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CHAPTER 3—METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

The present exploration of the topic has been intended to appraise parenting style and career decision self efficacy and career maturity of collegians. This has formed the base of my work through meticulously chosen title “The Relationship between Parenting styles, Career decision self efficacy and Career maturity of college students.” The work envelops lots of information, opinions, deliberations, notions, confrontations etc. and would be of immense help to readers in understanding the co-relation between parenting styles, career decision self efficacy and career maturity of college students.

Parenting styles affect students’ career development model. Parenting styles can have effect on Career decision self efficacy and Career maturity. As voiced by some distinguished researchers, different parenting styles have relationship to Career decision self efficacy and Career maturity differently, either optimistically or pessimistically. In particular, authoritative style can influence higher level of career decision self efficacy and career maturity. Furthermore, it is an increasingly demanding and challenging world, students’ career decision self efficacy and career maturity in higher education like college is significant phase of their overall career development since it prepares them for the challenges which they are likely to face in their future and profession.

This chapter envelops the fundamental information related to the participants used for the study, objectives, hypothesis, instruments utilized, procedures for data
collection, as well as the research design leading to the data analysis. The material and methods used in the study are discussed under the subsequent headings:

3.1 Research Problem

Any research work commences with the formulation of research problem by which in-depth exploration of the work is undertaken by the research scholar.

It has been reported that level of career awareness among college students is moderately squat. Parents or Parenting styles are found to be able to influence their children’s career choice. Families, especially parents are a child’s backbone. The child grows, develops and is generally dependent on his parents for almost a quarter of his life, as it happens in many cases in India. From the kind of clothes kids wear, the stream they choose in school, everything is decided by their parents. And this does not simply end here. The selection of the college, course, city of work and even career incredibly depends on their parents’ decisions. A child often stops pursuing his dreams and follows his parents’ dreams. In early years of his life, his creativity is restricted. Every parent wants his child to be a doctor or an engineer, especially in a country like India. Offbeat streams like fashion designing, writing, cartooning, photography etc. are not even considered to be very potential career options. Indian parents are often more concerned about what they will have to say to the society rather than their child’s wishes. Parents use different kind of parenting styles in child rearing process which may escort to bring into being a dependent child.
Research also has brought to our notice that career choice dilemma is one of the biggest problems that has been voiced out in collegians and to a larger extent due to parenting styles. Consequently, the investigator of this work has tried to establish the relationship between Parenting style, career decision self efficacy and career maturity of college students.

3.2 Objectives

1. To study the relationship between parenting style, career decision self efficacy and career maturity of college students.

2. To perceive the role of parenting styles on career decision self-efficacy of college students.

3. To examine the role of parenting styles on career maturity of college students.

4. To look into the differences in parenting styles, career decision self efficacy, and career maturity of the students as a function in context of their educational stream preferences.

5. To probe into the differences in parenting styles, career decision self efficacy, and career maturity of the students in context of the gender they belong to.

6. To investigate the differences in parenting styles, career decision self efficacy, and career maturity of the students with reference to their area of residence (Urban/Rural).
3.3 Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are formulated based on the research Objectives.

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant correlation between parenting styles and career decision self efficacy of college students.

1(a). There is no significant correlation between authoritative parenting style and career decision self efficacy of college students.

1(b). There is significant correlation between authoritarian parenting style and career decision self efficacy of college students.

1(c). There is significant correlation between permissive parenting style and career decision self efficacy of college students.

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant correlation between parenting styles and career Maturity of college students.

2(a). There is no significant correlation between authoritative parenting style and career Maturity of college students.

2(b). There is significant correlation between authoritarian parenting style and career Maturity of college students.

2(c). There is significant correlation between permissive parenting style and career Maturity of college students.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant correlation between Career Maturity and Career decision self efficacy of college students.
Hypothesis 4. Parenting styles do not predict career decision self-efficacy of college students.

4(a). Authoritative style does not predict Career Decision Self Efficacy of college students.

4(b). Authoritarian style does not predict Career Decision Self Efficacy of college students.

4(c). Permissive style does not predict Career Decision Self Efficacy of college students.

Hypothesis 5. Parenting styles do not predict of career maturity of college students.

5(a). Authoritative style does not predict Career Maturity of college students.

5(b). Authoritarian style does not predict Career Maturity of college students.

5(c). Permissive style does not predict Career Maturity of college students.

Hypothesis 6. There is no significant difference between parenting styles and Educational Streams of college students.

6(a). There is no significant difference between Authoritative parenting style and Educational Streams of college students.

6(b). There is no significant difference between Authoritarian parenting style and Educational Streams of college students.
6(c). There is no significant difference between Permissive parenting style and Educational Streams of college students.

Hypothesis 7. There is no significant difference between Career decision self efficacy and Educational Streams of college students.

Hypothesis 8. There is no significant difference between Career maturity and Educational Streams of college students.

Hypothesis 9. There is no significant difference between parenting styles and Gender of college students.

9(a). There is no significant difference between Authoritative parenting style and Gender of college students.

9(b). There is no significant difference between Authoritarian parenting style and gender of college students.

9(c). There is no significant difference between Permissive parenting style and Gender of college students.

Hypothesis 10. There is no significant difference between Career decision self efficacy and Gender of college students.

Hypothesis 11. There is no significant difference between Career maturity and Gender of college students.

Hypothesis 12. There is no significant difference between parenting styles and Residence of college students.
12(a). There is no significant difference between Authoritative parenting style and Residence of college students.

12(b). There is no significant difference between Authoritarian parenting style and Residence of college students.

12(c). There is no significant difference between Permissive parenting style and Residence of college students.

Hypothesis 13. There is no significant difference between Career decision self efficacy and Residence of college students.

Hypothesis 14. There is no significant difference between Career maturity and Residence of college students.

3.4 Variables

3.4.1 Independent variables

1. Parenting styles of students.

2. Demographic variables of students (Sex (Male/female), Age, Educational Stream (Arts/Commerce/Science), Area of Residence (Rural/Urban), Father’s Education, Mother’s Education.)

3.4.2 Dependent variables

1. Career decision self-efficacy.

2. Career maturity.
3.5 Research Design

The present study employed a survey design. Survey research is the oldest, reliable and most widely used research method in social science (Hackett, 1981). In order to collect data and answer research questions of this study, survey method has been used in this study; the survey in this study was distributed by a method: face-to-face distribution of paper surveys to a group. The sample included male and female students in Arts, Commerce and Science disciplines. This study has used a nonrandom purposive sampling design. The nonrandom purposive sample aims to allow the respondents for the surveying of individuals from the selected stream where equitable numbers of male and female college students could be located. Test-retest reliability was conducted on the PAQ, CDSE-SF, and CMI-R over two week period based on 30 students. The research design has been employed to examine independent effects of parenting styles on the career decision self efficacy and career maturity of undergraduate third years students in Gujarat. To analyze the data Correlation, Regression analysis, one way ANOVA and t-test analyses were conducted as it allowed for assessment of statistical relations between variables within participants.

3.6 Participants

Participants in this study consisted of undergraduate third year college students. The participants were enrolled in three streams (Arts/Commerce/Science) of different colleges such as, Green City Science College, Bahuddin Science College, J.J. Kundaliya Commerce College, Malaviya Commerce College, Christ Arts, Commerce and Science
College, Jasani Arts and Commerce College and Virbai Mahila College from Rajkot and Junagadh Cities. A total of 360 undergraduate students volunteered to participate in this study. Of the 360 survey responses, 60 could not be included in the study due to incomplete responses. A total of 300 survey responses were used in the final data analyses. Participants in the sample ranged in age from 18 to 25 years old. Female undergraduate students comprised 50% \((n = 150)\) of the sample, while male undergraduate students also comprised 50% \((n = 150)\) of the sample. Students’ Educational Streams comprised 33.3% (Arts \(n = 100\), Commerce \(n = 100\), Science \(n = 100\)), Students’ residential area comprised (Rural 42% \(n = 126\)/ Urban 58% \(n = 174\)).

3.7 Instruments

3.7.1 Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ)

The Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ; Buri, 1991) was used in this study to measure participants’ parents’ style of parenting. The Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ; Buri, 1991) was used to measure Baumrind’s (1966) permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative parenting styles, and has been one of the most widely used tools to investigate parenting styles. The PAQ was developed to measure parental authority as recalled by the child, adolescent, or young adult (Buri, 1991). The PAQ was used due to its suitability to the population under study, as this assessment has been noted as particularly valuable for both men and women, older adolescents, and young adults (Buri, 1991). The scale consists of 30 items, and ten items treat each of the three parenting styles, and the respondents are directed to respond to each item on a 5-point
Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 =disagree to 5 =agree). The three parenting style questions are embedded in the questionnaire in a random order. There are permissive (P: items 1,6,10,13,14,17,19,21,24 and 18), authoritarian (A: items 2,3, 7,9,12,16,18,25,26 and 29), and authoritative (T: items 4,5,8,11,15,20,22,23,27 and 30). The scores on each range are from 10 to 50 (Buri, 1991). Mean scores were calculated by dividing the total score for each parenting style by 10, with the highest mean score of the three subscales representing parents’ primary parenting style. The measure was slightly adapted to be applicable to participants of either a single- or two parents home. The original measure consists of separate measures for both fathers and mothers. In the current study, participants self-identified about both parents they would complete the measure. With the objective of evaluating parenting styles from a holistic perspective, a combined form of the PAQ [similar to a recent study by Kim and Chung (2003)] was used to assess overall parenting style, rather than a separate assessment of both the mother and father. According to Buri (1991), the PAQ continues to have strong reliability and validity. The reliability of the PAQ was found to be .77 to .92 in a test re-test check over a two-week period of time (Buri, 1991). Validity for the PAQ was found to be .74 to .87 for the subscales (Buri). 

In the current study test-retest reliability has been done of Gujarati version of PAQ, good reliability was found for the three PAQ subscales as follow: authoritative was found to be .77, authoritarian was found to be .78 and permissive was found to be .74.
3.7.2 Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale—Short Form (CDSE-SF)

Betz, Klein, and Taylor's (2001) 25-item Career Decision Self Efficacy—Short Form was used to assess the college students' self-efficacy in making career-related decisions. This scale shows the level of one's self-confidence when performing actions related to the selection of one's further career. The CDSE-SF contains five items for each of the five subscales: Self-Appraisal (e.g., "Determine what your ideal job would be"), Gathering Occupational Information (e.g., "Use the Internet to find information about occupations that interest you"), Goal Selection (e.g., "Choose a major or career that will fit your interests"), Planning (e.g., "Determine the steps you need to successfully complete your chosen major"), and Problem Solving (e.g., "Persistently work at your major or career goal even when you get frustrated"). For the original scale, 10 items were written to reflect each competency area totaling 50 different career decision-making tasks or behaviors. Because the original CDMSE contained 50 items, a shorter version that could be used easily in counseling assessment and as a pre-post measure for the evaluation of career interventions was desirable. In order to save time for researchers and participants, the CDSES (Taylor & Betz, 1983) was condensed from 50 items to 25 items to create a new instrument, the CDSESSF (Betz et al., 1996). The new scale used a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (no confidence at all) to 5 (complete confidence), with higher scores indicating a higher degree of CDSE. The 25 items are rationally distributed among five subscales. Each subscale score is the sum of the responses given to the five items on that subscale. There are (1) Self-Appraisal—(Items 5, 9, 14, 18, 22), (2) Gathering Occupational Information—(Items 1, 10, 15, 19,
23), (3) Goal Selection – (Items 2, 6, 11, 16, 20), (4) Planning – (Items 3, 7, 12, 21, 24), (5) Problem Solving – (Items 4, 8, 13, 17, 25). Thus, total subscale scores can range from 5 to 25 and mean subscale scores are computed by dividing the total subscale score by five (the number of items on each subscale). A total score is the sum of the five subscale scores or, alternatively stated, the sum across all 25 items. The maximum is 125. In a study conducted on the reliability and validity of the CDMSE-SF, internal consistency reliability of the short form ranged from .73 for Self-Appraisal to .83 for Goal Selection, with a total score of .94 (Betz & Taylor, 2001). Betz, Klein, and Taylor (1996) have also noted strong content, concurrent, and construct validity for both the CDMSE and CDMSE-SF. The CDMSE-SF was also used due to its prior use with ethnic/racial minority groups, as well as a common use with college-aged populations (Prideaux & Creed, 2001). For the current study, internal reliability ranged from .78 for Self-Appraisal, Occupational Information, Goal Selection, and Problem Solving to .81 for Planning. Similar internal reliability results were found for the CDMSE-SF total score which was .94.

In the Present Research test-retest reliability was used to find out the reliability of the Gujarati version of CDSE-SF. The reliability was found .85 which is high.

3.7.3 Career maturity Inventory- Revised (CMI-R)

Career maturity was measured for this study using the Career Maturity Inventory – Revised (CMI-R) Attitude Scale, developed by Crites and Savickas (1995). Several instruments have been constructed to measure career maturity; however, Crites’ (1973)
Career Maturity Inventory continues to be one of the most widely used. Crites' (1978) original inventory was divided into two sections including the Competencies Test, to measure the cognitive dimension of decision-making skills, and the Attitudes Scale, to measure the affective dimension of attitudes toward the career decision-making process. Specifically, the CMI Competence Test was designed to measure the degree to which an individual possessed the career information, planning, and decision-making skills to make realistic and wise career decisions (Betz, 1988). The CMI Attitude Scale was developed to measure individuals' attitudes toward careers and career choices. Using Crites' (1978) original assessment, the Career Maturity Inventory was subsequently revised in 1995 by Crites and Savickas and renamed the Career Maturity Inventory – Revised (CMI-R). The original Career Maturity Inventory was redesigned for several reasons: 1) to shorten administration time, 2) to extend its applicability to college students and employed adults, 3) to extend its usefulness in diagnosing career choice problems, 4) to make it more relevant and usable in career interventions, and 5) to provide the opportunity for a variety of data analyses (Busacea & Taber, 2002). With concerns about the applicability of the CMI to racial minorities, Crites and Savickas (1996) also revised the inventory to include statements that were free of racial or gender bias. The new 50-item CMI-R provides three scores, including: 1) an attitude scale, identifying the attitudes and feelings one has toward making a career choice, 2) a competence test, to measure one's knowledge about occupations and decisions involved in choosing a career, and 3) an overall career maturity score (Crites & Savickas, 1996). Due to similarities between the CMI-R competency test and the career decision making
self-efficacy assessment, the attitude scale was used to measure career maturity for this study. With the new CMI-R Attitude Scale, 25 multiple choice statements were provided, with a choice of either “Agree” or “Disagree.” Possible scores ranged from 1 to 25, with higher scores indicating more career mature attitudes. Sample statements included: “Everyone seems to tell me something different, as a result I don’t know which kind of work to choose” and “If someone would tell me what occupation to enter, I would feel much better” (Crites and Savickas, 1996). In a preliminary investigation, Busaceca and Taber (2002) found modest reliability for the new CMI-R. Internal reliability for the Attitude Scale was calculated at .54. Busaceca and Taber (2002) also found modest construct and criterion related validity for the revised CMI. More investigations into the reliability and validity of the CMI-R need to be conducted. However, Crites and Savickas (1996) indicate that the revised CMI should have similarly strong reliability and construct and criterion-related validity as the 1978 version, due to its statements being selected directly from the previous version. Internal reliability for the current study was similarly modest at .58.

In the present study test-retest reliability was used to know the reliability of the Gujarati version of CMI-R. The reliability is .68.

3.8 Procedure

English is an international language but majority students are come from Gujarati language which is their mother tongue Therefore, to understand the questionnaires in proper perception; the questionnaire was translated into Gujarati. Participants completed
a demographic information questionnaire and the PAQ, CDSE-SF and CMI questionnaires those were translated from English to Gujarati. All procedures in Gujarati medium colleges took place in Gujarati, the participants’ first language, while all procedures in the English medium colleges were completed in English. To check the reliability of questionnaires test-retest conducted on 30 students selected from the college and given the Gujarati version of questionnaires and the names of participants have been noted. After two week period of time same procedure has been done on the same participants.

Data collection began in the Arts, Commerce and science classes in August, 2013. The researcher used a purposive design which led them to classes of students where the ratio of male to female students was approximately equitable. With respect to the present work, after obtaining the permission of the concerned authority of the college, the researcher entered the selected classrooms; the researcher briefed the class about the significance of the work and then the questionnaires were handed to the students of the classes to be filled in. Randomization was not used in order to be inclusive of all the students in the class. The researcher remained in the room at all times for the proper filling in of the questionnaires. The implied consent was read out loud as the students followed along. The students were then told that they could begin the filling in of the questionnaire of the survey, and asked if they had any questions. The duration of each student’s participation was approximately 30-45 minutes. The study was turned in by each student as they completed it.
3.9 Data Analysis

The data from the questionnaire was analyzed by entering it into a statistical analysis program. SPSS 20 Version was used for data analysis. To examine the first Objective, the relationships between parenting style, career decision self-efficacy and career maturity of college students, correlations were computed.

Objectives second and third examined the role of parenting styles on career decision self-efficacy, and the role of parenting styles on career maturity, simultaneous multiple regression analyses were deemed appropriate.

An independent t-test and ANOVA was carried out to look at the rest of the three objectives. More specifically, a one-way Analysis of variance (ANOVA) has been performed to elicit differences between parenting style, career decision self efficacy and career maturity of the students as a function of their Educational Streams. Lastly, to investigate the differences in parenting styles, career decision self efficacy and career maturity of the students as a function of their Gender and Residence were analyzed by using an independent t-test.