REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

An adequate familiarity with the work which has already been done in the same area is required in any research. A summary of the writings of recognized authorities and of previous research provides evidence that the researcher is familiar with what is already known and what is still unknown and untested. Since effective research is based upon past knowledge, this step helps to eliminate the duplication of what has been done, and provides useful hypotheses and helpful suggestions for significant investigation.

Citing studies that show substantial agreement and those that seem to present conflicting conclusions helps to sharpen and define understanding of existing knowledge in the problem area, provides a background for the research project and makes the researcher aware of the status of the issue. Parading a long list of annotated studies relating to the problem is ineffective and inappropriate. Only those studies that are plainly relevant, competently executed and reported should be included (Digumarti Bhaskara Rao, 1987).

Capitalizing on the review of expert researchers can be fruitful in providing helpful ideas and suggestions. While review articles that summarize related studies are useful, they do not provide a satisfactory substitute for an independent research. Even though the review of related literature is not a substitute for an independent work, it is one of the first steps in the research process. It is a valuable guide to define the problem to recognize its significance, to suggest promising data gathering devices, to appropriate the study design, and sources of data for effective analysis and to arrive at fruitful conclusions. (Digumarti Bhaskara Rao, 2015).

The search for related literature is a time consuming process, even though it is necessary, as earlier stated, for a good research work. Hence, this chapter on Review
of Related Literature is meant for the study of literature rated to the intelligence, personality and achievement of secondary school students.

Intelligence is a native capacity and not an acquired one. It is manifested in different mental activities. It is the ability to learn to make use of acquired knowledge in new and complex situations. It is the ability to think abstractly, to solve problems, to perceive relationship and to profit from experience.

Personality is the integration of internal and external activities. It includes the external appearance, qualities, aptitude and capacities, etc. It is the result of the interaction of the individual with the environment. It is not a collection of the traits, but a particular organization of them. It is the total quality of the individual’s behaviour. Individual affects other individuals through his personality. Thus, personality is manifested in his various activities. In short, personality is the total quality of the behaviour, attitudes, interests, capacities, aptitudes and behaviour patterns, which are manifested in his relation with the environment.

Achievement is one’s learning attainments, accomplishments or proficiencies in performing a given task. Achievement is directly related to the growth and development of students in educational situations, where teaching and learning go hand-in-hand. The achievement involves the interaction of three factors, viz., aptitude for learning, readiness for learning, and opportunity for learning. The achievement also involves health and physical fitness, motives and desires, and emotional balances of the individuals in the fulfillment of given tasks. Achievement in education implies one’s knowledge, understanding or skills in a specified subject or a group of subjects.

RESEARCH STUDIES

As this study intends to find out the level of the intelligence, personality and achievement of the secondary school students, the research studies on intelligence, personality and achievement were taken into consideration for the present study.
INTELLIGENCE

The following are the research studies related to the intelligence.

Intelligence and Achievement Motivation

Alfred-Liro, Corinne Joanne (1999) stated that gifted children had higher achievement motivation.

Chauhan, S.S. (1984) observed that intelligence did not interact significantly with achievement motivation.

Gupta, P.L. (1983) found that the high motivated group of girls was more intelligent.

Mansuri, A.R. (1986) observed that the students having good general ability had high achievement motivation.

Narula, K.S. (1979) found that intelligence had no effect on achievement motivation.

Rajpoot (1984) found no interaction effect between intelligence and achievement motivation.


Tirupathi, R.C. (1986) reported that the achievement motivation.

Intelligence and Adjustment

Sharma, K.G. (1972) noticed that adjustment was at least partly dependent upon intelligence.

Singh, Y. (1978) showed that superior children did not differ from the average children in case of school, health, social and emotional adjustment.

Intelligence and Age

Amin (1982) reported that intelligence was negatively and moderately correlated with spatial ego-centrism.
Intelligence and Caste Reservation

Annaraja, P. and Thaigarajan, A. Ponnambala (1993) found that non-ST adolescents were better than STs regarding intelligence.

Balakrishna (1986) found that Christian tribal students possessed more intelligence and better reasoning ability than non-Christian tribal students.

Bej, Jayaprakash (1991) found that ST and SC boys and girls did not differ much in general intelligence.

Choudary and Sinha (1959) found no difference in concrete intelligence of tribal and non-tribal groups.

Srivastava (1986) found that Bhotia and Jallnsari tribals were more intelligent than non-tribal students.

Sujatha (1987) observed that tribal children possessed the basic cognitive abilities and psychological dispositions for successful participation in school.

Intelligence and Creativity

Bharadwaj, R.L. (1978) observed that intelligence was positive with creativity.

Gupta, A.K. (1980) found that creativity whether verbal or non-verbal was independent of intelligence.

Gupta, Krishna Kumari (1988) noticed that creativity had a significant correspondence.

Komarik (1972) found no significant relationship between creativity and intelligence.

Muddu, V. (1980) showed that high creative group was found to be negatively correlated with intelligence.

Pramod, Ku Prusty (2001) noticed that intelligence had significant and positive relationship with creativity

Qureshi, A.N. (1980) found that intelligence was significantly and positively correlated with creativity.
Sen Gupta, M. (1979) noticed that high and low creatives differed significantly on intelligence and mechanical reasoning.

**Intelligence and Gender**

Ajwani (1979) reported that sex had no effect on the problem-solving ability. The effect of direction of problem-solving ability was found to be independent of male or female sex.

Aruna (2006) found that boys and girls differed significantly in intelligence.

Barna (1981) found that boys and girls were not different with respect to intelligence and scholastic achievement.

Bhattacaryya, Anjana (1989) reported that boys performed better than girls on verbal reasoning test. In abstract reasoning test boys showed superiority over girls.

Debut (2005) found that male and female tribal and non-tribal students differed significantly in cognitive ability.

Dei, S.L. (1991) reported no significant difference between boys and girls on general intelligence.

Dixit, Mithilesh Kumari (1985) found that intelligence of the boys was higher than girls.

Fazia, Nazir (2013) found that boys have significantly high I.Q. compared to girls.

Gupta, Jyothika and Ram, Sukhjinder (2006) reported no interaction effect of emotional intelligence and sex on any transactional style.

Gupta, K.L. (1977) found a significant difference in the intelligence of boys and girls, with boys having higher intelligence.

Gupta, O.V. (1977) found that scholastic achievement promoted intelligence both in boys and girls.


Kar, S.B. (1961) found that in Pass Along Test, school boys were superior to the men and both these groups superior to women. In Block Design Test women were more homogenous than boys. In Porteus Maze Test no significant difference between school boys and the men but both the groups was superior to the women.

Kumar, D. (1981) noticed no significant difference in verbal and spatial abilities of students of two sexes.

Kumari (1986) found that intelligence is a major contributor of academic achievement of boys, and intelligence and intellectual commitment were major contributors of academic achievement of girls.

Kumari, Darshana (1986) found a positive relationship of intellectual commitment with interest in science for boys and with interest in humanities for girls. Intelligence and introversion were major contributors of academic achievement of boys and intelligence and intellectual commitment were major contributors towards academic achievement of girls. No sex differences found in intellectual commitment.

Lie and Lynn (2010) indicated that Chinese tribal males had high I.Q. as compared to females.

Magotra, H.P. (1982) reported that girls scored higher in intelligence test than boys.

Mishra (1997) found that intelligence was significantly correlated with academic achievement for both boys and girls; the correlation between intelligence and academic achievement was higher in case of girls.

Panda, S. (1991) reported that girls scored higher than boys on the intellectual ability test which showed progressive decline with increasing age.

Pandey, Asha (2004) observed that boys and girls of the CBSE do not appear to show significant difference in their cognitive competency in so far as geography-oriented environmental curriculum is concerned.
Pandey, S.N. and Md. Faiz Ahmad (2008) found no significant difference between male and female adolescents in intelligence.

Pillai, K.S. (1981) reported that in high intelligent group, sex differences were found in spatial abilities; in the average intelligent group, sex differences were found in all variables except attitude towards science and formulation; in the low intelligent group, sex differences were found in science aptitude, number series, verbal comprehension and interpretation, interest in science and spatial ability.

Prakash, V. (1986) reported that boys having university position were more intelligent than those having university participation. Similarly boys having inter-university position were more intelligent than those having university participation. Girls belonging to university position, inter-university participation and inter-university position groups possessed higher intelligence than girls having university participation.

Ray, Mrinmarji (1988) noticed no significant difference in the intelligence scores of Santhal females and Kora females and Kora males and Kora females. The difference in the intelligence scores of Santhal males and females was significant.

Sahai, S.K. (1985) reported that males were higher on mean intelligence as compared to females.

Selwyn, S. and Ben, Sam W. (2004) observed a significant difference between male and female students in numerical ability and intelligence.

Shariyar (2010) found no gender difference in intelligence.

Sharma (1982) noticed no significant difference in intelligence between boys and girls.

Singh, K.K. (1985) reported that boys were superior in intelligence to girls.

Sunil, Kiran K.S. (2005) investigated that men students had low emotional intelligence than women students.

Tripathi, R.C. (1986) investigated that girls had better average scores in intelligence and boys were better adjusted.
Intelligence and Home Background

Ramiah, L. (1990) noticed that parental involvement was relatively low and poor on the educational and intellectual dimensions.

Yadav, R.S. (1991) found that heredity sets the upper limit in the development of intelligence. Intelligence, termed as the ability of the individuals, is contributed to 80% by heredity and 20% by environmental factors.

Intelligence and Locality

Aruna (2006) found that urban and rural school students did not differ significantly with regard to intelligence.

Bhattacharya (1989) observed that urban students performed better than rural students in verbal reasoning test.

Bhattacharyya, Anjana (1989) found that urban students performed better than rural students on verbal reasoning test. Rural boys performed better than rural girls. Urban girls showed superiority over rural girls.

Fazia Nazir (2013) noticed that urban students have significantly high IQ as compared to rural students.

Gupta, K.L. (1977) found that rural and urban location has no relationship with intelligence.

Jaiprakash (1972) found significant difference between rural and urban tribal pupils in general mental ability.

Manoranjan, Panda (2005) noticed no significant difference in intelligence of students studying in schools different localities.

Ramesh, M (2007) found a significant difference in the problem solving ability possessed by rural and urban, urbans are superior than rurals.

Sunil, Kiran K.S. (2005) noticed that rural students have more emotional intelligence than urban students.
Tripathi, R.C. (1986) investigated that urban science girls secured better scores on intelligence tests.

**Intelligence and School Management**

Aruna (2006) found that government and private school students did not differ significantly in intelligence.

Manoranjan, Panda (2005) noticed no significant difference in intelligence of students studying in government and private schools.

Pareek, D.L. (1990) found that tribal students studying in private and central schools were more intelligent than in government schools.

Sharma (1982) found no significant difference in intelligence of students of different managements of schools.

**Intelligence and Medium of Instruction**

Mendelson (2007) found that the bilingual child had a better awareness of language differences, had better learning capability of new languages, and had important advantages in intelligence.

Srivasthava (2009) found that the cognitive systems of bilingually educated children differed from monolingual educated children in some ways of learning.

**Intelligence and Socio-Economic Status**

Basavanna (1984) noticed that economic and social factors had no effect on intelligence. However, social disadvantages affected verbal and numerical abilities.

Bharadwaj, R.L. (1978) found that intelligence on middle SES was interest promoting. Intelligence at high creativity level promoted vocational interests, the best at the middle level of SES. Intelligence was more vocational interests promoting in low creatives of the middle SES level. Intelligence promoted agricultural interests of high creatives when they belong to middle SES. Intelligence promoted artistic interest in highly ingenious solutions to problems of low originality adolescents of high SES.

Kumar, D. (1981) found that the intellectual abilities of convent students were more developed than those of higher secondary school students and municipal school students.

Mehta, P. and others (1967) reported that the high SES school boys showed no relationship between n-achievement and intelligence.

Sharma, K. (1981) found no significant SES group differences in verbal, numerical and non-verbal activity.


Sharma, M. (1980) found that intelligence level in moderately high SES and high SES school adolescents were significantly higher than those in the other two categories.

**Intelligence and Type of School**

Kailash (1973) found that residential schools were superior to the day-schools in respect of intelligence of the pupils.

Madhava, Rao P. (2013) found no significant difference in the intelligence of residential and non-residential secondary school tribal students.

**PERSONALITY**

The following are the research studies related to the personality.

Acharya, P. (1991) observed that on different personality variables, the reflective and impulsive groups could be different in the case of all but for the two personality variables, viz., succorance and dominance. The correlation between the performance scores on MFFT (Matching Familiar Figure Test) scores and EPPS (Edward Personal Performance Schedule) personality variables revealed an
insignificant relationship except for three variables, viz., differentiation, succorance and consistency.

Bhadury, J. (1989) observed that psychotism, psychopathic deviation, neuroticism, delinquency, anti-social behaviour and jealousy had a positive relationship with each other.

Bharambe, M.D. and Pandit, K.L. (1991) observed the influence of school atmosphere in the pre-experimental and the first change observed on attitude towards work, both measured by the paper-pencil test and observation-cum-performance test. A significant interaction between treatment and school atmosphere were found in the second stage of attitude towards work measured by the observation-cum-performance test.


Bhadury, J. (1989) observed that psychotism, psychopathic deviation, neuroticism, delinquency, anti-social behaviour and jealousy had a positive relationship with each other.

Bharambe, M.D. and Pandit, K.L. (1991) observed the influence of school atmosphere in the pre-experimental and the first change observed on attitude towards work, both measured by the paper-pencil test and observation-cum-performance test. A significant interaction between treatment and school atmosphere were found in the second stage of attitude towards work measured by the observation-cum-performance test.


Chatterji, P.S. (1983) observed that commerce and agricultural students obtained significantly higher extraversion scores in comparison to those in the arts and science groups. Students of the agriculture, arts and science groups attained significantly higher neuroticism scores in comparison to those in the commerce group.
Chhotray, M. (1991) reported that the humorous and the non-humorous groups of children did not show differential patterns in ascribing seriousness to the 15 coping problems. Children of humorous group did not report the feeling of being insulted when confronted with the problem situation. Emotional reactions were more specific. They possessed coping strategies which involved seeking social support, emotional support and information.

Chinara, B.D. (1992) noticed that the clarifying-response strategy was found to be more effective than the self-confrontation strategy for educating adolescents in individual dignity and tolerance.

Chopra, Reeta and Gartia, Radhakanta (2009) reported that the coefficient of correlation between teacher’s accountability and occupational stress is negative and significant. It indicates that teachers who are highly stressed occupationally are less accountable; on the other hand teachers who are less occupationally stressed are more accountable towards their profession.

Dhillon (1979) observed that participants scored higher on extraversion than non-participants. Participants scored significantly higher on the dimensions of neuroticism than non-participants.

Discippio, William J. (1971) studied divergent thinking a complex function of interacting dimensions of extroversion-introversion and neuroticism-stability. After controlling verbal intelligence, divergent thinking was found to be a complex function of extroversion-introversion and neuroticism-stability as measured by Eysenck Personality Inventory. Stable extroverts were significantly more fluent than stable introverts but neurotic introverts and extroverts attained fluency scores approximating the mean of the extreme stable counter parts.

Jaluria, Reeta (1988) reported that humour in adolescents was more a product than a process of personality, creativity and frustration. Affinity of humour to emotional dryness, ego, self-sentiment, integration, dominance, social boldness showed that it had its own personality.
Jani, Neelima (1990) reported that perception of subjects was not influenced by their security feelings and self-esteem.

Kumar, J. (1984) found that subjects high on extraversion had greater retention than moderate and low scorers. Extraversion and elaboration of encoding were not independent of each other. Extraversion and retrieval measures did not interact with each other. The three variables, extraversion, elaboration of encoding and retrieval measures were not independent of one another.

Patil, I. (1982) found that the superior and average groups differed significantly in respect of four needs: order, succorance, dominance and endurance. The superior group showed a higher degree of need for order and endurance whereas the average group showed a higher degree of need for succorance and dominance.

Purohit, Surabhi (2008) found that mothers who are supportive, normative and resilient have shown positive relationship with adolescent girl’s physical self concept.

Ramesh, R. and Ponnambala, Thiagarajan A. (2005) found that self-concept is above the average i.e. high self-concept in B.Ed. trainees.

Rao, D.G. (1965) found that differences in aspects of personality were not significantly related to differences in mental abilities.

Singh, E.L. (1979) reported that the differences with respect to simple vs. sophisticated did not turn out to be significant while that for the dependent-self sufficient dimension was significant.

Sr. Eve, Justina Remould (2006) reported that intervention programme had a significant impact on the emotional self awareness of student teachers of the experimental group. Treatment had affected the experimental group in their emotional expression. Experimental group members positively responded to the Enneagram educational programme and showed a significant change and improvement in the level of emotional awareness of others.
**Personality and Achievement Motivation**

Alfred-Liro, Corinne Joanne (1999) observed that giftedness was a strong determinant of attitudes and behaviour.

Crawford, Shawn Allan Stephen (1977) reported an interactive relationship between attributions, achievement motivation, meta-cognitive knowledge and strategic reading performance for normally achieving students and students with rearing disabilities.

Gupta, A. (1979) reported a positive relationship between personality and achievement motivation.

Gyanoni, T.C. (1984) observed that boys with high achievement motivation were intropunitive.

Lyngdoh, M.Q. (1986) found that the mean scores of the academic motivation components, viz., belongingness, positive attitude, optimism and flexibility were higher than alienation, negative attitude, pessimism and dogmatism.

Mansuri, A.R. (1986) observed that the students having high motivation towards school were better in achievement motivation than those with a low motivation towards school.

Sharma, N.K. (1981) reported that neuroticism was not related with achievement motivation.

Singh (1984) found that self-concept was significantly and positively related to achievement motivation.

Sinha, J.K.P. (1986) found that high prejudiced students had high achievement motivation.

Tiwari, Rita (1984) reported that the privileged students scored significantly higher in achievement motivation than deprived ones and privileged children displayed significantly higher general mental ability than the deprived students.

Varisco, Alfred Joseph (1998) found positive relation between achievement motivation and task goal orientation.
Personality and Adjustment

Gaikwad, J.M. (1988) observed that marital adjustment and child rearing practices seemed to be of slight influence in developing outgoing and emotionally stable characteristics in children. Harmonious marital adjustment was seen as remotely associated with the development of placid and relaxed qualities of personality. Emotional instability was more among children coming from families where marital adjustment was poor.

Godbole, A.Y. (1988) found that the improvement was significant in four problem areas: home adjustment, school adjustment, mental health and general behaviour. Comparison of pre-test and post-test performance of experimental group on adjustment and personality inventory scale showed that there was a significant improvement by the post-test time.

Gupta, B.D. (1988) observed that effective arts teachers were significantly higher than effective science teachers on adjustment. Effective arts and science teachers did not differ with respect to professional adjustment. Effective arts teachers were significantly better adjusted socially, psychologically and physically than effective science teachers.

Hementha, Kumar (2003) noticed that girls with average social isolation were found to face more intensity of problems in personal inadequacies, aspirations and life goals, recreation, moral, religious and spiritual aspects, academic achievement, cultural customs and traditions and customs and financial, money, and economic issues than girls with low social isolation. Girls with high social isolation were found to face more intensity of problems than girls with low social isolation and average social isolation.

Johnson, S.J. (1982) observed that sports participants differed from non sports participants in their personality characteristics. Sports participants were more adjusted, free from abnormal tendencies, more sociable (gregarious) and thoughtful (less impulsive) than non-sports participants.
Karunanidhi and Kaliappan (1997) found that the state of anxiety, anger-in, occupational stress and certain personality characteristics such as lower ego-strength, pro-tension, group adherence and high self-concept control influenced writer’s cramp.

Kumari, Sushma (1990) observed that offenders were mal-adjusted in all the areas of adjustment.

Lakshmi, Rupa and Ran, Bijay Narayan Sinha (1996) found that those on high and low on decisiveness, responsibility, masculinity, friendliness, heterosexuality, ego-strength, curiosity and dominance dimensions of personality did not differ significantly in terms of their depression scores. High and low scores on emotional stability groups differ significantly in terms of their depression scores.

Madhava, Kale (2007) found that the secondary school adolescent girls are extroverts.

Bhadury, J. (1989) observed that psychotism, psychopathic deviation, neuroticism, delinquency, anti-social behaviour and jealousy had a positive relationship with each other.

Bharambe, M.D. and Pandit, K.L. (1991) observed the influence of school atmosphere in the pre-experimental and the first change observed on attitude towards work, both measured by the paper-pencil test and observation-cum-performance test. A significant interaction between treatment and school atmosphere were found in the second stage of attitude towards work measured by the observation-cum-performance test.


Chatterji, P.S. (1983) observed that commerce and agricultural students obtained significantly higher extrversion scores in comparison to those in the arts and science groups. Students of the agriculture, arts and science groups attained significantly higher neuroticism scores in comparison to those in the commerce group.
Chopra, Reeta and Gartia, Radhakanta (2009) found that out of 120 secondary school teachers, 24 teachers i.e. 20% teachers are highly stressed occupationally, 65 teachers i.e. 54% are moderately stressed occupationally and the rest 31 teachers i.e. 26% teachers are less stressed occupationally.

Dhillon (1979) observed that participants scored higher on extraversion than non-participants. Participants scored significantly higher on the dimensions of neuroticism than non-participants.

Rao, D.G. (1965) found that academic adjustment significantly related to aspects of personality.

Sharma, M. (1980) reported that the satisfied and dissatisfied students differed significantly in almost all the personality traits measured through the HSPQ.

Singh, E.L. (1979) noticed that high and low superstitious persons differed significantly on all dimensions except simple vs. sophisticated. Factor of superstitiousness interacted with the locus of control factors in respect of emotion vs. mature, submissive vs. dominance, casual vs. conscientious and conservative vs. experimenting dimension. High superstitious persons displayed poor adjustment in home, health and social areas and a marginal adjustment in emotional and exceptional spheres. An individual’s position on the simple sophisticated dimension was determined jointly by the level of superstitiousness.

Tiwari, Rajesh Kumar (1997) observed no significant difference between smokers and non-smokers in respect of extraversion. Anxiety, insecurity, neuroticism and poor adjustment lead to the manifestation of smoking habits. Extraversion-introversion dimension is unrelated with smoking. Introverts smoke cigarettes for tranquillizing purposes whereas extraverts smoke for stimulating purposes.

Vijayalakshmi, R. (1991) reported that the family reared and institution reared children were similar in their personality adjustment. The self concept of these children was related to their personality adjustment.
Zahir, Saida (1988) found that neuroticism was developed by the mother’s detachment. Child centeredness made adolescents more sociable and introvert.

**Personality and Age**

Dixit (1963) found that at the age of 5, children indicated fairly good receptivity and responsiveness to the world around, the perception was undifferentiated and was mostly governed by what was obvious. At the age of 7, perception was guided more by facts than by fantasy and emotion. At the age of 8+, children were factual and realistic in manner of responding. At the age of 10+, perception was more influenced by the form of qualities of the blot than by fantasy and emotions and was realistic and factual.

Hussain, M.Q. (1963) noticed that age influenced personality adjustment. On Personality Scales, the tendency of normals was to rate higher than criminals except on age.

Singh, B.K. (1980) revealed that 5 year old girls were significantly more feminine than 3 and 4 year old girls. 4 and 5 year old boys were significantly more masculine than 3 year old boys.

Vidhu, M. (1968) revealed that extraversion and neuroticism were negatively related to age (age groups from 15 to 20 and from 20 to 25 years).

**Personality and Attitude**

Akthar, S.N. (1970) reported that there was maximum attitude modifiability in subjects who were low on neuroticism, extraversion, authoritarianism and rigidity and high on manifest anxiety. Personality variables influenced the extent of attitude modifiability in persuasive situations. A person whose attitude was highly modifiable was low on neuroticism, extraversion, authoritarianism and rigidity and was highly anxious.

Bhadury, J. (1989) found that feedback was effective in helping to improve attitude of students towards their teachers, pro-social orientations and pro-social behaviour. Change in attitude and behaviour contributed to improvement in teacher
appreciation. Attitude towards teachers, pro-social value orientation and pre-social value orientation had positive relationship with each other. Attitude towards teachers, pro-social behaviour orientation and pre-social behaviour orientation had a negative relationship with psychotism, psychopathic deviation, neuroticism, delinquency, anti-social behaviour and jealousy.

Bharamble, M.D. (1991) found a change in the attitude of children in age groups of 8 to 9 years.

Bhushan, R. (1985) reported that personality and attitudinal factors were closely related to belief in superstitions. Factors like intolerance of ambiguity, neuroticism, authoritarianism and religiosity were positively related to superstition, while extraversion had no significant relationship with superstition.

Chaturvedi, R.D. (1988) found that attitude towards social change was associated with empathic outlook in people possessing dominance, radicalism and independence. In association with non-empathetic outlook was noted in people oriented to submissiveness, conservation and subduedness. In conservative people, attitude towards social change was traditionistic throughout the aged period and was non-emphatic up to adulthood with a shift to empathy in senescence.

Gupta, Alka (1992) noticed that most satisfied students were significantly higher on n-achievement, n-nurturance and n-endurance while least satisfied students were higher on n-exhibition, n-dominance and n-aggression.

Pradhan, Renuka (1990) reported that personality and inter-personal attraction were correlated with each other. Attraction was based on similarity of attitude and personality were related to each other.

**Personality and Creativity**

Jacob, Annie K. (2007) found that higher mean value of over-achievers indicates that they possess more verbal creative abilities compared to under and normal achievers. No significant difference among three groups, i.e., the low, normal and high achievers do not vary in respect of mean non-verbal creativity scores. Self-
concept is significantly correlated to creativity. A positive self-concept enhances the creativity among students who are over-achievers.

Bali, S.S. (1981) noticed that Poets possessed factors like emotional sensitivity and creative mood and social will; Painters profile consists of factors like emotional sensitivity and creative mood; Scientists like ego-ideal, emotional introversion and social will; and Musicians like ego-ideal and social will.

Cacha, Frances B. (1976) attempted to determine whether different levels of figural creativity as measured by Torrance Tests were related to personality test as measured by 16 PF test and observed that figural creativity was related to happy-go-lucky, socially bold, relaxed and extroverted behaviour. A multiple correlation of 0.38 was obtained between creativity and some personality factors like shy vs. venturesome, sober vs. enthusiastic, relaxed vs. tense and phlegmatic vs. excitable.

Dagaur, B.S. (1988) noticed that anxiety affected both introverts and extraverts in creative thinking.

Dutt, Bountra and Sabhrawal (1973) found insignificant positive correlation between extroversion and creativity and further observed that high and low creatives could not be significantly differentiated on the extroversion scores.

Fernandez and Venkataraman (2003) found that students belonging to government and private schools are equal in their creative characteristics and ego scales. There was no significant correlation between creative characteristics and ego states, adult ego and child ego.

Jhag, D.S. (1979) found that creative boys were adventurous while creative girls were shy, timid, restrained and sensitive to threat.

Komarik, E. (1972) studied the relations between creativity and other measures of personality, namely, intelligence and Eysenck’s Orthogonal factors. A significant positive correlation was found between creativity and neuroticism, while no significant relationship was found between creativity and extroversion.
Kubie, L.S. (1958) noticed that high creatives need not necessarily be more neurotic than others.

Kurtzman, Kennith A. (1967) observed that creative students tend to be more adventurous, extroverted and self confident. They also have a less favourable attitude towards schools. In terms of peer’s acceptance, sex appeared to be an important factor. Higher creative boys received greater acceptance while higher creative girls are less accepted by their classmates. He found that the creative individuals tend to be significantly more extroverted.

Muddu, V. (1980) observed that personality characteristics of high creative group totally differed from those of low creative group.

Pal, Yesh (1992) found that personality factors played vital roles in promoting convergent thinking abilities.

Paramesh, C.R. (1972) observed that the high creative individuals were neither significantly more nor less introverted than the low creative individuals.

Patel, Kamla (1976) found that those with a high profile on all creativity variables were venturesome, placid, self confident and emotionally stable, while those low on all creative variables were shy.

Phillips, Victor K. (1973) found that the high and the low creative subjects differed significantly in terms of some personality factors and the way in which they perceived themselves. It was also found that within each group significant relationships were found between personality profiles and self perceptions. He found a significant negative correlation but the high and the low creative groups could not be differentiated significantly on social extroversion scores.

Srivastava, B. (1982) found a positive relationship between creativity different personality factors.

Zargar, A.H. (1980) found that the high and the low neurotic groups did not show any significant difference in creativity.
Personality and Gender

Agarwal, Richa (1990) reported that goal setting behaviour was a significant determinant of anagram task learning of female students. The success of female adolescents on anagram task learning was significantly influenced by risk taking behaviour.

Arunima (1989) found that aggression was found to be more in boys than in girls.

Babu, Sameer M. (2009) reported that boys have more self experience than girls. There is significant negative relationship between self experience for the whole sample boys students of parents working abroad and students of parents working in Kerala. There is a negative relationship between the experimental variables in the case of girls.

Bhatt, D.B (1990) found that male non-problematic group had more general capacity and insight than male problematic group. Female non-problematic was found socially precise, possessed more power than female problematic group.

Bharambe, M.D. and Pandit, K.L. (1991) reported that significant interactions between school atmosphere and sex and treatment and school atmosphere were observed on the first and second change of attitudes towards cleanliness measured by observation-cum-performance test.

Bharamble, M.D. (1991) found that sex was irrelevant to attitudinal change.

Bharathi, L. (1988) reported that working women who experience a high degree of role conflict would tend to experience a greater degree of stress than other groups. Women having a low degree of Type B personality factors had more stress than the high group in all its dimensions.

Bhoj, A.N.T. (1992) found no significant sex differences on introversion/extraversion dimension of personality.
Dagaur, B.S. (1988) found that at higher and average levels of neuroticism, there was no significant difference in mean originality scores of males and females. At lower levels of neuroticism, female extraverts showed more flexible and fluent behaviour than introverts.

Dagaur, B.S (1988) found at low levels of neuroticism, females extraverts showed more flexible and fluent behaviour, than introverts.

Dalu and Pratibha (1992) found that the differences were statistically significant for Q1, A1 and Q4 between male and female students.

George, M. (1969) found that in temperament, men were more ascendant, sociable and masculine than women. Women in humanities group had more restrain than men and were emotionally more stable, objective and friendly.

Gupta, Alka (1992) reported that the needs for dominance, abasement and aggression were negatively related with academic satisfaction in male graduate students. N-exhibition, n-autonomy, n-succorance and n-endurance were not related with the academic satisfaction of male graduate students. N-achievement, n-nurturance and n-endurance were positively related while n-aggression was negatively related with the academic satisfaction of female graduate students. Male students were higher on n-exhibition, n-autonomy and n-dominance while female students were significantly higher on n-affiliation.

Gupta, K.L. (1977) found that on the endomorphy-viscetontical classification the girls scored significantly higher than boys exhibiting higher endomorphism. Boys were more endomorphic than girls.

Jain, Neelima (1990) noticed that male subjects perceived females more favorably as compared to males perceiving males. Female subjects gave more favorable perceptions of male persons as compared to females perceiving females.

Jhag (1979) found that male and female subjects has more or less similar personality styles in respect of the reserved versus outgoing trait.
Joshi, Renuka (1989) observed that females were higher on fluency, originality, extraversion and neuroticism than males.

Karuna, Sharma and Sadhana, Mahajan (2001) found that extrovert females experienced significantly more stress in their perception of role erosion, role isolation and role ambiguity whereas in males more stress was felt on role stagnation. Introvert females were more stressed on all types of role stress except role stagnation and personal inadequacy as compared to males. Neurotic females had significant higher stress in their perception of inter role distinction, role overload, role isolation and role ambiguity. Neurotic females experienced more stress on all types of role stress except role stagnation. Stable males experienced more stress on inter role distinction, role stagnation, personal inadequacy and resource adequacy whereas females experienced more stress on inter role distinction and role erosion.

Kaur, Satwinderpal (2008) noticed that female secondary school teachers are significantly under more occupational stress than their male counterparts.

Khatoon, J. (1988) found that male students were more phlegmatic, adventurous, tough-minded and placid as compared to female students who were more excitable, shy, tender minded and apprehensive by nature. Interaction between achievement and sex significantly affected personality factors C, Q2 and Q4. Interaction of achievement, sex and locality did not have any significant effect on any personality factors.

Kohili and Om Prakash (1989) observed significant correlations between personality traits like intelligence, sober or enthusiastic, super-ego strength, timid or venturesome, tough-minded or tender-minded, group-dependent or self-sufficient of boys and girls.

Kumari, Shiv (1990) found that undergraduate girls were in general more modern than undergraduate boys and they were different in the aspects of modernity. As the level of aspiration rose under graduate boys and undergraduate girls showed a
decline in modernity. As self-concept increased, under graduate boys and girls showed significant increase in modernity.

Kumari, Sushma (1991) noticed exhibited extrovert tendencies in males.

Poulose, P.J. (1988) found that introversion, extraversion, self-concept the interaction of these variables and the sex had no significant effect on process outcome.

Prakash, V. (1986) found that boys of university position group were better on factor M than boys from university position, university participation and inter-university participation groups. Girls having university position and inter-university position and inter-university participation possessed significantly higher personality factor E than girls having university participation.

Krishna, K.P. (1973) observed that male and female students differed significantly in risk-taking, neuroticism, extraversion, security-insecurity, home adjustment and responsibility dimensions of personality.

Madhava, Kale (2007) found no significant difference between the personality of adolescent boys and girls.

Magotra, H.P. (1982) found that the mental life of boys was dominated by the feelings of depression and neurotic behaviour.

Mian, Shamshada (1988) noticed no significant differences were found between boys and girls in neuroticism, ego ideal, and internal control of fate.

Mishra, B.B (1997) found that personality factors except self-sufficiency are not significantly related to both boys and girls.

Naik, Ramesh H. (2006) found no significant difference between the interaction effects of male teacher’s introversion/extroversion personality type and favourable/unfavourable attitude towards profession on the academic achievement of their students.
Ram, Singh (2004) found that the popular students, in general view, boys as well as girls were found to be more extrovert in their behaviour than the neglected and rejected students. However, the neglected students were found to be more extrovert than their rejected counterparts. In the popular group, the boys showed high neurotic behaviour than the girls.

Sharma, C.S. (1986) noticed no differences in personality traits of leaders with regard to sex. A leader, whether male or female, had similar personality by traits.

Sharma, S.K. (1986) found that student’s perceptions regarding female teacher’s classroom behaviour were better than their perceptions regarding the classroom behaviour of male teachers.

Singh, B.K. (1980) observed that personality had a significant effect upon the development of sex-role preference in children.

Singh, H. (1993) found that male students were emotionally less mature and were characterized by emotional instability, emotional regression, personality disintegration and lack of independence.

Srinivas, Kumar (2002) found that irrespective of sex differences, the popular teachers are good teachers who possess certain temperamental traits like reflective, painful, active and responsible characteristics.

Srivastava, P. (1981) found the conservative girls to be more sober, more lax, more tough-minded and less individualistic.

Sudhir, M.A and Khaiangte (1977) noted that girls to be more intelligent, emotionally stable, conscientious and apprehensive than the boys.

Venkata, Rao (2004) found no difference of extrovertism and introvertism between boys and girls of high and low achievers.

Vidhu, M. (1968) found that girls scored higher on neuroticism than boys.

Yahaya, A (2009) showed that there was no significant difference between dimension of self-concept and personality of students according to gender.
Personality and Home Background

Arunima (1989) found that aggression in children was not related to aggression in parents. More aggression children were found in the families where parents had low education and income and were engaged in blue-collar jobs. Parents played an important role in making the child aggressive. Aggressive children belong to parents who not only associate positive meanings with physical punishment, but also use it as a mode of child-rearing. Large size of the family was found to be more conducive to making the children aggressive. The younger parents had more aggressive children in comparison to the older parents. Un-cogenous childhood and aggressive spousal relations were not found to be associated with aggressive parents.

Babu, Sameer M. (2009) found that there was an average self experience in building among students of ninth grade whose parents are working abroad and students of parents working in Kerala. Parental occupation plays a little role on self experience scores.

Chandresekhar, K. (2006) found that children of housewives evidence more positive perception than other groups.

Fernandez P. and Venkataraman, D. (2003) found that parent ego had significant correlation with adult ego and child ego.

Hussain, M.Q. (1963) observed that home influenced personality adjustment.

Jain, Neera (1989) found that high parental support high school- high control subjected to the development of self-esteem. The interaction of family structure with parental behaviour and that of sex with parental behaviour were found significant. The subjects of joint family were higher on socio economic power as compared to nuclear family.

Johi, J.K. (1984) found that ego identity was positively and significantly related to the perception of the adolescents of their school and home environment.
Kumar, R.B. (1954) reported that parents had great responsibility in developing a sane successful personality of their children.

Kumari, Sushma (1990) reported that students from a non-deprived home environment were found to be extrovert.

Pal, Anitha (1988) found that mothers of children with high cooperation were more development oriented.

Ramiah, L. (1990) reported significant relationship between parental involvement and self-concept of the students, the more parental involvement the better the self-concept.

Singh, B.K. (1980) reported that upper caste boys and girls were more conscious of their appropriate sex role than lower caste. Personality of parents did not influence the sex role preferences of their children.

Uchat, D.A. (1979) observed that students from advanced class had higher perception of themselves, themselves as students.

Vijayalakshmi, G. and Lavanya, P. (2006) reported that the students having highly educated fathers are feeling more stress.

Vijayalakshmi, R. (1991) reported that family reared and institution reared children were similar in their self concept.

**Personality and Locality**

Bhatt, D.B (1990) found male rural non-problematic group had more general capacity and insight than male rural problematic group. Male urban non-problematic was more intelligent than male urban problematic group. Female urban non-problematic was found socially precise, possessed more power than female urban problematic group.

Dalu, Pratibha (1992) found that rural male and urban male students did not differ in personality traits and values, these groups differed significantly in religious
information, orthodoxy and hostility. Between rural male and rural female students the difference was significantly in factor A, aesthetic values, religious information and religious tranquility.

Dwivedy and Om Prakash (2002) found that urban students had consistently scored higher mark in all the five aspects of character such as moral knowledge, moral judgement, socialization, empathy and autonomy, than the rural students of 6th, 7th and 8th classes.

Gupta, K.L. (1977) found that urban girls were more endomorphic than the rural girls. The rural girls were more ectomorphic than urban girls.

Hussain, M.Q. (1963) observed that locality influenced personality adjustment. On Personality Scales, the tendency of normals was to rate higher than criminals except on locality.

Jayanthi, N.L.N. and Padmanabhan, T. (2008) found that students studying in rural schools have more test anxiety than the students studying in urban schools.

Khatoon, J. (1988) found that rural students achieved higher mean values on factors E and Q2 than urban students. Achievement locality interaction did not affect the personality traits significantly. Rural students tended to be more assertive and self sufficient whereas urban students were obedient and group dependent.

Kumari, Sushma (1990) found that urban and rural juvenile delinquents and adult rural and urban offenders total adjustment was significantly correlated with social and emotional adjustment which were significantly related with each other.

Madhava, Kale (2007) noticed no significant difference between the personality of rural and urban school adolescent boys and girls.

Poulose, P.J. (1988) found that introversion, extraversion, self-concept the interaction of these variables and the residence had no significant effect on process outcome.
Ram, Singh (2004) found that the popular students, in general view, boys as well as girls; group and urban as well as rural groups, were found to be more extrovert in their behaviour than the neglected and rejected students. However, the neglected students were found to be more extrovert than their rejected counterparts. In the popular group, the boys showed high neurotic behaviour than the girls.

Sharma, C.S. (1986) noticed no differences in personality traits of leaders with regard to locality. There is no significant difference in personality traits of leaders belonging to rural and urban areas.

Sharma, N.K. (1981) found that area emerged as a significant correlate of Lie-Scale (social desirability) with means favouring tribal youth followed by urban and rural youth. Urban males were higher on extraversion than tribal females. Rural youth’s extraversion and neuroticism were positively correlated with achievement motivation and adjustment whereas urban youth’s extraversion was negatively related to neuroticism.

Singh, H (1993) found that high SES and urban and rural male students were emotionally less mature. They were characterized by emotional instability emotional regression, personality disintegration and lack of independence.

Srivastava, R.K. (1988) found that urban and rural boys did not differ significantly on personality needs except n-change. On the personality needs of heterosexuality, aggression, abasement, order, endurance and nurturance, female pupils of rural and urban locality differed significantly. The boys and girls of rural areas differed significantly on personality needs for order, exhibition, heterosexuality and endurance.

Sudhir, M.A and Khaiangte (1977) noted that urban areas turned out to be more intelligent, emotionally stable, conscientious and apprehensive than the rural background.
Venkata, Rao (2004) found no significant difference between rural and urban achievers on extrovert and introvert.

Verma, B.P. (1992) found that urban extroverts were less independent than introvert. The stable students were more fully independent than the introvert.

Yahaya, A. (2009) noticed no significant difference between dimension of self-concept and personality of students according to gender and there was no significant relation between dimension of self-concept and personality with students’ academic achievement.

**Personality and Institutional Management**

Dhila, B.D. and Yagnik, L.R. (1999) examined the pupil’s personality differences between two different curricula, namely, sainik and non-sainik schools. Sainik school students were more emotionally stable, active, enthusiastic, optimistic and self-confident, placid, self-disciplined, compulsive and have strong control over emotions than non-sainik school students. On the other hand, the non-sainik school students were shrewder and less submissive than sainik school students. The sainik and non-sainik students were equal in intelligence, outgoing, venturesome, zestful and composed.

Gakhar, S.C and Manhas, K.D. (2005) found significant difference in the emotional intelligence of adolescents studying in private and government schools with the private school students scoring higher.

**Personality and Religion**

Arunima (1989) found that the aggressive behaviour pattern was not confined to lower castes but transferred the boundaries of castes and class.

Hussain, M.Q. (1963) found that religion influenced personality adjustment.

Leela, A.V.S. (1988) found that the difference in mean scores of the high religious group on personality factors of O, Q₁, Q₂ and Q₄ were significantly higher
than those for the low group. Personality profiles of high and low religious groups were not similar. High and low religiosity was significantly associated with sex, girls being higher than boys.

Singh, Tirath and Kaur, Parminder (2008) reported no significant effect of religion, interaction between meditation and religion on self confidence when pre-self-confidence was taken as covariate.

Swami, Priyankant M. (1989) found that self-concept of orphan Muslim students and normal students were similar.

**Personality and Socio-Economic Status (SES)**

Asthana, Anju (1989) reported that SES was not found to contribute to social maturity at any of the five grade levels.

Hussain, M.Q. (1963) found that income influenced personality adjustment.

Kumari, Sushma (1991) reported that students of high SES showed a high temperament.

Santosh and Kaur, Ravdeep (2009) observed no significant difference between high and low SES students on executive, commercial, artistic, agricultural, persuasive, social and household areas. On the other hand, there is significant difference between them in the area of literary, scientific, agricultural and persuasive interests.

Sharma, R.K. (1978) reported that behaviour pattern of adolescents in low socio-economic status schools was significantly better than that of adolescents in high socio-economic status schools. Schools SES did not significantly influence the sociometric status of the adolescents. Normal adolescents were negatively influenced by the SES of the family.

**Personality and Values**

Agochiya, Devindra Pal (1992) revealed that youth workers were lower on theoretical, economic and aesthetic values, whereas they were higher on social,
political and religious values in comparison with other adults. Country wise
comparisons showed significant differences in altruism, extraversion, neuroticism,
social desirability, economic values and aesthetic, social, political and religious values
but not in psychotism. No significant difference emerged on all the six values and
other variables between government and non-government groups and between two
sexes.

Chinara, B.D. (1992) found that the democratic value preference patterns for
various combinations of groups were found curvilinear, which resembled M, N and U
in shape under the self-confrontation strategy.

Dalu, Pratibha (1992) observed that urban male and female students differed
significantly in Q1, theoretical, religious and aesthetic values, orthodoxy and hostility.
Rural male and urban male students did not differ in personality traits and values,
these groups differed significantly in religious information, orthodoxy and hostility.

Sandhu, Sadhana (1990) revealed that an interrelationship between Triguna
(three values) person’s inventory and psychoticism, extraversion and neuroticism
emerged with sattva and extraversion being negatively related suggesting a positive
relationship between sattva and introversion. Sattva was negatively correlated with
neuroticism and tamas was positively correlated with psychoticism.

ACHIEVEMENT

The following are some of the studies related to academic achievement.

Kamalamani, K (2001) found that even among lower achievers, girls were
poorer than boys. Metric schools’ high achievers had better learning characteristics
than high achievers of aided schools. Low achievers in Government Schools tend to
have poor profiles than low achievers of aided schools. Educational qualifications of
parents did not influence the learning characteristics of high achievers. Educational
qualifications of parents influenced the learner characteristics of low achievers.
Achievement and Achievement Motivation

Ahluwalia, I. (1985) reported that academic performance was positively and significantly related with achievement motivation.

Crawford, Shawn Allan Stephen (1977) stated that achievement motivation and academic achievement were positively correlated.

Rajput, A.S. (1984) observed no significant difference between academic achievement and achievement motivation.

Singhaulakh, S.P. (1979) stated that achievement motivation and academic achievement are positively correlated.

Umadevi, M.R. (2009) found positive relationship between achievement motivation and academic achievement of primary school student teachers.

Achievement and Income

Bhujendranath Panda (1991) found that IX and X class students with high income parents were better in their academic achievement than those of students with low income parents.

Chopra (1964) found that the students with high income parents were better in their academic achievement than those of students with low income parents.

Ekber, Tomul and Kzim, Celik (2009) noticed that the effects of family income significantly influenced on the academic achievement.

Gopal, Rao (1965) found a significant and positive correlation between economic status and academic achievement.

Govinda, Reddy (2002) observed that the family income has significant influence on academic achievement of D.Ed. students.

Har, Govinda Gupta (1968) found that except in the high intelligent group a significant relationship between academic achievement and their father’s income, seems to exist, in the moderate and low income groups.
Jagannadhan (1986) found that father’s income had much impact on the academic performance.

Jaya, Chandrarama Naidu (1998) found that the influence of father’s income was not significant on the academic achievement of learners from formal education; whereas mother’s income has significant influence on the academic achievement of learners of non-formal education and total sample.

Khanna (1980) observed that the students with high income parents were better in their academic achievement, than those of students with low income parents.

Krishna, Moorthy (1999) observed that the economic conditions of the family has caused no significant differences in respect of academic achievement in History of the second year higher secondary students.

Krishna Reddy, D. (2008) concluded that the academic / scholastic achievement of tenth class students has significant influenced by their parents’ annual income.

Long and Resh (1976) found no significant differences between father’s income and child’s level of abstract academic achievement.

Panda (2000) found that the children of middle income group had shown better performance in academic achievement.

Ravi, S. (2014) found that annual income has significant influence on the achievement in science of nineth class students.

Sanandaj and Jouhari (2010) showed that family income significantly affected academic achievement.

Sekhar, K. (2012) inferred that annual income has significant influence on the language marks, group subjects’ marks and total marks of junior college students.

Selvam and Sundaravalli (2002) found that the academic achievement has significant relationship with their economical, educational and vocational problems.

Siddi, Raju (2010) found that annual income had significant influence on the scholastic achievement of ninth class students in physical sciences.
Sujatha (2011) found that annual income of the family has significant influence on the academic achievement of B.Ed. students.

Vijay, Kumar Sethi (1990) observed that the parents of high achievers, of all four courses engineering, medicine, law and teaching, were generally had better income than those of low achievers.

Wiseman, Stephans (1964) did not find any significant influence of father’s income on the brightness of the child in the school.

**Achievement and Caste Reservation**

Raju, S., Raj, H and Tulasidharan, T. V. (1993) found that students of scheduled tribes and non-scheduled tribes differed significantly in their academic achievement.

**Achievement and Alcoholism**

Jordan, Sorenson (1990) reported that parental alcoholism buffers the effects of a child’s academic and educational success.

Rakesh, Lall (1991) observed that excessive drinking may have detrimental effects on the students academic performance. A student grades may suffer because the time required to academically succeed is being spent on consuming alcohol.

Schaller, M., Kemeny, A. and Maltzman, I. (1992) reported that few young adults had the ability to remain in good academic standing at a competitive university if a severe dependency on alcohol develops after admission into the college.

**Achievement and School**

Lalitha (1982) stated that there was no significant difference between the school achievements of high and low n-achievement tribal and non-tribal groups. The residential tribal school children had demonstrated better school achievement than the tribal and non-tribal children in common schools.

Sujatha Reddy, B.N. (1989) found that academic achievement of the students of private schools is lower than that of the government schools.
Achievement and Father’s Education

Barbara, Rupa Das (2002) reported that backward caste children of literate parents scored higher than the children of illiterate parents. The academic achievement of first generation learners, i.e., children of illiterate parents was found to be the lowest. The academic achievement of girls was found to be comparatively better than that of boys.

Chakrabarthy, Sharmistha (2002) observed that the education level of the family influenced female learners literacy academic achievement attending to literacy centers.

Chatterjee, et al (1971) found significant relationship between father’s education and the academic achievement in history of second year higher secondary students.

Dave and Dave (1971) found that poor academic achievement was due to low educational standards of their parents.

Govinda, Reddy (2002) noticed that father’s education and mother’s education have significant influence on the academic achievement of B.Ed. students. Brother’s education has significant impact on the total academic achievement of D.Ed. students.

Grovws, Douglas A. and Cebulla, Kristin J. (2000) stated that there was a positive relationship between educational level of the parents and students’ performance in mathematics. But, there was a considerable overlap in the performance of students from different educational background. In fact many students whose parents had a high school education or less scored higher than students whose parents had university degree. Students whose parents were university educated, performed about two-thirds of a proficiency level higher than those whose parents had no more than high school education. However, there was one important nuance to add to this finding. i.e., students whose parents worked in an occupation that required advance mathematics skill, in fact, performed almost one proficiency level higher
than students whose parents had similar education levels and income but whose occupation did not require advanced mathematics.

Har, Govinda Gupta (1968) observed that in the case of all the three, i.e., high, moderate and low intelligence groups of VIII class pupils, no significant relationship seem to exist between subjects academic progress and their father’s education.

Jagannadhan (1986) found that high school pupils academic performance and father’s education are significantly related.

Krishna Reddy, D. (2008) concluded that the academic / scholastic achievement of tenth class Students has significant influence on their father’s education.

Moula (2010) found that there was a significant relationship between father’s education and academic achievement.

Panda (2000) found that children of college educated father had shown better academic achievement.

Padmini (2010) noticed that father education has significant influence on the scholastic achievement of ninth class students in biological sciences.

Pavithran and Feroze (1965) found no significant relationship between the academic achievement of tenth class pupils and the education level of the fathers or other members of the family.

Ravi, S. (2014) found that father’s education has significant influence on the achievement in science of ninth class students.

Sankaraiah (2009) noticed that father’s education of B.Ed. students was significantly correlated with their academic achievement.

Sarma (1984) found that father’s and mother’s education was highly associated with the academic achievement.

Sekhar, K. (2012) inferred that father’s education had significant influence on the language marks, group subjects marks and total marks of junior college students.
Shamsuddin (1996) found that most of the secondary school male teachers were from families where fathers were not highly qualified, whereas most of the female teachers were from families with highly qualified fathers.

Siddi, Raju (2010) observed that father’s education had significant influence on scholastic achievement of ninth class students in physical sciences.

Vijaya Kumar, Sethi (1990) found that father’s education has got much impact on the academic achievement of their sons and daughters studying in professional courses, viz., engineering, law, medicine and teaching.

**Achievement and Gender**

Aggarwal (1974) found that girls performed better than boys in all the school subjects.

Aruna (1981) reported that boys had better academic achievement than girls.

Asud Ulla khan, *et al.* (1982) showed that gender of pre-university students (twelfth class) was found to be not effective in bringing about any variation in the academic achievement.

Balasubramanian, T. and Feroze, M. (1966) found that there existed no significant difference in the academic achievement of boys and girls of urban locality, while there was some marked difference in the academic achievement between boys and girls of rural locality.

Bhattacaryyya, Anjana (1989) reported that boys performed better than girls on verbal reasoning test. In abstract reasoning test, boys showed superiority over girls.

Bhujendranath, Panda (1991) observed that 9th and 10th class boys of rural areas and urban girls were better in academic achievement than their counter parts.

Chadha and Chandana (1985) reported that boys had better academic achievement than girls.

Chandran and Lim (2010) concluded that gender contributed to poor academic achievement during the early school years.
Dhalakia (1980) found no significant difference in the academic achievement of male and female teacher trainees.

Dubey (1982) found that girls performed better than boys in all the school subjects.

Farquhan, W.W. (1963) observed no significant relationship between academic achievement and gender of eleventh grade high school students.

Gakhar and Aseema (2004) found no significant difference in the academic achievement of boys and girls of tenth class in their previous annual examination.

Gilson, Judith (1999) observed that large differences were not found in mathematics academic achievement, quantitative ability of eighth grade girls from single gender schools or girls from co-educational schools.

Gopala, Charyulu (1984) found no difference in the academic achievement levels between male and female teacher trainees.

Govinda, Reddy (2002) found that gender does not have any significant influence on the academic achievement of D.Ed. students.

Gupta, P.L. (1983) found that girls, on the whole, had better academic achievement motivation, than boys and had higher academic achievement than boys. The relationship between academic achievement motivation and academic achievement was positive and significant.

Gupta, V.P. (1968) observed no significant differences between boys and girls of ninth class in three variables, i.e., academic achievement, intelligence and economic status.

Gurubasappa, H.D. (2009) found significant difference in the academic achievement of students’ sex.

Har, Govinda Gupta (1968) observed that, except, in the high intelligence group of eighth class pupils, a significant relationship between academic achievement and gender appeared to exist in both the moderate and low intelligence groups.
Husen (1967) found that boys were, on the whole, superior to girls in achievement in mathematics.

Jagannadhan (1983) reported that gender had no significant influence on the academic achievement of V, VI and VII class pupils.

Jerath, J.M. (1979) reported that males scored higher than females on fantasy measures and n-achievement.

Khalid, Mohd Nasin (1997) found that gender contributed significantly for the academic achievement.

Lalithamma, K.N. (1975) revealed that there was significant difference in the performance of boys and girls in mathematics, the difference being in favour of boys.

Mohanty, A.K. (2002) investigated that the mean score of boys was higher than that of girls in achievement.

Narula, K.S. (1979) stated that sex was not found to influence academic performance of the prospective secondary school teachers. However, males scored more than females on n-Ach.

Paavola, Sapiyonia (2008) found that girls’ average rate of achievement was 2% higher than boys. In Britan girls, average rate of scoring was 0.7% less than boys. Where there is no much encouragement for girls’ education, like in Turkey, the girls’ average performance was 4% less than boys.

Padmanabhan Nayar, K and Visweswaran, H (1966) found significant difference between academic achievement of urban boys and girls of tenth class. But, however, they found a marked difference in the academic achievement of rural boys and girls.

Padmini (2010) noticed that sex has significant influence on the scholastic achievement of ninth class students in biological sciences.

Pal, Anitha (1988) reported that girls were more competitive than boys and no sex differences observed in cooperation.
Panchanathan and Ganesan (1992) found that gender had no bearing on the academic achievement.

Panda (2000) found boys and girls studying in different areas did not differ in their performance in all the school subjects.

Panda (2002) observed that fifth class boys and girls studying in urban, rural and tribal areas did not differ in their academic achievement in all the school subjects.

Pavithran A.N. and Feroze, M. (1965) found no marked difference between boys and girls in academic achievement.

Panday, S.N. and Md. Faiz Ahmad (2008) found no significant difference between male and female adolescents on the measures of academic performance.

Quraishi and Bhat (1986) found that gender had significant effect on academic achievement.

Rama, Rao and Sinha (1993) reported that the performance of girls in examinations at all levels of higher education was much better than that of boys.

Rama, Swamy (1990) observed no significant difference between boys and girls of high and low achievers.

Rangaswamy and Visveswaran (1977) found no significant difference in the academic achievement of sports men and non-sports men in SSLC (XI class) examination. However, they said that girls who participate in sports are better achievers than boys, gender difference was however not significant in case of non-sports boys and girls.

Roach (1979) found that the girls scored significantly higher than boys on a mathematics academic achievement test.

Sam Willam Bassey and Joshua (2009) concluded significant gender differences in mathematics achievement.

Satyanandam (1969) found that gender had no bearing on the academic achievement.
Sharma (1976) found that girls performed better than boys in all school subjects.

Siddi, Raju (2010) noticed that sex has significant influence on the scholastic achievement of ninth class students in physical sciences.

Singh, Amit and Kumar, Dinesh (2011) stated that the academic achievement of boys and girls was not similar.

Sood (1999) found that although girls achieved somewhat higher than boys, yet insignificant differences exist in their mathematical academic achievement.

Subramanyam, K. and Rao, K. Srinivasa (1991) found no significant of difference between boys and girls with regard to their academic achievement.

Subramanyam and Srinivasa Rao (2008) revealed that boys and girls did not differ significantly in academic achievement.

Sujatha (2011) observed that gender has significant influence on the academic achievement of B.Ed. students.

Sundararajan, S. and Dhandapani, B. (1991) found no significant difference in the academic achievement of boys and girls.

Suneetha and Mayuri (2002) reported that gender was found to be more important variable than IQ in deciding the high academic performance, as more girls were found among top ranking students of classes nine and ten.

Tiwari (1980) found that girls performed better than boys in all school subjects.

Umadevi (2009) concluded that the male and female students did not differ in their academic achievement.

Vasantha, Ram Kumar (1969) found significant differences in the academic achievement of boys and girls.

Verma and Gupta (1990) revealed that VIII class boys belonging to the high environment group achieved significantly greater mean than boys belonging to the
low environment group. However, no significant differences were found in the case of girls of high, medium and low environment groups.

Vijayalakshmi and Hemalatha (1992) found that eleventh class girls had better mean academic achievement than boys.


Achievement and Home Background

Chatterji, et. al. (1971) investigated the effect of parent’s education, family size and general condition of the home upon scholastic achievement. The family size and the number of siblings were inversely related to the scholastic achievement especially in the low intellectual level. Parents’ help has significant positive contribution towards higher achievement; and parents’ educational level was directly related to the achievement of their children. But, father’s occupation did not show considerable effect. However, the study conclusively demonstrated that parent’s education had relationship with scholastic achievement.

Achievement and Locality

Bhattacaryya, Anjana (1989) found that urban students performed better than rural students on verbal reasoning test. Rural boys performed better than rural girls. Urban girls showed superiority over rural girls.

Chakraborti, Bhupal Prasad (2002) found that the urban and semi-urban students performed better when they were provided with multiple choice items and that the urban students performed better both in multiple choice items and non-multiple choice items than semi-urban students in mathematics.

Dwivedi, R.D. (2005) observed that the academic achievement of students of the urban schools was significantly higher than that of the schools of the rural schools.

Gakhar and Aseema (2004) found that tenth class rural students significantly achieved better in their annual previous examination (ninth class) than the urban students.
Gurubasappa, H.D. (2009) noticed significant difference in the academic achievement of students’ locality.

Jagannadhan (1983) concluded that the pupils of fifth, sixth and seventh classes from urban areas had better academic achievement than rural pupils.

Khalid (1997) found that location of the school contributed significantly for the academic achievement.

Konwar, L.N. (1989) found no significant difference in the mean n-personal achievement scores of urban and rural residents.

Koteswara, Narayana and Ramachandra, Reddy (1998) observed the influence of locality on the reading academic achievement of high school pupils.

Krishna, Moorthy (1999) found that locality has caused no significant difference in respect of academic achievement in History.

Mehera (2004) found that academic achievement was significantly related to locality of school.

Padmini (2010) investigated that locality has significant influence on the scholastic achievement of ninth class students in biological sciences.

Panchalingappa (2004) noticed no significant difference between rural and urban high school pupils of Devadasis in respect of their academic achievement.

Panda (2000) found that rural students exhibited better performance in all the school subjects as compared to their urban and tribal classmates. Students studying in urban schools had shown better performance in mathematics where P.G. trained mathematics teachers taught the subject. Rural students performed better in all the school subjects where infrastructure facilities were available in the schools compared to the schools with less facility.

Panda, B.N. (2002) revealed that fifth class rural students had shown better performance in all school subjects when compared to their urban and tribal classmates.
Pavithran and Feroze (1965) observed that the academic achievement of urban students of X class was significantly better than rural students in all subjects.

Prabhu, Swamy (2010) revealed that rural area D.Ed. students scored better marks in multiple choice type, match the following type and over performance. Urban area students have scored better marks in classification type and true/false. So, locality has significant influence on the marks scored.

Prakash (2000) in his study concluded that urban students were better in their mathematical academic achievement when compared to rural students.

Rajendran, S. and Selvi, J.A. (2007) found that rural students are inferior to urban students in their achievement scores in school subjects and also found that locality of the students has no influence on their achievement scores in all their school subjects.

Salim, Kumar (1998) reported that locality has significant influence on the academic achievement in biology of secondary schools pupils.

Siddi, R. (2010) found that native place had significant influence on scholastic achievement of ninth class students in physical sciences.

Sundararajan, S. and Dhandapani, B. (1991) found that urban students are better than rural students in respect of their academic achievement.

Suneel Kumar Singh, Saheen Malik and A.K. Singh (2003) observed that locality affects the academic achievement. Urban students were found better than rural students where as gender did not affect the academic achievement.

**Achievement and Institutional Management**

Gakhar, S.C. (1982) demonstrates the differential effects of the type of the school on the acquisition of the mathematical concepts by the students on the whole. Students studying in private schools had better academic achievement than those studying in government schools. This academic achievement was due to the strict supervision by the principal and managements of private schools, better teacher- pupil interaction, good educational environment, teachers special care of the weak students,
teachers interest in the study of the children and sense of security and guidance and counseling in private schools.

Jagannadhan, K. (1983) investigated into the type of the school and academic achievement and found that pupils of fifth, sixth and seventh classes in government schools achieved the highest mean (58.50) academic achievement followed by Panchayat Raj (49.81), private (45.99) and municipal (45.02) schools.

Manoranjan, Panda (2000) reported that the mean academic achievement of ninth class Pupils in the schools managed by SC and ST Development Corporation, Government and Non-Government differ significantly from one another. The academic achievement of pupils in Non-Government schools is better than the pupils from Government schools. The academic achievement of pupils from Government schools is better than that of pupils from SC and ST Development Corporation schools.

Sharma, B.D. (1977) found that children of the recognized private schools achieved higher scores in Arithmetic than those of municipal corporation schools.

Srinivasan, T. and Arivudayappan, A. (2004) reported that the academic achievement level of aided schools and government higher secondary schools is greater than Panchayat union middle school and government high schools.

Sudha, R. Sinha (1980) found that despite less physical facilities and higher workload, the private schools had better organizational structure and more competent students than the government schools.

Sujatha (2011) found that college management had significant influence on the academic achievement of B.Ed. students.

Sundararajan, S. and Dhandapani, B. (1991) noticed no significant difference in the academic achievement of government and private schools.

**Achievement and Medium of Instruction**

Gurubasappa H.D. (2009) found significant difference in the academic achievement of students’ medium of instruction.
Achievement and Mother’s Education

Bhujendranath Panda (1991) concluded that ninth and tenth class pupils with college educated mothers were having better academic performance than illiterate or elementary class educated mothers.

Borbora, Rupa Das (2002) reported that backward classes children of literate mothers showed better academic achievement than the children of illiterate mothers.

Chakrabartih, Sharmistha (2002) observed that the educational level of mothers influenced female learners’ literacy achievement attending literacy centers.

Dave and Dave (1971) found that poor academic achievement was due the low educational standards of their parents.

Govinda, Reddy (2002) noticed that mother’s education had significant effect on the academic achievement of B.Ed. students.

Har, Govinda Gupta (1968) found no significant relationship between academic achievement of pupils and their mothers’ education.

Jagannadhan (1986) found that mother’s education was not associated with the academic achievement of pupils whereas father’s education had impact on academic achievement.

Krishna, Moorthy (1999) observed significant relationship between academic achievement and education of mother.

Manchala (2007) found that, mother’s education has significant influence on the scholastic achievement of B.Ed. students.

Moula (2010) found significant relationship between mother’s education and academic achievement of standard eight pupils.

Pavithran and Feroze (1965) found significant relationship between academic achievement and educational status of the mother in the case of tenth class students.

Ranga Swamy and Visveswaran (1977) reported no definite pattern of relationship between academic achievement of pupils and educational status of parents.
Ravi, S. (2014) found that mother education has significant influence on the achievement in science of ninth class students.

Sarma (1984) observed that mother’s education was highly associated with the academic achievement of their sons and daughters.

**Achievement and Occupation of Parents**

Alexander (1965) found no significant relationship between academic achievement and occupation of the father in the case of eighth class students.

Ayishabi and Kuruvilla (1998) found no significant difference between mean scores of academic achievement motivation of pupils of ninth standard of working and non-working mothers.

Bal (1988) found no significant difference between academic achievement of pupils of ninth standard of working and non-working mothers.

Bhujendranath, Panda (1991) observed that students of skilled professional parents were found to be better in their academic achievement when compared with their counterparts.

Ford, Dawson (1970) found that the employment of mothers had no effect on the academic achievement of children.

Goswamy, Minakshi (2002) found that children studying ninth class with working mothers were more academic achievement-oriented than the children of non-working mothers. Boys with working mothers were most academic achievement-oriented than girls with working mothers.

Govinda, Reddy (2002) reported that the employment of father, brothers and sisters had significant effect on the academic achievement of students pursuing B.Ed. course.

Har, Govinda (1968) found no significant relationship between academic achievement and occupation of the father in the case of eighth class students.

Jagannadhan (1986) found much impact of father’s occupation on the academic achievement of students.
Jammar (1964) observed that students of skilled professional parents were found to be better in their academic achievement when compared with their counterparts.

Moula (2010) found significant relationship among father’s occupation and mother’s occupation and academic achievement of standard eight pupils.

Pavithran and Feroze (1965) found that the occupational status of the parents highly accelerated the academic achievement of tenth class students.

Rangaswamy and Visveswaran (1977) reported no definite pattern of correlation between academic achievement and occupational status of the family of eleventh class students.

Ravi, S. (2014) found that parents’ occupation has significant influence on the achievement in science of ninth class students.

Sekhar, K. (2012) inferred that occupation of father and mother had significant influence on the language marks, group subjects marks and total marks.

Smith (1966) found no significant relationship between academic achievement and occupation of the father in the case of eighth class students.

Stein (1973) found no significant difference between academic achievement of pupils of ninth standard of working and non-working mothers.

Sujatha (2011) observed that father’s and mother’s occupation had significant influence on the academic achievement of B.Ed. students.

**Achievement and Institutional Management**

Annaraja, P. and Kanmani, M. (2009) found significant difference in the academic achievement of M.Ed. students of university department and government aided colleges.

Surekha (2008) reported that girls from private schools performed academically better than the boys and girls from government schools.
Achievement and Socio-Economic Status (SES)

Gurubasappa, H.D. (2009) found significant difference in the academic achievement of students with varied socio-economic status.

Rajput, A.S. (1984) observed no significant difference between academic achievement and socio-economic status.

INTELLIGENCE AND PERSONALITY

Adaval (1973) reported that high level of anxiety, lack of confidence, submissiveness, group dependency and low ego-strength was correlated with conformity behaviour. Conformity was not significantly correlated with intelligence, conservatism and shyness separately.

Agarwal, R. (1985) reported a significant relationship between self-concept and personality characteristics.

Ajwani (1979) reported that the interaction between personality factors and intelligence had no effect on the problem-solving ability of subjects. The effect of direction of the problem-solving ability was found to be independent of facilitatory or inhibitory personality and high or low levels of intelligence.

Arunima (1989) observed that aggressive children scored lower on intelligence than non-aggressive children.

Aurora (1980) reported that non-deviants possessed a comparatively better personality. Their self sentiment attainment was good, ego and super-ego were strong. They were radical, submissive and desurgent and were realistic in dealings. In withdrawing deviant’s ego, super-ego and self sentiment were anemic. Intelligence remained retarded in adjustive function. Expectation evasion deviants suffered from dryness of emotionality.

Bhagavathy, G.P.K. (1977) found that there were significant differences in personality variables and intelligence (both verbal and non-verbal) between the four deviant and one normal group studies.
Bhatnagar, R.P. (1967) reported that personality and intelligence were found to be significantly correlated. It was found that the need for achievement autonomy, intraception, succorance dominance, nurturance, endurance and aggression correlated positively and the need for deference, affiliation and abasement correlated negatively to the academic achievement of the students.

Bhoj, A.N.T. (1992) found that introversion/extraversion scores showed no association with the patterns of cerebral dominance neuroticism.

Dubey (1980) reported that there was a great effect of frustration among the intelligent group.

Dutt, Sunil (1989) noticed that high intelligent students scored higher on problem solving ability than low intelligent students. Cognitive style and intelligence were found to contribute significantly to the total variance in problem solving ability.

Godbole, A.Y. (1988) reported that story telling had a positive effect for a wide variety of people irrespective of their intelligence and linguistic skills.

Gupta, Sushma (1991) reported that non-deprived students were more intelligent, more creative and more high achievement learning than deprived students. The deprived students were over protected, depressive, submissive and worried, however they showed a high academic self concept.

Jailkhani, Neerja (1988) reported that the experimental group gained significantly more I.Q. scores but not the control group.

Jain, Jayanti R. (1990) found positive self concept of adolescent girls and superior cognitive abilities went together significantly.

Jain, R. (1974) reported that intelligence and introversion were found to be correlated with inter-sensory transfer. Rigidity, intolerance of ambiguity and extroversion were not found to be related to transfer.

Jain, S. (1983) observed that intelligence was found to be a good predictor of nature, form and kind of concept formation ability. High intelligence students scored significantly higher on concept formation than lower ones. Verbal intelligence was
found to be the greatest significant interactional effect on concept formation and a positive linear significant relationship between the students’ scores on test of concept formation and verbal intelligence existed.

Kabu (1980) reported that personality factors were not found to have any consistent pattern in the mathematically gifted of different classes.

Kaur, Satwinderpal (2008) found that less effective teachers were under higher level of occupational stress than the highly effective and total group of teachers. Occupational stress correlated negatively with the teacher effectiveness, as the stress among teachers increases as their teaching effectiveness decreases.

Khiangte, Varparhi (1988) found that intelligence, sensitivity, independence, assertiveness and spontaneity were significant correlates of creative thinking abilities observed among secondary school students.

Kumari, Sushma (1990) found that in case of juvenile and adult female offenders, no significant differences were observed in case of personality characteristics, intelligence, achievement motivation and adjustment except in case of SES and health adjustment.

Latha (2001) observed positive relationship between Type-A behavioural pattern and hardness. Both are identical in identifying individual’s cognitive orientation.

Madhumathi, C. (1988) found that almost all the convicts had a happy childhood experience, were against violence, with high opinion about police and movies, with high faith in religion and well adjusted. Majority of subjects found to be reserved, assertive, tender minded, imaginative, shrewd, experimenting, self sufficient and tensed. Casual offenders were less intelligent and sober and more expedient whereas habitual offenders were more intelligent and happy go-lucky and conscientious, most of the convicts seemed to be emotionally stable but suspicious.
Murthy, Venkatesha (1988) found that juvenile delinquents and non-
delinquents differed significantly in their intelligence level. A majority of non-
delinquents were less intelligent as compared to non-delinquents.

Ojha, R.K. (1962) noticed positive relationship between intellectual
stimulation and different aspects of intelligence measured by Vernon’s Non-Verbal
group test, Vernon’s Pattern Drawing test and Vernon’s Graded Arithmetic test.

Pal, Yesh (1992) found that the total redundancy co-efficient for personality
and intelligence were 2.8 and 13.4%. Personality traits predicted 13% of total
variance of intelligence domain. The subjects covered by the students on the
relationship between intelligence and personality had been mostly cross-sections of
young and old children, adolescents, normal adults, males, neurotic children, children
of elementary school, nurses, male medical and psychiatric patients.

Sambhi, Punam (1989) reported that the personality dimensions of the three
groups of students were significantly different. The students of Sri Sathya Sai School
were found to be highly intellectual, gregarious, emotional, philosophical, strong and
practical and egoistic than those of Missionary schools who were discrete, emotional,
intellectual, vivacious, proud and apathetic and rash. Students of Central schools were
intellectual, irritable, emotional, rash, bright and timid and mediocre in terms of
personality factors.

Samuel, Premela (1988) found significant association between moral
developmental stage and personality traits. The stages differed with personality traits
and some of the social factors like interaction with other students, with teachers and
school behaviour. The stages differed with SES, extraversion and intelligence.

Shahin, A. (1971) reported that intelligence and personal-social behaviour
developed in an interrelated manner and intelligence and personal-social behaviour
were positively related.

Sharma, Archana (1989) reported that both extraversion and neuroticism had
positive correlation with psycho-motor performance while intelligence had a lower
correlation with it. The correlation between extraversion and reminiscence revealed a significant positive relationship for paired associative figure task only, whereas neuroticism had significant positive correlation with reminiscence for paired associative figure task and paired associative forward tasks.

Sharma, M. (1980) noticed that intelligence was an influencing factor in the development of behaviour pattern of the students in all types of schools. Normal adolescents were positively influenced by intelligence, self disclosure and sociometric status.

Shukla, P. (1973) reported that intelligence was highly correlated with space perception.

Singh, R.S. (1980) found a negative correlation between anxiety and ego-strength, anxiety and temperamental traction and no relation between anxiety and intelligence. There was a positive correlation between anxiety and need abasement and nurturance.

Singh, K.K. (1985) reported that personality traits were more or less independent of intelligence. Intelligence linked personality traits of high intelligent subjects showed them to be more scholastic, shrewd and controlled.

Singh, Y. (1978) stated no significant differences in case of teacher’s ratings of children for emotional maturity. According to parents, the superior children were more emotionally mature than the average children.

Sridhar, Y.N. and Hamid, Reza Badiei (2007) reported no significant relationship between emotional intelligence and personal efficacy.

Sultana, M. (1983) found significant difference between normal and clinical subjects. Normals were more intelligent.

Suresh, K.J. and Josith, V.P. (2008) found no significant relationship between emotional intelligence and stress, between aided and unaided, between aided and government and unaided and government college student teachers.
Swami, Priyankant M. (1989) reported that the intelligence of normal students was higher than the intelligence of orphan students.

Vidhu, M. (1968) reported that introverts were found to take less time than extroverts on Raven’s Progressive Matrices.

Zargar, A.H. (1980) reported that the level of expression (high and low) was not related to intelligence.

**INTELLIGENCE AND ACHIEVEMENT**

Agrawal, Archana (2002) found significant positive relationship between academic achievement and intelligence.

Aruna, N.S. (1981) found a significant positive correlation between intelligence and academic achievement of SC and ST students.

Ayodhya, P. (2007) noticed no correlation between academic achievement and intelligence.

Barna (1981) found that boys and girls were not different with respect to intelligence and scholastic achievement.

Baruah, Mukul Kumar (1988) found that at level 1 (plus-two stage) students with highest intelligence level generally go in for the polytechnic course. This was followed by science course, commerce course, arts group and the pharmacy group in that order. At the plus-two stage, students of science stream preferred to go in for the professional stream of study, preferably the engineering and medical courses.

Burwani, Rupa G. (1991) found that intellectual competence had high positive influence on academic achievement of both science group and commerce group. Academic achievement was positively associated with intellectual competence.

Chada and Sunanda Chandana (1990) observed positive and significant correlation between intelligence and academic achievement when the effect of creativity is partialed out.

Chatterji, P.S. (1983) found that science students were more intelligent than arts students. Science students achieved significantly higher verbal factor and total intelligence scores than others and they were significantly superior in numerical factor
of intelligence in comparison with arts and science students. Scores on intelligence test in science group were significantly higher than others.

Chaudhary, N. (1971) found the correlation coefficient between n-achievement and intelligence scores for the combined samples and for the boys were not significant, whereas the same was significant for girls. N-achievement and intelligence were significantly not related.

Chauhan, S.C. (1993) found that high intelligent students achieved higher scores in social studies and lower scores in mechanical and business vocational interests.

Jabbi and Rajya Lakshmi (2001) found that most of the tribal children had cognitive abilities desirable for educational development irrespective of age and sex.

Jogi, J.K. (1984) found that intelligence had a significant effect on achievement.

Kabu (1980) investigated that factor of intelligence was found to have significant influence on mathematical talent at the under-graduate level.

Kumari (1986) found that intelligence was a major contributor of academic achievement of boys, and intelligence and intellectual commitment were major contributors of academic achievement of girls.

Lalithamma, K.N. (1975) noticed that the academic achievement was positively related to intelligence.

Manas, Ranjan Panigrahi (2005) studied the influence of intelligence and SES on academic achievement of high school students and concluded that there existed a significant and positive correlation between academic achievement and intelligence. It is also found that high intelligence leads to better academic success. The students having higher intelligence are high achievers in academic performance than students having low intelligence. The girls of high socio-economic status are high achievers in academic performance than boys of low SES status and girls of low SES.
Manas, R.P. (2005) concluded that there existed a significant and positive correlation between academic achievement and intelligence and also found that high intelligence leads to better academic success.

Manoranjan Panda (2005) concluded that there was a significant relationship between academic achievement and intelligence in different categories of schools.

Mishra (1997) found that intelligence was significantly correlated with academic achievement of both boys and girls; the correlation between intelligence and academic achievement was higher in case of girls.

Ravi, S. (2014) found that intelligence has significant influence on the achievement in science.

Rose and Elizabeth (2001) noticed that the overall academic outcomes were higher for gifted students than normal students.

Sankaraiah (2009) found that intelligence of B.Ed. students was significantly correlated with their academic achievement.

Sharma, K.L. (1978) observed that achievement showed highest relationship with intelligence.


Sujatha (2011) found that intelligence had significant influence on the academic achievement of B.Ed. students.

Vidhu, M. (1968) observed a positive correlation between intelligence and academic performance was positive and highly significant.
PERSONALITY AND ACHIEVEMENT

Abraham, P.A. (1969) reported the influence of temperamental dimensions of neuroticism and introversion-extraversion on academic achievement showed sex differences. Factor analysis of the personality variables and academic achievement evolved a factor pattern in which three factors could be identified, viz. scholastic aptitude, neuroticism and extraversion-introversion.

Ahuja, Malvinder and Tachanut, Yaiuva (2006) reported that low persistence students achieved equal gain means through Multimedia CAI and CGL (Computer Assisted Instruction and Conventional Group Learning). Average persistence students achieved equal gain means through Multimedia CAI and CGL. High persistence students achieved equal gain mean through Multimedia CAI and CGL. Through Multimedia CAI high average and low persistence students were found to be equal in their gain means.

Anca, Munteanu and Iuliana, Coatea (2010) found that psychological personality type does not significantly influence school performance, meaning that students, even if have or not these personality features, can have similar school achievements. Energetic pattern of personality and emotional pattern are not conditions for school performance in adolescents.

Anuradha, Joshi (1990) reported that the personality effected the academic achievement of class nine students. The extroverts were found to benefit significantly more through the developed instructional strategy, as compared to the introverts.

Arora, R.K. (1992) studied the interaction effect of creativity and intelligence on emotional stability, personality adjustment and academic achievement. High creative / High intelligence group was significantly higher in emotional stability than the remaining three creative / intelligence groups. Those possessing both high convergent and divergent abilities were by far the most accommodative persons among different creative-intelligence groups.
Asthana and Usha (1990) studied internal and external conditions of control as determinants of performance, in relation to personality characteristics and individual’s locus of control. It was found that internal, warm-hearted, emotionally stable and assertive individuals performed better if they worked under intrinsic motivation. Those who were warm-hearted, assertive, adventurous and tense, performed well, irrespective of conditions of control.

Ayodhya, P. (2007) while studying the emotional problems of school children and their relation to life events and school academic achievement found that secondary school children had high rate of emotional problems. Boys had high life event scores and more number of events. The emotional problems found were of minor nature. Emotional problems did not have influence on academic achievement. Life events too did not have influence on academic achievement. No difference was found with regard to socio-demographic factors and emotional disorders, academic achievement. No association was found between academic achievement and intelligence.

Babu, A.N. (1978) found that maladjusted and well-adjusted students differed from each other to a very high extent with respect to intelligence.

Bhargava, K. (1980) reported that academic competence and schizophrenic personality had negative correlation and there was a negative correlation between neuroticism and academic performance.

Bhargava, M. and Sharma, A. (1995) explored the connection between the scholastic attainment and career maturity in the case of students. High and low achievers did not differ significantly in career attitude. High achievers and low achievers showed significant differences in total career competence as well as competence in self appraisal, occupational information, planning and problem solving. Low achievers showed better competence in goal selection.

Bhatt, Sahdev (1986) reported that the effect of culture (CT), self-disclosure (SD), obedience-disobedience tendency (ODT) on perception of science teaching
(PST) were significant. The interaction effects of CT and SD, CT and ODT and SD and ODT were not significant on PST scores. The low and average students and low and high SD students were significantly different on PST scores. The average and high SD students were not significantly different in PST. Obedient students obtained greater mean PST score than disobedient students.

Burwani, Rupa G. (1991) reported that discrepancies between real and ideal self-concept did not affect the academic achievement of commerce group but in the science group real and ideal self-concept were positively related. Students who revealed mental ill-health symptoms were poor in academic achievement.

Cattell and Sweeney (1966) claimed that High School Personality questionnaire (HSPQ) was predicting the school academic achievement of the students.

Chandra, Sekhar (2003) reported that there was no high participation about co-curricular activities by the secondary school students. Secondary school students possessed high personality. There was a positive correlation between student’s participation in co-curricular activities and their personality development.

Chatterji, P.S. (1983) reported that scores on the extraversion scale in the commerce group were significantly higher than students in science and arts groups whereas in agriculture group higher than the scores of arts group.

Darsana, M (2002) found \ substantial or marked relationship between emotional intelligence and examination anxiety for the whole sample and relevant sub-sample. There was significant difference between boys and girls in their emotional understanding and emotional intelligence but there was no significant difference between boys and girls in their emotional perception, emotional facilitation of thought and emotional management. There was significant difference between government and private school students in their emotional perception, emotional facilitation of thought and emotional intelligence.
Dhall, Taruna C. and Salni, Madhu (2008) found that working mothers’ children receiving high cognitive stimulation have better academic performance as compared to those receiving low cognitive stimulation. No significant difference was observed in academic performance scores of elementary school children belonging to moderate and low cognitive stimulation groups.

Govinda Reddy (2002) found that the factors B, E, F, M, Q₂ and Q₄ of 16 PF had significant influence on the total academic achievement of DIET students.

Gurubasappa, H.D. (2005) concluded that, the well-adjusted children in the school achieve high and the children with better mental ability will definitely achieve high. There is a significant difference in the academic achievement of students with different levels of adjustment and mental ability.

Jantli, R.T. (1988) reported that neuroticism and extraversion were significantly and negatively related to academic achievement.

Joshi, Renuka (1989) reported that the medicine students scored the lowest on psychoticism and social isolation and the engineering students yielded the highest on these two variables.

Kagade (2002) observed that there was no significant relationship between educational adjustment, home adjustment, and educational academic achievement of pupils (N=1941) studying classes eight and nine. There was a significant relationship between social adjustment and educational academic achievement.

Konwar, L.N. (1989) reported that on school socialization the high groups on achievement orientation, general achievement orientation and overall strength showed higher means of personal achievement scores than the low groups.

Koteswara, Narayana and Ramachandra, Reddy (1998) reported that all the 14 factors of HSPQ have significant influence on reading academic achievement in Telugu language high school students. Students whose personality characteristics for out-going, more intelligent, emotionally stable, excitable, assertive happy-go lucky, superego strength, venturesome, tense minded, doubting, apprehensive, self-
sufficiency, controlled and tense, performed significantly better on reading academic achievement in Telugu language, than the students, whose personality characteristics were observed as less intelligent emotionally less stable, phlegmatic, obedient, sober, moral standards, shy tough minded, vigorous, placid, group dependent, undisciplined and relaxed.


Kumar, S. and Mishra, D.P. (2005) found that the front benchers were most frequently described by the teachers as having good study habits, being good, natural, curious to learn, active and smart, disciplined and good at home work. The most frequently observed characteristics of back benchers as described by the teachers were mischievous, weak in studies, disinterested in school and homework, idler, quarrelsome, truant, delinquent and undisciplined. The front benchers were found to be significantly better than the back benchers in terms of their socio-metric status.

Martinsen and Swanberg (2010) showed that conscientiousness and openness were mediated by the strategic and an indirect effect on achievement through the surface approach.

Mavi and Iswar Patel (1997) explored the relationship between academic achievement and selected personality variables of ninth grade students. The personality variables are personality adjustment, intelligence, self-concept and level of aspiration. It was found that there was a weak relationship between the personality variable and academic achievement, in the case of tribal students. The non-tribal students scored higher than the tribal students.

Nagaraju, M.T.V. (2001) found that the factor B of HSPQ has its own influence on study habits score of the pupils. Hence, the pupils who have the
personality traits such as quick to group ideas, fast learning and high intelligence, are having good study habits than the pupils who have personality traits such as low intelligence, slow learning and very poor at grasping. The pupils who have the personality characteristics like emotional maturity, stability and realistic view of life have better study habits than the pupils who have the personality traits such as frustration, worms and easily annoyed. Also the pupils with personality traits such as self assumption, independence, boldness in approaches have good study habits than the pupils with personality traits such as reticence, anxiety, sobriety and dependable personality.

Naik, Ramesh H. (2006) reported that teachers with introversion orientation will have greater effect on academic achievement of their students in physical science than teachers with extraversion orientation. There was a significant difference between interaction effects of the introversion/extroversion personality type and effective/ineffective teaching on the academic achievement of their students in physical science.

Natesan and Susila (2000) indicated that the chosen personality factors are not significantly influencing the academic achievement of fifth standard boys and girls in the age group of 9 to 10 years studying in the schools.


Panchanadhan (1999) found that maintaining emotional balance among students, through a psychologist by using auto counseling increased their academic performance.

Patel, M.R. (1997) studied and compared students who are different on different problems, viz. health, monetary, personal, social, religious–cum-sex and
educational and also found that the under-achievers had more problems compared to high-achievers.

Prakash, S. (2003) found that the ascendance, vigorous and persistent temperaments were significantly related with the academic achievement in girls and total sample. Among boys, the ascendance, accepting, vigorous, cooperative and tough minded temperaments were significantly and positively correlated with academic achievement. Girls with low sociability figured significantly higher in mathematics achievement than girls with higher sociability at high memory level only.

Premalatha, Sharma (1986) reported that the under-achieving rural girls significantly differed in their study habits from high achieving rural girls of ninth and tenth classes.

Rao, D. Gopala (1965) found differences in achievement to be significantly related to aspect of personality like neurotic difficulties, morale and sense of responsibility.


Sangwan, Sheela, Nitasha and Krishna, (2002) compared the perceptual and conceptual abilities of 14-16 year old slow and average learners. The major findings of this study were the slow learner’s lower IQ and the associated mental capabilities accounted for lower performance (than the average learners) on perception tests. The average learners were also ahead of slow learners in terms of conceptual development.
Saulade, S.D. (1989) reported that extraversion showed a negative relationship with total number of traits, number of errors committed and time taken, but neuroticism had a positive relationship of these variables.

Saxena, P.C. (1981) observed that positive self-concept associated with higher academic achievement in mathematics, commerce and arts streams. The under-achievers were conspicuously of the opposite type, being aware of their actual difficulties and their need for individual help.

Saxena, P.C. (1998) investigated with an idea to discover the differences between the over- and under-achievers with respect to their interests, need patterns, adjustment problems, study habits and personal factors. The over-achievers were those who aspired to higher achievement, had sufficient endurance and possessed a capacity for fighting out their case while the under-achievers were meek, submissive, timid, brooding, impulsive and dependent type of immature individuals.


Sharma, N.K. (1981) reported that neuroticism had no relation with academic achievement.

Siddi Raju (2010) found that the computed values of ‘F’ for the Personality Factors, namely, (i) Factor (B): Less Intelligent vs. More Intelligent; (ii) Factor, (D): Phlegmatic vs. Excitable; (iii) Factor (E): Obedient, Mild, Conforming, Submissive vs. Assertive, Independent, Aggressive, Stubborn, Dominant; (iv) Factor (H): Shy vs. Venturesome (v) Factor (I): Though Minded vs. Tense Minded and (vi) Factor (Q): Undisciplined vs. Controlled were far greater than the critical value of ‘F’ (4.60) for 2 and 1797 df at 0.01 level of significance. Hence, the above personality factors had significant influence on the scholastic achievement of ninth class students in physical
sciences. It is found that the computed values of ‘F’ for the Personality Factors namely; (i) Factor (A): Reserved vs. outgoing and (ii) Factor (F): Sober vs. Happy - Go-Lucky, Gay Enthusiastic, Impulsively lively were greater than critical value of ‘F’ (2.99) for 2 and 1797df at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the above personality factors had significant influence on the scholastic achievement of ninth class students in physical sciences. It was found that the computed values of ‘F’ for the Personality Factors, namely, (i) Factor (C): Emotionally Less Stable vs. Emotionally Stable (ii) Factor (G): Moral standards vs. Super Ego-strength (iii) Factor (J): Vigorous vs. Doubting (iv) Factor (O): Placid vs. Apprehensive (v) Factor (Q2): Group dependent vs. self-sufficient and (vi) Factor (Q4): Relaxed vs. Tensed were less than the critical value of ‘F’ (2.99) for 2 and 1797 df at 0.05 level of significance. It was concluded that the above personality factors do not have significant influence on the scholastic achievement of ninth class students in physical sciences.

Sirohi, V. (2004) found that all under-achievers indicated deficiency in study habits, 98.7% of the under achievers tend to possess unfavourable attitude towards teacher and needed guidance, 97.5% of the students had poor concentration, 92.5% of students indicated deficiency in school and home environment, 72.8% of under achievers were low in self confidence, 24.6% of them indicated deficiency in attitude towards education, 70.3% had problems related to home assignments, 96.2% lack proper attitude towards examination.

Srivastava, S.K. (2002) studied the effect of self-concept on the learning style preferences. The findings were as the self-concept level of the urban boys increased, they showed increasing preference to flexible, non-individualistic, visual field-independent, long attention space, motivation-centered and environment-free learning style. With the increasing self-concept, the rural boys showed their increasing preferences towards flexible, non-individualistic, visual, field-dependent, long attention span, motivation centered and environment-free learning styles.

Srivastava and Saxena (1979) reported that academically successful students were more extravert than academically unsuccessful students.
Sujatha (2011) found that all personality factors have significant influence on the academic achievement of B.Ed. students.

Tyagi, Harish Kumar (2002) studied the general mental ability, reading ability, study habits, socio-economic status and psychogenic disorders as correlates and causes of scholastic backwardness and found that reading ability and study habits were found positively and significantly correlated with the academic achievement of scholastically backward children, and the scholastically superior and scholastically backward children were found to differ significantly in respect of psychogenic disorder.

Venkata, Rao (2004) reported that the mean value of high achievers was greater than low achievers. There was a significant difference between the high and low academic achievers with regard to neuroticism. High achievers were more stable than low achievers.

Vidhu, M. (1968) reported that extraversion and academic achievement were negatively associated.

Vijaya, Kumar Sethi (1990) found that the high and low achieving students taken together differed significantly from each other on personality factors of Lower – higher scholastic mental capacity (Factor-B); emotional instability (Factor-C); experience conscientiousness (factor G); shyness - venturesomeness (H); placidity apprehensiveness (factor O) and Low- High ergictension (Factor-Q₁). High achieving students were found to differ significantly from each other, on personality factors of Lower-higher scholastic mental capacity (Factor-B); desurgency - surgancy (Factor-F) and tough mindedness-tender mindedness (Facto-I). Low achieving students were found to differ significantly from each-other on factors of reservedness - outgoingness (Factor-A) Low-Higher scholastic mental capacity (Factor-B) tough mindedness - tendermindedness (Factor-I); trust placement suspiciousness (Factor-L) and Lower-higher ergictension (factor Q₄).
Vyas (1982) observed that personality adjustment was significantly related to university practical marks.

Though, there were studies related to intelligence, personality and achievement, and their interrelationship, they were not exactly the substitutes for the proposed study. Hence, now, a study on intelligence, personality and achievement of secondary school students has been undertaken.