Demographic Variables as determinants of Career Choice amongst Female MBA Students: An Empirical Perspective

Pranay Karnik*
Dr.Deepak Jaroliya**

*Assistant Professor, Prestige Institute of Management & Research, Indore.
** Professor, Prestige Institute of Management & Research, Indore.

Abstract

In today's competitive world it is very important for any working professional to stay relevant and keep growing. It is also very challenging for our management students to match the requirements of their potential recruiters along with living up to their own expectations from their respective careers. In smaller towns of India, the female MBA students often get affected by certain other factors such as family influence, relocation constraints and the opinion of family members and others about a particular job. Any career choice made by these students without considering these factors can result in unsuccessful careers or early career switches which are often not taken well by prospective recruiters. Understanding the probable impact of these factors on the career choice of female MBA students can not only help them in better decision making for their career choice this can also help their faculties, career counselors and mentors to guide them for a suitable career option. Thus this paper the authors tried to understand the various factors which affect the career choice among female MBA students and to find out whether the demographic profiles of the students affect their career choice. The results drawn from the study can be used by the B-Schools to accordingly guide the female students in finding right careers as per their career choices. A self-designed questionnaire was used in the study and the responses were taken from female students who are currently pursuing their MBA degree from reputed MBA institutes from Madhya Pradesh. Mean, ANOVA and t-test were used for the analysis of the data.
Key Words: Career choice, employability, job-specific skills, industry expectations.

Introduction

We seem to be living in an era, where most of the fresh graduates and many working professionals want to have an MBA degree to improve their employability. The aspirations of getting handsome salaries and perks, along with better job profiles are often considered to be some of the reasons for the same. However, many employability surveys have found out that the employability of the management students is a serious matter of concern. An ASSOCHAM study (2017) reported that only 7% of MBAs are actually employable. The lack of quality education in the B-Schools, lack of exposure about the industry expectations, lack of desired skills are some of the reasons which were found to be the causes for the same.

There are many students who are not able to sustain their jobs and are hoping their jobs very early in their careers. Choosing careers looking at the lucrative packages and fancy profiles only or due to the peer group pressures often results in students taking up jobs which they might not be suitable for or may lose interest in very soon. This not only reduces their own credibility in the job market, but also puts a question mark on the type of stuff the B-schools are producing.

Few earlier studies on career choices have indicated that for female MBA students, various other factors like family pressures, work timing and job location also play a significant role in selecting a career and may lead to incorrect selection of career. Lent and Brown (2010) have suggested in their study that quality of life is impacted by the satisfaction with one's career path. Hence it is important that the students make the right career choices and to do so they gather and analyze all the relevant information. Song and Park (2015) opined that careers carry a psychological value along with economic and social significance. Carpenter and Foster (1977) and Beyon et al. (1998) had given a three dimensional framework for career choice which is considered to be the most seminal work in this area. This framework emphasized on three influencing factors which are intrinsic (interest in a particular job, choosing a job which might give personal satisfaction), extrinsic (job market scenario, salary packages being offered in the desired jobs) and interpersonal (peer pressure, parents and teachers' influence). The career choice model given by Meece et al(1982) identifies academic performance, academic choice and persistence to be the major influencers in career choice. Overall these factors have been found to be playing significant roles in shaping one's career choice.

Review of literature

Astin et al (1987) opined in their study that the career choice decisions of some students are affected by the potential of earning, pragmatism and mostly are in accordance with their peers. Agrawala (2008) concluded that the father's influence, abilities, competencies and skills are important factors which influence the career choice of Indian MMA students. Bai (1998) in her study of career choice among Chinese university students found that Kerr (1997) and Sanborn (1974) concluded in their respective studies that the expectations of

parents, teachers and society along with the pressure to reach at higher levels and gender role expectations restrict the range of available career options. Ahmed et al (1997) conducted a study of career choice amongst accounting students in New Zealand and concluded career choice is not affected by intrinsic factors, accounting exposure in high school and other factors. 26% female chartered accountant in a study conducted by Silverstone and Williams (1979) in England and Wales said that parental influence was a factor in career choice. Bratcher (1982) in his study suggested that individual may continue to be influenced by familial forces that are outside their awareness. Dick and Rallis (1991) opined that grade inflation plays a significant role in choosing the course. Esters and Bowen concluded that that the career choice of students is mostly influenced by parents, guardians and friends. Felton et al (1994) found in the study among chartered accounting students that they gave more weights to combined market related factors as compared to other factors. A study by Findlay and Rawls (1984) also found that family's influence was the most influential factor among students in pursuing their agricultural career objectives. Fouad et al (2008) opined that career decisions of the kids are influenced by their parents as they often serve as role models to them. Gokuldas (2010) in his study found that the first career choice of engineering students was more influenced by intrinsic factors such as training and professional development as compared to extrinsic factors like brand name and job security. The author also concluded that the male engineering students were more influenced by the intrinsic factors whereas the female engineering students were more influenced by the extrinsic factors. Herr and Cramer (1996) suggested that the career aspiration level influences the curriculum choice and thus the career choice. Ozpancar et al (2008) suggested job guarantee was one of the major factors for choosing nursing as a career. Parental occupation (Stone and Wang, 1990) and parental education (Jones and Clarke, 2001, Monika and Kate, 2005) have also been found to have an influence on the career choice of the students. Ng et al (1998) suggested that the cultural differences affects the students' ranking of factors influencing their career choice Saemann and Croocker (2000) suggested that personalities and lifestyles of students affect their career choices. van Hooft (2004) concluded that along with parental socialization, religion and political ideology and demographic characteristics impact the career choice. Willis et al (2009) and Gleeson et al (1993) found that flexibility, high income, working conditions and

professional status were among the most influential factors affecting the career choice of UK Pharmacy students. On the contrary a study by Eiland et al (2010) that while selecting between pharmacy academia and other professions as a career, salary was not a significant factor. Worthington and Higgs (2003) suggested that interest in banking and finance profession is a determining factor in students opting finance major. Jha et al (2013) suggested in their study that one's previous qualification is a notable factor which must be considered in career decision. The authors also found that one third of the respondents in their study reported that their career choices were influenced by their friends, parents, senior family members directly or indirectly. It was also found that students having good quantitative skills (B.E. or B.Sc. background) are more motivated to choose finance as career. Mutekwe et al. (2011) concluded that parental expectations strongly influence the career choice. Sabot and Linn (1991) opined that the expectations of the grades and the incentives attached to a particular course influence the choice of career among students. Yap et al (2012) concluded that self esteem was the most basic factor among the medical students in choosing the medical profession. Ahmed et al (2017) opined that interest in the subject is the most influential factor while making a career choice amongst students. Limjuco et al (2018) concluded in their study that friends, guardians and teachers are less influential in career choice as compared to students' skills, environment and opportunity.

Rationale of the study

Previous researches on career choice have studied the impact of demographic variables on career choice. Some of the studies have found that that the gender has a significant effect on the career choice of students on the contrary some studies have found the opposite. Female MBA students from Madhya Pradesh studying in the renowned institute which offer decent placement opportunity often end up taking up jobs which are neither of their interest nor do they find themselves comfortable in those jobs. Previous qualification, academic performance, location preferences, parent's influence and peer pressures are some of the factors which usually affect career choice. MBA being a professional degree, the students are expected to take up jobs or start some business after completing the degrees. However choosing the right career becomes more difficult for a female student in small

_____

towns because of limitations related to family, safety and remuneration. A study by Lucas (1993) emphasizes upon the need to understand the career choice process of the students. Thus finding the impact of variables like previous qualification and MBA specialization on the factors affecting the career choice can help the faculty members and counselors to help the students in identifying better careers for them by understanding them better.

Objectives of the study

1. To explore the factors affecting career choice amongst female MBA students.
2. To study the impact of demographic variables viz graduation qualification and MBA Specialization on the factors affecting career choice.

Research Methodology

The study was conducted among 203 female MBA students belonging to major MBA institutes of Madhya Pradesh. A self-designed questionnaire was used for the study which had 21 items. The factors affecting the career choice were identified from the review of the literature and could majorly be termed as job related factors (work timing, salary, job location and the nature of the job), source of advice(family, peers, seniors, faculty and industry experts), factors related to self, named as "self-abilities"(academic performance, belief in one's ability, possession of relevant skills and salary expectations), factors related to others named as "other's influence" (Other's perception about the job, peer group pressure) and factors related to family named as "family's influence" (family's aspirations, salary expectations and exposure of parents, marriage plan and opinion about a particular job). Reliability of the tool was checked and Cronbach's Alpha for the items was found to be 0.660. Two way ANOVA and Independent Sample t-test were used for the analysis. Out of the various socio economic and demographic variables, graduation qualification and MBA specialization were considered for this study.

Hypotheses for the study were as follows-

1. $H_{01:}$ The job related factors do not differ on the basis of the graduation qualification of the female MBA students.

2. $H_{02:}$ The source of advice does not differ for female MBA students on the basis of their graduation qualification.

3. $H_{03:}$ The self abilities of female MBA students does not differ on the basis of the graduation qualification.

4. $H_{04:}$ Other's influence does not differ on the basis of the graduation qualification of the female MBA students.

5. $H_{05:}$ Family's influence does not differ on the basis of the graduation qualification of the female MBA students.

6. $H_{06:}$ The job related factors do not differ on the basis of the MBA specialization of the female MBA students.

7. $H_{07:}$ The source of advice does not differ for female MBA students on the basis of their MBA specialization.

8. $H_{08:}$ The self abilities of female MBA students do not differ on the basis of the MBA specialization.

9. $H_{09:}$ Other's influence does not differ on the basis of the MBA specialization of the female MBA students.

10. $H_{010:}$ Family's influence does not differ on the basis of the MBA specialization of the female MBA students.

Results and analysis

Variable 1: Graduation Qualification

Table indicating the test result of hypotheses related to the variable Graduation Qualification

Sr.No.	Hypothesis	Testing variables	f value	p Value	Test Result
1	H_{01}	Graduation qualification, job related factors	3.426	0.018	Rejected
2	H_{02}	Graduation qualification, source of advice	5.384	0.001	Rejected
3	H_{03}	Graduation qualification, self abilities	7.11	0.000	Rejected
4	H_{04}	Graduation qualification, other's influence	2.35	0.074	Accepted

_____

5	H_{05}	Graduation qualification, family's influence	6.215	0.000	Rejected

The hypotheses related to the variable Graduation Qualification were tested using one way ANOVA. In testing the **Hypothesis H_{01}** the first Table 1.1.3 indicates the interaction between the graduation qualification and the job related factors related to career choice of female MBA students. Out of total 203 students, 88 had B.Com, 30 had B.Sc., 80 had B.B.A. and 5 had other courses as their graduation qualification.

From Table 1.1.3, it was found that there is a significant difference in the job related factors on the basis of the graduation qualification of the female MBA students (f=3.426, p=0.018). Thus the **Hypothesis H_{01} is rejected**. So it can be said that difference amongst job related factors of career choice was due to different graduation qualification. The post hoc study (Table 1.1.4) also indicates that female groups of B.Sc. and B.com have significant difference towards job related factors. We can also say the same for the group of BBA and B com. Further it can also be concluded that female groups of B.Sc and B.com have shown more difference in comparison to group of BBA and B.com.

In testing the **Hypothesis H_{02},** table 1.2.3 indicates the interaction between the graduation qualification and the source of advice for female MBA students. On the basis of graduation qualification, a significant difference was found in the source of advice for female MBA students (f=5.384, p=0.001). Thus the **Hypothesis H_{02} is rejected**. So it can be said that the difference in the source of advice for career choice was due to different graduation qualification. The post hoc study (Table 1.1.4) also indicates the significant difference amongst female groups of B.Sc. and B.com in the source of advice for career choice. We can also say the same for the group of B.Sc. and other specialization (Specializations other than B.Sc., Bo.Com and BBA). Further it can also be concluded that female groups of B.Sc and other have shown more difference in comparison to group of B.Sc. and B.Com.

In testing the **Hypothesis H_{03}** table 1.3.2 indicates that there is a significant difference in the self abilities of female MBA students on the basis of the graduation qualification (f=7.1.1, p=0.000). Hence the **Hypothesis H_{03} is rejected.** It was found that there is

significant difference in the self abilities of the female MBA students for career choice due to different graduation qualification. By post hoc study (Table 1.3.4), it can be observed that female groups of B.Sc. and B.com have significant difference in the source of advice. We can also say the same for the group of B.Sc. and BBA. Further it can also be concluded that female groups of B.Sc. and BBA have shown more difference in comparison to group of B.Sc and B.Com.

In testing the **Hypothesis H$_{04}$,** table 1.4.2 indicates that there is no significant difference in other's influence on the basis of the graduation qualification of the female MBA students (f=2.350, p=0.074). Hence the **Hypothesis H$_{04}$ is accepted.**

In testing the **Hypothesis H$_{05}$,** table 1.5.3 indicates that there is a significant difference in the family's influence on the basis of the graduation qualification of the female MBA students (f=6.215, p=0.000). Hence the **Hypothesis H$_{05}$ is rejected.** It was found that there is significant difference in the family influence of the female MBA students for career choice due to different graduation qualification. By post hoc study (Table 1.5.4), it can be observed that female groups of B.Sc. and B.com have significant difference in the family influence. We can also say the same for the group of B.Sc. and BBA. Further it can also be concluded that female groups of B.Sc. and BBA have shown more difference in comparison to group of B.Sc and B.Com.

Variable 2: MBA Specialization

Table indicating the test results of hypotheses related to the variable MBA Specialization

Sr.No.	Hypothesis	Testing variables	f value	p Value	Test Result
1	H$_{06}$	MBA specialization, job related factors	3.862	0.005	Rejected
2	H$_{07}$	MBA specialization, source of advice	1.508	0.201	Accepted
3	H$_{08}$	MBA specialization, self abilities	2.232	0.067	Accepted
4	H$_{09}$	MBA specialization, other's influence	1.719	0.147	Accepted
5	H$_{010}$	MBA specialization, family's influence	7.5	0.000	Rejected

In testing **Hypothesis H$_{06}$,** table 2.1.2 indicates the interaction between the MBA specialization and the job related factors related to career choice of female MBA students. Out of the total 203 students, 78 were from marketing specialization, 72 from finance, 17

_____

from HR, 1 from systems and 35 were from other specialization. It was found that there is a significant difference in the job related factors on the basis of the MBA specialization of the female MBA students (F=3.862, p=0.005). Hence the **Hypothesis H$_{06}$ is rejected.**

In testing Hypothesis **H$_{07}$** table 2.2.2 indicates the interaction between the MBA specialization and the source of advice for female MBA students. It was found that there is no significant difference in the source of advice for female MBA students on the basis of their MBA specialization (F=1.508, p=0.201). Hence the **Hypothesis H$_{07}$ is accepted.**

In testing **Hypothesis H$_{08}$** Table 2.3.2 indicates that there is no significant difference in the self abilities of female MBA students on the basis of the MBA specialization (F=2.232, p=0.067). Hence the **Hypothesis H$_{08}$ is accepted.**

In testing **Hypothesis H$_{09}$**, table 2.4.3 indicates that there is no significant difference in other's influence on the basis of the MBA specialization of the female MBA students (F=1.719, p=0.147). Hence the **Hypothesis H$_{09}$ is accepted.**

In testing **Hypothesis H$_{010}$**, table 2.5.3 indicates that there is a significant difference in the family's influence on the basis of the MBA specialization of the female MBA students (F=7.500 p=0.000). Hence the **Hypothesis H$_{10}$ is rejected.**

Table indicating the result of all the hypotheses

	Graduation qualification	MBA Specialization
Job related factors	⍰	⍰
Source of advice	⍰	✗
Self abilities	⍰	✗
Other's influence	✗	✗
Family's influence	⍰	⍰

(Here ⍰ indicates that there is a significant difference in the factors on the basis on the variable and the corresponding null hypothesis is rejected and ✗ indicates that there is no

significant difference in the factors on the basis of the variable and the corresponding null hypothesis is accepted.)

Conclusion

The study was conducted with the objective of studying the impact of variables like graduation qualification and MBA specialization on the factors affecting career choice of female MBA students. It was found that graduation qualification, MBA specialization impacts many of the factors affecting career choice of female students. The graduation qualification of female MBA students seems to have an impact on all but one factors affecting career choice. Hence it can be said that as the career choice of the female MBA students it is very important for their faculty members, career counselors and mentors to critically consider these factors while suggesting suitable career paths. Any of the factors can have more impact at a particular point of time but they need to consider the longevity of the decision and accordingly should guide the students. Students are more informed nowadays and as they have access to all the latest and relevant information. They should also consider these factors and should choose a career in which they can sustain and perform for a considerable period as frequent changes in the early part of their respective careers can harm their employability.

Practical Implications

The current study has revealed that as the graduation qualification plays a very important role in the career choice of the female MBA students, they need to critically examine the available career options keeping their graduation qualification in mind and should consider a career where it can play a significant role in their success. If this exercise can be done at through an induction program or through a goal setting exercise, it can really help the student prepare for the campus drives and the further challenges of the job market.

Scope of Further Research

This study was conducted amongst the female MBA students of Madhya Pradesh and most of the respondents were from some renowned MBA institute of Madhya Pradesh which offer decent career opportunities for placements along with strong academic inputs. Usually the admission into these institutes is done through qualifying exams so it is often considered that the students studying in these institutes are career oriented and have better exposure and understanding of their career choices. However there are many more other institutes which lack on the exposure and placement opportunity. Naturally the students studying in these institutes find it more difficult to make suitable career choices because of lack of opportunities, skills set and exposure. Further studies can be conducted covering these institutes and based on the findings the students can be guided specifically to choose from the available career options and the skill gaps can be identified and accordingly suitable measures can be taken up.

References

- Agarwala, T., (2008) "Factors influencing career choice of management students in India", Career Development International, Vol. 13 Issue: 4, pp.362-376.

- Ahamed, K., Alam, K.F.& Alam, M. An empirical study of factors affecting accounting students' career choice in New Zealand. Accounting education 6(4), 325-335 (1997).

- Ahmed K.A.,Sharif, N. & Ahmad, N. (2017)" Factors Influencing Students' Career Choices:Empirical Evidence from Business Students". Journal of Southeast Asian Research, DOI: 10.5171/2017.718849.

- Astin, A.W., Green, K.C. & Korn, W.S. (1987). The American freshman:Twenty year trends. Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Higher Research Institute.

- Beyon, J., Kelleen, T., & Kishor, N. (1998). Do visible minority students of Chinese and South Asian ancestry want teaching as a career? Perceptions of some secondary school students in Vancouver, BC. Canadian Ethnic Studies, 30(2), 38-60.

- Bratcher, W.E. (1982). The influence of family on career selection: A family systems perspective. The Personnel& Guidance Journal, 61, 87-91.

_____

- Carpenter, P., & Foster, B. (1977). The career decisions of students teachers. Eductaional Research and Perspectives, 4(1), 23-33.

- Dick T P and Rallis S F (1991), "Factors and Influences on High School Students' Career Choices", *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, Vol. 22, No. 4, pp. 281-292.

- Eiland, L. S., Flowers, S. K., Andurkar, S. V., O' Brocta, R., Prabhu, S., & Medon, P. J. (2010). A comparative study of student and faculty perspectives regarding career opportunities in pharmacy academia. Currents in Pharmacy Tecahing & Learning, 2(1), 39-51.

- Esters, T. L., & Bowen, E. B. (2005). Factors influencing career choices of urban agricultural education students. Journal of Agricultural Education, 46(02), 24-35.

- Felton, S., Burh, N. and Northey, M.(1994) Factors influencing the business student's choice of a career in chartered accountancy, Issues in Accounting Education 9(1), 131-41.

- Findlay, H. J., & Rawls, W. J. (1984, Spring). Factors that influence agricultural career objectives among students attending historically black four-year institutions. *Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 25*(1), 28-34.

- Fouad, N. A., Kantamneni, N., Smothers, M. K., Chen, Y. L., Fitzpatrick, M., & Terry, S.(2008). Asian Amercian career development: A qualitative analysis. Journal of Voctaional Behavior, 72(1), 43-59.

- Gleeson, D., Gough, G., Glover, D. and Johnson, M. (1993), "Pharmacists in training: professional development or professionalism at risk?", The Pharmaceutical Journal, Vol. 251.

- Gokuladas, V.K., (2010), "Factors that influence first-career choice of undergraduate engineers in software services companies: A south Indian experience", Career Development International, Vol. 15 Issue 2.

- Herr, E. L., & Cramer, S. H. (1996). Career guidance and counseling through the lifespan (5th ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

- Jha, R.R., Priyadarshini, C., Ponnam.A, and Ganguly S., Factors Influencing Finance as a Career Choice Among Business School Students in India:A Qualitative Study. The IUP Journal of Soft Skills, Vol. VII, No. 4, 2013.
- Kerr, B.A. (1997) Smart Girls: A new psychology of girls, women and giftedness (rev.ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gifted Psychology Press.
- Lent, R. W., & Brown, S. D. (2008). Social cognitive career theory and subjective well-being in the context of work. Journal of Career Assessment, 16, 6–21. Song, B. I., & Park, Y. J. (2005).
- Lucas, M. S. (1993). Personal, social, academic and career problems expressed by minority college students. Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 21, 2-13.
- Limjuco, Renan. (2018). Career choice of Students: Basis for curricular offering of senior high schools in region XI. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327746059_CAREER_CHOICE_OF_STUDENTS_BASIS_FOR_CURRICULAR_OFFERING_OF_SENIOR_HIGH_SCHOOLS_IN_REGION_XI/citation/download
- Monica, A., & Kate, M. K. (2005). Early determinants of women in the IT workforce: A model of girl's career choices. Information Technology & People, 18(3), 230-259.
- Meece, J. L., Parsons, J. E., Kaczala, C. M., Goff, S. B., & Futterman, R. (1982). Sex differences in math achievements: Towards a model of academic choice. Psychological Bulletin, 91, 324-348.
- Mutekwe, E., Modiba, M., & Maphosa, C. (2011). Factors affecting female students' career choices and aspirations: A Zimbabwean example. Journal of Social Sciences, 29(2), 133-141.
- Ng, E.S.W., Burke, R.J. and Fiksenbaum, L. (2008), "Career choice in management: findings from US MBA students", Career Development International, Vol. 13 No. 4.

- Özpancar, N., Aydin, N., Akansel, N., (2008). Determination of begining nursing students' perceptions about nursing profession. C.U. Hemsirelik Yuksekokulu Dergisi, (12) 3, 9-17.

_____

- Sanborn, M.P.(1974). Career development problems of gifted and talented students. In K.B.Hoyt &J.R.Hebeler (Eds.), Career education for gifted and talented students (pp. 103-152). Salt Lake City, UT: Olympus.

- Saemann G. P. and Crooker K J (2000), "Student Perceptions of the Profession and Its Effect on Decisions to Major in Accounting", Journal of Accounting Education, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 1-22.

- Sabot R and Linn Wakeman J (1991), "Grade Inflation and Course Choice", The Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 159-170.

- Silverstone , R. and Williams, A. (1979) recruitment, training, employment and careers of women chartered accountants in England and Wales, Accounting and business research, 9(33), 105-21.

- Stone, J. R., & Wang, Y. (1990). The influence of participation in vocational education on expressed career choice in a related occupation. Journal of Vocational Research, 15(1), 41-54.

- van Hooft, E. A. J. (2004). Job seeking as planned behavior: In search of group differences(Unpublished doctoral dissertation). VU Amsterdam, Netherlands.

- Willis, S.C.; Shann, P.; Hassell, K.,(2009),"Pharmacy career deciding: making choice a "good fit"", Journal of Health Organization and Management, Vol. 23 Issue 1.

- Wong, S., C., K., Liu G., J., (2010) "Will parental influences affect career choice? Evidence from hospitality and tourism management students in China", International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, Vol. 22 Issue: 1, pp.82-102.

- Worthington A and Higgs H (2003), "Factors Explaining the Choice of a Finance Major: The Role of Students' Characteristics, Personality and Perceptions of the Profession", Accounting Education, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 1-21.

- Yap, C., Rosen, S., Sinclair, A. M., & Pearce, I. (2012). What undergraduate factors influence medical students when making their choice of post graduate career? British Journal of Medical and Surgical Urology, 5(1), 11-15.

- https://www.business-standard.com/article/pti-stories/only-7-per-cent-mba-graduates-employable-assocham-study-116042700823_1.html

Annexure

Graduation Qualification and Job related factors(Hypothesis H_{01})

Table 1.1.1 Descriptives(Hypothesis H_{01})

Mean								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
B.Com	88	2.1756	.55159	.05880	2.0587	2.2924	1.20	3.40
B.Sc.	30	1.9000	.68026	.12420	1.6460	2.1540	1.20	2.60
BBA	80	1.9750	.33734	.03772	1.8999	2.0501	1.20	2.60
Other	5	2.0000	.00000	.00000	2.0000	2.0000	2.00	2.00
Total	203	2.0515	.50446	.03541	1.9817	2.1213	1.20	3.40

Table 1.1.2 Test of Homogeneity of Variances(Hypothesis H_{01})

MeanJobRelated

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
20.315	3	199	.000

Table 1.1.3 ANOVA(Hypothesis H_{01})

Mean					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.525	3	.842	3.426	.018
Within Groups	48.880	199	.246		
Total	51.405	202			

Table 1.1.4 Post Hoc Tests(Hypothesis H_{01})

Multiple Comparisons

MeanJobRelated

Tukey HSD

(I) GradQual	(J) GradQual	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
B.Com	B.Sc.	.27557*	.10478	.045	.0041	.5470
	BBA	.20057*	.07656	.046	.0022	.3989

_____

	Other	.17557	.22785	.868	-.4148	.7659
B.Sc.	B.Com	-.27557*	.10478	.045	-.5470	-.0041
	BBA	-.07500	.10610	.894	-.3499	.1999
	Other	-.10000	.23940	.975	-.7203	.5203
BBA	B.Com	-.20057*	.07656	.046	-.3989	-.0022
	B.Sc.	.07500	.10610	.894	-.1999	.3499
	Other	-.02500	.22846	1.000	-.6169	.5669
Other	B.Com	-.17557	.22785	.868	-.7659	.4148
	B.Sc.	.10000	.23940	.975	-.5203	.7203
	BBA	.02500	.22846	1.000	-.5669	.6169

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 1.1.5 Homogeneous Subsets(Hypothesis H_{01})

MeanJobRelated

Tukey HSD

		Subset for alpha = 0.05
GradQual	N	1
B.Sc.	30	1.9000
BBA	80	1.9750
Other	5	2.0000
B.Com	88	2.1756
Sig.		.409

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

Graduation Qualification and source of advice (Hypothesis H_{02})

Table 1.2.1 Descriptives(Hypothesis H_{02})

Mean					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
B.Com	88	2.2443	.69168	.07373	2.0978	2.3909	1.00	4.50
B.Sc.	30	2.6500	.36906	.06738	2.5122	2.7878	1.75	3.00
BBA	80	2.3375	.51573	.05766	2.2227	2.4523	1.25	3.75
Other	5	1.7500	.00000	.00000	1.7500	1.7500	1.75	1.75

Table 1.2.1 Descriptives(Hypothesis H_{02})

Mean					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
B.Com	88	2.2443	.69168	.07373	2.0978	2.3909	1.00	4.50
B.Sc.	30	2.6500	.36906	.06738	2.5122	2.7878	1.75	3.00
BBA	80	2.3375	.51573	.05766	2.2227	2.4523	1.25	3.75
Other	5	1.7500	.00000	.00000	1.7500	1.7500	1.75	1.75
Total	203	2.3288	.59698	.04190	2.2462	2.4114	1.00	4.50

Table 1.2.2 Test of Homogeneity of Variances(Hypothesis H_{02})

MeanSourceOfAdvice

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
	3	199	.037
2.889			

Table 1.2.3 ANOVA(Hypothesis H_{02})

Mean					
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5.404	3	1.801	5.384	.001
Within Groups	66.585	199	.335		
Total	71.989	202			

_____

Table 1.2.4 Post Hoc Tests(Hypothesis H_{02})

Multiple Comparisons

MeanSourceOfAdvice

Tukey HSD

(I) GradQual	(J) GradQual	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
B.Com	B.Sc.	-.40568*	.12229	.006	-.7225	-.0888
	BBA	-.09318	.08936	.724	-.3247	.1383
	Other	.49432	.26594	.249	-.1947	1.1833
B.Sc.	B.Com	.40568*	.12229	.006	.0888	.7225
	BBA	.31250	.12384	.059	-.0083	.6333
	Other	.90000*	.27941	.008	.1761	1.6239
BBA	B.Com	.09318	.08936	.724	-.1383	.3247
	B.Sc.	-.31250	.12384	.059	-.6333	.0083
	Other	.58750	.26665	.126	-.1034	1.2784
Other	B.Com	-.49432	.26594	.249	-1.1833	.1947
	B.Sc.	-.90000*	.27941	.008	-1.6239	-.1761
	BBA	-.58750	.26665	.126	-1.2784	.1034

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 1.2.5 Homogeneous Subsets(Hypothesis H_{02})

MeanSourceOfAdvice

Tukey HSD

GradQual	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
		1	2
Other	5	1.7500	
B.Com	88	2.2443	2.2443
BBA	80		2.3375
B.Sc.	30		2.6500
Sig.		.084	.208

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

_____

Graduation Qualification and Self abilities(Hypothesis H_{03})

Table 1.3.2 (Hypothesis H_{02})

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

MeanSelfAbilities

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
9.222	3	199	.000

Table 1.3.1. Descriptives(Hypothesis H_{03})

Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
B.Com	88	1.8239	.49590	.05286	1.7188	1.9289	1.25	3.50
B.Sc.	30	2.1500	.15536	.02837	2.0920	2.2080	2.00	2.50
BBA	80	1.7781	.43025	.04810	1.6824	1.8739	1.00	2.50
Other	5	2.2500	.00000	.00000	2.2500	2.2500	2.25	2.25
Total	203	1.8645	.44859	.03149	1.8025	1.9266	1.00	3.50

Table 1.3.3 ANOVA(Hypothesis H_{03})

Mean

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.931	3	1.310	7.101	.000
Within Groups	36.719	199	.185		
Total	40.650	202			

1.3.4Post Hoc Tests(Hypothesis H_{03})

Multiple Comparisons

MeanSelfAbilities

Tukey HSD

(I) GradQual	(J) GradQual	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
B.Com	B.Sc.	-.32614*	.09082	.002	-.5614	-.0908

	BBA	.04574	.06636	.901	-.1262	.2177
	Other	-.42614	.19749	.139	-.9378	.0855
B.Sc.	B.Com	.32614*	.09082	.002	.0908	.5614
	BBA	.37187*	.09196	.000	.1336	.6101
	Other	-.10000	.20750	.963	-.6376	.4376
BBA	B.Com	-.04574	.06636	.901	-.2177	.1262
	B.Sc.	-.37187*	.09196	.000	-.6101	-.1336
	Other	-.47188	.19802	.084	-.9849	.0412
Other	B.Com	.42614	.19749	.139	-.0855	.9378
	B.Sc.	.10000	.20750	.963	-.4376	.6376
	BBA	.47188	.19802	.084	-.0412	.9849

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 1.3.5 Homogeneous Subsets(Hypothesis H_{03})

MeanSelfAbilities

Tukey HSD

		Subset for alpha = 0.05	
GradQual	N	1	2
BBA	80	1.7781	
B.Com	88	1.8239	
B.Sc.	30	2.1500	2.1500
Other	5		2.2500
Sig.		.078	.916

Graduation Qualification and other's influence (Hypothesis H_{04})

Table 1.4.1 Descriptives (Hypothesis H_{04})

Mean								
					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
B.Com	88	3.4375	.84013	.08956	3.2595	3.6155	1.50	5.00
B.Sc.	30	3.1000	.38056	.06948	2.9579	3.2421	3.00	4.50
BBA	80	3.5000	.68436	.07651	3.3477	3.6523	2.50	4.50
Other	5	3.5000	.00000	.00000	3.5000	3.5000	3.50	3.50
Total	203	3.4138	.72522	.05090	3.3134	3.5142	1.50	5.00

Table1.4.2 ANOVA(Hypothesis H_{04})

Mean

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.635	3	1.212	2.350	.074
Within Groups	102.606	199	.516		
Total	106.241	202			

Graduation Qualification and family influence (Hypothesis H_{05})

Table1. 5.1 Descriptives(Hypothesis H_{05})

Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
B.Com	88	2.7538	.72889	.07770	2.5994	2.9082	1.67	4.17
B.Sc.	30	2.2667	.22145	.04043	2.1840	2.3494	1.50	2.83
BBA	80	2.7792	.50787	.05678	2.6661	2.8922	1.83	3.83
Other	5	2.6667	.00000	.00000	2.6667	2.6667	2.67	2.67
Total	203	2.6897	.60686	.04259	2.6057	2.7736	1.50	4.17

Table1. 5.2 Test of Homogeneity of

Variances(Hypothesis H_{05})

MeanFamilyInfluence

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
19.325	3	199	.000

Table 1.5.3 ANOVA(Hypothesis H_{05})

Mean

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	6.373	3	2.124	6.215	.000
Within Groups	68.020	199	.342		
Total	74.393	202			

Table 1.5.4 Post Hoc Tests(Hypothesis H_{05})

Multiple Comparisons

MeanFamilyInfluence

Tukey HSD

(I) GradQual	(J) GradQual	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
B.Com	B.Sc.	.48712*	.12360	.001	.1669	.8074
	BBA	-.02538	.09031	.992	-.2594	.2086
	Other	.08712	.26879	.988	-.6093	.7835
B.Sc.	B.Com	-.48712*	.12360	.001	-.8074	-.1669
	BBA	-.51250*	.12516	.000	-.8368	-.1882
	Other	-.40000	.28241	.491	-1.1317	.3317
BBA	B.Com	.02538	.09031	.992	-.2086	.2594
	B.Sc.	.51250*	.12516	.000	.1882	.8368
	Other	.11250	.26951	.975	-.5858	.8108
Other	B.Com	-.08712	.26879	.988	-.7835	.6093
	B.Sc.	.40000	.28241	.491	-.3317	1.1317
	BBA	-.11250	.26951	.975	-.8108	.5858

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 1.5.5 Homogeneous Subsets(Hypothesis H_{05})

MeanFamilyInfluence

Tukey HSD

GradQual	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05
		1
B.Sc.	30	2.2667
Other	5	2.6667
B.Com	88	2.7538
BBA	80	2.7792
Sig.		.072

_____

MeanFamilyInfluence

Tukey HSD

		Subset for alpha = 0.05
GradQual	N	1
B.Sc.	30	2.2667
Other	5	2.6667
B.Com	88	2.7538
BBA	80	2.7792
Sig.		.072

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

MBA Specialization and Job related factors(Hypothesis H$_{06}$)

2.1.1 Descriptives(Hypothesis H$_{06}$)

Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Marketing	78	1.9256	.55466	.06280	1.8006	2.0507	1.20	3.00
Finance	72	2.2090	.52697	.06210	2.0852	2.3329	1.40	3.40
HR	17	1.8941	.45342	.10997	1.6610	2.1272	1.40	2.40
Systems	1	1.6000	.	.	.	.	1.60	1.60
Others	35	2.0971	.17061	.02884	2.0385	2.1558	1.60	2.20
Total	203	2.0515	.50446	.03541	1.9817	2.1213	1.20	3.40

2.1.2 ANOVA(Hypothesis H$_{06}$)

Mean

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	3.720	4	.930	3.862	.005
Within Groups	47.684	198	.241		
Total	51.405	202			

MBA Specialization and Source of Advice(Hypothesis H$_{07}$)

2.2.1 Descriptives(Hypothesis H$_{07}$)

Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Marketing	78	2.4455	.46053	.05215	2.3417	2.5493	1.50	3.00
Finance	72	2.2326	.79093	.09321	2.0468	2.4185	1.00	4.50
HR	17	2.3235	.52115	.12640	2.0556	2.5915	1.75	3.25
Systems	1	1.7500	.	.	.	.	1.75	1.75
Others	35	2.2857	.37447	.06330	2.1571	2.4144	2.00	3.75
Total	203	2.3288	.59698	.04190	2.2462	2.4114	1.00	4.50

2.2.2 ANOVA(Hypothesis H$_{07}$)

Mean

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	2.129	4	.532	1.508	.201
Within Groups	69.860	198	.353		
Total	71.989	202			

MBA Specialization and Self abilities(Hypothesis H$_{08}$)

2.3.1Descriptives(Hypothesis H$_{08}$)

Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Marketing	78	1.7788	.43764	.04955	1.6802	1.8775	1.00	2.75
Finance	72	1.8646	.53395	.06293	1.7391	1.9901	1.25	3.50
HR	17	1.9265	.35094	.08512	1.7460	2.1069	1.50	2.50
Systems	1	2.5000	.	.	.	.	2.50	2.50
Others	35	2.0071	.23861	.04033	1.9252	2.0891	1.75	2.50
Total	203	1.8645	.44859	.03149	1.8025	1.9266	1.00	3.50

2.3.2 ANOVA(Hypothesis H$_{08}$)

Mean

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1.754	4	.438	2.232	.067
Within Groups	38.896	198	.196		
Total	40.650	202			

MBA Specialization and Other's influence (Hypothesis H$_{09}$)

2.4.1 Descriptives(Hypothesis H$_{09}$)

Mean

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Marketing	78	3.2244	.69154	.07830	3.0684	3.3803	2.00	4.50
Finance	72	3.7431	.68686	.08095	3.5817	3.9045	1.50	5.00
HR	17	3.3235	.80896	.19620	2.9076	3.7395	2.50	4.50
Systems	1	4.5000	.	.	.	.	4.50	4.50
Others	35	3.1714	.58086	.09818	2.9719	3.3710	2.50	4.00
Total	203	3.4138	.72522	.05090	3.3134	3.5142	1.50	5.00

_____

MBA Specialization and   Family Influence (Hypothesis H$_{010}$)

2.5.1 Descriptives(Hypothesis H$_{010}$)

MeanFamilyInfluence

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Marketing	78	2.6389	.59241	.06708	2.5053	2.7725	1.50	4.00
Finance	72	2.8310	.74404	.08769	2.6562	3.0059	1.67	4.17
HR	17	2.5196	.47464	.11512	2.2756	2.7636	1.83	3.00
Systems	1	2.8333	.	.	.	.	2.83	2.83
Others	35	2.5905	.24031	.04062	2.5079	2.6730	2.33	3.00
Total	203	2.6897	.60686	.04259	2.6057	2.7736	1.50	4.17

2.5.2 Test of Homogeneity of Variances(Hypothesis H$_{010}$)

MeanFamilyInfluence

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
12.262[a]	3	198	.000

a. Groups with only one case are ignored in computing the test of

homogeneity of variance for MeanFamilyInfluence.