CHAPTER - II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Research takes the advantage of the knowledge, which has accumulated in the past as a result of constant human endeavour. A careful review of the research journals, books, dissertations, theses and other sources of information on the problems to be investigated is one of the important steps in the planning of any research study. The review of the related literature involves locating, reaching and evaluating of research as well as the reports of casual observations and the opinions that are related to the individual’s planned research projects.

The general purpose of the review is to help the research worker develop a thorough understanding and insight into work already done and the areas left untouched or unexplored. It is obligatory and desirable to see the related literature with a view to place the design of the research investigation on sounder lines. The survey of the related literature facilitates the investigator to have an idea as to what extent the problem has been explored and whether the evidence provided is adequate enough or not. Moreover, the survey of the related studies gives assistance in framing the objectives, outlaying the research design and locating the necessary data. A comprehensive review of the past studies is thus the backbone of any research endeavour. Thus, this chapter is devoted to review of literature relevant to the past studies. Here an attempt has been made to present pertinent literature, which is likely to have direct or indirect bearing on this study. Keeping in view the objectives of the study, the review may be presented in any of the following three orders: 1. Chronological order, 2. Theme wise order and 3. Chronological cum Theme wise order.

In the present study, the related studies have been presented in Chronological cum Theme wise order:
II.1 STUDIES DONE ABROAD

(a) Achievement Motivation in relation to certain personal and environmental variables:

Bruckman (1966); Macoby and Jacklin (1974); Ollendiek (1974); Crew (1982); Natesan and Geetha (1990) and Janice et al. (2004) found no significant sex differences in the achievement motivation. But Dowson (1948); Castenell (1983); Tohindi (1984); Jing (1995) and Nelson (2006) revealed the significant influence of sex on the achievement motivation level of the students. Mc Clelland et al. (1953); Hurlock (1973); Barbara and Teresa (2004) and Qizhen (2009) found boys with high achievement motivation than the girls. However, Minigione (1965); Glass et al. (1974) and Horner (1979) found girls with high achievement motivation in comparison to the boys.

Mc Clelland (1961) and Tohindi (1984) found significant socio-economic status differences in the achievement motivation. High socio-economic status adolescents showed high achievement motivation and vice versa.

(b) Academic Achievement in relation to certain personal and environmental variables:

Salami and Ogundokun (2009) indicated that gender did not significantly influence the academic achievement of the students. However, Bruner and Caron (1959); Clark (1959); Meyer and Thompson (1963); Cantwell (1966); Yates (1997); Kleinfeld (1999) and Gorard et al. (2001) in their studies found significant sex differences in the academic achievement. Girls achieved significantly higher as compared to the boys.

Mollenkopf (1956) revealed that socio-economic status had more influence on the academic achievement of students. Drews and Teahan (1957); Coster (1959); Frankel (1960); Jamuar (1963); Bowles and Levin (1968); Walberg (1972); Walberg and Marjoribanks (1974; 1976) found that the students belonging to high socio-economic status group showed high academic achievement as compared to the students belonging to the middle and low socio-economic status groups respectively.
Parental Press Areas:

Sewell and Hauser (1980); Stevenson and Baker (1987); Lee (1994); Deslandes and Royer (1997); Epstein and Sheldon (2002) and Sheldon and Epstein (2002) in their studies observed that parental involvement in the educational area was explored as a possible means through which students could be provided with additional supports. The students whose parents were more involved in their schooling earned higher grades, had better school attendance and fewer discipline problems than the students whose parents were less involved.

Olmstead and Rubin (1983) and Henderson and Berla (1994) in their research studies found that when parents participate in their children’s educational area, the result is an increase in student’s achievement and an improvement in students’ attitudes. Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch and Darling (1992); Keith et al. (1993) and Desimone (1999) assessed the parental participation in school-related activities, such as monitoring home-work and attending parent-teacher association meetings. Loucks (1992) found that parental involvement in the school resulted in improved student achievement. White, Taylor and Moss (1992) and Yoon, Wigfield and Eccles (1993) in their research studies reported that the involvement of parents in the educational area had a positive impact on children’s educational achievement.

Gelfer (1991) found that the more the parents become involved and learn about the school, the more the parents can help the students. The parents are able to increase their understanding of child development in areas of social, emotional, physical and moral development. This helps to provide a bond between home experiences and the educational programmes. Sui-chu and Willms (1996); Bredekamp and Copple (1997); Trusty (1998); Mc Neal (1999); Scribner, Young and Pedroza (1999); Fantuzzo and Mc Wayne (2002) and Yan and Lin (2002) in their research studies revealed that greater involvement of parents in children’s education positively affected the child’s school performance including higher academic achievement and greater social and emotional development.

Izzo et al. (1999); Marcon (1999); Fan and Chen (2001) and Hill et al. (2004) in their studies indicated that when parents participate at school and encourage learning at home, children tend to be more successful at all grade levels. Parents’ participation in education is associated with increased student achievement, better
school attendance, increased achievement motivation, reduced drop-out rate, better emotional adjustment, improved social behaviour and interaction with peers. Wherry (2003) found that students with involved parents were more likely to earn higher grades and test scores, pass their classes, attend school regularly, have better social skills, show good behaviour and adapt well to school.

Flouri and Buchanan (2004) found that father’s and mother’s involvement in child’s education at age 7 independently and significantly predicted educational attainment at age 20 in both sons and daughters. In a study conducted by Hill and Taylor (2004), it was found that parental involvement in children’s education was an important influence on children’s educational outcomes. Domina (2005) indicated that children whose parents are actively involved in their education showed higher level of academic development and academic achievement.

Jynes (2005) indicated that parental involvement had a positive impact on the educational outcomes of African American Youth. However, this influence was no longer statistically significant when variables for socio-economic status were included in the analysis. The results also showed that parents were slightly more likely to be involved in the education of their daughters than they were in the education of their sons.

Forrest (1967) found that father is a more punitive parent and thus is relatively more effective in the inhibition of anti-social influences.

Thompson (1947) studied the relationship of child’s emotional development with parental attitude. He found that if the emotional needs of the child are fulfilled by the parents with impatience, punishment and rejection, due to such negative attitudes, the emotional development of the child is wrapped. However, Sears et al. (1957) came to the conclusion that mother’s attitude and personality affects the emotional development of the child. Strage (2000) found that the students who received more emotional support from their parents performed better overall, and they had higher confidence.

Ornelas et al. (2007) in their research studies revealed that parents had a significant influence on the physical activities of adolescent. They played an important role in the development of healthy lifestyle behaviours in their children.
Baker and Stevenson (1986) and Lichter (1996) in their research studies reported that parents from higher socio-economic status are more likely to be involved in schooling than parents of lower socio-economic status. A higher educational level of parents is positively associated with a greater tendency for them to advocate for their children’s placement in honour courses and actively manage their children’s education. Domina (2005) found that the involvement of parents with low socio-economic status was more effective than that of parents with high socio-economic status. Parents actively involved in the other aspects of child’s education. Jeynes (2007) revealed that low socio-economic status significantly affected the parental involvement in students’ education. Parents participated in the educational processes and experiences of their children.

(d) Family Climate Dimensions:

In a study conducted by Symond (1939), it was observed that rejected children are less friendly and more rebellious than the accepted children. Baldwin (1949) studied children’s behaviour in schools in relation to atmosphere in the home and found that rejected children are highly emotional with their low emotional control. The rejected children showed more quarrelsome tendencies and sibling rivalry.

Sears (1950) concluded that rejection by the parents is associated with a large number of fears in their children. Also, older groups were more affected by parental rejection or acceptance than the younger group. Davitz (1958) reported that punishment and rejection give rise to fear, fear promotes defence reactions and defence reactions elicit further punishment.

Hallowitz and Stulberg (1959) observed that child’s feeling of rejection generates a vicious circle in the parent-child relationship. The child becomes anxious and insecure about whether or not his parents love him. He then tests them, retaliates, rebels or withdraws. The parents, in turn, feel unappreciated and rejected and their negative, hostile and rejected feelings are further stirred up, aggravated and intensified. Medinnus (1965) conducted a study and found that rejected children had more delinquent problems as compared to accepted children and they had strong feelings that their parents had rejected and neglected them. Desousa (1970) revealed that most of the behaviour problems in children are usually caused by their parents.
A weak parent tends to give no support to the growing child. Parental attitudes leading to rejection are likely to create delinquency problems.

Brown, Morrison and Couch (1950) in their research studies found that traits like honesty, friendliness and responsibility tended to come from restrictive and autocratic homes. Mothers of prejudiced children demanded unquestioned obedience from the children. There seemed to be little opportunity for the child to try his own wings.

Lengdon and Stout (1952) found that acceptance of individuality of the child together with warm and permissive climate in the home are important factors of good adjustment. Baumrind (1975; 1991) found that indulgent-permissive parenting offers warmth and caring but little parental control. These parents generally accept their children’s behaviour and punish them infrequently.

Macooby (1980) found that parents who provide high levels of warmth and affection compared to those that are more cold or rejecting, have children with more secure attachments and better peer relationships. Baumrind (1991) and Weiss and Schwarz (1996) revealed that adolescents from indulgent homes are more likely to be involved in problem behaviour and perform less well in school, but they have higher self-esteem, better social skills, and lower level of depression. Glasgow et al. (1997) reported that indulgent parents are tolerant, warm and accepting but they exercise little authority over their children. Indulgent parents are very committed to their children but they make few demands for responsible and mature behaviour and permit their children considerable freedom.

Belsky (1984); Cox et al. (1989) and Howes and Markman (1989) in their research studies indicated that when parents marital relationship is warm and supportive, mothers and fathers praise and stimulate their children more. Macooby (1984) found that parental control and warmth affects children’s aggression and pro-social behaviour, their self-concepts, their internalization of moral values and their development of social competence.

Watson (1957) concluded from his study that greater freedom provided by the parents tended to be associated with more child initiative, less hostility and higher levels of spontaniety and originality respectively. Levinson and Hoffman
(1969) found that in a democratic environment, parental pressures are minimized and the child’s use of reason and sense of self-determination are maximized.

Trapp and Kausler (1958) found that high or low parental dominance produced more avoidance behaviour among the children than moderate dominance.

Hurlock (1959) studied parental expectations in terms of what parents expect from their child and found that when a child failed to come up to the parental expectations, the attitude of the parents invariably got prejudiced. This impaired the parent-child relations. This in turn, influences the personality of the child. Slater (1962) found that family relationships continue to exert a marked influence and the home environment becomes increasingly less important in shaping the personality of the child as the child grows older. Parents are responsible for the happiness and unhappiness of the child. Crandall et al. (1964) revealed that well adjusted parents provide a better home environment and maintain better relationships with their children. Some parents have high and often unrealistic ambitions for their children. They are likely to make their children feel insecure and unaccepted when they fail to come up to their parental expectations.

Lamborn et al. (1991) found that adolescents who come from homes characterized as authoritative are better adjusted and more competent, they are confident about their abilities, competent in the areas of achievements and less likely to get into trouble.

(e) Research studies based on the relationship between achievement motivation and academic achievement:

Morgan (1952); Mc Clelland et al. (1953); Ricciute et al. (1955); Weise et al. (1959); Unlinger and Stephens (1960); Dember et al. (1962); Stanford et al. (1963); Ali (1988); Phalet and Claes (1993); Phalet and Lens (1995); Chen (1997); Berndt (1999) and Ryan (2001) reported positive correlation between achievement motivation and academic achievement. However, Settlemeyer (2010) found insignificant relationship between achievement motivation and academic achievement.
II.2 STUDIES DONE IN INDIA

(a) Achievement Motivation in relation to certain personal and environmental variables:

Mishra (1967); Sundram (1981); Bhattacharya and Bhardwaj (1983); Panda and Mishra (1985); Agarwal (1988); Saraswat (1988); Verma (1992); Minnalkodi (1997) and Ara (1999) found significant differences between boys and girls on achievement motivation. Singh (1972); Abrol (1977); Gupta (1978); Jerath (1979); Singh (1985); Gawande (1988) and Mohanty (1998) in their research studies found that the boys scored higher than the girls on achievement motivation.

Chaudhary (1971); Gokulnathan (1972); Aggarwal (1974); Patel (1977); Shanmugasundaram (1983); Joginder (1984); Mandila (1988); Chishty (1989); Rani (1992); Kour (1996); EllekkaKumar and Elankathirselvan (2001) and Bala (2005) found that girls had significantly higher achievement motivation than boys. However, Saraswat (1964); Dutt and Sabharwal (1973); Pathak (1974); PandhariPande (1976); Shukla (1977); Dhillon (1979); Naik (1979); Gandhi (1982); Koul (1982); Lalitha (1982); Bharathi (1984); Chauhan (1984); Ahluwalia (1985); Mitra (1985); Raghava (1985); Rao (1986); Tripathi (1986); Uchat (1987); Srivastava and Chandra (1989); Bharsakle and Srivastava (1992); Taj (1997); Ahmed (1998); Kour (2002); Bala (2003); Suman and Umphy (2003); Verma (2004); Rani and Kaushik (2005); Sharma (2007) and Sharma (2008) found insignificant sex differences in the achievement motivation.

Narain (1996) found significant differences between tribal and non-tribal students on achievement motivation. Mehta (1969); Gokulnathan (1972) and Singh (1979) reported that the tribal students had high achievement motivation than their non-tribal counterparts. Balakrishna (1986) also reported that christian tribals were better than non-christian tribals in achievement motivation. However, Sinha (1957); Pandey and Singh (1971); Banerjee and Pareek (1974) and Singh and Sinha (1983) in their research studies concluded that tribal students had lower achievement motivation than non-tribal students.

Fatima (1986); Sujatha and Yasodhara (1986); Mohanty (1989); Nayak (1990); Bharsakle (1997) and Bidyadhar (2006) found that non-tribal students have
better level of achievement motivation than their tribal counterparts. Shah (1989) in her study found that non-scheduled tribe students had higher achievement motivation than their scheduled tribe counterparts.

Patel (1987) found that the three groups viz. scheduled caste, scheduled tribe and the advantaged children differed significantly in their achievement motivation. The advantaged children scored significantly higher than the scheduled caste and scheduled tribe children on achievement motivation. Ojha and Singh (2002) reported that disadvantaged group obtained lower scores on achievement motivation as compared to the advantaged group. Sharma (2007) also found that the students belonging to different social categories differed significantly with each other on achievement motivation. Socially advantaged group had higher mean value (17.1) than the socially disadvantaged group (14.2) on achievement motivation.

Gupta (1978) revealed that the scheduled caste and backward class students had higher mean scores as compared to the non-scheduled caste students on achievement motivation. Benno (1995) and Sharma (2000) in their studies revealed that the students belonging to scheduled caste and non-scheduled caste differed significantly on achievement motivation. Kapoor (1997) found significant difference in the achievement motivation of students belonging to scheduled caste and scheduled tribe. Scheduled Caste students had high achievement motivation than scheduled tribe students.

Lyngdoh (1976); Mubayi (1976) and Lalitha (1982) revealed that tribal and non-tribal students do not differ significantly from each other in their level of achievement motivation. Koul (1982) and Verma (2004) found that caste had no effect on achievement motivation. Chauhan (1984) found that scheduled tribe and scheduled caste students do not differ significantly in relation to their achievement motivation. Khatarbhai (1997) also indicated no significant difference on achievement motivation score of scheduled caste and scheduled tribe students.

Chauhan (1989) found that scheduled tribe boys and girls do not differ significantly in relation to their achievement motivation. Maheshwari (1998) found no significant difference between scheduled caste and non-backward boys, between scheduled tribe and non-backward boys and between scheduled caste and scheduled tribe boys on level of achievement motivation.
Thamhankar (1968); Ojha (1973); Pathak (1974); Lyngdoh (1976); Mubayi (1976); Abrol (1977); Patel (1977); Bharathi (1984); Chauhan (1984); Watthayu (1985); Fatima (1986); Kumari (1992); Verma (1992); Nair (1996) and Akhter (1999) found that socio-economic status of the family significantly affected the level of achievement motivation of the students. Parikh (1976) and Mansuri (1986) reported that the students belonging to high socio-economic status had higher achievement motivation than the students belonging to middle or low socio-economic status. However, Dutt and Sabharwal (1973); Agarwal and Suraksha (1978); Ahluwalia (1985) and Ara (1999) found that socio-economic status of the family did not affect achievement motivation.

Ojha and Singh (2002) found significant interactional effect of Sex and Caste on the achievement motivation of students. However, Chauhan (1984) in his study revealed that Community and Sex, Community and Socio-economic status and Sex and Socio-economic status did not interact significantly in relation to the achievement motivation of students. Community, Sex and Socio-economic status did not interact significantly in relation to the achievement motivation of students. Verma (2004) in her study found no significant interactional effect of Sex and Reserved Categories on the achievement motivation of students. Sharma (2007) also reported no significant interactional effect of Sex and Social Categories on the achievement motivation of students.

(b) Academic Achievement in relation to certain personal and environmental variables:

Sundram (1981); Saraswat (1988); Rani (1992) and Vamadevappa (2005) found significant difference between boys and girls in their academic achievement. Gupta (1979); Misra (1986); Devi (1990); Ramachandran (1990); Aggarwal (1992); Harikrishnan (1992); Shukla and Agrawal (1997); Borbora (2001); Kour (2004) and Jagannath and Praveen (2007) reported that the girls had higher academic achievement than the boys. Narula (1979); Shukla (1984); Raghava (1985); Chakrabarti (1988); Gawande (1988); Samal (1990); Srivastava (1992); Mohan (1998); Taj (1999); Basappa (2003); Gupta (2003); Kour (2003); Kumari (2003); Singh (2004); Sharma (2006); Sharma (2007); Devi (2008); Sharma (2008); Sharma
(2009) and Tabassum (2009) have, however, found insignificant sex differences in the academic achievement.

Gopalacharyulu (1984) found significant difference between socially advantaged and disadvantaged students on academic achievement. Singh (1976); Sutradhar (1982); Varma (2003) and Sharma (2007) found that the students belonging to advantaged group achieved at a higher level as compared to the disadvantaged group. Sharma (1975); Pandey (1978); Ameerjan (1979) and Uniyal and Shah (1984) reported that the students belonging to higher castes had high academic achievement as compared to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes students. Patel (1987) revealed that the scheduled caste, scheduled tribe and the advantaged children differed significantly in their academic achievement. The advantaged children scored significantly higher than the scheduled caste and scheduled tribe children on academic achievement.

Vyas (1992) and Singh (2006) indicated that the scheduled castes and non-scheduled castes students differed significantly in their academic achievement. Gupta (1978) in his study reported that scheduled castes and backward class students were found to be poor academic achievers, as the mean academic achievement of these students was significantly lower than that of the non-scheduled caste students. Rani (1980); Verma (1985); Shukla and Agrawal (1997) and Chattopadhyay (1998) also reported that scheduled caste students were lower in academic achievement than the non-scheduled caste students. Gupta (1988) found that non-scheduled castes students performed better than the scheduled castes students on academic achievement. Singh (2006) revealed that non-scheduled caste boys and girls were higher in academic achievement than scheduled caste boys and girls.

Lata (1992) and Raju, Raj, Sanada and Tulasidharan (1993) in their research studies found that the scheduled tribes and the non-scheduled tribe students differed significantly in their academic achievement. Tripathi (1990) in his study found that tribal students had lower academic performance than non-tribal students. Annaraja and Thiagarajan (1993) revealed that non-scheduled tribe students showed better academic achievement than scheduled tribe students.

Aggarwal (1992) in her study found that scheduled caste girls had higher academic achievement than their male counterparts. Benno (1995) found significant
differences between scheduled caste students on the basis of academic achievement. Shukla and Agrawal (1997) observed that the level of academic achievement of boys belonging to scheduled castes and non-scheduled castes was found low in comparison to their girl counterparts.

Aruna (1981) reported that the academic achievement of the scheduled tribe students was found to be higher than scheduled caste students. However, Sujatha and Yeshodhara (1986) and Singh (1996) in their studies found that scheduled caste and scheduled tribe students were low in their academic achievement.

Verma (1985) revealed no significant difference between the students belonging to scheduled tribes and those belonging to other castes on the level of academic achievement. Maheshwari (1998) in her study revealed that no significant difference was found between scheduled caste and non-backward boys on the level of academic achievement. There was no significant difference between scheduled tribe and non-backward boys and between scheduled caste and scheduled tribe boys on levels of academic achievement. Kour (2003) found that Caste had no effect on the academic achievement of students. Kour (2004) revealed that the students belonging to scheduled caste and non-scheduled caste groups do not differ significantly with each other on academic achievement. Devi (2008); Sharma (2008) and Tabassum (2009) found that the students belonging to different reserved categories do not differ significantly from each other on academic achievement.

Tripathi (1969); Das (1975); Rao (1977); Gopalacharyulu (1984); Srivastava and Ramaswamy (1986); Gupta (1987); Mohan (1998); Suneeta and Mayuri (1999) and Basappa (2003) found that socio-economic status of the family significantly affected the academic achievement of students. Saini (1977); Trivedi (1987); Garg and Chaturvedi (1992) and Singh (2005) revealed that the students belonging to high socio-economic status had better academic achievement as compared to those belonging to low socio-economic status. Shukla and Agrawal (1997) found that scheduled caste students were low in socio-economic status as compared to non-scheduled caste students. However, Narang (1987) and Rajput (1989) reported that socio-economic status of the family did not affect academic achievement of the students.

(c) **Parental Press Areas:**

Aggarwal and Saxena (1977) and Nagaraja (1977) in their studies found that the parent-child relationship is the permanent predictor of emotional development in the children. Srivastava (1982) studied parent-child relationship and found that majority of children identified with mother, while less identification was shown with fathers. Mother was the main source of emotional support.

In a study conducted by Banoo (1982) in order to know the parental involvement and their contribution towards the education and personality of the children, it was found that the girls secured better scores in educational and physical areas whereas boys exhibited better scores in emotional and moral areas. No significant difference was observed between the mean scores of boys and girls in the social area. In both the groups moral area played dominated role among the five areas. Parents seem to attach much importance to moral preaching.

Jasrotia (1985) in her study found that sex had significant impact on the educational, social, emotional, physical and moral areas of parental press.

Kumari (1998) found that boys and girls differed significantly in the social area of parental press but did not differ with each other in their educational; emotional; physical and moral areas of parental press.

Gupta (1989); Kour (1994); Ahmed (1996) and Kumar (2006) revealed that sex showed no significant impact on the educational, social, emotional, physical and moral areas of parental press. Sharma (2010) in her study found that sex and reserved categories had no significant impact on the educational, social, emotional, physical and moral areas of parental press.
(d) **Family Climate Dimensions:**

Shah (1970) found that the adolescents from warm and loving families (where recognition and acceptance of the child along with careful guidance predominates) tend to be out-going, active and adjustable. They tend to have positive, friendly and co-operative attitudes with their peer groups. Overprotected adolescents whose needs are satisfied indiscriminately and who receive little guidance and training in discipline tend to be shy, withdrawn, inactive and unpopular with their peer groups. They are generally successful in making social adjustments.

Sinha and Sidana (1973) indicated that rejective behaviour on the part of the parents increase the number of fears in children. This study also showed that children who are punished by their parents have more fear tendencies as compared to their counterparts. The rewarding behaviour of the parents was found to be less fear-provoking.

Bhattacharya (1985) found that the home and the relationship an adolescent has with his parents have a great impact on how he will adjust himself to social situations and how he will be accepted by his peers. Adolescents who have a feeling of dislike towards their parents, brothers and sisters tend to be withdrawn and less social.

Kalra and Pyari (2004) revealed that the achievement of the students having favourable family climate was better than the group of students having unfavourable family climate.

(e) **Research studies based on the relationship between achievement motivation and academic achievement:**

Sinha (1967); Pathak (1974); Parikh (1976); Christian (1977); Gandhi (1982); ShanmugaSundaram (1983); Deshpande (1984); Sween (1984); Ahluwalia (1985); Mitra (1985); Watthayu (1985); Tripathi (1986); Ramaswamy (1988); Saraswat (1988); Sodhi (1989); Devanesan (1990); Rani (1992); Kour (1996) and Alam (2001) found significant and positive relationship between the achievement motivation and academic achievement of students. Sharma (2011) in her study also found significant relationship based on achievement motivation and academic achievement between boys and girls in the weak and under-privileged class category.
However, Rajput (1984); Sontakey (1986) and Harikrishnan (1992) reported that achievement motivation and academic achievement were not related to each other. Gawande (1988) found insignificant relationship between achievement motivation and academic achievement of non-backward and backward students. Sharma (2011) also found insignificant relationship based on achievement motivation and academic achievement between boys and girls in the general category, scheduled caste category and scheduled tribe category.