CHAPTER–II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter deals with the review of the literature. It is an attempt to discover relevant material published earlier in the problem of study. This covers the empirical research studies done previously in the problem area. The studies conducted during the last few decades in the field of personality and academic achievement that are more relevant and pertinent to the present investigation are discussed in this chapter.

The survey of related studies locating, studying and evaluating reports of relevant researches, study of published articles, going through related portions of encyclopedias and research abstracts, study of pertinent pages out of comprehensive books worth while study in any field of knowledge the research worker need an adequate familiarity with the work, which has already been done in the area of his choice. Researchers need to acquire up-to-date information about what has been taught and done in the particular area. Researcher has to build upon the accumulated and recorded knowledge, utilizing the previous findings to take many hints from the designs and procedures of previous researchers, matching his conclusions with conclusions drawn earlier and tries to add from his side, a line or two on the existing store of knowledge.
2.1. Purpose of Related Literature:

Review of related literature, provides a comprehensive understanding about what has already been known about a topic. It forms the basis for subscribing rationale for having chosen the problem for the study. Review of related literature allows the researcher to acquaint himself with the current knowledge in the field (or) area in which, he is going to conduct his research. It enables the researcher to define the limits of his study. It also helps the researcher to delimit and define his problem. The knowledge of the related literature helps the researcher update his knowledge on the work which others have done and thus states the objectives clearly and concisely.

By reviewing the related literature the researcher can avoid unfruitful and useless problem areas. He can select those areas in which positive findings are very likely to result and his endeavours are likely to add to the knowledge in a meaningful way. Through the review of related literature, the researcher can avoid unintentional duplication of well established findings. It is no use to replicate a study, when the stability, validity of it’s results have been clearly established.

The review of related literature gives the researcher an understanding of the research methodology, which refers to the way, the study is to be conducted. It helps the researcher to know about the tools and instruments, which proved to be useful and promising in the previous studies. It also provides an insight into the statistical methods, through which the validity of the results is to be established.
The important specific reason for reviewing the related literature is to know about the recommendations of the previous researchers, listed in their studies for further research.

Review of related literature in the concerned field is of greater significance in locating the research problem. Hence it plays the pivotal role at the crucial juncture of planning of the study. Review of related literature is an intellectual pursuit "essential to the development of the problem and to the deviation of an effective approach to its solution". The importance of related literature can not be denied in any research. It works as a guidepost, not only with regard to the quantum of work done in the field, but enables us to perceive the gaps and lacunae in the concerned field of research. The similar or related studies carried out by research workers at various levels is called review of related literature.

**Good, Barr and Scates (1941)** analysed the purpose of review of related literature as given under.

- To show whether the available evidence material solves the problem adequately without further investigation.
- To provide ideas, theories, explanations (or) hypotheses valuable in formulating the present study.
- To suggest the research methods to the problems.
- To locate comparative data useful in interpretation of the results.
- To contribute to the general scholarship of the investigator.
• It helps the research worker to find what is already known, what others have attempted to find out, what methods of attack have been promising (or) disappointing and what problems remain to be solved.
• It furnishes him with indispensable suggestions about comparative data, good procedures, likely method and tried techniques.
• It makes him alert to research possibilities that have been over looked and research approaches that have proved to be sterile.
• It prevents pointless repetition of research.

2.2. Need to know about related literature:

For any worthwhile study in any field of knowledge the research worker needs an adequate familiarity with the library and its many sources. Only then will an effective search for specialized knowledge be possible. The search for reference material is a time consuming but very fruitful phase of research programme. Every investigator must know what sources were available in his field of enquiry, which of them, he is likely to use and where and how to find them (Sukia et al, 1980).

According to Best (1959), practically all human knowledge can be found in books and libraries. Unlike other animals that must start a new life with each generation, man builds up accumulated and recorded knowledge of the past.

Availability of adequate information about educational thought and research does not by itself result in possession of its knowledge by investigator. The investigator may be very keen to posses up-to-date information regarding his field, and may try hard to update himself, and yet fails to get enough information due to non-existence of source of such information (Sukhia, 1980).
In the field of education, as in the other fields too, the research worker needs to acquire up-to-date information about what has been thought and done in the particular area from which, he intends to select a problem for research. But it is found that generally the extent of important, up-to-date information regarding educational research and ideas possessed by educational workers, is very limited (Sukhia, 1980).

2.3. The need and importance of related literature can be presented as below:

1. It is a crucial step to minimize the risk of dead ends, rejected topics, rejected studies, wasted efforts, trial and error, activity oriented toward approaches already discovered by previous investigators and, even more important, erroneous findings based on a faulty research design.

2. It makes study comparative and critical.

3. It also suggests, methods of research suitable to the problem.

4. It facilitates a cohesive and integrated approach to the problem.

The investigator should strive hard to be posted with necessary information, relating to his field of enquiry, basing on which, he has to build up his findings.

Thoroughness and comprehensiveness, evaluation and synthesis of the source are the qualities of related literature.
From the above discussion, it is clear that for any worthwhile investigation, a review of literature in the field is of great help to the investigator. The studies tell us how much work has been already done in a certain field and provide necessary knowledge and insight into the methods used to collect, analyse, interpret data and the findings. It also suggests solution and recommendations. Having realized the importance of related studies the investigator tried his best to study the related literature, but due to lack of resources and time, it was not possible for the investigator to go through the entire published and unpublished research in the field. The Ph.D. theses and other educational sources including research abstracts, journals, bulletins, above all the periodicals, available in the N.C.E.R.T. Library and internet searches have been consulted to get acquainted with the work already done. Some of the studies have been conducted both in India and abroad and were related with the field in which the investigator wanted to make some contributions.

According to the review of related literature, the present study is classified under three heads,

1. Studies related to personality characteristics Vs Academic achievers.
2. Studies related to personality characteristics Vs gender, locality and management.
3. Studies related to personal factors Vs Academic achievers.
2.4. Personality characteristics (Vs) Academic achievers:

Mishra, H.K. (1962), made a comparative study of non-academic background and personality structure of high and low achievers in engineering education. Two groups of high and low achievers were formed from amongst different engineering courses. In addition to studying personality traits, data on income, aspirations, identification of ideal engineering and rural and urban living students were obtained for both the groups. The study revealed that personality patterns of the two groups differed in traits like anxiety, Judgment and Neuroticism. There were, however no differences in their intelligence, attitude towards teacher, social adjustment and total emotionality. The groups did not seem to differ in their dimension either.

Rezier, Agnes, G. (1975), has compared of personality characteristics of persistent low and high achieving pharmacy students showed high achievement associated with a planned, orderly life style and introversion.

Gadzella, B.M. (1976), studied the differences between, and changes over a semester on self-perceptions of quality. The study analyzed 162 high and 120 low-achievers. A self-rating scale, devised with 37 students-suggested characteristics of a quality student, designed to record three different ratings on stanine scales, was used to collect the data. Characteristics were collapsed into five general groups reflecting learning in class; study habits and attitudes, peer relationships, student-instructor relationship; and physical and emotional needs.
Trend analysis showed significant difference between the two groups on three group characteristics; and significant upward shifts and interaction effects on all five group characteristics. Interesting self-rating patterns emerged. Traits of high and low achievers should be invaluable knowledge for instructors.

**Srivastava, S.S (1979)**, found out the personality characteristics of Indian students who rated themselves as academically successful and unsuccessful. The academically successful and unsuccessful students did not differ on two other second order factors, emotional versus alert noise and subdued versus independence. Academically successful students were significantly lower on anxiety factor than unsuccessful students. Academically successful students were more extrovert than academically unsuccessful students.

**Menon, S.K. (1980)**, the main findings of the study were over-achieving groups of superior and general ability and of boys and girls were less extrovert and less maladjusted than under achievers and showed greater academic interest and endurance. Over-achieving girls of general ability showed–strong interest in aesthetic, social and mechanical activities. Demographic factors and socio-economic status markedly influenced over and under-achievement. Higher occupational and educational levels of fathers, educational levels of mothers, family income and parental attention were related to high achievement, but the extent of relationship was not similar in boys and girls. Job aspiration, educational aspiration and general ambition were strongly associated with high achievement, particularly for girls. Urban residence was related to high achievement.
Kolwadkar, V. (1980), found that the variables such as socio-economic status (both high and low), father’s education, occupation, mother’s education, size of the family, ordinal position and health status were significantly related to scholastic achievement. Gifted children were found to be engaged in a great variety of hobbies. The correlation between emotional adjustment and academic achievement was found to be significant. More boys were found to be gifted than girls, the ratio was found to be 3:1

Gupta (1983), declared that certain personality variables are related to achievement of a particular sex, factor B and J in the case of male adolescents and factor C, D and O in the case of females.

Girija, P.R and Bhadra, B.P (1984), explored the personality characteristics of high and low achievers on motivation to succeed, efficient work plan and competitiveness. They indicate that the two groups differ significantly. The achievers, who are good in all these aspects scored higher. The trend of the results and the personality scale description, suggest that the high achievers are highly motivated to succeed in whatever they want to accomplish in life.

Sharma and Sunitha (1985), conducted a comparative study of anxiety pattern of high and low achievers of scientific stream. Findings indicate that the high achievers have significantly lower level of anxiety than the low achievers.

Sharma (1985), found that high and low achievers do not differ significantly on the locus of control dimension of personality.
Sood, R. (1988), searched for personality factors that could predict academic achievement in some professional courses and using cattell’s 16 PF test found a few factors, each ‘contributing’ positively, and a few others, negatively, to achievement in engineering, medicine, business management and law, exploring the relationship of creativity to personality, locus of control and alienation.

Jantli, R.T. (1988), explored the interrelationship between teacher behaviour pupil personality and the pupil growth outcome and found academic achievement negatively related to extraversion and neuroticism.

Khatoon, J. (1988), the major findings were high achievers obtained a higher mean value on personality factor H and lower mean value on factor-I than the low achievers. Rural students achieved higher mean values on factors E and Q₂ than their urban counterparts. On factors D, I and O girls achieved higher mean values, while on factor H they were lower than boys. Achievement locality interaction did not affect the personality traits significantly. Interaction between achievement and sex significantly affected personality factors C, Q₂ and Q₄. On Factors E, F, G and Q₃ the interaction effect of locality and sex was significant. Interaction of achievement, sex and locality did not have significant effect on any personality factor. High academic achievers were adventurous, active, impulsive, socially bold, tough-minded, expressive, obedient, conventional and humble, whereas low academic achievers were more shy, timid, threat sensitive, tender-minded, unconventional, aggressive and assertive. Rural students tended
to be more assistive and self-sufficient, whereas urban students were obedient and group-dependent. Male students were more phlegmatic, adventurous, tough-minded and placid in comparison to female students who were more excitable, shy, tender-minded and apprehensive by nature.

**Haq, Najmul, (1988),** found that male over achievers in English were more obedient, submissive, self-assured, secure and accommodating than under achievers who were more assertive, competitive, stubborn, apprehensive, insecure, worrying and troubled and aggressive. On the other hand, female over achievers in English were found to be more assertive, enthusiastic, tough-minded, self-sufficient, reject illusions, obedient and affected by feelings but less prone to circumspect individualism than female under achievers. Male under achievers in English were more emotionally stable, excitable, assertive, sober, tough-minded, apprehensive, dependent but less tense than underachieving females. Male over achievers in mathematics were more intelligent, emotionally stable, enthusiastic, relaxed and adventurous than female over achievers. On the other hand, female over achievers were more apprehensive, self-sufficient, tense and assertive than their male counterparts. Male under achievers in mathematics were higher on reservedness, intelligence, emotional stability, adventurousness, tough-mindedness, security and self control than female under achievers. On the other hand, female under achievers were more assertive and tense than male counterparts who were more obedient and relaxed.
Mohan, Anand (1988), found that a relationship existed between scholastic achievement and self-esteem. No significant relationship was found between scholastic achievement and feeling of security. Scholastic Achievement and depression was not significantly correlated but scholastic achievement and test anxiety were correlated. No significant correlation existed between feeling of security and depression and feeling of security and test anxiety. Self-esteem and depression were not significantly correlated.

Ramaswamy, R. (1988), found that, academic achievement was found positively related to personality, achievement motivation, self-concept, study habits, and SES among high and low achieving boys and girls. Significant difference was found between high and low achievers in personality, achievement - motivation, self-concept, study habits and SES.

Dixit, Santosh Kumar, (1989) found that Personality factors significantly influenced the educational achievement. Intelligence was related to educational achievement. Self-concept was not related to educational achievement.

Joshi, R. (1989), found differences among the four groups, significant in respect of all these. The engineering group was the highest on fluency, flexibility, originality, elaboration, extroversion and neuroticism, powerlessness, psychoticism and social alienation followed by medicine management and law groups. Women were higher than men on fluency, originality, extroversion and neuroticism.
Sharma, K. (1989), study aimed at identifying the over-achievers and the under achievers and compared them with some personality factors. The result showed that there were significant differences among the over-achievers, average achievers, and under achievers with regard to their adjustment in the school, home, social and religious and miscellaneous areas. The over-achievers had better adjustment than the under-achievers in all these areas of adjustment. Three types of discrepancy scores were obtained; the positive scores which indicated that the actual academic achievers’ scores exceeded the predicted academic achievement scored; the negative scores which showed that the actual achievement scores fell short of the predicted achievement scores and negative scores which showed an exact correspondence between the actual achievement scores and predicted achievement scores. The discrepancy scores were independent of the errors of measurement. Those who had more effective adjustment in the school, home, social and religious and miscellaneous areas were over-achievers and those having less effective adjustment in these areas were under achievers. Intelligence was related to adjustment in all these areas, which implied that adjustment was at least partly dependent upon intelligence.

Sinha, S. Trivedi, J.K. et al (1989), in his study of the salient features of personality of the high and low achievers, found the following main characteristics.
High Achievers:

a. **Background:** Sibling rivalry, attitude of respect and warm admiration for father, parents perceived generally as helpful, considerate and understanding; both parents reposed considerable confidence and trust in them; entertained high hopes of the subject.

b. **Thinking Perception:** Superior intelligence, interest in the abstract and the theoretical; desire for creative and novel expression.

c. **Emotional Variables:** Minimal Anxiety; Compartmentalisation of anxiety was not hampering in adjustment.

d. **Motivational Variables:** Strong drive and motivation; greater persistence goals clearly defined; desire for status and recognition as means of acceptance by others.

e. **Self –image:** Tend to underestimate their positive qualities, more self-critical.

Low Achievers:

a. **Background:** Harmonious sibling adjustments, distant and ambivalent relationship with father, frequently perceived as overbearing dominant and fearful.

b. **Thinking Perception:** Average intelligence; Conventional and common approach; interest tended to be more fantasy oriented; fantasy had a significant place in thinking.
c. Emotional Variable: Frequency of specific anxiety and insecurity; commonly overwhelmed by anxiety; inadequate defences, passivity, and dependency on others, repression and avoidance of common measures to handle anxiety.

d. Motivational Variables: Weak and Segmental motivation, fantasy and unrealistic aspiration; desire for approval and acceptance by others through good conduct instead of through achievement.

e. Self-image: Over estimates of their positive qualities; less self critical.

Yadav, P.L. (1989), found that High SES achievers had more anxiety, frustration and high SES failures had more neuroticism than their low SES counterparts. Rural high achievers had more anxiety and neuroticism, whereas urban failures had more frustration than their respective counterparts. Low achievers had more frustration, anxiety and neuroticism than high achievers. Low achievers and failures belonging to low and middle SES had more of frustration than those who belonged to high SES. Rural high achievers had more anxiety than the failures and the low achievers of urban setting. High school failures of rural area had more of neurotic fantasies than those of the urban whereas urban high achievers had more neuroticism than the rural students.

Ayishabi, T.C. (1990) found that Hindu, Christian and Muslim Students differed in social adjustment, introversion and self –concept and differed in only two personality variables, viz., introversion and manifest anxiety. Students of small, medium and large families differed in masculinity. There were
differences in personal adjustment, social adjustment, introversion and masculinity between the urban and rural students. High, average and low groups based on parental education differed in masculinity. Students of high, average and low parental occupations differed in parental adjustment, social adjustment, general anxiety and manifest anxiety. High, average and low groups in achievements differed in introversion. Students with different intelligence levels differed in personal adjustment, introversion, masculinity, general anxiety, manifest anxiety and examination anxiety.

Devi, Ujwala A. (1990), found that girls had a significantly higher academic achievement than boys. There was no significant difference in the intelligence levels of boys and girls. Boys showed a higher neurotic tendency than girls. There was no difference between boys and girls in the locus of control. Academic achievement showed a positive and significant correlation with intelligence. Academic achievement was negatively correlated with neuroticism. Intelligence showed a negative relationship with neuroticism and a positive relationship with locus of control.

Thilagavathi, T. (1990), found that the high, average and low achievers differed significantly among themselves in their intelligence. The high achievers secured comparatively higher mean score than the average and the low achievers in creativity. The high achievers belonged to the low level anxiety group and low achievers belonged to the high level anxiety group. Anxiety had only a negative influence on academic achievement.
Vijaya Kumar Sethi (1990), studied the personality patterns of high achieving and low achieving students in professional courses (Engineering, Medicine and Teaching Education). The major findings were high and low achieving students taken together differed significantly from each other on personality factors of lower-higher scholastic mental capacity (Factor-B); emotional instability (Factor-C); experience Conscientiousness (Factor-G); Shyness–Venturesomeness (Factor-H); Placidity apprehensiveness (Factor-O) and Low-High ergictension (Factor - Q1). High achieving students were found to differ significantly from each other, on personality factors of lower-higher scholastic mental capacity (Factor B); Desurgency–Surgency (Factor-F), and tough mindedness. Low achieving students were found to differ significantly from each other, on factors of reservedness-outgoingness (Factor–A); Low-Higher Scholastic Mental Capacity (Factor–B); Tough mindedness-Tender mindedness (Factor-I); Trust placement-Suspiciousness (Factor-L) and Lower-Higher ergictension (Factor-Q4).

Sinha, Neeta, (1991), found that reward and permissiveness were found supportive of academic talent among boys and girls in the science stream. Academically talented girls in the science stream were significantly different from the average girls w.r.t control, reward, deprivation of privilege and permissiveness. In science stream, academically talented boys and girls perceived the protectiveness, social isolation and deprivation of privilege, sub-areas in significantly different ways. Better study habits characterised the academically talented boys and girls in science and arts. They were
significantly different from the average groups. Academically talented boys and girls in science and arts streams were found significantly different in their self-concept from the average groups.

**Koteswara, Narayana M. (1991),** found that Urban Students had a higher achievement in comprehension vocabulary and composite reading ability than rural students. High scoring boys and high scoring girls did not differ in their mean scores on vocabulary and comprehension. Girls had better study habits than boys. Urban Students had better study habits than rural students.

**Namrata, (1992),** found that, there was an inverse relationship between academic achievement and level of stress as a whole. The students having lower level of anxiety tended to score higher in the high school examination. High achievers tended to be outgoing, intellectually superior, emotionally stable, obedient, accommodating, humble, enthusiastic and un-frustrated, whereas low achievers tended to be reserved, intellectually inferior, emotionally less stable, assertive, aggressive, independent minded, tense and frustrated.

**Sen, Barat Kalpana. (1992),** found that there was an overall significant difference between the two achievement groups in study habits. The two achievement groups differed significantly on intelligence. Between the two achievement groups differences were found in 12 out of 16 factors (Expect C, E, G and H). Study habit-achievement and intelligence–achievement were positively correlated.
Verma, B.P. (1992), found that correlations between traits of sociability, ascendance, secretiveness, reflective, impulsivity, placid, accepting, vigorous, co-operative, persistence, warmth, aggressiveness, tolerance and tough-minded, and academic achievement on the other hand, were not found to be significant. Relationship of between ‘responsible’ trait of temperament and academic achievement was positive and significant. High and Low achieving groups did not show any significant difference in the mean scores of sociability, ascendant, secretiveness, reflectiveness, impulsivity, placid, accepting, vigorous, co-operative, persistence, warmth, and aggressiveness. High Achieving group of students had significantly higher value of mean scores of ‘responsible’ trait than low achieving group of students.

Saxena, Anju and Rashmi (1994), undertook a study on personality structure of advantaged school-going children. The findings were advantaged children were highly superior in comparison to disadvantaged children on traits like emotional construction, abundance of creative impulses, high degree of empathy and given to introspection. Boys were superior in comparison to girls in relation to 15 personality traits.

Abraham, T. (1996), conducted a study to determine the influence of basic personality factors on academic achievement. The major findings were scholastic aptitude had the maximum influence on academic achievement. The influence of the temperamental dimension of neuroticism and introversion–extroversion on academic achievement showed sex differences. It was found that the factor analysis of the personality variables and academic achievement
evolved a factor pattern in which three factors could be identified, viz., scholastic aptitude, neuroticism and extroversion–introversion. The personality factors evolved from the analysis of scores obtained from a) a sample of boys and girls; b) a sample of boys; c) a sample of girls were similar. The personality factors evolved in the analysis had significant loading on the personality variables and so the influence of personality on academic achievement could be described in terms of the personality factors. Boys were found to be superior to girls in their achievement and the same trend was noted in the loading of the dominant personality factors.

Hom Chaudhuri S. (1996), correlates the academic performance of school students. The major findings of this study were that the high achievers were having more anxiety than the low achievers. The high achievers found the emotional atmosphere of their homes to their liking. The low achievers found an absence of good environment at house. The high achievers showed quite a high level of expectation with regard to their performance in the examinations. Their analysis of the performance was quite objective. The low achievers showed an abnormally high level of expectation and great judgement discrepancy with regard to performance. A substantial proportion of high achievers did not like the manner in which the classes were taken, they thought the college should provide better teaching. The high achievers observed the making of democracy in the life of nation more deeply than the low achievers. The low achievers showed their likes and dislikes for different aspects of community to a much lower extent than the high achiever. The high achievers showed their liking for a number of values upheld in the community.
Khan, Mohammad Ahmad (1996), conducted a study which attempts to reveal the personality profiles, need achievement and socio-economic status of gifted achievers and under achievers in rural Kashmir. Findings showed Gifted achievers having high super-ego strength, responsibility, conscientious, persistent, moralistic, emotionally disciplined, dominated by a sense of duty and concerned about moral standard and rules, whereas under achievers possessed low super-ego strength, self-indulgent, fickle, undependable and disregarded obligations to people. Gifted achievers were untroubled, self-assured, secure, serene, self-confident, insensitive to people’s approval and disapproval and had no fears. Conversely under achievers had guilt proneness tendencies, and were insecure, worrying, troubled, anxious, sensitive to people’s approval and disapproval and possessed phobic symptoms. Gifted achievers had high need achievement, and were optimistic, identified themselves with a successful authority and preferred intrinsic rewards when successful. Under achievers had low need achievement, and were pessimistic to some extent and preferred external reward when successful. Gifted achievers had high socio-economic status in comparison to under achievers.

Verma, B.P. and Sheikh, G.Q. (1996), found that in grade X students filed dependence–independence dimension was positively related to intelligence and super ego strength on 16 PF test. It was related to needs like abasement, nurturance and endurance. It had negative relationship with exhibition succorance and aggression needs.
Mavi, N.S. and Iswarpatel (1997), explored the relationship between academic achievement and selected personality variables of IX Grade Students. The personality variables are personality adjustment, intelligence, self-concept and level of aspiration. It was found that there was a weak relationship between the personality variable and academic achievement, in the case of tribal students. The non-tribal students, scored higher than the tribals, overall.

Mishra, S.P. (1997), found out the high achievers in arts were higher on the level of creativity than the low achievers in arts. The high achievers in commerce were higher as regards the levels of creativity than the low achievers in that stream. The high-achieving boys in arts had a higher creativity than their low achieving counterparts. The high – achieving girls in arts were significantly higher on the level of creativity than the low -achieving girls. The high achieving boys in science were higher on the level of creativity than their low achieving counterparts. The high achieving girls in science were higher on the creativity level than their low achieving counterparts. The high achievers in arts were higher in their level of intelligence than the low achievers. The high achievers in commerce were higher in their level of intelligence also. The high achievers in science were higher in intelligence than the low achievers.

Sangeeta (1997), found that Gifted high school students preferred flexible, visual, long attention span, motivation centered and environment centered learning style.
Narayana Koteswara, M. and Ramachandra Reddy, B. (1998), reported that all the 14 factors of HSPQ had significant influence on reading achievement in Telugu language of high school Students. Students whose personality characteristics for out-going, more intelligent, emotionally stable, excitable, assertive, happy–go-lucky, superego strength, venturesome, tense minded, doubting, apprehensive, self-sufficiency, controlled and tense, performed significantly better on reading achievement in Telugu language, than the students, whose personality characteristics were observed as less intelligent, emotionally less stable, phlegmatic, obedient, sober, moral standards, shy, tough minded, vigorous, placid, group dependent, undisciplined and relaxed.

Mecclum, L.A. and Merrel, K.W. (1998), studied the relationship between personalities with academic achievement levels. Majority of the students are on the low level of neurotic dimension while only a minority of them are on the high level. The study also shows that, on the whole, majority of the students have excellent academic achievement. This may be because they received good attention and care, and high appreciation from their peers, parents and the students around them, enabling them to improve their self concept which had positive impact on their learning process.

Sood, S. (1999), has attempted to study different personality factors as facilitators of mathematical achievement and found that out of 16 factors only seven personality factors correlated significantly. They included scizothymia–cyclothymia, lower-higher mental capacity, submissiveness-dominance, desurgency-surgency, threctia-parmia, art lessness, shrewdness, and conservatism.
CRIDAL (The centre for Research in Distance and Adult Learning, (1999), presented a seminar to describe some of the preliminary findings of the research titled ‘Factors that enhance high achievers success in open learning: A comparative study of high achieving and low achieving students at OUHK. It has also been suggested that high achieving students might have different motivation to study than low achievers, and that they are able to organize their study materials and study habits more efficiently. Other studies have suggested that active, independent engagement in the learning process might be more conducive to achievement than a passive, instructor-dependent one. Preliminary analyses indicate that there were some areas in which statistically significant differences occurred between the high achieving and low achieving students. For example, the high-achieving group had higher mean rating regarding their self-perception of their ability to do the specified course, confidence with studies, perfectionism, desire to do more than just the minimum requirements, competitiveness, and interest in achieving excellence and success. They also perceived themselves to be more highly motivated to avoid failure but, if they did fail, were more likely to see this as a valuable learning experience and recover from it. The low-achieving students indicated a range of commitments (or) difficulties that influenced their course out-comes more than they influenced the outcomes of the high-achievers. These included engagement in social activities, working overtime or long hours, shift work, travel outside Hong Kong, significant changes in work responsibilities, change of Job (or) working conditions, or work commitments that combined unfavourably with keeping up with the study schedule. On the other hand, the high achievers were
more likely to rate their job environment as favourable to their studies. The 
low-achieving students also indicated that their results were more likely to be 
affected by problems such as volume of course materials, their writing skills in 
the language of the course, their self-motivation. Other factors included test and 
examination anxiety, finding time to study, the need to spend time with family, 
friends (or) colleagues, and spouses or family. The study indicated that the 
high-achieving students were more likely than the low-achievers to try and 
understand meanings thoroughly, to regulate their learning strategies to fit the 
purpose of the study, and to link new knowledge to their previous learning.

**Pufal-struzik, I. (1999)** found that highly gifted students achieve a higher level 
of self-actualization than the control group. A higher level of anxiety as the 
permanent personality feature is the characteristic of highly gifted students who 
have a sense of self-actualization. Gifted students understand and control better, 
their own actions and effects due to internal locus of control. Gifted students 
who have a strong sense of self-actualization achieve high results in the field of 
creative intellectual attitudes. The author investigated gifted students who have 
a sense of self-actualization and found that they have a higher level of self- 
acceptance. A strong need for intellectual stimulation is characteristic of gifted 
students who have a sense of self-actualization.

**Mohanty, P. (1999),** made a comparative study of High and Low achievers 
among rural scheduled caste primary school girls. There is significant and 
positive relationship between academic achievement and socio-economic status 
of high achieving SC girls. There is no significant difference in the values of
correlation coefficients between socio-economic status and academic achievement in the case of high and low achievers among rural SC girls. The relationship of home environment and academic achievement is found to be significantly positive only in the case of low achieving girls. Such relationship indicated that low achievers essentially come from the families having poor home environment. Large family, low level of parental education, poor learning facilities, inadequate family income and lack of parental support – are some of the major factors associated with low achievers due to which they are unable to climb the ladder of success. There is insignificant relationship between home environment and academic achievement of high achievers. Such factors include small and nuclear family, adequate family income, parental expectations and commitment and education of parents.

Mishra, G. (1999), found that on High school personality Questionnaire (HSPQ) the tribal tenth grade students were more intelligent, sober, conscientious, zestful, self-sufficient, controlled and tense than their SC counterparts. The SC students were reserved, less intelligent, emotionally less stable, inactive, submissive, happy-go-lucky, having weaker ego strength, tough minded, insecure, group dependent and tense. In contrast, general category students were outgoing, more intelligent, emotionally stable, overactive, tender minded, reflective, self-assured, relaxed and had low level of integration.

Neeta Kaushik (1999), studied influence of certain personality characteristics on adolescent learners socio metric status in instructional group situations. The major findings were that the magnitude of influence of extroversion of female
adolescents on their socio-metric status is found to be significant. Female adolescents of high and low extroverted and average and low extroverted groups have been found to differ significantly in respect of their socio metric status. Female adolescents of high and average extroverted group don’t differ significantly with regard to their socio metric status. High and average, high and low and average low self concept also show that differences in self concept contribute to differences in their social acceptance. Self concept as a whole exerts a moderate influence on sociometric status. The influence of the other two components, namely, inferiority and emotional stability have also been found to be significant.

Nateson, N. and Susila, C. (2000), indicated that the chosen personality factors (Cattell’s Children personality questionnaire) are not significantly influencing the achievement of V Standard boys (N=300) and girls (N=300) in the age group of 9 to 10 years in schools.

Johnson, Pitts and Lane, (2000). Studied the possible causes of increasing attrition rates through an evaluation of the relationship between personality traits and academic achievement in gifted students. Results from the study showed that there were significant correlations between ten personality traits and academic achievement. “High Achievers,” those determined as not at risk, were found to be more introverted, abstract in thinking, emotionally stable, mature, serious, conscientious, self-assured, secure, self-satisfied, precise, composed, resourceful and moralistic. Conversely, “under achievers”, are those determined to be at risk, appeared to be more extroverted, warm, kind, willing
to participate, concrete in thinking, affected by feelings, enthusiastic, spontaneous, expressive, cheerful, expedient, insecure, group-oriented, and not bound by social rules. Both groups of students exhibited global, perceptual tendencies; however, the achievers were highly flexible and more able to adapt to analytical situation than were the under achievers.

**Basanti, Jagan Mohan and Mukhopadhaya (2000),** studied the effect of Psychological factors and academic achievement among tribal students. It was found that boys and girls did not differ in terms of psychological constraints. The degree of psychological constraints differed between high achievers and low achievers. High achievers had low levels of psychological constraints. It was revealed that psychological constraints and academic achievement are negatively correlated with each other.

**Betsy Mc Coach, D and Del Siegle, (2001),** compared high-achieving and low-achieving adolescents’ attitudes toward school, attitudes toward teacher, goal-valuation, motivation, and general academic self-perceptions. There were 96 high achievers and 148 low-achievers in the present study. It revealed that there were statistically significant large differences between the high-achievers and low-achievers on all five factors. High-achieving students exhibited more positive academic self-perceptions, motivation/self–regulation, goal-valuation, attitudes towards school, and attitudes towards teachers than low achieving students. The results of this study suggest that students who possess high self-motivation and self-regulation and who have positive academic self-perceptions are much more likely to be high-achievers than students who possess lower
academic self-perceptions and lower motivation/self-regulation. It remains to be seen whether increasing student’s academic self-perception and motivation/self-regulation will translate into achievement gains for low-achieving students. These results suggest that high achievers and low achievers differ in both their motivational pattern and their academic self-perceptions.

Govinda Reddy (2002), investigated that, factors B, E, F, M, Q₂ and Q₄ of 16PF have significant influence on the total scholastic achievement of DIET Students.

Mohanty, A.K. (2002), conducted a survey to see whether components of family environment bear any relationship with academic achievement of gifted, under achievers and his findings showed the mean score of boys to be higher than that of girls. The boys scored higher in cohesion, intellectual cultural organisation, moral and religious emphasis, while the girls scored higher on conflict, achievement orientation and organization of components of family environment scale. Inutility the underachiever’s academic achievement was significantly related with all components of FES except active recreational organization. In the case of underachieving girls’ cohesion, independence and control components of FES were found to be correlated significantly with their academic achievement.

Goel Swami Pyari (2002), studied the relationship between achievement and feeling of security, family attachment, and found that low achievement has a positive relationship with the feelings of security, whereas the average and high
achievement had a negative relationship with the feeling of security. Family attachment and achievement scores were negatively related. A related factor responsible for higher educational achievement was the parental attitude. Feelings of security/insecurity were significantly and positively related to the family attachment. Theoretical, aesthetic and religious values were positively related with achievement score, but economic and political values were negatively related with achievement score. Social value had a positive relationship with the average achievements but the low and high achievements were negatively correlated. There was no difference in value pattern of low and average achievers whereas high achievers gave the first preference to theoretical value than to social, political, economic, aesthetic and religious value.

Rao, S.B. (2003), research aimed at investigating the role of certain aspects of personality and patterns of adjustment in scholastic performance. He concluded that the high and low achievers did not show significant difference in general mental ability. The level of academic achievement was positively related to academic adjustment. Differences in achievement were found to be significantly related to aspects of personality like neurotic difficulties, moral and sense of responsibility. Academic adjustment was found to be significantly related to the considered aspects of personality. Differences in academic adjustment were not found to be significantly related to differences in mental ability. Differences in the aspects of personality were not significantly related to difference in mental ability.
Annie, K. Jacob (2004), Studied the psychological factors such as self concept, values, anxiety, introversion and extroversion. Over achievers, normal achievers and underachievers differ in respect of their verbal creativity scores and there is significant positive relationship between creativity and self-concept for overachievers and underachievers.

Gyanani, T.C. and Kapoor, A. (2004), found that the children, whose parents followed good child – rearing practices, are found to be highly participating, warm hearted, active, obedient, mildly, assertive, happy, less realistic, vigorous, zestful, placid, self-assured, self-disciplined and controlled while, on the other hand, the children who are reared poorly are found to be reserved, active, taciturn, realistic, and vigorous. Child-rearing practices influence the various personality factors of boys and girls differently. Boys were found to be emotionally less stable, active, mildly assertive, dominating, sober, restrained, forthright, natural, self-assured, placid and relaxed. On the other hand, girls are found to be emotionally stable, less active, relaxed, energetic, worrying and shy. Personality factors are found to be statistically significant among the students. This shows that boys whose parents adopt poor child-rearing practices are serious, careless and tense in comparison to the boys whose parents adopt good child rearing practices. Girls, who are getting poor child-rearing practices are found to be submissive, serious, unwilling to act, individualistic, slightly restrained and calculating in comparison to girls whose parents adopt good child-rearing practices.
Chauhan, R.S. (2004), found that a positive linkage is held between the extroversion and introversion personality type of poor adjusted pupils with their degree of learning style preferences. However, the extroversion and introversion personality type may have a positive and significant linkage with individualistic (Vs.) Non-individualistic preferences of urban male, Short attention span (Vs.) Long Attention span, Environment-oriented (Vs.) Environmental-Free preferences of Urban female, visual Vs. aural, Motivation-centred Vs. Motivation Non-centred preferences of rural female and Individualistic Vs. Non-individualistic learning style preference of pupils in general.

Rajani, M. (2004), found that the personality factors viz., (1) Factor–B (less intelligent Vs more intelligent), (2) Factor–C (Emotionally less stable Vs Emotionally stable), (3) Factor–E (Obedient Vs Assertive) (4). Factor-G (Moral standards Vs Superego’s strength) (5). Factor–H (Shy Vs Venturesome), 6) Factor-Q₁ (placid Vs Apprehensive), 7) Factor–Q₃ (Undisciplined Vs Controlled) and 8) Factor-Q₄ (Relaxed Vs Tense) of HSPQ have significant influence on study habits of intermediate students. The remaining factors of HSPQ don’t have significant influence on study habits.

Marilyn Macdonald (2004), studied the Cognitive, Academic and personality characteristics of early school leavers and persisters. The major findings of the study were that both leavers and persisters are found to be concrete thinkers. The persisters had significantly higher academic self-concept than the leavers, and the other group had significantly higher academic self-concepts than the
persisters. There was no significant difference between the dimension of self-concept and personality of students according to gender. According to Azizi et al. (2005) those who have positive self concept usually received good attention and care from their parents, families, teachers, friends (or) students around them. They will always have the chance to gain more success than failure. This is because they feel appreciated and they get good support from others. Findings from the study also showed that majority of students have extrovert personality.

Panchalingappa (2004), the results indicated that there are significant differences between normal and under achievers in respect of their self confidence, general anxiety, test anxiety and study habits. It also reveals that lack of self confidence, general anxiety, test anxiety and poor study habits are all possible casual factors associated with under achievement.

Jean-Paul E. Priete (2005), suggests students with green personality characteristics (curious, seeking, inventive, theoretical; complex, philosophical, principal, national) were more likely to have a serious and mature attitude toward their occupational plans as opposed to their blue counterparts who may need to give more careful thought to the type of work they value and enjoy.

Khan, Z.N. (2005), conducted a study on 400 students (200 Boys & 200 Girls) selected from senior secondary school of A.M.V., Aligarh–India, to establish the prognostic value of different measures of cognition, personality and demographic variables for success at higher secondary level in science stream.
He found that the combined sample of boys and girls yielded seven factors. It was concluded that the students in the sample are conscientious, venturesome, kind, stable, reserved, trusting, persevering, lively, co-operative, possessing high intelligence and are fairly high on academic achievement. The scores of low achievers (boys and girls) yielded six factors. The factors obtained by the low achievers reveal that such students are lively, reserved, impulsive, conscientious, trusting, experimenting and harsh. They also have achievement motivation, verbal and non-verbal intelligence, divergent thinking and high socio-economic status.

High achieving boys revealed that such boys are reserved, submissive, expedient, suspicious, fickle-minded, lively, nervous, co-operative, shy, impulsive, conservative and harsh. They also have non-verbal intelligence and high socio-economic status. High achieving girls revealed that for high achievement, girls require the following characteristics: Venturesome, persevering, submissive, reserved, serious, cooperative, experimenting, expedient, harsh, nervous, impulsive and trusting. They also have non-verbal intelligence and socio-economic status, but lack divergent thinking.

High achievers are stable, conservative and dominant but the low achievers are shy, impulsive and harsh. Stability and dominance are important characteristics of a person who is likely to be methodically engaged in his studies, which may result in high achievement. On the contrary, low achievers are impulsive i.e. they are uneasy, affected by feelings, impatient-excitable and act on in their studies and, hence, are shy as well as harsh. Low achievers are fickle-minded, expedient and submissive, but the high achievers are persevering, conscientious and venturesome.
This shows that perseverance, conscientiousness and venturesome behaviour tend to help in high achievement. It is also quite logical that a person who is able to take risk and is hard working and conscientious will secure higher marks at any examination than the one who is fickle-minded, expedient and submissive. High achievers are reserved, serious and trusting in nature, which traits seem to help in high achievement. The reservedness and seriousness lead to high achievement, because a person with these traits is able to devote sufficient time to his studies, without interference of his peers. But it is essential for high achievement that the person should not possess nervous temperament. Low achievers are sociable, suspicious and lively. All these characteristics lead to low achievement, which is perhaps due to the carefree nature of the students in this group. High achieving student is co-operative, kind and possesses sufficiently high level of verbal intelligence, but the low achieving students are deficient in verbal intelligence. Thus, verbal intelligence is very important. The high achieving boys have been found to be impulsive, suspicious shy, fickle-minded, conservative, dominant, and belong to low socio-economic status. The high achieving girls have been found to be stable, trusting, venturesome, persevering, experimenting, submissive and belong to high socio-economic status.

Rangaswami, G., (2006), concluded that there was no significant relationship between the personality factors A, B, C, D, F, H, I, J, Q₁, Q₂, Q₃, Q₄ with moral judgement score. There was significant relationship between the personality factor E (Obedient Vs assertive) and G (Moral standards Vs super ego strength) with moral judgment scores of the students.
Sophia Gir, Prabha Jain and Radhika Lodha (2006), focused on the comparative analysis of social maturity and locus of control of high achievers and low achievers. Analysis of data revealed that samples belonged to moderate level of social maturity, showed internal orientation which makes one to take credit for their deeds rather than blame. Significant difference was found between the social maturity and locus of control of 9 to 10 year old boys and girls.

Ayodya (2007), studied the emotional problems of school children and their relation to life events and school achievements, and found that the Secondary School Children had high rate of emotional problems. Boys had high life event scores and more number of events. Boys outnumbered girls in decreased scholastic achievement. The emotional problems found were of minor nature. Emotional problems did not have influence on scholastic achievement in the present study. Life events too did not have influence on scholastic achievement. No difference was found with regard to socio-demo-graphic factors, emotional disorders, and scholastic achievement. No association was found between scholastic achievement and intelligence.

Prasad, C.N. (2007), studied all the factors other than Q₃ of HSPQ which had shown significant influence on boys. The low score in the factor ‘Q₃’ shows qualities like disciplined and self-conflict, can be observed in the boys. The factor A, B, F, J, Q₂ and Q₄ of HSPQ have no significant influence on the urban and rural students. But for remaining factors C, D, E, G, H, I, O and Q₃ of HSPQ, the mean values of the urban students are more than the rural student.
The factors A, C and H of HSPQ have not significantly influenced the boys in the non-residential schools. But for the remaining factors, B, D, E, F, G, I, J, Q₁, Q₂, Q₃ and Q₄ of HSPQ, the mean values of boys in the non-residential schools are more than the girls in the non-residential schools, other than the factors G, H, J, Q₃ and Q₄ of HSPQ which showed significant influence on the X class students. All the personality factors of HSPQ except the factor ‘O’ of HSPQ significantly influenced the academic achievement of the students.

Prabhakar, G. (2008), inferred that among the 16 PF personality factors, the students who are having personality characteristics of 1. Emotionally stable, calm mature, 2) Venturesome, socially bold i.e. parmia; 3) Tender-mind, dependent, sensitive i.e. premisa; 4) Experimenting, Critical, free thinking i.e. Radicalism; 5) Controlled, socially precise, following self image i.e. high self concept control, and 6) Conscientious, persevering, rule minded i.e. stronger super - ego strength, have significantly better study – habits than the students who are having the personality characteristics of (1) Affected by feelings, emotionally less stable; (2) Shy, restrained, timid i.e., threctia, (3). Tough-minded, self-reliant i.e., Harmia; (4) Conservative, Tolerant of traditional difficulties, i.e. conservation; (5) Undisciplined, self-conflict, careless i.e., low integration; and (6) Expedient, evades rules i.e., weaker super-ego strength.

It is also inferred that the students, who are having personality characteristics of (1) Trusting, adaptable, free of Jealousy, i.e. Alaxia; (2) Forth right, natural, artless, i.e., Artlessness; (3) Placid, self-assumed confident, i.e.,
untroubled adequacy; 4) Group dependent, sound follower i.e. Group-adherence; and 5) Relaxed, tranquil, unfrustrated i.e. low ergictension, have significantly better study habits than the students who are having personality characteristics of (1) Suspicious, self-opinionated, hard to fool, (2) Shrewdness; (3) Apprehensive, worrying, depressive, troubled i.e. Guilt proneness; (4) Self-sufficient, resourceful, i.e., self-sufficiency and (5) Tense, frustrated, driven i.e. ergictension.

**Krishna Reddy, K. (2009),** concluded that, the students with personality characteristics more intelligent, emotionally stable, Obedient, super-ego strength, venturesome, tense minded, Placid and accommodating, humble and controlled have significantly better scholastic achievement, than the students with the personality characteristics less intelligent, emotionally less stable, assertive, moral standards, shy, tough-minded, apprehensive, undisciplined, aggressive, headstrong and self-assured.

**Yadav, M.K., and Tyagi, S.K. (2009),** found that the accuracy of self-assessment of Achievement in Mathematics was significantly influenced by the achievement level of students when Intelligence and Dependence were taken as covariates. High achievers were found to self assess themselves more accurately than the low achievers.
2.5. Personality characteristics (Vs) Gender, Locality and Management:

Sudhir, M.A. and Khaiangte (1977), noted that high creative girls from urban areas turned out to be more intelligent, emotionally stable, Conscientious and apprehensive than the high creative girls from rural background. The rural high creative boys were outgoing, conscientious, tender minded and self-sufficient as against their reserved, group dependent and expedient urban counterparts.

Dagaur, B.S. (1988), found that the higher the level of neuroticism, the higher were the mean scores on originality, flexibility, and fluency. At higher and average levels of neuroticism, there was no significant deference in the mean original scores of males and females. At low levels of neuroticism, females extraverts showed more flexible and fluent behaviour, than introverts. Anxiety affected both introverts and extroverts in their creative thinking.

Mian, Shamshada, (1988), found that Girls were superior to boys in intelligence and S. Achievement. On the other hand, boys compared to girls had higher scores in achievement motivation, level of success, perseverance and realistic attitude. No significant differences were found between boys and girls in neuroticism, ego ideal, and internal control of fate. Highly intelligent boys as compared to highly intelligent girls were less neurotic, possessed realistic attitude and had hope of success. They were also higher in scholastic achievement, n-achte ego ideal, perservance and internal control of fate. There was no significant difference between low intelligence girls and boys with respect to neuroticism, scholastic achievement, ego ideal and internal control of fate.
Joshi, R. (1989), found that Females were reported to be higher on fluency, originality, extraversion and neuroticism than males.

Kashyap and Veena, (1989), found that adolescent problems were found highly and positively related to anxiety frustration, feeling of insecurity and emotional immaturity. Adolescent problems were highly and negatively correlated with feeling of security and emotional maturity, moderately and negatively correlated with intelligence, and appreciably and negatively correlated with scholastic achievement. High and low problem groups of different groups of R, U, B and G did not differ on anxiety. Rural girls felt significantly less secure than rural boys and urban girls. High Intensity of problems did not interfere with scholastic the achievement in high intelligence group. The urban Boys were found higher in achievement than the rural boys.

Kohili and Om Prakash, (1989), found that students belonging to the high intelligence group and high socio-economic status were more religions in attitude than the students of the low intelligence group and low SES. Girls were more inclined towards religion than boys. Intelligence, SES and Sex did not interact with each other to produce significant differences in the mean scores on religious attitude. There were significant correlations between personality traits like intelligence, sober (or) enthusiastic, super-ego strength, timid (or) venturesome, tough-minded (or) tender-minded, grou –dependent (or) self-sufficient, self concept, control and the attitude scores of boys and girls in respect of religion.
**Bhatt, D.B. (1990),** found Non-problematic male group to be more intelligent than the problematic group. Further, the same picture emerged in their ego strength too. The female non-problematic group was found more intelligent and had higher ego strength than the female problematic group. Male rural non-problematic group had more general capacity and insight than male rural problematic group. Male urban non-problematic was more intelligent than male urban problematic group. Female urban non-problematic was found socially precise, possessed more power than female urban problematic group.

**Dadu and Pratibha, (1992),** found that between rural male and female students, the differences were statistically significant for Q₁, A₁ and Q₄ and in theoretical, aesthetic and religious values; no difference was found in religious attitudes but the means of female students were slightly higher than the corresponding means of male students. Rural male and urban male students did not differ in their personality traits and values; these groups differed significantly in religious information orthodoxy and hostility. Between rural female and urban female students, significant difference existed in respect of Q₁, aesthetic value, economic value and political value and also in religious Puritanism and religious orthodoxy. Between rural male and rural female students the deference was significant in factor A, aesthetic value, religious information and religions Tranquility. Urban male and female Students differed significantly in Q₁, Theoretical, religious and aesthetic values, orthodoxy and hostility.
Singh, H. (1993), found that high SES and male students were emotionally less mature. They were characterized by emotional instability, emotional regression, personality disintegration, and lack of independence.

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

Geeta, P.S. and Karunanidhi, S. (1995), noted that Hindu, Muslim, and Christian students differed in religious attitude and achievement motivation. However, they had equal degree of locus of control.

Mishra, B.B. (1997), conducted a study on “correlates of academic achievement of high school students in India”. The study was confined to the X class students of two Govt. high schools of Puri Town in Orissa state. He found that personality factors except self-sufficiency are not significantly related to the academic achievement of both boys and girls.

Dhila, B.D., and Yagnik, L.R. (1999): examined the pupil’s personality differences between two different curricula, namely, sainik and non-sainik schools. Sainik school students were more emotionally stable, active, enthusiastic, optimistic, and self-confident, placid, self-disciplined, compulsive and have strong control over emotions than non-sainik school students. On the other hand, the non-sainik school students were shrewder and less submissive than sainik school students. The sainik and non-sainik students were equal in intelligence, outgoing, venturesome, zestful, and composed.
Suneetha, B. and Mayuri, K. (1999), reported that gender was found to be more an important variable than IQ in deciding the high academic performance, as more girls were found among top ranking students of classes IX and X.

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

Ram Singh (2004), found that the popular students, in general view, boys as well as girls; group and urban as well as rural groups, were found to be more extrovert in their behaviour than the neglected and rejected students. However, the neglected students were found to be more extrovert than their rejected counterparts. In the popular group, the boys showed high neurotic behaviour than the girls.

Gakhar, S.C. and Manhas, K.D. (2005), found that no significant difference was observed between boys and girls with respect to emotional intelligence. A significant difference was observed in the emotional intelligence of adolescents studying in private and government schools with the private school students scoring higher. No significant difference was observed between adolescents of rural and urban areas and scheduled and non-scheduled castes.


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

Yahaya, A. (2009), studied the relationship between the self-concept and personality of students and with their academic achievement. The research findings showed that there was no significant difference between dimension of self-concept and personality of students according to gender and there was no significant relation between dimension of self-concept and personality with students’ academic achievement.

2.6. Personal factors (Vs) Academic achievers:

Mary Esther (1945), found that there existed statistically significant differences in the achievement of most successful students with good study habits and least successful students with poor study habits.

Diener, C.L. (1960), found the similarities and differences between over achieving and under achieving students and observed that the two groups differed significantly in their study habits, indicating a positive relationship between them.

Baumrind, D. (1971), stated that individuals, who have high academic achievement are more responsible, like school and seldom violate the rules and regulations.
Babu, A.N. (1978), made a comparative study of personality factors of high intelligence and high creative thinkers and explains that, maladjusted and well-adjusted students differ from each other to a very high extent with respect to intelligence.

Desai, H.G. (1979), found that low achievers of high school had high ability in mathematics and less favourable attitude to the subject; they came from families with very strict standards (or) discipline, they were kept very busy in domestic work and did not receive any outside help for the study.

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

Premalatha Sharma (1986), reported that the under achieving rural girls significantly differ in their study habits from high achieving rural girls of IX and X Classes.

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

Ahmed, M.I. (1992), found that creativity was positively related to security-insecurity and negatively to fatalism. It has been also reported that high academic achievers in schools are not so creative in comparison to the medium achievers (Mondol, 1999).

Verma, Jagadish (1992), found that sex did not make a difference in the learning styles of students, but it had a direct bearing upon achievement motivation and anxiety. There were urban-rural differences in learning styles of students. Parent’s education had influenced in shaping the achievement – motivation of high school students, but it had no impact on learning style and anxiety.

Stella and Purushottaman (1993), showed that there is no significant difference between study habits of under achieving boys and girls.

Borkowski, J.G. and Thorpe, P.K. (1994), found that Under-achievers lack motivation, self regulation skills, (or) a combination of these two traits. “Underachievers may not lack knowledge of strategies, but, they may not understand that strategic behaviour in conjunction with effort results in achievement.
Rawat, Leela (1995), found that there was no significant difference between the study habits of boys and girls and their academic achievement.

Bhargava, M. and Sharma, A. (1995), explored the connection between the scholastic attainment and career maturity in the case of students. The sample of 80 students (40 high achievers and 40 low achievers) was based on their total scores obtained at the high school, findings. High and low achievers did not differ significantly in career attitude. High achievers and low achievers showed significant differences in total career competence as well as competence in self appraisal, occupational information, planning and problem solving. Low achievers showed better competence in goal selection.

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

Saxena, P.C. (1998), investigation was an endeavour to discover the differences between the over and underachievers with respect to their interests, need patterns, adjustment problems, study habits and personal factors. The over-achievers were those who aspired to higher achievement, had sufficient endurance and possessed a capacity for fighting out their case while the under achievers were meek, submissive, timid, brooding, impulsive and dependent type of immature individuals.
Kamalamani, K., (2001), found that even among lower achievers, girls were poorer than boys. Metric schools’ high achievers had better learning characteristics than high achievers of aided schools. Low achievers in Government Schools tend to have poor profiles than low achievers of aided schools. Educational qualifications of parents did not influence the learning characteristics of high achievers. Educational qualifications of parents influenced the learner characteristics of low achievers.

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

Darsana, M. (2002), found that there is substantial (or) marked relationship between emotional intelligence and examination anxiety for the whole sample and relevant sub-sample. There is significant difference between boys and girls in their emotional understanding and emotional intelligence but there is no significant difference between boys and girls in their emotional perception,
emotional facilitation of thought and emotional management. There is significant difference between government and private school students in their emotional perception, emotional facilitation of thought and emotional intelligence.

Sangwan, Sheela: Nitasha and Duhan, Krishna, (2002). compared the perceptual and conceptual abilities of 14-16 year old slow and average learners. The major findings of this study were the slow learner’s lower IQ and the associated mental capabilities accounted for lower performance (than the average learners) on perception tests. The average learners were also ahead of slow learners in terms of conceptual development.

Sharma, S., and Nidhi. (2002), studied the association of parental involvement parental aspiration and students achievement and students’ aspiration. The major findings of this study were parents of high and low achieving students exhibited differentiated behaviour profiles with regard to some dimensions of parental involvement. Parents of high achieving students often provided academic guidance to their children and also planned various cultural activities such as arranging picnics, dance shows and other festivals.

Tyagi, Harish Kumar (2002), studied the general mental ability, reading ability, study habits, socio-economic status and psychogenic disorders as correlates and causes of scholastic backwardness. The major findings of this study were reading ability and study habits were found positively and significantly correlated with the academic achievement of scholastically backward children. The scholastically superior and scholastically backward children were found to differ significantly in respect of psychogenic disorder.
Srivastava, S.K. (2002), studied the effect of self-concept on the learning style preferences in 115 pupils. The findings were as the self-concept level of the urban boys increased, they showed increasing preference to flexible, non-individualistic, visual field-independent, long attention space, motivation-centred and environment-free learning style. With the increasing self-concept, the rural boys showed their increasing preferences towards flexible, non-individualistic, visual, field–dependent, long attention span, motivation centered and environment –free learning styles.

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

Sirohi, V. (2004), found that all under-achievers indicated deficiency in study habits. 98.7% of the under-achievers tend to possess unfavourable attitude towards teacher and needed guidance. 97.5% of the students had poor concentration. 92.5% of students indicated deficiency in school and home environment. 72.8% of under-achievers were low in self confidence. 24.6% of them indicated deficiency in attitude towards education. 70.3% had problems related to home assignments. 96.2% lack proper attitude towards examination.
Surekha, B. (2004), concluded that there is a significant difference in adjustment problems between the students of Private and Government schools. The Government schools students are having more adjustment problems than private school students. Students of private schools are well adjusted than students of Government schools.

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

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

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

**Diwaker Sharma and Girijesh Kumar (2005),** found on the basis of research, the creatively gifted, learning disabled girls are good natured, adoptable, careless, worrying, get emotional when frustrated, introspective, slow and cautious, determined, conscientious, emotionally disciplined, adventurous, active, friendly, impulsive, carefree, fidgety, insecure, gentle, artistically fastidious, anxious about self, vigorous, like to go with the group, depressed, uncontrolled, tensed, frustrated and fretful, whereas academically gifted students are critical, cool, emotionally mature, unruffled, show restraint in avoiding difficulties, cheerful, happy go lucky, expressive, quick, undependable, disregard obligation to people, shy, careful, emotional, cautious, self-reliant, hard, guarded, fastidiously obstructive, self-confident, careless, fearless, exacting will powers, socially precise, relaxed, and unrestrained. On the basis of research findings, the conclusion has been drawn that creatively gifted learning–disabled males are good natured, ready to cooperate, warm-hearted, careless, determined, concerned about morals, kind, imaginative in inner life, attention seeking, worrying, depressed, tense, expecting attention and frustrated. Academically gifted male students are emotionally matured, unruffled, calm, talkative, cheerful, frank, expressive, quick, alert, evaluate coolly, controlled, socially precise, compulsive and show restraint in avoiding difficulties. It is concluded that creatively gifted learning–disabled females are
good natured, warmhearted, easy-going, ready to co-operate, careless, attentive to people, determined, concerned about moral standard, consistently orderly, adventurous, active, tense, frustrated, fretful, overt interest in opposite sex and do not see danger signals. Academically gifted females are emotionally mature, unruffled, calm, evaluate coolly guarded, act individualistically, controlled, socially precise, compulsive and show restraint in avoiding difficulties.

On the basis of these findings the conclusion has been that urban creatively gifted learning–disabled are good natured, easy going, ready to cooperate, warm hearted, attentive to people, careless, distractible, excitable, showing off, impatient, hostile, admiration-demanding, independent-minded, show many nervous symptoms, determined, conscientious, adventurous, do not see danger signals, expect affection, kind, show overt interest in opposite sex, tense, frustrated and fretful. Urban academically gifted students are characterised as emotionally stable, unruffled, calm, show restraints in avoiding difficulties, talkative, cheerful, frank, expressive, quick, alert, individualized, controlled, socially precise and follow self-image. Rural academically gifted students were found to be emotionally mature, calm, unruffled, showing restraint in avoiding difficulties, attention seeking, getting excitable, self-assertive, prone to jealousy, talkative, cheerful, happy-go-lucky, frank, expressive, quick, alert, evaluates coolly, guarded, act individualistically, controlled, following self-image, exacting will power, socially precise and compulsive.
**Vamadevappa, H.P. (2005),** found that there is a significant difference between high achievers and low achievers with respect to parental involvement. There is a significant difference between boys and girls in their academic achievement.

**Milevsky, A., Schlechter, M. Netter, S., & Keehn, D. (2006),** studied the connection between the student’s personality and their parent’s upbringing styles. Findings indicate that majority of the students have extrovert personality. According to him, the respondents who have these extrovert personality traits are possibly brought up with a democratic upbringing style whereby their parents allow them to interact positively and they were given opportunity to express their opinion freely. Analysis of the data in the study indicates that majority of the students have neurotic type of personality.

**Anil Sehrawat (2007),** found that the socioeconomic status influences students’ achievement goals, perceived school goal emphasis and well-being. The major findings were high achieving adolescents are significantly higher on perception of school goal emphasis and perception of school emphasis on task goals. High achieving and low achieving adolescents are similar as far as personal achievement goals are concerned. Significant differences were found among high achieving and low achieving adolescents on school related well being and its dimensions affect school, personal academic efficacy and self-reported disruptive behaviour.
Culoto, A. and Regina, A. (2007), found that high-achievers demonstrated the greatest need for silence. While medium achievers desired less quiet than high achievers, they also revealed a need for less noise than low-achievers. A comparison of high-achievers with low-achievers revealed that high-achievers exhibited moderate preferences for verbal kinesthetic activities and working alone or in pairs, and they also expressed slight preferences for bright light. When compared with high-achievers, medium achievers evidenced a greater need for late afternoon classes and cooler temperatures, although the preference for both groups was slight. The high-achievers prefer early morning classes and activities that permit them to read, interact and engage in whole body movement. They are task persistent and like to continue working until the job is completed. Conversely, low achievers crave late afternoon classes and don’t benefit from analytic, step-by-step, structured activities, but instead crave more global assignments.