether impacted by the permissive parenting, and it was essentially influenced by all the three thinking styles (Types I, II, and III). In expansion, the considering fashion factors essentially intervened the relationship between the permissive parenting styles and CDSE. The discoveries of this think about might shape the premise for creating future CDSE intercessions for male and female students.

In any case, this consider incorporates two restrictions that ought to be famous. To begin with, in two of the three schools, the analysts collected information amid the ultimate hour of the school day when the understudies were tired and needed center. Thus, a few of the answers were incapable to be connected.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors wish to express their gratitude to the Directorate of Research and Community Service – University of Indonesia for funding the present study via a “PITTA” Grant. Furthermore, the authors would like to thank Enago (www.enago.com) for the English language review.

REFERENCES

1. Albion, M. J., & Fogarty, G. J. (2002). Career decision making difficulties of adolescent boys and girls. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 9, 14–19.

2. Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1984). The effect of sampling error on convergence, improper solutions, and goodness-of-fit indices for maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 49(2), 155-173.
3. Babbitt, L. G., Brown, D., & Mazaheri, N. (2015). Gender, entrepreneurship, and the formal–informal dilemma: Evidence from Indonesia. *World Development*, 72, 163-174.
4. Baumrind, D. (1978). Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. *Youth and Society*, 9, 239–276.
5. Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting styles on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56–95.
6. Betz, N. E., Klein, K. L., & Taylor, K. M. (1996). Evaluation of a short form of the Career decision self-efficacy scale. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 4(1), 47-57.
7. Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental authority questionnaire. *Journal of personality assessment*, 57(1), 110-119.
8. Colfer, C. J. P., Achdiawan, R., Roshetko, J. M., Mulyoutami, E., Yuliani, E. L., Mulyana, A., & Adnan, H. (2015). The balance of power in household decision-making: encouraging news on gender in Southern Sulawesi. *World Development*, 76, 147-164.
9. Creed, P., Patton, W., & Prideaux, L. (2006). Causal relationship between career indecision and career decision-making self-efficacy. *Journal of Career Development*, 33(1), 47-65.
10. Fan, J. (2016). The role of thinking styles in career decision self-efficacy among university students. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 20, 63-73. doi: 10.1016/j.tsc.2016.03.001
11. Fan, J., & Zhang, L. F. (2014). The role of perceived parenting styles in thinking styles. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 32, 204-211.
12. Gati, I., & Saka, N. (2001). High school students' career-related decision-making difficulties. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 79, 331–340.
13. Guay, F., Senecal, C., Gauthier, L., & Fernet, C. (2003). Predicting career indecision: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50(2), 166-177.
14. Gushue, G. V., & Whitson, M. L. (2006). The relationship among support, ethnic identity, career decision self-efficacy, and outcome expectations in African American high school students: Applying social cognitive career theory. *Journal of Career Development*, 33, 112-125.
15. Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
16. Kunnen, E. S., Sappa, V., van Geert, P. L., & Bonica, L. (2008). The shapes of commitment development in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Adult Development*, 15, 113–131.
17. Koumoundourou, G., Tsaousis, I., & Kounenou, K. (2011). Parental influences on Greek adolescents' career decision-making difficulties: The mediating role of core self-evaluations. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 19, 165–182.
18. Lease, S. H., & Dahlbeck, D. T. (2009). Parental influences, career decision-making attributions, and self-efficacy: Differences for men and women. *Journal of Career Development*, 36, 95–113.
19. Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., Brenner, B., Chopra, S. B., Davis, T., Talleyrand, R., & Suthakara, V. (2001). The role of contextual supports and barriers in the choice of math/science education options. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48, 474-483.

20. Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., Schmidt, J., Brenner, B., Lyons, H., & Treistman, D. (2003). Relation of the contextual supports and barriers to choice behavior in engineering majors: Test of alternative social cognitive model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50, 458-465.
21. Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., Sheu, H., Schmidt, J., Brenner, B. R., Gloster, C. S., & Treistman, D. (2005). Social cognitive predictors of academic interests and goals in engineering: Utility for women and students at historically Black universities. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52, 84-92.
22. Marsh, H. W., Balla, J. R., & McDonald, R. P. (1988). Goodness-of-fit indexes in confirmatory factor analysis: The effect of sample size. *Psychological bulletin*, 103(3), 391.
23. Sawitri, D. R. (2009). Pengaruh status identitas dan efikasi diri keputusan karier terhadap keraguan mengambil keputusan karier pada mahasiswa tahun pertama di Universitas Diponegoro. *Jurnal Psikologi Undip*, 5 (2).
24. Sawitri, D. R., Creed, P. A., & Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J. (2015). Longitudinal relations of parental influences and adolescent career aspirations and actions in a collectivist society. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 25(3), 551-563.
25. Sawitri, D. R., & Creed, P. A. (2015). Perceived career congruence between adolescents and their parents as a moderator between goal orientation and career aspirations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 81, 29-34.
26. Situmorang, D. D. B. (2019). *Pengaruh parenting styles terhadap career decision self-efficacy melalui thinking styles: Perbandingan antara siswa laki-laki dan perempuan*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Magister Sains Psikologi Pendidikan, Universitas Indonesia, Depok.
27. Solimun, Fernandes, A. A. R., & Nurjannah. (2017). *Metode statistika multivariate pemodelan persamaan structural (SEM) pendekatan WarpPLS*. Malang: UB Press.
28. Sovet, L., & Metz, A. J. (2014). Parenting styles and career decision-making among French and Korean adolescents. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 84(3), 345-355.
29. Sternberg, R. J., & Wagner, R. K. (1992). Thinking Styles Inventory (Unpublished test). Yale University.
30. Sternberg, R. J., Wagner, R. K., & Zhang, L. F. (2003). Thinking Styles Inventory – Revised (Unpublished test). Yale University.
31. Sternberg, R. J., Wagner, R. K., & Zhang, L. F. (2007). Thinking Styles Inventory– Revised II (Unpublished test). Tufts University.
32. Surjono, Prasisca, Y., & Sutikno, F. R. (2015). Gender Equality and Social Capital as Rural Development Indicators in Indonesia (Case: Malang Regency, Indonesia). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 211, 370-374.
33. Taylor, K. M., & Betz, N. E. (1983). Applications of self-efficacy theory to the understanding and treatment of career indecision. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 22(1), 63-81.
34. Trusty, J. (1998). Family influences on educational expectations of late adolescents. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 91, 260–270.
35. Vignoli, E., Croity-Belz, S., Chapeland, V., De Fillipis, A., & Garcia, M. (2005). Career exploration in adolescents: The role of anxiety, attachment, and parenting styles. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 153–168.

36. White, R. J. (2009). The role of parenting style, ethnicity, and identity style on identity commitment and career decision self-efficacy (Doctoral's dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (UMI No. 3368670)