A BRIEF REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

EMPIRICAL STUDIES ON COMPETENCE MOTIVATION

Motivation is the driving force behind all the actions of a person. It is a significant aspect in daily life. Individuals’ primary behaviors and feelings are influenced by his or her inner drive to be successful over life’s challenges whereas he or she place goals for himself or herself. Motivation is differently experienced by the people, whether motivation is task or ego-based in nature. Some of them struggle to achieve their goals for personal pleasure or satisfaction and self-improvement whereas some compete with their environment in achievement situation to basically be classified as the most excellent. An individual’s motivation also encourage his feelings of competence and self-confidence as he or she achieve his goals and provides him with means to compete with others in order to improve himself and to search for new information to learn and absorb. This motivation which is aimed at self improvement and which increase one’s sense of competence has been treated in the recent literature as competence motivation.

Traditionally, the wholistic construct of motivation was bifurcated into two forms i.e intrinsic and extrinsic of the empirical studies available in the field have been keeping focus on one or the other. Intrinsic motivation is the degree to which people chooses to participate in an activity for the pleasure derived from the task itself rather than for any extrinsic reward that may be forthcoming (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Intrinsically motivated, people experience enjoyment, interest in an activity and feelings of competence and control whereas extrinsically motivated individuals participate in an activity to receive a reward or avoid a punishment, they usually do not want to perform the task and think that it is not in their control on whether they succeed or not. Keefe and Jenkins, (1993) reported that If these people perform the task, they anticipate some sort of gain other than knowledge, for example rewards,
praise or keep away from punishment. In order to account for the striving to achieve success with reference to a given goal, the construct of achievement motivation was proposed by McClelland, Atkinson, Clark & Lowell, (1953) and became the central point of empirical investigations. Achievement motivation is individuals’ motivation to achieve success, enjoyment of overcome obstacles and completing assignments, the drive to struggle for success and excellence.

Hence, various researchers have tried to address the issue from varied and differing angles, mainly focusing on intrinsic, extrinsic and achievement motivation. The construct of competence motivation which came into existence later on to account for a general drive aimed at self-improvement and to increase one’s sense of competence drew least attention for researchers so far. Empirical studies of motivation which have direct or indirect implications for the study from the point of view of competence motivation of students have been reviewed in the following pages.

McClelland and Atkinson conducted a lot of studies to demonstrate the significance of the achievement motive for prediction of career performance and success (Atkinson, 1966; McClelland, 1985, 1987; McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1953; McClelland & Boyatzis, 1982; McClelland & Franz, 1992). Positive correlations have been invariably reported between achievement motive construct and academic performance (Busato, Prins, Elshout, & Hamaker, 2000; Giesen, Gold, Hummer, & Jansen, 1986; Robbins et al., 2004; Trapmann, 2008; Trapmann, Hell, & Schuler, 2007).

A person who have fear of failure does not desire to take any risk, but when forced he preferred to choose either a easy task so that he is not failed, or choose so difficult a task that it cannot be predictable to be completed. Atkinson and Feather, (1966) conducted an experiment with five-year-olds in which a ring-toss was used to help recognize individual motivation levels. Those five-year-olds who had high motivation levels have a propensity to
throw ring-toss at goals of medium complexity and in contrast five-year-olds who had low motivation levels tended to avoid goals of medium difficulty. Five-year-olds who had low motivation level have a propensity to select tasks which were very close, or those which were far-away. In a study on intrinsic and extrinsic motivated students Condry and Chambers, (1978) found that students with intrinsic orientation used more logical information gathering and decision-making strategy in comparison of those students who were extrinsically oriented.

Latta, (1974) assumed that the proposed attempt or efforts on the assignment play a role in achievement motivation. If the person has already related experiences or skills in performing the assignment, the quantity of proposed effort to complete the task would be low, and the chances for a positive result were improved and on the other hand if the person had no experiences or skills, then the planned effort was great, and the probability for a positive result were reduced.

Shanab and colleagues, (1981) conducted a study on undergraduates and found that positive verbal feedback during a puzzle-solving assignment led undergraduates to spend more time on the assignment and to rate their concentration as higher than participants in a control condition who received neutral feedback. They further revealed that praise contributed an increase of intrinsic motivation. On the other hand Pittman et al., 1982, found intrinsic motivational orientation was characterized by a first choice for tasks that were relatively composite, difficult, challenging, and enjoyable, lead the person to increase more competence over time and extrinsic motivational orientation lead participants to prefer tasks that were relatively simple, expected, and easily completed. They further supported that introduction of rewards promoted an extrinsic motivational orientation.

Meaher and Braskamp, (1986), McClelland and his colleagues organized the study of motivation by designing evaluation procedures to
recognize the characteristics related with highly motivated individuals. McClelland, (1961, 1985) investigation identify the motives which were linked their wish to be successful. These persons revealed specific behavior that identified them as “achievers”. This type of Study centered on achievement motivation.

Lepper, (1982) reported in his study that intrinsically motivated students be likely to use plans that require more attempts or efforts and that facilitate them to process information more deeply. They also select assignments that were more challenging and were willing to put in greater amounts of attempt to accomplish learning goals. In contrast, extrinsically oriented learners were prone to enlarge the minimal amount of attempts effort required to get the maximal reward. This study also demonstrated that, in certain conditions, extrinsic rewards had potential for declining existing intrinsic motivation.

A large number of studies (Langens, 2005; McClelland et. al., 1989; Schmalt & Sokolowski, 2000; Schultheiss & Brunstein, 2005) have showed that implicit motives were triggered by natural stimulus, like activity incentives, encouragements or characteristics of a task itself. They were stimulated by environmental signal that sign the accessibility of a satisfying emotion (Schultheiss & Brunstein, 1999). Further, Langens et. al., (2005), found that individuals who have high explicit accomplishment or achievement orientation recognize themselves to be highly achievement-oriented. These explicit achievement motives were strongly linked with the self-concept of persons’ own abilities or skills. Individuals with high explicit achievement motive did not essentially had a need to carry out high-quality presentation but they were just worried to appear to be competent for their personal satisfaction and in front of others. These individuals had goal to produce high achievement with the purpose of outperform other persons satisfy difficult principles of superiority (Langens, 2005).
Woike, (1995); Woike et al., (2003), conducted a study and found that how implicit and explicit motives vary in terms of their relationship with memory. In a study of 1995, it was shown that when self-conceptions and well-articulated standards which communicated to explicit motives, were made relevant, subjects recalled more content-specific routine most-memorable experiences. But when specific affective states which communicated to implicit motives, were made relevant, subjects recalled more domain-specific affective most-memorable experiences.

In the further investigation, Woike et. al., (2003) studied how implicit and explicit motives were associated with the autobiographical knowledge. Participants who wrote in relation to an emotional experience with an achievement theme, had high implicit need for achievement, and those participants who wrote in relation to a self-descriptive experience, had high explicit need for achievement. Implicit achievement grades were also higher for participants who recalled a specific memory, and explicit achievement grades were higher for those participants who recalled common events. By taking 822 students from different subjects as their sample, Trapmann et. al., (2007) conducted a study to explore the relationship between different cognitive, temperamental, and motivational predictors, and academic success criteria (scores, academic satisfaction, progress or improvement and learning behavior). The findings of the study revealed that academic scores were best predicted by a combination of school scores, higher intelligence, and a higher level of the extrinsic achievement motive.

There was ample confirmation for positive results of implicit/explicit motive equivalence. Brunstein et.al., (1995) hypothesized that varying degrees of motivational similarity might be reproduced in persons dissimilarities in affecting experiences of emotional happiness. This was assumed by them that individuals who were engaged in objectives or goals that thematically correspond with their implicit first choices should exhibit high
happiness in contrast to people who were worried with motive-incongruent concerns. Based on the difference between organization and unity, they classified motivational themes of power and achievement as agentic concerns, and categorized attachment and intimacy related concerns like communal strivings. The results of this demonstrated that greater participation in motive-congruent goals was usually linked with higher levels of well-being for example, among learners with a strong communal motive, struggling for communal-oriented goals was reproduced in better mood. Likewise, among students with a strong agentic motive, struggling for agentic goals was positively associated to well-being. Learners who were strongly engaged in tasks that did not suited to their motives reported comparatively low happiness.

Gottfried, (1990) in her study found that there is a relationship between motivation and achievement, but she preserve that the underlying relationship works in the opposite direction. Similar to consequences from other studies, she reported that elementary-age children with higher academic intrinsic motivation be likely to have, more positive perception of their academic competence and they tend to show higher achievement and IQ and lower academic anxiety. Keefe and Jenkins, (1993) revealed that Students who had high motivation to achieve usually performed well academically in comparison of students who had low motivation. But motivation did not assurance achievement likewise, achievement did not reflect motivation.

Pyszczynski & Greenberg, (1987) and Baumeister & Newman, (1994) conducted a study and found that motivated employee was driven by motivation to explore, whereas unmotivated employee was driven by motivation to avoid or keep away from means motivated individuals had a lower cost of processing information in comparison of unmotivated individuals. Motivated individuals showed interest for obtaining information that was helpful for the production process. Dickinson, (1987) asserted that success
improved motivation in only those students who were paying attention on learning goals, i.e who were intrinsically or implicitly motivated. Koestner & McClelland, (1990) viewed that research on intrinsic motivation had directed to the conclusion that intrinsic motivation would be better in situations that promote feelings of challenge, competence and autonomy. It was also asserted by them that if external actions improve feelings of competence, like when someone was informed that he or she had completed a task very well, intrinsic motivation was expected to enhance. In contrast, events that direct feelings of incompetence were expected to weaken intrinsic motivation.

High achievers work harder and will attempt to use different resources to achieve success. Research by Senecal et. al., (1995) demonstrated that even when all possibilities of failure were removed from a condition, many learners would put off, give up or not try the assignment if the result had no perceived value. Halonen, (1995) observed that an individuals’ tendency to display higher-order thoughts links to his motivation.

Intrinsic motivation has been examined by social and educational psychologists since the early 1970s. Investigations had found that Intrinsic motivation was typically related with high scholastic accomplishment and enjoyment by students. It was significant for parents and teachers, to recognize why supporting and encouraging educational motivation from an early age was very important for educational accomplishment at any age. For the reason that learners form self-concepts, standards, and beliefs about their skills adolescent age, the development of early academic motivation had important inferences for later on educational careers. It was observed by Blank, (1997) that students high in academic motivation were more likely to had improved levels of academic achievement and had lower failure or dropout rates. In a study on young children Metsala, Wigfield and McCann, (1997) found that positively motivated young children, had a strong sense of their individual competency and efficacy in comparison of low motivated
students, on the other hand, Skinner & Belmont, (1991) revealed that less motivated children were submissive, did not try hard, and quit easily in the appearance of challenge or difficulties. Alderman, (1999) revealed in his study that students frequently thought that skill was the primary component for attaining success and the main cause for failure was lack of skill. Their motive then be converted into avoiding failure and protecting their confidence from the perception that they had low skill. If the student attribute achievement to ability, attempt may be seen as useless, and the student may in fact decrease attempt to protect their self-respect. For some students, the means to avoid failure was to succeed. Even though achieving the product was a success. Instead of gain the rewards or benefits of the outcome, the goal for these students was to not fail or to avoid failure at any rate (Simons et. al., 1999).

A great number of researches (Deci et. al., 1991; Hardre & Reeve, 2003; Reeve, 2002) support the unequivocal role of social support in academic motivation success. Students who perceive their parents and teachers as supporting and stimulating their autonomy and competence were more intrinsically motivated at school (Reeve et. al., 1999). Vallerand et al., (1997) also found that students in classrooms with autonomy-supportive teachers were more likely to stay in school in comparison of students in classrooms with controlling teachers. It was observed by Furrer & Skinner,(2003); Ryan & Powelson, (1991) that Relatedness has also been revealed to have a controlling influence on academic motivation. Various previous researchers (Broussard & Garrison, 2004; Gottfried, 1990; Lange & Adler, 1997) have reported that there is a comparatively consistent association between motivation and achievement in reading and math. Additionally, Motivation was also linked to achievement and IQ.

Eppler and Harju, (1997) studied the relationship between achievement motivation and academic performance within a model that also included students’ background factors and learning behavior and work commitments.
They found that achievement motivation was a better predictor of academic success in comparison of other predictors.

D. Allen, (1999) conducted a study and observed the structural relationships among motivation, background of student, academic performance, and perseverance. It was found by him that motivation was not directly related to academic performance but that it did predict perseverance and also found that academic performance was directly influenced by the parents’ education, financial support, and high school grade. Similarly, Robbins et. al., (2002) found that goal directedness or a generalized sense of reason and accomplishment, envisaged reduce in psychological suffering which was a key indicator of first-year college dropout. Simultaneously, goal directedness did not directly envisaged end of year educational performance but was arbitrated by educational behaviors such as learning skills, class attendance, etc.

Number of investigations had confirmed the relationship between the needs for autonomy or independence, competence and relatedness and resultant intrinsic motivation and happiness across different areas of person’s life (Illardi et al., 1993; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Baard, Deci, & Ryan, 2004). Positive feedback, which satisfied individual’s need for competence, improved intrinsic motivation, while negative feedback thwarted felt competence satisfaction and declined intrinsic motivation (Vallerand & Reid, 1984; Vansteenkiste & Deci, 2003). People with a high need for achievement was very responsive to the chance to do something better than before or than others and to improve abilities (McClelland, 1985; Brunstein & Heckhausen, 2008). As a result they choose challenging tasks of moderate difficulty from which they get realistic feedback about performance and ability (Atkinson, 1957). For them, the struggling for and attainment of achievement goals were accompanied by positive emotions such as interest and proud. On the contrary, the same class of situations were said to be much less attractive for
people who had lower need for achievement. Additionally, low need for achievement people did not feel positive emotions whereas struggling for and accomplishing the achievement goal. They vary from high achievement motivated people in the skill of getting satisfaction from seeking and attaining a particular type of reward such as competence feeling (McClelland, 1985; Brunstein et. al., 1998).

Studies conducted by Atkinson, (1999) demonstrated a percentage of learners will work hard to attain a goal, they did not enjoy, only to preserve their high grade point standard or high class rank. This reproduces back on the learner’s feelings toward success. Those students who hold a high attitude of success work hard to attain success, in spite of the goal. High achievement motivation and high achievement may be related with normal perfectionism or thoroughness (Accordino et. al., 2000).

Research since the 1950s has centered on three most important motivational needs, the need for achievement ($n_{Achievement}$), the need for power ($n_{Power}$), and the need for affiliation ($n_{Affiliation}$). From all the motivational classifications the achievement motive attracted the most concentration due to its significance in all areas of life. Many investigators presumed that along with the cognitive abilities, general achievement motivation can be examined as the second career relevant trait, significant for both academic and career success (Eckardt & Schuler, 1992; Schuler & Prochaska, 2001; Zimmermann, 2008).

By taking 244 students from 9 to 12 grades as their sample, McCoach and Siegle, (2001) found that there was a statistically significant differences among high and low achievers on the subsequent five factors: attitudes toward school and educators, motivation, goal-valuation and general academic self-perceptions. On the other hand, academic self-perceptions and motivation or self-regulation, envisaged students’ achievement, as well as the five-factor model (McCoach & Siegle 2001). It was also found that academic
self-perceptions and motivation were the two factors that envisage academic achievement the best. Green et. al., (2006) hold this result when they asserted that motivation and self-concept were directly attached to students’ financial success and long-term wellbeing and happiness. Consequently, scholastic self-concept and motivation were two significant variables in academic achievement, and can envisage educational accomplishment, as well as reason discrepancy in scholastic success. Eccles & Wigfield, (2002) observed in their empirical study that children attached more value to actions at which they perform better than others and were increasingly more motivated to study subjects in which they experience achievement.

Sanchez and Roda, (2004) conducted a study on primary school students and took the sample of 245 students. The findings of the study have indicated that academic self-concept strongly and positively forecasts both general achievement, as well as achievement in arts, languages and in mathematics and non-academic self-concepts negatively envisage school achievement.

Ahmed and Bruinsma, (2006) conducted a study on a sample of 181 graduate students and found a significant relationship among academic self-concept and academic performance. The results of the study have indicated that the more a student feels positive in relation to his or her ability or skill, the high would his achievement be. Further, Slavin, (2006) reported that people who were intrinsically motivated to learn were motivated to learn for the pleasure derived from learning, rather than for external rewards. In contrast, extrinsically motivated to learn do so for external rewards that learning would carry. Brown (2009) have stated that Positive academic motivation not only helps an individual to succeed in school, but also helps the individual to see that learning is rewarding and important in all facet of life.

As it is clear from the above discussed empirical studies conducted in the motivational perspective there is quite an overlap across various lines of
framework for addressing the issue of academic performance of students. It is important to note that each approach adopted ultimately focused on enhancing student’s motivation in the classroom. Since competence is multifaceted concept, can refer to skills, abilities and concern with mastery and effectiveness in transaction with the environment. Implied in the construct of competence motivation is the preferences for personal responsibility for performance thus an impetus for better performance in personally meaningful and relevant tasks for students with the freedom to make choice about classroom experience and the work in which they engage themselves. Role of parents and school in this context become crucial in helping students meet their preferences for challenges and approach the task with realistic expectations and cope with difficulties effectively.

PERSONALITY AND COMPETENCE MOTIVATION OF CHILDREN

Personality has a strong influence on academic achievement, but evaluation of achievement feedback brings about changes in motivation actions preferences and self referent confidence. Murray, (1938) found that person who were highly achievement motivated search for challenging task and had need to achieve competition and enjoy the activities. Whereas those who were low in achievement motivation, keep away from achievement situations or conditions and dislike assessments.

Consistent with earlier researches which shown a relationship between university student’s personality characteristics and their academic motivation, Komarraju & Karau, (2005); Komarraju et. al., (2009); Richardson & Abraham, (2009) also found that children’s personality uniqueness were positively related with their total implicit motivation and with every subcomponent.

Ozer and Benet-Martinez, (2006) reported that the Big Five traits i.e extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness have been linked to a variety of activities which includes job performance, educational achievement, leadership and happiness (John, Srivastava, 1999;

It has been shown that personality was directly linked to children's academic achievement because of positive traits that encourage educational learning. Positive traits linked to conscientiousness, such as organizational expertise and self-discipline, by their very nature, were likely to promote improved school performance. On the other hand, personality characteristics influence children's academic achievement through other, mediating factor such as children’s motivation, or enthusiasm to perform (Poropat, 2009).

Conscientious people are typically systematic, alert, consistent, deliberate, hard-working, and reasonable. While all of these characteristics put up with a reasonable contribution to achievement, their relative significance probably differ depending upon the variety of accomplishment considered. Galton, (1892) recommended that self-control, as capability to defy excitement and control desires was a unexpectedly poor forecaster of highest accomplishment.

Hough, (1992) distinguished among achievement and dependability facet of conscientiousness and revealed that the achievement-oriented individual was one who works hard, tries to accomplish a good job, and completes the task at hand.

Barrick & Mount, (1991) found that conscientious individuals were achievement-oriented and reliable as well as orderly and purposeful (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Barrick, Mount and Strauss (1993) and Gellatly, (1996) connected Conscientiousness to goal-setting inspiration. It was observed by Malouff, Schutte, Bauer & Mantelli (1990) that neurotic personalities were less likely to be goal-oriented. While examining the relation between personality and achievement motivation, it was shown that achievement was best explained by conscientiousness (Komarraju and Karau, 2005). Conscientious
people were precise, hard-working, punctual, disciplined, well-organized, careful, and persevering. It has been shown that highly conscientious students' possessed higher need for achievement, in contrast, those who scored low on this dimension possessed low need for achievement. Other researchers have been also revealed that conscientiousness was linked with academic achievement (Barbaranelli et. al., 2003, Cheng and Ickes, 2009). O'Connor and Paunonen, (2007) demonstrated conscientiousness, in particular, to be the most strongly and constantly related with scholastic success. Cheng and Ickes (2009) found that there was reciprocal relationship between conscientiousness and self-motivation means they reciprocally remunerated for each other in predicting university-level scholastic presentation.

McRae, et.al (2004), observed that openness to experience has motivational and structural components. Individuals who were high in openness were motivated to search for new skills and to involve in self-examination. Structurally, they have a fluid style of consciousness that permit these individuals to make novel or new links among somewhat related thoughts. Closed individuals' in contrast were more relaxed with recognizable and conventional, conventional experiences.

Wolfe and Johnson, (1995) could not discover logical relation among openness to experience and educational accomplishment. On the other hand, O'Connor and Paunonen, (2007) found that openness to experience was occasionally positively related with scholastic achievement. People high in openness might be more motivated to involve in intellectual pursuits that enhance their knowledge. (Furnaham, et.al 2006) Openness to experience, particularly the thoughts were linked to need for cognition,(Fleischhauer, et.al 2010) a motivational predisposition to think about ideas, analyze information, and get pleasure from solving puzzles, and to typical intellectual engagement.
Sung and Choi, (2009) in a study on creativity, explore the part of personality on its related inspiring aspects. They reported that Agreeableness positively linked with intrinsic motivations, Openness to Experience was optimistically linked to extrinsic motivations whereas and that Extroversion can be the most important forecaster of creative performance. Various studies have investigated the relationship between personality factors and motivation generally focused on university undergraduate students and found there is a strong relationship between student's personality characteristics and their academic motivation. Komarraju & Karau, (2005) observed that high levels of openness to experiences was strongly linked to high levels of academic motivation and engagement, signifying that distinction in student motivation might be connected to critical differences in personality characteristics. In addition, Richardson and Abraham, (2009) revealed that achievement motivation fully arbitrated the impact of conscientiousness on student's academic or educational performance. Likewise, it was revealed by Komarraju, Karau, and Schmeck, (2009), that 17% of the discrepancy in student's intrinsic academic motivation may possibly be explained by their personality factors conscientiousness and openness to experiences, at the same time as 13% of the discrepancy in extrinsic academic motivation may possibly be explained by levels of personality factors conscientiousness, neuroticism and extraversion. Other investigation has found that student's personality characteristics may be differentially linked to different sub-facets of motivation.

Clark and Schorth, (2010) in their study found that students who were intrinsically motivated to gain information or knowledge and achieve things were more conscientious and agreeable while students who were intrinsically motivated to experience inspiration had higher levels of openness to experience. Therefore it was come into view that personality characteristics may relate in a different way to different sub features of motivation. in the
recent study, agreeableness, openness to experience and conscientiousness were observed to explore whether these fundamental personality characteristics would predict children’s intrinsic reading motivation after accounting for reading ability and self-concept. In the context of reading, conscientiousness was studied as conscientious children were typically more achievement oriented and self-disciplined and were consequently more possibly to be self-motivated to involve in reading assignments. Children who comprise higher levels of openness to experience were more intellectually curious or questioning and therefore may be more likely to have a aspiration to learn through reading. Finally agreeable children were usually more obedient and as a result may also reveal higher levels of reading motivation in school (Clark and Schorth, 2010).

Agreeableness was related with a disposition toward nurturance, altruism, faith and friendly compliance. Heaven et. al., (2002) studied the relationship between personality variables and academic performance of children and found that academic performance was positively associated with agreeableness.

Personality dimension of extroversion vs introversion was tied to motivation through Eysenck’s theory of arousability. Eysenck, (1976) postulated that introverts are more sensitive and easily arousable to external as well as internal stimulation than extroverts. On the other hand extroverts are likely to be bored with low level of stimulation and require higher stimulation while introverts will be distressed by overstimulation. From motivational point of view extroverts will be stimulation seekers, introverts will seek to avoid overstimulation.

Extrovert students interact more with their peers and teachers in the classroom. Little work has observed motives and goals that were linked with extraversion. Initial examination of this area revealed that extraversion was in general linked with high motivation for social contact, status and power (Olson
& Weber, 2004), personal strivings for closeness and interdependence (King, 1995), and desiring for higher positive influence and interpersonal contact (King & Broyles, 1997).

Shiners, (2000) studied a sample of 3rd through 6th grade children 8-12 years and were seen at 15-19 years & 17-23 years and found that parent reported extroversion predicted social competence both concurrently and in late adolescence.

Neuroticism people suffer from negative emotions, psychological pain, dissatisfaction and mood swings in many facet of their life. Kuhl, (2000) studied the relationship between achievement motivation and neuroticism in academic settings and found that neuroticism had a detrimental influence on motivational processing during skill learning and performance. Heaven et. al., (2002) observed a negative relationship between neuroticism and achievement among school children. On the other hand Farsides and Woodfield, (2003) found that neuroticism was positively associated with academic achievement in middle school but negatively at college years.

Locus of control is a person’s belief that his own actions can make a distinction. Locus of control show the extent to which an individual think that he has an impact on his life therefore, this belief system is one of the most important feature of the personality (Kooranian, Khosravi & Esmaeeli, 2008). Individuals with an internal locus of control, feel that they take part in an activity because of high intrinsic motivation while, individuals with an external locus of control, feel that they join an activity because of an external cause.

Studies have shown that an internal locus of control was linked to higher academic achievement (Findley & Cooper, 1983). Internals earn somewhat improved scores and work harder. A study done by McCombs (1991), recommended that what underlies the internal locus of control was the concept of "self as agent." Means Individuals’ thoughts control his actions and
that when he realizes this executive function of thinking, he can positively influence his ideas, motivation, and academic performance.

Anderman and Midgley, (1997) observed that students who thought that their poor performance was reasoned by factors which were out of their control were doubtful to perceive any reason to hope for improvement. In contrast, if students pointed that their poor performance was due to lack of important abilities or to poor learning habits, they were more likely to persevere in the future. In other words, students with an external locus of control were more possible to react to failure by giving up hope and not trying harder in contrast students with an internal locus of control were likely to react to failure by trying harder to get better.

Some research has been observed association between locus of control and academic achievement while others have reported that external locus of control and academic achievement were negatively associated with each other (Wood, Saylor, & Cohen, 2009), on the other hand, secondary problems such as psychological and relationship problems were lead by academic problems (Bigdeli & Malekzadeh, 2005).

Psychologists had made effort to examine and recognize the factors that influence academic achievement. Their investigations have found a relationship between academic achievement and personality variables, family, community and school (Assadi, Nakai, Najafi, & Fazel, 2007). Studies in this field, in addition to the these factors, has revealed the significance of locus of control in decision making, its successes and failures as well as affective role of the locus of control in academic achievement.

Self efficacy believes helps to conclude that how much effort individuals will expand on an activity, how long they will preserve when tackling obstacles, and how resilient they will be in the phase of unpleasant circumstances (Schunk, 1995; Pajares, 1996). The higher sense of efficacy, the grater the attempt, persistent and resilience (Bandura, 1997).
A vast amount of goal studies has shown that goals motivate and direct behavior (Lock & Latham, 2002). Individuals may followed a valued goal even when they had low self efficacy for attending it these other factors despite, a prosperity of research shown that self efficacy can influence person’s choice of activities, motivation, achievements outcomes (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 1996). Eccles et.al.,(1998) found that When students had high self-efficacy, the belief that they can direct their achievement outcomes, and internal attributions for success, they had a propensity to be more positively motivated and do better on different achievement tasks and activities.

Self regulation is self’s capability to change its behavior or actions (Baumeister and Vohs, 2007). Studies show that Self-regulation and motivation are strongly interrelated. These are important for success. People with good self regulation and high competence motivation set difficult but goals which are achievable for them and they search for help when desired, breakdown the task into components and make plan and select proximal goals, create positive effects, organize the atmosphere, self monitored and get feedback and they are self evaluative. Stipek, (1993) reported that Self regulated children know how to develop strategies, search for help and evaluate performance, revise and correct own work. They were motivated preferring task with choices, challenge and control. Student at elementary school level can be depicted as self regulated to the degree that they were meta cognitively, motivationally and behaviorally active contributor in their own learning process (Zimerman,1989). Paris and Ayres, (1994) have emphasized on the importance of self regulation for making preference or select goal. Children can choose suitable goals such as working toward mastery and task completion depending on condition. People can direct their actions through self regulation that engage modulation of opinions, affection and behaviors. This control permit individuals to direct their activities towards accomplishing a goal and to adapt their actions to changing conditions (Kanfer,1990; Zimmerman,2000).It implies that personality of the individual
plays crucial role in the development of competence motivation. That is along with many other consequences personality as a predictor of competence motivation especially in the classroom context can give us important leads in the understanding of the aspect.

As is clear from the above discussed studies personality in the context of motivation has been addressed from a very limited angle. Only few broad construct of personality factors of personality found out by Cattell as universally present across culture have not been explored so far in the context of motivation. Hence the present investigation will take into account this aspect of personality of rural students taken from drug afflicted and normal families. In this context the following hypotheses have been proposed for verification:-

- **Personality profile of rural students from drug afflicted families would be characterized by low A, C, D, G, H and high O, Q3 and Q4 factors as compared to their counterparts from non drug afflicted families.**
- **Contribution of personality in competence motivation of rural students from drug abuse afflicted families would be low as compared to students from non drug abuse afflicted families.**

**PARENTING AND COMPETENCE MOTIVATION OF CHILDREN**

Most important environment for a person is the family which is the nucleus or primary environment from birth till death. Family not only provides support and nourishment but also provide atmosphere of security. Parents comprise that first school of the child. Child socializes under the dynamic guidance of his father and mother. Therefore, it is the parent child association that forms the base of all learned behavior.

A variety of investigations have pointed out that the quality of parent child relationship is crucial significance in the growth of child’s personality. Some investigators (Cassidy & Belin, 1994) had found that if the parents were able to accept negative emotions of their child with support and comfort, in turn the child could better regulate or control his emotional behavior. Gottman,
(1997) pointed out that parents could be emotional trainers in reaction to children’s negative emotions. A good parent child relationship would direct secure attachment and secure attachment further reinforced the parent child relationship. On the other hand when parents were punitive and less communicative and low on warmth that would lead to weak or poor parent child bond.

In several studies (Baumrind, 1991; Baumrind & Black, 1967), Baumrind has reported that there is a positive relationship between authoritative parenting style and academic performance. Baumrind, (1991), in his study, found that children who are 4-15 years old, of parents authoritative the parenting characterized by high levels of nurturance, sensitivity, involvement, reasoning and encouragement of autonomy, were most motivated, competent, and achievement oriented. Additionally, it was found by Baumrind and Black, (1967) that authoritative parenting was positively linked with academic performance in contrast authoritarian and permissive parenting was negatively related with scores. Leung and Kwan, (1998) also revealed that motivational orientation was a mediator between parenting style and self-perceived academic competence. Authoritative parenting leads to intrinsic motivation whereas neglectful parenting leads to a motivation, which means lack of motivation.

Much of the investigations on parent involvement, as it relates to children's outcomes, have given emphasis to the association among precise parent involvement behaviors and children's achievement. Parental contribution at school for instance with school activities, direct communication with educators and supervisors is linked with better achievement in mathematics and reading (Griffith, 1996; Reynolds, 1992; Sui-Chu & Willms, 1996). Higher levels of parent association in their children's learning experiences at home for example administration and observation, every day discussions regarding school had been linked with children's higher
achievement grades in reading and writing, in addition to higher report card scores (Griffith, 1996; Sui-Chu & Willms, 1996). Other investigation had shown that parental attitude and expectations regarding their children's education were strongly linked to children's thinking in relation to their own competencies, in addition to their achievement (Galper, Wigfield, & Seefeldt, 1997). On the other hand, a small number of researches link parent participation to preschool children's outcomes for susceptible groups, for example low-income children.

Zaslow and Eldred, (1998) consummated that parenting was important to children's development as were influenced from children's larger social context. Parents play role in child’s performance in school works, games or athletics. The support given to child by his family in educational learning improvement result in child’s well performance in school. Children's perception of competence was not innate but they develop it through direct experience of their success and influence from parents and teachers.

Children’s motivation was influenced not only by parents, but also to varying degrees by teachers and peers. Wang and Eccles, (2012) conducted a study and found that perceived support from parents and teachers was a significant barrier against the general declines in school engagement during secondary school years. The results suggested that most teenagers continue to be influenced considerably by their parents and teachers when it comes to school engagement even though they may be persuaded into misconduct outside the classroom by their peers. Parents who evidenced high levels of school contact had children who established greater social competency in comparison of children of parents with lower levels of school contact (Parker et. al., 1997).

Parents participation in children's schooling improve their children's learning, as well as their performance. Epstein, (1983) found that elementary school children whose parents were highly involved in their schooling like
attending parent teacher conferences, had improved homework habits and complete more homework than children of parents who were not highly involved. Such involvement revealed to have positive result for children’s performance. Stevensons and Baker, (1987) demonstrated that during the elementary and junior high school years, children of highly involved parents in children’s schooling reported by teachers as received high scores. Indeed, much studies showed that parents’ concentration and involvement in school, as reported by children, parents, teachers, and principals, were linked with heightened achievement among elementary school and junior high school children (Grolnick & Ryan, 1989; Grolnick & Slowiaczek, 1994).

The quality of parent/child attachment and parents’ support and expectations of children are other factors expected to contribute to children’s attitude of competence. Ainsworth, (1982); Bowlby, (1988) suggested that secure attachment provides a supportive framework to children from they could explore and master the challenges inside their environment. Children may come to perceive themselves more positively, as well as more competent with this kind of attachment and security of the attachment relationship provide children a secure emotional support (Diener, Isabella, & Behunin, 2007; Eccles & Midgley, 1990; Paterson, Field, & Pryor, 1994;). Research by Berrick, Barth, & Needell, (1994) showed that the formation of secure attachments in early childhood was most important for a child’s social and cognitive growth Children without such attachments may not build up a sense of their own competence and the capacity to faith others. In contrast lack of secure attachment association thwarts the child’s ability to explore his or her environment and growth of feelings of competence.

Erikson, Egeland & Pianta, (1989) conducted a longitudinal study in the context of ‘The Minnesota Mother-Child Interaction Project’. Data regarding parents & child development was taken from high risk (low income) families. The results of the study indicated that by age six, concerning 25 percent of
the sample of 200 children had experienced major maltreatment, and developmental data showed that those children had to a large extent poorer developmental effects opposing the normal treated children, with particular insufficiency in exploration, perseverance, and other achievement-oriented actions or behavior. They also demonstrated a great deal higher levels of insecure or disorganized attachment. A dramatic decline in developmental progress during toddler period of children was observed in cases where mothers were psychologically unavailable. Average scores of these children on mental functioning test fall from top 20% (at 9 months of age) to bottom 20% by (2 years of age) 65% of the neglected children were referred for special education service or grade retention by the end of Kindergarten. These studies make it amply clear that parental interaction, more strongly influence cognitive development.

Investigation has been shown a clear link between parent involvement and children’s success in school. Parental support for autonomy help their children to explore their environment, initiate behavior, and take an active role in problems solving. Children of highly involved parents were perceived themselves more competent than children of authoritarian or controlling parents (Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994). Several studies had linked parent’s involvement to improved perceptions of competence and control among children. Grolnick & Ryan, (1989) also revealed that involved parents were more likely than their uninvolved parents to had elementary school children who perceive themselves as competent in school. Similarly Grolnick & slowiaczek, (1994) demonstrated that parent’s participation in their elementary school children’s lives was associated with children’s school performance throughout children feeling competent and in control of their school results. Further, studies (Gottfried, Fleming, & Gottfried, 1994) have also revealed a correlation between parent involvement and children’s educational progress and successive intrinsic academic motivation.
Feinstein and Symons (1999) also found that parental concentration in their child’s education was the solitary greatest predictor of achievement at age 16. Parental participation in their child’s reading has been found to be the most significant determinant of language and developing literacy (Bus, van Ijzendoorn & Pellegrini, 1995). Also, parents who introduced their children to books give them a head start in school and an advantage more than their peers during primary school (Wade & Moore, 2000).

Lieberman et al., (1999) highlighted the significance of parental availability, parental attachment and dependence on parental help for overall healthy growth, mental and social, self-esteem and a sense of security of children. Various studies (Harter, 1990; Levitt, Guacci-Franco & Levitt, 1994; Ohannesian, Lerner, Lerner, & Voneye, 1998) have been also examined positive associations between children’s competence beliefs or confidence and their perceptions of availability of their parents’ acceptation and support.

Elliot and Dweck, (2005) highlighted that people have an inborn need to experience themselves as competence, to feel that they were able of successfully influencing their environment. Children may adopted a positive approach to achievement along three dimensions first, children’s fulfillment of psychological needs may provided them with regulatory resources that allow them to decide whether they want to achieve and why (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Feeling of competence and autonomy or self sufficiency may direct children to be motivated by inherent or self-directed reasons rather than external or controlled reasons. Second, children’s fulfillment psychological needs may contribute to their beliefs about their ability for achievement (Deci & Ryan, 1985), reproduced in children’s perception of competence and effectiveness, expectancies for performance and sense of control. While children’s satisfaction of their competence need was expected to be most appropriate, their satisfaction of other needs may also be significant means that when children feel related to their parents, they may feel valuable, which may direct them to feel competent. Third, when children were able to meet their
psychological needs, they may develop a variety of learning plans, such as checking over their work for mistakes, which improve achievement. Children’s experience of themselves as purposeful, for instance, may motivated them to accept helpful learning strategies as they struggle to meet goals they viewed as valuable.

Parental involvement or participation had the greatest effect in the early years, its importance to children’s educational and literacy result continues into the adolescent and even adult years (Desforges & Abouchaar, 2003). Hoover-Dempsey and Sandler, (1997) recommended that parental attitudes exceeded their parental role influence their participation in their child's education and ultimately psychological well being and academic performance. Friedel, Hruda, and Midgley, (2001) found in their study that parents’ values and objectives for schoolwork were related with students' motivational directions towards school. Most appropriate to the present study, Cooper, Lindsay, Nye, and Greathouse, (1998), found that positive parental attitudes towards homework were connected with more common homework perseverance by the student and with higher scores in elementary school. Parental feelings towards homework were also directly linked to the student’s positive feelings and reliability in engagement in homework.

Eccles et. al., (1998), revealed in their study that parents continue to have a powerful influence on their teenager’s growth, and many parents remain fully involved in their teenager’s lives. They continue to give opportunities for their children to increase their competencies, and feedback which influences teenager’s sense of competence and motivation.

The quality of the parent-child association had long been recognized to be one of the strongest forecasters of best child development. Affectionate, reactive parenting was linked with later child language improvement (Bee et al., 1982; Clarke-Stewart, 1973), school achievement, cognitive growth and behavioral modification (Werner & Smith, 1982; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Escalona, 1987). On the other hand, parents who were less involved and
demonstrative with their children were more likely to spectator an array of academic and behavior difficulties with those children as they develop (Olweus, 1980). At the extreme end of the spectrum, child abuse and neglect were strongly linked to poor developmental results, in likewise the short and the long term.

Parental level of expectancy or hope for child achievement was likely included as a positive message about parents’ self-confidence and energy the child’s sense of competence. Parents’ valorization and expectation or hope of their children’s school achievement have been observed as positively related with their children’s competence beliefs (McGrath & Repetti, 2000).

The collective consequence of parental support in the home, an excellence home and school learning atmosphere, a constructive affiliation between parents and teachers had been found to made a constructive involvement to children’s school achievement during the school years (Gutman and Midgley, 2000).

Parental participation in their youngster’s literacy practices positively have an effect on children’s academic performance (Fan and Chen, 2001) and was a more influential force for academic achievement than other family environmental variables, for instance social class, size of family and level of parental education (Flouri and Buchanan, 2004). Parental objectives and anticipations on their children’s achievements had a powerful impact on children’s education or school outcomes (Fan and Chen, 2001; Desforges and Abouchaar, 2003). There is plenty confirmation that parents who encourage the view that reading is an important and valuable activity had children who were motivated to read for enjoyment or satisfaction (Baker and Scher, 2002).

Studies have confirmed that children’s performance in primary and secondary school was positively influenced by their parental involvement in their learning (Feinstein & Symons, 1999; Fan & Chen, 2001) incased higher academic achievement, better cognitive competence, improved problem-
solving skills, better school attendance, better school enjoyment, and fewer behavioral problems at school.

A child’s own direct experience of success or failure in different areas plays an apparent role. Parents’ feelings and values directly influenced the values a child attached to some ability or quality. The degree of importance parents place on a child’s performance in school works, athletics, or games is a significant factor in forming the child’s goal. One recent study found that as family cohesiveness increased, teenagers’ self-esteem or confidence increased ultimately (Baldwin & Hoffman, 2002).

Various researches (Mullis, Mullis, Cornille et.al., 2004) also demonstrated that the parents involvement had long lasting effects on their children’s literacy practices and this participation produce reflective outcomes. Similarly Flouri & Buchanan, 2004, reported that parental contribution in their child’s literacy practices was a more influential force than other family background variables, for instance social class, family size and level of parental learning whereas reading enjoyment was more central for children’s educational success than socio-economic status of their family’s (OECD, 2002). In addition, of all school subject matters, reading has been found to be chiefly sensitive to parental influences (Senechal & LeFevre, 2002). In turn, success in reading was first step to success in other academic areas as well (Jordan, Snow & Porsche, 2000).

Parental participation inside the school can perform as a pioneer to successful practices at home and parents were more competent to help their children if they were kept knowledgeable regarding how they were doing in school and the most excellent ways to give confidence and motivate them to learn (Desforges and Abouchaar, 2003).

A number of studies revealed that various types of parental engagement had a positive influence on numerous indicators of student achievement, as well as higher scores and test grades, improved enrolment in higher level programs and superior classes, higher successful achievement of
classes, lower absenteeism or dropout rates and better probability of instigation post secondary schooling (Pushor 2007; Harris and Goodall 2007; Desforges and Abouchaar 2003).

Parental contribution in a child’s schooling in conjunction with environmental and financial aspects can have an effect on child’s growth in domains for example cognition, language, and social expertise. Various studies in this area had revealed the significance of family interaction or relations and involvement in the years previous to entering school (Bergsten, 1998; Hill, 2001; Wynn, 2002). Various research conclusions had also shown that a sustained attempt of parental involvement during the child’s schooling can progress academic achievement (Driessen, Smit & Sleegers, 2005; Fan, 2001; Hong & Ho, 2005). Academic disappointment had been connected with jeopardy (risk) behaviors and negative results for instance substance misuse, delinquency, and emotional and behavioral evils (Annunziata, Houge, Faw, & Liddle, 2006).

Jeynes, (2005) in a meta-analysis of more than 50 studies, found that kinds of participation that have need of a large investment of time, for example corresponding or reading with the child, also parenting style and parental anticipations, had a larger impact on educational achievement than several other types of involvement, for instance parental presence and involvement at school. Certainly, reading and communication with the youngster appear as significant aspects of parental attachment in various studies. Conversely, parents who involve in their children's literacy behaviors or activities not only profit their children, there are also several benefits that had been accounted for the parents themselves, as well as greater skill attainment, better confidence and self-esteem, an improved parent-child affiliation, and improved engagement with learning.

Parents who were controlling, use rewards or incentives and punishments for academic performance, or show negativity or anger about
academics or education could discourage children from increasing intrinsic motivation (Gottfried, Fleming & Gottfried, 1994). Similarly, when parents support autonomy or independence, children were more likely to be intrinsically motivated and participated in school and had a better skill to self-regulate or ability to alter their behavior at school. Controlling parents were found to encourage extrinsic, rather than intrinsic, motivation in their children (Grolnick, Friendly, & Bellas, 2009). Some parental actions, like praising children’s intelligence, aptitude rather than their effort, attempt and mastery of knowledge and abilities could send a message that intelligence was a permanent attribute or characteristic, a belief that could lead children to avoid fear failure or challenges (Dweck, 2010).

Children’s capacity to form optimistic relationships with adults is important to their social growth and school or academic success (Bronson, 2006; Howes, 2000; Paleromo, Hanish, Martin, Fabes & Reiser, 2007; Pianta, 1999). Cultivation and positive interactions liberate chemicals that promote brain growth. The excellence of these associations forecast children’s social–emotional competence, persistence, interest for learning, and educational success (Clifford, Barbarin, Chang, Early, Bryant & Howes, et al. 2005; Hamre & Pianta, 2001; Howes, 2000; Pianta, Howes, Burchinal, Bryant, Clifford & Early, et al., 2005). High-quality social relations help all children, in spite of family or economic environment, and they are related with the positive growth of literacy and other academic proficiencies (Mashburn, 2008). Warm, helpful relations encourage children’s motivation, engagement, self-direction, support, and optimistic thoughts toward school (Pianta & Steinberg, 1992; Birch & Ladd, 1997; Howes, Burchinal, Pianta, Bryant, Early & Clifford, et. al., 2008).

Houtenville and Conway, (2008) on the basis of few studies which had used financial modelling to inspect the influence of parental engagement, originated a model which suggested that parental attempt or efforts the combination of all types of involvement has a great effect on student
achievement compared with school resources for example per student spending on teaching. The extent of this effect was equal to more than $1,000 in per student payments per annum and enhanced academic results to levels correspondent to those of pupils whose parents had received extra four to six years of learning.

The consequences or effect of parental involvement in school has on a child’s academic achievement is complicated to verify (Bakker and Denessen 2007; Harris and Goodall 2007; Harris and Goodall 2008; Bull, Brooking and Campbell 2008; Avvisati, Besbas and Guyon 2010). A few investigations recommended that a parent’s involvement in school actions was positively linked with pupil’s social and emotional change (Henderson and Mapp 2002; Westmoreland et.al 2009).

SCHOOL SITUATION AND COMPETENCE MOTIVATION OF CHILDREN

School is very important for children. It offers them a routine & life outer from family where they grow and develop frequently. School directly influence children's educational achievement, their accomplishment of literacy, numeracy and scientific knowledge. Prescribed educational qualifications are the key to a child's entry into advanced education or training and also employment. The learning of specific facts and skills is a direct consequence of classroom teaching (Good & Brophy, 1986), social cognitions and feelings are also influenced by school and these may be just as influential in predicting later result as intelligence or school prospectus. Such indirect effects of school are more indefinable for the reason that they are mediated by children’s motivation to learn or avoid learning, their formation of themselves as pupils, and the attributions they generate for explaining success and failure.

Scholastic achievement varies significantly amongst schools in spite of the individual and social distinctiveness of pupils entering them. Rutter et al. (1979) Fifteen Thousand Hoursforged or copied new methods which
displayed the existence of efficient and ineffective secondary schools. This innovative study was disagreeing sharply with claims (Coleman et al., 1966; Jencks et al., 1972) that schooling had no significant effect on achievement or attainment. Effective schools influence rates of attendance (Mortimore et al., 1988a) and disruptive behavior (Gray et al., 1983).

School characteristics influence their students’ attitudes toward school, as calculated in attendance and also their feelings regarding classes and subjects (Mortimore et al., 1988a; Tizard, Blatchford, Burke, Farquhar & Plewis, 1988). Butler, (1989b) found that young children may be motivated mostly to seek and attend information important to acquiring competence, and interest in evaluating competence should increase throughout middle childhood Ruble & Frey, (1991) also concluded on the basis of their analysis of the implications of stages of skill attainment for self-evaluative strategies. They reasoned that young children likely to be at early stages of skill attainment, when it was most useful to seek information relevant to clarifying task requirement and acquiring initial proficiency or skill. With age, however, children were more likely to be at later stages of skill attainment, when it was suitable to seek information relevant also to evaluating their competence.

Positive school climate has also been observed to provide an inspiring environment both for individual growth and academic success. In a study Johnson and Johnson, (1993), found that positive school environment yield positive educational and psychological outcomes for children and school staff. Positive school environment has been found to be helpful for preventing disruptive or anti social behaviors among high risk school students (Hayness, 1998; Kuperminc et al., 1997).

Correlates of positive classroom environment discovered by other researchers include: Lower dropout rates, higher attendance report, increased involvement, deep rather than surface learning, improved scores and
motivation to learn, (Patrick, et al., 2007; Lau & Lee, 2008; Tapola & Niemenvirta, 2008).

A caring or helpful school environment has been recognized as one of the several external development characteristics of children’s environment that encourages positive growth, both academically and socially. Homana and Torney-Purta (2006) reported that positive school environment as being important for the development of competitive, responsible, and talented citizen.

Numerous studies also shown that negative class environment can prevent optimal learning and progress (Johnson & Johnson, 1993; Kuperminc et al., 1997; Kuperminc &Leadbealer & Blatt, 2001; Manning & Saddlemire, 1996). Unfavorable school climate characterized by irresponsible or negligent behavior of teachers have been observed to contribute to incidences of school dropout among school students and adolescents (Siddiqui, 2003).

Successful adjustment of school partially depends on past experiences of children and on children possessing the skills and information to respond to the demands of the school setting (Dockett, Perry & Tracey, 1997; Fabian, 2000). When children demonstrate a variety of social skills related with cooperation, initiating interactions or assertion, and self control, they were more likely to adjust easily to school. Difficulties were possible to arise when children were: non compliant; disorganized or confused, distractible, or when they were disruptive/ antisocial and had difficulty considering the rights of others (Margetts, 2002). Adjustment to schooling was influenced by a range of individual and family characteristics, societal trends, contextual and life experiences. It was the interaction of the child’s own characteristics and their experiences that eventually determines how a child adjusts to school (Margetts, 2002). Other studies (Ladd & Price, 1987; Margetts, 1997) found that the existence of a familiar friend in the same class supports children’s
adjustment to school and was linked to higher levels of social skills and academic competence, and lower levels of problematic behavior.

As children start school they face many challenges. Personal challenges arise as children take on a new personality and the behaviors and demands of being a school student (Dockett & Perry, 1999; Dunlop, 2000). Children must also adjust to strange buildings and classrooms, school and teachers’ expectations, new academic challenges, and they need to mix up with new and more dissimilar group of students (Cleave, Jowett & Bate, 1982; Ledger, Smith & Rich, 1998). Children were faced with large groups of children or students of different ages and size specially during school assembly and playtime, and they were confronted with challenges of making new friends.

Various studies have exposed that school connectedness was consistently linked to higher academic performance (test scores and grades) and school behavior (Klem & Connell, 2004). Osternman, (2000) revealed that sense of belongingness has also been closely associated to engagement inside the school setting.

Increased school connectedness have been found to be linked to high academic achievement, contribution in extra-curricular activities, good school attendance and relationship with various social groups (Weiss, Cunningham, Lewis & Clark, 2005). School climate has been observed to play a critical role in increasing health and positive attitude towards education. It has also been recognized to create interests, motivation and enthusiasm among students in the classroom (Nelson, 2004).

**TEACHER & COMPETENCE MOTIVATION OF CHILDREN:** A teacher play an essential role in the life of students. Motivation is helpful for attainment of the objective for teachers. A teacher motivates students and achieve their task without motivation this is not easy to achieve. Metz (1978), conducted a study on junior high school students and found that class disruptions were
probable when there was a mismatch or disparity in teacher’s behavior and students expectations of teacher behavior. In lower classes, the disturbance was linked to the teacher ability or skill to keep organization in the class, whereas in higher classes, students’ challenge to teacher power were centered on teacher’s mastery or lack of mastery of the subject matter. Also, when students observe teachers as not incharge, or as not possessing power, they feel justified in disrupting the class (Ingersoll, 1999).

Sternberg (1985) examined that a good teacher bears a striking similarity to a good parent and that schools in which teachers were supportive, and at same time, remained hard and preserved well defined standards for behavior, had less problems, lower rates of criminal behavior, higher rate of attendance and higher grades on tests and achievements.

Teacher’s guidance was significant for students and that guidance motivated and increased their concentration on learning. It was observed that with supportive guidance, directions all students can attain high mastery. Teacher allows student to select any task and guide them for performing the task. When students perform their task it could provide them a sense of control and they were motivated. Pintrich & Degroot, (1990) have revealed that achievement of students improved when students were intrinsically motivated and when teachers were supportive of self-sufficiency or autonomy. Students could have increased motivation when they feel some sense of autonomy or independence in the learning process, and that motivation decreased when students had no voice in the class organization. Teachers can guide students by giving students options could be as simple as letting them choose their lab associates or select from alternate assignments or task, or as complex as ‘agreement teaching’ where in students could decide their own grading level, due dates and assignments. (Kurvink, 1993; Reeve and Hyungshim, 2006).

Teacher student association has been reported as a key factor of classroom environment. High quality teacher student association facilities
academic motivation, school involvement, academic achievement, sense of worth, and more general social emotional happiness (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Teachers who belief, care about, and were respectful of students had been reported to give the social emotional happiness which increase academic performance (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Roeser, Midgley & Urdan, 1996).

In the classroom teacher had a motivational influence on students either positive or negative.” This includes the way information was presented, way of interaction with students, teacher’s behavior, the amount of preference and control given to students, and chances given students to work alone or in groups. Students responded to who teachers were, what they did, and how comfortable they feel in the classroom. (Olson, 1997).

It has been revealed that all students are influenced by achievement motivation (Atkinson, 1999; Spence, 1983; Wlodkowski, 1985), and students may benefit from increased motivation from teachers (Bar-Tal, Frieze, and Greenberg, 1974). Teachers with proper training, can guide and motivate students to choose and complete the task. They are able to increase the perceived value of the task, causing larger numbers of students to complete projects. This increases overall production of the class (Alschuler, Tabor, and McIntyre, 1969).

Wentzel, (1998) found that support from teacher predict obedience of students to class room norms. Numerous studies have shown that strong relationship between teacher student produces students who have a greater sense of belonging, feel more secure and easily ask questions (Beck & Malley, 1998). Teacher support and caring relationship increases motivation and self regulation in students. Similarly, Positive teacher student relationship lead to better academic performance of the students and in contrast negative teacher student relationship result in decreased motivation, autonomy, self regulation and lower performance of the students. Several studies has shown that strong student-teacher relationship results academic achievement and
With effective teaching and mentoring teachers helps students to explore their world with a sense of trust and autonomy towards ultimate goal of fully intrinsic self regulation and enhanced academic achievement and success.

When students are struggling with poor academic performance, low motivation, teacher can help them how to learn by teaching strategies for completing an assignment, note-taking or reviewing for an exam. (Tuckerman, 2003). Similarly Margolis and McCabe, (2006) reported that teachers motivate students for hard work. Students can become frustrated and de motivated when they feel like they’re struggling but not getting the recognition as other students are. Absenteeism and unpunctuality of teacher results in failure to complete the syllabus, which in turn, influence motivation, interest and commitment to learn among the students (Kafui, 2005).

Supportive teacher behaviors like listening, giving examples, showing empathy for students and encouragement, quick response of student’s questions allows for student autonomy can foster increased student interest, engagement, enjoyment and performance. (Reeve and Hyungshim, 2006).

Palmer, (2007) found that Teacher’s enthusiasm and way of teaching had strong influence on motivation of the student. Student’s motivation was increased when teacher made content appropriate to real life. Frey and Fisher, (2010) also supported this and reported that students are motivated by the tasks which are meaningful to the real life of them.

Truby, (2010) explored that human beings are naturally curious and self-directed means they want to learn, make choices, and achieve. Students were more motivated when they were given choices. Their own choice of doing something was more motivating for them rather than what they had been told to do.
PEER INFLUENCES AND COMPETENCE MOTIVATION OF CHILDREN: - Peer group has powerful influences on a child's life. Every child want to be accepted by his peers and not work hard in school if the peer group does not value achievement. Coleman's research, (1960) has examined the role of the peer group in patterns of achievement. Schools in which students valued achievement highly, there was a closer relationship between academic excellence and intelligence in contrast of schools where achievement was less valued. Similarly, studies on educational aspiration have also found that children’s and adolescents' aspirations were relatively similar to those of their peers, particularly valued peers (Haller & Butterworth, 1960; Kardel & Lesser, 1969; McDill & Coleman, 1965; Simpson, 1962).

Parker & Asher, (1987) conducted a study on children and adolescents and found that children and adolescents who were accepted by their peers and had good social skills, perform better in school and had more positive academic achievement motivation. In contrast, socially rejected and highly aggressive children were at risk for various negative outcomes, including competence and motivational outcomes.

Peers have strong influence on adolescents’ involvement with their families and their participation in school. Kindermann, (1993) observed that motivation of the children’s peer groups influence children’s change in motivation across year. Other researchers have posited that adolescents’ value of school and adolescents' different achievement levels in school were also influenced their peer (Coleman, 1961; Steinberg & Silverberg, 1986; Delgado Gatian, 1986).

High achieving children with high achievers friends develop more positive academic motivation to over time. In contrast, low achievers who join low-achieving peer-group were less motivated to complete school work and participate other activities valued by their peer group. Some of these activities
may improve adolescents’ competence, and some may not (Kindermann, 1993; Kindermann et.al., 1996). MacIver and Reuman, (1994) observed that peers group also influence middle school and high school-age students’ level of engagement in school. As these students grow older, their motivation to engage in learning or education was influenced by their social group. A large number of studies (Newcomb & Bagwell, 1995; Wentzel, Barry, & Caldwell, 2004) reported that Children who had friends were more sociable, helpful, and self confident compared to their peers who were without friends. Similarly, (Aboud & Mendelson, 1996; Wentzel et.al., 2004) found that children with reciprocated friendships also likely to be more emotionally supportive, autonomous, altruistic or selfless, and less aggressive than children who did not have such friendships.

Peer relationships, was also shown as positively related to test grades and scores in elementary and middle school (Berndt & Keefe, 1995; Wentzel et.al., 2004). Student with reciprocated friendships tend to be more mixed up and engaged in school related activities than those students who did not have this kind of friendships (Berndt & Keefe, 1995; Berndt, Laychak, & Park, 1990; Ladd, 1990; Ladd & Price, 1987).

Children who were rejected by peers or who had lack of friends were suffering from emotional distress. In a study Wentzel & Asher, (1995) found that middle school students who were without friends, students who had few friends and were not liked or disliked by their peers, were well-liked by their teachers, the most highly motivated children, and were uniformly self confident in comparison of their average status peers. Wentzel, (1998) conducted a longitudinal study and found that these students remained academically and socially well-adjusted over the course of middle school years.

Peer relationships, having friends also has been related positively to grades and test scores in elementary and middle school( Berndt & Keefe,
Student with friends also tend to be more involved and engaged in school related activities than those who do not have reciprocated friendships (Berndt & Keefe, 1995; Berndt, Laychak & Park, 1990; Ladd, 1990; Ladd & Price, 1987).

Harter, (1990) reported that correlation between peer approval or support and self confidence increases during adolescence. Support from peer group was strongly related to self-worth in contrast support from close friends. Peer approval was associated with self confidence, parental influence continues to be linked to adolescents’ self confidence and this correlation did not decline until emerging adulthood (Harter, 1999).

Social competence frequently is linked with person level outcome like effective behavioral repertoires. In a study it was found that popular students when compared with average status peers, popular students were more supportive, helpful and sociable, display better leadership skills and were more self confident. In contrast, rejected students tends to be less compliant, less self confident, less friendly, and more aggressive, disruptive, and reserved than their average status peers (Newcomb, Bukowski, & Pattee, 1993; Rubin et.al.,1998; Wentzel & Asher, 1995).

Friends were supposed to play an important role in providing contexts for self expression, affirmation, validation (Hartup & Stevens, 1997). Having friends appears to mediate the negative effects of cruel and punitive home environments on children’s relations with the broader peer group (Schwartz, et.al.,2000), and being without associates predicts less than optimal levels of emotional well-being (Parker & Asher,1993; Wenz-Gross, Siperstein, Untch, & Widaman,1997).

Newcomb & Bagwell, (1995) revealed that children with friends, engage in more positive interactions, complete tasks with greater proficiency and resolve more conflicts in comparison of children who were without friends.
Children also demonstrated more concern and emotional intensity with friends than with non friends (Parker & Gottman, 1989), and they were more successful at making transitions when friends accompany them (Ladd & Price, 1987). In contrast, friends were supposed to play a comparatively insignificant role in socializing each other with respect to larger group norms and expectations (Hartup & Steven, 1997).

Various studies have shown that as children enter school, they start to compare themselves with others to assess their own behaviors and attitudes (Ruble, Boggiano, Feldman, & Loebel, 1980; Veroff, 1969), also come to conform to peer group standards (Berends, 1950), and this predisposition seems to increase through the elementary-school years (Constanzo & Shaw, 1966).

Motivation of students was also influenced by attitudes of other children and the absence or presence of harassment or maltreatment. Ryan and Patrick, (2001) reported that social environment of the classroom play an important role in student motivation and engagement. Mutual debate has been found to facilitate logical argumentations among children (Kim et.al., 2003). Students’ attitudes about their capabilities and their understanding of success and failure further influence their motivation to engage themselves in learning (Anderman & Midgley, 1998). Students, who recognized poor performance as a lack of achievable or possible skills, rather than as some innate personal deficiency, were more likely to re-engage themselves in a assignment and try again. Students whose self-concept was bound up in their history of failure were less likely to be motivated to learn.

Several researches demonstrated that students who had reciprocated friendship in middle school display improved academic achievement and prosocial behavior (Wentzel et.al., 2004). Nelson and DeBacker, (2008) found a positive correlation between positive peer relationships and student
achievement. Particularly students who perceive to be respected and valued by their peers were more likely to report adaptive achievement motivation. In addition, they reported that best friend who values academics also contributes to adaptive achievement motivation of their friends. In contrast children connected with friends who reject school were more likely to do poorly academically (Veronneau, Vitaro, Pedersen & Tremblay, 2008).

Nelson and DeBacker, (2008) supported this finding and shown that having a poor quality friendship relates to maladaptive achievement motivation. Significantly research findings revealed that adolescents who socialize and made friendships with deviant peers were at greater risk for developing a variety of psycho-social adjustment problems such as substance use, youth aggression, teenage pregnancy, and general school failure (Fergusson, Woodward, & Horwood, 1999; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2010).

On the basis of above discussed studies about overall school situations which includes influence of teachers and peers, academic performance of children can be inferred that where parental participation in children’s school related activities remain active only these children have been found to perform well. Hence the following hypothesis is being proposed for empirical verification:-

- School environment would have relatively low contribution in competence motivation of rural students from drug abuse afflicted families as compared to students from non drug abuse afflicted families.

**PARENTAL DRUG ABUSE AND COMPETENCE MOTIVATION OF CHILDREN**

Every individual is born unique and no one is quite identical as the other. According to Mizan Adilliah et.al., (2000), this difference will reason persons to have dissimilar dimensions of personality and self-concept of
themselves. Self-concept is the way an individual perceives himself and his potential to assess his strengths and limitation.

Children depend on their family to fulfill their physical, psychological and social needs and their economic security and welfare. All of these can be jeopardized (threatened) by parent’s habits of misusing substances. A family has a powerful influence and effect on the growth of a child because a child spends more time with family members than in school with other student, friends and teachers. Parents pass their own life history, personalities, and relationship with each other into the family dynamics. Significant parental conflict has a negative effect on the whole family system. Children suffer from insecure attachment in these kinds of family circumstances.

A number of researchers have found that individuals who suffer from substance abuse usually experience family disturbance (Kaufman and Kaufman, 1979; Velleman 1992), violence, aggression in family (Coleman and Strauss, 1983; Kaufman et.al., 1989; Bushman and Cooper 1990), loss of employment and financial insecurity (Liddle et al. 1995; Velleman, 1992), marital breakdown (Kosten et.al., 1983), and physical and psychological neglect (Kaufman et al. 1989; Bushman and Cooper 1990; Rossow, 2001).

Kaufman and Pattison, (1981) observed that alcoholism can negatively affect the family system and that dysfunctional family systems can encourage, and preserve, alcoholism. Children of alcoholics parents who faced higher risk of alcoholism, even when they were adopted into a non-alcoholic family, signifying a genetic factor to alcoholism (Cadoret et.al., 1985; Hesselbrock, 1995).

Nace and his colleagues, (1982) displayed that alcoholic and their family members were influenced by psychological factors which includes stigma associated with alcoholism, emotional withdrawal, guilt and craving. Velleman, (1992) also described the influence of drinking on family roles, communication, social life and finances, like finances that were limited due to
payments on alcohol, family gatherings were spoiled because of alcoholic behaviors, and roles that have to be allocated as the addicted family member was incapable to carry out daily tasks.

Kumpfer, (1987) revealed that home environment of drug abusive families was comprised of low parent child attachment, extremely high family conflict, lack of sharing of prosocial morals, high level of punishment, and less effective communication. McMohan and Luthar, (1998) point’s two findings regarding children of drug addicted parents. Firstly, these children have poorer physical, intellectual or educational, social and emotional developmental outcomes in contrast of other children. Secondly they were at risk of substance misuse. A disorderly or uncontrolled home disrupt life of the child by making it hard to complete tasks like homework and not being able to obtain desired rest resulting in lack of ability to perform in school (Lambie and Sias, 2005).

Adolescent personality characteristics such as sensation seeking, disobedience, and tolerance for deviance were strong predictors of their alcohol or other drug abuse. A positive relationship or attachment of parent and adolescent served as a protecting factor, offsetting the risk of alcohol or other drug misuse linked with peer alcohol or other drug misuse. These findings further hold the opinion that parental warmth and monitoring were serious components in predicting the child’s risk of alcohol or other drug misuse (Kandel and Andrews, 1987). Cloninger, (1987) have speculated to a great extent of the heritability for alcoholism was mediated by personality traits. In other words, Children of alcoholics’ might be predictable to be different from Children of non alcoholics’ on key personality dimensions, differences that may explain the risk of alcoholism and other behavioral problems in children of alcoholics parents.

Family interactions also influence the children of alcoholic’s risk for alcohol abuse. Jacob and Krahn, (1988) found that families with an alcoholic
parent exhibit more negative family interaction during problem-solving debate than families in which the parents were non alcoholics. In addition, parental overindulge drinking appears to be connected with more disturbed family interactions than does stable drinking (Jacob and Leonard, 1988).

Parents child relationship has often been conceptualized in terms of the interaction between two dimensions of parental behavior. The one that deals with the emotional relationship and the second which relates to different forms of parental control. Winefield and colleagues, (1990) in their study found that consequences of neglecting parenting in life of adults was still observed in later ages like women were proved to have poorer work adjustment and men had less valuable interpersonal relationships. In another study, they compare offender and non-offender adolescents regarding their perception of parenting, and found that male offenders adolescents perceived their fathers more neglecting in contrast of the male non-offenders adolescents.

Zucker, (1994) concluded that inadequate parenting in early childhood results in development antisocial behavior and alcohol abuse during adolescence and adulthood. The level of mutual warmth, support, and control within the parent teenager relationship considerably predicted the risk of adolescent drug or marijuana use. Lamborn, et.al., (1992); Paulson, (1994), conducted a study and found that parents who use opiates and other drugs have low level of involvement in their children’s schooling such as poor attendance at school programs appears to have negative implication for their children’s performance at school and due to this poor attendance they may left behind (Simon, Johnsan, and Conger, 1994). Grolnick & Ryan, (1989) also shown that parental involvement improve children’s perception of competence and control among children. Involved parents were more likely than uninvolved parents had elementary school children who perceive themselves as competent in school. Parental drug abuse problem results in low level of emotional involvement, lack of supportiveness and closeness
which has been found to have negative influence on children’s well-being. In contrast children whose fathers were involved had positive attitude toward school (Flouri, Buchanan, & Bream, 2002), and more likely to enjoy school, they had improved academic outcomes, higher educational expectations, higher level of academic and economic achievement, career success, professional competency, higher educational accomplishment and psychological well being (Bell, 1969; Lozoff, 1974; Barber and Thomas, 1986; Barnett et al. 1992; Furstenberg & Harris, 1993; Harris, Furstenberg, & Marmer, 1998; Flouri, 2005) and more likely to display more cognitive competence on standardized intellectual assessments (Lamb, 1987).

Stanger et. al., (1999) confirmed that children whose parents abuse drug scored lower on social and academic competence than children from a national US sample and higher on variety of measures of internalizing and externalizing emotional, behavioral problems.

Lamborn et. al., (1991) also testified that children who were neglected by their parents scored lowest on measures of psychosocial competence and highest on measures of psychological and behavioral dysfunctions in comparison of children of supportive parents. Brook and colleagues, (1996) found that drug addicted parents frequently become aggressive and harmful toward their family members. The children of drug abuser have been found to experience social, emotional, behavioral problems than children of non drug abusive parents. These parents were unable to fulfill the psychological needs of their children. Fulfillment of these psychological needs may contribute in children’s perception of competence, expectations of performance and sense of control (Deci and Ryan, 1985).

Brook et al., (1996) stated that parental drug abuse problem result in poor parenting, lack of emotional attachment, high level of internal tension or stress, difficulty in trusting others and interpersonal relationship, unmet emotional needs. Poor parenting and cognitive abilities increase the risk of
maladaptive child behavior pattern; on the other hand normative parenting and intellectual abilities protect the child and help to expand growth of competence (Masten, 2001). Warm support from parents and secure relationship with brothers and sisters play a significant role in development of social competence in children (Dunn & Munn, 1985; Herrera & Dunn, 1997). Cleaver et al., (1999) demonstrated that parental drug abuse problems can interfere with the process of secure attachment. Their Insecurity affects the strength of a person’s self esteem and social competence (Helson and Wink, 1987; Little and kobak’, 2003).

Different studies showed that children of involved parents displayed better social and emotional development (Allen & Daly, 2002), including more resilience to stress, better life satisfaction, better self-direction and self control, more supportive relationships, greater social adjustment, positive relationship with their peers, greater social competence, open-minded, successful marriages, and fewer antisocial behaviors (Desforges & Abouchaar, 2003).

Child developmental studies pointed out that experience in early childhood have distinctive influences on later developmental, psycho-social adjustment and outcomes (Collins et. al., 2000; Kovan et.al., 2009). These may be realized over time throughout a variety of implicated mechanisms such as a heightened inherited liability to early behavior problems, as well as cognitive deficits and high-risk environments. Kandel, (1990) found that, behavioral problems among children of substance-misusing parents were common by age of 12 years. Children of high level substance misusing mothers were more likely to be hostile, withdrawn and not well adjusted. Similar comparisons demonstrated that children of substance misusers were more likely to experience socio-economic drawback, more social isolation and report high levels of stress in comparison of non-misusing groups (Kumpfer
and DeMarsh, 1986; Sowder and Burt, 1980). Children living with fathers who misused illicit drugs reported a higher incidence of physical violence and had witnessed more marital conflict children from non-substance-misusing families.

Family contexts may give exposure to key occurrence and consequences for alcohol abuse. Many alcohol-abusing persons mention family arguments, poor family communication, and insufficient family problem solving, and irritating at home as antecedents of a drinking episode (O'Farrell & Fals-Stewart, 1999).

Roberts & Linney, (2000) concluded that drinking and family functioning were linked although the relationship may be causal, mutual, iterative, or incidental to other causes. There were several family problems that were likely to co-occur with person’s alcohol abuse, including intimate partner aggression, conflict/clash and low relationship satisfaction, economic and legal vulnerability, and child risks. Communication in family systems that involve members with substance problems were characterized as highly critical, involving large amounts of irritating, judgments, complaints, blame and guilt (Reilly, 1992).

The quality of parental relationship spills over into relationship with their children. Couples with satisfying marital relationships were more warm and supportive for their children and in contrast negative relationships was found between couples whose marriage was full of discord and their children (Parke & Buriel, 1998). Their children show high level of anxiety, depression or hopelessness and antisocial behavior (Harold & Conger, 1997). Usually, relationships of father’s with their children seem to be more strongly influenced by the quality of their marital relationship than do mother’s relationships, but the spillover happens for both parents.

Parents with conflicted marriages had a poor parenting style which was characterized as unresponsive, angry, and deficient or lacking in providing
structure and setting limits (Parke & O'Neil, 2000). Children under this kind of rearing style tended to exhibit a lot of anger and disobedience in interacting with their parents. Children may also be influenced directly by marital conflict when they actually see arguments and fights. The more common and violent the conflict, the more likely the children were to display distress, embarrassment, and self-blame (Frosch & Mangelsdorf & McHale, 2000).

Researches regarding impact of different family background and cultural factors on motivation of students, as well as the role of parental attitude, beliefs, and actions in encouraging children’s motivation have shown that families challenged by different combinations of environmental and psychosocial risk factors or stressors frequently establish family patterns of interaction which were far from optimal with respect to their development-enhancing features (Sameroff, Seifer, Barocas, Zax, & Greenspan, 1987; Liaw & Brooks-Gunn, 1994; Belsky & Fearon, 2002; Burchinal, Roberts, Hooper & Zeisel, 2000).

Beckerman, (1998) found that Substance-misusing parents were more likely to be involved with the criminal justice system and children of substance-misusing women were at increased risk of experiencing family disturbance. Imprisonment often results in family disturbance because of separation and possible breakdown of relationships, frequent changes in caregivers. Sidebotham and Golding, (2001) found that paternal and maternal substance abuse was significantly linked to different kinds of child abuse such as physical abuse, emotional abuse, sexual abuse and neglect but these effects disappeared when background factors were controlled for and also demonstrated that successively increasing rates of abuse were found for those children who reported that their mothers, fathers or both parents had substance misuse problems. This risk was significantly high where both parents, rather than the father only, had substance misuse problems. The quality of the care-giving environment can be seriously damaged by the
problems of parental substance misuse. Families of individuals with alcohol use disorders were frequently characterized by physical and emotional abuse, conflict, confusion, communication problems, impulsiveness, unpredictability, discrepancies in communication with children, breakdown in rituals and traditional family rules, (Connors, Donovan, & DiClemente, 2001).

Individuals married to persons with alcohol use disorders found to have higher level of psychological, stress-related medical problems, and greater use of medical care systems, than Individuals married to non alcoholics persons (Holder, 1998; Connors, Donovan, & DiClemente, 2001).

Children of substance abusing parents were broadly considered at high risk for a range of biological, behavioral problems and developmental including for increasing risk substance abuse problems of their own. Rochester Longitudinal study suggest high numbers of environmental hazard such as maternal mental illness and nervousness, inflexibility in parenting attitudes, few positive maternal relations, stressful life events, low education, unskilled occupation, minority status, single parenthood and large family size were linked to lower IQ grades and increased socio emotional problems in four-year-old children. The influences of environmental hazard outweigh the adverse consequences of prenatal substance exposure. A high level parental substance misuse contributes in challenging aspect of the lives of these children was that they appear to have inadequate opportunities to develop the kinds of abilities and relationships that might serve as barrier against risk.

Parental substance misuse create disturbance in family life. These disturbed families function poorly, family members perceive their environment to be less cohesive, and have lower levels of expression of warmth, affection, love and caring, and higher levels of unresolved conflict, quarrels and arguing (Burke et. al., 2006).

Cousins and Milner, (2006) observed that family environment into which a child born had strong and long-lasting influence over his or her growth and future life opportunities. Children living with parents who misuse alcohol
had feeling of socially excluded means socially avoided and isolated and lack the ability to interact effectively with the environment (Laybourn et.al., 1996) feelings of low self-worth or confidence (Gorin, 2004) and may also experience poverty, avoid social interaction and to enter in school, and lack parental support (Alison, 2000; Mahoney and MacKechnie, 2001). Many children from these families dislike school and believe they were not intelligent.

It has been found that children growing up in environment of harsh conditions face many challenges as they shift into adolescence and adulthood, including high risks for academic failure, behavioral problems, social difficulties, and various forms of psychopathology (Luthar, 2006; Burt & Masten, 2009; Luecken & Gress, 2010). A number of childhood factors have been identified as encouraging resilience, including contextual factors such as positive parenting and schools (Luthar, 2006; Masten, 2007). Children’s personality distinction likewise may promote positive functioning in the face of difficulty, there was significant evidence showing that IQ, self-regulation, and positive self-perceptions were linked with good developmental outcomes among children who had overcome diverse drawback and adversities (Sapienza & Masten, 2011).

Neppl and collegues, (2009) found that hostile parenting produce violent behavior in children which in turn was associated with higher levels of aggression later in their interactions with their own children. The quality of parenting experienced by children who grow up with drug misusing parents was more likely to be described by instability and inconsistency. Children of these parents experience poor parental attachment and low responsiveness. It was also found that even child’s mother did not misuse drugs but living with drug misuse husband, negatively influence her relationship with her child which weaken the mother’s capacity to deal with stress in environment.

Children frequently had a great deal of higher level of consciousness regarding parental alcohol and drug abuse than parents and experts can
imagine, even though they cannot completely recognize (Gorin, 2004; Barnard and Barlow, 2003). Studies have found that a number of children have an alertness of parental alcohol and drug abuse approximately when they are at the age of five (Bancroft Cunningham, Backett-Milburn and Masters, 2004; Christensen, 1995; Laybourn, Brown and Hill, 1996). Various parents may attempt to hide their use of substances and any linked paraphernalia such as; children were not permitted in the similar room. Younger children may be more possible to witness parents taking drugs because of parental perceptions that they were too immature to recognize (Hogan and Higgens, undated). In the case of alcohol, there can be fewer cover up or disguise due to a broader social acceptance. Children possibly will feel confused bewildered, perplexed, disappoint and scared by parental alcohol and drug abuse and subsequent behaviours (Gillan and Robertson (2009), Barnard and Barlow (2003); Laybourn, Brown and Hill, (1996). As children mature or grow older, they can be more and more angry and frustrated with a father mother or parents (Bancroft Cunningham, Backett-Milburn and Masters H (2004,). Bancroft Cunningham, Backett-Milburn and Masters, (2004) also demonstrated that knowing in relation to parental alcohol and drug abuse did not indicate that children will share this knowledge with others. Frequently parents and children were anxious that other persons knowing can direct to social work participation and the elimination of children (Hogan and Higgens, undated). Kroll, (2004) indicated that in a little case, children can feel scared regarding the consequences of telling someone outside of their family. Children can keep away from circumstances where parental drug and alcohol abuse can become more generally known for instance, they avoid inviting their friends round to the home.

All the above studies hint at negative impact of parental neglect, psychological unavailability and parental drug abuse on children’s school adjustment and academic performance due to their diminished or afflicted competence motivation. Hence the following hypotheses have been proposed for verification:-
• Family relationship in drug abuse afflicted families would be characterized by low concentration, low acceptance and high avoidance rejection as compared to normal families.

• Family relations in drug abuse afflicted families would negatively influence the competence motivation of rural students from drug abuse afflicted families.

OTHER RELEVANTS STUDIES RELATING TO PARENTAL & THEIR CHILDREN’S DRUG ABUSE PROBLEMS

Adoption studies have compared children born of parent who was alcoholic usually the father and reared by adoptive parents who were nonalcoholic with adopted children born of nonalcoholic parents the adopted infants of an alcoholic parent developed alcoholism as adults at higher rates than adopted children born of nonalcoholic parents (Cloninger, Bohman & Sigvardsson, 1981). In one study, it was found that adopted children were significantly more likely to become alcoholic if a sibling in their adoptive family alcohol addicted, and this influence was increased if the sibling was of the identical gender and close in age to the adopted person (Sharma, McGue, & Benson, 1996).

Kaufman and Pattison, (1981) reported that alcoholism can negatively affect the family system and that dysfunctional family systems can encourage, and sustain, alcoholism. Children of parents who were alcoholics face a higher risk of alcoholism, even when they were adopted into a non-alcoholic family, signifying a genetic factor to alcoholism as well (Cadoret et al., 1985; Hesselbrock, 1995).

The children of alcoholic parents may possibly expose to higher levels of family clash, as well (Moos & Billings, 1982; Webb & Baer, 1995). In a comparison of parents with a history of substance abuse with non substance abuser parents it was found that non substance abuse parents have lower restriction, control, destruction avoidance and traditionalism in relation to their families (Elkins, McGue, Malone, & Iacono, 2004).
In a study Sher, (1991) compared children of substance misusers with their peers whose parents did not misuse substances and found that children of substance misusers were at the high risk of experiencing a range of health social and psychological problems than their peers whose parents did not misuse substances. Parental substance abuse increase the risk for substance abuse in emerging adulthood during an interaction between parenting and certain characteristic of child’s personality, in particular their capacity for self regulation. Children who were doing poorly at school may increase their relationship with substance using peers and these peer association, in turn, may lead to higher levels of substance abuse and lower educational achievement. Children whose parents misuse substances shown that parental substance misuse increase the risk of alcohol and other drug use during teenage and was a risk factor for adult alcohol and other drug misuse (Chassin et. al., 1991).

Family influences were significant factors in protecting against the development of teenager alcohol abuse (Foxcroft and Lowe, 1992), and that negative family influences can create the opposite consequence (Catalono et.al., 1999, Rossow and Lauritzen 2001). Jesse, (1989) reported that children from alcoholic/addictive families were repeatedly victims of physical and sexual abuse, neglect, and ongoing family problems. They were more susceptible to substance abuse. Children in these families were likely to be at high risk due to the occurrence of alcohol or other drug misuse inside their families than their peers and in their communities.

Genetics studies (O'Farrell & Fals-Stewart, 1999) explained an increased susceptibility to alcohol use disorder, family environment contribute to and mediate their appearance or expression. Cadoret et.al., (1995) reported a higher incidence of substance abuse among the children of alcoholic fathers compared to other persons, and attributed part of the consequence to the increased possibility of early conduct problems among these children.

It was found by Eiden and Leonard, (1996) that there were disturbances in the mother-infant attachment in homes where the father was a
heavy drinker. Among mothers, the influence on their parenting appear to result from their own alcohol/drug problems, among fathers, the consequence on their parenting appears to outcome from their own experiences of parental neglect in childhood, leading to child neglect and lack of parental warmth, love or affection (Locke & Newcomb, 2004).

Brothers and sisters are significant environmental influences on many aspects of individual development. It was found by Stevenson & Lee, (2001) that heavy drinker individual's family relationships frequently were unclear and dysfunctional—this includes relationships with siblings that may become upset as a result of a complex of disruptive behaviors that may accompany heavy drinking. In some cases, siblings were role models for drug use and might be the ones providing access to substances (Kaufman & Kaufman, 1992; Epstein, Botvin, & Diaz, 1999; Vakalahi, 2001; Epstein, Williams, & Botvin, 2002). On the other hand, brothers and sisters, mainly elder supportive siblings/step-siblings/foster siblings, were often present in the lives of those who made good adaptation in spite of being the son or daughter of an alcoholic parent (Werner & Johnson, 2000).

Social factors which influence early development within the family like a lack of mutual attachment, ineffective parenting and a chaotic or disorganized home environment have been shown to be critically significant indicators of risk of alcohol and other drug abuse (Coyer 2001, NIDA 1997). Drug misuse by parents and friends has been shown as the powerful predictor of alcohol and other drug abuse among children (Challier et al., 2000).

In a study Fals-Stewart and colleagues, (2004) compared the outcome of children of drug-misusing or alcohol-misusing fathers with children of non-substance-misusing fathers. They found that drug-misusing fathers reported more dysfunctional disciplinary practices and have less control on their children. These findings shown that children of alcohol misusing parents were at risk for substance abuse, in part because of impairments, destructions that happen in family socialization and behavioral management.
Observations of these children from drug afflicted families reveal that they are tend to achieve lower in academics and slow in learning of cognitive skills which persuade one to conclude about their low IQ. In these ways it seems that children living in homes where parents misuse drugs has negative effect on their whole life.

An overview of empirical research done in the context of consequences of parental drug abuse and family relations on various dimensions of children’s development and performance in various domains of activity especially the academic performance to clearly hint of that the basic damage being done to the child by parental drug abuse is in the context of their competence motivation. This aspect of the problem has not been addressed by any of the study so far. Hence the following hypotheses are being proposed for empirical verification.

HYPOTHESES

1. Competence motivation of rural students belonging to drug abuse afflicted families would be low as compared to students from non drug abuse afflicted families.

2. Family relationship in drug abuse afflicted families would be characterized by low concentration, low acceptance and high avoidance rejection as compared to normal families.

3. Personality profile of rural students from drug afflicted families would be characterized by low A, C, D, G, H and high O, Q3 and Q4 factors as compared to their counterparts from non drug afflicted families.

4. Contribution of personality in competence motivation of rural students from drug abuse afflicted families would be low as compared to students from non drug abuse afflicted families.

5. Family relations in drug abuse afflicted families would negatively influence the competence motivation of rural students from drug abuse afflicted families.

6. School environment would have relatively low contribution in competence motivation of rural students from drug abuse afflicted families as compared to students from non drug abuse afflicted families.