CHAPTER – II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter research studies revealing the impact of Adjustment, Creativity, Self-concept, Anxiety and Achievement Motivation on Academic Achievement are mentioned in brief, leading to formulation of objectives and hypotheses of the study undertaken.

2.1 Adjustment and Academic Achievement

2.1.1 Studies in Abroad

Semler (1960) found linear correlations between adjustment scores and achievements scores. Sandefur and Bigge (1963) reported inverse relationship between the number of problems and the students achievement scores. Sontakey (1986) found that emotional problems and needs of under-achievers were graver than those of achievers, and achievers were more cooperative and sociable. Chen, et al., (1997) investigated that children's social adjustment contributed to academic achievement. Tamlinson (1998) investigated that academic adjustment and race made independent contributions to academic achievement.

Thus, it was found that investigations conducted in abroad indicated a positive and significant relationship between adjustment and academic achievement.
2.1.2 Studies in India

Mathur (1963) studied the effects of socio-economic status on the achievement and behaviour. The results revealed that achievement was highly correlated with adjustment. Rao (1964) studied the problems of adjustment and academic achievement. It was found that over- and under-achievement groups differed significantly on their adjustment. Sinha's (1966) study revealed that high achievers were found to be superior in intelligence, better in adjustment, and moderate in level of anxiety, whereas low achievers were poor in intelligence, high anxiety level and were very poor in adjustment. Srivastava (1967) found that under-achievement was related to poor family, school and emotional adjustment. Chawla (1970) found that lack of adjustment was one of the factors of the low academic achievement. Hiregange (1970) studied the extent of relation of three variables, viz., intelligence, social-emotional adjustment and socio-economic status with academic achievement. The study upheld that intelligence was the best single predictor of academic success. Next best predictor was socio-emotional adjustment.

Dhaliwal (1971) studied the personality correlates of academic over- and under-achievement. The results revealed that superior study habits, reservedness, high verbal ability, home, emotional and social adjustment and security feelings correspond with over-achievement or academic success, whereas inferior study habits, outgoing tendencies, low verbal ability, emotional instability, assertiveness, happy-go-lucky temperament, poor adjustment in home, emotional and school areas and insecurity feelings were associated with academic under-achievement or academic failure. Saxena (1972) found that the over-
achieving students had consistently and significantly lower number of problems of adjustment in the various areas measured than the under-achievers. Sharma (1972) conducted a comparative study of adjustment of over-and under-achievers. Results showed that there were significant differences among the over-achievers, average-achievers, and under-achievers with regard to their adjustment in the school, home, social, religious and miscellaneous areas. Rai (1974) revealed that adjustment is significantly related to achievement Seetha (1975) found that no significant relationship existed between social adjustment and academic achievement. Mathew (1976) studied some personality factors related to under-achievement in science. The study revealed that the mean scores of normal achievers were significantly less than the mean scores of under-achievers in maladjustment and the mean scores of over-achievers significantly exceeded the mean scores of under-achievers in social skills, freedom from withdrawing tendencies, social standards, freedom from anti-social tendencies, family relations and community relations.

Chopra (1982) found that home adjustment was more closely related to academic achievement than emotional, health and social adjustment. Mehrotra (1986) found that there was a positive relationship between personality adjustment in five areas, viz., home, health, social, emotional and school adjustment and academic achievement. Ramachandran (1990) revealed that adjustment problems have been found to be negatively associated with achievement. Joshi (1990) found that overall achievement of students was not significantly correlated with adjustment in general. Srivastava (1992) delimited his study to class X students of JNVs and gave percentage distribution
for different levels of intelligence, self-concept, SES, occupational aspirations and adjustments: including adjustment all of them were positively related to achievement. Rajamanikam and Vasanthal (1993) found out that there was a significant positive correlation between adjustment and achievement. Rongali (1993) revealed that there was a significant and positive relationship between adjustment and achievement of students of A.P. residential schools.

Majority of studies conducted in India and abroad showed a positive and significant relationship between adjustment and academic achievement. This was true even when different tools were used to measure adjustment both in India and abroad. In other words, those students who were well adjusted with their home, school, society and their emotions achieved better academically and at a higher level than those who were illustrated in those areas of adjustment. Thus, it was found in majority of studies that adjustment among all the variables would influence achievement very significantly.

2.2 Creativity and Academic Achievement

2.2.1 Studies in Abroad

Getzels and Jackson (1962) focussed attention on the relationship between creativity and achievement and they selected two groups of children as ‘High IQ’ and ‘High creative’. The first group comprised of children in the top 20 percent on IQ but not on creativity, while the second group consisted of children in the top 20 percent on creativity but not on IQ. Though the intelligent group had a mean IQ 23 points above that of the creativity group, no significant differences were detected between the two groups.
Torrance (1962a) has conducted, at least, eight replicatory studies in which he avoided some of the shortcomings of Getzels and Jackson. In four of the six studies conducted on elementary school children he found that there were no significant differences in overall academic achievement between the ‘High IQ Group’ and ‘High Creative group’. Also he arrived at the same results in case of both samples of university students which he studied.

Torrance (1962b) has compared the mean achievement scores of ‘High IQ’ and ‘High creative’ groups of school children in four subject areas. Results revealed that highly creative children tend to do better in reading and language skills.

Some correlational studies also provide evidence that high levels of creativity are differently related to success in different subject areas. For example, Torrance (1963) reports partial correlations of 0.48 between creativity and reading skill, and only 0.28 between creativity and arithmetic skill. Cline, Richards and Needham (1963) have also demonstrated that scores on creativity tests correlated significantly with high school science marks.

Flescher (1963) has also tried to clarify the relationship between creativity and achievement in a study in which the validity of implications concerning the comparative influence of unusual creative thinking and exceptional intelligence in the learning process has thoroughly been studied. He found that there existed a significant relationship between intelligence and scholastic performance while creativity was not related to academic success.

In another study, Yamamoto (1964) has revealed that there existed significant differences between high creatives and low-creatives in their school
achievement. Yamamoto (1964b) compared the achievement scores of the 'High Creative Group' with the 'Low Creative Group' allowing for differences in IQ between the two groups. The study showed that the highly creative thinkers surpassed the low-creative children and the differences in achievement between the two groups were not due to differences in their IQ. Thus, the study arrived at the conclusion that there exists a significant relationship between performance on creativity tests and success in school learning.

Hudson (1966) approached the issue of relationship between creativity and academic achievement in a different way. In a series of studies covering several years and involving several hundred boys of proven academic ability, he investigated relationship between academic achievement and intellectual style. He was interested in the extent to which the stylistic biases in the boys' profiles on a number of ability measures, including IQ, accuracy, vocabulary, general knowledge and expressed interests were reflected in their preference for arts or science-type subjects. He observed that it was possible to sort the boys into 'arts-bias' and 'science-bias' groups by examining their score patterns. He arrived at the conclusion that success in a particular subject area is closely related to an individual's intellectual style. Elaborating on this point he suggested that divergent/convergent thinking dichotomy is one major way of conceptualizing differences in intellectual style that the divergent thinkers show an overwhelming performance for arts subjects whereas convergent thinkers strongly give their preference for science subjects. Thus, Hudson's research adds strong support to the idea that preference for a divergent mode of thinking is reflected in a particular pattern of school achievement.
Cropey (1970) has also attempted to investigate the relationship between creativity and school achievement. Results, revealed that the children of the ‘High-High Group’ surpassed all other groups in their achievement which suggests that IQ alone is an inadequate predictor of academic success; at the very least, high achievement as well as low achievement scores can be affected by the creativity scores.

Despite contradictory views on the relationship between creativity and academic achievement there is a large consensus on the positive role of creativity in facilitating achievement. There are differing viewpoints as suggested by different researchers in which creativity may facilitate academic achievement. Bruner (1962) has suggested the conventional intelligence as the basis for creativity. In his view, convergent thinking provides an essential foundation on which the divergent thinker builds. The creative solutions occur only when the relevant field of subject matter is thoroughly known.

The second viewpoint that the minimum level of intelligence is necessary for high levels of achievement. This view is also related to the first view-point that creativity interacts with intelligence in adding to achievement by building on the convergent processes is actually based on the notion that there may be an IQ threshold below which divergent processes cannot operate, and above which they become independent. It is McClelland (1958) who first introduced the threshold concept in hypothesizing the relationship between IQ and achievement. In his observation, IQ and achievement are closely related only upto a certain level and beyond that level, achievement on longer is directly related to IQ but is determined by other factors.
Anderson's (1960) concept of ability gradient seems to be the extension of threshold notion to the divergent thinking, according to which ability level can be thought of in terms of thresholds, meaning thereby that a minimum IQ level may be considered necessary to carry on a task, but beyond that level there are other factors that would determine performance in that task. Likely in achievement, too, the minimal IQ level is necessary but beyond that level creative functioning does not depend on merely IQ but other factors like personality.

Kim and Michal (1995) revealed that measures of creativity showed little relationship to school performance. Females tended to be more creative than males.

2.2.2 Studies in India

Mehdi (1977) points out high correlation between creativity and school achievement. Acharyulu (1978) attempted to test for interactive effects of intelligence and creativity upon achievement in different school subjects. A translated version of the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (both verbal and figural batteries) and cattells Culture Fair Intelligence Test were used to measure creativity and intelligence respectively. The study used correlational and 7x3 factorial (fixed effects) ANOVA designs. Schoffe's contrasts were also used for testing the hypotheses. The study found that the correlations between verbal creativity scores and school achievement were as high as those between intelligence and school achievement.

Menon (1980) revealed the correlations between creativity and
achievement as 0.45, creativity and intelligence as 0.29 and intelligence and achievement as 0.24. Vijayalakshmi (1980) used Nair’s Kerala University Test of Creative Thinking for measuring the creativity of secondary school students and established that average academic achievement of high creatives was more than the average academic achievement of low creatives. She further demonstrated a significant difference between high creatives and low creatives in academic achievement. Sharma (1982) reported that scholastic achievement was found to be positively related to the measures of creativity. The study of Singh (1982) showed that verbal, non-verbal and total creative thinking variables had positive and significant relationship with academic achievement of high school boys and girls. In a study conducted by Dye (1984) on National Rural Talent Scholarship awardees has also demonstrated the positive and significant relationship between creativity and the total subsequent achievement scores of N.R.T.S awardees.

Brar (1986) attempted to compare the performance in B.Ed. examination of high creative and low creative boys and girls. This study revealed that the influence of creativity on performance in the B.Ed. examination for the total sample was significant in case of total performance and theory part while it was not significant in case of skill-in-teaching and the art and craft parts. In the multiple predictions of total performance in the B.Ed. examination with the help of creativity for boys and girls separately, in case of boys creativity made a significant contribution. The contribution of creativity was higher in case of boys as compared to that for the total sample. In case of girls creativity made no significant contribution in predicting total performance in B.Ed. examination.
The study of Golwalkar (1986) showed that high creative non-tribal students had a higher scholastic achievement in science subject than the tribal students.

Raina (1986) undertook a study on psycho-social correlates of scientific creativity among high school students and revealed that, students who had high problem solving ability in science were more creative in science than their peers with middle and low problem-solving ability. The mean scientific creativity score of high achievers in science was more than that of middle and low achievers. Further, middle achievers were more creative than low achievers in science. Rani (1986) arrived at a conclusion that high and low creative subjects were significantly differentiated on scholastic achievement in humanities, literature, together with overall achievement scores. Positive and significant correlations were obtained between creativity index and scholastic achievement in science, humanities, literature, together with overall scholastic achievement scores. Kaile (1988) found that the conjoint effect of intelligence and creativity is different on achievement in different subjects.

Irudayaraj (1989): Padhan (1990): Thilagavathi (1990): Patel (1992): and Arora (1992) selected creativity as one of the variables in their study to investigate its relationship with achievement. All except Irudayaraj found significant relationship between the two variable. Chadha and Chandna (1990) arrived at a positive first order correlation between creativity and achievement, but when the influence of intelligence was partialled out they got only a negative correlation between creativity and achievement. Perhaps the achievement measured was in opposite direction to divergent thinking. Padhi (1991) studied along with main effects, the interaction effects also and found
the interaction of creativity and classroom environment significant on scholastic achievement. Gupta (1991) identified deprived and non-deprived adolescents of high and low SES and analysed difference in their personality traits, level of adjustment, intelligence and academic achievement. She found male students and students of non-deprived home environment to exhibit extrovert tendencies. The non-deprived students were more intelligent, more creative and high achieving as compared to deprived students.

Bawa and Kaur (1995) found that there was a better relationship between creativity and languages than between creativity and social studies and general science achievement measures. Khare and Grewal (1997) investigated that the coefficients of correlation between creativity and academic achievement of students studying in urban and rural primary schools were significant. Further, coefficients of correlations for urban girls were also found significant.

Thus, it is found from the above review of related studies that there were controversial findings in respect of the relationship between creativity and academic achievement of high school pupils. Therefore, a study was taken up to pin-point the nature and extent of relationship between creativity and academic achievement of JNV students.

2.3 Self-Concept and Academic Achievement

2.3.1 Studies in Abroad

Caplain (1960) working with elementary school children found a significant positive relationship between self-concept and academic achievement.
Fink (1962) showed a relationship between adequacy of self-concept and level of academic achievement. Everett (1962) established a relationship between scholastic achievement and self-concept. Taylor (1964) concluded that the value the students place upon their own worth affects their achievement which means that academic under-achievers are less confident, less optimistic and less self-accepting than academic achievers. Brookover and Thomas (1964) study indicated that specific self-concept of ability is a significantly better predictor of grade point average in mathematics, social studies and science: the same did not hold for females except in social studies.

Edwards (1966) investigated into the prediction of college success with biographical data and self-ratings and found the relationship of self-concept with academic achievement to be linear. Blair (1968) also found the relationship to be linear in the case of Negro students. Brookover, Hamacheck and Erickson (1966) found that there was a relationship between self-concept and academic achievement of students in secondary schools. Quimby (1967) found a relationship between low self-ideal and under-achievement. Engle, Davis and Mayer (1968) found that under-achievement was function of the student’s attitude towards himself. Jones and Grieneeks (1970) found that self-perception appeared to be the most accurate predictor of academic achievement. Cole (1974) found highest correlation between self-concept and total achievement in mathematics.

Graham (1975) found that the student’s reading achievement scores were significantly related to their intellectual and school status self-concept scores and the mathematics achievement scores were significantly related to both their
behavioural and intellectual and school status self-concept scores. In Graig’s (1976) study, significant positive correlations were found between gains in self-concept and gains in academic achievement.

Maqsud and Rouhani (1991) reported that self-concept was significantly correlated with measures of achievement in English and mathematics. Mboya (1993) found a significant positive relationship was found between self-concept and academic achievement between boys and girls, but magnitude of this relationship was stronger for girls than for boys. Jeon (1993) found that self-concept was correlated with intelligence but not with achievement. Schicke and Fagan (1994) observed significant positive correlations between general self-concept and academic achievement.

Gaskin et al., (1995) reported that self-esteem was not a significant predictor of academic achievement, in case of children of low-income families. Helmake, et al., (1995) reported that in elementary school, prior self-concept does not significantly contribute to the prediction of subsequent achievement. Marsh and Yeung (1997) study revealed that self-concept effects tended to be larger and more systematic for mathematics than for science and particularly English.

2.3.2 Studies in India

Self-concept is a variable most often selected by researchers. Bhatnagar (1966) noticed a definite relationship between the ego-function and scholastic performance. Mehta (1968) studied the self-concept of bright under-achieving students in relation to their academic achievement and found
the relationship to be linear. Sharma (1968) revealed that self-concept scores were curvilinearly related to school achievement. Vanarase (1970) found that the achievers were found to be more self-confident, more independent, more mature, emotionally more stable and more conscientious. Saxena (1972) found that a positive self-concept was associated with higher academic achievement in mathematics, commerce and arts streams.

In Ramkumar’s (1976) study, it was found that there was relationship between self-concept and academic achievement and it was positive and significant. Goswami (1978) found that global self-concept and scholastic achievement had a significant positive correlation.

Homchauduri (1980) found that self-concept emerged as the most significant correlate of academic performance. Further, he found that there was no significant difference between the girls and the boys with regard to their self-concept. Hirunval (1980) found that self-concept, pupils' academic performance and classroom climate were positively related. Singh (1983) studied the relationship between self-concept and academic achievement of male and female students. He found that there was a positive and significant relationship between self-concept and academic achievement of arts, science and commerce students. There was significant difference in the self-concept of high and low academic achievers. This was true in both rural as well as urban male and female students. He also found that there was no significant difference in the self-concept of urban male and female high achievers.
Sween (1984) studied the impact of self-concept on students performance. He found that students with high self-concept achieved significantly higher scores than those with low self-concept. Pathani (1985) investigated the effect of self-concept and need (self-actualisation) on academic achievement of adolescents. He found that self-concept was a significant predictor of academic achievement (actual) and academic achievement (perceived). Patel (1987) found that the total achievement was positively related with self-concept, the social aspect of teacher estimation and achievement motivation in the scheduled caste group.

Srivastava (1992) delimited his study to class X students of JNVs and gave percentage distributions for different levels of intelligence, self-concept, SES, occupational aspirations and adjustment; including self-concept all of them were positively related to achievement. The study by Madasamy (1992) is innovative in that it attempts to develop a positive self-concept among adolescent girls through an experimental case study method. It was found that the level of self-concept of adolescent girls increases after implementation of consciously designed intervention programmes. As self-concept is seen related to the desire to learn, it was found that the positive development of self-concept in the pupils is likely to increase their favourable attitude towards schools and enhance their academic achievement. Krishnan (1993) investigated the significant relationship between self-concept and academic achievement of the college students.

Rangappa (1994) studied the effect of self-concept on achievement in mathematics. He found that: (i) There was a significant difference in
achievement of the students of class VII in mathematics belonging to high, normal and low self-concept groups. (ii) The students of class VII belonging to high self-concept group performed better in mathematics than the students belonging to normal self-concept group. (iii) There was a high significant difference of achievement between high and low self-concept groups. Students of class VII belonging to high self-concept group performed better in mathematics than the students belonging to the low-self-concept group. (iv) The students of class VII belonging to normal self-concept group performed better in mathematics than the students belonging to low self-concept group.

Maikhuri and Pande (1997) revealed that academic achievement and self-concept were not significantly related. Minnalkodi (1997) found that there was a significant positive relationship among achievement scores and self-concept of students.

All the studies reviewed above indicated that self-concept and academic achievement were positively related to each other. But the research investigations conducted by Jeon (1993); Helmake et al., (1995); Maikhuri and Pande (1997) arrived at altogether contradictory results. Hence, there was a need for the present study to probe into further details about the nature of relationship of self-concept with academic achievement.

2.4 Anxiety and Academic Achievement

2.4.1 Studies in Abroad

Cox (1960) investigated into correlates of general and test anxiety in children to identify the optimum level of anxiety (motivation) needed to do a
difficult task. He found that there is a curvilinear relationship between anxiety and academic achievement. Sarason (1961) conducted a study on anxiety and the intellectual performance of college students. For both males and females, anxiety correlated negatively and significantly with eleven of the thirteen intellectual measures. Feldhersen and Klausmeier (1962) studied anxiety, intelligence and achievement of children of low, average and high intelligence and found that anxiety and achievement were negatively related. Philips (1962) studied social class anxiety as sources of variation on school achievement. He found a negative relationship between anxiety and scholastic achievement. Walter, Denzler and Sarason (1964) studied anxiety and the intellectual performance. Test anxiety was significantly and negatively related to intellectual test performance. In Lunneberg's (1964) study the correlation between the anxiety and achievement measures for each grade was all negative (range -0.18 to -0.32) and statistically significant, indicating that high anxiety was associated with poorer achievement in reading and arithmetic.

Carrier and Jewell (1966) studied the efficiency in measuring the effect of anxiety upon academic performance. He found that prediction of examination performance was better for female than male subjects when anxiety was considered as an independent variable and a score on a final examination performance was taken as dependent variable. Mulroy (1966) investigated the relationship between anxiety level and achievement in reading and arithmetic. It was concluded that anxiety had a detrimental effect on all children regardless of sex, age, or social status. Hill and Sarason (1971) studied anxiety in repeaters. They found a distinct tendency that repeaters to be more anxious than children making normal progress through the grades.
Randel, et al., (1992) found that anxiety had significant correlation with academic achievement. Williams (1993) reported that the test anxiety and self-concept were related independently and approximately equal to student academic achievement, overall and across all four content sub-areas. Schonetter (1995) reported that gender and test anxiety differentially influenced students learning and learning outcomes. Low test-anxious males showed higher achievement outcomes. perceived more success over their performances, and felt more confident than high test-anxious male or female. Lucking and Manning (1996) reported that anxiety is one among the factors contributing to low academic achievement. Newbegin and Owens (1996) reported that study state anxiety is negatively related to academic achievement. Williams (1996) found that anxiety was related to lower performance on science achievement test.

2.4.2 Studies in India

A few of the Indian researchers studied the relationship of anxiety with academic achievement. Adaval, Kakkar, Agarwal and Gupta (1961) studied the causes of failure. They concluded that working under anxiety and tension, and lack of guidance while selecting the courses were other reasons given by students for their failure in examinations. Singh (1965) conducted a study to discover some of the non-intellectual correlates of academic achievement of college students. The study revealed that, among other conclusions, that academic achievement was negatively related to anxiety.

Sinha (1966) analysed some of the factors associated with success and failure in university education. He also found that anxiety and achievement
were found to be negatively correlated. Raina (1966) undertook an exploratory study of children's anxiety. It was found that the relationship between anxiety and achievement for both sexes was negative and significant. Sinha (1967) found that academic achievement was positively and significantly related to anxiety at 0.01 level. Pandit (1969) studied the role of anxiety in academic learning and achievement. The important findings were: (i) Anxiety bore a negative relationship with learning and academic achievement. (ii) Subjects having less anxiety were found superior in learning and achievement, irrespective of the task difficulty. (iii) High learners and achievers were more anxious than low achievers and learners in motivating context situations. Sharma (1969) studied the relationship between anxiety and achievement. It was found that negative correlation existed between anxiety and academic achievement.

Bhaduri (1971) reported that over-achievers tended to be less anxious. Dhaliwal (1971) studied some factors contributing to academic success and failure among high school students—personality correlates of academic over- and under-achievement. He found that anxiety and need for achievement bore a curvilinear relationship with over- and under-achievement. Singh (1972) explored the relationship between anxiety and academic achievement. The result indicated a negative correlation between academic achievement and anxiety. Rai (1974) studied a few differential personality correlates of low and high achievers. He found that anxiety as a personality trait had a changing role in scholastic achievement. Low level of anxiety helped in achieving high, whereas, very high level of anxiety was detrimental to achievement. Tiwari and Rai (1976) conducted a study of differential
personality correlates of low and high achievers. They found that: (i) Low achievers were significantly more anxious than high achievers at 1% level. It means that anxiety is a differential personality correlate of low and high achievers. (ii) Normal degree of anxiety does not affect achievement. (iii) There is a negative relationship between anxiety and achievement. **Hussain (1977)** undertook a study of academic attainment in relation to the level of aspiration and anxiety. The overall results showed that anxiety and level of aspiration had significant effect on academic achievement. Moderate anxiety and moderate level of aspiration were significantly related to high academic attainment. While high and low anxiety and high and low level of aspiration were significantly related to low academic achievement. **Christian (1977)** studied anxiety in relation to performance and reported that there was a significant negative relationship between performance and anxiety.

**Lakshmi (1977)** found that high anxiety students showed more significant gains in performance than the low anxiety students. **Tripathi (1978)** studied that academic achievement had a negative though significant relationship with anxiety. **Homchauduri (1980)** found that anxiety had low positive significant relationship with academic performance. **Deshpande (1984)** found that the students from the low-achieving schools were more anxious than the students of the high-achieving school. **Lall (1984)** found that academic success was negatively and significantly related to personal problems and sensitivity, anxiety and neuroticism. **Mehrotra (1986)** found that both for the boys and girls an inverse relationship between level of anxiety and academic achievement. **Patel (1987)** studied the relationship between anxiety and academic
achievement. He found that there was no relationship between anxiety and achievement. Sabapathy (1986) studied the relationship between anxiety and academic achievement. He found that anxiety was negatively and significantly related to achievement in mathematics, achievement in general science, achievement in social studies and total academic achievement. Gupta (1987) found that anxiety had a significant negative correlation with academic achievement for the total sample, arts and science groups, boys and girls, boys of arts group and girls of science group, girls of science group of the middle socio-economic status, internal boys of the arts curriculum and external girls of the arts curriculum. Further, he found that academic achievement and anxiety differentiated the maximum number of groups.

Namrata (1992) revealed that stress is negatively related to achievement. Trivedi (1995) noticed a negative relationship between the anxiety levels and academic achievement among the girls students of commerce and arts streams. But among boys and students of science stream a positive correlation had been found, but the correlation had been found to be very low and not significant.

Verma (1996) found that there was significant main effect of test anxiety on academic performance of students in English, mathematics, general science and social studies. It was, further, revealed that students with low test anxiety scored higher in these courses than students with high test anxiety. Patel (1997) found that low test anxiety group showed better performance in mathematics than the high test anxiety group.
Thus, the studies reviewed above showed contradictory results. There was no unanimity among the researchers as to what actually would be the influence of anxiety on academic achievement. Hence there was a need for the present study to probe into further details about the nature of relationship of anxiety with academic achievement.

2.5 Achievement Motivation and Academic Achievement

2.5.1 Studies in Abroad

**Uhlinger** and **Stephens (1960)** made a study on achievement motivation and its relation to academic achievement of students of superior ability. The hypothesis that high achievers evidence greater need for achievement than do low achievers was confirmed. **Atkinson** and **Litwin (1960)** reported a positive correlation between achievement motivation and persistence and performance in examination. **Sultan (1961)** made an analysis of factors related to educational achievement. It was concluded that a child’s poor performance might be due to lack of basic ability or to lack of motivation and of positive emotional involvement. **Caplehorn** and **Sultan (1965)** conducted a study on need achievement and its relation to school performance anxiety and intelligence they found that need achievement to be significantly related to the academic performance of students. **Ringness (1967)** studied identification patterns, motivation and school achievement. Low achievers were found more motivated than others to affiliate with peers; high achievers were more motivated academically. **Entwistle** and **Entwistle (1970)** conducted a study to find out the relationship between academic motivation and school attainment. The results
of the study showed that there was significant positive relationship between academic motivation and school attainment.

Raynor and Rubin (1971) studied the effects of achievement motivation and future orientation on level of performance. The results indicated that the high achievement motivation and low test anxiety students performed better than the low achievement motivation and high test anxiety students. Bruce (1977) identified five factors affecting the academic performance of Indian students: self-concept, achievement motivation, anti-Indian discrimination, culture conflict and family instability. Analysis suggested that achievement motivation and culture conflict were the most important correlates of academic achievement. Schultz (1993) reported that achievement motivation is a significant mediator of academic performance among minority children, independent of intellectual ability.

2.7.2 Studies in India

Muthayya (1965) studied achievement motivation among high and low achievers in scholastic field. He observed that the mean score on need-achievement of the high achievers was greater than that of low achievers. Bhatnagar (1967) undertook a study of the personality variables as predictors of academic achievement. It was found that need for achievement correlated positively with academic achievement of students. Sinha (1967) conducted a study of intelligence and some personality factors in relation to academic achievement of school students. He found that academic achievement was positively and significantly related to achievement motivation. Mehta (1968)
conducted a research on achievement motive. The achievement motivation showed a low but significant positive relationship with the total school marks. Mehta, et al., (1969) undertook a study on the achievement motive in high school boys. He found that the achievement motivation level showed positive correlation with the performance at the annual examination.

Gokul Nathan (1970) studied social class, education, achievement in relation to achievement motivation. Results indicated that there was a relationship between achievement motivation and academic achievement. Chandrakala (1972) undertook a study of academic motivation and performance in school examination. The coefficient of correlation between academic motivation and scholastic performance was 0.63 and it was significant at 0.05 level. High achievers and low achievers significantly differed on academic motivation. Dutt and Subhrawal (1973) conducted a survey of the achievement motivation level of the Delhi students and found that the mean n-Achievement level was quite high and the magnitude of the correlation (Pearsonian) between academic achievement and achievement motivation was 0.45.

Srivastava (1974) studied the effect of academic and personality characteristics on the academic achievement. He revealed that academic motivation was found to influence the academic achievement even if SES and intelligence were held constant. High and low academic achievers were found to differ significantly in their academic motivation. Walaytiram (1974) studied the effect of some non-cognitive factors on the high school examination results. The conclusions of the study were: (i) Achievement motivation had significant
influence on all the subject at the lower level of intelligence but at the higher level in science only. (ii) Motivation did not show any effect unless it was of a sufficiently high order. Pathak (1974) studied the achievement motive, educational norms and school performance of high school pupils. He found that the pupils studying in schools of high socio-economic and achieving status had high n-Achievement scores. Achievement motivation score was positively related to pupils school performance.

Seetha (1975) found that greater need achievement was noted in case of high achievers than low and non-achievers. Parikh (1976) studied the achievement motivation, school performance and educational norms of secondary school pupils. The study revealed that the achievement motivation was positively related to performance. Patel (1977) found that there was a significant positive relationship between achievement motivation and performance. Christian (1977) revealed that there was significant positive correlation between achievement motivation and academic achievement. Shanmugasundaram (1983) investigated the influence of achievement motivation on academic achievement. He found that among high achieving urban students, achievement motivation had a significant positive influence upon academic achievement. He also found that women students had greater achievement motivation and they also performed academically better than men students. Deshpande (1984) working with high and low-achieving school achievement motivation was found to be higher in the students on the high-achieving schools than those of the low-achieving schools.

Maitra (1985) found that achievement motivation and extraversion positively and significantly related with academic achievement for both sexes.
but both lost significant effect on academic achievement when intelligence was partialled out. Sontakey (1986) found that the achievement motivation was a poor predictor of achievement in biological as well as natural sciences. Besides, high achievers and low achievers did not differ significantly on achievement motivation. Further, he found that achievement motivation had positive association with achievement in biological sciences as well as in natural sciences. Mehta (1987) found that students who had high achievement motivation achieved higher school achievement. Promod (1996) investigated that achievement motivation was the most dominating factor on academic performance.

Minnalkodi (1997) revealed that there was a significant positive relationship among achievement scores and achievement motivation of students. Rao and Rao (1997) found that there was a positive correlation between achievement motivation and academic achievement.

Thus, it was found from the above review of related studies that there were controversial findings in respect of the relationship between achievement motivation and academic achievement of high school pupils. Therefore, a study was taken up to pin-point the nature and extent of relationship between achievement motivation and academic achievement of JNV students.

2.6 Conclusions

From what has been reviewed above, it may be concluded that:

(i) Some of the findings of the studies quoted above are contradictory. In the light of these conflicting results it is of great importance to pursue the study and examine the problem in greater detail.
(ii) It may be further noted that the studies reviewed above included only two to three or at the most four independent variables to find their relationships to academic achievement and also to predict achievement. No study has included as many as five predictor variables (with 10 compounds) of academic achievement.

(iii) Very few of the studies have investigated the actual adjustment problems of students particularly in the new climate prevailing in JNVs in different areas and their relationship with academic achievement of students studying in JNVs.

(iv) Very few studies have investigated the factors affecting the academic achievement of JNV students.

(v) Therefore, there is a need to bring together greater number of variables influencing academic achievement of JNV students and to study their relative contribution in predicting academic achievement of JNV students.

In the light of the literature cited above objectives and hypotheses of the study were formulated and appropriate methods of analysis were carried out.
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