CHAPTER-IV

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS

The present chapter deals with the analysis of data and interpretation and discussion of results. It presents the interpretation of results hypothesis wise based on objectives of the study. In this chapter, the abbreviated form of various terms will be used in various figures and tables. The analysis of data and interpretation of results have been given below in the following sub headings.

4.1 ANALYSIS OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF DIFFERENT VARIABLES

4.1.1 Analysis of Descriptive Statistics for Total Sample
4.1.2 Analysis of Descriptive Statistics for Boys
4.1.3 Analysis of Descriptive Statistics for Girls

4.2 ANALYSIS OF CORRELATION WITH DIFFERENT VARIABLES

4.2.1 Career Beliefs with Internet Savviness of Total Sample
4.2.2 Career Beliefs with Family Environment of Total Sample
4.2.3 Career Beliefs with Socio-Economic Status of Total Sample
4.2.4 Career Beliefs with Career Indecision of Total Sample

4.3 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DIFFERENT VARIABLES

4.3.1 Analysis of Variance of internet savviness, family environment and socio-economic status on career beliefs
4.3.2 Analysis of Variance of internet savviness, family environment and career indecision on career beliefs
4.3.3 Analysis of Variance of socio-economic status, family environment and career indecision on career beliefs
4.3.4 Analysis of Variance of socio-economic status, career indecision and internet savviness on career beliefs
4.3.5 Analysis of Variance of institutional types and gender on career beliefs

4.4 ANALYSIS OF REGRESSION OF TOTAL SAMPLE

4.4.1 Regression Analysis of Total Sample

4.1 ANALYSIS OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF DIFFERENT VARIABLES

Descriptive statistic like mean, S.D., Sk and Ku were used to describe the nature of variables viz. career beliefs, internet savviness, family environment, socio-economic status and career indecision in case of total sample.
4.1.1 ANALYSIS OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR TOTAL SAMPLE

The mean, S.D., Sk and Ku of the variables under study i.e. career beliefs, internet savviness, family environment, socio-economic status and career indecision in case of total sample has been given in table 4.1

Table 4.1: A summary of descriptive statistics of different variables for total sample (N=720)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Sk</th>
<th>Ku</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Beliefs</td>
<td>126.64</td>
<td>31.30</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>High Average -vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control and Self Direction</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>Low Average -vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Common Practice</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.412</td>
<td>High Average -vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalism</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>Average -vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>Low Average -vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.206</td>
<td>Low Average -vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige and Social Status</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>Low Average -vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.513</td>
<td>Low Average -vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Worth</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
<td>Low Average -vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Savviness</td>
<td>102.58</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Gathering</td>
<td>20.55</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>4.045</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Mediated Communication</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.218</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Self Efficacy</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Self-Expression</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Fluency</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Collaboration</td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>1.409</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Framework</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.521</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Orientation</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>4.960</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.544</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Orientation</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio Economic Status</td>
<td>77.81</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>-0.167</td>
<td>Middle SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Indecision</td>
<td>24.31</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.533</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Filed Survey, 2013
Note: The higher the score the greater is the negativity of career beliefs

To substantiate the data presented in table 4.1, a bar diagram is drawn to depict the mean of different variables of total sample has been given in fig 4.1.
Fig: 4.1 Bar diagram showing comparison of different variables of total sample
1. Career Beliefs

The sum total of eight factors i.e. control and self direction, culture and common practice, fatalism, gender, persistence, prestige and social status, proficiency and self worth provide a composite career beliefs pattern score. Table and figure 4.1 shows that the value of mean and S.D. of total career beliefs for total sample were 126.64 and 31.30 respectively. High scores indicate higher negativity in the content of career beliefs. Mean is found to be high average negativity as per the norms. It means that the total sample had high average negative career beliefs. This demonstrates that the adolescents had high average negative thoughts about career preparations and career development. Sk is found to be 0.11 which is positive and reveals that the data is positively skewed. Ku is 0.014 which is lesser that 0.263 ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is leptokurtic.

(i) Control and Self Direction

Table and figure 4.1 reveals that for the total sample, the mean and S.D. of control and self direction dimension of career beliefs were 20.63 and 6.44 respectively. The mean score for total sample is on low average negativity as per the norms. It reveals that the adolescents had low average negativity in their sense of control over their life situations and the orientation to direct their life and also they have low average negative confidence to manage the trajectory of their life. Sk is found to be 0.09 which is positive and shows that the distribution is positively skewed. Ku is 0.286 which is greater than Ku for normal curve and shows that curve is platykurtic.

(ii) Culture and Common Practice

Table and figure 4.1 indicates that the mean value of culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs is 19.09 and S.D. is 6.50. The mean is found to be high on average negativity as per norms for total sample. It shows that the adolescents in this sample were highly influenced by common practice and unwritten norms that orient the people of a community and shape their career preparation behavior. Sk is 0.25 which is positive and reveals that the distribution is positively skewed. Ku is found to be -0.412 which is greater than Ku for normal curve 0.263. The result indicates that the curve is platykurtic.
(iii) Fatalism

Table and figure 4.1 demonstrates that the value of mean and S.D. for fatalism dimension of career beliefs were 15.37 and 5.12 respectively. The mean is found to be average negativity as per the norms for total sample. It demonstrates that the total sample had average negative beliefs that portray a sense of resignation and a passive acceptance of one’s life situation. They had an average feeling of pessimism, a sense that nothing can be changed and that matters are pre-ordained by more powerful forces. Sk for the fatalism is found to be 0.10 which is positive and depicts that the distribution is positively skewed. Ku is found to be -0.237 which is lesser than 0.263 and indicates that curve is leptokurtic.

(iv) Gender

Table and figure 4.1 depicts that mean of gender dimension of career beliefs is found to be 8.90 and S.D. is 3.73. The mean is found to be low average negativity as per the norms for the total sample. It depicts that total sample had below average faith in beliefs towards existing male-female stereotypes pertaining to engagement with the world of work. Sk is 0.53 which is positive and exhibits that the data is positively skewed. Ku for gender is 0.279 which is greater than 0.263 and shows that curve is platykurtic.

(v) Persistence

Table and figure 4.1 exhibits that for persistence dimension of career beliefs the mean and S.D. were 18.60 and 6.13 respectively. The mean is found to be low average negativity as per norms. It reveals that the negativity in adolescents determine to persist towards future career goals in spite of the barriers encountered during the process of career preparation is at the low average level. Sk is -0.04 which is negative and depicts that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.206 which is lesser than 0.263 and shows that curve is leptokurtic.

(vi) Prestige and Social Status

Table and figure 4.1 shows that in case of total sample, the mean and S.D. of prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs found to be 19.07 and 6.75 respectively. The mean is found to be low average negativity as per the norms which demonstrate that the negativity in sample’s orientation to occupational structures and hierarchies embedded in their culture is at the low average level. Sk is 0.19 which is positive and shows that the data is positively skewed. Ku is -0.127 which is lesser than the 0.263 and reveals that the curve is leptokurtic.
(vii) Proficiency

Table and figure 4.1 indicates that the mean and S.D. of proficiency dimension of career beliefs were found to be 14.23 and 5.87 respectively. The mean score on proficiency dimension is low on average negativity. This demonstrates that the adolescents are willing to acquire qualifications and skills that can enhance personal proficiency for an occupation before entering the world of work. They have the willingness to submit to rigors of a formal training programme and spend resources like time, efforts and finance to achieve the distinction of being formally qualified as per the norms of a given educational system. Sk is 0.31 which is positive and demonstrates that the distribution is positively skewed. Ku is -0.513 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and exhibits that the curve is platykurtic.

(viii) Self Worth

Table and figure 4.1 demonstrates that for self worth dimension of career beliefs the mean and S.D. were 10.74 and 5.33 respectively. Mean is found to be low negativity as per the norms. This indicates that the sample showed a faith in one’s personal ability for career preparation and an overall orientation to being able to prepare for a career. Sk is found to be 0.60 which is positive and shows that the data is positively skewed. Ku for self worth is -0.225 which is lesser than 0.263 ku for normal curve and depicts that the curve is leptokurtic.

2. Internet Savviness

Internet savviness is the sum total of the six dimensions i.e. information gathering, computer mediated communication, internet self-efficacy, creative self expression, internet fluency and social collaboration. Table and figure 4.1 shows that the value of mean and S.D. of internet savviness for total sample were 102.58 and 10.73 respectively. Mean scores indicates that adolescents were average on internet savviness. It means that young adolescents are comfortable and confident with internet. They use internet for personal and school tasks and activities though not extensively as indicates by scores. Sk is found to be -0.23 which is negative and showed that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.053 which is lesser than 0.263 ku for normal curve and exhibits that the curve is leptokurtic.
(i) **Information Gathering**

Table and figure 4.1 demonstrates that the value of mean and S.D. of information gathering dimension of internet savviness were 20.55 and 3.54 respectively. Mean scores shows that adolescents had an average ability to use various search engines to find the resources from the internet. They had an average ability to discriminate and filter accurate information from inaccurate information found on the internet. Sk is found to be -1.04 which is negative and depicts that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is 4.045 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is platykurtic.

(ii) **Computer Mediated Communication**

Table and figure 4.1 depicts that for the total sample, the mean and S.D. of computer mediated communication of internet savviness were 16.27 and 2.58 respectively. Mean scores indicates that the selected sample had an average involvement in communication through various formats audio, video, instant messaging, e-mails, chat rooms and discussion forums and tools to exchange the conversation or data between two or more individuals. Sk is found to be -0.13 which is negative and shows that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.218 which is lesser than 0.263 and exhibits that the curve is leptokurtic.

(iii) **Internet Self-Efficacy**

Table and figure 4.1 exhibits that for internet self efficacy dimension of internet savviness the mean and S.D. were 13.72 and 2.54 respectively. Mean score reveals that the adolescents had an average beliefs about their capabilities to produce a desired level of outcomes in navigating the internet and accessing its resources for personal or school use. It means that adolescents on an average explore and use new internet tools and resources that they perceive to be of their interest and use in their lives. Sk is found to be -0.32 which is negative and demonstrates that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.701 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and indicates that the curve is platykurtic.

(iv) **Creative Self Expression**

Table and figure 4.1 indicates that the mean value of creative self expression dimension of internet savviness is 16.18 and S.D. is 2.62. Mean score shows that the adolescents of the present sample on an average author and publish websites, design and create artwork, blog, podcast and create video artifacts. Sk is found to be -0.25 which is negative and depicts that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.026 which is lesser than ku for normal curve and indicates that the curve is leptokurtic.
(v) **Internet Fluency**

Table and figure 4.1 reveals that mean and S.D. of internet fluency dimension of internet savviness were 18.01 and 2.93 respectively. Mean score indicates that the adolescents in the present sample had average knowledge of internet and also possess the competencies and skills to navigate and make use of its resources. Sk is found to be -0.29 which is negative and shows that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.158 which is lesser than 0.263 ku for normal curve and depicts that the curve is leptokurtic.

(vi) **Social Collaboration**

Table and figure 4.1 shows that mean of social collaboration dimension of internet savviness is found to be 18.17 and S.D. is 2.44. Mean scores demonstrated that adolescents on an average basis collaborate online to perform personal work and school work like working in an online study group to complete the assignments. Sk is found to be -0.55 which is negative and indicates that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is 1.409 which is greater than ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is platykurtic.

3. **Family Environment**

Family Environment Scale developed by Vohra (1997) is based upon dimensional theory, where several dimensions are measured together to give a complete and comprehensive picture of one’s family environment. Present scale uses seven such clearly defined independent dimensions to measure family environment i.e. competitive framework, cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation, organization, and recreational orientation.

(i) **Competitive Framework**

Table and figure 4.1 shows that the mean and S.D. of competitive framework dimension of family environment were found as 9.68 and 5.65 respectively in case of total sample. The mean score for total sample is high as per norms. It revealed that the family members of adolescents in the present sample are high on competitiveness and achievement orientation. They gave importance to grades in schools, or success they achieve at the school and other areas of life. Sk is -0.29 which is negative and shows that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.052 which is lesser than 0.263 ku for normal curve and reveals that the curve is leptokurtic.
(ii) **Cohesion**

Table and figure 4.1 reveals that in case of total sample, the mean and S.D. of cohesion dimension of family environment were 8.98 and 2.20 respectively. The mean is found to be average as per the norms. It shows that the family members of adolescents in the present sample had an average support for each other and they have an average felling of togetherness. Sk is -0.50 which is negative and indicates that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.612 which is greater than the ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is platykurtic.

(iii) **Expressiveness**

Table and figure 4.1 indicates that the value of mean for expressiveness dimension of family environment is 8.92 and S.D. is 2.42. The mean on expressiveness is high as per the norms. It demonstrates that family members are encouraged to act openly and express their feelings directly. The family members are free to express the feelings of disagreement or disapproval at home. They usually indulge in spontaneous discussions without any fear of hesitation of hurting each other feelings. Sk is -0.55 which is negative and reveals that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.127 which is lesser than 0.263 ku for normal curve and exhibits that the curve is leptokurtic.

(iv) **Independence**

Table and figure 4.1 demonstrates that for independence dimension of family environment the mean and S.D. were 8.50 and 2.41 respectively. The mean is found to be average as per the norms. It demonstrates that the extent to which family members were assertive, self sufficient and make their own decisions is average in case of total sample. Sk is -0.24 which is negative and depicts that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.521 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is platykurtic.

(v) **Moral Orientation**

Table and figure 4.1 exhibits that the mean value of moral orientation dimension of family environment is 9.95 and S.D. is 5.92. The mean is found to be high as per the norms. This reveals that the family members give importance to religion. They have high ethical and moral values and encourage adolescents to follow them. Sk is 0.79 which is positive and shows that the data is positively skewed. Ku is 4.960 which is greater than ku for normal curve and indicates that the curve is platykurtic.
Analysis and Interpretation of the Results

(vi) *Organization*

Table and figure 4.1 depicts that for the organization dimension of family environment the value of mean is 9.36 and S.D. is 2.62. The mean is found to be high as per the norms. This demonstrates that the family members of adolescent in the present sample place high emphasis on rules and their activities are carefully planned. Each individual’s duty in the family is clearly defined, and they are usually neat and orderly. Sk is -0.34 which is negative and shows that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.544 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and reveals that the curve is platykurtic.

(vii) *Recreational Orientation*

Table and figure 4.1 shows that in case of total sample, the mean and S.D. of recreational orientation dimension of family environment were 7.54 and 2.13 respectively. The mean score for total sample is average as per the norms. It revealed that family of adolescents in the present sample had an average extent of participation and interest in social, recreational, political, intellectual and cultural activities. They on an average basis went out to see plays, attend lectures, watch sports events or just go out for fun. Sk is -0.23 which is negative and indicates that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.151 which is lesser than 0.263 and depicts that the curve is leptokurtic.

4. *Social-Economic Status*

Table and figure 4.1 indicates that for the total sample, mean on socio-economic status is 77.81 and S.D. is 17.04. According to the norms, the mean score on socio-economic status indicates that the total sample belonged to the middle socio-economic strata of society. Sk is 0.36 which is positive and showed that the data is positively skewed. Ku is -0.167 which is lesser than 0.263 ku for normal curve and exhibits that the curve is leptokurtic.

5. *Career Indecision*

Table and figure 4.1 shows that the mean and S.D. of career indecision were 24.31 and 5.33 respectively in case of total sample. An above average score on the variable of career indecision in the present study reflect that adolescents are indecisive as compared to the normative sample. They are more uncertain in making relevant career decision. Sk is -0.01 which is negative and shows that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.533 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and reveals that the curve is platykurtic.
4.1.2 ANALYSIS OF DESCRIPTIVE FOR BOYS

The mean, S.D., Sk and Ku of the variables under study i.e. career beliefs, internet savviness, family environment, socio-economic status and career indecision in case of boys has been given in table 4.2.

Table 4.2: A summary of descriptive statistics of different variables for boys (N= 360)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Sk</th>
<th>Ku</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Beliefs</td>
<td>134.63</td>
<td>30.41</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>High –vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control and Self Direction</td>
<td>22.02</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>Average -vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Common Practice</td>
<td>20.34</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.336</td>
<td>High –vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalism</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>Average –vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>Low Average –vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>Low Average –vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige and Social Status</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>Low Average –vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.755</td>
<td>Average –vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Worth</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.670</td>
<td>Low Average –vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Savviness</td>
<td>104.01</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.403</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Gathering</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>6.178</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Mediated Communication</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Self Efficacy</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Self-Expression</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Fluency</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>0.513</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Collaboration</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Framework</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.330</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.605</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Orientation</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.862</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Orientation</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio Economic Status</td>
<td>79.62</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.419</td>
<td>Middle SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Indecision</td>
<td>24.45</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.466</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Filed Survey, 2013

Note: The higher the score the greater is the negativity of career beliefs

To substantiate the data presented in table 4.2, a bar diagram is drawn to depict the mean of different variables of boys has been given in fig 4.2.
Fig: 4.2 Bar diagram showing comparison of different variables of boys
1. **Career Beliefs**

Table and figure 4.2 shows that the sum total of eight factors i.e. control and self direction, culture and common practice, fatalism, gender, persistence, prestige and social status, proficiency and self worth provide a composite career beliefs pattern scores. The value of mean and S.D. of total career beliefs for boys were 134.63 and 30.41 respectively. High scores indicate higher negativity in the content of career beliefs. Mean is found to be high negativity as per the norms. It means that the boys had high negative career beliefs. This demonstrates that the boys had strong negative thoughts about career preparations and career development. Sk is found to be 0.14 which is positive and exhibits that the data is positively skewed. Ku is 0.521 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is platykurtic.

(i) **Control and Self Direction**

Table and figure 4.2 indicates that for the sample of boys, the mean and S.D. of control and self direction dimension of career beliefs were 22.02 and 5.91 respectively. The mean score for boys exhibits average negativity as per the norms. It reveals that the boys had average negativity in their sense of control over their life situations and the orientation to directing their life and also they have average negative confidence to manage the trajectory of their life. Sk is found to be 0.20 which is positive and shows that the distribution is positively skewed. Ku is 0.355 which is greater than Ku for normal curve and indicates that curve is platykurtic.

(ii) **Culture and Common Practice**

Table and figure 4.2 reveals that the mean value of culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs is 20.34 and S.D. is 6.12. The mean is found to be high negativity as per norms. It shows that the boys in the sample were highly influenced by common practice and unwritten norms that orient the people of a community and shape their career preparation behavior. Sk is 0.27 which is positive and shows that the distribution is positively skewed. Ku is found to be -0.336 which is greater than Ku for normal curve 0.263 and demonstrates that curve is platykurtic.

(iii) **Fatalism**

Table and figure 4.2 demonstrates that the value of mean and S.D. for fatalism dimension of career beliefs were 16.08 and 4.78 respectively. The mean is found to be
average negativity as per the norms. It shows that the boys had average negative beliefs that portray a sense of resignation and a passive acceptance of one’s life situation. They had an average negative feeling of pessimism, a sense that nothing can be changed and that matters are pre-ordained by more powerful forces. Sk for the fatalism is found to be 0.06 which is positive and reveals that the distribution is positively skewed. Ku is found to be -0.208 which is lesser than 0.263 and shows that curve is leptokurtic.

(iv) Gender

Table and figure 4.2 exhibits that mean of gender dimension of career beliefs is found to be 9.58 and S.D. is 3.95. The mean is found to be low average negativity as per the norms. It shows that boys had below average faith in beliefs towards existing male-female stereotypes pertaining to engagement with the world of work. Sk is 0.58 which is positive and indicates that the data is positively skewed. Ku for gender is 0.131 which is lesser than 0.263 and reveals that curve is leptokurtic.

(v) Persistence

Table and figure 4.2 depicts that for persistence dimension of career beliefs the mean and S.D. is 19.14 and 6.22 respectively. The mean is found to be low average negativity as per norms. It exhibits that the boys are determine to persist towards future career goals in spite of the barriers encountered during the process of career preparation. Sk is -0.01 which is negative and shows that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.064 which is lesser than 0.263 and indicates that curve is leptokurtic.

(vi) Prestige and Social Status

Table and figure 4.2 indicates that in case of boys, the mean and S.D. of prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs found to be 20.28 and 6.81 respectively. The mean is found to be low average negativity as per the norm which demonstrates that negativity in boys orientation to occupational structures and hierarchies embedded in their culture is at the low average level. Sk is 0.23 which is positive and reveals that the data is positively skewed. Ku is -0.126 which is lesser than the 0.263 and shows that the curve is leptokurtic.

(vii) Proficiency

Table and figure 4.2 shows that the mean and S.D. of proficiency dimension of career beliefs were found to be 15.60 and 5.90 respectively. The mean score on proficiency dimension exhibits average negativity. This demonstrates that the boys had average
negativity to acquire qualifications and skills that can enhance personal proficiency for an occupation before entering the world of work. They had an average willingness to submit to rigors of a formal training programme and spend resources like time, efforts and finance to achieve the distinction of being formally qualified as per the norms of a given educational system. Sk is 0.14 which is positive and shows that the distribution is positively skewed. Ku is -0.755 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and indicates that the curve is platykurtic.

(viii) Self Worth

Table and figure 4.2 exhibits that for self worth dimension of career beliefs the mean and S.D. is 11.54 and 5.56 respectively. Mean is found to be low average negativity as per the norms. This indicates that the boys had faith in their personal ability for career preparation and an overall orientation to being able to prepare for a career. Sk is found to be 0.43 which is positive and reveals that the data is positively skewed. Ku for self worth is -0.670 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and depicts that the curve is platykurtic.

2. Internet Savviness

Table and figure 4.2 exhibits that Internet savviness is the sum total of the six dimensions i.e. information gathering, computer mediated communication, internet self-efficacy, creative self expression, internet fluency and social collaboration. The value of mean and S.D. of internet savviness for boys were 104.01 and 10.45 respectively. Mean scores indicates that boys were average on internet savviness. It means that young boys are comfortable and confident with internet. They use internet for personal and school tasks and activities though not extensively as indicates by scores. Sk is found to be -0.03 which is negative and shows that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.403 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and reveals that the curve is platykurtic.

(i) Information Gathering

Table and figure 4.2 indicates that the value of mean and S.D. of information gathering dimension of internet savviness were 20.35 and 3.78 respectively. Mean scores shows that boys had an average ability to use various search engines to find the resources from the internet. They had an average ability to discriminate and filter accurate information from inaccurate information found on the internet. Sk is found to be -1.59 which is negative and indicates that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is 6.178 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and exhibits that the curve is platykurtic.
(ii) **Computer Mediated Communication**

Table and figure 4.2 reveals that for the sample of boys, the mean and S.D. of computer mediated communication dimension of internet savviness were 16.62 and 2.41 respectively. Mean scores indicates that the boys had an average involvement in communication through various formats audio, video, instant messaging, e-mails, chat rooms and discussion forums and tools to exchange the conversation or data between two or more individuals. Sk is found to be -0.30 which is negative and shows that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.192 which is lesser than 0.263 and reveals that the curve is leptokurtic.

(iii) **Internet Self-Efficacy**

Table and figure 4.2 exhibits that for internet self efficacy dimension internet savviness the mean and S.D. were 13.94 and 2.49 respectively. Mean score indicates that the boys had an average beliefs about their capabilities to produce a desired level of outcomes in navigating the internet and accessing its resources for personal or school use. It means that boys on average explore and use new internet tools and resources that they perceive to be of their interest and use in their lives. Sk is found to be 0.01 which is positive and shows that the data is positively skewed. Ku is 0.55 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and demonstrates that the curve is platykurtic.

(iv) **Creative Self Expression**

Table and figure 4.2 depicts that the mean value of creative self expression dimension of internet savviness is 16.56 and S.D. is 2.49. Mean score shows that the boys of the present sample on an average author and publish websites, design and create artwork, blog, podcast and create video artifact. Sk is found to be -0.21 which is negative and indicates that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.028 which is lesser than ku for normal curve and exhibits that the curve is leptokurtic.

(v) **Internet Fluency**

Table and figure 4.2 demonstrates that Mean and S.D. of internet fluency dimension of internet savviness were 18.43 and 2.66 respectively. Mean score indicates that the boys in the present sample had average knowledge of internet and also possess the average competencies and skills to navigate and make use of its resources. Sk is found to be -0.52 which is negative and shows that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.513 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and reveals that the curve is platykurtic.
(vi) **Social Collaboration**

Table and figure 4.2 indicates that Mean of social collaboration dimension of internet savviness is found to be 18.44 and S.D. is 2.34. Mean scores demonstrates that boys on an average basis collaborate online to perform personal work and school work like working in an online study group to complete the assignments. Sk is found to be -0.03 which is negative and shows that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.031 which is lesser than ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is leptokurtic.

3. **Family Environment**

Family Environment Scale developed by Vohra (1997) is based upon dimensional theory, where several dimensions measured together to give a complete and comprehensive picture of one’s family environment. Present scale uses seven such clearly defined independent dimensions to measure family environment i.e. competitive framework, cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation, organization and recreational orientation.

(i) **Competitive Framework**

Table and figure 4.2 indicates that the mean and S.D. of competitive framework dimension of family environment were found as 10.17 and 7.74 respectively in case of boys. The mean score for boys is high as per norms. It reveals that the family members of boys in the present sample are high on competiveness and achievement orientation. They gave importance to grades in schools, or success they achieve at the school and other areas of life. Sk is -0.37 which is negative and shows that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.330 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and exhibits that the curve is platykurtic.

(ii) **Cohesion**

Table and figure 4.2 shows that in case of boys, the mean and S.D. of cohesion dimension of family environment were 8.86 and 2.12 respectively. The mean is found to be average as per the norms. It demonstrates that the family members of boys in the present sample had an average support for each other and they have an average felling of togetherness. Sk is -0.33 which is negative and exhibits that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.488 which is greater than the ku for normal curve and depicts that the curve is platykurtic.
(iii) **Expressiveness**

Table and figure 4.2 demonstrates that the value of mean for expressiveness dimension of family environment is 8.63 and S.D. is 2.39. The mean on expressiveness is high as per the norms. This demonstrates that in the family of boys they are encouraged to act openly and express their feelings directly. They can express the feelings of disagreement or disapproval freely at home. They usually indulged in spontaneous discussions without any fear of hesitation of hurting each other feelings. Sk is -0.63 which is negative and exhibits that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.592 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is platykurtic.

(iv) **Independence**

Table and figure 4.2 shows that for independence dimension of family environment the mean and S.D. were 8.60 and 2.49 respectively. The mean is found to be average as per the norms. It depicts that the extent to which family members were assertive, self sufficient and make their own decisions is average in case of boys. Sk is -0.34 which is negative and reveals that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.605 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and indicates that the curve is platykurtic.

(v) **Moral Orientation**

Table and figure 4.2 depicts that the mean value of moral orientation dimension of family environment is 10.19 and S.D. is 8.02. The mean is found to be high for boys. This exhibits that the family members gave importance to religion. They have high ethical and moral values and encourage boys to follow them. Sk is 0.08 which is positive and demonstrates that the data is positively skewed. Ku is 0.470 which is greater than ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is platykurtic.

(vi) **Organization**

Table and figure 4.2 exhibits that for the organization dimension of family environment the value of mean is 9.36 and S.D. is 2.75. The mean is found to be high in the present sample as per the norms. This demonstrates that the family members of boys place high emphasis on rules, their activities are carefully planned. Each individual’s duty in the family is clearly defined, and they are usually neat and orderly. Sk is -0.30 which is negative and depicts that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.862 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is platykurtic.
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(vii) **Recreational Orientation**

Table and figure 4.2 reveals that in case of boys, the mean and S.D. of recreational orientation dimension were 7.48 and 2.19 respectively. The mean score for boys is average as per the norms. It reveals that family of boys in the present sample had an average extent of participation and interest in social, recreational, political, intellectual and cultural activities. They on an average basis went out to see plays, attend lectures, watch sports events or just go out for fun. Sk is -0.36 which is negative and shows that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.055 which is lesser than 0.263 and indicates that the curve is leptokurtic.

4. **Social-Economic Status**

Table and figure 4.2 shows that for the sample of boys, mean on socio-economic status is 79.62 and S.D. is 18.40. According to the norms, the mean score of socio-economic status indicates that the sample of boys belongs to the middle socio-economic strata of society. Sk is 0.17 which is positive and shows that the data is positively skewed. Ku is -0.419 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and depicts that the curve is platykurtic.

5. **Career Indecision**

Table and figure 4.2 indicates that the mean and S.D. of career indecision were 24.45 and 5.36 respectively in case of boys. An above average score on the variable of career indecision in the present study reflect that boys are indecisive as compared to the normative sample. They are more uncertain in making relevant career decision. Sk is -0.03 which is negative and shows that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.466 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and exhibits that the curve is platykurtic.

4.1.3 **Analysis of Descriptive for Girls**

The mean, S.D., Sk and Ku of the variables under study i.e. career beliefs, internet savviness, family environment, socio-economic status and career indecision in case of girls has been given in table 4.3.
Table 4.3: A summary of descriptive statistics of different variables for girls (N= 360)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Sk</th>
<th>Ku</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Beliefs</td>
<td>118.66</td>
<td>30.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.522</td>
<td>Average -vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control and Self Direction</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>Low Average -vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Common Practice</td>
<td>17.84</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.437</td>
<td>High Average -vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalism</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>Average –vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>08.21</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.131</td>
<td>Low –vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.549</td>
<td>Low Average –vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige and Social Status</td>
<td>17.86</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.265</td>
<td>Low Average –vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>Low Average –vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Worth</td>
<td>09.93</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>Low –vty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Savviness</td>
<td>101.14</td>
<td>10.82</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Gathering</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.537</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Mediated Communication</td>
<td>15.92</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.389</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Self Efficacy</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Self-Expression</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Fluency</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.467</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Collaboration</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>2.162</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Framework</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressiveness</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-0.355</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.384</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Orientation</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.295</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Orientation</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio Economic Status</td>
<td>76.01</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>Middle SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Indecision</td>
<td>24.16</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.591</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Filed Survey, 2013

Note: The higher the score the greater is the negativity of career beliefs

To substantiate the data presented in table 4.3, a bar diagram is drawn to depict the mean of different variables of girls has been given in fig 4.3.
Analysis and Interpretation of the Results

Fig: 4.3 Bar diagram showing comparison of different variables of girls
1. Career Beliefs

The sum total of eight factors i.e. control and self direction, culture and common practice, fatalism, gender, persistence, prestige and social status, proficiency and self worth provide a composite career beliefs pattern score. Table and figure 4.3 indicates that the value of mean and S.D. of career beliefs for girls were 118.66 and 30.15 respectively. High scores indicate higher negativity in the content of career beliefs. Mean is found to be average negativity as per the norms. It means that the girls had average negative career beliefs. This demonstrates that the girls had average negative thoughts about career preparations and career development. Sk is found to be 0.09 which is positive and shows that the data is positively skewed. Ku is -0.522 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and exhibits that the curve is platykurtic.

(i) Control and Self Direction

Table and figure 4.3 indicates that for the sample of girls, the mean and S.D. of control and self direction dimension of career beliefs were 19.24 and 6.64 respectively. The mean score for girls is found to be low average negativity as per the norms. It reveals that the girls had low average negativity in their sense of control over their life situations and the orientation to directing their life and also they have low average negative confidence to manage the trajectory of their life. Sk is found to be 0.16 which is positive and shows that the distribution is positively skewed. Ku is 0.254 which is greater than Ku for normal curve and depicts that curve is platykurtic.

(ii) Culture and Common Practice

Table and figure 4.3 reveals that the mean value of culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs is 17.84 and S.D. is 6.64. The mean is found to be high average negativity as per norms. It shows that the girls in this sample were influenced by common practice and unwritten norms that orient the people of a community and shape their career preparation behavior, at high average level as per the norms. Sk is 0.34 which is positive and indicates that the distribution is positively skewed. Ku is found to be -0.473 which is greater than Ku for normal curve 0.263 and depicts that curve is platykurtic.
(iii) Fatalism

Table and figure 4.3 demonstrates that the value of mean and S.D. for fatalism dimension of career beliefs were 14.66 and 5.35 respectively. The mean is found to be average negativity as per the norms. It shows that the girls had average negative beliefs that portray a sense of resignation and a passive acceptance of one’s life situation. They had an average negative feeling of pessimism, a sense that nothing can be changed and that matters are pre-ordained by more powerful forces. Sk for the fatalism is found to be 0.22 which is positive and indicates that the distribution is positively skewed. Ku is found to be -0.221 which is lesser than 0.263 and reveals that curve is leptokurtic.

(iv) Gender

Table and figure 4.3 exhibits that mean of gender dimension of career beliefs is found to be 8.21 and S.D. is 3.36. The mean is found to be low negativity as per the norms. It indicates that girls had low faith towards existing male-female stereotypes pertaining to engagement with the world of work. Sk is 0.28 which is positive and shows that the data is positively skewed. Ku for gender is 0.131 which is lesser than 0.263 and exhibits that curve is leptokurtic.

(v) Persistence

Table and figure 4.3 depicts that for persistence dimension of career beliefs the mean and S.D. were 18.06 and 6.00 respectively. The mean is found to be low average negativity as per norms. It shows that the determination of the girls to persist towards future career goals in spite of the barriers encountered during the process of career preparation is at low average level. Sk is -0.09 which is negative and indicates that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.549 which is greater than 0.263 and demonstrates that curve is platykurtic.

(vi) Prestige and Social Status

Table and figure 4.3 exhibits that in case of girls, the mean and S.D. of prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs found to be 17.86 and 6.47 respectively. The mean is found to be low average negativity as per the norm which demonstrates that girl’s negativity
towards occupational structures and hierarchies embedded in their culture is at low average level. Sk is 0.10 which is positive and shows that the data is positively skewed. Ku is -0.265 which is greater than the 0.263 and reveals that the curve is platykurtic.

(vii) **Proficiency**

Table and figure 4.3 shows that the mean and S.D. of proficiency dimension girl’s were found to be 12.86 and 5.51 respectively. The mean score on proficiency dimension is low average negativity. This demonstrates that the girls had low average negativity to acquire qualifications and skills that can enhance personal proficiency for an occupation before entering the world of work. They had low average negative belief of the willingness to submit to rigors of a formal training programme and spend resources like time, efforts and finance to achieve the distinction of being formally qualified as per the norms of a given educational system. Sk is 0.47 which is positive and shows that the distribution is positively skewed. Ku is -0.044 which is lesser that 0.263 ku for normal curve and depicts that the curve is leptokurtic.

(viii) **Self Worth**

Table and figure 4.3 reveals that for self worth dimension, the mean and S.D. were 9.93 and 4.97 respectively. Mean is found to be low negativity as per the norms. This indicates that the girl’s shows faith in their personal ability for career preparation and an overall orientation to being able to prepare for a career. Sk is found to be 0.76 which is positive and reveals that the data is positively skewed. Ku for self worth is 0.480 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and indicates that the curve is platykurtic.

2. **Internet Savviness**

Internet savviness is the sum total of the six dimensions i.e. information gathering, computer mediated communication, internet self-efficacy, creative self expression, internet fluency and social collaboration. Table and figure 4.3 reveals that the value of mean and S.D. of internet savviness for girls were 101.14 and 10.82 respectively. Mean scores indicates that girls were average on internet savviness. It means that young girls are comfortable and confident with internet. They use internet for personal and school tasks and activities though
not extensively as indicated by scores. Sk is found to be -0.40 which is negative and shows that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.262 which is lesser than 0.263 ku for normal curve and reveals that the curve is leptokurtic.

(i) Information Gathering

Table and figure 4.3 indicates that the value of mean and S.D. of information gathering dimension of internet savviness were 20.75 and 3.27 respectively. Mean scores shows that girls had an average ability to use various search engines to find the resources from the internet. They had an average ability to discriminate and filter accurate information from inaccurate information found on the internet. Sk is found to be -0.13 which is negative and depicts that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.537 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and exhibits that the curve is platykurtic.

(ii) Computer Mediated Communication

Table and figure 4.3 shows that for the sample of girls, the mean and S.D. of computer mediated communication of internet savviness were 15.92 and 2.70 respectively. Mean scores indicates that the girls had an average involvement in communication through various formats audio, video, instant messaging, e mails, chat rooms and discussion forums and tools to exchange the conversation or data between two or more individuals. Sk is found to be 0.07 which is positive and shows that the data is positively skewed. Ku is -0.389 which is greater than 0.263 and reveals that the curve is platykurtic.

(iii) Internet Self-Efficacy

Table and figure 4.3 reveals that for internet self efficacy dimension of internet savviness the mean and S.D. were 13.50 and 2.58 respectively. Mean score indicates that the girls had an average beliefs about their capabilities to produce a desired level of outcomes in navigating the internet and accessing its resources for personal or school use. It means that girls on average explore and use new internet tools and resources that they perceive to be of their interest and use in their lives. Sk is found to be -0.61 which is negative and exhibits that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.700 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is platykurtic.
(iv) Creative Self Expression

Table and figure 4.3 depicts that the mean value of creative self expression dimension of internet savviness is 15.80 and S.D. is 2.70. Mean score shows that the girls in the present sample on an average author and publish websites, design and create artwork, blog, podcast and create video artifacts. Sk is found to be -0.24 which is negative and demonstrates that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.007 which is lesser than ku for normal curve and indicates that the curve is leptokurtic.

(v) Internet Fluency

Table and figure 4.3 indicates that mean and S.D. of internet fluency dimension of internet savviness were 17.59 and 3.13 respectively. Mean score indicates that the girls in the present sample had average knowledge of internet and also possess average competencies and skills to navigate and make use of its resources. Sk is found to be -0.04 which is negative and shows that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.467 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is platykurtic.

(vi) Social Collaboration

Table and figure 4.3 depicts that mean of social collaboration dimension of internet savviness is found to be 17.89 and S.D. is 2.50. Mean scores demonstrates that girls on an average basis collaborate online to perform personal work and school work like working in an online study group to complete the assignments. Sk is found to be -0.94 which is negative and exhibiting that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is 2.162 which is greater than ku for normal curve and reveals that the curve is platykurtic.

3. Family Environment

Family Environment Scale developed by Vohra (1997) is based upon dimensional theory, where several dimensions measured together to give a complete and comprehensive picture of one's family environment. Present scale uses seven such clearly defined independent dimensions to measure family environment i.e. competitive framework, cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation, organization, and recreational orientation.
(i) Competitive Framework

Table and figure 4.3 depicts that the mean and S.D. of competitive framework dimension of family environment were found as 9.19 and 1.89 respectively in case of girls. The mean score for girls is average as per norms. It reveals that the family members of girls are average on competiveness and achievement orientation. They gave average importance to grades in schools, or success they achieve at the school and other areas of life. Sk is -0.79 which is negative and shows that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is 1.225 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and depicts that the curve is platykurtic.

(ii) Cohesion

Table and figure 4.3 reveals that in case of girls, the mean and S.D. of cohesion dimension of family environment were 9.09 and 2.27 respectively. The mean is found to be average as per the norms. It shows that the family members of girls in the present sample had an average support for each other and they have an average felling of togetherness. Sk is -0.65 which is negative and indicates that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.815 which is greater than the ku for normal curve and exhibits that the curve is platykurtic.

(iii) Expressiveness

Table and figure 4.3 shows that the value of mean for expressiveness dimension of family environment is 9.22 and S.D. is 2.41. The mean on expressiveness is high as per the norms. This demonstrates that the family members of girls are encourage them to act openly and express their feelings directly. They can freely express the feelings of disagreement or disapproval at home. They usually indulge in spontaneous discussions without any fear of hesitation of hurting each other feelings. Sk is -0.50 which is negative and reveals that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.355 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is platykurtic.

(iv) Independence

Table and figure 4.3 exhibits that for independence dimension of family environment the mean and S.D. were 8.41 and 2.33 respectively. The mean is found to be average as per the norms. It shows that the extent to which family members were assertive, self sufficient
and make their own decisions is average in case of girls. Sk is -0.14 which is negative and reveals that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.384 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and demonstrates that the curve is platykurtic.

(v) Moral Orientation

Table and figure 4.3 depicts that the mean value of moral orientation dimension of family environment is 9.72 and S.D. is 2.41. The mean is found to be high for girls. This reveals that the family members of girls give importance to religion. They have high ethical and moral values and encourage girls to follow them. Sk is -0.37 which is negative and shows that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.295 which is greater than ku for normal curve and exhibits that the curve is platykurtic.

(vi) Organization

Table and figure 4.3 shows that for the organization dimension of family environment the value of mean is 9.36 and S.D. is 2.48. The mean is found to be high as per the norms. This demonstrates that the family members of girls in the present sample place high emphasis on rules, their activities are carefully planned. Each individual duty in the family is clearly defined, and they are usually neat and orderly. Sk is -0.40 which is negative and shows that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.118 which is lesser than 0.263 ku for normal curve and depicts that the curve is leptokurtic.

(vii) Recreational Orientation

Table and figure 4.3 indicates that in case of girls, the mean and S.D. of recreational orientation dimension of family environment were 7.60 and 2.07 respectively. The mean score for girls is average as per the norms. It reveals that family of girls had an average extent of participation and interest in social, recreational, political, intellectual and cultural activities. They on an average bases went out to see plays, attend lectures, watch sports events or just go out for fun. Sk is -0.08 which is negative and indicates that the distribution is negatively skewed. Ku is 0.231 which is lesser than 0.263 and shows that the curve is leptokurtic.
4. Social-Economic Status

Table and figure 4.3 depicts that for the sample of girls mean of socio-economic status scale is 76.01 and S.D. is 15.38. According to the norms, the mean score on socio-economic status scale indicates that the sample of girls belongs to the middle socio-economic strata of society. Sk is 0.53 which is positive and demonstrates that the data is positively skewed. Ku is 0.208 which is lesser than 0.263 ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is leptokurtic.

5. Career Indecision

Table and figure 4.3 reveals that the mean and S.D. of career indecision were 24.16 and 5.30 respectively in case of girls. An above average score on the variable of career indecision in the present study reflect that girls are indecisive as compared to the normative sample. They are more uncertain in making relevant career decision. Sk is -0.01 which is negative and exhibits that the data is negatively skewed. Ku is -0.591 which is greater than 0.263 ku for normal curve and shows that the curve is platykurtic.

4.2 ANALYSIS OF CORRELATION WITH DIFFERENT VARIABLES

This section deals with bivariate coefficient of correlations between the variables of career beliefs, internet savviness, family environment, socio-economic status and career indecision among adolescents. The objective of this analysis is to find the relationship between the variable of career beliefs, internet savviness, family environment, socio-economic status and career indecision. In accordance with this objective, product-moment coefficients of correlation were worked out, to analyze the data.

4.2.1 CAREER BELIEFS WITH INTERNET SAVVINESS OF TOTAL SAMPLE

The variable of career beliefs includes eight dimensions namely control and self direction, culture and common practice, fatalism, gender, persistence, prestige and social status, proficiency and self worth. The variable internet savviness includes six dimensions namely information gathering, computer mediated communication, internet self-efficacy, creative self expression, internet fluency and social collaboration. The analysis of correlation matrix of career belief with internet savviness for total sample has been given in table 4.4
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Table 4.4: Correlation matrix of career belief with internet savviness for total sample (N=720)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>CSD</th>
<th>CCP</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>PSS</th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>CSE</th>
<th>ISE</th>
<th>CEC</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>0.734**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>0.749**</td>
<td>0.524**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.621**</td>
<td>0.503**</td>
<td>0.504**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.688**</td>
<td>0.446**</td>
<td>0.539**</td>
<td>0.386**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.641**</td>
<td>0.352**</td>
<td>0.407**</td>
<td>0.259**</td>
<td>0.345**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>0.718**</td>
<td>0.416**</td>
<td>0.411**</td>
<td>0.343**</td>
<td>0.504**</td>
<td>0.410**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>0.634**</td>
<td>0.375**</td>
<td>0.302**</td>
<td>0.258**</td>
<td>0.361**</td>
<td>0.309**</td>
<td>0.371**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>0.638**</td>
<td>0.337**</td>
<td>0.362**</td>
<td>0.210**</td>
<td>0.391**</td>
<td>0.372**</td>
<td>0.413**</td>
<td>0.489**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>-0.170**</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IG</td>
<td>-0.150**</td>
<td>-0.130**</td>
<td>-0.075*</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.168**</td>
<td>-0.071*</td>
<td>-0.189**</td>
<td>-0.165**</td>
<td>0.549**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMC</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>-0.100**</td>
<td>-0.125**</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.656**</td>
<td>0.234**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISE</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-0.097**</td>
<td>-0.089**</td>
<td>0.639**</td>
<td>0.331**</td>
<td>0.377**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.089**</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.578**</td>
<td>0.123**</td>
<td>0.446**</td>
<td>0.238**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.597**</td>
<td>0.196**</td>
<td>0.226**</td>
<td>0.378**</td>
<td>0.177**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>-0.089**</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.072*</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>-0.119**</td>
<td>-0.087**</td>
<td>-0.082**</td>
<td>0.615**</td>
<td>0.262**</td>
<td>0.327**</td>
<td>0.283**</td>
<td>0.340**</td>
<td>0.343**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 Level  
** Significant at the 0.01 Level  

( Critical Value 0.062 at 0.05 and 0.081 at 0.01 level, df 718)  

1. **Correlation of Career Beliefs with Internet Savviness and its Dimensions**

Table 4.4 shows that the correlation of career beliefs and internet savviness is -0.059. This value is less than table value of 0.062 at 0.05 level of significance and hence is not found to be significant even at 0.05 level of significance. Negative but significant correlation is found between career beliefs and information gathering (-0.150) at 0.01 level and with social collaboration (-0.089) at 0.05 level of significance. No significant correlation is found between career beliefs and computer mediated communication (-0.055), internet self-efficacy (-0.024), creative self expression (-0.028) and internet fluency (-0.007) dimensions of internet savviness. Thus there exists no significant relationship between career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions namely computer mediated communication, internet self-efficacy, creative self expression and internet fluency except information gathering and social collaboration.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_1$: There exists no significant relationship between career beliefs and internet savviness (information gathering, computer mediated communication, internet self-efficacy, creative self expression, internet fluency and social collaboration) of adolescents, is accepted for internet savviness and its dimensions i.e. computer mediated communication, internet self-efficacy, creative self expression and internet fluency except information gathering and social collaboration. It means that only two dimensions of internet savviness i.e. information gathering and social collaboration contributes towards career beliefs of adolescents.

Adolescents who had ability to use various search engines to find resources and to discriminate and filter accurate information from inaccurate information found on internet and socially collaborate online to perform school work i.e. completion of assignments, exchange and sharing of ideas which deepen learning. All this might leads to decreases in negativity of adolescents about their career beliefs. These adolescents have less negative thoughts about their career preparations and career developments.

**(i) Correlation of Control and Self Direction Dimension of Career Beliefs with Internet Savviness and its Dimensions**

From table 4.4 it reveals that the correlation between control and self direction dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness (-0.047) which is not significant even at
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0.05 level of significance. No significant correlation is found between control and self
direction dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of internet savviness viz. internet self-
efficacy, creative self expression, internet fluency and social collaboration -0.048, -0.009, -
0.010, -0.024 respectively. Significant but negative correlation is found between control and
self direction and information gathering (-0.130) and computer mediated communication (-
0.100) dimension of internet savviness at 0.01 level of significance. It indicates that there
exists no significant relationship between control and self direction dimension of career
beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions i.e. internet self-efficacy, creative self
expression, internet fluency and social collaboration except information gathering and
computer mediated communication dimension of internet savviness.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{10}$: There exists no significant relationship between
control and self direction dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its
dimensions of adolescents, is accepted for internet savviness and its dimensions i.e. internet
self-efficacy, creative self expression, internet fluency and social collaboration except
information gathering and computer mediated communication dimension of internet
savviness. It means only two dimensions of internet savviness i.e. information gathering and
computer mediated communication contributes towards control and self direction beliefs of
adolescents.

It reveals that the adolescents who had ability to use various search engines to find
resources and to discriminate and filter accurate information from inaccurate information
found on internet and are involved in communication through various formats audio, video,
instant messaging, e-mails, chat rooms and discussion forums had less negativity in their
sense of control over their life situations and the orientation to direct their life and also posses
less negative confidence to manage the trajectory of their life.

(ii) Correlation of Culture and Common Practice Dimension of Career Beliefs with Internet
Savviness and its Dimensions

Table 4.4 reveals that correlation between culture and common practice dimension of
career beliefs with internet savviness is -0.035 which is not significant even at 0.05 level of
significance. Negative but significant relationship is found between culture and common
practice dimension of career beliefs and computer mediated communication dimension of
internet savviness (-0.125) at 0.01 level of significance. The values of correlation between culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of internet savviness viz. information gathering and social collaboration are -0.075 and -0.072 respectively which in comparison to the table value is found negative and significant at 0.05 level. No significant correlation is found between culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of internet savviness viz. internet self-efficacy (-0.033), creative self expression (-0.008) and internet fluency (-0.010). The result indicates that there is no significant relationship between culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions viz. internet self-efficacy, creative self expression and internet fluency except information gathering, computer mediated communication and social collaboration.

Hence, the null hypotheses $H_1 (ii)$: stating that There exists no significant relationship between culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions of adolescents, is accepted for internet savviness and its dimensions i.e. internet self-efficacy, creative self expression and internet fluency except information gathering, computer mediated communication and social collaboration dimensions of internet savviness. This exhibits that only three dimensions of internet savviness i.e. information gathering, computer mediated communication and social collaboration contributes towards culture and common practice beliefs of adolescents.

Above results depicts that the adolescents who had ability to use various search engines to find resources and to discriminate and filter accurate information from inaccurate information found on internet, involved in communication through various formats audio, video, instant messaging, e-mails, chat rooms and discussion forums and socially collaborate online to perform school work i.e. completion of assignments, exchange and sharing of ideas which deepen learning are less influenced by common practice and unwritten norms that orient the people of a community and shape their career preparation behavior.

(iii) Correlation of Fatalism Dimension of Career Beliefs with Internet Savviness and its Dimensions

The table 4.4 depicts that correlation of fatalism dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness is -0.024. This value is less than table value of 0.062 at 0.05 and 0.81 at
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0.01 level of significance. No significant relationship is found between fatalism and information gathering (-0.002), computer mediated communication (-0.017), internet self-efficacy (-0.019), creative self expression (-0.031), internet fluency (-0.007) and social collaboration (-0.009) dimensions of internet savviness. Thus there exists no significant relationship between fatalism dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_1$ (iii): There exists no significant relationship between fatalism dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions of adolescents, is accepted. The result shows that internet savviness and its dimensions did not contribute towards the fatalism beliefs of adolescents.

**Correlation of Gender Dimension of Career Beliefs with Internet Savviness and its Dimensions**

The table 4.4 reveals that correlation of gender dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness is -0.040. This value is less than table value of 0.062 at 0.05 and 0.81 at 0.01 level of significance. No significant relationship is found between gender and information gathering (-0.004), computer mediated communication (-0.034), internet self-efficacy (-0.022), creative self expression (-0.024), internet fluency (-0.022) and social collaboration (-0.060) dimensions of internet savviness. Thus there exists no significant relationship between gender dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_1$ (iv): There exists no significant relationship between gender dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions of adolescents, is accepted. The result shows that internet savviness and its dimensions did not contribute towards the gender beliefs of adolescents.

**Correlation of Persistence Dimension of Career Beliefs with Internet Savviness and Its Dimensions**

Table 4.4 shows that the value of relationship between persistence dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness is -0.060, which in comparison to the table values is not significant even at 0.05 level. Significant but negative correlation is found between
persistence and information gathering (-0.168), creative self expression (-0.086) dimensions of internet savviness at 0.01 level of significance. No significant relationship is found between persistence dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness dimensions viz. computer mediated communication (-0.007), internet self-efficacy (-0.057), internet fluency (-0.033) and social collaboration (-0.060). The results exhibits that there exists no significant relationship between persistence dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions viz. computer mediated communication, internet self-efficacy, internet fluency and social collaboration except information gathering and creative self expression.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_1 (v)$: There exists no significant relationship between persistence dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions of adolescents, is accepted for internet savviness and its dimensions viz. computer mediated communication, internet self-efficacy, internet fluency and social collaboration except information gathering and creative self expression. The result reveals that only two dimensions of internet savviness viz. information gathering and creative self expression contribute towards persistence dimension of career beliefs.

It reveals that adolescents who had ability to use various search engines to find resources and to discriminate and filter accurate information from inaccurate information found on internet and author and publish websites, design and create artwork, blog, podcast and create video artifacts are less negative to persist towards their future career goals in spite of barriers encountered during the process of career preparation.

(vi) Correlation of Prestige and Social Status Dimension of Career Beliefs with Internet Savviness and its Dimensions

Table 4.4 shows that the value of relationship between prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness is -0.055, which in comparison to the table values is not found to be significant even at 0.05 level. Significant but negative relationship is found between prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs and dimension of internet savviness viz. information gathering (-0.071) at 0.05 and social collaboration (-0.119) at 0.01 level of significance. No significant relationship is found between prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs and dimension of internet savviness viz. computer
mediated communication (-0.048), internet self-efficacy (-0.026), creative self expression (-0.016) and internet fluency (-0.028). The result depicts that there exists no significant relationship between prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions viz. computer mediated communication, internet self-efficacy, creative self expression and internet fluency except information gathering and social collaboration.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_1 (vi)$: There exists no significant relationship between prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions of adolescents, is accepted for internet savviness and its dimensions viz. computer mediated communication, internet self-efficacy, creative self expression and internet fluency except information gathering and social collaboration. It means that information gathering and social collaboration dimensions of internet savviness contribute towards prestige and social status beliefs of adolescents.

Adolescents who had ability to use various search engines to find resources and to discriminate and filter accurate information from inaccurate information found on internet and socially collaborate online to perform school work i.e. completion of assignments, exchange and sharing of ideas which deepen learning had less negativity in orientation to occupational structures and hierarchies that are deeply embedded in their culture.

(vii) Correlation of Proficiency Dimension of Career Beliefs with Internet Savviness and its Dimensions

Table 4.4 shows that the value of relationship between proficiency dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness is -0.170, which in comparison to the table values is found to be significant but negative at 0.01 level. Significant but negative correlation is found between proficiency dimension of career beliefs and information gathering (-0.189), internet self-efficacy (-0.097), creative self expression (-0.089) and social collaboration (-0.087) dimensions of internet savviness at 0.01 level of significance. No significant relationship is found between proficiency dimension of career beliefs and computer mediated communication (-0.057) and internet fluency (-0.006) dimension of internet savviness. The result depicts that there exists significant and negative relationship between proficiency
dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions viz. information gathering, internet self-efficacy, creative self expression and social collaboration except computer mediated communication and internet fluency.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_1$ (viii): There exists no significant relationship between proficiency dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions of adolescents, is not accepted for internet savviness and its dimensions viz. information gathering, internet self-efficacy, creative self expression and social collaboration except computer mediated communication and internet fluency.

The above result demonstrates that adolescents, who are comfortable and confident with internet, use various search engines to find resources and to discriminate and filter accurate information from inaccurate information found on internet, have belief about their capabilities to produce a desired level of outcome in navigating the internet and accessing its resources for personal or school use and author and publish websites, design and create artwork, blog, podcast and create video artifacts and socially collaborate online to perform school work i.e. completion of assignments, exchange and sharing of ideas which deepen learning are willing in acquiring qualifications and skills that can enhance personal proficiency for an occupation before entering the world of work. They have the willingness to submit to rigorous formal training programme and spend resources like time, efforts and finance to achieve the distinction of being formally qualified as per the norms of a given education system.

(viii) Correlation of Self Worth Dimension of Career Beliefs with Internet Savviness and its Dimensions

Table 4.4 shows that the value of relationship between self worth dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness is -0.057, which in comparison to the table values is not found to be significant even at 0.05 level. Significant but negative relationship is found between self worth dimension of career beliefs and dimension of internet savviness viz. information gathering (-0.165), internet self-efficacy (-0.089), and social collaboration (-0.082) at 0.01 level of significance. No significant relationship is found between self worth dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimension viz. computer mediated
communication (-0.004), creative self expression (-0.007) and internet fluency (-0.025). The result depicts that there exists no significant relationship between self worth dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness dimensions viz. computer mediated communication, creative self expression and internet fluency except information gathering, internet self-efficacy and social collaboration.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_1$ (viii): There exists no significant relationship between self worth dimension of career beliefs and internet savviness and its dimensions of adolescents, is accepted for internet savviness and its dimensions viz. computer mediated communication, creative self expression and internet fluency except information gathering, internet self-efficacy and social collaboration. It means that only information gathering, internet self-efficacy and social collaboration dimensions of internet savviness contribute towards self worth beliefs of adolescents.

The above result suggests that adolescents who had ability to use various search engines to find resources and to discriminate and filter accurate information from inaccurate information found on internet, had belief on their capabilities to produce a desired level of outcomes in navigating the internet and accessing its resources for personal or school use and collaborate socially online to perform school work i.e. completion of assignments, exchange and sharing of ideas which deepen learning had less negativity in one’s ability for career preparation and overall orientation to being able to prepare for a career.

4.2.2 CAREER BELIEFS WITH FAMILY ENVIRONMENT OF TOTAL SAMPLE

Career beliefs includes eight dimensions namely control and self direction, culture and common practice, fatalism, gender, persistence, prestige and social status, proficiency and self worth. Family environment includes seven dimensions namely competitive framework, cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation, organization, and recreational orientation. The analysis of correlation matrix of career belief with family environment for total sample has been given in table 4.5.
Table 4.5

Correlation matrix of career belief with family environment for total sample (N=720)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>CSD</th>
<th>CCP</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>PSS</th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>EX</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>MO</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>RO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>0.734**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>0.749**</td>
<td>0.524**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.621**</td>
<td>0.503**</td>
<td>0.504**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.688**</td>
<td>0.446**</td>
<td>0.539**</td>
<td>0.386**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.641**</td>
<td>0.352**</td>
<td>0.407**</td>
<td>0.259**</td>
<td>0.345**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>0.718**</td>
<td>0.416**</td>
<td>0.343**</td>
<td>0.504**</td>
<td>0.410**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>0.634**</td>
<td>0.375**</td>
<td>0.302**</td>
<td>0.258**</td>
<td>0.361**</td>
<td>0.309**</td>
<td>0.371**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>0.638**</td>
<td>0.337**</td>
<td>0.362**</td>
<td>0.210**</td>
<td>0.391**</td>
<td>0.372**</td>
<td>0.413**</td>
<td>0.489**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>-0.265**</td>
<td>-0.128**</td>
<td>-0.134**</td>
<td>-0.117**</td>
<td>-0.125**</td>
<td>-0.181**</td>
<td>-0.211**</td>
<td>-0.223**</td>
<td>-0.305**</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>-0.143**</td>
<td>-0.064*</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.120**</td>
<td>-0.099**</td>
<td>-0.140**</td>
<td>-0.146**</td>
<td>-0.171**</td>
<td>0.108**</td>
<td>0.394**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>-0.166**</td>
<td>-0.100**</td>
<td>-0.113**</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.136**</td>
<td>-0.100**</td>
<td>-0.150**</td>
<td>-0.144**</td>
<td>-0.165**</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.286**</td>
<td>0.363**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO</td>
<td>-0.066*</td>
<td>-0.065*</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>-0.105**</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.110**</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.146**</td>
<td>-0.102**</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.153**</td>
<td>0.123**</td>
<td>0.122**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>-0.214**</td>
<td>-0.067*</td>
<td>-0.074*</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.149**</td>
<td>-0.220**</td>
<td>-0.193**</td>
<td>-0.228**</td>
<td>-0.182**</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.305**</td>
<td>0.297**</td>
<td>0.258**</td>
<td>0.164**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>-0.093**</td>
<td>-0.075*</td>
<td>-0.088**</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.096**</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>-0.004*</td>
<td>-0.097**</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.241**</td>
<td>0.203**</td>
<td>0.085*</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.194**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 Level
** Significant at the 0.01 Level

( Critical Value 0.062 at 0.05 and 0.081 at 0.01 level, df 718)

2. Correlation of Career Beliefs with Dimensions of Family Environment

Table 4.5 shows that the correlation of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment viz. cohesion, expressiveness, independence, organization, and recreational orientation are -0.265, -0.143, -0.166, -0.214, -0.93 respectively. These values are more than table value of 0.081 at 0.01 level of significance and hence are significant at 0.01 level of significance. Negative but significant correlation is found between career beliefs and moral orientation (-0.066) at 0.05 level of significance. No significant correlation is found between career beliefs and competitive framework (-0.036) dimensions of family environment. Thus there exists significant but negative relationship between career beliefs and family environment dimensions i.e. cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation, organization, and recreational orientation except competitive framework.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_2$: There exists no significant relationship between career beliefs and dimensions of family environment of adolescents, is not accepted for cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation, organization, and recreational orientation. It means all the dimensions of family environment except competitive framework contributes towards career beliefs of adolescents.

It demonstrates that when in the family of adolescents there is support for each other and they have feeling of togetherness. They act openly and express their feelings directly and indulge in spontaneous discussions without any fear or hesitation of hurting each other’s feelings, make their own decisions, have high ethical and moral values. In their family emphasis is placed on rules, their activities are carefully planned and they participate in social, recreational, political, intellectual and cultural activities, i.e. went out to see plays, attend lectures, watch sports events or just go out for fun. All this might leads to decrease in negativity of adolescents about their career beliefs. These adolescents have less negative thoughts about their career preparations and career developments.

The findings are supported by Sumari, Louis and Sin (2009), who revealed that there is relationship between family interaction patterns and career beliefs although the relationship is weak. The study also showed that family interaction patterns contribute less than 10% of the variance in career decision making self efficacy.

(i) Correlation of Control and Self Direction Dimension of Career Beliefs with Dimensions of Family Environment
Table 4.5 reveals that the correlation between control and self direction dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment viz. expressiveness, moral orientation, organization, and recreational orientation -0.064, -0.065, -0.067, -0.075 respectively is found to be significant at 0.05 level of significance. Significant but negative correlation is found between control and self direction and cohesion (-0.128) and independence (-0.100) dimension of family environment at 0.01 level of significance. No significant relationship is found between control and self direction dimension of career beliefs and competitive framework dimensions of family environment .It indicates that there exists a significant and negative relationship between control and self direction and cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation, organization, and recreational orientation dimensions of family environment except competitive framework.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_2 (i)$: There exists no significant relationship between control and self direction dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment of adolescents, is not accepted in case of cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation, organization, and recreational orientation except competitive framework dimensions of family environment.

It reveals that when in the family of adolescents there is support for each other and they have feeling of togetherness. They act openly and express their feelings directly and indulge in spontaneous discussions without any fear or hesitation of hurting each other’s feelings, make their own decisions, have high ethical and moral values. In their family emphasis is placed on rules, their activities are carefully planned and they participate in social, recreational, political, intellectual and cultural activities, i.e. went out to see plays, attend lectures, watch sports events or just go out for fun. These adolescents had less negativity in their sense of control over their life situations and the orientation to directing their life and also posses less negative confidence to manage the trajectory of their life.

(ii) Correlation of Culture and Common Practice Dimension of Career Beliefs with Dimensions of Family Environment

Table 4.5 reveals that negative but significant relationship is found between culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and organization dimension of family environment (-0.74) at 0.05 level of significance. Significant correlation is found between culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment viz. cohesion (-0.134), independence (-0.113) and recreational orientation (-
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0.088) at 0.01 level of significance. No significant relationship is found between culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment viz. competitive framework (-0.027), expressiveness (-0.042) and moral orientation (-0.015). The result indicates that there is a negative but significant relationship between culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment viz. cohesion, independence, organization and recreational orientation except competitive framework, expressiveness and moral orientation.

Hence, the null hypotheses $H_2$ (iii): There exists no significant relationship between culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment of adolescents, is not accepted for cohesion, independence, organization and recreational orientation dimensions of family environment and accepted for competitive framework, expressiveness and moral orientation dimensions of family environment. This exhibits that cohesion, independence, organization and recreational orientation dimension of family environment contributes towards culture and common practice beliefs of adolescents.

Above results depicts that when in the family of adolescents there is the feeling of togetherness and the support for each other. They are allowed to make their own decisions. In their family emphasis is placed on rules, their activities are carefully planned and they participate in social, recreational, political, intellectual and cultural activities, i.e. went out to see plays, attend lectures, watch sports events or just go out for fun. Adolescents coming from this family environment are less influenced by common practice and unwritten norms that orient the people of a community and shape their career preparation behavior.

(iii) Correlation of Fatalism Dimension of Career Beliefs with Dimensions of Family Environment

The table 4.5 depicts that correlation of fatalism dimension of career beliefs and cohesion and moral orientation dimension of family environment are -0.117 and -0.105 respectively. These values are more than table value of 0.81 at 0.01 level of significance and hence are significant at 0.01 level of significance. No significant relationship is found between fatalism and competitive framework (-0.40), expressiveness (-0.003), independence (-0.016), organization (-0.048) and recreational orientation (-0.035) dimensions of family environment. The result indicates that there is no significant relationship between fatalism dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment viz. competitive framework, expressiveness, independence, organization and recreational orientation except cohesion and moral orientation.
Hence, the null hypothesis $H_2$ (iii): There exists no significant relationship between fatalism dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment of adolescents, is accepted for dimensions of family environment viz. competitive framework, expressiveness, independence, organization and recreational orientation except cohesion and moral orientation. The result shows that only cohesion and moral orientation dimensions of family environment contribute towards the fatalism beliefs of adolescents.

Above results demonstrates that when in the family of adolescents there is the feeling of togetherness and the support for each other and importance is given to religion adolescents are encouraged to follow them then adolescents are less negative towards their sense of control over their beliefs that portray a sense of resignation and a passive acceptance of one’s life situation.

(iv) Correlation of Gender Dimension of Career Beliefs with Dimensions of Family Environment

The table 4.5 reveals that correlation of gender dimension of career beliefs and cohesion, expressiveness, independence, organization, and recreational orientation dimension of family environment are -0.125, -0.120, -0.136, -0.149, -0.96 respectively. These values are more than table value of 0.081 at 0.01 level of significance and hence are significant at 0.01 level of significance. No significant relationship is found between gender dimension of career beliefs and competitive framework (-0.047) and moral orientation (-0.024) dimensions of family environment. Thus there exists significant and negative relationship between gender dimension of career beliefs and dimension of family environment i.e. cohesion, expressiveness, independence, organization, and recreational orientation except competitive framework and moral orientation.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_2$ (iv): There exists no significant relationship between gender dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment of adolescents, is not accepted for dimension of family environment i.e. cohesion, expressiveness, independence, organization, and recreational orientation except competitive framework and moral orientation. The result shows that dimension of family environment viz. cohesion, expressiveness, independence, organization, and recreational orientation contribute towards the gender beliefs of adolescents.
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It exhibits that when in the family of adolescents there support is for each other and they have feeling of togetherness. They act openly and express their feelings directly and indulge in spontaneous discussions without any fear or hesitation of hurting each other’s feelings, make their own decisions. In their family emphasis is placed on rules, their activities are carefully planned and they participate in social, recreational, political, intellectual and cultural activities, i.e. went out to see plays, attend lectures, watch sports events or just go out for fun. All this might leads to decrease in beliefs towards existing male-female stereotypes pertaining to engagement with the word of work.

(v) Correlation of Persistence Dimension of Career Beliefs with Dimensions of Family Environment

Table 4.5 shows that significant but negative correlation is found between persistence and cohesion (-0.181), expressiveness (-0.099) independence (-0.100), moral orientation (-0.110) and organization (-0.220) dimensions of family environment at 0.01 level of significance. No significant relationship is found between persistence dimension of career beliefs and family environment dimensions viz. competitive framework (-0.026) and recreational orientation (-0.014). The results exhibits that there exists significant and negative relationship between persistence dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment dimensions viz. cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation and organization except competitive framework and recreational orientation.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_2$ (v): There exists no significant relationship between persistence dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment of adolescents, is not accepted for dimensions of family environment dimensions viz. cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation and organization except competitive framework and recreational orientation. The result demonstrates that dimensions of family environment viz. cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation and organization contribute towards persistence dimension of career beliefs.

It reveals that when in the family of adolescents there is support for each other and they have feeling of togetherness. They act openly and express their feelings directly and indulge in spontaneous discussions without any fear or hesitation of hurting each other’s feelings, make their own decisions, have high ethical and moral values. In their family
emphasis is placed on rules, their activities are carefully planned. All this might lead to less negativity in adolescents to persist towards their future career goals in spite of barriers encountered during the process of career preparation.

(vi) Correlation of Prestige and Social Status Dimension of Career Beliefs with Dimensions of Family Environment

Table 4.5 shows that significant but negative correlation is found between prestige and social status and cohesion (-0.221), expressiveness (-0.140) independence (-0.150) and organization (-0.193) dimensions of family environment at 0.01 level of significance. No significant relationship is found between prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs and family environment dimensions viz. competitive framework (-0.045), moral orientation (-0.025) and recreational orientation (-0.048). The results exhibits that there exists significant and negative relationship between prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment dimensions viz. cohesion, expressiveness, independence and organization except competitive framework, moral orientation and recreational orientation.

Hence, the null hypothesis \( H_2^{(vi)} \): There exists no significant relationship between prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment of adolescents, is not accepted for dimensions of family environment dimensions viz. cohesion, expressiveness, independence and organization except competitive framework, moral orientation and recreational orientation. It means that cohesion, expressiveness, independence and organization dimensions of family environment contribute towards prestige and social status beliefs of adolescents.

Above results depicts that when in the family of adolescents there is the feeling of togetherness and support for each other. They act openly and express their feelings directly and indulge in spontaneous discussions without any fear or hesitation of hurting each other’s feelings. They are allowed to make their own decisions. In their family emphasis is placed on rules, their activities are carefully planned. These adolescents have less negativity in orientation to occupational structures and hierarchies that are deeply embedded in their culture.
The findings are supported by Bhatnagar and Gupta (1999) who found that career preferences and beliefs of middle class high school students are restricted to a handful of three to four careers, which they, their families and communities firmly believe are good careers.

(vii) Correlation of Proficiency Dimension of Career Beliefs with Dimensions of Family Environment

Table 4.5 shows that the value of relationship between proficiency dimension of career beliefs and dimension of family environment viz. cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation and organization are -0.223, -0.146, -0.144, -0.146, -0.228 respectively. These values are more than the table values 0.081 at 0.01 level of significance, hence are found to be significant but negative at 0.01 level. Significant but negative correlation is found between proficiency dimension of career beliefs and recreational orientation (-0.064) dimensions of family environment at 0.05 level of significance. No significant relationship is found between proficiency dimension of career beliefs and competitive framework (-0.009) dimension of family environment. The result depicts that there exists significant and negative relationship between proficiency dimension of career beliefs and cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation, organization, and recreational orientation dimensions of family environment.

Hence, the null hypothesis $\text{H}_2$ (vii): There exists no significant relationship between proficiency dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment of adolescents, is not accepted for cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation, organization, and recreational orientation except competitive framework dimensions of family environment.

It demonstrates that when in the family of adolescents there is the feeling of togetherness and support for each other. They act openly and express their feelings directly and indulge in spontaneous discussions without any fear or hesitation of hurting each other’s feelings. They are allowed to make their own decisions. In their family emphasis is placed on rules, their activities are carefully planned. They participate in social, recreational, political, intellectual and cultural activities, i.e. went out to see plays, attend lectures, watch sports events or just go out for fun. These adolescents are willing to acquire qualifications and skills that can enhance personal proficiency for an occupation before entering the world of work.
They have the willingness to submit to rigorous formal training programme and spend resources like time, efforts and finance to achieve the distinction of being formally qualified as per the norms of a given education system.

(viii) Correlation of Self Worth Dimension of Career Beliefs with Dimensions of Family Environment

Table 4.5 shows that the value of relationship between self worth dimension of career beliefs and dimension of family environment viz. cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation, organization and recreational orientation are -0.305, -0.171, -0.165, -0.102, -0.182 and -0.097 respectively. These values are more than the table values 0.081 at 0.01 level of significance, hence are found to be significant but negative at 0.01 level. No significant relationship is found between self worth dimension of career beliefs and competitive framework (-0.003) dimension of family environment. The result depicts that there exists significant and negative relationship between self worth dimension of career beliefs and cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation, organization, and recreational orientation dimensions of family environment.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_2^{(viii)}$: There exists no significant relationship between self worth dimension of career beliefs and dimensions of family environment of adolescents, is not accepted for cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation, organization, and recreational orientation except competitive framework dimensions of family environment. It means cohesion, expressiveness, independence, moral orientation, organization, and recreational orientation dimensions of family environment contribute towards prestige and social status beliefs of adolescents.

It suggested that the when in the family of adolescents there is feeling of togetherness and support for each other. They act openly and express their feelings directly and indulge in spontaneous discussions without any fear or hesitation of hurting each other’s feelings. They are allowed to make their own decisions. In their family emphasis is placed on rules, there activities are carefully planned. They participate in social, recreational, political, intellectual and cultural activities, i.e. went out to see plays, attend lectures, watch sports events or just go out for fun. These adolescents had faith in their personal ability for career preparation and overall orientation to being able to prepare for career.
4.2.3 CAREER BELIEFS WITH SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF TOTAL SAMPLE

Career beliefs include eight dimensions namely control and self direction, culture and common practice, fatalism, gender, persistence, prestige and social status, proficiency and self worth. The other variable is socio-economic status. The analysis of correlation matrix of career belief with socio-economic status for total sample has been given in table 4.6.

Table 4.6: Correlation matrix of career belief with socio-economic status for total sample (N=720)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>CSD</th>
<th>CCP</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>PSS</th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>SES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>0.734**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>0.749**</td>
<td>0.524**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.621**</td>
<td>0.503**</td>
<td>0.504**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.688**</td>
<td>0.446**</td>
<td>0.539**</td>
<td>0.386**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.641**</td>
<td>0.352**</td>
<td>0.407**</td>
<td>0.259**</td>
<td>0.345**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>0.718**</td>
<td>0.416**</td>
<td>0.411**</td>
<td>0.343**</td>
<td>0.504**</td>
<td>0.410**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>0.634**</td>
<td>0.375**</td>
<td>0.302**</td>
<td>0.258**</td>
<td>0.361**</td>
<td>0.309**</td>
<td>0.371**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>0.638**</td>
<td>0.337**</td>
<td>0.362**</td>
<td>0.210**</td>
<td>0.391**</td>
<td>0.372**</td>
<td>0.413**</td>
<td>0.489**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>-0.258**</td>
<td>-0.135**</td>
<td>-0.130**</td>
<td>-0.092**</td>
<td>-0.154**</td>
<td>-0.153**</td>
<td>-0.285**</td>
<td>-0.219**</td>
<td>-0.194**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 Level
** Significant at the 0.01 Level

(Critical Value 0.062 at 0.05 and 0.081 at 0.01 level, df 718)

Where stands for CB: Career Beliefs, CSD: Control and Self Direction, CCP: Culture and Common Practice, F: Fatalism, G: Gender, P: Persistence, PSS: Prestige and Social Status, SW: Self Worth, SES: Socio-Economic Status

3. Correlation of Career Beliefs with Socio-Economic Status

Table 4.6 reveals that significant but negative relationship is found between career beliefs and socio-economic status (-0.258) at 0.01 level. Thus there is a significant but negative relationship between career beliefs and socio-economic status.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_3$: There exists no significant relationship between career beliefs and socio-economic status of adolescents, is refuted. The results depicts that socio-economic status contributes towards career beliefs of adolescents.
The result shows that as the socio-economic status of adolescent’s family increases, their negative thoughts about career preparations and career development decreases and vice versa. The findings are supported by Arulmani and Nag-Arulmani (2010), who suggested that that negativity in career beliefs decreased as SES increased.

(i) Correlation of Control and Self Direction Dimension of Career Beliefs with Socio-Economic Status

Table 4.6 depicts that negative but significant correlation at 0.01 level is found between control and self direction dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status (-0.135). It exhibits that negative but significant relationship between control and self direction and socio-economic status of adolescents.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_3 (i)$: There exists no significant relationship between control and self direction dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status of adolescents, is not accepted. The result shows that socio-economic status contributes towards control and self direction beliefs of adolescents.

The result indicates that as the socio-economic status of adolescents family increases their negativity in their sense of control over their life situations and the orientation to direct their life and also they negative confidence to manage the trajectory of their life decreases and vice versa. The findings are supported by Arulmani (2007) who found performance on the control and self-direction beliefs scale suggests that the beliefs held by the low SES Group reflect a lower orientation to exercising control and self-direction over their lives.

(ii) Correlation of Culture and Common Practice Dimension of Career Beliefs with Socio-Economic Status

Table 4.6 reveals that the correlation of culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status is (-0.130) this value is more than table value of 0.081 at 0.01 level of significance and hence is significant at 0.01 level of significance. Thus there exists significant and negative relationship between culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_3 (ii)$: There exists no significant relationship between culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status of adolescents, is not accepted. The result demonstrated that socio-economic status contributes towards culture and common practice beliefs of adolescents.
The result exhibits that as the socio-economic status of adolescents family increases their faith in common practices and unwritten norms that orient the people of a community and shape their career preparation behavior decreases and vice versa.

**(iii) Correlation of Fatalism Dimension of Career Beliefs with Socio-Economic Status**

Table 4.6 indicates that significant and negative relationship is found between fatalism dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status (-0.092) at 0.01 level. It indicates that there exists a significant negative relationship between fatalism dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_3$ (iii): There exists no significant relationship between fatalism dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status of adolescents, is not accepted. The result exhibits that socio-economic status contributes towards fatalism beliefs of adolescents.

The result shows that as the socio-economic status of adolescents family increases their negative beliefs that portray a sense of resignation and a passive acceptance of one’s life situation decreases. The felling of pessimism, a sense that nothing can be changes and that matters are pre-ordained by more powerful forces also decreases and vice versa.

**(iv) Correlation of Gender Dimension of Career Beliefs with Socio-Economic Status**

Table 4.6 demonstrates that significant but negative relationship is found between gender dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status (-0.154) at 0.01 level. It reveals that there exists a significant negative relationship between gender dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_3$ (iv): There exists no significant relationship between gender dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status of adolescents, is not accepted. The result exhibits that socio-economic status contributes towards gender dimension of career beliefs of adolescents.

The result shows that as the socio-economic status of adolescents family increases their faith towards existing male-female stereotypes pertaining to engagement with the world of work decreases and vice versa.
(v) Correlation of Persistence Dimension of Career Beliefs with Socio-Economic Status

Table 4.6 shows that negative but significant correlation at 0.01 level is found between persistence dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status (-0.153). It demonstrates that there exists a significant negative relationship between persistence dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status.

Hence, the null hypothesis \( H_3 (v) \): There exists no significant relationship between persistence dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status of adolescents, is not accepted. The result exhibits that socio-economic status contributes persistence beliefs of adolescents.

Negative relationship in the present study indicates that as the socio-economic status of adolescents family decreases their negativity for determination to work towards future career goals in spite of the barriers encountered during the process of career preparation increases and vice versa.

(vi) Correlation of Prestige and Social Status Dimension of Career Beliefs with Socio-Economic Status

Table 4.6 reveals that the relationship between prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status is found to be significantly negatively correlated (-0.285) at 0.01 level. It exhibits that there exists a significant negative relationship between prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status.

Hence, the null hypothesis \( H_3 (vi) \): There exists no significant relationship between prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status of adolescents, is not accepted. The result exhibits that socio-economic status contributes towards prestige and social status beliefs of adolescents.

Negative significant relationship shows that as the socio-economic status of adolescents family decreases their faith towards the orientation to occupational structures and hierarchies that are deeply embedded in culture increases and vice versa.

The findings are supported by Desai and Whiteside (2000) who found out that career belief about prestige and respectability play a powerful role amongst middle and higher SES families in India. Lightbody, Nicholson, Siann and Walsh (1997) also found beliefs about the respectability of a career to have a stronger influence on Asian career choosers than those of British origin.
Correlation of Proficiency Dimension of Career Beliefs with Socio-Economic Status

Table 4.6 depicts that significant but negative relationship is found between proficiency dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status (-0.219) at 0.01 level. It shows that there exists a significant negative relationship between proficiency dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status.

Hence, the null hypothesis \( H_3 (\text{vii}) \): There exists no significant relationship between proficiency dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status of adolescents, is not accepted. The result exhibits that socio-economic status contributes towards proficiency beliefs of adolescents.

The result shows that as the socio-economic status of adolescent’s family increases, their negativity in attribute to acquire qualifications and skills that can enhance personal proficiency for an occupation before entering the world of work decreases. They are willing to submit to rigors of a formal training programme and spend resources like time, efforts and finance to achieve the distinction of being formally qualified as per the norms of a given educational system and vice versa.

The findings are supported by Arulmani (2007) who found that the performance of the sample on the proficiency beliefs scale indicates that the lower SES group is likely to place a low value on obtaining the necessary skills and education to qualify for entering the world of work. As a result, it is possible that this group may prefer to enter the world of work as unskilled labourers and also Chandra (1997) who found that higher SES high school student’s career beliefs reflect a definite orientation to making long term plans and preparing proactively for the future. Lower SES groups tend to have a short term view and the content of their career beliefs does not seem to reflect systematic long term planning.

Correlation of Self Worth Dimension of Career Beliefs with Socio-Economic Status

Table 4.6 reveals that the relationship between self worth dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status is found to be significantly negatively correlated (-0.194) at 0.01 level. It shows that there exists a significant negative relationship between self worth dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status.

Hence, the null hypothesis \( H_3 (\text{viii}) \): There exists no significant relationship between self worth dimension of career beliefs and socio-economic status of adolescents, is not
accepted. The result exhibits that socio-economic status contributes towards self worth beliefs of adolescents.

Negative significant relationship shows that as the socio-economic status of adolescent’s family decrease, negativity in one’s personal ability for career preparation and an overall orientation to being able to prepare for a career increases and vice versa.

The findings are supported by Ojha (1996) who examining beliefs pertaining to self-worth among low SES working children and school drop-outs found that their self-esteem and their confidence to express or even acknowledge their talents is low.

4.2.4 CAREER BELIEFS WITH CAREER INDECISION OF TOTAL SAMPLE

The variable of career beliefs includes eight dimensions namely control and self direction, culture and common practice, fatalism, gender, persistence, prestige and social status, proficiency and self worth. The other variable is career indecision. The analysis of correlation matrix of career belief with career indecision for total sample has been given in table 4.7.

Table 4.7: Correlation matrix of career belief with career indecision for total sample (N=720)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>CSD</th>
<th>CCP</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>PSS</th>
<th>PRO</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>0.734**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>0.749**</td>
<td>0.524**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.621**</td>
<td>0.503**</td>
<td>0.504**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0.688**</td>
<td>0.446**</td>
<td>0.539**</td>
<td>0.386**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>0.641**</td>
<td>0.352**</td>
<td>0.407**</td>
<td>0.259**</td>
<td>0.345**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>0.718**</td>
<td>0.416**</td>
<td>0.0411**</td>
<td>0.343**</td>
<td>0.504**</td>
<td>0.410**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>0.634**</td>
<td>0.375**</td>
<td>0.0302**</td>
<td>0.258**</td>
<td>0.361**</td>
<td>0.309**</td>
<td>0.371**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>0.638**</td>
<td>0.337**</td>
<td>0.0362**</td>
<td>0.210**</td>
<td>0.391**</td>
<td>0.372**</td>
<td>0.413**</td>
<td>0.489**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>0.333**</td>
<td>0.222**</td>
<td>0.242**</td>
<td>0.108**</td>
<td>0.201**</td>
<td>0.179**</td>
<td>0.269**</td>
<td>0.288**</td>
<td>0.277**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the 0.05 Level
**Significant at the 0.01 Level

(Critical Value 0.062 at 0.05 and 0.081 at 0.01 level, df 718)

4. Correlation of Career Beliefs with Career Indecision

Table 4.7 reveals that significant relationship is found between career beliefs and career indecision (0.333) at 0.01 level. It shows that there exists a significant relationship between career beliefs and career indecision.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_4$: There exists no significant relationship between career beliefs and career indecision of adolescents, is not accepted. The result reveals that career indecision contributes to career beliefs of adolescents.

The result shows that as the inability of adolescent’s to select and commit to career increases, their negative thoughts about career preparations and career development also increases and vice versa. The findings are supported by Arulmani, Laar and Easton (2003) who suggested that career beliefs seem to set the stage upon which career indecision occurs. Data from the study suggests that negative belief structures could act as barriers, preventing individuals from grasping life chances, taking control of their lives and improving their socioeconomic status.

(i) Correlation of Control and Self Direction Dimension of Career Beliefs with Career Indecision

Table 4.7 indicates that significant correlation at 0.01 level is found between control and self direction dimension of career beliefs and career indecision (0.222). It shows that there exists a significant relationship between control and self direction dimension of career beliefs and career indecision.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{4(i)}$: There exists no significant relationship between control and self direction dimension of career beliefs and career indecision of adolescents, is not accepted. The result exhibits that career indecision contributes towards control and self direction of adolescents.

Significant relationship in the present study indicated that as the inability of adolescents to select and commit to career increases their negativity in their sense of control over their life situations and the orientation to direct their life and also the negative confidence to manage the trajectory of their life also increases and vice versa.
(ii) Correlation of Culture and Common Practice Dimension of Career Beliefs with Career Indecision

Table 4.7 depicts that the relationship between culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and career indecision is found to be significantly positively correlated (0.242) at 0.01 level. It indicates that there exists a significant relationship between culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and career indecision.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_4$ (ii): There exists no significant relationship between culture and common practice dimension of career beliefs and career indecision of adolescents, is not accepted. The result demonstrates that career indecision contributes towards culture and common practice beliefs of adolescents.

Significant relationship shows that as the adolescents uncertainty in making relevant career decision increases their faith in common practice and unwritten norms that orient the people of a community and shape their career preparation behavior also increases and vice versa.

(iii) Correlation of Fatalism Dimension of Career Beliefs with Career Indecision

Table 4.7 shows that significant and positive relationship is found between fatalism dimension of career beliefs and career indecision (0.108) at 0.01 level. It exhibits that there exists a significant relationship between fatalism dimension of career beliefs and career indecision.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_4$ (iii): There exists no significant relationship between fatalism dimension of career beliefs and career indecision of adolescents, is not accepted. The result indicates that career indecision contributes towards fatalism beliefs of adolescents.

The result shows that as the inability of adolescent’s to select and commit to career increases their negative beliefs that portray a sense of resignation and a passive acceptance of one’s life situation also increase. The felling of pessimism, a sense that nothing can be changes and that matters are pre-ordained by more powerful forces also increases and vice versa. The findings are supported by Lunney’s (1993) who survey of Liberal Arts Graduates revealed that decided students demonstrated stronger career beliefs about hard work, in their abilities to overcome obstacles, and in their own control over outcomes.
(iv) Correlation of Gender Dimension of Career Beliefs with Career Indecision

Table 4.7 exhibits that significant and positive relationship is found between gender dimension of career beliefs and career indecision (0.201) at 0.01 level. It shows that there exists a significant relationship between gender dimension of career beliefs and career indecision.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{4\text{ (iv)}}$: There exists no significant relationship between gender dimension of career beliefs and career indecision of adolescents, is not accepted. The result indicates that career indecision contributes towards gender beliefs of adolescents.

The result demonstrates that as the adolescents uncertainty in making relevant career decision increases their faith towards existing male-female stereotypes pertaining to engagement with the world of work also increases and vice versa.

(v) Correlation of Persistence Dimension of Career Beliefs with Career Indecision

Table 4.7 reveals that significant correlation at 0.01 level is found between persistence dimension of career beliefs and career indecision (0.179). It reveals that there exists a significant relationship between persistence dimension of career beliefs and career indecision.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{4\text{ (v)}}$: There exists no significant relationship between persistence dimension of career beliefs and career indecision of adolescents, is not accepted. The result exhibits that career indecision contributes towards persistence beliefs of adolescents.

Significant relationship in the present study indicates that as the inability of adolescents to select and commit to career decreases their negativity for determination to work towards future career goals in spite of the barriers encountered during the process of career preparation also decreases and vice versa.

The findings are supported by Luzzo (1997) who examined Mexican American undergraduate students, and found that participants who perceived more career barriers were less likely to believe they had control over the barriers, or that they were responsible for their own career decision-making processes. Students with more confidence had more adaptive career beliefs.
(vi) Correlation of Prestige and Social Status Dimension of Career Beliefs with Career Indecision

Table 4.7 demonstrates that the relationship between prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs and career indecision is found to be significantly positively correlated (0.269) at 0.01 level. It demonstrates that there exists a significant relationship between prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs and career indecision.

Hence, the null hypothesis \( H_4(vi) \): There exists no significant relationship between prestige and social status dimension of career beliefs and career indecision of adolescents, is not accepted. The result indicates that career indecision contributes to prestige and social status beliefs of adolescents.

Significant relationship shows that as the adolescents uncertainty in making relevant career decision decreases their faith towards the orientation to occupational structures and hierarchies that are deeply embedded in culture decreases and vice versa.

(vii) Correlation of Proficiency Dimension of Career Beliefs with Career Indecision

Table 4.7 reveals that significant and positive relationship is found between proficiency dimension of career beliefs and career indecision (0.288) at 0.01 level. It reveals that there exists a significant relationship between proficiency dimension of career beliefs and career indecision.

Hence, the null hypothesis \( H_4(vii) \): There exists no significant relationship between profitability dimension of career beliefs and career indecision of adolescents, is not accepted. The result indicates that career indecision contributes towards proficiency beliefs of adolescents.

The result demonstrates that as the adolescent’s inability to select and commit to career increases, their negativity in attribute to acquire qualifications and skills that can enhance personal proficiency for an occupation before entering the world of work also increases. They are not willing to submit to rigors of a formal training programme and spend resources like time, efforts and finance to achieve the distinction of being formally qualified as per the norms of a given educational system and vice versa.
(viii) Correlation of Self Worth Dimension of Career Beliefs with Career Indecision

Table 4.7 indicates that the relationship between self worth dimension of career beliefs and career indecision is found to be significantly positively correlated (0.277) at 0.01 level. It shows that there exists a significant relationship between self worth dimension of career beliefs and career indecision.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{4(viii)}$: There exists no significant relationship between self worth dimension of career beliefs and career indecision of adolescents, is not accepted. The result indicates that career indecision contributes to self worth beliefs of adolescents.

Significant relationship exhibits that as the adolescent’s uncertainty in making relevant career decision decrease, negativity in one’s personal ability for career preparation and an overall orientation to being able to prepare for a career also decreases and vice versa.

The findings are supported by Arulmani (2005) who indicates that social cognitive variables in the form of strongly held beliefs about self, career preparation and the world of work combine with socioeconomic status (SES) to influence the career indecision process.

4.3 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DIFFERENT VARIABLES

The independent variable internet savviness includes high internet savviness and low internet savviness, these categories were identified by employing Kelley’s (1939) method. Top 27 percent adolescents were identifies as having high internet savviness and bottom 27 percent adolescents were identified as having low internet savviness. Further, adolescents were identified having positive family environment and negative family environment from each of these two categories of internet savviness by using Kelley (1939) method. Top 27 percent adolescents were identifies as having positive family environment and bottom 27 percent adolescents were identified as having negative family environment. Further from each of the four groups of adolescents, high socio-economic status and low socio-economic status groups were again identifies on the basis of top and bottom 27 percent cases. Initially the sample size is 720 but after employing this procedure sample on which analysis of variance is conducted is 114. Similar procedure was employed for remain three sets of analysis of variance.
4.3.1 Analysis of Variance for Internet Savviness, Family Environment and Socio-Economic Status on Career Beliefs

For different subgroups sum of squares, degree of freedom, mean sum of squares and F-ratios has been given in the table 4.8.

Table 4.8: A summary of Analysis Of Variance (2×2×2) factorial design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet Savviness (IS)</td>
<td>43.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Environment (F)</td>
<td>231.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>231.64</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic Status(S)</td>
<td>8668.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8668.04</td>
<td>12.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS × F</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS × S</td>
<td>1457.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1457.12</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F × S</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS × F × S</td>
<td>74.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74.32</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error Term</td>
<td>85288.99</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>678.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level  ** Significant at 0.01 level

(Critical Value 3.94 at 0.05 level and 6.90 at 0.01 level, df 1/106)

MAIN EFFECTS

- Internet Savviness

Table 4.8 reveals that F-value of difference in mean of internet savviness is 0.06 which in comparison to the table value was not found to be significant even at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis \( H_5 \): There exists no significant difference between high and low internet savviness on career beliefs, is accepted. It shows that there exists no significant difference between high and low internet savviness on career beliefs.

- Family Environment

Table 4.8 reveals that F-value of difference in mean of family environment is 0.34 which in comparison to the table value was not found to be significant even at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis \( H_6 \): There exists no significant difference between
positive and negative family environment on career beliefs, is accepted. It shows that there exists no significant difference between positive and negative family environment on career beliefs.

- **Socio-Economic Status**

  Table 4.8 reveals that F-value of difference in mean of socio-economic status is 12.78 which in comparison to the table value was found to be significant at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_7$: There exists no significant difference between high and low socio-economic status on career beliefs, is accepted. It shows that there exists significant difference between high and low socio-economic status on career beliefs.

  In order to find out which category had more negativity towards their career beliefs, mean scores of both the groups were compared. Since the mean score on career beliefs of adolescents with low socio-economic status is 141.14 and high socio-economic status 121.51, it can be concluded that adolescents who belongs to low socio-economic status had more negativity towards their career beliefs. They have more negative thoughts about their career preparations and career development as compared to adolescents belonging to high socio-economic status.

  The findings are supported by Arulmani and Nag-Arulmani (2010) who suggested that that negativity in career beliefs decreased as SES increased. Where the maximum obtainable score on The Career Belief Patterns Scale- CBPS (Arulmani, Van laar & Easton, 2002) is 224, the low SES group recorded a mean score of 105.46 (SD 28.85) while the mean score of the upper-middle SES participants is 84.98 (SD 25.87). This difference is statistically significant and indicates that low SES participants have greater negativity in career beliefs in comparison to the upper-middle groups. Arulmani, Laar and Easton (2003) examines the interaction between career beliefs and socioeconomic status within a sample of Indian high school students. Significant socioeconomic status differences were observed, with the lower SES groups showing higher levels of negative career beliefs.

**FIRST ORDER INTERACTION**

- **Interaction between Internet Savviness and Family Environment on Career Beliefs (IS × F)**

  Table 4.8 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between internet savviness and family environment is .01, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at
0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of internet savviness do not interact with family environment to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_8$: There exists no significant interaction effect of internet savviness and family environment on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between internet savviness and family environment.

- **Interaction effect of Internet Savviness and Socio-Economic Status on Career Beliefs** (IS × S)

  Table 4.8 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between internet savviness and socio-economic status is 2.15, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of internet savviness do not interact with socio-economic status to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_9$: There exists no significant interaction effect of internet savviness and socio-economic status on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between internet savviness and socio-economic status.

- **Interaction effect of Family Environment and Socio-Economic Status on Career Beliefs** (F × S)

  Table 4.8 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between family environment and socio-economic status is 0.10, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of family environment do not interact with socio-economic status to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{10}$: There exists no significant interaction effect of family environment and socio-economic status on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between family environment and socio-economic status.

**SECOND ORDER INTERACTION**

- **Interaction among Internet Savviness, Family Environment and Socio-Economic Status on Career Beliefs** (IS × F × S)

  Table 4.8 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between internet savviness, family environment and socio-economic status is 0.11, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of internet savviness,
family environment and socio-economic status do not interact with each other to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{11}$: There exists no significant interaction effect of internet savviness, family environment and socio-economic status on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between internet savviness, family environment and socio-economic status.

### 4.3.2 Analysis of Variance for Internet Savviness, Family Environment and Career Indecision on Career Beliefs

For different sub groups sum of squares, degree of freedom, mean sum of squares and F- ratios has been given in the table 4.9.

**Table 4.9: Summary of Analysis of Variance (2×2×2) factorial design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet Savviness (IS)</td>
<td>1486.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1486.63</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Environment (F)</td>
<td>3181.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3181.35</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Indecision (C)</td>
<td>17655.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17655.93</td>
<td>20.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS x F</td>
<td>380.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>380.09</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS x C</td>
<td>2930.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2930.86</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x C</td>
<td>1156.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1156.65</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS x F x C</td>
<td>283.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>283.40</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>91964.36</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>867.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level  ** Significant at 0.01 level

(Critical Value 3.94 at 0.05 level and 6.90 at 0.01 level, df 1/106)

**MAIN EFFECTS**

- **Internet Savviness**

Table 4.9 F- value of difference in mean of internet savviness is 1.71 which in comparison to the table value was not found to be significant even at 0.05 level of
significance. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{12}$: There exists no significant difference between high and low internet savviness on career beliefs, is accepted. It shows that there exists no significant difference between high and low internet savviness on career beliefs.

- **Family Environment**

  An analysis of table 4.9 depicts that that F-value of difference in mean of family environment is 3.67 which in comparison to the table value was not found to be significant even at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{13}$: There exists no significant difference between positive and negative family environment on career beliefs is accepted. It shows that there exists no significant difference between positive and negative family environment on career beliefs.

- **Career Indecision**

  Table 4.9 reveals that F-value of difference in mean of career indecision is 20.35 which in comparison to the table value was found to be significant at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{14}$: There exists no significant difference between high and low career indecision on career beliefs, is not accepted. It shows that there exists a significant difference between high and low career indecision on career beliefs.

  In order to find out which category had more negativity towards their career beliefs, mean scores of both the groups were compared. Since the mean score on career beliefs of adolescents with high career indecision is 138.53 and low career indecision 109.30, it can be concluded that adolescents who are more uncertain in making relevant career decision and more unable to select and commit to career had more negativity towards their career beliefs. They have high negative thoughts about their career preparations and career development as compared to adolescents who are less uncertain in making relevant career decision and are less unable to select and commit to career.

  The findings are supported by Arulmani, Laar and Easton (2003) who suggested that career beliefs seem to set the stage upon which career indecision occurs. Data from the study suggests that negative belief structures could act as barriers, preventing individuals from grasping life chances, taking control of their lives and improving their socioeconomic status.
Analysis and Interpretation of the Results

FIRST ORDER INTERACTION

- Interaction effect of Internet Savviness and Family Environment on Career Beliefs
  \((\text{IS} \times \text{F})\)

  Table 4.9 reveals that the F- ratio for interaction between internet savviness and family environment is .44, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of internet savviness do not interact with family environment to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis \(H_{15}\): There exists no significant interaction effect of internet savviness and family environment on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between internet savviness and family environment.

- Interaction effect of Internet Savviness and Career Indecision on Career Beliefs
  \((\text{IS} \times \text{C})\)

  Table 4.9 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between internet savviness and career indecision is 3.38, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of internet savviness do not interact with career indecision to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis \(H_{16}\): There exists no significant interaction effect of internet savviness and career indecision on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between internet savviness and career indecision.

- Interaction effect of Family Environment and Career Indecision on Career Beliefs
  \((\text{F} \times \text{C})\)

  Table 4.9 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between family environment and career indecision is 1.33, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of family environment do not interact with career indecision to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis \(H_{17}\): There exists no significant interaction effect of family environment and career indecision on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between family environment and career indecision.
SECOND ORDER INTERACTION

- Interaction effect of Internet Savviness, Family Environment and Career Indecision on Career Beliefs (IS × F × C )

Table 4.9 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between internet savviness, family environment and career indecision is 0.33, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of internet savviness, family environment and career indecision do not interact with each other to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis \( H_{18} \): There exists no significant interaction effect of internet savviness, family environment and career indecision on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between internet savviness, family environment and career indecision.

4.3.3 Analysis of Variance for Socio-Economic Status, Family Environment and Career Indecision on Career Beliefs

For different sub groups sum of squares, degree of freedom, mean sum of squares and F- ratios has been given in the table 4.10.

Table 4.10: Summary of Analysis of Variance (2×2×2) factorial design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic Status(S)</td>
<td>3604.48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3604.48</td>
<td>4.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Environment (F)</td>
<td>898.921</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>898.92</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Indecision (c)</td>
<td>6582.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6582.19</td>
<td>8.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x F</td>
<td>1039.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1039.68</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x C</td>
<td>239.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>239.36</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F x C</td>
<td>32.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.52</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x F x C</td>
<td>516.99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>516.99</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>77929.47</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>735.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level  ** Significant at 0.01 level  
(Critical value 3.94 at 0.05 level and 6.90 at 0.01 level for 1/106 df)
**MAIN EFFECTS**

- **Socio-Economic Status**

  Table 4.10 reveals that F-value of difference in mean of socio-economic status is 4.90 which in comparison to the table value was found to be significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{19}$: There exists no significant difference between high and low socio-economic status on career beliefs, is not accepted. It shows that there exists a significant difference between high and low socio-economic status on career beliefs.

  In order to find out which category had more negativity towards their career beliefs, mean scores of both the groups were compared. Since the mean score on career beliefs of adolescents with low socio-economic status is 139.42 and high socio-economic status 122.67, it can be concluded that adolescents who belongs to low socio-economic status had more negativity towards their career beliefs. They have more negative thoughts about their career preparations and career development as compared to adolescents belonging to high socio-economic status.

- **Family Environment**

  Table 4.10 reveals that F-value of difference in mean of family environment is 1.22 which in comparison to the table value was not found to be significant even at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{20}$: There exists no significant difference between positive and negative family environment on career beliefs, is accepted. It shows that there exists no significant difference between positive and negative family environment on career beliefs.

- **Career Indecision**

  Table 4.10 reveals that F-value of difference in mean of career indecision is 8.95 which in comparison to the table value was found to be significant at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{21}$: There exists no significant difference between high and low career indecision on career beliefs, is accepted. It shows that there exists a significant difference between high and low career indecision on career beliefs.

  In order to find out which category had more negativity towards their career beliefs, mean scores of both the groups were compared. Since the mean score on career beliefs of adolescents with high career indecision is 141.49 and low career indecision 119.81, it can be
concluded that adolescents who are more uncertain in making relevant career decision and face more problems to select and commit to career had more negativity towards their career beliefs. They have high negative thoughts about their career preparations and career development as compared to adolescents who are less uncertain in making relevant career decision and face less problems to select and commit to career.

FIRST ORDER INTERACTION

- Interaction effect of Socio-Economic Status and Family Environment on Career Beliefs ($S \times F$)

  Table 4.10 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between socio-economic status and family environment is 1.41, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of socio-economic status do not interact with family environment to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{22}$: There exists no significant interaction effect of socio-economic status and family environment on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between socio-economic status and family environment.

- Interaction effect of Socio-Economic Status and Career Indecision on Career Beliefs ($S \times C$)

  Table 4.10 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between socio-economic status and career indecision is 0.32, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of socio-economic status do not interact with career indecision to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{23}$: There exists no significant interaction effect of socio-economic status and career indecision on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between socio-economic status and career indecision.

- Interaction effect of Family Environment and Career Indecision on Career Beliefs ($F \times C$)

  Table 4.10 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between family environment and career indecision is 0.04, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of family environment do not interact with career indecision to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{24}$: There exists no significant interaction effect of family environment and
career indecision on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between family environment and career indecision.

SECOND ORDER INTERACTION

- Interaction effect of Socio-Economic Status, Family Environment and Career Indecision on Career Beliefs (S × F × C)

Table 4.10 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between socio-economic status, family environment and career indecision is 0.70, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of socio-economic status, family environment and career indecision do not interact with each other to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis H25: There exists no significant interaction effect of socio-economic status, family environment and career indecision on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between socio-economic status, family environment and career indecision.

4.3.4 Analysis of Variance for Socio-Economic Status and Career Indecision and Internet Savviness on Career Beliefs

For different sub groups sum of squares, degree of freedom, mean sum of squares and F- ratios has been given in the table 4.11.

**Table 4.11: Summary of Analysis of Variance (2×2×2) factorial design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic Status(S)</td>
<td>2863.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2863.82</td>
<td>4.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Indecision (C)</td>
<td>17998.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17998.31</td>
<td>27.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Savviness (IS)</td>
<td>90.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90.75</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x C</td>
<td>122.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>122.76</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x IS</td>
<td>276.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>276.64</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C x S</td>
<td>1115.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1115.55</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S x C x IS</td>
<td>30.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.62</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>70496.08</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>665.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level  ** Significant at 0.01 level
(Critical value 3.94 at 0.05 level and 6.90 at 0.01 level for 1/106 df)
MAIN EFFECTS

- **Socio-Economic Status**

  Table 4.11 reveals that F-value of difference in mean of socio-economic status is 4.30 which in comparison to the table value was found to be significant at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis H₂₆: There exists no significant difference between high and low socio-economic status on career beliefs, is not accepted. It shows that there exists a significant difference between high and low socio-economic status on career beliefs.

  In order to find out which category has better career beliefs, mean scores of both the groups were compared. Since the mean score on career beliefs of adolescents with low socio-economic status is 136.97 and high socio-economic status is 119.38, it can be concluded that adolescents who belongs to low socio-economic status had more negativity towards their career beliefs. They have more negative thoughts about their career preparations and career development as compared to adolescents belonging to high socio-economic status.

- **Career Indecision**

  Table 4.11 reveals that F-value of difference in mean of career indecision is 27.06 which in comparison to the table value was found to be significant at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis H₂₇: There exists no significant difference between high and low career indecision on career beliefs, is accepted. It shows that there exists a significant difference between high and low career indecision on career beliefs.

  In order to find out which category had more negativity towards their career beliefs, mean scores of both the groups were compared. Since the mean score on career beliefs of adolescents with high career indecision is 144.75 and low career indecision is 114.34, it can be concluded that adolescents who are more uncertain in making relevant career decision and more unable to select and commit to career had more negativity towards their career beliefs. They have high negative thoughts about their career preparations and career development as compared to adolescents who are less uncertain in making relevant career decision and are less unable to select and commit to career.

- **Internet Savviness**

  Table 4.11 reveals that F-value of difference in mean of internet savviness is 0.13 which in comparison to the table value was not found to be significant even at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis H₂₈: There exists no significant difference between high and low internet savviness on career beliefs, is accepted. It shows that there exists no significant difference between high and low internet savviness on career beliefs.
FIRST ORDER INTERACTION

- **Interaction effect of Socio-Economic Status and Career Indecision on Career Beliefs**

  Table 4.11 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between socio-economic status and career indecision is 0.18, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that socio-economic status do not interact with career indecision to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{29}$: There exists no significant interaction effect of socio-economic status and career indecision on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between socio-economic status and career indecision.

- **Interaction effect of Socio-Economic Status and Internet Savviness on Career Beliefs**

  Table 4.11 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between socio-economic status and internet savviness is 0.41, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of socio-economic status do not interact with internet savviness to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{30}$: There exists no significant interaction effect of socio-economic status and internet savviness on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between socio-economic status and internet savviness.

- **Interaction effect of Career Indecision and Internet Savviness on Career Beliefs**

  Table 4.11 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between career indecision and internet savviness is 1.67, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of career indecision do not interact with internet savviness to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{31}$: There exists no significant interaction effect of career indecision and internet savviness on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between career indecision and internet savviness.

SECOND ORDER INTERACTION

- **Interaction Effect of Socio-Economic Status, Career Indecision and Internet Savviness on Career Beliefs**

  Table 4.11 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between socio-economic status, career indecision and internet savviness is 0.04, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of socio-economic
status, career indecision and internet savviness do not interact with each other to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{32}$: There exists no significant interaction effect of socio-economic status, career indecision and internet savviness on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between socio-economic status, career indecision and internet savviness.

4.3.5 Analysis of Variance for Institutional Types and Gender on Career Beliefs

For different sub groups sum of squares, degree of freedom, mean sum of squares and F- ratios has been given in the table 4.12.

Table 4.12: Summary of Analysis of Variance (3x2) factorial design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type (I)</td>
<td>76409.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38204.843</td>
<td>47.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (G)</td>
<td>45888.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45888.200</td>
<td>56.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I x G</td>
<td>2136.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1068.112</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>579804.86</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>812.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level  ** Significant at 0.01 level

(Critical value 3.86 at 0.05 level and 6.69 at 0.01 level for 1/714 df)

(Critical value 3.00 at 0.05 level and 4.64 at 0.01 level for 2/714 df)

MAIN EFFECTS

- Institutional types

Table 4.12 reveals that F- value of difference in mean of institutional types is 47.05 which in comparison to the table value was found to be significant at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{33}$: There exists no significant difference between private, government and government aided schools on beliefs, is not accepted. It shows that there exists significant difference between private, government and government aided schools on the variable of career beliefs. It may be inferred that the students studying in different types of institute were different on their career beliefs scores. In order to probe deeper, F ratio is followed by t-test. The value of t-ratio for different combinations of different type of institutions have been given in table 4.13
### Table 4.13 t-ratio of different combination of different types of institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Government Aided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>117.10</td>
<td>30.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.56**</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>140.95</td>
<td>30.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Aided</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>121.89</td>
<td>27.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level
** Significant at 0.01 level

(Critical value 1.96 at 0.05 level and 2.59 at 0.01 level for 1/478 df)

In addition to the data presented in table 4.13, a bar diagram has been drawn the mean scores of different types of institution have been presented in fig: 4.4

![Bar diagram showing comparison of different variables of girls](image)

**Fig 4.4 Bar diagram showing comparison of different variables of girls**
Table 4.13 and fig 4.4 indicates that the mean scores of private schools is 117.10, which is less than the corresponding mean scores of 140.95 for government schools. The t-ratio for difference in mean scores of private and government schools is 8.56 which in comparison to the table value was found significant at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected in case of private and government school. The result indicates that adolescents studying in government school had more negative beliefs about their career preparations and career development than adolescents studying in private school.

Table 4.13 and fig 4.4 indicates that the mean scores of private schools is 117.10, which is less than the corresponding mean scores of 121.89 for government aided schools. The t-ratio for difference in mean scores of private and government aided schools is 1.79 which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted in case of private and government aided schools. The result indicates that the career beliefs of adolescents studying in private schools and government aided school did not differ significantly.

Table 4.13 and fig 4.4 indicates that the mean scores of government schools is 140.95 which is higher than the corresponding mean scores of 121.89 for government aided schools. The t-ratio for difference in mean scores of government and government aided schools is 7.20 which in comparison to the table value was found significant at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected in case of government and government aided school. The result indicates that adolescents studying in government school had more negative beliefs about their career preparations and career development than adolescents studying in government aided school.

- **Gender**

Table 4.12 reveals that F-value of difference in mean of gender is 56.51 which in comparison to the table value was found to be significant at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis \(H_34\): There exists no significant difference between male and female on the variable of career beliefs, is not accepted. It shows that there exists a significant difference between male and female adolescents on the variable of career beliefs.

In order to find out which category had more negativity towards their career beliefs, mean scores of both the groups were compared. Since the mean score on career beliefs of male adolescents is 134.63 and female adolescents is 118.66, it can be concluded that male
adolescents have more negativity towards their career beliefs. They have high negative thoughts about their career preparations and career development as compared to female adolescents.

The finding is supported by Dimakakou, Argyropoulou, Drosos and Terzaki (2012) who revealed statistically significant relationships between the level of career beliefs and gender.

**INTERACTION EFFECTS**

- **Interaction effect of Institutional Types and Gender on Career Beliefs (I x G)**

  Table 4.12 reveals that the F ratio for interaction between institutional types and gender is 1.32, which in comparison to the table value was not found significant even at 0.05 level. It indicates that the variable of institutional types do not interact with gender to yield significantly different in respect of career beliefs. Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{35}$: There exists no significant interaction effect of institutional types and gender on career beliefs, is accepted. It is concluded that there is no difference in the career beliefs due to interaction between institutional types and gender.

**4.4 ANALYSIS OF REGRESSION OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE**

Regression analysis is required to know the degree of change in the dependent variable with respect to independent variable. It is also known as prediction statics. It predicts the most likely values of a variable or the basis of specific value of another variable or a number of other variables. The variable whose values are predicted is known as criterion or dependent or explained variable and the variable whose values from the basis of prediction is known as predictor or independent or explanatory variable. Therefore, regression is a statistical tool with the help of which one can estimate or predict the unknown values of one variable from the known values of another variable. Multiple regressions predict the most likely value of variable i.e. dependent variable from the values of two or more variables. In other words, it expresses dependent variable as a function of two or other independent variables (Asthana & Bhushan, 2007). In the present study step wise method of regression is employed out find out the predictors of criterion variable career beliefs from among the independent variables of internet savviness, family environment, socio-economic stats and career indecision.
4.4.1 REGRESSION ANALYSIS FOR TOTAL SAMPLE

Regression analysis is done to find out the predictors of career beliefs by introducing internet savviness (total internet savviness) and its dimensions, dimensions of family environment, socio-economic status and career indecision as independent variables for total sample under study. The analysis of the regression for the total sample has been given in table 4.14.

Table 4.14

Stepwise multiple regression equations for career beliefs and internet savviness, family environment, socio-economic status and career indecision for total sample (N=720)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.325(a)</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>29.57866</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>84.770**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.402(b)</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>28.66347</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>47.452**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.450(c)</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>27.97172</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>36.802**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.472(d)</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>27.64203</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>18.134**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 level  ** Significant at 0.01 level
(Critical Value 3.85 at 0.05 and 6.66 at 0.01 level, df 718)

a. Predictors: (Constant), CI
b. Predictors: (Constant), CI, SES
c. Predictors: (Constant), CI, SES, CO
d. Predictors: (Constant), CI, SES, CO, SC

Table 4.14 presents the stepwise multiple regression equations for career beliefs which is criterion (dependent) variable and independent variables of internet savviness, family environment, socio-economic status and career indecision in case of total sample. The table provided the value of R, R square, adjusted R square, R square change and F change. The r square tells how much variance in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable in the calculation. The adjusted R square is more accurate and as it automatically takes account of the number of independent variables. The adjusted R square is
usually smaller than adjusted R square, as it also takes account of the fact that one is looking at sample rather than whole population (Cohen et al., 2007).

The above table 4.14 shows that at the first step, career indecision (CI) variable is introduced. The value of R, R square and adjusted R square is 0.325, 0.106 and 0.105 respectively. The value of adjusted R square is 0.105 indicating that 10.5 % of the variance in the dependent variable career beliefs is explained by the independent variable career indecision.

The variable introduced at the second step is socio-economic status (SES) which gave the value of R, R square and adjusted R square as 0.402, 0.160 and 0.159 respectively. The value of adjusted R square showed that 15.9 % of the variance in the dependent variable career beliefs is explained by the independent variables of career indecision and socio-economic status conjointly. Also the introduction of socio-economic status brought about 0.056 units of increment in the value of R square. This indicates an additional 5.6 % of the total variance in the dependent variable is explained by the addition of socio-economic status. In order to see whether these increase in the percentage of total variance after each addition were significant or not, the F-value is calculated. The F-value for this step is 47.45 which is significant at 0.01 level. This demonstrates that increase in the prediction value after the addition of socio-economic status is significant. This career indecision and socio-economic status contributes conjointly as well as independently towards the prediction of career beliefs.

The next variable introduced in the previous set of variable (i.e. CI and SES) is cohesion (CO) which is the dimension of family environment. The value of R, R square and adjusted R square is found to be 0.450, 0.203 and 0.199 respectively. This shows that 19.9 % of the variance in the dependent variable career beliefs is caused by the addition of cohesion in the previous equation. Also the introduction of cohesion brought about 0.041 units of increment in the value of R square. This demonstrates that additional 4.1 % of the total variance in the dependent variable is explained by the addition of cohesion. The F-value of this step is 36.80 which is significant at 0.01 level. This shows that cohesion is significant predictor of career beliefs.

For the next step, social collaboration (SC) which is the dimension of internet savviness is introduced and the values of R, R square and adjusted R square is found to be 0.472, 0.222 and 0.218 respectively. The value of adjusted R square showed that 21.8 % of the variance in the criterion variable career beliefs is caused by the addition of social
collaboration in the previous equation. The R square change is observed as 0.020 depicting that extra 2% of the total variance in the criterion variable is explained by the addition of social collaboration. The F value of this equation is observed as 18.134 which is significant at 0.05 level. This demonstrates that social collaboration is significantly predictor of criterion variable.

In the present study career indecision (CI), socio-economic status (SES), cohesion (CO) and social collaboration (SC) were all found to be the predictors of career beliefs and contributes significantly to career beliefs.

Hence, the null hypothesis $H_{36}$: None of the independent variables of internet savviness, family environment, socio-economic stats and career indecision would contribute significantly in predicting the career beliefs both independently as well as conjointly among adolescents stands rejected for career indecision, socio-economic status, cohesion (dimension of family environment) and social collaboration (dimension of internet savviness).