

Perceived parental rejection and occupational aspiration of male students

Ashok Kumar Ranjan^{1*}

ABSTRACT

To seek the relation of Perceived Parental Rejection with Occupational Aspiration and the effect of sex on perceived parental rejection and occupational aspiration of high school students 'Parental Scale' (Hindi Version) constructed and standardized by Bhardwaj et al (2000) and 'Occupational Aspiration Scale' (Hindi Version) constructed and standardized by Grewal (1998) were administered on 200 students of male (100) and female (100) sex undergoing study in high schools of Saran district of Bihar. The age range of respondents was from 12 to 15 years. The analysis of data revealed that parental rejection casts negative effect on occupational aspiration of both male and female students. There was found significant difference between male and female students on perceived parental rejection and on occupational aspiration between male and female students. Female students were found significantly higher than male students on occupational aspiration and lower on parental rejection in comparison to male students.

Keywords: Parental, Rejection, Occupation, Aspiration, Sex.

The foundation of the growth of personality lies in the womb of the family. It refers to a group related to blood or marriage. The child uses his parents as models for his adjustment to life. The fundamental patterns established at home, can be modified or changed as the child grows up but they cannot be eradicated completely. Relationship between the parents and the child is a central factor in the social, educational and all-round development of the child. Parents have great influence on the subject choice and vocational choice of their children. Children expect their parents to be important guides and counselors. They turn more to them than to anyone else (Birk, 1979; Mitchell, 1978; Roberts, 1979) for help regarding career planning. Parental rejection /acceptance becomes very important in this regard because on feeling rejected children whether they are male or female hardly seek the help of parents regarding career planning and choices. Persons brought up in rejecting homes are likely to develop intense defensive awareness of others. They will probably have aggressive tendencies.

Parenting as the style of child upbringing refers to a privilege or responsibility of mother and father, together or independently to prepare the child for society and culture (Veeness, 1973). This provides ample opportunity to a child to find roots, continuity and a sense of belonging

¹Research Scholar, P. G. Deptt. of Psychology, J. P. University, Chapra, India.

*Responding Author

© 2020 | Author; licensee IJSI. This is an Open Access Research distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any Medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Perceived parental rejection and occupational aspiration of male students

(Sirohi and Chauhan, 1991) and serves as an effective agent of socialization. The two distinctive roles of parents include both mothering and fathering. A child depends on both mother and father together or independently for upbringing him/her. It is important to note that most of the children have a fairly definite clear cut concept of 'father' which differs markedly from their concept of 'mother' (Meltzer 1943). The chief models or dimensions of parenting are :

1. Rejection vs. Acceptance
2. Carelessness Vs. Protection,
3. Neglect vs. Indulgence,
4. Utopian Expectation vs. Realism,
5. Lenient Standard vs. Moralism
6. Freedom vs. Discipline,
7. Faulty Role Expectation vs. Realistic Role Expectation
8. Marital Conflict vs. Marital Adjustment.

A child develops shocks when he does not find proper care and response of his parents. The infantile honesty and truthfulness meets an adverse atmosphere and therefore the psychological growth of the child is affected. It is quite natural that a child meets proper nourishment of his genuine feelings. Denial of love and affection freezes the genial current of infantile simplicity. Various aberrations in the behaviour of child are the product of this denial of natural love to them.

Rejection of parents manifests itself in interpersonal relationships in direct ways, when the child has to face excessive criticism, harsh and inconsistent punishment by both or either of the parents in his upbringing. Rejection of parents may also show itself in physical neglect, denial of love and affection, lack of interest in his activities and failure to spend time with him. On the other hand parental acceptance implies an attitude of love for the child. The accepting parent puts the child in a position of importance in the home and develops a relationship of emotional warmth. Parental acceptance encourages the child and makes itself apparent in receptive or positive attitude towards the child's idea and judgement, worthiness and capability, love and affection and admiration along with the adequate attention towards him.

Level of occupational aspiration (LOA) has been defined as orientation towards occupational goal (Haller and Miller, 1967). The LOA is considered as a concept which is logically a special instance of the concept level of aspiration. Its special nature consists only in the continuum of difficulty in the occupational hierarchy. The term level of occupational aspiration finds its root in the concept of level of aspiration. The term level of aspiration is defined by English and English (1962) as 'an ardent desire to accomplish what one sets out to do. According to Eysenck (1972) aspiration is the possible goal and individual sets himself for his performance. Occupational aspiration is the occupational or vocational goal set by an individual or students by himself/herself for himself/herself to achieve through his education. According to Haller (1964) occupational aspiration level is the level on the occupational prestige hierarchy which the individual views as his goal.

Considering this, the objective of the investigation is to explore the role of perceived parental rejection in occupational aspiration and the role of sex in perceived parental rejection and occupational aspiration of high school students.

Perceived parental rejection and occupational aspiration of male students

In the light of above objectives, the following hypotheses were formulated,

1. Rejected group will be significantly lower than accepted group on occupational aspiration.
2. Male group will be perceiving significantly lower parental rejection than female group.
3. Male group will be significantly higher on occupational aspiration than female group.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The study was conducted on a sample of 200 subjects undergoing study in high schools of Saran district of Bihar. In this sample of 200 students 100 students were of male sex and 100 students were of female sex. The age range of students was from 12 to 15 years.

Tests used

For measuring perceived parental rejection/acceptance and occupational aspiration 'Parenting Scale' (Hindi Version) constructed and standardized by Bhardwaj et al (2000) and 'Occupational Aspiration Scale' (Hindi Version) constructed and standardized by Grewal (1998) were used.

Statistical analysis

To test the role of perceived parental rejection/acceptance in occupational aspiration two groups of students on the basis of STEN value of 'Z' scores on rejection/acceptance dimension of Parenting Scale were formed – rejected and accepted groups. Occupational aspiration scores of these two groups were compared using 't' test. Again, to seek the effect of sex on perceived parental rejection/acceptance and occupational aspiration male and female groups were compared on their perceived acceptance/rejection 'Z' scores and occupational aspiration scores. 't' test was also run to test the significance of mean differences.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The mean occupational aspiration scores of rejected and accepted groups are 50.55 and 58.64 respectively (Table – 1). The obtained 't' value for Rejected x Accepted compared groups is 6.57. The obtained 't' value = 6.57 is higher than the value required for significance at .01 level. So there exists significant difference between rejected and accepted groups on occupational aspiration. Accepted group has obtained significantly higher mean score than rejected group. So, accepted group is significantly higher than rejected group on occupational aspiration. Significantly higher mean occupational aspiration scores of accepted groups in comparison to rejected group denotes that parental rejection is detrimental to occupational aspiration of school students because on being rejected by their parents children are not benefited by parental guidance and counseling in deciding their future occupational goals and choices.

Table – 1 showing comparison on occupational aspiration scores – rejected and accepted groups

Groups	N	Means	S.Ds.	df	't' ratio	Level of Sig.
Rejected	60	50.55	8.15	198	6.57	.01
Accepted	140	58.64	7.55			

The mean perceived parental rejection/acceptance 'Z' scores of male and female groups are 90.75 and 98.25 respectively (Table – 2). The obtained 't' value for Male x Female compared groups is 2.75. The obtained 't' value = 2.75 is higher than the value required for significance at

Perceived parental rejection and occupational aspiration of male students

.01 level. So, there exists significant difference between male and female groups on perceived parental rejection/acceptance. On placing mean 'Z' scores of the two groups of STEN scale, as mentioned in the manual of Parenting Scale, it is found that the mean 'Z' score of female group falls in the category of accepted group whereas the mean 'Z' score of male group falls in the category of rejected group. This proves that in current scenario girl students are acquiring more importance in family environment and are being more accepted than male students.

Table – 2 showing comparison on perceived parental rejection/acceptance 'z' scores – male and female groups

Groups	N	Means	S.Ds.	df	't' ratio	Level of Sig.
Male	100	90.75	18.22	198	2.75	.01
Female	100	98.25	20.34			

The mean occupational aspiration scores of male and female groups are 52.84 and 59.59 respectively (Table – 3). The obtained 't' value for Male x Female compared groups is 5.97. The obtained 't' value = 5.97 is higher than the value required for significance at .01 level. So there exists significant difference between male and female groups on occupational aspiration. Female group has obtained significantly higher mean score than male group. So, female group is significantly higher than male group on occupational aspiration. Significantly higher mean occupational aspiration scores and higher parental acceptance of female group in comparison to male group denotes that parental rejection is detrimental to occupational aspiration of male school students because on being rejected by their parents male students are not benefited by parental guidance and counseling in deciding their future occupational goals and choices. This has contributed to significantly lower occupational aspiration score of male group in comparison to female group. In addition to this, shrinking opportunities for male students and growing opportunities for female students due to reservation policy might have also contributed to significantly higher occupational aspiration of female students in comparison to male students.

Table – 3 showing comparison on occupational aspiration scores – male and female groups

Groups	N	Means	S.Ds.	df	't' ratio	Level of Sig.
Male	100	52.84	7.74	198	5.97	.01
Female	100	59.59	8.23			

CONCLUSION

The study has finally led to the following conclusions,

1. Perceived parental rejection lowers occupational aspiration of students.
2. Students perceiving parental rejection are significantly lower on occupational aspiration than students perceiving parental acceptance.
3. Male students perceive higher parental rejection than female students.
4. Male students are significantly lower on occupational aspiration than female students.

REFERENCES

- Bhardwaj, R.L., Sharma, H. and Garg, A. (2000): 'Parenting Scale', Pankaj Mapan, Bal Niwas, Taj Basai, Agra.
Birk, A. (1979): 'Parental Impact on Children's Career Development', Paper Presented at the

Perceived parental rejection and occupational aspiration of male students

- Meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, DC.
- English, H.B. and English, A.C. (1962): 'A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psycho-Analytical Terms', David MC Kay Company Inc, New York.
- Eysenck, H.J. (1972): 'Encyclopedia of Psychology', Fontana Collins.
- Grewal, J.S. (1998): 'Occupational Aspiration Scale' National Psychological Corporation, Agra.
- Haller, A.O. (1964): 'A Measure of Level of Occupational Aspiration', Personnel and Guidance Journal, 43, 448-463.
- Haller, A.O. and Miller, I.W. (1967): 'Occupational Aspiration Scale: - Theory, Structure and Correlates', Department of Rural Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Meltzer, H. (1943): 'Sex Differences in Children's Attitude to Parents', Journal Genet.Psychol., 62, 331-336.
- Mitchell, A. (1978): 'Career Development Needs of Seventeen Year olds' American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, DC.
- Roberts, J. (1979): 'Survey Shows Little Change in Students' College Aspirations' Public Education, 14, 1-3.
- Sirohi, A. and Chauhan, N.S. (1991): 'Parenting in Child Socialization: A Study of Fathering in Multivariate Setting', Indian Journal of Psychology, 66(1-4), 29-35.
- Veeness, J.E. (1973): 'The Social Meaning of Parenthood', Psychiatry Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes, 36, 291-310.

Acknowledgements

The authors profoundly appreciate all the people who have successfully contributed to ensuring this paper in place. Their contributions are acknowledged however their names cannot be mentioned.

Conflict of Interest

The author declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Ranjan A. K (2020). Perceived parental rejection and occupational aspiration of male students. *International Journal of Social Impact*, 5(4), 39-43. DIP: 18.02.006/20200504, DOI: 10.25215/2455/0504006