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METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

In the preceding chapter, the researcher has presented the review of related literature, focused the problem, discussed the significance of the problem, stated the objectives, and formulated the hypotheses.

In the present chapter discussion about the methodology of the research is proposed to be presented. This chapter discusses about the design of the study, sample considered, tools used the methods followed for data collection and the statistical techniques adopted.

The research is intended to find out the relation between the following variables.

1. Self-efficacy, intelligence, personality, and occupational choice.
2. To find out the effect of the demographical factors on self-efficacy, intelligence, personality and occupational choice.

4.0.0 DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The researcher has selected four variables for the study. Self-efficacy and occupational choice as dependent variables and intelligence and personality are independent variables, apart from gender, nativity, parents educational qualifications, type of the college, and group (subject) are also independent variables.
As the number of independent variables are multiple regression analysis was employed to test the hypothesis formulated in the present investigation a part from significance of difference.

4.1.0. SAMPLE OF THE STUDY

Nine hundred intermediate students (both girls and boys) studying in different colleges as Kurnool District constituted the sample of the study. First the number of colleges in Kurnool District were listed. Through stratified random sampling, in total sixteen colleges were selected of which four are Government Institutions, Four aided Institutions, four unaided Institutions and Four minority Institutions.

From each type 225 students of which 100 are boys and 125 are girls. Thus the total of 900 students of which 400 are boys and 500 are girls were selected which constitute the sample of present study.
### TABLE- 4.1 SHOWING NUMBER OF INTERMEDIATE COLLEGES SELECTED FOR STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.no</th>
<th>Type of the college</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aided</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Un-aided</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>minority</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE- 4.2 SHOWING TOTAL SAMPLE OF THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No</th>
<th>Type of the college</th>
<th>Number of boys</th>
<th>Number of girls</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>government</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>aided</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>un-aided</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>minority</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.0. TOOLS USED

In this study the researcher has used the following tools.

1. **Self-efficacy scale** by Ralf Schwarzer & Matthias Jerusalem, 1993.

2. **Standard Progressive Matrices** (sets-A, B, C, D and E) by J.C. Raven 1958

3. **16-personality factor questionnaire** by Cattele (form-C) 1962.

4. **Occupational choice** (locally standardized)
4.3.0. DESCRIPTION OF TOOL

4.3.1 SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

Definitions:

Self-efficacy is belief in one's capability to organize and execute the course of action required to manage prospective situation. It is concerned with individual's perceived capabilities to produce results and to attain designated types of performance. Self-efficacy judgments are both task and situation-specific, contextual and individual makes use of these judgments in reference to some type of goal.

Self-efficacy beliefs develop from various sources like mastery experience, verbal persuasions, vicarious experiences etc. physiological states such as anxiety, stress, arousal, fatigue and mood states also provide information about efficacy beliefs.

It is important to restate that these sources of efficacy information are not directly translated into judgments of competence. Individuals interpret the results of events, and these interpretations provide the information on which judgments are based. The types of information people attend to and use to make efficacy judgments, and the rules they employ for weighting and integrating them, form the basis for such interpretations. Thus, the selection, integration, interpretation, and recollection of information influence judgments of self-efficacy.
Importance of Self Efficacy In Daily Life

Self efficacy beliefs influence motivational and self-regulatory process in several ways. They influence the choices people make and the courses of action they pursue. Strong self-efficacy beliefs enhance human accomplishment and personal well-being in many ways. People with a strong sense of personal competence in a domain approach difficult tasks in that domain as challenges to be mastered rather than as dangers to be avoided, have greater intrinsic interest in activities, set challenging goals and maintain a strong commitment to them, heighten their efforts in the face of failure, more easily recover their confidence after failures or setbacks and attribute failure to insufficient effort or deficient knowledge and skills which they believe they are capable of acquiring. High self-efficacy helps create feelings of serenity in approaching difficult tasks and activities. Conversely, people with low self-efficacy may believe that things are tougher than they really are, a belief that fosters stress, depression, and a narrow vision of how best to solve a problem. As a result of these influence, self-efficacy beliefs are strong determinants and predictors of the level of accomplishment that individuals finally attain.

Example of Self Efficacy

Students confident in their academic skills expect high marks on exams and expect the quality of their work to reap benefits. The
opposite is also true of those who lack such confidence. Students who doubt their academic ability envision low marks before they begin an exam. The expected results of these imagined performances will be differently envisioned: continued good grades and academic success for the former, curtailed possibilities and academic failure for the latter.

The socially anxious man confronted with the decision of whether to attend the party envisions disastrous outcomes largely because he has little confidence in his capabilities to meet the demands associated with parties. These beliefs vary in level, strength, and generality and these dimensions prove important in determining appropriate measurements.

**Measurement of Self Efficacy**

Self-efficacy beliefs should be measured in terms of particularized judgments of capability that may vary across realms of activity, different levels of task demands within a given activity, domain, and under different situational circumstances.

The researcher has selected the self-efficacy questionnaire standardized and prepared by Ralf Schwarzer and Matthias Jerusalem, in the year 1993.

Self-efficacy scale consists of ten statements with four options. (1=not at all true, 2=hardly true, 3=moderately true, 4=exactly true.) The student has to go through the statement and give one response of his choice.
4.3.2. SCORING OF SELF-EFFICACY

It consists of ten statements. There are four alternative responses. These responses were numbered 1 to 4 (not at all true-1, hardly true-2, moderately true-3, and exactly true-4). The minimum and maximum possible scores on self-efficacy scale ranges from 10-40. Low score indicates low self-efficacy, high score indicates high self-efficacy. The reliability of the scale was established by using test-retest method and it is found to be 0.64 and validity of the scale computed is 0.80.

4.3.3. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

The reliability of the self-efficacy questionnaire was established by using test-retest method. The researcher has selected 50 students of intermediate first and second year and administered the self-efficacy questionnaire to them. Again after one month the same questionnaire was given to the same students of intermediate first year and second year and test was administered. Then reliability and validity was found to be root .64 and 0.80. This value show that this scale is suitable for our condition. The same scale is translated in to Telugu by the researcher with the help of research supervisor.

4.4.0. STANDARD PROGRESSIVE MATRICES

It is a test of person's capacity at the time of the test to apprehend meaningless figures presented for his observation see the
relation between them, conceive the nature of the figure completing each system of relations presented, and by so doing develop a systematic method of reasoning.

Raven's progressive matrices consist of five sets of non-verbal items {A, B, C, and D & E}. The scale consists of 60 problems divided into five sets of 12. In each set the first problem is as nearly as possible self-evident. The problems which follow become progressively difficult. The five sets provide five opportunities for grasping method and five progressive assessments of a person's capacity for intellectual activity. Each set has 12 items in order of difficulty. To ensure sustained interest and freedom from fatigue, the figures in each problem are boldly presented, accurately drawn and, as far as, possible pleasing to look at. The scale is intended to cover the whole range of intellectual development from the time the child is able to grasp the idea of finding a missing piece to complete the pattern and to be sufficiently long to assess a person's maximum capacity to form comparisons reason by analogy without being unduly exhausting or unwieldy.

Everyone whatever his age, is given exactly the same series of problems in the same order and is asked to work at his own speed, without interruption, from the beginning to end of the scale. As the order of the problem provides the standard training in the method of working, the scale can be given either as an individual, a self-administered or as a group test. Person's total scores provide an index of his intellectual
capacity, whatever his nationality or education. The contribution which each of the five sets makes to the total provides a means of assessing the consistency of the estimate.

Each problem in the scale is really the mother or source of a system of thought hence the name progressive matrices. The scale has a retest reliability varying with age, from 0.83 to 0.93. It correlates 0.86 with the Terman-Merril scale. And has been found to have a "g" saturation of 0.82+. A set of test book is required for administration of RPM.

The researcher has selected intermediate first year and second year students for his research work. Hence he made them sit sufficiently apart comfortably at tables with RPM booklets and answer sheets. Necessary instructions were given followed by strict supervision to avoid copying. One hour time was given to solve 60 non-verbal items.

4.4.1. SCORING OF STANDARD PROGRESSIVE MATRICES

A person's score on the scale is the total number of problems he solves correctly when he is allowed to work quietly through the series from the beginning to the end. Non-verbal responses of standard progressive matrices are scored according to the scoring key prepared by J.C.Raven.
4.5.0. SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Growing use of 16-PF form A and B in many studies in clinical, dimensions of personality form-C has been constructed. Form A and Form-B take much time hence form-C has been prepared keeping in view.

1. To meet the need
2. To use at the same time a more elementary vocabulary
3. To include an index
4. To guard against attempt at distortion of the self picture.
5. As a third extension of the 16-PF itself.

In terms of the personality factors measured, form-C is exactly parallel to form- A and form-B. An extensive factor analysis, originally based on many hundreds of new questions, was carried out, as reported in detail elsewhere. It aimed to give maximum reliability and validity of measurement possible with only six items per factor. The result showed good validity and confirmed that the same factors are being measured as in the A and B 16PF forms. It tests the basic independent factors such as emotional stability, dominance, timidity, shrewdness, intelligence, enthusiasm (surgency), conservatism, nervous tension, and the factors involved in neuroticism, morale, leadership, social adjustment, and vocational preference and success.
The sixteen dimensions are independent. That is correlation between one and another is usually negligible. And each of the sixteen scales brings an entirely new piece of information about the person, a condition not found in many alleged multi-dimensional scales.

**TABLE- 4.3 SHOWING 16-PERSONALITY FACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR-A</th>
<th>Aloof (schizothyme)</th>
<th>Warm (cyclothymis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-B</td>
<td>Dull (low general ability)</td>
<td>Bright (intelligent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-C</td>
<td>Emotional (general tability)</td>
<td>Mature (egocentric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-E</td>
<td>Submissive (submission)</td>
<td>Dominant (dominance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-F</td>
<td>Glum, silent (desurgency)</td>
<td>Enthusiastic surgency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-G</td>
<td>Casual (weakness of character)</td>
<td>Conscientious (super-ego)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-H</td>
<td>Timid (withdrawn schizothyme)</td>
<td>Adventurous (cyclothymiacs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-I</td>
<td>tough</td>
<td>Sensitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-L</td>
<td>trustful</td>
<td>Suspecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-M</td>
<td>Conventional (concerns)</td>
<td>Eccentric (unconcern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-N</td>
<td>simple</td>
<td>Sophisticated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-O</td>
<td>Confident (freedom from anxiety)</td>
<td>Insecure (anxious insecure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-Q1</td>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>Experimenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-Q2</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>Self sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-Q3</td>
<td>uncontrolled</td>
<td>Self-controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR-Q4</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.1. CAPSULE DESCRIPTION OF SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTORS

Factor-A Aloof (Schizothymia) the person who scores low (1 or 2) on this factor tends to be stiff, cool aloof. He likes things rather than people. Working alone and avoidance of clash of view points. He is likely to be precise and rigid in his way of doing things and in personal standards, and in many occupations these are desirable traits. He may tend, at time to be critical, obstructive or hard.

Factor -A Warm, outgoing (Cyclothymia) the person who scores high on factor -A tends to be good-natured, easygoing, ready to cooperate, attentive to people, softhearted, kindly, trustful, adaptable. He likes occupations dealing with people and socially impressive situations. He readily forms active group. He is generous in personal relations, less afraid of criticism, better able to remember names of people. But he is often less dependable in precision work and in obligations.

Factor-B Dull (low general ability) the person scoring low on factor-B tends to be slow to learn and grasp, dull sluggish. He tends to have little taste or capacity for the higher forms of knowledge and to be somewhat boorish.

Factor-B Bright (intelligence) the person who scores high on factor-B tends to be quick to grasp ideas, a fast learner, and intelligence. He is usually rather cultured.
Factor-C Emotional (general instability) the person who seeks low on factor-C tends to be emotionally immature, lacking in frustration tolerance, changeable, evasive, neurotically fatigued, worrying, easily annoyed, generally dissatisfied, having symptoms of phobia, sleep disturbances, psychosomatic complaints. Low factor –score is common to almost all forms of mental disorders.

Factor-C mature (ego strength) the person who scores high on factor-C tends to be emotionally mature, stable, calm, phlegmatic, realistic about life, placid, possessing ego strength, having an integrated philosophy of life, better able to maintain high group morale.

Factor-E submissive (submission) the person who scores low on Factor-E tends to be dependent, a follower, and to take action which goes along with the group. He tends to lean on others in making decisions and is often soft-hearted, expressive and easily upset.

Factor-E Dominant (dominance) the person who scores high on factor-E tends to be ascendant, self-assured, assertive, and independent-minded. Bold in his approach to situations. He may at times be hard, stern, hostile, solemn, tough-minded, and authoritarian.

Factor-F Glum, silent (de-surgency) the person who scores low on factor F tends to be taciturn, reticent, introspective. He is some times incommunicative, melancholic. Anxious, depressed, smug, languid, slow.
Factor-F Enthusiastic (surgency) the person who scores high on this trait tends to be cheerful, talkative, frank, expressive, quick, alert, and imperturbable. He is frequently chosen as an elected leader.

Factor -G Casual (weakness of Character the person who scores low on factor-G tends to be fickle, undependable, irresolute, unsteady, quitting, he is sometimes demanding, impatient, indolent, obstructive, lacking to internal standards.

Factor-G Conscientious (super ego strength) the person who scores high on factor-G tends to be strong in charter persevering, responsible, determined, consistent, planful, energetic, cautious, well-organized. He is usually conscientious, with high regard for moral standards, and prefers efficient people to other companions.

Factor-H Timid (withdrawn schizothymia) the person who scores low on this trait tends to be shy, withdrawn, cautious, retiring, cool, a wallflower.

He usually has inferiority feelings. He tends to be slow and impeded in speech and in expressing himself, dislikes occupations with personal contacts, prefers one or two close friends to large groups, and is not able to keep in contact withal that is going on around him.

Factor-H Adventurous (adventurous cyclothymics) the person who scores high on factor-H tends to be sociable, participating, ready to try new things, spontaneous, abundant in emotional response. He is
able to face wear and tear in dealing with people and grueling emotional situations, without fatigue. However, he can be careless of detail, ignore danger signals, and consume much time talking. He may be pushy and active in interest in the opposite sex.

Factor-I Tough (toughness) the persons who scores low on factor-I tends to be practical, realist. Masculine, independent, responsible, but uncultured. He is sometimes phlegmatic, hard, cynical, and smug. He tends to keep a group operating n a practical and realist no-nonsense basis.

Factor-I Sensitive (sensitivity) the person who scores high on Factor-I tends to be tender-minded, imaginative, introspective, artistic, fastidious, excitable. He is sometimes demanding, impatient, dependent, and impractical; he dislikes crude people and rough occupations. He tends to slow up group performance, and to upset group morale by negative remarks.

Factor-L Trustful (lack of paranoid tendency) the person who scores low on factor-L tends to be free of jealous tendencies, adaptable. Cheerful, composed, concerned about other people, a good team worker.

Factor-L Suspecting (paranoid tendency) the persons who scores high on factor-L tends to be mistrusting and doubtful he is often involved in his own ego is self-opinionated, and interested in internal and mental life. He is usually deliberate in his actions. Unconcerned about other people. And a poor team leader.
Factor-M Conventional (practical concernedness) the person who scores low of factor-M tends to be anxious, to do the right thing. Practical and conformist. He is easily concerned but able to keep his head to emergencies; he is often rather narrowly correct and unimaginative.

Factor-M Eccentric (Bohemian unconcern) the person who scores high in this factor tends to be unconventional, unconcerned, egocentric, sensitive, imaginative, he some times makes emotional scenes, is somewhat responsible, impractical, undependable, he is often rejected in group situations.

Factor-N Simple (Naïve simplicity) the persons who score low in this factor tends to be unsophisticated, sentimental, and simple. He is easily pleased and sometimes crude, and awkward.

Factor-N sophisticated (sophistication) the person who scores high in this factor tends to be polished, experienced, worldly, shrewd, he tends to be hard headed and analytical, he has an intellectual, unsentimental approach to situations.

Factor-O Confident (freedom from anxiety) the person who scores low in this factor tends to be placid, calm, with unshakable nerve, he has a mature, un anxious confidence in himself and his capacity to deal with things, he is resilient and secure.
Factor-0 Insecure (anxious insécurité) the person who scores high in this factor tends to be depressed, moody, a worrier. Suspicious, brooding, avoiding people. He has a childlike tendency to anxiety in difficulties. He does not feel accepted in groups or free to participate. High factor-O score is very common in clinical groups of all types.

FactorQ1-Conservative (conservatism) the person who scores low in this factor tends to be overly cautious and moderate. He is opposed to any change, inclined to go along with traditions, and tends not to be interested in analytical intellectual thought.

Factor - Q1Experimenting radicalism) the person who scores high on factorQ1 tends to be interested in intellectual matters and fundamental issues. He frequently takes issue with ideas, either old or new. He tends to be better informed less inclined to moralize. And more inclined to experiment in life generally, more tolerant of inconvenience.

Factor - Q2 Dependent (group dependence) the person who scores low in this factor tends to be work oriented, and make decisions with other people. Like and depends on social approval and admiration. He tends to go along with the group and may be lacking in resolution.

Factor - Q2 self-sufficient the person who score high in this factor tend to be independent, resolute, accustomed to going his own way, making decisions and taking action on his own. He is not necessarily dominant however in his relations with others.
Factor - Q3 uncontrolled (poor self sentiment) the person who scores low in this factor tends to lack control and character stability he is not too considerate, careful, or conscientious.

Factor Q3 self-controlled (high self-sentiment) the person who scores high in this factor tends to have strong control, of his emotions and general behavior, is inclined to be considered, careful, and evident what is commonly termed self-respect. He sometimes tends, however to be obstinate. Effective leader are high on Q3.

Factor-Q4 stable (relaxation) the person who scores low on factorQ4 tends to be calm, relaxed, composed and satisfied.

FactorQ4 tense the persons who scores high in this factors tend to be tense, excitable, restless, fretful, impatience. He is often over fatigued, but unable to remain inactive. He takes a poor view of group unity, orderliness, leadership.

4.5.2. DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE TEST

a) Arrangement of items

Six questions (also called items) are set up for each of the sixteen factors except general intelligence, where eight items are used. To the 98 items thus constituted are added seven motivational distortion items. The items are arranged in a roughly cyclic order determined by a plan to give maximum convenience in scoring by stencil.
b) **Method of answering**

Three alternative answers are provided for each of the 105 items, since the two-alternative forced choice situation, forbidding any middle of the road compromise tends to force an incorrect distribution of attitudes and often produces aversion to the test on the part of the examinee.

**Validity and reliability:** The validity of the test itself is meant to be an internal validity. That is to say, the items, as stated above, are chose as being good measures of the factors, as shown by factor analysis. The mean correlations of all single items with factors they represent is +.37 and the mean correlation of each group of sex items with factor it represents is about +.71.

Reliability has been worked out as a test-retest correlation with a one-week interval between. The values obtained on a population of two hundred students are factor A-.54 B-.57, C-.47, E-.42, F-.50, G-.41, H-.61, I-.55, L-.45, M-.39, N-.41, O-.32, Q1-.71, Q2-.45, Q3-.52, Q4-.55 respectively. The reliability then range from +.75 to +.90 area for each of the sixteen factor scales. The same scale was translated by Mrs. Gayathri Research Scholar Dept. of Education S.V.U. Tirupati. It is an adopted one.
4.5.3 SCORING OF 16-PERSONALITY FACTORS

There are 105 items in 16-personality factors scale. Each item scores 0, 1, or 2. Except the factor-B, intelligence items, which score 0 (incorrect) or 1 correct). Each item score contributes to only one factor i.e. an item's score is never added into two different factors, which would produce false correlations between these factors. Scoring is accomplished by key, easily, rapidly, and objectively (in a standard manner). The answers are on separate answer sheet. Card-board stencil scoring keys are used one for factors A, C, F, H, L, N, Q1, and Q3, and the other for B, E, G, I, M, O, Q2, MD and Q4. We must fit the stencil over the answer sheet and count the pencil marks visible through the holes for factor-A, allowing one for holes so marked and 2 for holes with a 2 above them. Sum and enter the total where the spear point indicates the space for-A (raw score) on the right. Same criteria is adopted for factors C and F etc. proceed the same for second stencil. But note the factor B is peculiar in having holes only with a score 0 or 1.

Before using the scoring stencils, the technician should take a quick look at each answer sheet to make sure that there are no anomalous responses. E.g. making two out of three alternatives, or entirely omitting an item.
4.6.0. OCCUPATIONAL PREFERENCE LIST

Occupational preference list was standardized by research scholar. For this purpose 100 students of intermediate first and second year were selected using random sampling technique. These students are from different groups (MPC, BPC, CEC, and HEC). Then they were asked to enlist the professions of their choice based upon their groups. Then 10 common preferences enlisted by 100 students based upon their groups were selected for the large sample. The selected list is as follows.

TABLE-4 SHOWING THE LIST OF OCCUPATIONS KNOWN AT INTERMEDIATE LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S1. No</th>
<th>MPC/BPC</th>
<th>HEC/CEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>DOCTOR</td>
<td>LAWYER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ENGINEER</td>
<td>JUDGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ASTRONOMER</td>
<td>JOURNALIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ARCHITECT</td>
<td>COLLECTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PHYSICST</td>
<td>POLITICIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BOTANIST</td>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PHYSIOTHERAPIST</td>
<td>CHARTERED ACCOUNTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PHARMACIST</td>
<td>BANK CASHIER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ZOOLOGIST</td>
<td>BUSINESS MANAGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AGRICULTURIST</td>
<td>ACCOUNTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ANY OTHER</td>
<td>ANY OTHER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6.1. SCORING FOR OCCUPATIONAL PREFERENCES

The students were required to rank the 10 occupations according to their preference the researcher has considered first and second occupational choice for research purpose and omitted remaining preferences.

4.7.0. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

Through stratified random sampling technique researcher has selected intermediate colleges of Kurnool district. The researcher met the sample of 900 students in groups of 20 each. They were distributed self-efficacy questionnaire and RPM. After developing rapport they were explained the significance of the study and instructions were given accordingly.

In second session 16 personality factors and occupational choice list was given and data was collected from all the 900 students. The responses of the subject were scored accordingly and the obtained data was subjected to statistical analysis. Such as t-values MRI.

4.8.0. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The researcher has collected the required data from the sample and, scores were given to each questionnaire as per the scoring key, and correlations, frequency distribution, mean standard deviation, t-values and f-values were computed, for the obtained data.