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Any seat of learning may be divided into three important components i.e. student community, teaching staff and non-teaching-administrative staff. Though each component plays an important role in the smooth functioning of the educational institution, the student community occupies the central position. It will not be hyperbolic to say that the very existence of the educational institution heavily depends on the student community. Thus, the student community is the core component of the educational institution. The educational institution, whether it is a school or a college or a university, is established only to impart knowledge to the students. Hence, the reputation of any educational institution depends to a great extent on the academic performance of the students.

It has generally been observed that even in most reputed educational institutions, there is wide variation in the academic performance of the students. One segment shows remarkable academic performance, whereas other segment shows poor academic performance. Such variation in academic performance continues to exist even when equal facilities and opportunities are provided to all students. Social scientists, especially Psychologists, have been burning mid light lamp to identify the variables which may be responsible for such variation in the academic performance of the students. Some studies have demonstrated that the differences in the intelligence level of the students may
be one of the contributing factors for differences in the academic performance of the individual.

There is a large body of research data demonstrating the determining influence on academic achievement of certain factors lying outside the individual, such as socio-cultural background, home conditions and schooling facilities. With intelligence being held constant, differences in these environmental factors are bound to affect academic achievement. If these environmental factors are also held constant, as they might be well in homogeneous group of subjects exposed to similar environmental conditions, still the phenomenon of over-underachievement exists, and we assume that they do, and then study habits and certain personality factors will have to be added in accounting for the differences in academic achievement.

**ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE**

Academic performance is related to the acquisition of principles, generalization, capacity to perform efficiently and certain manipulations of objects, symbols and ideas. Assessment of academic performance has been largely confined to the evaluation in terms of information, knowledge and understanding. The dictionary of Education prepared by Good (1973) defines that academic achievement is the “knowledge attained or skills developed in the school subjects, are usually designed by test scores or by mark assigned by teacher or by both.” Hawes and Hawes (1982) defined academic achievement as the successful accomplishment or performance in particular subjects, areas.
or courses, usually by reasons of skill, handwork, and interest typically summarized in various types of grades, marks, scores, or descriptive, commentary.

Academic achievement is of great importance in the present socio-economic and cultural context. Obviously in schools great emphasis is placed on formal education. The effectiveness of any educational system is gauged to the extent of the student achievement whether be it in cognitive, affective or psychomotor domain.

According to the new Webster’s Dictionary, academic achievement may be defined as “The act of achieving or performing, accomplishment an exploit, and a great or heroic deed, and a feat”. Therefore, to maximize the achievement within the given set up is the ultimate goal of every educational process.

The reason for studying subject is that the value of academic achievement is dichotomous first to pursue higher education; the second new task and lucrative jobs. Consequently pressure on school and college going students for achieving high academic scores increased astonishingly. Parents be to see still more conscious about higher academic scores in examination of their children as they found that their wards would remain lagging if an aspired job children could not get even after spending sixteen or more years in schooling and investing most of the economic resources. Higher grades in the class will be an indicator of better learning and knowledge and better grades
would entail upward promotion to the higher category and would be helpful in getting employment. Parents assume and attach higher standard of academic achievement of their children consciously or unconsciously without equitable consideration of their abilities, capabilities, and essential physical facilities and personality traits.

There is a substantial body of evidence that suggests that personality variables like loneliness, neuroticism, and locus of control have great impact on the academic performance of the students. Hence these personality traits need some explanation.

**LONELINESS**

Loneliness is the inability to maintain the level of affiliation one desires. It is subjective state: A person can be alone and not feel lonely, or be in a crowd and feel lonely. The partners in a long marriage can experience loneliness, whereas a recently widowed person may not feel lonely (Tornstam, 1992). Loneliness occurs only when the actual level of affiliation does not correspond to the desired level.

At least two distinct form of loneliness exist, emotional isolation and social isolation (Peplau and Perlman, 1982). In emotional isolation, a person feels a lack of deep emotional attachment to one specific person. By contrast, people who experience social isolation suffer from a lack of friends, associates, or relatives (Dugan and Kivett, 1994).
The two types of loneliness often do not go hand in hand. For example, an individual may have many friends and acquaintances and a large, extended family, yet lack any single person with whom to share a deep relationship. Similarly, people who frequently attend parties or eat in crowded cafeterias with many others may still experience a sense of loneliness if they feel emotionally detached from the people who surround them. Although they might not feel socially isolated in such cases as these, they may experience emotional isolation (Russell et al., 1984; Bell, 1993).

Of course, being alone is not invariably bad. Many people crave time by themselves. What is critical in producing loneliness, then, are the attributions we make regarding the experience of being alone (Dykstra, 1995; Archibald, Bartholomew and Marx, 1995).

There are many possible sources of loneliness, both situational and circumstantial (e.g. death of loved one, unemployment, moving) and personal or psychological (e.g. shyness, poor health, poor social skills). Experiences of loneliness and their intensity will usually reflect some combination of these factors.

For many students, university is a time of much excitement and exhilaration that comes with change, growth, and new horizons. However, most students experience brief periods of loneliness from time to time during their college years. For some, the experience of loneliness can be extended and debilitating. It can have a negative effect on academic performance and on
personal growth and development. Still, loneliness is a normal experience that student can learn to cope with constructively and effectively.

CAUSES OF LONELINESS

Almost everyone experiences loneliness at some time in his or her life. There are many factors that contribute to feeling lonely. Making a major life change such as leaving home to go to college, ending a relationship, changing jobs, or moving to a new geographical location can put a person in a position to experience loneliness. When we are separated from familiar people and places, we often feel disconnected, like we don't belong, for a time. Usually, as we meet people and become familiar with places, the feeling subsides fairly quickly.

Some people fell disconnected or left out because they don't know how to approach or contact others socially. Many fear being rejected so they don't attempt to make friends or develop relationships.

The real culprit though is how we interpret being separated or alone. Intense feelings of loneliness are generally accomplished by thoughts like "I don't have lots of friends because I'm not really worthy of them." "I'm not interesting enough to be noticed or attractive." People with low self-esteem often believe that others would not be interested in knowing them and that their loneliness is evidence of their weakness as a person.

However, the main causes of loneliness are as under:-
**Being abused and rejected by others.** In this case, people outside of the lonely individual have treated this person in a rejecting manner. These include things like being lied to, being made fun of, being abandoned or rejected (by family and friends), being told abusive things like, "you're no good", or "we don't want you around." In these cases of verbal and psychological assaults, individuals develop defensive walls to protect themselves from this negative environment; often times shutting out both people that can help them as well as those that can harm them.

**Being unable to fit in.** Closely linked to the previous idea is another idea of being unable to fit in. Sometimes lonely individuals feel as if they are "a black pearl in a box of shining jewels." They feel like a misfit, someone who cannot fit in with the rest of the crowd. Very often there are feelings of wanting to be like everyone else, to be "normal" instead of standing out and being rejected because of it. In some cases, the desire may extend to being popular and well-liked, not only fitting in but being looked up to and admired.

**Broken heart or missing someone.** Not surprising, in some of the poems, it is encountered that loneliness was because of a reason break up in a romantic relationship, or just simply missing that special someone in their life. Sometimes when romantic relationships end, there is a feeling of intense loneliness, and this was especially the case for lonely individuals who experienced a break up with a person that they were still in love with. Within
all of us is a desire to have special people close to us, and when that special someone is torn away from us, these intense feelings of loneliness can occur.

CHARACTERISTICS OF LONELY PERSONS

According to Edmiston (2007) the lonely person may be characterized as:

a) They have high expectations of others. When these high expectations are not met they get disappointed and then retreat into their shells.

b) They require people to agree with them exactly. Over the years they narrow down the range of acceptable people until there is no-one left.

c) They expect good to be done to them first before they will reciprocate and they are always waiting for someone else to act and thus they do not take the first step.

d) They move location too often to develop deep friendships.

e) They are impatient with others. Love is patient and takes time to develop.

f) They believe they are elite and "cannot associate" with most people.

g) Sometimes they lack knowledge of how to go about making friends, engaging in small talk and showing the gestures of acceptance - smiling, nodding, and small courtesies.

h) Lack of listening skills. Poor listeners often come across as self-centered so they have few friends.

i) An "all or nothing" view of acceptance and rejection.

j) Anger - at one's self, at others, at the world in general. Anger isolates.
k) Fear of embarrassment and fear of rejection.

l) Distrust of others as the result of a severe life trauma.

m) Being overwhelmed by life so they choose isolation to reduce the stress levels.

n) Being so consumed by the need to perform that life is "all work and no play".

o) Being so competitive that life is a "battle" where everyone else is a rival and friendship is thus excluded.

HOW DOES LONELINESS AFFECT PEOPLE?

A primary problem with loneliness is that when people experience it, they often engage in defensive behaviors that may provide some immediate relief from the pain, but in the long run perpetuate the feelings of loneliness. For example, some people who feel lonely withdraw from many of their existing social contacts or from opportunities for contacts with others because they fear rejection. They retreat to the security of their home after school or work and narrow their activities to reading, watching television, or hobbies they can do alone. While learning to spend enjoyable time alone is important and helpful, avoiding social engagement is counterproductive.

Others compensate for their feelings of loneliness by over activity. By working long hours, immersing themselves in campus activities, or occupying themselves with other types of constant activity, they avoid the painful feelings that loneliness can bring. Still others unintentionally sabotage their relationship
by exhibiting overly possessive, clinging, depended behavior. Some attempt to
anesthetize themselves with food and/or alcohol and other drugs.

All of these behaviors are self-defeating because, while they may
provide immediate emotional relief, they tend to confirm the lonely person's
irrational self-beliefs about not being worthy of others' friendship or
companionship.

NEGATIVE EFFECT OF LONELINESS

People experiencing loneliness often feel depressed, anxious, and/or angry.
Some may experience physical symptoms such as headaches, stomach pain,
and reduced energy. They are often overly self-critical and self-absorbed in
their unhappiness.

If you are lonely you may find yourself engaging in the following behaviors
that perpetuate the problem:

• You experience low self-esteem. You depend on your classmates and
  friends to build your self-esteem and to initiate activities, etc.

• You blame yourself and other students for your poor social
  relationships. You falsely assume that nobody likes you.

• You do not make any attempt to get involved in social activities. You
  expect everyone that you admire to like and include you in their
  activities and conversations. If they do not include you in their social
  activities you may become more withdrawn, angry, and isolated from
  other activities.
• You become self-conscious and worry unnecessarily about being evaluated by your instructors, classmates, and peers.

• You have difficulty engaging in assertive behavior. You are afraid to stand up for your rights and say "no" to unreasonable requests.

• You avoid meeting people and new situations. You have difficulty introducing yourself, making telephone calls and participating in group activities.

• You perceive yourself in a negative way. You become overly critical of your physical appearance.

• You feel isolated, alone and unhappy about your situation.

HOW TO OVERCOME LONELINESS AND REGAIN A POSITIVE OUTLOOK

Loneliness can be overcome. But it depends on YOU. Only you can build your self-esteem and learn to feel good about yourself. If you are lonely, do something about it:

• Seek out situations that enable you to get involved with other students.

  For example, ask someone in your class to be your study partner.

• Learn to be assertive. If you are shy, learn to say hello or start a short conversation with the student who sits next to you in class, on the bus, etc. Get involved in class discussions.
• Learn to enjoy life by developing your social skills. If you see someone that you like, don't just sit there and hope that the person will come to you. Make the first move. Use verbal or nonverbal cues to let the person know that you are interested in getting to know him/her. For example, make eye contact and smile. You can also go over, say "hi", and introduce yourself.

• Do some volunteer work, helping others will boost your self-esteem and make you feel good about yourself.

• Don't judge people on the basis of your past experiences. Give your instructors, classmates and peers a chance, and try to get to know them. Remember! There are individual differences in people. Learn to admire and accept these differences.

• When you are alone, use the time to enjoy yourself. For example, listen to music or watch a favorite television show. Do not spend the time eating endlessly or worrying about your problems.

• Remember that loneliness is very common. Almost everyone feels it at some time. It is not a defect. It is something that can be changed. It is a sign that important needs are not being met. Changing the situation may involve finding and developing a circle of friends, but it may also mean finding ways of learning to enjoy your times alone; to use them more constructively and pleasanably.
• Do not wait for other people to visit you or speak to you. Try to talk to people you sit next to in class or at meals or in breaks at work. Say hello, or even just smile, at people you pass on the staircase or elsewhere in college or in your workplace.

• Try to put yourself in new situations where you will meet people with interests in common. Choose activities that you are genuinely interested in and enjoy - societies or sports or voluntary work. Do not, however, over-extend yourself, filling your time with too many things just to avoid being alone.

• Do not deprive yourself of things you would like to do just because you have nobody to do them with e.g. going to a concert or for a walk, or seeing a film.

• Try not to be critical of your efforts. Remind yourself that intimate friendships take time to develop. Do not disparage friendships in the belief that only romantic relationships will relieve your loneliness or give you confidence and social status.

• Build relationships by being a good friend to others.

• Respond to others and their interests (but do not feign an interest you do not feel).

• Some people are more at ease in groups and others in 'one to one' situations. Consider your own preferences and 'style'. Find others with
similar outlooks and interests. Remember that, despite appearances, not everyone is interested in bars or sports.

- Challenge the reality of your pessimistic or negative thought. Much of what we experience as loneliness comes from irrational interpretations of our current life situations. You may not even be aware of negative thoughts about yourself, so the first step is to try to identify negative self-thoughts you may be having about your current life situation. Then look for contrary evidence to your irrational thoughts (e.g. you've had friends before, you've been in a good relationship, you've had positive working relationships, etc.) It's almost always there.

- Take advantage of this particular time in your life to do some things you want to do for yourself. This is probably a time when you have fewer time commitments and obligations to others, so enjoy it! You can do more of what you want to do, when you want to do it.

- This is a good time to focus on you and learn more about yourself. Take time to develop personal interests that you may not have had time for before.

- Get involved in activities that are interesting to you and that will put you in a position to meet, work, and socialize with others. Getting involved with campus activities, volunteering, or working for a cause you believe in will help you to meet people with similar interests and values.
• Try a new recreational activity. Exercise and physical activity will increase your energy and help you to feel better about yourself.

• Work on developing relationships with others. Avoid impulsive, desperate, and "clingy" behaviors that tend to drive others away. Some helpful tips on developing relationships are included in the TX State brochure, Meaningful Relationships: How to Attract Them, Nurture them, and Keep Them.

• Work on your listening and communication skills. Ask others about themselves and seek their opinions. Listen attentively and actively.

• Present a positive self-image. Greet others with a friendly smile, a strong handshake, and direct eye contact in a n assertive manner. Let others know from your body language that you welcome their communication with you. People who act shy or timid are often avoided by others who fear being too intrusive or overpowering.

LONELINESS VERSES ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

Loneliness is a very important personality trait which is coloured with emotions including unhappiness, distress, and irritability. According to Weiss (1973), there are two sources of loneliness. The first is “emotional isolation” and the other one is “social isolation”. Emotional isolation occurs when people lack intimate and stable attachment whereas social isolation is due to lack of friends and community. If either type of isolation lasts too long, lonely people,
may sink into a self critical depression (Peplau, Russell and Heim, 1979). It is important to point out that loneliness is not the same thing as solitude or being alone. It has been observed that many individuals live alone but do not feel lonely simply because of the reason that they have close ties to good friends and family. Other individuals, on the other hand, live in large families but feel desperately lonely because they think that no one understand them or cares about them. Hence feeling of loneliness can not be understood by studying actual isolation. Certain events of life such as the break up of dating relationship or a marriage, widowhood, moving away from home, loosing a job, quarrelling frequently with family and friends may set the stage for loneliness (Rubenstein and Shaver, 1982). It is interesting to note that loneliness depends on how a person interprets and reacts to these events overtime. Paplau and Perlman (1982) and Weiner (1985) have identified three styles of thinking that are related to prolonged loneliness and unhappiness. According to them the first style of thinking related to prolonged loneliness is internality i.e. the person believes that reason for his loneliness is either internal or external. Internal reasons are manifested in such statement as “I am unattractive”; “I do not know how to make friend”. External explanations, on the other hand, are manifested in such statements as “The people I work with are unfriendly”, “I am having a run of bad luck”. In either type of thinking the individual either blames himself or others. However, it has been observed that internal blames tend to make lonely people more
withdrawn. In second type of thinking is known as stability, the reason for his loneliness is either permanent or temporary. Needless to say people who believe that the reason for their loneliness is permanent they make no efforts to improve their circumstances and hence they remain lonely. Control is the third style of thinking related to loneliness. According to this style of thinking the lonely person believes that there is absolutely nothing one can do to change the situation. Such style of thinking often prolongs the loneliness and the lonely persons feeling of despair. It has been observed by Anderson, Horowitz and French (1983) that the people who believe their loneliness is the result of internal, stable causes tend to feel depressed and helpless and remain stuck in their misery, whereas people who believe their loneliness is due to controllable, temporary causes whether internal or external, are more likely to fight back, to make new friends, to change themselves or their circumstances. In view of these findings it is logical to assume that lonely persons who differ with respect to their beliefs about the causes of their loneliness may also differ with respect to their academic performance. More specifically, it is assumed that the people who are high on loneliness scale are expected to show poorer academic performance as compared to those individuals who are low on loneliness scale.

Another consideration that motivated the author to undertake the present investigation is the fact that there is substantial body of evidence showing impact of neuroticism on several aspects of behaviour. The characteristics of
this personality variable strongly suggest that neuroticism is likely to affect academic performance.

NEUROTICISM

Neuroticism is a cognitive-affective trait or a negative expression of personality. Neuroticism, or negative affectivity, is one of a small set of global traits that reflect one's general approach to life and summarize the tendencies of individuals (Denollet, 1993). The personality dimension of Neuroticism reflects the tendency to experience emotional distress and the inability to cope effectively with stress. Highly neurotic people are extremely tense, anxious, insecure, suspecting, jealous, emotionally unstable, hostile and vulnerable (Maddi, 1980).

Personality Psychologists currently use the term Neuroticism or negative affectivity to refer to a stable and heritable personality trait that involves a temperamental sensitivity to negative stimuli (Tellegen, 1985). That is people who are high on this trait are prone to experiencing a broad range of negative moods including not only sadness, but also anxiety, guilt and hostility. Clark and Livesly (1994) also concluded that positive affectivity involves a disposition to feel joyful, energetic, bold, proud, enthusiastic and confident; people low on this disposition tend to feel unenthusiastic, unenergetic, dull, flat and bored. Neuroticism as a personality trait has been shown to include facets of anxiety, anger, hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness and vulnerability (Costa and Widiger, 1994).
Neuroticism is generally conceived as emotional instability. Traits of neuroticism include being calm or anxious, composed or excited, poised or nervous. Neurotic individuals are generally complainers and defeatists. While analyzing the personality characteristics of neurotic individuals, Conley (1984) and McCrae and Costa, (1984) observed that these persons complain about different things at different ages and are always ready to see the sour side of life and none of its sweetness.

Neuroticism is also referred as negative affectivity. Since it has been demonstrated that emotions tend to occur in cluster i.e. a person who feels one negative emotion tends also to feel others, it is, therefore, expected that the trait negative affectivity (NA) describes a person’s tendency to feel anger, scorn, guilt, anxiety, sadness and other negative moods (Watson and Clark, 1984). Watson and Pennebaker (1989) have demonstrated that high NA people frequently feel worried and tense even in the absence of objective problems. They further found that high NA people as compared to low NA people complain more about their health and report more physical symptoms even in the absence of health problems.

NEUROTICISM VERSES ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

In view of such characteristics of neurotic persons, investigators directed their attention towards academic performance of such individuals. Numerous researches assumed that low NA students are likely to show better academic performance as compared to high NA students. A large number of
studies were carried out to test this assumption. The findings obtained by various researchers are quite conflicting. For instance Furneaux (1956), Lynn (1959), Biggs (1959) Goh and Moore (1978) and Savage (1972) obtained positive correlation between neuroticism and academic performance, whereas Sarnoff et al., (1959) and Bending (1960) found no association between neuroticism and academic achievement. Moreover, McCandles and Castaneda (1956) and Savage (1962) found negative correlation between neuroticism and academic performance. Whereas, Walsh and Walsh (1978) found a curvilinear relationship between neuroticism and academic performance.

Most recently, Svanum and Zody (2001) predicted that anxiety would be negatively correlated with academic achievement, but were surprised to find that students with some type of anxiety disorders actually had high GPAs. McKenzie, Gow and Schweitzer (2004) contended that a student’s level of neuroticism or emotional instability does not directly affect grades and academic performance. Instead their study found previous academic performance, displaying high levels of conscientiousness, an internal locus of control, and valuing the task to be the most important predictors of learning strategies used by college students. Consequently, having motivation, the skill to perform, and the willpower to succeed are all essentials for students to achieve high academic success.
Vidhu (1968) conducted a study to find out the relationship between the two factors. The sample consisted of 300 students, proficient in English as well as in Hindi, studying in classes, eight to tenth. The group of students was divided into three subgroups, each consisting of 50 boys and 50 girls. The JPI for the first group and the MPI for the second and third group were employed to measure personality variable. The investigation reveals that the relationship between neuroticism and educational attainment and vocabulary were negative.

Basu (1970) hypothesized that the higher the academic success of the students, the lower the neuroticism scores. A sample from secondary school students in Bengal was selected for the study. The Moudeslay Personality Inventory and results obtained were employed to measure the variables. The study reveals that there was a correlation -.9 between neuroticism scores for each group and academic success.

The studies reviewed above have obtained a negative but significant relationship between neuroticism and academic achievement. On the other hand Upmanya (1974) obtained a positive relationship between neuroticism and academic achievement. However, the obtained co-efficient of correlation was .11 which is too low to be of any significance. The low correlation is attributed to the curvilinear relationship between the two variables. The present study is designed to resolve these conflicting findings.

Another important variable, which though extensively investigated, is locus of control. It is one of the most powerful personality traits, which
influence widest range of behavioural patterns including physical and psychological health. Thus, one of the most important considerations that motivated the present researcher to carry out this investigation is to see how locus of control affects academic performance.

**LOCUS OF CONTROL**

Do we feel that a college is a bore? Was that poor marks last semester because the instructor disliked me? Are our good marks this semester due to luck? If answered, “Yes” to these questions, we may be an “external”, that is we believe that we have little control over the outcomes of our actions-the **locus of control** is outside us. If answered “No”, we may be an “internal”, that is, we believe that we can control what happens to us-the **locus of control** is within us.

A concept first developed by Phares (1957) relating to beliefs about internal verses external control of reinforcement. It is assumed that individuals develop a general expectancy regarding their ability to control their lives. People who believe that the events that occur in their lives are due to their efforts and personality characteristics are said to have an “expectancy of internal control”, while people who believe events in their lives to be a function of luck, chance, fate, powerful others are said to have an “expectancy of external locus of control”. Various questionnaires have been devised to measure this belief system, of which the best known are the Rotter (1966) I-E Scale, the Levenson (1974) IPC Scale, and the Collins (1974) scale. Each of
these has been criticized on psychometric grounds. The concept has been widely used and applied in cross cultural studies, studies on health beliefs and behaviour, investigations of mental illness and many other areas of research.

According to Rotter (1966, 1971) and Phares (1973), if individuals believe that behaviour is rewarded not because of skill but because of luck, they believe in the external control of their actions. If they believe that their behaviour deserves success or reward, they believe in the internal control of their actions. Phares (1973) states that internal-external (IE) control of reinforcement is a generalized expectancy that refers to the way that individuals see the connection between their behaviour and occurrence of reward or punishment. People are neither all internal, nor all external, but more or less internal.

Internal seems to have more self-confidence and self control, work better with others, and have better mental health. Phares (1973) noted that internals are more energetic in their efforts to control the environment. For example, internal tuberculosis patients sought more information about their condition, asked more questions, and were more cooperative than externals. Even in prison internal knew more about the working of the institution and parole. More internals than externals stopped smoking after the surgeon’s general report and did not begin again.
INTERNAL VERSES EXTERNAL CONTROL

Rotter’s (1966) locus of control concept implies that people—adult and children—develop expectancy about the reinforcement of their behaviour. Internal believe that their behaviour generates reinforcement; externals believe that reinforcement occurs, because of luck or fate. An internal locus of control is usually thought to be desirable because of the personality trait associated with internality: lack of anxiety, tolerance, self-confidence, independence, and achievement. Rotter (1966) state that internals are more alert to environmental information and more desirous of avoiding failure; externals are supposedly anxious, suspicious, passive, and poor achievers.

From this description internality would seem to be the desired state and schools have begin to initiate programs to foster (to make healthy) internality. While there have been such efforts, cautious criticism suggests externality may not be all bad. It may actually be a realistic way of coping with hostile environment. Rotter (1966) noted that internals sometime overestimate their control, which may produce problems, such as a loss of a sense of psychological security.

Internality, nevertheless, seems to be the more positive condition, especially in schooling. Studies such as Ulrey’s (1974) showed that improving internality also improves academic work. The author employed a ropes-course technique (teaching youngster’s self-sufficiency through camping experiences) that resulted in increased internality that transferred to the classroom.
Some research is (McCombs, 1991) suggest that what underlies the internal locus of control is the concept of "self as agent". This means that our thoughts control our actions and that when we realize this executive function of thinking we can positively affect our beliefs, motivation, and academic performance. "The self as a agent can consciously or unconsciously direct, select, and regulate the use of all knowledge structure and intellectual processes in support of personal goals, intentions, and choices". McCombs (1991) asserts that "the degree to which one chooses to be self-determining is a function of one’s realization of the source of agency and personal control". In other word, we can say to ourselves, I choose to direct my thoughts and energies toward accomplishment. I choose not to be daunted by my anxieties or feeling of inadequacy.

There is a fairly considerable literature on the relation between anxiety and academic performance which is of interest to us because anxiety and neuroticism are highly correlated. Anxiety is a diffused irrational fear; it is not directed to an appropriate target and not controlled by self-insight, spreads through out of the life and strain the individual social relationship. It puts the individual on alert and predisposes him to see other person or group as menacing. There is substantial amount of evidences to suggest that development of such irrational fear depends on how the individual interprets his experiences and how he interprets the causes of his experiences. If the individual perceives the events, whether positive or negative, as being a
consequence of his own actions and which are under his personal control then he is not likely to develop irrational fear or anxiety. If a person, on the other hand perceives positive or negative events as being unrelated to his own behaviour rather attributes the vicissitudes of existence of fate, luck, behaviour of others or environmental factors, he is more likely to develop irrational fear or anxiety.

The first types of individuals are known as “internally oriented” individuals while the later types of individuals are considered as “externally oriented” individuals. Thus, it is highly logical to assume that internals and externals may differ with respect to academic performance; the former may show superiority over the later.

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AND LOCUS OF CONTROL

Locus of control of reinforcement refers to an individual’s perception of reinforcement contingencies. The more a person sees a connection between his own behaviour and what happens to him the more “internal” he is considered. Conversely, the more he does not perceive connections between his reinforcement and his actions but sees the consequences as luck, chance or the influence of others, the more external he is considered. Organizing in Rotter’s social learning theory (1966) locus of control orientation has been found to be related to an impressive array of significant behaviour ranging from academic achievement to psychological adjustment. While there are multiple
dimensional measure of locus of control available. The most popular measure for both children and adults provide a single global score.

Recent work has focused on antecedents of, and changing of, locus of control as well as on devising procedure that take advantage of the differences in information processing associated with internal and external orientations. For example, schools curricula have been designed to be consistent with children’s locus of control orientation, with resultant increases in academic achievement and liking for schools.

Weiner, Russell and Lerman (1978, 1979) undertook a series of studies in which they cited the occasions when student had succeeded or failed on an examination for a particular reason such as help from others, luck, and lack of effort.

These researchers found that the student’s emotions are more closely associated with their interpretations of their experiences rather than with the outcome of examination. Thus, Weiner, Russell and Lerman (1978, 1979) observed that those who believed they did well because of their own efforts and abilities tended to feel proud, competent and satisfied whereas those who blamed others for their failures tended to feel angry, surprised, hostile or alarmed.

Moreover these researchers also found that those who believed they did well because of lucky fluke or chance tended to feel gratitude, surprise or guilt and those who believe their failure were their own fault tended to feel regret,
guilt and resignation. These findings portrays clear picture of the characteristics behavioural patterns of internally oriented and externally oriented individuals.

More specifically these findings make it crystal clear how internally and externally oriented persons interpret their experiences. The emotional reactions of these two types of individuals and their way of interpretations of the experiences, lead us to assume externally oriented individuals are more anxious, hostile, prone to dependence than internally oriented individuals. Such characteristics, lead us to assume that externally oriented individuals are likely to show poorer academic performance than internally oriented individuals. The present study is designed to test these assumptions.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. It is assumed that the people who are high on Loneliness Scale are expected to show poorer academic performance as compared to those individuals who are low on Loneliness Scale. One objective of the present study is to test this assumption since no study has been undertaken till date.

2. Another consideration that motivated the present author to undertake this proposed research is the existence of substantial body of evidence, though conflicting, demonstrating relationship between Neuroticism and academic performance. The findings obtained by various researchers are
quit conflicting. The present study is an attempt to resolve this important controversy.

3. The emotional reactions of these two types of individuals (i.e. internally oriented and externally oriented) and their way of interpretation of the experiences, lead us to assume externally oriented individuals are more anxious, hostile and prone to dependence than internally oriented individuals. Such characteristics, in turn, lead us to assume that externally oriented individuals are more likely to show poorer academic performance than internally oriented individuals. Another objective of the present study is to test this assumption.

The present investigation was initiated to study the academic performance in relation to loneliness, neuroticism, and locus of control among university students. The main objectives of the study were (1) to investigate the relationship between academic performance and loneliness, i.e., to see whether or not high and low lonely subjects differ with respect to academic performance; (2) to investigate the relationship between academic performance and neuroticism, i.e., to see whether or not subjects with high and low level of neuroticism differ with respect to academic performance; (3) to investigate the relationship between academic performance and locus of control, i.e., to see whether or not internally oriented and externally oriented subjects differ with respect to academic performance; (4) to investigate interactional effects between loneliness and neuroticism, between loneliness and locus of control.
between neuroticism and locus of control and among loneliness, neuroticism and locus of control on academic performance.

The present study was designed to answer the following questions:-

1. Do high lonely and low lonely subjects differ in their academic performance?

2. Do subjects with high and low level of neuroticism differ in their academic performance?

3. Do internally oriented and externally oriented subjects differ in their academic performance?

4. Is there an interactional effect of loneliness and neuroticism on academic performance?

5. Is there an interactional effect of loneliness and locus of control on academic performance?

6. Is there an interactional effect of neuroticism and locus of control on academic performance?

7. Is there an interactional effect among loneliness, neuroticism, and locus of control on academic performance?

In order to answer the above questions, a 2x2x2 factorial design, in which three personality variables (i.e. loneliness, neuroticism, and locus of control) each variable varying in two ways, was used. Loneliness was varied by selecting high lonely and low lonely subjects. Neuroticism was varied by selecting those who have high level of neuroticism and low level of
neuroticism and locus of control was varied by selecting externally oriented and internally oriented subjects. Thus, there were eight groups of subjects as given below:

- High lonely-high level of neuroticism externally oriented subjects.
- High lonely-high level of neuroticism internally oriented subjects.
- High lonely-low level of neuroticism externally oriented subjects.
- High lonely-low level of neuroticism internally oriented subjects.
- Low lonely-high level of neuroticism externally oriented subjects.
- Low lonely-high level of neuroticism internally oriented subjects.
- Low lonely-low level of neuroticism externally oriented subjects.
- Low lonely-low level of neuroticism internally oriented subjects.

In order to form above mentioned eight groups of subjects, Loneliness Scale developed by Russell, Peplau and Cutrona (1980), Neuroticism Scale Questionnaire, developed by Scheier and Cattell (1961), and Locus of Control (I-E Scale), developed by Rotter (1966) were administered on 800 Post Graduate students randomly selected from the faculties of Arts and Social Sciences, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh. They all belonged to same socio-economic and cultural background. The age of the subjects ranged from 18 years to 28 years. On the basis of their scores on these various scales, these eight groups were formed.

To be more specific on the basis of their scores on Loneliness Scale (Russell, Peplau and Cutrona, 1980) two groups, namely high lonely and low
lonely subjects were formed. The subjects whose scores on loneliness scale fell on or above 3rd quartile were considered as high lonely subjects. The subjects whose scores on loneliness scale fell on or below 1st quartile were considered as low lonely subjects. The 1st and 3rd quartiles were 38 and 48 respectively.

Neuroticism Scale Questionnaire (Scheier and Cattell, 1961) was administered on these two groups of subjects. In each group, the subjects whose scores on Neuroticism Scale Questionnaire fell on or below 1st quartile were considered as low level of neuroticism subjects and the subjects whose scores fell on or above 3rd quartile were considered as high level of neuroticism subjects. The 1st and 3rd quartiles were 37 and 47 respectively. Thus, on the basis of their scores on Neuroticism Scale Questionnaire, each group was divided into two sub-groups to form four groups of subjects, namely, high lonely-high level of neuroticism subjects, high lonely-low level of neuroticism subjects, low lonely-high level of neuroticism subjects, low lonely-low level of neuroticism subjects.

Locus of Control Scale as developed by Rotter (1966) was administered on these four groups of subjects. In each group, the subjects whose scores on I-E Scale fell on or above 3rd quartile were considered as internally oriented subjects. The subjects whose scores on the I-E Scale fell on or below 1st quartile were considered as externally oriented subjects. The 1st and 3rd quartiles were 11 and 15 respectively. Thus, on the basis of their scores
on the I-E Scale, each group was divided into two sub-groups to form eight groups of subjects as mentioned above.

The following tools were used in the present study.

(A) UCLA Loneliness Scale: The UCLA loneliness scale developed by Russell, Peplau and Ferguson (1978) and revised by Russell, Peplau and Cutrona (1980) was used to measure the loneliness level of students. The UCLA is a 20-item Likert type scale to measure the general loneliness levels of participants. The reliability coefficient of the UCLA was calculated as .94 by the Retest Method and the Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient of the UCLA was found to be .96. The parallel form validity of the UCLA was tested with the Beck Depression Inventory and the correlation coefficient was found to be .77 (Demir, 1990). There were four alternatives to one statement, i.e., never (1), rarely (2), sometime (3), and often (4). The subjects were asked to indicate how often they felt the way described in each of the statement and were asked to circle one number accordingly. And on the basis of scores on this scale the subjects were divided into high and low loneliness groups.

(B) Neuroticism Scale Questionnaire: The scale developed by Scheier and Cattell (1961) to determine high level of neuroticism and low level of neuroticism. The subjects were given the neuroticism scale questionnaire, which was in booklet form with clear instruction printed on that. Questions were about attitude and opinions- what do and how you feel about certain
situations. Some people feel one way; others feel another way. Thus, there was no “right” or “wrong” answers to the questions.

The following instructions were written on NSQ booklet:

1. Make sure you have put your name and whatever is asked for at the top of this page.

2. Never pass over a question, but give some answer to every single one. Your answers will be kept entirely confidential, so answer truthfully.

3. Do not spend time puzzling things out. Answer each question immediately, the way you want to at this moment (not last week or usually). You may have answered questions like this before, but answer them as you feel NOW.

To record the total score, total of each page were put in the place provided at the bottom of that page, then added those two subtotals and placed the combined and final total in the place provided at the bottom and extreme right of the right-hand test booklet page. That yielded the “raw scores” which was further converted to normative scores according to instructions provided in the handbook. On the basis of scores yielded, the Ss were divided in two groups, i.e. Low level of neuroticism subjects and High level of neuroticism subjects.

(C) Locus of Control Scale (I-E Scale) The scale was developed by Rotter (1966) and it was employed to determine internally oriented and externally oriented subjects. The scale is 29 items, forced choice test including
six filler items intended to make somewhat more ambiguous the purpose of the test.

A careful reading of the items makes it clear that the items deal exclusively with the subjects' belief about the nature of the world, i.e. they were concerned with the subjects expectations about how-reinforcement is controlled. Consequently, the test is considered to be a measure of a generalized expectancy.

The I-E scale was administered with the following instructions:

“This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people, each items consists of a pair of alternatives lettered ‘a’ or ‘b’. Please select the one statement of each pair which you more strongly believe to be the case of as far as you are concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be true rather than the one you think you should choose or the way would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief; obviously there are no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers. Please answer these items carefully but do not spend too much time on any item. Be sure to find any answer for every choice. In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you are concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice, do not be influenced by your previous choice”. The score is the total number of external choice made by the subjects.
Academic performances of these eight groups of subjects, so formed, were assessed by recording their average performance in three consecutive examinations (two promotional and one final year examination).

The data, thus, obtained were tabulated group wise and were statistically analyzed by means of three way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and necessary inferences were drawn.

"F"-ratio were calculated for the variation of each independent variable and also for any possible interaction between two or more than two variables.

F-ratio for loneliness variation was 14.46, which is significant indicating that high lonely and low lonely group of subjects differed with respect to academic performance.

F-ratio for neuroticism variation was 0.00, which is insignificant indicating that high level of neuroticism and low level of neuroticism subjects did not differ with respect to academic performance.

F-ratio for locus of control was 0.43 which is insignificant. The result suggested that internally oriented and externally oriented subjects did not differ with respect to academic performance.

F-ratio for interaction between loneliness and neuroticism was 0.00, which is also insignificant. The result suggested that there is no interactional effect of loneliness and neuroticism on academic performance.
F-ratio for interaction between loneliness and locus of control was 2 12, which is also insignificant. Result showed that there was no interactional effect of loneliness and locus of control on academic performance.

F-ratio for interaction between neuroticism and locus of control was 0.46, which is also insignificant. Result showed that there is no interactional effect of neuroticism and locus of control on academic performance.

F-ratio for interaction among loneliness, neuroticism and locus of control was 1.32, which is insignificant.

The first finding of our research i.e., high lonely subjects show poorer academic performance than low lonely subjects, is in the expected direction. It has been established beyond doubt that people experiencing loneliness often feel depressed, anxiety, anger and develop poor self concept. Moreover, lonely individuals are often overly self critical and self absorbed in their unhappiness. These characteristics of the individual are bound to impair their academic performance. Numerous studies have provided empirical support to this contention Goswick and Jones (1981), for instance have demonstrated a positive relationship between loneliness and poor self concept and Bartlett (2002) has found that lonely individuals are depressed, they lack a clear purpose (meaningful goals) and develop feelings of inadequacy (self esteem), which, in turn, lead to low level of academic achievement. Similarly, Demir and Tarhan (2001) have found positive relationship between loneliness and social dissatisfaction and their results also revealed a significant relationship
between achievement scores and loneliness, indicating that as the level of loneliness increased, academic achievement decreased. The first finding of our research is in total agreement with the findings cited above. Our finding also supports the view that loneliness induces depression, anxiety and poor self concept, which, in turn, causes poor academic performance (Ashtiani, Ejei, Khodapanahi and Tarkhorani, 2007).

Another potential explanation of our present finding may be the fact that a positive relationship has been found between loneliness and neuroticism, between loneliness and satisfaction with life, between loneliness and anxiety, and between loneliness and maladjustment (Neto and Barros, 2000, 2003; Tumkaya, Aybek and Celik, 2008). It is very much obvious that a person, who is neurotic, dissatisfied with his life, anxious and maladjusted, is likely to show poorer academic performance as compared to a person who does not have these characteristics. The first finding of our investigation provides strong empirical support to this contention by showing that high lonely subjects secured poorer marks in their examination as compared to low lonely subjects.

Personality factors like low self esteem, social anxiety and shyness significantly contribute in the development of loneliness (Jong-Gierveld, 1987). These personality characteristics are assumed to impair academic performance. Our first finding provides empirical support to this assumption. Our finding is also consistent with the findings obtained by Ashtiani, Ejei, Khodapanahi and Tarkhorani (2007), who have demonstrated a negative
significant relationship between self-concept, self-esteem and depression which decreases academic achievement.

Last but not the least important explanation of our finding, i.e., high lonely subjects show poorer academic performance as compared to low lonely subjects, is consistent with the previous results (Perry et. al., 1988; Boulton & Smith, 1994; Austin & Joseph, 1996; Ladd, Kochenderfer & Coleman, 1997; Graham & Juvonen, 1998; Hodges & Perry, 1999; Andreou, 2000; Schwartz, 2000; Schwartz et. al., 2001; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002).

The second finding of our research, i.e., subjects with high level of neuroticism and subjects with low level of neuroticism did not differ with respect to their academic performance, is an addition in the already existing gravely conflicting findings regarding the impact of neuroticism on academic performance. There are good number of studies which have found negligible or no relationship between neuroticism and academic performance (Mwamwenda, 1995; McKenzie, Taghavi-Khonsary and Tindell, 2000; Furnham, Chamorro-Premuzic and McDougall, 2003), other investigators have demonstrated negative correlation between neuroticism and academic performance strongly suggesting that neuroticism impairs academic performance. (Savage, 1962; Chamorro-Premuzic and Furnham, 2003; Diseth, 2003; Laidra, Pullman and Allik, 2006; Pallegama, Ariyasinghe and Parera, 2007). To add fuel to fire, interestingly some researchers have
shown facilitative effect of neuroticism on academic performance (Furneaux, 1956, 1962; Broadbent, 1958; Lynn, 1959; Lynn and Gordon, 1961; Upmanya, 1974). Still other investigators have observed a U-Shaped relationship between neuroticism and academic success (Lynn and Gordon, 1961; Savage, 1962; McKenzie, Taghavi-Khonsary and Tindell, 2000). Such a curvilinear relationship was explained in terms of Yerkes-Dodson law which states that the optimum drive required for efficient learning is inversely related to the complexity of the task. Hence, Lynn (1959) has reported neuroticism impairs performance when the task is difficult but facilitates performance when the task is simple or easy. Similarly, McKenzie, Taghavi-Khonsary and Tindell (2000), have observed negligible or negative correlation between neuroticism and academic achievement for the low super-ego group of subjects but observed positive correlation between neuroticism and academic achievement for the high super-ego group of subjects.

In the light of these conflicting findings regarding the impact of neuroticism on academic performance, the second finding of our research is in agreement with the findings obtained by (Mwamwenda, 1995; McKenzie, Taghavi-Khonsary and Tindell, 2000; Furnham, Chamorro-Premuzic and McDougall, 2003), who have also demonstrated that neuroticism has no effect on academic performance.

The third finding of our research i.e., internally oriented subjects and externally oriented subjects did not significantly differ in their academic
performance, is surprising and in the unexpected direction, hence needs deep
and through analysis. In view of the characteristics of internally oriented and
externally oriented subjects, a positive relation between locus of control beliefs
and achievement is logical. Logically, if success is positively valued, people
who feel more able to control outcomes should exert more effort and hence
should get greater success as compared to externally oriented people who
firmly believe that the outcome is the result of luck and chance. For example,
an internal student, who studies hard and done well on a test, will attribute the
success to own actions. This student will then continue to study hard, because
an expectation to succeed in the future is established. Moreover, the individual
feels a positive emotional response of pride for the successes, which
strengthens the expectation and the motivation. On the other hand, an external
student may study and do well on a test, but may believe the success is due to
an easy test, or luck, or a variety of other factors. This student does not
attribute success to own actions, and so may not consistently study. Therefore,
the more internal the perspective, the greater the expectation, and the stronger
the motivation to achieve. Thus numerous studies have shown that internally
oriented subjects show superior academic performance than externally oriented
subjects (Phares, 1976; Lefcourt, 1976; Bar-Tal and Bar-Zohar, 1977;
Wiest, Wong and Kreil, 1998; Carden, Bryant and Moss, 2004; Gifford,
Mianzo and Briceno-Perriott, 2006; Kirkpatrick, Stant, Downes and
Gaither, 2008). The second finding of our investigation is not in agreement
with the finding cited above. However, our finding provides strong empirical support not only to Phares, Wilson and Klyver' (1971) hypothesis but also to the findings obtained by previous researchers. Phares, Wilson and Klyver' (1971), hypothesized that the generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement would operate in a situation which does not provide any very explicit cues that external forces may have influenced one's performance, but would recede in importance in a situation which does provide such explicit cues. The academic setting provides a number of explicit cues relating to the course and the instructor arousing specific expectancies regarding the locus of blame for poor academic performance. On the basis of Phares' hypothesis, it would be predicted that individual differences in locus of control would be unrelated to attribution of responsibility for poor academic performance. Thus, the second finding not only provides empirical support to this hypothesis, but also is in agreement with the finding obtained by Brenenstuhl and Badgett (1977) and Gadzella, Williamson and Ginther (1985), who did not find any significant correlation between academic achievement and locus of control.

Another possible explanation of the second finding may be given in terms of size of the sample. As states elsewhere there were 50 subjects in each group which may not be considered as large sample. It is possible that if large sample is used the result may be reversed. Hence further research is needed in future using large sample. The finding of such a study may resolve the
controversy regarding the impact of locus of control on academic performance. The foregoing discussion clearly highlighted the existing controversy regarding the influence of locus of control on academic performance. We have just noticed that a large number of studies have found that internally oriented subjects show better academic performance than externally oriented subjects. But at the same time other studies, though smaller in number, demonstrated no relationship between locus of control and academic performance, i.e., internal and external oriented subjects did not differ with respect to academic performance. Hence, an exhaustive study is needed to resolve this controversy.

All the interactional effects, i.e., interaction between loneliness and neuroticism; interaction between loneliness and locus of control; interaction between neuroticism and locus of control and interaction among loneliness, neuroticism and locus of control are insignificant. These insignificant interactional effects suggest that all the independent variables worked independently. For example, the insignificant interaction between loneliness and neuroticism suggest that the academic performance of high lonely and low lonely subjects is independent of neuroticism. The other insignificant interactional effects may possibly be explained in the same way.

The overall findings of the present research at least highlight the fact that student should not feel lonely whether they are at home or in hostels, for loneliness is found to have profound adverse effects on academic performance. On the basis of our findings, it is strongly recommended to parents and
academic administrators to leave no stone unturned to evolve a mechanism by which a student may not develop a feeling of loneliness. In this sense the findings of the present research are very important for parents and academic administrators.