

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 394 103

CG 026 935

AUTHOR Boes, Susan R.  
TITLE The Relationships among Parental Marital Status, Selected Interpersonal Variables, and the Career Development of a College Population.  
PUB DATE Nov 95  
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Georgia Educational Research Association (20th, Atlanta, GA, November 2-3, 1995).  
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS Career Development; \*Divorce; Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; Marriage; Parent Background; \*Parent Child Relationship; \*Self Efficacy; \*Self Esteem; Sex Differences; \*Socioeconomic Status; Undergraduate Students

## ABSTRACT

The increasing rate of divorce and its effects on children is a major concern in the United States. This study investigated the relevance of family composition due to parental marital status on several interpersonal variables and the impact of these variables on the career development of college students. The interpersonal variables measured were: self-efficacy, self-esteem, and the degree of certainty a participant had for his or her current career choice. A secondary purpose of the investigation was the examination of gender and socioeconomic status (SES) as possible moderators on the long term effects of divorce on vocational certainty. Undergraduate students (n=136) were given self-report measures on the selected variables. A multiple discriminant analysis was used to measure the interpersonal variables as they predicted and classified the participants according to group membership. Instruments used were: the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, the Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Career Decision Scale. Socioeconomic classification was computed using the Hollingshead Index of Social Position. Multiple discriminant analysis was performed on both an analysis sample and a holdout sample for cross-validation. Socioeconomic status was found to be statistically significant when the univariate procedure was performed, upholding the findings of other studies showing that family SES is often negatively impacted by divorce. Structure coefficients and loadings derived from the discriminant analysis procedure upheld the significance of SES. Contains 12 tables and 52 references. (JBJ)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Paper Presented at the Georgia Educational Research Association  
20th Annual Meeting in Atlanta, Georgia.

The Relationships Among Parental Marital Status,  
Selected Interpersonal Variables, and  
the Career Development of a  
College Population

Susan R. Boes  
West Georgia College

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND  
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL  
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*S. BOES*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Running head: The Relationships Among Parental Marital Status

The Relationships Among Parental Marital Status,  
Selected Interpersonal Variables, and  
the Career Development of a  
College Population

Susan R. Boes

West Georgia College

## Abstract

This study investigated the relevance of family composition due to parental marital status on several interpersonal variables and the impact of these variables on the career development of college students. The interpersonal variables measured were self-efficacy, self-esteem and the degree of certainty a participant had for his or her current career choice. A secondary purpose of the investigation was the examination of gender and socioeconomic status as possible moderators on the long term effects of divorce on vocational certainty. One hundred and thirty six undergraduate students at a large southeastern university were recruited as volunteer participants and given self-report measures on the selected variables. A multiple discriminant analysis was used to measure the interpersonal variables as they predicted and classified the participants according to group membership. Self-esteem was measured by the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1989), self-efficacy was measured by the Self-Efficacy Scale (Sherer, Maddux, Mercandante, Prentice-Dunn, Jacobs, & Rogers, 1982), and career choice certainty was measured by the Career Decision Scale (Osipow, 1980). Socioeconomic classification was computed using the Hollingshead Index of Social Position (1965). Multiple discriminant analysis was performed on both an analysis sample and a holdout sample for cross-validation. Socioeconomic status was found to be statistically significant when the univariate procedure was performed upholding the findings of other studies showing that family SES is often negatively impacted by divorce. Structure coefficients and loadings derived from the discriminant analysis procedure upheld the significance of SES.

The Relationships Among Parental Marital Status,  
Selected Interpersonal Variables, and the Career Development of a College Population

The increasing rate of divorce and its effects on our children is a major concern in the United States. There is a vast amount of literature on the short term effects of this phenomenon (Kulka & Weingarten, 1979) while research on the long term effects has been less but is now beginning to emerge (Burm, 1992).

Divorce always affects at least two people, the divorcing couple, but children may also be involved. Glick (1979) in a study on demographic perspective, projecting from past data, estimated that by 1990 the proportion of children under 18 years of age who would experience parental divorce would be close to one-third of this age population. This continuous rise in conjugal dissolution has renewed concern for many that the institution of marriage and the family may be in jeopardy (Furstenberg, Nord, Peterson, & Zill, 1983).

The literature details an abundance of studies surrounding the trauma of divorce and its effect on the younger child and adolescent but, until recently, there was little research directed toward the older adolescent, the college student, or the young adult (Bianchi, Rosen, & Reilly, 1987; Cain, 1989; Elliot, 1990; Farber, Primavera, & Felner, 1983; Kalter, 1987). Physically mature, late adolescent/young adult children of divorce are perceived as adults with advanced developmental levels and as emotionally separated from home (Cain, 1989), yet the developmental stages of college students and young adults are in need of resolution before they can be successfully considered to enter adulthood (Burm, 1992).

Initially researchers held that the impact of parental divorce subsided after a period of readjustment (Hetherington, Cox, & Cox, 1978; Wallerstein & Kelly, 1974), but some literature now indicates that the effects of parental divorce linger through adolescent/young adult development (Bianchi et al., 1987; Bonkowski, 1989; Cooney, 1988). Other research indicates that late adolescent/young adult children of divorce may develop difficulties as they enter adulthood (Lopez, Campbell, & Watkins, 1988; Wallerstein, 1987/1988, 1991; Wallerstein & Corbin, 1989). Among these researchers, Wallerstein (1987/1988), the principal investigator of the California Children of Divorce project, reported during a follow-up on the longitudinal study an unexpected finding which she termed the "sleepers effect" (p. 109). It first appeared that some immediate effects of parental divorce were resolved or inconsequential for certain children, but after a period of time certain effects became apparent. These were exhibited through various anxieties and fears. Wallerstein found the sleeper effects are generally demonstrated as one enters adulthood and begins to make decisions that have implications for the future. These sleeper effects include difficulties with resolution of certain developmental issues. Other psychosocial developmental issues that could be considered sleeper effects include fear of commitment, concern about relationships, and educational and vocational delays.

Burm (1992) suggests that the increased number of older children expected to experience parental divorce is a salient research focus. The adolescent and emerging young adult child is the population that provoked Wallerstein's concerns about the long term impact of divorce (Wallerstein, 1987/1988). Today this young adult child of

divorce population is increasing (Glick, 1984) because of increasing parental divorce and are susceptible to effects of the divorce.

A meta-analysis (Amato & Keith, 1991) conducted across 37 studies on the long-term consequences of parental divorce examined various forms of well-being. Results of the meta-analysis suggest that parental divorce "has broad negative consequences for quality of life in adulthood," (Amato & Keith, 1991, p. 54) Certain problems such as lowered self-esteem (Hetherington, 1972; Rosenberg, 1965; Young & Parish, 1977), economic distress (Hutchinson & Spangler, 1987), and feelings of loss of control (Wallerstein, 1987/88) tend to be similar for children's adjustment to parental divorce. While initial universal responses of children of divorce are generally egocentric there are common threads. There is a sadness with the immediate loss, the fear of an unknown or frightening future, and anger connected with these losses (Lewis & Wallerstein, 1988).

In a survey of 83 clinical directors of college mental health counseling centers the directors reported college students from separated or divorced families indicated greater degrees of insecurity, anxiety, feelings of abandonment, and depression. Additionally, the students were described as inclined toward increased drug and alcohol use, having both sleep and eating disturbances, and an inability to concentrate on studies, problems with peers, and parental loyalty dilemmas. Analyses of the survey responses indicate that parental divorce may be a major life transition stressor for the late adolescent (Farber, et al., 1983). Financial difficulties, tuition concerns, academic distress, identity issues and problems influencing self-esteem



were among the major stressors reported as concerns by college-aged adult children of divorce in therapy sessions (Hillard, 1984).

Other investigations reported impaired self-esteem of adult children of divorce during their struggle to resolve identity (Kalter, Riemer, Brickman, & Woo Chen, 1985; Paddock-Ellard & Thomas, 1981; Young & Parish, 1977). Other clinicians recognize daily that an adult population of children of divorce contend with "dimensions of developmental struggles" even if the parental divorce was perceived as amicable (Everett, 1992, p.1).

Feelings of uncertainty about the future leave many adult children of divorce with concern about personal control (Cooney, 1988). Amato (1988) described the feeling of a lowered sense of power for an 18-34 year-age sample as a negative consequence of parental marital status. Children experiencing parental divorce are involved in an event which they are unable to control. The lack of influence over their lives that these children have often leaves them feeling a general loss of control. Children of divorce who adopt this thinking may find it a persistent quality and self-fulfilling in many aspects of their lives.

This sense of lessened personal control and powerlessness is consistent with feelings of lower self-efficacy, that is having less confidence in one's abilities to accomplish a specific behavior (Bandura, 1977). Feeling efficacious and in control of one's life leads to more effective problem-solving behaviors. During the ten year follow-up interviews of the California Children of Divorce Project, Wallerstein (1987) found a pervasive feeling of helplessness among the 16-18 year-age group



interviewed. A lack of control or a powerless feeling leads to less confidence in one's ability, less pursuit in attempting difficult tasks and less persistence in attempts at performance when obstacles arise (Hackett & Betz, 1981).

College students have particular vocational developmental tasks to accomplish for resolution of career maturity. Specifically, Chickering and Havighurst (1981) suggest that "choosing and preparing for a career is the most challenging developmental task of all for the late adolescent and young adult" and refer to it as "the organizing center for the lives" of this age group (p. 32). Cooney (1988) suggests that for a college population these developmental tasks involve leaving home, adjustment to college, commitment in relationships, and choice of and implementation of a career.

Rosenberg (1989) concluded from his investigation of adolescents that family breakup under certain conditions is related to lower self-esteem. Other researchers (Amato, 1986; Raschke & Raschke, 1979) have found lowered self-esteem is associated with children of divorce, parental conflict and living within a divorced family (Parish & Taylor, 1979) although the results of other research on young adults have been inconsistent (Amato, 1988; Kulka & Weingarten, 1979).

Possible reasons for lowered self-esteem in children of divorce include internalization of the conflict between the feuding parents and interference with the quality of the parent-child relationship due to parental conflict (Amato, 1988). Burn (as cited in Amato, 1988) found that low self-esteem creates problems in the general psychological adjustment of children, in their school work, and in their social

relationships. This led to Amato's conclusion that lowered self-esteem may persist into adult years. If true, lowered self-esteem may well involve the degree of vocational certainty for older children of divorce.

Clarifying purpose (Chickering, 1969) is a student developmental vector which directly influences the career decision: this vector involves the development and integration of an individual's vocational plans and interests. The primary task of this vector is the clarification of vocational aspirations. Chickering found that family and life-style are intertwined with this developmental vector often making establishment of purpose more difficult to complete. A student who has experienced changes in family life style due to the conflict of parental divorce, may have difficulty with the achievement of this developmental goal.

In another investigation involving personal characteristics and career maturity, Luzzo (1993) found that psychological and educational factors played a more significant role in career maturity. However, this investigation did lend support to educational and occupational opportunities, parental support and socioeconomic status of college students as possible mediators of career maturity.

Assessing self-efficacy (Hackett & Betz, 1981) and self-esteem (Korman, 1967) is important because research has shown these variables to affect the formation of occupational choice and the sense of success in an occupation (Super, 1990). The child of divorce who feels out of control (Amato, 1988) may lack confidence in skills displaying low self-efficacy in many situations. Taylor and Popma (1990) found career decision-making self-efficacy a significant predictor of vocational indecision for a

college population. College-aged adult children of divorce, who may feel little power in their lives due to parental divorce may also be influenced by self-efficacy in their career decidedness.

#### Purpose of this Study

The purpose of the study was to examine whether parental marital status of the college population investigated is related to the specific self-concept variables of self-efficacy and self-esteem and whether these variables are related to degree of certainty for the current career of choice. A second purpose was to examine whether socioeconomic status (SES) and gender of adult children of divorce in a college population act as moderating variables on the long term effects of divorce on vocational certainty. Because previous research has indicated several variables as developmental stage (Wallerstein & Kelly, 1980), age at time of divorce (Kalter & Rembar, 1981; Wallerstein, 1983), gender (Lamb, 1977; Landis, 1960), and SES (Hetherington, et al., 1978; Hutchinson & Spangler, 1987) may act as mediating factors associated with childrens' adjustment to divorce it was deemed appropriate to add SES and gender variables to the analysis.

This research was undertaken to investigate the psychosocial developmental task of the career development process, which Chickering and Havighurst (1981) defined as a salient task of the college-age population, and how divorce might effect this task for college student-age children of divorce. No direction was indicated for differences because research on career decision making is sparse for this group.

## Procedures

This investigation measured 136 volunteer students from a large southeastern university primarily in the College of Education in the Teacher Education Program. Students were measured using the Self-Efficacy Scale (SES) (Sherer, Maddux, Mercandante, Prentice-Dunn, Jacobs, & Rogers, 1982), the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1989), the Career Decision Scale (Osipow, 1980), and a demographic data questionnaire. Socioeconomic status of the participant's family was developed employing The Two Factor Index of Social Position by Hollingshead (1965). The demographic questionnaire categorized the students into the two groups according to parental marital status, children of divorced families (ACDs) and children of intact families (ACIs). In his research, Silvestri (1992) referred to late adolescent/young adult children of divorce as adult children of divorce (ACDs) and adult children of intact families as ACIs. Silvestri's categorization will be used to distinguish the two groups in this paper. In addition, the demographic questionnaire gathered data to determine the (SES) socioeconomic position of the students' families according to occupation and education of the birth or adoptive parents, as well as the gender of the participant and his or her age at the time of their parental divorce.

The Self-Efficacy scale (Sherer et al., 1982) is a scale of general self-efficacy. It has 23 items and was chosen because of the 2 subscales, General Self-Efficacy and Social Self-Efficacy. The RSE (Rosenberg, 1989), a short 10 item scale, was used because of its vast use in research and its previous rigid psychometric analyses (Wylie, 1961). The CDS by Osipow and associates (Osipow, 1980) was used because

of its scale of certainty and a second scale indicating indecision. The open-ended question on the CDS asking the participant to describe his or her situation if it is different from the preceding questions was of special interest because these answers can be helpful to counselors in determining individual obstacles to career decidedness.

This investigation employed a correlational research design using a multiple discriminant analysis. The research tested the linear combinations of the Independent Variables (Hair, Jr., Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1992) of self-efficacy, self-esteem, and career decidedness, SES and gender that best distinguish the ACD and the ACI groups involved in the study. A 2-group discriminant analysis using an analysis sample to determine the discriminant function and a hold-out sample of equal size to validate the discriminant function (Hair et al., 1992) was employed. Before the discriminant analysis could be run SES and gender were developed into a block statistic of SESGENX so that this block could be entered as a control variable as a possible moderator of the effects of divorce. All variables were entered by the computer in a stepwise procedure which first accepts the variable with the largest value for discrimination of the groups.

### Results

The discriminant analysis on the SESGENX block variable determined statistical significance as a discriminator. The independent variable block captured 17.7% of the variance of the discriminating function with a canonical correlation of .4213 as

## Relationships Among Parental 12

indicated on table 1. When the univariate statistic was run to check the consistency of the discriminant function only SES was significant (Table 2).

Table 1

### Summary of Discriminant Functions Resulting from the Block Variable

| Discriminant<br>Function | Eigen-<br>Value | Canonical<br>Correlation | Chi-<br>Square | df | Prob.  |
|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|----------------|----|--------|
| 1                        | .2158           | .4213                    | 12.117         | 2  | .0023* |

Note. \* $p < .05$

Table 2

### Univariate Statistics for Gender and SES Block Variable

| Variable              | Wilks' Lambda | F       | Significance |
|-----------------------|---------------|---------|--------------|
| Gender                | .99439        | 0.3556  | .5531        |
| Family Classification | .82404        | 13.4527 | .0005*       |

Note. \* $p < .05$  for family classification.

Both the discriminant analysis on the analysis sample (Table 3) and the holdout sample (Table 4) indicated statistical significance for the discriminant function but the eigenvalues were low at .2303 and .2453 respectively. Canonical correlations for the analysis and holdout samples were low but could have practical significance because the independent variables captured 18.7% and 19.7% of the variance respectively. However, looking at the difference between the percentage of variance captured by the block (17.7%) and when all of the independent variables were entered little extra variance was captured by entering all of the variables. This indication of SES as a mediating variable of divorce is consistent with other research (Hetherington, et al., 1978; Hutchinson & Spangler, 1987).

Table 3

Summary of Discriminant Functions Resulting from the Discriminant Analysis for the Analysis Sample

| Discriminant Function | Eigen-Value | Canonical Correlation | Chi-Square | df | Prob.  |
|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------|----|--------|
| 1                     | .2303       | .4327                 | 12.645     | 4  | .0131* |

Table 4

Summary of Discriminant Functions Resulting from the Discriminant Analysis for the Holdout Sample

| Discriminant Function | Eigen Value | Canonical Correlation | Chi-Square | df | Prob.  |
|-----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------|----|--------|
| 1                     | .2453       | .4438                 | 13.382     | 4  | .0096* |

Note. \* $p < .05$



The univariate statistic Wilks Lambda was run on each sample to determine the relative importance of each independent variables but only the block reached significance at .82248 (Tables 5 & 6). Standardized coefficients and structure coefficients upheld the significance of the block variable as indicated by tables 7 & 8. The standardized coefficient for the block variable for the analysis was .95215 and for the holdout sample was .90965. The structure coefficients were .96800 and .83764 for the block variable.

Table 5

Univariate Statistics for the Analysis Sample

| Variable        | Wilks' Lambda | F       | Significance |
|-----------------|---------------|---------|--------------|
| SES and Gender  | .82248        | 13.5976 | .0005*       |
| Self-Esteem     | .99445        | 0.3513  | .5555        |
| Self-Efficacy   | .98077        | 1.2354  | .2706        |
| Career Decision | .98536        | 0.9357  | .3371        |

Note. \* $p < .05$  for SES and Gender.

Table 6

Univariate Statistics for the Holdout Sample

| Variable        | Wilks' Lambda | F       | Significance |
|-----------------|---------------|---------|--------------|
| SES and Gender  | .85316        | 10.8429 | .0016*       |
| Self-Esteem     | .99464        | .3394   | .5622        |
| Self-Efficacy   | .94524        | 3.6498  | .0606        |
| Career Decision | 1.00000       | .0002   | .9882        |

Note. \* $p < .05$  for SES and Gender.

Table 7

Standardized Discriminant Function and Structure Coefficients for Analysis Sample

| Variable        | Standardized Coefficient | Structure Coefficient |
|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| SES and Gender  | .95215                   | .96800                |
| Self-Esteem     | .06364                   | -.15560               |
| Self-Efficacy   | .24143                   | .29177                |
| Career Decision | -.07002                  | -.25393               |

Table 8

Standardized Discriminant Function and Structure Coefficients for  
Holdout Sample

| Variable        | Standardized<br>Coefficient | Structure<br>Coefficient |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| SES and Gender  | .90965                      | .83764                   |
| Self-Esteem     | -.37852                     | .14820                   |
| Self-Efficacy   | -.60256                     | -.48598                  |
| Career Decision | .34699                      | .00379                   |

Classification matrices were developed for the block, analysis, holdout and entire sample (Tables 9, 10, 11, 12). To give predictive accuracy, the rate of accuracy for each group must be at least 25% above chance accuracy which for a 2 group membership is 50% (Hair et al., 1992). Twenty five percent above chance accuracy for 2 group membership is 62.5%. The analysis and holdout samples were both higher than chance accuracy at 70.77% and 66.15% while the classification prediction for the entire sample was 58.08% which is below the standard set for reliable predictive accuracy. While the analysis and holdout sample prediction was above the 25% over chance both are still relatively low for predictive purposes. The classification prediction for the block variable was 66.15% which is above the 25% chance accuracy needed for predictive accuracy. Only the classification prediction for the entire sample was below the 62.5% chance accuracy necessary for prediction purposes.

Table 9

Discriminant Function Classification Results for Block Variable

| Actual Group |    | Predicted Group Membership |             |
|--------------|----|----------------------------|-------------|
|              | N  | ACI Group                  | ACD Group   |
| ACI Group 1  | 29 | 18<br>62.1%                | 11<br>37.9% |
| ACD Group 2  | 36 | 11<br>30.6%                | 25<br>69.4% |

Note. Percent of cases correctly classified: 66.15%.

Table 10

Discriminant Function Classification Results for the Analysis Sample  
Resulting from the Discriminant Analysis

| Actual Group |    | Predicted Group Membership |             |
|--------------|----|----------------------------|-------------|
|              | N  | ACI Group                  | ACD Group   |
| ACI Group 1  | 29 | 19<br>65.5%                | 10<br>34.5% |
| ACD Group 2  | 36 | 9<br>25.0%                 | 27<br>75.0% |

Note. Percent of cases correctly classified: 70.77%.

Table 11

Discriminant Function Classification Results for the Holdout Sample  
Resulting from the Discriminant Analysis

| Actual Group |    | Predicted Group Membership |             |
|--------------|----|----------------------------|-------------|
|              | N  | ACI Group                  | ACD Group   |
| ACI Group 1  | 38 | 30<br>78.9%                | 8<br>21.1%  |
| ACD Group 2  | 27 | 14<br>51.9%                | 13<br>48.1% |

Note. Percent of cases correctly classified: 66.15%.

Table 34

Classification Results for the Entire Sample

| Actual Group |    | Predicted Group Membership |             |
|--------------|----|----------------------------|-------------|
|              | N  | ACI Group                  | ACD Group   |
| ACI Group 1  | 67 | 54<br>80.6%                | 13<br>19.4% |
| ACD Group 2  | 63 | 39<br>61.9%                | 24<br>38.1% |

Note. Percent of cases correctly classified: 58.08%.

The open-ended question on the CDS (Osipow, 1980) provided some rich statements concerning the career choice of some participants. This question asks the participant to better describe him- or herself if the previous questions above did not do so about his or her career choice. Several responses to the open-ended item on the CDS indicated that more information earlier in the students' college career would

be helpful. Some responses indicated uneasiness about going out into the real world or fear of graduate school. Additional responses gave exact reasons for their present career choice. A male ACI respondent wrote of a compromise situation

I have a career decision made, but the one I am dating does not want to move far from home. My career would require me to travel/possibly live in a major city or foreign country. Thus, I am compromising my career for this person.

Individual responses were coded into categories that emerged from the responses. These included (1) a sense of confidence and readiness for the career of choice, (2) statement of a particular reason for the career choice, (3) an indicator that more occupational career information would make a career decision easier, (4) a questioning of choice or of readiness to begin the career of choice, and (5) a religious or spiritual theme. Responses not fitting in any of the above categories were coded as "other".

The question on the demographic questionnaire asking about the birth or adoptive fathers occupation was answered by some ACDs in a different manner than was expected and created some seemingly emotional arousal in certain participants.

### Discussion

A multiple discriminant analysis procedure was used to determine group membership prediction based on the best linear composite or combination of predictor scores (Hair, et al., 1992). The block of the two potential moderating variables was entered with the three independent scale measures in a stepwise

procedure for the discriminant analysis. One discriminant function was derived from the analysis. Statistical significance was reached for the block variable of SES and gender. Further manipulation of data found that significance pertained to the SES variable. While the classification ratio of 58.08 for the total sample did not reach the 25% over chance accuracy criterion suggested by Hair, et al. (1992) for clear prediction purposes, both the analysis sample and the holdout sample were above the 62.5% criterion recommended. Discriminant coefficients indicated that the block variable of SES and gender were the important independent variables in classifying the participants into group membership. Structure coefficients indicated that SES and gender as a block was the highest loading variable followed in rank order by self-efficacy, career decidedness and self-esteem. However, the amount of variance captured by the later three independent predictor variables was minimal.

The relationship among self-efficacy, self-esteem, and vocational certainty in a college population and relatedness to parental marital status was not supported. The secondary hypothesis addressing gender and SES as variables noted in the literature to be possible mediators of divorce adjustment on the primary research question was likewise not supported. While the investigation did not clearly discriminate between the ACD and the ACI groups due to the combined predictor variables, some factors of interest were derived from the study, particularly, in regards to SES differences between ACDs and ACIs.

More ACI families were classified in the upper SES levels while the majority of ACD families were categorized in the lower categories. This could be due to the fact



that the majority of ACD families were headed by custodial mothers. This is indicative of previous research classifying divorced families, headed by custodial mothers, in a lower socioeconomic status (Cooney, 1988; Hetherington, 1979).

The majority of the participants were enrolled in the teacher education program within the College of Education which indicated late classification status. Majors from the other colleges were limited in number. Acceptance into the teacher education program may indicate certainty about the chosen profession. Students accepted into teacher education are at least a junior in student classification. While student classification was not a demographic data item it is clear that this information would have added to the research to determine if juniors or seniors were more certain about their chosen career than underclass participants in this investigation.

While this investigation was considered innocuous, some participant responses on the demographic data questionnaire, concerning the occupation of the birth or adoptive father, might be interpreted to involve an emotional response in regard to the father. Respondents indicated this possible emotional dissonance by placing a question mark in the space for the answer; marking N/A; some wrote unknown while others gave comments such as "no idea". One male placed a derogatory slang name in the item space for the father's occupation. These responses seem to indicate some non-custodial fathers are "not known" by the child or are not available to the child of divorce. Feelings about the non-custodial parent, if this parent is unavailable to the child, were not assessed. Perhaps counseling centers that are capable of targeting

students with strong feelings about a neglected relationship might find such an assessment advantageous for counseling with ACDs.

Limitations of the study included (1) use of only a single institution, (2) no randomized design, (3) the use of volunteer participants with self-report instruments, (4) the potential for answering the questions according to the socially desirable manner rather than actual feelings, (5) the use of a correlational design rather than a design which could assign causality. Because the attribute of parental marital status was previously set the design was ex post facto.

Recommendations for future research include: (1) replication with a larger sample across all student classifications, (2) replication with a sample of a wider variety of majors rather with a singular sample of like majors (3) a larger sample, and (4) more exact questions on the demographic questionnaire concerning occupation and salary of birth or adoptive parents. A larger sample across all student classifications could additionally examine if seniors are more certain of career choice than freshmen or sophomores. While this sample size met the requirements of 100 participants for a discriminant analysis (Hair et al., 1992) it was small. A larger sample would add to the statistical value. The Hollingshead Two Factor Index of Social Position (1965) is relatively outdated and certain careers were difficult to determine. A more current measure coupled with more precise questions on the demographic questionnaire could define more accurate information.

### Implications of the Study

For counselors this research may be helpful in (1) looking at our clients in their entire context not just as undecided about a career with no concern about what may be happening interpersonally, (2) making counselors aware of the family composition of clients in order to better understand the issues and needs of their clients, (3) realizing the interdependence and complementary nature of career and personal counseling since issues may be intertwined rather than separate entities working independently of one another. A consideration for college counseling centers might be to identify early on students who need some vocational decision direction, through the use of such instruments as the CDS. Examination during a core curriculum class could provide adequate time for intervention.

Teachers may find this research leads to an understanding that parental divorce is a pervasive event effecting many areas of a student's life. Becoming aware of the various factors that can bring distress to student's due to parental marital discord and divorce may lead to more empathic understanding of the young adult student's situation.

## REFERENCES

- Amato, P. R. (1986). Marital conflict, the parent-child relationship and child self-esteem. Family Relations, 35, 403-410.
- Amato, P. R. (1988). Long-term implications of parental divorce for adult self-concept. Journal of Family Issues, 9, 201-213.
- Amato, P. R., & Keith, B. (1991). Parental divorce and adult well-being: A meta-analysis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53, 43-58.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Bianchi, L. G., Rosen, L. A., & Reilly, N. P. (1987). The effects of divorce on college students. (ERiC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283 078)
- Bonkowski, S. E. (1989). Lingering sadness: Young adults' response to parental divorce. The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, 70, 219-223.
- Burm, D. D. (1992). The long-term effects of parental divorce on young adults' psychological separation from their parents and their career maturity. Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. AAD93-22995)
- Cain, B. S. (1989). Parental divorce during the college years. Psychiatry, 52, 135-146.
- Chickering, A. W. (1969). Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A. W., & Havighurst, R. J. (1981). The life cycle. In A. W. Chickering & Associates (Eds.), The modern American college (pp. 16-50). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cooney, T. M. (1988). Young adults and parental divorce: Exploring important issues. Human Relations, 41(11), 805-822.

Elliot, L. B. (1990). Experiencing parental divorce during college. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 329 817)

Everett, C. A. (Ed.). (1992). Divorce and the next generation: Effects on young adults' patterns of intimacy and expectations for marriage [Special issue]. (Introduction). Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 18(3/4), 1-2.

Farber, S. S., Primavera, J., & Felner, R. D. (1983). Older adolescents and parental divorce: Adjustment problems and mediators of coping. Journal of Divorce, 7(2), 59-75.

Furstenberg, F. F., Jr., Nord, C. W., Peterson, J. L., & Zill, N. (1983). The life course of children of divorce: Marital disruption and parental contact. American Sociological Review, 48, 656-668.

Glick, P. C. (1979). Children of divorced parents in demographic perspective. Journal of Social Issues, 35(4), 170-182.

Glick, P.C. (1984). Marriage, divorce, and living arrangements. Journal of Family Issues, 5(1), 7-26.

Hackett, G., & Betz, N. E. (1981). A self-efficacy approach to the career development of women. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 18, 326-339.

Hair, J. F., Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1992). Multivariate data analysis (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Hetherington, E. M. (1972). Effects of parental absence on personality development in adolescent daughters. Developmental Psychology, 7, 313-326.

Hetherington, E. M., Cox, M., & Cox, R. (1978). The aftermath of divorce. In J. H. Stevens, Jr. & M. Mathews, (Eds.) Mother/child father/child relationships, (pp. 149-176). Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Hillard, J. R. (1984). Reactions of college students to parental divorce. Psychiatric Annals, 14(9), 663-670.

Hollingshead, A. B. (1965). Two Factor Index of Social Position. New Haven, CT: Yale Press.

Hutchinson, R. L., & Spangler, S. L. (1987). Children of divorce: Facilitating well-being. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 292 014)

Kalter, N. (1987). Long-term effects of divorce on children: A developmental vulnerability model. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57, 587-600.

Kalter, N., & Rembar, J. (1981). The significance of a child's age at the time of parental divorce. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 51, 85-100.

Kalter, N., Riemer, B., Brickman, A., & Woo Chen, J. (1985). Implications of parental divorce for female development. Journal of American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 24(5), 538-544.

Korman, A. K., (1967). Self-esteem as a moderator of the relationship between self-perceived abilities and vocational choice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 51, 65-67.

Kulka, R. A., & Weingarten, H. (1979). The long-term effects of parental divorce in childhood on adult adjustment. Journal of Social Issues, 35(4), 50-78.

Lamb, M. E. (1977). The effects of divorce on children's personality development. Journal of Divorce, 1(2), 163-174.

Landis, J. T. (1960). The trauma of children when parents divorce. Journal of Marriage and Family Living, 22, 7-13.

Lewis, J. M., & Wallerstein, J. S. (1988). Divorce-specific assessment of families. In C. J. Kestenbaum & D. T. Williams (Vol. Eds.), Handbook of clinical assessment of children and adolescents: Vol. II, (pp. 959-982). New York: New York University Press.

Lopez, F. G., Campbell, V. L., & Watkins, C. E., Jr. (1988). The relation of parental divorce to college student development. Journal of Divorce, 12(1), 83-98.

Luzzo, D. A. (1993). Predicting the career maturity of undergraduates: A comparison of personal, educational, and psychological factors. Journal of College Student Development, 34, 271-275.

Osipow, S. H. (1980). Manual for career decision scale. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Paddock-Ellard, K., & Thomas, S. (1981). Attitudes of young adolescents toward marriage, divorce, and children of divorce. Journal of Early Adolescence, 1(3), 303-310.

Parish, T. S., & Taylor, P. (1979). The impact of divorce and subsequent father absence on children's self-concept. Journal of Youth and adolescence, 8, 427-432.



Raschke, H. J., & Raschke, V. J. (1979). Family conflict and children's self-concepts: A comparison of intact and single-parent families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 367-374.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rosenberg, M. (1989). Society and the adolescent self-image. (Revised edition). Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. Psychological Reports, 51, 663-671.

Silvestri, S. (1992). Treating adult children of divorce: A model based on redecision therapy. Transactional-Analysis-Journal 22(3), 164-173.

Super, D. E. (1990). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. In D. Brown, L. Brooks & Associates (Eds.), Career choice and development (2nd ed., pp. 197-261). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Taylor, K. M., & Popma, J. (1990). An examination of the relationships among career decision-making self-efficacy, career salience, locus of control and vocational indecision. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 37, 17-31.

Wallerstein, J. S. (1983). Children of divorce: The psychological tasks of the child. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 53, 230-243.

Wallerstein, J. S. (1987/88). Children after divorce: Wounds that don't heal. Perspectives, 24(3,4) 107-113.

Wallerstein, J. S. (1991). The long-term effects of divorce on children: A review. Journal of the American Academy of Child Adolescent Psychiatry, 30(3), 349-360.

Wallerstein, J. S., & Corbin, S. B. (1989). Daughters of divorce: Report from a ten-year follow-up. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 59(4), 593-604.

Wallerstein, J. S., & Kelly, J. B. (1974). The effects of parental divorce: the adolescent experience. In E. J. Anthony & C. Koupernick (Eds.), The child in his family: Children at psychiatric risk: Vol.III (pp. 479-505). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Wallerstein, J. S., & Kelly, J. B. (1980). Surviving the breakup: How children and parents cope with divorce. New York: Basic Books.

Wylie, R. C. (1961). The self concept. A critical survey of pertinent research literature. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Young, E., & Parish, T. (1977). Impact of father absence during childhood on the psychological adjustment of college females. Sex Roles, 3, 217-227.