

**Adolescents Job Values in Relation to their Fathers' Job Ranks**

**Dr. Sanjay Kumar**

*Assistant Professor, Dept. of Psychology, N.N College, Singhara, Vaishali*

*(B.R.A. Bihar University, Muzaffarpur), (Bihar) India*

**Abstract**

The study was conducted on 300 adolescents (boys) belonging to the age group of 17-20 years. All the subjects came from the territorial zone of Muzaffarpur and Hajipur district. The father of all the subjects were employees of Nationalized Bank and Life Insurance Corporation of India. The father of all the subjects were taken from three job ranks namely the executive, the ministerial staff and menial staff's sons. All the subjects came from upper caste only. The sample was thus incidental cum purposive random sampling method one. An Inventory of the measurement of job value constructed by Prasad (1968) as used in this research. It was hypothesized that adolescents of Bank & L.I.C. executive officers, ministerial staff and menial staff would differ significantly on the different job values. Besides a PDS was used get other necessary information about the respondents. The data were obtained in accordance with the manuals and analyzed using t- test. The results confirmed the hypothesis.

**Key Words:** Adolescents, Job Value, Fathers Job Ranks

**Introduction**

Adolescence is the most important period of human life. Poets having described it as the spring of life of human being and an important era in the total life span. Adolescence is the period when an individual is capable of begetting off spring. It means that when power of reproducing its own kind is attained by the individual then we can say that he has become an adolescent. Chronologically adolescence comes roughly in between the years from 12 to the early 20's. The onset of adolescence varies from culture to culture depending on the socio-economic condition of the society. Adolescent considered to be well adjusted in one society with a particular culture background may not be considered the same in

different society with different culture settings. In this period great changes occur in all developmental dimensions of the individual.

Whereas there had already developed serious and sophisticated literary concern with the phenomenon of adolescence as a separate and distinct phase in human development really began with the work of G. Stanley Hall, who published two volume work in adolescence 1916. Though now largely relegated with vague respect to the dusty achieves of psychological history, Hall was a most remarkable man: Father of child study movement in America. Prior to the study of Hall some misconceptions regarding adolescence prevailed in the society.

Hall stands half way between the philosophic fiction of the past centuries and the controlled observation and experimental approach of the present time.

It is patently evident that lack of education and training present serious obstacles to job placement and security in technological society, questions are currently being raised about the number of young people actually requiring advanced education. Furthermore, several studies (Carter, 1971; Wolf and Kidd, 1971) suggest that this situation may continue into the 1980's. In some instances, advanced graduates education may take employment even in lower level jobs more rather than less difficult, because employers may consider in such applicants "overqualified".

Nevertheless college graduates are expected to continue to have a competitive advantage over those with less education, and it is unlikely that they will experience significant levels of unemployment for prolonged periods.

The problem of finding appropriate employment and even, in some cases, any employment for young people is not simple one. And if anything, it is likely to become more difficult in the future, as our entire society grows more complex, more specialized, more technologically oriented and more subject to the effects of forces beyond our immediate control.

In the light of above points and practical consideration of the present study, here was undertaken to study of pattern of adolescents job values in relation to their fathers job ranks and different kinds of organizations.

### **Objective of the study:**

The present study aimed to investigate the impact of adolescents job volume is related in any way to their father's job ranks.

Hypothesis: (i) The nationalized bank Executives, Ministerial staff's & Menial staff's adolescents and L.I.C. Executives, Ministerial staff's & Menial staff's officers adolescent would differ significantly on altruism, economic returns and physical condition of work.

### **Methodology:**

The methodology of the study included the following steps:

- (a) Sample: An incidental cum purposive sample was used. The sample consisted of 300 adolescents belonging to Muzaffarpur and Hajipur district. In other respect they were matched as far as possible.
- (b) Research tools:
  - (i) PDS: A personal Data sheet (PDS) prepared by the researcher himself was used for collective necessary information of the respondents such as the sons of Bank or L.I.C. Executives officers, ministerial staff and menial staff, age, sex and the like.
  - (ii) Inventory of vocational values developed by based (1968) was used for measuring three dimensions of vocational values.
- (c) **Procedure & Research design:**

On the above mentioned criteria and restriction the total number of respondents included in this research break up of which is as follows:-

Respondents	Banks	L.I.C.	Total
Executive officers	50	50	100
Ministerial staff	50	50	100
Menial staff	50	50	100
Total	150	150	300

**TABLE NO.-1**

Significance of difference between executive sons (N.B.) and executive sons (L.I.C.) with regard to altruism.

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-ratio	P-Value
Nationalized Bank	50	42.2	5.20		
Executive sons				1.23	NS
L.I.C. Executive sons	50	44.0	8.85		

The mean score of executive officers sons (NB) is 42.2 while that of executive officer's sons (LIC) is 44.00. The obtained t-ratio is 1.23 which is not significant at .05 level of confidence. It means that the two said groups do not differ significantly on altruism. Thus the hypothesis has gone to be rejected.

**TABLE NO. – 2**

Significance of difference between executive sons (N.B.) and Executive sons (L.I.C.) with regard to economic returns.

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-ratio	P-Value
Nationalized Bank	50	35	6.40		
L.I.C. Executive sons	50	37.60	5.80	2.10	.05

It is evident from Table 2 that the mean score of executive officers sons (NB) is found to be 35.00 whereas the mean score of executive officers son (L.I.C.) is 37.6 and the obtained t-ratio is 2.18 which is statistically significant at .05 level of confidence. It means that the two groups differ significantly on economic returns. The mean of latter group is large than the former group which clearly indicates that the sons of executive officer's (L.I.C.) place greater value on economic returns than the sons of executive officers (N.B.) do thus the hypothesis remains verified.

**TABLE – 3**

Significance of difference between executive sons (N.B.) and executive sons (L.I.C.) with regard to physical condition of work

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-ratio	P-Value
Nationalised Bank	50	34.0	5.10		
L.I.C. Executive sons	50	33.9	5.20	.09	NS

Table 3 show's that the mean score of executive officer's (N.B.) is 34 while that of the executive officers sons (L.I.C.) is 33.9 the obtained t-ratio is .09 which is statistically not significant that the two

groups do not differ significantly on physical condition of work which makes it clear that the two groups attach similar importance to physical condition of work. Thus the hypothesis has gone to be rejected.

**TABLE NO.- 4**

Significance of difference between ministerial sons (N.B) and ministerial son's (L.I.C.) with regard to altruism.

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-ratio	P-Value
N.B. ministerial	56	43.34	6.75		
Staff sons				.88	NS
L.I.C. Ministerial	50	44.62	7.65		

Table No. 4 shows that the difference between the two means is not significant statistically at .05 level of confidence because the t-ration is .88. This reflects that the two groups do not differ significantly on altruism, obviously, the two groups have like interest in altruism. Thus the hypothesis has gone to be rejected.

**TABLE NO.- 5**

Significance of difference between ministerial staff sons (N.B.) and ministerial staff sons (L.I.C.) with regard to economic returns.

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-ratio	P-Value
N.B. Ministerial	50	38.67	7.54		
Staff's sons				2.03	.01
L.I.C. Ministerial staff sons.	50	34.22	8.16		

It is clear for table 5 that the mean score of ministerial staff son's (L.I.C.) is 34.22 The difference between the two means is statistically significant at .01 level of confidence, the obtained t-ratio being 2.83. It means that the two groups differ

significantly, on economic returns. The mean score the former group is larger than the mean score of the latter group, which clearly indicates that the former group places greater value on hypothesis remains verified.

**TABLE NO.- 6**

Significance of difference between menial staff sons (N.B.) and menial staff son (L.I.C.) with regard to physical condition of work.

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-ratio	P-Value
N.B. menial	50	36.55	6.25		
Staff's sons				1.83	NS
L.I.C. menial staff's sons	50	34.35	8.06		

It is evident from table 6 that the mean score of menial staff (N.B.) is 36.55 while that the mean score of menial staff L.I.C. is 34.35. The t-value being 1.83, is not significant even at .05 level of confidence which means

that the physical conditions of work. It is clear that the two groups exhibit similar tendency to value physical condition of work. Thus, the hypothesis remains unverified.

**TABLE NO.- 7**

Significant of difference between menial sons (N.B.) and menial sons (L.I.C.) with regard to altruism.

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-ratio	P-Value
N.B. menial staff sons	50	46.0	9.85	.88	NS
L.I.C. Menial staff's sons	50	44.6	8.76		

It is clear from that table 7 that the mean score of the menial staff's sons (N.B.) is 46.0 and of the menial staff's sons (L.I.C.) is 44.6, the difference between the two means is not statistically significant even at .05

level of confidence, the t-ratio being 0.88. It means that the sons of menial staff (N.B) and the sons of menial staff (L.I.C) do not differ significantly on altruism. Obviously, the groups exhibit similar tendency to rate altruism. Thus the hypothesis is unverified.

**TABLE NO.- 8**

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-ratio	P-Value
N.B. menial staff sons	50	36.1	6.85	2.03	.05
L.I.C. Menial	50	38.7	5.86		

It is clear from the results contained in Table 8 that the mean score of menial staff's sons (N.B.) is 36.1 and the mean score of menial staff's sons (L.I.C.) is 38.7. The obtained t-ratio is 2.03, which is statistically significant at .05 level of confidence. It means that the two groups differ significantly on economic

returns. The mean score of menial staffs sons (L.I.C) higher on economic returns than the mean score of menial staff's sons (N.B.) obviously the latter group attach more importance to economic returns than the former group does thus the hypothesis verified.

**TABLE NO. - 9**

Significance of difference between menial sons (NB) and menial sons (LIC) with regard to physical conditions of work:-

Group	N	Mean	SD	t-ratio	P-Value
N.B. menial staff sons	50	32.6	4.95	1.39	NS
L.I.C. Menial staff's sons	50	34.01	5.01		

Table 9 represents that the mean score of menial staff's sons (N.B.) is 32.6 and the mean score of menial staff's sons (LIC) is 34.01 the t-ratio being 1.39 is not significant even at .05 level of confidence which

indicates that the two groups do not differ significantly on physical conditions of work clearly the two groups are the same in the importance assigned to physical conditions of work thus the hypothesis stands verified.

**Works Cited:**

1. Argris, C. 1957: Personality and organization. The conflict between system and the individual. New York: Harper.
2. B. Lal, Boris. Jr. 1964: An occupational studies of job satisfaction and need satisfaction. Journal of experimental education 32 (4), 383-388
3. Blood, M.R, 1969: Work values and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied psychology, 53, 456-459.
4. Berger, P.L 1964: The Human shape of work. New York Mc Million.
5. Campbell & et. al 1967: Factors contribution to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in six occupation groups.
6. Caro F.G. 1966: Social class and attitudes of youth relevant for the realization of adult goal. Social forces 44, 492-498
7. Caro, F.G. & Phil blad, C.T. 1965: Aspirations and expectations: A re-examination of the bases of for social class differences in the occupational orientations of male high school students. Sociology and social research 49, 465-475.
8. Kroger, R & Louttat C.M. 1935: The influence of father occupation on the vocational choices of high school boys. Journal of applied psychology 19, 203-212.
9. Anatharman & Ravindoranath K.V. 1982: Need Satisfaction and its advantages among bank employees. Managerial psychology, vol 3 (1), 49-55.
10. Dipboye, W. J. & Anderson, W.F. 1961: Occupational stereotypes and manifest needs of high school students. Journal of counseling psychology 8, 296-304.
11. Rao, G. C. & Paik 1973: A study of occupational values and preference of school going rural youths. Manas, 1973, Vol. 20 (2) 73-91.