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CHAPTER - 5

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE STUDY

5.1 INTRODUCTION:

In this, research main aim is “A Study of Vocational interest & Achievement Motivation of Higher Secondary School Students in Relation to Gender, Area, Type of Family and Faculty. The sample of the study were selected randomly from kachchh district. The sample of the present study was divided by their gender like male students and female students, area of residency like urban area and rural area, type of family like nuclear and joint family and student’s study faculty which is arts, commerce and science.

Vocational interest and achievement motivation scale was given to the students to fill up the details. The incomplete form was cancelled and with help of F test difference between the vocational interest and achievement motivation was calculated. The conclusion of this study is writ down as under.

5.2 CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY:

(1) There is no significant mean difference between the Outdoor work interests of students in relation to their gender.

(2) There is a significant mean difference between the Outdoor work interests of students in relation to their area.

(3) There is no significant mean difference between the Outdoor work 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 significant mean difference between the outdoor work interest of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

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

(12) There is no significant mean difference between the students Gender, Area and Faculty.

(13) There is no significant mean difference between the Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

(14) There is no significant mean difference between the Gender, Type of family and Faculty.
(15) There is no significant mean difference between the students outdoor work interest 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 their gender.

(17) There is significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to their area.

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

(19) There is 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 significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family.

(24) There is significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interests of students in relation to Area and Faculty.

(25) There is not significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interest of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.
(26) There is no significant mean difference between the Mechanical work interest of students in relation to Gender, Area and Type of family.

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

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

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

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

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

(32) There is significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to their gender.

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

(34) 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 significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Gender and Faculty.

(38) There is significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family.

(39) There is significant mean difference between the Computational work interests of students in relation to Area and Faculty.

(40) There is significant mean difference between the Computational work interest of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

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

(42) There is significant mean difference between the students Gender, Area and Faculty.

(43) There is no significant mean difference between the computational work interest of students in relation to Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

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

(47) There is no significant mean difference between the Scientific work interests of students in relation to their area.

(48) There is significant mean difference between the Scientific work interests of students in relation to Type of family.

(49) There is significant mean difference between the Scientific work interests of students in relation to Faculty.

(50) There is 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 significant mean difference between the Scientific work interest of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.
(56) There is significant mean difference between the Scientific work interest of students in relation to Gender, Area and Type of family.

(57) There is significant mean difference between the students Gender, Area and Faculty.

(58) There is no significant mean difference between Scientific interest of students in relation to Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

(59) There is no significant mean difference between scientific work interest of students in relation to Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

(60) There is significant mean difference between the students Scientific work interest 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 their gender.

(62) There is significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interests of students in relation to their 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 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 significant mean difference between the Persuasive work interest of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

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

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

(73) There is no significant mean difference between persuasive work interest of students in the Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

(74) There is no significant mean difference between persuasive work interest of students in the Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

(75) There is significant mean difference between the students Persuasive work interest 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 their gender.

(77) There is significant mean difference between the Artistic work interests of students in relation to their area.
(78) There is 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 not 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 interest of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

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

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

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

There is significant mean difference between the students Artistic work interest in relation to Gender, Area, Type of family and Faculty.  

There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to their gender.  

There is no significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to their area.  

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

There is significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Faculty.  

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 significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family.  

There is significant mean difference between the Literary work interests of students in relation to Area and Faculty.
(100) There is not significant mean difference between the Literary work interest of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

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

(102) There is no significant mean difference between the students Gender, Area and Faculty.

(103) There is no significant mean difference between the Gender, Type of family and Faculty. The Hypotheses is accepted.

(104) There is significant mean difference between the Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

(105) There is no significant mean difference between the students Literary work interest 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 their gender.

(107) There is no significant mean difference between the Musical work interests of students in relation to their 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 not significant mean difference between the Musical work interest of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

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

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

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

(119) There is significant mean difference between the Musical work interest of students Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

(120) There is significant mean difference between the students Musical work interest 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 their gender.

(122) There is significant mean difference between the Clerical Services work interests of students in relation to their area.

(123) There is 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 significant mean difference between the Clerical Services work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family.

(129) There is significant mean difference between the Clerical Services work interests of students in relation to Area and Faculty.

(130) There is not significant mean difference between the Clerical Services work interest of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.
(131) There is no significant mean difference between the Clerical Services work interest of students in relation to Gender, Area and Type of family.

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

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

(134) There is significant mean difference between the clerical services the students in relation to Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

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

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

(137) There is significant mean difference between the Social Services work interests of students in relation to their area.

(138) There is 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 significant mean difference between the Social Services work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family.

(144) There is significant mean difference between the Social Services work interests of students in relation to Area and Faculty.

(145) There is significant mean difference between the Social Services work interest of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

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

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

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

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

(151) There is significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation work interests of students in relation to their gender.

(152) There is no significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation work interests of students in relation to their area.

(153) There is significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation work interests of students in relation to Type of family.

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

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

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

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

(158) There is significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation work interests of students in relation to Area and Type of family.

(159) There is significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation work interests of students in relation to Area and Faculty.
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(160) There is significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation work interest of students in relation to Type of family and Faculty.

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

(162) There is significant mean difference between Achievement Motivation the students in relation to Gender, Area and Faculty.

(163) There is significant mean difference between the Achievement Motivation the students in relation to Gender, Type of family and Faculty.

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

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

5.3 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

In this study only two scales vocational interest and achievement motivation were measure on student and research need much time. The main factor is the sample of this study is only from kachchh district. Sample selection of the students is from higher secondary standard. And the variables are gender, area of residency, type of family and student’s study faculty. Present study is conducted with limited time. Result of research included the 11th and 12th standard students, it not applicable to higher secondary students or college going
students. Career is most important in human beings life and the motivated environment is affected on career of students. Individual cases were generalized over the students for this study to address culture differences between students.

It remains unclear as to how informed students may be with their future educational and career options in this setting. Several other criteria, including parental support, added to future research offer promise. Nuclear family and Joint Family are affected on motivation of students. Sometimes many people are disturbing each other in joint family but in opposite way in India they all are supported very well to their child that’s why India has more joint families than nuclear family. Children are very flexible with grandparent or the other member of family in joint position, their motivation level is also very high.

5.4 SUGGESTION FOR THE FUTURE STUDY

(1) In the present study higher secondary school students are included. If other college as well as other students had been included, then comparative study could have been possible to see the effect.

(2) In the present study the students of rural and urban areas of only Kutch district have been included. For wider research demonstration could have been selected from the whole Kutch district or other various districts.

(3) Only Students have been included in the present study. For comparative study other variable should have been included.

(4) Conclusion could have been more reliable and proper by expanding the scope of research.
Research can be performed by considering factors like caste, religion, blind faith, superstitions, physical fitness, economic matters etc. These factors are all related to Vocational Interest and Achievement Motivation.

Research can be made more reliable by applying statistically more developed analytical methods.

5.5 IMPORTANCE OF THE RESEARCH:

This research is useful to know the vocational interest of higher secondary school students and increase the level of achievement motivation. Students face so many problems to choose the career and occupation for whole life. When somebody select the one option from different fields, after this he or she need to energy to gain this aim. The environment of family is important in students’ achievement. When they decided to go on one field than it responsibilities to the parents and of course the family to make possible this for children. Vocational interest and Achievement motivation are related with each other. Counseling for students is also make important role in selection of career. This research can make solution to select the field of career and it also helpful to the teachers to increase the level of achievement level in each and every student. This research have own results and the culture of society is much affected on results.

5.6 CONCLUSION:

Life needs settlement and it comes from good job field and wealthy life. For this purpose parents are very conscious about the vocation interest. In Indian students are very tense for career not only students but also the parents. When child grownup relatives are asking what your child is doing or what he wants to do in future doctor,
engineer. These fields are very common but now changing’s are started. Students choose different field like choreographer, photographer, painter or writer. There are some problems Gender, area of residency, type of family and faculty (Arts, Commerce, and Science). The role of gender is affected on motivation and field of interest, because girls are not ready to go far from their house and parents not allowing to go alone for study but boys have support from their family now scenario is changed. The students decided to go in one-field arts, commerce and science. This makes pressure on students. They are choosing this faculty when they are completed 10th Exam. The role of counselor is also important in student’s decision. The main Conclusion of this study is each school need one counselor. Counseling of students, help them to make perfect decision and bright future. Motivation for students it comes through teachers, family member and relatives. Students Vocation and Achievement motivation related with each other. When decision is strong, motivation is on higher level. The Hard work of students shows in their progress and achievement.