



# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCE RESEARCH, IDEAS AND INNOVATIONS IN TECHNOLOGY

ISSN: 2454-132X

Impact Factor: 6.078

(Volume 7, Issue 5 - V7I5-1231)

Available online at: <https://www.ijariit.com>

## Career discrepancy and subjective well-being among undergraduate students in close liaison to career decision self- efficacy

Riya Rajesh Shah <a href="mailto:riyashah18400@gmail.com">riyashah18400@gmail.com</a> University of Mumbai, Mumbai, Maharashtra	Anushka Thacker <a href="mailto:thackeranushka@gmail.com">thackeranushka@gmail.com</a> University of Mumbai, Mumbai, Maharashtra	Mitali Maral <a href="mailto:mitalimaral@gmail.com">mitalimaral@gmail.com</a> University of Mumbai, Mumbai, Maharashtra	Bhavi Mehta <a href="mailto:mehta.bhavi29@gmail.com">mehta.bhavi29@gmail.com</a> University of Mumbai, Mumbai, Maharashtra
Krutik Shah <a href="mailto:7vishalshah@gmail.com">7vishalshah@gmail.com</a> University of Mumbai, Mumbai, Maharashtra	Krishna Vyas <a href="mailto:kryshavyas@gmail.com">kryshavyas@gmail.com</a> University of Mumbai, Mumbai, Maharashtra	Hetvi Sanghavi <a href="mailto:hetvisanghavi03@gmail.com">hetvisanghavi03@gmail.com</a> University of Mumbai, Mumbai, Maharashtra	Kavya Shah <a href="mailto:kavyashah35@gmail.com">kavyashah35@gmail.com</a> University of Mumbai, Mumbai, Maharashtra

### ABSTRACT

*The current study aims to establish a possible relation between three variables: career discrepancy, career decision self-efficacy, and subjective well-being. Respondents were 86 subjects currently enrolled in undergraduate students within the territorial boundaries of India. Subjects were to answer items present in the three forms, while filling certain demographic details. The current study had four hypotheses; a negative correlation between career discrepancy and self-efficacy; a positive correlation between self-efficacy and subjective well-being; a negative correlation between career discrepancy and subjective well-being; and career discrepancy and self-efficacy significantly predicting relationship with subjective well-being. Results concluded significant agreement with the hypothesis, but all correlations were weak. Multiple linear regression revealed a moderate level of prediction, with both career discrepancy and career decision self-efficacy significantly predicting subjective well-being.*

**Keywords:** Career Discrepancy, Career Decision Self-Efficacy, Satisfaction with Life Satisfaction, Subjective Well-Being

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Career discrepancy has been defined as a major source of the intergenerational conflict that is observed between the parents and their children with respect to the disagreement over the career decisions. This is termed as parent- child career discrepancy. (Leong et al., 2004; Rogers et al., 2018). The age range between 18 and 25 is termed as the transition stage in which the individuals are in a phase of developing a separate identity to that of their parents. It has been stated that the individual's still view their parents as their authority figures who still have a power of setting rules and expectations (Youniss and Smollar 1985). In Spite of the children trying to individuate from the parents they still do experience a strong attachment towards them, work for their approval, respect them, feel the obligations as part of their family and try to meet the expectations. (Youniss and Smollar 1989). Thus, according to Weidman's (1989) model parents continue to be an important aspect in the lives of their children.

Self-efficacy is defined as our beliefs, our expectations in our capabilities to successfully perform a series of behaviors. As a result of its importance in the career decision making it has received attention in various parts of the career behavior. Taylor and Betz (1983) originally defined Career decision self-efficacy. It was defined with respect to making career decisions an individual's ability in successfully completing the tasks related to it. It has been measured with respect to specific task domains like self-appraisal, goal selection, gathering information, planning and problem solving. Career decision self-efficacy has shown to be related to more adaptive career beliefs (Luzzo & Day, 1999) fear of career commitment (Betz & Serling, 1993), high versus low vocational identity (Robbins, 1985), and the career exploratory behavior (Blustein, 1989).

Diener et al. (1985) defined life satisfaction as an overall cognitive judgement of one's life and is also related in having a number of positive concomitants like being healthier and having more friends. (Diener and Biswas-Diener, 2008). It has a rich literature with many different types of predictors pertaining to life satisfaction.

As previous studies have focused on how different parental and children's expectations and beliefs lead to career discrepancy, how career congruence was related to life satisfaction and also the relationship between self-worth and career discrepancy, in our study we aim to investigate how parent child career discrepancy is associated with career self-efficacy and life satisfaction.

**Theoretical Explanations:** Weidman's (1989) undergraduate socialization model recognizes and incorporates the impact that parents' socialization has on students' adjustment to college. This model suggests that adolescents' relationships with their parents has an effect on how they cope with different normative pressures including career choices, values, and lifestyle preferences. These decisions would also have an impact on the students' academic and social success.

Self-discrepancy theory (Higgins 1987) suggests that a discrepancy between parents' expectations and the perception that college students about their parents' expectations causes emotional turmoil.

The notion behind this cognitive theory is that conflict between beliefs about the ideal self (i.e., attributes that people wish to possess), actual self (i.e., the attributes that people believe they currently possess), and ought self (i.e., attributes that people believe they should or have to possess) results in negative emotions, though many early researchers believed that the discrepancy between actual and ideal self is theoretically linked to self-esteem there has not been any research to show this association.

Beck's (1967) **seminal cognitive theory** states that the activation of schemas may lead to information processing that is biased and can cause difficulties in adjustment. Hence, when college students are unable to meet their expectations, they can be subjected to intense, unpleasant emotions. In an attempt to relieve this distress, college students tend to create a dangerous pattern of using other people's expectations to measure their own success. Therefore, they define themselves by their closeness to their parents' expectations instead of their own standards and achievements. (Higgins et al. 1986)

According to the **social cognitive career theory** (Lent et al., 1994, 2000), individual-parent career goal discrepancies are environmental influences, and can be both distal and proximal. Distal influences, like opportunities for skill development and the availability of role models, happen before any active decision-making and can affect an individual's efficacy beliefs (e.g., regarding ability to deal with career-related activities), the expectations and interest regarding career-related activities. Proximal influences, like availability of jobs and the financial support impact active career choice making by affecting the person's ability to translate career interests into goals and goals into actions. They also influence critical career choices by exerting direct effects on career goal choice and actions. For example, when people have to suppress their career wishes to follow parental preferences.

**Goal-setting theory** (Carver & Scheier, 1990) explains how a person's cognitive, affective, and behavioral processes regulate, and is regulated by goals. According to this, individual-parent career goal discrepancy disrupts goal pursuit and achievements. when people set goals and take goal-directed actions, they constantly take and monitor feedback from external (parents) and internal environments (their own reflections). they adjust their goals and goal-pursuit actions based on this (Bandura, 1989). Feedback from families and in-groups is a huge moderator in this process, especially in collectivistic cultures.

**The Social Cognitive Learning Theory (SCLT)** proposed by Albert Bandura (Moneva, J. C., & Moncada, K. A. (2020) states that people learn by observing others, and the human thought processes involved in understanding personality. In this theoretical context, Bandura presented self-efficacy as an exploratory model of how humans behave and its outcomes. Moreover, self-efficacy is at the center of this theory and it refers to the belief that a person can do a task to their ability and capacity. Individuals' held beliefs about their own self-efficacy influences whether they will reproduce a behavior They observed. This theory recognizes the importance of reciprocal relationships between the behavior, individual, and the environmental influences in understanding how people learn. Students learn from others by observing and imitating behavior. While imitating someone, the student has to establish a commonality among the person and their own behavior. high self-efficacy students usually get what they desire for. They might be able to perform a task efficiently with self-confidence. Even In cases where parents' expectations are too much, they believe that they would meet those expectations. No matter the toughness of the situation they would find a way to escape.

## **2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Parents play a pivotal role in the development of their children. However, the findings of this study suggest that when parents place too-great-an emphasis on grades and marks, students may feel nervous and perform poorly in examinations. Existing literature suggests that parents can best support their children by emphasizing the importance of education, learning processes, understanding subject matter, hard work and discipline. Studies examining the possible roles of perceived parental pressure in students' academic performance have been documented. (Moneva, J. C., & Moncada, K. A. (2020). In a study by Nagpal, M., & Sinha, C., (2016), there was a positive relationship between perceived parental pressure and test anxiety, and a negative correlation between perceived parental pressure and academic achievement, in close liaison with test anxiety. In a study examining the role of parental educational expectation and subjective well-being, positive correlation between Parental Educational Expectation (PEE) and adolescent SWB, with negative correlation with perceived academic pressure. (Lu, H., Nie, P., & Sousa-Poza, A. (2021). In another study attempting to understand parental pressure and self-efficacy, results found that the students have high levels of parental pressure such as parents have high expectations of their students. Also, parents obliged students to have high achievements and they push them in attaining high grades. On the other hand, students have a high level of self-efficacy beliefs such as students can always manage to solve difficult problems if they try hard. Also, they can solve problems if they invest necessary efforts and if they are in trouble they can usually think of solutions.

A variety of research has been accumulated in studying the various facets of career discrepancy with more than one facet for self-efficacy. Career discrepancy between parent and child indicates a marked degree of parental pressure to pursue the right career path that is not agreed upon by the two parties. Parental participation is a driving force in shaping high school students' post-secondary

plans. While there are studies that look at the relationship between parental involvement and secondary students' decisions to go to college as well as parental involvement and students' potential career choices, there is little research on whether parental involvement drives students to pursue careers that are contrary to their wishes. Parental participation in the form of parental expectations becomes increasingly relevant as students' progress through middle and high school, according to research (K Clophus, 2018). The aim of this correlational analysis was to see whether parental involvement could predict high school seniors' postsecondary plans. The study's findings have conflicting consequences, and while failing to dismiss the null hypotheses in several respects, research still indicates parental expectations are a guiding factor in students' post-secondary plans. Gloria and Ho's (2003) study of 160 East Asian American college students shed light on the complicated effects of Asian parental participation in academia. Despite the fact that 88 percent of mothers and 81 percent of fathers said their mothers and fathers helped them in having a college degree, students said they felt more supported overall by their peers than by their families. Researchers clarified that adolescents may experience both strong parental support and high pressure to succeed, and that academic failure can lead to feelings of embarrassment, remorse, and inferiority for not being able to meet family standards, as well as a loss of family and community support.

A study conducted by Agliata A and Renk E (2007) aimed to study parents-college expectation discrepancies and the communication reciprocity. The correlational findings suggested that when there is a higher expectation discrepancy present between the student's and the parents, lower levels of self-worth was seen among the college students. A study by Mahdi Khan Mohammadi et al. (2018) examined the impact of parenting styles on undergraduate students in Malaysia's career decisions. Male students reported considerably more career indecision, showing gender having a profound impact in career choice. Around 62 percent of Malaysian undergraduate students reported career indecision, while only 38 percent were certain about their future careers, according to the results of this research. Efficient parenting style and affectionate constraint parenting style were related to lower scores on career indecision, while neglectful parenting style and affectionless control style were related to higher scores on career indecision. A study by Bandura et al., (2001), self-efficacy beliefs as shapers of children's aspirations and career trajectories. It was also discovered that the higher a family's socioeconomic status, the more parents believe in their ability to support their children's academic development and the greater their educational expectations are for them. All three forms of children's perceived self-efficacy – academic, social, and self-regulatory – are positively related to parental expectations. Parental aspirations have no effect on their children's perceived occupational efficacy because their children's perceived self-efficacy and academic achievement are fully mediated.

Career decision self-efficacy (CDSE) denotes beliefs in one's ability to successfully complete tasks necessary in making career decisions (Taylor & Betz, 1983). In 2018, a study was conducted by Xue Xing. This study examined the influence of family factors on the career decision-making self-efficacy of secondary vocational students in China. They used a survey method which included three sections that measured career decision-making self-efficacy and parental career-related behaviors. Regression analysis indicated that general parental psychosocial support was the only significant factor explaining 38.3% of the variance of the dependent variable, career decision-making self-efficacy. It also indicated that general parental psychosocial support had substantial influence on career decision-making self-efficacy.

High CDSE was found to be significantly related to a strong tendency to foreclose. High career decision self-efficacy related significantly to progress in attaining vocational commitment. Given that students negotiate the career decision-making process based on limited but mainly positive experiences, they may establish high career decision self-efficacy and quickly attach to a particular career goal. (Jin, L., Watkins, D., & Yuen, M., 2009). Students report significant increases in empowerment with no commensurate decreases in career indecision. In addition to shedding light on the nuanced relationship between empowerment or career decision self-efficacy and indecision, results indicate the potential constructivist career development has to empower culturally diverse college students. (Grier-Reed, T. L., & Skaar, N. R., 2010).

There was no previous scale that existed which is psychometrically sound and directly assesses the discrepancy that students experience between individually-set career related goals and parentally-set career related goals. Sawitri, Creed & Perdhana (2020) developed a scale of 15 items that can be used with young adults also providing initial validation. In their first study, they developed the items, which were reviewed by experts. The scale was also administered to a sample of undergraduate Indonesian students belonging to the first year. exploratory factor analysis was used to reduce the number of items and measure the factor structure. confirmatory factor analysis was also used on a holdout sample to analyze and measure this underlying structure. Initial construct validity was evaluated and proof was provided along with recommendations for research use and practice.

### **3. METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Hypothesis**

- H1- There is a negative correlation between career discrepancy and self-efficacy
- H2- There is a positive correlation between self-efficacy and subjective well-being
- H3- There is a negative correlation between career discrepancy and subjective well-being
- H4- Career discrepancy and self-efficacy significantly predict relationship with subjective well-being

#### **3.2 Design**

The design of the current study is a Correlational Research with two independent variables and one dependent variable.

#### **3.3 Variables**

Career Discrepancy; Career decision self-efficacy; Subjective well-being.

#### **3.4 Operational Definition**

“Career discrepancy measures three broad domains of discrepancy: differences in individual and parent perceptions of ability (e.g., to complete requisite education programs), choice (e.g., over the career direction chosen), and enthusiasm (e.g., amount of energy expended on progressing career direction (Sawitri et al., pg 5).

“Career decision self-efficacy (CDSE) refers to one’s beliefs about his/her ability to make career related decisions and complete career related tasks (Lent, Brown, and Hackett 1994). High CDSE has a positive influence on one’s career-related behavior in terms of self appraisal, planning, goal selection, gathering occupational information, and career-related problem solving.”( Réka Török et al, p.764)

“Subjective well-being (SWB) is the personal perception and experience of positive and negative emotional responses and global and (domain) specific cognitive evaluations of satisfaction with life. It has been defined as ‘a person’s cognitive and affective evaluations of his or her life’” (Diener, Lucas, & Oishi, 2002, p. 63).

### 3.5 Sample

The sample in the current study was obtained with the help of convenience sampling. There were a total of 102 responses, out of which 6 chose not to participate after reading the consent form, 10 did not fit the inclusion criteria (3 were from junior college, 3 were not from India and 4 were already graduated students). Therefore, the subjects were 86 undergraduate students currently pursuing their education in India. The mean age of the subjects was 20.37 years. The sample included both male and female students.

### 3.6 Instruments

The current study employed three scales, each of which were filled as separate sections in the Google Form.

The first scale was **Discrepancies Between Individual-Set and Parent-Set Career Goals Scale which consisted of 15 items**. The three-factor model identified in the scale were ability, choice and enthusiasm, each of these factors generated acceptable fit statistics. All factor loadings were significant ( $p < .001$ ) and ranged from .85 to .93 (ability), .67 to .87 (choice), and .84 to .95 (enthusiasm); correlations among latent variables ranged from .43 to .59. Content validity was supported by a review of the literature, focus groups, pilot testing, and use of expert reviewers. Construct validity was supported by the EFAs and CFAs, which indicated that the new measure reflected the three intercorrelated domains (i.e., ability, choice, and enthusiasm discrepancies). Researchers also provided evidence that the Individual–Parent Career Goal Discrepancies Scale might more meaningfully be interpreted at the full-scale level and that at this level it was internally reliable. Additionally, the association with the Adolescent–Parent Career Congruence Scale supported divergent construct validity, and the association with the Career Distress Scale supported convergent validity. At 15 items, the Individual–Parent Career Goal Discrepancies Scale was practical and convenient to use when a short scale of important discrepancies between individual-set and parent set career goals is needed in future research and practice.

The second scale was the **Career Decision Self Efficacy Scale (CDSES-SF)**. Developed by Betz et al, it consisted of 25 items. The 25 items were divided, such that, 5 items belonged to 5 original five specific factors the scale attempted to assess; self-appraisal, occupational information, goal selection, planning, and problem solving. The **self-appraisal** factor refers to the extent one accurately assesses her/his career-relevant abilities, values, and interests. **Occupational information** refers to the extent of knowledge one has about university programs, occupations, and labor markets. **Goal selection** refers to the extent one can set priorities in order to successfully manage her/his professional advancement. **Planning** refers to the extent one can establish plans for the future and can identify career paths. **Problem solving** refers to the extent one is able to figure out alternative coping strategies and solve career choice problems; and that alternative leads to an integrative, socially acceptable, and personally satisfying solution (Betz and Luzzo 1996). In addition, research (Betz, Klein, & Taylor, 1995 and Betz & Luzzo, 1996) has shown that the 25-item CDSE-Short Form is nearly as reliable and is as valid as the longer CDSE (50 items). Betz, Hammond,& Multon (2005) showed that the five level response continuum is as reliable and valid as is the 10-level continuum. Thus the researchers recommend that future research may use the short form with the five level response continuum. The scoring keys for the scales are shown at the back of the CDSE/CDSE-SF Manual.

The third scale was **Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)** which consisted of 5-items. The scale has shown to be a valid and reliable measure of life satisfaction, showing high internal consistency and reliability and suited for use with different age groups and populations. Since then, studies with samples from many countries have confirmed these favourable properties. Relatively high correlations are reported between the scale and a person’s satisfaction with their day, a memory recall task of satisfying and dissatisfying times, and peer reports of the scale. Studies show that correlations between the SWLS and other constructs such as positive affect, negative affect, optimism, or self-esteem are lower than correlations between the (same) SWLS collected with different methods or in different time periods.(van Beuningen, J., 2012)

### 3.7 Procedure

The procedure for the current experiment involved making Google Forms containing **three sections with three different scales** measuring Parent-set and Individual-set Career-Discrepancy Scale, Career-decision Self Efficacy Scale-Short Form And Satisfaction with Life Scale respectively. Prior to the beginning of the survey, participants were provided with a consent form which explained, in vivid detail, the current criteria for the study. Participants were to indicate whether they wished to participate or not by selecting the appropriate option. The demographic details of the respondents were taken to understand the sample characteristics. The demographic details covered sample characteristics like age, gender, course they are pursuing currently, the year they are currently enrolled in, city and state. This was done to ensure that participants not adhering to the inclusion criteria can be excluded. The subjects in the study responded on a 6 point Likert Scale (1 being Strongly Disagree and 6 being Strongly Agree) in the first section of the Form. The responses on the second scale consisted of the level of confidence ranging from no confidence at all to complete confidence. The third scale included a 7-point Likert Scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The form consisted of the debrief which helped the respondents understand what the study was about. The forms were sent through social media and were filled online. Participants’ email were taken in case they need to occupy the results of the study.

**3.8 Data Analysis**

Data is analyzed on the basis of descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics employed in the current study was **mean, range and standard deviation**. A **Bivariate Distribution Correlation** was done between subjective well-being and self-efficacy, self-efficacy and career discrepancy and subjective well-being and career discrepancy. **Multiple Linear Regression** was done to assess whether the two variables (career decision self-efficacy and career discrepancy) significantly predict a relation to subjective well-being.

**4. RESULTS**

There were 102 respondents who answered the survey. Out of which 6 did not wish to participate for the study and 10 were not meeting the inclusion criteria and hence, were discarded. The total participants were therefore 86. The mean age of these college students is 20.83. The data collected was downloaded and analyzed using the statistical tool of SPSS software package. Outliers were checked for the data and removed.

**Table 1.1: Descriptive Statistics**

VARIABLES	N	RANGE	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION
CD	86	61	33.686	15.221
SE	86	1.8	3.555	0.408
SWB	86	27	21.27	6.139

In order to study correlation between the variables of Career Discrepancy, Career-Decision self-efficacy and subjective well-being. The scores of career discrepancy and subjective well-being were calculated by summing the items in each element. In case of career- decision self-efficacy the scores were added for all items and then averaged by dividing it by 25.

According to table 1.1, the range for Career Discrepancy variable is 61 with a mean score of 33.686 (SD=15.221). The Career-Decision self-efficacy score has a range of 1.8 with a mean score of 3.56 (SD=.408) and the mean of 21.27 was found in the subjective well-being variable with a range of 27 (SD= 6.139).

**Table 1.2: Correlation**

		CD	SE	SWB
CD	Pearson Correlation	1	-.332	-.276
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.001	.005
	N	86	86	86
SE	Pearson Correlation	-.332	1	.367
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.001		.000
	N	86	86	86
SWB	Pearson Correlation	-.276	.367	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.005	.000	
	N	86	86	86

Table 1.2 represents Pearson Product Moment Correlation between the scores of career discrepancy, career-decision self-efficacy and subjective well-being. A weak negative correlation was found between career discrepancy and career-decision self-efficacy with  $r = -0.332$  ( $p < .001$ ;  $N=86$ ). This is in line with our hypothesis which implies that when the career discrepancy is high, the self-efficacy of the individual will be low and vice versa.

There is a weak negative correlation between career discrepancy and subjective well-being which is statistically significant ( $r = -0.276$ ;  $p < .005$ ). This is also in line with our hypothesis which suggests that higher the career discrepancy, lower will be the subjective well-being of the individual and vice versa.

A significant weak positive correlation was found between career-decision self-efficacy and subjective well-being with ( $r = 0.367$ ;  $p < .000$ ) indicating that score of self-efficacy is significantly related to the element of subjective well-being.

**Table:1.3  
Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.402	.161	.141	5.72299

Table 1.3 represents the R value which is the multiple regression coefficient and is the measure of quality of prediction of the dependent variable. i.e., in the current experiment subjective well-being.  $R = .402$  which indicates a moderate level of prediction. R Square is the coefficient of determination which is the proportion of variance in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variable. Here, the  $R^2$  value is .161 which means that independent variable explains 16.1% of variability in the dependent variable (SWB).

**TABLE:1.4  
ANOVA**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	522.839	2	261.419	7.982	.001
	Residual	2718.463	83	32.753		
	Total	3241.302	85			

The table 1.4 shows that the independent variables i.e., CD AND SE statistically predict the dependent variable i.e., SWB.  $F(2,83) = 7.982$  ( $p < .001$ ).

**TABLE:1.5**  
Coefficients<sup>a</sup>

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		95.0% Confidence Interval for B		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	7.117	6.355		1.120	.266	-5.522	19.756
	CD	-.070	.043	-.174	-1.629	.107	-.155	.015
	SE	4.647	1.602	.309	2.901	.005	1.461	7.833

a. Dependent Variable: SWB

When all other independent variables are held constant, unstandardized coefficients represent how often the dependent variable differs from an independent variable. The unstandardized coefficient B1 for CD = -.070 which implies that an increase in career discrepancy scores, there will be a decrease in SWB. And B1 for SE= 4.647 which suggests that an increase in career-decision self-efficacy, an increase in subjective well-being will be found.

**5. DISCUSSION**

According to the results, there is a negative correlation between career discrepancy and career decision self-efficacy, which is in line with the expectations of our hypothesis. However, the correlation between career discrepancy and career decision self-efficacy was weak. It was also found that there is a positive correlation between career decision self-efficacy and subjective well-being, as expected. But the correlation was weak. On the other hand, there is a negative correlation between career discrepancy and subjective well-being as per the expectations in the current study. Career discrepancy and career decision self-efficacy predicted the relationship with subjective well-being.

Self-discrepancy theory (Higgins 1987) suggests that a discrepancy between parents’ expectations and the perception that college students’ about their parents’ expectations causes emotional turmoil which might lead to low subjective well-being. The results of the current study were similar to this particular theory that high career discrepancy leads to low subjective well being. One of the main reasons that could be attributed to the weak correlations between career discrepancy and career decision self efficacy and career decision self efficacy and subjective well being could be the relatively small sample size which is 86 respondents. It's quite possible that a stronger correlation would be found with a larger sample size as suggested by the trend observed.

Social Cognitive Learning Theory (SCLT) proposed by Albert Bandura (Moneva, J. C., & Moncada, K. A. (2020) presented self efficacy as an exploratory model of how humans behave and its outcomes. Moreover, self-efficacy is at the center of this theory and it refers to the belief that a person can do a task to their ability and capacity. Individuals' held beliefs about their own self-efficacy influences whether they will reproduce a behavior they observed. High self-efficacy students usually get what they desire for. They might be able to perform a task efficiently with self-confidence. Even In cases where parents' expectations are too much, they believe that they would meet those expectations. The association between parental pressure and student’s self-efficacy has been studied previously and a significant relationship was found. The current study aimed at exploring the relationship between career discrepancy and career decision self efficacy and a significant correlation was also observed.

**6. LIMITATION AND SUGGESTION**

The sample size in the study is comparatively small thus not giving an exact gist of whether the variables correlate with each other or not. Most of the participants in the study came from urban cities where people are more open minded and accepting as compared to people from rural areas. Thus, the results cannot be accepted only based on data gathered from urban population. The study was conducted via an online platform which opened gates for fake responses as well as participants lying and giving more socially desirable answers. As the survey is online there is no way of knowing it. The questionnaire was long which may have led the participant to get bored or experience fatigue and thus randomly selecting answers rather than answering honestly. There is a possibility that the participant is still unclear about his/her career choice and then too have participated just for the sake of participating.

Offline surveys can be conducted. Future research could prompt at an increased sample size, and an inclusion of a diverse population could be considered, asking concise questions and keeping the questionnaire short, conduction of a pre-test and selection of participants appropriate for the study, consideration of Gender differences, having a more standardized questionnaire for Indian population

**7. CONCLUSION**

The study has been fruitful is implying the relation between career discrepancy, career decision self efficacy, and subjective well-being. Although the results of the study reveal a weak correlation, the results are in line with the hypothesis. The results could be viewed as a statistical step in validating the Discrepancy Between Individual-Set and Parent-Set Career Goals Scale. The current study could also be a step in understanding perceived discrepancy and its impact on career decision and the ability to make a career decision.

**8. REFERENCES**

[1] Bandura A, Barbaranelli C, Caprara GV, Pastorelli C.(2001) Self-efficacy beliefs as shapers of children's aspirations and career trajectories. *Child Dev.* 187-206  
 [2] Betz, N. & Klein, K. (1996). Relationships among measures of career self-efficacy, generalized self-efficacy, and global self-esteem. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 4, 285-298.  
 [3] Betz, N.E., Hammond, M., & Multon, K. (2005). Reliability and validity of response continua for the Career Decision Self-efficacy Scale. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 13. 131-149.  
 [4] Diener ED, Emmons RA, Larsen RJ, Griffin S. The satisfaction with life scale. *J Pers Assess.* 1985;49:71–5

[5] Van Beuningen, J.(2012).The satisfaction with life scale examining construct validity. Den Haag/Heerlen: Stats Netherlands.

[6] Jin, L., Watkins, D., & Yuen, M. (2009). Personality, career decision self-efficacy and commitment to the career choices process among Chinese graduate students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(1), 47-52.

[7] Grier-Reed, T. L., & Skaar, N. R. (2010). An outcome study of career decision self-efficacy and indecision in an undergraduate constructivist career course. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 59(1), 42-53.

[8] Nagpal, M., & Sinha, C. (2016). Perceived parental pressure and academic achievement among Students: Exploring the mediating effect of test anxiety among school students, Bangalore. *Open Journal of Educational Psychology*.

[9] Lu, H., Nie, P., & Sousa-Poza, A. (2021). The Effect of Parental Educational Expectations on Adolescent Subjective Well-Being and the Moderating Role of Perceived Academic Pressure: Longitudinal Evidence for China. *Child Indicators Research*, 14(1), 117-137.

[10] Mahdi K., Sara E., Sidek N., Tajularipin S., Marzuki J., & Hossein A. (2018). Undergraduate Students' Career Decision across Perceived Parenting Styles: Evidence for Gender Differences. *International Research Journal of Education and Sciences* 1-6.

[11] Moneva, J. C., & Moncada, K. A. (2020). Parental Pressure and Students Self-Efficacy.

[12] Agliata A and Renk E (2007), College Students' Adjustment: The Role of Parent-College Student Expectation Discrepancies and Communication Reciprocity, *J Youth Adolescence*, 37, 967-982, DOI 10.1007/s10964-007-9200-8

[13] Sawitri, D. R., Creed, P. A., & Perdhana, M. S. (2020). The Discrepancies Between Individual-Set and Parent-Set Career Goals Scale: Development and Initial Validation. *Journal of Career Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845320901795>

[14] 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.

[15] Török, R., Tóth-Király, I., Bóthe, B., & Orosz, G. (2016). Analyzing Models of Career Decision Self-Efficacy: First-Order, Hierarchical, and Bifactor Models of the Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale. *Current Psychology*, 36(4), 764-773. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9464-9>

[16] Xing, Xue & Rojewski, Jay. (2018). Family Influences on Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy of Chinese Secondary Vocational Students. 21. 48-67.

[17] Leong, F. T. L., Kao, E. M.-C., & Lee, S.-H. (2004). The relationship between family dynamics and career interests among Chinese Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 12, 65-84. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1069072703257734>

[18] Rogers, M. E., Creed, P. A., & Praskova, A. (2018). Parent and adolescent perceptions of adolescent career development tasks and vocational identity. *Journal of Career Development*, 45, 34-49. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0894845316667483>

[19] Youniss, J., Smollar, J.(1985).Adolescent relations with mothers, fathers, and friends. Chicago:The University of Chicago Press

[20] Youniss, J., & Smollar, J. (1989). Transformations in adolescents' perceptions of parents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 12, 71-84.

[21] Weidman, J. C. (1989). Undergraduate socialization: A conceptual approach. *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*, 5, 289-232

[22] Hagmaier, T., Abele, A. E., & Goebel, K. (2018). How do career satisfaction and life satisfaction associate? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 33(2), 142-160. doi:10.1108/jmp-09-2017-0326

[23] Betz, N. E., & Luzzo, D. A. (1996). Career assessment and the career decision-making self-efficacy scale. *Journal of career assessment*, 4(4), 413-428.

[24] Betz, N. E., Hammond, M. S., & Multon, K. D. (2005). Reliability and validity of five-level response continua for the Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 13(2), 131-149.

[25] Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of personality assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.

**APPENDIX**

Items	Factor 1: Ability	Factor 2: Choice	Factor 3: Enthusiasm
1. I don't think I can meet the requirements for the career my parents want for me.	<b>.93</b>	-.07	.03
2. I don't think I have what it takes to reach the career my parents think I should pursue.	<b>.83</b>	.06	.06
3. I am not as clever as I need to be to reach the career my parents want for me.	<b>.83</b>	.02	-.07
4. I am not sure that I have the ability to strive for the career my parents think is ideal for me.	<b>.82</b>	.04	-.04
5. I doubt that I am able to reach the career my parents think is best for me.	<b>.82</b>	-.03	-.06
6. My parents have a preferred career for me as they disagree with the choice I have made for myself.	-.01	<b>.93</b>	.07
7. My parents want me to change my own career choice to the career they really want for me	-.08	<b>.82</b>	-.08
8. My parents insist that the career they want for me is better than my own career choice.	-.03	<b>.79</b>	.02
9. My parents believe that my own career choice is not good enough.	.01	<b>.77</b>	-.05
10. My parents encourage me to pursue a career that I don't really want.	.11	<b>.53</b>	.01
11. I am not motivated to reach the career my parents want me to have.	-.10	.04	<b>.95</b>
12. I am not enthusiastic about achieving the career my parents want for me.	.01	-.02	<b>.88</b>
13. I am not interested in making an effort toward the career my parents want me to have.	.10	-.02	<b>.78</b>
14. I am not seriously trying to achieve the career my parents want for me.	.01	-.03	<b>.73</b>
15. I am not working as hard as I could to achieve the career my parents want me to have.	.17	.12	<b>.63</b>
Eigenvalues	7.28	2.65	1.25
% variance explained	46.62	15.49	6.47

Note. N = 231. Main loadings highlighted in bold.

Figure 1: Items in the Discrepancies Between Individual-Set and Parent-Set Career Goals Scale

Source: Sawitri, D. R., Creed, P. A., & Perdhana, M. S. (2020). *The Discrepancies Between Individual-Set and Parent-Set Career Goals Scale: Development and Initial Validation*. *Journal of Career Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845320901795>

- In most ways my life is close to my ideal
- The conditions of my life are excellent
- I am satisfied with my life
- So far I have gotten the important things I want in life
- If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing

Figure 2: The Satisfaction with Life Scale

Source: Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). *The satisfaction with life scale. Journal of personality assessment, 49(1), 71-75.*

Due to possible copyright infringement, the current study will not provide sample items from the Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale- Short Form (CDESES-SF).