CHAPTER I
SURVEY OF LITERATURE.

The realisation that home constitutes one of the most important single factor in a child's life for his proper development has given psychological researches an orientation towards home and family. The family provides the individual with a unique environment and training which help him to play successfully the role assigned to him by the society. Vernon (1965) showed that poor socioeconomic, cultural and social environment had diminishing effect on children's spatial and practical abilities. Henderson and Merritt (1968) studied the influence of varied experiences and opined that children with experiential limitations suffer from linguistic handicap, manifested in their school progress.

All characteristics, however, are not equally affected by home. According to Bloom (1966, p. 209) "educational achievement is rather obviously influenced by environmental differences" while others may be to a lesser degree.

The success in school achievement as measured by achievement tests or the average school examination marks in different curricular subjects are more affected by home than by the student's mental abilities — and as such, home has been regarded as one of the important factors in the child's educational achievement (Bloom, 1966, p. 210; Mishra, Dash & Padhi, 1960-61).
The available literature on the relationship between home environment and academic achievement are summarised below.

Fraser's study (1959) on home environment and its effect on academic achievement is one of earliest and most widely cited work. Her "results have shown clearly that the factors in the home environment are more closely correlated with school progress than with intelligence" (Fraser, 1959, p.75). According to Wiseman (1964) the home environment is more important for the child's education than his school or neighbourhood. Marjoribanks (1975) opined that change in family environment may give "modest increment" in school performance scores. Bradley and Caldwell (1976) obtained results which indicated that home environment might produce instability of performance on infant's mental tests.

Mishra, Dash and Padhi (1960-61) in India found that the correlation of home environment with school achievement was more than its correlation with intelligence. They concluded that if the home environment was not conducive to the child's study, his achievement might be poor inspite of his good intelligence. Anantha Krishnan's study (1977) showed that deterioration in academic achievement was influenced by unfavourable home conditions. De and Sinha (1970) found that home adjustment had a positive influence on academic motivation. Kakkar (1970a) found that scholastic achievement was low when there were conflicts in the home.
Mathur and Hundal (1972) obtained a low, negative correlation between family size and achievement, showing that bigger the family size, the lower would be the achievement of the children.

The investigations relating to mother's employment and children's educational achievement perhaps present the most consistent findings. Fraser (1959), Stolts (1960), Roy (1961), Frankel (1964) and Banducci (1967) found no significant difference in academic achievement between the children of working and non-working mothers. The difference, if any, appeared to be beneficial to the children of the working mothers (Fraser, 1959; Roy, 1961).

According to Finkelman (1967), mother's employment did not produce any "significant difference in the children's perception of their parents as nurturant or authority figures".

In a country like India, where unemployment still presents an unsurmountable problem for educated and qualified males, it is expected that only a negligible percentage of women will get jobs outside home. As such, not much attention has been directed to this problem and hence investigations in this area are few and far between. The available work is that of George and Thomas (1967) which showed no significant difference in academic achievement between the children of working and non-working mothers.
Parental interest, encouragement and active participation in the child's educational activities have been found to be a motivating factor for better performance. Douglas (1964), Wiseman (1964) and Willmon (1969) found that parental encouragement and participation influenced academic progress favourably.

Similar result was obtained by Gupta (1968) in India showing that tuition at home was significantly related to higher achievement. His high-achiever group showed a relationship between parental encouragement and achievement scores though this was not the case for moderate and low intelligence groups. Anantha Krishnan (1977) opined that lack of motivation on the part of the parents was responsible for lower academic achievement of the offsprings.

In recent years, assessment of parent-child relationship has gained considerable importance in psychological researches because of its influence in all aspects of child development. According to Ausubel and Sullivan (1970, p. 289), parent-child relations constitute perhaps the most important single factor exerting the maximum influence on the socialisation and development of the child.

There is no ideal or standard pattern of parent-child relationship. It depends upon many factors — namely, the parents' nature, needs and experiences. The personality and potentialities of the child and the home environment being influenced by these factors, may accelerate or retard the child's various achievements.
Due to the lack of any standard pattern of parent-child relationship, there is no direct way of measuring it. Usually, it is assessed from the parental attitudes towards the child and child-rearing, which reflect this relationship.

The earliest study for assessment of child-rearing practices goes to the credit of Stogdill (1936), who attempted to measure the parents' attitudes towards parental control and social behaviour of children. The important studies since then and the major parent-child dimensions are presented in the following table:

**MAJOR PARENT-CHILD DIMENSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigators</th>
<th>Psychological Dimensions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symonds (1939)</td>
<td>Dimensions: Acceptance - Rejection, Dominance - Submission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, Kalhorn and Breese (1945)</td>
<td>Syndromes: Democracy in the Home, Acceptance of child, Indulgence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin, Kalhorn and Breese (1949)</td>
<td>Clusters: Warmth, Adjustment, Restrictiveness, Clarity, Interference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roff (1949) (based on Baldwin, Kalhorn and Breese, 1945)</td>
<td>Factors: Concern for child, Democratic guidance, Permissiveness, Parent-child harmony, Sociability, Adjustment of parents, Activeness of home, Non-readiness of suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorr and Jenkins (1953) Factors (based on Baldwin, Kalhorn and Breese, 1945)</td>
<td>Factors: Dependence—encouraging, Democracy of child training, Organisation and effectiveness of control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAJOR PARENT-CHILD DIMENSIONS (Contd..)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigators</th>
<th>Psychological Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


More recent studies include those of Hurley (1965), who concluded that the accepted child received more parental encouragement and impetus for learning, whereas the rejected one showed a "decreased curiosity in exploring and manipulating the world of people, objects and ideas", which slowed down his rate of learning and was reflected in the child's educational achievement. Rolcik (1965) found a significant relationship between scholastic achievement and parental interest in school-work in happy, complete families. According to Baumrind (1967) controlling, demanding but communicative and affectionate parents have
the most matured children, while non-affectionate and non-controlling parents have discontented and immature offsprings. 

Honsik's findings (1967) revealed that able, concerned parents and activating mothers helped to accelerate cognitive development.

Hurley (1967) studying the malevolent behaviour of parents showed that less intelligent children evoke more ill-feelings than the more intelligent ones and that ambitious, educated parents manifest greater malevolence towards their slow-learning children than the less ambitious and less educated ones.

Patel's findings (1964) showed that the amount of maternal care influenced the personality pattern of the child. Choudhury (1967) found a significant relationship between emotionality of children and parents' punishing behaviour.

Studies on the effect of reward and punishment on learning do not report consistent results, though the effect of rewards have been found to be more favourable than punishment in learning situations.

McGeoch (1958, p. 245-246) stated that reinforcement operates in a all-or-none fashion in human learning. "Learning does not always increase with increasing amounts of reward, nor when it does, is the increase in learning always proportional in a regular way to the amount of reward". Similar result was reported by Brackbill, Kappy and Starr (1962) who obtained a noticeable difference between non-reward and any value of reward.
They concluded that the relationship between the two variables was not a linear one. Smith (1967) opined that punishment only suppressed behaviour without bringing any constructive change to it. Leff's findings (1968) revealed that greater suppression of behaviour resulted from high-intensity punishment in the case of continuously punished subjects, while intermittently punished ones showed only a trend toward suppression of behaviour. Ryan, and Watson's results (1968) showed that intermittent reward situations produced more vigorous performance than the continuous reward situations.

Out of the four reinforcing conditions – praise, correct, disapproval or alone, Stein (1969) found that all reinforcing conditions produced more achievement than alone. Praise was significantly more effective than others, indicating that social reinforcement enhanced children's achievement.

In a study dealing with relationship between scholastic achievement and home environment, intelligence plays a very important and critical role. It becomes imperative to know how far this innate ability influences individual achievement. To disregard this aspect of individual difference will leave many questions unanswered regarding the environmental influences on attainment.

In the studies showing the relationship between intelligence and academic achievement, socio-economic status has been taken as an inseparable variable; hence the effect of socio-economic status on achievement has been discussed here and has not been dealt under home environment.
In Orme's study (1975), intelligence was found to be the major determinant of school achievement. According to Gupta (1973) intelligence is the best single predictor of academic achievement. Deb and Ghosh (1971) opined that intelligence played a positive role in academic achievement. Kundu (1962) reported that intelligence was "sufficiently related to achievement." Rao (1970) obtained a high correlation between scholastic achievement and intelligence. Muthayya (1962) found no significant difference between the high-achievers and low-achievers though the high-achievers were more intelligent.

In studying the relationship between intelligence, socio-economic status and academic achievement, Fraser (1959) found a higher correlation between income and school achievement than between income and intelligence. Curry (1962) found a highly significant positive correlation between socio-economic status and academic achievement and so did Miner (1968). A significant relationship was obtained by Kannett and Cropley (1970) between socio-economic status and intelligence and a positive correlation was obtained between social status, intelligence and educational achievement by Lindgren and Guedes (1963).

Investigations in the same area in India include those of Gupta (1968) who obtained a significant relationship between income and academic achievement in moderate and low intelligence groups. Shanthamani (1967) obtained a positive relationship between economic status of parents and intelligence of the children. Rao (1970) reported a substantial relationship between socio-economic status and achievement.
Kaushal (1971) found that students of middle and higher socio-economic class have a lower academic achievement than those coming from the poor economic standing and concluded that class structure does not automatically help the students of higher class for better academic performance.

Gupta (1968); Chopra (1969), Kakkar (1970b), Mathur and Hundal (1972) and Anantha Krishnan (1977) found a significant positive correlation between socio-economic status and academic achievement. Saini (1977) observed that educational and economic status of parents was positively related to academic achievement at college level.

Jamuar (1963) concluded that academic achievement was positively related with father's occupation. Similar result was also obtained by Sinha (1973).

To sum up the various studies undertaken in different areas of home environment, achievement and intelligence, it may be said that the general findings suggest that intelligence, home environment and academic achievement are positively related; and that home environment exerts a more determining influence on academic achievement than intelligence (Fraser, 1959; Marjoribanks, 1975; Mishra, Dash and Padhi, 1960–61; Anantha Krishnan, 1977).

It is also evident from the foregoing survey of literature that a negligible amount of investigation has been done in India to determine the environmental effect on school learning.
The major part of the research out of these deals with the relationship between intelligence, socio-economic status and achievement. Moreover, the studies deal with one or two particular aspects of home and its effect upon academic achievement. The total effect of all these factors and some others, such as parent-child relationship, reward-punishment effect and parental encouragement have not been studied in detail so far.

In the light of these facts, it was deemed worthwhile to plan the study to investigate the effects of home environment, if any, on academic achievement of the school-going children. It was revealed from the survey of literature that intelligence, socio-economic background, maternal employment, encouragement, parent-child relationship and reward-punishment have varying degrees of influence on academic achievement. Since no Indian or Western studies reported any differential effect of maternal employment on children's education, this variable was not included in the present study.