CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction: -

According to Oxford Dictionary “A tribe is a group of people in a primitive or barbarious stage of development acknowledging the authority of a chief and usually regarding themselves as having a common ancestor.”

D.N. Majumdar defines tribe as a social group with territorial affiliation, endogamous with no specialization of functions rules by tribal officers hereditary or otherwise, united in language or dialect recognizing social distance with other tribes or castes. According to Ralph Linton tribe is a group of bands occupying a contiguous territory or territories and having a feeling of unity deriving from numerous similarities in a culture, frequent contacts and a certain community of interests.

L.M. Lewis believes that tribal societies are small in scale are restricted in the spatial and temporal range of their social, legal and political relations and possess a morality, a religion and world view of corresponding dimensions. Characteristically too tribal languages are unwritten and hence the extent of communication both in time and space is inevitably narrow. At the same time tribal societies exhibit a
remarkable economy of design and have a compactness and self-sufficiency lacking in modern society.

1.2 T.B. Naik has given the following features of tribes in Indian context:-

- A tribe should have least functional interdependence within the community.
- It should be economically backward (i.e. primitive means of exploiting natural resources, tribal economy should be at an underdeveloped stage and it should have multifarious economic pursuits.)
- There should be a comparative geographical isolation of its people.
- They should have a common dialect.
- Tribes should be politically organized and community panchayat should be influential.
- A tribe should have customary laws.

Naik argues that for a community to be a tribe it should possess all the above mentioned characteristics and a very high level of acculturation with outside society debar it from being a tribe. Thus term usually
denotes a social group bound together by kin and duty and associated with a particular territory.

Nandurbar district of Maharashtra is known to be a tribal district. In this district there are six ‘Talukas’ and it is closely associated with the state of Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh. The tribal people are living in hilly area of Satpuda belt. These people have been left behind in the streams of flow for development due to the lack of infrastructure to communicate with them and lack of higher education among this community. The Government of Maharashtra has taken up many steps to improve the financial status of these people, to improve their standard of living and for their overall development. But even today the communication with these people is only for six-seven months in a year due to the adverse geographical condition. Some villages do not have proper communication with the civilians in the city of Nandurbar.

The continuous prevailing poverty compels these people to go elsewhere to earn to fulfill their basic needs and to get jobs to earn their livings. They generally migrate to the Gujarat state and hence the students have to leave their studies incomplete. This adversely affects the personality development of Tribal students.

There are many factors that affect the life-style of tribal’s e.g. consumption of alcohol, drug addiction, restrictionless life, early
marriages, lack of education, expenses on marriage, lack of communication, old traditions etc. affect their day to day behaviour and personality.

Generally, tribal youth are deprived of the stimulating environment which is a prerequisite for the all sided development of an individual. In the absence of stimulating environment development of children retards. They cannot develop their personality well, even when they have necessary potentials. Development of various psychological functions is shaped by the characteristics of environment in which developing organism is placed and to which it is exposed. Importance of early childhood experiences in the personality development was long back recognized by Psychologists. Child training styles have been mentioned as the single most powerful experience on the developing personality. Children from tribal community become victim of our social system and therefore, they are generally inferior to Non-tribal groups in various personality characteristics.

1.3 Psychological consequences of underprivileged or deprived environment: Following are some of the major psychological consequences of underprivileged or deprived environment:-

i) Cognition: It is assumed that a deprived individual is cognitively disadvantaged. In the current psychological literature cognition is viewed
as a set of processes which are concerned with the laws determining how organisms know the world around them. Knowing the world subsumes perception, recognition, retention, imagery, meaning, association and problem solving (Triandis, 1964). Bruner (1961) maintained that lack of cognitive deprivation was a prerequisite to a child’s capacity for adaptive inference in dealing with his environment.

ii) Personality: It is believed that deprivation can have significant psychological consequences for personality development. Riessman (1962) described in detail the personality makeup of the deprived individual. He states that “the deprived child, frequently, feels alienated, not fully part of society, leftout, frustrated in what he can do.” Verma (1966) concluded from his study that the more privileged the group socio-culturally; the better is the development of personality traits among its members.

iii) Learning Capacity: It is hypothesized that the deprived is inferior in learning capacity to the privileged. But Blair (1965) pointed out that culturally disadvantaged students are not significantly different learners from advantaged students.

iv) Language Development: It is assumed that deprivation has serious effects on the language development. Bernstein (1961) believes that deprived groups are at home with what he calls “Public language” but are
deficient in “formal language”. He further points out, “though by no means definitive, there is a body of evidence suggesting that language measures are particularly responsive to the effects of social disadvantage.” Risseman (1962) reported, “Despite various sources of latent creativity, underprivileged children do not realize their potential because of formal language deficiencies. Nevertheless, they have considerable facility with informal or public language.... The forms of communication characteristics of deprived children raise important educational questions. The acquisition of knowledge obviously requires some degree of facility with formal language. Underprivileged children are capable of utilizing language in a rich and free fashion, have well-defined non-verbal form of communication but are solely lacking in advanced linguistic form.”

v) Motivaiton : It is thought that motivation may not remain unaffected by deprivation. The psycho-sociogenic motives are largely acquired through experience of social interaction in various settings. However, once acquired, these motives profoundly influence the way in which individuals appraise the demands and constraints raised by social settings. Since satisfaction of motives demands upon the richness of resources available to individuals in their environment, it can be safely assumed that deprivation would keep individuals more occupied with meeting
deficiency needs, and that their higher needs would not get adequate opportunities for proper growth.

It is thought that cultural rejection is one sort of social pressure which acts as a barrier to effective intellectual and social functioning of minority group children.

vi) Anxiety: Anxiety refers to unpleasant emotion and involves a state of tension and discomfort. Because anxiety threatens our well being, we are strongly motivated to do something to alleviate the discomfort. It works as a drive and assumes motivational properties (Taylor, 1951). Anxiety may be learned through association of events either with primary motives or with previously acquired sociogenic motives. It may be specially attached to particular situation or may be of generalized type. Since paucity of economic resources lead to frustrative experiences, it is expected that deprivation and anxiety will go together. Rath (1975) has shown that low caste group suffers from insecurity and neuroticism.

vii) Self - Concept: Several researchers have postulated a low self-concept for deprived group members. Ramkumar (1971) found that the S.C. students had lower self-concept score than the higher caste students.

The Non-privileged groups in India are generally those castes in the traditional social system which are recognized by the Constitution of
the country as disadvantaged or deprived groups and worthy of special attention, remedial measures and protection of interest. Passow (1970) defined the disadvantaged or non-privileged child as “one who because of social or cultural characteristics, for example, social class, race, ethnic origin, poverty, sex, geographical location etc. comes in to the school system with knowledge, skills and attitudes which impede learning.” Basically, a non-privileged child has been categorized on the basis of low level of parental education, inferior occupation, rural residential area, low income etc. (Panda, 1988). Recently the social scientists have begun to study these deprived or non-privileged groups. Many assumptions concerning the probable effects of deprivation on the personality and behaviour of the members of the deprived groups have been made and empirically assessed.

The socio-economic and other environmental factors are found to be major sources of individual and social pathology, and it is believed that they lead to overwhelming accumulation of psychological deficiencies. Empirical evidence for such effects has been found in several studies. Jensen (1966) found that due to decreased exposure to varied stimulating environmental conditions, non-privileged children are found to be extremely underdeveloped in perceptual discrimination.
Personality development is also hampered due to socio-economic deprivation. It has been observed by Symmonds (1968) and Langmeier (1972) that deprivational conditions result in hardening of emotional feelings, insecurity and inferiority. Whiteman and Deutsch (1968) found that self-concept and verbal ability are significantly related to deprivation. Gordon (1968) has stated that terms such as “Socio-economic deprivation”, “Socially disadvantaged”, and “Culturally aliniated” reflect concern with deficiencies in stimulating conditions of the childhood.

Chouhan and Jain (1987) studied personality of socially disadvantaged student in relation to their ecology (Urban-Rural) and sex. The study showed that urban disadvantaged students to be more reserved, shrewd, undisciplined and group dependent than their rural counterparts; whereas the females found to be more assertive, toughminded, expedient and relaxed in comparison to their male counterparts.

In India, attempts have been made at studying the effects of caste and social class on achievement and development of personality characteristics. The child-rearing practices and degree of advantage play a significant role in one’s personality development. The impact of socio-economic disadvantage on personality development has been the focus of number of studies. Children from socially disadvantaged or non-privileged groups become victim of our social system and they, therefore,
are generally inferior to socially advantaged or privileged groups in various personality characteristics.

1.4 Clarification of the terms -

1.4 Self-Concept -

Every individual exists in a constantly changing world of experience of which he is the center. It is his basic tendency and striving to know and understand himself as well as his environment. He reacts to his environment as he experiences and perceived it. Due to constant interactions with his environment, gradually the form of his ‘self’ is differentiated and developed. In this process, an integrated, organized and unique self-structure comes out. In this process, an integrated, organized and unique self-structure comes out. All his behavior is directed towards actualizing, preserving and enhancing this self-structure. That part of self-structure which the individual perceives as a set of specific and relatively stable self-characteristics formulates his self-concept.

Rogers, in his 1947 Presidential address to the American Psychology Association, noted that the ‘self’ had come back into Psychology. The concept of self had fallen into disrepute in Psychology, possibly due to the dominance of Behaviorism, but was coming back as a legitimate research concern by the late 1940s. Rogers (1951) defined self-
concept as “an organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are admissible of awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one’s characteristics and abilities; the perception and concept of the self in relation to others and to the environment; the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objects; and goals and ideals which are perceived as having positive or negative valence.”

The extensive interest in self has a long history; theoretically the notion of the self can be traced back to the ancient Greeks. The formulation by Mead and Cooley (1934, 1902) provided a fruitful basis for empirical work; nevertheless the notion of the self-concept did not become a research concern until the 1940s.

Virtually all investigators agree that two distinct aspects of the self, first identified by philosopher James (1890) more than a century ago, emerge and become more refined with age. The first is the ‘I’ or the existential self. It includes the following realizations: That the self is separate from the surrounding world, can act on and gain a sense of control over its environment, has a private inner life not accessible to others, and maintains continuous existence over time. The second facet of the self is the ‘me’, a reflective observer that treats the self as an object of knowledge and evaluation by sizing up its diverse attributes. Self-
understanding begins with the dawning of self-awareness in the second year of life (Lewis & Brooks, 1979) and gradually evolves into a rich, multifaceted view of the self’s characteristics and capacities over childhood and adolescence. ‘I’ and ‘me’ are intimately intertwined and influence each other.

The notion ‘self’ received utmost importance in Client – centered therapy, the pioneer of which was Carl R. Rogers (1951). According to him the best vantage point for understanding behavior is from the internal frame of reference of the individual himself. Self-concept is the central construct of Roger’s theory. It may be conceived of as an organized gestalt comprising:

1. The individual’s perception of himself and the values attached to them.
2. The individual’s perception of himself in relation to other persons and the values attached to them.
3. The individual’s perception of various aspects of the environment and the values attached to them.

According to Roger’s self-theory, self-concept is not self-awareness or consciousness. It is the conceptual gestalt concerning oneself which need not always be in awareness, but available to
awareness. A person may not always be aware of his feelings or attitudes that may lie deep but on which he can fall back as and when he wants to use. Perceptions and values attached to the self modify from time to time. The individual’s behaviour and gratification of needs are normally consistent with his self-concept. When a strong need conflicts with a person’s self-concept, he might adopt devious measures to find gratification of his behaviour consistent with his self-concept. Maneuvering of perceptions to secure apparent consistency leads to maladjustment. Among the most influential works in stimulating research on self-concept was that of Snygg and Coombs (1949). They presented a method of predicting individual behaviour in specific situations, which assumed that an individual’s personal frame of reference is a crucial factor in his or her behaviour.
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Figure 1-1: Diagrammatic Representation of the ‘self-structure’ by Snygg and Combs (1959)
In particular, they declared the ‘phenomenal field’ that part which the individual experiences as ‘characteristic of himself.’ All behaviour is directed towards the goal of preserving and enhancing the phenomenal-self. It includes the self-concept and those aspects of life which are not a part of the ‘real-self’ but are in some way related to it: one’s family, career, home, school, clothing and the like. The environment that the individual perceives or notices is termed as the ‘phenomenal environment’.

The self arises in the course of interaction in a pre-existing symbolic environment; it is the most significant product of early socialization. Mead (1934) says that “There is a social process out of which selves arise and within which further differentiation, evolution and organization take place. Discussion of the development of self must also include the views of Cooley (1902). According to Cooley, the self is any idea or system of ideas with which is associated the appropriate attitude we call self-feeling. The self is the result of the individual’s imaginative processes and emotions as he or she interacts with others; it is reflected or ‘looking-glass self’ composed of three principal elements; “The imagination of our appearance to the other person; the imagination of his judgment of that appearance; and some sort of self-feeling such as pride” In simplest terms, according to Mead (1934), to have a self is to have the
capacity to respond to, and direct one’s own behaviour. One can behave towards oneself as one can towards any other social object. One can evaluate, blame, encourage and despair about oneself; one can alter one’s behaviour. And in the process of observing, responding to, and directing one’s behaviour, one’s structure of attitudes towards self is changing. It is important to keep in mind that behaviour towards the self does not occur in a vacuum; one is behaving towards oneself in the context of interaction with others.

The International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (1968), describes self as a “Development formulation in the psychological makeup of the individual, consisting of interrelated attitudes that the individual has acquired in relation to his own body and its parts, to his capacities and to objects, which define and regulate his relatedness to them in ‘concrete situations and activities. The attitudes that compose the self-system are, therefore the individual’s cherished commitments, stands on particular issues, acceptances, rejections, reciprocal expectations (roles) in interpersonal and group relations, identification”.

As Gordon (1968) has put it, “The self is a complex process of continuing interpretive activity – simultaneously the person’s located stream of consciousness (both reflexive and non-reflexive including perceiving, thinking, planning and evaluation, choosing etc) and the
resultant structure of self-conceptions (The special systems of self referential meanings available to this active consciousness)."

Self-concept is often described as a global entity; how people feel about themselves in general, but it has also been described as made up on multiple self-conceptions, with concepts developed in relation to different roles (Griffin, Chassin & Young, 1981; Burkitt, 1991; Rowan & Cooper, 1998). Thus self-concept may be generally and situationally specific. Strang (1957) has identified transitory or temporary self-concepts also, besides the overall basic self-concept. These ideas of self are influenced by the mood of the moment or by recent or continuing experience.

1.4.1 Self-concept: a multidimensional construct

As individuals mature, the emergence of new cognitive capacities allows adolescents’ self-conceptions to become increasingly more abstract and psychological. In fact, various researchers Green, Nelson, Martin and Marsh contend that self-conceptions tend to become more differentiated, complex and better organised as individuals progress from childhood to adulthood (for example, Byrne and Shavelson, 1996; Harter, 1999; Marsh, 1989). This observed developmental trend is good reason to suggest that our understanding of academic achievement and well being will be further enhanced by giving consideration to self-concept. For this reason, research into self-concept has attracted considerable attention
over the past few decades. Early research conceived self-concept to be a unidimensional construct emphasising a single, global measure of self-concept (see Byrne, 1984; Wylie, 1979). The usefulness of unidimensional perspectives has since been severely criticised (Wylie, 1979). Whereas earliest research studied global self-concept, recent studies have begun to shift in focus to the measurement of multiple facets of self-concept. In fact, Shavelson, Hubner and Stanton (1976) developed a theoretical model of a multidimensional, hierarchical self-concept in which general self appears at the apex and is divided into academic and non-academic components that are further divided into more specific components. This ‘landmark’ review of the theoretical construction of self-concept has had a profound influence on future self-concept research, which has consequently led to considerable advances in the quality of self-concept research due to much stronger theoretical models, better measurement instruments, and improved methodology has been very important in demonstrating the existence of separate dimensions of self-concept as well as the increasing differentiation and complexity of self-concept with age (for example, Marsh, 1989). A wealth of research continues to support the multidimensionality of self-concept (for example, Marsh and Yeung, 1998), however, support for the proposed hierarchy of self-concept appears to be weak (for example, Byrne, 1996a; Marsh, 1990a). Despite the lack of support for the hierarchical nature of
self-concept, research has repeatedly demonstrated the importance of considering the multidimensional nature of self-concept in educational settings.

1.4.2 Negative and Positive Self-concept

The Negative Self - Concept

The self-concept has three dimensions: knowledge, evaluation. What does the person with a negative self-concept of himself? The answer is: very little. There appear to be two characteristic types of negative self-concept. In one the person’s view of himself is markedly disorganized: he has no sense of stable and integrated self. The second type of negative self-concept is almost the exact opposite of the first type. Here the self-concept is too stable and too organized—in the other words, rigid. Possibly as a result of a loveless, excessively strict upbringing, the individual creates a self-image that allows for no deviation from the set of iron laws that in his mind constitute ‘respectability’. In both types of negative self-concept, new information about the self is bound to cause anxiety—that is, a sense of threat to the self.

As far self-evaluation, a negative self-concept by definition involves a negative judgment of the self whatever the person is, it is never good enough.
What does the person with a negative self-concept expect of himself? Either too little or too much (Rotter, 1954). In both instances, there is probably a self-fulfilling prophecy at work. In its extreme form, a negative self-concept is characterized by inaccurate knowledge of the self, unrealistic expectations and low self-esteem.

**The Positive Self Concept** -

The basic of the positive self-concept in not so much admiration of the self as it is acceptance of the self. What makes this self-acceptance possible is the fact that the person with a positive self-concept is not too loose but it is stable and diversified. It contains a large number of different “personality pigeonholes” in which the person can store information about himself-negative information as well as positive (chodoroff 1954). Thus the person with a positive self-concept can understand and accept a great deal of disparate information about himself/herself.

Since the positive self-concept in large enough to accommodate the entire range of the person’s mental experience, his evaluation of himself is positive he is able to accept himself for what he is. And by accepting himself, he accepts other people as well.
As for expectations, the person with a positive self-concept sets goals that are appropriate and realistic. Thus, a positive self-concept is characterized by a broad and diversified knowledge of the self, realistic expectations and high self-esteem.

1.4.3 Factors shaping the Self-concept -

A variety of sources influence one’s self-concept. Chief among them are one’s own observation. Feedback from others and cultural values.

1) One’s own observation -

Our observation of our own behaviour and obviously a major source of information about what we are like. Individuals begin observing their own behaviour and drawing conclusions about themselves early in life. Leon Festinger’s (1954) social comparison theory proposes that individuals compare themselves to other to determine how attractive they are, how they did on psychology examination, how their social skill stacks up and so forth. Although Festinger’s original theory claimed that people engage in social comparison for the purpose of accurately assessing their abilities, research suggests that they also engage in social comparison to improve their skills and to maintain their self-image (Wood and Wilson, 2003) People’s observations of their own behaviour
are not entirely objective. Self observations tend to be biased in a positive direction. In other words, most people tend to evaluate themselves in a more positive light than they really merit (Taylor and Proown, 1988, 1994)

2) Feedback from others -

Our self-concept is shaped significantly by the feedback we get from important people in our life. Early on, parents and other family members play a dominant role. Studies find a link between parent’s views of child and the child’s self-concept (Berne and Svary, 1993: Burhans and Dweek, 1995). There is even stronger evidence for a relationship between children’s perceptions of their parent’s attitudes toward them and their own self-views (Felson, 1989, 1992).

Teachers, classmates and friends also provide feedback during childhood. In later childhood and adolescence, parents and classmates are particularly important sources of feedback and support (Harter, 2003). Later in life, feedback from close friends and marriage partners assumes importance.
3) Cultural Values -

Self-concept is also shaped by cultural values. Among other things. The society in which individuals are reared defines what is desirable and undesirable in personality and behaviour.

For example, American culture puts a high premium on individuality, competitive success, strength and skill. When individuals meet cultural expectations, they feel good about themselves and experience increases in self-esteem and vice versa (Cross and Gore, 2003).

Members in individualistic cultures usually have an independent view of the self, whereas those in collectivist cultures often have an interdependent view of the self (Weiten and Llou, 2007). Cultural values are also responsible for various stereotypes that can mold people’s self-perceptions and behaviour. And stereotypes about gender, ethnicity, class, caste and religion can influence self-conception.

1.4.4 Some Basic Assumptions Regarding Self-concept-

Many of the successes and failures that people experience in many areas of life are closely related to the ways that they have learned to view themselves and their relationships with others. It is also becoming clear that self-concept has at least three major qualities of interest to
counselors: (1) it is learned, (2) it is organized, and (3) it is dynamic. Each of these qualities, with corollaries, follow.

Self-concept is learned. As far as we know, no one is born with a self-concept. It gradually emerges in the early months of life and is shaped and reshaped through repeated perceived experiences, particularly with significant others. The fact that self-concept is learned has some important implications:

Because self-concept does not appear to be instinctive, but is a social product developed through experience, it possesses relatively boundless potential for development and actualization.

Because of previous experiences and present perceptions, individuals may perceive themselves in ways different from the ways others see them.

Individuals perceive different aspects of themselves at different times with varying degrees of clarity. Therefore inner focusing is a valuable tool for counseling.

Any experience which is inconsistent with one’s self-concept may be perceived as a threat and the more of these experiences there are the more rigidly self-concept is organized to maintain and protect itself.
When a person is unable to get rid of perceived inconsistencies, emotional problems arise.

Faulty thinking patterns, such as dichotomous reasoning (dividing everything in terms of opposites or extremes) or over generalizing (making sweeping conclusions based on little information) create negative interpretations of oneself.

Self-concept is organized. Most researchers agree that self-concept has a generally stable quality that is characterized by borderlines and harmony. Each person maintains countless perceptions regarding one’s personal existence and each perception is orchestrated with all the others. It is this generally stable and organized quality of self-concept that gives consistency to the personality. This organized quality of self-concept has corollaries.

Self-concept requires consistency, stability and tends to resist change. If self-concept changed readily the individual would lack a consistent and dependable personality.

The more central a particular belief to one’s self-concept, the more resistant one is to changing that belief.

At the heart of self-concept is the self-as-doer, the “I”, which is distinct from the self-as-object, the various “Me’s”. This allows the
person to reflect on past events, analyze present perceptions, and shape future experiences.

Basic perceptions of oneself are quite stable, so change takes time. Rome was not built in a day, and neither is self-concept.

Perceived success and failure impact on self-concept- Failure in a highly regarded area lowers evaluations in all other areas as well. Success in a prized area raises evaluations in other seemingly unrelated areas.

Self-concept is dynamic. To understand the active nature of self-concept, it helps to imagine it as a gyrocompass: a continuously active system that dependably points to the “true north” of a person’s perceived existence. This guidance system not only shapes the ways a person views oneself, others, and the world, but it also serves to direct action and enables each person to take a consistent “stance” in life. Rather than viewing self-concept as the cause of behavior, it is better understood as the gyrocompass of human personality, providing consistency in personality and direction for behavior. The dynamic quality of self-concept also carries corollaries.

The world and the things in it are not just perceived: they are perceived in relation to one’s self-concept.
Self-concept development is a continuous process. In the healthy personality there is constant assimilation of new ideas and expulsion of old ideas throughout life.

Individuals strive to behave in ways that are in keeping with their self-concepts, no matter how helpful or hurtful to oneself or others.

Self-concept usually takes precedence over the physical body. Individuals will often sacrifice physical comfort and safety for emotional satisfaction.

Self-concept continuously guards itself against loss of self-esteem, for it is this loss that produces feelings of anxiety.

If self-concept must constantly defend itself from assault, growth opportunities limited.

1.4.5 Self-esteem: The evaluative side of self-concept

Self-esteem represents how much a person likes, accepts, and respects himself overall as a person; it includes the judgment we make about our worth and the feelings associated with those judgments. Knowing who you are and liking how you are represent two different things. Although adolescents become increasingly accurate in understanding who they are (their self-concept), this knowledge does
guarantee that they like themselves (their self-esteem) any better. The cognitive sophistication – increased accuracy in understanding themselves, allows them to differentiate various aspects of self-esteem, for e.g. an adolescent may have high self-esteem in terms of academic performance but lower self-esteem in terms of relationship with others (Feldman, 1977).

According to Rosenberg (1979), “a person with high self-esteem is fundamentally satisfied with the type of person he is, yet he may acknowledge his faults while hoping to overcome them”. High self-esteem implies a realistic evaluation of the self’s characteristics and competencies, coupled with attitude of self-acceptance and self-respect.

Self-esteem ranks among the most important aspects of children’s social cognitive development. Children’s evaluations of their own competencies affect their emotional experiences and future behaviour and similar situations as well as their long-term psychological adjustment. Self-esteem originates early in life, and its structure becomes increasingly elaborate over years (Stipek et al, 1992).

1.4.6 The Determinants of Self-esteem

Researchers have studied the multifaceted nature of self-esteem by applying methods like Factor Analysis to children’s ratings of themselves
on many characteristics. Harter’s (1990) findings revealed that before age 7, children distinguish how well others like them (social acceptance) from how “good” they are at doing things (competence). By 7-8 years, children have formed at least three separate self-esteem – academic, physical and social, that become more refined with age (Marsh, 1990). Furthermore, school age children combine their separate self-evaluations into a general appraisal of themselves – an overall sense of self worth. Consequently during middle childhood self-esteem takes on the hierarchical structure as shown in the figure. With the arrival of adolescence, several new dimensions of self-esteem are added – close friendship, job competence, romantic appeal etc. that reflect salient concerns of this period.

Figure 1-2: Facets of Self-esteem (Shavelson et al., 1976)
For James (1890), global self-esteem reflects the ratio of a person’s perceptions of competence or success in discrete domains relative to the importance of success in these domains. Harter (1986) included the scholastic competence, athletic competence, social acceptance, physical appearance and behavioural conduct domains and found that competence (low discrepancy) in the domains deemed important is associated with high levels of self-esteem. There is number of evidence that discrepancy between actual and ideal self-concept clearly exert a powerful influence on self-esteem (Higgins, 1987; Simmons and Blyth; 1987; Tesser and Campbell, 1983).

Findings with adolescents also support the Cooley’s (1902) postulation that the origins of self-esteem lay in an individual’s perceptions of what significant-others thought of the self, which Mead (1934) termed as ‘perspective-taking skills’. Perspective taking improves greatly over middle childhood and adolescence. Consequently, older children are better at reading the messages they receive from others and incorporating these into their self-definitions. Adolescent who feels that he or she is receiving the positive regard of significant others (e.g. parents and peers) will express positive regard for the self in the form of self-esteem. With regard to the relative impact of different sources of social support on global self worth, Rosenberg (1979) has suggested a
developmental shift, in that for young children, perceived parental attitudes towards the self are of almost exclusive significance, whereas among older children and adolescents, peer judgments gain increasing importance.

There is considerable consensus that physical appearance significantly contributes to self-esteem during adolescence (Harter, 1989; Simmons and Rosenberg, 1975). Although physical attractiveness clearly touted in our society (Elkind, 1984), it not only reflects societal emphasis on the importance of good looks, there may; be a more basic relationship between the outer self, reflected in the appearance, and the inner self, namely global feelings of self-esteem. Developmentally, physical capabilities represent the first sense of self to emerge moreover, from an early age the physical or outer self is a salient dimension that provokes evaluative reactions from others (Langlois, 1981), reactions that may well be incorporated into the emerging sense of inner self.

1.4.7 Changes in global self-esteem

Self-esteem once established does not remain stable throughout. In early childhood, it’s very high then it drops over the first few years of elementary school as children start making social comparisons—that is judge their abilities, behavior, appearance, and other characteristics in relation to those of others (Stipek and McIver, 1989; Ruble et al, 1980).
Once children enter school they receive frequent feedback about themselves in relation to their classmates. In addition they become cognitively better able to make sense of such information. As a result self-esteem adjusts to a more realistic level that matches the opinions of others as well as objective performance. Self-esteem undergoes change during adolescence; longitudinal studies reveal gradual, consistent improvements in self-esteem over grades 7-12 (McCarthy and Hoge, 1982); there are several reasons for such gains:

- There may be increasing realism about the ideal self, reducing the real ideal discrepancy.

- Increased autonomy and freedom of choice over the adolescence years may also play a role. If the individual has more opportunities to select valued performance domains in which he or she is competent, self-esteem will be increased.

- Relatively increased role taking ability may lead the adolescent to behave in more social acceptable ways that enhance the evaluation of the self by others.

The rise in the self-worth suggests that for most young people, becoming adolescent leads to feelings of pride and self-confidence. A study of self-esteem in 10 industrialized countries showed that the
majority of teenagers had an optimistic outlook on life, a positive attitude towards school and work, faith in their ability to cope with life problems (Offer, 1988).

The picture of change in self-esteem during early adolescence is less sanguine. Simmons and Blyth (1987) suggested a developmental readiness hypothesis for this, that children can be thrust into environments before they are psychologically equipped to handle the new social and academic demands.

With regards to timing of puberty, early maturing girls fare the worst; they are more dissatisfied with their body image, which exerts and influence on their self-esteem. They do not fit the cultural stereotypes of female attractiveness and are not yet emotionally prepared to deal with social expectations (Peterson and Taylor, 1980).

Negative self-perceptions lead to more predictable behaviour than positive self-perceptions. Presumably, this happens because negative self views involve more tightly organized schemas than positive ones; as a result, someone with generally high self-esteem can interpret a success in a variety of ways, but someone with low self-esteem tends to over generalize the implications of a failure.
Credible feedback indicating that one has some of the characteristics of his or her ideal self is a positive experience, while feedback indicating the presence of undesired characteristics is negative. It also matters whether one’s “good” or “Bad” qualities are common or rare. The lowest level of self-esteem is found among those who perceive their liked characteristics to be quite common and their unlinked characteristics to be relatively rare.

**Self-esteem and Social Comparison**

Social comparison is a major determinant of how we evaluate ourselves. Depending on our comparison group, specific success and failures may contribute to high or low self-evaluation or be completely irrelevant.

Several lines of research help clarify some of the ways in which these complex social comparisons operate. When we compare ourselves to other, our self-esteem goes up; when we perceive some inadequacy in them – a contrast effect happens. When, however, the comparison is with someone to whom we feel close, our esteem goes up; when we perceive something very good about them- an assimilation effect happens. In a similar way, a person who compare unfavorable within group members experiences lower self-esteem and increased depression much more than if the unfavorable comparison is with out-group members.
Self-esteem should not be considered as an immutable trait but rather the processes responsible for its potential change must be illuminated. Only by understanding these processes, the strategies to maintain or enhance self-esteem can be sought. Strategies implied by Harter’s research (1986) include valuing the individual’s areas of competence and discounting domains in which he is not competent, selecting social comparison groups that are more similar to the self, as well as interacting with peers who can provide support and affirmation that can be internalized in the form of positive regard for the self.

1.5 Achievement motivation:-

Achievement motivation or the need for achievements the psychological drive to excel, a social form of motivation to perform at a high level of competence. It is sometimes abbreviated to N Ach or n Ach. Usually this is understood to mean competing in socially valued activities where achievement can be recognized and given appropriate recognition either by the group of internally by the performer.

The term need for achievement was first introduced by Henry Murray in 1938 in his book “Explorations of Personality” where he used it in the sense of overcoming obstacles or being regularly willing to take
on difficult tasks. The term achievement motivation has been the preferred term more recently.

1.5.1 Need for achievement -

Need for Achievement (N-Ach) refers to an individual’s desire for significant accomplishment, mastering of skills, control or high standards. The term was first used by Henry Murray in “Explorations in Personality” (1938) and associated with a range of actions. These include: “intense, prolonged and repeated efforts to accomplish something difficult. To work with singleness of purpose towards a high and distant goal. To have the determination to win” (p164). The concept of N Ach was subsequently popularized by the psychologist David McClelland. (citation needed)

Need for Achievement is related to the difficulty of tasks people choose to undertake. Those with low N-Ach may choose very easy tasks, in order to minimize risk of failure, or highly difficult tasks, such that a failure would not be embarrassing. Those with high N-Ach tend to choose moderately difficult tasks, feeling that they are challenging, but within reach.

People high in N-Ach are characterised by a tendency to seek challenges and a high degree of independence. Their most satisfying
reward is the recognition of their achievements. Sources of high N-Ach include:

1. Parents who encouraged independence in childhood
2. Praise and rewards for success
3. Association of achievement with positive feelings.
4. Association of achievement with one’s own competence and effort, not luck
5. A desire to be effective or challenged.
6. Intrapersonal Strength.

The pioneering research work of the Harvard Psychological Clinic in the 1930s, summarised in Explorations in Personality, provided the start point for future studies of personality, especially those relating to needs and motives. David C. McClelland’s and his associates’ investigations of achievement motivation have particular relevance to the emergence of leadership. McClelland was interested in the possibility of deliberately arousing a motive to achieve in an attempt to explain how individuals express their preferences for particular outcomes - a general problem of motivation. In this connection, the need for achievement refers to an individual’s preference for success under conditions of
competition. The vehicle McClelland employed to establish the presence of an achievement motive was the type of fantasy a person expressed on the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), developed by Christiana Morgan and Henry Murrya, who note in Explorations in Personality that “... when a person interprets an ambiguous social situation he is apt to expose his own personality as much as the phenomenon to which he is attending. Each picture should suggest some critical situation and be effective in evoking a fantasy relating to it” (p531). The test is composed of a series of pictures that subjects are asked to interpret and describe to the psychologist. The TAT has been widely used to support assessment of needs and motives. (1).

The procedure in McClelland’s initial investigation was to arouse in the test audience a concern with their achievement. A control group was used in which arousal was omitted. In the course of this experiment, McClelland discovered through analyzing the stories on the TAT that initial arousal was not necessary. Instead, members of the control group - individuals who had no prior arousal - demonstrated significant differences in their stories, some writing stories with a high achievement content and some submitting stories with a low achievement content. Using results based on the Thematic Apperception Test, McClelland demonstrated that individuals in a society can be grouped into high
achievers and low achievers based on their scores on what be called “N-Ach” (1).

McClelland and his associates have since extended their work in fantasy analysis to include different age groups, occupational groups and nationalities in their investigations of the strength of need for achievement. These investigations have indicated that the N-Ach score increases with a rise in occupational level. Invariable, businessmen, managers and entrepreneurs are high scorers. Other investigations into the characteristics of the high achievers have revealed that accomplishment on the job represents as end in itself; monetary rewards serve as an index of this accomplishment. In addition, these other studies found that the high achievers, though identified as managers, businessmen and entrepreneurs, are not gamblers. They will accept risk only to the degree they believe their personal contributions will make a difference in the final outcome (2).

These explorations into the achievement motive seem to turn naturally into the investigation of national differences based on Max Weber’s thesis that the industrialization and economic development of the Western nations were related to the Protestant ethic and its corresponding values supporting work and achievement. McClelland and his associates have satisfied themselves that such a relationship, viewed
historically through an index of national power consumption, indeed exists. Differences related to individual, as well as to national, accomplishments depend on the presence or absence of an achievement motive in addition to economic resources or the infusion of financial assistance. High achievers can be viewed as satisfying a need for self-actualization through accomplishments in their job assignments as a result of their particular knowledge, their particular experiences, and the particular environments in which they have lived (3).

Measurement -

The techniques McClelland and his collaborators developed to measure N-Ach, N-Affil and N-Pow (see McClelland et al., 1958) can be viewed as a radical break with the dominant psychometric tradition. However, it should be recognised that McClelland’s thinking was strongly influenced by the pioneering work of Henry Murray, both in terms of Murray’s model of human needs and motivational processes (1938) and his work with the OSS during World War Two. It was during this period that Murray introduced the idea of “situation tests” and multi-rater / multi-method assessments. It was Murray who first identified the significance of Need for Achievement, Power and Affiliation and placed these in the context of an integrated motivational model.
Whilst trait-based personality theory assume that high-level competencies like initiative, creativity and leadership can be assessed using “internally consistent” measure (see psychometrics), the McClelland measure recognize that such competencies are difficult and demanding activities which will neither be developed nor displayed unless people are undertaking activities they care about (i.e. are strongly motivated to undertake). Furthermore, it is the cumulative number of independent, but cumulative and substitutable, components of competence they bring to bear while seeking to carry out these activities that will determine their success. Accordingly, the N-Ach, N-Aff and N-Pow scoring systems simply count how many components of competence people bring to bear whilst carrying out activities they have a strong personal inclination (or motivation) to undertake.

An important corollary is that there is no point in trying to assess people’s abilities without first finding out what they care about. So one cannot (as some psychometricians try to do) assess such things as “creativity” in any general sense. One has always to ask “creativity in relation to what?” So McClelland’s measures, originally presented as means of assessing “personality”, are best understood as means of measuring competence in ways which break radically with traditional psychometric approaches. (See Raven (2001) for a fuller discussion).
1.5.2 David McClelland’s motivational needs theory -

American David Clarence McClelland (1917-98) achieved his doctorate in psychology at Yale in 1941 and became professor at Wesleyan University. He then taught and lectured, including a spell at Harvard from 1956, where with colleagues for twenty years he studied particularly motivation and the achievement need. He began his McBer consultancy in 1963, helping industry assess and train staff, and later taught at Boston University, from 1987 until his death. McClelland is chiefly known for his work on achievement, motivation, but his research interests extended to personality and consciousness. David McClelland pioneered workplace motivational thinking, developing achievement-based motivational theory and models, and promoted improvements in employee assessment methods, advocating competency-based assessments and tests, arguing them to be better that traditional IQ and personality-based tests. His ideas have since been widely adopted in many organisations and relate closely to the theory of Frederick Herzberg.

David McClelland is most noted for describing three types of motivational need, which he identified in his 1961 book, The Achieving Society:
• Achievement motivation (n-ach)

• Authority / power motivation (n-pow)

• Affiliation motivation (n-affil)

1.5.3 David McClelland’s needs-based motivational model -

These needs are found to varying degrees in all workers and managers, and this mix of motivational needs characterises a person’s or manager’s style and behaviour, both in terms of being motivated, and in the management and motivation others.

The need of achievement (n-ach) -

The n-ach person is ‘achievement motivated’ and therefore seeks achievement, attainment of realistic but challenging goals, and advancement in the job. There is a strong need for feedback as to achievement and progress, and a need for a sense of accomplishment.

The need for authority and power (n-pow) -

The n-pow person is ‘authority motivated’. This driver produces a need to be influential, effective and to make an impact. There is a strong need to lead and for their ideas to prevail. There is also motivation and need towards increasing personal status and prestige.
The need for affiliation (n-affil)-

The n-affil person ‘affiliation motivated’, and has a need for friendly relationships and is motivated towards interaction with other people. The affiliation driver produces motivation and need to be liked and held in popular regard. These people are team players.

1.5.4 Developing Achievement Motivation -

Motivation is the underlying reason for human behavior. Adults will frequently lament that a student is “just not motivated” when he or she fails to succeed. When asked to explain what that means, they usually report that the student is engaging in academic behavior that does not promote learning - not completing assignment, avoiding homework of classroom tasks, disrupting others, rushing through assignments, and so forth. In reality, these types of behavior do not represent a lack of motivation, but rather motivation that is governed by something other than the need to achieve academically or behave in a manner that meets the expectations of the adults in the system.

Achievement motivation is influenced by those factors that affect students’ perceptions of their relationship to the achievement setting (e.g., the classroom). Several internal and external factors contribute to a student’s motivational orientation in the classroom. These include
recognizing the relationship between effort and ability, understanding the classroom reward structures, balancing academic mastery and social competence, and choosing tasks of appropriate difficulty. Although research in this area tends to focus on academic behaviour - such as completing assignments, participating in class, and so forth - these concepts can easily be extrapolated to understand other behaviours that occur in the school setting.

Students’ conceptions about these factors change over time. In early childhood and the primary grades, children focus on self-mastery and competence. More effort to master their environment typically leads to better outcomes. Young children are intrinsically motivated to gain more competence. In later childhood and adolescence, children become more externally oriented, more focused on academic and social competence as compared to others. This shift results in motivational orientations that are complicated by the need to protect one’s sense of self-worth and the need to continue to gain academic skills or comply with behavioral expectations.
1.5.5 Components of Achievement Motivation -

Social Comparison -

With regard to social comparisons, a positive motivational orientation would be represented by beliefs that personal growth and mastery are more important than comparing one’s performance to others. For example, doing well would mean improving on one’s best attempt or learning new material. Negative motivational orientation includes beliefs that one’s performance is meaningless unless compared to the performance of others. This includes a student’s preference for comparing his or her grades to classmates and judging his or her learning on the basis of others’ performance.

Ability and Effort -

Concepts of ability and effort are interrelated. Some adolescents believe that ability can be improved by applying more effort, and others believe that ability is a fixed quantity and no amount of effort will change it. A positive motivational orientation includes the belief that one’s effort does affect one’s outcomes, and a negative motivational orientation is demonstrated by a belief that effort will have little or no effect on achievement outcomes.
**Reward Salience -**

Reward salience is the component of achievement orientation that reflects student’s beliefs about classroom and school rewards. Students with a positive motivational orientation interpret receiving a reward as information about performance on a specific task. A negative motivational orientation is characterized by a more global interpretation of the meaning of rewards that includes conclusions about worth, status, and general ability. For example, if students do not receive a reward in the classroom, they assume that it was because they were not as smart as the students who did. They may also generalize that they are not as valuable as other members of the class because of their supposed inferior ability.

**Task Preference -**

With regard to task preference, positive orientation is reflected by task choices that are moderately challenging and offer the greatest potential for new learning. Negative motivational orientation is represented by more defensive choices of task difficulty. Extremely easy tasks present a safely zone where little effort is required and little is revealed about underlying ability. Similarly, students with negative motivational orientation do not expect to be successful on extremely
difficult tasks, reducing the negative implications of failure if their expectations prove to be true.

**Enhancing Achievement Motivation**

Several aspects of the classroom and school environment have important implications for student motivation. By designing schools and classrooms with attention to motivational constructs, educators can help maximize the probability that students will adopt positive motivational orientations.

**Understanding Rewards**

Rewards are a daily part of classroom life. Even behaviors and activities that are not commonly considered rewards, such as teacher or parent attention, function as rewards. The presence of rewards alone does not alter achievement orientation as much as the significance of these rewards to the students who do or do not receive them. It is important to determine the purpose and fictions of a reward, as well as the types of rewards that are required to outweigh peer influences.

**Purpose of rewards**

Certainly offering an immediate reward for a specific behavior can produce a desired result. In the absence of that reward, however, the
behavior is unlikely to occur. If the goal is immediate compliance, a reward may prompt the desired result. If the goal is to foster an internal desire to complete the activity, offering a reward is likely to be counter effective. The negative impact of rewards is further compliance when rewards are based on competition or are scarce.

**External versus internal motivators** -

Competitive rewards maximize the potential for social comparison. If students repeatedly fail to receive a reward, they must employ defensive strategies to protect their sense of self-worth. The students might refuse to participate in the activity, reasoning that if they do not try, no one would know whether they could have achieved the reward or not. They might sabotage others or attempt to win the reward by cheating. Rewards that focus on effort expenditure or task completion are less likely to promote those negative defensive strategies, but tangible rewards continue to foster a reliance on external motivators, rather than encourage internal motivation. Teachers can consider using naturally occurring reinforcers, such as activity opportunities, rather than tangible rewards that are directly related to task completion or achievement.
Comparison to Others -

Charts that are posted in the classroom or at home are commonly used by teachers and parents to motivate adolescents to improve in some skill, such as math test scores or homework completion. Comparing adolescents to improve in some skill, such as math test scores or homework completion. Comparing adolescents to siblings, friends or classmates may seem to be an innocuous way to let students know how they are doing, but the implications must be examined carefully. A student who has experienced repeated failures or difficulties in school can view these comparisons as extremely threatening to his or her sense of self-worth. Not all students arrive in a classroom with the same level of readiness to learn. For whatever reason, some students are more prepared to be successful than others.

For those students who are at risk of academic difficulties, public comparison can be very threatening and prompt defensive reactions. If a student does not meet explicit or perceived standards, he or she may elect to disengage from the tasks that are reflected on the chart. If the student exerts no effort, then no assumptions can be made about whether or not the student would have been successful. If a student does try very hard to achieve the milestones that are represented on a chart but never quite achieves at the level of his or her classmates, the student experiences a
great deal of negative information about his or her performance. Repeated failure can create a sense of ineffectiveness and low self-esteem, further reducing motivation for learning. In addition, when students are not engaged in learning as the primary activity of school, their energy is likely to be directed toward activities that are inappropriate and may distract others from learning.

**Goal Setting and Measuring Progress -**

Educators can minimize the impact of social comparison and help students develop realistic goals and recognize progress. By working with teachers and parents, administrators can help adults create environments where academic success is valued and encouraged.

**Strategies for parents -**

Administrators can suggest that parents work with adolescents on individual goal setting and attending to personal growth. By focusing on what is important to the student and setting personal goals for achievement, parents can help their children protect themselves from situations that threaten positive motivation. Parents can use information from school - such as grades, class rank and comparative statements - and interpret what it really means in the context of their children’s personal goals. Then parents can encourage their children to devise strategies that
will help them make progress toward these goals, such as improving organizational and study skills, seeking guidance when applying to college, accessing academic support systems available on campus, and informing their teachers of their goals and strategies.

**Strategies for teachers**

To minimize the impact of social comparison, administrators can help teachers emphasize individual goal setting and individual progress monitoring in the classroom. When feedback on performance is meaningful, based on mastery, and delivered privately, students can make accurate evaluations of their progress. If charts are used, they should be individual, comparing the student’s progress to his or her own previous performance and future goals. In addition, individual goal setting and progress monitors enable teachers to guide student choices regarding task difficulty.

Students can choose tasks that maximize the opportunity for learning and mastery. Students who are focused on individual growth will choose tasks of moderate challenge that offer the greatest opportunity for new learning. Students who are focused on how their level performance compared to others’ may choose tasks that very easy or impossibly hard. These tasks offer little in the way of learning opportunity because they are chosen to ensure success (such as a task that is easy to do) or negate
the information revealed when success does not occur (such as a task that is too hard for anyone to do.)

**Understanding Competition -**

Competition is an inherent part of schools and larger society. Many adults feel that experiencing competition in the school setting prepares students for competition in the future marketplace, but the learning environment is not the place to experience those life lessons. Competitive structures negatively affect academic growth, self-concept, and future motivation for learning. Competition implies scarcity of rewards. Winning implies worthiness.

When students are forced to compete in academic settings, they are forced to employ reasoning that protects their underlying sense of self-worth. Failure avoiders simply “check out.” They refuse to engage in the competition, thus refusing to risk evaluation of their worthiness. By refusing to engage, these students are at risk for continued failure and minimal academic progress, thus perpetuating a negative cycle with devastating consequences. Over-strivers exhibit tremendous effort to achieve competitive gains. This can result in temporary success, but can also set up the student for anxiety and negative reactions when losses occur. The overstriver’s self-worth is dependent on winning, not on progress.
1.5.6 Effects of Achievement Motivation on Behavior

Scott T. Rabideau studied the effects of n-Ach on behaviour. He defined motivation as the driving force behind all the actions of an individual. The influence of an individual’s needs and desires both have a strong impact on the direction of their behavior. Motivation is based on your emotions and achievement-related goals. There are different forms of motivation including extrinsic, intrinsic, physiological, and achievement motivation. There are also more negative forms of motivation. Achievement motivation can be defined as the need for success or the attainment of excellence. Individuals will satisfy their needs through different means, and are driven to succeed for varying reasons both internal and external.

Motivation is the basic drive for all of our actions. Motivation refers to the dynamics of our behavior, which involves our needs, desires, and ambitions in life. Achievement motivation is based on reaching success and achieving all of our aspirations in life. Achievement goals can affect the way a person performs a task and represent a desire to show competence (Harackiewicz, Barron, Carter, Lehto, & Elliot, 1997). These basic physiological motivational drives affect our natural behaviour in different environments. Most of our goals are incentive-based and can vary from basic hunger to the need for love and the establishment of
mature sexual relationships. Our motives for achievement can range from biological needs to satisfying creative desires or realizing success in competitive ventures. Motivation is important because it affects our lives every day. All of our behaviour, actions, thoughts, and beliefs are influenced by our inner drive to succeed.

1.5.7 Implicit and Self-Attributed Motives -

Motivational researchers share the view that achievement behaviour is an interaction between situational variables and the individual subject’s motivation to achieve. Two motives are directly involved in the prediction of behaviour, implicit and explicit. Implicit motives are spontaneous impulses to act, also known as task performances, and are aroused through incentives inherent to the task. Explicit motives are expressed through deliberate choices and more often stimulated for extrinsic reasons. Also, individuals with strong implicit needs to achieve goals set higher internal standards, whereas others tend to adhere to the societal norms. These two motives often work together to determine the behavior of the individual in direction and passion (Brunstein & Maier, 2005).

Explicit and implicit motivations have a compelling impact on behaviour. Task behaviours are accelerated in the face of a challenge through implicit motivation, making performing a task in the most
effective manner the primary goal. A person with a strong implicit drive will feel pleasure from achieving a goal in the most efficient way. The increase in effort and overcoming the challenge by mastering the task satisfies the individual. However, the explicit motives are built around a person’s self-image. This type of motivation shapes a person’s behaviour based on their own self-view and can influence their choices and responses from outside cues. The primary agent for this type of motivation is perception or perceived ability. Many theorists still cannot agree whether achievement is based on mastering one’s skills or striving to promote a better self-image (Brunstein & Maier, 2005). Most research is still unable to determine whether these different types of motivation would result in different behaviours in the same environment.

1.5.8 The Hierarchal Model of Achievement Motivation -

Achievement motivation has been conceptualized in many different ways. Our understanding of achievement-relevant effects, cognition, and behaviour has improved. Despite being similar in nature, many achievement motivation approaches have been developed separately, suggesting that most achievement motivation theories are in concordance with one another instead of competing. Motivational researchers have sought to promote a hierarchal model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation by incorporating the two prominent theories: the
achievement motive approach and the achievement goal approach. Achievement motives include the need for achievement and the fear of failure. These are the more predominant motives that direct our behavior toward positive and negative outcomes. Achievement goals are viewed as more solid cognitive representations pointing individuals toward a specific end. There are three types of these achievement goals: a performance-approach goal, a performance-avoidance goal, and a mastery goal. A performance-approach goal is focused on attaining competence relative to others, a performance-avoidance goal is focused on avoiding incompetence relative to others, and a mastery goal is focused on the development of competence itself and of task mastery. Achievement motives can be seen as direct predictors of achievement-relevant circumstances. Thus, achievement motives are said to have an indirect or distal influence, and achievement goals are said to have a direct or proximal influence on achievement-relevant outcomes (Elliot & McGregor, 1999).

These motives and goals are viewed as working together to regulate achievement behavior. The hierarchal model presents achievement goals as predictors for performance outcomes. The model is being further conceptualized to include more approaches to achievement motivation. One weakness of the model is that it does not provide an
account of the processes responsible for the link between achievement goals and performance. As this model is enhanced, it becomes more useful in predicting the outcomes of achievement-based behaviors (Elliot & McGregor, 1999).

1.5.9 Achievement Goals and Information Seeking -

Theorists have proposed that people’s achievement goals affect their achievement-related attitudes and behaviors. Two different types of achievement-related attitudes include task-involvement and ego-involvement. Task-involvement is a motivational state in which a person’s main goal is to acquire skills and understanding whereas the main goal in ego-involvement is to demonstrate superior abilities (Butler, 1999). One example of an activity where someone strives to attain mastery and demonstrate superior ability is schoolwork. However situational cues, such as the person’s environment or surroundings, can affect the success of achieving a goal at any time.

Studies confirm that a task-involvement activity more often results in challenging attributions and increasing effort (typically in activities providing an opportunity to learn and develop competence) than in an ego-involvement activity. Intrinsic motivation, which is defined as striving to engage in activity because of self-satisfaction, is more prevalent when a person is engaged in task-involved activities. When
people are more ego-involved, they tend to take on a different conception of their ability, where differences in ability limit the effectiveness of effort. Ego-involved individuals are driven to succeed by outperforming others, and their feelings of success depend on maintaining self-worth and avoiding failure. On the other hand, task-involved individuals tend to adopt their conception of ability as learning through applied effort (Butler, 1999). Therefore less able individuals will feel more successful as long as they can satisfy an effort to learn and improve. Ego-invoking conditions tend to produce less favorable responses to failure and difficulty.

Competence moderated attitudes and behaviors are more prevalent in ego-involved activities than task-involved. Achievement does not moderate intrinsic motivation in task-involving conditions, in which people of all levels of ability could learn to improve. In ego-involving conditions, intrinsic motivation was higher among higher achievers who demonstrated superior ability than in low achievers who could not demonstrate such ability (Butler, 1999). These different attitudes toward achievement can also be compared in information seeking.

Task- and ego-involving settings bring about different goals, conceptions of ability, and responses to difficulty. They also promote different patterns of information seeking. People of all levels of ability
will seek information relevant to attaining their goal of improving mastery in task-involving conditions. However they need to seek information regarding self-appraisal to gain a better understanding of their self-capacity (Butler, 1999). On the other hand people in ego-involving settings are more interested in information about social comparisons, assessing their ability relative to others.

**1.5.10 Self-Worth Theory in Achievement Motivation -**

Self-worth theory states that in certain situations students stand to gain by not trying and deliberately withholding effort. If poor performance is a threat to a person’s sense of self-esteem, this lack of effort is likely to occur. This most often occurs after an experience of failure. Failure threatens self-estimates of ability and creates uncertainty about an individual’s capability to perform well on a subsequent basis. If the following performance turns out to be poor, then doubts concerning ability are confirmed. Self-worth theory states that one way to avoid threat to self-esteem is by withdrawing effort. Withdrawing effort allows failure to be attributed to lack of effort rather than low ability which reduces overall risk to the value of one’s self-esteem. When poor performance is likely to reflect poor ability, a situation of high threat is created to the individual’s intellect. On the other hand, if an excuse allows poor performance to be attributed to a factor unrelated to ability,
the threat to self-esteem and one’s intellect is much lower (Thompson, Davidson, & Barber, 1995).

A study was conducted on students involving unsolvable problems to test some assumptions of the self-worth theory regarding motivation and effort. The results showed that there was no evidence of reported reduction of effort despite poorer performance when the tasks were described as moderately difficult as compared with tasks much higher in difficulty. The possibility was raised that low effort may not be responsible for the poor performance of students in situations which create threats to self-esteem. Two suggestions were made, one being that students might unconsciously withdraw effort, and the other stating that students may reduce effort as a result of withdrawing commitment from the problem. Regardless of which suggestion is true, self-worth theory assumes that individuals have a reduced tendency to take personal responsibility for failure (Thompson, Davidson, & Barber, 1995).

1.5.11 Avoidance Achievement Motivation -

In everyday life, individuals strive to be competent in their activities. In the past decade, many theorists have utilized a social-cognitive achievement goal approach in accounting for individuals striving for competence. An achievement goal is commonly defined as the purpose for engaging in a task, and the specific type of goal taken on
creates a framework for how individuals experience their achievement pursuits. Achievement goal theorists commonly identify two distinct ideas toward competence: a performance goal focused on demonstrating ability when compared to others, and a mastery goal focused on the development of competence and task mastery. Performance goals are hypothesized to produce vulnerability to certain response patterns in achievement settings such as preferences for easy tasks, withdrawal of effort in the face of failure, and decreased task enjoyment. Mastery goals can lead to a motivational pattern that creates a preference for moderately challenging tasks, persistence in the face of failure, and increased enjoyment of tasks (Elliot & Church, 1997).

Most achievement goal theorists conceptualize both performance and mastery goals as the “approach” forms of motivation. Existing classical achievement motivation theorists claimed that activities are emphasized and oriented toward attaining success or avoiding failure, while the achievement goal theorists focused on their approach aspect. More recently, an integrated achievement goal conceptualization was proposed that includes both modern performance and mastery theories with the standard approach and avoidance features. In this basis for motivation, the performance goal is separated into an independent approach component and avoidance component, and three achievement
orientations are conceived: a mastery goal focused on the development of competence and task mastery, a performance-approach goal directed toward the attainment of favorable judgments of competence, and a performance-avoidance goal centered on avoiding unfavorable judgments of competence. The mastery and performance-approach goals are characterized as self-regulating to promote potential positive outcomes and processes to absorb an individual in their task or to create excitement leading to a mastery pattern of achievement results. Performance-avoidance goals, however, are characterized as promoting negative circumstances. This avoidance orientation creates anxiety, task distraction, and a pattern of helpless achievement outcomes. Intrinsic motivation, which is the enjoyment of and interest in an activity for its own sake, plays a role in achievement outcomes as well. Performance-avoidance goals undermined intrinsic motivation while both mastery and performance-approach goals helped to increase it (Elliot & Church, 1997).

Most achievement theorists and philosophers also identify task-specific competence expectancies as an important variable in achievement settings. Achievement goals are created in order to obtain competence and avoid failure. These goals are viewed as implicit (non-conscious) or self-attributed (conscious) and direct achievement behavior.
Competence expectancies were considered an important variable in classical achievement motivation theories, but now appear to only be moderately emphasized in contemporary perspectives (Elliot & Church, 1997).

1.5.12 Approach and Avoidance Goals -

Achievement motivation theorists focus their research attention on behaviors involving competence. Individuals aspire to attain competence or may strive to avoid incompetence, based on the earlier approach-avoidance research and theories. The desire for success and the desire to avoid failure were identified as critical determinants of aspiration and behavior by a theorist named Lewin. In his achievement motivation theory, McClelland proposed that there are two kinds of achievement motivation, one oriented around avoiding failure and the other around the more positive goal of attaining success. Atkinson, another motivational theorist, drew from the work of Lewin and McClelland in forming his need-achievement theory, a mathematical framework that assigned the desire to succeed and the desire to avoid failure as important determinants in achievement behavior (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996).

Theorists introduced an achievement goal approach to achievement motivation more recently. These theorists defined achievement goals as the reason for activities related to competence. Initially, these theorists
followed in the footsteps of Lewin, McClelland, and Atkinson by including the distinction between approach and avoidance motivation into the structure of their assumptions. Three types of achievement goals were created, two of which being approach orientations and the third and avoidance type. One approach type was a task involvement goal focused on the development of competence and task mastery, and the other being a performance or ego involvement goal directed toward attaining favorable judgments of competence. The avoidance orientation involved an ego or performance goal aimed at avoiding unfavorable judgments of competence. These new theories received little attention at first and some theorists bypassed them with little regard. Motivational theorists shifted away and devised other conceptualizations such as Dweck’s performance-learning goal dichotomy with approach and avoidance components or Nicholls’ ego and task orientations, which he characterized as two forms of approach motivation (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996).

Presently, achievement goal theory is the predominant approach to the analysis of achievement motivation. Most contemporary theorists use the frameworks of Dweck’s and Nicholls’ revised models in two important ways. First, most theorists institute primary orientations toward competence, by either differentiating between mastery and ability goals
or contrasting task and ego involvement. A contention was raised toward the achievement goal frameworks on whether or not they are conceptually similar enough to justify a convergence of the mastery goal form (learning, task involvement and mastery) with the performance goal form (ability and performance, ego involvement, competition). Secondly, most modern theorists characterized both mastery and performance goals as approach forms of motivation, or they failed to consider approach and avoidance as independent motivational tendencies within the performance goal orientation (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996).

The type of orientation adopted at the outset of an activity creates a context for how individuals interpret, evaluate, and act on information and experiences in an achievement setting. Adoption of a mastery goal is hypothesized to produce a mastery motivational pattern characterized by a preference for moderately challenging tasks, persistence in the face of failure, a positive stance toward learning, and enhanced task enjoyment. A helpless motivational response, however, is the result of the adoption of a performance goal orientation. This includes a preference for easy or difficult tasks, effort withdrawal in the face of failure, shifting the blame of failure to lack of ability, and decreased enjoyment of tasks. Some theorists include the concept of perceived competence as an important agent in their assumptions. Mastery goals are expected to have a uniform
effect across all levels of perceived competence, leading to a mastery pattern. Performance goals can lead to mastery in individuals with a high perceived competence and a helpless motivational pattern in those with low competence (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996).

Three motivational goal theories have recently been proposed based on the tri-variant framework by achievement goal theorists: mastery, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance. Performance-approach and mastery goals both represent approach orientations according to potential positive outcomes, such as the attainment of competence and task mastery. These forms of behavior and self-regulation commonly produce a variety of affective and perceptual-cognitive processes that facilitate optimal task engagement. They challenge sensitivity to information relevant to success and effective concentration in the activity, leading to the mastery set of motivational responses described by achievement goal theorists. The performance-avoidance goal is conceptualized as an avoidance orientation according to potential negative outcomes. This form of regulation evokes self-protective mental processes that interfere with optimal task engagement. It creates sensitivity to failure-relevant information and invokes an anxiety-based preoccupation with the appearance of oneself rather than the concerns of the task, which can lead to the helpless set of motivational
responses. The three goal theories presented are very process oriented in nature. Approach and avoidance goals are viewed as exerting their different effects on achievement behavior by activating opposing sets of motivational processes (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996).

1.5.13 Intrinsic Motivation and Achievement Goals -

Intrinsic motivation is defined as the enjoyment of an interest in an activity for its own sake. Fundamentally viewed as an approach form of motivation, intrinsic motivation is identified as an important component of achievement goal theory. Most achievement goal and intrinsic motivational theorists argue that mastery goals are facilitative of intrinsic motivation and related mental processes and performance goals create negative effects. Mastery goals are said to promote intrinsic motivation by fostering perceptions of challenge, encouraging task involvement, generating excitement, and supporting self-determination while performance goals are the opposite. Performance goals are portrayed as undermining intrinsic motivation by instilling perceptions of threat, disrupting task involvement, and creating anxiety and pressure (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996).

An alternative set of predictions may be derived from the approach-avoidance framework. Both performance-approach and mastery goals are focused on attaining competence and foster intrinsic motivation.
More specifically, in performance-approach or mastery orientations, individuals perceive the achievement setting as a challenge, and this likely will create excitement, encourage cognitive functioning, increase concentration and task absorption, and direct the person toward success and mastery of information which facilitates intrinsic motivation. The performance-avoidance goal is focused on avoiding incompetence, where individuals see the achievement setting as a threat and seek to escape it (Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996). This orientation is likely to elicit anxiety and withdrawal of effort and cognitive resources while disrupting concentration and motivation.

### 1.5.14 Personal Goals Analysis

In recent years, theorists have increasingly relied on various goal constructs to account for action in achievement settings. Four levels of goal representation have been introduced: task-specific guidelines for performance, such as performing a certain action, situation-specific orientations that represent the purpose of achievement activity, such as demonstrating competence relative to others in a situation, personal goals that symbolize achievement pursuits, such as getting good grades, and self-standards and future self-images, including planning for future goals and successes. These goal-based achievement motivation theories have
focused almost exclusively on approach forms behavior but in recent years have shifted more toward avoidance (Elliot & Sheldon, 1997).

Motivation is an important factor in everyday life. Our basic behaviors and feelings are affected by our inner drive to succeed over life’s challenges while we set goals for ourselves. Our motivation also promotes our feelings of competence and self-worth as we achieve our goals. It provides us with means to compete with others in order to better ourselves and to seek out new information to learn and absorb. Individuals experience motivation in different ways, whether it is task- or ego-based in nature. Some people strive to achieve their goals for personal satisfaction and self-improvement while others compete with their surroundings in achievement settings to simply be classified as the best. Motivation and the resulting behavior are both affected by the many different models of achievement motivation. These models, although separate, are very similar in nature and theory. The mastery and performance achievement settings each have a considerable effect on how an individual is motivated. Each theorist has made a contribution to the existing theories in today’s achievement studies. More often than not, theorists build off of each other’s work to expand old ideas and create new ones.
1.6 Emotional intelligence:

Emotional intelligence (EI) refers to the ability to perceive, control, and evaluate emotions. Some researchers suggest that emotional intelligence can be learned and strengthened, while other claim it is an inborn characteristic.

Since 1990, Peter Salovey and John D. Mayer have been the leading researchers on emotional intelligence. In their influential article “Emotional Intelligence,” they defined emotional intelligence as, “the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and actions” (1990).

Salovey and Mayer proposed a model that identified four different factors of emotional intelligence: the perception of emotion, the ability reason using emotions, the ability to understand emotion, and the ability to manage emotions.

According to Salovey and Mayer, the four branches of their model are, “arranged from more basic psychological processes to higher, more psychologically integrated processes. For example, the lowest level branch concerns the (relatively) simple abilities of perceiving and
expressing emotion. In contrast, the highest level branch concerns the conscious, reflective regulation of emotion” (1997).

Emotional intelligence (EI) is the ability, capacity, skill; or, in the case of the trait EI model, a self-perceived ability to identify, assess, and control the emotions of oneself, of others, and of groups. Different models have been proposed for the definition of EI and there is disagreement about how the term should be used. Despite these disagreements, which are often highly technical, the ability-EI and trait-EI models (but not the mixed models) enjoy support in the literature and have successful applications in various domains.

1.6.1 History of E.I.-

The earliest roots of emotional intelligence can be traced to Darwin’s work on the importance of emotional expression for survival and second adaptation. In the 1900s, even though traditional definitions of intelligence emphasized cognitive aspects such as memory and problem-solving, several influential researchers in the intelligence field of study had begun to recognize the importance of the non-cognitive aspects. For instance, as early as 1920, E.L. Thorndike used the term social intelligence to describe the skill of understanding and managing other people.
Similarly, in 1940 David Wechsler described the influence of non-intellective factors on intelligent behavior, and further argued that our models of intelligence would not be complete until we can adequately describe these factors. In 1983, Howard Gardner’s Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligence introduced the idea of multiple intelligences which included both interpersonal intelligence (the capacity to understand the intentions, motivations and desires of other people) and intrapersonal intelligence (the capacity to understand oneself, to appreciate one’s feelings, fears and motivations). In Gardner’s view, traditional types of intelligence, such as IQ, fail to fully explain cognitive ability. Thus, even though the names given to the concept varied, there was a common belief that traditional definitions of intelligence are lacking in ability to fully explain performance outcomes.

The first use of the term “emotional intelligence” is usually attributed to Wayne Payne’s doctoral thesis, A Study of Emotion: Developing Emotional Intelligence from 1985. However, prior to this, the term “emotional intelligence” had appeared in Leuner (1966). Greenspan (1989) also put forward an EI model, followed by Salovey and Mayer (1990), and Daniel Goleman (1995). The distinction between trait emotional intelligence and ability emotional intelligence was introduced in 2000.
1.6.2 Definitions -

Substantial disagreement exists regarding the definition of EI, with respect to both terminology and operationalizations. There has been much confusion about the exact meaning of this construct. The definitions are so varied, and the field is growing so rapidly, that researchers are constantly re-evaluating even their own definitions of the construct. Currently, there are three main models of EI:

- Ability EI model
- Mixed models of EI (usually subsumed under trait EI)
- Trait EI model

Different models of EI have led to the development of various instruments for the assessment of the construct. While some of these measures may overlap, most researchers agree that they tap different constructs.

1.6.3 Ability model -

Salovey and Mayer’s conception of EI strives to define EI within the confines of the standard criteria for a new intelligence. Following their continuing research, their initial definition of EI was revised to “The ability to perceive emotion, integrate emotion to facilitate thought,
understand emotions and to regulate emotions to promote personal growth.”

The ability-based model views emotions as useful sources of information that help one to make sense of and navigate the social environment.[12] The model proposes that individuals vary in their ability to process information of an emotional nature and in their ability to relate emotional processing to a wider cognition. This ability is seen to manifest itself in certain adaptive behaviors. The model claims that EI includes four types of abilities:

1. Perceiving emotions – the ability to detect and decipher emotions in faces, pictures, voices, and cultural artifacts—including the ability to identify one’s own emotions. Perceiving emotions represents a basic aspect of emotional intelligence, as it makes all other processing of emotional information possible.

2. Using emotions – the ability to harness emotions to facilitate various cognitive activities, such as thinking and problem solving. The emotionally intelligent person can capitalize fully upon his or her changing moods in order to best fit the task at hand.

3. Understanding emotions – the ability to comprehend emotion language and to appreciate complicated relationships among emotions.
For example, understanding emotions encompasses the ability to be sensitive to slight variations between emotions, and the ability to recognize and describe how emotions evolve over time.

4. Managing emotions – the ability to regulate emotions in both ourselves and in others. Therefore, the emotionally intelligent person can harness emotions, even negative ones, and manage them to achieve intended goals.

The ability EI model has been criticized in the research for lacking face and predictive validity in the workplace.

**Measurement of the ability model -**

The current measure of Mayer and Salovey’s model of EI, the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) is based on a series of emotion-based problem-solving items. Consistent with the model’s claim of EI as a type of intelligence, the test is modeled on ability-based IQ tests. By testing a person’s abilities on each of the four branches of emotional intelligence, it generates scores for each of the branches as well as a total score.

Central to the four-branch model is the idea that EI requires attunement to social norms. Therefore, the MSCEIT is scored in a consensus fashion, with higher scores indicating higher overlap between
an individual’s answers and those provided by a worldwide sample of respondents. The MSCEIT can also be expert-scored, so that the amount of overlap is calculated between an individual’s answers and those provided by a group of 21 emotion researchers.

Although promoted as an ability test, the MSCEIT is most unlike standard IQ tests in that its items do not have objectively correct responses. Among other problems, the consensus scoring criterion means that it is impossible to create items (questions) that only a minority of respondents can solve, because, by definition, responses are deemed emotionally “intelligent” only if the majority of the sample has endorsed them. This and other similar problems have led cognitive ability experts to question the definition of EI as a genuine intelligence.

1.6.4 Mixed models -

The model introduced by Daniel Goleman focuses on EI as a wide array of competencies and skills that drive leadership performance. Goleman’s model outlines four main EI constructs:

1. Self-awareness – the ability to read one’s emotions and recognize their impact while using gut feelings to guide decisions.

2. Self-management – involves controlling one’s emotions and impulses and adapting to changing circumstances.
3. Social awareness – the ability to sense, understand, and react to others’ emotions while comprehending social networks.

4. Relationship management – the ability to inspire, influence, and develop others while managing conflict.

Goleman includes a set of emotional competencies within each construct of EI. Emotional competencies are not innate talents, but rather learned capabilities that must be worked on and can be developed to achieve outstanding performance. Goleman posits that individuals are born with a general emotional intelligence that determines their potential for learning emotional competencies.[16] Goleman’s model of EI has been criticized in the research literature as mere “pop psychology” (Mayer, Roberts, & Barsade, 2008).

**Measurement of the Emotional Competencies (Goleman) model**

Two measurement tools are based on the Goleman model:

1. The Emotional Competency Inventory (ECI), which was created in 1999, and the Emotional and Social Competency Inventory (ESCI), which was created in 2007.

2. The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal, which was created in 2001 and which can be taken as a self-report or 360-degree assessment.
1.6.5 Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI) -

Bar-On defines emotional intelligence as being concerned with effectively understanding oneself and others, relating well to people, and adapting to and coping with the immediate surroundings to be more successful in dealing with environmental demands. Bar-On posits that EI develops over time and that it can be improved through training, programming, and therapy. Bar-On hypothesizes that those individuals with higher than average EQs are in general more successful in meeting environmental demands and pressures. He also notes that a deficiency in EI can mean a lack of success and the existence of emotional problems. Problems in coping with one’s environment are thought, by Bar-On, to be especially common among those individuals lacking in the subscales of reality testing, problem solving, stress tolerance, and impulse control. In general, Bar-On considers emotional intelligence and cognitive intelligence to contribute equally to a person’s general intelligence, which then offers an indication of one’s potential to succeed in life. However, doubts have been expressed about this model in the research literature (in particular about the validity of self-report as an index of emotional intelligence) and in scientific settings it is being replaced by the trait emotional intelligence (trait EI) model discussed below.
Measurement of the ESI model -

The Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i), is a self-report measure of EI developed as a measure of emotionally and socially competent behavior that provides an estimate of one’s emotional and social intelligence. The EQ-i is not meant to measure personality traits or cognitive capacity, but rather the mental ability to be successful in dealing with environmental demands and pressures.[3] One hundred and thirty three items (questions or factors) are used to obtain a Total EQ (Total Emotional Quotient) and to produce five composite scale scores, corresponding to the five main components of the Bar-On model. A limitation of this model is that it claims to measure some kind of ability through self-report items (for a discussion, see Matthews, Zeidner, & Roberts, 2001). The EQ-i has been found to be highly susceptible to faking (Day & Carroll, 2008; Grubb & McDaniel, 2007).

1.6.6 Trait EI model -

Petrides and colleagues [20] (see also Petrides, 2009) proposed a conceptual distinction between the ability based model and a trait based model of EI.[9] Trait EI is “a constellation of emotional self-perceptions located at the lower levels of personality”. In lay terms, trait EI refers to an individual’s self-perceptions of their emotional abilities. This definition of EI encompasses behavioral dispositions and self perceived
abilities and is measured by self report, as opposed to the ability based model which refers to actual abilities, which have proven highly resistant to scientific measurement. Trait EI should be investigated within a personality framework.[21] An alternative label for the same construct is trait emotional self-efficacy.

The trait EI model is general and subsumes the Goleman and Bar-On models discussed above. The conceptualization of EI as a personality trait leads to a construct that lies outside the taxonomy of human cognitive ability. This is an important distinction in as much as it bears directly on the operationalization of the construct and the theories and hypotheses that are formulated about it.[9]

**Measurement of the trait EI model -**

There are many self-report measures of EI,[22] including the EQ-i, the Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test (SUEIT), and the Schutte EI model. None of these assess intelligence, abilities, or skills (as their authors often claim), but rather, they are limited measures of trait emotional intelligence [20]. One of the more comprehensive and widely researched measures of this construct is the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (TEIQue), which was specifically designed to measure the construct comprehensively and is available in many languages.
The TEIQue provides an operationalization for the model of Petrides and colleagues, that conceptualizes EI in terms of personality.[23] The test encompasses 15 subscales organized under four factors: Well-Being, Self-Control, Emotionality, and Sociability. The psychometric properties of the TEIQue were investigated in a study on a French-speaking population, where it was reported that TEIQue scores were globally normally distributed and reliable.[24]

The researchers also found TEIQue scores were unrelated to nonverbal reasoning (Raven’s matrices), which they interpreted as support for the personality trait view of EI (as opposed to a form of intelligence). As expected, TEIQue scores were positively related to some of the Big Five personality traits (extraversion, agreeableness, openness, conscientiousness) as well as inversely related to others (alexithymia, neuroticism). A number of quantitative genetic studies have been carried out within the trait EI model, which have revealed significant genetic effects and heritabilities for all trait EI scores.[25]

Two recent studies (one a meta-analysis) involving direct comparisons of multiple EI tests yielded very favorable results for the TEIQue.
1.6.7 Criticisms of the theoretical foundation of EI -

**EI cannot be recognized as a form of intelligence**

Goleman’s early work has been criticized for assuming from the beginning that EI is a type of intelligence. Eysenck (2000)[32] writes that Goleman’s description of EI contains assumptions about intelligence in general, and that it even runs contrary to what researchers have come to expect when studying types of intelligence:

“[Goleman] exemplifies more clearly than most the fundamental absurdity of the tendency to class almost any type of behaviour as an ‘intelligence’... If these five ‘abilities’ define ‘emotional intelligence’, we would expect some evidence that they are highly correlated; Goleman admits that they might be quite uncorrelated, and in any case if we cannot measure them, how do we know they are related? So the whole theory is built on quicksand: there is no sound scientific basis.”

Similarly, Locke (2005)[33] claims that the concept of EI is in itself a misinterpretation of the intelligence construct, and he offers an alternative interpretation: it is not another form or type of intelligence, but intelligence—the ability to grasp abstractions—applied to a particular life domain: emotions. He suggests the concept should be re-labeled and referred to as a skill.
The essence of this criticism is that scientific inquiry depends on valid and consistent construct utilization, and that before the introduction of the term EI, psychologists had established theoretical distinctions between factors such as abilities and achievements, skills and habits, attitudes and values, and personality traits and emotional states.[34] Thus, some scholars believe that the term EI merges and conflates such accepted concepts and definitions.

**EI has little predictive value -**

Landy (2005)[35] claimed that the few incremental validity studies conducted on EI have shown that it adds little or nothing to the explanation or prediction of some common outcomes (most notably academic and work success). Landy suggested that the reason why some studies have found a small increase in predictive validity is a methodological fallacy, namely, that alternative explanations have not been completely considered:

“EI is compared and contrasted with a measure of abstract intelligence but not with a personality measure, or with a personality measure but not with a measure of academic intelligence.” Landy (2005)

Similarly, other researchers have raised concerns about the extent to which self-report EI measures correlate with established personality
dimensions. Generally, self-report EI measures and personality measures have been said to converge because they both purport to measure personality traits.[20] Specifically, there appear to be two dimensions of the Big Five that stand out as most related to self-report EI – neuroticism and extroversion. In particular, neuroticism has been said to relate to negative emotionality and anxiety. Intuitively, individuals scoring high on neuroticism are likely to score low on self-report EI measures.

The interpretations of the correlations between EI questionnaires and personality have been varied. The prominent view in the scientific literature is the Trait EI view, which re-interprets EI as a collection of personality traits.[36][37][38]

1.6.8 Criticisms of measurement issues

Ability EI measures measure conformity, not ability -

One criticism of the works of Mayer and Salovey comes from a study by Roberts et al. (2001).[39] which suggests that the EI, as measured by the MSCEIT, may only be measuring conformity. This argument is rooted in the MSCEIT’s use of consensus-based assessment, and in the fact that scores on the MSCEIT are negatively distributed (meaning that its scores differentiate between people with low EI better than people with high EI).
**Ability EI measures measure knowledge (not actual ability)**

Further criticism has been offered by Brody (2004),[40] who claimed that unlike tests of cognitive ability, the MSCEIT “tests knowledge of emotions but not necessarily the ability to perform tasks that are related to the knowledge that is assessed”. The main argument is that even though someone knows how he should behave in an emotionally laden situation, it doesn’t necessarily follow that he could actually carry out the reported behavior.

**Ability EI measures measure personality and general intelligence**

New research is surfacing that suggests that ability EI measures might be measuring personality in addition to general intelligence. These studies examined the multivariate effects of personality and intelligence on EI and also corrected estimates for measurement error (which is often not done in some validation studies). For example, a study by Schulte, Ree, Carretta (2004),[41] showed that general intelligence (measured with the Wonderlic Personnel Test), agreeableness (measured by the NEO-PI), as well as gender had a multiple R of .81 with the MSCEIT. This result has been replicated by Fiori and Antonakis (2011),[42]; they found a multiple R of .76 using Cattell’s “Culture Fair” intelligence test and the Big Five Inventory (BFI); significant covariates were intelligence (standardized beta = .39), agreeableness (standardized beta = .54), and
openness (standardized beta = .46). Antonakis and Dietz (2011a)[43], who investigated the Ability Emotional Intelligence Measure found similar results (Multiple R = .69), with significant predictors being intelligence, standardized beta = .69 (using the Swaps Test and a Wechsler scales subtest, the 40-item General Knowledge Task) and empathy, standardized beta = .26 (using the Questionnaire Measure of Empathic Tendency)—see also Antonakis and Dietz (2011b)[44], who show how including or excluding important controls variables can fundamentally change results—thus, it is important to always include important controls like personality and intelligence when examining the predictive validity of ability and trait EI models.

**Self-report measures are susceptible to faking -**

More formally termed socially desirable responding (SDR), faking good is defined as a response pattern in which test-takers systematically represent themselves with an excessive positive bias (Paulhus, 2002). This bias has long been known to contaminate responses on personality inventories (Holtgraves, 2004; McFarland & Ryan, 2000; Peebles & Moore, 1998; Nichols & Greene, 1997; Zerbe & Paulhus, 1987), acting as a mediator of the relationships between self-report measures (Nichols & Greene, 1997; Gangster et al., 1983).
It has been suggested that responding in a desirable way is a response set, which is a situational and temporary response pattern (Pauls & Crost, 2004; Paulhus, 1991). This is contrasted with a response style, which is a more long-term trait-like quality. Considering the contexts some self-report EI inventories are used in (e.g., employment settings), the problems of response sets in high-stakes scenarios become clear (Paulhus & Reid, 2001).

There are a few methods to prevent socially desirable responding on behavior inventories. Some researchers believe it is necessary to warn test-takers not to fake good before taking a personality test (e.g., McFarland, 2003). Some inventories use validity scales in order to determine the likelihood or consistency of the responses across all items.

**Claims for the predictive power of EI -**

Landy distinguishes between the “commercial wing” and “the academic wing” of the EI movement, basing this distinction on the alleged predictive power of EI as seen by the two currents. According to Landy, the former makes expansive claims on the applied value of EI, while the latter is trying to warn users against these claims. As an example, Goleman (1998) asserts that “the most effective leaders are alike in one crucial way: they all have a high degree of what has come to be known as emotional intelligence. ...emotional intelligence is the sine
qua non of leadership”. In contrast, Mayer (1999) cautions “the popular literature’s implication—that highly emotionally intelligent people possess an unqualified advantage in life—appears overly enthusiastic at present and unsubstantiated by reasonable scientific standards.” Landy further reinforces this argument by noting that the data upon which these claims are based are held in “proprietary databases”, which means they are unavailable to independent researchers for reanalysis, replication, or verification. Thus, the credibility of the findings cannot be substantiated in a scientific way, unless those datasets are made public and available for independent analysis.

In an academic exchange, Antonakis and Ashkanasy/Dasborough mostly agreed that researchers testing whether EI matters for leadership have not done so using robust research designs; therefore, currently there is no strong evidence showing that EI predicts leadership outcomes when accounting for personality and IQ. Antonakis argued that EI might not be needed for leadership effectiveness (he referred to this as the “curse of emotion” phenomenon, because leaders who are too sensitive to their and others’ emotional states might have difficulty to take decisions that would result in emotional labor for the leader or followers). A recently-published meta-analysis seems to support the Antonakis position: In fact, Harms and Credé found that overall (and using data free from problems
of common source and common methods), EI measures correlated only \( r = .11 \) with measures of transformational leadership. Interestingly, ability-measures of EI fared worst (i.e., \( r = .04 \)); the WLEIS (Wong-Law measure) did a bit better (\( r = .08 \)), and the Bar-On measure better still (\( r = .18 \)). However, the validity of these estimates does not include the effects of IQ or the big five personality, which correlate both with EI measures and leadership. In a subsequent paper analyzing the impact of EI on both job performance and leadership, Harms and Credé found that the meta-analytic validity estimates for EI dropped to zero when Big Five traits and IQ were controlled for.

1.6.9 Emotional intelligence theory (EQ - Emotional Quotient)

Emotional Intelligence - EQ - is a relatively recent behavioural model, rising to prominence with Daniel Goleman’s 1995 Book called ‘Emotional Intelligence’. The early Emotional Intelligence theory was originally developed during the 1970s and 80s by the work and writings of psychologists Howard Gardner (Harvard), Peter Salovey (Yale) and John ‘Jack’ Mayer (New Hampshire). Emotional Intelligence is increasingly relevant to organizational development and developing people, because the EQ principles provide a new way to understand and assess people’s behaviours, management styles, attitudes, interpersonal skills, and potential. Emotional Intelligence is an important consideration
in human resources planning, job profiling, recruitment interviewing and selection, management development, customer relations and customer service, and more.

Emotional Intelligence links strongly with concepts of love and spirituality: bringing compassion and humanity to work, and also to ‘Multiple Intelligence’ theory which illustrates and measures the range of capabilities people possess, and the fact that everybody has a value.

The EQ concept argues that IQ, or conventional intelligence, is too narrow; that there are wider areas of Emotional Intelligence that dictate and enable how successful we are. Success requires more than IQ (Intelligence Quotient), which has tended to be the traditional measure of intelligence, ignoring essential behavioural and character elements. We’ve all met people who are academically brilliant and yet are socially and inter-personally inept. And we know that despite possessing a high IQ rating, success does not automatically follow.

1.6.10 Aspect of Emotional intelligence

This is the essential premise of EQ: to be successful requires the effective awareness, control and management of one’s own emotions, and those of other people. EQ embraces two aspects of intelligence:
• Understanding yourself, your goals, intentions, responses, behaviour and all.

• Understanding others, and their feelings.

1.6.11 The five domains or Component of Emotional intelligence -

Goleman identified the five ‘domains’ or Components of Emotional Intelligence

The ability to recognize and understand personal moods and emotions and drives, as well as their effect on others. Hallmarks• of self-awareness include self-confidence, realistic self-assessment, and a self-deprecating sense of humor. Self-awareness depends on one’s ability to monitor one’s own emotion state and to correctly identify and name one’s emotions.

[•A hallmark is a sure sign: since self-awareness is necessary for, say, realistic self-assessment, that is, without self-awareness no realistic self-assessment, the presence of realistic self-assessment is a sure sign (sufficient to conclude that there is) self-awareness.]

Self-regulation; Managing your own emotions -

The ability to control or redirect disruptive impulses and moods, and the propensity to suspend judgment and to think before acting.
Hallmarks include trustworthiness and integrity; comfort with ambiguity; and openness to change.

**Internal motivation; Motivating yourself.**

A passion to work for internal reasons that go beyond money and status - which are external rewards, - such as an inner vision of what is important in life, a joy in doing something, curiosity in learning, a flow that comes with being immersed in an activity. A propensity to pursue goals with energy and persistence. Hallmarks include a strong drive to achieve, optimism even in the face of failure, and organizational commitment.

**Empathy; Recognising and understanding other people’s emotions.**

The ability to understand the emotional makeup of other people. A skill in treating people according to their emotional reactions. Hallmarks include expertise in building and retaining talent, cross-cultural sensitivity, and service to clients and customers. (In an educational context, empathy is often thought to include, or lead to, sympathy, which implies concern, or care or a wish to soften negative emotions or experiences in others.) See also Mirror Neurons.

It is important to note that empathy does not necessarily imply compassion. Empathy can be ‘used’ for compassionate or cruel behavior.
Serial killers who marry and kill many partners in a row tend to have great emphatic skills!

**Social skills; Managing relationships, i.e., managing the emotions of others.**

Proficiency in managing relationships and building networks, and an ability to find common ground and build rapport. Hallmarks of social skills include effectiveness in leading change, persuasiveness, and expertise building and leading teams.

1.6.12 Emotional Intelligence and Student Behaviour -

Joana Metais and Don Jordan reported that, discussions on raising standards of students’ performance and school improvement frequently include references to reducing the incidence of “misbehaviour.” There are numerous models of behaviour management, which aim to secure student behaviour conducive to learning or, in some cases, to bring about the behaviour which demonstrates that the teacher is firmly in control. They fall broadly into three categories, interventionist (Canter, 1976), interactionist (Dreikurs, Grunwald, & Pepper, 1982; Balson, 1993) and non-interventionist (Gordon, 1991). In each category, the emphasis may be on corrective, supportive or preventive strategies, involving students at different times and to different degrees (Jordan, 1996). However, some
models only involve students who conspicuously conform with or contravene rules, (thereby incurring rewards or “consequences”) and it may be possible for some students to complete their school career virtually unnoticed by their teachers and therefore uninvolved in the social learning process.

External reinforcement models of learning and behaviour management have been criticised because:

- Misbehaviour is not context-free and, whilst given behaviour may be unacceptable to adults, it is possible that the student, because of age, understanding or level of involvement, does not realise that it is inappropriate;

- Teachers may contribute to student misbehaviour through inappropriate responses, which may escalate low-level disruptions into major issues (Murphy, 1986). Some behaviour management strategies might actually support poor teaching practices leading to misbehaviour by mitigating the worst effects of those practices (Stockport Education Psychology Service, 1993).

- These strategies may fail in the short term where students do not share the teacher’s link between “misbehaviour” and “consequence” (In this
case, students may perceive an unpleasant “consequence” as random aggression and may respond aggressively or even violently.);

- In the longer term, “conditioning” students to respond to the teacher’s expectations and reliance on reward and punishment wipe out intrinsic motivation and may restrict the effectiveness of behaviourist models to the specific context (Hill, 1990) and undermine students’ ability to set standards and to assess their performance independently.

Misbehaviour and low academic achievement may result from students’ social and emotional difficulties, coupled with an inability to use socially skilful ways to gain teacher support (MacMullin, 1994). The more socially skilled the student, the more effective he or she is in helping to establish a framework of behaviour and the better he or she resolves any inconsistencies between behaviour and the agreed expectations.

Others stress the importance of teachers’ acknowledging and dealing positively with students’ emotions, because the physiology of the brain means that learning and strong emotions compete for space in the working memory (Goleman, 1996). In support, Gibbs (1996) argued that strong emotions of anger, love concern, hate, fear, excitement, sadness, or jealousy need to be addressed before students can effectively solve problems or reflect critically.
An individual’s ability to analyse and deal effectively with emotions and the resulting behaviour in relation to his or her goals, is one aspect of what Goleman (1996) defined as emotional intelligence. Another dimension concerns the individual’s relationships with others. Gardner (1993) described these dimensions as intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligence, where intrapersonal intelligence ... is a capacity to form an accurate, veridical model of oneself and to be able to use that model to operate effectively in life. Interpersonal intelligence is the ability to understand other people: what motivates them, how they work, how to work cooperatively with them.

If we, as teachers, accept that emotional growth and social skilling are essential to enable students to analyze and adapt their behaviour according to different circumstances, we ensure that they are part of students’ educational experience, in terms of the classroom culture, curriculum, and our own behaviour.