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Discussion
The researcher undertook this work to enlarge understanding with regard to one of the most important factors of human development in an educational perspective i.e., academic achievement. The main objective of the research was to see the impact of personality, need-achievement and family climate on over and underachievement in private and government schools.

In this connection academic achievement of the chosen sample was recorded. Personality of the sample students was tested in its factors components, need for achievement; one of the major personal correlates of academic achievement as stated in the preceding chapters, was also studied. Family climate which is found to be an influential factor associated with academic achievement was also included in the study. Results reported in chapter four give an overall picture of findings of present study.

As for the sex differences within the groups of underachievers and overachievers in private and government schools, still sharper and more frequent differences have been discovered along various personality factors, need-achievement and family climate.

The purpose of the present research is to give the possible logical as well as empirical interpretation of the results arrived at in the present investigation.

**Personality Differences between Underachievers and Overachievers**

Underachievers have been found to be less participating, having less intelligence, less maturity, low level of enthusiasm, less persistence and less sensitivity. They have more group dependence, less control and lesser level of social preciseness whereas their overachieving counterparts show opposite personality attributes.

As far as the participating and outgoing characteristic is concerned, lower scores of underachievers indicate aloofness, and stiffness which make them socially unattractive, although their lower scores represent their preciseness and dependability in their work. This may give an impression to their parents and teachers that they are able to manage their studies well. But at the same time when
a person is stiff, he is less likely to interact with others. This is a well known fact that the more a person interacts the more he/she is benefited. But when this interaction is limited, the problems of underachievers go unnoticed. Higher scores of overachievers indicate warm hearted, trustful, attentiveness to people and easygoing characteristics. Their easygoingness, however, lowers dependability on them. This easygoingness may be seen in every field like, academic as well as non-academic. Overachievers generally do not appear to be serious stakeholders due to their easygoingness, therefore they often surprise others by their performance.

It is quite understandable that subjects who are outgoing and participating with an accompanying characteristic of being warmhearted and easygoing are not inhibited and they take interest in greater number of activities, they tend to be more demonstrative, they tend to mix up with people more easily and tend to attain the knowledge with this interaction. This may also indicate their interest in various activities as well as in academic activities with an easygoing attitude. Gwaronski (1965) and Menon (1973) too found overachievers to be having greater interest in schoolwork. It is, conversely, quite reasonable to expect lower interest of underachievers due to less participation which results in lower academic achievement of underachievers. The results are consistent with the results obtained by Dhaliwal (1971) and Puri (1987) who had reported lower scores of underachievers on this trait.

As for emotional stability and maturity is concerned overachievers have been found to be more emotionally stable and more mature than underachievers. The result is in consonance with those found by Puri (1987); Dhaliwal (1971). The maturity and emotional stability brings about responsibility and an understanding of what is good and what is bad for the individual. A responsible child will be able to focus on his studies better, handle his/her situation well and attain better academically than an irresponsible child. With this trait of maturity the student is more likely to get higher marks. It was reported by Tushton (1966) and Suri (1973) that maturity of the students results in their higher marks. Gwaronski (1965) also reports that overachievers are more responsible than underachievers.
He found that students who are mature are also persistent in their work. Maturity has been found to be associated with overachievement by Dhaliwal (1971). Smith also reported that students who are emotionally stable also show the trait of responsibility and ascendancy. On the other hand, immaturity and impulsiveness indicates spontaneity and a tendency to act upon whims and inclinations. Impulsive people are likely beset with desires of the moment and focus their attention upon them (Blatt & Quinn, 1967). Given that thoughts of the future do not weigh heavily in their decisions, they often pursue immediate gratification, neglecting or ignoring longer term responsibilities. Consequently, impulsiveness is similar to the construct of present-time orientation. It is therefore, not surprising that overachievers are more emotionally stable and mature than underachievers.

As far as enthusiasm is concerned (Factor F), it is a very favorable characteristic to attain higher level of achievement and it goes with the desire to excel. As those who are enthusiastic are heedless of what is not necessary for them to do. They are more likely not to pay any attention to the activities, which are hindrance towards attaining their goals which may be related to their studies. As a matter of general observation, those who are enthusiastic and motivated, show better academic performance. Therefore, it is more likely to expect overachievement of students because of higher enthusiasm, whereas underachievers were more sober and serious and give an impression of seriousness about their studies too. On the contrary they may be hiding their academic difficulties behind an impression of seriousness and might be feeling secured as long as people do not know about them. That’s why people are surprised to see their lower achievement than expected from their demeanor. The results are consonant to the findings by Puri (1987) and Dhaliwal (1971).

As far as superego is concerned which is termed as factor G, overachievers are superior on this dimensions compared to their underachieving counterparts. The lower scores of underachievers on this factor indicate (in some cases) lying, showing off, defiance of law and order, temper tantrums, whereas high scores of overachievers indicate impersonal and moral character showing stronger super ego strength of this factor. Higher moral values and persistence of overachievers
puts them on advantage as because they may tend to value the advice and concern of their elders towards them. A persistent person is a person, in whose repertoire no ups and downs can be seen. He is able to prioritize his studies because this ability is associated with their adjustment to other priorities that can be catered at later stage or at some other time. This ability is in turn related to their decision making. They have better understanding of what is good for them; their plan of action is clearer to them. Because of this trait of higher persistence, it becomes easier for them to stick to their time table, which eventually leads them to be overachievers. Whatever their efforts are they are pursued consistently and with the same spirit, in academic or non-academic fields. Persuasion of any work in a consistent manner always bears fruitful results, an understanding of this relationship keeps the child motivated to work harder. Overachievers seem to understand this relationship. Their self-motivation may become an asset for their achievement higher than expected. The results of Menon (1973); Gebhart & Hoyt (1958) corroborate the present finding.

On the other hand it seems that underachievers are not able to decide which need is most important at the present moment because they may be giving equal weightage to all kinds of demands and therefore they may not perceive the importance of studies and hence give no priority to their academic activities, resulting into their underachievement. The present investigator’s findings are in consonance with Gwaronski (1965), who reports that persistence is associated to maturity and responsibility. The opposite is true for underachievers who are less persistent and more expedient. Low conformity towards social rule and success principals is a basic characteristic of underachievers (LoGiudice, 1991; Willard-Holt, 1998). It may be because they want to do their studies in their own way and may not tolerate the interference of others. They may not want to even listen to the suggestions given by their parents and teachers and if they listen to these suggestions, they may not adapt themselves as far as application and adoption of other’s strategies and experiences are concerned. This led the investigator to believe that at the root of problems of underachievers’ lies lack of change and adjustment on their part as it is very well known that change and adjustment are the most important components of intelligence. The more intelligent a child is, the
more he/she is able to adjust to his environment and therefore enhancing his/her growth and development to its maximum potential. However they may be applying positive cognitive strategies in their studies but because of this trait of expediency in their personality they often do not bear the fruit of their efforts. It seems that they tend to believe that they are not going to succeed as far as their efforts are concerned. Conversely they may tend to believe that their success is only a matter of chance. Therefore it is not surprising to find underachievers to be more expedient than overachievers.

In consonance of the study conducted by Jayagopal (1974), the results of the present study indicate similar trend i.e., overachievers are more tender minded and sensitive (Factor I) than underachievers are. This characteristic of sensitivity of overachievers puts them higher on empathy and understanding of others as their higher scores on superego strength (Factor-G) have already shown. While underachievers, on the other hand are more inclined towards tough mindedness. Either because they are more oriented towards themselves that’s why they are less sensitive. Or as a matter of general observation people, who are more sensitive, keep on pondering over others’ problems and they forget about themselves or they do not give much importance to their own problems. Therefore it is more likely that people who are more oriented towards their problems (may be in obsessive manner) are unable to think for others. If we consider this observation to be a scale of measurement, underachievers seem to be tilted more towards themselves. Because they are not able to sort out their problems on their own, this characteristic puts them on disadvantage, as they seem unable to understand the help provided to them by their teachers and parents. This trait of underachievers and overachievers seems to correspond to the traits proposed in the four dimensional model - the "Final Four" by Doyle (1999) -that rests upon external philosophical, psychoanalytic, and neuro-physiological criteria. According to this model, introverted-tough-minded people are withdrawn and rational, thorough and rather picky, while Extraverted-Tough-minded people are gregarious, rational, outgoing and quite interpersonally insensitive. Whereas Introverted-Tender minded people are withdrawn and emotional, nurturing and rather dependent, and Extraverted-Tender minded are gregarious, emotional, outgoing and relatively
interpersonally sensitive. Adopting Merrill and Reid's (1981) nomenclature, these types are referred as Analyticals, Drivers, Amiables and Expressives respectively.

Since personality factor tender-mindedness versus tough-mindedness has been addressed and extraversion versus introversion has not been taken under the present investigation, therefore perusal of four dimensional model proposed by the Doyle (1999), clearly indicates drivers to be representing underachievers. Among various characteristics of Drivers interpersonal insensitivity is more suggestive of underachievement, whereas Expressive seems to represent overachievers. But at the same time it is surprising to find introverted tender mindedness i.e. Amiable, showing those characteristics, which have been found to characterize underachievement also, the characteristics being nurturing and rather dependent. This led the investigator to believe that tender mindedness, if tilted towards introversion represents underachievement.

Due to the possibility of interpersonal insensitivity it seems that underachievers are not responsive to other people in their environment, the other people in their environment being their parents and teachers. Therefore underachievers who are found to be more tough-minded are more likely to be interpersonally insensitive. This characteristic might be explained in view of the fact that underachievers have adjusted themselves to their negative and low self-concept. They believe that there can be no improvement as far as their studies are concerned and therefore by this belief, they protect their self-esteem. Although the lower scores of underachievers on PF-C (Emotionally Unstable versus Mature) show that they are affected by feelings, easily upset and changeable. Therefore their lower scores on PF-C and PF-I led the investigator to believe that underachievers are worried with themselves. In order to protect themselves from the worries of outside world they become interpersonally insensitive, this may be one of their personalized tendencies showing their adjustment to their environment. As John (1999) has defined personality traits as “generalized and personalized determining tendencies-consistent and stable modes of an individual’s adjustment to their environment.” The results of present investigation have also shown that this personality factor (PF-9): negatively predicts
underachievement, showing higher the tender mindedness lower will be the underachievement

Another most important factor of personality with a contingent effect on academic performance is that of self-sufficiency (Factor Q2). This characteristic is bound up with independent decisions, resoluteness, confidence and resourcefulness. As overachievers have already been shown to have higher enthusiasm for better achievement, therefore the more self-sufficient and more resourceful a student is, the more he will strive for different sources of knowledge and experience. The power of self-sufficiency and decision-making helps one in organizing and planning his activities (Taylor, 1964), which eventually leads him to consistent efforts ensuring maximum utilization of his time, as has been shown by their higher scores on factor -G. Haq (1987) and Agarwal (1976) too found self-sufficiency to be positively associated with overachievement. It is therefore, quite convincing that overachievers are more prone to be self-sufficient. On the other hand underachievers being sound followers and dependent of their groups tend to have lower self-confidence (Vanarse, 1970; Dhaliwal, 1971; Sharma, 1981). They lack in ability to strive something for them on their own. This lack of self-sufficiency could be overcome if they are demonstrative so that they could be helped. But at the same time they have low conformity to social rules and resist authority. These characteristics go against their success in academics resulting in achievement lower than expected. The results are consistent with those obtained by Saxena, (1972); Vanarse, (1970; Jayagopal, (1974).

Lower scores of underachievers indicate their group dependency, but they have also been found to be more conventional and strongly seeking social approval. This trait of indicating the need of social approval together with the trait of being aloof and stiff (indicating social unattractiveness, on factor-A) put them on loggerheads. Because this is one of the basic human need to be noticed and appreciated by other fellow beings and especially by those who are important for the student. It seems that this need to be noticed is met as far as underachievers are concerned but the need to be appreciated is not satisfied because their underachievement does not bring about the happiness of their success for their
immediate relations. This feeling of unhappiness becomes associated to their memory and unsatisfied needs become translated into the need of social approval. But at the same time they seem unable to become demonstrative and socially attractive, so they experience continuous conflict with these needs and therefore, they have difficulty to resolve these issues.

On the dimension of anxiety (Q3) underachievers are found to score lower indicating untutored, unreflective emotionality and an anxious insecurity whereas overachievers score higher on this factor indicating self-control, foresightedness and social orientation. This anxious insecurity which they experience indicates that they are not at ease with themselves, they are always worrying for something or the other, which does not help them to concentrate on their studies. They might be having knowledge of their subject matter but due to anxiety they are not able to apply their knowledge. Therefore it is not surprising that due to this factor underachievers are not able to put their heart seriously into any activities including academics and thus not achieving as predicted by their intelligence. Overachievers due to higher self-control and understanding are able to plan their time fruitfully and attain better than predicted by their intelligence.

This factor has also been regarded as gyroscopic factor producing steadiness and purpose in personality. Higher scores of overachievers on this factor indicate steadiness and purpose of their personality which is not surprising as they seem to understand the value of education and know that the road to success is through education. That’s why they give priority to their studies and see it in terms of benefits at a later period of time and their social orientation shows that they have understood that society has gained success by putting in fun only after hard work and they value the presence, advice and help which can be gained through this social interaction. Therefore they are not aloof and also spend their time with family and friends. Mermelstein (1998) in this connection found that an ability to postpone gratification is necessary to sustain an apparently innate motivation to succeed scholastically. In due course, subjects of present investigation have shown similar trends while performing as overachievers. That’s why they may give priority to their studies and see it in terms of benefits at a later
period of time. This common character shows low level of aloofness in spending their time with family and friends, which is also an indication of positive effect on the mental health and mood of the child. When the child is happy and studies in this positive mood, it leads to an association of happiness with studies and it keeps reinforced with the achievement more than predicted by their intelligence.

As far as Factor Q3, is concerned, Overachievers are found to be scoring higher on the strength of self-sentiment factor indicating self-control, foresightedness and social orientation, whereas underachievers are found to score lower on this factor indicating untutored, unreflective emotionality and an anxious insecurity. The results thus obtained seem to be quite convincing as higher strength of self-sentiment of overachievers with controlled and exacting will power helps them to remain focused as they have tendency to follow self-image also. They have been reported to be compulsively trying to keep their academic record at an improved level, if they have attained higher academic achievement. As every child is susceptible to be affected by different types of distractions as he/she is in a growing stage. When the child is looked after all the time beyond a certain limit he/she starts feeling irresponsible on his/her part as he/she does not get enough chance to exercise his/her self-control as the case may be with the children of better socio-economic families. While on the other hand, they are left to themselves from a very early age as the case with lower socio economic families. They need care, attention and guidance from their parents which are not provided to them. This leads to the conclusion that underachievers are not getting enough chance to exercise their self-control on which they are found to score lower. Our findings are in consonance with those of Bhaduri (1971) who reports that greater number of underachievers is found from higher socio-economic families.

The results of present investigation indicate that underachieving subjects tend to be lax and careless of social rules. Social rules are made for the benefits of members of the society. These are necessary to follow especially for children who need to learn social norms, these social norms are supposed to follow so as to pass knowledge and experience from one generation to another generation. If this
process goes on smoothly in a society, it makes younger generation to be responsible and helps to develop confidence in them. But if the children defy social rules and authority it would bring conflict, confusion and unhappiness in their repertoire which can make them irresponsible and lower in confidence. Moreover, this may become the cause of their untutored and unreflective emotionality. These results are in consonance with that of Puri (1987), who has reported that underachievers are lower in self-sentiment integration.

Various researchers have tried to identify relevant causes associated to the phenomenon of underachievement. On the basis of findings of present investigation it can safely be concluded that underachievement of students is due to their less participation, less intelligence, less enthusiasm, less sensitivity but more group dependency, less control and less social preciseness than overachievers. This shows that the influence of personality factors on underachievement is more pronounced than that of environmental factors. Similar findings have been reported by Negpal (1979) that non-intellectual factors are related to acquisition of knowledge, which in turn results in over and under achievement. The results are supported by the findings of Bhaduri (1971), Dhaliwal (1971); Menon (1972); Jayagopal (1974); Ghuman (1976); Haq (1987); Chauhan (1993). Therefore the results clearly show that underachievers may attain lower marks due to certain personality factors though they are intelligent enough to attain higher academically.

The discussions of results clearly indicate that the investigator’s hypothesis no.1a (which states that there is no significant difference in the personality of underachievers and overachievers) is rejected.

The concept of identification with academics is rooted with symbolic interactionist perspective on self-esteem. Self-theory proposed by Mead, (1934) Cooley (1902) and James (1963) presents symbolic interactionist view of self, which states that people receive feedback from their environment and that this feedback if attended to is perceived. If those perceptions are taken as accurate they
will become part of the self-concept and if that part is viewed as central then the changes in self-concept will affect the individual's self-esteem.

The characteristics of underachievers can be explained on the basis of their poor identification with academics. If a person does not value a particular domain, it will not be possible to bring about a change or improvement in that domain. Considering the case of academic domain of underachievers, if an effort is made by parents or teachers, to improve that domain they can not achieve success until they make him/her personally involved, this can be achieved only if he/she identifies himself/herself with academic domain. Individuals also selectively value domains in which they have gained some success relatively well. Because underachievers have failed and they have witnessed the occurrence of underachievement, therefore it is more likely that they tend to disvalue the academic domain. An underachieving individual also does not view an academic domain as important as the self, which is why he/she does not respond with the feedback given to him/her in that domain. The present investigator's observation seems to be in consonance with the findings of Crocker & Major (1989); Major & Schmader (1998); Taylor & Brown (1988); Tesser (1988); Tesser & Campbell (1980) who maintain that individuals selectively value domains for which their group, or they personally, fare relatively well. If we want them to be responsive to the feedback, identification with academics becomes a necessary condition for learning. This fact has been argued by Newmann (1981) and Finn (1989) also. Walker et al (2005) report that investigation of motivational construct identification with academics, which includes perceptions of belonging and valuing within an academic context, shows positive intercorrelations among measures of identification with academics, self-efficacy, and intrinsic motivation, each contributing uniquely to the prediction of meaningful cognitive engagement. Only extrinsic motivation predicted shallow cognitive engagement. Underachievers are reported to have low attainment value in learning and deficit in using effective learning strategies by Lau & Chan (2001). For the development of self-esteem mastery of academic tasks is essential. It has been pointed out by Young et al (1995) that the mastery of academic tasks is probably the best
indicator of child current functioning and is essential to the development of self-esteem and psychological well being.

Thus, students who are identified with academics, for example, should be more motivated to succeed and persist longer in the face of failure because their self-esteem is more strongly influenced by academic performance. For identified students, good performance should be intrinsically rewarding (resulting in higher self-esteem), and poor performance should be aversive (yielding lower self-esteem) as it seems to happen with overachievers. By contrast, disidentified students should experience lower motivation to succeed in academics because little contingency exists between academic outcomes and self-esteem. That is, good performance is not intrinsically rewarding, and poor performance is not intrinsically punishing, leaving those who have disidentified with schooling with little intrinsic incentive to expend effort in academic endeavors. These individuals may therefore seem to be underachievers having higher academic problems. The explanation of present investigator is in consonance with symbolic interactionist perspective on self-esteem (James, 1890/1963; Mead, 1934 and Cooley, 1902).

When differences in the personality factors were studied with respect to gender, both overachiever boys and overachiever girls were found to be achieving higher on personality factors B, E, G and Q2 than underachiever boys and underachiever girls (with the difference of personality factor-I on which only girls differ and personality factors-C and F on which boys have been found to differ). These differences indicate towards the fact that underachievement of boys and girls may be because of their lower level of intelligence, more aggressiveness and assertiveness, more expedience and less persistence, less self-sufficiency and more group dependence than their overachieving counterparts. Moreover underachievement of boys may also be due to their immaturity and less enthusiasm whereas underachievement of girls may be because of more tough-mindedness and lower level of sensitivity.
The discussion of results clearly points out that investigator's hypotheses no.2a (which states that there is no significant difference in the personality of underachieving boys and overachieving boys) & 3a (which states that there is no significant difference in the personality of underachieving girls and overachieving girls) are rejected.

When differences in personality factors were studied with respect to different school systems, overachievers of both private and government schools were found to be achieving higher on personality factors B, C, G, I than underachievers of private and government schools (with the difference of personality factor- Q₂ and Q₄ on which overachievers of only government schools have been found to differ from their counterparts). This again led the investigator to conclude that underachievement in private and government schools may be due to lower level of intelligence, emotional instability and immaturity, less persistence and more expedience, more tough-minded-ness and less sensitivity. Moreover two additional causes also seem to influence underachievement in government schools, therefore it can be concluded that underachievement in government schools is also because of less self-sufficiency, more group dependency and more relaxed temperament.

The results clearly show that investigator's hypotheses no. 4a (which states that there is no significant difference in personality factors, of underachievers and overachievers of private schools) and 5a (which states that there is no significant difference in personality factors of underachievers and overachievers of govt. schools) are rejected.

When differences in personality factors were studied with respect to gender and school systems, private schools and government schools were found to show differences in personality factors with some continuity. Girls of private schools show difference only on one personality factor-I whereas boys of government schools are found to differ on personality factor-J. There are two factors-B and G on which both boys of private schools and girls of government schools are found to differ, with one additional factor of personality-C on which
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boys of private schools and factor E and Q2 on which girls of government schools are found to show differences. This indicates towards the fact that underachievement of boys in private schools is most probably determined by their lower level of intelligence, immaturity and emotional instability, more expedience and less persistence whereas underachievement of girls in private schools may be due to their lower sensitivity and higher tough-mindedness. Underachievement of boys of government schools is, on the other hand is because they are more internally restrained and reflective whereas underachievement of girls in government schools is because of their lower level of intelligence, more obedience and accommodating temperament, more expedience, lower self-sufficiency and more group dependency.

The results clearly show that investigator’s hypotheses no. 6a (which states, that there is no significant difference in the personality of underachieving boys and overachieving boys of private schools), 7a. (which states that there is no significant difference in the personality of underachieving girls and overachieving girls of private schools), 8a (which states that there is no significant difference in the personality of underachieving boys and overachieving boys of govt. schools) and 9a (which states that there is no significant difference in the personality of underachieving girls and over achieving girls of government schools) are rejected.

n-Ach Differences between Underachievers and Overachievers

Another psychological factor that was considered in the present study and a significant contributor in an individual’s social development is that of need for achievement. It is the desire to succeed and to excel which shows higher level of need to work hard for self-produced rewards such as feelings of personal mastery (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark & Lowell, 1953; John Atkinson 1957, 1981).

A brief look on the results reported in chapter four of present investigation, states that underachievers are having lower n-Ach than overachievers. The findings are consistent with what Singh (1985) had reported. While studying the
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relationship between academic achievement and n-Ach, Singh (1983) had suggested the presence of one factor for overachievers, called the self-promoting Motivation Factor, and for underachievers the “Aggressive Assertion Factor”, on the basis of which the two can be differentiated. He has also reported that underachievers’ motivational organization is significantly less harmonious than that of overachievers.

The results thus obtained seem to be quite convincing as underachievers have also been found to be lacking in consistency (Gebhart & Hoyt, 1958), are less disciplined (Gwaronski, 1965), aspired for immediate gratification (Vanarse, 1970), and showed withdrawal, defeatist attitudes (Hauylock, 1986), relied more on luck or fate and showed lack of interest in studies/extra reading (Maitra, 1985) as compared to overachievers. All these characteristics represent a lower level of their n-ach than their counterparts.

Achievement motivation can be explained on the basis of goal theory. Goals refer to potentially accessible, conscious cognitive representations. They are not traits in the sense of classic personality traits, but rather cognitive representations that show stability, as well as contextual sensitivity (Pintrich, 2000). The current predominance and importance of contribution from goal theory in the study of motivation has been confirmed by Murphy & Alexander (2000).

Students can be identified on the basis of difference in their goals because of the difference in their personality make-up. These goals are: Learning, Mastery, Task or Task Involved Goals as reported by Anderman & Midgley (1997); Kaplan (1997); Ames (1992), Performance Goals or ability focused goals as reported by Nicholls (1984); Thorkildson & Nicholls (1998). After reviewing certain conclusions regarding the kinds of goals adopted by different people, underachievers and overachievers can also be shown to be adopting different kinds of goals corresponding to their cognitive processing. As it has been suggested by Covington (2000), that there is a need to incorporate different personal variables for e.g. a student’s conception of his intelligence, relationship
between mastery goals and achievement, because they are adaptive so they leave a positive effect on the personality.

An overview of mastery goals suggest that overachievers tend to apply mastery or learning goals as it has been shown by their interest and positive attitude towards school and studies, by using deep processing and effective learning strategies, their greater persistence and their more intrinsically oriented motivation. They could have been applying performance goals, but as reported by Ames (1992); Pintrich (2000); Pintrich & Schunk (1996); Urdan (1999), children adopting performance goals have been found towards lesser use of strategies and poorer conduct. But this poorer conduct indicates the possibility that they might not be applying performance approach goals as overachievers are found to have good adjustment and an interest in studies and positive attitude towards school. Dhaliwal (1971) points out those overachievers have good social and personal adjustment than underachievers have. Maitra (1985) reported that overachievers have an increased interest in reading. Their higher interest in studies may be due to their higher achievement orientation and their reliance on their own efforts, as it was reported by Maitra (1985) that overachievers relied less on luck or fate than underachievers. The results of present investigation show that they have more persistence and consistency than underachievers', findings which are in consonance with the findings of Gwaronski (1965) and Menon (1973). They have found overachievers to be higher on persistence than underachievers. Therefore it is more likely that overachievers adopt mastery or learning goals.

On the other hand, underachievers may be having achievement goals which are associated with superficial processing and disorganization in study planning resulting in their underachievement. This conclusion is in consonance with the studies of Lau and Chan (2001); Baker, Bridger, & Evans (1998). Lau and Chan (2001) had attributed the cause of underachievement to be the deficiency in using effective learning strategies. Because of poor study skills the student becomes lazy due to repeated failures. Baker, Bridger, & Evans (1998) have found that a deficit in strategic problem solving and lack of organization of study skills or in other words it is disorganization which is related to
underachievement. Poor organization or study skills and low self-esteem has been found to contribute to academic underachievement.

While pondering over performance and ego goals it seems that underachievers are more likely to adopt performance avoidance goals as their lower scores on achievement motivation can be supported by the findings of Elliot (1997) who suggests that avoidance goals do not contribute to intrinsic motivation. Extrinsic motivation is also reported by Walker et al (2005) to predict shallow cognitive engagement. It seems that underachievers tend to adopt goals which are directed towards avoiding an undesirable outcome. They may tend to adopt surface or rehearsal processing which is reported by Alballi, 1998; Bandalos, Finney & Geske, 2003, those children who are performance-goal oriented tend to be associated with surface strategy or rehearsal process in learning. Elliot (1999) also reported that persistence, effort and deep processing is predicted by mastery goals whereas disorganization and surface processing is predicted by performance avoidance goals. Persistence and effort mediate the relationship between performance-approach goals and exam performance, whereas disorganization mediates the relationship between performance-avoidance goals and exam performance. Pintrich (2000) in this connection reports that mastery goals orient students towards greater persistence, greater use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies, and good conduct. This shows that underachievers are more likely to apply performance avoidance goals, these performance avoidance goals which are predicted by expediency or disorganization. While on the other hand overachievers are more likely to apply mastery goals which are predicted by persistence. The results are in consonance with those found by Roney, Higgins & Shah (1995); Roney & Sorrentino (1995); Schunk (1996). They have reported direct relationships between goals and academic results.

Therefore it may be concluded that underachievers are having performance goals which are associated with superficial processing and disorganization in study planning resulting into low self-esteem and lower motivation to approach and achieve success. This led the investigator to believe that underachievers are
less capable of directly attacking the barriers, which stand in their path; and they tend to embrace a wrong learning paradigm of high expectations, low effort, and high success, as a result of which they tend to believe that if they are truly capable, they should be able to succeed without effort. Moreover they feel that some uncontrollable factor in their environment is in a large part responsible for what happens to them. It seems that this belief keeps them away to take responsibility of their own actions and trying to put some effort on their own. This conclusion is in consonance with those found by Shaw & Black (1960); Cornale (2000).

Dweck (2007) examined the self-conceptions people use to structure the self and guide their behavior. She demonstrated empirically that students who hold an entity theory of intelligence are less likely to attempt challenging tasks and are at risk for academic underachievement. "Entity" theory views their intelligence as an unchangeable internal characteristic. Another theory proposed by Dweck is “incremental” theory, students with an "incremental" theory believe that their intelligence is malleable and can be increased through effort. As students' belief about the reason for their success and failure are important influences on motivation (Weiner, 1985) therefore it is more likely that their belief about their intelligence and therefore the reasoning for their success and failure influences their need –achievement which has been found to predict underachievement, supporting the results of present investigation. Because underachievers think that their intelligence is a fixed trait, this belief keeps them away to put some effort in academic endeavor as they feel that nothing can be changed through effort. He may hide his abilities even from self as reported by James (1991) and Colleen (1998). They report that underachievers seem to have lost belief that the world is basically safe, meaningful and predictable and that only good things happen to good people. This perception of helplessness of underachievers towards their own selves can also explain their lower enthusiasm, lower participation, aloofness and tough-mindedness. Persistence can be expected in those children who believe in their ability to put some effort and have experienced success from their effort. As it has been explained earlier those
underachievers are more likely to endorse performance avoidance goals which do not predict effort and persistence but instead they predict disorganization.

Results of the present study have shown that underachievers score higher on the trait of dependency, therefore it is more likely that due to lower level of self-sufficiency they are not able to make their own decisions. And even if they make some decisions it may be difficult for them to translate their decisions into actions. Expediency and anxious insecurity of underachievers (as has been reported by their lower scores on factor-G and Q3) seems to be an important component of their lower level of n-Ach. They may not attribute the cause of their underachievement towards themselves as they have an inability to accept responsibility for their own actions; therefore the chances of improvement on their part are very low. The presence of these traits seems quite consistent with the traits of being indisciplined and disorganized. By virtue of these traits it is more likely that underachievers score lower on n-ach. Reverse is true for overachievers, where their higher persistence and steadiness seem to be an important component of their n-Ach which has been found to be higher than underachievers.

These findings establish that underachievers are not actually aware of their difficulties and their need for individual help. This is contrary to the prevalent belief that underachievers do not want to overcome their difficulties.

The discussion of results clearly shows that investigator's hypothesis no.1b (which states that there is no significant difference in the n-Ach of underachievers and overachievers) is rejected.

When differences in need achievement were studied with respect to gender, both overachiever boys and overachiever girls were found to have higher need achievement than underachiever boys and underachiever girls, indicating towards the probability of overachiever boys and overachiever girls applying mastery approach and applying deep processing strategies, whereas underachiever boys and girls adopting performance avoidance orientation and applying with surface strategy or rehearsal process in learning, the interpretation in consonance with the findings reported by Albaili (1998); Bandalos, Finney & Geske (2003).
The discussion of results clearly points out that investigator’s hypotheses no.2b (which states that there is no significant difference in n-Ach of underachieving boys and overachieving boys) & 3b (which states that there is no significant difference in n-Ach of underachieving girls and overachieving girls) are rejected.

When differences in need achievement were studied with respect to different school systems, overachievers of both private and government schools were found to have higher level of n -Ach than underachievers of private and government schools. This again led the investigator to conclude that overachievers of private and government schools are mastery goal oriented and apply deep cognitive processing in learning whereas underachievers are adopting performance avoidance orientation and applying with surface strategy or rehearsal process in learning.

The results clearly show that investigator’s hypotheses no. 4b (which states that there is no significant difference in n-Ach of underachievers and overachievers of private schools) and 5b (which states there is no significant difference in n-Ach of underachievers and overachievers of govt. schools) are rejected.

When differences in n-Ach were studied with respect to gender and school systems, private schools were found to show difference in need achievement of only girls whereas in government schools only boys were found to show n-Ach differences.

For the children attending private schools, the family system is undergoing rapid changes, which is accompanied by the changes in their value system. In spite of these changes, the family values are still practiced either at a conscious or a subconscious level. The old values always stressed on the use of strategies so as to equip the girls with as many good qualities as possible. Moreover it is believed that as far as education of girls is concerned it should not disturb their ability to look after the house. Though the values are changing but the effect of these age old values seem to influence the attitude of parents at a subconscious level which
could be transmitted from their behaviour towards their children. As a result, parents are under the pressure of a continuous conflict which goes on between the need to make their girls independent to meet the challenges of the changed environment of society and the need of keeping them aware of their family values. Since girls are more sensitive (especially overachiever girls, as found by the result of present investigation) than boys (who have not been found to differ significantly on sensitivity by the results of present study) they are more likely to sense the pressure and conflict of their parents and therefore they start feeling subordinated than the boys who are not sensitive enough to parental conflicts. This subordination may result in the enhancement of their n-Ach which is visible in the higher n-Ach of overachiever girls than underachiever girls who are tough-minded, whereas no such difference has been found in the n-Ach of underachieving and overachieving boys attending private schools.

The discussion of results clearly indicates that investigator's hypothesis no. 7b (which states that there is no significant difference in n-Ach of underachieving girls and overachieving girls of private schools) is rejected.

In the families, sending their children to government schools, traditional values are more or less intact. These families are not under as much pressure of change due to upward mobility as compared to that experienced by the families who are sending their children to private schools. Therefore girls going to government schools are more or less secure and they do not experience upheavals in their environment due to intact family values. Boys on the other hand, get more influenced by their outside environment as compared to girls. As it is already known, the strong impact of media on the youngsters which influences them to a great degree. Boys also observe their fellow boys going to private schools and they find themselves disadvantaged in comparison to the confident, smart, vocal, demonstrative boys attending private schools, who receive more care and concern from their parents as compared to them. These better situations available to the children attending private schools may indicate better avenues for them. This may be one of the most influencing causes making the overachiever boys of government schools to feel more subordinated and therefore resulting in the
enhancement of the n-Ach of these boys over the underachieving boys of government schools, whereas underachiever boys have a less favourable family climate and also a lower level of n-Ach, which can account for their underachievement.

The discussion of results clearly reveals that investigator's hypothesis no. 8b (which states that there is no significant difference in n-Ach of underachieving boys and overachieving boys of govt. schools) is rejected.

Family Climate differences between Underachievers and Overachievers

Another social factor which gets associated to the academic achievement of students is the climate of family in which they get raised.

The results of present investigation indicate a significant difference in the family climate of underachievers and overachievers. This shows that parents of overachievers are more supportive, democratic, attentive, accepting, trustful, having higher expectations, more warmth, more open communication and maintaining a perfect balance between restrictiveness and freedom, indulgence and avoidance, partiality and fairness, with their children than the parents of underachievers. Dimensions reported here clearly represent the psychological well-being of the parents, which is the hallmark of Belsky's work. In this connection, Caldwell and Bradley (1984) have reported about the characteristics of developmentally stimulating environments. According to them, the optimal development of a young child requires an environment ensuring gratification of all basic physical needs and careful provisions for health and safety, a positive emotional climate in which the child learns to trust others and himself, an optimal level of need gratification, contact with adults who value achievement and who attempt to generate in the child secondary motivational systems related to achievement and the cumulative programming of experiences that provide an appropriate match for the child's current level of cognitive, social and emotional organization. This kind of stimulating environment is more likely to be present in the families of children attending private schools than those attending government schools.
While taking middle class into consideration, there are a number of families which are either upwardly mobile or have stabilized themselves as far as their economic conditions are concerned. But it is not necessary that all of them provide psychologically sound family environment to their children. Depending upon the level of happiness, which is based on the least discrepancy between their aspirations and achievements of life, the degree of adjustment and mutual relationship between the parents, the quality of relationship of parents with other family members and neighbors, transmission of clear message of expectations and demands from both the parents and expression of complete understanding and support to their children, determines the psychological make-up of the family. Moreover considering sound development of children, the family should have intellectual, cultural, recreational orientation and provide independence to the children. When all these characteristics are present in a family then only the benefit from the family of better economic conditions could be translated, resulting into better growth, development and academic achievement of children. According to Belsky (1984) parental personality and psychological well being is the most influential determinant in supporting parental functioning. While working on the issue of child’s ecology, Belsky (1984) concluded that parenting practices are highly influenced by the characteristics of parent as well as children and subsystem of social support. However these do not cast their equal impact on a child’s system. Furthermore parent’s own developmental history and personality shaping also help to determine the pattern of parent child relationship.

Initially it was supposed that the child is underachieving because of his personality, (as has also been reported by the results of present investigation) but now the focus has been shifted to his/her social contexts, particularly family environment. Belsky’s work is most useful in exonerating the child of blame for poor outcomes. Blame, however, might seem to shift to the parent, as parental personality is viewed as a relatively transcendent or intrinsic and immutable characteristic. As there may be the possibility of some intrinsic or immutable characteristics which could have been transmitted from the parents and these inherited characteristics may get reinforced by the environment (the behavior of parents commensurating with their attitude) prevailing in the family. Similar
phenomenon has been reported by Bronfenbrenner and Belsky (1984) whose main interest lies primarily on interpersonal interaction between parent and child.

It has been observed that parental functioning differs according to the characteristics of children and it also depends on the birth order of the child. Usually, parents are strict with their elder children and become lenient with the younger siblings. They have this attitude and expectation that older children would become responsible and independent as soon as possible. However, such a tendency is not generally reported for younger children. Moreover when the parents feel that the child listens to them and understands them, then they become relaxed and contended, whereas if they feel that the child is adamant and does not listen to them, then they become tense and worrying and also start behaving in the same way as their children behave towards them. Their tension may be because of their strained relationship with others or unfavorable support subsystems whereas their contentment towards their children may be due to their favorable support system. Belsky (1984) reports, that the influence of contextual subsystems of social support is greater than the influence of child characteristics on parental functioning.

One of the most important determinants of parent child relationship seems to be the educational status of the parents. This educational status makes itself visible in the form of parental involvement in the child’s activities and educational status. In this context, Maitra (1985) reports that underachievers seem to be independent of the physical set up of home or the socio-economic status of the parents, but dependent more on parents’ educational status in the form of their involvement in the child’s activities and educational guidance. This parental involvement will vary, according to the educational level of parents which will again be different for the children attending private and government schools. It may also depend on their point of view of their life and their child rearing methods. Moreover their point of view of life may not co-ordinate with their circumstances. Their circumstances or more appropriately their contextual subsystems of support (family’s social resources, as reported by Belsky, 1984) may be favorable or unfavorable so as to translate their aspirations and
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achievement orientations into actions through the process of parental involvement. Therefore at the same level of family eco-context are critical differences in the inner-family socialization activity. A statement by Schneewind (1989), concluded that "the psychological makeup of family life ... has an important influence on how a family's potential eco-context is actually utilized." seems to explain the situation well.

Schneewind (1989) has demonstrated that low socio-economic eco-context and rigid unstimulating job conditions of the father were associated with an authoritarian parenting style that produced sons with inferiority feelings and weakly internalized locus of control. It was reported by Schneewind (1989) that it is the expressive family climate factor (measured by high degree of mutual control, intellectual/cultural orientation, active-recreational orientation, and independence) that appeared to be an important mediating factor in the child outcome variable, which was the social adjustment of the son (termed "extraverted temperament").

This led the investigator to conclude that parents of overachievers are relatively more psychologically healthy, who provide more favorable family climate than those of underachievers.

The discussion of results clearly indicates that investigator's hypothesis no.1c (which states that there is no significant difference in the family climate of underachievers and overachievers) is rejected.

The results of present investigation indicate underachieving and overachieving boys are equal in terms of their family climate. However a significant difference has been observed in the family climate of underachiever girls and overachiever girls, who study in private schools. Kohn's work (1969) showed that working-class fathers, whose jobs require compliance and obedience, tend to hold values that stress obedience in their children, whereas middle-class fathers, whose jobs require effective intellectual functioning and self-direction, value intellectual development and independence in their children. Therefore it is more likely that fathers of underachiever girls hold values that stress obedience
whereas those of overachiever girls hold values that stress intellectual development and independence in their girls.

Since underachiever girls and overachiever girls of private schools differ only on one personality factor-I (tender minded versus tough-minded) showing higher sensitivity of overachiever girls than underachiever girls, and higher tough-mindedness of underachiever girls than their counterparts. Moreover, overachiever girls are having higher level of n-Ach than underachiever girls. Therefore it may be concluded that though their personality is more or less the same, the difference in achievement is due to the difference in need achievement and in family climate of underachieving and overachieving girls of private schools. Our interpretation is supported by Wong & Csikszentmihalyi (1991). It was reported by them that personality factors are better predictor of grades than experience.

In private schools a significant difference has been found in the family climate of girls whereas no difference has been found in family climate of boys. Therefore, investigator's hypothesis no.6c (which states, that there is no significant difference in the family climate of underachieving boys and overachieving boys of private schools) is accepted while hypothesis no. 7c (which states that there is no significant difference in the family climate of underachieving girls and overachieving girls of private schools) is rejected.

Although in government schools, no difference is found in the family climate of girls whereas a significant difference is found in the family climate of boys. Therefore, investigator's hypothesis no. 8c (which states that there is no significant difference in the family climate of underachieving boys and overachieving boys of govt. schools) is rejected while hypothesis no.9c (which states, that there is no significant difference in the family climate of underachieving girls and overachieving girls of government schools) is accepted.
School Type Differences between Underachievers and Overachievers

The variable school systems found its place in the present study as a prospective determiner of academic achievement. General observations as well as research background make it important to be studied in the current context.

School is the area where children learn to relate to one another, and the role of the teacher in this relating process is vital. “The teacher represents in psychoanalytic jargon, the superego of the student.” Glicksberg (1951) states the impact of this socializing function of the teacher, is more apparent at the time of middle childhood. It is within the peer group and teacher–child climate, rather than the company of parents, that the child explores his outer world. He tests the meaning of authority and independence and experiments with these roles and behaviors through peer group and teacher relationships (Brown, 1968).

The incidence of underachievement and overachievement has been viewed to be influenced by types of schools. As number of overachievers found in private schools are greater than that found in government schools in the sample of present investigation, it suggests that there is something in the environment of private schools which is different from those of government schools. The most suggestible reasons for this may be the difference in the internal features of schools, in the form of rules, standards and classroom management.

The results of present investigation state that schools are likely to exert positive influence on the academic progress of children. School environment seems to be acting as a catalyst force for a child’s academic interest. Thus, once the interest is developed in a child, he will move by himself on the road of learning. In consonance with this, studies of Rutter et al (1979) and Wang et al (1997) can be coded here. They found that differences in student outcomes between schools were symmetrically related to social organizational institutions and classroom management of the school, such as formal and informal rules and standards applied.
In private schools, the children who are good in studies are given responsibilities in the form of various duties such as duties for assembly, games etc. Here a number of co-curricular activities are conducted in which participation of every child is encouraged. Moreover various kinds of competitions are held from time to time. An open communication is promoted between the teacher and the student and an enquiring attitude of students is given impetus. The environment involving these kinds of activities in private schools results in the enhancement of their personality as it provides avenues to meet the various needs of the children. Here the channel which is provided to the children builds up their confidence, leading to the enhancement of their cognitive abilities. It casts a lasting influence on the achievement of children. This led the investigator to believe that they feel satisfied with the school teachers and fellow students, the fact which is supported by the results of Bronis (1999) who suggests that satisfaction with the school is the most important predictor of student’s perceptions of their academic achievement. Similarly school academic has been reported to be the strongest predictor of academic achievement by Richardson and Lee (1986); Mujis (1997). While on the contrary the environment in government schools is strikingly different than that in private schools. Here in government schools, not only studies are done on a regular and systematic manner, there are no such curricular activities and the children are not given responsibilities to discharge. They are not supervised on a regular basis, as far as their class work and home work is concerned. They remain meek, subdued and not asking their teachers, if they do not understand anything as they are not encouraged to do so. In this way a communication gap persists in the government schools where obedience is expected from the students, without taking into account their developmental needs at that particular period of time. With a near total absence of co-curricular activities and the indifferent and cold attitude of teachers, children remain too much at disadvantage. There is no avenue for building up of their confidence, their self-esteem is lowered, and their personality needs are not addressed. This all will result in the lowering of their interest and enthusiasm for studies leading to the lower level of their achievement, falling below their predicted level.
Incidence & explanation of underachievement in different School systems

This difference in the achievement of children attending private and government schools can be explained on the basis of critical theory. Lareau (1989) found that whereas middle and upper class parents sought strong involvement and communication with their child's teacher, low income, and working class families often kept their distance from schools. The working class parents tended to see teachers primarily responsible for education of their child; the parents in middle class families tended to view education as a shared responsibility. According to the theory of cultural capital, Bourdieu (1977) suggests that schools represent and reproduce middle or upper class values and forms of communication. There are social class differences between private and government schools which are related to workplace values and are representative of varying expectations of teachers and parents from background of different classes (Bowles and Gintis). Lareau (1989) suggests that parents of higher social class will become more involved in their child's schooling than those who have less cultural capital, which means language, meaning, thought and behavioral styles, values and disposition (Bourdieu).

For Bourdieu each individual occupies a position in a multidimensional social space, he or she is not defined by social class membership, but by the amounts of each kind of capital he or she possesses. As far as cultural capital is concerned, it is through education that the process of social and cultural reproduction and various forms of capital tend to transfer from one generation to the next. Educational success, according to Bourdieu, entails a whole range of cultural behavior, which extends to certain non-academic features. Privileged children have learned this behavior, as have their teachers. Children of unprivileged backgrounds have not. The children of privilege therefore fit the pattern of their teachers' expectations with apparent 'ease'; they are 'docile'. The unprivileged are found to be 'difficult', to present 'challenges'. Yet both behave as their upbringing dictates. Bourdieu regards this 'ease' or 'natural' ability-distinction-as in fact the product of a great social labor, largely on the part of the
parents. It equips their children with the dispositions of manner as well as thought which ensure that they are able to succeed within the educational system and can then reproduce their parents' class position in the wider social system. Therefore children attending private schools seem to possess better cultural capital than those attending government schools. The kind of social labour on the part of parents is certainly more from those attending private schools than those attending government schools. And therefore, due to this higher amount of cultural capital and greater amount of social labor of parents, it is more likely to get more overachievers from private schools than from government schools.

A difference in achievement of children from different SES has been reported by different researches which can be explained on the basis of attribution process. It was reported by O'Sullivan & Howe (1996) that relative to children from higher income families, children from lower income families tend to believe that they have little control over their environment and therefore are more likely to attribute their success to external factors such as luck or difficulty of the task rather than to their own effort or ability.

While in the incidence of underachievement between the two types of schools: private and government schools, not much significant differences were found. It is therefore the hypothesis no. 10b (which states that there is no difference in the incidence of under and overachievement in private and government schools) is partly accepted and partly rejected.

Conforming the observation of present investigation various researchers such as Stockhard & Wood (1984); McCall, Beach & Lau (2000) report that underachievement is more prevalent among boys than among girls. The reason suggested by Lueptow (1996) for this phenomenon is that females value achievement more highly and are more motivated to achieve than males. Condry & Dyer (1971) show that females do not show a motive to avoid success in areas those are acceptable for them to enter.

While in the incidence of overachievement of boys and girls not much differences were found. It is therefore the hypothesis no. 10a (which states that
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the incidence of under and overachievement of boys does not differ from that of girls) is partly accepted and partly rejected.

Underachievement of students (boys and girls) attending government schools can be explained on the basis of lower amount of cultural capital available to them as compared to those attending private schools. When we consider theories of social stratification developed by Pierre Bourdieu in his work Distinction, it is claimed that how one chooses to present one's social space to the world one's aesthetic dispositions, depicts one's status and distances oneself from lower groups. These dispositions are internalized at an early age and guide the young towards their appropriate social positions, towards the behaviors that are suitable for them, and an aversion towards other lifestyles.

These social classes, especially the ruling and intellectual classes, preserve their social privileges across generations, labeled as the failure of liberal ideology despite the myth that contemporary postindustrial society boasts equality of opportunity and high social mobility, achieved through education. When we apply this failure of liberal ideology, it is very true in Indian context wherein we have not been able to create uniformly stimulating conditions for the children of all the classes, creed and religion so that they may achieve academically and realize their true potential. Inequalities of wealth, income, power, prestige and opportunity in Indian society have been continuously patterned and persistent. Moreover this pattern is increasing discrepancies between haves and have nots. Combined positive effect of factors which seems to enhance academic achievement of students is found to be operating in private schools; the investigator has still found the occurrence of underachievement in these schools. This shows that the wealth, income, power, prestige and opportunity which is continuously being patterned and persistent, is certainly creating and exerting (though inadvertently) some negative effects resulting in the underachievement of these children. On the other hand as accordingly cultural capital (e.g. competencies, skills, and qualifications) can also be a source of misrecognition and symbolic violence. Therefore working class children (or the children attending government schools) can come to see the educational success of their middle-class peers (children attending private
schools) as always legitimate, seeing what is often class-based inequality as instead the result of hard work or even "natural" ability. This may produce a negative effect on underachieving children of government schools that they do not have that natural ability to succeed academically as their counterparts have.

**Educational Implication:** Keeping in mind the results of present investigation it is hoped that the findings would have some educational value. To begin with, certain differential personality characteristics which have been identified as being associated with overachievement and underachievement might help in prediction of academic achievement in boys and in girls, in private as well as government schools.

So far, intelligence has been recognized as the single most important but at the same time an imperfect predictor of academic achievement. These personality characteristics along with intelligence would help us to understand underachievement and can guide us to apply appropriate strategies of interventions in the right way.

The personality differences between boys and girls in the groups of underachievers as well as overachievers, which the results of present investigation have brought out, might be of some further help in understanding the two sexes in the context of their characteristics and dealing with them by applying suitable methods of guidance and counseling.

The empirical findings of present investigation indicate that underachievement is negatively associated with n-Ach. The level of n-Ach can be enhanced leading to an improvement in academic achievement. Kolbe (1965) has suggested that a concentrated effort in increasing the achievement motivation of students (through counseling, contacts, awareness of characteristics of highly motivated persons, etc) can result in
an improvement in school achievement, particularly with above average students. McClelland & Alshculer (1971) have found that only moderate success has been found to improve the achievement of students through special motivation courses. These efforts towards the possibility of enhancement of n-Ach will reduce the likelihood of underachievement.

Dweck theory (1986) suggests that successful students believe that intelligence is a fluid quality that can be changed and developed through hard work and effort, whereas less successful students view intelligence as a fixed trait. The students who developed a learned helplessness are less likely to expand effort necessary in order to be successful in academic endeavor. This suggests that cognitive and metacognitive strategies are not stable traits of the learner, but rather these strategies can be learned and controlled by the students (Garcia & Pintrich, 1994). Better academic achievers have been reported to regulate their learning strategies to fit the purpose of study (Olugbemiro, 2000).

Therefore there is a need to focus on means of boosting these beliefs by investigating various achievement motivation models that include confidence or self-efficacy beliefs. Self-efficacy beliefs relate to self-regulation, as proposed by Seth et al (2004). The changes in motivation should also include proper development of self-esteem, by applying intervention proposed by Bartz (1983). Reducing social comparisons and interpersonal competition among students is one of the main strategies, proposed by Bartz. This would be very helpful in promoting sensitivity among the students. Achievement motivation may be enhanced through such means as offering attainable but challenging goals to students, while coping skills are aided by stressing students' strengths.

Underachievers, as found by Olugbemiro (2000) and other researches, were unable to prioritize their studies and to choose among
social, academic, personal demands. It was also found that they were unable to make use of support services. In order to deal with these inabilities they should be provided with a training program for time management and effective study strategies. It should be clarified to them that help and support services can address not only the problems they regard as 'solvable' but also those, students who regard it as 'unsolvable' and assist them in identifying their problems.

Significance of increase of n-Ach could be emphasized in teachers training program. This would change the way teachers perceive underachievement. Therefore it would not be inappropriate to say that there is a need to keep up motivation of the teachers if we want to motivate the school going children.

Family climate of children may have a significant association (Mann Whitney Test) with underachievement as shown by less favorable family climate of underachievers than that of overachievers. This can be an area to work on the problems of underachievers by guiding and counseling the parents of these underachieving children with special emphasis on underachieving girls of private schools and underachieving boys of government schools. These underachieving girls of private schools and underachieving boys of government schools have been found to be having less favorable family climate than their counterparts.

Personality characteristics predicting underachievement can be recognized by school authorities and teachers. In some cases parents, by their behavior are themselves reinforcing underachievement in their children. So parents should also be informed and guided to participate in this process of identification of underachievement in the schools. This process of identification will be very helpful in correcting underachievement of school going children due to personality
characteristics at an early stage.

**Suggestions for Further Research:** At the end it does not appear out of place to point out that the present investigation, as any individual piece of research raises many more questions than it has been able to answer. It is, however expected that the present work would at least serve as a threshold in the area of achievement of the students in a large educational setting. But certain issues that were outside the realm of present researcher might have been dealt with, would possibly be stimulating to the interested workers in the field for further explorations.

1. By way of suggestions emanating from the findings of the present research, it may be submitted at the outset that the researchers in this field would better avoid using such intelligence tests which require two administrations, because there will be more chances that the data will be lost.

2. A very interesting finding that emerged from the humble study, is a gradual shift of overachievement phenomenon from the government schools to the private institutions. Quite conversely underachievement frequency of occurrence has moved back gradually from the private to the government schools, something very interesting for the future researchers.

3. Causal factors of these forward and backward shifts of over and underachievers may be more elaborately explored.

4. It may also emanate from the perusal of present study that more dependable conclusions could be drawn if the future investigators constitute their comparison groups more homogenously.

5. Still sharper differences may be expected if the achievement scores are derived from the standardized achievement tests for the future investigators or at least converted into z-scores.

The summary of results is presented in the next chapter.