

CAREER MATURITY AMONG SCHOOL STUDENTS OF PUNJAB AND HIMACHAL PRADESH IN RELATION TO SELECTED PERSONAL AND FAMILY VARIABLES

Dr. Veenu Khurana

Associate Professor,,Guru Nanak Dev College of Education,Majatri (Mohali)

INTRODUCTION: In Montreal Symposium (1974) after much discussion, the experts attending the Symposium redefined Career Maturity as “one’s disposition to confront vocational or career development tasks as they are encountered as compared to others who are in the same stage of life and facing the same development tasks.”

Herr and Cramer (1996), in theoretical perspective of career maturity, refer it to factors of, ‘transitions to transnational and global economics; dramatics shifts in occupational structures; higher unemployment rates among groups of youths and adults; demands for higher trends of literacy, numeracy, flexibility and teachability in the labour forces of industrialized nations; concerns about the quality of life and women productivity and changes in the composition of the labour force.’ These factors change the content, processes and consumers of career interventions and services.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To find the career maturity of students in relation to their personal variables, namely, gender, physical fitness and occupational aspirations.
2. To investigate the career maturity of students in relation to their family variables, namely, parental education, economic status, social class and parental support (as perceived by students).

HYPOTHESES

- I. Career maturity among students is not related significantly with their occupational aspirations.
- II. Parental education does not account for significant differences in career maturity of their wards.

- III. Economic status of family does not account for significant differences in career maturity among secondary school students.
- IV. No significant difference exists in the career maturity of students belonging to general category and other categories (SC/ST/BC/OBC).
- V. Career maturity among students does not differ significantly in relation to their parental support.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

Career Maturity: The definition given by Crites (1978) has been adopted in the present study for 'career maturity'. Career maturity refers to attitude towards career decision making (orientation towards work and willingness to be realistic and make compromise in careers) and the skills or competencies needed for making strong career decisions which include self appraisal, information seeking, planning, goal setting and problem solving.

Personal Variables: The personal variables include, gender (male/female), physical fitness (physically fit/ any physical disability) of the students and their occupational aspirations which denotes realistic and also idealistic expressions of the level of occupational preferences (as given by Grewal, 2011).

Family Variables: The family variable are factors related with the parents of the students such as parental education (up to senior secondary level/ graduation or higher), economic status in terms of the monthly income of the family (lower with monthly income of Rs 15000 or less and upper class with monthly income of more than 15000 rupees), social status in terms of class or category one belongs to i.e. General or Others which includes scheduled caste, scheduled tribes, backward class, other backward class etc.) and parental support as perceived by students (in terms of parental interest, parental behavior and resources provision as proposed by Nandwana&Asawa, 2006).

Variables undertaken in the present study

The career maturity among students was studied in relation to personal variables, (namely, gender, physical ability/disability and occupational aspiration); family variables, (namely, parental education, economic status, social status and parental support);

Personal Variables: The personal variables included,

Gender (Male/Female): Physiological condition.

Physical fitness/ Physical disability: Physically fitness denotes students without any kind of physical disability or who are physically advantaged whereas physical disability refers to any kind of physical challenges like visual impairment, hearing impairment, orthopaedic impairment or speech impairment which necessitate some sort of special provision under inclusive education.

Occupational Aspirations: Occupational aspiration usually means what the individual considers to be an ideal vocation for him and refers to the point in the vocational prestige hierarchy of various vocational fields which an individual view as a goal. Designed in this way, aspiration is quite similar, if not identical with person's fantasy choice.

Family Variables: The family variables are factors related with the parents of the students such as

Parental education: The educational status of parents of the students in terms of level of attainment in terms of school education like matric pass, twelfth pass, or higher education like graduate or post-graduate etc.

Economic status: Economic status denotes the financial status of a family in terms of the monthly income of the family i.e. less than 15000 (lower class) and more than Rs. 15000 per month (upper class)

Social Status: In India there are thousands of castes and sub-castes in every State. On the basis of these castes, a social status (or class) is assigned as different privileges are associated with these castes and categories. The individuals are categorized to 'General category, Scheduled Castes (SC), Scheduled Tribes (ST), Backward class (BC) Other Backward Classes (OBC) etc. The general category is considered to be socially advantaged group and those from

other categories are said to be socially disadvantaged group thus given lower status traditionally.

Parental support: “A parent is the primary helper, monitor, coordinator, observer, record keeper and decision maker for the child”, (James Whittaker, 1978). The first and foremost duty of parents is to look after their children in the best possible way to take interest in their welfare and to see their progress. Successful parenting entails both effective components - in terms of commitment, empathy and positive regard for children. “Parenting is a process that formally begins during or before pregnancy and continues through the balance of life span. Parenthood is central to childhood to child development and to society’s long term investment in children”, (Bornstein, 1998). Parents are the first and lifelong teachers and guides of every child. Parents are children’s primary advocates and their life-long security. Parents do teach values about work and teach important lessons in decision-making, work habits, conflict resolution and communication skills which are the foundations of successful career development.

Now the parents are much aware and alert and they realize that their children need more support and supervision, as reported by Shellenberger (2000). They prepare children for all the situations in they have to survive and thrive. For this, the parents provide all the needed support to their wards. Support can be of various kinds and on the basis of which the following types of parental supports may be envisaged, Bornstein(1998):

Nurturant caregiver:Parents have to meet the biological, physical, and health requirements of children. Parents are responsible for promoting children's wellness and preventing their illness. Parents in virtually all higher species nurture their young, providing sustenance, routine care, protection, supervision, grooming, comfort, and the like. Nurturance is prerequisite to children's survival and well-being.

Material caregiver: Parents should provide, organize, and arrange the child's physical world, including home and local environments. Parents are responsible for the number and variety of inanimate objects (toys, books, tools) available to the child, the level of ambient stimulation, the limits on physical freedom, and the overall safety and physical dimensions of children's experiences. The amount of time children spend interacting

with their inanimate surroundings rivals or exceeds the time children spend in direct social interaction with parents.

Social caregiver:Parents should use variety of visual, verbal, affective, and physical behaviors to engage children emotionally and manage their interpersonal exchanges. Rocking, kissing, tactile comforting, smiling, vocalizing, and play illustrate parent-child interpersonal interactions.

Didactic caregiver :Parents use to stimulate children to engage and understand the environment and to enter the world of learning. Didactics means introducing, mediating, and interpreting the external world; teaching, describing, and demonstrating; as well as provoking or providing opportunities to observe, to imitate, and to learn.

Parents Support positively leads to adolescent's development. The support of parents yields desired results in academic achievement, vocational achievement besides improving the self-esteem and moral behaviour of the child. Parents support their children with physical affection, companionship, monitoring and counseling as well. Especially during adolescent period which is the most crucial and critical period of life when adolescents struggle, progress, fall and get up, get matured, and finally settle at the base-ladder to begin their future life. Parents' Support positively leads to adolescent's development. The support of parents yield desired results in academic achievement, vocational achievement besides improving the self-esteem and moral behaviour of the child. It is believed that use of parental support often transmits in adolescent recognition of their abilities and to make decision. Parents' support enhances adolescents' self-esteem by communicating parental confidence in his abilities to understand and cope successfully with social environment and role making skills as adults of tomorrow (Nandwana and Asawa ,2006).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

CAREER MATURITY AMONG SCHOOL STUDENTS OF PUNJAB AND HIMACHAL PRADESH IN RELATION TO SELECTED PERSONAL AND FAMILY VARIABLES

DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

The research was carried out in secondary schools of Himachal Pradesh and Punjab. Since, it was not possible to cover these states completely; the five secondary schools from each of the three selected districts (out of 22) from Punjab (Fatehgarh Sahib, Roop Nagar and SAS Nagar-Mohali) and also five secondary schools from each of the two districts (out of 12) in Himachal Pradesh, namely, Shimla, and Mandi were taken. Only 9th class students were selected for study.

CAREER MATURITY AMONG STUDENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR PERSONAL VARIABLES

The career maturity among students was also tested in relation to three personal variables, namely, gender, occupational aspiration and physical fitness. The results pertaining to these aspects have been presented in following three sub-sections:

Comparison between male and female students on their career maturity:

Table 1.1: T-test values for gender difference in career maturity among students in Punjab

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t-value
Career choice attitude	Male	262	28.44	0.102	0.4154	1.251
	Female	305	27.92	0.070		
Self appraisal	Male	262	6.98	0.004	0.0872	7.789
	Female	305	6.3	0.0036		
Occupational Information	Male	262	6.77	0.0041	0.0870	0.229
	Female	305	6.75	0.0034		
Goal selection	Male	262	6.96	0.0041	0.088584	3.273
	Female	305	6.67	0.0036		

Planning	Male	262	6.94	0.0036	0.084181	8.434
	Female	305	6.23	0.0034		
Problem solving	Male	262	6.76	0.0039	0.087463	5.259
	Female	305	6.3	0.0036		
Overall Career Competence	Male	262	34.11	0.111	0.459301	4.049
	Female	305	32.25	0.099		

The values of career choice attitude given in table 1.1 show that a mean score difference of 0.52 exist between male and female students and the value of 't' (1.25) for this mean score difference is not significant at .05 level of significance. It shows that no gender differences exist in career choice attitude among schools students in Punjab.

With respect to various dimensions of career competence, it was found that boys scored higher on all the dimensions (except one), namely, self-appraisal (M= 6.98; t= 7.78, p<.01), goal selection (M= 6.96; t= 3.27, p<.01), planning (M= 6.94; t=8.43, p<.01), problem solving (M=6.76; t= 5.25, p<.01) and overall competence (M= 34.11; t= 4.04, p<.01) than female students (M= 6.3; 6.67; 6.23; 6.3; and 32.25 respectively) in schools of Punjab. For occupational information there exist no difference (t=0.229, p>.05).between male (M= 6.77) and female students (M=6.75).

Looking at all these results, it is clear that male students in Punjab have higher level of career maturity than their female counterparts. Keeping this in view the null hypothesis VIII (a) "No significant differences occur between boys and girls on career maturity in Punjab" is rejected.

In the State of Himachal Pardesh also gender differences were examined in the career maturity of secondary school students and results of analysis have been given in table 1.2:

Table 1.2: T-test values for gender difference in career maturity among students in H.P.

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t-value
Career choice attitude	Male	157	26.83	5.267	0.535	1.214
	Female	167	26.18	4.284		
Self appraisal	Male	157	6.31	1.43	0.158	0.570
	Female	167	6.22	1.407		
Occupational Information	Male	157	6.1	1.422	0.159	0.880
	Female	167	6.24	1.44		
Goal selection	Male	157	6.15	1.422	0.162	0.618
	Female	167	6.25	1.492		
Planning	Male	157	6.21	1.323	0.151	1.526
	Female	167	5.98	1.39		
Problem solving	Male	157	6.05	1.44	0.161	0.0621
	Female	167	6.06	1.459		
Overall Career Competence	Male	157	31.38	5.658	0.622	0.337
	Female	167	31.59	5.532		

With respect to various dimensions of career maturity, it can be seen that there are meager differences in mean scores of male and female students in career choice attitude ($d= 0.65$), self appraisal ($d=0.09$), occupational information ($d= -0.14$), goal selection ($d= - 0.10$), planning ($d = 0..23$), problem solving ($d= -0.01$) and overall competence ($d= - 0.21$). These differences between mean scores of male and female students for various dimensions of career maturity are not significant as none of the values of 't' entered in table 1.2 is significant at .05 level of significance.

It can be comprehended from the these results that null hypothesis VIII (b) "No significant differences occur between boys and girls on career maturity in Himachal Pardesh" is not rejected. It implies that no gender difference exist in career maturity of secondary school students (of 9th class) in H.P.

Career maturity in relation to occupational aspirations of students

To study the relationship between career maturity of students and their occupation aspiration, product moment correlation was worked out. In the following table 4.17, the values of co-efficient of correlation have been shown:

Table 1.3: Values of co-efficient of correlation between various dimensions of career maturity and their occupational aspirations

	Career Choice Attitude	Self appraisal	Occupational Information	Goal selection	Planning	Problem solving	Overall competence
Occupational Aspirations	0.041	0.053	0.015	0.008	0.044	0.037	0.040

The values of co-efficient of correlation between occupational aspiration and different dimensions of career maturity, namely, career choice attitude ($r=.041$); self appraisal ($r=.053$); occupational information ($r=0.015$); goal selection ($r=0.008$); planning ($r=0.044$); problem solving (0.037) and overall competence ($r=.040$) are not significant at .05 level of significant. It means that occupational aspiration of the students is not correlated to their career maturity. Therefore, the null hypothesis X that "Career maturity among students is not related significantly with their occupational aspirations" is not rejected.

The plausible reason for this result could be that most of the students have average/below average career maturity but average/high levels of occupation aspiration.

Career maturity among students in relation to their physical fitness

Another personal variable of the students was related with their physical fitness i.e. whether the students are physically advantaged students (i.e. do not have any physical disability) or physically challenged (which may include any kind of physical disability like orthopedic/ visual/ hearing or related with speech). The purpose was to see if any kind of physical challenge affect the career maturity of these students, therefore, these students were compared with those who were physically fit i.e. physically advantaged without any disability for their career maturity. During data collection around 52 students were found to be physically challenged. Out of these 52 students, 46 students responded on all the data collection tools in complete sense. To compare these students, another 46 students who were physically advantaged were selected randomly from the same class with same number as of physically challenged student. For example, if two physically challenged students were found from a school ‘X’ then out of the data collected from the same class of this school X, the data of two physically fit students was randomly taken. In this way the data of 46 physically fit students was taken out which was later compared with data obtained from physically challenged students on Career Maturity Inventory. T-test was employed to see the significance of differences in mean scores of these two groups of students, details of which are given in table 1.4:

Table 1.4: t-test values for Career Maturity between physically advantaged and physically challenged students:

	Physically fit/ Physically Challenged	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	S.E _D	t-values
Career Choice Attitude	Fit	46	27.91	5.23	1.068	1.058
	Challenged	46	26.78	5.01		

Self appraisal	Fit	46	6.75	1.52	0.288	2.98
	Challenged	46	5.89	1.23		
Occupational Information	Fit	46	6.62	1.47	0.291	1.339
	Challenged	46	6.23	1.32		
Goal selection	Fit	46	6.51	1.61	0.337	0.861
	Challenged	46	6.22	1.62		
Planning	Fit	46	6.6	1.37	0.29	2.07
	Challenged	46	6.02	1.45		
Problem solving	Fit	46	6.59	1.40	0.297	1.347
	Challenged	46	6.19	1.448		
Overall Career Competence	Fit	46	33.29	6.01	1.22	1.369
	Challenged	46	31.62	5.69		

The values entered in table 1.4 show that except for two dimension of career maturity, namely, self-appraisal and planning, on all the remaining dimensions, the physically challenged students do not differ from their physically fit counterparts in their career maturity.

In the dimension of self-appraisal, the mean score difference of 0.68 between physically challenged (M= 5.89) and physically fit students (6.57) is significant as calculated t-value (2.98) is higher than critical value of t at .01 level of significance. It connotes that physically challenged students have lower level of competence for self-appraisal as compared to their physically advantaged counterparts.

For competence of planning also, a significant difference ($t=2.07$, $p<.05$) was observed between physically challenged ($M=6.02$) and physically fit students ($M=6.6$). The mean scores of these two groups of students indicate that physically advantaged students have higher competence for planning their career than physically challenged students.

Except these two differences, the two groups of students neither differ in their career choice attitude ($t=1.058$, $p>.05$) nor in their overall career competence ($t=1.369$, $p>.05$). These results may be quoted as the students who are physically challenged possess equal level of career maturity as of their physically advantaged counterparts. On this basis, the null hypothesis IX "Students who are physically fit and those who have some physical disability do not differ in their career maturity" is not rejected.

CAREER MATURITY AMONG STUDENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR FAMILY VARIABLES

It is to reiterate that the family variables are those which are related with the parents of the students such as Parental Education (upto secondary level i.e. less than graduation and graduation or higher), Economic status in terms of the monthly income of the family i.e. less than 15000 (lower class) and more than Rs. 15000 per month (upper class), Social Status in terms of class or category one belongs to (General, or Others such as scheduled caste, scheduled tribes, backward class, other backward class etc.), and Parental Support' (parental interest, parental behavior and resources provision) as perceived by students.

The analysis was made separately for all these four family variables to see any change in career maturity due to each of these factors. In following four sub-section the analysis and results pertaining to career maturity in relation of family variables, namely, parental education, economic status, social status and parental support have been presented in 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 respectively.

1.1.1 Career maturity among students in relation to their parental education

The career maturity among students was studied in relation to their parental education. The students were divided into two groups; one whose parents have education up to school level (i.e. less than graduation) and another whose either parent has higher education (i.e. graduation or higher). The first group was named as students with less educated parents and second group was named as students with more educated parents. These two groups of students were

compared for their career maturity by working out the t-test. The values have been illustrated in table 1.5:

Table 1.5: T-test detail for career maturity among students in relation to their parental education:

	Parental education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	S.E_D	t-values
Career choice attitude	Less educated	557	26.81	4.928	0.334	2.54
	More educated	334	27.66	4.762		
Self appraisal	Less educated	557	6.43	1.244	0.083	1.583
	More educated	334	6.56	1.181		
Occupational information	Less educated	557	6.49	1.229	0.085	.917
	More educated	334	6.57	1.218		
Goal selection	Less educated	557	6.50	1.267	0.086	.192
	More educated	334	6.48	1.227		
Planning	Less educated	557	6.45	1.196	0.083	.451
	More educated	334	6.49	1.200		
Problem solving	Less educated	557	6.52	1.253	0.086	1.293
	More educated	334	6.41	1.234		
Overall career competence	Less educated	557	32.39	6.003	0.375	0.139
	More educated	334	32.51	5.039		

The value of t for career choice attitude (as given in table 1.5) is significant at .01 level of significance. The mean scores on career choice attitude of students whose parents were less educated and of those whose parents were more educated came out to be 26.81 and 27.66 respectively. It shows that students whose parents are more educated possess more favorable career choice attitude as compared to those students whose parents are less educated.

As far as competence (of career maturity) is concerned, none of the t-value for self appraisal ($t=1.58$, $p>.05$), occupational information ($t=0.917$, $p>.05$), goal selection ($t=0.192$, $p>.05$), planning ($t= 0.451$, $p>.05$), problem solving ($t=1.293$, $p>.05$) and overall competence ($t=0.139$, $p>.05$). These value indicate that no significant difference exist between students whose parents were less educated and those whose parents were more educated in their competence for self-appraisal, occupational information, goal selection, planning , problem solving and overall competence. In other words it may be said that parental education does not account for significant differences in competence related with career maturity of their wards.

On the basis of these results the null hypothesis XI “Parental education does not account for significant differences in career maturity of their wards” is not rejected completely. Parental education do matter to establish career attitude among their wards but do not affect the career related competence of their wards.

1.1.2 Comparison on career maturity between students in relation to economic status of family

The students were dichotomized on the basis of their family income i.e. low (<15000 per month) and high (≥ 15000 per month). The scores obtained by these two groups of students on different dimensions of CMI were compared by employing t-test, the details of which have been given in table 1.6:

Table 1.6:T-test detail for career maturity among students in relation to the economic status of their families

	Economic status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	S.E_D	t-values
Career choice attitude	Lower	313	26.59	4.072	0.307	4.366
	Higher	578	27.93	4.88		
Self appraisal	Lower	313	6.54	1.33	0.091	3.747
	Higher	578	6.88	1.221		
Occupational information	Lower	313	6.02	1.502	0.099	5.161
	Higher	578	6.53	1.216		
Goal selection	Lower	313	6.69	1.377	0.094	3.421
	Higher	578	7.01	1.247		
Planning	Lower	313	6.53	1.092	0.079	3.024
	Higher	578	6.77	1.199		
Problem solving	Lower	313	6.45	1.281	0.089	0.449
	Higher	578	6.49	1.246		
Total score on competence	Lower	313	31.33	4.697	0.356	6.61
	Higher	578	33.68	5.691		

The value given in table 1.6 illustrates that the students who belong to lower income group family differ significantly from those belonging to higher income group in all the dimensions of career maturity except one i.e. competence for career planning.

In career choice attitude, students who belong to lower income group obtained a mean score of 26.59 whereas students from higher income group attained mean score 27.93, the difference in these two mean scores is significant at .01 level of significance ($t=4.366$). Having the higher mean score, the students from higher income group family possessed better career choice attitude than lower income group students.

In the first dimension of career competence i.e self appraisal students from lower and higher income group obtained mean scores of 6.54 and 6.88 respectively and the difference in the mean scores is significant ($t=3.747$, $p<.01$). These values indicate that students from higher income group have higher level of competence for self appraisal as compared to lower income group students.

Similarly for other three dimensions of career competence i.e. occupational information ($t=5.16$, $p<.01$), goal selection ($t=3.42$, $p<.01$), planning ($t=3.024$, $p<.01$) the students belonging to higher income group ($M= 6.53, 7.01, 6.77$ respectively) outperformed the students from lower income group ($M= 6.02, 6.69, 6.53$ respectively). It is inferred that students belonging to families with higher economic status have significantly higher level of competence pertaining to acquiring occupational information, selecting career goals and planning for the career as compared to the students who belong to families with lower economic status.

Where as in the fifth dimension of competence i.e. problem solving, no significant difference was observed ($t=0.449$, $p>.05$) between students who belong to families with lower economic status ($M=6.45$) and higher economic status ($M=6.49$).

Further, in overall competence also, the former groups of students i.e. higher income group ($M= 33.68$) differ significantly ($t= 6.61$, $p<.01$) from those of lower economic group ($M=31.33$). It implies that the students of higher economic status have higher level of overall career competence than the students who belong to families with lower economic status.

Looking at these results, the null hypothesis XII "Economic status of family does not account for significant differences in career maturity among secondary school students" is rejected. It signifies that economic status do matter for significant differences in

career maturity among secondary school students. Students from higher income group have higher level of career maturity than students from lower income group.

1.1.3 Career maturity among students in relation to social status of their families

In India there are thousands of castes and sub-castes in every State. On the basis of these castes, a social status (or class) is assigned as different privileges are associated with these castes and categories. The individuals are categorized to 'General category, Scheduled Castes (SC), Scheduled Tribes (ST), Backward class (BC) Other Backward Classes (OBC) etc. The general category is considered to be socially advantaged group and those from other categories are said to be socially disadvantaged group thus given lower status traditionally.

In the present study, it was intended to see the career maturity in relation to these social classes i.e. whether students who belong to General class differ from those who belong to other categories like SC/ST/. therefore a comparison on career maturity was made between students belonging to General category and other) categories (SC, ST, OBC etc). t-test was used to see the significance of differences in mean scores of these two groups of students on all the dimensions of career maturity. The details of which is presented in table 1.7 below:

Table 1.7 :T-test detail for career maturity among students in relation to the social status (class)

Dimensions of Career Maturity	Category_cat	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t-values
career choice attitude	General	574	27.51	4.968	0.334	1.643854
	Other	317	26.96	4.675		
self appraisal	General	574	6.47	1.248	0.0840	0.95202
	Other	317	6.55	1.174		
occupational information	General	574	6.52	1.225	0.0857	1.049361
	Other	317	6.43	1.226		
Goal selection	General	574	6.45	1.263	0.0869	2.07135

	Other	317	6.63	1.23		
planning	General	574	6.51	1.209	0.0831	1.203058
	Other	317	6.41	1.176		
Problem solving	General	574	6.44	1.266	0.0861	1.39395
	Other	317	6.56	1.21		
Overall competence	General	574	32.39	5.28	0.372	0.45587
	Other	317	32.56	5.356		

On the basis of values given in table 1.7, following inferences have been made:

In the Career Choice Attitude dimension of career maturity, students from General category scored 27.51 and others obtained a mean of 26.96. The difference in mean score is not significant ($t=1.64, p>.05$). It implies that students from general category do not differ from students in their attitude for career choice.

Pertaining to competence, in four out of five dimensions, namely, self-appraisal ($t=0.95, p>.05$), occupational information ($t=1.049, p>.05$), planning ($t=1.20, p>.05$) and problem solving ($t=1.39, p>.05$), no significant difference exist between the students belonging to general category ($M=6.47, 6.52, 6.51$ and 6.44 respectively) and students from other categories ($M=6.55, 6.43, 6.41$ and 6.56 respectively). As far as fifth dimension of competence i.e. goal selection is concerned, a significant difference ($t=2.07, p<.05$) was observed between students from general category ($M=6.45$) and students belonging to categories such as SC/ST/ OBC etc ($M=6.63$). The higher mean score in favor of students from other categories indicate that they have higher competence of goal selection than students in general category.

In overall competence, no significant difference exist between students of general category and other categories as calculated value of t is 0.455 which is lesser than

critical value of t at .05 level of significance. It may be said that social class of the students do not account for their overall career competence.

Keeping these findings in view, the null hypothesis XIII which states “No significant difference exists in the career maturity of students belonging to general category and other categories (SC/ST/BC/OBC)” is not rejected. In other words, social class of the students do not affect their career maturity as the students from general category and other categories have equal level of career maturity (except for goal selection).

1.1.4 Comparison on career maturity among students in relation to their parental support

To see the relation of parental support with the career maturity of the students, the data was collected from the students on Parental Support Scale (modified). The scale had three dimensions, namely, parental interest, parental behavior and resources provision on which students had to respond as per their perception about the support they get from their parents in these three aspects. The scores obtained by students on each of the three dimensions of parental supports, and total score, were correlated with the seven dimensions of career maturity by using Pearson’s product moment correlation. The values of co-efficient of correlation have been given in table 1.8:

Table 1.8: Co-efficient of correlation between dimension of parental support and career maturity

Variables	Parental interest	Parental behavior	Resources provision	Overall Parental Support
Career Choice Attitude	.062	.079*	.054	.072*
Self Appraisal	.071*	.082*	.045	.069*
Occupational Information	.034	.027	.065*	.059
Goal Selection	.081*	.092*	.039	.068*
Planning	.067*	.071*	.056	.066*

Problem Solving	.021	.023	.021	.059
Overall Competence	.066*	.073*	.058	.067**

The career choice attitude of the students is positively correlated with perceived behavior of their parents towards them ($r=0.79$, $p<.05$) and also with overall parental support ($r=.072$, $p<.05$). Parental interest ($r=.062$, $p>.05$) as well as resource provisions by parents ($r=.054$, $p>.05$) is not correlated with their career choice attitude of the students. It conveys that with higher support from parents (overall) and also in terms of behavioral support enhances the career choice attitude of the students.

The competence for self-appraisal in students is correlated positively with perceived parental interest in them ($r= .071$, $p<.05$), behavioral support from parents ($r=.082$, $p,.050$ and overall parental support ($r=.069$, $p<.05$), but is not related with provision of resources by their parents. With increase in interest of parents in their wards activities and behavioral support, the competence of students for self-appraisal enhances. Higher is the parental support, more competent a student is in his/her appraisal for career.

The competence to acquire and use occupational information among student is correlated significantly only with their perceived support from their parents in terms of provision of resources ($r=.065$, $p<.05$). The competence for occupational information among student increases with increase in support of parents by providing required resources.

Goal selection competence among students is positively correlated with overall parental support ($r=.068$, $p<.05$) as well as parental interest ($r=.081$, $p<.05$) and parental behavior ($r=0.92$, $p<.05$) but not with resource provisions ($r=.039$, $p>.05$). Those students who perceived to have higher parental support or more interest of their parents towards them or higher behavioral supports from parents have higher level of competence for their goal selection.

There exist a significant correlation between competence for career planning among students and overall parental support ($r=.066$, $p<.05$) they get. Higher is the parental support, more competent the student is for planning their career. Besides, parental interest ($r=.067$, $p<.05$) as well as parental behavior ($r=.071$, $p<.05$) is positively correlated with competence for career planning.

The competence of problem solving is not correlated with any dimension of parental support, parental interest ($r=.021$, $p>.05$), parental behavior ($r=.023$, $p>.05$), resource provision ($r=.021$, $p>.05$) and overall parental support ($r=.059$, $p>.05$).

Overall career competence of students is positively correlated with their parental interest in them ($r=.066$, $p<.05$), behavioral support ($r=.073$, $p<.05$) and overall parental support ($r=.067$, $p>.05$). These values indicate that higher parental support account for increased career competence among students. The students who feel that their parents take interest in them and those who get higher behavioral support from their parents have higher level of career competence.

These results of correlation forces to reject the null hypothesis, "Career maturity among students does not differ significantly in relation to their parental support". It may be inferred that career maturity among students is positively correlated with their parental support.

From the above discussion it may be said that family variables significantly contribute towards the career maturity of the students.

MAJOR FINDINGS

- It is also established that students' career choice attitude is not affected by vocational/occupational guidance but their career competence is affected by vocational/occupational guidance. The students who received any form of vocational/occupational guidance have higher career maturity in the dimension of competence than those who did not get vocational guidance in any form.
- It is seen that Career maturity among students is not related significantly with their occupational aspirations.
- It is also found that students, whose parents are more educated, possess more favourable career choice attitude as compared to those students whose parents are less educated.
- It has been seen that parental education does not account for significant differences in competence related with career maturity of their wards.
- Also, It is recorded that Parental education do matter to establish career attitude among their wards but do not affect the career related competence of their wards.
- It has been examined that students who belong to lower income group family differ significantly from those belonging to higher income group in all the dimensions of career maturity except one i.e. competence for career planning.
- It has also been noticed that Students from higher income group have higher level of career maturity than students from lower income group.

- It is established that social class of the students do not affect their career maturity as the students from general category and other categories have equal level of career maturity (except for goal selection).
- It is seen that higher support from parents (overall) and also in terms of behavioural support enhances the career choice attitude of the students.
- Thus, It has been noticed that higher is the parental support, more competent a student is in his/her appraisal for career.
- It is noticed that the competence for occupational information among student increases with increase in support of parents by providing required resources.
- Research confirmed that students who perceived to have higher parental support or more interest of their parents towards them or higher behavioural supports from parents have higher level of competence for their goal selection.
- It has been established that the students who feel that their parents take interest in them and those who get higher behavioural support from their parents, have higher level of career competence.
- The research exhibits that career maturity among students is positively correlated with their parental support.

REFERENCES:

1. Anastasi, A. (1990): "Psychological testing: basic concepts and common misconceptions" In A.M. Rogers & C.J. Sheirer (Eds.), G. Stanley Hall Lecture Series, 5 (pp. 87-120). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
2. Bhatnagar, A. & Gupta N. (1999). Guidance and Counseling. Vol. II, New Delhi: National Council of Education
3. Braddock, L. (2001): Guidance Programme Pages. Retrieved from www.fcps.com 19-6-2001, Handbook.
4. Crow, L. D. & Crow A. (1979). Educational Psychology. New Delhi: Eurasia Publishing House (Pvt). Ltd.
5. Francis, K.X., McDaniel, M., & Doyle, R.E. (1987). Training in Role Communication Skills: Effect of Interpersonal and Academic Skills of High-Risk Freshmen. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 28, 151 – 156
6. Good,I.J.{1973): *The American Statistician*, Vol. 27, No. 5 (Dec., 1973), pp. 227-228. Published by: American Journal of Psychology.Houghton Mifflin Company

7. Hudesman, J. (1986, September). Impact of Counseling Style on the Academic Performance of College Students in Special Programmes. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 394 – 399
8. Kochhar, S.K. (2000). *Educational and Vocational Guidance in Secondary Schools*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited.
9. Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Collins, K. M. T. (2001). Writing apprehension and academic procrastination among graduate students. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 92, 560-562.
10. Shertzer, B. & Shelly C. S. (1976). *Fundamentals of Guidance*. Boston:
11. Simpson, et al. (1994) Dynamic activation of frontal, parietal, and sensory regions underlying anticipatory visual spatial attention. *J. Neurosci.* 31, 13880–13889. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.
12. Vaidya (1989) Vaidya N. (1989). *The impact science teaching*. New Delhi: Oxford and I BH Publishing Co.

