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CHAPTER 1—INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

Parenting styles have become focal point in the early part of 21st century (Caporella, 2007). Parenting plays a pivotal role in the growth and development of children and adolescents. True parenting always aspires to mould the human asset in humanistic spirit. A majority parents perceive that the most intricate phase in child rearing is his/her formative years. Youth is period of psychological as well as physical maturity in which an individual is anticipated to ascertain his or her own identity and to further develop indispensable dexterity for career. The college time is significant exploration and development of individuals (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1998).

Parenting Styles: Parenting Styles can be defined as a psychological approach that parents use in the child-rearing process. It incorporates behaviors; parents engage in with their children, as well as inculcation of the values and beliefs about appropriate child-rearing practices that shape their children’s development. In other way parenting style can also be defined as the child-rearing practices and interactive behaviors which have been developed and implemented by parents. Parenting style will be considered in reference to three general categories: authoritative, authoritarian and permissive (Schwartz & Scott, 2003). Parenting is a socialization process through which parents transmit their cultural values, beliefs, traditions, and norms as well as other socially and culturally desirable behaviors to their children, adolescents, and young adults to be good citizens of the society and for the realization of adult competence.
Career decision self-efficacy: Career decision self-efficacy, as defined by Hackett and Betz (1995), has broadly been used to depict the self-efficacy involved in diverse career-related tasks and behaviors. It is needless to say that; career decision self-efficacy is the conviction that one effectively completes to formulate career decisions. “One of the key aspects of progress in career decision making is (the) willingness to explore the environment” and having self-efficacy is suggested to “facilitate such exploratory behavior” (Wolfe & Betz, 2004.).

Career maturity: The notion of career maturity was pioneered by researchers Donald Super (1957) and John Crites (1978). According to Super (1957), career maturity has been defined as the degree to which an individual exhibits career behaviors and choices that are apt for his or her age. Originated from the developmental theory of vocational behaviour, career maturity, as the maturity of attitudes and competencies pertaining to career assessment, has been defined normatively in terms of congruence between individual’s career conduct and his anticipated behaviour at that age.

Researchers have precisely acknowledged that parents and family play an imperative part in the career development of their children. It has been voiced that parents are “a major source of knowledge and beliefs about occupations” that children and adolescents learn (Bryant et al., 2006.). Conversely, the extent to which parenting modes affect career development, specifically career decision self-efficacy and career maturity, has yet to be fully explored (Whiston & Keller, 2004; Bryant et al., 2006). This study in particular focuses on theories by specifically investigating the theoretical constructs of career decision self-efficacy and career maturity.
Regardless of the recognition of these theoretical constructs, restricted quantities of studies have been conducted on career development. College time is the time when young adults commence formulating their distinctiveness and increase a better sense of their persona. Students develop and sketch their career and futures by the experience of academics. Many students face difficult decisions regarding their career development during college and are significantly influenced by their family in career planning (Bright, Pryor, Wilkenfeld, & Earl, 2005).

1.1 Parenting Styles

Parenting style has been a major topic of study for the early part of the 21st Century. It is a welcome topic for researchers who have an interest in parents and their impacts on the socialization and the development of their children. Parenting style is one of their focuses. To describe the theoretical model of parenting style it is essential to define parenting first and distinguish between parenting styles and parenting practices. Parenting, as defined by Bradley and Caldwell (1995), is the regulation of behavior and development of the children, with the intention that they can live a socially desirable life, adapt to their environment, and pursue their own goals. Parenting styles have been defined as specific parenting practices and attitudes that parents express toward their own children (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). In the parenting process, child and adolescent development is influenced by: 1) the values and goals parents place on their children in the socialization process, 2) the parenting practices that they employ, and 3) the attitudes they express toward their children (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).
1.1.1 Definition of Parenting Styles

Parenting styles, as defined by Baumrind, are “the consistent patterns of parental behaviors and attitudes with which parents interact and deal with their children and adolescents along two parental dimensions, that is, demandingness and responsiveness” (Baumrind, 1966). Other psychologists (Darling, 2000) have defined as, “a complex activity that includes many specific behaviors that work individually and together to influence child outcomes” Specifically, parenting style is “a constellation of parental behaviours and attitudes toward their children that are conveyed to the children and that, as a whole, create an emotional bond in which the parents' behaviours are expressed” (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).

Parenting styles have been described as the strategies that parents use in raising their children, which incorporate warmth, affection, involvement, punitiveness, and control (Reitman, Rhode, Hupp, & Altobello, 2002). Darling and Steinberg (as cited in Huver, Otten, Vries, & Engels, 2009) defined parenting styles as a universal climate in which a family functions and child rearing behavior of parents or other primary caregivers involve. Parenting styles can be defined as the “differing styles of discipline, nurturance, reinforcement, and acceptance used in child-rearing” (McClun & Merrell, 1998).

The child-rearing practices and interactive behaviors which have been developed and implemented by parents are referred to as parenting style. Parent-child relationships are greatly affected by the parenting style the parent incorporates into parent-child interactions. Three main parenting styles have been observed by professionals. These three parenting styles are parental authoritativeness, parental
authoritarianism and parental permissiveness (Schwartz & Scott, 2003). Moreover, parenting styles have been defined in regards to two other elements, including: 1) parental responsiveness (warmth, acceptance, support and involvement) and 2) parental demandingness (control, supervision, and maturity demands) (Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Baumrind, 1991).

1.1.2 Theoretical Models of Parenting Styles

The first theoretical tripartite model of parenting style was coined by Baumrind (1966, 1967, 1973). In her research, she found what she considered to be the four basic elements that could help to silhouette successful parenting: responsiveness vs. unresponsiveness and demanding vs. undemanding. From these, she identified three general parenting styles: authoritarian- firm but not warm, permissive- warm but not firm, and authoritative- warm and firm. (Baumrind, D. 1967;1971;1978; McKay M. 2006). Later, Maccoby and Martin expanded and revised Baumrinds typologies. Maccoby and Martin identified two parenting dimensions which are demandingness and responsiveness (Gould & Martindale, 2009). Responsiveness is the extent to which parents respond to and fulfill the needs of their children (Knox & Schacht, 2007). Bengston (2005) stated that demandingness corresponds to the degree to which parents try to control their children’s performance and the level to which parents expect mature and responsible behavior from their children (as cited in Knox & Schacht, 2007). According to Maccoby and Martin, these two dimensions jointly create four types of parenting styles, three of which are quite similar to Baumrind’s original classification and
conceptualization of parenting styles. Their conceptualization adds the fourth type, the neglecting or uninvolved parenting style - neither warm nor firm.

According to Baumrind (1967, 1973) and Maccoby and Martin (1983), the four types of parenting styles and their typical characteristics are as follow:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Demanding</th>
<th>Undemanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsive</td>
<td>Authoritative/Propagative</td>
<td>Indulgent (Permissive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unresponsive</td>
<td>Authoritarian/Totalitarian</td>
<td>Neglectful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Authoritative Parenting Style: A parenting style marked by parental behaviours that is equilibrium of responsiveness and demandingness; children are expected to follow the rules and guidelines established by their parents, when children break the rules, they are disciplined in a fair and consistent manner, authoritative parents are also flexible. These parents are responsive and willing to listen to their children. Authoritative Parents are warm but firm. They encourage their adolescent to be independent while maintaining limits and controls on their actions. Authoritative parents engage in discussions and debate with their adolescent, although ultimate responsibility resides with the parent. It is high in all four dimensions of family functioning. As noted by Maccoby (1992) People with authoritative parenting styles want their children to utilize reasoning and work independently, but they also have high expectations for their children. If there are
extenuating circumstances, they will allow the child to explain what happened and adjust their response accordingly. This type of parenting style consists of a constellation of parental characteristics of high standards, such as high emotional attachment and support to children, encouragement of a two-way communication between parents and children, and consistent implementation of the rules established by parents (Baumrind, 1991). According to Baumrind (1971, 1991), Authoritative parents often “want their children to be assertive as well as socially responsible and self-regulated” (Baumrind, 1989). They are able to balance “clear, high expectations (for their children) with emotional support and recognition of (their) children’s autonomy. Authoritative parents have also been characterized as providing a warm family climate for their children, (but) likewise promoting independence in their children, resulting in a “more active career exploration on the part of (their) children” (Kerka, 2000).

(2) Authoritarian Parenting Style: Parents labeled as authoritarian have been viewed as both highly restrictive and very demanding but low in warmth. They are strict disciplinarians, use a restrictive, punitive style, and insist that their children follow parental directions. Those parents with an authoritarian parenting style establish the strict rules and regulations that their children are expected to follow. If children fail to follow the rules then result is punishment. The parents fail to explain the reason behind such rules. If asked to explain, the parent might simply reply, “You will have to do this because I said so.” These parents have high demands, but are not responsive to their children. Parent attempts to shape, control, and evaluate the behavior and attitudes of the child in accordance with a set standard of conduct, usually an absolute standard, theologically motivated and formulated by a higher
authority. As a result, adolescents may become rebellious or dependent. Those who become rebellious might display aggressive behaviors. Adolescents who are more submissive tend to remain dependent on their parents. According to Kerka (2000), “although authoritarian parenting is associated with school success, pressures to conform and fulfill parents’ expectations regarding education and careers can cause a poor fit between the individual and the chosen career, as well as estranged family relationships and poor mental health”. As noted by Baumrind (1967, 1971) children with authoritarian parents tend to be anxious, socially withdrawn, and unhappy.

(3) Permissive Parenting Style: is characterized by non-restrictiveness and high levels of responsiveness. Permissive parents sometimes referred to as indulgent parents. It is high in warmth but low maturity demands to make of their children. They are indulgent and passive in their parenting, and believe that the way to demonstrate their love is to give into their children’s wishes. Permissive parents do not like to say no or disappoint their children. These parents rarely discipline their children because they have relatively low expectations of maturity and self-control. Permissive parents provide their children with a great deal of freedom to make decisions. They “attempt to behave in a nonpunitive, accepting, and affirmative manner towards their children’s impulses, desires, and actions… (and) make few maturity demands” (Baumrind, 1989). Permissive parents do not like to say no or disappoint their children. As a result, children are allowed to make many important decisions without parental input.

(4) Neglecting or Uninvolved Parenting Style: A parenting style, at the other extreme, characterized by low in both dimensions (i.e., the degree of
responsiveness and demandingness) and which is believed to be the most detrimental of the four types of parenting styles on children’s and adolescents’ development (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). While these parents fulfill the child’s basic needs, they are generally detached from their child’s life. Uninvolved Parents are not warm and do not place any demands on their children. They minimize their interaction time, and, in some cases, are uninvolved to the point of being neglectful. These parents may be overwhelmed by their circumstances or they may be self-centered. Parents might also engage in this style if they are tired, frustrated, or have simply “given up” in trying to maintain parental authority. “These parents do not monitor their children’s behavior or support their interests. Neglectful parents are often preoccupied with their own problems, and are disengaged from parental responsibilities” (Glasgow et al., 1997, p. 508). They do not provide composition for their children and may be “actively rejecting or else neglect(ing) their childrearing responsibilities altogether” (Baumrind, 1991b). “Families with uninvolved (or inactive) parents seem unable to function well either because they cannot set guidelines, or because they do not pursue interests that involve places and persons outside the family. This makes it more difficult for children to develop self-knowledge and differentiate their own career goals from their parents’ goals” (Kerka, 2000).

1.1.3 Characteristics of Parenting Styles

*Characteristics of the Authoritative Parenting Style:*

- Encourage independence
- Place limits, consequences and expectations on their children's behavior
• Express warmth and nurturance
• Consent to children to voice opinions
• Encourage children to discuss options
• Administer fair and consistent discipline

*Characteristics of the Authoritarian Parenting Style:*

• Have strict rules and expectations.
• Very demanding, but not responsive.
• Don't convey much warmth or nurturing.
• Utilize punishments with little or no explanation.
• Don’t give children choices or options.

*Characteristics of the Permissive Parenting Style:*

• Have few rules or standards of behavior
• When there are rules, they are often very inconsistent
• Are usually very nurturing and loving towards their kids
• Often seem more like a friend, rather than a parent.
• May use bribery such as toys, gifts and food as a means to get child to behave

*Characteristics of the Uninvolved Parenting Style:*

• Are emotionally distant from their children
• Offer little or no supervision
• Show little warmth, love and affection towards their children
• Have few or no expectations or demands for behavior
1.1.4 Gender and Parenting in India

Parents tend to have different behavior on parenting based on the gender of child. Research examining gender and parenting styles in India has suggested that parents’ child rearing practice of male and female is different. India is a land of diverse traditions, all deep-rooted in the same value system. The Indian parenting style builds the respect for other people, their values and customs. Specifically in India, authoritarian parenting is also consistent with Hindu values of respect for and duty towards one’s parents (Saraswathi and Pai 1997). Thus, the child grows up to value personal interests more than those of the community. Research on the role of gender in parenting in Asian cultures is quite inadequate, Someya et al. (2000). Research conducted with traditional Indian families (families living in rural areas of India) suggest that there is a long-standing sex bias against girls, particularly in
Northern India (Dasgupta, 1987). Researchers found lower preference to female children and strong preference to male children. This bias was supported by the research that suggested there was generally a higher female infant mortality rate, poorer nutritional status for females, and lower value placed on them socially (Dasgupta, 1987).

1.2 Career Decision Self Efficacy

Career decision self-efficacy (CDSE) has become a well-liked topic of research in the career development literature because of its significant impact on the career decision-making process of young adults. Self-efficacy is defined as one’s confidence in personal skills as well as the belief that one can effectively direct personal behaviour to reach the goals set. Self-efficacy is the expectation and conviction of an individual in relation to how successfully he/she can perform a certain task. The college experience provides students with the opportunity to help develop and prepare for their careers and futures. Presumably, many college students will be faced with challenging decisions regarding their career development during college and thereafter. Young adulthood is typically a crucial time for career decision-making and development (Whiston, & Keller, 2004). It is a time when there is the potential for certain factors and variables to either enhance or detract from college students’ experience, particularly with regards to their career development.

1.2.1 Definition of Career Decision Self Efficacy

Self-efficacy may be assessed as a prerequisite for the productivity and efficiency of the activities of an individual (Bandura, 1997). More specifically, career decision self-efficacy, is defined as an individual’s belief that he or she can
successfully complete tasks indispensable to career decision making (Taylor & Betz, 1983). Put in a different way, career decision self-efficacy refers to a person's self-belief and self-reliance in her or his dexterity to engage in and successfully complete career decision-making tasks (Taylor & Betz, 1983). According to Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy theory, there are four sources through which self-efficacy expectations can be learned. Self-efficacy can be learned through: 1) performance accomplishments, by personally mastering experiences, 2) vicarious experiences, by modeling others, 3) psychological states, by reducing anxiety levels, and/or 4) verbal persuasion, by receiving suggestions, encouragement and/or support from others (including family). Self-efficacy can be hindered in several ways. For example, women and racial/ethnic minorities may be unable to learn vicariously, due to a lack of role models in certain non-traditional careers. This may also lead them to expect that they may not succeed in non-traditional fields. Family members, for example, may also encourage or discourage their children from entering certain fields through various types of verbal persuasion. Hackett and Betz (1981) were the first to apply Bandura's (1977) propositions about self-efficacy to career behaviour in a seminal study of women's career development.

1.2.2 Theoretical Model of Career Decision Self Efficacy

Betz and Hackett (1981) conducted the first empirical study of career self efficacy. They looked at the relationship of career-related self-efficacy expectations to perceived career options in college men and women, with the rationale to probe the usefulness of self-efficacy theory to the understanding and clarifying women's career choices and trajectories. More explicitly, the understanding of women's career
development, the study was conducted with 235 undergraduate male and female students enrolled in introductory psychology courses. The results showed that there were sex differences in self-efficacy when looking at traditional and nontraditional occupations. Females scored higher in self-efficacy in more traditional jobs, whereas males scored higher in nontraditional jobs that tended to be male dominated. This study also showed a relationship between self-efficacy and career decision making. One of the most important aspects of this study was the notion that “the concept of self-efficacy may be useful not only in expanding the range of career options but in facilitating success and satisfaction in career pursuits” and “the influence of self-efficacy expectations on career development have direct implications for systematic programs of interventions capable of increasing self efficacy and consequently, facilitating career development” (Betz & Hackett, 1981).

Career decision self-efficacy is based on two well-established psychological theories: one developed in the disciplines of social and personality psychology (the theory of self-efficacy) and the other originating from vocational psychology (the theory of career maturity). In this foundational study, the authors outlined this concept’s potentials and proposed its generalization to other groups of subjects and other aspects of vocational development. From that study, the concept of career self-efficacy has been applied to multiple areas of academic and professional development and different populations and groups (Betz, 2007; Hackett & Betz, 1995; Lent & Hackett, 1987). For college students, searching for a job or exploring careers is one of the most important life tasks. During this period, most college students explore their interests and aptitudes to fix on their future career and furthermore, to find a satisfying job. Vocational contentment is consistently
moderately related to life satisfaction (Bowling, Eschleman, & Wang, 2010); thus, the significance of making a “good” career decision is great. While the career decision process is intricate, as is its relation to satisfaction, it is an important developmental challenge and one that will likely affect a good portion of students’ future lives. Career decision-making self-efficacy (Betz and Hackett, 1981; Taylor and Betz, 1983) identifies the degree of confidence, the students put across about their competency or ability—self-efficacy—to embark +on educational and occupational information-gathering and goal-planning activities (Peterson, 1993a). The career choice process in college students is unique since these individuals generally have the freedom to pursue whichever careers they desire. The idyllic outcome for these students is to have a career they find fulfilling, and that eventually provides them with high levels of vocational contentment. After this stage, making time to consider life-changing career activities becomes more difficult. Therefore, college students, especially juniors and seniors, invest most of their time on career development activities such as internship experiences. Determining one’s future career is perceived as a big challenge to almost every college student.

1.2.3 Career Decision Self Efficacy and Parental influence

Parents are the prime source of career information and support for the students. Keeping this in mind, there are numerous ways that you can have an encouraging impact on your student’s career development. Studies show that parents are the single greatest influence on a student’s career selection. It is imperative for parents to give students support and encouragement to discover the many options accessible to find the best career fit for them (the students), as opposed to trying to
live out their own disgruntled career dreams all the way through young student. Roe, an early theorist, proposed that early childhood experiences play an oblique role in determining later career behavior (Brown, Lum, and Voyle 1997). She suggested that parent-child relationships influence personality orientations and the development of psychological needs; vocational interests and choices are some of the ways in which individuals try to satisfy those needs (ibid.). Although Osipow (1997) and others point out the difficulty of demonstrating links between parenting styles and vocational choices, some research substantiation is emerging. Parent-child connectedness facilitates risk taking and exploration, which are needed for identity configuration in general as well as for the formation of vocational identity (Altman 1997; Blustein 1997).

The overall development of students during college will be explored in relation to career development to determine the issues that may be explicit to this population. The parental influence on the development of college students has been pondered over as well as discussed to endow with support for the overall level of influence of parents on their children’s lives. Parent-child relationships are coupled with progress in career decision making, assenting career self-efficacy beliefs, and career planfulness.

1.3 Career Maturity

Career maturity is an imperative perception in career development and has in the last few years acknowledged a lot of consideration. Career maturity is one phase of career development, Super (1955) was the first canvasser to kick off the concept of career maturity in the Career Pattern Study. Portrayed as a segmental model,
Super's "loosely unified set of theories" (1990; p. 199) utilizes the construct of career maturity (CM), which has become one of the most prevalent as well as ubiquitous variables in research involving the career development of adolescents (Powell & Luzzo, 1998). His work, at the outset formulated in the early 1950s, has been widely tested, expanded, revised and refined until the present day. Career maturity was initially called "vocational maturity", is now known as "career maturity" was proposed by Super 60 years ago (Super, 1955).

Initially the career maturity was generalized to life-span career development (Super, 1955). Career maturity is the first facet of Super's Life-Career Rainbow. The second dimension in the Life-Career Rainbow is life space. The outer band of the Life-Career Rainbow represents the major life stages: Growth, Exploration, Establishment, Maintenance, and Decline. Having career maturity will prepare that individual for those demands as well as any changes that may come about later in life. The Life-Career Rainbow takes into account the various transitions an individual may experience. Career maturity represents the life span and the course of life in the rainbow.

1.3.1 Description of Concept

The notion of career maturity evolves through developmental stages. It should be noted that present research focuses specifically on the perception of career maturity rather than maturity in broad-spectrum. Crites (1976) divided career maturity into two dimensions, attitudinal and cognitive. The attitudinal dimension refers to individuals' attitudes and feelings about making a vocational choice and whether they continue to pursue their career choice as they enter the workforce. The
cognitive dimension refers to clients' wakefulness of a need to make a career decision and their understanding of their vocational preferences. For college students, the cognitive dimension is central to their career development. These students are dealing with the cognitive challenges of choosing a career, finishing college, and finding employment. To complete these tasks, the individual must have adequate as well as sufficient acquaintance on the subject of the world of work and their personal strengths as well as their educational abilities. Career maturity implies that the individual is competent to accomplish tasks that are apposite for his or her age and stage of development (Brown & Lent, 2005). An individual's career maturity depends on his or her capability to muddle through the demands of the milieu at any given life stage, and the individual has to be ready to cope with these demands. According to Super (1990), individuals go through five stages of career development, including: growth in childhood, exploration in adolescence, establishment in young adulthood, maintenance in adulthood, and withdrawal. According to Super's (1957) theory, certain career tasks and vocational behaviors are accomplished during each stage and development along this continuum is viewed as a measurement of career maturity.

1.3.2 Definition of Career Maturity

Career Maturity: Super (1957) and Crites (1978) have defined career maturity as "the extent to which an individual has mastered vocational development tasks including knowledge and attitudinal components that are appropriate for his or her stage of career development" (Betz, 1988, p. 80).
Career maturity has been defined as one’s ability to make reasonable and responsible career decisions with an awareness of what the requirements are to make such decisions (Levinson, et al., 1998).

Super (1990) defined career maturity as “the individual’s readiness to cope with the developmental tasks with which he or she is confronted because of his or her biological and social developments and because of society’s expectation of people who have reached that stage of development”.

Hence, it can be inferred that career maturity is an individual’s promptness to make well informed, pragmatic, age-appropriate career choices and decisions (King, 1989; Levinson, Ohler, Caswell, & Kiewra, 1998; Powell & Luzzo, 1998; Savickas, 1984).

1.3.3 Theoretical Models of Career Maturity

The Crites model (1965, 1971) has three levels: at the first level are the variables (a total of 20); at the second, intermediate level are the four factors (consistency, realism, competencies and attitudes) which group the variables; and the third level consists of the degree of career development. This is a hierarchical model where significant, relatively high correlations exist between variables within one factor, and moderate correlations are found between variables in different factors.
Table 2
The Crites Model of Career Maturity (1965, 1971)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Career Development Consistency:</th>
<th>Realism:</th>
<th>Competencies:</th>
<th>Attitudes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filed</td>
<td>Interests</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Preferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>Goal selection</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Social Class</td>
<td>Self-appraisal</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Super's Model of Career Maturity: Below is a brief representation of Super’s model of Career maturity.

Table 3
Super’s Model of Career Maturity (Gonzalez, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Playfulness:</th>
<th>Career Exploration:</th>
<th>Information:</th>
<th>Decision Making:</th>
<th>Reality Orientation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distant Future</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>Education and instruction</td>
<td>Principles</td>
<td>Self Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Income and Requirements</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Duties</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supply and Demand</td>
<td>Crystallization</td>
<td>Work Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Career Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Super’s et al. (1957) model of career maturity indicates the magnitude of a range of phases of career maturity in making career choices. As it can be observed from above model, it is critical that individual engages in the exploration of probable career options and the attainment of information is of the outmost value. Individual should also get hold of decision making skills and have pragmatic orientation to decision making.

1.3.4 Career Maturity and Parenting Styles

Super (1957) has accentuated the significance of developing career maturity all through adolescence, as failure to progress in an appropriate manner may lead to difficulty in making satisfying career decisions. Researchers have long acknowledged that parents and family play very essential role in the career development of their children and adolescents. It has been suggested that parents are “a major source of knowledge and beliefs about occupations” that children and adolescents learn (Bryant et al., 2006, p. 154). However, the extent to which parenting styles affect career development, explicitly career decision self-efficacy and career maturity, has yet to be completely explored (Whiston & Keller, 2004; Bryant et al., 2006). The advice of parents has an impact on career choice in the collective oriented culture, and it seems that Korean students have not had the prospect to make self-sufficient and rational decisions (Lee, 1997).

The first practical quantify of CM was in print not by Super but by one of his students (who later became a colleague), John Crites. Crites's (1971) model of CM, which envelops both cognitive and affective components, has acknowledged substantial consideration in the career development as well as improvement
literature. A number of assessment instruments have been constructed to compute CM. One of the most widely used, the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI; Crites, 1973), was deliberated to test attitudes in view of decisiveness, involvement, independence, orientation and conciliation.

1.4 Rationale of the Study

The rationale of the present study endeavors to link a gap in the existing literature by empirically investigating the correlation amid parenting styles on the occupation allied decision of self efficacy and career maturity of college students. More distinctively, three relationships are explored: (a) the association involving parenting style and career decision self efficacy, (b) the correlation between parenting style and career maturity, and (c) the relationship between career decision self efficacy and career maturity.