CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Parental pressurisation for academic excellence is a problem of grave concern in India. The problem in its present magnitude has emerged quite recently as a result of parental "over-concern" about their children, for attaining higher standards and greater academic excellence. In the contemporary Western society, with more permissive child-rearing practices and wider options for children to take up vocational programmes of their choice, the parental involvement in academic matters of their children does not take ugly dimensions, and hence, there are not many studies directly related to the problem of parental pressurisation. However, a number of studies involving parenting variables related to the dependent variables of the present study, namely, academic interest, academic achievement, self-esteem and creativity are reviewed here which would give a theoretical perspective to the problem, namely, parental pressurisation in studies. In addition to this, the literature pertaining to the interrelationship of the study variables are also reviewed. For convenience as well as for ease of understanding, the literature reviewed is presented here under the following three main sections.
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Thus the available literature related to the present study is presented under three main sections: (1) Parenting variables related to Academic Achievement, (2) Self-esteem, and (3) Creativity. Each of these main section is divided into different sub-sections. At the end of each
main section, the pertinent literature is reviewed and the relevance of the present study is indicated.

2.1. PARENTING VARIABLES RELATED TO ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

2.1.1. Parenting Styles

Parenting styles, according to Fogel and Melson (1988) is the tendency to behave in consistent fashion in disciplining or relating to the child. Darling and Steinberg (1993) have differentiated parenting style from parenting behaviour. According to them parenting style is a kind of basic climate in the family including a set of attitudes and values rather than a set of specific parenting behaviours.

2.1.1.1. Classification of Parenting Styles

Researchers like Baumrind (1975), Conger (1977) and Elder (1980) agree that an important dimension of parental behaviour is authority and control, versus autonomy, and the parents' behavioural patterns vary widely across this range. Mussen, et al. (1984) have identified the following six parental behaviour patterns which vary across the two extremes: parental authority/control versus autonomy. They are
"autocratic" (parents simply instruct their young what to do), "authoritarian" (the child or adolescent can participate in discussions but has no voice in decision making), "democratic" or "authoritative" (the young person contributes freely to the discussions of issues relevant to his/her behaviour and may even make decisions, but the ultimate authority is retained by parents), "equilitarian" (there is minimal role differentiation between parent and child), "permissive" (the balance in decision making tilts in favour of the child or adolescent) and "laissez faire" (the young person is free to subscribe to or disregard parental wishes).

Baumrind in a series of studies of pre-school children and their families (Baumrind and Black, 1967) and in later studies with somewhat older children (Baumrind, 1971; 1973; 1978) delineated three modes of family interaction. The three parenting styles identified by Baumrind are "authoritarian", "authoritative" and "permissive". These three family types differ in the values, behaviours, and standards which children are expected to adopt, in the ways these values, behaviours, and standards are transmitted, and in parental expectation of the behaviour of children. Baumrind's view is widely accepted and has been reformulated for use by Dornbusch et al. (1987) in the study of adolescents and their parents. Their study has made it clear that Baumrind's typology of parenting
styles can be successfully applied to adolescents and is related to their academic performance.

Santrock (1994) recognises three prototypic patterns of parenting identified by Baumrind and explains the forms of parenting as follows:

"Authoritarian parenting" is a restrictive, punitive style that exhorts the child to follow the parent's directions and to respect work and effort. The authoritarian parent places firm limits and controls on the child. Baumrind's studies (1971, 1973) have found that authoritarian pattern is high in demanding and low in parental responsiveness.

"Authoritative parenting" encourages children to be independent but still places control on their actions. Extensive verbal give-and-take is allowed and parents are warm and nurturant towards the child. Authoritative parenting is multi-faceted. Maccoby and Martin (1983) for example, describe authoritative parenting as combining both parental responsiveness and demand. Steinberg and his colleagues (Steinberg, 1990; Steinberg, Elmen, and Mounts, 1989; Steinberg et al., 1991) have suggested that in adolescence, three specific components of authoritativeness contribute to healthy psychological development and success in school and they are (1) parental acceptance or warmth,
(2) behavioural supervision and strictness, and (3) psychological autonomy granting or democracy. This suggestion parallels the three central dimensions of parenting identified by Schafer (1965) in his pioneering work on the assessment of parenting practices through children's reports. Likewise, they are conceptually similar to the dimensions of parental control discussed by Baumrind (1991a, 1991b) namely, supportive control (similar to warmth), assertive control (similar to behavioural supervision and strictness), and directive/conventional control (similar to antithesis of psychological autonomy granting).

"Permissive parenting" comes in two forms: permissive-indifferent and permissive-indulgent (Maccoby and Martin, 1983). Permissive-indifferent parenting is a style in which the parent is very uninvolved in the child's life; it is associated with children's social incompetence especially a lack of self-control. Permissive-indulgent parenting is a style of parenting in which parents are highly involved with their children but place only a few demands or controls on them. Permissive-indulgent parenting is also associated with children's social incompetence, especially a lack of self-control.

The four classifications of parenting explained by Santrock (1994) involve combinations of acceptance and responsiveness on the one hand,
and demand and control on the other and all these dimensions combine
to produce authoritarian, authoritative, permissive-indifferent, and
permissive-indulgent parenting.

2.1.1.2. Parenting Style and Academic Achievement

There is extensive literature linking parenting behaviours and
academic achievement of children. Thus, the discipline and control
strategies adopted by parents are found to be an important factor that
explains the role of family on the academic achievement of children. Hess
and Holloway (1984) analysed the results from studies of pre-school,
primary and middle school children and identified five processes
linking family and school achievement. Among these various processes,
discipline and control strategies appeared to have a major influence on
school achievement (Baumrind, 1973; Marjoriebanks, 1979; Hess and
McDevitt, 1984).

Baumrind (1971, 1979) found that an authoritarian parenting style
in which parents stress obedience and respect for authority is associated
with children who are less socially competent relative to children whose
parents have an authoritative parenting style.
Lupton (1984) found that parents of high achievers are often socially higher than the parents of average achievers and they frequently provide richer learning environments and appear to exert subtle but effective pressure on their children. Schaefer and Edgerton (1985) found that parents who have more progressive parenting styles and who view their children as being active and independent agents tend to have children who score higher in ability tests.

An Indian study by Parikh, Shah, and Patel (1986) relating family adjustment and academic achievement, showed that high achievers exhibited better family adjustment than low achievers.

Results from several studies show that children having a positive relation with parents tend to do better in school (Rollins and Thomas, 1979; Estrada et al. 1987; Kurdek and Sinclair, 1988; Sue and Okazaki, 1990).

Dornbusch et al. (1987) examined the relation between parenting style and adolescent school performance using nearly 8,000 adolescents (aged 14-18 years) from a variety of backgrounds and indicated that in virtually each ethnic (including Asian), socio-economic and family structure group, adolescents whose parents were less permissive, less
authoritarian, and more authoritative performed better in school than their peers.

Referring to the study by Dornbusch et al. (1987), Steinberg, Elmen, and Mounts (1989) made an elaborate study on a sample of 120 adolescents, the over-time relation between three aspects of authoritative parenting - acceptance, psychological autonomy, and behavioural control, and school achievement. In addition, the mediating role of psychosocial maturity was also studied. The term psychosocial maturity is defined by them in terms of the adolescent's sense of self-reliance, identity and self-direction. Greenberger (1982) suggests that differences in psychosocial maturity may differentiate the successful from unsuccessful students above and beyond differences attributable to social class or academic ability. The results of the study of Steinberg et al. (1989) indicate that: (1) authoritative parenting facilitates, rather than simply accompanies, school success, (2) each component of authoritativeness studied makes an independent contribution to achievement, and (3) the positive impact of authoritative parenting on achievement is mediated through the development of psychosocial maturity in adolescents.

Steinberg and his colleagues have suggested that, in adolescence, three specific components of authoritativeness contribute to healthy
psychological development and school success (Steinberg, 1990; Steinberg et al., 1989, 1991).

Wentzel, Feldman, and Weinberger (1991) investigated two non-intellectual factors (self-restraint and emotional adjustment) which partly explain the relation between parenting and academic achievement in 6th grade boys. Their findings underscore the contribution of social and emotional development to academic and intellectual achievements, and the key role of parent-child relationships in influencing such development.

Research on school outcomes other than grades, shows that authoritative parenting also is associated with increase in a number of attitudinal and behavioural indicators of academic orientation during adolescence, including a stronger work orientation, greater engagement in classroom activities, higher educational aspirations, more positive feelings about school, greater time spent on home-work and more positive academic self-conception (Steinberg, Elmen, and Mounts 1989; Lamborn et al., 1991; Patterson and Yoerger, 1991).

Steinberg et al. (1992) have found in an ethnically and socio-economically heterogeneous sample of approximately 6,400, American 14
to 18-year-olds that authoritative parenting (high acceptance, supervision, and psychological autonomy granting) leads to better adolescent school performance and stronger school engagement. The positive impact of authoritative parenting on adolescent achievement, however, is mediated by the positive effect of authoritativeness on parental involvement in schooling. In addition, non-authoritativeness attenuates the beneficial impact of parental involvement in schooling on academic achievement. Their findings indicate that parental involvement is much more likely to promote adolescent school success when it occurs in the context of an authoritative home environment.

Steinberg et al. (1994) revealed the over-time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful families. During their 1-year follow up study in an ethnically and socio-economically heterogeneous sample of approximately 2,300, 14 to 18-year-olds, it was found that differences in adjustment (psychosocial development, school achievement, internalised distress and behaviour problems) associated with variations in parenting are either maintained or increased over time. However, whereas the benefits of authoritative parenting are largely in the maintenance of previous levels of high adjustment, the deleterious consequences of neglectful parenting continue to accumulate.
Oh-Hwang (1995) found that in adolescents (ages 14-18) better parenting practices foster the development of greater psychosocial maturity that leads to high levels of academic achievement.

The findings of a recent study on 900 11-year-old Australian children and their parents by Marjoribanks (1996), suggest that a parenting model defined by parents' aspirations, parenting practices, and parenting style mediate substantially the relationships between family social status and children's academic achievement but not the associations between intellectual ability and outcomes.

Thus, from the studies reviewed linking parenting styles and children's academic achievement, it is clear that adolescents who are raised in authoritative homes perform better in school than their peers (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1994; Lamborn et al., 1991; Oh-Hwang, 1995). The analyses made by Steinberg et al. (1989) support the fact that authoritative parenting enhances adolescents' psychological development which in turn contributes to their success in school. The result of their study points to the benefit of a parent-child relationship characterised by the combination of psychological autonomy and firm behavioural control. Steinberg et al. (1989; 1992; 1994) observed overtime changes in school achievement and
the parenting styles. These studies provide support for the notion that authoritative parenting leads to and not simply accompanies higher academic achievement.

2.1.2. Parental Involvement in Studies

Researchers have recently focused on parental involvement as a key mediator between background factors, such as parent education and academic achievement. For example, Stevenson and Baker (1987) found that the relation between parent education and school performance was mediated almost entirely by parents' level of involvement.

2.1.2.1. Conceptualisation of Parental Involvement

Parental involvement, according to Maccoby and Martin (1983) is the degree to which a parent is committed to his or her role as a parent and to the fostering of optimal child development. It typically concerns the amount of effort put in to child-oriented versus other activities (Pulkkinen, 1982). In the educational domain, parental involvement has typically focused on one specific activity, such as going to school activities and events (Becker and Epstein, 1982; Stevenson and Baker, 1987), or helping with home work or number of contacts between families.
and schools (Iverson, Brownlee, and Walberg, 1981). Grolnick and Slowiaezek (1994) have the conceptualisation of parental involvement in education as the dedication of resources by the parent to the child within the educational domain. They suggest that the children must experience the resources for them to have their influence. Such a viewpoint represents the child as an active processor of information rather than a passive recipient of inputs.

2.1.2.2. Types of Involvement

There are three types of parental involvement as assessed by Grolnick and Slowiaezek (1994) in their study. They are named as behavioural, personal, and cognitive/intellectual involvement. In the first category of involvement, the parent overtly manifest involvement through his or her behaviour by going to school, and participating in activities such as open houses. Support for the importance of this resource is provided in a study by Epstein and Becker (1982). The second type, namely, personal involvement includes the child’s affective experience that the parent cares about school, and has and enjoys interactions with them around school. Such a perception may convey a positive feeling towards school and the child. The third category of involvement, namely, cognitive/intellectual which involves exposing the
child to cognitively stimulating activities and materials such as books, and current events, represents a historically new role for parents in promoting their children's cognitive development (Lareau, 1987).

2.1.2.3. Parental Involvement and Academic Achievement

2.1.2.3.1. Process Involved

Little empirical work is available regarding the processes through which parental involvement might be associated with school performance. Epstein (1988) suggested that the parent's involvement may convey to the child the importance of education, which might lead to more responsible and independent behaviour in school. Another possible impact may be through the child's attitude towards himself or herself. For example, a child who perceives a parent as involved might also feel more competent (Patterson, 1986). Involvement might also have direct effects on achievement through assistance with studies and stimulation of greater competence per se.

Grolnick, Ryan, and Deci (1991) suggested that parents' behaviour does not affect the child through skill building, as has been traditionally assumed, but affects through its impact on children's attitudes and
motivation related to school. They have identified a set of motivational "inner resources" necessary for school success.

2.1.2.3.2. Inner Resources for Academic Achievement: Theoretical Perspective

Grohick et al. (1991) have identified a set of motivational "inner resources" necessary for school success. The three inner resources or motivation variables are: (1) Control understanding, (2) Perceived competence, (3) Perceived autonomy or Self-regulation. The three resources have been theorised to be crucial to intentional behaviour.

First, if an individual is to act intentionally, he or she must perceive how the outcomes are linked to his or her behaviour; this is the issue of control understanding (Skinner, Wellborn and Connell, 1990). Second, children must realise themselves as having the capacity or competence to take necessary actions to achieve success (Bandura, 1977; Harter, 1982a). Finally, children must experience their behaviour as autonomous or choiceful (Ryan and Connell, 1989), an issue separate from either perceived competence or control. Grohick et al. (1991), suggested a distinction between autonomous versus controlled behaviour. Autonomy concerns the degree to which the initiation and regulation of action emanate from one's core sense of self. In contrast, controlled activity
describes the process of yielding to pressure from some force, whether it be an external inducement or non-integrated intra-psychic demand. Relative autonomy has been linked to school competence (Ryan and Connell, 1989). Thus, the three concepts, control understanding, perceived competence and relative autonomy were found to be critical motivational resources for academic achievement in school.

2.1.2.3.3. The Parenting Environment Promoting Inner Resources

Grolnick et al. (1991) have proposed two dimensions of parenting environment for facilitating inner resources in children. The two dimensions are: (1) autonomy support versus control and (2) involvement versus non-involvement. Autonomy support versus control is the degree to which parents encourage children to initiate and make their own choices rather than apply pressure and inducements to control the children’s behaviour; and involvement versus non-involvement is the degree to which parents are interested in, and spend time relating to their children concerning their activities and experiences such as school work. The results of their study indicated that perceived parental autonomy support and involvement were positively associated with perceived competence, control understanding, and perceptions of autonomy.
There are a number of studies that have provided support for the utility of these two dimensions as predictors of developmental outcomes. Studies examining variables related to autonomy support (most typically focusing on control, which is the absence of autonomy support) have found that parental emphasis on obedience, compliance, and the use of power assertive techniques lead children to be less social (Baldwin, 1955), more hostile (Hoffman, 1960), more dysphoric and disaffiliated (Baumrind, 1967), and less adjusted (Schaefer, 1965).

Several researchers have also provided evidence about the effects of the second dimension, involvement. For example, high levels of involvement were found to be associated with competence and achievement motivation (Pulkkinen, 1982) and low levels of involvement were related to disobedience and aggression (Hatfield, Ferguson and Alpert, 1967). Furthermore, Gordon, Nowicki and Wickern (1981) related maternal involvement to the development of an internal locus of control, and Stevenson and Baker (1987) reported a positive association between parent involvement in school activities and children's school performance. On the basis of these findings, it is clear that children of highly involved parents will feel more competent, display greater control understanding, and have more autonomous academic motivational orientations than the children of less involved parents.
An interview study of mothers and fathers by Grolnick and Ryan (1989) assessed both the autonomy support and involvement dimensions. The researchers found that children of parents rated by the interviewers as highly autonomy supportive, had higher self-reported and other-reported competence, showed more independent self-regulation, and evidenced fewer school adjustment problems than did children of parents rated highly controlling. Additionally, the researchers found maternal involvement to be related to greater control understanding and teacher-rated competence and to fewer adjustment problems.

A recent study by Grolnick and Slowiaczek (1994) on 300, 11-14-year-old children found that children's motivational resources are mediators between parent involvement and children's school performance.

The study by Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler (1995) found that the major educational outcomes of the involvement process are children's development of skills and knowledge, as well as a personal sense of efficacy for succeeding in school.

The results of a comprehensive study on 500,000 students from 41 countries by the Third International Mathematics and Science study...
released in 1996, found that Asian children (Indian children excluded) outrank their peers in America and Western Europe. One of the reason for top performance of Asian children in Mathematics and Science Test was found to be parental involvement (Wingert and Greenberg, 1996).

The review of literature on parental involvement in studies indicates that, in adolescents parental involvement in the context of an authoritative environment promote the development of motivational inner resources which in turn facilitates academic success.

2.1.3. Parental Expectations and Academic Achievement

Most studies relating family influence on academic performance tend to focus on variables such as parental expectancy and encouragement (Eccles, 1983).

Haggard (1957) found that parents of high achieving students have expectations and standards for their children. According to Smith (1969) and Bloom (1973) parental expectations are one of the extra-curricular factors that might influence children's academic performance.

A number of studies have yielded a positive relationship between parental aspiration for the education of their children and their academic
achievement (Finlayson, 1971; Fotheringham and Creal, 1980; Soto, 1988; Cherian, 1991 and 1994). Bee (1992) has pointed out that parents who have high expectations of their child to do well in academic matters have children who show most rapid cognitive progress.

In a Canadian study, Fotheringham and Creal (1980) found that parental expectations of children were associated with 19 percent of the variance in academic achievement; While a Sri Lankan study by Nile (1981) found that 12 percent of the variance was associated with parental aspiration.

Hill (1980) opines that parental beliefs influence children's perceptions of their own abilities, their attitudes, and expectations for success and failure. These directly affect the children's cognitive performance. With regard to studies conducted by Parsons, Alder, and Kaczala (1982), it has been noted that boy's and girl's expectancies of success were more highly correlated with their parents' expectations for them than with their own past performance.

Au and Harackiewicz (1986) studied on Chinese children, the effects of perceived parental expectations on their mathematics performance and found that while taking arithmetic test anticipating
parental evaluation, the performance was better for those who perceived their parents as having higher expectations of them. In contrast, performance in the peer evaluation condition was unrelated to perceived parental expectation.

Studies have shown that parents' achievement beliefs, attitudes and values not only guide their behaviour with their children (Alexander and Entwisle, 1988; Entwisle and Hayduk, 1988), but also appear to have an influence on their children's achievement beliefs (Eccles, 1983; Phillips, 1987). For example, Phillips (1987) reported that among a group of uniformly high achieving children, perceptions of academic competence were influenced more by parents' perceptions than by the children's record of achievement.

Smith (1991) conducted a study on 7th and 9th graders and found that student's expectations had moderately strong positive association with perceived parental, particularly maternal educational goals.

From the studies reviewed relating parental expectations and academic achievement, it is found that parental expectation is an important non-cognitive variable influencing academic achievement. There are a number of studies showing a positive relationship between
parental aspirations for the education of their children and academic achievement. It is seen that parental beliefs and aspirations for studies influence children's expectancies for success or failure, which in turn affect their academic achievement.

2.1.4. Parental Academic Pressure in Relation to Academic Achievement and Psychological Maladjustment in Children

There are reports in the American media which portray east Asian students (in China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Japan) especially those in high schools as nervous, depressed, and generally overburdened by the pressures of trying to maintain high levels of academic excellence (Holman, 1991; Watanabe, 1992). However, there are many studies showing the superiority in academic performance of Chinese and Japanese students over American students (Stevenson et al., 1986, 1990; McKnight et al., 1987; Lapointe et al., 1992).

Crystal et al. (1994) conducted a cross cultural study of 1,247 Japanese, 1,663 Chinese and 1,386 American High school students on psychological maladjustment and its relation to academic achievement, parental expectations and parental satisfaction. Asian students reported higher levels of parental expectation and lower levels of parental satisfaction concerning academic achievement than their American peers.
Nevertheless, Japanese students reported less stress, lower levels of depressed mood, aggression and academic anxiety, and fewer somatic complaints than did American students. Chinese students reported less stress, academic anxiety, and aggressive feelings than their American counterparts; but did report higher frequencies of depressed mood and somatic complaints. High academic achievement as assessed by a test of mathematics was generally not associated with psychological maladjustment. The only exception was in the United States, where high achievers indicated more frequent feelings of stress than did low achievers.

A survey carried out in Ireland as part of a major study by the Department of Education on more than 10,000 Junior and Leaving Certificate students and over 1200 school leavers found intense examination stress in the students and placed much of the blame on the high expectations of parents (Irish Independent (Dublin), 26 June 1995). It is reported that females are likely to have much higher levels of stress than males and both boys and girls feel greater strain, experience greater loss of sleep and loss of confidence at Leaving Certificate level than at Junior Certificate level. The study found that parental expectations appear to have a much stronger effect on girls’ experience of stress than on their male counterparts. Bright students who have higher
verbal/numerical abilities or who do well in the Junior Certificate examination tend to show higher stress levels, and this was because of the associated expectations and pressures on higher ability pupils.

A recent report from the children’s charity Childline found that secondary school pupils in Britain worry more about work and exams than anything else. More than 1,000 children who called the helpline were surveyed and the results showed that eight out of every 10 worry about examination and school work, and nearly seven out of 10 are anxious about the future. Many of the callers believed that both their parents and their teachers had expectations of them which were far too high, which left them feeling both frustrated and vulnerable, and very stressed (BBC Breakfast News, 23 April 1996; Sunday Independent (Dublin), 28 April 1996).

In India there are no large scale empirical studies which investigated the psychological adjustment of adolescents in relation to mounting academic pressures. Nevertheless, a number of reports have appeared in magazines, and newspapers, regarding the psychological problems of children, with mounting academic pressure as an important causative factor including pressurisation from parents (Femina, 8 September 1990; Femina, 8 September 1994; Indian Express Sunday
A cover story-report published in Femina, September 8, 1994, blames over-ambitious parents for escalating the pressure on children to achieve more in studies, causing psychological problems and under-achievement in studies. The report says that most parents consider their child either as an extension of themselves or a means of realising their dreams. A bad performance from a child can mean a loss of face and most parents find it difficult to reconcile to the fact that their children are of average intelligence. The report also presents a few cases of the victims of parental over-ambition.

With regard to the situation in Kerala, Menon (1993) has reported in Indian Express on the alarming rise in stress-related problems of the students as pressures to excel academically mount. He reports that as many as 18 percent of students between the ages of 14 and 16 in several upmarket schools in the Thiruvananthapuram suffer from examination-related stress, according to preliminary random surveys conducted by the Voluntary Organisation for Youth Counselling (VOYCE) in 1992.
According to Bilwani, as reported in Femina September 8, 1994, out of the 500 to 600 cases registered each year at the Civic Hospital, Ahmedabad, almost 50 percent have scholastic problems that range from inability to concentrate to a total lack of interest in studies. Bilwani points out that, in most cases, "Children lack an independent method of learning and as there are few creative outlets for children, they slowly start developing an aversion for studies." Char (1990) observes that too much academic pressure can make a child diffident in life, leading to failure.

2.1.5. Evaluation of Literature and Relevance of the Present Study

The foregoing literature on parenting variables and academic achievement has given a theoretical perspective to the problem under study.

There is general agreement among recent researchers that parental involvement in the context of an authoritative home environment facilitates academic success by promoting motivational inner resources in children (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992; Lamborn et al., 1991, 1994; Grolnick et al., 1991; Oh-Hwang, 1995).
Parental expectation for academic achievement is found to be associated with better academic achievement. However, there are no studies relating parental over-expectation and children’s academic achievement or interest in studies.

The literature on academic pressure in relation to academic achievement and psychological maladjustment has also been reviewed. Surprisingly, recent surveys carried out in Britain and Ireland have found a large number of secondary school pupils suffering from severe examination stress, mainly due to their parents’ high expectations. Crystal et al. (1994) comment that intense academic pressure and rigid teaching methods are stereotypically associated with Asian education. Regarding the situation in India, many psychiatrists and educationalists report that Indian children are under pressure to be high achievers and a considerable amount of pressure is exerted by parents by making unrealistic demands on their children. Menon (1993) also has reported on the alarming rise in stress-related problems of the students of Kerala. This information is not based on empirical evidence. Thus, there is an urgent need in India to make a systematic and scientific study about the deleterious effects of parental pressurisation in studies. The present study is an attempt in this direction.
2.2. SELF-ESTEEM

The empirical evidence relating self-esteem and other study variables gives a theoretical perspective to the problem under study and also reveals unexplored areas. Therefore, the literature on self-esteem related to the present study are reviewed under the following subsections.

2.2.1. Conceptualisation of Self-esteem

The literature on 'self-esteem' shows that several researchers have conceptualised the term and the explanations given by them are given below.

Self-esteem is frequently described in terms of evaluative attitudes. According to Rosenberg (1965), self-esteem means 'the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself: it expresses an attitude of approval or disapproval. Coopersmith (1967) has also defined the concept in a similar way. According to Bachman and O'Malley (1977), self-esteem refers to an individual's self-evaluation or judgement of his/her own worth. According to Pavur and Little (1981) self-esteem is the total set of evaluative attitudes about one's worth as a person in a variety of situations. Mussen et al. (1984) distinguish self-
esteem from self-concept and indicate that self-esteem is not identical to self-concept, though the two are often confused. The self-concept is a set of ideas about oneself that is descriptive rather than judgmental. Self-esteem, on the other hand, refers to one's evaluation of one's own qualities. Researchers like Bee (1992), Santrock (1994), Zigler and Stevenson (1987), and Sprinthall and Collins (1995) agree that self-esteem is the evaluative and affective dimension of self-concept. Self-esteem also is referred to as self-worth or self-image.

Some of the definitions conceive 'self-esteem' in terms of the relation between two sets of attitudes. According to Cohen (1959) self-esteem is the degree of correspondence between an individual's ideal and actual concept of himself; he considers it as a discrepancy between ideals and actual attainment. Silber and Tippett (1965) explain the term as the attitude a person has toward himself which is presumed to reflect the approximation of the person's self-image, how he actually sees himself with his own ideal self-image and how he would really like to be. Carlson (1965) has pointed out that if people are to have self-esteem, there must be a correspondence between their concepts of self and their self-ideals. Harter's interesting research on self-esteem (Harter, 1988, 1990) shows that self-esteem is the degree of discrepancy between the value an individual places on some skill or quality and the amount of that skill or
quality the individual sees herself as having. Block and Robins (1993) defined self-esteem as "the extent to which one perceives oneself as relatively close to being the person one wants to be."

Many investigators have considered self-esteem as a psychological response. Rogers (1950) describes acceptance of self as a tendency of the person to perceive himself as a person of worth, worthy of respect rather than condemnation. Rosenberg (1965) has stated that high self-esteem expresses the feeling that one is 'good-enough' and the individual feels that he is a person of worth. Low self-esteem on the other hand implies self-rejection, self-dissatisfaction and self-contempt. According to Forsman and Johnson (1996) self-acceptance refer to the individual's evaluation of his self-concepts and his coping-abilities, and correlates with basic self-esteem.

While defining the concept, some authors have viewed self-esteem as a personality function. Ziller et al. (1969) define self-esteem as a component of the self-system which regulates the extent to which the self-system is maintained under conditions of strain, such as during the processing of new information concerning the self. Zigler and Stevenson (1987) consider self-esteem as a vital part of the child's personality, affecting all aspects of her behaviour.
Apart from the definitions and descriptions given above, it seems relevant to mention the various terms used by different authors with meanings more or less similar to self-esteem. Fouche and Grobbelaar (1970), for example, stressed one's self-confidence in defining self-esteem. Wells and Marwell (1976) consider the term self-acceptance and self-esteem as equivalent. In her critical review of measures of self-concept, Wylie (1974) used the words, 'self-regard' or 'self-regarding attitudes' as generic terms to include self-satisfaction, self-acceptance, self-esteem, self-favourability, congruence between self and ideal self, and discrepancies between self and ideal self.

Thus, the literature on the conceptualisations of self-esteem have presented the term as an evaluative, judgmental, or affective aspect of a person's self-conception and also as the discrepancy between self-image and ideal self-image.

2.2.2. Components/Dimensions of Self-esteem

Some authors have made an attempt to describe the nature of self-esteem by analysing the components and specifying the various aspects of it.
According to Simpson and Boyle (1975) there are three specific types of self-esteem: global self-esteem (resulting from a general evaluation), specific self-esteem (related to a situation or role such as work), and task specific self-esteem (related to competence in a particular activity).

Shavelson, Hubner, and Stanton (1976), after analysing the components of self-esteem, found that general self-esteem lies at the top of a hierarchy and can be separated into academic and non-academic components. The latter is assumed to be further divisible into physical, emotional and social aspects.

Franks and Marolla (1976) conceive self-esteem as having two interacting dimensions: outer self-esteem (which gives rise to feelings of self-worth), and inner self-esteem (which gives rise to feelings of power and competence). Self-esteem consists of "inner or outer" self-esteem (Gecas and Schwalbe, 1983), where inner refers to the self-esteem which is acquired by one's own, and outer by other's appraisal of one's success.

Franks and Marolla (1976) also distinguish between "given or earned", where 'given' refers to the self-esteem which is based on "the reflected appraisal of others" (Mead, 1934) and 'earned' to the self-esteem
which is a result of the individual's appraisals of his ability to cope with an impartial world so as to obtain desired goals by his own intentional acts. The former is supposed to be accompanied by a more passive orientation and the latter by a more active orientation.

Flemings and Watts (1980) have reported three factors of self-esteem, namely, social confidence, school abilities and self-regard. Some authors like Mc Farlin and Blascovich (1981) differentiate between 'chronic' and 'acute' self-esteem. Chronic self-esteem involves the relatively enduring perception of overall worth or competence, while acute self-esteem refers to an individual's perception of worth or competence within the context of a specific task or setting.

According to Harter (1982b) self-esteem may vary according to different skill domains or areas of competence. The Self-Perception Profile for children taps five specific domains-scholastic competence, athletic competence, social acceptance, physical appearance and behavioural conduct-plus general self-worth (Harter, 1985). The Self-Perception Profile for Adolescents taps eight domains (Harter, 1989), including three skill domains not present in the children's version-job competence, romantic appeal, and close friendship. A recent study by

To conclude, many researchers have indicated the need for understanding the children's domain-specific aspects of self-esteem, while measuring the global self-worth.

2.2.3. The Antecedents of Self-esteem

The antecedent factors of self-esteem reviewed here serve as a theoretical backdrop to the problem under present study. The strongest and most convincing general formulations of the antecedents of self-esteem were expressed by James (1890) and Mead (1934).

James' analysis particularly as revealed in 'Principles of Psychology' (1890), explains the possible influences upon self-esteem. James concludes that human aspirations and values have an essential role in determining whether one regards oneself favourably. According to him, one's achievements are measured against his/her aspirations for any given area of behaviour. If achievement approaches or meets aspirations in a valued area, the result is high self-esteem; if there is wide divergence, then we regard ourselves poorly.
Another source of self-esteem, according to James, is the value placed upon extensions of the self. James views the self as "the sum total of all the material possessions, family members, his reputation and work. If they wax and prosper, he feels 'triumphant'; if they dwindle and die away, he feels 'cast down'."

In addition to the material constituents of the self, James proposes a "social self which is the recognition he gets from his peers. A man has as many social selves as there are people who recognise him." The enhancement of a man's extended self, be it his body, race, father or reputation, would thus be expected to raise self-esteem, and derogation would be expected to have the opposite effect.

According to Mead (1934) an individual internalises the ideas and attitudes expressed by key figures in his life and this holds true for attitudes and actions expressed towards himself as well as towards external objects. He develops self-attitudes consistent with those expressed by the significant others in his world. From Mead's formulation, one can conclude that self-esteem is largely derived from the reflected appraisal of others. If he places high value on himself, there have been key persons in his life who have treated him with respect. Horney (1945, 1950) describes a wide range of adverse factors like
domination, indifference, lack of respect, disparagement, lack of admiration, lack of warmth, isolation, and discrimination which might produce feelings of helplessness and isolation, which she terms "basic anxiety" that can cause unhappiness and reduced personal effectiveness. She indicates that the common antecedent of all these conditions is a disturbance in the relationship between parent and child. Sullivan (1953) asserts that the self develops in social interaction, and that significant others, such as parents, play a role in this process. Behaviours of significant others are perceived by the child as symbols of his or her worth.

Adler (1927) places greater stress on the importance of actual weakness and infirmities in producing low self-esteem.

Rogers (1951) argues that a permissive atmosphere which permits free expression of ideas and does not resort to harsh or frequent evaluative comparisons, enables the individual to know and accept himself. Conflicts can be averted if parents and significant others accept the views and values of the child, although, they need not necessarily agree with him. In this way, the child can come to respect himself, gain assurance in driving his own values, and learn to trust himself as a locus of experience.
To conclude, there are many factors contributing to the development of self-esteem. First and foremost is the amount of respectful, accepting, and concerned treatment that an individual receives from the significant others in his life. A second factor contributing to self-esteem is one's history of successes and the status and position he/she holds in the world. Finally, if an individual is able to live up to his values and aspirations for success, then, that individual achieves high self-esteem.

2.2.4. Parenting Behaviours/Attitudes and Self-esteem

Much research has been conducted relating parenting to self-esteem. A brief review of the extensive literature is presented below.

An important context for the evolution of one's self-esteem is the family and the kinds of interactions that occur among family members. Wylie (1961) points out that all personality theorists who are concerned with the study of the self, give great importance to parent-child interaction in the development of self-perception.

The extensive studies by Coopersmith (1967) on American pre-adolescent children have indicated that there are three important parental treatments which act as antecedents to children's self-esteem. They are:
total or nearly total acceptance of the children by their parents, clearly
defined and enforced limits, and respect and latitude for individual
action (freedom from restriction) that exist within the defined limits.

The major conclusions of the studies conducted by Rosenberg
(1965), Coopersmith (1967), Bachman (1970), and Thomas et al., (1974)
were that parental support of and parental willingness to grant autonomy
and freedom to their children are positively related to high self-esteem
among the children. The above kind of behaviour, according to Gecas
and Schwalbe, (1986) conveys to the child information about his or her
inherent worth and suggests to the child that the parent trusts the child
and considers him or her to be a responsible person. This too has
favourable consequences for the child's self-esteem.

The parents of low self-esteem boys are critical and rejective of
their children (Hanson and Maynard, 1973). According to Baumrind
(1975) high self-esteem adolescent boys have parents who are democratic
but also less permissive than those of low self-esteem boys. Low self-
esteeem boys have parents who are sometimes permissive but occasionally
harsh when their children go beyond the limits they will tolerate.
Sometimes the parents are too restrictive and inconsistent in their
discipline (Hamacheck, 1976).
Miller (1976) in a study of 203 eighth graders and their mothers, found that mothers who are empathetic, genuine, and possessing positive regard, have children with high levels of self-esteem compared to mothers lacking in these qualities.

Modell's (1978) study on 30 boys and 30 girls (age 10-11 years) indicated that the permissiveness of mothers is associated with high self-esteem of daughters. Also, the relation between maternal restrictiveness and self-esteem of sons is found to be non-significant. The results further indicate that, with fathers, permissiveness is related to high self-esteem and restrictiveness to low self-esteem in both sons and daughters.

The study undertaken by Soavedra (1978) on a sample of 60 adolescent males indicated that there exists a linear relationship between adolescent's reported perception of parental warmth or acceptance and the feelings of self-esteem.

According to Kokenes (1978) high self-esteem adolescents report that their parents accept, understand and like them; those with low self-esteem have parents who use psychological pressure techniques such as withdrawal of love, guilt, or self-pity to control them. Students whose parents give supportive responses and other positive behaviour have
higher self-esteem than those who report indifferent or critical responses. Their parents are strict but consistent and they demand high standards, although they are also flexible enough to allow deviations from rules under special circumstances (Graybill, 1978).

Adolescents who are physically abused by parents develop a low self-esteem (Hiroth, 1982). Another study has shown that maternal loving and demanding dimensions (actions that communicate acceptance and approval towards children) exhibited positive relationships with children's self-esteem, while maternal punishment (use of arbitrary force or restrictiveness) showed a negative relationship (Peterson, Southworth, Peters, 1983).

Children who have a good relation with parents tend to show better social adjustment and self-esteem development (Mac Donald and Parke, 1984; Demo, Small, and Savin-Williams, 1987).

In a Chinese study, Cheung and Lau (1985) showed that a good relationship with parents is associated most noticeably with higher self-esteem in adolescents. They also found that relationship with parents was a stronger predictor of self-esteem than that with school.
Gecas and Schwalbe (1986) obtained significant correlation between adolescents’ self-esteem and their perception of parental support, autonomy control, and participation, but they found little correspondence between parent’s reports of the same behaviour and adolescent self-esteem.

An Indian study by Singh and Singh (1986) on 200, 17-21-year-old students examined whether self-concept of the subjects was affected by the type of family discipline. The results indicated that general self-concept is more positive in normal discipline (ND) than in harsh discipline group; self-confidence, worthiness, feelings of shame and guilt, sociability, and emotional stability were more positive in the ND group than in the harsh discipline group.

Numerous investigators have demonstrated relationships between adolescents’ self-esteem and their perception of their parents’ supporting and controlling behaviour (Openshaw, Thomas, and Rollins, 1981; Barber and Thomas, 1986; Felson and Zielinski, 1989; Barber, 1990). All of these studies have found that parental supportive behaviour is positively related to self-esteem and various types of negative controlling behaviours have been found to be negatively related to self-esteem.
The study by Kinney and Emilie (1989) focused on parental beliefs about child rearing and children's perception of parental behaviour on self-esteem. The study showed that the higher the degree of democracy in maternal behaviour, the greater the likelihood for higher achievement, academic self-esteem and general self-esteem in children.

The study conducted by Joubert (1991) on 50 male and 84 female college students, revealed that sons with higher scores in self-esteem reported that their mothers were fairer and less likely to use verbal abuse, and daughters with high self-esteem reported both of their parents were more interested in their activities and refrained from verbal abuse.

Barber et al. (1992) have found that parenting behaviours (e.g., support and control) were significantly related to self-esteem in U.S. adolescents, while the same parenting behaviours were not related to self-esteem in German adolescents.

Buri et al. (1992) investigated the stability of parental nurturance as a salient predictor of self-esteem for seven distinct adolescent and early adulthood age groups (N= 784). The analysis showed that even though mother's and father's nurturance together were more strongly related to self-esteem during the junior school years than during the high school
and college years, parental nurturance still remained a robust predictor of self-esteem during these latter years.

Lau and Leung (1992) conducted a study on 1668 Chinese secondary school students and the results showed that better relation with parents was associated with higher general, academic, appearance, social and physical ability self-concepts.

Hopkins and Klein (1993) found a positive relation between parental nurturance and global self-worth. Nurturance also showed a positive relationship with several dimensions of self-perception. This research underscored the importance of nurturance in the development of self-esteem and the usefulness of a multidimensional construct of self-perception.

Nielsen and Metha (1994) investigated the relationships between multiple dimensions of self-esteem and adolescent’s perceptions of parental behaviours using non-clinical (N=119) and clinical (N=30) samples of adolescents. Perceptions of parental behaviours were consistently unrelated to dimensions of self-esteem among adolescents in the clinical sample. Among adolescents in the non-clinical sample, perception of parental support and autonomy granting were related to
multiple dimensions of self-esteem. Perceptions of parental discipline were inconsistently related to dimensions of non-clinical self-esteem.

Behamdouni (1996) found that mother’s acceptance was significantly and positively associated with adolescent’s self-esteem and was also found to be the most powerful predictor of adolescent self-esteem. Other significant predictors of self-esteem were mother’s use of firm discipline and psychological control and father’s authoritativeness.

From the literature reviewed relating parenting behaviours and self-esteem, it is seen that most of the studies have focused on adolescents as subjects and many investigators have used adolescents’ perception of their parents’ supporting and controlling behaviour as an important study variable (Openshaw et al., 1981; Barber and Thomas, 1986; Gecas and Schwalbe, 1986; Felson and Zielinski, 1989; Kinney, and Emilie, 1989; Barber, 1990; Joubert, 1991; Nielsen and Metha, 1994). This may be because, many early theorists like Mead (1934) and Sullivan (1953) have asserted that perceived parental behaviours are reliably predictive of self-esteem.

To summarise, all the studies reviewed here have shown that there is consensus among researchers that parental nurturance, support,
participation and allowance of freedom within well-prescribed limits have a positive effect on adolescents' self-esteem, and severe controlling behaviours have been found to be negatively related to self-esteem. Indian studies relating parenting behaviour and self-esteem are not available except that of Singh and Singh (1986) relating type of family discipline and late adolescents' self-concept.

2.2.5. Self-esteem and Academic Achievement

Self-esteem is found to be an important personality variable related to the academic achievement of children. An increasing amount of evidence supports the theory that there is a correlation between self-concept and achievement in school (Bell and Ward, 1980). A review of literature showing the pattern of association of these two variables is given below.

In an extensive study on pre-adolescent children, Coopersmith (1967) has found that their Grade Point Average is positively and significantly related to their self-esteem.

According to Hansen and Maynard (1973) the relationship between negative self-concept and school achievement begins very early.
A positive relationship between self-esteem and academic achievement has been reported in several other studies also like those of Caplan (1969), Weidman, Phelan, and Sullivan, (1972), and Yates (1975).

Fairly strong correlation were found between self-esteem during high school and later educational and occupational attainment, by Bachman and O'Malley (1977). The results further revealed that self-esteem had no causative effect on later attainment. It appears that self-esteem and later attainment are heavily influenced by prior causal factors such as academic ability, past academic performance and family socio-economic level. In other words, academic talent and performance contribute to self-esteem during high school and also later academic and occupational attainments. But, self-esteem adds very little by way of a contribution to later attainment. In a similar investigation, a positive relation between self-esteem and academic achievement is reported on a female sample (O'Malley and Bachman, 1979).

Strathe and Hash (1979) have pointed out that there are significant and positive correlations between self-concept and academic performance and that studies on school drop-outs show that low aspirations, accomplishments, and self-esteem were already present or predictable by the start of the tenth grade.
An Indian study by Thomas and Sanandaraj (1982) conducted on a sample ninth grade students in Kerala, found that the correlation between self-esteem and academic achievement is positive and statistically significant.

A correlational study on Mexican American adolescents (N=87) showed that self-esteem had a low but significant correlation with reading achievement of the subjects. But, it had no significant relationships with the subject's Grade Point and achievement in Mathematics (Powers and Sanchez, 1982).

The review of studies relating self-esteem and academic achievement given above has shown that there are a number of studies which indicate a positive correlation between self-esteem and academic achievement (Coopersmith, 1967; Caplan, 1969; Wiedman et al., 1972; Yates, 1975; O'Malley and Bachman, 1977, 1979; Strathe and Hash, 1979; Thomas and Sanandaraj, 1982). In the academic sphere, it was assumed for many years that the 'causal order' of the links ran from self-esteem to achievement (Coleman, Campbell, and Hobson, 1966). Regarding this, Purkey (1970) reasons that students who have confidence in themselves have the courage to try and are motivated to live up to what they believe about themselves. Students who have negative attitudes about
themselves impose limitations on their own achievement. More recent findings and more detailed investigations have suggested that the causal ordering of the links between self-esteem and attainment are different from those first assumed (Rutter and Hay, 1994).

There is now considerable evidence (Harter, 1983; Dweck, 1986; Chapman, Lambourne, and Silva, 1990) for a more complex sequence of effects, with self-esteem following from (rather than contributing directly to) achievement, but in its turn playing a crucial role in mediating future motivation and achievement related behaviours.

According to Maruyama, Rubin, and Kingsbury (1981) self-esteem is more likely to be an outcome than a cause of school achievement. Strathe and Hash (1979) have pointed out that a positive self-concept contributes to high achievement, and high achievement in turn can enhance self-concept.

According to Bednar et al. (1989), achievement can improve children's self-esteem. The emphasis on the importance of achievement in improving self-esteem has much in common with Bandura's (1977) cognitive social-learning concept of self-efficacy, which refers to individual's belief that he can master a situation and produce positive
outcomes, and also James's (1890) famous formula: Self-esteem = success/pretensions.

Finally, the significant positive correlation also indicates that the academic achievement can contribute to the development of self-esteem and the two factors are mutually reinforcing.

Pottebaum, Keith, and Ehly (1986) have suggested that there may not be a causal relation between self-concept and achievement but a third unknown variable may be causally predominant over both self-concept and achievement.

Khursid and Fatima (1984) made a comparative study of the personality traits of high and low achievers including 408 high school students in India and found that in comparison to low achievers, high achievers are more self-sufficient.

Roma and Tiwari (1984) found that high scholastic achievers possess a higher self-concept when compared to low achievers. Thus in India the studies relating self-esteem and academic achievement are very few. This necessitates further research relating the two variables.
2.2.6. Gender Differences and Self-esteem

De Man (1982) in a study on adolescents and young adults found that male subjects who were brought up by strictly controlling parents reported lower self-esteem than other subjects. But in the case of female subjects, the autonomy-control variation in parental attitude had no effect in the self-esteem of adolescents and young adult.

The study conducted by Demo, Small, and Savin-Williams (1987) indicates that self-esteem of boys, compared to that of girls, is more strongly related to family relation, and they explain this difference due to greater parental responsiveness to the self-esteem of boys than of girls, that is responsiveness in terms of control and support behaviour. Adolescent boys may express and communicate their self-esteem in ways that prompt parents to respond with support, control, or communication, while girls provide fewer or more subtle expressions and thereby deny parents’ potential cues for appropriate responses.

A study on young adolescents (N= 1,850) by Wigfield et al. (1991) found that boys reported higher self-esteem than girls. The study on Chinese adolescents by Lau and Leung (1992) noted that boys and girls...
were similarly affected by relation with parents in their self-concept and boys in general were higher than girls in all domains of self-concept.

Thus, while reviewing the pattern of sex difference and self-esteem, De Man (1982) and Demo et al. (1987) found that self-esteem of boys is more affected by relation with parents; while Lau and Leung did not find this difference. Wigfield et al. (1991), and Lau and Leung (1992) found higher scores of self-esteem for males. The studies on gender differences and self-esteem are worthy of attention specially in the Indian context, where differential treatment is believed to be shown by parents towards their sons and daughters.

2.27. Socio-economic Status and Self-esteem

The studies of Rosenberg (1965) and Ziller (1969) have shown that a significant positive relationship exists between socio-economic status and self-esteem. However, Coopersmith (1967) obtained only a weak relationship between the two variables.

According to Brown and Renz (1973) adolescents from lower socio-economic status families have lower self-esteem than those from higher status families; and membership in a disadvantaged group often has an important influence on self-concept.
One of the aspect of socio-economic status, namely occupational status, was considered in a study by Bachman and O'Malley (1977) which showed a positive relationship between occupational status of the subjects and self-esteem.

Stern (1977) examined the relationship between social class and self-ideal congruence. The study supported the hypothesis that subjects from higher social classes possess greater congruence of self-concept than subjects from lower social classes.

A study on Blacks and Whites by Taylor and Walsh (1979) showed that when socio-economic status is controlled, the global self-esteem of Blacks is at least as high as that of Whites. Rice (1984) is of the opinion that socio-economic status of the parents cannot by itself produce low self-esteem children. Lower class, low income families produce high self-esteem children, if the parents' self-esteem is high and the parental self-esteem depend on the self-acceptance of the parents within their community.

The above findings by Western investigators indicate that socio-economic status of the family has a significant and positive relation to self-esteem and the relation may be direct or indirect.
2.2.8. Evaluation of Literature and Relevance of the Present Study

The literature reviewed here has given a theoretical perspective regarding the formation of self-esteem. Many early theorists assert that the self develops from reflected appraisals of others (Mead, 1934) and in social interactions with key persons, mainly parents, characterised by freedom, respect and warmth (Horney, 1945, 1950; Rogers, 1951; Sullivan, 1953).

There is an emerging consensus among recent researchers that parental verbal abuse and various types of negative controlling behaviours have unfavourable consequences on children's self-esteem. There is hardly any Indian study relating parenting behaviour and self-esteem. Therefore, the present study aims to study the association of parental academic pressure variables and self-esteem. Excepting for the study by Thomas and Sanandraj (1982), no serious attempt has been made to relate self-esteem and academic achievement, even though there are studies relating self-concept and academic achievement. The present study finds out the association between self-esteem and academic achievement. Gender differences in self-esteem among Indian students is mostly an unexplored area and also information is wanting as regards the relationship between socio-economic status and self-esteem. Therefore, a
systematic and scientific study relating self-esteem and the variables: academic achievement, sex, and socio-economic status is highly warranted in the Indian context.

2.3. CREATIVITY

In the present investigation creativity is an important variable studied in relation to factors like, parental pressure, academic interest, self-esteem, academic achievement, socio-economic status, and gender. Hence the literature on creativity related to the study variables is reviewed and presented under the following headings.

2.3.1. Conceptualisation of Creativity

2.3.1.1 Definition

Researchers studying creativity during the past five decades have developed different definitions and different approaches about creativity.

An early approach to the study of creativity is to consider it as a special kind of thinking. It is also the most popular way of looking at creativity. Guilford (1956) was the first to make the distinction between two basic kinds of thinking, namely, convergent thinking and divergent
thinking, while explaining his model of intellect. Guilford (1967) explained that divergent thinking is the ability to generate a range of possible solutions to a given problem, in particular to a problem for which there is no single right answer. Guilford argued that creativity is synonymous with divergent thinking and is distinct from IQ performance, which more resembled convergent thinking. He believed that creative thinking included the following: (1) thinking up unique answers even when not asked specifically to do so; (2) being able to think of many associations to a single word; (3) being able to think of many ideas related to a single word or problem; (4) being able to look at an old problem in a new way; and (5) seeing how common objects can be used for new purposes. Tests of creativity have been devised based on Guilford's theory. The best known of these, the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking, incorporates different tasks to assess divergent thinking.

Some psychologists defined creativity as a psychic process. They lay more stress on the process working within the psyche of the creator. Torrance (1966) a leading researcher on creativity has described creative thinking as a process of becoming sensitive to problems, deficiencies, gaps in knowledge, missing elements, disharmonies, and so on, identifying the difficulty, searching for solutions, making guesses, or formulating hypotheses about the deficiencies, testing and re-testing these hypotheses,
possibly modifying and re-testing them, and finally communicating the results.

One way of defining creativity is to apply the four criteria of novelty, appropriateness, transcendence of constraints, and coalescence of meaning (Jackson and Messick, 1968). A creative idea may transcend constraints by lending a new perspective to something with which we are all familiar and most creative ideas have meaning that coalesce over time, which means the depth and value of an extremely creative idea often are not apparent at first, but become more obvious as time passes.

According to Fontana (1981) creativity is a kind of thinking that involves originality and fluency, that breaks away from existing patterns and introduces something new. Wallace (1986) discusses creativity as involving thinking, intuition, feeling and sensing.

Perkins (1984) based on his research and analysis of literature has presented the snow flake model of creativity. Like the six sides of a snow flake, each with its own complex structure, Perkin's model consists of six characteristics common to highly creative individuals. They are: commitment to a personal aesthetic, excellence in finding problems, mental mobility, willingness to take risks, objectivity and inner
motivation. Children and adults who are creative may not have all the six characteristics, but the more they have, the more creative they tend to be.

Fogel and Melson (1988) suggest that creativity involves the freedom to experiment with materials and to generate novel responses to them. They have defined creativity as a flow experience that takes-on broader meaning than simply insight or resourcefulness. They assert that creativity can apply to the entire life project of an individual: the ability to use internal resources, to face challenges, avoid boredom and anxiety, and feel satisfied and happy with one's life.

Fryer and Collings (1991) investigated the teachers' views about creativity and its development with a sample of 1,028 teachers and further education lecturers from England, Wales and Ireland. The study revealed that creativity was perceived mainly in terms of "imagination", "originality", and "self-expression". Only half the sample regarded "divergence" as synonymous with creativity. Most of them thought that creativity could be developed, but almost three-quarters thought it was a rare gift. Santrock (1994) defines creativity as the ability to think about something in novel and unusual ways and to come up with unique solutions to problems.
Thus, while analysing the meaning of creativity as given by psychologists like Fontana (1981), and Santrock (1994), it is found that they have incorporated the conceptualisation of Guilford, considering creativity as a thinking ability that brings about novel and unusual solutions to problems.

Not everyone is satisfied with the idea that creativity is solely a type of thinking or is the same as divergent thinking (Mansfield, Busse and Krepelka, 1978). Some consider this a rather narrow definition and point out that evidence shows that divergent thinking in childhood is not highly correlated with creative activities in adulthood (Feldhusen and Clinkenbeard, 1987). Some see divergent thinking as one of the components that creative activity comprises. Keating (1980), expands the definition of creativity to include, along with divergent thinking, content knowledge, the ability to communicate, and the ability to critically analyse.

2.3.1.2. The Creative Process

According to Fontana (1981), the creative act typically involves four stages. They are: "preparation", which is primarily concerned with the recognition that a particular problem is worthy of study, or particular
theme is suitable for a book or a picture or a piece of music, "incubation" during which the problem or the theme is mulled over, often at an unconscious level, "inspiration", when the possible solution to the problem or a flood of ideas for the book etc., come abruptly into the conscious mind, and "verification", the last stage when the solution is put to the test or the ideas are tried out on paper or on canvas.

A theoretical perspective to creativity in everyday life is given by Csikszentmihalyi and Larson (1984). Creativity arises in everyday tasks such as cooking, doing school work, and solving difficult interpersonal problems with friends and within the family. According to them creative people have a profound involvement with their activity, which combines a loss of self-consciousness with deep concentration. The experience is subjectively pleasing and at the same time requires highly complex use of mental or physical skills. Further, the state of consciousness in which a person is totally involved and committed to the activity is called flow, "a condition in which one feels whole and acts with clarity, commitment, and enthusiasm". Csikszentmihalyi and Larson, (1984) have given a model of flow experience that suggests that flow experience will occur when skills match the challenges of a situation. Thus high school students enjoy classes in which their efforts pay off in mastery, and not
the classes in which they are overwhelmed with works which are too boring (Mayers, 1978; Csikszentmihalyi, 1978).

Fisher (1990) has identified five stages in the working of the creative process. They are stimulus, exploration, planning, activity, and review. Regarding the first stage, stimulus, he says that initial stimulus may be prompted by an awareness that there is a problem to be solved. This can be a challenge offered by parent or teacher. In the second stage, exploration, children can be helped to move beyond their first ideas and to consider alternatives before making a decision. The third stage, planning, involves defining the problem or task and gathering of information or data. The fourth stage, activity, means doing something with one's own ideas. The last stage, review, means evaluation of the idea that has been realised or a problem that is solved. According to Fisher (1990) the very young can be trained to use their judgement and imagination to evaluate their ideas. This is where creative process becomes subject to critical thinking and where Piaget's second goal of education 'to form minds which can be critical, can verify, and not accept everything they are offered' becomes so important.

To sum up the literature on the creative process, Fontana (1981) and Fisher (1990) suggest that creative thinking does not occur
spontaneously, but an intentional and sustained effort is required by the child and it involves several stages. The stage-wise development of creativity process is of great importance because adults working with the children can influence, positively or negatively, the continuity of the flow process. Investigators like Mayers (1978) and Csikszentmihalyi (1978) assert that children overwhelmed with work (can be too much academic pressure) or those with very boring environment with no challenges, cannot experience the creativity flow in their daily life.

2.3.2. Parenting Environment and Creativity

Today researchers are looking at creativity, not as a faculty of the human elite, but as a basic human endowment. Thus, all children are born with creative potential and the significant persons in their life, mainly the parents and teachers should provide a climate to support the children's creative efforts. The literature relating parenting environment and creativity is given under two headings, namely, (1) psychological climate and creativity and (2) parent-child relationship and creativity.

2.3.2.1. Psychological Climate and Creativity

Rogers (1961) says that human beings require two conditions if they are to function creatively, psychological freedom and psychological
safety. The child's sense of psychological safety, he says may result from three related processes: (1) accepting the child as an individual of unconditional worth and having a faith in the child no matter what his/her present state is, (2) avoiding external evaluation and encouraging self-evaluation, and (3) empathising with the child, trying to see the world from the child's point of view, understanding and accepting him. Fisher (1990) observes that psychological freedom fosters creativity by permitting children's freedom of expression. Children should feel secure enough to try out new things and be given the freedom to do so, within bounds.

Shainess (1989) discusses the possible roots of creativity, noting the distinction between productivity and creativity, and listed the following factors which seem to be important in the creative child with extraordinary potential: (1) good biologic endowment, (2) fostering of interests by a parent or interested adult, (3) feelings of being valued and loved, (4) allowance of freedom of development, (5) good toleration of isolation and loneliness, (6) the ability to perceive similarities in apparently dissimilar, and (7) capacity for love and spirituality.

According to Fisher (1990) a willingness to stand up for one's own ideas and feelings requires a sound basis of self-esteem and this basis is
built only through an authoritative parent-child relationship. Hence parents, who are the most influential and significant figures in children's life, have a very important role in fostering creativity in children mainly by way they relate to their children.

Thus, the parent-child relationship is an important variable influencing creativity and a brief review of the studies relating the two are presented below.

2.3.2.2. Parent-Child Relationship and Creativity

There are a few recent studies revealing the relation between parenting variables and creativity in children.

Studies of precocious children (scientific discoveries, athletic accomplishments, musical compositions, inventions, and the like) reveal parental support in addition to extensive training by talented teachers (Feldman, 1980).

Moglia (1989) investigated the relationship between ten family environmental factors including 'pressure to achieve' and creativity in subjects (10-22 year-olds). The factor negatively associated with creativity
was the degree families had cast work, school, and recreational activities into an achievement oriented and competitive frame work.

Hussain and Sajid (1990) investigated the relationship between creativity and Parent's Interest in Creative Activities (PICA) and traditional/non-traditional living conditions (TLC) among 400, 8th - 10th grade males in India and found that PICA and TLC are significantly associated only with non-verbal creativity, and joint family is positively associated with verbal and non-verbal creativity.

Michael and Dudek (1991) interviewed the mothers of 15 high-creative and 15 low-creative 8-year-olds and found that mothers of high-creatives were less emotionally involved with their children and less likely to be perceived as over-protective. They were more self-confident and self-realised in their homes and had higher occupational level.

Raw and Marjoriebanks (1991) examined the relationships between 312 Australian 16-year-old children’s perception of their family and school environments, and measures of their creativity, and found that adolescents’ creativity has modest associations with their perception of both family and school environments.
From the literature reviewed, it is seen that empirical literature suggesting a positive relation between parenting environment and creativity is only few, even though there is a good amount of theoretical literature regarding the significance of parental attitudes in fostering creativity in children.

2.3.3. Other Correlates of Creativity

The variables involved in the present study related to creativity (correlates) are socio-economic status (SES) of the family, sex and birth order of children, academic achievement, and self-esteem of children. A brief review of studies relating these variables and creativity is presented here under different sub-sections. The empirical literature is vast with a number of Indian studies relating the variables to creativity.

2.3.3.1. Socio-economic Status and Creativity

There is a large amount of empirical literature, both in India and abroad, showing the relationship between SES and creativity.

Higher socio-economic status with higher creativity index has been observed in the studies conducted by Skager, Schultz, and Klan (1966), Taft (1969), Lichtenwalner and Maxwell (1969), Kunz and Mayer (1969),

Ogletree (1971) concluded that social class has a definite effect on creativity, favouring the upper and middle class groups. Ogletree and Ujlaki (1973) in a cross cultural study of English, Scottish and German subjects observed that in all countries subjects from upper class families obtained significantly higher creative scores (verbal and non-verbal) than subjects from middle and lower class families. On the other hand, Greenberg, Shore, and Davidson (1972) found that creativity index did not significantly differentiate different social class subjects. Torrance (1963) and Smith (1965) observed that lower class youngsters were superior on non-verbal tasks of creativity.

Indian investigators like Badrinath and Satyanarayanan (1979), Seetharam and Vedanyagam (1979) and Chadha and Sen (1981) did not observe significant difference in the creativity scores of high, middle and low SES students.

Sharma (1980) and Sharma and Jarial (1980) investigated how the components as well as total creativity measures differed in students from high and low SES. Sharma (1980) found that the students of high SES
scored significantly higher than the students of low SES in originality components of creativity and total creativity, whereas, it had no effect on fluency and flexibility components of creativity of the students. Another study by Sharma and Jarial (1980) revealed that the students of high SES scored significantly higher than the students of low SES in fluency, whereas, no significant difference was found in the flexibility, originality, and total creativity scores of these groups. The study by Vijayalakshmi (1980) in Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala, found that high creative children came from families of high SES status and low creative children from low SES families.

The extensive literature linking SES and creativity has resulted in contradicting evidence both in India and abroad. This has necessitated further studies on this aspect.

2.3.3.2. Gender Differences and Creativity

Gender differences in creativity were examined in a number of studies conducted in India and abroad. Since the literature is extensive, studies conducted abroad and in India are reviewed separately.

Olive (1972 a) observed that females were superior to males on five out of seven divergent thinking sub-tests. Harris and Evans (1973) found
that the females had significantly higher scores than males on four out of nine creativity measures. Similar observations have also been made by many investigators (Helson, 1968; Richmond, 1971; Warran and Luria, 1972; Richmond and Nortan, 1973; Bruce, 1974; Suter and Domino, 1975, and Richardson, 1985).

Carringer (1974) observed that neither the main effect of sex nor the interaction effect was significant. There are many studies showing no significant relationship between sex and creativity (Olshin, 1965; Simpkins and Eisenman, 1968; Eisenman and Schcessel, 1970; Ginsberg and Hood, 1970; Schoel and Busse, 1971; Albert and Elliott, 1973; Aliotti and Blanton, 1973; Halpin et al., 1973; Leonard and Lindauer, 1973; Ward and Cox, 1974; Khatena and Zetenye, 1975).

Superiority of males over females in the matter of creativity has been observed by many investigators (Lauglin, Doherty, and Dunn, 1968; and Tisdall, Blackhurst, and Marks, 1971).

Abra and Valentine (1991) conducted a survey of the explanations on gender differences in creative achievement and observed that in some fields of endeavour the majority of seminal achievements have come from men. The authors considered possible explanations for this finding and
emphasised that creative achievement depended on both biological and environmental factors and that inborn talents establish a potential whose fulfilment depended on appropriate opportunities. They further explained that since men and women differ in both the above factors either one or both could produce a creative achievement difference.

Conflicting results have been obtained in India with regard to sex and creativity. There are many Indian researchers who have found significant difference in the different components of creativity favouring the males (Raina, 1971; Rawat and Agarwal, 1977; Badrinath and Sathyanarayanan, 1979 and Dharmangadan, 1981). On the other hand, Hussain (1974) has found superiority of females in the components of creativity. Passi (1972) has found in secondary school students that girls were superior to boys in non-verbal creativity and boys superior to girls in verbal creativity. There are many studies that indicated that males and females do not differ significantly in any of the measures of creativity (Gakhar, 1974; Lal, 1977; Rasool, 1977; Gupta, 1979; Saxena, 1981; Pandey and Pandey, 1984; Shukla and Sharma, 1986). The study by Srivastava and Thomas (1991) on 100 pre-school children did not find any significant difference in creativity measures between boys and girls.
The literature reviewed indicates that opposing results have been obtained both in India and abroad. Indian studies are found to be mainly conducted in the 1970's and early 1980's. The last decade has seen a change in favour of better status and role of women in society, accompanied by changes ensuring equality of opportunity for the girl child. Hence it is worth investigating the gender differences in creativity in the present context.

2.3.3.3. Academic Achievement and Creativity

The empirical literature linking academic achievement and creativity is extensive, including a large number of Indian studies conducted mainly on secondary school students.

The findings of Getzels and Jackson (1958) and later, of Torrance (1960) indicate that creative thinking abilities are important in educational achievement. Flescher (1963), however, clarified that creativity was not related to academic success, and further indicated that the substantial relationships found by Getzels and Jackson and also Torrance can be easily explained by the fact that they were concerned with those pupils in the creativity group who possessed sufficiently high intelligence, considerably above 120.
More recently, McCabe (1991) studied the influence of creativity on the academic achievement of female students (12 - 16 years) and the study suggests that although high levels of creativity may be associated with high levels of academic performance, this is not a causative one.

Indian studies are non-conclusive. A number of studies have tried to see the relation between academic achievement (school examination scores) and creativity among high school students.

Many Indian investigators have found a positive, significant relationship between the different measures of creativity and academic achievement (Passi, 1972; Singh, Mathur, and Saxena, 1977; Mehdi, 1977; Gupta, 1979; Asha, 1980; Jarial, 1981). However, Paramesh (1973) and Badrinath and Satyanarayanan (1979) have found no significant difference between creativity and academic achievement. Sandhu (1979) found no significant difference between creativity and academic achievement in science, when the effect of intelligence was partialled out. Sharma (1981) also found that high and low achievers did not differ significantly in verbal creativity. Mehdi (1988) comments that it is futile to expect a measure of divergent thinking to correlate highly with convergent type of achievement.
Padhi (1991) examined the relationship among creativity, academic self-concept and academic achievement of secondary school students and found that the creative ability of students is a better predictor of their academic self-concept in all the school subjects than achievement. More recently, Padhi (1995) found that creativity is significantly related with achievement in five subject areas. He reasons that high creative children may be very inquisitive and very free to express their creative urge in the form of success in classroom performance as compared to low creative ability students.

The present investigation makes an attempt to relate the two variables, keeping in mind the clarification given by Flescher (1963) and Mehdi (1988) regarding the relationship between academic achievement and creativity.

2.3.3.4. Self-esteem and Creativity

There are a number of studies relating creativity and personality. Some of these studies have shown that creative individuals are high in self-sufficiency and self-confidence (Cattell and Drevdahl, 1955; Drevdahl, 1956; Kurtzman, 1967; Payne et al., 1975; Patel, 1976).
Salkind and Ambron (1987) assert that the degree of self-esteem of the children will affect their behaviour by limiting or extending the range of things they will attempt. Low self-esteem tends to make children less original and more imitative, whereas high self-esteem brings out initiative and independent judgement.

Self-esteem is the evaluative part of self-concept and a number of studies relating self-concept and creativity are reviewed and presented below.

Jha (1975) found that high ego strength and self-confidence are some of the personality dimensions of high creative persons. The result of the study by Gupta (1977) showed the importance of having higher and healthier self-concept and higher self-acceptance as important personality characteristics conducive to higher creativity, whether verbal or non-verbal. Mallappa and Upadhyaya (1977) found the low-creative group of persons having low ego strength. Singh (1978) found a positive and significant relationship between verbal creativity in teachers and their self-concept. Kundu (1987) conducted a study on high school students and found that creativity was positively related to ego-strength.
Robles (1989) did not find significant relationship between creativity and self-esteem in Puerto Rican kindergarten children. Kalliopuska (1992) found that self-regard and self-acceptance had positive but non-significant correlation with creativity.

Quesnell (1997) examined the enhancement of self-esteem in elementary school children using a creative art therapy program and demonstrates how implementing a program of creative expression in the classroom can enhance self-esteem in elementary school children.

To conclude, on the basis of available literature reviewed above, it is seen that studies relating self-esteem and creativity are scanty. However, there are a few studies relating self-concept and creativity and most of the Indian studies have tried to investigate the personality characteristics of highly creative adults. They have found that highly creative people have high ego-strength and self-confidence (Jha, 1975; Mallappa and Upadhyaya, 1977; Singh, 1978). The present investigation makes an attempt to study the relation between creativity and self-esteem of high school students.
2.3.4. Evaluation of Literature and Relevance of the Present Study

The foregoing literature on creativity brings out the importance of psychological climate characterised by psychological freedom and psychological safety, for nourishing the creative instinct in children (Shainess, 1989; Fischer, 1990). This serves as a theoretical background for the present research. There are few studies relating parenting environment and creativity (Michael and Dudek, 1991; Raw and Marjoribanks, 1991). None of these investigators have studied the influence of pressurising environment in terms of studies on the creative ability of children. However, the study by Moglia (1989) has shown a negative association between creativity and the degree to which the families had cast work, school, and recreational activities into an achievement oriented and competitive frame work. In the present study the investigator tries to find out the influence of parental pressurisation for studies on the creativity of their children.

The literature on correlates of creativity, namely, socio-economic status of families, sex and academic achievement of children are extensive with a large number of Indian studies. The extensive literature linking socio-economic status and creativity have resulted in contradicting evidence in India and abroad. Conflicting results have been obtained
while studying gender differences in creativity. The same trend is seen while studying academic achievement and creativity. Regarding self-esteem and creativity, it is found that Indian researchers like Jha (1975), Mallappa and Upadhyaya (1977) and Singh (1978) have restricted their studies to the personality characteristics of highly creative persons. Thus, it is found that the relation between self-esteem and creativity is mostly an unexplored area in India and abroad, and there is a need to study this aspect.