DOI: https://doi.org/ 10.53555/ks.v12i3.3064

The Mediating Role Of Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy In The Connection Between Personality Traits And Career Choices In Undergraduate Students

Dr. Haleema Akbar^{1*}, Dr. Asma Asma², Sher Zaman³, Amin Ullah Khan⁴, Zubaida Shakir⁵

^{1*}Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Women University Mardan, <u>drhaleemaakbar@wumaradn.edu.pk</u>
²IPFP Fellow (Assistant Professor), Institute of Education and Research (IER), University of Peshawar, <u>asma@icp.edu.pk</u>
³SDEO BPS 17, <u>sherzamanafridi82@gmail.com</u>

⁴PhD Scholar, Qurtuba University of Science and Information Technology D.I.Khan, <u>amin.tareeni@gmail.com</u> ⁵Lecture, University of Science and Technology Bannu, <u>zubhayat@gmail.com</u>

Abstract

The study aimed to investigate the mediating role of career decision-making self-efficacy in the connection between personality traits and career choices in undergraduate students, focusing on variations between genders and school types. The population included 10 public and 10 private schools, with a sample of 10 students from each, totaling 200 students selected through simple random sampling. Data were collected via a questionnaire adapted from the Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy Short Form by Betz & Taylor (2012). Results showed slightly higher self-efficacy among male students and those attending private schools. The study suggests a need for structured career development programs in schools, emphasizing the importance of understanding factors influencing career decision-making for effective guidance by administrators and policymakers.

Key words: Mediating role, career decision-making, self-efficacy, personality traits, undergraduate students

Introduction

In the dynamic landscape of higher education, the process of career decision-making among undergraduate students is a multifaceted journey influenced by a myriad of factors (Jiang, (2016). One such influential determinant is the individual's personality traits, which shape not only academic pursuits but also play a pivotal role in guiding future career choices. Understanding the intricate interplay between personality traits and career decisions is crucial for educators, career counselors, and policymakers seeking to enhance the effectiveness of guidance programs and support mechanisms for students navigating the complexities of career planning (Samuels-Jones, 2020).

Muscatello, Bruno, Mento, Pandolfo, and Zoccali, (2016) says that Personality traits, encompassing a range of psychological characteristics, have been extensively studied in relation to various life outcomes, including educational and career choices. However, the mechanisms through which these traits impact and interact with career decisions remain a subject of ongoing exploration (Chuang, Lee, & Kwok, 2020). Recognizing the need for a nuanced understanding, this research aims to delve into the mediating role of career decision-making self-efficacy—a concept rooted in Bandura's social cognitive theory. Career decision-making self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in their capability to successfully execute tasks and make effective decisions regarding their career paths (Xin, Tang, & Zhou, 2020). The hypothesis guiding this study is that career decision-making self-efficacy acts as a mediator in the relationship between personality traits and the ultimate career choices made by undergraduate students (Dostanić, Suvajdžić, & Krpović–Bojanić, 2021).

By unraveling the intricate connections between personality traits, career decision-making self-efficacy, and the resultant career choices, this research seeks to contribute valuable insights to the fields of psychology, education, and career development (Falco, & Summers, 2019). The findings of this study may offer practical implications for designing targeted interventions and support systems that care to the unique needs of individuals based on their personality profiles, ultimately fostering more informed and satisfying career decisions among undergraduate students.

The objective of this study is to explore the gender-based disparities in career decision-making self-efficacy among higher secondary students. By delving into this area, the research aims to shed light on potential differences in how boys and girls perceive their abilities to make career choices confidently. The hypothesis posits that there is no substantial variance in career decision-making self-efficacy between male and female students. Through rigorous analysis and comparison, this study seeks to contribute valuable insights into the factors influencing career aspirations and decision-making processes among adolescents, ultimately aiming to inform educational and career guidance strategies tailored to address any identified gender disparities.

Literature Review

Understanding the intricate interplay between personality traits, career decision-making self-efficacy (CDMSE), and career choices is vital for comprehending individuals' career development trajectories, particularly among undergraduate students. This literature review aims to explore existing research examining the mediating role of Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy in the relationship between personality traits and career choices among this demographic.

Akosah-Twumasi, Emeto, et, al. (2018) indicates that personality traits play a significant role in shaping individuals' career preferences and decisions. Traits such as extraversion, conscientiousness, openness to experience, agreeableness, and neuroticism have been extensively studied in relation to vocational interests and occupational choices. For instance, individuals high in conscientiousness may be drawn to structured and goal-oriented professions, while those high in openness to experience may seek out creative or unconventional career paths (Baruddin, Rameli, & Alhassora, 2021).

Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy refers to individuals' beliefs in their ability to effectively engage in career decisionmaking processes (Lam, & Santos, 2018). It encompasses confidence in gathering occupational information, self-appraisal, goal setting, planning, and problem-solving skills related to career choices. Studies have consistently demonstrated the positive influence of CDMSE on career decision-making outcomes, including career exploration, commitment, and satisfaction (Lee, Jung, Baek, & Lee, 2022).

Recent research has begun to explore the mediating role of Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy in the relationship between personality traits and career choices. Findings suggest that Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy may act as a mechanism through which personality traits influence individuals' career decision-making processes (Falco, & Summers, 2019, and Chuang, Lee, & Kwok, 2020). For or example, individuals with certain personality traits, such as high levels of extraversion or openness to experience, may exhibit greater Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy, thereby facilitating more proactive and informed career decision-making.

Understanding the mediating role of Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy in the connection between personality traits and career choices has practical implications for career counseling and guidance interventions aimed at enhancing students' career decision-making abilities (Penn, & Lent, 2019). Future research endeavors should employ longitudinal designs and consider additional factors, such as cultural influences and socioeconomic backgrounds, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of this complex relationship.

In conclusion, the literature reviewed underscores the importance of considering both personality traits and Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy in understanding undergraduate students' career choices. By elucidating the mediating role of Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy researchers can offer valuable insights into the mechanisms underlying individuals' career decision-making processes and inform strategies for promoting effective career development interventions among this demographic.

Methods and Methodology

The study employed a survey design to collect data, focusing on a descriptive and quantitative approach. The population comprised 200 students from various schools in the Peshawar district of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The sample, drawn from both private and government schools, consisted of 200 male and female students from 20 schools. Each school contributed 10 students selected through simple random sampling. Data collection utilized a modified version of the Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy Short Form (CDMSE-SF) developed by Taylor & Betz (2012), adapted to fit the study's requirements. This instrument measured five components related to career decision-making, including, planning, and problem-solving, with a total of 10 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale. Analysis of the collected data involved editing, tabulating, and then analyzing it using SPSS software version 23, employing statistical tools such as mean, standard deviation, and t-test for interpretation and inference.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

This study seeks to investigate the variations in career decision-making self-efficacy among higher secondary students, with a specific focus on gender differences. By examining how boys and girls perceive their abilities to make career choices confidently, the research aims to provide valuable insights into potential disparities that may exist in this critical aspect of adolescent development. The hypothesis posits that there will be no significant difference in career decision-making self-efficacy between male and female students. Through thorough analysis and comparison, this study aims to contribute to the understanding of factors influencing career aspirations and decision-making processes, thereby informing educational and career guidance strategies aimed at fostering equal opportunities for all students, regardless of gender.

4.1 Descriptive Analysis of the Sample

Table 4.1:	Frequency	Distribution	Analysis	in	Percentage	of	students	Regarding	Planning	variable	of	Career
decision n	naking self-e	efficacy										

S.No	Items	SA	Α	UC	DA	SDA	Mean	S.Deviation
1	I can develop a plan for upcoming	83	66	22	27	2	2.00	1.077
	next five years.	41.5	33.0	11.0	13.5	1.0		
2	I am confident about the completion	99	74	15	11	1	1.71	.867
	of major (field of study) I already selected.	49.5	37.0	7.5	5.5	0.5		
3	I know how to develop an impressive	69	78	25	24	4	2.08	1.063
	resume.	34.5	39.0	12.5	12.0	2.0		
4	I am sure to find employer relevant to	93	74	16	10	7	1.82	1.016
	my career possibilities.	46.5	37.0	8.0	5.0	3.5		
5	I have the ability to successfully deal	85	81	22	9	3	1.82	.906
	with the interview process.	42.5	40.5	11.0	4.5	1.5		
	Total	17.16	14.92	4	3.24	0.68	0.3772	0.19716

PLANNING:



Figure 4.1: Mean and standard deviation of students Regarding Planning variable of career decision making selfefficacy.

The data in table 4.1 shows career decision making self-efficacy on 05 constructs. Item 16 indicates that 74.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 14.5% of the respondents were disagreed or strongly disagreed, where as only 11.0% ticked the "Uncertain" option. Item 17 indicated that 86.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 6.0% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 7.5% were "Uncertain" . Item 18 indicated that 73.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed,14.0% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 7.5% were "Uncertain" about the statement asked. Item 19 indicated that 83.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 8.5% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 8.0% were "Uncertain" .Item 20 depicts that 83% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 6.0% of the respondents disagreed or strongly agreed, 6.0% of the respondents disagreed or strongly agreed, 8.5% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 8.0% were "Uncertain" .Item 20 depicts that 83% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 6.0% of the respondents disagreed or strongly agreed, 6.0% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 11.0% were "Uncertain" about the statement asked. The mean score and standard deviation (Mean =(0.3772) S.D=(0.19716) of the data also reveals that most of the public and private male and female students had a minor difference in career decision making self-efficacy. The overall data represent mix responses towards variables of career decision making self-efficacy. In addition , the data is also shown graphically.

S.No	Items	SA	Α	UC	DA	SDA	Mean	S.Deviation
6	I am confident to take steps if I get in	83	74	29	12	2	1.88	.938
	trouble during selection of field of study	41.5	37.0	14.5	6.0	1.0		
7	I am sure that during frustration I am	70	78	30	11	11	2.08	1.102
	able to work on my career goal.	35.0	39.0	15.0	5.5	5.5		
8	I will consider to change my major	64	86	22	15	13	2.14	1.142
	(field of study) if I get annoyed.	32.0	43.0	11.0	7.5	6.5		
9	I will make decision to change my	47	100	28	14	11	2.21	1.054
	occupation if I am not satisfied with	23.5	50.0	14.0	7.0	5.5		
	the one I am already in.							
10	I am able to identify alternative	71	81	31	9	8	2.01	1.027
	major(field of study) if I failed to get	35.5	40.5	15.5	4.5	4.0		
	my first choice.							
	Total	13.4	16.76	5.6	2.44	1.8	0.4128	0.21052

Table 4.2: Frequency Distribution Analysis in Percentage of Students Regarding Problem Solving variable of Career decision making self-efficacy.



PROBLEM SOLVING:

Figure 4.2: Mean and standard deviation of students Regarding Problem Solving variable of career decision making self-efficacy.

The data in table 4.2 shows career decision making self-efficacy on 05 constructs. Item 21 indicates that 78.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 7.0% of the respondents were disagreed or strongly disagreed, where as only 14.5% ticked the "Uncertain" option. Item 22 indicated that 74.0% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 11.0% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 15.0% were "Uncertain". Item 23 indicated that 75.0% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 14.0% of the respondents disagreed, whereas only 11.0% were "Uncertain" about the statement asked. Item 24 indicated that 73.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 12.5% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 14.0% were "Uncertain". Item 25 depicts that 76.0% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 12.5% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 8.5% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 14.0% were "Uncertain" about the statement asked. The mean score and standard deviation (Mean =(0.4128) S.D=(0.21052) of the data also reveals that most of the public and private male and female students had a little minor difference in career decision making self-efficacy. The overall data represent responses towards variables of career decision making self-efficacy. In addition, the data is also shown graphically.

4.3: PLANNING FEMALE:

Figure 4.3: Frequency Distribution Analysis in percentage of female students Regarding planning variable of Career decision making self-efficacy

S.No	Items	SA	Α	UC	DA	SDA	Mean	S.Deviation
1	I can develop a plan	47	27	7	17	2	2.00	1.189
	for upcoming next	47.0	27.0	7.0	17.0	2.0		
	five years.							
2	I am confident about	57	33	5	4	1	1.58	.806
	the completion of	57.0	33.0	5.0	4.0	1.0		
	major (field of study)							
	I already selected.							
3	I know how to	41	37	5	16	1	1.99	1.096
	develop an impressive	41.0	37.0	5.0	16.0	1.0		
	resume.							
4	I am sure to find	52	35	5	5	3	1.72	.986
	employer relevant to	52.0	35.0	5.0	5.0	3.0		
	my career possibilities.							
5	I have the ability to	43	32	17	7	1	1.62	.826
	successfully deal with	43.0	32.0	17.0	7.0	1.0		
	the interview process.							
	Total	48	32.8	7.8	9.8	1.6	1.782	0.9806



Figure 4.3: Mean and standard deviation of all female students Regarding planning variable of career decision making self-efficacy.

The data in table 4.3 shows career decision making self-efficacy on 05 constructs. Item 16 indicates that 74.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 19.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, where as only 5.0% ticked the "Uncertain" option. Item 17 indicated that 90.0% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 5.0% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 5.0% were "Uncertain". Item 18 indicated that 78.0% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 17.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 5.0% were "Uncertain" about the statement asked. Item 19 indicated that 87.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 8.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 5.0% were "Uncertain" Item 20 depicts that 75.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 8.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 17.0 % were "Uncertain" about the statement asked. The mean score and standard deviation (Mean =(1.782) S.D=(0.9806) of the data also reveals that most of the public and private female students had a minor difference in career decision making self-efficacy. In addition , the data is also shown graphically.

4.4: PLANNING MALE:

4.4:Frequency Distribution Analysis in percentage of female students Regarding planning variable of Career decision making self-efficacy.

S.No	Items	SA	Α	UC	DA	SDA	Mean	S.Deviation
1	I can develop a plan for	36	39	15	9	1	1.99	.959
	upcoming next five years.	(36.0)	(39.0)	(15.0)	(9.0)	(1.0)		
2	I am confident about the	42	41	10	6	1	1.83	.911
	completion of major ((42.0)	(41.0)	(10.0)	(6.0)	(1.0)		
	field of study) I already							
	selected.							
3	I know how to develop an	28	41	20	8	3	2.17	1.025
	impressive resume.	(28.0)	(41.0)	(20.0)	(8.0)	(3.0)		
4	I am sure to find	41	39	11	5	4	1.92	1.041
	employer relevant to my	(41.0)	(39.0)	(11.0)	(5.0)	(4.0)		
	career possibilities.							
5	I have the ability to	47	39	12	1	1	2.02	.943
	successfully deal with the	(47.0)	(39.0)	(12.0)	(1.0)	(1.0)		
	interview process.					•		
	Total	34.8	39.8	13.6	5.8	2	1.986	0.9758



Figure 4.4: Mean and standard deviation of all male students regarding planning variable of career decision making self-efficacy.

The data in table 4.5 shows career decision making self-efficacy on 05 constructs. Item 16 indicates that 75.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 10.0 % of the respondents were disagreed or strongly disagreed, where as only 15.0% ticked the "Uncertain" option. Item 17 indicated that 83.0% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 7.0% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 10.0 % were "Uncertain". Item 18 indicated that 69.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 11.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 10.0 % were "Uncertain" about the statement asked. Item 19 indicated that 80.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 9.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 2.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 11.0% were "Uncertain". Item 20 depicts that 86.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 2.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 11.0% were "Uncertain" about the statement asked. The mean score and standard deviation (Mean =(1.986) S.D=(0.9758) of the data also reveals that most of the public and private male students had a minor difference in career decision making self-efficacy. The overall data represent mix answers from all male respondents to show their responses towards variables of career decision making self-efficacy. In addition , the data is also shown graphically.



4.5: PLANNING COMPARISON AMONG MALE AND FEMALE:

Figure 4.5 shows standard deviation and mean in variable planning between male and female. figure shows a high frequency of mean in male with a slight difference in female. figure also shows high frequency of standard deviation in female as compare to male.

4.6: PROBLEM SOLVING: FEMALE

4.6: Frequency Distribution Analysis in percentage of all female students Regarding Problem solving variable of career decision making self-efficacy.

S.No	Items	SA	Α	UC	DA	SDA	Mean	S.Deviation
6	I am confident to take steps if I get in	56	32	5	6	1	1.64	.905
	trouble during selection of field of study	56.0	32.0	5.0	6.0	1.0		
7	I am sure that during frustration I am able	44	30	13	7	6	2.01	1.185
	to work on my career goal.	44.0	30.0	13.0	7.0	6.0		
8	I will consider to change my major (field of	36	32	11	10	11	2.28	1.341
	study) if I get annoyed.	36.0	32.0	11.0	10.0	11.0		
9	I will make decision to change my	27	39	17	9	8	2.32	1.197
	occupation if I am not satisfied with the	27.0	39.0	17.0	9.0	8.0		
	one I am already in.							
10	I am able to identify alternative major (field	44	35	12	5	4	1.90	1.059
	of study) if I failed to get my first choice.	44.0	35.0	12.0	5.0	4.0		
	Total	41.4	33.6	11.6	7.2	6	2.03	1.1374



4.6: Mean and standard deviation of all female students Regarding Problem solving variable of career decision making self-efficacy.

The data in table 4.6. shows career decision making self-efficacy on 05 constructs. Item 21 indicates that 88.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 7.0 % of the respondents were disagreed or strongly disagreed, where as only 5.0% ticked the "Uncertain" option. Item 22 indicated that 74.0% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 13.0% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 13.0 % were "Uncertain". Item 23 indicated that 68.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 21.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 11.0% were "Uncertain" about the statement asked. . Item 24 indicated that 66.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 17.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 17.0% were "Uncertain" .Item 25 depicts that 79.0% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed , 9.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 12.0 % were "Uncertain" about the statement asked. The mean score and standard deviation (Mean =(2.03) S.D=(1.1374) of the data also reveals that most of the public and private female students had a minor difference in career decision making selfefficacy. The overall data represent mix answers from all female respondents to show their responses towards variables of career decision making self-efficacy. In addition, the data is also shown graphically.

career decision making self-efficacy. S.No Items SA A UC DA SDA Mean S.Deviation 6 I am confident to take steps if I get in trouble 27 42 24 6 1 2.12 .913 during selection of field of study 27.0 42.0 24.0 6.0 1.0 7 I am sure that during frustration I am able to 48 17 5 1.015 26 4 2.14 work on my career goal. 26.0 48.0 17.0 4.0 5.0 8 I will consider to change my major (field of 28 54 5 2 1.99 .882 11 study) if I get annoved. 28.0 54.0 5.0 2.0 11.09 20 5 3 2.10 .882 I will make decision to change my occupation 61 11 if I am not satisfied with the one I am already 20.0 11.0 5.0 3.0 61.0

4.7: PROBLEM SOLVING:MALE

Table 4.7: Frequency Distribution Analysis in percentage of male students regarding problem solving variable of

222 The Mediating Role Of Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy In The Connection Between Personality Traits And Career Choices In Undergraduate Students

	in.							
10	I am able to identify alternative major (field	27	46	19	4	4	2.12	.988
	of study) if I failed to get my first choice.	27.0	46.0	19.0	4.0	4.0		
	Total	25.6	50.2	16.4	4.8	3	2.094	0.936



Figure 4.7: Mean and standard deviation of all male students regarding Problem solving variables of career decision making self-efficacy.

The data in table 4.3.14 shows career decision making self-efficacy on 05 constructs. Item 21 indicates that 69.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 7.0 % of the respondents were disagreed or strongly disagreed, where as only 24.0% ticked the "Uncertain" option. Item 22 indicated that 74.0% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 9.0% of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 17.0 % were "Uncertain". Item 23 indicated that 82.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 7.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, whereas only 17.0 % were "Uncertain" about the statement asked. Item 24 indicated that 81.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 8.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed, 8.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed , 8.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed , 8.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed , 8.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed , 8.0 % of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed , 8.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed , 8.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed , 8.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed or strongly agreed , 8.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed , 8.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed or strongly agreed , 8.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed or strongly agreed , 8.0 % of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed or strongly agreed and private male score and standard deviation (Mean =(2.094) S.D=(0.936) of the data also reveals that most of the public and private male students had a minor difference in career decision making self-efficacy. The overall data represent mix answers from all male respondents to show their responses towards variables of career decision making self-efficacy. In addition , the data is also shown graphically.





Figure 4.3.15 reveals standard deviation and mean in variable problem solving between male and female. figure shows a high frequency of mean in male with a slight difference in female. figure also shows high frequency of standard deviation in female as compare to male.

Table 4.8: Variables (Mean, R, SD and Variance) N=200											
CDMSE	Mean	Range		SD	Variance						
		Max	Min								
Planning	0.3772	2.08	1.71	0.19716	0.979						
Problem solving	0.4128	2.21	1.88	0.21052	1.1128						

Table 4.8 provides an overview of the Mean, Range, Standard Deviation, and Variance of Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy (CDMSE) and its various scales. For the planning aspect, the mean score is 0.3772, with a range from 1.71 to 2.08. The Standard Deviation is 0.19716, indicating the extent of variability around the mean, while the Variance is calculated to be 0.979. Similarly, for problem-solving, the mean score is 0.4128, with a range from 1.88 to 2.21. The Standard Deviation is 0.21052, and the Variance is 1.1128. These statistical measures provide valuable insights into the distribution and dispersion of scores within each aspect of career decision-making self-efficacy, aiding in a comprehensive understanding of the data presented.

Inconclusion there is no significant difference in the perceptions of career decision-making self-efficacy between male and female students. This suggests that both genders, on average, view their abilities to make career choices confidently in a similar manner. Similarly, the research reveals that there is no substantial disparity in career decision-making self-efficacy between students attending government schools and those in private institutions. These results suggest that regardless of gender or school type, students tend to exhibit comparable levels of confidence in their career decision-making abilities. Such insights are crucial for understanding and addressing potential factors that may influence career aspirations and decision-making processes among adolescents, guiding the development of more inclusive and effective educational and career guidance strategies.

5.1 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the findings from the presented results shed light on various aspects of career decision-making self-efficacy among students. The majority of students exhibited a strong response to career decision-making self-efficacy, particularly emphasizing problem-solving skills. Descriptive analyses revealed minor differences in self-efficacy levels between male and female students, as well as between students from public and private schools. However, further statistical analysis through t-tests indicated statistically non-significant differences, supporting the conclusion that gender and school type do not significantly impact students' self-efficacy in career decision-making. Mean score values further emphasized the minor differences observed across demographics, suggesting a general consensus among students in their confidence levels. Additionally, the comparison between government and private school students also revealed minor differences in self-efficacy levels, further supporting the notion of a uniform trend in career decision-making self-efficacy among students. Overall, these findings highlight the importance of fostering a supportive environment for all students to develop and enhance their career decision-making skills, irrespective of gender or school type.

References

- 1. Akosah-Twumasi, P., Emeto, T. I., Lindsay, D., Tsey, K., & Malau-Aduli, B. S. (2018, July). A systematic review of factors that influence youths career choices—the role of culture. In *Frontiers in education* (Vol. 3, p. 348903). Frontiers.
- Baruddin, W. N. M. B., Rameli, M. R. M., & Alhassora, N. S. A. (2021). Relationship between Personality Trait and Career Decision-Making Self-Efficacy on the Commitment to Career Choices among Undergraduate Students of Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. REVISTA GEINTEC-GESTAO INOVACAO E TECNOLOGIAS, 11(3), 1094-1115.
- 3. Chuang, N. K., Lee, P. C., & Kwok, L. (2020). Assisting students with career decision-making difficulties: Can career decision-making self-efficacy and career decision-making profile help?. Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education, 26, 100235.
- 4. Chuang, N. K., Lee, P. C., & Kwok, L. (2020). Assisting students with career decision-making difficulties: Can career decision-making self-efficacy and career decision-making profile help?. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education, 26*, 100235.
- 5. Dostanić, J., Suvajdžić, K., & Krpović–Bojanić, Ž. (2021). Decision-making styles, career decision self-efficacy, and career adaptability among high school students. *The Career development quarterly*, *69*(1), 63-77.
- 6. Falco, L. D., & Summers, J. J. (2019). Improving career decision self-efficacy and STEM self-efficacy in high school girls: Evaluation of an intervention. *Journal of Career Development*, 46(1), 62-76.
- 7. Falco, L. D., & Summers, J. J. (2019). Improving career decision self-efficacy and STEM self-efficacy in high school girls: Evaluation of an intervention. *Journal of Career Development*, 46(1), 62-76.
- 8. Jiang, Z. (2016). Emotional intelligence and career decision-making self-efficacy: Mediating roles of goal commitment and professional commitment. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 53(1), 30-47.
- 9. Lam, M., & Santos, A. (2018). The impact of a college career intervention program on career decision self-efficacy, career indecision, and decision-making difficulties. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 26(3), 425-444.
- Lee, S., Jung, J., Baek, S., & Lee, S. (2022). The relationship between career decision-making self-efficacy, career preparation behaviour and career decision difficulties among South Korean college students. *Sustainability*, 14(21), 14384.

- 11. Muscatello, M. R. A., Bruno, A., Mento, C., Pandolfo, G., & Zoccali, R. A. (2016). Personality traits and emotional patterns in irritable bowel syndrome. *World journal of gastroenterology*, *22*(28), 6402.
- 12. Penn, L. T., & Lent, R. W. (2019). The joint roles of career decision self-efficacy and personality traits in the prediction of career decidedness and decisional difficulty. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 27(3), 457-470.
- 13. Samuels-Jones, M. A. (2020). An exploration of career decidedness in third year first-generation undergraduate students at a small private Midwest college. Northeastern University.
- 14. Xin, L., Tang, F., Li, M., & Zhou, W. (2020). From school to work: Improving graduates' career decision-making selfefficacy. *Sustainability*, *12*(3), 804.