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RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION:

In every field development of knowledge is grow up. Curiosity is common in Humankind. We are always searching new in our society. Questions begun from knowledge and more research give answer of those questions. Research in common parlance refers to a search for knowledge. One can also define research as a scientific and systematic search for pertinent information on a specific topic. In fact, research is an art of scientific investigation. Dictionary definition of research is a careful investigation or inquiry especially through search for new facts in any branch of knowledge. Some people consider research as a movement from the known to the unknown. It is actually a voyage of discovery.

Research is an academic activity and as such the term should be used in a technical sense. According to Clifford Woody, research comprises defining and redefining problems, formulating hypothesis or suggested solution, collecting, organizing and evaluating data making deductions and reaching conclusions and at last carefully testing the conclusion to determine whether they fit the formulating hypotheses.

3.2 TITLE:

A Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students In Relation to Gender, Area, Type of Family and Faculty

3.3 OBJECTIVES:

(1) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to Gender.
(2) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to Area.

(3) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to Type of Family.

(4) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to Faculty.

(5) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to Gender and Area.

(6) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to Gender and type of family.

(7) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to Gender and faculty.

(8) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to Area and type of family.

(9) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to Area and faculty.

(10) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to type of family and faculty.

(11) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to Gender, Area and type of family.

(12) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to Gender, Area and faculty.
(13) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to Gender, type of family and faculty.

(14) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to Area, type of family and faculty.

(15) To Study of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in relation to Gender, Area, Type of Family and Faculty.

3.4 HYPOTHESES:

(1) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor work interests of students in relation to Gender.

(2) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor work interests of students in relation to Area.

(3) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor works interests of students in relation to Type of family.

(4) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor work interests of students in relation to Faculty.

(5) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor work interests of students in relation to Gender and Area.

(6) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor work interests of students in relation to Gender and Type of family.

(7) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor work interests of students in relation to Gender and Faculty.
(8) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family.

(9) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor work interests of students in relation to Area and Faculty.

(10) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor work of interests students in relation Type of family and Faculty.

(11) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Type of family.

(12) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Faculty.

(13) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor work interests of students in relation to Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

(14) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family and Faculty.

(15) There is no significant mean difference between the outdoor work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(16) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Gender.

(17) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Area.
(18) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Type of family.

(19) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Faculty.

(20) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Gender and Area.

(21) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Gender and Type of family.

(22) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Gender and Faculty.

(23) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of Family.

(24) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Area and Faculty.

(25) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

(26) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Type of family.
(27) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Faculty.

(28) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

(29) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(30) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(31) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Gender.

(32) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Area.

(33) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Type of family.

(34) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Faculty.

(35) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Gender and Area.
(36) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Gender and Type of Family.

(37) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Gender and Faculty.

(38) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family.

(39) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of Faculty.

(40) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

(41) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Type of family.

(42) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Faculty.

(43) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Gender, Type of Family and Faculty.

(44) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Area, Type of family and Faculty.
(45) There is no significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(46) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Gender.

(47) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Area.

(48) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Type of family.

(49) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Faculty.

(50) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Gender and Area.

(51) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Gender and Type of Family.

(52) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Gender and Faculty.

(53) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family.

(54) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Area and Faculty.
(55) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

(56) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Type of Family.

(57) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Faculty.

(58) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Gender and Type of Family and Faculty.

(59) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Area, Type of Family and Faculty.

(60) There is no significant mean difference between the scientific work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area, Type of Family and Faculty.

(61) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Gender.

(62) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Area.

(63) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Type of family.

(64) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Faculty.
(65) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Gender and Area.

(66) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Gender and Type of family.

(67) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Gender and Faculty.

(68) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family.

(69) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Area and Faculty.

(70) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Type of family and faculty.

(71) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Type of family.

(72) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Faculty.

(73) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Gender, Type of family and Faculty.
(74) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(75) There is no significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(76) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Gender.

(77) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Area.

(78) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Type of family.

(79) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Faculty.

(80) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Gender and Area.

(81) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Gender and Type of family.

(82) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Gender and Faculty.

(83) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family.

(84) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Area and Faculty.

(85) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.
(86) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Type of family.

(87) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Faculty.

(88) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

(89) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(90) There is no significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(91) There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Gender.

(92) There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Area.

(93) There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Type of family.

(94) There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Faculty.

(95) There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Gender and Area.
There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Gender and
Type of family.

There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Gender and
Faculty.

There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Area and
Type of family.

There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Area and
Faculty.

There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Type of
family and Faculty.

There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Type of family.

There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Faculty.

There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Area, Type of family and Faculty.
(105) There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(106) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Gender.

(107) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Area.

(108) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Type of family.

(109) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Faculty.

(110) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Gender and Area.

(111) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Gender and Type of family.

(112) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Gender and Faculty.

(113) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family.

(114) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Area and Faculty.
(115) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

(116) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Type of family.

(117) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Faculty.

(118) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

(119) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(120) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(121) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Gender.

(122) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Area.

(123) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Type of family.

(124) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Faculty.
(125) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Gender and Area.

(126) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Gender and Type of family.

(127) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Gender and Faculty.

(128) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family.

(129) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Area and Faculty.

(130) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

(131) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Type of family.

(132) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Faculty.

(133) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Gender, Type of family and Faculty.
(134) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(135) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical services work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(136) There is no significant mean difference between the Social service work interests of students in relation to Gender.

(137) There is no significant mean difference between the Social service work interests of students in relation to Area.

(138) There is no significant mean difference between the Social services work interests of students in relation to Type of family.

(139) There is no significant mean difference between the Social services work interests of students in relation to Faculty.

(140) There is no significant mean difference between the Social services work interests of students in relation to Gender and Area.

(141) There is no significant mean difference between the Social services work interests of students in relation to Gender and Type of family.

(142) There is no significant mean difference between the Social services work interests of students in relation to Gender and Faculty.

(143) There is no significant mean difference between the Social services work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family.
(144) There is no significant mean difference between the Social services work interests of students in relation to Area and Faculty.

(145) There is no significant mean difference between the Social services work interests of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

(146) There is no significant mean difference between the Social services work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Type of family.

(147) There is no significant mean difference between the Social services work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area and Faculty.

(148) There is no significant mean difference between the Social services work interests of students in relation to Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

(149) There is no significant mean difference between the Social services work interests of students in relation to Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(150) There is no significant mean difference between the Social services work interests of students in relation to Gender, Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(151) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Gender.

(152) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Area.

(153) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Type of family.
(154) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Faculty.

(155) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Gender and Area.

(156) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Gender and Type of family.

(157) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Gender and Faculty.

(158) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Area and Type of family.

(159) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Area and Faculty.

(160) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

(161) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Gender, Area and Type of family.

(162) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Gender, Area and Faculty.

(163) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Gender, Type of family and Faculty.
(164) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Area, Type of family and Faculty.

(165) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation of students in relation to Gender, Area, Type of family and Faculty.

3.5 VARIABLES:

In the proposed study Two Gender (Boys and Girls), Two Area (Urban and Rural) and two Type of Family (Joint Family and nuclear Family), Three Faculty (Arts, Commerce, and Science), will be taken as an independent variables. The score of Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation score taken as dependent variables.

In this study the Independent and dependent variables has been shown in this table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of Variables</th>
<th>Types of variables</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Name of the levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Gender                | Independent        | 2     | 1. Girls  
                  |                       |        | 2. Boys   |
| 2   | Area                  | Independent        | 2     | 1. Urban  
                  |                       |        | 2. Rural  |
| 3   | Type of Family        | Independent        | 2     | 1. Joint Family  
                  |                       |        | 2. Nuclear Family |
| 4   | Types Of Faculty      | Independent        | 3     | 1. Arts  
                  |                       |        | 2. Commerce  
                  |                       |        | 3. Science |
| 5   | Vocational interest   | Dependent          | 10    | 1. Out Door  
                  |                       |        | 2. Mechanical  
                  |                       |        | 3. Computational |
                  |                       |        | 4. Scientific  
                  |                       |        | 5. Persuasive  
                  |                       |        | 6. Artistic  
                  |                       |        | 7. Literary  
                  |                       |        | 8. Musical  
                  |                       |        | 9. Clerical services  
                  |                       |        | 10. Social service |
| 6   | Achievement motivation| Dependent          | 1     | Achievement motivation |
3.5.1 INDEPENDENT VARIABLES:

1. Gender: Boys and Girls
2. Area: Rural area and Urban area
3. Type of family: Joint Family and Nuclear Family
4. Faculty: Arts, Commerce and Science

3.5.2 DEPENDED VARIABLES:
The score of Vocational Interest and Achievement motivation.

3.5.3 CONTROLLED VARIABLES:
1. In this study sample, selection was taken from urban and rural areas of Kutch.
2. For this study limited sample were taken.

3.6 SAMPLE:
In present study, sample selection were selected randomly in Kutch District. I need 720 Higher Secondary School Students. Approximately 800 Sample were selected for the research study. After disposing off incomplete and unclear details, total 720 samples was selected as per primary planning.

**EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN (2 x 2 x 2 x 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty(D)</th>
<th>Boys (A₁)</th>
<th>Girls (A₂)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban (B₁)</td>
<td>Rural (B₂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty(D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts (D₁)</td>
<td>30 30 30 30</td>
<td>30 30 30 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. (D₂)</td>
<td>30 30 30 30</td>
<td>30 30 30 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sci. (D₃)</td>
<td>30 30 30 30</td>
<td>30 30 30 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90 90 90 90</td>
<td>90 90 90 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Gender: BOYS (A₁) and GIRLS (A₂)
B = Area: URBAN AREA (B₁) AND RURAL AREA (B₂)
C = Type of Family: JOINT FAMILY (C₁) AND NUCLEAR FAMILY (C₂)
D = Faculty: ARTS (D₁), COMMERCE (D₂) AND SCIENCE (D₃)
3.7 **TOOLS:**

The main purpose of the study is to measure Vocational interest and Achievement Motivation of higher secondary school students in relation to gender, area, type of family and faculty. For this purpose two inventories was used, (1) Vocational inventory and (2) Achievement Motivation inventory.

3.7.1 **DATA SHEET:**

In this data sheet, we need student’s information. In the inventory form, we include Name of the student, Age, Area of Residence, Type of family, Standard, Faculty, Category, etc. items in sheets to measure Vocational Interest and Achievement Motivation of students.

3.7.2 **VOCATIONAL INTEREST INVENTORY:**

In order to measure the Vocational Interest, of Higher secondary school students who are studying in different schools of Urban And Rural Area of kutch, “vocational interest Inventory” by Dr. Surekha Amin & Dr. J.H.Shah was used which is a very reliable tool in this study.

3.7.2.1 **DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCALE:**

Vocational interest inventory was proving on higher secondary school students of Gujarat district. This test is in Gujarati language. This test has 10 fields section of work interest as per kuder Richardson’s method, and each section has one work interest and 12 Questions in each section. In this, test students have to give the answers of the questions and make a cross on right option, for each question has five options and they have to choose one answer. Which work is mostly they want to do? Moreover, they have to choose one option. The options are mostly like to do, not to like, surely not like and impartial.
3.7.2.2 RELIABILITY:

The reliability of the scale was determined by calculating according to kudar richardens method and split-half reliability method found to be 0.74 and 0.86.

3.7.2.3 VALIDITY:

Besides face validity, as all items related to the variable under focus, the scale has high content validity. It is evident from the students that items of the scale are direct related to the concept of interest.

3.7.2.4 FACTORS OF VOCATIONAL INTEREST:

The ten fields of interest are identifying. These are Out door work interest, Mechanical Interest, Computational, Scientific, Persuasive, Artistic, Literary, Musical, Clerical Service and Social Services. The scale can be used for research and survey purposes. It will be use for individual assessment. It is self-administering and does not require the services of highly trained tester. It is eminently suitable for group as well as individual testing.

3.7.2.5 SCORES OF SCALE:

The present inventory has constructed for the Gujarati knowing subjects of India. For this as per Gujarati alphabet and scoring card ง= 4, ง'=3, ง'=2, ง= 1, ง= 0.

3.7.3 ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION SCALE:

In order to measure the Achievement motivation level, of higher secondary school students who are studying in different schools of Urban and Rural Area, we were used "Achievement motivation scale" by Dr. Ashwin Jansari.

3.7.3.1 DEVELOPMENT OF SCALE:

Achievement Motivation scale have 25 questions. In 21 Century, all people were attached with technology there for in this inventory, new
five questions about technology are included. One question has six options and students have to round mark in one option, which they like, most suitable for the question.

**3.7.3.2 RELIABILITY:**

Its test-retest and split-half reliability is 0.63 and 0.72 respectively. An attempt has also made to reliability the test by showing that recognized high achievement score high on this test.

**3.7.3.3 VALIDITY:**

In order to find out the validity from the coefficient of reliability, the reliability index was calculated, which indicated high validity on account of being 0.56.

**3.7.3.4 USE OF THE SCALE:**

The scale can be used for research and survey purposes. It can also be used for individual assessment. It is self-administering and does not require the services of highly trained tester. It is eminently suitable for group as well as individual testing.

**3.7.3.5 SCORING OF THE SCALE:**

The score is 0 to 50 for 25 questions. If students get score between the 41 to 50 the achievement motivation level is very high, 31 to 40 score is for high, 21 to 30 is medium score, 11 to 20 is low score and less than 10 score is dawn score level of achievement motivation.

**3.8 DATA COLLECTING:**

The first step of data collecting is to find out higher secondary school and arrange the meeting with the Principal of different Schools. With Permission of Principals, we define students by Gender (boys and Girls), Faculty (Arts, Commerce, and Science), Area of Residency (Urban and Rural), Type of family (Joint and Nuclear). According to find out Vocational Interest and Achievement Motivation, students have
to fill up Pre Prepared Personal Information form. In this form, we include some study variables, Name of the student, age, gender, school name, residence address, type of family, No of members in family, study faculty. We used Gujarati version of this form.

3.9 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS:

Research procedure statistical analysis is most important part. For this work total number of score was define from the filled questioners. Both inventory’s scores was manage by related variables. After getting raw score, for next procedure we used 2x2x2x3 ‘F’ test for the research analysis and get inter relation of variables we used mean analysis.

Research methodology gives how to shape our study by our practical work. In chapter 4 interpretation of statistical analysis with related variables in F score and mean tables and charts are given.