

## VOCATIONAL CHOICES OF ADOLESCENTS IN RELATION TO THEIR SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Dr. R.K. Yadav\* & Neelam Garg\*\*

### ABSTRACT

*The study has been done on a sample of 240 eleventh class students of Rewari district. Thurstone's Vocational Interest Schedule and Dr. S.P. Kulshrestha's Socio-Economic Status Scale have been used for data collection. The executive and physical sciences related jobs have been given highest preference by the students whereas the jobs related to artistic and music fields have been given least preference. The socio economic status of the students influences their vocational choices to a great extent.*

### INTRODUCTION

One manifest impact of democracy in India is the explosion in the aspirations of people. Everyone fosters high ambitions. The vocational fields are also increasing day by day. Many studies have been carried out to explore the vocational choices of adolescents. Human motives for doing a work are numerous, such as needs, values, interests, temperament, self-concept and socio-economic status etc. All the studies have established that adolescents vocational preferences are not vague or random. Studies made by Terman and Miles (1976), Carter and Strong (1988), Yum (1992), Strong (1993), Kuder (1939), and Traxler and Mc Call (1972) are important. All agree that men tend to be more interested in physical activity, mechanical and scientific matters, politics and selling etc. Preference for art, music, literature, clerical work, teaching and social work is more characteristic of women. There is a good consistency in their preferences and it may be hoped that they would prefer these vocations if their preferences and it may be hoped that they would prefer these vocations if they have a choice to do so. Now the question arises: why do adolescents prefer one vocation rather than the other? What are the motives for preferring a vocation? How much socio-economic status acts as influencing variable for preferring different types of vocations?

### AIMS OF THE STUDY

#### MAIN AIM

To find out the extent to which socio-economic

status acts as influencer for the vocational preferences of adolescents.

### SUBSIDIARY AIMS

1. To find out the vocational preferences of adolescents.
2. To find out the hierarchy of vocational preferences of adolescents.
3. To find out the relationship between vocational preferences and socio-economic status

### HYPOTHESES

To conduct the study smoothly following null hypotheses were formed.

1. The students do not have realistic vocational choices.
2. There is no relationship between the vocational choices of students with their socio-economic status.

### PROCEDURE

#### METHOD

Descriptive Survey Method of research has been used.

### SAMPLE

240 students, studying in XI class in Rewari district of Haryana were selected for the present study. Out of it half belonged to rural areas. Eighty students belonged to each of the three faculties i.e. Science, Arts and Commerce.

### TOOLS

1. Thurstone's Vocational interest schedule.
2. Socio-economic status scale (Rural) by Dr. S.P. Kulshrestha.
3. Socio-economic status scale (Urban) by Dr. S.P. Kulshrestha.

\*Principal, Rao Abhay Singh College of Education, Saharanwas, Rewari (Haryana)

\*\*Research Scholar, Bhagwant University, Ajmer (Rajasthan)

After data collection available data were analysed. To make the analysis more meaningful following statistical techniques were used by the investigator.

1. Mean                      2. Standard Deviation.    3. Co-efficient of correlation

## RESULTS

Following tables present the results of the investigation.

**TABLE 1**  
**Showing the means and S.Ds and Areas of Preferences of total groups**

| S. No. | AREA OF PREFERENCE  | MEAN | RANK | S.D. |
|--------|---------------------|------|------|------|
| 1.     | Physical Sciences   | 6.48 | II   | 5.08 |
| 2.     | Biological Sciences | 6.39 | III  | 5.52 |
| 3.     | Computational Work  | 5.71 | IV   | 4.93 |
| 4.     | Business            | 4.96 | VIII | 4.97 |
| 5.     | Executive Work      | 7.30 | I    | 5.03 |
| 6.     | Persuasive Work     | 5.48 | VII  | 4.20 |
| 7.     | Linguistic Work     | 5.47 | V    | 4.43 |
| 8.     | Humanitarian Work   | 5.17 | VI   | 4.34 |
| 9.     | Artistic Work       | 3.91 | IX   | 3.49 |
| 10.    | Music               | 3.64 | X    | 3.80 |

**TABLE 2**  
**Showing the means and S.Ds of areas of Preferences of urban and rural students**

| S. No. | AREA OF PREFERENCE  | Rural Students |      | Urban Students |      |
|--------|---------------------|----------------|------|----------------|------|
|        |                     | MEAN           | S.D. | MEAN           | S.D. |
| 1.     | Physical Sciences   | 5.92           | 2.95 | 7.83           | 5.52 |
| 2.     | Biological Sciences | 5.02           | 5.72 | 7.39           | 5.60 |
| 3.     | Computational Work  | 5.62           | 4.76 | 5.80           | 5.10 |
| 4.     | Business            | 4.57           | 4.01 | 5.23           | 3.26 |
| 5.     | Executive Work      | 7.18           | 5.11 | 7.42           | 5.19 |
| 6.     | Persuasive Work     | 5.02           | 4.22 | 5.11           | 4.03 |
| 7.     | Linguistic Work     | 4.90           | 3.96 | 6.01           | 4.78 |
| 8.     | Humanitarian Work   | 4.49           | 4.32 | 5.00           | 4.06 |
| 9.     | Artistic Work       | 3.52           | 3.06 | 4.30           | 3.73 |
| 10.    | Music               | 2.80           | 3.33 | 4.12           | 4.02 |

**TABLE 3**  
**Showing Means and S.Ds of the scores of vocational preferences of the students of different groups statuswise**

| AREA |                     | High |      | Average |      | Low  |      |
|------|---------------------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|
|      |                     | Mean | S.D. | Mean    | S.D. | Mean | S.D. |
| 1    | Physical Sciences   | 6.64 | 4.6  | 6.79    | 5.19 | 7.03 | 5.1  |
| 2    | Biological Sciences | 5.74 | 5.17 | 6.49    | 5.69 | 6.04 | 5.3  |
| 3    | Computational Work  | 7.63 | 5.06 | 5.95    | 3.41 | 4.54 | 3.41 |
| 4    | Business            | 6.55 | 4.34 | 5.44    | 4.28 | 3.58 | 3.89 |
| 5    | Executive Work      | 8.62 | 4.91 | 7.75    | 5.06 | 6.01 | 5.11 |
| 6    | Persuasive Work     | 6.16 | 4.18 | 5.83    | 4.26 | 3.82 | 3.66 |
| 7    | Linguistic Work     | 6.10 | 4.55 | 5.83    | 4.38 | 5.33 | 4.37 |
| 8    | Humanitarian Work   | 5.65 | 4.06 | 6.4     | 3.92 | 4.27 | 4.22 |
| 9    | Artistic Work       | 4.45 | 3.59 | 4.15    | 3.43 | 3.28 | 3.67 |
| 10   | Music               | 4.00 | 3.97 | 3.64    | 3.51 | 2.92 | 3.99 |

**TABLE 4**  
**Showing the coefficients of correlation between the socio-economic status scores and the scores of vocational preferences of the students of different categories:-**

|    | area                | Urban | Rural  | High  | Average | Low   |
|----|---------------------|-------|--------|-------|---------|-------|
| 1  | Physical Sciences   | .04   | .17    | .08   | .25**   | .057  |
| 2  | Biological Sciences | .045  | .17    | .055  | .20*    | .053  |
| 3  | Computational Work  | .15   | .246** | -.084 | .06     | .278* |
| 4  | Business            | .18*  | .225*  | -.41* | .09     | .318* |
| 5  | Executive Work      | .136  | .21*   | -.095 | .053    | .199  |
| 6  | Persuasive Work     | .11   | .17    | -.26  | .21*    | .247* |
| 7  | Linguistic Work     | .06   | .135   | -.10  | .07     | .112  |
| 8  | Humanitarian Work   | .05   | .20*   | -.05  | .093    | .137  |
| 9  | Artistic Work       | .124  | .18*   | -.26  | .19*    | .051  |
| 10 | Music               | .066  | .124   | -.32  | .29**   | .192  |

### FINDINGS

1. The jobs related to the field of executive work were preferred by most of the students in the total sample.
2. Urban students have given their preferences for the jobs related to the field of physical sciences whereas rural students preferred the field of executive work.

3. Science students preferred the jobs related to physical and biological sciences, Arts students were interested in the field of executive work. The commerce students have given their preferences for the fields of computational and linguistic work.
4. Students belonging to higher socio-economic groups have given their preferences for the fields of executive work, computational work and physical sciences.
5. Students belonging to the average socio-economic status category have given greater preferences for the fields of executive work, physical science and biological sciences.
6. Students of the lower socio-economic status category have given greater preference for the jobs related to the fields of physical and biological sciences.
7. All the students have shown least interest in the areas of artistic work and music.
8. Urban (Science) students belonging to the average or low socio-economic status have preferred the jobs related to the area of biological and physical science.
9. Urban (Arts) students belonging to average or low socio-economic status have given their preference for the jobs related to the area of executive work.
10. Urban (Commerce) students belonging to average or low socio-economic status have given their preferences for the jobs related to the area of computational work.
11. Rural (Science) students belonging to the high, average and low categories have given their preferences for the area of physical sciences, biological sciences and executive work.
12. Rural (Arts) students belonging to the high and average categories have given their preferences for the area of executive work and the students belonging to the lower status have preferred the jobs related to the area of physical sciences.
13. Rural commerce students belonging to the high, average and low categories have shown their preferences for the jobs related to the area of computational work.
14. The urban students have given high preferences to business, executive work and computational work, executive work, business and artistic work.

## CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the findings discussed in the foregoing pages the following conclusions are drawn:

Executive work is preferred by most of the students. They do not seem to be interested in artistic and music fields.

The science students have opted the vocations pertaining to their courses of study. The students of arts faculty have given highest preference to executive work, while the computational work has been preferred most by commerce students.

Urban students have given preference for business while the rural students are interested in services.

The socio-economic status plays a great role in the selection of vocations. The students whose parents are rich like to go for business. The students having high socio-economic status also like to for the jobs related to the field of physical sciences.

The students having average socio-economic status have preferred have the jobs related to biological sciences, persuasive work and also to artistic work, to some extent. The students of low status do not seem to be influenced by their status so far as it relates to the business field.

## REFERENCES

- Alvi, S.V.; Khan, : A study of the validity of the S.B. Shankt N. Hussain, (1990) Holland Theory in a non western culture. Journal of the Vocational Behaviour, Vol. 63. PP 132-146"
- Best, John W (1996) : Research in Education VII edition. Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi.
- Cohen, D. (1971) : Differentiating motivation underlying vocational choice. The Journal of Educational Research 64 PP 229.234
- Croanbach, Lee J. (1970) : Essential of Psychological Testing. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York.
- Garret, Henry E;(1998) : Statistics in the psychology and Education. Longmans Green and Company, New York.
- Good carter ,V ;Barr, : The methodology of Educational A.S. and Scates, D.E.(1981) Research New York, Appleton Century Crafts, Inc.

- Kats and Festinger,(1996) : Research Method in the Behavioural Sciences, New York : Holt Rinehart Winston
- Khan, Mohd. Sharif(1990) : Educational Research, Ashish Publishing House, New Delhi
- Koul Lokesh (1998) : Methodology of Educational Research, Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Super, D.E. (1987) : Appraising Vocational Fitness Harper and Brothers, New York.
- Zytowski, D.G. (1968) : Vocational Behaviour: Readings in the theory and Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.