CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Rural-Urban differences

2.1 General: Leevy Roy (1940) studied contrasts in urban and rural life. His results showed some contrast of activities between rural and urban life based on data from a survey of 1000 rural and 1000 urban families in Illinois. This study showed the chief differences between economic, recreational, social and religious activities of rural-urban families. It does not show what the trends in these matters may be. The study showed that rural and urban families have similar patterns despite difference on location of homes and modes of making a living. Though there is considerable difference in the degree to which the patterns manifest themselves in the two areas, parents of both urban and rural families appear neglectful in visiting schools.

J.D.Chitambar (1973) concludes that, rural people are different from those living in urban areas. The
differences reflect, difference in cultures or sub-cultures of these two areas. He also concludes that, the differences that exist have a significance which is expressed in the behavioural difference between rural and urban people.

George, Charles and Peck (1974) using data from three national surveys, focussed on two questions pivoted to the issue of rural-urban difference: (1) Defining rurality in terms of residence, do additional differences remain among the rural and urban residents, independent of differences generated by other potent variables? (2) Will there be any increase in the predictive utility of rurality generated by use of composite definition? On the basis of the close and consistent behavioural and symbolic association of abstinence with rural life and consumption with urban life (drinking of alcoholic beverages was selected as the indicator of rural-urban life style). The addition of a life style indicator clearly increased the predictive utility of the rural-urban variable.

2.2 Intelligence: Many researchers in the world over have tried to see whether there are significant urban and rural differences in intelligence attainment. Terman and Merrill working in America found that rural children
are definitely inferior in general ability as a group, to urban children. This conclusion was supported by Burt. Testing in rural and urban schools, he found twice as many sub-normal children in former as in the latter. Scottish Mental Survey of 1932, however, indicated that there was little statistically significant difference between mean scores of urban and rural children on the group verbal test used by them. Post-war students have tended to support the conclusion of Terman, Merrill and Burt rather than those of the Scottish Survey. A similar study was made by Cross and Revell in Cambridgeshire in 1950. They compared the performance of rural and urban children in a Local Education Authority's secondary school selection examination and found that, whereas the percentage of rural children in lower scores exceeded that of urban children, this majority became progressively less until, it was replaced by an urban majority in Verbal Scores (IQ of over 120).

The fact that rural children as a group average is significantly lower than urban, on current intelligence tests, it has been repeatedly demonstrated. Various countries where studies have produced these results are the
U.S. (McNemar, 1942; S. Sanders & Osborne, 1955); Sweden (Carlson, 1954); Rumania (Rosca, 1939; Radulescu-Motru and Nester, 1963); Ceylon (Straus, 1954); India (Chopra, 1964). McNemar's study showed that rural children on the whole averaged ten IQ points, are lower than the urban. Sukhendra Lal Chopra (1968), pointed out that in the above study average scores of urban and rural children appear to have been compared without equating the group on socio-economic conditions of their families. Since the people in rural areas are generally poor, less educated than those in urban areas, variations may be due to difference in the home background rather than simple residence in rural or urban areas.

Comparison of the intelligence test scores and academic achievement of students from urban rural areas when matched on home background, Indian conditions appeared particularly appropriate for such a study, because, difference in urban and rural environment are comparatively more marked than in more developed countries.

Pessy and Thomas (1919) observed that, in England, where rural living enjoys greater prestige than other countries, and in Scotland where scholastic opportunity
has been more evenly equated, no significant differences in mean IQs of urban and rural children were observed (Dickerteth, 1917). They further observed that even within rural communities, economic factors play an important role. Their study showed that the intelligence test scores of rural students were related to the quality of the social, and the children living in good farm land averaged higher than those in hilly areas.

The greater proportion of 'Blanket' tests place the rural children below the urban, in Intelligence test. And the greater proportion of the investigators seem convinced that the difference in result is due to difference in native mobility of the two population (Sorokin Zimmerman, 1969).

Abraham, Thomas and Rao (1970), selected 120 pupils from two schools, 60 boys and 60 girls for pilot study and

---

1 For purposes of analysis, the psychological test may be divided into two main classes; those which separate communities by size and compare the rural with the urban and those which divide the groups according to the occupations of the parent. Those which divide community by size and compare the Intelligence test results, are referred as 'Blanket' comparison.
450 pupils: from rural-urban areas for final testing. Non-verbal intelligence test was developed consisting of 5 sub-test series, misfits, analogy reflection and similar figures. The skewness of distribution of scores was 0.05 and kurtosis was 0.256. Differences between boys and girls were significant. Differences for urban-rural background were not significant.

J. Shrinivas (1966) chose 300 urban and 300 rural VIII, IX and X Standard students, for his investigation. He concluded that no difference in intelligence existed between rural and urban high school students.

Mann and others (1976) observed that average IQ of rural children is usually 5-10 points below the average IQ of city children. They also observed that, in general the educational opportunities of rural children are usually somewhat inferior to those of city children. Environmental influences play an important role in developing the functions that are measured by most intelligence tests and the rural-urban difference is very likely, the result of such factors.
Dr. Gunwant Shah (1966), in his study "Group Difference in Intelligence", concludes that, difference between the means of the pupils from rural and urban areas are not significant at any age except at the age of 10 years. This he explains on the basis of the fact that, since independence, the condition of Indian villages have been changing, urbanization has started and they are no longer detached from cities.

2.3 Interest: - Goyal R.P. (1960) carried on a survey from requiring information on occupation choices after schooling. Out of 433 students, 261 from urban area and 172 from rural area. Occupations which were higher on the socio-economic ladder were preferred mostly, specially the professional technical jobs, such as those of engineers, physicists, scientists, doctors, teachers, jurists, nurses and draughtsman, jobs which are clerical, sales, farming etc. are some of the least preferred ones. 25% of the subjects were undecided and unclassifiable, while most of the rural preferred occupations as service, sport, transport and communication than the urban subjects. Not much difference was observed between freshers and seniors.
Rajendra Pandey (1974) derived the following conclusions:

1. The youth found it difficult to mention alternative occupations when asked to do so, the rural being more uncertain than the urban.

2. Urban youth mostly aspire for white collar jobs.

3. Achievement-orientation, realistic approach and active involvement in life are implicant in their job choices; although urban youth surpass rural youth in this regard.

4. Rural youth give more emphasis in social service, high pay, and interest in work respectively, whereas urban youth's basic emphasis is in job followed by emphasis on high pay and social service aspect of the job.

5. For both, interpersonal sources are major sources of inspiration.
6. Urban youth, more than the rural, are willing to encounter difficulties in the fulfilment of their occupational goal and to forego immediate pleasure for the sake of long term rewards.

7. As for the choice of life goal, urban youth mostly aspire professional, technical jobs, rural youth mostly for white-collar jobs and independent occupations.

8. As regards aspirations for income, urban youth tend to aspire for earning more income as compared to rural youth.

Similar is the difference between the educational aspirations of the two (Pandey 1971, pp.i-21 also 1973, pp.196-207).

It is apparent that urban youth evince greater tendency for upward social mobility than do rural youth.

2.4 Personality:- An analysis of difference in "Source Traits" by Holler and Wolf (1962) selected values and aspiration of boys residing in farms, in rural non-farm and village areas and in small urban areas of Michigan country. The data included questionnaire measurements of Cattell's
16 "source trait". Analysis of variance was used to test effects of residence and residence-by-status interaction of mean scores of 26 personality orientation variables were found. Residence was associated with 14 of these and interaction was associated with 6 of the 26. 18 are associated with either or interaction or both. These findings give strong support to the hypotheses of rural-urban differences in personality orientations.

Ennis (1973) studied the 16 personality factors on the students who were drawn from rural, suburban, medium sized urban and large urban population. Results indicated that high achievers as contrasted with low achievers, were more self-sufficient, more relaxed, and unfrustrated conscientious, socially precise, and intelligent.

Hathway, Manachesi and Young (1959) used the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory to determine the rural-urban difference. Their data indicated the presence of personality difference for rural and urban youth with the more likely to express feelings of shyness, self-deprecation and suspicion.

Rural-urban personality orientations were reported by
Haller and Wolf (1962). Using the data collected in 1957 in an area within 20 miles of Toledo and 40 miles of Detroit, these researchers concluded that personality orientations are related to residence. Many of the orientation variables were interpreted as adaptively functional for the types of social environment in which those possessing them reside.

Another aspect of personality that was investigated was conservatism, radicalism. Haer (1952) using the population size of 2,5000 as the dividing line for rural and urban areas, found that there was no increase in radical orientations as the size of the community increased.

Biswa Chatterjee (1971) tried to find out, in what ways, belonging to different caste and class groups in the rural settings were related to those psychological traits of personality viz. authoritarianism, dogmatism and rigidity factors which have been recognised to be a hindrance to social change. According to the author this study has brought to light some interesting ways in which caste-group belonging and educational level, influence responses to 3 scales of psychological traits.
Mundal and Satvir Singh (1975) designed a study to find the hierarchy of personality characteristics and motives of the farmers. 400 farmers were selected from Rohtak Block of Haryana, where agriculture development was perceptible. All the farmers were administered tests of personality, intelligence, motives, interests, aspiration and attitudes. The results indicated that farmers are dominantly achievement motivated and also take interest in politics, religion and intellectual issues. Temperamentally they were shrewd, conscientious, venturesome, stable, self-opinionated, calm and relaxed.

2.5 Achievement: D.S. Rawat has compared the scores of 185 boys and 127 girls on the achievement tests in science, prepared by himself, for fourth form in England. His results show a significant difference between the average scores of boys and girls (C.R. being 7.9). Further he has discovered insignificant difference between means of 56 boys reading in rural schools and 104 in urban schools in class XII, C.R. being 0.308.

Savera (1963), in a comparative study of the achievement in science of urban and rural students, concludes that
the superiority in the performance of urban boys to performance of rural boys and urban girls may be due to:

1) Difference in the standard of teaching;

ii) Qualifications of teachers;

iii) Quality and quantity of apparatus used.

2.6 Socio-Economic Status and Academic Performance:

Victor Jesudasan (1976) developed a model for socio-economic achievement by making use of the conceptual framework of 'socio-economic life cycle'. The model is tested by using a data from a large data set pertaining to male youth (age of 20–21) in three cities (Delhi, Hyderabad and Visakhapatnam). Four indications of social origins viz., father's education, mother's education, father's occupation and family income. Father's education has the largest effect on son's educational attainment. Mother's education has a small but discernible effect on son's education. The occupational attainment is determined by the level of education attained by the youth.

Washbourne (1959) studied the relationship of socio-economic status and urbanism with academic performance in the college and found that while urbanism (upto a population
of 500,000), was positively related to higher academic performance, and socio-economic-status was not related.

Higher education as status stabilizer: students in Bangalore (1977) - In this paper, an attempt has been made at examining the role of higher education which is essentially an urban phenomenon stabilizing the social status structure in urban India, by analyzing the social background of students entering higher and professional education in a metropolis. By examining more closely the pattern of occupational inbreeding among medical students, it was found that, higher education functions as a status stabilizer, contributing to status retention in urban area.

Walter Slocum (1968), studied the influence of reference group values of educational aspirations of rural high school students. Previous studies by American rural sociologists found lower levels of educational aspirations among farm than non-farm high school students. However, information from a statewide study of students in 30 rural high schools in Washington does not confirm earlier findings. On the contrary more farm than non-farm boys aspired and
expected to go to college.

Shatnagar Gurnara Saran's (1963) study is based on the hypotheses that education accelerates the process of social change. Seeks to show how education which is an exogenous factor in village community, has affected the structure of the village. The impact of education, on the beliefs and attitudes of rural people and on various elements of social structure has been also studied.

Harry Schwarsweller (1973) focussed his study on the influence of regional socio-economic circumstances on educational plans of rural-urban in 3 modern industrial societies. The study population consists of high school seniors in 4 areas of Kentucky, 3 areas of Norway and 3 areas of Germany. Regional variations are manifested in all the 3 countries, even when social class and place of residence are controlled.