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The millennial generation is slowly entering the workforce, while the majority is in high school or in college, the impact they will have on organizations is still unknown. This research aims to explore the employability and factors relating to in millennials in college. The purpose of this study is to identify the emotional intelligence and career maturity levels of millennials in college. The theoretical frameworks used in this study were the theories of emotional intelligence, career maturity, and employability.

The sample of this study is all undergraduate and graduate students in a department in the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences (CALS) at a southern land-grant institution, the University of Florida (UF). The five constructs of emotional intelligence that were measured are relating well to others, emotional mentoring, managing emotions, self-awareness, and self-motivation. The attitude scale of career maturity was measured. An online survey tool was used to administer the survey to participants.

The results showed that three generations existed in the department, Millennials, Gen X, and Baby Boomers. Generational differences exist regarding career maturity
and emotional intelligence. Undergraduate students perceive themselves to have a higher ability in emotional intelligence than graduate students. Females and males scored differently on emotional intelligence scales and career maturity. Student classification and age were the only constructs that were statistically significant with career maturity. Therefore, as an individual increases in age and student classification, career maturity increases as well.

The findings of this study suggest that curriculum should reflect needed development in undergraduates in ethics, communication, and soft skill development. The researcher recommends that having high emotional intelligence and high career maturity contributes to employability.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Generational cohorts have been named after a myriad of factors, such as monumental events, demographics, social movements, and pop culture (Pew Research Center, 2010). Researchers have had contradictory opinions as to the exact dates of each generational cohort, and variations have been available with no consensus (Tulgan, 2000). Another issue in generational studies has been the controversy over their necessity. The first standpoint implied that generational studies have not been necessary, based on the theory that all generations in their early adulthood have been examined and seen as entitled (Cappelli, 2010). This area believes that it is important to consider the history, personality, and values of each generation in an organizational setting (Smola & Sutton, 2002). An exponential increase in research and popular media has been occurring in regards to generational cohorts in the workplace since the late 1990s, placing an emphasis on how they will work together (Zemke, Raines, & Filipzak, 2000; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002).

The population has become very diverse in recent times, especially diverse in ethnicity, gender, and age (Gist, Stevens, & Bavetta, 1991). In the workforce, there have been four generations since 2000. The four generations are Veterans, Baby Boomers, Gen X, and the Millennials. The Veteran generation was born before 1946, and its members have also been called the “silent generation,” “GI,” “matures,” or the “children of the Great Depression” (Pew Research Center, 2010). The Baby Boomers were born between 1946 and 1964. They received their name because of the boom in birth rates after World War II (Pew Research Center, 2010). Next, those in Generation X...
were born between the years of 1965 to 1980. This generation has been described as disliking authority and being independent (Pew Research Center, 2010; Tulgan, 2000). The Millennial generation was born between the years of 1981 to 2000 (Howe & Strauss, 2000). Millennials are the newest generation to enter the workforce (Pew Research Center, 2010).

**Millennials**

Strauss and Howe (1991) popularized the term “Millennial” when they published the book, *Generations: The History of America's Future, 1584 to 2069*. This book contributed to the examination of generational cohorts in the history of the U.S. and their impact on organizations. Howe and Strauss’ next book, *Millennials Rising: The Next Great Generation* (2000) focused on Millennial research and gave rise to the popularization of the Millennials in the popular media and research. Millennial research began in the early 2000s, when the Millennials started entering college and the workforce (Howe & Strauss, 2000). Researchers ascribe to one of the two schools of thought on Millennials: whether Millennials are the best or the worst generation. Researchers, who believe Millennials are the worst generation, criticize Millennials for their self-entitlement, obsession with television, communication solely through online means or text messaging, and desire for high-achievement with minimal effort (Bauerlein, 2008). Conversely, the researchers that believe Millennials are the greatest generation adheres to Howe and Strauss’ (2000) seven traits of Millennials: sheltered, team-oriented, high-achieving, confident, pressured, conventional, and full of promise (Howe & Strauss, 2000). The seven traits have not been agreed upon by all researchers because of the lack of consensus on the Millennials. An undisputed characteristic of Millennials has been that they are high-achieving and they demand and
question everything (Cooney, 2007). These personality traits have been distressing employers. Employers believe Millennials are pretentious and ambitious. Millennial’s show lack of communication, leadership, group collaboration, and conflict management skills before entering the workplace (Boussiakou, Boussiakou, & Kalkani; 2006; Hartman & McCambridge, 2011). Millennials have been described as self-centered high-achievers who would clash in the corporate culture (Safer, 2007; Kowske, Rasch, & Wiley, 2010). Millennials have been said to behave quite differently than Baby Boomers and Gen Xers, not including the typical attitudes that come with the young age, a possible cause of that being technology and social media (Deal, Altman, & Rogelberg, 2010). Their parents have been described as protective and allowing them to live at home until their thirties (Pew Research Center, 2010). The Millennial generation is the most racially diverse of all generations (Pew Research Center, 2009).

In regards to Millennials’ aspirations and education, Millennials have been on track to become the generation with the most education in the nation’s history, but due to the depressed economy, they have not been able to find jobs (Pew Research Center, 2010). College attendance has never been this high in history, a contributing factor being community college enrollment (Pew Research Center, 2010). According to Deal, Altman, and Rogelberg (2010), “Millennials are entering college in record numbers but are arriving with low levels of general knowledge on which to build the educational foundation they will need to be successful later in life” (p. 193). Over half of college presidents believe incoming freshman arrive less prepared for college, but the reason as to why Millennials are less prepared is unknown (Pew Research Center, 2010).
Millennials in the Workplace

An abundance of research on Millennials’ personality traits has been available, but there is little research on Millennials entering or in the workforce (Kowske, Rasch, & Wiley; 2010). Millennials are working with three other generations in the workplace: Baby Boomers, Gen Xers, and Veterans (McCuiston, Wooldridge, & Pierce, 2004). This mix of employees and leaders having varying styles and goals has presented challenges that need to be considered. It has been suggested that if employers provide employees with trust and opportunities and bosses who are competent, then all employees of all generations will work together (Deal, Altman, & Rogelberg, 2010).

Unfortunately, all generations are worried in the recession; Baby Boomers and Veterans are anxious about retirement, Gen Xers are concerned about their future benefits, and Millennials cannot find jobs (Deal, Altman, & Rogelberg, 2010). According to the Pew Research Center (2010b), “As jobs vanished and businesses closed, America’s newest entrants into the labor force have often found themselves among the last hired and the first to lose their jobs” (p. 39).

Employers want to know what the Millennials are like and what their abilities are. Millennials want to be valued at their organizations and they emphasize a balance between work and personal life, which means that it needs to be reflected in their employers (Smola & Sutton, 2002). Conversely, Millennials sleep with their iPods, are glued to their Facebook pages, while impatiently waiting to start earning six figures and unwilling to adapt to the organizational structures before them (Alsop, 2008). Much is to be learned about what Millennials want out of their careers and what fulfills them.

Many industries are concerned about Millennials’ ability to perform in the workforce. For example, the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE)
posted an article in 2009 on Millennials called “The Challenges of Managing Millennials in the Workplace.” Universities and employers are unsure if Millennials can survive in the workplace with the other generational cohorts. AgProfessional Magazine came out with an article on Millennials called “Is Your Workplace ‘Cool’ Enough for Millennials” (Ferri-Reed, 2011). On November 11, 2007, CBS broadcast a special on the show 60 Minutes called “The Millennials are Coming.” This show highlighted the fact that not only employers and researchers are curious that Millennials are entering the workforce but also the general public.

Equally important, Millennials grew up having an online presence and being immersed in social media, but how has that impacted their interpersonal skills and the way they interact with people in other areas of their lives? According to Gibbs (1995) in his Time magazine article the author described the importance of emotional intelligence: “IQ gets you hired but EQ gets you promoted” (p. 59). Even though the author’s comment was comical, the importance of emotional intelligence in the workplace is emphasized and has been a realistic advantage in the workplace. Emotional intelligence has been described as the ability to manage emotions intrapersonally and interpersonally (Weisinger, 1998). Educators need to incorporate emotional intelligence into curriculum to prepare college students for their potential careers (Jaeger, 2003). If Millennials are high-achieving and self-entitled (Howe & Strauss, 2000), then will they have difficulty interacting with others in the workplace in a team environment? Finding the Millennial impact on organizations will take more time because they are just now graduating college and entering the workforce (Howe & Strauss, 2000). As the U.S. workforce becomes more diverse with gender, ethnicity, and age, the workplace needs
employees that have interpersonal skills to interact effectively (Gist, Stevens, & Bavetta, 1991). Interpersonal skills or social competencies aid in communicating effectively to others in any setting.

Furthermore, there is a need for higher education educators to facilitate the emotional development of students in college and those entering the workforce (Boussiakou, Boussiakou, & Kalkani; 2006). Students who have been preparing to go into the workforce or college need help understanding how to manage and be aware of their emotions, positive or negative (Boussiakou, Boussiakou, & Kalkani; 2006). According to Boussiakou, Boussiakou, and Kalkani (2006), “Emotional intelligence abilities are a priority for human resources management that gives guidance in hiring and promoting people, and gives directions for developmental efforts in large organizations” (p. 1). Employers’ top two priorities when hiring college graduates are teamwork and communication (Bhavnani & Aldridge, 2000). Since the first of the Millennials turned 18 years old in 2000 and entered the workforce or college, organizations are interested in what Millennials know and how they work (Howe & Strauss, 2000). This is important because employers believe that Millennials are unprepared to enter the workplace; training and education need to address these issues (Cooney, 2007). Educators must build a strong foundation in students entering the workforce to develop emotional intelligence and critical thinking (Stedman & Andenoro, 2006). Since educators prepare students for the workplace, the needs of employers must be addressed (Stedman & Andenoro, 2006). Emotional intelligence assists the development of job-related skills and may determine a person’s potential (Zeidner, Matthews, & Roberts, 2004). Zeidner, Matthews, and Roberts (2004) described
emotionally intelligent individuals as being more successful, having stronger relationships, and communicating better in their work environments.

According to Albrecht (2006), there is a lack of research on emotional intelligence as a broad competency for Millennials. Research has switched from the term “interpersonal skills” to the term “emotional intelligence” in the last decade. The concept of interpersonal skills and emotional intelligence has been used interchangeably and is a very broad term; there have been no successful assessments to encompass all the components (Albrecht, 2006).

**Statement of the Problem**

There is a growing concern about the impact Millennials will have on organizations, their lack of communication, team skills, and their heavy influence of social media and technology relating to their lack of emotional intelligence. Do Millennials have the necessary emotional intelligence and career maturity that is needed for the workplace, in order to be employable? Do Millennials have lower emotional intelligence because of their heavy influence on social media and online presence? Millennials have been called the most educated generation, yet the most unemployed. Part of that is due to the economy but another part could be due to their inability to transition well into the workplace (Jayson, 2010). The research problem of this study is to examine if Millennials have the necessary emotional intelligences that need to match up with their career needs.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this research was to examine the role of emotional intelligence and career maturity in Millennials who are in college in the Agricultural Education and Communication department at the University of Florida to ascertain their employability.
A secondary purpose of this study will be to explore the relationship of emotional intelligence and career maturity in Millennials; this will be analyzed to identify if demographic and education variables affect an employable college graduate.

**Objectives**

This research will address the following objectives:

- To determine the level of emotional intelligence of students,
- to determine the level of career maturity of students,
- to identify the relationship between emotional intelligence and career maturity of students, and
- to identify the perceived values in the workplace held by students.

**Significance of the Study**

This study could alleviate concern for employers and determine if Millennials can handle the stress and develop the “people skills” or emotional intelligence needed for the workplace. Millennials need more training in communicating, how to deal with conflict, and working in teams which have been shown to relate somewhat to emotional intelligence (Hartman & McCambridge, 2011). This study can inform researchers on Millennials’ emotional intelligence but further research is needed. Although the boom in Millennial research began in the early 2000s when the Millennials started entering college, not much is known about their impact on organizations yet (Strauss & Howe, 2002). This study could start the examination of their level of emotional intelligence and their abilities to cope with the skills needed to work with others.

Also, this study could possibly find the impacts of Millennials working with other generations in an organizational setting. This study will be beneficial because
educators can use the results to provide Millennials proper training and emotional development, and ensure a smooth transition to the workplace. This could enhance the recruitment and training process for organizations. Results from this study can provide further explanation as to why Millennials are the most educated generation, yet the most unemployed generation (Jayson, 2010). Besides the economy and their lack of experience, emotional intelligence levels could be a factor in the reasons employers are hesitant to hire Millennials and are investing in Millennial research.

Educators need to address this to better prepare Millennials for the workforce. If leadership educators understand what employers want and what Millennials lack, the transition into the workforce would be smoother. Examining Millennials’ emotional intelligence will give leadership educators insight into what is important to maintaining and advancing their careers. This study could provide direction for educators to assist students in developing the emotional intelligence needed after graduation.

According to the American Association for Agricultural Education 2011- 2015 Research Priority Areas, Priority 4 Meaningful, Engaged Learning in All Environments aligns with this study:

Learners in all agricultural education learning environments will be actively and emotionally engaged in learning, leading to high levels of achievement, life and career readiness, and professional success. (Doerfert, 2011, priority #4)

This priority aligns with the study because the purpose of the study is based on developing prepared and professional college graduates for the workplace. This research aims to examine emotional intelligence of Millennial students in agricultural colleges. This examination will provide further research for educators to focus on
career maturity in Millennial students. This study will help in identifying the emotional intelligence level of Millennials in college before they graduate and enter the workforce. Through this study, educators could restructure curriculum to ensure the development of emotional intelligence in Millennials to become more employable.

Definition of Terms

- **Emotional intelligence** – “the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ emotions, to discriminate among them, and to use the information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (Mayer & Salovey, 1993, p. 433). In this study, emotional intelligence was measured by the score on Weisinger’s assessment.

- **Career Maturity** – “the feelings, the subjective reactions, the dispositions that the individual has toward making a career choice and entering the world of work” (Crites, 1978, p. 3). In this study, career maturity will be measured by the attitude scale of the career maturity inventory (Crites, 1978).

Limitations and Assumptions

Similar to other studies, there are limitations to the validity of the study concerning the generalizability of the population. The youngest Millennials are 10 years old while the oldest are 30 years old. There is a 20-year gap, meaning the study cannot be generalizable to the entire population of Millennials. The study can be generalized to the department. It will be able contribute to future research in this area of emotional intelligence and career maturity of Millennials in college now. Also, there is an assumption that the participants of the study have answered the self-reported assessment truthfully and understood the operationally defined terms. Self-assessments are difficult to use because individuals’ perceptions of themselves are not always the truest. Another limitation would be using an online instrument may not get the response rate needed, especially surveying college students.
Chapter Summary

The Millennial generation is the most diverse in history (Pew Research Center, 2010) have been described as self-centered high-achievers that would clash in the corporate culture (Safer, 2007; Kowske, Rasch, & Wiley, 2010). As Millennials enter and graduate from college, employers are still awaiting their impact on organizations (Howe & Strauss, 2000). The research problem of this study is the inquiry concerning the impact Millennials will have on organizations and their heavy influence of social media and technology relating linking to their lack of emotional intelligence. The purpose of the study is to address the problem by examining the role of emotional intelligence and career maturity in Millennials that are in college. The significance of the study is that it will be beneficial because results from this study can provide further explanation as to why Millennials are the most educated generation yet the most unemployed generation (Jayson, 2010). Through this study, educators could restructure curriculum to ensure the development of emotional intelligence in Millennials to become more employable.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the role of emotional intelligence and career maturity of the Millennial that are in college to ascertain the employability of a selected sample of this generation. To achieve this, emotional intelligence and career maturity theories were examined. Also, other variables such as age, gender, race, team and leadership experience, job experience, student classification and career interest were explored. This chapter includes relevant studies, the theoretical framework, and a conceptual model that illustrates the relationship of the theories and factors in this study.

Theoretical Framework

Theory of Emotional Intelligence

From Darwin to modern researchers, explanations of emotional intelligences have included being able to manage one’s own emotions, understanding others’ emotions, having empathy, adapting, and recognizing and expressing emotions interpersonally (Bar-On, 2006). These general descriptions of emotional and social intelligences illustrate the portrayal of emotional intelligence of research. Behavioral scientists have been trying to understand how individuals function and why individuals behave a certain way. These general descriptions have served as foundations for the individual theories that have arisen by different researchers (Bar-On, 2006; Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 1997).

The concept of emotional-social intelligence is the combination of emotional intelligence, interpersonal skills, and the capacities necessary to interact and
communicate effectively and appropriately with others. The concept of social (or emotional) intelligences started with Thorndike in 1920. Thorndike (1920) proposed that social intelligence is similar to the intelligence quotient (I. Q.), which started the impetus of social intelligence research.

Gardner’s theory of personal intelligence (1983) was one of the foundational works on the topic of social intelligence. Gardner’s concept of personal intelligence has two components, intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligences (Gardner, 1983). His theory contends individuals need to understand themselves and others’ feelings, moods, and intentions (Gardner, 1983). Gardner’s theory overlapped with the theory of emotional intelligence and directed research to a mixed model of social intelligence. Gardner (1983) defined intrapersonal intelligence as the ability to understand and distinguish among ones feelings. In addition, Gardner (1983) defined interpersonal intelligence as the ability to determine the feelings of others and behave appropriately.

Goleman and Boyatzis continued to publish books on emotional-social intelligence in the workplace, including the *Emotionally Intelligent Workplace* (2002) and *Primal Leadership* (2001).

According to Speilberger (2004), the three major emotional-social intelligence theories are from Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (1997); Goleman (1998); and Bar-On (2006). Along with their theories, these researchers have also created the three most widely used emotional-social intelligence assessments (Speilberger, 2004): Mayer Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 1997), the Emotional Competence Inventory (Goleman, 1998) and the Emotional Quotient Inventory (Bar-On, 2006).

The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test focuses on emotional intelligence as an individual construct. Emotional intelligence is not a part of this model of emotional intelligence, unlike Goleman and Bar-On's assessments. Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (1999) hypothesized that emotional intelligence is similar to other intelligences and can be operationalized as a set of capacities. As a result, they are credited for establishing that emotional intelligence meets all criteria for a standard intelligence, thus verifying the concept.

Emotional and social intelligences are based on similar constructs that overlap. Some researchers have presumed that emotional intelligence stems from the expansive concept of social intelligence (e.g., Bar-On, 2000; Gardner, 1983; Goleman, 1995). According to Roberts, Zeidner, and Matthews (2001), emotional intelligence has been criticized for not being a valid intelligence because of issues relating to reliability validity,
and scoring. However, Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (1999) proved that valid and reliable measures of emotional intelligence can be developed.

Emotional intelligence has been shown to have a considerable influence on human performance. More than 20 studies examined the relationship between emotional-social intelligence and physical health, psychological health, academics, social interactions, performance at work and self-actualization (Bar-On, Handley, & Fund, 2005). Bar-On, Handley, and Fund (2005) found that one can teach or improve emotional social intelligence to children as well as adults. Research studies on emotional and social intelligence began on children because of a concern about what happens when children leave the academic setting and enter postsecondary school or the workforce (Dawda & Hart, 2000). The focus of that research has become the performance of individuals when interacting socially, specifically in the workplace.

According to Bar-On (2006), it is important to develop the necessary skills to interact and adapt to different environments. Weisinger’s (1998) model of emotional-social intelligence is a mixed model that presents emotional intelligence and social intelligence as different constructs that should be jointed because of their similarities.

Weisinger’s (1998) and Bar-On’s (2006) models of emotional intelligence are similar to Gardner’s (1983) concept of personal intelligences, which includes an intrapersonal (emotional) intelligence component and an interpersonal (social) intelligence component (Bar-On, 2006). Weisinger’s model of emotional intelligence has emotional and social components as the basis for using emotional intelligence for assessing the interpersonal skills in Millennials. Weisinger’s (1998) model of emotional intelligence included interpersonal and intrapersonal scales. Under the interpersonal
scale, the sub-scales are self-awareness, managing emotions, and self-motivation. Under the intrapersonal scale, the sub-scales are relating well to others and emotional mentoring.

Regarding emotional intelligence and its relation to gender, Parker, Summerfeldt, and Hogan (2004) found that when looking at emotional-social intelligence in relation to grade point average (GPA) and gender, gender had no significant impact on emotional-social intelligence or academic success. Bar-On (1997) found no significant differences in gender in relation to emotional-social intelligence. Although, Bar-On also found that women scored higher on the sub-scale of interpersonal skills but males scored higher on intrapersonal skills. Lastly, Dawda and Hart (2000) did not find a relationship between emotional intelligence and gender for Millennial college students.

Some researchers have suggested that race provides different contextual factors that could influence results based on cultural backgrounds. However, with regard to emotional and ethnicity, Bar-On (1997) found no significant differences in emotional-social intelligence between different races.

According to Bar-On (1997), when comparing emotional intelligence and age, emotional intelligence levels increase with age. According to a study by Mayer, Caruso, and Salovey (1999), results showed adults having higher levels of emotional intelligence than children because of the life experiences they had accumulated. The authors suggested that emotional intelligence starts in childhood and increases until middle age.

According to Boyatzis and Saaticioglu (2008), university faculty members have not viewed emotional and social development as part of their job descriptions, but instead, the responsibility of campus career resources. This examination by the authors
suggested that if the faculty does not believe in the development of emotional and social intelligences in students, then students will not receive emotional and social intelligence development because it is not required in the curriculums. Cohen (2006) suggested that emotional-social learning has been placed with importance in the research, but there has been little application in education.

According to Cherniss and Goleman (2001), the best combination for success is experience and emotional-social intelligence. Also, the authors found that when looking at different intelligences like IQ, emotional-social intelligence and experience, IQ is the least significant when it comes to success in the workplace. The study of emotional intelligence has been the most important when forecasting success in a leadership setting. Lastly, Cherniss and Goleman (2001) suggested that as one accumulates more experience, emotional intelligence increases.

**Career Development**

Super (1980) started research on career development in the early 1950s. Super's theory of career development and the life span theory shined the light on career development in a new perspective (Super, 1980). Super also constructed the Career Development Inventory (CDI), which has become one of the most widely used career inventories (Super, 1980). Super’s theory consists of the notion that individuals have multiple life roles and must be adaptable to plan a career. Nevill and Super’s (1988) career theory includes the constructs of career identity, career readiness, and career maturity. Career identity is the concept that an individual’s concept of themselves changes as they grow with experience. Career readiness is described as the capability to be trained in career relevant skills. Career maturity was described as the capability to be challenged and execute demands of work related tasks.
Super’s theory is the foundation for the career maturity construct of the study. Nevill and Super’s (1988) found that career maturity was not related to socioeconomic status, but gender has shown significance. In Nevill and Super’s study, females were found to have higher levels of career maturity than males. Nevill and Super’s (1988) study found that women have higher career maturity than males and more commitment at work and home. This has led to a shift in the research to career development focusing on women.

Holland’s codes for vocational guidance started the research on career planning for students (Holland, 1996). Holland’s research on occupational planning has improved career resources, guidance for students, and military specialties. The CDI was constructed to measure an individual’s readiness for making choices related to their education and future aspirations (Savickas & Hartung, 1996). Albert and Luzzo (1999) suggested that social cognitive career theory (SECT) should encourage individuals to be more personally involved in the career decision process. This theory challenges individuals to be in tune with their environment, empowerment and have set goals for career development.

Luzzo (1995) found that college women scored higher on all dimensions of career maturity than college men. Also, Nevill and Super (1988) found that women were more committed to work than males in the dimension of career commitment. These findings suggest that women prepare more for careers and are more committed to careers, which could be due to the perceptions that women need to work harder in their professional careers. According to Nevill and Super (1988), gender was not found to be related to career maturity and career commitment.
The history of career maturity started with research on high school and college students because career development starts at an early age. Super (1988) suggested that the development of individuals in regards to their career maturity is its prime in early adulthood. He also suggested that college is the most important time to develop the decision making and maturity needed for a career.

Career maturity, as discussed previously, can differ with individuals, specifically within different cultures. According to Twenge and Campbell (2008), it has been suggested that Millennials from different cultures may experience dissimilar life events so a culture may have a different influence on the Millennial generation. Chung (2002) found that women have higher career decision making skills, but in a previous study the author found no gender difference. Also, Chung (2002) found that African Americans scored higher on career decision making than Caucasians. These results were different than Gloria and Hird’s (1999), where Caucasians had higher scores than other ethnicities.

Nevill and Super (1988) found that juniors and seniors in college are more invested in the career planning process and more committed than freshmen and sophomores. Hauw and De Vos (2010) found that Millennials’ expectations about their career, training, job security, and career development are affected by generational influences. Also, Nevill and Super (1988) found that women had less work experience than males because of the other roles that they anticipate. Women have anticipated more roles due to childbearing and domestic responsibilities.

**Related Studies**

In 2010, the highest amounts of unemployed or not working 18-29 year olds was recorded in the past 30 years (Pew Research Center, 2010). While criticisms of
Millennials are inconsistent, this study shows the perceptions of employers. The unsettling workforce calls for employees to continually learn and adapt to the ever-changing workforce (Fugate, Kinicki, & Ashforth, 2004). Since the workforce is changing, employees need to be adaptable and have a career identity to survive (Hall & Mirvis, 1995). Lifestyles have changed dramatically in the past 20 years due to technology and societal changes. Individuals have to juggle different roles in life and find it difficult to manage employee role, organizational role, parent role, and others (Fugate, Kinicki, & Ashforth, 2004).

In the past ten years, a number of studies have been conducted about the strong relationship between emotional intelligence and occupational performance (Orme, 2003; Bar-On, 1997; Bar-On, 2006; Bar-On, Handley, & Fund, 2006; Handley, 1997; Ruderman & Bar-On, 2003). Orme (2003) found that over 60% of leadership is dependent on emotional-social intelligence and 30% of performance in occupations is dependent on emotional-social intelligence.

Research has been conducted on Millennials in the workplace, their motivation, their personalities, and how to work with them in an organizational setting (Howe & Strauss, 2000; Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010; Deal, Altman, & Rogelberg, 2010). However, there is little research on the employability of Millennials and the factors that influence it. Myers and Sadaghiani (2010) did a study on Millennials in the workplace and found that Millennials’ different perspectives on the marketplace and technologies can enhance organizational communication and productivity because people in this generation grew up on technology and had information readily available.
Bhavnani and Aldridge questioned the education college students receive due to the observations of employers:

Why do some students flounder on their initial job assignments after graduation, while others move quickly up the career ladder? One common criticism voiced by employers is that new hires do not seem to function well in a team-based environment. Both groups of respondents polled, industry and academia, agreed that the top two skills needed by graduates seeking employment are teamwork and communication. (2000, p. 1)

According to Fugate, Kinicki, and Ashforth (2004), employability is a “psychosocial construct that embodies individual characteristics that foster adaptive cognition, behavior, and affect, and enhance the individual-work interface” (p. 16). Employees have been expected to obtain the knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs) necessary to get and maintain the job (Fugate, Kinicki, & Ashforth, 2004). There is not much literature explaining the concept of employability as it relates to organizations and foundational studies (Fugate, Kinicki, & Ashforth, 2004). Fugate, Kinicki, and Ashforth’s (2004) construct of employability has three dimensions that align with the research on the need for job seekers to be adaptable in order to be employable. Also, employability is a concept of adaptability in which individuals recognize opportunities specific to their work (Fugate, Kinicki, & Ashforth, 2004). The three dimensions of employability are career identity, personal adaptability, and social and human capital (Fugate, Kinicki, & Ashforth, 2004). Employability does not guarantee employment but it can add to the factors of gaining the job (Fugate, Kinicki, & Ashforth, 2004).

that individuals who are very employable dynamically engage in the context, adapt to their occupational needs, and execute their career identities. To be employable, it has been necessary to adjust behaviors and cognitions to get the best results out of a situation. Kanfer, Wanberg, and Kantrowitz (2001) suggested six categories of behaviors for employment: personality traits, generalized expectancies, self-evaluations, motives, context, and biographical variables. Self-evaluation is a competency of emotional intelligence. Kanfer, Wanberg, and Kantrowitz (2001) proposed that these categories influence the job search process and outcomes.

Figure 2-1. Heuristic model of employability (Fugate, Kinicki, & Ashforth, 2004).

The model (Figure 2-1) shows the three dimensions of employability and the relationship among them. Fugate, Kinicki, and Ashforth (2004) describe career identity as the role one takes in career opportunities as well as the personal dispositions such as "knowledge, skills, and abilities" (p. 20). Social and human capital refers to one's
interpersonal skills and the emotional intelligence one exercises in interacting with people on a daily basis.

Adaptability and social and human capital are components of the emotional intelligence framework. Career identity has been identified with career maturity as parts of the career development framework. Since there is overlap in the three theories frameworks, it can be concluded that there are similarities in the foundations. Therefore, emotional intelligence and career maturity are necessary to be employable.

**Conceptual Model**

A conceptual model (Figure 2-2) was created by the researcher to theoretically explain the employability of Millennials in college using career maturity and emotional intelligence as predictors. In this model, it has been suggested that career maturity and emotional intelligence influence the employability of Millennials. The conceptual model (Figure 2-2) has multiple components that will be explained briefly, following with how the model functions as operationalized in the study.

The individual in the model is a Millennial, operationally defined as those individuals born from 1982 to 2002 (Howe & Strauss, 2002). The demographics of the individual (e. g. age, gender, race, student classification, etc.) can affect perceptions, behavior, beliefs, and attitudes. EI refers to emotional Intelligence which is how people manage and express emotions and the ability to use social competencies (Bar-On, 2006). Employability is the construct that exemplifies the individual characteristics that encourage adaptive behavior and enhances the work interface (Fugate, Kinicki, & Ashforth, 2004). Career maturity is the level of maturity and development an individual has developed on decision making in the world of work (Crites, 1978). The leadership experience is the amount of experience one has in a leadership position in any context.
Job experience is the amount of experience one has had in a work setting, internship, or professional environment. Communication requirements signify the necessary interactions with others in a work environment. Technical skills are the necessary requirements to fulfill the specific job, i.e. software skills, trade skills.

Figure 2–2. The conceptual model created to illustrate employability using emotional intelligence and career maturity as predictors for employability the generation of Millennials.

The model was created in order to illustrate the factors and outcomes of employability when Millennials are developing career skills in college. As seen in Figure 2-2, the individual has associated demographic variables, levels of education and skills, and personal experiences that have shaped them. The feedback loop connecting the variables produce the individuals levels of emotional intelligence and career maturity, which are factors that contribute to the Millennial’s employability. An ideal outcome would be an individual with a high level of emotional intelligence and high level of career maturity because the chances of employability would increase. An unfavorable outcome
would be an individual with a low level of emotional intelligence and low level of career maturity because the chances of employability would decrease. The outcome of a situation where the individual has inconsistent high and low levels, the outcome is unknown because it depends on the context. Employability is based on the context because some jobs require less interacting with others and more technical skills or more relationship focused and less technical skills.

**Chapter Summary**

The theories of emotional intelligence and career maturity were discussed in order to provide contextual background for the study. The research of Weisinger (1998) relating to emotional social intelligence and Crites (1978) work of career maturity were the foundation for this study. These theories have provided insight into factors that may influence emotional intelligence and career maturity of Millennials in college. Demographic variables were also been examined in order to understand the context of the study. Studies on employability and similar studies were explained to provide more background information. The conceptual model (Figure 2-3) was created to visually represent the ideas that relate to the employability of Millennials based on their career maturity and emotional-social intelligence.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Chapter one introduced the background of the development of emotional intelligence before and during the job entry process. The four generational cohorts in the workplace were explained including their generalized values in the workplace.

Chapter two focused on the literature on which emotional intelligence and career maturity is founded upon. The conceptual model created by the researcher was explained as it relates to the study. The concept of employability was discussed regarding Millennials entering the workforce with the skills developed.

The purpose of the study was to identify the variables associated with millennials’ emotional-social intelligence and career maturity. The researcher used the methods in this section to investigate the following objectives of the study:

• To determine the level of emotional intelligence of students,
• to determine the level of career maturity of students,
• to identify the relationship between emotional intelligence and career maturity of students, and
• to identify the perceived values in the workplace held by students.

This chapter explains the population of the study and describes the instrument used to collect data. Lastly, data analysis methods for the study are described, ensuring validity and reliability of the instruments.

Research Design

To address the research objectives a descriptive survey method was used. Three questionnaires were used to measure the student demographics and the constructs of
career maturity and emotional intelligence. The predictor variables for the study were age, race, gender, and student classification. A causal comparative design was deemed appropriate for measuring career maturity and emotional intelligence using instruments already developed and validated.

The following is a discussion of the threats to validity in this study. History and maturation was not a concern because participants were given seven weeks to complete the questionnaire. The selection of the participants was a threat because a purposive sample was used. Because of this, findings could not be generalized to the population. The instruments had been used in previous research and were reviewed by a panel of experts for the researcher’s purposes of this study and to ensure face validity. Subject effects were addressed by respondents remaining anonymous to the researcher. The proposed research ensured the protection of human subjects because it measured their interactions and did not physically or mentally harm them. The researcher disclosed information to subjects and their information was kept confidential.

**Population**

The population for this study were undergraduate and graduate students at the University of Florida in the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences (N=4,000) during the Fall 2011 semester. A purposive sample (n=221) was drawn from students enrolled in Agricultural Education and Communication Department. In the department of Agricultural Education and Communication department, there are graduate and undergraduate students. There is one major in the program; however there are two specializations in the undergraduate program and four specializations in the graduate program. The two specializations in the undergraduate program were agricultural education and communication and leadership development. The specializations of the
one graduate program degree with four areas of focus: agricultural education, agricultural communication, extension education, and agricultural leadership. Results from this purposive sample cannot be generalized to all Millennials, but can provide direction for future research regarding Millennials. Research is still inconclusive about the definition of the generational cohorts, but for this study the definitions of Howe and Strauss (2000) was used.

**Instrumentation**

The researcher found no single instrument that measures the career maturity of an individual and their emotional intelligence in order to become more employable. The researcher adapted two instruments and followed Dillman’s Tailored Design Method (DTDM) (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009). This study consisted of a 103-item questionnaire to address the research objectives. The questionnaire consisted of sections addressing emotional intelligence, career maturity, and demographics. The outcomes for this study were emotional intelligence and career maturity levels. An expert panel reviewed the content of the questionnaire to ascertain their content and face validity.

The career maturity of Millennials was used in the study to determine the level of maturity during college. A scale of Career Maturity Inventory measured career maturity in the study (Crites, 1978). The first part of the questionnaire administered to participants was the Attitude Scale of the Career Maturity Inventory (CMI) developed by (Crites & Savickas, 1995). The CMI was used to determine the level of career maturity, factors such as independence and decisiveness. The Attitude Scale inquires about students’ feelings regarding entering the world of work (Crites & Savickas, 1995). The inventory was a self-reported instrument with 50 items. The researcher adapted the
instrument to a Likert-type scale with strongly agree, agree, neither agree/disagree, disagree, and strongly disagree. The CMI Administration and Use Manual (Crites, 1978) provides the stability ($r = .71$) and internal consistency ($K-R 20$ coefficient $= .74$) of the instrument. Crites (1978) approved the instrument to be used with college students, although it is intended for high school students.

The emotional intelligence assessment used for the questionnaire is Developing Your Emotional Intelligence developed by Weisinger (1998). This instrument examined an individual’s emotional-social intelligence. The assessment has two scales and five subscales. The intrapersonal scale includes three sub-scales: self-awareness, managing emotions, self-motivation (Weisinger, 1998). The interpersonal scale includes two sub-scales: relating well to others and emotional mentoring (Weisinger, 1998). The instrument used a Likert-type scale of 1 (low ability) to 7 (high ability). The instrument’s reliability was established in a similar study examining the emotional intelligence of undergraduate and graduate students in a college of agriculture. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were as follows: self-awareness ($\alpha = .85$), managing emotions ($\alpha = .79$), self-motivation ($\alpha = .80$), relating well to others ($\alpha = .91$), and emotional mentoring ($\alpha = .85$) (Stedman, Cannon, Crow, & Sims, 2009).

The 12 work values in Super’s Works Values Inventory Revised (SWVI-R) were used with the constant comparative method in order to code student’s open-ended answers to the question: what do you value in a career? The 12 work values are achievement, coworkers, income, security, mental challenge, variety, prestige, independence, creativity, lifestyle, supervision, and work environment (Robinson &
Betz, 2008). As shown below in Table 3-1, the author’s meanings of each work value are presented.

Table 3-1 Super’s Work Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super’s Work Values Inventory–Revised (SWVIR)</th>
<th>Super’s Work Values Inventory–Revised (SWVIR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Achieve a feeling of success from a job well done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>Have good interactions with fellow workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Can try out new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Receive pay raises that keep me ahead of the cost of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Can make decisions on my own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>Have time enough for leisure activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Challenge</td>
<td>Always have new problems to solve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>Know that others think my work is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Know that my position will last</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>Have a boss who treats me well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>Do many different things to get my work done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>Work in a good place (clean, warm, well lit, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Robinson & Betz, 2008, p. 461)

The post-hoc Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for emotional intelligence were as follows: self-awareness (α=.91), managing emotions (α=.82), self-motivation (α=.83), relating well to others (α=.94), and emotional mentoring (α=.92). For career maturity, the post-hoc Cronbach’s alpha coefficients was (α=.87).

The demographic portion of the questionnaire was administered to determine the age, race, education, gender, student classification, job experience and leadership experience of the participants. The study was approved by the University of Florida Institutional Review Board: IRB-02 Protocol #2011-U-0960.

Data Collection

The survey instrument was administered through Qualtrics™, an online survey administration tool. According to Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2009), sending surveys
through an online platform can reduce potential response rates, especially in undergraduate students. The participants’ information remained anonymous from the researcher. The instrument included the informed consent which participants had to agree to before moving forward to the survey instrument, then the attitude scale of the CMI, the Developing Your Emotional Intelligence, and ended with a thank you. Participants were e-mailed the link to the survey, every week participants were sent another e-mail with the link along with a reminder. The researcher used the Dillman Tailored Design Method (DTDM), according to Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2009), to reduce non-response error. The survey instrument was available to participants during a seven-week period to decrease history effects. An e-mail to participants was sent to introduce the study on October 20, 2011 and closed on December 9, 2011. Qualtrics allowed the researcher to only send reminder e-mails to participants who had not responded, which alleviated having to send repeated e-mails to all participants.

**Data Analysis**

The data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The frequencies (f), means (μ), and standard deviations (σ) were measured between variables. An analysis of variance and descriptive statistics was used to discover findings. For the first objective in measuring emotional intelligence levels, descriptives and analysis variance was run with demographic variables. For the second objective in measuring career maturity levels, descriptives and analysis variance was run with demographic variables. For the third objective in identifying the relationship between emotional intelligence and career maturity, Pearson Product Moment Correlations were used to find significance in relationships among key variables. For the fourth objective in identifying the perceived values in the workplace of students, the
constant comparative method was used. The researcher coded the participant’s open-ended statements regarding what they value in a career according to the 12 work values. Super and Betz’s 12 work values are achievement, coworkers, income, security, mental challenge, variety, prestige, independence, creativity, lifestyle, supervision, and work environment.

Chapter Summary

This chapter explained the methods used to meet the objectives of this study as stated in chapter one. The study’s design was quantitative and has a descriptive survey that was administered online. The population and sample of the study were also described as a convenient sample of undergraduate students at the University of Florida. The threats to validity of the study were explained to describe how they were accounted for. The next section will describe the findings of the study.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

Introduction

Chapter one described the generational shift in the workplace since the millennium and the introduction of Millennials into the workplace. The gap in the research regarding the development of skills during college and the transition to the workplace was also described. The background of the factors that might develop the skills necessary for Millennials to work effectively with other generations was discussed. The purpose, assumptions, and limitations of the study were explained as well. The findings of the research will be discussed by the objectives guiding the study. The following objectives were created to assess the competence of Millennials now in college:

• To determine the level of emotional intelligence of students,
• to determine the level of career maturity of students,
• to identify the relationship between emotional intelligence and career maturity of students, and
• to identify the perceived values in the workplace held by students.

In chapter two, a review of the literature was discussed in depth. The foundational studies for emotional intelligence and career maturity were examined in order gain understanding of the instrumentation chosen for the study. Also, the literature aided the researcher to develop a conceptual model for the research.

In chapter three, the methodology of the research was discussed to answer the objectives. The procedures designed to collect data and the population was discussed, as well. The data downloaded from Qualtrics were then analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).
This chapter will explain the results of the study, starting with the demographics of
the sample. The chapter will also discuss the findings of each objective according to
the data collected from the students of the AEC department assessing their emotional-
social intelligence and career maturity. The population of the study is millennials
enrolled in the agricultural education and communication department. The sample is
the undergraduate and graduate students in the Agricultural Education and
Communication Department (AEC) at the University of Florida. As discussed in chapter
three, the Agricultural Education and Communication department at UF has a total of
221 undergraduate and graduate students. This list of students included distance
learning, Gainesville campus, and Plant City campus. This study had a response rate
of 29.4%. According to Israel (2009), 28.6% is the necessary response rate for a finite
population. Therefore the response rate is acceptable for the sample. There were no
significant differences between early and late respondents regarding emotional
intelligence or career maturity.

Demographics of Respondents

The respondents were asked five demographic questions. The demographics
were in regards to their gender, race, age, and classification. The researcher grouped
age ranges by generations. As stated in chapter one, the age ranges used in the study
are according to the Pew Research Center’s (2010) definitions of generational cohorts.
According to Pew Research Center (2010), the age ranges are Millennial cohort II (ages
18-24), Millennial cohort I (ages 25-31), Gen X (ages 32-46), and Baby Boomers (ages
47 and older). Table 4-1 provides a frequency distribution of respondents’ age ranges,
by generational cohort. Out of the 65 respondents, 58.5% (n=38) were Millennial cohort
II, 21.5% \((n=14)\) were Millennial cohort I, 12.3% \((n=8)\) were Gen X, and 7.7% \((n=5)\) of the respondents were Baby Boomers.

Table 4-1. Respondents by Generational Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millennial cohort II</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial cohort I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2 shows the distribution of respondents by gender. Females were a majority with 58.2% \((n=46)\) and males were 22.8% \((n=18)\). There was one respondent who replied other with 1.3%.

Table 4-2. Respondents by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students in the AEC department were asked to choose their ethnic background, see Table 4-3). The majority of respondents were White/Caucasian with 74.7% \((n=59)\). Hispanic/Latino students accounted for 3.8% \((n=3)\) and other accounted for 3.8% \((n=3)\). There were no students who chose American Indian/ Native American, Asian, Black/African American, or Pacific Islander.

Table 4-3. Respondents by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The system used at the University of Florida College of Agricultural and Life Sciences to classify students uses numbers to classify respondents as an agricultural and life science student. In Table 4-4, respondents classified themselves as follows: 

- n=1 (1.3%) student identified themselves as 1AG (freshmen),
- n=10 (12.7%) identified themselves as 3AG (juniors),
- n=13 (16.5%) identified themselves as 4AG (seniors),
- n=3 (3.8%) identified themselves as 5AG (fifth year),
- n=26 (32.9%) identified themselves as 7AG (first year master's student),
- n=8 (10.1%) identified themselves as 8AG (master's/dottor), and
- n=4 (5.1%) identified themselves as 9AG (doctoral candidate).

Table 4-4. Classification of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0AG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2AG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3AG</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4AG</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5AG</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6AG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7AG</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8AG</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9AG</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The specializations for the undergraduate and graduate students are in Table 4-5.

Out of the 65 respondents, 43% (n=27) were undergraduate students and 57% (n=37) were graduate students. From the undergraduate students, n=13 (46%) were Agricultural Education majors and n=15 (54%) were Communication Leadership Development majors. From the graduate students, n=11 (30%) were Agricultural Education students, n=7 (19%) were Extension, n=9 (24%) were Agricultural Leadership, and n=10 (24%) were Agricultural Communication.
Participants were asked if they have ever held a job or experienced a professional internship. Two participants responded they have not have had a job, out of the total of 65 students.

Table 4-5. Respondents by Student Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergrad students</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication/Leadership</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Communication</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective One: Determine the Level of Emotional Intelligence of Students.**

Respondents indicated their ability of the situation described in the emotional intelligence instrument on a seven-point Likert scale. The scale ranged from low ability (1) to high ability (7). Details of the instrument can be found in Appendix D, Developing Your Emotional Intelligence (Weisinger, 1998). It includes interpersonal and intrapersonal constructs. The interpersonal scales are self-awareness, managing emotions, and self-motivation. The intrapersonal scales are emotional mentoring and relating well to others. Overall, respondents scored highest in “relating well to others” with \( n = 62, M = 108, SD = 18.08 \). As shown in Table 4-6, respondents scored in “emotional mentoring” with \( n = 65, M = 70.49, SD = 12.05 \); “self-awareness” with \( n = 64, M = 64.58, SD = 10.69 \); “managing emotions” with \( n = 64, M = 47.66, SD = 8.98 \); and the lowest overall score in “self-motivation” with \( n = 63, M = 35.33, SD = 6.54 \).
The following section shows the findings regarding the emotional intelligence scales within each demographic. Table 4-7 provides the results of the emotional intelligence scales through the generational cohorts. In the scale “relating well to others” Baby Boomers scored the highest with M=112.60, SD=19.68 (n=5); Millennial cohort II scored M=109.17, SD=16.48 (n=36); Millennial cohort I scored M=105.36, SD=23.76 (n=14); and Gen X scored lowest M=104, SD=13.95 (n=7).

In the scale “emotional mentoring” Baby Boomers scored the highest with M=73.40, SD=13.88 (n=5); Millennial cohort II scored M=71.24, SD=11.06 (n=38); Gen X scored M=69.25, SD=8.34 (n=8); and Millennial cohort I scored the lowest M=68.14, SD=16.05 (n=14).

In the scale “self-awareness” Baby Boomers scored the highest with M=65.60, SD=14.67 (n=37); Millennial cohort II scored M=65.36, SD=10.43 (n=37); Gen X scored M=64.75, SD=7.94 (n=8); and Millennial cohort I scored the lowest M=62.36, SD=12.03 (n=14).

In the scale “managing emotions” Millennial cohort I scored the highest with M=49.64, SD=10.60 (n=14); Gen X scored M=49.25, SD=9.19 (n=8); Baby Boomers scored M=48.20, SD=8.32 (n=5); and Millennial II scored lowest M=46.49, SD=8.55 (n=37).
In the scale “self-motivation” Gen X scored the highest with $M=36.13$, $SD=6.72$ ($n=8$); Millennial cohort II scored $M=35.36$, $SD=6.88$ ($n=36$); Millennial cohort I scored $M=35.00$, $SD=6.15$ ($n=14$); and Baby Boomers scored lowest $M=34.80$, $SD=6.53$ ($n=5$).

Table 4-7. Emotional Intelligence Scales and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relating well to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>112.60</td>
<td>19.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial II</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>109.17</td>
<td>16.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>105.36</td>
<td>23.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>104.00</td>
<td>13.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73.40</td>
<td>13.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial II</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71.24</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.25</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68.14</td>
<td>16.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65.60</td>
<td>14.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial II</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>65.36</td>
<td>10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>64.75</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62.36</td>
<td>12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49.64</td>
<td>10.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49.25</td>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48.20</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial II</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46.49</td>
<td>8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.13</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial II</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35.36</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4-8, the results of the emotional intelligence scales and race are provided. In the scale “relating well to others” Hispanics scored the highest with $M=114.33$, $SD=20.52$ ($n=3$); participants who identified with other scored $M=108.33$, $SD=12.74$ ($n=3$); and White/Caucasians scored lowest $M=107.64$, $SD=18.41$ ($n=56$). In the scale “emotional mentoring” Hispanics scored the highest with $M=76.33$, $SD=12.70$ ($n=3$); participants who identified with other scored $M=72.00$, $SD=7.21$ ($n=3$); and
White/Caucasians scored lowest \( M=70.12, SD=12.28 \) (\( n=59 \)). In the scale “self-awareness” White/Caucasians scored the highest with \( M=64.83, SD=10.64 \) (\( n=58 \)); Hispanics scored \( M=63.00, SD=15.39 \) (\( n=3 \)); and participants who identified with other scored lowest \( M=61.33, SD=10.50 \) (\( n=3 \)). In the scale, “managing emotions” White/Caucasians scored the highest with \( M=47.79, SD=8.25 \) (\( n=58 \)); participants who identified with other scored \( M=47.33, SD=11.59 \) (\( n=3 \)); and Hispanics scored lowest \( M=45.33, SD=21.45 \) (\( n=3 \)). In the scale, “self-motivation” White/Caucasians scored the highest with \( M=35.74, SD=5.91 \) (\( n=57 \)); participants who identified with other scored \( M=32.33, SD=6.35 \) (\( n=3 \)); and Hispanics scored lowest \( M=30.67, SD=15.95 \) (\( n=3 \)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-8. Emotional Intelligence Scales and Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relating well to others</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Mentoring</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Awareness</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing Emotions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Motivation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4-9, the results of the emotional intelligence scales and gender are provided. In the scale, “relating well to others” participants who identified with other scored the highest with \( M=123, (n=1) \); females scored \( M=109.50, SD=17.25 \) (\( n=44 \));
and males scored lowest $M=103.24$, $SD=20.05$ ($n=17$). In the scale, “emotional mentoring” participants who identified with other scored the highest with $M=80$, ($n=1$); females scored $M=71.37$, $SD=11.81$ ($n=46$); and males scored lowest $M=67.72$, $SD=12.71$ ($n=18$). In the scale, “self-awareness” participants who identified with other scored the highest with $M=72$, ($n=1$); females scored $M=65.18$, $SD=9.90$ ($n=45$); and males scored lowest $M=62.67$, $SD=12.69$ ($n=18$). In the scale, “managing emotions” participants who identified with other scored the highest with $M=55$, ($n=1$); males scored $M=50.22$, $SD=10.79$ ($n=18$); and females scored lowest $M=46.47$, $SD=8.07$ ($n=45$). In the scale, “self-motivation” participants who identified with other scored the highest with $M=36$, ($n=1$); males scored $M=35.72$, $SD=7.49$ ($n=18$); and females scored lowest $M=35.16$, $SD=6.27$ ($n=44$).

Table 4-9. Emotional Intelligence and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relating well to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>109.50</td>
<td>17.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>103.24</td>
<td>20.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71.37</td>
<td>11.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67.72</td>
<td>12.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65.18</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62.67</td>
<td>12.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.22</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46.47</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.16</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 4-10, the results of the emotional intelligence scales and student classification are provided. In the scale, “relating well to others” undergraduate students scored the highest with $M=111.68$, $SD=18.48$ ($n=25$) and graduate students scored lowest $M=105.51$, $SD=17.60$ ($n=37$). In the scale, “emotional mentoring” undergraduate students scored the highest with $M=72.74$, $SD=12.28$ ($n=27$) and graduate students scored lowest $M=68.89$, $SD=11.77$ ($n=38$). In the scale, “self-awareness” undergraduate students scored the highest with $M=65.22$, $SD=10.97$ ($n=27$) and graduate students scored lowest $M=64.11$, $SD=10.60$ ($n=37$). In the scale, “managing emotions” undergraduate students scored the highest with $M=48.48$, $SD=10.16$ ($n=27$) and graduate students scored lowest $M=47.05$, $SD=8.11$ ($n=37$). In the scale, “self-motivation” undergraduate students scored the highest with $M=36.26$, $SD=7.66$ ($n=27$) and graduate students scored lowest $M=34.64$, $SD=5.55$ ($n=36$).

A one-way analysis of variance was used to determine the differences in emotional intelligence and the demographic variables. The demographic variables that were examined are age, race, gender, and student classification. Significant
relationships exist when scores are less than at the 95% confidence interval. There were no significant relationships between emotional intelligence and the demographic variables. Tables 4-11, 4-12, 4-13, and 4-12 illustrate the significance levels. As a note, the correlation is significant at the p < .05 level, 2-tailed for the one-way analysis of variance.

Table 4-11. One-way analysis of variance between emotional intelligence and age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relating well to others</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional mentoring</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing emotions</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-motivation</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-12. One-way analysis of variance between emotional intelligence and race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relating well to others</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional mentoring</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing emotions</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-motivation</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-13. One-way analysis of variance between emotional intelligence and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relating well to others</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional mentoring</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing emotions</td>
<td>1.485</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-motivation</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-14. One-way analysis of variance between emotional intelligence and Student classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Eta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relating well to others</td>
<td>1.758</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional mentoring</td>
<td>1.624</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing emotions</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-motivation</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective Two: Determine the Level of Career Maturity of Students.**

Respondents used a five-point Likert scale to indicate the level of agreement/disagreement to the 50 statements in the instrument. Respondents answered with strongly agree (1) as the lowest score, agree (2), neither disagree/agree (3) as the middle score, disagree (4), and strongly disagree (5) as the highest score. Details of the instrument can be found in Appendix C. The overall scores of respondents are shown in Table 4-15 ($n=62$, $M=169.35$, $SD=17.77$).

**Table 4-15. Respondents’ level of career maturity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Maturity</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>169.35</td>
<td>17.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baby Boomers scored higher in career maturity ($n=5$, $M=177.80$, $SD=14.18$). The remaining scores of generational cohorts are shown in Table 4-16. Gen X scored $M=175.63$, $SD=10.79$ ($n=8$); Millennials cohort I scored $M=169.79$, $SD=14.82$ ($n=14$); and Millennial cohort II scored the lowest with $M=166.54$, $SD=20.17$ ($n=35$).

**Table 4-16. Career maturity and Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>177.80</td>
<td>14.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>175.63</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennial I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>169.79</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennials II</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>166.54</td>
<td>20.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-17 shows the scores of career maturity and race. White/Caucasian scored higher in career maturity ($n=56$, $M=170.61$, $SD=17.23$). Respondents who identified as “other” scored in the middle ($n=3$, $M=159.67$, $SD=17.78$), and Hispanic scored lower ($n=3$, $M=155.67$, $SD=26.08$).

Table 4-17. Career maturity and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>170.61</td>
<td>17.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>159.67</td>
<td>17.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>155.67</td>
<td>26.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-18 shows the scores of career maturity and gender. Females scored higher in career maturity ($n=43$, $M=170.09$, $SD=17.42$). Males scored in the middle ($n=18$, $M=169$, $SD=18.53$), and respondents who identified as other scored lower ($n=1$, $M=144$).

Table 4-18. Career maturity and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>170.09</td>
<td>17.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>169.00</td>
<td>18.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>144.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graduate students in the study scored higher in career maturity ($n=37$, $M=174.5$, $SD=15.43$), as shown in Table 4-19. Undergraduate students scored lower in career maturity ($n=25$, $M=161.52$, $SD=18.39$).

Table 4-19. Career maturity and student classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>174.65</td>
<td>15.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>161.52</td>
<td>18.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way analysis of variance was used to determine the differences in career maturity and the demographic variables. The demographic variables that were examined were age, race, gender, and student classification. Significant relationships
exist when scores are less than at the 95% confidence interval. A significance level of .003 exists between career maturity and student classification ($F=9.244$, $p < .05$). There were no significant relationships between emotional intelligence and age, race, and gender. Table 4-20 illustrates the significance levels for the demographic variables and career maturity.

Table 4-20. One-way analysis of variance between Career maturity and demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>$Df$</th>
<th>$Eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1.499</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Classification</td>
<td>9.244</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective Three: Identify the Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Career Maturity of Students.**

The purpose of this objective was to examine any relationships that may have existed between the scales and demographics in the study. The demographic variables that were used in the correlation were age, gender, race, and classification of graduate and undergraduate students. The constructs used in the correlation were career maturity, relating well to others, emotional mentoring, self-awareness, managing emotions, and self-motivation. A Pearson product moment correlation was utilized with all scales of emotional intelligence, career maturity, and demographics. College students had two significant correlations between variables. A low positive correlation was found between career maturity and student classification ($r = .359$) and career maturity and undergrad vs. graduate ($r = .365$) (Davis, 1971). According to Davis (1971), values of $r$ between +.30 and +.49 show a moderate positive association. In the correlation, there was no statistical difference among these variables: gender, race,
relating well to others, managing emotions, self-motivation, self-awareness, and emotional mentoring.

**Objective Four: Identify the Perceived Values in the Workplace Held by Students.**

Participants were asked what they value in a career through free response. The researcher used constant comparative method and coding to evaluate participant’s preferred work values regarding a career. The 12 work values scales developed by Super and Betz (2008) were used to analyze the students open ended answers. Following are the work values in order of number of students who agree to the importance and the percentage. Achievement scored the highest with \(n=49\) student statements (39.8%), Coworkers had \(n=16\) (13%), Income had \(n=9\) (7.3%), Security had \(n=9\) (7.3%), Mental Challenge had \(n=8\) (6.5%), Variety had \(n=8\) (6.5%), Prestige had \(n=7\) (5.7%), Independence had \(n=5\) (4.1%), Creativity had \(n=3\) (2.4%), Lifestyle \(n=3\) (2.4%), Supervision had \(n=3\) (2.4%), and Work Environment had \(n=3\) (2.4%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Challenge</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

In this chapter, the findings of the study were discussed. The demographics were age, gender, race, and student classification. Each objective was described along with the number of respondents, means, and standard deviations. Six constructs were measured during data collection using one-way analysis. Those constructs were career maturity, relating well to others, emotional mentoring, self-awareness, managing emotions, and self-motivation. The findings of the study will be discussed in the following section.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Chapter one described the importance of understanding generational differences in the workplace as well as in the process of career maturity. The context of the study, college students career development and emotional intelligence, was explained.

Chapter two focused on the foundational literature of emotional intelligence and career maturity. The theories behind the instruments were described. The conceptual model developed by the researcher was explained thoroughly. This chapter was a comprehensive literature review.

Chapter three was the methodology of the study. This chapter described the participants, instrumentation, and research design. The process of data collection and analysis were presented as well.

Chapter four presented the research findings of the study. The results of each of the four objectives were explained.

This chapter will discuss the results of the study according to the data collected from the students of the AEC department assessing their emotional intelligence and career maturity. The conclusions from each objective will be described, as well as the recommendations for practitioners.

Purpose

The purpose of this research was to examine the role of emotional intelligence and career maturity in Millennials who are in college to ascertain the employability of Millennial college students. The secondary purpose of the study was to explore the
relationship of emotional intelligence and career maturity in Millennials. This will be analyzed to identify if various variables affect an employable college graduate.

**Objectives**

This research addressed the following objectives:

- To determine the level of emotional intelligence of students,
- to determine the level of career maturity of students,
- to identify the relationship between emotional intelligence and career maturity of students, and
- to identify the perceived values in the workplace held by students.

**Methodology**

The population of this study was college students in an agricultural education and communication department at a land-grant institution. A purposive sample was taken using 221 undergraduate and graduate students in the AEC department at the University of Florida. Out of 221 students, 65 responded. This study had a response rate of 29.4%.

**Summary of Findings**

**Objective One: Determine the Level of Emotional Intelligence of Students.**

The purpose of this objective was to measure the level of emotional intelligence in the college students in the AEC department. This study used Weisinger’s (1998) instrument, Developing your Emotional Intelligence. The five constructs in this instrument are self-awareness, self-motivation, relating well with others, managing emotions, and emotional mentoring. Respondents indicated their ability of emotional intelligence using a seven-point Likert scale.
Regarding the demographic of age, each generational cohort was compared with each of the five constructs. In the scale “relating well to others” Baby Boomers scored the highest with $M=112.60$, $SD=19.68$ ($n=5$) and Gen X scored lowest $M=104$, $SD=13.95$ ($n=7$). In the scale “emotional mentoring” Baby Boomers scored the highest with $M=65.60$, $SD=14.67$ ($n=37$) and Millennial cohort I scored the lowest $M=68.14$, $SD=16.05$ ($n=14$). In the scale “self-awareness” Baby Boomers scored the highest with $M=65.60$, $SD=14.67$ ($n=37$) and Millennial cohort I scored the lowest $M=62.36$, $SD=12.03$ ($n=14$). In the scale “managing emotions” Millennial cohort I scored the highest with $M=49.64$, $SD=10.60$ ($n=14$) and Millennial II scored lowest $M=46.49$, $SD=8.55$ ($n=37$). In the scale “self-motivation” Gen X scored the highest with $M=36.13$, $SD=6.72$ ($n=8$) and Baby Boomers scored lowest $M=34.80$, $SD=6.53$ ($n=5$).

Regarding the groups of ethnicity, each ethnicity was compared with each of the five constructs. In the scale “relating well to others” Hispanics scored the highest with $M=114.33$, $SD=20.52$ ($n=3$) and White/Caucasians scored lowest $M=107.64$, $SD=18.41$ ($n=56$). In the scale “emotional mentoring” Hispanics scored the highest with $M=76.33$, $SD=12.70$ ($n=3$) and White/Caucasians scored lowest $M=70.12$, $SD=12.28$ ($n=59$). In the scale “self-awareness” White/Caucasians scored the highest with $M=64.83$, $SD=10.64$ ($n=58$) and participants who identified with other scored lowest $M=61.33$, $SD=10.50$ ($n=3$). In the scale “managing emotions” White/Caucasians scored the highest with $M=47.79$, $SD=8.25$ ($n=58$) and Hispanics scored lowest $M=45.33$, $SD=21.45$ ($n=3$). In the scale “self-motivation” White/Caucasians scored the highest with $M=35.74$, $SD=5.91$ ($n=57$) and Hispanics scored lowest $M=30.67$, $SD=15.95$ ($n=3$).
Regarding gender, each gender group was compared with each of the five constructs. In the scale relating well to others, “relating well to others” females scored higher than males with $M=109.50$, $SD=17.25$ ($n=44$). In the scale “emotional mentoring” females scored highest $M=71.37$, $SD=11.81$ ($n=46$). In the scale “self-awareness” females scored highest $M=65.18$, $SD=9.90$ ($n=45$). In the scale “managing emotions” males scored highest $M=50.22$, $SD=10.79$ ($n=18$). In the scale “self-motivation” males scored highest $M=35.72$, $SD=7.49$ ($n=18$).

Regarding student classification, each group was compared with each of the five constructs. In the scale “relating well to others” undergraduate students scored the highest with $M=111.68$, $SD=18.48$ ($n=25$). In the scale “emotional mentoring” undergraduate students scored the highest with $M=72.74$, $SD=12.28$ ($n=27$). In the scale “self-awareness” undergraduate students scored the highest with $M=65.22$, $SD=10.97$ ($n=27$). In the scale “managing emotions” undergraduate students scored the highest with $M=48.48$, $SD=10.16$ ($n=27$). In the scale “self-motivation” undergraduate students scored the highest with $M=36.26$, $SD=7.66$ ($n=27$). Undergraduate students scored higher than graduate students in all five scales. Using a one-way ANOVA between the five scales of emotional intelligence and the demographics no statistical significance was found.

**Objective Two: Determine the Level of Career Maturity of Students.**

This objective measured career maturity (Crites, 1978) through a five-point Likert scale through statements, respondents answered regarding their attitude toward the statements. The overall scores of respondents in career maturity in this study are $M=169.35$, $SD=17.77$ ($n=62$).
Regarding each of the demographics, each group was compared with the scores of career maturity. In the demographic group of age, Baby Boomers scored higher in career maturity (n=5, M=177.80, SD=14.18). The scores in age went in order of generation. In relation to race, White/Caucasians scored higher in career maturity (n=56, M=170.61, SD=17.23). With gender, Females scored higher in career maturity (n=43, M=170.09, SD=17.42). In regards to student classification, graduate students in the study scored higher in career maturity (n=37, M=174.50, SD=15.43).

There is a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of career maturity between undergraduate and graduate students. A significance level of .00 exists between career maturity and student classification (F=9.244, p<.05). No significant differences between age, race, and gender and career maturity in this study.

**Objective Three: Identify the Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Career Maturity of Students.**

This objective used a Pearson Product Moment Correlation between all of the variables. This includes relating well to others, self-motivation, self-awareness, emotional mentoring, managing emotions, career maturity, and demographic variables. A low positive correlation was found between career maturity and student classification (r=.359) and career maturity and undergrad vs. graduate (r=.365). According to Davis (1971), values of r between +.30 and +.49 show a moderate positive association. In the correlation, there was no statistical difference among these variables: gender, race, relating well to others, managing emotions, self-motivation, self-awareness, and emotional mentoring.

**Objective Four: Identify The Perceived Values in the Workplace Held by Students.**
The researcher used constant comparative method and coding to evaluate participants’ preferred work values regarding a career. The 12 work values scales developed by Super and Betz (2008) were used to analyze the free responses. Achievement scored the highest, with \( n=49 \) (39.8\%) students including it as important in their statements. Coworkers was the second highest important value (13\%, \( n=16 \)).

**Conclusions**

**Objective One: Determine the Level of Emotional Intelligence of Students.**

Females in the AEC department perceive themselves to have a higher ability on relating well to others, emotional mentoring, and self-awareness. Males in the AEC department perceive themselves to have a higher ability in managing emotions and self-motivation. Generational differences are present regarding emotional intelligence, similar to previous research on the topic of traits of generations. Undergraduate students perceive themselves to have a higher ability of emotional intelligence.

**Objective Two: Determine the Level of Career Maturity of Students.**

As experience increases with age, career maturity increases. Females have higher levels of career maturity than males. Graduate students are more career mature than undergraduates.

**Objective Three: Identify the Relationship Between Emotional Intelligence and Career Maturity of Students.**

A low positive relationship between student classification and career maturity was found to be statistically significant.

**Objective Four: Identify the Perceived Values in the Workplace Held by Students.**

The college students in the AEC department value personal achievement and relationships with their coworkers in the workplace.
Discussion and Implications

The purpose of the research was to identify the emotional intelligence and career maturity levels of college students in the agricultural education and communication department. The interpersonal skills and career development obtained by college students while in college are factors which could add to their employability when entering the workplace. The concept of emotional intelligence was used in the study using Weisinger’s (1998) five scales: relating well to others, emotional mentoring, self-awareness, managing emotions, and self-motivation. These five scales were measured independently as all are important to balancing intrapersonal and interpersonal skills. These skills are necessary to develop in students before they enter the workplace because the workplace is the most diverse it has ever been. Emotional intelligence has been found to be related to performance at work (Orme, 2003; Bar-On, 1997, 2004, 2006).

The variety of different generations found in the department of agricultural education and communication was unexpected. The presence of Baby Boomers in the sample was possibly due to the departments’ distance learning program for extension agents and industry leader’s continuing education. Generational research has increased since the early 2000s, (Zemke, Raines, & Filipzak, 2000; Lancaster & Stillman, 2002), but there has not been generational research in a department of agricultural education and communication at a land-grant institution. The respondents were a mix of Baby Boomers, Gen Xers, and Millennials. The Millennials were split up in this study in two groups because of the literature supporting the two different Millennial cohorts having differences (Teagle, Mueller, & Lockshin, 2010; Loughlin & Barling, 2001). Baby Boomers perceived themselves to be highest in relating well to others and emotional...
mentoring. Baby Boomers come from a different time where face to face relationships are focused on. Baby Boomers grew up with less technology and relied on their interpersonal skills to communicate. The younger Millennial cohort scored close to the Baby Boomers in both of those scales. Also, Baby Boomers and younger Millennial cohort scored the same in self-awareness scale. This was an interesting finding in this study. Baby Boomers and the younger Millennial cohort were similar in multiple scales, this may be due to the fact that both their parents have similar styles.

The Gen Xers in the study scored highest in self-motivation. This is not surprising since this generation has a high tendency toward independence (Howe & Strauss, 2000). The older Millennial cohort scored the highest in managing emotions. There is no literature supporting these results. One reason could be their dependence on technology. Social media and increased technology usage has influenced communication to be impersonal. The different generational findings on emotional intelligence were mostly consistent with the traits of each generation found by Howe and Strauss (2000). The findings cannot be generalized to all members of the generational cohorts but gives results on the tendencies of the individuals in the department of AEC. Undergraduate students perceived themselves to have higher emotional intelligence than graduate students.

Undergraduate students in the department of AEC may have scored themselves higher in emotional intelligence because they are required to take courses in soft skill development. The department of AEC provides students with courses that are comprehensive in personality assessments, emotional intelligence, leadership theories, interpersonal competencies, and cross-cultural competencies. The types of courses that
develop soft skills, in the department of AEC especially are required for all specializations in all levels of higher education. The undergraduate courses that primarily focus on soft skills are the following: AEC 3414 Leadership Development, AEC 4434 Communication and Leadership in Groups and Teams, AEC 3073 Intercultural Communication, AEC 3413 Working with People: Interpersonal Leadership Skills, AEC 4417 Leadership for Personal and Organizational Change, AEC 4930 Communication and Leadership Development Capstone Experience, and Internships for all specializations. At the graduate level, the courses that primarily focus on soft skills are the following: AEC 5302: Professional Skill Development in Agriscience Education I and II, AEC 5454: Leadership Development for Extension and Community Nonprofit Organizations, AEC 6905 Interpersonal Leadership, AEC 6905 Facilitation of Leadership Programs, and AEC 6905 Organizational Leadership. It is not common that a college requires soft skill courses, however if the sample in the study were required to take soft skill courses, perhaps there is a correlation that can be investigated. It can be suggested that the student’s high level of emotional intelligence was due to soft skill development courses required or an unaware of their own inflated narcissistic self-perception (Howe & Strauss, 2002).

Although this department has a variety in terms of age, the participants were not diverse in race. Respondents were a majority of white/Caucasian students. This is indicative of the makeup of the department, which has been a traditional agricultural background whose demographics are usually Caucasian and conservative. This is due to the AEC department being a historically based agricultural education primarily including white/Caucasian students.
There were no significant differences in gender and emotional intelligence in this study, but differences were present. The differences that were present between males and females are consistent with research findings on gender tendencies. Females have higher abilities in relating well to others, self-awareness, and emotional mentoring. Females are generally better suited at nurturing and thriving in social interactions. Males are generally higher in self-motivations and managing emotions in the gender literature. Bar-On (1997) found that males score higher in intrapersonal skills and females score higher in interpersonal skills. This study was consistent with his findings on gender and emotional intelligence.

In this study, the more experience a person has along with their increasing age, the more mature they exhibit in making decisions about the world of work. This is consistent with Crites’ (1978) findings with career maturity. Also relating to career maturity, graduate students were more mature than undergraduate students. Females scored higher in career maturity than males. This finding has been consistent with the literature on females maturing faster than males (Nevill & Super, 1988; Luzzo, 1995; Nevill & Super, 1988). However, research reports that women may need to be more mature because they work harder than men when trying to reach their career goals (Nevill & Super, 1988). The literature on race and career maturity is consistent with this study, in that there is no consistency in findings related to race.

This study found a relationship between student classification and career maturity. This means the more experience students have in developing their skills, the more prepared they are for their chosen career. Suggested that this is due to the closer a student is to graduating or the higher the Nevill and Super (1988) also found that the
higher the student classification, the higher the career maturity. They classification, the students are aware that they need to be committed to the career planning process. The results of this study show that respondents value personal achievement and relationships with coworkers in a career. Millennials want to be valued at their jobs; Smola and Sutton (2002) found similar results in their study.

Figure 4–1. The conceptual model created to illustrate employability using emotional intelligence and career maturity as predictors for the generation of Millennials.

Regarding Millennials and their employability, age, student classification, and gender are important. Race was shown not to be significant in this study. The older an individual is the more career maturity the individual has. There are a myriad of factors involved in making an individual more employable, such as how they interact with others and adapting to the context. The literature supports the conceptual model developed by the researcher.
All generational cohorts have different traits and values regarding the workplace, (Deal, Altman, & Rogelberg, 2010) as mentioned earlier, but they are all needed in the workplace. As seen in Figure 4-1, there are different variables that contribute to an individual's employability. The feedback loop shows that all variables are connected. However, the variables between emotional intelligence and career maturity need further investigation. The models impact for the future can be generalized to educators in all levels of learning but especially in higher education. Also, the model provides the student with an understanding of the process of learning and eventually being considered for a job. Educators should use the model for using emotional intelligence and career maturity as predictors for employability. Based on the results from the self-reported emotional intelligence and career maturity instruments, students in the department of AEC have high employability. However, the construct of employability does not guarantee a job, it increases ones chances.

**National Research Agenda**

According to the American Association for Agricultural Education 2011-2015 Research Priority Areas, Priority 4 aligns with this study: Meaningful, Engaged Learning in All Environments. The key outcome of this priority is the following:

Learners in all agricultural education learning environments will be actively and emotionally engaged in learning, leading to high levels of achievement, life and career readiness, and professional success. (Doerfert, 2011)

This priority aligns with the study because the purpose of the study was based on developing prepared and professional college graduates for the workplace. This research aimed to examine emotional intelligence of Millennial students that in agricultural colleges. This study provided further research for leadership educators to focus on career maturity in Millennial students. This study assisted in identifying the
emotional intelligence level of Millennials in college before they graduate and enter the workforce. Through this study, leadership educators could restructure curriculum to ensure the development of emotional intelligence in Millennials to become more employable.

**Recommendations**

Based on the results and conclusions of this study, the researcher has made recommendations for practitioners and researchers. However, generalizability must be approached with caution as the researcher suggests only applying these to the respondents of this research.

**Recommendations for Practice**

Educators in higher education need to focus on college students developing strong foundations in emotional intelligence and career maturity for the workforce. Students should be aware of the needs of employers before they enter the workplace so they will become more employable. Zeidner, Matthews, and Roberts (2004) found that emotionally intelligent individuals are more successful and have stronger relationships in the workplace. This means that educators must aid in the development of emotional intelligence skills in college students, no matter what age.

The Pew Research Center (2010) found that universities are accepting the highest amount of college students with lower levels of knowledge. It is recommended that university administrators make efforts to raise standards for all students and make professional development a priority. Bhavani and Aldridge (2000) found those employers’ top priorities when hiring college graduates are teamwork and communication skills. Employers in all industries look for these qualities; therefore team
building and communication courses need to address these needs. A study by the Texas Agricultural Extension Service (Ayers & Stone, 1999) found that their extension core competencies included emotional intelligence competencies as well. In addition, they wanted their professionals to develop these skills in order to build a better workforce. This shows that not only educators, but the industry is trying to instill emotional intelligence in the workforce by enforcing it as a priority. As shown earlier in the national research agenda, communication and interpersonal skills have been important in the workforce.

Through this study, educators could restructure curriculum to ensure the development of emotional intelligence in Millennials to become more employable. Orme (2003) found that over 60% of leadership is dependent on emotional-social intelligence and 30% of performance in occupations is dependent on emotional-social intelligence. It is recommended that research should be conducted on emotional intelligence and leadership ascension. Based on Orme (2003), it can be suggested that emotional intelligence plays a role in the process of an individual moving into a leadership position. A student learning emotional intelligence frameworks is not effective without the practice and experience of interacting with others. Educators should continue or start implementing emotional intelligence and other soft skills in their courses.

More importantly, employers want employees who are adaptable and can maintain multiple roles in the organization (Hall, 1976; Hall, 2002; Hall & Mirvis, 1995; Mirvis & Hall, 1994). The public sector is also vocal about capacity building, diversity training, and stronger relationship building and collaboration in the sector.
With technology and individuals constantly being “online,” lifestyles have changed; therefore, individuals need to adapt as well (Fugate, Kiniski, & Ashforth, 2004; Ashforth, 2001). Adaptability is a part of emotional intelligence and it is crucial to success in the workplace (Hall, 2002; Pulakos, Arad, Donovan, & Plamondon, 2000). Myers and Sadaghiani (2010) suggested that Millennials’ different perspectives on the marketplace and technologies can enhance organizational communication and productivity. Millennials need to be appreciated for their strengths by employers and not criticized.

Recommendations for Research

Based on the findings, it is recommended that researchers continue to find how to further develop emotional intelligence in students (Boussiakou, Boussiakou, & Kalkani, 2006). This study should be replicated within a larger sample to generate generalizability to a group of millennials in order to find if the topic is pertinent to all departments in higher education. Education priorities and employers proclaim to need individuals in the workforce with the ability to build relationships and collaborate cross-culturally. But how exactly do they develop those kinds of individuals? It is recommended that more research be conducted on the other potential factors that can improve college students’ teamwork and communication skills before they enter the workforce. It is imperative that researchers determine the level of emotional intelligence and career maturity that Millennials have now, so they can set a level that they need to be at. Lv, Wang, Lin, and Shi (2008) found in a study with undergraduate students that self-efficacy is a mediating variable between emotional intelligence and career maturity. It is recommended that research be done on employers and graduates of the AEC department in order to gain an understanding of what is needed to improve on regarding students’ skill development (Suvedi & Heyboer, 2004). Millennials need to be
researched further because of the impact they potentially have on the workplace. More importantly, Millennials are growing up with an online presence, so their needs for the workplace need to be addressed as well. Also, the role of social media should be addressed since millennials are immersed in social media. How has social media and having an online presence affect millennials’ interpersonal skills? Is there a negative impact regarding millennials entering the workplace and having different skills and values?

Leadership will change based on millennials’ emotional intelligence and career maturity. Millennials being the newest generation in the workforce, organizations are hesitant. However, the researcher suggests that millennials will change the culture of organizations in all sectors across industries. Millennials bring new skills to the workplace, some of which will change the work interface. Also, communication should be more important because of the variety of generations in the workforce.

Orme (2003) and Bar-On (2006a) found that about two-thirds of leadership is reliant on emotional intelligence. This means that the emotional intelligence developed is related to the leadership potential of an individual. The researcher recommends further studies on how emotional intelligence, career maturity, and leadership relate to one another. This topic needs to be further researched not only in student development but in organizations. It has been found that there is a strong relationship between emotional intelligence and performance in the workplace (Bar-On, 1997; Bar-On, 2004; Bar-On, 2006; Bar-On, Handley, & Fund, 2006; Handley, 1997; Ruderman & Bar-On, 2003; Orme, 2003). The researcher made a connection between emotional intelligence,
career maturity and employability. Further research should be considered regarding the link between the three constructs based on the results and the model’s applicability. Critical thinking and emotional have been linked as having a relationship (Stedman & Andenoro, 2006; Stedman, Cannon, Crow, & Sims, 2009). Individuals with higher levels of critical thinking have a tendency to be more aware and better manage their emotional state. The researcher recommends future studies to find the role critical thinking plays in this model.

Millennials have been said to be the greatest generation because of their confidence and high-achievement (Howe & Strauss, 2000). These traits that Millennials are said to portray disconcerting employers because millennials might not adapt well to the corporate culture (Safer, 2007; Kowske, Rasch, & Wiley, 2010). According to the Pew Research Center (2010), the millennial generation has the most education but is unable to find jobs, but there is no research to support that millennial traits are the traits that make them unemployable. Deal, Altman, and Rogelberg (2010) found that the highest amounts of students are coming to college with the lowest levels of knowledge. Universities are unsure about the cause of unpreparedness in college students’ education (Pew Research Center, 2010). Further research needs to be done as to the preparedness of students before and after college. Literature on generational differences in the workforce need to be reviewed and consensus needs to be reached. Then valuable research can be implemented in education and in organizations. Rivera and Alex (2008) suggest there is a need to prepare the agricultural workforce in capacity building, diversity, and training to build a stronger network. Another recommendation for future research is to investigate the perceptions of millennials
regarding ethics. Ethics guide decision making in the workplace, emotional intelligence
and critical thinking of the millennials will certainly impact future decisions when
millennials integrate in leadership positions. Millennials are used to mass media,
information overload, and access to instant communication. These factors may affect
their ethics and the decisions they will have to face in the workplace.

Conclusion

This chapter summarized the previous four chapters: introduction, literature
review, methodology, and results. The purpose and objectives of the study were
restated. The literature was presented regarding career maturity and emotional
intelligence. The methods of the study were explained including the sample and
instrumentation. Next, the findings of the four objectives were described in the analysis.
This chapter discusses the conclusions of the results and the relation to the national
research agenda.
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Right to withdraw from the study:
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I am pleased to advise you that the University of Florida Institutional Review Board has recommended approval of this protocol. Based on its review, the UFIRB determined that this research presents no more than minimal risk to participants, and based on 45 CFR 46.117(c), An IRB may waive the requirement for the investigator to obtain a signed consent form for some or all subjects if it finds either: (1) That the only record linking the subject and the research would be the consent document and the principal risk would be potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality. Each subject will be asked whether the subject wants documentation linking the subject with the research, and the subject’s wishes will govern; or (2) That the research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.
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ISF:dl
APPENDIX C
CAREER MATURITY INVENTORY- ATTITUDE SCALE

The Career Maturity Inventory - Screening Form A-2

Developed by Dr's. John O. Crites and Mark L. Savickas

DIRECTIONS

The Career Maturity Inventory Screening Form (Form A-2) has been constructed to survey the various attitudes which are important in making decisions about your career; it is not a personality inventory, an interest inventory, an achievement test, or an aptitude test. The attitude scale, which you are about to take, asks about your attitudes and feelings toward making a career choice and entering the world of work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Once you choose a job, you can't choose another one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  In order to choose a job, you need to know what kind of person you are.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  I plan to follow the line of work my parents suggest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  I guess everyone has to go to work sooner than later, but I don't look forward to it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  You can do any kind of work you want to as long as you try hard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  I'm not going to worry about choosing an occupation until I'm out of school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  Your job is important because it determines how much you can earn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Work is worthwhile mainly because it lets you buy the things you want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  The greatest appeal of a job to me is the opportunity it provides for getting ahead.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 I often dream about what I want to do, but I really haven't chosen a line of work yet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 You should choose a job that allows you to do exactly what you want to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>Your parents know better than anybody else which occupation you should enter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td>If I can just help others in my work, I'll be happy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td>Work is dull and unpleasant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td>Everyone seems to tell me something different; as a result I don't know what kind of work to choose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td>I don't know how to go about getting into the kind of work I want to do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td>There is no point in deciding upon a job when the future is so uncertain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td>I spend a lot of time wishing I could do work I know I can never do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td>I don't know what courses I should take in school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td>It's probably just as easy to be successful in one occupation as it is in another.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td>By the time you are 15 you should have your mind pretty well made up about the occupation you intend to enter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td>Whether you are interested in a particular kind of work is not as important as whether you can do it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td>I seldom think about the job I want to enter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>It doesn't matter which job you choose as long as it pays well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>You can't go very far wrong by following your parents' advice about which job to choose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td>Working is much like going to school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td>I am having difficulty preparing myself for the work I want to do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td>I know very little about the requirements of jobs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The job I choose has to give me plenty of freedom to do what I want.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>The best thing is to do is to try out several jobs, and then choose the one you like best.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>There is only one occupation for each person.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>There are so many things to consider in choosing an occupation, its hard to make a decision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I can't understand how some people can be so certain about what they want to do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>As long as I can remember, I've known what kind of work I want to do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I want to really accomplish something in my work – to make a great discovery or earn a lot of money or help a great number of people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>You get into an occupation mostly by chance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>It's who you know, not what you know that's important in a job.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>When it comes to choosing a job, I'll make up my own mind.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>You should choose an occupation which gives you a chance to help others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>When I am trying to study, I often find myself daydreaming about what it will be like when I start working.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I have little or no idea what working will be like.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>You should choose an occupation, then plan how to enter it .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I really can't find any work that has much appeal to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>You should choose a job in which you can someday become famous.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>If you have some doubts about what you want to do, ask your parents or friends for advice or suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Knowing what jobs are open is more important than knowing what you are good at when you choose an occupation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>The most important part of work is the pleasure that comes from doing it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>I keep changing my occupational choice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>As far as choosing an occupation is concerned, something will come along sooner or later.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>You shouldn't worry about choosing a job because you don't have anything to say about it anyway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part One

For each item, rate how well you are able to display the ability described. Before responding, try to think of actual situations in which you have been called on to use the ability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low ability</th>
<th>High ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Identify changes in physiological arousal
2. Relax when under pressure in situations
3. Act productively when angry
4. Act productively in situations that arouse anxiety
5. Calm yourself quickly when angry
6. Associate different physical cues with different emotions
7. Use internal “talk” to affect your emotional states
8. Communicate your feelings effectively
9. Reflect on negative feelings without being distressed
10. Stay calm when you are the target of anger from others
11. Know when you are thinking negatively
12. Know when your “self-talk” is instructional
13. Know when you are becoming angry
14. Know how you interpret events you encounter
15. Know what senses you are currently using
16. Accurately communicate what you experience
17. Identify what information influences your interpretations
18. Identify when you experience mood shifts
19. Know when you become defensive
20. Know the impact that your behavior has on others
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low ability</th>
<th>High ability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Know when you communicate incongruently
22. “Gear up” at will
23. Regroup quickly after a setback
24. Complete long-term tasks in designated time frames
25. Produce high energy when doing uninteresting work
26. Stop or change ineffective habits
27. Develop new and more productive patterns of behavior
28. Follow words with actions
29. Work out conflicts
30. Develop consensus with others
31. Mediate conflict between others
32. Exhibit effective interpersonal communication skills
33. Articulate the thoughts of a group
34. Influence others, directly or indirectly
35. Build trust with others
36. Build support teams
37. Make others feel good
38. Provide advice and support to others, as needed
39. Accurately reflect people’s feelings back to them
40. Recognize when others are distressed
41. Help others manage their emotions
42. Show empathy to others
43. Engage in intimate conversations with others
44. Help a group to manage emotions
45. Detect incongruence between others’ emotions or feelings and their behaviors
Part Two

Review your responses. The following charts indicate which items reflect which competencies.

**Intrapersonal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Awareness</th>
<th>Managing Emotions</th>
<th>Self-Motivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10</td>
<td>7, 22, 23, 25, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21</td>
<td>13, 27</td>
<td>27, 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpersonal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relating Well</th>
<th>Emotional Mentoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8, 10, 16, 19, 20, 29</td>
<td>8, 10, 16, 18, 34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35</td>
<td>37, 38, 39, 40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43</td>
<td>44, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44, 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organize your responses as follows. For each of the five competencies, count the number of responses for which you scored 4 or lower using tic marks in the left column. Count the number of responses for which you scored 5 or higher using tic marks in the right column.

**Intrapersonal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Responses of 4 and lower</th>
<th>Responses of 5 and higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpersonal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Responses of 4 and lower</th>
<th>Responses of 5 and higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relating Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Mentoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study your patterns and identify which competencies you want to improve.
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