

The My Children's Future Scale: Construct validity, measurement invariance, and reliability in a Turkish sample

Australian Journal of Career Development

2020, Vol. 29(3) 185–195

© Australian Council for Educational Research 2020

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/1038416220941853

journals.sagepub.com/home/acd



Erol Esen

Department of Counseling and Guidance, Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey

Abstract

The *My Children's Future Scale* (MCFS) measures the support provided by parents for their children's careers. The aim of this study was to adapt the MCFS to Turkish and examine its psychometric characteristics in a study conducted in the Turkish context. Participants consisted of 280 parents (190 mothers and 90 fathers). The factor structure of the MCFS and measurement invariance across parent gender were examined. The unidimensional factor structure was confirmed and the scale was invariant across parent gender. In addition, the reliability of the MCFS was assessed for internal consistency and test-retest reliability. Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega coefficients were calculated as .87, and test-retest reliability coefficient as .83. Our findings suggested that the Turkish form of the MCFS can be considered a valid and reliable data collection tool for use in Turkey to measure the support provided by parents for their children's careers.

Keywords

Parental support, scale adaptation, My Children's Future Scale, career development, measurement invariance, validity, reliability

Introduction

"Have a good job" is probably one of the sentences most frequently heard by children and adolescents from their parents and the people around them. Parents give various messages to their children regarding their career path, ranging from kind-hearted wishes like the one mentioned above, to demands to take over the family business. Most children make decisions about their future professional and academic life as well as usual leisure time activities by observing their parents and listening to their comments about working life (Bryant et al., 2006; Galambos & Sears, 1998), while others observe their parents in their working environment to shape their ideas (Nota & Ginevra, 2014).

In addition to psychological, political, and economic factors (Pişkin, 2016; Schultheiss, 2003), parents play the most important role as a social factor in their children's career development (Alliman-Brissett et al., 2004; Blustein, 2011; Noack et al., 2010; Turner & Lapan, 2002; Whiston & Keller,

2004) and career-related decisions in almost every culture (Bardick et al., 2004; Hamamcı et al., 2013; Shumba & Naong, 2012). Parental support for career plans significantly influences child and adolescent career development processes, as this support is linked to educational options and opening up career-related experiences (Kenny & Medvide, 2013; Lent et al., 2000). Parental support includes encouragement, instrumental assistance, behavioural modelling, and emotional backing (Nota et al., 2012; Sawitri et al., 2014).

The influence of parents is observed in many different ways, as it is associated with perceived career self-efficacy (Alliman-Brissett et al., 2004; Bandura et al., 2001; Bryant et al., 2006; Nota et al., 2007; Öztemel, 2012), career adaptability (Gonzalez, et al., 2001; Guan et al., 2016), decision-making processes (Hamamcı & Hamurlu, 2005; Paloş & Drobot, 2010), career interests (Lapan et al., 2000), career decision-making self-efficacy (Hargrove et al., 2002; Keller & Whiston, 2008; Metheny & McWhirter, 2013), career

Corresponding author:

Erol Esen, Department of Counseling and Guidance, Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey.

Email: erol.esen@cbu.edu.tr

outcome expectations (Isik, 2013; Metheny & McWhirter, 2013), and coping strategies (Lustig et al., 2017; Raque-Bogdan et al., 2013).

Moreover, parents play a significant role in shaping certain psychological factors, such as personality (Schofield et al., 2012), values (Paloş & Drobot, 2010), interests (Ferry, 2006), and talents (Olszewski-Kubilius, 2010), and these factors affect the career development of children (Caspi & Roberts, 2001; Isaacson & Brown, 2000). In addition to the broad consensus on the significant role of parents, post-modern theories and new career development models, such as life design counselling (Savickas et al., 2009), relational theory of working (Blustein, 2011), and happenstance learning theory (Krumboltz, 2009) also emphasise the influence of families on the career construction of their children (Ginevra et al., 2015; Korkut-Owen & Niles, 2016).

This research highlights that parents can have both positive and negative effects on their children's career development, depending on their own attitudes and behaviours (Bacanli et al., 2018; Gati & Saka, 2001; Noack et al., 2010). For instance, Lent et al. (2000) suggested that parents who share their own knowledge and experiences with their children, give advice regarding their future career, and support and encourage them verbally play a significant role in the development of their career-related self-efficacy beliefs. Keller and Whiston (2008) also emphasise that adolescent trust in their parents' decision-making skills has a strong, positive effect on their own decision-making processes regarding their future careers. Similarly, it has been reported that when adolescents perceive that their autonomy is supported by their parents, they experience less indecisiveness in their career development process (Guay et al., 2003).

However, the influence of parents might not always be in the child's best interest. Some parents demand careers for their children based on their own expectations and give little regard to the children making their own autonomous decisions (Nota & Ginevra, 2014; Usinger, 2005). Lindstrom et al. (2007) found that parents who were less hopeful about the future unwittingly limited their children's career options and interests due to their own life experiences. On the other hand, parents with high achievement expectations for their children tried to motivate them to obtain occupations that were beyond the ability or outside of their area; potentially leading to them feeling strained and stressed (Kulaksızoğlu, 1999).

A limited number of studies has examined the role of parents' perceptions of their support in the children and adolescents' career development (e.g. Ginevra et al., 2015; Nota et al., 2012; Porfeli et al., 2013; Restubog et al., 2010). Restubog et al. (2010) reported that both the adolescents' and parents' perceptions of parental support affected the adolescents' career choice via career self-efficacy. Similarly, Ginevra

et al. (2015) found that parents' perceptions of support predicted their adolescents' career choice through the mediating effect of the adolescents' perceptions of parental support and career self-efficacy.

Some studies have also indicated that mothers perceive that they are more supportive of their children's career development than fathers (Ginevra et al., 2015; Nota et al., 2012). Likewise, Porfeli et al. (2013) indicated that mothers identified themselves as the primary source of support in offering information about career opportunities and guiding children about their academic choices. These findings are consistent with the study findings of McCabe and Barnett (2000), who declared that mothers play a greater role in terms of children's career development compared to fathers. A further study showed that although girls have more interaction with their parents about career issues than boys, both genders assess their mothers as the most aware of their potential careers and career interests (Otto, 2000).

Although the influence of parents operates cross-culturally, parental support is more influential on adolescents' construction of their career aspirations, interests, and values in collectivist cultures (Agbenyo & Collett, 2014; Garcia et al., 2012; Sawitri et al., 2014). The children and adolescents in collectivist cultures are generally encouraged to follow parental norms rather than to build their own competencies and interests in career construction (Oettingen & Zosuls, 2006). In such cultures, parents have a high tendency to impose their own views and values (Agbenyo & Collett, 2014). Although this support from parents can create a favourable effect only if their children perceive it supportive (Garcia et al., 2012). On the other hand, in individualistic cultures, children and adolescents are both supported and willing to decide for themselves (Hegna, 2014), with being autonomous, self-reliant, and competitive standing out among the values underlined by parents (Easton & Van Laar, 2014; Howard et al., 2009).

It is believed that young people currently are experiencing more challenges during their career development due to the rapid changes in social and work life in the 21st century (Herr et al., 2004). These changes inevitably affect students as well as young people in the labour market (Eryılmaz & Mutlu, 2017). In today's world, it is now quite optimistic to talk about a clearly defined or one-dimensional linear career process evolving from academic life to working life (Peavy, 2001). Savickas and Porfeli (2012) emphasised that adolescents preparing for their future career (i.e. assuming adult responsibilities, engaging in decision-making processes, and readying themselves for work) is directly related to being flexible and adaptable in continuously changing conditions. The uncertainties due to such rapid and continuous changes place a heavy burden on young individuals (Yeşilyaprak, 2012).

Table 1. Original English and back-translated English versions of the My Children's Future Scale.

	Original items	Back translation
1	When my daughter/son and I talk about her/his future, I try to understand her/his point of view without communicating my ideas.	When I talk to my daughter/son about her/his future, I try to understand her/his perspective without reflecting my own ideas. (.52)
2	When my daughter/son and I talk about her/his future, I stimulate her/him to consider more aspects and possibilities.	When I talk to my daughter/son about her/his future, I encourage her/him to think about more options and possibilities. (.73)
3	My daughter/son and I talk about her/his future serenely, considering several aspects and possibilities.	We speak calmly with my daughter/son about her future, considering the various options and possibilities. (.75)
4	I encourage my daughter/son to consider her/his abilities and her/his strengths when she/he thinks about what to do in the future.	I encourage my daughter/son to consider her/his abilities and strengths when she/he thinks about what to do in the future. (.70)
5	There is a certain harmony between my daughter/son and me regarding what she/he will do in the future.	I agree with my daughter/son about what she/he is going to do in the future. (.57)
6	I talked with my daughter/son about the concept of work and the occupations so that she/he can think better about her/his future.	I talked with my daughter/son about the work concept and the occupations so that she/he could think better about her/his future. (.75)
7	I talked with my daughter/son about her/his career interests, about what she/he would like for her/his future, in order to help her/him to focus her/his career ideas.	I talked with my daughter/son about her/his career interests and what she/he wants to do in the future in order to focus her/his career options. (.76)
8	I try to stimulate my daughter/son to talk about her/his wishes and hopes regarding her/his career future.	I encourage my daughter/son to talk about her/his wishes and hopes for her/his career future. (.82)
9	When we talk about his future, I encourage my daughter/son to do what he/she likes best.	When I talk with my daughter/son about her/his future, I encourage her/him to do what she/he likes the most. (.83)

Note: Standardised factor loadings reported in brackets after each item.

Parental support plays an important role in coping with these uncertainties and career challenges (Calvete & Ve Connor-Smith, 2006). It has been reported that adolescents who perceive support from their parents feel more competent about fulfilling their career development tasks, such as goal setting, accessing accurate information, and making choices (Ginevra et al., 2015). In other words, parental support improves individuals' career-related self-efficacy perceptions, and higher levels of self-efficacy facilitate decision-making processes. As a result, individuals are more likely to be aware of existing obstacles, and they able to cope with them more effectively (Lapan et al., 2000; Nota et al., 2007).

Several studies have highlighted the importance of examining parent and adolescents' perceptions simultaneously (Ginevra et al., 2015; Rogers et al., 2018), although researchers in Turkey have mostly examined adolescent perceptions of their parents' support (Hamamcı et al., 2013; Karacan-Özdemir & Yerin Güneri, 2017; Öztemel, 2012). No studies have been conducted examining parental support and approaches towards their children' career development. Similarly, no research in Turkey has focused on data collection instruments used to obtain data about these issues. Although some instruments assessing parental support have either been developed (Şeker & Kaya, 2018) or adapted (Bacanli et al., 2018; Güneş, 2015; Özünlü & Bacanlı, 2015), there

are no measures for collecting data about parents' perception of their support for their children's career development.

In the career development literature, two different approaches, namely self-report measures and objective procedures (e.g. parent observation; Diemer, 2007), are used to evaluate parental support for their children's career development, with self-report scales being used in the majority of studies (Gottlieb & Bergen, 2010). The *My Children's Future Scale* (MCFS), developed by Nota et al. (2012), is one of the more widely used measurement tools to assess parents' perception of their support (Ginevra et al., 2015). The MCFS consists of nine items, making it easy to administer and cost-effective. As the MCFS is not available to researchers and practitioners in Turkey, the current study aimed to adapt it for use in this country and examine its psychometric characteristics. As career influence can vary across parental gender (Santrock, 2015), measurement invariance of the structure of the scale was also tested.

Method

Participants

A convenience sampling method was used to select the 280 parents (190 mothers and 90 fathers) for the study. These were parents of students attending one

public middle school and one public high school in Izmir, which is a western city in Turkey. Only one of the parents of each child was included in the study to ensure independence of the parent groups. Of these parents, 29 (10.4%) were single and 251 (89.6%) were married. Their ages ranged from 29 to 65 ($M = 43.62$ years, $SD = 6.36$). Fifty-two (18.6%) were primary school graduates, 28 (10%) were middle school graduates, 73 (26.1%) were high school graduates, 28 (10%) had an associate degree, 81 (28.9%) were undergraduates, and 18 (4%) held a graduate degree. Sixty-six (23.6%) participants had one child, 163 (58.2%) had two, and 51 (18.2%) had three or more. The average age of the children was 14.96 years ($SD = 5.37$).

The parents' occupations were categorised according to the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-08; International Labour Office, 2012): 2.1% were classified as managers ($n = 6$), 32.1% as professionals ($n = 90$), 5.8% as technicians and associate professionals ($n = 16$), 7.5% as clerical support workers ($n = 21$), 14.6% as service and sales workers ($n = 41$), 1.1% as skilled agricultural, forestry, and fishery workers ($n = 3$), 3.2% as craft and related trades workers ($n = 9$), 5.7% as plant and machine operators, and assemblers ($n = 16$), and 27.9% as elementary occupations (e.g. cleaners, helpers, labourers in mining, construction, manufacturing and transport) ($n = 78$). Elementary occupations include the performance of basic and routine tasks which may require the use of hand-held tools and notable physical effort (International Labour Office, 2012).

Measures

MCFS. The MCFS measures perceptions of parents regarding their support for their children's career choices. It has a unidimensional structure and focuses on parents' propensity to provide support and assistance to their children for the future and for career exploration. Parents respond to the nine items on a Likert-type scale (1 = *It does not describe me at all* to 5 = *It describes me perfectly*); see Table 1 for items. Scores potentially range from 9 to 45; higher scores indicate more support by parents. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of the original version of the scale was .76 (Nota et al., 2012).

Demographics. Information about participants, including gender, age, occupation, number of children, and age of children were collected.

Translation of the MCFS

After receiving necessary permissions to translate MCFS into Turkish, the researchers followed recommendations by Beaton et al. (2000) to adapt the items. First, the original version of the scale was translated into Turkish by two academics in the field of career

counselling and English language teaching, since the guidelines recommended having independent translators from different academic backgrounds. Later, two translators and the author synthesised the translations, and one common translation was produced at a meeting in which translators and author discussed and resolved the issues related to inadequate wording and uncertainties. Next, the items were back-translated into the original language by another English literature academic, who was blind to the original scale. Last, two experts in career counselling confirmed that all items were clear and comprehensible. The back-translated version was sent to the authors of the original scale, who indicated that the back-translated version was acceptable. Original and back-translated items of the scale are shown in Table 1.

Data collection

After obtaining necessary ethic permissions, the final Turkish version of the MCFS and demographic variables were administered to 280 parents after they were informed about the aim of the study and given verbal informed consent. The scale was administered to 90 parents four weeks later to obtain test-retest reliability. According to Streiner and Kottner (2014), there should be enough time between the two administrations so that the participants do not recall their initial responses, but not so long time that the trait being assessed changes. The four weeks interval was considered appropriate (cf. Büyüköztürk, 2004).

Data analysis

The scale was developed in two phases. In the first phase, the factor structure of the scale was examined through exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). In the second phase, discriminant validity and measurement invariance between mothers and fathers were tested.

Prior to any analyses, missing and extreme values were checked and no problems identified. Univariate normality assumptions were checked, revealing that kurtosis values ranged between -0.21 and 1.48 , skewness ranged between -1.51 and -0.69 , and critical ratio values were < 5 (Bentler, 2005), indicating all values were within the threshold guidelines (Kline, 2011; West et al., 1995). For multivariate normality, the critical ratio value was 36.61 , indicating non-normality (Bentler, 2005; Byrne, 2010). Thus, an asymptotically distribution-free (ADF) estimation method was used for the CFA as ADF is robust against violation of multivariate normality (Jomeen & Martin, 2007).

Although many researchers approve that a larger sample size is better for CFA, there is no common agreement on the exact sample size required (Harrington, 2009). Muthén and Muthén (2002)

suggested that it is necessary to have at least 150 participants if data are normally distributed and 265 with non-normal distributions. The critical N (CN) value was examined to determine if the number of participants was sufficient (Hoelter, 1983). Since critical N value for the data was 150, the number of the participants met both criteria, and the sample size was considered sufficient for CFA (Marsh et al., 1988).

The fit indices used were based on Brown's (2006) three-category classification: (a) absolute fit indices that evaluate the overall discrepancy between the implied and observed covariance matrices (i.e., χ^2/df , goodness of fit index, GFI, and standardized root mean square residual, SRMR); (b) the parsimony indices that take into account the model's complexity (root mean square error of approximation, RMSEA, and adjusted goodness of fit, AGFI); and (c) the incremental fit indices that show how well a specified model fits relative to an alternative baseline model (i.e., comparative fit index, CFI, and Tucker-Lewis Index, TLI). Accordingly, the following indices were used: χ^2/df (<5 desired), SRMR (<.06), RMSEA (<.08), and CFI (>.90; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003).

We also examined convergent validity as part of construct validity. Convergent validity evaluates how a structure is measured by its constructs. In convergent validity calculations, the level of variance among latent structures was examined by using the composite reliability (CR) criterion (>.70; Hair et al., 2014).

Measurement invariance assesses whether the measure performs equivalently across groups (i.e. that the construct measured has the same meaning for both groups, Putnick & Bornstein, 2016, and individuals from different groups ascribe the same meanings to its items, Milfont & Fischer, 2010). Four steps are suggested to test measurement invariance: (a) configural invariance, (b) metric invariance, (c) scalar invariance, and (d) strict invariance (Putnick & Bornstein, 2016; Widaman & Reise, 1997). Configural invariance refers to whether the factor structure fits each group (i.e. that individuals from the different groups conceptualise the construct in the same manner; Milfont & Fischer, 2010). The metric invariance model examines whether different groups respond to the items in the same way (Steenkamp & Baumgartner, 1998). Scalar invariance determines if the observed item scores are related to the latent variable scores in the same manner; Vandenberg & Lance, 2000). Last, strict invariance assesses if measurement error is similar for each item across groups (Milfont & Fischer, 2010).

In line with Byrne and Stewart's (2006) recommendations, χ^2 , CFI, and RMSEA fit indices were used for comparing models during measurement invariance testing, and $\Delta\chi^2$ and ΔCFI values were obtained for both models. Non-significant $\Delta\chi^2$ values indicate that measurement invariance is supported, and the model fit is not significantly poorer compared to

the previous model. There is no statistical significance test for ΔCFI . A ΔCFI value $\leq -.01$ suggests that the invariance hypothesis should not be rejected (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002).

Finally, Cronbach's alpha, McDonald's omega coefficients, and test-retest reliability coefficient were calculated. SPSS 23.0 was used to conduct the descriptive and reliability analyses; CFA and measurement invariance tests were performed by AMOS.

Results

Construct validity

The CFA fit indices for the unidimensional model were good, $\chi^2 = 45.18$, $df = 26$, $\chi^2/df = 1.74$, RMSEA = .06, CFI = .94. Item factor loadings are reported in Table 1. For convergent validity, the CR value was .87 in the analysis. As this value was >.60, convergent validity was supported (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988).

Measurement invariance

CFAs were conducted separately for mothers and fathers, with the fit indices for both showing good fit (see Table 2). The results of the tests for multi-group invariance between mothers and fathers are reported in Table 3. From Table 3, the configural model displayed good fits to the data, supporting that the factor structure was equal across mothers and fathers. When the factor loadings were constrained, $\Delta\chi^2(8) = 9.91$, $p > .05$, and $\Delta CFI < .001$, supporting metric invariance, suggesting there is agreement between mothers and fathers regarding how the MFCS construct was perceived. For scalar invariance, the item intercepts were constrained to be equal, giving a $\Delta\chi^2(9) = 6.63$, $p > .05$, and an $\Delta CFI < .001$, supporting invariance and suggesting that the vectors of item intercepts were equal between mothers and fathers. Last, strict invariance was tested by constraining the item residuals to be equal, producing a $\Delta\chi^2(9) = 14.31$, $p > .05$, and $\Delta CFI = .01$, indicating strict invariance was supported.

Reliability

The reliability of the scale was examined by using Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega coefficients, which both were calculated as .87. Mean and standard deviation values for each item and item-total

Table 2. Fit indices for mother and father groups.

	χ^2	df	p	χ^2/df	RMSEA	CFI	SRMR
Mother	31.07	26	.23	1.19	.032	.95	.07
Father	30.37	26	.25	1.16	.043	.94	.08

RMSEA: root mean square error of approximation; CFI: comparative fit index.

Table 3. Fit indices for invariance tests.

	χ^2	df	RMSEA	CFI	$\Delta\chi^2$	Δdf^a	ΔCFI
Configural invariance	125.94	54	0.07	.92	–	–	–
Metric invariance	135.85	62	0.07	.92	9.91	8 (20.09)	.001
Scalar invariance	142.48	71	0.07	.92	6.63	9 (21.67)	.001
Strict invariance	156.79	81	0.07	.91	14.31	9 (21.67)	.01

RMSEA: root mean square error of approximation; CFI: comparative fit index.

^aCritical χ^2 value for Δdf values given in parentheses.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics, internal consistency, and item total correlations.

Item	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	4.09	.97									
2	4.31	1.02	.44								
3	4.22	1.02	.41	.56							
4	4.30	1.04	.31	.51	.52						
5	3.76	1.12	.22	.24	.30	.31					
6	4.23	1.05	.39	.52	.44	.46	.28				
7	4.32	.94	.31	.46	.47	.44	.31	.53			
8	4.34	1.02	.44	.46	.41	.42	.41	.47	.58		
9	4.33	1.01	.47	.41	.48	.45	.45	.45	.41	.43	–
Corrected item total correlation			.53	.64	.64	.61	.44	.63	.63	.65	.64

score correlations are shown in Table 4. A test-retest reliability coefficient was also calculated based on 90 participants (58 mothers and 32 fathers) four weeks apart; this was found as .83.

Discussion

The aim of this study was to examine the psychometric characteristics of a Turkish version of the MCFS, which measures parents' perceptions of their support for their children's career development and other career-related issues. For the purposes of the study, cultural validity was obtained by using the back-translation guideline suggested by Beaton et al. (2000). Further validity and reliability studies were conducted by administering the scale to a group of mothers and fathers. Construct validity for a unidimensional model was supported using CFA, and convergent validity by assessing a critical value (.70; Grewal et al., 2004; Hair et al., 2014). These results supported that the Turkish form of the MCFS measured the construct it was supposed to measure. In addition, the factor loadings ranged between .52 and .83, which demonstrated that Turkish form was congruent with the original scale. As the CFA produced good fit indices, construct validity of the Turkish version of the MSFS can be considered to be supported.

Supporting a child's career development is one of the most important parental tasks. Parents provide career-related information, teach values, offer support, and provide resources (Bardick et al., 2005). However, mothers and fathers can have different

expectations regarding their children's career development (Clutter, 2010; Simpson, 2003). Although both parents influence their children's career aspirations, fathers and mothers do play different roles (Li & Kerpelman, 2007; Otto, 2000), as the quality of communication and relationship between children and parents is highly affected by the gender of the parent; especially for adolescents. Studies focusing on this dimension have shown that adolescents receive more support from their mothers than their fathers on career-related issues, mothers are more willing to communicate with their children about career development, mothers tend to use more supportive language (Leaper et al., 1998; McCabe & Barnett, 2000). Consequently, measurement invariance was one of the psychometric properties examined. Establishing measurement invariance gives confidence that the scale is measuring the same construct across groups or across time. Scores from the Turkish form of the MCFS were measurement invariant across mothers and fathers, as was the original form, suggesting that the items were interpreted similarly by mothers and fathers.

The reliability of the scale was examined by calculating test-retest reliability, Cronbach's alpha, and McDonald's omega. The Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega were both high (.87), compared to an alpha of .76 for the original version (Nota et al., 2012) and .85 (mothers) and .81 (fathers) reported by Ginevra et al. (2015). Alphas $>.70$ are considered acceptable (DeVellis, 1991; Hair et al., 2010). In addition, test-retest reliability was calculated as .83. These are expected to be $>.80$ for retest intervals of 2 to

4 weeks (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2002). Accordingly, it can be concluded that the Turkish form of MCFS is a reliable measurement tool.

One of the most important factors affecting individuals' career development is the presence or lack of support from their families (Blustein, 2011; Shumba & Naong, 2012). The extant literature shows that well-supported children and adolescents cope more effectively with challenges during their career development (Klink et al., 2008), set more realistic goals (Ginevra et al., 2015), and are able to make decisions that are more suitable for their personalities (Nota et al., 2007). On the other hand, when they feel that they are not supported, they experience greater stress (Calvete & Ve Connor-Smith, 2006), are less aware of their career development responsibilities (Lapan et al., 2000), and have more problems making decisions (Keller & Whiston, 2008). Referencing these findings, the MCFS can be used to evaluate parental support and inform parental education programs to support career development. In addition, other scales measuring other career-related variables can be administered along with the MCFS, and relationships among these variables can be tested.

It is necessary to take into consideration the limitations of a study when interpreting findings. First is that we used a convenience sample, which is a threat to external validity (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2010). In order to reduce this limitation, the researchers collected socio-demographic information (e.g. about their educational background and number of children) in order to confirm that the sample was diverse and the results could be generalised. The sample also contained a relatively small sample of fathers ($n=90$) compared to mothers ($n=190$). Additionally, criterion-related validity was not examined. Discriminant validity of the original version of the scale was tested with the *Hope Scale* (Snyder et al., 1991) and the *Life Orientation Scale* (Scheier et al., 1994), and the scale was found to have good discriminant validity (Nota et al., 2012). Criterion-related validity needs to be assessed further in future studies.

In conclusion, the Turkish form of the MCFS is a valid and reliable scale that can be used for measuring parents' perceptions of their support for their children's career development. Measuring this support is essential in today's world due to increasing competition and uncertainties regarding the career development process, rapidly changing roles and responsibilities, less linear career progress, labour force competition, and increasing anxiety about the future in young people (Yeşilyaprak, 2012). As parental support is often examined in the Turkish context by focusing on children and adolescents' perceptions, this version of the MCFS will supplement these data by including parental perspectives.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Ethics approval

The Ethics Committee of Institute of Educational Sciences in Dokuz Eylül University approved the study procedure.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Informed consent

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

ORCID iD

Erol Esen  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8285-2666>

References

- Agbenyo, H., & Collett, K. (2014). Career advice and guidance in a world where vocational skills matter. In G. Arulmani, A. J. Bakshi, F. T. Leong, & A. G. Watts (Eds.), *International and cultural psychology* (pp. 255–270). Springer.
- Alliman-Brissett, A. E., Turner, S. L., & Skovholt, T. M. (2004). Parent support and African American adolescents' career self-efficacy. *Professional School Counseling, 7*(3), 124–132.
- Bacanli, F., Akyol, E. Y., Kaynak, S., & Özhan, M. B. (2018). Ergen-Ebeveyn Kariyer Uyumu Ölçeği'ni Türkçeye uyarlama çalışması [Adaptation of the adolescent-parent career congruence scale into Turkish]. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi, 19*(2), 389–407. <https://doi.org/10.12984/egged.396759>
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 16*(1), 74–94. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02723327>
- Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (2001). Self-efficacy beliefs as shapers of children's aspirations and career trajectories. *Child Development, 72*(1), 187–206. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00273>
- Bardick, A., Bernes, K., Magnusson, K., & Witko, K. (2005). Parents' perceptions of their role in children's career planning. *Guidance and Counseling, 20*(3/4), 152–157.
- Bardick, A. D., Bernes, K. B., Magnusson, K. C., & Witko, K. D. (2004). Junior high career planning: What students want. *Canadian Journal of Counselling and Psychotherapy/Revue Canadienne de Counseling et de Psychothérapie, 38*(2), 104–117.
- Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine, 25*(24), 3186–3191.
- Bentler, P. M. (2005). *EQS version 6.1 structural equations program manual*. Multivariate Software.

- Blustein, D. L. (2011). A relational theory of working. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.10.004>
- Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. Guilford Press.
- Bryant, B. K., Zvonkovic, A. M., & Reynolds, P. (2006). Parenting in relation to child and adolescent vocational development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 69*(1), 149–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2006.02.004>
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2004). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı [Data analysis manual for social sciences]*. Pegem Akademi.
- Byrne, B. M. (2010). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming* (2nd ed.). Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Byrne, B. M., & Stewart, S. M. (2006). Teacher's corner: The MACS approach to testing for multigroup invariance of a second-order structure: A walk through the process. *Structural Equation Modeling, 13*(2), 287–321. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328007sem1302_7
- Calvete, E., & Ve Connor-Smith, J. K. (2006). Perceived social support, coping, and symptoms of distress in American and Spanish students. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping, 19*(1), 47–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615800500472963>
- Caspi, A., & Roberts, B. W. (2001). Personality development across the life course: The argument for change and continuity. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*(2), 49–66. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1202_01
- Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 9*(2), 233–255. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5
- Clutter, C. (2010). *The effects of parental influences on their children's career choice* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Kansas State University, Manhattan.
- Cohen, R. J., & Swerdlik, M. E. (2002). *Psychological testing and assessment*. McGraw-Hill.
- DeVellis, R. F. (1991). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Sage.
- Drost, E. A. (2011). Validity and reliability in social science research. *Education Research and Perspectives, 38*(1), 105–123.
- Diemer, M. A. (2007). Parental and school influences upon the career development of poor youth of color. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 70*(3), 502–524. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.02.003>
- Easton, S., & Van Laar, D. (2014). The assessment of quality of working life in career guidance and counseling. In G. Arulmani, A. J. Bakshi, F. T. L. Leong, & A. G. Watts (Eds.), *Handbook of career development international perspectives* (pp. 645–657). Springer.
- Eryılmaz, A., & Mutlu, T. (2017). Yaşam boyu gelişim yaklaşımı perspektifinden kariyer gelişimi ve ruh sağlığı [Career development and mental health from the perspective of life-span development approach]. *Psikiyatride Güncel Yaklaşımlar, 9*(2), 227–249. <https://doi.org/10.18863/pgy.281802>
- Ferry, N. M. (2006). Factors influencing career choices of adolescents and young adults in rural Pennsylvania. *Journal of Extension, 44*(3), 1–6.
- Galambos, N. L., & Sears, H. A. (1998). Adolescents' perceptions of parents' work and adolescents' work values in two-earner families. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 18*(4), 397–420. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431698018004004>
- Garcia, P. R. J. M., Restubog, S. L. D., Toledano, L. S., Tolentino, L. R., & Rafferty, A. E. (2012). Differential moderating effects of student-and parent-rated support in the relationship between learning goal orientation and career decision-making self-efficacy. *Journal of Career Assessment, 20*(1), 22–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072711417162>
- Gati, I., & Saka, N. (2001). High school students' career-related decision-making difficulties. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 79*(3), 331–340. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2001.tb01978.x>
- Ginevra, M. C., Nota, L., & Ferrari, L. (2015). Parental support in adolescents' career development: Parents' and children's perceptions. *The Career Development Quarterly, 63*(1), 2–15. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2015.00091.x>
- Grewal, R., Cote, J. A., & Baumgartner, H. (2004). Multicollinearity and measurement error in structural equation models: Implications for theory testing. *Marketing Science, 23*(4), 519–529. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.1040.0070>
- Gonzalez, A., Greenwood, J., & Wen-Hsu, J. (2001). Undergraduate students' goal orientations and their relationship to perceived parenting styles. *College Student Journal, 35*(2), 182–192.
- Gottlieb, B. H., & Bergen, A. E. (2010). Social support concepts and measures. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 69*(5), 511–520. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2009.10.001>
- Guan, P., Capezio, A., Restubog, S. L. D., Read, S., Lajom, J. A. L., & Li, M. (2016). The role of traditionality in the relationships among parental support, career decision-making self-efficacy and career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 94*, 114–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2016.02.018>
- Guay, F., Senécal, C., Gauthier, L., & Fernet, C. (2003). Predicting career indecision: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*(2), 165–177. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.50.2.165>
- Güneş, A. (2015). *Kariyere ilişkin ebeveyn desteği ölçeği'nin Türkçe'ye uyarlama çalışması [The adaptation study of the career-related parent support scale]* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara, Turkey.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2014). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*. Sage.
- Hamamcı, Z., Bacanlı, F., & Dogan, H. (2013). The investigation of factors influencing on students' career and educational decisions of students. *Electronic Journal of Social Studies, 12*(44), 284–299.
- Hamamcı, Z., & Hamurlu, M. K. (2005). Anne babaların meslek gelişimine yardımcı olmaya yönelik tutumları ve bilgi düzeylerinin çocuklarının mesleki kararsızlıkları ile ilişkisi [Relationship between level of knowledge and attitudes of parents about helping their children for career development and career indecision of their children]. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 6*(10), 55–69.

- Hargrove, B. K., Creagh, M. G., & Burgess, B. L. (2002). Family interaction patterns as predictors of vocational identity and career decision-making self-efficacy. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *61*(2), 185–201. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.2001.1848>
- Harrington, D. (2009). *Confirmatory factor analysis*. Oxford University Press.
- Hegna, K. (2014). Changing educational aspirations in the choice of and transition to post-compulsory schooling—a three-wave longitudinal study of Oslo youth. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *17*(5), 592–613. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2013.853870>
- Herr, E. L., Cramer, S. H., & Niles, S. G. (2004). *Career guidance and counseling: Through the lifespan* (6th ed.). Pearson Education Inc.
- Hoelter, J. W. (1983). The analysis of covariance structures: Goodness-of-fit indices. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *11*(3), 325–344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124183011003003>
- Howard, K. A., Ferrari, L., Nota, L., Solberg, V. S. H., & Soresi, S. (2009). The relation of cultural context and social relationships to career development in middle school. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *75*(2), 100–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.06.013>
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6*(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- International Labour Office. (2012). *International standard classification of occupations: Structure, group definitions and correspondence tables*.
- Isaacson, L. E., & Brown, D. (2000). *Career information, career counseling, and career development*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Isik, E. (2013). Perceived social support and locus of control as the predictors of vocational outcome expectations. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *13*(3), 1426–1430.
- Jomeen, J., & Martin, C. R. (2007). Assessment and relationship of sleep quality to depression in early pregnancy. *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology*, *25*(1), 87–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02646830601117308>
- Karacan-Özdemir, N., & Yerin Güneri, O. (2017). The factors contribute to career adaptability of high-school students. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *67*, 183–198. <https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2017.67.11>
- Keller, B. K., & Whiston, S. C. (2008). The role of parental influences on young adolescents' career development. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *16*(2), 198–217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072707313206>
- Kenny, M. E., & Medvide, M. B. (2013). Relational influences. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Career development and counseling: Putting theory and research to work* (2nd ed., pp. 329–356). Wiley.
- Korkut-Owen, F., & Niles, S. G. (2016). Yeni yaklaşım ve modeller [New approaches and models]. In B. Yeşilyaprak (Eds.), *Mesleki rehberlik ve kariyer danışmanlığı: Kuramdan uygulamaya [Career guidance and career counseling: From theory to practice]* (8th ed., pp. 274–305). Pegem Akademi.
- Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Klink, J. L., Byars-Winston, A., & Bakken, L. L. (2008). Coping efficacy and perceived family support: Potential factors for reducing stress in premedical students. *Medical Education*, *42*(6), 572–579. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2008.03091.x>
- Krumboltz, J. D. (2009). The happenstance learning theory. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *17*(2), 135–154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072708328861>
- Kulaksızoğlu, A. (1999). *Ergenlik psikolojisi [Psychology of adolescence]* (2nd ed.). Remzi Kitabevi.
- Lapan, R. T., Adams, A., Turner, S., & Hinkelman, J. M. (2000). Seventh graders' vocational interest and efficacy expectation patterns. *Journal of Career Development*, *26*(3), 215–229. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089484530002600305>
- Leaper, C., Anderson, K. J., & Sanders, P. (1998). Moderators of gender effects on parents' talk to their children: A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, *34*(1), 3–27. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.34.1.3>
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (2000). Contextual supports and barriers to career choice: A social cognitive analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *47*(1), 36–49. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.47.1.36>
- Li, C., & Kerpelman, J. (2007). Parental influences on young women's certainty about their career aspirations. *Sex Roles*, *56*(1–2), 105–115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9151-7>
- Lindstrom, L., Doren, B., Metheny, J., Johnson, P., & Zane, C. (2007). Transition to employment: Role of the family in career development. *Exceptional Children*, *73*(3), 348–366. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440290707300305>
- Lustig, D. C., Xu, Y. J., & Strauser, D. R. (2017). The influence of family of origin relationships on career thoughts. *Journal of Career Development*, *44*(1), 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845316633791>
- 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), 391–410.
- McCabe, K. M., & Barnett, D. (2000). The relation between familial factors and the future orientation of urban, African American sixth graders. *Journal of Child & Family Studies*, *9*(4), 491–508. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009474926880>
- Metheny, J., & Mcwhirter, E. H. (2013). Contributions of social status and family support to college students' career decision self-efficacy and outcome expectations. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *21*(3), 378–394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072712475164>
- Milfont, T. L., & Fischer, R. (2010). Testing measurement invariance across groups: Applications in cross-cultural research. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, *3*(1), 111–130. <https://doi.org/10.21500/20112084.857>
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (2002). How to use a Monte Carlo study to decide on sample size and determine power. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *9*(4), 599–620. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0904_8
- Noack, P., Kracke, B., Gniewosz, B., & Dietrich, J. (2010). Parental and school effects on students' occupational exploration: A longitudinal and multilevel analysis.

- Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(1), 50–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.02.006>
- Nota, L., Ferrari, L., Solberg, V. S. H., & Soresi, S. (2007). Career search self-efficacy, family support, and career indecision with Italian youth. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 15(2), 181–193. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072706298019>
- Nota, L., & Ginevra, M. C. (2014). The concepts of work, study, and leisure of parents and children. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*, 26(1), 107–122. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijamh-2013-0503>
- Nota, L., Ginevra, M. C., Ferrari, L., & Soresi, S. (2012). “Il futuro dei figli”: Uno strumento per misurare Il supporto fornito dai genitori ai processi di scelta e Progettazione del futuro scolastico-professionale dei figli [“The children’s future”: A questionnaire to evaluate parents’ support to their children’s school-career choices and future planning]. *Giornale Italiano Di Psicologia Dell’Orientamento*, 13(1), 3–17.
- Oettingen, G., & Zosuls, K. M. (2006). Culture and self-efficacy in adolescents. In F. Pajares & T. Urda (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 245–265). Information Age.
- Olszewski-Kubilius, P. (2010). The role of family in talent development. In S. I. Pfeiffer (Ed.), *Handbook of giftedness in children: Psycho-educational theory, research and best practices* (pp. 53–70). Springer.
- Otto, L. B. (2000). Youth perspectives on parental career influence. *Journal of Career Development*, 27(2), 111–118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089484530002700205>
- Öztemel, K. (2012). Kariyer kararsızlığı ile mesleki karar verme öz yetkinlik ve kontrol odağı arasındaki ilişkiler [Relationships between career indecision career decision making self efficacy and locus of control]. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 32(2), 459–477.
- Özünlü, M. B., & Bacanlı, F. (2015). Kariyer seçiminde aile etkisi ölçeği’nin lise öğrencileri için Türkiye’ye uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışmaları [The adaptation of the family influence scale for high school students: Validity and reliability studies]. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 13(1), 13–32.
- Paloş, R., & Drobot, L. (2010). The impact of family influence on the career choice of adolescents. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 3407–3411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.524>
- Peavy, R. V. (2001). New visions for counselling in the 21st century: Sociodynamic counselling. *Australian Journal of Career Development*, 10(2), 15–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/103841620101000205>
- Pişkin, M. (2016). Kariyer gelişim sürecini etkileyen faktörler [Factors affecting career development process]. In B. Yeşilyaprak (Ed.), *Mesleki rehberlik ve kariyer danışmanlığı: Kuramdan uygulamaya [Career guidance and career counseling: From theory to practice]* (8th ed., pp. 44–89). Pegem Akademi.
- Porfeli, E., Ferrari, L., & Nota, L. (2013). Work valence as a predictor of academic achievement in the family context. *Journal of Career Development*, 40(5), 371–389. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845312460579>
- Putnick, D. L., & Bornstein, M. H. (2016). Measurement invariance conventions and reporting: The state of the art and future directions for psychological research. *Developmental Review*, 41, 71–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2016.06.004>
- Raque-Bogdan, T. L., Klingaman, E. A., Martin, H. M., & Lucas, M. S. (2013). Career-related parent support and career barriers: An investigation of contextual variables. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 61(4), 339–353. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2013.00060.x>
- Restubog, S. L. D., Florentino, A. R., & Garcia, P. R. J. M. (2010). The mediating roles of career self-efficacy and career decidedness in the relationship between contextual support and persistence. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 77(2), 186–195. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.06.005>
- 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(1), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845316667483>
- Santrock, J. W. (2015). *Adolescence* (16th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Savickas, M. L., Nota, L., Rossier, J., Dauwalder, J. P., Duarte, M. E., Guichard, J., Soresi, S., Van Esbroeck, R., & Van Vianen, A. E. (2009). Life designing: A paradigm for career construction in the 21st century. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 75(3), 239–250. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.04.004>
- Savickas, M. L., & Porfeli, E. J. (2012). Career Adapt-Abilities Scale: Construction, reliability, and measurement equivalence across 13 countries. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 80(3), 661–673. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2012.01.011>
- Sawitri, D. R., Creed, P. A., & Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J. (2014). Parental influences and adolescent career behaviours in a collectivist cultural setting. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance*, 14(2), 161–180. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10775-013-9247-x>
- Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (1994). Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the Life Orientation Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(6), 1063–1078. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.6.1063>
- Schofield, T. J., Conger, R. D., Donnellan, M. B., Jochem, R., Widaman, K. F., & Conger, K. J. (2012). Parent personality and positive parenting as predictors of positive adolescent personality development over time. *Merrill Palmer Quarterly*, 58, 255–283. <https://doi.org/10.1353/mpq.2012.0008>
- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8(2), 23–74.
- Schultheiss, D. E. P. (2003). A relational approach to career counseling: Theoretical integration and practical application. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 81(3), 301–310. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2003.tb00257.x>
- Şeker, G., & Kaya, A. (2018). Lise öğrencilerinin meslek seçiminde aile desteği: Bir ölçek geliştirme çalışması [Family support in high school students’ choice of vocation: A scale development study]. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 8(49), 157–171.

- Shumba, A., & Naong, M. (2012). Factors influencing students' career choice and aspirations in South Africa. *Journal of Social Sciences, 33*(2), 169–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2012.11893096>
- Simpson, J. C. (2003). Mom matters: Maternal influence on the choice of academic major. *Sex Roles, 48*(9–10), 447–460. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023530612699>
- Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., Yoshinobu, L., Gibb, J., Langelle, C., & Harney, P. (1991). The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual-differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*(4), 570–585. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.4.570>
- Steenkamp, J. E. M., & Baumgartner, H. (1998). Assessing measurement invariance in cross-national consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research, 25*, 78–90. <https://doi.org/10.1086/209528>
- Streiner, D. L., & Kottner, J. (2014). Recommendations for reporting the results of studies of instrument and scale development and testing. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 70*(9), 1970–1979. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12402>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2010). *Using multivariate statistics*. Allyn and Bacon.
- Turner, S., & Lapan, R. T. (2002). Career self-efficacy and perceptions of parent support in adolescent career development. *The Career Development Quarterly, 51*(1), 44–55. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2002.tb00591.x>
- Usinger, J. (2005). Parent/guardian visualization of career and academic future of seventh graders enrolled in low-achieving schools. *The Career Development Quarterly, 53*(3), 234–245. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2005.tb00993.x>
- Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods, 3*(1), 4–70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109442810031002>
- West, S. G., Finch, J. F., & Curran, P. J. (1995). Structural equation models with nonnormal variables: Problems and remedies. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Structural equation modeling: Issues, concepts, and applications* (pp. 56–75). Sage.
- Whiston, S. C., & Keller, B. K. (2004). The influences of the family of origin on career development: A review and analysis. *The Counseling Psychologist, 32*(4), 493–568. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000004265660>
- Widaman, K. F., & Reise, S. P. (1997). Exploring the measurement invariance of psychological instruments: Applications in the substance use domain. In K. J. Bryant, M. Windle, & S. G. West (Eds.), *The science of prevention: Methodological advances from alcohol and substance abuse research* (pp. 281–324). American Psychological Association.
- Yeşilyaprak, B. (2012). Mesleki rehberlik ve kariyer danışmanlığında paradigma değişimi ve Türkiye açısından sonuçlar: Geçmişten geleceğe yönelik bir değerlendirme [The paradigm shift of vocational guidance and career counseling and its implications for Turkey: An evaluation from past to future]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri, 12*(1), 97–118.