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ABSTRACT

This current research studied the career development process of African American women utilizing Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory (1977). The sample included 108 African American women who ranged in age from 18 to 63 with a mean age of 25 years old. The study examined the Social Cognitive variables of learning experiences in the form of racist and sexist events (recent and lifetime) in relation to career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies and career indecision. Previous research indicated a significant inverse relationship between career decision-making self-efficacy and career indecision, but in this study found varying results depending upon whether age was not controlled or controlled. When age was not controlled, the relationship between career decision-making self-efficacy and indecision was not significant; yet when age was controlled a significant inverse relationship was found. Initially, it was hypothesized that African American women’s racist experiences (recent and lifetime) would have significant inverse relationships with career decision-making self-efficacy, yet only their lifetime racist events had a significant inverse relationship when age was not controlled; both were non-significant when age was controlled. In addition, African American women’s sexist events (recent and lifetime) were expected to have a significant inverse relationship with career decision-making self-efficacy, but this was not supported, regardless of not controlling or controlling for age. Further, this study found that if age is
not controlled, the African American women’s appraisal of their racist events as stressful
was significantly inversely related to career decision-making self-efficacy, but when age
is controlled, no relation was found. In addition, racist and sexist experiences did not
predict career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies for African
American women. Although not hypothesized, an exploratory analysis showed sexist
events (recent and lifetime) predicted career indecision. Future research on the impact of
sexism on African American women’s career development process was suggested to be
beneficial to decrease their overall career indecision.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In this chapter, first a summary of Bandura’s (1977) Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) and its primary tenets, self-efficacy and outcome expectations are presented. In addition, Bandura’s sources of self-efficacy are forwarded. Next, a synopsis of Hill’s (1997) study of the career decision-making self-efficacy and indecision of European and African American men and women that was based on SCT is overviewed. Further, the impact of sexual and racial discrimination on women’s stress levels forwarded by Landrine and Klonoff (1996) is highlighted in this section. These experiences of racism and sexism are labeled as learning experiences and related to Bandura’s sources of self-efficacy (Hackett & Byars, 1996). Finally, a figure of the relationship of the research variables is included.

African American women and girls’ career development is complex with various aspects that need to be considered. African American women are far too often the victims of double jeopardy, discrimination and prejudice which may result in them limiting or avoiding exploring all careers (Hackett & Byars, 1996). This may be due to their fears that the dominant culture will not be accepting of them or may devalue their skills (Evans & Herr, 1991). African American women’s personal qualities or attributes
along with environmental influences and familial support need to be considered to understand their vocational behavior (Pearson & Bieschke, 2001).

A theory, which may serve as a good umbrella in order to study the complex career development process of African American women and girls, is Social Cognitive Theory. Albert Bandura (1977) developed Social Cognitive Theory. Social Cognitive Theory can be viewed in terms of a model of “triadic reciprocal/causality” which suggests that there is an interacting/bi-directional relation amongst the qualities of the person and his or her environment (Bandura, 1986). That is, one must take into consideration the person’s qualities or attributes (i.e., their cognitive, emotional, and physical attributes), the environmental influences, and the person’s behavior (Bandura, 1986). Social Cognitive Theory focuses, in particular, on an individual’s personal agency to achieve a desired result in a particular situation or environment.

In Social Cognitive Theory, outcome and efficacy expectations are central constructs. Outcome expectations are an individual’s belief that certain behaviors will result in desired outcomes (Bandura, 1986). Efficacy expectations are beliefs that one can perform the behaviors required to achieve certain outcomes or results (Bandura, 1986). According to Bandura’s (1986) Social Cognitive Theory, one’s strength or level of personal efficacy expectation may determine if one continues to persevere toward an outcome within a difficult situation. Further, if an individual stops prematurely in efforts to achieve the desired outcome, the result may be a sense of failure and decreased self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977, 1986).
Bandura outlined four essential sources of self-efficacy. The four sources of efficacy information are performance accomplishments, vicarious learning/modeling, verbal persuasion, and affective states (Bandura, 1977). Performance accomplishments refer to one’s positive or negative cognitive appraisals of learning experiences. Some examples of this “mode of induction” forwarded by Bandura include participant modeling, performance desensitization and exposure, and self-instructed performance. Vicarious learning/modeling has been described as one’s observation of a valued model’s performance and the positive or negative feedback they receive (i.e., live modeling and symbolic modeling). Verbal persuasion includes messages of encouragement or discouragement. Encouragement serves to increase self-efficacy, and lack of encouragement or discouragement usually serves to weaken one's self-efficacy beliefs. The fourth source of efficacy information is affective states, also described as emotional arousal. The level of one’s anxiety or arousal may facilitate or hinder one’s performance or self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977).

Finally, one’s ability is seen as vital in the theory. Expectations alone would not suffice if one were not capable of executing the skills needed to produce the desired behavior (performance). Therefore, with the appropriate skill level and incentives in place, along with a strong sense of self-efficacy expectations, an individual has the resources needed to attain desired outcomes. Social Cognitive Theory proposes that a skill level slightly above one’s current performance level, combined with a strong sense of self-efficacy, is essential in one’s journey to attain a desired goal (Bandura, 1986).
Addressing Social Cognitive Theory with a sample that included racial/ethnic minority persons was a pivotal dissertation study conducted by Hill (1997). The two main purposes of the study were to: 1) examine the differences in the career decision-making processes between four groups which included Euro-American men and women, and African American men and women; and 2) determine the usefulness of the application of Social Cognitive Theory to understanding the career development of Euro-American men and women, and African American men and women. Hill’s (1997) examination of the relation between career decision-making self-efficacy, outcome expectations, behavioral intentions, overall career barriers and indecision revealed for African Americans that career decision-making self-efficacy had a significant positive relation with academic and career outcome expectations and behavioral intentions. Especially important to the present study, for African Americans career decision-making self-efficacy also had the expected significant negative correlation with career indecision (Hill, 1997). No relation was found, however, between overall perceptions of career barriers and any of the other social cognitive variables.

Consistent with findings from previous studies (e.g., Betz, Klein, & Taylor, 1996), there were no significant differences in the levels of career decision-making self-efficacy amongst Hill’s (1997) four groups. Yet, African American women reported significantly higher career indecision as compared to African American men and Euro-American men and women (Hill, 1997). Also, group differences in perceptions of specific career barriers were examined. African Americans perceived racial discrimination (e.g., higher levels of racial discrimination in getting a job, receiving a promotion, worries about having a
racially biased boss, and being compensated at a lower wage) as more of a career barrier and disapproval by significant others as less of a career barrier than did Euro-Americans. Further, women of both races perceived higher levels of sex discrimination and conflict between children and career demands than did men. The former barrier included being mistreated or discriminated against for having or planning to start a family, experiencing sexual harassment, and receiving an inequitable wage as compared to men (Hill, 1997).

Finally, a noteworthy finding was that in a hierarchical regression to predict career indecision, only career decision-making self-efficacy was a significant predictor; career and academic outcome expectations and overall career barriers, as measured by the total score on the Career Barriers Inventory-Revised (CBIR, Swanson, Daniels, & Tokar, 1996) did not predict or add to the prediction of indecision beyond career decision-making self-efficacy (Hill, 1997). This finding pointed to the importance of self-efficacy, but left uncertain the role of outcome expectations and specific career barriers, in the prediction of career indecision.

Overall, Hill’s (1997) work supported the utility of Social Cognitive Theory with diverse populations, but it also suggested further study is needed to examine the relations amongst its constructs for these populations. In particular, Hill’s (1997) findings underscore the need for more research to explore the career development process and the expected relations amongst the constructs in the Social Cognitive Theory with African Americans in general, and African American women in particular. Especially important, since career indecision may impede African American women’s progress toward attaining their desired outcomes, is the study of specific factors that may contribute to African
American women’s greater indecision than Euro-American women despite comparable
career decision-making self-efficacy.

Hill’s (1997) work and the writings of others (e.g., Byars & Hackett, 1998; Hackett & Byars, 1996) have begun to highlight the possible role of two specific and important barriers, sexual and racial discrimination, in African American women’s career decision-making process. Racism, for example, clearly is a major source of general stress for African American women (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). Racist encounters range from subtle, covert acts of racism to being threatened or physically assaulted. They may occur in areas of employment, as well as in the acquisition of health and social services (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). Indeed, increased psychiatric symptoms and feelings of inadequacy have been linked to a higher frequency of experienced racist events in the past year and over one’s lifetime (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). Such on-going experiences are linked for many African Americans with bouts of depression, stress, and rage (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). Indeed, much literature associates experiences of racist and sexist events to mental disorders (e.g., National Institute of Mental Health, 1983; Pearson & Bieschke, 2001).

Relevant to Social Cognitive Theory, experiences with racism and sexism may be conceptualized as important early learning experiences for African American women. For example, Holiday (1985) suggested that although socialized to be assertive in their behavior, many African American girls receive inconsistent or “differential feedback,” often in the form of sexist or racist responses to such behavior; such feedback weakens their self-esteem, as discussed by Hackett and Byars (1996). Hackett and Byars (1996)
further discussed that in classrooms African American women often receive negative, counter-productive feedback due to racism and sexism. Furthermore, researchers (e.g., Ogbu, 1991) have forwarded the hypothesis of an “attitude achievement paradox” amongst African American students. The paradox involves these students’ tendencies to have a high belief in academic success attainment that is not matched by actual success experiences.

Sexism and racism are two specific factors that may contribute to this inconsistency between beliefs and outcomes; these students’ academic efforts may not receive equal reward as compared to majority students and they may be aware that many African Americans, especially women, receive inequitable wages and tend to be at the bottom of the economic ladder (Hackett & Byars, 1996). As a result of the “attitude achievement paradox,” a low effort syndrome may occur. The syndrome is a result of African American women being discouraged and unmotivated to strive for career success (Hackett & Byars, 1996). This pattern seems consistent with the predictions of Social Cognitive Theory; that is, learning experiences generate outcome and self-efficacy expectations, which then affect subsequent behavior.

Hackett and Byars (1996) also emphasized the dual status that African American women hold. This status is termed “double jeopardy”. African American women’s “double jeopardy” (i.e., their status as women and members of a racial/ethnic minority group), as coined by Beale (1970), results in them being set apart from others and put at risk for negative learning experiences with society’s majority (Hackett & Byars, 1996). Initial work in the vocational realm (Hackett & Byars, 1996; Hill, 1997) suggested this
double risk status may be salient there as well. Consequently, it seems critical for researchers to examine the specific effects of experiences with racist and sexist events on the career choice process of African American women. Indeed, scholars in the vocational research community have urged the examination of racial/ethnic minority career development, including looking at the impact of racism and sexual discrimination on vocational behavior (Brown, 2000). The aforementioned literature (e.g., Klonoff & Landrine, 1995; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996) seems to indicate that younger ethnic minority women may be at greatest risk for racism and sexism, and thus merit specific study.

The present research, thus, focuses on the career choice processes of young African American women within the context of Social Cognitive Theory. Racist and sexist events are conceptualized in this research as learning experiences that may affect self-efficacy (Byars & Hackett, 1998; Hackett & Byars, 1996; Lent, Brown, & Hackett (1994); Luzzo, 1993). Social Cognitive Theory posits that learning experiences shape self-efficacy, outcome expectations, interests, goals, and choice actions. Thus, learning experiences in the form of racism and sexism may be related to career decision-making self-efficacy and other components of the career choice process.

The present research extends the work of Hill (1997) by exploring specifically the relation of perceived experiences racist and sexist behavioral events to career decision-making self-efficacy and career indecision of African American women. Hill (1997) explored African American students’ general perceptions of career barriers in relation to these variables, but did not do so in the context of actual experiences with specific
behavioral events. The present research also is consistent with Lent, Brown, and Hackett’s (2000) suggestion to study individuals’ learning experiences, including environmental/contextual influences, to begin to understand the beliefs learned through life experiences and the effects of barriers on career decision making self-efficacy, career decidedness, and outcome expectations for career decisions.

Thus, this study used Social Cognitive Theory to focus on young African American women to determine how their learning experiences with racism and sexism are related to their career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies (see Figure 1). Further, since past research has suggested that levels of career indecision may be related to career decision-making self-efficacy for African American women, but has produced mixed results with regard to the relation of career outcome expectancies to career indecision (Hill, 1997; Osipow & Reed, 1985; Taylor & Betz, 1983), the present study examined with special care how career decision-making outcome expectancies related to career indecision.
Figure 1. Relations of research variables.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

To explore African American women’s career decision-making self-efficacy and decidedness in relation to their learning experiences involving racism and sexism, a literature review of relevant research is presented in this chapter. First, research focused on understanding the career development of African American women is forwarded. Second, Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory and its extension to the career arena are examined, followed by a presentation of important issues that need to be considered for African American women (e.g., learning experiences in the form of racism and sexism). In addition, specific research articles that focus on career decision-making self-efficacy and indecision are forwarded. Finally, a synopsis of the research findings and the rationale and hypotheses for the current study are presented.

Career development of African American women and girls

This section includes a representative sample of the research that covers the career development of African American women and girls. These articles were chosen due to their focus on vital factors that affect African American women’s and girls’ career development. Some of these factors are the women’s tenacity in the face of on-going racism and sexism, socialization in the home to have a strong work ethic, familial
support and the value that the women place on career. One theoretical article and four qualitative articles are forwarded.

From a theoretical perspective, Evans and Herr (1991) examined the influence of racism and sexism in the career development of African American women. The authors focused on African American women’s career development and aspirations. Historically, African American women’s work history began in slavery as mostly domestic and agricultural workers. Even once the African American woman attained an education, she was still faced with impediments in career development due to her race and sex. African American college students often select careers that service other African Americans, including education, social science, medicine, and law; these are seen as safe or “protected careers”.

Even though African American women are less likely overall to experience racism than are African American men, they are still more likely to experience racism and sexism in the workplace as compared to African American men and White women. During the 60’s and the 70’s, African American women moved in the workforce from unskilled to skilled careers, yet still continued to experience discrimination in the labor force, for example being underpaid and underemployed as a group. Evans and Herr (1991) hypothesized that African American women may begin to perceive themselves as victims of double discrimination and prejudice and in turn, they may use the following techniques to avoid the probable sabotaging of their aspirations in the career arena: The women may decline to participate in a particular activity, modify life-styles, or redirect
ambitions and goals. The effects of perceived racism and sexism on career aspirations could be low aspirations that may be due to the perceptions of limited opportunities.

These authors highlighted a researcher, Slaney (1980), who viewed African Americans as not being different from other groups in terms of decision-making and career goals, but what was different was the African Americans’ view that uncontrolled, disruptive variables may impede their completion and attaining of goals. Other groups may be more concerned about entry complications, but African American women are more concerned about disruptive factors once in the job or career. For example, finances, relationship problems, and chance factors may be a problem. The authors also forwarded a hypothesis that some African American women may not view discrimination as a barrier due their perception that since they have limited their career options to safe non-biased areas, the chance of being discriminated against is small. For example, African American women seem to choose female dominated careers due to their perception that they may be exposed to less racism and sexism. Another view forwarded by the authors was African American women may be externally influenced in choosing careers. This may be due to them having a fear of success that centers on being fearful that others may perceive them in a negative manner or view them as being less feminine.

In conclusion, Evans and Herr (1991) suggested a coping system that African American women may utilize in their career development. They suggested African American women avoid careers that are perceived as having a higher probability of racial and sexual discrimination, lower or alter their career goals in order to avoid prejudice, discrimination, and disappointment, and internalize biases (i.e., racism and sexism). All
of these influences may affect African American women’s career aspirations and goal attainment.

The hypotheses forwarded by Evans and Herr (1991) are informative and consistent with empirical literature. The authors highlighted a possible coping strategy that African American women may utilize in making career decisions. On the positive side, the coping system allows the women to believe that there are opportunities for them and possibly some career options, such as female dominated and social services occupations that may value their skills regardless of the color of their skin. On the negative side, the manner in which the African American women exclude career options results in many fields not being pursued. These coping systems may offer African American women some ways to survive racism and sexism in the career arena. Evans and Herr (1991) stopped short of offering alternative techniques or theories that address African American women and girls’ manner of managing racism and sexism.

Although racism and sexism are realities in many African American women’s lives, family influences may serve as a buffer to this discrimination. Pearson and Bieschke (2001) studied familial influences on the career development of professional African American women. The purpose of their study was to examine the manner in which African American women make meaning of their family of origin experiences and the impact that this may have on their career development. Also, these researchers focused on the socialization of the women’s African American heritage (i.e., how career development was viewed by their families) and how these dynamics help to motivate the African American women toward career success. Lastly, they examined what aspects of
the family experience had a negative impact on the pursuit, entry, and maintenance of a career choice.

Pearson and Bieschke (2001) utilized an open-ended interview. They also utilized a qualitative methodology called Consensual Qualitative Research (Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997). This method involves a systematic manner of examining intensely the open-ended responses of a small sample. The participants in the study were fourteen African American women from the U.S. The mean age of the women was forty years with a standard deviation of 6.7 years. Four of the women came from single parent homes, seven had both parents, and three of the women were from homes with a primary caregiver other than a parent (e.g., a grandmother). Seven women described their SES as poor, three described it as working class, three described themselves as middle class, and one indicated her SES to be upper class. Eight women had bachelor degrees, two were working on completing advanced degrees, one held a master’s degree, and five had doctoral degrees. It was noted that the women had been in their field an average of 13 years.

The demographic questionnaire sought to gain information about the African American women’s career paths, and educational and work history. In addition, information was obtained about their jobs, position titles, dates of employment, primary responsibilities, and one specific question asked the participant to “indicate which occupational field category accurately described them.” The study also included a semi-structured interview that covered job history, family background and functioning, values, socioeconomic status, and the relationship of family and career. The Maintenance
The subscale of the Adult Career Concerns Inventory (ACCI; Super, Thompson & Lindeman, 1988) was used to assess career stability given the authors’ primary goals of identifying and focusing on women who were well established in their career.

The family unit’s focus on education was highlighted as having an influence on African American women’s success. The closeness of both nuclear and extended family relationships helped in the career development process. Family resources in terms of exposure to a variety of occupations and advanced social skills were important. The African American women’s gender role socialization tended to be androgynous or flexible which was seen as vital to the women’s success. Lastly, an important factor was the internalization of a strong work ethic from their family; this included an expectation that they would be gainfully employed and pursue higher education.

Pearson and Bieschke (2001) utilized rigorous procedures for choosing the fourteen African American women who met the criteria desired in the study. Researchers took the initiative to study African American women who were examples of accomplished professionals in their respective careers. The research highlighted areas that appear to be salient in the career success of African American women. Familial experiences and influences from the nuclear as well as extended family, relatives, and friends (e.g., mentors) were highlighted as valuable in the career development of the participants. All of these factors are ideals that can be shared within the educational and greater community in order to aid in career development of future generations of successful African American girls. Some limitations of the study include the small
sample size and the specific focus on “successful” African American women that may limit generalizability.

As discussed in Pearson and Bieschke (2001), familial influences in the form of socialization and expectations of a strong work ethic have a profound impact on the career development of African American women and girls, but career values also have been shown to impact career development. To examine the career development of African American women and girls, Weathers, Chalmer, and Rodriguez (1994) focused on Black college women’s career values and career development. The goal of the study was to examine how values and cultural influences may impact decision-making; this in turn was viewed as resulting in a better understanding of the process. Also, the study focused on African American women’s career decisions and which values are the most important. In addition, the study examined the impacts of racial identity and feminist identity on the career development of African American women. The participants in the study were seventy-two undergraduate African American women who attended a predominantly white university on the West Coast. Their ages ranged from 18 to 22 years, with a mean age of 20 years. Twenty-seven percent were freshmen, eleven percent sophomores, and thirty percent were juniors, and thirty percent were seniors; fifty-one percent of the women were social science majors.

Instruments in the study included a demographic data sheet, the Career Values Survey that included items borrowed from many sources by (e.g., Osipow, 1983; Super & Nevill, 1985), the Racial Identity Development Scale (RIDS; Parham, 1989; Helms, 1989, 1990), and the Feminist Identity Development Scale (FIDS; Downing & Rousch,
1985). The researchers utilized a mailing procedure that involved sending 272 packages; 43 were returned unopened and only 72 were usable instruments. In order to analyze with a paired comparison method, a proportions matrix was created which showed the average percentage of respondents who chose one career value and not the other career values.

Results of the study indicated that seventy-six percent of the students chose the career value of balance between career and family as most important. Three-fourths of the women valued achieving self-fulfillment. Sixty percent valued changing the character of their profession, and over fifty percent valued family prestige and forty-seven percent valued acquiring financial wealth. As indicated, African American women valued both career and family and these often can be in conflict with each other due to the demands placed on women in one domain at the expense of the other domain. Self-fulfillment was the next value most chosen by the respondents and it may speak to the need for the women to have an inner sense of accomplishment. The women in the study valued changing the character of the professions they were in and acquiring wealth that could add prestige to their families. Forty percent of the respondents indicated valuing working with similar persons as important in their career decision-making process.

The researchers conducted nine different multiple regression analyses and utilized the total scores for the nine career values as dependent variables and the subscale scores of the racial identity measure as predictors. Racial identity levels significantly predicted a value for achieving self-fulfillment. The authors noted that higher levels of Preencounter stage beliefs (having a more Eurocentric frame of reference which includes fulfilling personal gains related to one’s career) were related to higher values of achieving self-
fulfillment in choosing a career. These findings highlight the importance of exploring with African American women who may be in turmoil between a more Africentric perspectives towards career, which is described by Cheatham (1989) as including a communalistic worldview as compared to the Preencounter stage of racial identity that is focused on one’s self-fulfillment in career choice.

This research suggests that when focusing on African American women’s and girls’ career development, familial responsibility along with values of attaining career self-fulfillment and making a difference are dynamics that must be considered. Weathers et al (1994) included only undergraduate women between the ages of 18 to 22 years of age, which may limit generalizing to other populations. In addition, the students’ majors were predominantly in the social sciences.

Another variable that may be important in understanding African American women’s and girls’ career development is ego identity. With a focus on understanding the saliency of African American women’s ego identities, Gooden and Washington (1996) explored the ego identity of late adolescent African-American women. They also examined the impact of race and gender factors on identity formation, and sought to determine the saliency of these identity domains (i.e., race, gender, sexual orientation, relationships, career, religious beliefs, and political beliefs) for career development. Also, the quality of the late adolescent women’s investment in these domains was explored. Finally, the researchers explored how late adolescent African American women characterized and portrayed their identity.
The study utilized a qualitative interview strategy. The authors and a doctoral student in psychology collected the data; all were African American women. The participants in the study were 17 African American women between the ages of 18 to 22 years. The students were from a Southern California community college. The students were recruited from the Office of Student Activities and the Black Student Alliance Organization. Data were gathered through individual sessions that lasted approximately 40 to 75 minutes on campus. The questions were related to the seven domains of the study; specific probes were to focus on race, gender, career, religious beliefs, political beliefs, relationships, and sexual orientation. The authors independently coded the interview responses. Inter-rater reliability was 93%. The responses were examined meticulously to ascertain the quality of each woman’s investment in the various domains, while also determining the importance of each area; the intersections of the domains were explored, while also identifying prominent themes and issues.

The results of the study revealed that race was the primary source of self-definition for the women. This variable was a source of strength for them, due to the ongoing racism that they faced and their ability to overcome the negative stereotypes that many held against them because of the color of their skin. Blackness was seen as inherently positive because as they struggled against society’s negative views of Blacks, it impelled the women to strive harder to accomplish their goals. This strength took the form of them being tough and having the ability to cope with adversities that came their way. Being Black helped them develop a strong sense of self that enabled them to stand against negativity that may have come from the majority. Gender identity emerged as the
next important source of identity for the women, but was less important than race. An explanation for this occurrence that was forwarded was that gender is an issue that African American women focus on later due to the prominence of racism and one’s Blackness in their immediate lives. Relationships were the third most important aspect of their identity, with bonds between other women of primary importance. Career identity also was important to the majority of the sample, with many focusing on their goals and the importance of family members’ support and influence. Religious beliefs, sexual orientation, and political beliefs were noted as being important to the African American women, but were not as salient as race, gender, relationships, and career influence to their ego identities.

Gooden and Washington (1996) showed that women viewed their Blackness as a source of strength. In addition, the women embraced their heritage of coming from Africa, the motherland, and saw their ancestors as strong people with pride and dignity, who have overcome adversities. This sense of pride was discussed by the 17 African American women in the study as helping them to have a strong sense of self-worth, helping them to form a strong identity, and their ancestors’ courage served as a source of strength and pride that helped them to overcome adversity. Limitations of the study were the small sample size that limits generalizability to the broader African American women population. Data suggest, then, that African American women’s and girls’ career development is not specific to the person, but affected by factors such as familial influences. Societal struggles and accomplishments of significant role models and
ancestors also may play a profound role in African American women attaining their career goals.

In addition to the aforementioned factors, one’s career aspirations and expectations may also have an impact on career development. Researchers such as Arbona and Novy (1991) examined the extent to which ethnic group membership and gender were related to first year college students’ career aspirations and expectations. Also, the relationship amongst the students’ career expectations and availability or distribution of jobs according to the labor market was studied. Career aspirations were defined as, “the occupations students wanted to pursue if there were no reality constraints”. Career expectations were defined as “the occupations students expected to pursue, taking into account reality factors” (p. 232). Participants were from an urban university in the Southwest; the students included 126 Blacks (29 men and 97 women), 107 Mexican Americans (52 men and 55 women) and 633 Whites (328 men and 305 women). Average age of the participants was 17.8 years (range of 16 to 19 years). The data were from a larger study conducted in the summer of 1987 that utilized mailed surveys. The socioeconomic status of the students was assessed with the Hollingshead’s Index of Social Position.

In terms of ethnic differences by gender in career aspirations, there were no significant differences amongst men or women. Findings for career expectations revealed that only 10% of African American women had career expectations of selecting Social occupations as compared to 26% Mexican American and 29% White women. Thus, although research (Smith, 1980) usually has maintained that African Americans seek
careers in education and the social sciences in greater numbers as compared to Whites, the aforementioned results suggest an alternative view. When gender differences by ethnic group in relation to career aspirations and career expectations were explored, there was a small difference for both Mexican Americans and Caucasians, but not for African Americans. Arbona and Novy’s (1991) study speaks to the need for counselors, educators, and researchers to be aware of potential differences among women in their career aspirations and expectations. Women and perhaps some minority women in particular, should be encouraged to broaden their horizons and not limit themselves to exploring one occupational domain (e.g., Social occupations). Limitations of the study include the limits of generalizability to other populations due to the study’s focus on an age range from 16 to 19 years. The data were collected through mailing survey data, and that may have resulted in a misunderstanding of the concepts studied. Also, the manner in which the authors presented their results was confusing at times.

Overall, the literature reviewed suggests that researchers, counselors, and educators need to consider perceptions of career barriers when assisting women, and especially ethnic minority women. Although there have been strides made for African American women in the career arena, still many African American women perceive themselves as victims of double discrimination and prejudice and in turn, tend to avoid considering all occupations areas as possible choices. Unfortunately, these women may decline to participate in a particular activity, modify life-styles, or redirect ambitions and goals due their fear of being discriminated against. Therefore counselors, educators, and researchers must impress upon the African American woman or girl to think more
broadly about career aspirations and expectations and not limit their choices based on stereotypes or fears of facing discrimination (Evans & Herr, 1991).

These environmental influences may impact African American women’s career decision-making process. African American girls’ and women’s personal agency must be examined due to their tendency to adopt coping strategies that on a positive side allow them to believe that there are opportunities for them, such as in female-dominated and social services occupations where their skills are valued regardless of the color of their skin. On the negative side, the manner in which the African American women delete career options results in many fields not being pursued, especially fields that are viewed as male- or Caucasian-dominated (Evans & Herr, 1991).

A specific environmental influence that may impact African American women’s career success is their perception of the amount of family support they are receiving. Also important may be their perceptions of the closeness of family relationships--both nuclear and extended family (Pearson & Bieschke, 2001). In addition, family resources, including exposure to a variety of occupations and advanced social skills, that aid in exploration of various fields need to be considered as they may assist African American women and girls to have a clear understanding of their career options and the level of expectation their family places on them in terms of gender role socialization. For example, does the family value androgynous or strong work ethic views or does the traditional female role dominate as important in her family? Also, consideration may need to be given to the importance of exploring with African American women their need for self-fulfillment while negotiating their responsibilities and loyalties toward their
families and helping them to find a balance between these two values (Weathers, Chalmer, & Rodriquez, 1994).

African American women’s identity development also needs to be considered. Many African American women view their Blackness as a source of strength and pride (Gooden & Washington, 1996). Thus, professionals and researchers who focus on African American girls and women must help the women to embrace their heritage and see themselves as a people who have evolved from ancestors who came from Africa, the motherland, and that they are a people of dignity who have overcome numerous adversities in the form of discrimination and prejudice. One’s blackness needs to be a sense of pride for it exemplifies the struggle of the women or ancestors that have paved the way for advancement in the career arena.

Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory and its extension to the career arena

Social Cognitive theory offers a lens through which to examine the career development of African American women and girls. The themes noted in the literature of barriers in the forms of racism and sexism and one’s personal agency to overcome these discriminations seem consistent with Social Cognitive Theory.

In 1977, Albert Bandura developed Social Cognitive Theory. His initial research and findings were based on animal behavior, and the ideas were extended to human behavior. Social Cognitive Theory can be viewed in terms of a model of “triadic reciprocal/causality” which suggests that there is an interacting/bi-directional relation amongst the qualities of the person and his or her environment (Bandura, 1986). That is, one must take into consideration the person’s qualities or attributes (e.g., their internal
cognitive, emotional, and physical attributes), the environmental influences, and the person’s behavior (Bandura, 1986). Social Cognitive Theory focuses, in particular, on an individual’s personal agency to achieve a desired result in a particular situation or environment.

In Social Cognitive Theory, outcome and efficacy expectations are central constructs. Outcome expectations are an individual’s belief that certain behaviors will result in desired outcomes (Bandura, 1986). Efficacy expectations are beliefs that one can perform the behaviors required to achieve certain outcomes or results (Bandura, 1986). According to Bandura’s (1986) Social Cognitive Theory, one’s strength or level of personal efficacy expectation may determine if one continues to persevere toward an outcome within a difficult situation. Further, if an individual stops prematurely in efforts to achieve the desired outcome, the result may be a sense of failure and decreased self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977, 1986).

Bandura outlined four essential sources of self-efficacy. The four sources of efficacy information are performance accomplishments, vicarious learning/modeling, verbal persuasion, and affective states (Bandura, 1977). Performance accomplishments refer to the possible positive or negative cognitive appraisals of a learning experience. Some examples of this “mode of induction” forwarded by Bandura include participant modeling, performance desensitization and exposure, and self-instructed performance. Vicarious learning/modeling has been described as one’s observation of a valued model’s performance and the positive or negative feedback they receive (i.e., live modeling and symbolic modeling). Verbal persuasion includes messages of encouragement or
discouragement. Encouragement serves to increase self-efficacy, and lack of encouragement or discouragement usually serves to weaken one's self-efficacy beliefs. The fourth source of efficacy information is affective state, also described as emotional arousal. The level of one’s anxiety or arousal may facilitate or hinder one’s performance or self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977).

Gainor (2006) focused on the history of examinations of self-efficacy as it relates to career evaluation and practice, and she identified as significant the pioneering work of Hackett and Betz (1981) examining the relationship of self-efficacy to career development. Reference was made in this work to the focus on self-efficacy and career development. Then, Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994) expanded on the relationship of self-efficacy to academic and career behavior; this served to integrate Bandura’s SCT with various career theories (e.g., Gottfredson, Holland, Krumboltz, and Super). Lent et al., (1994) expanded Bandura’s SCT to a hybrid model, Social Cognitive Career Theory, that allowed for further examination of one’s self-efficacy and how environmental contextual variables may advance or hinder development of career interests, goals, and attainments. While SCCT has been shown to be an invaluable theory (Betz & Hackett, 1997; Brown & Lent, 1996; Taylor & Betz, 1983), the focus of the current study is on Bandura’s (1977) Social Cognitive Theory.

In order to examine Bandura’s (1977) Social Cognitive Theory, specifically the task domains including accurate self-appraisal, gathering occupational information, goal selection, planning, and problem solving, Paulsen and Betz (2004) forwarded a hypothesis that career decision-making self-efficacy for college students may relate to
The researchers emphasized that they were not postulating causality but a reciprocal influence of self-perceived competencies and career decision-making self-efficacy (Paulsen & Betz, 2004). Previously, the academic areas that were significant in a general liberal arts education included English, Mathematics, Science, and Social Science (Banta, 1992). In their study, Paulsen and Betz (2004) examined the relation of self-efficacy or confidence to six basic confidence dimensions that are seen as vital in the goals of both a general or liberal arts education to career decision-making self-efficacy. The six confidence domains included Mathematics, Science, Using Technology, Writing, Leadership, and Cultural Sensitivity.

The participants in the study were 627 undergraduates currently enrolled in an introduction to psychology course at a large, midwestern university. Extra credit was given for participation. Participants included 346 (55%) women and 277 (44.5%) men. 80% of the participants were Caucasian, 9% African American, 6% Asian American/Pacific Islander, 2% Latino/Hispanic, 1% multiracial, and 1% Native American. Due to the small sample of the majority of the racial groups, only the data from the Caucasian and African American (n = 54) subgroups were seen as adequately substantial to analyze separately. The total sample included 80% freshmen, 13% sophomores, 5% juniors, and 1.4% seniors.

The researchers included the Expanded Skills Confidence Inventory (ESCI, Betz et al., 2003) which measures self-efficacy or confidence in relation to 17 basic dimensions of vocational activity similar to the Basic Interest Scales of the Strong Interest
Inventory (SII; Harmon, Hansen, Borgen & Hammer, 1994) and five of the six Holland (1997) themes which include Investigative for Science and Mathematics, Artistic for Writing, Social for Cultural Sensitivity, Enterprising for Leadership, and Conventional for Using Technology (Paulsen & Betz, 2004). In addition, to measure self-efficacy expectations in order to successfully complete tasks required to make sound career decisions, the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale-Short form (CDMSE-SF; Betz, Klein, et al., 1996) was utilized.

The results of the study revealed a range of relationships from .14 (between Mathematics and Writing confidence) and .63 (Leadership and Cultural Sensitivity). The relationships of the Basic Confidence Scales with career decision-making self-efficacy varied from .35 (with using Technology) to .59 (with Leadership); these all indicate low to moderate correlations rather than significantly high correlations. Six predictors, which included Mathematics, Science, Using Technology, Writing, Leadership, and Cultural Sensitivity, accounted for 49% of the variance in predicting career decision-making self-efficacy. In terms of gender and race, level of confidence in both leadership and cultural sensitivity was most related to women’s and European American’ career decision-making self-efficacy. In contrast, for men and African Americans, level of confidence in leadership and math, science, and technology were important.

Paulsen and Betz’s (2004) study utilized Bandura’s (1977) Social Cognitive Theory as a framework and solid measures of career decision-making self-efficacy and confidence. The study emphasized the importance of Leadership confidence for all groups in terms of level of career decision-making self-efficacy. In practice and in
academia, focusing on the confidence levels in academic skills seems important for both Caucasian Americans and African Americans. Limitations of the study include a small sample of African Americans that was deemed adequate in being utilized in the analyses, yet the other ethnic/racial groups could not be utilized due to the small percentage of participants.

In conclusion, Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory (1977) focus on confidence level, and more specifically career decision-making self-efficacy, was shown to be related to self-efficacy for the skill areas of academia including Mathematics, Science, Using Technology, Writing, Leadership, and Cultural Sensitivity for both Caucasian and African Americans. The reciprocal influence of self-perceived competencies and career decision-making self-efficacy indicates the importance of these factors for students attaining their academic goals in general or in liberal arts educational settings (Paulsen & Betz, 2004). Leadership confidence and one’s level of confidence in academia skills were important for Caucasian and, specific to the current study, African Americans (Paulsen & Betz, 2004).

Applying Social Cognitive Theory to African American women’s career development

Hill (1997) conducted a study that compared more specifically career decision-making self-efficacy and related variables among African American (AA) and Euro-American (EA) college students. In addition, her research sought to clarify the utility of Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) in understanding the career development of both Euro-American and African American college students. Hill’s (1997) hypotheses were based on Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory tenet of triadic-reciprocal that speaks to the
interaction of one’s self-efficacy expectations, outcome expectations and goal representations influencing behaviors needed to obtain the desired result. Specifically, Hill’s hypotheses were as follows: 1) African American men have significantly higher levels of career decision making self-efficacy in comparison to African American women and Euro-American men and women; 2) African American women have significantly higher levels of career decision making self-efficacy as compared to Euro-American women; 3) Euro-American men and women have higher academic and career outcome expectations as compared to African American men and women; and lastly, 4) African American men and women report greater career barriers as compared to Euro-American men and women (Hill, 1997). The researcher included instruments to assess an individual’s career decision-making self-efficacy (CDMSES-short form), career barriers (Career Barriers Inventory; CBI: Swanson, Daniels, & Tokar, 1996) and indecision (CDS), behavioral intentions, and academic and career outcome expectations.

Hill’s (1997) examination of the relation between career decision-making self-efficacy, outcome expectations, behavioral intentions, barriers and indecision revealed for African Americans that career decision-making self-efficacy had a significant positive relation with academic and career outcome expectations and behavioral intentions. This finding is consistent with Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura 1977, 1986). Important to the present study, for African American men’s and women’s career decision-making self-efficacy also had the expected significant negative correlation with career indecision (Hill, 1997).
Consistent with findings from previous studies (e.g., Betz, Klein, & Taylor, 1996), there were no significant differences in the levels of career decision-making self-efficacy amongst the four groups. Yet, African American women reported significantly higher career indecision and indecisiveness as compared to Euro-American women (Hill, 1997). Also, for all participants, there was an inverse relation found between overall perceived career barriers and career decision-making self-efficacy, but African American men and women reported more perceived racial discrimination (e.g., higher levels of racial discrimination in getting a job, receiving a promotion, worries about having a racially biased boss, and being compensated at a lower wage) as a career barrier than did Euro-Americans. Further, germane to the current study, women of both races perceived higher levels of sex discrimination as a career barrier than did the men. This included being mistreated or discriminated against for having or planning to start a family, experiencing sexual harassment, and receiving an inequitable wage as compared to men (Hill, 1997).

Finally, a noteworthy finding was that in a regression to predict career indecision, only career decision-making self-efficacy was a significant predictor; career outcome expectations and overall career barriers did not predict or add to the prediction of indecision beyond career decision-making self-efficacy (Hill, 1997). This finding pointed to the importance of self-efficacy, but left uncertain the role of outcome expectations and barriers (e.g., sexual and racial discriminatory events), in the prediction of career indecision.

Overall, Hill’s (1997) work supported the utility of Social Cognitive Theory with diverse populations, but it also suggested further study is needed to examine the relations
amongst its constructs for these populations. In particular, Hill’s (1997) findings underscored the need for more research to explore the career development process and the expected relations amongst the constructs in the Social Cognitive Theory with African Americans in general, and African American women in particular. Especially important, since career indecision may impede African American women’s progress toward attaining desired outcomes, is the study of factors that may contribute to African American women’s greater indecision than Euro-American women despite comparable career decision-making self-efficacy.

Hackett and Byars (1996), and later Byars and Hackett (1998), addressed some of these issues and concerns when they focused on Social Cognitive Theory as applied specifically to African American women and girls. Their articles provide an informative, theoretical foundation for future work and described the sources of self-efficacy for African American women and girls. They effectively combined and synthesized background research and previous studies that had focused on self-efficacy issues of African American women and girls. They also succinctly presented how learning experiences in the form of racism and sexism may affect career self-efficacy. Relevant to the present study, the racist and sexist events that women and girls may experience were suggested to have an influence on career self-efficacy. Hackett and Byars (1996) strongly endorsed the notion Beale (1970) forwarded that African American women may be at special risk as they may have the burden of “Double Jeopardy,” which has been described as being a woman and a minority.
As part of their articles, Hackett and Byars (1996) and Byars and Hackett (1998) presented a thorough and informative outline of the sources of self-efficacy for African American women and girls. They proposed, consistent with Social Cognitive Theory, that performance accomplishments have the most influence on African American women’s and girls’ career self-efficacy. They argued that learning experiences such as socialization experiences might be different for African American women as compared to White women. In terms of racism, differential standards or negative racist feedback are usually given to African American girls from teachers even though they may be performing at a level equal to or better than their peers. In reference to sexism, they noted that African American women tend to be at the bottom or lower end of the economic ladder (Hackett & Byars, 1996).

Hackett and Byars (1996) and Byars and Hackett (1998) also discussed vicarious learning. Vicarious learning involves learning the behaviors or skills needed to accomplish a task through observing valued role models (Hackett & Byars, 1996). As applied to African American women and girls, they argued that it might be important for women and girls to see African American women role models who are successful in the career domain. Indeed, this seems consistent with what Miller (1988) discussed as the “Trickle-up effect.” Byars and Hackett (1998) commented on the importance of this effect, referring to how accomplishments of mothers, aunts and siblings motivate the individual towards striving to achieve equal and/or more than the prior generation. Byars and Hackett (1998) noted the importance of role models sharing with the African American woman how they coped with racism and sexism; role models need to discuss
the process of coping, how they coped, not just the outcome, accomplishments or results.
The role model needs to let the African American woman or girl see and hear how she
overcame the barriers of sexism and racism.

The third source of self-efficacy expectations discussed by Hackett and Byars (1996)
and Byars and Hackett (1998) is physiological and affective states; these include the
emotional experiences that African American women may have from being different than
others in terms of color in different arenas, such as in the high school classroom and in
college (Hackett & Byars, 1996). Hackett and Byars (1996) and Byars and Hackett
(1998) commented that African American girls might experience elevated anxiety in
many school situations, which can result in them feeling inferior, paranoid, and distrustful
of authorities. The affect associated with the sense of inferiority and/or aloneness can be
very negative and it was stressed that African American women and girls must be helped
to come to an understanding of being different, and knowing that because of this, they
will have to cope with racism and sexism. In terms of their affect and self-esteem,
African American women and girls need to have a strong, unwavering sense of self in
knowing themselves and separating out the views of others. If their affective state is not
addressed, they may develop decreased self-efficacy and diminished motivation, which
could lead to an increase in drop out rates, and decreased outcome expectations (Byars &
gave credit to the work of Bandura (1977) who stressed that one needs a strong, solid
sense of self and “coping efficacy.”
The final source of self-efficacy, discussed by Hackett and Byars (1996) and Byars and Hackett (1998), verbal persuasion, includes what is said to African American women about being an African American and a woman; positives are a must as they are essential to self-efficacy growth. For example, the authors stressed the importance of parents being open and honest with children about the obstacles they have faced and the coping strategies and supports they have utilized in overcoming sexism and racism. Negative statements may be attributed to the self and damage one’s self-efficacy. For instance, a negative message may include parents stating disparaging comments such as “you will never amount to anything or succeed because the system won’t allow Blacks to advance”; these comments are the most detrimental (Ogbu, 1991). In terms of learning experiences, Hackett and Byars (1996) included an important suggestion that the messages conveyed to African American girls and women are consistent with the quality of the person’s performance and encouraging. In addition, they suggest that counselors need to focus on positive encouragement plus learning experiences and information and skill building.

Hackett and Byars’ (1996) and Byars and Hackett’s (1998) effectively considered psychological and sociological factors that may affect African American women’s and girls’ self-efficacy, and the sources of that self-efficacy. They defined the sources of self-efficacy and gave elaborate examples of how one’s self-efficacy may be affected positively or negatively by significant others and environmental constraints. More importantly to the present study, the articles appropriately began the discussion of how learning experiences in the form of racism and sexism may affect one’s career self-efficacy. In addition, Byars and Hackett (1998) must be commended in their efforts to
expand their original article by focusing on women from varying minority groups (e.g., Hispanic Americans) in addition to African American women. Again, this later article detailed the importance of role models being similar and accessible to the young woman, so that shared meaningful conversations can occur and include the role model giving concrete examples of sexual and racial discrimination events that she has overcome by utilizing effective coping strategies.

To address the lack of empirical studies focused on Social Cognitive Theory tenets as applied to African Americans, Chaney, Betz, and Multon’s (2007) psychometric study, surveyed a large sample of African American women and men to gain more knowledge of reliability and validity of the short form of the Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale (CDSE-SF; Betz, Klein, et al., 1996). Prior authors (e.g., Fouad, 1993; Subich 1996) had emphasized the importance of not inferring psychometric or usefulness of measures to populations, e.g. African American, that were not a part of the initial sample. Thus the total sample for this research included 220 African American women (66%) and men (34%). The largest subsample (N = 168) was from a southeastern large historically Black university, and 25% were non-traditional college undergraduates in psychology courses. The remaining participants (N = 52) were undergraduates enrolled in both a public and private university. The students had completed the CDSE during orientation (for freshmen) and classes. The sample also included some upperclassmen. The mean age of the students was 21.3 (SD = 4.4) with ages ranging from 18 to 46. The CDSE-SF includes 25 items assessing the five career-choice competencies of Crites’s
(1978) model of career maturity including self-appraisal, gathering occupational information, goal selection, planning, and problem solving.

The results of study revealed similar coefficient alpha values as predominantly Caucasian samples; the alpha values ranged from .78 to .85 for subscales with a sample of 400 students and .80 to .84 for a sample of 603 (Betz et al., 2005). In the study, the original five subscale alphas were as follows: .81 (self-appraisal), .79 (occupational information), .85 (goal selection), .83 (planning), and .78 (problem solving). Goal selection was found to be the most reliable subscale as noted in prior studies (Chaney et al., 2007). These results indicated that the CDSE-SF is a useful measure in analyzing African American’s level of self-efficacy to complete tasks required in making good career decisions.

Results from a factor analysis indicated that a four-factor structure represented the data, which was consistent to Crites’ theory of career maturity that postulated a four or five factor solution. A large factor included items focused on decision-making and information gathering in Chaney et al. (2007), which is consistent with Peterson and delMas (1998) findings that forwarded that both decision-making and information gathering were a part of career decision self-efficacy.

The Chaney et al. (2007) study of the factor structure of the CDSE-SF with a sample of 220 African Americans is commendable. The study found that the CDSE-SF is a reliable and sound measure of African Americans level of career decision self-efficacy. Limitations of the study, though, may be that 25% of the students in the sample were non-traditional which may have impacted the results due to them being older and having
experienced being in a career or employed. Future research focused on large African American samples that are traditional in comparison to non-traditional students may shed light on a possible varying level of career decision self-efficacy and factor structure.

In conclusion, the literature on Social Cognitive Theory’s application to members of minority groups, with a focus on African American women specifically, suggests that career decision-making self-efficacy has a significant negative correlation with career indecision (Hill, 1997). Specific to differences amongst women, African American women reported significantly higher career indecision as compared to Euro-American women. Also, women in general reported a higher level of perceived sexual discrimination when compared to African American and Euro-American men (Hill, 1997). Hackett and Byars’ (1996) and Byars and Hackett’s (1998) articles serve to illustrate, and interpret in the context of SCT, how racial and sexual discriminatory experiences may have disparaging effects on African American women’s and girls’ career decision-making self-efficacy and decision status.

In sum, although preliminary work has hypothesized and made reference to the relation of career decision-making self-efficacy to career indecision, and the role of learning experiences in developing self-efficacy, there continues to be a lack of empirical study of African American women and their unique contextual factors (e.g., the intersection of racist and sexist discrimination). Chaney et al. (2007), however, addressed the reliability and factor structure of the CDSE-SF and included a large sample of African American women and men, many of whom were non-traditional students. They also
assessed the time relevancy of completing tasks related to career decision self-efficacy and career choice.

Thus, the focus of the current study is to concentrate on a representative sample of young African American women, and explore variables relevant to Social Cognitive Theory in relation to the career decision-making. Exploring the power of sexual and racial discrimination as learning experiences that affect self-efficacy is one goal and confirming the relation of career decision-making self-efficacy to career indecision among African American women is another. Since there is so little research on these areas with African American women, the remainder of the chapter reviews general literature on their experiences of racism and sexism and their career decision-making.

Sexist and racist discrimination and their outcomes

Hill’s work with SCT, and the writings of others (i.e., Byars & Hackett, 1998; Hackett & Byars, 1996), highlighted the role of two important domains of barriers, sexual and racial discrimination, for African American women’s career decision-making process. Other researchers (e.g., Klonoff & Landrine, 1995; Landrine & Klonoff, 1996) already had begun to build the empirical case for the more general effects of sexual and racial discriminatory events and women’s physical and mental health. These issues have been discussed as barriers in the vocational literature (e.g., Brown, 2000; Gainor & Lent, 1998; Osipow & Reed, 1985; Taylor & Betz, 1983), but little empirical work has been done to link them in an explicit manner to vocational outcomes. Consequently, it seems prudent to review the more general literature on the effects of racist and sexist
discrimination as a foundation for the present research on their effects in relation to vocational outcomes.

Klonoff and Landrine (1995) focused on sexual discrimination that has occurred over a person’s lifetime or more recently. They assessed the frequency of these experiences in various employment, educational, and health domains. Participants were obtained through random sampling via solicitations in varied arenas such as college campuses, sororities, small office buildings, and airports. Six hundred-thirty one women (403 Caucasians women and 228 minority women) participated in the study. The minority women in the study included 117 Latin American, 38 African American, 25 Asian American women, and 46 women who chose another designation. The participants were varied in terms of marital status, educational attainment and income levels. Instruments utilized in the study were the Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE), the Psychiatric Epidemiology Research Interview-Life Events Scales (PERI-LES) of Dohrenwerd, Krasnoff, Askenasy, and Dohrenwend (1978) and the Hassles-Frequency Scale of Kanner, Coyne, Schaeffer, and Lazarus (1981). The women were instructed to complete the SSE twice with lifetime and recent sexist events/experiences in mind. The hypotheses for their study were that as sexist events increase, there may be more negative effects on women’s health (physical and mental) as a result of the sexist events. Correlational analysis revealed that greater reports of sexist events predicted a higher level of endorsement of stress related symptoms/events (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995).

In addition, Klonoff and Landrine (1995) found that most women in their sample reported that they had experienced sexual discrimination (99%) over a lifetime, and in the
past year (97%). A prototype of the typical woman who would experience frequent sexual
discriminatory events was described as unmarried, member of an ethnic group, and 23
years old; the prototype of a woman who would experience infrequent sexual
discriminatory events was described as being a 32 year old, unmarried white woman.
Age, ethnicity, and marital status related to experiencing sexist events, but education and
social class were not relevant (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995).

This study conducted by Klonoff and Landrine (1995) was informative by linking
sexual discriminatory events (lifetime and recent) to women’s mental health, but no
additional information was forwarded on whether the women had obtained mental health
treatment from a professional. The authors made an excellent effort to include minority
women in the study, yet there was only a small representation of African American
women, Latinas comprised the largest group of the minority women.

With sexual discriminatory events found to relate to women’s mental health in
general, and specifically, that ethnic minority women are more likely to experience sexual
discrimination, Landrine and Klonoff (1996) went a step further to develop a measure to
study racial discrimination and its negative physical and mental consequences. African
American men and women experience widespread racism on a regular basis, including
face-to-face encounters in employment, health and social services settings. Due to these
on-going experiences, many African Americans suffer with or through bouts of
depression, stress, and rage (National Institute of Mental Health, 1983).

In developing the Schedule of Racist Events (SRE), Landrine and Klonoff (1996)
utilized a theoretical model that viewed racial discrimination as a series of events that are
stressful and may take varying forms. The authors viewed racist events as negative stresses that happen to African Americans because of the fact that they are African Americans. Also, the authors conceptualized racist events’ nature as being frequent or infrequent, which allowed them to measure the racist events on a time line from acute (recent) to chronic (lifetime) occurrences; they also assessed appraisal of these events as stressors (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996).

Participants for the study were obtained by soliciting African American men and women who were attending a meeting at a Black student union as well as other meetings of Black faculty and staff organizations at a large university. The participants were asked to complete a survey that included the Hopkins Symptoms Checklist-58 (HSCL-58; Derogatis, Lipman, Rickles, Uhlenhuth, & Covi, 1974), demographic items, the African American Acculturation Scale (Landrine & Klonoff, 1994), smoking status, and the SRE. A total of 153 participants were included (83 women, 66 men, and 4 unidentified). They were students, faculty, clerical, and janitorial staff at a university. The participants were varied in terms of age, marital status, educational/career levels, and income.

The majority of the sample (98.1%) had experienced discrimination within the past year on their jobs, in stores, at banks, and at the university. One-third of the sample experienced adverse physical contact in the form of being physically and verbally assaulted. Over a lifetime, the entire sample of African American men and women experienced at least one racist event. The majority of the participants appraised the racist events as stressful and unsettling. There were no differences found in terms of frequency of racist events and appraisal of the events for African American men and women. The
authors concluded that racism and experiences of racist interactions are widespread in the lives of African American men and women.

When examining the relation between the SRE and the HSCL-58, Landrine and Klonoff (1996) found that racist events experienced recently and over a lifetime correlated positively to mental health symptoms of increased stress, low self-esteem and feelings of inadequacy. The relation between the SRE and the African American Acculturation Scale suggested that African Americans who were more immersed in their African culture reported and experienced more racist events over the past year and over their lifetimes; they also gave a subjective appraisal that the racist events were more stressful.

Landrine and Klonoff (1996) provided the research community with a clear understanding of the mental and physical effects that racist events might have on African American men and women. The study included attention to acculturation status and illustrated the price that African American men and women may pay for remaining immersed in their culture. Most importantly, the study highlighted the pervasiveness of subtle racist events and those that may be aggressive and physical in nature. The study lacked random sampling, but this is understandable due to the problem in obtaining African American participants in a college setting.

With the purpose of clarifying the validity of the Schedule of Racists Events Scale, Klonoff and Landrine (1999) collected additional data on the reliability and validity of the scale. The participants included 520 African Americans (277 women and 243 men). The participants varied in demographic characteristics. The sample was
selected randomly from a census tract in San Bernardino County, California (middle to working class census). Instruments in the study included the SRE and the Hopkins Symptom Checklist-58 (HSCL; Derogatis, Lipman, Rickles, Uhlenhuth, & Covi, 1994) and a demographic questionnaire.

In terms of recent racial discriminatory events, Klonoff and Landrine (1999) found 96% of the sample reported having experienced a racist discrimination event in the past year. Over a lifetime, there were a small percentage of people who had never experienced racism (12 out of 520 or 3% of the sample). An evaluation of the respondents’ appraisals of the racist events revealed that over 95.6% of the sample viewed the racist events as stressful. Thus, from a mental health perspective, the data supported that racism is a common source of stress for African Americans. In addition, a concurrent validity study was conducted which involved dividing the sample into those reporting a high amount of symptoms versus those reporting a low amount of symptoms; the split was accomplished by using the sample’s median score of 75 on the HSCL. A multivariate analysis of variance revealed that reported psychiatric symptoms related to frequency of racist experiences. Thus, the SRE was found to be useful in capturing the effects of stressful, racist events on an individual.

Klonoff and Landrine’s (1999) work represents an excellent cross-validation study to collect valuable data on the Schedule of Racist Events. The sample size and procedure for collecting data were excellent. The authors were wise in utilizing a well-known instrument for measuring stressful, psychiatric symptoms, the Symptom Checklist-58. One can conclude from the results of the study that those pervasive experiences of racial
discrimination in the lives of both African American women and men are related to an increase in stress related disorders (e.g., hypertension).

In conclusion, research focused on the effects of sexist and racist discrimination for African American men and women suggests that as these events increase there may be more negative effects on physical and mental health. Klonoff and Landrine’s (1995) study revealed that over 99% of the women sampled experienced sexual discriminatory events over a lifetime, with 97% having experienced such events in the past year. In addition, the researchers forwarded a profile or prototype of the typical woman who experiences frequent sexist events as unmarried, member of an ethnic group, and approximately 23 years old. Thus, according to these findings, one could conclude that young African American women may be at high risk to experience an increase level or frequency of sexual discriminatory events (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995).

Similarly, Landrine and Klonoff’s (1996) study focused on the occurrence of racist events and the effects on African American men and women. They found that over 98.1% of their sample experienced a racist event in the past year and 100% of the sample experienced a racist event in their lifetime. Persons’ appraisal of the events was described as stressful and unsettling. The overall conclusion of the study was that experiences of racist interactions are widespread in the lives of African American men and women (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). Klonoff and Landrine’s (1999) study further highlighted the prevalence of racist discriminatory events amongst African American men and women in the past year and over their lifetimes.
Although the research on sexist and racist discrimination has begun to substantiate that sexist and racist events do occur and have stressful effects on individuals, many studies of sexist events have not had a large representation of African American women (e.g., Klonoff & Landrine, 1995). Further, vocational outcomes of these experiences have not been studied. To address the lack of focus on African American women and vocational outcomes, the current study samples African American women exclusively with a focus on conceptualizing sexist and racist events as learning experiences per Social Cognitive Theory. This research examines the relation of these events to African American women’s career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectations, and their career indecision.

Career decision-making self-efficacy and career indecision

Career decision-making self-efficacy and its relation to indecision within the SCT framework for African American women are foci of the current research project. In order to appreciate the history of the research on career decision-making self-efficacy as well as to clarify the construct and its importance, a pivotal study by Taylor and Betz (1983) is presented. With SCT as the guiding force behind their research, they examined career indecision and applied self-efficacy theory to it. The study extended research conducted by Osipow et al. (1976) on indecision. The purpose of the study was to construct a measure to examine self-efficacy expectations; this measure is now known as the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale (CDMSES). Taylor and Betz (1983) aimed to study the psychometric and “normative” characteristics of the measure and its relation to a measure of career indecision (Taylor & Betz, 1983).
The Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale’s development comprised focusing on a domain of behaviors that captured the five Career Choice Competencies forwarded in Crites’ (1961, 1965) model of career maturity. The career choice competencies included accurate self-appraisal, gathering occupational information, goal selection, making plans for the future, and problem solving. With the five competency areas in mind, ten behavioral items that best represented each competency were selected to be included in the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale (Taylor & Betz, 1983). Respondents indicated their level of self-efficacy for career decision-making tasks by replying to the statements using a ten-point scale (complete confidence (9) to no confidence (0)) in terms of confidence in their ability to successfully complete each task. An examination of the mean item response range (6.4 to 7.0) allowed the authors to conclude that on average, college students appear to have the self-assurance in their abilities to carry out the tasks required in successful career decision-making (Taylor & Betz, 1983).

To assess vocational indecision, the Career Decision Scale (CDS) by Osipow, Carney, Winer, Yanico, and Koschier (1980) was utilized (Taylor & Betz, 1983). A total of 346 students participated in the study with racial/ethnic background not reported. Group 1 (private liberal arts university) consisted of 68 male and 85 female students, and SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) scores were obtained for them. Group 2 (large state university) included 60 male and 133 female students, and ACT (American College Test) scores were obtained for them. The researchers found an inverse relation of career decision-making self-efficacy scores to indecision. The relation between career decision-
making and indecision was stable over time, and moderate in magnitude. Thus, greater indecision was linked to decreased confidence in one’s ability to make career decisions. More specifically, the Career Decision Scale Factor 1 (lack of structure and confidence) had the strongest relation to Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy scores. There were no significant gender differences in Group 1 for Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy scores and indecision scores. Female students in Group 2, however, had significantly lower indecision scores (more decidedness) as compared to the male students in Group 2 and Group 1 male and female students. This surprising result may suggest public university students are more decisive as compared to students in private universities (Taylor & Betz, 1983).

Stepwise multiple regression analyses were run with the overall Career Decision Scale score as the dependent variable and career decision-making self-efficacy, verbal ability and math ability as the independent variables (Taylor & Betz, 1983). In general, career decision-making self-efficacy was the best predictor of career indecision ($R^2$ change = .48) (Taylor & Betz, 1983).

In conclusion, Taylor and Betz’s (1983) pivotal research and development of the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale yielded a useful instrument to measure career decision-making self-efficacy expectations. Scores on the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale related as expected to indecision and were stable over time. In order to continue the study of career decision-making self-efficacy and its possible connections with other vital career variables, Taylor and Popma (1990) examined the relation of career decision-making self-efficacy to career salience, locus of control, and
vocational indecision. Their study was based on the work of researchers such as Hackett and Betz (1981), who were among the first to suggest that studying self-efficacy could help in the understanding of the career development process.

A total of 407 students (203 women, 204 men) participated in this research. The majority of the students were in their first year and their mean age was 18.9 years. Approximately, 87% of the sample was Caucasian; African American students comprised 4.7% of the sample, and Asian, Middle Eastern and Hispanics were 2.5%, .98% and .74% of the sample, respectively. The students were enrolled in a General Psychology course at a Midwestern University and received course credit for participation (Taylor & Popma, 1990).

Procedurally, the instruments were presented in a counter-balanced order. The instruments included in the study were the following: a demographic questionnaire; questions inquiring on the status of decisions related to academic major and career choices; the CDMSES (Taylor & Betz, 1983); the Occupational Self-Efficacy Scale (OSES) (Betz & Hackett, 1981) which measures self-efficacy expectations for success in completing the education and training needed to enter 20 occupations/careers; the Locus Of Control (LOC)-Rotter Internal-External (I-E) Scale which measures a person’s beliefs in terms of external control (Rotter, 1954, 1966); the Career Salience Questionnaire by Greenhaus (1971) which measures the degree to which one’s career is important; and lastly, the Career Decision Scale (CDS; Osipow, Carney, Winer, Yanico, & Koschier, 1980). All are well-known instruments with good reliability and validity data.
Pearson product-moment correlations were computed to examine the relation of career decision-making self-efficacy scores to other scales in the study. Career decision-making self-efficacy related moderately and negatively to vocational indecision; the higher an individual’s level of vocational indecision, the lower their career decision-making self-efficacy score. Career decision-making self-efficacy also related positively to occupational self-efficacy, but no relation was found between career decision-making self-efficacy and career salience. Also, the stronger one’s external locus of control, the lower was one’s career decision-making self-efficacy. A multiple regression analysis was conducted with vocational indecision as the dependent variable, and career decision-making self-efficacy, career salience, and locus of control as the independent variables. The analysis resulted in an R of .54 with 29% of the variance captured; yet only career decision-making self-efficacy significantly contributed to prediction of vocational indecision. That career decision-making self-efficacy was the single significant predictor of vocational indecision confirmed earlier findings (e.g., Taylor & Betz, 1983).

Although this research was correlational in nature, it spurred vital research in the vocational domain that focused on various personal and environmental characteristics that may affect vocational development. Yet, this study was limited in that the results cannot be necessarily generalized to members of minority groups.

With the intent of extending the study of career decision-making self-efficacy, Luzzo (1993) focused on the unanswered question in the literature of whether self-efficacy expectations relate to effective decision-making. He included measures to examine the relations between career decision-making self-efficacy (as measured by the
CDMSES), career decision-making attitudes (as measured by the Career Maturity Inventory Attitude scale, Crites, 1978) and career decision-making skills (as measured by Super, Thompson, Lindeman, Jordaan & Myers, 1981, Decision-Making scale of their Career Development Inventory), and career maturity (as measured by the Career Maturity Attitude Scale, Crites, 1978b).

A total of two hundred and thirty-three participants (162 women and 71 men) comprised the sample. Their ages ranged from 18 to 52 years (M=24.74) and 80% of the sample was Caucasian, 7% was Asian American, 5% was Hispanic, and 4% was African American. Students were enrolled in an Introductory Psychology course and participated voluntarily. The participants were debriefed after completion of the instruments, which were presented in a counter-balanced order to control for order effects in terms of construct linkages.

The pertinent results that relate to the current study include a significant relation between career decision-making self-efficacy and career maturity attitudes (r’s= .364, .311); this relation suggested a theoretical link between a level of belief in one’s ability to make career decisions and one’s emotions, feelings, and subjective reactions related to the career decision-making process. Surprisingly, there was no significant relation between career decision-making self-efficacy and career decision-making skills (as operationalized in this research). Also, gender differences were not found in career decision-making self-efficacy; this lent support to previous findings (Taylor & Betz, 1983; Taylor & Popma, 1990b).
Luzzo’s (1993) study provided insight as to the difference between career decision-making skills and attitudes and substantiated earlier findings of no significant gender differences in career decision-making self-efficacy. Although strong methodologically, the sample for this study included few minority group members, especially African-Americans, which limits the generalizability of the findings.

Moving from career decision-making skills and attitudes to focusing on career outcomes expectations, Betz and Voyten (1997) examined how self-efficacy (as measured with the CDMSES) and outcome expectations influence career exploratory intentions (a behavioral measure) and decidedness (as measured by the CDS). The main purpose of the study was to examine career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectations in relation to level of career decidedness and career exploration as operationalized by behavioral intentions. Previous research had shown the relation of career decision-making self-efficacy to career indecision (Taylor & Betz, 1983); thus the Betz and Voyten study added outcome expectations in order to test Lent et al.’s (1994) model of vocational behavior, which was coined Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT), and is an extension of Bandura’s (1971) Social Cognitive Theory (SCT). Lent et al. (1994) developed SCCT as a career/academic choice process model, and in doing so hypothesized that self-efficacy in combination with outcome beliefs (expectations) predict interests. Next, interests bring forth a desire or career choice goal (e.g., going to college), which then results in a choice action (e.g., choosing a college major). Choice actions lead to performance domains/attainments (either positive or negative results or outcomes). Outcome expectations also influence choice goals and actions directly. Lent et al. (1994)
highlighted that ultimately, self-efficacy affects all variables directly, but life situations and circumstances may hamper one’s goals, thus re-assessment or changing one’s direction may be needed.

Participants in the Betz and Voyten (1997) study were enrolled in an Introduction to Psychology course and received extra credit for participating. A total of 350 participants (125 men and 220 women, and 5 unknown) were involved. The sample was comprised of 16% minorities (i.e., 6% African American, 6% Asian American, 3% Hispanic, and 1% American Indian) (Betz & Voyten, 1997).

Correlational analyses revealed no significant gender differences in the relations amongst the variables in the study. The relation between career decision-making self-efficacy and career outcome expectations, however, was significantly stronger for men than for women (Betz & Voyten, 1997). For both men and women, as the relation between career decision-making self-efficacy and exploratory intentions increased, levels of career indecision decreased. Further, as expected, career outcome expectations had a significant positive relation with exploratory intentions for both men and women ($r= .50$ for men and women), but academic outcome expectations correlated highly with exploratory intentions only for men ($r= .48$). Higher levels of indecision correlated significantly with exploratory intentions in women ($r= .25$) but not men. Overall, 25% and 29% of the variance in exploratory intentions was accounted for by career outcome expectations for female and male students respectively, and 19% and 28% of the variance in indecision, for women and men respectively, was captured by career decision-making self-efficacy.
This study substantiated earlier findings of no significant gender difference in levels of career decision-making self-efficacy. In addition, it was effective in examining the relations amongst self-efficacy, indecision and outcome expectations in order to test the applicability of Lent et al.’s (1994) model of vocational behavior. Although the methodology in this research was strong, the low numbers of minority group members, especially African-Americans, again limits the generalizability of the findings of the study.

Continuing the examination of career decision-making self-efficacy, Kraus and Hughey (1999) went a step beyond paper and pencil research and included an intervention intended to affect career decision-making self-efficacy and career indecision. This study was based on Krumboltz’s (1979) discussion of career decision-making (CDM) skills as a result of learning experiences. The procedure involved instructing the students on career choice competencies and giving them a chance to practice these competencies. This allowed them to incorporate the competencies in their career development and career decision-making skills repertoire.

Participants were high school juniors from a Midwestern integrated school. The sample included 30 female and 30 male students, and they were assigned randomly to the treatment and control groups with 15 female and 15 male students in each group. The racial/ethnic composition of the sample was 67% Caucasian, 15% African Americans, 5% Hispanics, 7% Asian, and 2% American Indian. The counselor in the study was a Caucasian woman with 17 years of experience as a school counselor; at the time of the study she was a high school guidance counselor and the primary researcher. To control
for possible biasing effects, her performance was self-monitored. Instruments included CDMSES/short form (Betz, Klein & Taylor, 1996a) and the CDS (Osipow, Carney, Winer, et al., 1976).

The CDMSES/short form and the CDS were administered after the intervention, and then again four weeks later. A post test-only delayed post-test control-group design was chosen in order to control threats to external validity and re-test effects. Mixed model, repeated measures analysis was utilized to test interactions and main effects for the between subjects and within subjects factors (Kraus & Hughey, 1999).

Kraus and Hughey (1999) found no significant difference between the treatment and control groups in level of career decision-making self-efficacy at post-test or delayed post-test. When the treatment effects were examined separately by gender, no significant difference was found for men in terms of career decision-making self-efficacy scores. For treatment and control group women, however, the members of the treatment group had higher career decision-making self-efficacy scores than did the members of the control group. The authors noted men overall had higher career decision-making self-efficacy scores. Post hoc analyses were conducted to study the relation of career decision-making self-efficacy with career indecision. Most related to the current study was a significant inverse relation between career decision-making self-efficacy and career indecision, which substantiated previous research in this area (e.g., Taylor & Betz, 1983; Taylor & Popma, 1990).

This study by Kraus and Hughey (1999) was pivotal due to its examination of the impact of an intervention on career development and career decision-making skills. Men
overall had higher levels of career decision-making self-efficacy, but the most striking finding was the higher career decision-making self-efficacy scores for women in the treatment group as compared to those in the control group. These findings underscore the importance of examining the career decision-making process and possible career interventions for women. The researchers made a good effort to include racial minority group members, and with a larger sample it would have been possible to examine treatment effects in relation to minority group status. In addition, a pretest may have shed light on whether the intervention was effective above and beyond the other studied variables. Despite questions about whether another counselor should have been recruited for the treatment, sound methods and analyses generally were utilized.

In conclusion, the research on career decision-making self-efficacy suggests that career indecision generally is related moderately and in a negative direction to career decision-making self-efficacy expectations. That is, greater indecision is linked typically to decreased confidence in one’s ability to make career decisions. Further, when regression analyses included other variables (e.g., verbal and math ability), career decision-making self-efficacy was usually the best predictor of vocational indecision. Although the majority of the studies revealed no significant gender differences in career decision-making self-efficacy, a pivotal finding from Kraus and Hughey (1999) was that women might be especially responsive to treatments aimed at increasing career decision-making self-efficacy. These findings underscore the importance of continued research to examine the career decision-making process with women and possible career
interventions aimed at increasing career decision-making self-efficacy and enhancing career development for women.

Although the research on career decision-making self-efficacy/career indecision has served to increase our knowledge about career development, in terms of the importance of one’s career decision-making self-efficacy and how it affects career indecision, a major limitation of the research thus far has been the lack of an adequate number of minorities in samples, including African Americans. Generally, the percentage of African Americans in samples was reported to be less than ten percent and this limits confidence in the generalizability of findings beyond Caucasian persons. Therefore, an important focus of the present study is to look at African American women’s career decision-making self-efficacy in relation to career indecision.

Summary and hypotheses

The career development and career choice processes of African American women from the perspective Social Cognitive Theory are the primary foci of the current study. Specifically, career decision-making self-efficacy and career indecision consistently have been shown to have an inverse relation; as career decision-making self-efficacy decreases, career indecision increases (Betz & Voyten, 1997; Taylor & Betz, 1983). The majority of the studies of career decision-making self-efficacy and indecision, however, consistently have lacked a representative sample of African Americans (Taylor & Betz, 1983; Taylor & Popma, 1990). Indeed, only very limited research (e.g., Arbona & Novy, 1991; Gooden & Washington, 1996; Pearson & Bieschke, 2001) has examined African American women’s career development processes. Therefore, the current study addresses
the lack of research focused on African Americans, especially young African American women career development and career choice process. The relations among career decision-making self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and career indecision are examined.

The present research also builds on the work of Hill (1997) and Hackett and Byars (1996) who began to apply Social Cognitive Theory’s tenets to the vocational behavior of African Americans. Hill’s (1997) study, in particular, explored the differences in the career decision-making process for African American and Euro American college students. She found no significant difference in levels of career decision-making self-efficacy amongst the Euro-American men and women, and African American men and women in her sample, but her data revealed that African American women had significantly higher career indecision as compared to Euro-American women. In addition, African American women reported higher levels of perceived racism as a career barrier to attaining desired goals as compared to Euro-American women. Relevant to these findings, Hackett and Byars (1996) interpreted barriers such as racism as learning experiences. With the aforementioned in mind, the analysis of racist and sexist discriminatory events and their relation to African American women’s career decision-making self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and career indecision are the second focus of the current study.

This research follows the advice of Hill (1997), Osipow and Reed (1985), and Taylor and Betz (1983); these authors implored the research community to explore the career development process from the perspective of the Social Cognitive Theory. Other authors also exhorted vocational researchers to be more inclusive (e.g., Brown, 2000).
hope to contribute specifically to the literature on African American women’s career
decision-making process by examining their career decision-making self-efficacy and
outcome expectancies in relation to their career indecision, thereby helping to determine
the factors that may impede their successful attainment of their career goals. In addition,
the current study incorporates Hackett and Byars’ (1996) and Byars and Hackett’s (1998)
conceptualization of racist and sexist events as learning experiences that may have an
effect on African American women’s career decision-making process. Klonoff and
Landrine’s (1995) and Landrine and Klonoff’s (1996) Schedule of Sexist Events and
Schedule of Racist Events instruments are utilized to research the relations of sexual and
racial discriminatory events to African American women’s career decision-making self-
efficacy, outcome expectancies, and career indecision.

In sum, the current study seeks to contribute to the psychological literature on
African American women’s career development process by using Social Cognitive
Theory to examine how learning experiences with racism and sexism relate to career
decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies. Also, since past research has
suggested that levels of career indecision may be related to career decision-making self-
efficacy and outcome expectancies for African American women (Hill, 1997), the present
study examines how career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectations may
be related to career indecision. Based upon the information that has been presented, then,
the following hypotheses are forwarded:
**Hypothesis 1a:** African American women who endorse higher levels of sexist event experiences, in the past year or over their lifetime, endorse lower levels of career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies.

**Hypothesis 1b:** African American women who endorse higher levels of racist event experiences, in the past year or over their lifetime, endorse lower levels of career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies.

**Hypothesis 1c:** Sexist and racist events each contribute unique variance to prediction of career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies for African American women.

**Hypothesis 2a:** African American women who report more career decision-making self-efficacy, report lower career indecision.

**Hypothesis 2b:** African American women who report higher outcome expectancies for career decision-making, report lower career indecision.

**Hypothesis 2c:** Higher career decision-making self-efficacy and higher outcome expectancies for career decision-making each contribute unique variance to the prediction of career indecision among African American women.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

In this chapter, the present research methods are presented. First, a description of the participants and procedures, including a description of the demographics of the African American women, is presented. Included as a part of the procedures, a discussion of sample size is offered and related to the hypotheses and their foundation in the literature. Third, research instruments are described, and this is followed by a summary of the statistical analyses as they relate to the hypotheses in the current study.

Participants and Procedure

One hundred and eight African American women between the ages of 18 to 63 were included in this research project. Data were collected between 2005 and 2006. A socio-economically and occupationally diverse group of African American women was sought through various social and professional organizations in two mid-western cities. These included college and university, church group, and business organization sources. Although the primary age range for the research was intended to be ages 18 to 35 years, some organizations who participated in this project included women beyond the age of thirty-five.
Participation was voluntary. Leaders and contact persons from the organizations were contacted in person or by phone to obtain permission to present a description of the study to potential participants. Informed consent forms were provided to the women prior to their completing the instruments included in the packet.

Participants were asked to complete a demographic sheet and five surveys. The order of the instruments was as follows: CDS, CDMSSES, demographic sheet, outcome expectancy items, SSE, and SRE. This order is important in order to get measures of the criterion variables first, so as not to compromise the results. The demographic information sheet asked the participants to indicate their age, educational level, current occupation, employment status, desired occupation or goal if not the same as current occupation, marital status, and racial/ethnic background (i.e., primarily African American or Black; also bi-racial, for example, African American and Caucasian).

The two hypotheses with the most stringent power demands were hypotheses 1C and 2C. Prior work by Hill (1997) informed power calculations for 2C and indicated that self-efficacy and outcome expectations predict career indecision with an R squared of .20 for African American participants. No literature exists on the relation of racism and sexism to occupational self-efficacy and outcome expectations (1C), but effect size for these hypothesis tests may be estimated based on previous literature that showed that for African American females, SSE and SRE scores correlated approximately .30 with
mental health-related variables (e.g., Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). This being the case, the test of 2C determined the targeted sample size. To test the unique contributions of SSE and SRE scores to the prediction of self-efficacy and outcome expectations, then, it was determined that if alpha is set at .05 and the desired power is .80, a sample of 110 persons is needed to find a significant increment of .06 to $R^2$ squared at Step 2 of a regression assuming an increment of .10 at Step 1. These increments were chosen to reflect realistically the likely overlap of SSE and SRE scores.

**Instruments**

*Career Decision Scale* - The Career Decision Scale (CDS; Osipow, Carney, Winer, Yanico, & Koschier, 1976) was developed to measure the level of certainty of high school and college students in their career decision-making process. Moreover, the CDS has been used extensively in the research community to measure the extent and nature of career indecision.

The 18 CDS items are related to aspects of vocational decision-making. For example, Item 1 reads, “I have decided on a career and feel comfortable with it, I also know how to go about implementing my choice”; Item 12 reads, “I know what I’d like to major in, but I don’t know what careers it can lead to that would satisfy me.” Responses are obtained using a 4-point Likert scale with response alternatives ranging from “exactly like me” (scored 4) to “not at all like me” (scored 1). Items 1 and 2 measure the extent to
which a respondent endorses statements reflecting a definite choice of an educational major (Item 1) and a career alternative (Item 2). The composite of the scores on Items 1 and 2 are an index of vocational/educational decidedness (Certainty subscale). The total of items 3 to 18 provides an index of vocational indecision (Indecision subscale). The maximum score for the Certainty subscale is 8, and it is 64 for the Indecision subscale. Indecision scores may range from 16 to 64, with higher scores indicating greater degrees of vocational indecision. The CDS also incorporates one open-ended question to assess one’s view of barriers to decision-making that may not be captured in the scale. The present research study used the Indecision subscale.

According to Osipow, Carney, and Barak (1976) test-retest reliability coefficients for the CDS were .90 and .80 for two samples of college students, race was not indicated, over a 2-week test-retest period. In addition, Slaney, Palko-Nonemaker, and Alexander (1981) found an alpha coefficient of .70 for the total CDS for a sample of undergraduates. An extensive review of the CDS is contained in its manual (Osipow, 1980); and its utilization in career assessment is discussed by Osipow and Winer (1996).

Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale. The Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale (CDMSES) was developed by Taylor and Betz (1983) to measure the level of an individual’s belief that he or she can successfully complete tasks needed to make career decisions. The scale is based on Crites’ (1961, 1965) model of career maturity that
includes the domain of behaviors relevant to the process of career decision-making (Taylor & Betz, 1983). The five career choice competencies addressed on the CDMSES are accurate self-appraisal, gathering occupational information, goal selection, making future plans and problem solving. The CDMSES consists of 50-items (10 per scale) designed to assess self-efficacy expectations with regard to career decision-making tasks. Respondents indicate their confidence in accomplishing a specific task on a 10-point scale ranging from No Confidence at All (0) to Complete Confidence (9). A total score reflecting career decision-making self-efficacy expectations is computed by summing the confidence ratings for all 50 items. Total CDMSE scores may range from 0 to 450 (Taylor & Betz, 1983; Taylor & Popma, 1990).

The CDMSES is reported to have high internal consistency reliability; the standardized value of coefficient alpha was .97 for a group of 346 primarily white students (Taylor & Betz, 1983). Item-total correlations also were generally high with values of 43 of the 50 items (86%) in the range of .50 to .80, and only one value below .30. Reliabilities (coefficient alpha) for the five 10-item subscales were .88, .89, .87, .89, and .86 for Self-Appraisal, Occupational Information, Goal Selection, Planning, and Problem Solving, respectively (Taylor & Betz, 1983). Test-retest reliability was .83 over a six-week period for a sample of college students (Luzzo, 1993).
Taylor and Popma (1990) also conducted analyses to assess the relation of the CDMSES total score and subscales with vocational indecision (CDS), vocational decidedness (CDS) and other variables. Results with a sample of college students showed a negative relation between career decision-making self-efficacy and vocational indecision (-.51). A moderately positive relation was found amongst career decision-making self-efficacy and vocational decidedness (.46); this result indicates that as the individual’s vocational choice becomes more stable he or she is also more apt to have increased confidence to finish career decision-making tasks.

**Outcome Expectancies** Items adapted from Bieschke (1993) and Fouad and Smith (1996) that were utilized by Betz and Voyten (1997) were selected to assess outcome expectations related to career decision-making behaviors in this research. Items address behaviors that may be useful in one’s examination of career options and decision-making. Responses to the 7 scale items are made on a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1). In their research, Betz and Voyten (1997) found coefficient alpha was .79.

**The Schedule of Sexist Events.** The Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE) was developed by Klonoff and Landrine (1995) to measure a woman’s self-report of incidents of sexist events in varying settings. For example, question 2 asks, “How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employer, boss or supervisors because you are a
woman?” (p.443). The SSE’s main focus is to evaluate global sexist discrimination. The instrument is comprised of 20 items that are rated from 1 (the event never happened) to 6 (the event happens almost all of the time). Each question is answered twice, one time to get the frequency of the sexist event over a woman’s lifetime (Lifetime Sexist Events) and the second time, to assess the frequency of the sexist event in the past year (Recent Sexist Events) (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995). Two scores are obtained from the responses. First, the sum of the respondent’s ratings for the past year’s frequency of events on all 20 items is obtained. This may range from 20 to 120. Next, the sum of the respondent’s ratings for their lifetime’s frequency of events on all 20 items is obtained. The lifetime events score also may range from 20 to 120.

With a sample of 631 women (403 White women and 228 women of color), Klonoff and Landrine (1995) conducted a principal components analysis with an orthogonal rotation; this yielded four factors for the SSE-Lifetime scale. These factors accounted for 58.8% of the variance. The same four factors were obtained for SSE-Recent scale; they accounted for 54.4% of the variance. The four factors were defined as Sexist Degradation and its Consequences, Sexist Discrimination in Distant Relationships, Sexism in Close Relationships, and Sexist Discrimination in the Workplace; the aforementioned names were indicative of the nature of the items that loaded on each factor (Klonoff & Landrine, 1995). The researchers reported high internal consistency.
reliability for items of the SSE-Lifetime, and the SSE-Recent subscales. For the SSE-
Lifetime factors (I to IV), internal consistencies were .89, .82, .67, and .68, respectively.
For the SSE-Recent factors (I to IV), the internal consistencies were .88, .74, .70, and .61,
accordingly. Total scale Cronbach’s alphas for the items of the SSE-Lifetime and the
SSE-Recent were .92 and .90 for this sample.

To assess the validity of the SSE, Klonoff and Landrine (1995) utilized the PERI-
LES and the Hassles-F scales; these are well known instruments used to assess stressful
life events. Preliminary results indicated that the SSE is valid for measuring stressful
events due to its high correlation with the PERI-LES and the Hassles-F scales (Klonoff &
Landrine, 1995).

The Schedule of Racist Events. The Schedule of Racist Events (SRE) was
developed by Landrine and Klonoff (1996) to assess both frequencies (recent and
lifetime) and self-appraisal of racist events. The researchers viewed the racist events as
dergent from normal, everyday life events due to their nature of being negative and
stressful (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). The SRE is based on a global stress prototype, and
modeled after the PERI-Life Events Scale (Dohrenwend, Krasnoff, Askenasy, &
Dohrenwend, 1978) and the Hassles Frequency scale (Kanner, Coyne, Schaeffer, &
Lazarus, 1981). In addition, the items of the SRE were developed to examine racism in
varying life arenas. For example, question 1 asks, “How many times have you been treated unfairly by teachers and professors because you are Black?” (p.162).

The recent and lifetime racist events subscales consist of 18 items that are rated on a six point scale (1=If this has Never happened to you, to 6= If this has happened Almost all of the time), the recent racist events score range from 18 to108. The lifetime racist events subscale also consists of 18 items; the score on it also can range from 18 to 108. The appraisal subscale consists of the sum of the respondents’ ratings for how stressful each event was on the first 17 items. The appraisal racist events score ranges from 17 to 102. Responses are made on a scale from (1=events not stressful, to 6=events extremely stressful).

From a sample of 153 African Americans (83 women, 66 men, 4 unidentified), Landrine and Klonoff (1996) reported reliability and validity information on the SRE. Reliability estimates for the SRE consisted of internal consistency reliability coefficients that were very elevated (i.e., .95 for recent racist events, .95 for lifetime racist events, .94 for appraised racist events). Split half-reliability coefficients also were high, (i.e., .93 for recent racist events, .91 for lifetime racist events, and .92 for appraised racist events). To assess the validity of the SRE, the researchers correlated the three SRE subscales with the Hopkins Symptom Checklist (HSCL-58; Derogatis, Lipman, Rickles, Uhlenhuth, & Covi, 1974). The results revealed that all three subscales of the SRE were related highly to
variables captured by the HSCL-58; for example symptoms of stress, somatic symptoms, feelings of inadequacy, and low self-esteem (as assessed by the Interpersonal Sensitivity subscale of the HSCL-58) correlated with these scores. More complex analyses revealed that 17.6% of the variance in somatic symptoms (r squared equals .42) was accounted for by racist experiences within the last year. Also, 17.6% of the variance in low self-esteem/feelings of inadequacy was accounted for by the appraisal of racism as stressful.

In addition, Landrine and Klonoff (1996) utilized multivariate analysis of variance to discover that when dividing respondents into high versus low psychiatric symptom groups, higher psychiatric symptoms related to increased experiences with racism.

In a cross validation study, Klonoff and Landrine (1999) again examined the SRE in relation to the total symptoms score on the Hopkins Symptom Checklist-58 (HSCL). The measures were significantly correlated. As individuals reported increased psychiatric symptoms, they also reported increased occurrences of experiencing racist events and appraisals of the events as more stressful. Reliability in this cross-validation also was comparable to the work of Landrine and Klonoff (1996). The researchers assessed the factor structure of the SRE with a Principal Components Analysis with rotation for orthogonal factors for each of the three subscales (recent, lifetime, and appraisal). The findings indicated that the SRE items primarily loaded on one factor. These results were consistent with Landrine and Klonoff (1996).
Statistical Analysis

Data were summarized, frequencies were run, and means, standard deviations and inter-correlations were determined initially. Then, an examination of criterion variables was conducted to determine their relation to the demographic variables. To test Hypothesis 1a, the CDMSES total score was correlated with the SSE recent and SSE lifetime scores. Also, the OES total score was correlated with the same two scores. To test Hypothesis 1b, the CDMSES total score was correlated with the SRE recent and SRE lifetime scores. Also, the OES total score was correlated with the same two scores. To test Hypothesis 1c, a hierarchical regression analysis first was conducted with the CDMSES total score as the dependent variable and the SRE recent and SSE recent scores as the independent variables. Initially, the SSE recent score was entered at Step 1. The SRE recent score was entered at Step 2. Then the order of entry of the two predictors (independent variables) was reversed. A significant \( p < .05 \) incremental contribution in predicting the CDMSES total at Step 2 in each case was interpreted as support for Hypothesis 1c. This analytic strategy was repeated to examine the SSE and SRE lifetime events scores as predictors. Finally, the same analytic procedures were repeated to predict the OES total score.

To test Hypothesis 2a, the CDMSES total score and CDS Indecision score were correlated. To test Hypothesis 2b, the OES total score and CDS Indecision score were
correlated. To test Hypothesis 2c, a hierarchical regression was conducted with the CDS Indecision score as the dependent variable and CDMSES total and OES total scores as independent variables. Initially, the CDMSES total score was entered at Step 1. In the second step, the OES total score was entered. Then the order of entry of the two predictors (independent variables) was reversed. A significant ($p < .05$) incremental contribution in predicting the CDS at Step 2 in each case was interpreted as support for Hypotheses 2c. Exploratory analyses with the CDS total score and the CDMSES total score were conducted as well.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, the results of the data analysis are presented. First, basic sample descriptive information is provided. This is followed by a description of the reliability analyses and their implications for tests of the hypotheses. Correlation and regression results related to tests of the hypotheses are presented next. Finally, the results of some exploratory analyses are described.

Sample Descriptive Analyses

Analysis began with a review of the data for missing and out of range values. There were 130 surveys given out to various women, and there were 116 surveys returned. Due to omitted items, there were a total of 8 cases deleted. The variables for each of the 108 surveys were entered into an Excel file and then converted to an SPSS data file so further analysis could be completed. In terms of the sample, the ages for the African–American women ranged from 18 to 63, with a mean age of 25 (SD = 6.88) years old.

Years of education was examined and 17 women (15.7% of the sample) had attained 12 years of education, 19 women (17.6% of the sample) had attained 14 years of
education, 10 women (9.3% of the sample) had attained 16 years of education, 3 women (2.8% of the sample) had 18 years of education and 1 woman (0.9% of the sample) had 27 years of education. Degree attainment was also examined. A total of 76 women (70%) were high school graduates, 12 women (11.1%) had attained associate degrees, 9 women (8.3%) had attained a bachelor’s degree, and 4 women (3.7%) had attained a master’s degree.

Income data were collected and 30 women (49.2% of the sample) reported that they earned $22,000 or less, 14 women (12.9% of the sample) reported that they earned between $22,000 and $30,000, 5 women (4.6% of the sample) reported that they earned between $30,000 and $35,000, 3 women (2.8% of the sample) earned between $35,000 and $45,000, 1 woman (.9% of the sample) reported that she earned between $45,000 and $50,000, 3 women (2.8% of the sample) reported that they earned between $50,000 and $60,000, 3 women (2.8% of the sample) reported that they earned between $60,000 and $70,000, and 2 women (1.8% of the sample) reported that they earned between $70,000 and $95,000.

Information on marital status also was gathered. The majority of the women in the sample were single. Ninety-six women (88.9% of the sample) were single, 11 women (10.2% of the sample) were married and 1 woman did not answer the question. Eighty-seven women (86% of the sample) were not currently raising children, and 19 women (17.6% of the sample) were currently raising children.

Thirty-five women (32.4% of the sample) stated they were not college students, but 71 women (65.7% of the sample) reported that they were students. Employment
status data also were gathered. The examination of the women’s status as homemakers, unpaid workers, and full time workers indicated that 14 women (13% of the sample) responded that they were homemakers. Ninety-two women (85.2 % of the sample) indicated that they were not homemakers when describing their current employment. Ninety-six women (88.9% of the sample) responded no to the question related to working without pay and 70 women (64.8% of the sample) stated they were not full-time paid employees, in comparison to 36 women (33.3% of the sample) who stated they were full-time paid employees.

Important to the present study was women’s expectations of employment stability, 74 women (68.5% of the sample) reported that they expected to stay in their current employment position for the next year. Thirty women (27.8% of the sample) reported that they expected to change their employment position within the next 12 months. Four women’s surveys contained missing data for this item.

Lastly, in a question evaluating how important their employment is to them in their life, using a Likert Scale ranging from 1 to 7 with 1 being no importance and 7 being extremely important, 2 women (1.9%) rated job importance at a 4, 12 women (11.1 %) rated it as a 5, 23 women (21.3%) rated it as a 6 and 69 women (63.9%) rated job importance as a 7, extremely important. Two women did not respond.

**Preliminary Analyses of Relationships among Focal Variables**

Table 1 presents the inter-correlations of the focal study variables. An examination of the relationships between among the total scores of the major research variables resulted in both expected significant correlations and unexpected significant
correlations. Indecision, Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy, and Outcome Expectancies are the primary variables of interest and exhibit the following correlations with experience of sexist and racist events.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for Total Scores on Each of the Major Research Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Indecision</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Career Decision-making Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Outcome Expectation</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.38**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Schedule of Sexist Events-Year</td>
<td>0.42**</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.85**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Schedule of Racist Events-Year</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.76**</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td>0.85**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Appraisal of Racist Events</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Indecision</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>372.60</td>
<td>31.06</td>
<td>39.55</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>36.74</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>44.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Career Decision-making Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>52.79</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>23.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N’s vary from 91 to 103.

** p < .01.
* p < .05.
+ p < .10.

There were significant positive relationships between Schedule of Sexist Events-Year, Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime, and Schedule of Racist Events-Year with Indecision. As racist (year) and sexist (year and lifetime) events increased, indecision
increased. Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy significantly and negatively correlated to the Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime at the .05 level.

Indecision and Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy have a negative but non-significant correlation, as do Indecision and Outcome Expectations. There is a positive significant relationship between Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy and outcome expectations. Increased career decision-making self-efficacy is correlated with increased outcome expectancies. Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy and Outcome Expectations were not significantly related to the other variables, which was unexpected.

Reliability Analyses

Reliability analysis was performed for the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale (CDMSES). The alpha reliability coefficient for the present sample of African-American women was determined to be .95. This is consistent with Taylor and Betz (1983) who surveyed 346 students from a large university and a private liberal arts college and reported an alpha reliability of .97 for the total scores. Similarly, Luzzo (1983a,b) reported an internal consistency reliability score of .93 for the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale total score.

The Career Decision Scale (CDS) also was examined and the alpha coefficient for the present sample of African-American women was .91. A previous study conducted by Slaney, Palko-Nonemaker, and Alexander (1981) reported an alpha coefficient of .70 for the Career Decision Scale total score using a sample of undergraduate students with race unspecified.
Reliability analyses for the Schedule of Sexist Events (SSE) Recent and Lifetime scales resulted in alpha coefficients for the present sample of .94 (recent) and .93 (lifetime) Schedule of Sexist Events (lifetime). These are comparable to what was reported in a previous study conducted by Klonoff and Landrine (1995). They used the Schedule of Sexist Events with 631 women, ages 18 –73, and this sample included 228 women of color (38 indicated they were Black). The alpha coefficients for their sample were .90 (recent) and .92 (lifetime).

Reliability analyses for the Schedule of Racist Events (SRE), Recent and Lifetime, and Appraisal scales resulted in alpha coefficients for the present study of .95 (recent), .95 (life), and .96 (appraisal). These reliabilities are very consistent with other research. For example, Landrine and Klonoff (1996) used the Schedule of Racist Events with 153 African –Americans (83 women and 66 men). Their alpha coefficients were .95 (recent), .95 (life) and .94 (appraisal).

Finally, the reliability analysis for the Outcome Expectation Scale yielded an alpha coefficient of .79. This matches the findings of Betz and Voyten (1997) who reported an alpha coefficient of .79.

Tests of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1A stated that African American women who endorse higher levels of sexist event experiences, in the past year or over their lifetimes, endorse lower levels of career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies. Testing hypothesis 1A required correlating the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale total score with the Schedule of Sexist Events-Recent and the Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime scores.
Significant inverse correlations between the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale total score and the Schedule of Sexist Events-Recent and Lifetime scores were expected, but not observed ($r_{SSE\text{-}recent} = -.09$, $r_{SSE\text{-}lifetime} = -.17$, $p > .05$). Thus, these analyses did not support the hypothesis that African-American women who report experiencing higher levels of sexist events in the past year or lifetime report lower levels of career decision-making self-efficacy.

When the Outcome Expectation Scale total score was correlated with the Schedule of Sexist Events-Recent and Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime scores, a similar result was noted. TheOutcome Expectation Scale total score correlated non-significantly ($p > .05$) with Schedule of Sexist Events-Recent score ($r_{SSE\text{-}recent} = .11$) and the Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime ($r_{SSE\text{-}lifetime} = .10$). Thus, the hypothesis that African-American women who experience higher levels of sexist events, in the past year or over a lifetime have lower outcome expectancies for career decision-making was not supported.

Hypothesis 1B stated that African American women who endorse higher levels of racist event experiences, in the past year or over their lifetime, endorse lower levels of career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies. Testing Hypothesis 1B required correlating the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale total score with Schedule of Racist Events-Recent and Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime scores. A significant negative correlation was expected between the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale total score and Schedule of Racist Events-Recent and Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime scores. The Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale total score did
not correlate significantly with the Schedule of Racist Events-Recent ($r_{SRE\text{-recent}} = -.11$),
yet was significantly negatively correlated with Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime ($r_{SRE\text{-lifetime}} = -.19$) at $p < .05$ level. That is, African-American women who experienced higher levels of racist events over a lifetime had lower career decision-making self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 1B also required correlating the Outcome Expectancy Scale score and the Schedule of Racist Events-Recent and Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime scores. The correlations between the Outcome Expectancy Scale score and the Schedule of Racist Events-Recent and Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime scores were expected to be significant and negative, but neither one was significant ($r_{SRE\text{-recent}} = .09$, $p > .05$; and $r_{SRE\text{-lifetime}} = .08$, $p > .05$). Thus, the hypothesis that African-American women who experience higher levels of racist events experience lower career decision-making outcome expectancies was not supported.

Hypothesis 1C stated that sexist and racist events each contribute unique variance to prediction of career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies for African American women. Testing hypothesis 1C required a hierarchical regression analysis with the Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy Scale total score as the dependent variable and the Schedule of Racist Events-Recent and Schedule of Sexist Events-Recent scores as the independent variables. Unfortunately, the sample size for the hierarchical regression analysis was smaller than desired due to missing data. Nevertheless, the Schedule of Racist Events-Recent score was entered into the regression in Step 1. A non-significant R-squared resulted ($R^2 = .014$, $F (1, 81) = 1.161$, $p > .05$). In the second step, the Schedule of Schedule Sexist Events-Recent score was added to the regression to
determine if it further contributed to the prediction of Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy Scale. A significant increase did not occur. These results are summarized in Table 2.

Next, the order of the predictors was reversed and the Schedule of Sexist Events-Recent was entered in Step 1. A non-significant R-squared resulted ($R^2 = .010$, $F (1, 81)= .83, p>.05$). In the second step, Schedule of Racist Events-Recent was added to the regression and a significant increase did not occur. These results also are summarized in Table 2.

Testing Hypothesis 1C also required a hierarchical regression analysis with Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy Scale Total score as the dependent variable and Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime and Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime scores as the independent variables. In the first analysis to test this portion of Hypothesis 1C, the Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime was entered into the regression in Step 1. A non-significant R-squared resulted ($R^2 = .04$, $F (1, 80) = 3.31, p>.05$). In the second step, Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime was added to the equation to determine if it further contributed to the prediction of Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy Scale. A significant increase did not occur. These results are summarized in Table 3.

Next, the order of predictors was reversed and Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime was entered in Step 1. A non-significant R-squared ($R^2 = .019$, $F (1, 80) = 1.52, p>.05$). In the second step, Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime was added to the regression and a significant increase did not occur. These results also are summarized in Table 3.
Table 2

Hierarchical regression analyses for tests predicting CDMSES Total score using SRE Recent and SSE Recent scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Total R Squared</th>
<th>R Squared Incremental</th>
<th>F Incremental</th>
<th>Df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SRE Recent</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td>(1,81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SSE Recent</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>(1,80)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Hierarchical regression analyses for tests predicting CDMSES Total score using SRE Lifetime and SSE Lifetime scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Total R Squared</th>
<th>R Squared Incremental</th>
<th>F Incremental</th>
<th>Df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SRE Life</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>3.306</td>
<td>(1,80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SSE Life</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>(1,79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SSE Life</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>1.522</td>
<td>(1,80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SRE Life</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>1.731</td>
<td>(1,79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next, the same analyses were computed using Outcome Expectancy Scale as the dependent variable and the Schedule of Racist Events-Recent and Schedule of Sexist Events-Recent as the independent variables. Schedule of Racist Events-Recent was entered in Step 1. A non-significant R-squared resulted ($R^2 = .010$, $F (1,92) = .89$, $p > .05$). In the second step, Schedule of Sexist Events-Recent was added to the regression to see if it further contributed to the prediction of Outcome Expectancy Scale. A significant increase did not occur. These results are presented in Table 4.
Next, the order of the predictors was reversed using Schedule Racist Events-Recent and Schedule of Sexist Events-Recent as the independent variables with Outcome Expectancy Scale as the dependent variable. In this analysis, the Schedule of Sexist Events-Recent was used in Step 1 of the regression. A non-significant R-squared resulted ($R^2 = .027$, $F (1, 92) = 2.52, p > .05$). In the second step the Schedule of Racist Events-Recent was added to the regression. A significant increase did not occur. These results are presented in Table 4 as well.

Testing this portion of Hypothesis 1C also required a hierarchical regression analysis using the Outcome Expectancy Scale as the dependent variable and Schedule Racist Events-Lifetime and Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime as the independent variables. The Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime was entered in Step 1. A non-significant R-squared resulted ($R^2 = .009$, $F (1, 91)= .86, p > .05$). In the second step, Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime was added to the regression. A significant increase did not occur. These results are presented in Table 5.

In the next part of this analysis, the Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime was entered in Step 1. A non-significant R-squared resulted ($R^2 = .033$, $F (1, 91) = 3.13, p > .05$). In the second step, Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime was added. A significant increase did not occur. These results are also in Table 5 on the next page.
Table 4

Hierarchical regression analyses predicting OES Total Score using SRE Recent and SSE Recent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Total R Squared</th>
<th>R Squared Incremental</th>
<th>F Incremental</th>
<th>Df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SRE Recent</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>(1,92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SSE Recent</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>1.756</td>
<td>(1,91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SSE Recent</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>2.524</td>
<td>(1,92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SRE Recent</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>(1,91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 2A stated that African American women who report more career decision-making self-efficacy, report lower career indecision. Testing hypothesis 2A required correlating the Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy Scale total score with the Career Decision Scale score. This was expected to be a significant inverse relationship. This study found a negative correlation of $r = -0.18$ ($p > .05$) but it was not significant. Thus, African-American women who reported higher career decision-making self-efficacy did not report significantly lower career indecision.

Table 5

Hierarchical regression analyses predicting OES Total Score using SRE Lifetime and SSE Lifetime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Total R Squared</th>
<th>R Squared Incremental</th>
<th>F Incremental</th>
<th>Df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SRE Life</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>(1,91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SSE Life</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>2.431</td>
<td>(1,90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SSE Life</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>3.130</td>
<td>(1,91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SRE Life</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>(1,90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 2B stated that African American women who report higher outcome expectancies for career decision-making, report lower career indecision. Testing hypothesis 2B required correlating the Outcome Expectancy Scale-Total score with the Career Decision Making Scale score. This was expected to be a significant inverse relationship. A significant correlation between the Outcome Expectancy Scale-Total score and the Career Decision was not found ($r = -.12; p > .05$). Thus, African-American women who report higher outcome expectancies do not report significantly lower levels of career indecision.

Hypothesis 2C stated that higher career decision-making self-efficacy and higher outcome expectancies for career decision-making each contribute unique variance to the prediction of career indecision among African American women. Testing hypothesis 2C required a hierarchical regression with the Career Decision Scale-Indecision score as the dependent variable and the Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy Scale-Total and the Outcome Expectancy Scale-Total scores as the independent variables. Unfortunately, the data from some surveys were omitted due to missing values and thus the sample size for the regression was reduced; this affected the power for this analysis. Nevertheless, initially the Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy Scale-Total score was entered in Step 1. A non-significant R-squared resulted ($R^2 = .034$, $F (1, 89) = 3.10$, $p > .05$). At the second step, the Outcome Expectancy Scale-Total score was entered to see if it would add further to the prediction of Career Decision Making Scale-Indecision. A significant increase did not occur. The order of the predictors was then reversed and the Outcome Expectancy Scale-Total score was entered in Step 1 of the regression. A non-significant
R-squared resulted ($R^2 = .025$, $F (1, 89) = 2.33$, $p > .05$). At the second step, the Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy Scale-Total score was added to see if it would further predict the Career Decision Scale-Indecision score. A further increase did not occur.

These results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Hierarchical regression analyses predicting CDS Indecision Score using CDMSES Total Score and OES Total Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Total R Squared</th>
<th>R Squared Incremental</th>
<th>F Incremental</th>
<th>Df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CDMSES</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>3.104</td>
<td>(1, 89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OES</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>(1, 88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>OES</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>2.325</td>
<td>(1, 89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CDMSES</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>1.526</td>
<td>(1, 88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exploratory Analyses

An examination of the relationships among the total scores of the major research variables resulted in both expected significant correlations and unexpected significant correlations. Indecision, Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy, and Outcome Expectancies are the primary variables of interest and exhibit the following correlations with experiences of sexist and racist events.

The bivariate correlations presented earlier in Table 1 showed significant positive relationships of the variables Schedule of Sexist Events-Year, Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime, and Schedule of Racist Events-Year. For ease of comparison, these results are reproduced again in the lower left diagonal of Table 7, along with new exploratory analyses. In this section of the results, a consideration of relationships with the Schedule
of Racist Events Appraisal Scale is also considered. The Appraisal Scale did show a 
significant correlation with Indecision.

Table 7

Exploratory Analyses: Descriptive Statistics for Total Scores on Each of the Major 
Research Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Indecision</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>-.21+</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Career Decision-making</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Outcome Expectation</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Schedule of Sexist</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events-Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Schedule of Sexist</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events-Lifetime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Schedule of Racist</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.75**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events-Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Schedule of Racist</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.85**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events-Lifetime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Appraisal of Racist</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>372.60</td>
<td>31.06</td>
<td>39.55</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>36.74</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>44.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>52.79</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>19.68</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>23.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The correlations reported in the lower diagonal of the table are simple bi-variate $r$’s. 
N’s for the lower diagonal values vary from 91 to 103. The upper diagonal of the table 
reports partial correlations controlling for the age of the respondents. $N$ for the upper 
diagonal values is 67, due to non-reporting of age by some respondents. 
** p < .01. 
* p < .05. 
+ p < .10.

Exploratory analyses as reported in the top, right diagonal matrix of Table 7 
showed that the relationships found in Table 1 held even when controlling for age. In 
addition, Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime was now also significantly related to
Indecision. In other words, as racist (year, lifetime, and appraisal) and sexist (year and lifetime) events increased, indecision increased. Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy significantly and negatively correlated to the Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime at the .05 level in the bivariate correlations, but this relationship was not statistically significant when age was controlled. However, note that the sample size and thus statistical power decreases slightly with the partial correlations.

Indecision and Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy have a negative but non-significant correlation when age is not controlled, but this correlation becomes stronger and statistically significant ($r = -.30, p < .05$) when age is controlled. A similar pattern is found for the relationship of Indecision and Outcome Expectations. The bivariate correlation, although negative, is not statistically significant when age is not controlled, but becomes significant when age is controlled, $r = -.21, p < .10$ (or $p < .05$, one-tailed). There is a positive, significant relationship between Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy and outcome expectations both when age is controlled and when it is not. This suggests that increased career decision-making self-efficacy is associated with increased outcome expectancies. Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy was not significantly related to Schedule of Sexist Events-Year or -Lifetime, nor to Schedule of Racist Events-Year, regardless of whether age was controlled or not. Outcome Expectations were not significantly related to any of the racist or sexist event variables, regardless of whether age was controlled, which was unexpected.

Finally, additional partial correlation and subsample analyses were conducted to determine whether the correlation values reported in Table 7 showed substantial changes
when: (a) college (yes/no) was included as a control variable; (b) only students were included in the analysis; and (c) income level was included as a control variable. Although not identical, the general pattern of results held regardless of considering these potential covariates. In addition, when they were used in the analysis, sample sizes tended to decrease, sometimes substantially (i.e., for income). Thus, it seems reasonable to base interpretations on values reported in Table 1.

In addition, exploratory analyses were conducted to examine if sexism and racism each contribute unique variance in the prediction of career indecision for African American women. A hierarchical regression was conducted with the Career Decision Scale-Indecision Total score as the dependent variable and the Schedule of Sexist Events-Recent score and the Schedule of Racist Events-Recent scores as the independent variables. The Schedule of Sexist Events-Recent score was entered into the regression in Step 1. A significant R-squared resulted ($R^2 = .192; F (1, 88) = 20.868, p < .01$). In the second step, the Schedule of Racist Events-Recent score was added to determine if it further contributed to the prediction of career indecision. A significant increase did not occur (See Table 8).

Next, the order of the predictors was reversed and the Schedule of Racist Events-Recent score was entered at Step 1. A non-significant R-squared resulted ($R^2 = .056; F (1, 88) = 5.232 p < .05$). In the second step, the Schedule of Sexist Events-Recent score was added to the regression and a significant increase did occur (See Table 8).

In order to examine the relation of sexism and racism over one’s lifetime to career indecision, a hierarchical regression analysis with Career Decision Scale-Indecision Total
score as the dependent variable and the Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime score and the Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime scores as the dependent variables. The Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime score was entered into the regression at Step 1. A non-significant R-squared resulted (R² = .035; F (1, 86) = 3.107, p > .05). In the second step, the Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime score was added to determine if it further contributed to the prediction of career indecision. A significant increase did occur (See Table 9).

Next, the order of the predictors was reversed and the Schedule of Sexist Events-Lifetime score was entered into Step 1. A significant R-squared resulted (R² = .130; F (1, 86) = 12.85; p < .01). In the second step, the Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime score then was added to the regression and a significant increase did not occur (See Table 9).

Table 8
Hierarchical regression analyses for prediction of CDS Indecision Score using SSE-recent total score and SRE-recent total score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Total R Squared</th>
<th>R Squared incremental</th>
<th>F incremental</th>
<th>Df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SSE Recent</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>20.868**</td>
<td>(1, 88)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRE Recent</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>2.149</td>
<td>(1, 87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SRE Recent</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>5.232</td>
<td>(1, 88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SSE Recent</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>17.101**</td>
<td>(1, 87)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; ** p < .01
Table 9

Hierarchical regression analyses prediction of CDS Indecision Score using SRE-life total score and SSE-life total score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Total R Squared</th>
<th>R Squared incremental</th>
<th>F incremental</th>
<th>Df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SRE Life</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>3.107</td>
<td>(1, 86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SSE Life</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>10.112**</td>
<td>(1, 85)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SSE Life</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>12.853**</td>
<td>(1,86)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SRE Life</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>(1,85)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; ** p< .01

Summary of Results

For this sample, there was a significant positive correlation between Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy and outcome expectations, but these variables did not correlate significantly as expected with most of the other variables of interest, including Career Indecision. Thus, it was not surprising that Hypothesis 1A (i.e., higher levels of sexist event experiences relate to lower levels of career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies) was not supported and 1B (i.e., higher levels of racist event experiences relate to lower levels of career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies) was only partially supported. Only the Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy Scale total score was significantly negatively correlated with Schedule of Racist Events-Lifetime score. Consequently, Hypothesis 1C (i.e., sexist and racist events each contribute unique variance to prediction of career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies for African American women) also received no support.

Hypothesis 2A, that African American women who report more career decision-making self-efficacy report lower career indecision, resulted in an inverse relationship but
it was not significant. Hypothesis 2B, that African American woman who report higher outcome expectancies for career decision-making report lower career indecisions, was not supported. Similarly, Hypothesis 2C, that higher career decision-making self-efficacy and higher outcome expectancies for career decision-making each contribute unique variance to the prediction of career indecision among African American women, was not supported.

Exploratory analyses found that the relationships amongst some but not all of the research variables when controlling for age were generally the same. A notable exception is that when age was controlled, the Scheduled of Racist Events-Lifetime significantly related to Indecision. As racist lifetime events increased, indecision increased. Even more notable, when age was not controlled, Indecision and Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy had a negative but non-significant correlation, but the relationship between the variables was stronger and statistically significant when age was controlled. Examining relations of research variables with Outcome Expectations, similar patterns were found for the relationship of Indecision and Outcome Expectations. It was negative, but not statistically significant when age was not controlled, but significant when age was controlled. In addition, the relationships of Appraisal of Racist events with the research variables were examined. The Appraisal of Racist Events had a significant inverse relationship with Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy; in comparison to positive significant relationships amongst other research variables, except for Outcome Expectations that was not significant.
Finally, exploratory analyses to examine whether sexism and racism each contribute unique variance in the prediction of career indecision for African American women indicated Schedule of Sexist Events-Recent and Lifetime scores predicted career indecision. The Schedule of Racist Events-Recent and Lifetime scores, however, did not contribute uniquely to the prediction of career indecision.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Sexism and racism were examined in this study in relationship to career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies. More specifically, African American women’s experiences of sexism and racism in the past year and over their lifetime were explored from the perspective of Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1986). This chapter details the summary of the findings, interpretations of the results in comparison to previous studies, limitations of the current study, and the implications for future research and practice.

Summary of findings

The current research examined sexist and racist events or experiences as career barriers for African-American women, and explored their relation with career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectations. The research was survey in nature, with questionnaires assessing sexist and racist events (recent and lifetime), career indecision, and career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies. Data were collected between 2005 and 2006. Out of 130 surveys distributed by multiple contacts, 116 surveys were returned. Due to omitted items, there were a total of 8 cases deleted. This community-based sample of 108 African American women ranged in age from 18 to 63,
with a mean age of 25 (SD = 6.88) years. This sample was in marked contrast to earlier studies (e.g., Arbona & Novy, 1991; Weathers, Chalmer, & Rodriquez, 1994; Gooden & Washington, 1996) in which the percentage of African Americans, and especially African American women, was reported to be less than ten percent; that fact had limited confidence in the generalizability of prior findings beyond Caucasian persons.

In Social Cognitive Theory, outcome and self-efficacy expectations are central constructs. Outcome expectations are defined as one’s belief that certain behaviors will lead to desired outcomes (Bandura, 1986). Efficacy expectations are beliefs that one can perform the behaviors required to achieve certain outcomes or results (Bandura, 1986). These constructs are learned and according to Bandura’s (1986) Social Cognitive Theory, and one’s personal efficacy and outcome expectations may determine if an individual will persevere toward a desired outcome (Bandura, 1977; 1986).

Based on Social Cognitive Theory and the work of Hackett and Byars (1996), it was expected that as women have learning experiences in the form of significant sexist and racist events, these events affect their career decision-making self-efficacy. Yet, the current study did not find a significant inverse relationship between sexist events and career decision-making self-efficacy. This was true whether African American women’s sexist events were recent or reported over a lifetime.

African American women’s racist event experiences over a year and over their lifetime also were examined in relation to their career decision-making self-efficacy. An inverse relationship again was expected. Racist events over a lifetime initially did relate
inversely to career decision-making self-efficacy, but recent racist events did not relate to career decision-making self-efficacy.

Learning experiences derived from life events (i.e., racist and sexist events) also were hypothesized to relate to career decision-making outcome expectations (Byars & Hackett, 1998). Unexpectedly, African American women’s reports of sexist and racist events over their lifetime or recently did not result in a significant inverse relationship with these outcome expectations. Further, sexist and racist events (recently or lifetime) did not contribute unique variance in the prediction of either career decision-making self-efficacy or outcome expectancies.

The current study also did not yield a significant inverse relationship between career decision-making self-efficacy and career indecision, which was in stark contrast to prior research (e.g., Taylor & Betz, 1983; Taylor & Popma, 1990). In this study when data from the entire sample of women were analyzed, African American women who reported higher career decision-making self-efficacy, did not report significantly lower career indecision. Along the same lines of thinking, African American women’s outcome expectancies for career decision-making were speculated to have an inverse relationship with career indecision, but no significant inverse relationship was found in the data for the overall sample. Finally, with SCT in mind, it was hypothesized that career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies for career decision-making both would uniquely predict career indecision for African-American women. Yet, neither variable contributed to the prediction of career indecision for the overall sample.
Although not hypothesized, a significant positive relationship was found between sexist experiences recently and lifetime and racist experiences over a lifetime with indecision. As a result, the separate contributions of sexist and racist events over an African-American woman’s lifetime or recently to the prediction of her current career indecision were examined. These regression analyses highlighted that African American women’s sexist events over their lifetime and recently did uniquely predict their career decidedness; but their racist events recent or lifetime did not uniquely predict career decidedness.

Further exploratory analyses moderated the previously noted lack of support for some hypotheses; specifically, when age was controlled, career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectations correlated as expected with indecision, and racist events (year, lifetime, and appraisal of racist events) and sexist events (year and lifetime) were positively related to indecision. Closer examination of the appraisal of racist events score also found that whether age is not controlled or controlled, appraisal of racist events had a significantly positive relationship to indecision, but no consistent significant relationship was found with career decision-making self-efficacy or outcome expectations. In addition, when controlling other variables (e.g., college, only students, and income level) the results were consistent with this pattern of results observed when age was controlled.

**Interpretations of results**

Given the significant role sexism has been shown to play in the career choice process (e.g., Byars & Hackett, 1996; Hackett & Byars, 1996), it was surprising that
higher levels of reported sexist event experiences did not relate to lower levels of career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies (regardless of age not being controlled or controlled). A possible explanation of why sexist events (recent or lifetime) did not relate to career decision-making self-efficacy for African American women in the current study may be found in Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT). According to this theory, there are multiple person inputs such as gender, race/ethnicity, and other background contextual affordances that affect learning experiences and self-efficacy and these other influences may lessen the impact of sexism (learning experiences) on one’s career decision-making self-efficacy (Lent, et al., 1994). These African American women may have had other struggles, including poverty and environmental hurdles, that were more powerful than sexual discriminatory events (recent or lifetime), and thus these latter events may not have had a significant effect on their career decision-making self-efficacy (i.e., their beliefs that they can perform the behaviors required to achieve certain outcomes or results).

In comparison, however, racist events over the women’s lifetime were related to their career decision-making self-efficacy in a significant manner when age was not controlled. Racism has been shown to be a major source of general stress for African American women (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). Racist encounters may range from subtle, covert acts of racism to being threatened or physically assaulted. The act may take place at one’s employment or while they are conducting their everyday lives (Landrine & Klonoff, 1996). The significant relationship of career decision-making self-efficacy with the overall sample of African American women’s experiencing of racist events over their
lifetimes may highlight a modest cumulative effect of racism on their career decision-making self-efficacy. In addition, African American women’s appraisals of the racist events they experienced were significantly related to career decision-making self-efficacy (again when age was not controlled); no significance was found, however, when controlling age.

The current study found that neither sexist nor racist event experiences in the past year and over African American women’s lifetime were related to outcome expectations (regardless of age not being controlled or controlled). Perhaps these African American girls or women received affirming messages from their culture that sexism and racism are to be expected and pursuit of career goals in employment and higher educational pursuits can be achieved regardless of these experiences encountered in life (Pearson & Bieschke, 2001). These may have moderated the impact of sexist and racist events on outcome expectations.

Exploratory analyses of these African American women’s appraisals of the racist events they experienced suggested that these appraisals were related to indecision, but not to self-efficacy and outcome expectations, whether age was controlled or not. Thus, it appears that these women’s appraisals of their experiences of racist events as stressful directly related to their indecision without linking to the normal process of SCT via the primary research variables of career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectancies. Indeed, analyses indicated that when age was controlled, recent and lifetime sexist and racist experiences and the appraisal of racist experiences all consistently related inversely to indecision. It appears the connection of these experiences to
indecision is either a direct one or takes place through some other mechanism. This seems an important direction for future research.

It is notable, too, that African American women’s recent and lifetime sexist experiences predicted unique variance in indecision in the overall sample. This result may be related to the African American women’s lower comfort level in exploring and considering male dominated fields due to early experiences in elementary school through high school. Many African American girls and women may have been discouraged by guidance counselors, teachers, and most significantly, their families in pursuing careers dominated by men. For example, African American girls and women may have been told that women make good teachers, nurses, and social workers (Byars & Hackett, 1998).

Career decision-making self-efficacy and more positive outcome expectancies for career decision-making did not relate consistently or contribute unique variance to the prediction of career indecision in this overall sample of African American women as had been expected. This finding is similar to Hill’s (1997) findings that in predicting career indecision, career outcome expectations did not predict or add to the prediction of career indecision, but it contradicts much other previous research on SCT (Betz & Voyten, 1997). It is critical to note, however, that many of these prior studies surveyed young college women and that in the present study there was a significant inverse relationship between African American women’s career decision-making self-efficacy and career indecision when age was controlled.

It appears, then, in the current study that age moderated the relationship between self-efficacy and indecision for this sample. This result is more similar to previous
studies (e.g., Hill, 1997; Kraus & Hughey, 1999; Taylor & Betz, 1983) that had shown a consistent significant inverse relationship between career decision-making self-efficacy and career indecision amongst African-American men and women, along with Caucasian men and women. This finding points to age as an important moderator variable in this research.

Further, age appeared to be an important moderator again in that African American women who reported more positive outcome expectancies for career decision-making reported lower career indecision as expected when age was controlled. This finding also is consistent with prior studies (e.g., Betz & Voyten, 1997; Taylor & Betz, 1983) with primarily young White samples. It may be that the variables of interest in the present research were more relevant to some of the women, especially the younger women, than others and this may explain the differential findings. In conclusion, when examining the relations amongst Social Cognitive Theory’s variables (Bandura, 1986) with the current sample of African American women, as expected in Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1986), SCT does seem to be capturing aspects of their career choice process if age is included as a covariate. As an example, the findings from this research seem to support SCT tenets that African American women’s self-efficacy and outcome beliefs about their career decision-making are related to their indecision.

Interestingly, however, although sexist and racist experiences seem to have some relation to indecision, they do not impact career decision-making self-efficacy expectations or expectancies for career decision-making outcomes. In other words, the research seems to suggest that for these African American women, the negative experiences of sexism and
racism did not ultimately change their thinking about the process of making career
decisions, but may have affected their level of indecision.

Limitations of the study

A limitation of the current study was the sample size that may have impacted the
significance of predictions and correlations in the study. A larger sample size may have
increased the power for the analyses so that the number of significant relationships
amongst the variables in the study may have been increased.

Another limitation of the study may be the lack of generalizing to African
American women who live in varying regions of the United States and abroad. It may be
that data from African American women who are living in different areas of the United
States and other countries may have resulted in the expected significant relationships
amongst the Social Cognitive Theory variables.

Lastly, a critical limitation of the study was that the sample was comprised of a
third of African American women who were not students and were full-time employed.
This study originally aimed at capturing young African American women’s between the
ages of 18 to 35. This mixed age and experience range is a limitation that affected the
relationships amongst the Social Cognitive Theory variables.

Implications for future research

Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1977) does appear to be capturing the career
choice process for African American women in this study. Although, when not
controlling for age, the findings indicated no significant inverse relationship between
career decision-making self-efficacy and indecision. Yet, when age was controlled, a
larger statistical relationship was found between career decision-making self-efficacy and outcome expectations. Future research needs to control for age and focus specifically on each age group, for example, African American women between the ages 18 to 25 years old.

In addition, future research is needed examining the impact of possible background contextual influences on indecision, (i.e., familial level of support of her attending college, economic barriers, and stressors) that may hinder African American women’s career choice process. Furthermore, research focusing on how racism and sexism relate to career indecision would be beneficial amongst various cohorts of African American women from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds. Although racism and sexism as learning experiences did not function through self-efficacy or outcome expectations, they did relate to indecision. Thus, I would be interested in examining the mechanism for the individual or joint effects of racism and sexism as learning experiences on African American women’s career indecision; this may further researchers’ understanding of the relations amongst Social Cognitive Theory’s variables.

Future research is needed as well to examine the relationship between African American women’s sexist and racist experiences with additional career outcome variables (e.g., choice of career, length of time in chosen career, and career advancement in chosen career). These examinations may further explain how experiences in the actual workforce affect the career choice process for African American women. As an example, African American women’s experiences of racism and sexism, or the lack thereof, may have significant impact on the aforementioned outcome variables.
Implications for future practice

Social Cognitive Theory has been described as a good theoretical model of the career choice process when applied to majority or college samples (Hill, 1997). When age was controlled, the significant relationships and predictions of the social cognitive variables were found as previously indicated in past studies (Taylor & Betz, 1983; Taylor & Popma, 1990). For example, career decision-making self-efficacy was significantly inversely related to indecision. Thus, in terms of future practice, gleaning from the results of the current study, it seems important for clinicians, teachers, and family members to view SCT as a good model which captures parts of the career choice process for young African American women.

In addition, future practice with African American women will need to include an examination of the impact of sexist and racist experiences (recent and lifetime) may have on their level of indecision. Prior research has indicated that African American women’s career indecision may start as early as primary to high school due to their sexist experiences with biased educators and family members (Hackett & Byars, 1996). Applying the present results to practice, African American girls and women may benefit from exposure to career days in which women of all races in diverse career fields discuss their experiences in terms of racism and sexism; especially important may be their sharing the manner in which they overcame these obstacles in order to help model coping with career decision-making issues. In addition to career days, it may be beneficial for the African American girls and freshmen in college are oriented to college life and
mentored by female upper-classmen of all races to observe and gain coping skills of how they have overcome racism and sexism in the college/university setting.
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APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHICS

Age:

Years of Education:

Highest degree/diploma earned:

Total Household Income:

Please indicate your racial/ethnic background:

___________________ African American

___________________ Bi-racial (African American and other race, e.g., Caucasian)

Please indicate whether you are:

___________________ Married/Partnered

___________________ Currently raising dependent children

___________________ Single with no dependent children

Please indicate all activities that describe your current employment:

___________________ Homemaking

___________________ Other unpaid work

___________________ Full time paid employment

___________________ Part time paid employment
______________________ Student (part time or full time)

Please write your desired occupation:

_____________________________________________________________________

How important is work/career in your life?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

not at all          extremely

important          important
APPENDIX B

CAREER DECISION SCALE

This questionnaire contains some statements that people commonly make about their educational and occupational plans. Some of the statements may apply to you; others may not. Please read through them and indicate how closely each item describes you in your thinking about a career or an educational choice by circling the appropriate number on the answer sheet. An example is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Exactly like me</th>
<th>Very Much like me</th>
<th>Only Slightly like me</th>
<th>Not at all like me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am excited about graduating and going to work.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Circle Your Answers:

1. I have decided on a career and feel comfortable with it. I also know how to go about implementing my choice. [4 3 2 1]
2. I have decided on a major and feel comfortable with it. I also know how to go about implementing my choice. [4 3 2 1]
3. If I had the skills or the opportunity, I know I would be a _____ but this choice is really not possible for me. I haven't given much consideration to any other alternatives, however. [4 3 2 1]
4. Several careers have equal appeal to me. I'm having a difficult time deciding among them. [4 3 2 1]
5. I know I will have to go to work eventually, but none of the careers I know about appeal to me. [4 3 2 1]
6. I'd like to be a ____________________, but I'd be going against the wishes of someone who is important to me if I did so. Because of this, it's difficult for me to make a career decision right now. I hope I can find a way to please them and myself. [4 3 2 1]
7. Until now, I haven't given much thought to choosing a career. I feel lost when I think about it because I haven't had many experiences in making decisions on my own and I don't have enough information to make a career decision right now. [4 3 2 1]
8. I feel discouraged because everything about choosing a career seems so 'iffy and uncertain; I feel discouraged, so much so that I'd like to put off making a decision for the time being. [4 3 2 1]
9. I thought I knew what I wanted for a career, but recently I found out that it wouldn't be possible for me to pursue it. Now I've got to start looking for other possible careers. [4 3 2 1]
10 I want to be absolutely certain that my career choice is the "right" one, but none of the careers I know about seem ideal for me.

11 Having to make a career decision bothers me. I'd like to make a decision quickly and get it over with. I wish I could take a test that would tell me what kind of career I should pursue.

12 I know what I'd like to major in, but I don't know what careers it can lead to that would satisfy me.

13 I can't make a career choice right now because I don't know what my abilities are.

14 I don't know what my interests are. A few things "turn me on" but I'm not certain that they are related in any way to my career possibilities.

15 So many things interest me and I know I have the ability to do well regardless of what career I choose. It's hard for me to find just one thing that I would want as a career.

16 I have decided on a career, but I'm not certain how to go about implementing my choice. What do I need to become a ________ anyway?

17 I need more information about what different occupations are like before I can make a career decision.

18 I think I know what to major in, but I feel I need some additional support for it as a choice for myself.

19 None of the above items describe me. The following would describe me better, (write your response below).

______________________________________________________________
APPENDIX C

CONFIDENCE SCALE

INSTRUCTIONS: This scale contains fifty tasks dealing with future decision-making. Please rate each item according to the amount of confidence you have in yourself accomplishing that task. You may rate yourself on a scale from 0 to 9.

0=No Confidence to 9=Complete Confidence

1. Make a career decision and then not worry about whether it was right or wrong. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
2. Persistently work at your career goal even when you get frustrated. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
3. Find out which occupations will require more new employees in the year 2000. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
4. Change jobs if you are not satisfied with the one you enter. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
5. Choose the career you want even though the job market is declining with opportunities in this field. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
6. Determine whether you would rather work primarily with people or with information. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
7. Identify employers, firms, and schools related to your career possibilities. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
8. Find information about employers who hire people with exceptional skills in English. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
9. Successfully manage the job interview process. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
10. Find information in the library about occupations in which you are interested. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
11. Talk with a person already employed in the field in which you are interested. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
12. List several occupations that you are interested in. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
13. Make a plan of your goals for the next five years. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
14. Select one occupation from a list of potential occupations you are considering. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
15. Choose a career in which most workers are predominately the opposite sex. (Example: a woman working as an auto mechanic) 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
16 Apply again to college or technical school after being rejected the first time.
17 Come up with a strategy to deal with failing courses in high school.
18 Move to another city to get the kind of job you really would like.
19 Choose a field of study or career that your parents do not approve of.
20 Describe the type of lifestyle you would like to live.
21 Choose the best major for you even if it would take you longer to finish your college degree.
22 Choose a career that will fit your preferred lifestyle.
23 Choose an educational program or career that will suit your abilities.
24 Go back to school to get a college degree after being out of school 5-10 years.
25 Decide what you value most in an occupation.
26 Figure out what you are and are not ready to sacrifice to achieve your career goals.
27 Prepare a good resume.
28 Find and use the career center in your high school.
29 Find information about educational programs in engineering.
30 Talk to a teacher in an area you feel is important to your career.
31 Find information about colleges or technical schools.
32 Resist attempts of parents or friends to push you into a career or field of study you believe is beyond your abilities.
33 Decide whether or not you will need to attend college or technical school to achieve your career goals.
34 Determine the steps you need to take to successfully complete the program necessary for your career.
35 Determine what your ideal job would be.
36 Change fields of study if you did not like your first choice.
37 Find out about the average yearly earnings of people in an occupation.
38 Ask a teacher about schools and job opportunities you are interested in.
39 Plan course work outside of your field of study that will help you in your future career.
40 Get letters of recommendation from your teachers.
41 Describe the job duties of the career/occupation you would like to pursue.
42 Select one area of study from a list of potential areas you are considering.
43 Figure out whether you have the ability to successfully take more math courses than required for graduation.
44 Choose an area of study or career that will fit your interests.

45 List several areas of study or majors that you are interested in.

46 Identify some reasonable areas of study or career alternatives if you are unable to get your first choice.

47 Determine the steps to take if you are having academic trouble with your chosen area of study.

48 Determine the academic subject you have the most ability in.

49 Choose a major or career that will fit your interests.

50 Get involved in a work experience associated with your future goals.
This section contains some statements related to behaviors that may be useful in one’s examination of career options and decision-making. Please read through the items and indicate how strongly you agree (5) or disagree (1) with the statements.

Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree

1. If I learn more about different career, I will make a better career decision. 1 2 3 4 5

2. If I know my interests and abilities, then I will be able to choose a good career. 1 2 3 4 5

3. If I know about the education I need for different careers, I will make a better career decision. 1 2 3 4 5

4. If I spend enough time gathering information about careers, I can learn what I need to know to make a good decision. 1 2 3 4 5

5. If I am able to consider and set clear goals, I will make better career decisions. 1 2 3 4 5

6. If I am able to plan effectively for the future, I will make better career decisions. 1 2 3 4 5

7. If I have good problems solving skills, my career decisions will be of higher quality. 1 2 3 4 5
APPENDIX E

RACIST EVENTS

We are interested in your experiences with racism. As you answer the questions below, please think about your ENTIRE LIFE, from when you were a child to the present. For each question, please circle the number that best captures the things that have happened to you. Answer each question TWICE, once for what has happened to you IN THE PAST YEAR, and once for what YOUR ENTIRE LIFE HAS BEEN LIKE.

Use these numbers:
Circle 1 = If this has NEVER happened to you
Circle 2 = If this has happened ONCE IN AWHILE (less than 10% of the time)
Circle 3 = If this has happened SOMETIMES (10%-25% of the time)
Circle 4 = If this has happened A LOT (26%-49% of the time)
Circle 5 = If this has happened MOST OF THE TIME (50%-70% of the time)
Circle 6 = If this has happened ALMOST ALL OF THE TIME (more than 70% of the time)

1 How many times have you been treated unfairly by teachers and professors because you are Black?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   How stressful was this for you? (Not at all (1) to Extremely (6) 1 2 3 4 5 6

2 How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employers, bosses and supervisors because you are Black?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   How stressful was this for you? (Not at all (1) to Extremely (6) 1 2 3 4 5 6

3 How many times have you been treated unfairly by your co-workers, fellow students and colleagues because you are Black?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   How stressful was this for you? (Not at all (1) to Extremely (6) 1 2 3 4 5 6
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4 How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in service jobs (store clerics, waiters, bartenders, bank tellers and others) because you are Black?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

   How stressful was this for you? (Not at all (1) to Extremely (6)
5 How many times have you been treated unfairly by strangers because you are Black?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

   How stressful was this for you? (Not at all (1) to Extremely (6)
6 How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in helping jobs (doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, case workers, dentists, school counselors, therapists, social workers and others) because you are Black?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

   How stressful was this for you? (Not at all (1) to Extremely (6)
7 How many times have you been treated unfairly by neighbors because you are Black?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

   How stressful was this for you? (Not at all (1) to Extremely (6)
8 How many times have you been treated unfairly by institutions (schools, universities, law firms, the police, the courts, the Department of Social Services, the Unemployment Office and others) because you are Black?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

   How stressful was this for you? (Not at all (1) to Extremely (6)
9 How many times have you been treated unfairly by people that you thought were your friends because you are Black?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR? 1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? 1 2 3 4 5 6

   How stressful was this for you? (Not at all (1) to Extremely (6)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Past Year</th>
<th>Entire Life</th>
<th>Stressful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 How many times have you been accused or suspected of doing something wrong (such as stealing, cheating, not doing your share of the work, or breaking the law) because you are Black?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 How many times have people misunderstood your intentions and motives because you are Black?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 How many times did you want to tell someone off for being racist but didn't say anything?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 How many times have you been really angry about something racist that was done to you?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 How many times were you forced to take drastic steps (such as filing a grievance, filing a lawsuit, quitting your job, moving away, and other actions) to deal with some racist thing that was done to you?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 How many times have you been called a racist name like n____, coon, jungle bunny or other names?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 How many times have you gotten into an argument or a fight about something racist that was done to you or done to somebody else?</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How stressful was this for you? (Not at all (1) to Extremely (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 How many times have you been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hit, or threatened with harm because you are Black?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How stressful was this for you? (Not at all (1) to Extremely (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 How different would your life be now if you HAD NOT BEEN treated in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a racist and unfair way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN THE PAST YEAR?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please circle your response: Same as now (1); A little different (2);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different in a few ways (3); Different in a lot of ways (4); Different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in most ways (5); Totally different (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please circle your response: Same as now (1); A little different (2);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different in a few ways (3); Different in a lot of ways (4); Different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in most ways (5); Totally different (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

SEXIST EVENTS

Please think carefully about your life as you answer the questions below. For each question, read the question and then answer it twice: answer once for what your ENTIRE LIFE (from when you were a child to now) has been like, and then once for what the PAST YEAR has been like. Circle the number that best describes events in YOUR ENTIRE LIFE, and in the PAST YEAR, using these rules:

Circle 1 = If the event has NEVER happened to you
Circle 2 = If the event happened ONCE IN A WHILE (less then 10% of the time)
Circle3 = If the event happened SOMETIMES (10-25% of the time)
Circle 4 = If the event happened A LOT (26-49% of the time)
Circle 5 = If the event happened MOST OF THE TIME (50-70% of the time)
Circle 6 = If the event happened ALMOST ALL OF THE TIME (more than 70% of the time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How many times have you been treated unfairly by teachers or professors because you are a woman?</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>ALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How many times have you been treated unfairly by your employer, boss or supervisors because you are a woman?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How many times have you been treated unfairly by your coworkers, fellow students or colleagues because you are a woman?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in service jobs (by store clerks, waiters, bartenders, waitresses, bank tellers, mechanics and others) because you are a woman?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>How many times have you been treated unfairly by strangers because you are a woman?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  1 2 3 4 5 6

6  How many times have you been treated unfairly by people in helping jobs (by doctors, nurses, psychiatrists, case workers, dentists, school counselors, therapists, pediatricians, school principals, gynecologists, and others) because you are a woman?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  1 2 3 4 5 6

7  How many times have you been treated unfairly by neighbors because you are a woman?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  1 2 3 4 5 6

9  How many times have you been treated unfairly by your boyfriend, husband, or other important man in your life because you are a woman?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  1 2 3 4 5 6

10 How many times were you denied a raise, a promotion, tenure, a good assignment, a job, or other such thing at work that you deserved because you are a woman?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  1 2 3 4 5 6

11 How many times have you been treated unfairly by your family because you are a woman?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  1 2 3 4 5 6

13 How many times have people made inappropriate or unwanted sexual advances to you because you are a woman?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  1 2 3 4 5 6

14 How many times have people failed to show you the respect that you deserve because you are a woman?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  1 2 3 4 5 6

15 How many times have you wanted to tell someone off for being sexist?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  1 2 3 4 5 6

16 How many times have you been really angry about something sexist that was done to you?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  1 2 3 4 5 6
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  1 2 3 4 5 6
17. How many times were you forced to take drastic steps (such as filing a grievance, filing a lawsuit, quitting your job, moving away, and other actions) to deal with some sexist thing that was done to you?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  

18. How many times have you been called a sexist name like bitch, cunt, chick, or other names?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  

19. How many times have you gotten into an argument or a fight about something sexist that was done or said to you or done to somebody else?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  

20. How many times have you been made fun of, picked on, pushed, shoved, hit, or threatened with harm because you are a woman?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  

21. How many times have you heard people making sexist jokes, or degrading sexual jokes?
   How many times IN THE PAST YEAR?  
   How many times IN YOUR ENTIRE LIFE?  

23. How different would your life be now if you HAD NOT BEEN treated in a sexist and unfair way IN THE PAST YEAR? The same as it is now (1) to Totally Different (6)
   THROUGHOUT YOUR ENTIRE LIFE? The same as it is now (1) to Totally Different (6)