

College Students' Positive Psychological Capital Study on the Relationship Between Self - efficacy and Career Decisions

Yalin Li

School of Vocational Education, Tianjin University of Technology and Education, Tianjin, 300222, China

Abstract

Positive psychology is constantly evolving, and personal positive areas are increasingly noted, more and more study of Positive Psychology. The study of college students; positive psychological capital study on the relationship between self - efficacy and career decisions. Adoption of positive psychological capital questionnaire, students study of career decision making self - efficacy scale for college students. (1) positive psychological capital of college students and college students; career decision making self - efficacy is notable is related. (2) positive psychological capital of college students on college students; career decision making self - efficacy to the forecast of the very important role.

Keywords

College students; Positive psychological capital; Career decision-making self-efficacy.

1. Introduction

Employment is the biggest livelihood and the most basic support for economic development. The State Council issued the "14th Five-Year Plan for Employment Promotion" in 2021, emphasizing the need to achieve more adequate and higher-quality employment. During the "14th Five-Year Plan" period, to achieve more adequate and higher-quality employment is to promote high-quality development. , the internal requirements of building a modern socialist country in an all-round way. According to statistics from CCTV Finance and Economics Channel , the number of graduates in 2022 reached 10.76 million , which can be called "the most difficult year for employment in history". How to promote the employment of college students is a topic of science and people's livelihood to be solved. This paper discusses the factors that affect how high-quality employment of college students is, in order to propose feasible psychological intervention methods for affecting employment.

As far as the current development form is concerned, college graduates are in the stage of entering their careers, and often because they do not have a clear understanding of their career decisions, they may show slow employment , slow employment and other phenomena [1] . Career decision-making self-efficacy plays an important role in the process of individual employment. Taylor and Betz put forward the term "career decision-making self-efficacy" on the basis of Jepson, D's career decision theory and Bandura's self-efficacy theory . During activities, the assessment or confidence of one's ability to complete various tasks [2] . In the research on career decision-making self-efficacy, the study found that high-efficiency people have more accurate career orientation and higher career goals [3] , which are closely related to career planning [2] . Research shows that the higher the occupational self-efficacy, the higher the employment quality of college students [4] , and the lower the employment pressure of college students [5] . Studies have shown that college students with high career decision-making self - efficacy tend to have high sociability and adaptability . It can be seen that exploring college students' career decision-making self-efficacy has important research significance not

only in promoting high-quality employment of college students, but also in promoting their mental health.

The research shows that among the factors affecting career decision-making self-efficacy, in addition to some external environment and other factors, the psychological variable of psychological capital plays a role in career decision-making self-efficacy that cannot be ignored. Psychological capital was first proposed by economists, and later with the emergence of positive psychology, "positive psychological capital", referred to as psychological capital, is the observable and developmental help that an individual possesses in the process of development to help improve work. A positive and optimistic mental state of efficiency or learning outcomes, this psychological capital includes resilience, hope, optimism, and self-efficacy [6-9]. The influence of psychological capital as the research content of positive psychology on college students' career decision-making self-efficacy is still unknown. Therefore, this study aims to explore the relationship between the two and put forward relevant educational suggestions to improve college students' psychological capital. Psychological capital is the psychological energy of college students. The research on psychological capital can provide some theoretical suggestions for college students' study and life, and has important theoretical significance for college students' psychological health. It can improve the psychological and physiological capital for colleges and universities, enhance students' self-efficacy in career decision-making, and prepare for students' future employment and difficulties in life.

To sum up, it is assumed that the demographic variables are significantly different in the total score and each dimension of career decision-making self-efficacy and the total score and each dimension of psychological capital; it is assumed that the total score of the two variables is significantly correlated. The purpose is to explore the relationship between the two and provide feasible suggestions for colleges and universities to improve positive psychological capital and enhance students' professional self-efficacy.

2. Research Methods

2.1. Subject

Taking college students from a university in Zhengzhou as the research object, a total of 148 questionnaires were distributed, 148 were recovered, and 1 invalid questionnaire was excluded. The invalid questionnaire had random answering questions, and 147 valid questionnaires were as follows.

Table 1. Basic situation (n = 147)

| | feature | number of people | percentage |
|------------------------|-------------|------------------|------------|
| gender | male | 36 | 24 % |
| | Female | 111 | 76 % |
| grade | freshman | 31 | 21 % |
| | Sophomore | 31 | 21 % |
| | junior year | 46 | 31 % |
| | senior year | 39 | 27 % |
| Is it an only child | Yes | 23 | 15 % |
| | no | 124 | 85 % |
| Birthplace | town | 56 | 38 % |
| | rural | 91 | 62 % |
| Is it a student cadre? | Yes | 97 | 66 % |
| | no | 50 | 34 % |

2.2. Measuring Tools

The research tool used in this study is the Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PPQ) compiled by Zhang Kuo et al. Divided into four dimensions of resilience, self-efficacy, hope and optimism, there are 26 questions in total, and the Likert score is seven-point, ranging from 1=completely inconsistent to 7=completely consistent, and the higher the score, the higher the psychological capital. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of this scale in this study was 0.79.

Long Lirong compiled "college students' career decision-making self-efficacy questionnaire" [10]. "College Students' Career Decision Self-Efficacy Questionnaire" has 39 questions, which are divided into the dimension of self-evaluation information collection; the dimension of choosing goals; the dimension of making plans; and the dimension of problem solving. The five-point scoring system ranges from 1=no confidence at all to 7=completely confident. The higher the score, the higher the career decision-making efficacy. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of this scale in this study was 0.76.

2.3. Data Collection

The students of different majors and different grades were measured, and the data was collected anonymously by using the questionnaire method, and the data was collected online in the form of questionnaire stars.

2.4. Data Processing

The data was collected, SPSS25.0 was used for data processing, variance analysis, t test, reliability analysis, and descriptive statistics of the data were performed, and the results were presented in the form of a three-line table.

3. Research Results

3.1. Differences Among Different Types of College Students

3.1.1. Gender Difference Analysis Results

Table 2. Gender difference results

| project | male | Female | t |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------|
| self-efficacy | 32.67 ± 7.43 | 29.31 ± 6.13 | 2.71 ** |
| hope | 29.61 ± 6.17 | 29.30 ± 6.02 | 0.265 _ |
| toughness | 30.72 ± 5.75 | 28.71 ± 5.77 | 1.83 _ |
| psychological capital | 123.67 ± 21.16 | 116.68 ± 20.16 | 1.79 _ |
| Self-evaluation | 20.47 ± 5.04 | 18.46 ± 4.54 | 2.24 * _ |
| collect information | 30.66 ± 7.69 | 27.28 ± 6.89 | 2.49 * _ |
| Choose a target | 30.86 ± 7.20 | 27.30 ± 6.70 | 2.72 ** _ |
| Make plans | 27.72 ± 6.42 | 24.17 ± 5.57 | 3.20 ** _ |
| problem solved | 23.86 ± 5.50 | 21.26 ± 5.09 | 2.61 ** _ |
| career decision self-efficacy | 113.58 ± 30.65 | 118.47 ± 27.19 | 2.81 ** _ |

Note: *p < 0.05 **p < 0.01

from Table 2 : (1) There is no significant gender difference in the total score of positive psychological capital of college students. (2) In each dimension, the self-efficacy (t= 2.71 , p<0.01) has a relatively large gender difference, reaching a statistical level of difference. Boys (32.67±7.43) scored higher than girls (29.31±6.13); gender differences in other dimensions did not reach a statistically significant level.

From Table 2 , it can be concluded that: (1) The gender difference in career decision-making self-efficacy ($t = 2.81, p < 0.01$) is very large, reaching a statistically significant level. (2) In self-evaluation ($t = 2.24, p < 0.05$), collecting information ($t = 2.49, p < 0.05$), choosing goals ($t = 2.72, p < 0.01$), making plans ($t = 3.20, p < 0.01$), problem solving ($t = 2.61, p < 0.01$), there are significant differences in the five dimensions, and the average value of boys in the five dimensions is higher than that of girls.

3.1.2. Difference Analysis Results of Grades

Table 3. Difference analysis results for grades

| project | freshman | Sophomore | junior year | senior year | F |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------|
| self-efficacy | 29.13 ± 5.35 | 31.84 ± 6.73 | 30.66 ± 6.30 | 28.92 ± 7.57 | 1.47 _ |
| hope | 28.58 ± 5.37 | 31.58 ± 5.69 | 29.04 ± 6.46 | 28.66 ± 6.06 | 1.81 _ |
| toughness | 27.84 ± 4.36 | 31.71 ± 7.46 | 29.57 ± 5.61 | 27.82 ± 4.98 | 3.45 * |
| Self-evaluation | 18.90 ± 4.16 | 20.00 ± 4.95 | 18.40 ± 5.19 | 18.82 ± 4.73 | 0.72 _ |
| psychological capital | 114.16 ± 16.50 | 126.64 ± 22.04 | 118.62 ± 20.31 | 114.87 ± 21.31 | 2.57 _ |
| collect information | 27.48 ± 6.19 | 29.61 ± 7.62 | 27.44 ± 7.82 | 28.17 ± 6.96 | 0.65 _ |
| Choose a target | 27.03 ± 5.38 | 29.80 ± 7.39 | 27.53 ± 7.83 | 28.53 ± 6.64 | 1.01 _ |
| Make plans | 23.96 ± 4.52 | 26.35 ± 6.65 | 24.29 ± 6.38 | 25.71 ± 5.80 | 1.25 _ |
| problem solved | 21.48 ± 5.00 | 22.77 ± 5.43 | 21.29 ± 5.65 | 22.23 ± 5.04 | 0.59 _ |
| career decision self-efficacy | 118.87 ± 23.00 | 128.54 ± 30.88 | 118.97 ± 31.92 | 123.48 ± 27.00 | 0.87 _ |

Note: * $p < 0.05$

From Table 3: (1) The difference in psychological capital of grades did not reach a statistically significant level. (2) In each dimension of positive psychological capital, only the resilience dimension ($F = 3.45, p < 0.05$) was significantly different. After LSD multiple comparisons, it was found that the level of positive psychological capital in the second year was higher than that of the other three grades; The difference in decision-making efficacy was not significant and did not reach a statistically significant level.

3.1.3. Whether the Student Cadre Difference Analysis Results

Table 4. Differences in whether to serve as a student leader

| project | Yes | no | t |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------|
| self-efficacy | 31.25 ± 5.85 | 27.92 ± 7.46 | 2.98 * |
| hope | 30.13 ± 5.65 | 27.90 ± 6.52 | 2.15 * |
| toughness | 29.27 ± 5.75 | 29.06 ± 5.97 | 0.20 |
| optimism | 30.05 ± 5.51 | 28.94 ± 7.66 | 1.01 |
| psychological capital | 120.70 ± 18.54 | 113.82 ± 23.57 | 1.945 |
| Self-evaluation | 19.50 ± 4.58 | 17.88 ± 4.87 | 1.99 * |
| collect information | 29.22 ± 7.09 | 25.90 ± 7.01 | 2.70 ** |
| Choose a target | 29.00 ± 6.75 | 26.54 ± 7.17 | 2.05 * |
| Make plans | 25.79 ± 5.86 | 25.54 ± 5.94 | 2.20 * |
| problem solved | 22.46 ± 5.22 | 20.76 ± 5.30 | 1.87 |
| career decision self-efficacy | 125.98 ± 28.42 | 114.62 ± 28.05 | 2.31 * |

Note: * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

From Table 4 : (1) There is no significant difference in the total score of psychological capital on whether they are student cadres or not. (2) There is a significant difference in self-efficacy ($t = 2.98$, $p < 0.05$), and it is hoped that the difference ($t = 2.15$, $p < 0.05$) will reach a statistically significant level. In the four dimensions, the mean value of serving as a student leader is higher than that of not serving as a student leader.

From Table 4 , it can be concluded that: (1) Career decision-making self-efficacy ($t = 2.31$, $p < 0.05$) has a significant difference in whether or not to serve as a student cadre. As a student leader (14.62 ± 2.805). (2) Career decision-making self-efficacy is in self-evaluation ($t = 1.99$, $p < 0.05$), choosing goals ($t = 2.05$, $p < 0.05$), making plans ($t = 2.20$, $p < 0.05$), collecting information ($t = 2.05$, $p < 0.05$) 2.70 , $p < 0.01$) was significantly different, and the mean value of serving as a student cadre was higher than that of those who did not serve as a student cadre.

3.1.4. Difference Analysis Results of Whether the Only Child

Table 5. Differences in whether the only child

| project | Yes | no | t |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------|
| self-efficacy | 31.30 ± 6.77 | 29.91 ± 6.58 | 0.93 _ |
| hope | 28.43 ± 7.18 | 29.55 ± 5.81 | - 0.82 |
| toughness | 30.39 ± 7.08 | 28.98 ± 5.55 | 1.07 _ |
| optimism | 28.09 ± 8.51 | 29.97 ± 5.81 | - 1.32 |
| psychological capital | 118.21 ± 26.60 | 118.40 ± 19.38 | - 0.41 |
| Self-evaluation | 20.57 ± 4.67 | 18.65 ± 4.70 | 1.79 _ |
| collect | 29.34 ± 8.31 | 27.87 ± 7.01 | 0.90 _ |
| information | 30.26 ± 7.09 | 27.78 ± 6.91 | 1.57 _ |
| Choose a target | 27.08 ± 6.04 | 24.65 ± 5.89 | 1.81 _ |
| Make plans | 23.21 ± 5.22 | 21.64 ± 5.29 | 1.30 _ |
| problem solved | 130.47 ± 30.07 | 120.61 ± 28.31 | 1.52 _ |
| career decision self-efficacy | | | |

It can be seen from the above table that whether it is an only child or not has no significant difference in the two variables and each dimension.

3.1.5. Analysis of Differences in Family Residence

Table 6. Results of differences in family residence

| project | rural | town | t |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| self-efficacy | 29.28 ± 6.84 | 31.51 ± 6.00 | - 2.02* |
| hope | 28.88 ± 6.37 | 30.19 ± 5.37 | - 1.29 |
| toughness | 28.57 ± 5.63 | 30.21 ± 6.00 | - 1.67 |
| optimism | 29.09 ± 6.70 | 30.62 ± 5.53 | - 1.43 |
| psychological capital | 115.83 ± 20.89 | 122.55 ± 19.47 | - 1.95 |
| Self-evaluation | 18.22 ± 4.45 | 20.14 ± 4.97 | - 2.43 * |
| collect information | 26.95 ± 7.04 | 29.98 ± 7.16 | - 2.52 ** |
| Choose a target | 27.19 ± 6.68 | 29.76 ± 7.21 | - 2.20 * |
| Make plans | 24.23 ± 5.77 | 26.35 ± 6.10 | - 2.13 * |
| problem solved | 21.08 ± 4.95 | 23.23 ± 5.61 | - 2.44 * |
| career decision self-efficacy | 117.68 ± 27.38 | 129.48 ± 29.58 | - 2.47 * |

Note: * $p < 0.05$ ** $p < 0.01$

From Table 6, it can be concluded that: (1) The difference of positive psychological capital in the family residence is not significant, and it does not reach a significant level in psychological statistics. (2) There is a significant difference in the dimension of self-efficacy ($t = -2.02$, $p < 0.05$), the mean value in rural areas (29.28 ± 6.84) is lower than that in urban areas (31.51 ± 6.00), and there are no significant differences in other dimensions.

from Table 6 : (1) The difference of career decision-making self-efficacy in the family residence ($t = -2.47$, $p < 0.05$) was significant. (2) In self-evaluation ($t = -2.43$, $p < 0.05$), collecting information ($t = -2.43$, $p < 0.01$), choosing goals ($t = -2.20$, $p < 0.05$), making plans ($t = -2.13$, $p < 0.05$) and problem solving dimensions ($t = -2.44$, $p < 0.05$) were significantly different, and the mean in urban areas was significantly higher than that in rural areas.

3.1.6. Whether You Have Received Scholarship Difference Analysis

Table 7. Difference analysis of whether you have received a scholarship

| project | Yes | no | t |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| self-efficacy | 33.59 ± 6.62 | 20.09 ± 6.27 | 3.62 *** |
| hope | 31.88 ± 6.40 | 28.63 ± 5.74 | 2.82 ** |
| toughness | 30.32 ± 5.83 | 28.26 ± 5.79 | 1.29 _ |
| optimism | 39.11 ± 6.55 | 29.25 ± 6.20 | 1.53 _ |
| psychological capital | 126.91 ± 20.67 | 115.83 ± 19.91 | 2.82 ** |
| Self-evaluation | 20.47 ± 4.45 | 18.50 ± 4.73 | 2.15 * _ |
| collect information | 30.61 ± 6.60 | 27.35 ± 7.25 | 2.35 * _ |
| Choose a target | 30.26 ± 6.37 | 27.54 ± 7.05 | 2.01 * _ |
| Make plans | 27.41 ± 5.62 | 24.32 ± 5.90 | 2.70 ** _ |
| problem solved | 23.58 ± 5.03 | 21.38 ± 5.28 | 2.15 * _ |
| career decision self-efficacy | 132.35 ± 26.71 | 119.10 ± 28.69 | 2.39 * _ |

Note: * $p < 0.05$ *** $p < 0.001$ ** $p < 0.01$

from Table 7 : (1) The positive psychological capital of college students ($t = 2.82$, $p < 0.01$) has a very significant difference in whether to obtain a scholarship. (2) There is a very significant difference in the dimension of hope ($t = 2.82$, $p < 0.01$), and those who have received scholarships (31.88 ± 6.40) are significantly higher than those who have not received scholarships (28.63 ± 5.74). In the dimension of self-efficacy ($t = 3.62$, $p < 0.001$), the difference is relatively large, reaching an extremely significant level in psychostatistics. The mean value of scholarship recipients (33.59 ± 6.62) was significantly higher than that of no scholarship recipients (20.09 ± 6.27).

from Table 7 : (1) Career decision-making self-efficacy ($t = 2.39$, $p < 0.05$) is significantly different on whether or not a scholarship has been obtained. (2) In planning ($t = 2.70$, $p < 0.01$), self-evaluation ($t = 2.15$, $p < 0.05$), problem solving ($t = 2.15$, $p < 0.05$), information gathering ($t = 2.35$, $p < 0.05$) and selection goals ($t = 2.01$, $p < 0.05$) were significantly different, among which the difference in planning was very significant, and the mean of students who had won scholarships (27.41 ± 5.62) was significantly higher than those who had not received scholarships (24.32 ± 5.90).

3.2. Variable Analysis

Table 8. Correlation analysis of variables

| | self- assessment price | collection letter interest | select target mark | formulate plan Draw | problem solved | career decision self- efficacy able to feel |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---|
| self-efficacy | 0.613 ** ₋ | 0.60 ** ₋ | 0.62 ** ₋ | 0.59 ** ₋ | 0.58 ** ₋ | 0.63 ** ₋ |
| toughness | 0.44 ** ₋ | 0.46 ** ₋ | 0.47 ** ₋ | 0.45 ** ₋ | 0.48 ** ₋ | 0.48 ** ₋ |
| hope | 0.55 ** ₋ | 0.51 ** ₋ | 0.54 ** ₋ | 0.48 ** ₋ | 0.50 ** ₋ | 0.54 ** ₋ |
| optimism | 0.52 ** ₋ | 0.50 ** ₋ | 0.49 ** ₋ | 0.42 ** ₋ | 0.43 ** ₋ | 0.49 ** ₋ |
| psychological capital | 0.64 ** ₋ | 0.62 ** ₋ | 0.64 ** ₋ | 0.58 ** ₋ | 0.60 ** ₋ | 0.65 ** ₋ |

Note: **p<0.01

from Table 8 that the two variables are significantly positively correlated on the total score. There are significant positive correlations between the two variables in all dimensions. It shows that the higher the level of psychological capital, the higher the career decision-making self-efficacy. The richer the psychological capital accumulation of college students, the stronger the psychological energy, the higher the self-efficacy of their future career in a certain profession, the more they can believe in themselves, and the more confident they are.

Four. discuss

3.2.1. Discussion on Positive Psychological Capital of College Students

There was no significant gender difference in the total psychological capital score. In all dimensions of psychological capital, gender differences in self-efficacy dimension are significant, males are higher than females, and other dimensions are not significantly different. Boys and girls are physically and psychologically different. Faced with the same social pressure, boys and girls have different social responsibilities. Boys have more responsibilities and face more problems and requirements. Therefore, boys' self-efficacy will increase. high.

It can be concluded from the previous article that the grade difference of college students' psychological capital is not significant. Consistent with previous studies [11]. In each dimension of psychological capital, only the resilience dimension is significantly different. After the post-mortem test, it was found that the psychological capital level of the sophomore was higher than that of the other three grades. Different grades have different lengths of time in school, different levels of understanding of schools, different breadth of professional knowledge learned, and different degrees of understanding of majors, so there are significant differences in resilience levels.

The previous article concluded that there was no significant difference in psychological capital in terms of whether students were cadres or not. There were significant differences in self-efficacy and hope, but no significant differences in the other two dimensions. The average value of serving as a student leader is higher than that of not serving as a student leader. Students who have served as student leaders often face various problems in the class or other situations, and often have to deal with various problems. After completing various tedious tasks assigned by teachers, their self-confidence when facing problems and their hope for the future will be significantly higher than the average of students who have not served as student leaders during their college years.

The previous article concluded that there is little difference in the psychological capital in the place of residence of the family, and it does not reach the significant level of the major of

psychos. Only the self-efficacy dimension is significantly different, and the mean value in rural areas is lower than that in urban areas. The education and other resources that rural students receive in rural areas will be significantly less than that of urban students.

There is a very significant difference in the psychological capital of college students whether they receive scholarships or not. There is a very significant difference in the dimension of hope, and the mean of having received a scholarship is significantly higher than that of not having received a scholarship. There is an extremely significant difference in the dimension of self-efficacy, and the mean value of having received a scholarship is significantly higher than that of not having received a scholarship. Students who received scholarships during their college years were awarded scholarships for outstanding performance and academic performance, so their self-efficacy and hope for the future were on average higher than those of students who did not receive scholarships.

3.2.2. Discussion on the Professional Self-efficacy of College Students

The total score of career decision-making self-efficacy was significantly different in gender. There are significant differences in the five dimensions of self-evaluation, information collection, target selection, planning, and problem solving. Boys have higher averages than girls in the five dimensions. When faced with various difficulties and challenges in career choices and work, women lack the confidence and attitude to solve problems, especially when they encounter problems such as going against the wishes of family and friends, lack of confidence and attitude. Obviously, therefore, women should take part in more activities in university life and study.

The difference of college students' career decision-making self-efficacy is significant whether they serve as student cadres. There are significant differences in college students' career decision-making self-efficacy in making plans, self-evaluation, collecting information, and choosing goals. Students who have served as student leaders in universities often face various situations in the school, deal with various problems and troubles, and can deal with interpersonal relationships and work problems in school work. Therefore, students who serve as student leaders will also have better self-evaluation.

The difference of career decision-making self-efficacy in the family place of residence is obvious, reaching the statistical significance level. There are significant differences in self-assessment, problem solving, information collection, planning, and target selection, and the average in urban areas is significantly higher than that in rural areas. Compared with urban students, students from rural areas are exposed to fewer resources and have a poorer living environment. Students from rural areas are lower than students from urban areas in terms of collecting information, making plans, and choosing goals.

It can be concluded from the previous article that there is a significant difference in the career decision-making self-efficacy of college students whether they have won a scholarship. There are significant differences in self-evaluation, information collection, target selection, planning, and problem solving. College students won scholarships due to their outstanding academic performance during their college years. They have plans for their four-year college studies and, of course, plans for the future. They are also higher than students who have not received scholarships in other dimensions.

3.2.3. Analysis of Variables and Dimensions

It can be seen from the foregoing that there is a positive correlation between the two variables in the total score, and the correlation is relatively close, reaching a statistically significant level. There are significant positive correlations between the two variables in all dimensions. It shows that the higher the level of psychological capital, the higher the career decision-making self-efficacy. The richer the accumulation of psychological capital and the stronger the psychological energy of college students, the higher the self-efficacy and confidence in their future careers.

4. Insufficient

The sample is only selected in this school, and the scope is small and not extensive, so it may be difficult to promote it in the whole province; when discussing the relationship between the two, whether there is an intermediary variable needs to be discussed in depth, which will be discussed in the future. supplemented in the study. The future research direction can add factors such as the type of interpersonal relationship, the type of parenting style, and the academic performance for research.

5. Conclusion

There are differences in psychological capital in terms of whether they have received scholarships, and the differences have reached a statistically significant level; the dimensions of self-efficacy have large differences in demographic variables such as gender, family residence, whether they are student leaders, and whether they have received scholarships. Reached a significant level; Hope differs significantly in terms of whether it is a student cadre and whether it has received a scholarship; Resilience differs significantly in grades.

Career decision-making self-efficacy, self-evaluation, collecting information, choosing goals, making plans, significant differences in gender, family residence, scholarship availability, and student leadership; problem solving in gender, family residence, and scholarship availability There are significant differences.

There was a significant positive correlation between the two variables in the total score. There is a significant positive correlation between the two variables in all dimensions

6. Recommendations

The researchers based on the "state-like theory", which holds that psychological capital is both stable and changes with changes in environmental factors [12]. Therefore, the psychological capital of college students can be changed in some ways. Improve the psychological capital level of college students, carry out psychological capital group intervention activities, release themselves through group games, open their hearts, and gain subjective positive experience. Research shows that group psychological intervention activities can effectively improve the psychological capital level of college students [13]; The counseling of graduates' career planning focuses on cultivating the ability and courage to face and deal with difficulties; they should be trained in time to improve their ability to collect information and formulate plans; Be optimistic about problems.

References

- [1] Zhang Sha. Research on the formation of career decision-making of college students' "slow employment" group [J]. Think Tank Times, 2019(40):34-35.
- [2] Wang Kaili . Research on the relationship between psychological capital, career decision-making self-efficacy and career planning of college students [D]. 2019.
- [3] Gushue, G. V., Clarke, CP, & Pantzer, KM Self efficacy, perceptions of barriers, vocational identity, and the career exploration behavior of Latino/a high school students. The Career Development Quarterly, 2006, 54(4), 307-317.
- [4] Tong Huijie, Tong Ding, Qiu Yuejiao. The employment quality of college students in southern Jiangsu: the influence of self-efficacy and career expectations [J]. Psychological Technology and Application, 2017,5(03):169-174.

- [5] Ma Aiping. Research on the relationship between employment pressure, career decision-making self-efficacy and personality traits of college students [D]. Guangxi Normal University, 2016.
- [6] Fred, Luthans, and, et al. Positive psychological capital: beyond human and social capital[J]. Business Horizons, 2004 ,47(1): 45-50.
- [7] Luthans F, Avolio BJ, Walumbwa FO, etal. The Psychological Capital of Chinese Workers: Exploring the Relationship with Performance[J]. Management & Organization Review,2005,1(2):249-271.
- [8] Luthans F, Youssef CM, Avolio B J. Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- [9] Jensen SM, Luthans F. Relationship between Entrepreneurs' Psychological Capital and Their Authentic Leadership[J]. Journal of Management Issues. 2006, 18, 254-273.
- [10] Peng Yong xin, Long Li rong. (2001). Research on self-efficacy assessment of college students' career decision-making. Applied Psychology, 7(2), 38-43.
- [11] Wang Shimei. Research on the Influence of Proactive Personality on College Students' Creativity: The Mediating Role of Psychological Capital and Creative Motivation [D]. Zhejiang University, 2014.
- [12] B. J. Avolio & F. Luthans. The High Impact Leader: Moments Matter for Accelerating Authentic Leadership Development[M]. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2006.
- [13] Adolescent students' psychological capital [D]. Fujian Normal University, 2012.