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INTRODUCTION

Human resources development seems to be fundamental for all other development. If human resources are developed, a country get excellence in every field. In a broadest sense, education is considered as a basic need to the development of human resources. For better achievement of student, much time and effort of the school are used to help in their scholastic endeavors. Educators are in trouble due to the wide range of differences among students’ achievement scores when the schools provides a standard environment to all pupil, and each one is exposed to a uniform program related to class room instruction.

Education has always been related with the prediction of scholastic achievement. Generally it refers to the extent of degree of mastery. It has been defined as performing in terms of standard of excellence or simply as a desire to be successful. It is used to indicate successful attainment of some goal by giving some criterion amount of effect. Thus, achievement is the attainment or accomplishment of the knowledge after a definite period of learning and training.

Wolman’s dictionary of social sciences defines academic achievement as a specific level of attainment or proficiency in academic work as evaluated by non-standardized or standardized test or by a combination of both. Academic achievement is defined as an expression of one way an individual learns to utilize his energies. It has been explained that achievement is the extensive area in which a learner is gaining from instructions in a given area of learning i.e. achievement is reflected by the extent to which knowledge or skill has been adopted by a person by training. It has also been defined as a level of proficiency attainment in
academic work. Now a days academic achievement in a broader meaning is believed as a indicator of an individual’s expertise, potential and success. Academic achievement is taken as skill developed or knowledge obtained in the course subjects usually designated by test scores or by marks obtained.

DETERMINANTS OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

The studies identified many factors that might responsible for the variance in achievement including individual attributes as well as those related to school, home, society and community etc. The first review in this area in India can be seen in the First Educational Research Survey done by Buch (1974). The report on achievement included some categories namely, correlates in general, personality correlates, socio-economic status, failure, backwardness, under and over achievement and miscellaneous (Dave, 1974). The Second Survey of Research in Education (Dave & Anand, 1979) classified studies taken the same categories like the first one. Further two categories backwardness and failure were replaced by poor curriculum organization. In this sequence The Third Survey of Research in Education, studies were correlates of achievement with eight categories; personality correlates, creativity and achievement, socio-economic status and achievement, affective correlates, under and over achievers, achievement of SC/ST students, institutional characteristic and achievement, and miscellaneous (Anand & Padma, 1987). Padma (1991) classified studies by (1) variable (2) education level and (3) subject. The variable were further analyzed under four broad categories, viz. teaching-related, student-related, sociological and others. Teaching related variables were mostly the teaching method and classroom interaction between teacher and students. Students-related variables were intelligence, interest, anxiety, aptitudes, values. Under the sociological variable
Socio-economic status was the predominant variable with parental attitude, home environment, encouragement, aspiration and cultural influence as the secondary level variables; other variables included language and home work ability. Balasubramanian (1997) has given broad categories that include affective cognitive variables and environment of school and home which were found to be related variable with academic achievement.

There is a wealth of studies has done related to educational attainment of students in other countries also. In the present day the studies on correlates of achievement is so vast that it is very difficult to classify them. However, some determinants are discussed below:

A. School Factors

School practices such as the assignment of teachers, teacher-expectation, learning opportunities, teaching styles and retention have a profound impact on the academic achievement of students. Teacher quality as determined by education experience and expertise have been shown to be the single most significant factor contributing to student’s achievement. Environment of school and classroom has a significant impact on student motivation and achievement (Maehr & Midgley, 1996). The motivation is influenced by the psychological environment of a school, i.e., by the meaning given to the allover education experiences (Maehr, 1990). Purkey and Smith (1983) found close correlation between positive school culture and academic quality. School climate and scholastic success are correlated (Ahuwalia, 1990; Panda, Sahoo & Sahoo, 1995; Reddy, 1994; Sananda Raj & Sreethi, 2000). It is found that achievement scores higher with improvement in the facilities of the school (Varghese, 1995). Classroom environment may affect students’ learning attitudes and behavior.
before it influences their academic achievement (Cheng, 1994). Classroom environment is related to academic achievement (Ganihar & Shaik, 2004; Oza, 1995; Ramana, 1997). School environment (Salili & Lai, 2003), school type (Govindas & Varghese, 1993; Kingdon, 1996; Sinha, 1980; Veeraraghavan and Samal, 1988), school atmosphere (Ganihar & Shaik, 2004; Merchant, Paulson & Rothlisberg, 2001) also influence academic performance. Crosnoe, Johnson and Elder (2004) observed that school sector (public or private) and size of class are two important component of schools. The good finding of private schools leads to better academic performance and some resources such as computers, which shown to enhance academic achievement (Crosnoe, Johnson and Elder 2004; Eamon, 2005). Size of class can increase teacher-student bonding which also have a positive affect on academic achievement (Eamon, 2005).

Teacher’s expectation have been found to have a significant impact on student’s achievement (Goode, 1985; Goodland, 1984; Gondson Bilings, 1994; Ferguson, 1998). Gyanani (1998) found the significant impact of student’s achievement with teacher’s expectation. Teacher education (Govinda & Varghese, 1993) and teaching style (Merchant, Paulson & Rothlisberg, 2001) significantly predict academic achievement. Instructional programme has its impact on the academic performance of students (Alfassi, 2003; Luyben, Hipworth & Pappas, 2003). Teacher behaviors (Ganguly, 1989; Muifs & Reynolds, 2002) and Teacher effectiveness (Veerraghavan & Bhattacharya, 1989; Wood, Murdock & Cronin, 2002) also influence academic achievement. Other factors of school like experienced and trained teachers and good morel of the teacher contribute to high academic achievement (Suneetha & Mayuri, 2000).
Parental Factors

Parental Expectation High expectation from the parents are generally associated with higher levels of academic achievement. It includes expectations that children earn, high grades, child rearing beliefs, provisions for academically enriching home environments and standards of acceptable behavior in and out of school (Wong, 1990; Phillips, Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, Klebanov and Crane, 1998; Okagaki & French, 1998).

Parental education and Socioeconomic Status Phillips, Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, Klebanov and Crane (1998) found that parental education and their socioeconomic status are not good predictors of students academic achievement. Researchers found that unfavorable home environments, ineffective parenting, low parental expectations, language differences and high levels of mobility might account for lower levels of academic achievement among students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds (Laosa, 1978; Frymier & Gansneder, 1989). Ferguson (1998) found that parental education accounted for about twenty four percent of variance in student test scores, while socioeconomic status accounted for about twenty six percent. Children of literature parents show better academic achievement (Borbora, 2001). Parenting practices also affect children’s performance (Anuradha & Bharathis, 2001; Brown, Mounts, Lamborn & Steinberg, 1993; Park & Bauer, 2002; Rath & Patnaik, 1999; Rimm, 1995). Students who have low socioeconomic status earn lower test scores and more likely to drop out of school (Hochschild, 2003; Eamon, 2005). It is observed that low socioeconomic status prevents access to vital resources and creates additional stress at home (Majoribanks, 1996; Jeynes, 2002; Eamon, 2005).
Parental involvement its impact on the child’s educational outcome (Badhri, 1991; Hill & Craft, 2003; Marchent, Paulson & Rothlisberg, 2001; Taj, 1999). Bogenschneider (1997) concluded that parental involvement is a potent predictor of school success, regardless of ethnicity, family structure, parental education, or gender. When parents are not involved, their children achieve low and show poor homework habits (Baker & Stevenson, 1986; Epstein, 1982). Van Voorhis (2003) found that parental involvement affected achievement more strongly than socio economic status. In other words, parental involvement affected achievement independently of family background measures. However Anderson and Keith (1997), Reynolds and Walberg (1992); Shumow, Vandell and Kang (1996) found that relationship between parents involvement and children’s academic achievement is indirect rather than direct. When parents set high standards, children work harder and thus, their school achievement is found higher (Natriello & McDill 1986). High parent aspiration have been associated with increasing student’s interest in education (Majoribanks, 1996). The effect of parental involvement in school has been linked with positive and negative effects on academic achievement (McNeal, 2001; Domina, 2005). Maternal characteristics are another key factor that affect academic achievement (Majoribanks, 1996; Baharudin & Tom, 1998; Eamon, 2005). Educated Mothers have higher self-esteem have children who receive higher test score (Baharudin and Luster, 1998; Eamon, 2005).

**Personal Factor**

Intelligence and intellectual aptitudes as defined which influence achievement. Brody (1997) found that measures of intelligence and academic achievement are positively correlated with one another, most likely in a reciprocal
relationship. Various studies (e.g. Chakarvarthi, 1988; Devi, 1990; Dixit, 1989; Kaur, 1992; Panda & Nath, 1992; Yadav & Shrivastava, 1989) found relation between intelligence and academic achievement. Intelligence, probably the most studied variable and one of most stable variables in order to make valuable predictions, has been traditionally considered as an important predictor of academic achievement (Furnham, 1995). Rapport, Denney, Chung and Hustance (2001) found individual differences in intelligence to be associated with variations in academic performance. Nevertheless correlations between intelligence and achievement have proved to be only moderate and they can have a high variability (Gustafsons & Balke, 1993). It can be seen that whether it is a scholastic aptitude test or a conventional intelligence test or test of primary abilities, the measured abilities are only moderately correlation between intelligence and achievement. Petrill and Wilkerson (2000) indicate that correlation between intelligence and achievement is substantial and consistent, averaging around .50. So many trail of consistent evidence of only a moderate correlation between intelligence and achievement gradually led to the acceptance of intelligences as one of the several determinants but not the sole determinant of academic performance.

Motivation is also very important personal variable that is able to explain academic achievement (Castejon & Vera-Munoz, 1996). Oxford, Park-on, Ito, Sumrall (1993) in the Japanese language program observed that student characteristics like motivation, learning style, gender, and learning strategies shows very important role in academic achievement. Some studies concluded that achievement fuels performance (e.g., Ayishabi & Kuruvilla, 1998; Geetha, 2000; Gupta & Veeraraghavan, 1986; Yadav & Mayuri, 2001). High motivation level, maturity and self-discipline are seen as necessary general characteristics of
successful students for achievement of distance education programs (Willis, 1994). There are other studies that found no significant relationship between achievement motivation and scholastic success (Katyal & Bindra, 1995; Ray, Lipika, Bibi & Manjula, 1994). Dutt (1983) and Harbans (1987) in their study revealed that achievement motivation of boys and girl did not differ significantly. Studies conducted by Hundal and Jerath (1972) have shown negative correlations between achievement motivation and academic achievement. It is also known that motivation can be influenced by the perception that the students have about their own academic achievements.

Importance of Study habits in academic achievements is also evident in many studies (Misra, 1992; Taplin & Jegede, 2001; Verma & Kumar, 1999; Yadav & Mayuri, 2001). It has found that study habits are associated with academic achievements independently on scholastic aptitudes (Aluja & Blanch, 2004; Matt, Pechersky & Cervantes, 1991). Badhri (1991) identified that poor study habits are a cause of low-achievements. Effective study habits has also been founded consistently to be related to academic performance. For example, Jones, Slate and Kyle (1992) observed that college students with high level of academic achievements have more effective study habits that do low-achieving students with respect to study techniques, time managements and attitudes towards learning. It is also concluded that there is a gender difference in study habits, females have better study habits than males (Sananda Raj & Sreethi, 2000).

It is recognized that Self concept influences the academic achievements of student (Dubey & Mishra, 1997; Grantham & Ford, 2003). Self concept can be considered as an essentially independent variable although it is related to both intelligence and motivation. Since an individual strives to achieve that which is
consistent with his/her self concept. Moreover self concept influence achievement. (Montero & Alonso, 1992; Byrne, 1984) and Marsh (1984, 1990) indicate that self concept can be actually considered as a multi dimensional variable. Certain researches have found persistent correlations of 0.4 to 0.6 between achievements and self concepts (Skallvik & Valas, 1999). A number of studies have supported the contention that positive self-concept correlates with academic achievements (Bel Castro, 1985; Bruns, 1992; Cherian & Moeketsi, 1998; Diaz, 1998; Ford, 1996; Geetha, 2000; Goswami, 1978; Kumar, 1999; Saraswa, 1989; Schunk, 1998; Sharma, 1979; Shrivastava, 1992; Van Boxtel & Monk, 1992) and this relationship is linear (Shah, 1978). There are also some studies in which no any relationship between self concept and academic achievements was found (e.g, Byrne, 1986). Several studies inferred better self concept among high achievers than low achievers (Pujar, Gaonkar & Sharma, 1997; Tiwari & Bansal, 1994). In a study on junior college students, Deshmukh (2000) observed that high and low self concept groups do not differ significantly on academic achievements.

A positively relationship between study skills and academic performance has been reported consistently in the literature (e.g., Al- Hilawani & Sartawi, 1997; Biustein et al., 1986; Jones & Slate, 1992). Series of studies conducted by Jones and Slates (1992); Jones, Slate, Perez and Marini (1993) estimated that study skills explained approximately 15% of the variance in the grades of undergraduate students.

It is known that test anxiety and academic achievements are related (Hambree, 1988; Seipp, 1991; Williams 1993). Negative relation between test anxiety and performance : High test anxious students tend to score lower than low
test anxious students (Birenbaum & Nasser, 1994). King, Ollendick and Gullone (1992) observed that test anxious students achieve lower academic grades than their less anxious peers of equal ability. There is an extensive amount of empirical evidence of the negative effects of test anxiety on academic performance (Hancock, 2001). Hill and Wigfield (1984) reported studies with correlation upto - .60 between test anxiety and achievements, suggesting that anxiety and achievements share significant variance. Hembree (1988) found that test anxiety routinely causes poor performance. Anxiety causes a performance decrement (Geetha, 2000; Gupta & Anshika, 1998; Murty & Kulshretha, 1999; Yadav & Mayuri, 2001). Williams 1994 found reciprocal relationship; however in that poor performance may result in anxiety, which leads to further decrements in performance (Williams, 1994).

Success and failure have their cumulative effects and go a long way towards determining attitudes which, in turn, help to provide impetus for need satisfaction or failure in achieving. Pal, Jain and Tiwari (1985) found that scholastic achievement affected level of aspiration. Abu- Hilal (2000) observed that level of aspiration had direct effect on achievement and mediated between attitudes and achievements. Level of aspiration was found to have a significant level of achievements indicating that students with higher level of aspiration had better achievements. Interest is also an important determinant of success in academic achievement. It is one of the critical constructs related learning and so associated with academic performance also. Interest in a subject is related to motivation and learning (Schiefele & Csikszentmihalyi, 1995). Some research evidence suggests that interest is correlated with performance in achievement test (Ganguly, 1989; Schiefele, Krapp & Winteler, 1992; Steinkamp & Maehr, 1983).
Level of aspiration as an important determinants of academic achievements at secondary level (Khan, 2000) and unrealistic level of aspiration adversely affected scholastic achievement (Khan, 2000; Nagose, 1984). Tiwari, Kumar and Morbhatt (1980) found that high school girl whose academic performance was high had higher level of aspiration than high academic performance boys.

Student teacher relationship plays an important role in student performance (Burke, 1996; Jacobson, 2000; Liu, 1997; Steele, 1992). Student teacher relationships are associated with higher academic achievement (Crosnoe, Johnson & Elder Jr., 2004; Niebuhr and Niebuhr, 1999). Communication educators have long been emphasizing that student teacher interaction is a critical variable in the educational fortune of students (Hunt, 2003) and also that these interactions contribute towards better academic achievements (Ozerk, 2001; Suneetha & Mayuri, 2000). Student who trust their teachers are more motivated and as a result perform better in school (Crosnoe, Johnson, & Elder Jr., 2004). In a study by DeMoulin (2002) it was concluded that non-involvement in extracurricular activities by students is a failure of personal development during adolescent year is dependent upon involvement in such activities and efficient learning derives largely from good personal development. Gerber (1996) found that extra-curricular participation is not determinants to student performance and that participation in these types of activities promotes greater academic achievement. A number of studies have held the view that participation in extracurricular activities helps in making academic performance better (Camp, 1990; Finn & RocK, 1997; Gifford & Dean, 1990; Mahoney, Cairns & Framer, 2003; Marsh, 1992; O’ Brien & Rollefson, 1995).
Emotional Intelligence

Psychologists have identified a variety of intelligence over the year (Gardener, 1983). Most of these can be grouped into one of the three clusters ‘abstract’, ‘concrete’ or ‘social’ intelligence. The first academic work on emotional intelligence was published as an article in imagination, cognition and personality by Mayer and Salovey in (1990), but Daniel Goleman (1995), who published a book “Emotional intelligence” was the man who publicized the concept. Emotional intelligence has its roots in social intelligence (Young, 1996). Mayer and Salovey (1993) define emotional intelligence as the ability to monitor one’s own and others’ feelings and emotion to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one’s thinking and action that promote emotional and intellectual growth. In other words, it is a set of skills that enable us to make our way in a complex world i.e., the personal, social and survival aspects of overall intelligence the exclusive common sense and sensitivity that are essential to effective daily functioning.

Bar-on (1997) characterized emotional intelligence as “an array of non-cognitive capabilities, competencies and skills that influence one’s ability to successes in coping with environment demands and pressures”. Mayer and Salovey (1997) clarified that emotional intelligence involves the ability to perceive accurately, appraise and express emotions, the ability to access and/or generate feeling when they facilitate thought, the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge, and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth. Cooper and Sawaf (1998) define emotional intelligence as the ability to sense, understand and effectively apply the power and acumen of emotion as a source of human energy, information, connection and

Similar studies have linked sex (Ge, Conger, and Elder, 2001), age (Fernandez and Rodriguez, 2003), location of residence (Conger and Elder, 2000) to emotional processes and development during adolescence. Emotional intelligence in relation to demographic factors may prove useful to those searching for insight into adolescent emotional, social, and psychological development (Chan, 2005 and Harrod, 2010).

Hein (2003) defines emotional intelligence as being able to know how to separate healthy feeling from unhealthy one’s and how to turn negative feelings, into positive ones. Emotional intelligence has a definite relation with human brain its related to verbal performance (Jausovec & Jausovec, 2005). Caruso and Wolfe
(2004) define emotional intelligence as the ability to perceive emotions, access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, understand emotions and emotional knowledge and reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional intellectual growth. Development of emotional intelligence and its some preliminary observation clarified by (Pandey & Tripathy, 2004). Bradbery and Greaves (2005) defines emotional intelligence as how we manage behavior, navigate social competencies and make personal decision that achieve positive results. Emotional intelligence is compared and constructed with a measure abstract intelligence but not with a personality measure but not with a measure of academic intelligence. Emotional intelligence and adolescents’ perception about family environment revealed by Uma Devi and Rayal (2004). Coates and Draves (2006) offer a compensatory model between emotional intelligence and intelligence that posits that the association between emotional intelligence and job performance becomes more positive as cognitive intelligence decreases. Emotional intelligence is a set of self perceived skills, competencies and personality traits including optimism and self esteem (Boyatzis & Goleman, 2000). Emotional intelligence is associated with important social outcomes, including social adjustment (Engelberg & Sjobej, 2004), altruism and civic virtue (Charbonnea & Nicol, 2002) with respect to academic achievement. In various researches emotional intelligence was found to be significantly correlated with vocational performance (Amelang & Steinmayr, 2006); everyday behavior (Brackett, Mayer & Warner, 2004); self report and performance (Brackett, River, Shiffman & Learner, 2006); multiple intelligence (Bay & Lim, 2006), self efficacy (Chan, 2005) level of information and knowledge (Manna & Smith, 2004), intelligence and logic (Locke, 2005), social skill (Betlow, 2006). Non-
significant gender differences in emotional intelligence has been reported by some researchers (Tyagi, 1996; Aquino, 2003; Brackett & Mayer, 2003; Bansibihari & pathan, 2004; Tiwari & Srivastava, 2004; Cakan & Altun, 2005; Browne & Schutte, 2006; and Shah & Thinugam, 2008). However, significant gender differences in emotional intelligence has also been reported by another group of researchers (Brackett, 2001; Mandell & Pherwani, 2003; Day & Carroll, 2004; Goldenberg, Matheson and Mantler, 2006; Young, 2006; Osborne, 2009). Females have been reported to have higher emotional intelligence than that of males (Bhosle, 1999; King, 1999; Sutarso, 1999; Wing & Love, 2001; Singh, 2002; Brackett, Mayer and Warner, 2004; and Katyal & Awasthi, 2005).

Thinking Style

The theory of Mental Self Government proposed by Sternberg (1998b) conceives that the various style of government we see in our world is external reflection or mirrors that we find in our mind (Sternberg, 1994a). The theory (Sternberg, 1990a, 1994a, 1997) assumes that people need some how to govern or ménage their everyday activities. There are many ways of doing so, as people choose styles of managing themselves with which they are comfortable. However, people are some what flexible in their use of styles and try with the various degrees of success to adapt themselves to the stylistic demands of giving situation. When applied to intelligence, the metaphor of Mental Self Government generates thirteen stylistic ways which Sternberg calls, thinking styles. Here thinking style is defined as a preferred way of thinking, and refers to personal preference in employing one’s intelligence and competence when thinking or dealing with
things. It is not ability skill it is rather a favored way of expressing or using one or more abilities (Grigorenko & Sternberg, 1997). Thus thinking style is the interface between two, it do not reside in the domain of abilities and domain of personality (Sternberg 1988a, 1988b, 1994b).

Sternberg (1988, 1997) provides categories and characterization of how people organize, direct and manage their own thinking activities and he proposes 13 thinking styles which fall under five aspects of Mental Self Governance. These 13 styles are briefly described under their different dimensions as under:

1) Functions  2) Forms  3) Levels  4) Scope  5) Leanings

Functions

We know that governments carries out legislative, executive and judicial function. The mind also carries out the frame functions. The legislative function of the mind is concerned with creation, Formulation and planning of ideas. People who have a legislative style prefer tasks that require using creative strategies and generating new approaches and solution of problem. Such individuals like to create their own rules and ideas to do things in their own way. They do not prefer problems that are structured or predefined (Sternberg, 1994a). The preferred kinds of activities of a legislative stylist are innovative projects designing, writing of creative papers, creation or invention in different fields like science, education, bank, policy maker etc. students tend to do best on projects, assignments and essays in which they can express their own point of views and ideal and unstructured activities. Sometimes Students with legislative styles get into trouble when their approach does not conform to that of teacher’s.
The executive function is concerned with implementing and doing things based on ideas of others. People who have an executive style are more concerned with the proper implementation of tasks within a set of guidelines. They follow in predefined existing ways. They should use to get things done and prefer problems that are predesigned or prestructured (Sternberg, 1994a). They like to fill gaps within already existing structures rather than to create new structures themselves. Some of the kinds of activities they are likely to prefer are solving given mathematical problems, applying rules to problems, giving talks or lessons based on other people’s ideas and enforcing rules. So many occupation are related with this style i.e., police officer on patrol, builder of other people’s design, solider and administrative assistant. They follow orders and directions and evaluate themselves in the same way the system is likely to evaluate them, namely in terms of how well they do, what they are told. Thus a gifted child with an executive style is likely to do well in school.

The judicial function is concerned with judgment, evaluation and comparing. The judicial style is seen in those people who like to evaluate the work process, rules and procedures, who like to judge things and ideas (Sternberg, 1994a). They prefer activities related to giving opinion, writing, critics, judging people and their work, and evaluating programs. Some of their preferred kind of occupations are system analyst, program evaluation judge, critic, consultant, admission officer, contract supervisor.

**Forms**

According to Sternberg (1988, 1997) different forms of thinking styles are: Monarchic, Hierarchic, Oligarchic and Anarchic. Each form results in a different way of approaching and its problems. In monarchic form a single goal of doing
things predominates. People with monarchical style prefer engaging in activities that require them to focus on only one thing at a time until it is completed. People with monarchical style tend to focus on one goal or need at a time. The individual tends to let anything get in the way of his or her solving a problem. Monarchical people can be counted on to get a thing done, given that they have set their mind to it. In the classroom, they are likely to be thinking about something on which their mind is set earlier, instead of doing tasks assigned by the teacher. Some example of monarchical child is, a child who has a strong interest in sports but is not a reader may become a reader if given sports novels to read. A child who loves cooking but not mathematics could be given problems to do that involves recipes. In these ways, the child may become interested in things that previously were of no interest (Sternberg, 1997).

The hierarchic style allows for multiple goals each of which may have different priority. People with a hierarchic style prefer distributing their attention and energies over several tasks that are prioritized. Person with many goals to recognize that not all goals can be fulfilled equally well, to recognize that some goals are more important than others. Having good knowledge of priorities, and to be systematic in their approach to solving homework, assignment by prioritizing task he/she will benefit from having a hierarchic style.

The oligarchic style prefer working toward several objectives all at the same time without prioritizing the task. A student who has an oligarchic style of thinking perform tasks by giving equal weightage for example, they do well in assessment system in which each unit has equal weightage of marks. But they experience conflict and tension when they have to assign priorities. Since everything seems equally important, completing goals keep oligarchic individuals
from completing tasks. According to Sternberg (1997) oligarchic students are not always sure what to do first, or how much time to allot to each of the tasks they need to complete. Oligarchic students often run into trouble while studying because they have trouble allocating their time to different subjects. They may allocate maximum time for unimportant task and little time to the tasks the teacher consider important. They need help in time allocation.

The anarchic style characterize individual prefer working on tasks that require no system at all, and, thus allow for greater flexibility. Person who do not like to be tied down to system, rules or particular approaches to problems. For individuals with an anarchic thinking style, rules, procedures and guidelines are hindrances. Sternberg, (1994a) Students who have an anarchic thinking style tend to perform best when tasks and situations are unstructured, when there are no clear procedures to be followed, or when the problems that they confront are most readily solved through insight that represent a departure from existing mindset. people who have an anarchic style generally enjoy dealing with a mixture of needs and goals that are often difficult to sort out (Sternberg, 1997). They like to take a approach to problem solving, often seem or unaware of the need for rules and regulations and often appose existing systems, although not necessarily in favour of any clearly specified alternative. Anarchic students feel trouble in school particularly if the school environment is a rigid one and so they need help in focusing. They are most at risk for antisocial behaviour, but they also may have a creative steak. They are wide ranging in the scope of things they will consider, and so may see solutions to problems that others over look.
Levels

In general, one can distinguish between global and local levels, corresponding to these two levels are the two aspects of Mental Self Government (Grigorenko & Sternberg, 1995). A person with a global style prefers activities that require them to attend problems that are general in nature and that require abstract thinking. They deal with relatively large and abstract issue, and to ignore deal with minor details. The global thinking style person like to conceptualize and work in the world of ideas. A student with a global style will excel on assignment, but he will do much less on assignments that require examination of specific details. The local style prefer activities that require them to attend to very specific and concrete details. It characterizes individuals who prefer tasks that require engagement with specific concrete details and that often require considerable precision in execution. The person with local style relishes the very small matters and likes to work on problems that require precision. Local thinking style students perform well on detail oriented tasks and tests but may however, have trouble on abstract essays.

Scope

Mental Self Government needs to deal with internal and external issues (Grigorenko & Sternberg, 1995). The individuals with an internal style refers to a preferences to perform projects, tasks or events that allow one to work independently from others. Internalist tend to be introverted, task oriented, about and both less socially sensitive and less interpersonally aware than externalists. They like to work single-handedly. Their preferences is to apply their abilities to things in isolation from other people (Grigorenko & Sternberg, 1995; Sternberg, 1997). External style refers to a preferences for activities that allow working and
interacting with others at different stage of progress. Grigorenko & Sternberg, (1995) conceptualized that externalists tend to be extroverted, people oriented, outgoing, socially, more sensitive and more interpersonally aware than internalist. People like group work and do not prefer to work alone.

**Leanings**

In Mental Self Government, two major regions of leaning is distinguished: Conservative and Liberal. The Liberal style characterizes individuals who like to go beyond existing rules, structures, procedures and who allow substantial change from the way things are currently done. Individuals with this style look for indistinct and uncertain stimuli and become bored when things never seem to change (Grigorenko & Sternberg, 1995). Individuals with a predominantly conservative style like to prefer familiar tasks that require the application of adherence. Conservative student prefer existing rules and procedures, minimizes change, avoid ambiguous situations where possible, and prefer familiarity in life and work. They are happiest in a structured and relatively predictable environment. When such structure does not exit, the individual may look for to create it (Sternberg, 1997).

Styles appear to be largely a function of person’s interaction with the environment, and they can be developed and socialized. Thinking styles are socialized at least in part (Sternberg, 1994a, 1997; John, 2005) suggesting that they can to some extent be modified by the environment in which people live (Zhang & Sternberg, 1998). An individual with one style in one task or situation may have a different style in a different task or situation. Moreover, some individuals may have one preferred stylistic profile at another stage. Therefore, styles are not fixed, but changeable (Stenberg, 1997).
Rewarding students for using preferred styles on some tasks is likely to lead to greater display of the rewarded styles. However some people retain less rewarded styles despite environmental pressure suggest that socialization does not fully account for the origins of styles and that there may be pre programmed dispositions that are difficult to change (Grigorenko & Stenberg, 1997). Finally thinking style manifest themselves in any activity and therefore can be measured in an ecologically valid situation as well as in a laboratory setting. In other words, thinking styles are deflected in styles of learning and teaching styles of working and playing and so on (Grigorenko & Stenberg, 1997).

**Academic Motivation**

Motivation has long been considered by experts of psychology and education as an important factor that affects students’ learning and achievement. It is a common contention that adaptive motivational orientations facilitates learning while maladaptive ones impede it. Recent researches on motivation has focused on the nature of motivational constructs and the ways these constructs affect learning and achievement. According to the social cognitive model of motivation, motivation is a dynamic, multifaceted phenomenon that explains how and why students are engaged in their learning activities. In line with this thinking, research on motivation has identified a number of motivational construct that have impacts on students’ learning (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Contemporary motivational theories assume some kind of goal or purpose or intentionality in explaining human behavior especially in terms of liking and stability. Most of human behavior are goal directed (Ford, 1987). These goals may not always be conscious and they may not always present as a motivational force directing and organizing the stream of person's activity. Goals can motivate behavior and inform people
about their capabilities. Goals never affect performance directly, they depend on the commitment of the people. Specific goals enhance task performance through greater amount of effort required for successes and self satisfaction anticipated when accomplished. The goals also promote self evaluations of capabilities. Researches have explained that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and achievement goals are powerful enables for academic learning and achievement (Linnenbrick & Pintrich, 2002). These two motivational construct also represent two major theories in the recent past studies of motivation (Eccles, Wigfield & Schiefele, 1998; Graham, Weiner & Zucker, 1996; Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). In Self Determination Theory (SDT) Deci and Ryan, (1985) distinguished between different types of motivation based on the different reasons or goals that give rise to an action. The most basic distinct types of motivation are intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation refers to doing something because it is inherently interesting or enjoyable while extrinsic motivation refers to doing something because it leads to a separable outcomes. Researchers have shown that the quality of experience and performance can be very different when one is behaving for intrinsic versus extrinsic reasons. Kahoe & McFarland (1975) and Vallerand, Pelletier, Blias, Briere, Senecal & Vallieres (1992) stated that intrinsic motivation is a global construct that can be differentiated into three more specific motives : (i)Intrinsic motivation to know, (ii)Intrinsic motivation to accomplish, and (iii)Intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation. Similarly Vallerand, Pelletier, Blias, Briere, Senecal and Vallieres (1992) considered three dimensions of extrinsic motivation. These are:

(i) Identified regulation, (ii) Introjected regulation (iii) External regulation
In Self Determination Theory (SDT) Deci & Ryan, (1985) distinguished between different types of motivation based on the different reasons or goals that give rise to an action. The most basic distinct types of motivation are intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation refers to doing something because it is inherently interesting or enjoyable while extrinsic motivation refers to doing something because it leads to a separable outcomes. Researchers have shown that the quality of experience and performance can be very different when one is behaving for intrinsic versus extrinsic reasons.

Deci (2000) explain that three types of motivation i.e., intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, amotivation. The intrinsic motivation continuum (i.e. intrinsic motivation to know, to accomplish and to experience stimulation) represents high levels of self-determination while extrinsic motivation represents intermediate levels of self-determination. Thus, the continuum is posited to run from amotivation to intrinsic motivation, (Deci and Ryan, 2000). Amotivated is the third type of motivation. In amotivated motivation, individuals neither intrinsically motivated nor extrinsically motivated. Amotivated individual experience feelings of incompetence and expectancies of uncontrollability they perceive their behavior as caused by forces out of their own control. They feel undeceived, and start asking themselves why in the world, they go to school. Eventually, they may stop participating in academic activities.

Harackiewicz and Elliot (1993, 1998) identify the joint effects of target and purpose goals on intrinsic motivation. Dweck and Leggett (1988) proposed two types of goals, e.g. learning and performance goals. These goals lead to different affective reactions and behaviors. That goals related to challenge and mastery on task lead to an adaptive pattern of cognition. On the other hand, goals
which focuses on the demonstration of high ability, are more likely to believe that
effort and ability are inversely related with the subsequent inferences that high
effort signifies low ability. The individual having this type of goal may attribute
failure as a result of lack of ability. Gottfried found positive correlation between
motivation and achievement. Specifically, young students with higher academics
intrinsic motivation had significantly higher achievement and intellectual
performance. She also found that early intrinsic motivation correlates with later
motivation and achievement and that later motivation is predictable from early
achievement (Gottfried, 1990). It was also found that perceived academic
competent and self-determined in the school context develop an autonomous
motivational profile toward education, which in turn, leads students to achieve
higher school grades. Perceived academic competence and perceived academic
self-determination positively influenced autonomous academic motivation, which
in turn, had a positive impact on school performance (Fortier, Vallerand, & Guay,
variables and students academic achievement, the study included an investigation
of the relationship of individual motivation and its effect on academic
achievement. Finding indicated that student academic motivation showed no
significant effect on relationship with academic achievement. Several other
researchers have suggested that only motivation directly affects academic
achievement; all other factors affect achievement only through their influence on
motivation.