
The Role of Social Context in Influencing Career Decision Making in Generation Next

Shamsher Singh¹ and Anuvi Sharma²

¹ Banarsidas Chandiwalla Institute of Professional Studies, Dwarka, New Delhi

² M&B Footwear Pvt Ltd (Lee Cooper Shoes) Noida, Uttar Pradesh

The present study has tried to explore influence of social context in carrier decision making of generation next. The primary objective was to find the role played by various social context such as family, teachers, friends and media in the career decision making of generation next. The study has primarily focused on the young generation in the urban area of Delhi, capital city of India. The study has adopted the descriptive survey design. The questionnaire was the main research instrument used for the study. Primary data was collected from 106 respondents through simple random sampling method. The population for the study were the students either pursuing graduation or post graduation study or completed their education. The data has been tested for reliability. The results of this study support that the close social context is one of the key influencing factor for career decision making. It found that parents, family members, sibling and relatives do influence the career desionmaking. Similarly the professionals whom the individuals admire and career advisors, strongly influence the career decision making of the generation next. No other category of the influencers has any influence in career decision making. The study has brought the social context that influences the mind of the young generation while they are in the process of career decisions making

Keyword : Social context , Influence, career decision making, generation next.

INTRODUCTION

Generation -Next are those born between 1980 and 1992, these are between 20-30 years of age and comprise about 17 percent of the world's population. They are quite different in their values and characteristics from their parent's generation. Most of them, being single children, are used to dealing head-on with figures of authorities and are inclined to establish a familial attitude with their friendship groups. They have a strong trust in their social network and are a peer-oriented population. A large number of them have computers and mobile phones from their teens and spend a considerable amount of time messaging, chatting, watching videos and visiting social networking sites. They are tech-savvy population and have grown up using the Internet and its applications for communication, entertainment, social networking, shopping, information, reviews, and news and so on.

Generation next has grown up using two crucial elements in their daily lives – mobile and social media. While the Internet has become an integral part of their lives, one of the most remarkable phenomenon over the past few years has been the growth of the mobile and wireless market. This growth in technology has made mobile banking possible through SMS or Mobile Internet, which is commonly used to check account balances and account transactions.

About two-third of the global Internet population visits social networks, Face book has more than 400

million active users. World-wide, Face book saw 69 percent growth in the number of users in May 2010 as compared to May 2009. The U.S. still has more Face book users, 115 million, than any other country. Over the past year, Latin America and Europe saw the strongest growth rates in users, with the number of visitors in those regions growing by 102 percent and 74 percent respectively. Face book went from being non-existent to number one in most European countries in the past few years.

Making career decisions is a lifelong process. It is all about exploring and experiencing the world of work. It is also about understanding abilities, interests, skills, and values and combining these to create a meaningful framework for life. Making a career decision, or any decision for that matter, can be very easy or very difficult depending on the amount of information an individual have about the choices available. Career decision-making begins with an awareness of the world around you and the ability to understand what is personally important. The following checklist may help student in beginning:

- Learn about yourself: interests, abilities, skills, and values.
- Observe individuals in the workplace.
- Talk with family and friends about their work experiences.
- Collect information about specific careers and companies.
- Experience different careers through volunteer or part-time work, or school internship, co-op, and apprenticeship programs.
- Consider your personal short-term and long-term goals

The next section is devoted to the literature review. This is followed by objective & hypothesis, methodology and result and discussion section respectively. The paper ends with conclusion.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Career decision-making is influenced by numbers of influences that may be related to education, training, jobs and careers and retirement. While contextual influences such as the family, peers, the labour market are acknowledged, they have infrequently been the focus of sustained investigation in relation to career decision-making (Patton & McMahon, 1999). A number of researcher has found that the career decision process is a rational one (e.g. Dawis & Lofquist, 1984; Dawis, Lofquist & Lloyd, 1976; Dawis, Lofquist, & Weiss, 1968; Holland, 1959, 1992;

Scott, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1960). Social learning and social cognitive approaches to career decision-making also emphasise that learning experiences shape people's vocational interests, values and choices (e.g. Krumboltz, 1979; Krumboltz & Nichols, 1990; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1996).

Vocational decision-making does not occur in a vacuum, and social cognitive variables such as self-efficacy do not operate independently of their social and physical context. However, the manner in which 'context' has been considered in the research is somewhat limited. For instance Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994, 1996) have characterised the environment as: predispositions gender, race, disability, and status. The opportunities for skill development, cultural and gender-role socialization processes, emotional and financial support for selecting a particular option, job availability in one's preferred field and socio-cultural barriers also influence the career decision making. Other researchers such as Rounds and Hesketh (1994) list variables such as gender, prestige, equal employment opportunity (EEO), climate, type of contract and type of career path as 'environmental' variables in their Interactional model of vocational behaviour. Szymanski and Hershenson (1998) reviewed a wide range of career development

The Role of Social Context in Influencing Career Decision Making in Generation Next

theoretical approaches and then classified constructs into five types: individual; contextual; mediating; environment; and outcome. Patton and McMahon's (1997, 1999) systems theory framework draws attention not only to the individual as a system but also to the social context and broader environmental/societal context as larger systems in which the person develops and makes career decisions. Along with a range of other writers (Collins, 1990; Leong, 1996; Sears, 1982; Vondracek, Lerner, & Schulenberg, 1986), they point to the range and complexity of the influences of human career decision-making and development, and the need to consider a much broader range of variables across various disciplines.

There are a number of research studies conducted by scholars on careers decision making and the role of different influences. Some of the studies have been given here. The study of Andreas Hirschi (2010), University of Lueneburg investigated that chance events are considered important in career development, yet little empirical research is available on their predictors and consequences. The results showed that the majority of both groups reported a significant influence of chance events on their transition from compulsory school to vocational education or high school. In another study undertaken by Ladislav Valach, Richard A. Young (2009), found that there are several issues that contribute to the contextual action theory of career and counseling. This theory is based on the notion that career is constructed through the intentional goal-directed actions of persons and that counseling is a process that involves both action and career.

The study undertaken by Siriwan Ghuangpeng (2010), investigated what factors appear to drive the career decision-making of Thai and Australian tourism and hospitality students. The study identified several factors that were perceived to influence the career decision making process of Thai and Australian students. These factors appeared to

be interrelated and could have a positive or negative impact on students' decision to seek a career in the industry. The study also highlighted the important implications of culture for career decision-making and suggested that although Thai and Australian students identified similar factors as influencing their career decision-making, they perceived the importance of these factors differently. The study concluded that career decision-making is a complicated process. Although this study provided a structured model to demonstrate how students make their career decision, it is essential to recognise the complex range of factors associated with students' decisions. The study undertaken by Peter McIlveen and Wendy Patton (2006), found that the science and professional practices of vocational psychology and career development are important factor in career decision making.

OBJECTIVE AND HYPOTHESIS

The objective of the study is to find the role of various social context such as family members, teachers, friends and media etc in the career decision making of generation next. The following hypothesis have been formulated for the study.

H0₁- Age of the social context doesn't have significant influence in career decision making.

H0₂- Gender of the social context doesn't have significant influence in career decision making.

H0₃- Qualification of the social context doesn't have significant influence in career decision making.

H0₄- Qualification of the mother doesn't have significant influence in career decision making.

H0₅- Qualification of father doesn't have significant influence in career decision making.

H0₆- Annual family income of social context doesn't have a significant influence in career decision making.

METHODOLOGY

The present study is a descriptive type of research study. The study aims to determine the role of social context in influencing career decision making in generation next. In order to conduct this study, young students who either have completed their study or are pursuing study in Delhi have been surveyed using simple random sampling method. This was in line with our objective to find who influence the young mind in their career decision making. The study has been carried out during March to August 2015. The structured questionnaire was used as the instrument for data collection.

Research Limitation: The study has focused on the students either pursuing graduation or post graduation study in urban area only and hence cannot be generalized for whole student population. This may be overcome by further studies in different area such as semi urban and rural area.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Demographic Analysis : There is equal representation of male and female students in the survey. This was done to ensure that sample was representative of both the genders and is not biased towards any one gender. 33% respondents were between 18-20 years age and remaining were above 20 years of age. Majority of respondents (65%) were pursuing graduation study and remaining were pursuing post graduate study. This is the ideal sample for our study where the majority of graduation class requires career advice.

The qualification of respondent's mother profile indicates that 51.9% of the respondents are graduates followed by 25.5% and 22.6% being senior secondary and post graduates respectively. The qualification of respondent's father profile indicates that 53.8% of the respondents are graduates followed by 36.8% and 9.4% being post graduates and senior secondary respectively. Therefore, it is the right profile of parents who can guide their ward towards better career decision making.

Reliability Test: The research instrument has been tested for reliability. The Cronbach alpha value is 0.729. Cronbach's alpha score is greater than the Nunnally's (1978) generally accepted score of 0.7. At .0729 it indicates good internal consistency. Therefore, it indicates that our data is reliable for analysis. In order to find the influence of social context and test hypothesis ANOVA and frequency analysis have been employed.

ANOVA - Analysis of variance is a general method for studying sampled-data relationships. The method enables the difference between two or more sample means to be analysed, achieved by subdividing the total sum of squares. The purpose is to test for significant differences between class means, and this is done by analysing the variances.

Computation of ANOVA on the basis of age indicates that in case of majority of influencers the significance value is greater than 0.05 so we accept H01, and conclude that majority of influencers does not have the significant influence on the respondents however in case of industrialist the significance value is less than 0.05 which indicates that the industrialist does have significant influence on the career decision making process of students.

Computation of ANOVA on the basis of gender indicates that in case of majority of influencers the significance value is greater than 0.05 so we accept H02, and conclude that majority of influencers does not have the significant influence on the respondents however in case of celebrities the significance value is less than 0.05 which indicates that the celebrities does have significant influence on the career decision making process of students.

Computation of ANOVA on the basis of educational qualification show that in case of majority of influencers the significance value is greater than 0.05 so we accept H03, and conclude that majority of influencers does not have the significant influence on the respondents

**The Role of Social Context in Influencing
Career Decision Making in Generation Next**

Table 1: Computation of ANOVA on the basis of age

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Internet	Between Groups	.351	1	.351	.297	.587
	Within Groups	123.008	104	1.183		
	Total	123.358	105			
Films	Between Groups	.005	1	.005	.006	.941
	Within Groups	96.759	104	.930		
	Total	96.764	105			
TV	Between Groups	2.913	1	2.913	2.556	.113
	Within Groups	118.521	104	1.140		
	Total	121.434	105			
Media	Between Groups	.875	1	.875	.836	.363
	Within Groups	108.861	104	1.047		
	Total	109.736	105			
Politicians	Between Groups	.169	1	.169	.139	.710
	Within Groups	126.746	104	1.219		
	Total	126.915	105			
Sports Icons	Between Groups	.110	1	.110	.102	.750
	Within Groups	112.117	104	1.078		
	Total	112.226	105			
Celebrities	Between Groups	.580	1	.580	.368	.545
	Within Groups	163.957	104	1.577		
	Total	164.538	105			
University Lecturer	Between Groups	.220	1	.220	.132	.717
	Within Groups	173.374	104	1.667		
	Total	173.594	105			
Favourite Teacher	Between Groups	1.030	1	1.030	.900	.345
	Within Groups	119.092	104	1.145		
	Total	120.123	105			
Friends	Between Groups	.399	1	.399	.344	.559
	Within Groups	120.545	104	1.159		
	Total	120.943	105			

**The Role of Social Context in Influencing
Career Decision Making in Generation Next**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.992
	Within Groups	106.877	104	1.028		
	Total	106.877	105			
Relatives	Between Groups	.085	1	.085	.071	.791
	Within Groups	125.537	104	1.207		
	Total	125.623	105			
Siblings	Between Groups	.052	1	.052	.038	.846
	Within Groups	142.674	104	1.372		
	Total	142.726	105			
Career Advisors	Between Groups	.748	1	.748	.664	.417
	Within Groups	117.289	104	1.128		
	Total	118.038	105			
Social Networking Sites	Between Groups	.119	1	.119	.087	.769
	Within Groups	142.872	104	1.374		
	Total	142.991	105			
Radio	Between Groups	.281	1	.281	.270	.604
	Within Groups	108.059	104	1.039		
	Total	108.340	105			
Industrialist	Between Groups	6.269	1	6.269	5.416	.022
	Within Groups	120.382	104	1.158		
	Total	126.651	105			
Parents	Between Groups	.084	1	.084	.100	.753
	Within Groups	87.925	104	.845		
	Total	88.009	105			
Rich People	Between Groups	.030	1	.030	.026	.871
	Within Groups	118.432	104	1.139		
	Total	118.462	105			
Professional	Between Groups	.105	1	.105	.136	.713
	Within Groups	80.235	104	.771		
	Total	80.340	105			

**The Role of Social Context in Influencing
Career Decision Making in Generation Next**

Table 2: Computation of ANOVA on the basis of gender

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Internet	Between Groups	2.415	1	2.415	2.077	.153
	Within Groups	120.943	104	1.163		
	Total	123.358	105			
Films	Between Groups	.764	1	.764	.828	.365
	Within Groups	96.000	104	.923		
	Total	96.764	105			
TV	Between Groups	.943	1	.943	.814	.369
	Within Groups	120.491	104	1.159		
	Total	121.434	105			
Media	Between Groups	.151	1	.151	.143	.706
	Within Groups	109.585	104	1.054		
	Total	109.736	105			
Politicians	Between Groups	2.726	1	2.726	2.283	.134
	Within Groups	124.189	104	1.194		
	Total	126.915	105			
Sports Icons	Between Groups	.943	1	.943	.882	.350
	Within Groups	111.283	104	1.070		
	Total	112.226	105			
Celebrities	Between Groups	7.934	1	7.934	5.269	.024
	Within Groups	156.604	104	1.506		
	Total	164.538	105			
University Lecturer	Between Groups	.236	1	.236	.141	.708
	Within Groups	173.358	104	1.667		
	Total	173.594	105			
Favourite Teacher	Between Groups	.009	1	.009	.008	.928
	Within Groups	120.113	104	1.155		
	Total	120.123	105			
Friends	Between Groups	.943	1	.943	.818	.368
	Within Groups	120.000	104	1.154		
	Total	120.943	105			

**The Role of Social Context in Influencing
Career Decision Making in Generation Next**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family	Between Groups	1.142	1	1.142	1.123	.292
	Within Groups	105.736	104	1.017		
	Total	106.877	105			
Relatives	Between Groups	.340	1	.340	.282	.597
	Within Groups	125.283	104	1.205		
	Total	125.623	105			
Siblings	Between Groups	2.726	1	2.726	2.025	.158
	Within Groups	140.000	104	1.346		
	Total	142.726	105			
Career Advisors	Between Groups	.038	1	.038	.033	.856
	Within Groups	118.000	104	1.135		
	Total	118.038	105			
Social Networking Sites	Between Groups	2.726	1	2.726	2.022	.158
	Within Groups	140.264	104	1.349		
	Total	142.991	105			
Radio	Between Groups	2.415	1	2.415	2.371	.127
	Within Groups	105.925	104	1.019		
	Total	108.340	105			
Industrialist	Between Groups	.085	1	.085	.070	.792
	Within Groups	126.566	104	1.217		
	Total	126.651	105			
Parents	Between Groups	.085	1	.085	.100	.752
	Within Groups	87.925	104	.845		
	Total	88.009	105			
Rich People	Between Groups	1.142	1	1.142	1.012	.317
	Within Groups	117.321	104	1.128		
	Total	118.462	105			
Professional	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	1.000
	Within Groups	80.340	104	.772		
	Total	80.340	105			

**The Role of Social Context in Influencing
Career Decision Making in Generation Next**

Table 3: Computation of ANOVA on the basis of educational qualification

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Internet	Between Groups	.959	2	.479	.403	.669
	Within Groups	122.400	103	1.188		
	Total	123.358	105			
Films	Between Groups	2.353	2	1.177	1.284	.281
	Within Groups	94.411	103	.917		
	Total	96.764	105			
Tv	Between Groups	4.325	2	2.163	1.902	.154
	Within Groups	117.109	103	1.137		
	Total	121.434	105			
Media	Between Groups	.137	2	.069	.064	.938
	Within Groups	109.599	103	1.064		
	Total	109.736	105			
Politicians	Between Groups	.002	2	.001	.001	.999
	Within Groups	126.913	103	1.232		
	Total	126.915	105			
Sports Icons	Between Groups	.673	2	.337	.311	.733
	Within Groups	111.553	103	1.083		
	Total	112.226	105			
Celebrities	Between Groups	.080	2	.040	.025	.975
	Within Groups	164.457	103	1.597		
	Total	164.538	105			
University Lecturer	Between Groups	.233	2	.117	.069	.933
	Within Groups	173.361	103	1.683		
	Total	173.594	105			
Favourite Teacher	Between Groups	.905	2	.453	.391	.677
	Within Groups	119.217	103	1.157		
	Total	120.123	105			
Friends	Between Groups	.858	2	.429	.368	.693
	Within Groups	120.085	103	1.166		
	Total	120.943	105			

**The Role of Social Context in Influencing
Career Decision Making in Generation Next**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family	Between Groups	.604	2	.302	.293	.747
	Within Groups	106.273	103	1.032		
	Total	106.877	105			
Relatives	Between Groups	5.510	2	2.755	2.362	.099
	Within Groups	120.113	103	1.166		
	Total	125.623	105			
Siblings	Between Groups	1.931	2	.966	.706	.496
	Within Groups	140.795	103	1.367		
	Total	142.726	105			
Career Advisors	Between Groups	.109	2	.055	.048	.953
	Within Groups	117.928	103	1.145		
	Total	118.038	105			
Social Networking Sites	Between Groups	.556	2	.278	.201	.818
	Within Groups	142.435	103	1.383		
	Total	142.991	105			
Radio	Between Groups	1.065	2	.533	.511	.601
	Within Groups	107.274	103	1.041		
	Total	108.340	105			
Industrialist	Between Groups	11.138	2	5.569	4.966	.009
	Within Groups	115.513	103	1.121		
	Total	126.651	105			
Parents	Between Groups	.289	2	.144	.170	.844
	Within Groups	87.721	103	.852		
	Total	88.009	105			
Rich People	Between Groups	6.551	2	3.275	3.014	.053
	Within Groups	111.912	103	1.087		
	Total	118.462	105			
Professional	Between Groups	.669	2	.335	.433	.650
	Within Groups	79.670	103	.773		
	Total	80.340	105			

**The Role of Social Context in Influencing
Career Decision Making in Generation Next**

Table 4: Computation of ANOVA on the basis of qualification of mother

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Internet	Between Groups	5.112	2	2.556	2.226	.113
	Within Groups	118.247	103	1.148		
	Total	123.358	105			
Films	Between Groups	2.541	2	1.270	1.389	.254
	Within Groups	94.224	103	.915		
	Total	96.764	105			
TV	Between Groups	2.410	2	1.205	1.043	.356
	Within Groups	119.024	103	1.156		
	Total	121.434	105			
Media	Between Groups	.180	2	.090	.085	.919
	Within Groups	109.556	103	1.064		
	Total	109.736	105			
Politicians	Between Groups	.787	2	.394	.321	.726
	Within Groups	126.128	103	1.225		
	Total	126.915	105			
Sports Icons	Between Groups	1.251	2	.626	.581	.561
	Within Groups	110.975	103	1.077		
	Total	112.226	105			
Celebrities	Between Groups	3.743	2	1.872	1.199	.306
	Within Groups	160.795	103	1.561		
	Total	164.538	105			
University Lecturer	Between Groups	10.905	2	5.453	3.452	.035
	Within Groups	162.689	103	1.580		
	Total	173.594	105			
Favourite Teacher	Between Groups	1.789	2	.895	.779	.462
	Within Groups	118.333	103	1.149		
	Total	120.123	105			
Friends	Between Groups	.834	2	.417	.358	.700
	Within Groups	120.109	103	1.166		
	Total	120.943	105			

**The Role of Social Context in Influencing
Career Decision Making in Generation Next**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family	Between Groups	.944	2	.472	.459	.633
	Within Groups	105.933	103	1.028		
	Total	106.877	105			
Relatives	Between Groups	3.384	2	1.692	1.426	.245
	Within Groups	122.239	103	1.187		
	Total	125.623	105			
Siblings	Between Groups	5.184	2	2.592	1.941	.149
	Within Groups	137.542	103	1.335		
	Total	142.726	105			
Career Advisors	Between Groups	5.477	2	2.739	2.506	.087
	Within Groups	112.561	103	1.093		
	Total	118.038	105			
Social Networking Sites	Between Groups	3.865	2	1.933	1.431	.244
	Within Groups	139.125	103	1.351		
	Total	142.991	105			
Radio	Between Groups	2.691	2	1.346	1.312	.274
	Within Groups	105.649	103	1.026		
	Total	108.340	105			
Industrialist	Between Groups	1.871	2	.936	.772	.465
	Within Groups	124.780	103	1.211		
	Total	126.651	105			
Parents	Between Groups	.082	2	.041	.048	.953
	Within Groups	87.927	103	.854		
	Total	88.009	105			
Rich People	Between Groups	1.189	2	.594	.522	.595
	Within Groups	117.273	103	1.139		
	Total	118.462	105			
Professional	Between Groups	.839	2	.420	.544	.582
	Within Groups	79.500	103	.772		
	Total	80.340	105			

**The Role of Social Context in Influencing
Career Decision Making in Generation Next**

Table 5: Computation of ANOVA on the basis of qualification of father

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Internet	Between Groups	3.259	2	1.630	1.398	.252
	Within Groups	120.099	103	1.166		
	Total	123.358	105			
Films	Between Groups	1.090	2	.545	.586	.558
	Within Groups	95.675	103	.929		
	Total	96.764	105			
Tv	Between Groups	3.283	2	1.641	1.431	.244
	Within Groups	118.151	103	1.147		
	Total	121.434	105			
Media	Between Groups	5.187	2	2.593	2.555	.083
	Within Groups	104.549	103	1.015		
	Total	109.736	105			
Politicians	Between Groups	1.516	2	.758	.623	.539
	Within Groups	125.399	103	1.217		
	Total	126.915	105			
Sports Icons	Between Groups	2.381	2	1.190	1.116	.331
	Within Groups	109.846	103	1.066		
	Total	112.226	105			
Celebrities	Between Groups	8.621	2	4.311	2.848	.063
	Within Groups	155.916	103	1.514		
	Total	164.538	105			
University Lecturer	Between Groups	8.031	2	4.016	2.498	.087
	Within Groups	165.563	103	1.607		
	Total	173.594	105			
Favourite Teacher	Between Groups	1.783	2	.891	.776	.463
	Within Groups	118.340	103	1.149		
	Total	120.123	105			
Friends	Between Groups	3.001	2	1.500	1.310	.274
	Within Groups	117.943	103	1.145		
	Total	120.943	105			

**The Role of Social Context in Influencing
Career Decision Making in Generation Next**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family	Between Groups	2.470	2	1.235	1.218	.300
	Within Groups	104.408	103	1.014		
	Total	106.877	105			
Relatives	Between Groups	.997	2	.499	.412	.663
	Within Groups	124.626	103	1.210		
	Total	125.623	105			
Siblings	Between Groups	1.573	2	.786	.574	.565
	Within Groups	141.154	103	1.370		
	Total	142.726	105			
Career Advisors	Between Groups	.061	2	.031	.027	.974
	Within Groups	117.976	103	1.145		
	Total	118.038	105			
Social Networking Sites	Between Groups	7.762	2	3.881	2.956	.056
	Within Groups	135.228	103	1.313		
	Total	142.991	105			
Radio	Between Groups	1.115	2	.557	.535	.587
	Within Groups	107.225	103	1.041		
	Total	108.340	105			
Industrialist	Between Groups	1.681	2	.841	.693	.502
	Within Groups	124.970	103	1.213		
	Total	126.651	105			
Parents	Between Groups	.864	2	.432	.510	.602
	Within Groups	87.146	103	.846		
	Total	88.009	105			
Rich People	Between Groups	.475	2	.238	.207	.813
	Within Groups	117.987	103	1.146		
	Total	118.462	105			
Professional	Between Groups	2.086	2	1.043	1.373	.258
	Within Groups	78.254	103	.760		
	Total	80.340	105			

**The Role of Social Context in Influencing
Career Decision Making in Generation Next**

Table 6: Computation of ANOVA on the basis of annual family income

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Internet	Between Groups	3.207	3	1.069	.907	.440
	Within Groups	120.152	102	1.178		
	Total	123.358	105			
Films	Between Groups	.575	3	.192	.203	.894
	Within Groups	96.189	102	.943		
	Total	96.764	105			
TV	Between Groups	2.945	3	.982	.845	.472
	Within Groups	118.489	102	1.162		
	Total	121.434	105			
Media	Between Groups	2.412	3	.804	.764	.517
	Within Groups	107.323	102	1.052		
	Total	109.736	105			
Politicians	Between Groups	3.373	3	1.124	.928	.430
	Within Groups	123.542	102	1.211		
	Total	126.915	105			
Sports Icons	Between Groups	1.768	3	.589	.544	.653
	Within Groups	110.458	102	1.083		
	Total	112.226	105			
Celebrities	Between Groups	6.349	3	2.116	1.365	.258
	Within Groups	158.189	102	1.551		
	Total	164.538	105			
University Lecturer	Between Groups	1.291	3	.430	.255	.858
	Within Groups	172.303	102	1.689		
	Total	173.594	105			
Favourite Teacher	Between Groups	.883	3	.294	.252	.860
	Within Groups	119.240	102	1.169		
	Total	120.123	105			
Friends	Between Groups	1.915	3	.638	.547	.651
	Within Groups	119.028	102	1.167		
	Total	120.943	105			

**The Role of Social Context in Influencing
Career Decision Making in Generation Next**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Family	Between Groups	3.894	3	1.298	1.286	.283
	Within Groups	102.983	102	1.010		
	Total	106.877	105			
Relatives	Between Groups	4.010	3	1.337	1.121	.344
	Within Groups	121.612	102	1.192		
	Total	125.623	105			
Siblings	Between Groups	1.781	3	.594	.430	.732
	Within Groups	140.946	102	1.382		
	Total	142.726	105			
Career Advisors	Between Groups	5.000	3	1.667	1.504	.218
	Within Groups	113.038	102	1.108		
	Total	118.038	105			
Social Networking Sites	Between Groups	5.708	3	1.903	1.414	.243
	Within Groups	137.283	102	1.346		
	Total	142.991	105			
Radio	Between Groups	.780	3	.260	.247	.864
	Within Groups	107.559	102	1.055		
	Total	108.340	105			
Industrialists	Between Groups	1.091	3	.364	.295	.829
	Within Groups	125.560	102	1.231		
	Total	126.651	105			
Parents	Between Groups	1.770	3	.590	.698	.556
	Within Groups	86.240	102	.845		
	Total	88.009	105			
Rich People	Between Groups	.277	3	.092	.080	.971
	Within Groups	118.186	102	1.159		
	Total	118.462	105			
Professionals	Between Groups	1.755	3	.585	.759	.520
	Within Groups	78.585	102	.770		
	Total	80.340	105			

The Role of Social Context in Influencing Career Decision Making in Generation Next

Computation of ANOVA on the basis of educational qualification of mother show that in case of majority of influencers the significance value is greater than 0.05 so we accept H04, and conclude that majority of influencers does not have the significant influence on the respondents.

However in case of University Lecturer the significance value is lower than 0.05 which indicate that they have significant influence in the career decision making of generation next.

Computation of ANOVA on the basis of educational qualification of father show that in case of majority of influencers the significance value is greater than 0.05 so we accept H05, and conclude that majority of influencers does not have the significant influence on the respondents. However in case of social networking site the significance value is 0.053 which indicate that social networking site does have significant influence in the career decision making of generation next.

Computation of ANOVA on the basis of annual family income show that in case of majority of influencers the significance value is greater than 0.05 so we accept H06, and conclude that family income does not have the significant influence on the respondents.

Frequency analysis

It was found that the close social context is one of the most influencer for career decision making. It is evident from the result as parents (84% agreement) family (76.4% agreement only 7.6 disagreement) sibling(47.2 % agreement), relative (44.3% agreement). Similarly the professionals whom the individual admire strongly influence career decision making as 86.8% of the respondents' agree where as only 5.6% disagree to this statement. Also the career advisors influence career decision making as there is 60.4% agreement and 18% disagreement. The same cannot be said about the friend as the opinion is

almost divided equally with 30.5% agreement and 31.2% disagreement. Similar is with the social networking sites as there is 36.8% agreement and 35.9% disagreement to this statement.

The result indicates that majority of respondent (51%) agree that internet does influences in career decision making where is 73.6% respondents agree that films does not influence in Career Decision Making. It was found that only 23.6% of the respondents' agree whereas and 38.7% disagree that TV influences career decision making. We found that print media does influences in career decision making as 62.2% of the respondents' agreed with the statement and only 16.1% disagree to this statement .Also the radio does not influences career decision making as indicated by 19.8% of the respondents' agreement and 37.7% disagreement to this statement.

The politicians doesn't influence career decision making as 78.3% of the respondents' agree and only 11.3% disagree to this statement similarly it was found that sports icons don't influence in career decision making as 68% of the respondents' agree and 10.4% disagree to this statement.

It was found that the favourite teacher (60.4% agreement, 15% disagreement), does influence career decision making where as not all university lecturer influence the career decision making (38.6 % agreement 37.8% disagreement). However the opinion is somewhat similar in case of celebrities as well (38.6 % agreement 37.8% disagreement). When we take the case of industrialist and rich people it was found that they do not influence the career decision making. It is indicated with 45.3% and 51% agreement and 22.7% and 17% disagreement respectively.

CONCLUSION

The result of ANOVA supports that celebrities, university lecturer , and social networking sites have

The Role of Social Context in Influencing Career Decision Making in Generation Next

significant influence on the career decision making whereas no other influences has strong influence on the career decision making.

The results of this study provide support that the close social context is one of the most influencer for career decision making. It is found parents, family members, sibling and relative does influence the career desionmaking. Similarly the professionals whom the individual admire as well as career advisors, strongly influence career decision making. However same cannot be said about the friends, celebrities and social networking sites as the opinion is almost divided equally with respondents. These finding supports the findings of the previous studies (e.g.Krumboltz,1979;Patton & McMahon, 1999; Pryor & Bright, 2003 ; Fisher and Stafford 1999).

REFERENCES

- Collins, A. (1990). Mid-life career change research. In R. A. Young & W. A. Borgen(Eds.), *Methodological approaches to the study of career* (pp. 197–220). New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.
- Dawis, R. V., & Lofquist, L. H. (1984). *A psychological theory of work adjustment: An individual differences model and its applications*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dawis, R. V., Lofquist, L. H., & Lloyd, H. (1976). Personality style and the process of work adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, Vol. 23, pp.55–59.
- Dawis, R. V., Lofquist, L. H., & Weiss, D. J. (1968). *A theory of work adjustment (A revision)*. Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation No. XXIII. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Fisher, T. A., & Stafford, M. E. (1999). Reliability and validity of the career influence inventory: A pilot study. *Journal of Career Assessment*, Vol. 7, pp.187–202
- Hirschi, Andreas (2010), 'The role of chance events in the School-to-work Transition: the influence of demographic, personality and career development variables', *Fortune Journal of Management*, Vol. 6, pp 12-17.
- Holland, J. L. (1959). A theory of vocational choice. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, Vol. 6, pp.35–45.
- Holland, J. L. (1992). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (3rd ed.). Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources
- Ladislav Valach, Richard A. Young (2009), *Some Cornerstones in the Development of a Contextual Action Theory of Career and Counselling*, Springer Publication
- Krumboltz, J. D. (1979). A social learning theory of career choice. In A. M. Mitchell, G. B.,
- Jones, & J. D. Krumboltz (Eds.), *Social learning theory and career decisionmaking* (pp. 19–49). Cranston, RI: Carroll Press.
- Krumboltz, J. D., & Nichols, C. W. (1990). Integrating the social learning theory of career decision making. In W. B. Walsh & S. H. Osipow (Eds.), *Career counseling: Contemporary topics in vocational psychology* (pp. 159–192). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Towards a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 45, pp.79–122.
- Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1996). Career development from a social cognitive perspective. In D. Brown, L. Books & Associates (Eds.), *Career choice and development* (3rd ed., pp. 373–422). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Leong, F. (1996). Challenges to career counseling. In M. L. Savickas & W. B. Walsh (Eds.), *Handbook of career counseling theory and practice* (pp. 333–346). Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Patton, W., & McMahon, M. (1999). *Career development and systems theory: A new relationship*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- McIlveen, Peter and Patton, Wendy (2006) *A Critical Reflection on Career Development*. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Guidance* Vol.6, No.1, :pp. 15-27.
- Pryor, R. G. L., & Bright, J. E. H. (2003). Order and chaos: A twenty-first century formulation of careers. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 55, No 2, pp.121–128.
- Rounds, J., & Hesketh, B. (1994). The theory of work adjustment: Unifying principles. In M. L. Savickas & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Convergence in career development theories: Implications for science and practice* (pp. 177–186). Palo Alto, CA: Consultin Psychologists Press.
- Sears, S. (1982). A definition of career guidance terms: A national vocational guidance association perspective. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, Vol. 31, pp. 137–143.
- Scott, T. B., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1960). *A definition of work adjustment*. Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation. No. X. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota
- Siriwan Ghuangpeng, (2010), 'Factors Influencing Career Decision-Making: A Comparative Study of Thai and Australian Tourism and Hospitality Students'. accssed at http://vuir.vu.edu.au/19360/1/Siriwan_Ghuangpeng.pdf
- Szymanski, E. M., & Hershenson, D. B. (1998). *Career*

The Role of Social Context in Influencing Career Decision Making in Generation Next

development of people with disabilities: An ecological model. In R. M. Parker & E. M. Szymanski (Eds.), *Rehabilitation counseling: Basics and beyond* (3rd ed., pp. 327–378). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Vondracek, F., Lerner, R., & Schulenberg, J. (1986). *Career development: A life-span developmental approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

BRIEF PROFILE OF THE AUTHORS

Shamsher Singh, PhD., is Associate Professor in Marketing and International Business Area at Banarsidas Chandiwalla Institute of Professional Studies, New Delhi India. He has done Ph.D. on “Study of Effectiveness of Customer Relationship Management in Indian Banking Sector with special reference to NCR Delhi.” from the Department of Management Studies, Jamia Hamdard University Delhi, India. He did MBA from Department of Management Studies, University of Pune, India. He has about 20 years of corporate experience and more than fourteen years of teaching experience. His research papers have been published in reputed journals like *International Journal of Financial Services Management*, UK, *Indian*

Journal of Marketing, *Asia Pacific Business Review*, *Amity Business Review*; *International Research Journal of Business and Management*, UK; *Anveshak International Journal of Management*, *European Journal of Commerce and Management Research*, UK, *International Journal of Management Prudence*, *International Journal of Management Science Review*, *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *NICE Journal of Business*, *Effulgence and Management Edge* among others. He has done research work in Customer Relationship Management in Indian Banking sector. His research interests are in the area of consumer behavior, service quality, customer relationship management, service marketing internet & mobile banking, technology application in services and social media marketing.

Ms Anuvi Sharma is the Human Resource Manager at Lee Cooper Shoes, Corporate Office, India. She is pursuing her Ph.D. on “A Comparative analysis of CSR Activities of Public and Private Companies in Delhi and NCR” from Uttarakhand Technical University, Dehradun. She did her MBA from Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, New Delhi and Bachelor of Business Administration from Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, New Delhi. She has about three years of corporate experience.