CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Adolescence is a very crucial period of life. It is said to be the foundation period also. What a person thinks about himself or herself he or she is like that. Personal experience and the comment the adolescent receives from close relatives and friends shape his or her self perception. No a days the adolescence have a pressure of performance. This pressure is highest. Their academic achievement and the academic motivation are of most concern.

This is also the time of conflicts. The maximum conflicts are with parents. If the parents have used the best parenting style that suite their temperaments than these conflicts are negligible. Here in this study all these aspects are studied.

1. SELF-CONCEPT

The term self-concept is a general term used to refer to how someone thinks about or perceives themselves. The self concept is how we think about and evaluate ourselves. To be aware of oneself is to have a concept of oneself. The concept of self is probably the most distinctive and indispensable concept in personality and social psychology. In psychological discussion the word 'self' has been used in many ways. Two main meanings emerge, however; the self as the subject or agent and the self as the individual who is known to himself. The term self-concept has come into common use to refer to the second meaning which relates to the phenomenological approach, Allport (1961) has described self-concept as 'something of which we are immediately aware. We think of it as the warm, central private region of our life. As such it plays a crucial part in our consciousness (a concept broader than self), in our personality (a concept broader than consciousness) and in our organism (a concept broader than personality). Thus, it is some kind of core in our being.
The behavior of an individual which is simple or complex is influenced by how he sees himself. If an individual feels he is accepted socially, he will act friendly and comparatively. Research studies from several areas of behaviour, have shown that how self-concept built in early years of life and reinforced by later experiences, influences behaviour and characteristic reactions to people and situations. Self-concept may be defined as the totality of a complex, organized, and dynamic system of learned beliefs, attitudes and opinions that each person holds to be true about his or her personal existence. Self-concept is different from self-esteem (feelings of personal worth and level of satisfaction regarding one's self) or self-report (what a person is willing and able to disclose).

The self-concept is the accumulation of knowledge about the self, such as beliefs regarding personality traits, physical characteristics, abilities, values, goals, and roles. Beginning in infancy, children acquire and organize information about them as a way to enable them to understand the relation between the self and their social world. This developmental process is a direct consequence of children's emerging cognitive skills and their social relationships with both family and peers. During early childhood, children's self-concepts are less differentiated and are centered on concrete characteristics, such as physical attributes, possessions, and skills. During middle childhood, the self-concept becomes more integrated and differentiated as the child engages in social comparison and more clearly perceives the self as consisting of internal, psychological characteristics. Throughout later childhood and adolescence, the self-concept becomes more abstract, complex, and hierarchically organized into cognitive mental representations or self-schemas, which direct the processing of self-relevant information.
The self-concept is composed of relatively permanent self-assessments, such as personality attributes, knowledge of one's skills and abilities, one's occupation and hobbies, and awareness of one's physical attributes. For example, the statement, "I am brave" is a self-assessment that contributes to the self-concept. In contrast, the statement "I am hungry" would not normally be considered part of someone's self-concept, since being hungry is a temporary state. Nevertheless, a person's self-concept may change with time, possibly going through turbulent periods of identity crisis and reassessment. The self-concept is not restricted to the present. It includes past selves and future selves. Future selves or "possible selves" represent individuals' ideas of what they might become, what they would like to become, and what they are afraid of becoming. They correspond to hopes, fears, standards, goals, and threats. Possible selves may function as incentives for future behavior and they also provide an evaluative and interpretive context for the current view of self.

Self-concept is inherently phenomenological, that is, it refers to the person's own view of him- or herself. In fact, one leading scholar in the field (Wylie, 1974) has argued that comparisons to external events are not particularly relevant in the assessment of self-concept.

Self-concept is the cognitive part of self-perception. Self-esteem is the affective dimension (how we feel about ourselves). Self-changing involves both knowing how (learning) and wanting to (motivation). It is important to see that learning is different from performing.

1.1.1 Components of Self-Concept:

According to Hurlock (1974) the concept of self has three major components: the perceptual, the conceptual and the attitudinal.
a) The perceptual component is similar to physical self-concept which includes the image of one's appearance, attractiveness and sex appropriateness of body and the importance of different parts of body.

b) The conceptual component is similar to 'psychological self-concept' which relates to the origin of the individual, his abilities and disabilities, his social adjustment and traits of personality.

c) The attitudinal component refers to attitudes of a person about his present status and future prospects, his feelings about his worthiness, his attitudes of self-esteem, pride and shame. It includes his beliefs, convictions, values also.

Carl Rogers believes that Self Concept has three different components:

a) The view you have of yourself (Self image)

b) How much value you place on yourself (Self esteem or self-worth)

c) What you wish you were really like (Ideal self)

1.1.2 Self: Indian Context:

Classical Indian views of the self and person range from maximal to minimal conceptions, from a view of everyone's true self as the supreme being, infinite, immortal, self-existent, self-aware, and intrinsically blissful, to a view of the person as nothing more than the living human body that ceases to be at death. (“Consciousness is an adventitious attribute of the body, like the intoxicating power of fermented grain.”) Every major school and sub school takes a stance on what a self is and how it is known; a rich diversity of opinion and argument marks this area of classical Indian thought. Speculation about mystical possibilities are
recorded in very old, pre-classical texts known as *Upaniṣads* ("secret doctrines"), from as early as 800 or even 900 B.C. The ancient *Upaniṣads* suggest that there lies in each of us, hidden, occult, a somehow spiritual self that enjoys ways of being and awareness superior to our everyday consciousness. The reality of this self would explain discoveries in meditation and the results of yogic or ascetic practices — such seems to be the implicit thesis. The classical schools of *Vedānta*, *Sāṁkhya*, and *Yoga* owe much to *Upaniṣadic* mysticism with respect to their views of a hidden, true or supreme self.

### 1.1.3 Structure and Development of the Self Concept

**Markus and Wurf** (1987) state that the most dramatic advances in the last decade of research on the self-concept can be found in work on its structure and content. Historically, one of the major stumbling blocks to linking the self-concept to behavior has been the view of the self-concept as a stable, generalized, or average view of the self. More recent research in social psychology (Greenwald and Pratkanis, 1984; Schlenker, 1980) has resolved this problem by conceptualizing of the self-concept as a multifaceted phenomenon composed of a set of images, schemas and prototypes (Markus and Wurf, 1987).

In the self concept-based model of motivation, one's concept of self is composed of four interrelated self-perceptions: the perceived self, the ideal self, one's self esteem, and a set of social identities. Each of these elements plays a crucial role in understanding how the self-concept relates to energizing, directing and sustaining our behavior. Each of these self-representations will be described and their inter-relationships discussed.
1.1.4 The Perceived Self

Most models and descriptions of the self involve elements of self perceptions; however, most are unclear as to what aspects of the self the individual holds perceptions of. One of the earliest theorists writing on the nature of the self was William James (1890). He saw the self as consisting of whatever the individual views as belonging to himself or herself, which includes a material, a social, and a spiritual self. The perceptions of the material self are those of one's own body, family, and possessions. The social self includes the views others have of the individual, and the spiritual includes perceptions of one's emotions and desires. Gecas (1982) asserts that the content of the self-concept consists of perceptions of social and personal identities, traits, attributes, and possessions. This utilizes three general categories of self-perceptions that are believed to incorporate most of those suggested in earlier research. These include traits, competencies and values.

a) Traits

Traits are labels for broad reaction tendencies and express relatively permanent patterns of behavior. Fundamental to this definition is the assumption that people make internal attributions to individuals who demonstrate a particular behavior pattern in different situations or at different times without apparent external reasons. The more crosssituational consistency one observes, and the more external causes of behavior seem to be lacking, the more likely one would make an internal attribution (Harvey, Kelley, and Shapiro, 1957). It is not important at this point to understand what really motivates aggressive behavior. What is important is that individuals hold a set of self-perceptions regarding many different traits.
b) Competencies

A second element in the perceived self is competencies. Individuals hold perceptions of what skills, abilities, talents, and knowledge they possess. These can range from very specific skills to more general competencies, such as the leadership skills to create and manage change.

c) Values

Values are defined as concepts and beliefs about desirable end states or behaviors that transcend specific situations, guide selection or evaluation of behavior and events, and are ordered by relative importance (Schwartz and Bilsky, 1990). Individuals demonstrate certain values through their speech and actions. This element of the perceived self is concerned with the set of values that the individual believes guides his or her decisions and actions.

An individual's perception of his/her attributes (i.e., traits, competencies, and values), can be describe in terms of two separate dimensions, level and strength. Level of self-perception refers to the degree to which the individual perceives he/she possesses this attribute. Does the individual see himself or herself as highly introverted (trait), or a very good tennis player (competency), or a hard worker (value)? This dimension deals with the issue of where individuals see themselves, relative to their ideal selves, and is directly related to the issue of high and low self esteem.

The second dimension of the perceived self is the strength of the perception, and refers to how strongly the individual holds the perception of attribute level. Individuals with strong perceived selves are relatively firm in their perceptions of an attribute level. These strong perceptions of self are a result of consistent and clear feedback regarding the attribute. A weak perceived self is reflected in individuals who are relatively unsure of an attribute level, often
resulting from conflicting or ambiguous feedback regarding the attribute. How these self-perceptions develop is explained next.

**Development of Perceived Self**

Self-perceptions are determined through interaction with one's environment. Processes of attitude formation, attitude change, (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980) and self attribution (Jones, 1990) all contribute to the development of a set of self perceptions. As indicated above, when feedback is unambiguous, plentiful, and consistent, a set of strongly held self-perceptions is formed. Ambiguous, lacking, or inconsistent feedback results in weakly held self perceptions.

**The Ideal Self**

While the perceived self describes the set of perceptions individuals hold of their actual traits, competencies, and values, the ideal self represents the set of traits, competencies and values an individual would like to possess (Rogers, 1959). By possess we mean that the individual desires to believe that he/she actually has a particular trait, competency, or value, or wants others to believe that the individual has the trait, competency, or value. This view of ideal self is similar to Schlenker's (1985) "idealized image" (i.e., the ultimate person one would like to be).

**Development of the Ideal Self**

The establishment of the ideal self is determined through a mix of external, or other directed standards, and internal, or inner-directed standards, depending on one's orientation to the world (Reisman, 1961). The ideal self of the other-directed individual is developed largely through the established norms and role expectations of reference group members. For the inner-directed individual, the ideal self is determined largely through the development of a set
of internalized goals and standards, and the individual becomes his or her own audience. Gottfredson's (1981) perspective on individual and social achievement motivation is similar to this conceptualization. The author asserts that in individually oriented achievement motivation, the individual strives to achieve some internalized standards of excellence. In contrast, socially oriented achievement motivation reflects an individual's perseverance to fulfill the expectations of significant others.

Lewis (1990) suggests that development of a concept of self has two aspects:

(1) The Existential Self:

This is “the most basic part of the self-scheme or self-concept; the sense of being separate and distinct from others and the awareness of the constancy of the self” (Bee 1992). The child realises that they exist as a separate entity from others and that they continue to exist over time and space. According to Lewis awareness of the existential self begins as young as two to three months old and arises in part due to the relation the child has with the world. For example, the child smiles and someone smiles back, or the child touches a mobile and sees it move.

(2) The Categorical Self:

Having realised that he or she exists as a separate experiencing being, the child next becomes aware that he or she is also an object in the world. Just as other objects including people have properties that can be experienced (big, small, red, smooth and so on) so the child is becoming aware of him or her self as an object which can be experienced and which has properties. The self too can be put into categories such as age, gender, size or skill. Two of the first categories to be applied are age (“I am 3”) and gender (“I am a girl”).
In early childhood the categories children apply to themselves are very concrete (e.g. hair colour, height and favourite things). Later, self-description also begins to include reference to internal psychological traits, comparative evaluations and to how others see them.

1.1.5 Self-Concept Theory – Historical Perspective

A milestone in human reflection about the non-physical inner self came in 1644, when Rene Descartes wrote Principles of Philosophy. Descartes proposed that doubt was a principal tool of disciplined inquiry, yet he could not doubt that he doubted. He reasoned that if he doubted, he was thinking, and therefore he must exist. Thus existence depended upon perception.

A second milestone in the development of self-concept theory was the writing of Sigmund Freud (1900) who gave us new understanding of the importance of internal mental processes. While Freud and many of his followers hesitated to make self-concept a primary psychological unit in their theories, Freud's daughter Anna (1946) gave central importance to ego development and self-interpretation.

Self-concept theory has always had a strong influence on the emerging profession of counseling. Prescott Lecky (1945) contributed the notion that self-consistency is a primary motivating force in human behavior. Raimy (1948) introduced measures of self-concept in counseling interviews and argued that psychotherapy is basically a process of altering the ways that individuals see themselves.

By far the most influential and eloquent voice in self-concept theory was that of Carl Rogers (1947) who introduced an entire system of helping built around the importance of the self. In Rogers' view, the self is the central ingredient in human personality and personal
adjustment. Rogers described the self as a social product, developing out of interpersonal relationships and striving for consistency. He maintained that there is a basic human need for positive regard both from others and from oneself. He also believed that in every person there is a tendency towards self-actualization and development so long as this is permitted and encouraged by an inviting environment (Purkey & Schmidt, 1987).

While most self-concept theorists continued to write and conduct research during the 1970's and 1980's, general interest in self-concept declined. In a recent article explaining the likely causes for the decline of "humanistic" education, Patterson (1987) presents reasons for the decline of interest in self-concept as well. He offers four likely causes:

1. A cornucopia of contrived games, gimmicks, and techniques that were introduced and controlled by unprepared professionals.

2. A national mood of "back to basics" in education prevailed where concern for the emotional needs of students was viewed as inimical to academic excellence.

3. Poor judgment by counselors and teachers in selecting suitable materials for values clarification programs resulted in public opposition to any attempt to introduce values in school.

4. Strong opposition by those who objected to any consideration of personal development of students because they believed it to be secular humanism and, therefore, an effort to undermine religion.

Fortunately, there is a new awareness on the part of both the public and professionals that self-concept cannot be ignored if we are to successfully address such nagging problems as drug and alcohol abuse, drop-out rates, dysfunctional families, and other concerns. In addition
to this growing awareness, new ways are being developed to strengthen self-concepts. For example, research by cognitive theorists (McAdam, 1986; Ryan, Short & Weed, 1986) are demonstrating that negative self-talk leads to irrational thinking regarding oneself and the world.

1.1.6 Self-Concept: Basic Assumptions

It is also becoming clear that self-concept has at least three major qualities. (1) it is learned, (2) it is organized, and (3) it is dynamic. Each of these qualities, with corollaries, follow.

Self-concept is learned. As far as we know, no one is born with a self-concept. It gradually emerges in the early months of life and is shaped and reshaped through repeated perceived experiences, particularly with significant others. The fact that self-concept is learned has some important implications:

- Because self-concept does not appear to be instinctive, but is a social product developed through experience, it possesses relatively boundless potential for development and actualization.

- Because of previous experiences and present perceptions, individuals may perceive themselves in ways different from the ways others see them.

- Individuals perceive different aspects of themselves at different times with varying degrees of clarity. Therefore, inner focusing is a valuable tool for counseling.

- Any experience which is inconsistent with one's self-concept may be perceived as a threat, and the more of these experiences there are, the more rigidly self-concept is organized
to maintain and protect itself. When a person is unable to get rid of perceived inconsistencies, emotional problems arise.

- Faulty thinking patterns, such as dichotomous reasoning (dividing everything in terms of opposites or extremes) or overgeneralizing (making sweeping conclusions based on little information) create negative interpretations of oneself.

- Self-Concept is organized. Most researchers agree that self-concept has a generally stable quality that is characterized by orderliness and harmony. Each person maintains countless perceptions regarding one's personal existence, and each perception is orchestrated with all the others. It is this generally stable and organized quality of self-concept that gives consistency to the personality. This organized quality of self-concept has corollaries.

- Self-concept requires consistency, stability, and tends to resist change. If self-concept changed readily, the individual would lack a consistent and dependable personality.

- The more central a particular belief is to one's self-concept, the more resistant one is to changing that belief.

- At the heart of self-concept is the self-as-doer, the "I," which is distinct from the self-as-object, the various "me's." This allows the person to reflect on past events, analyze present perceptions, and shape future experiences.

- Basic perceptions of oneself are quite stable, so change takes time. Rome was not built in a day, and neither is self-concept.

- Perceived success and failure impact on self-concept. Failure in a highly regarded area lowers evaluations in all other areas as well. Success in a prized area raises evaluations in other seemingly unrelated areas.
- Self-Concept is dynamic. To understand the active nature of self-concept, it helps to imagine it as a gyrocompass: a continuously active system that dependably points to the "true north" of a person's perceived existence. This guidance system not only shapes the ways a person views oneself, others, and the world, but it also serves to direct action and enables each person to take a consistent "stance" in life. Rather than viewing self-concept as the cause of behavior, it is better understood as the gyrocompass of human personality, providing consistency in personality and direction for behavior. The dynamic quality of self-concept also carries corollaries.

- The world and the things in it are not just perceived; they are perceived in relation to one's self-concept.

- Self-concept development is a continuous process. In the healthy personality there is constant assimilation of new ideas and expulsion of old ideas throughout life.

- Individuals strive to behave in ways that are in keeping with their self-concepts, no matter how helpful or hurtful to oneself or others.

- Self-concept usually takes precedence over the physical body. Individuals will often sacrifice physical comfort and safety for emotional satisfaction.

- Self-concept continuously guards itself against loss of self-esteem, for it is this loss that produces feelings of anxiety.

- If self-concept must constantly defend itself from assault, growth opportunities are limited.

This brief overview of self-concept theory has focused on describing the ways people organize and interpret their inner world of personal existence. The beginnings of self-concept
theory and its recent history have been discussed. Three major qualities of self-concept—that it is: (1) learned, (2) organized, and (3) dynamic—have been presented. Individuals have within themselves relatively boundless potential for developing a positive and realistic self-concept. This potential can be realized by people, places, policies, programs, and processes that are intentionally designed to invite the realization of this potential.

1.1.7 Self-Concept: Measurement

Self-concept is a dominant element in personality pattern, the measurement of self-concept becomes very essential. If we want to understand personality of an individual, to understand and predict his life adjustment and his success and failure, we cannot proceed further without knowing this self-concept.

A variety of methods and techniques have been developed to index self-concept, few important techniques among these are Q-sort, 'semantic differential technique, other types of rating methods, questionnaire and adjective checklists.

An examination of various instruments developed to measure self-concept reveals that these measures have not incorporated many important components of self-concept presumed in theory and in observation; these measures do not deal with all aspects of self-concept but provide narrow and limited indexes depending upon purpose and interest of investigators. As such, a valid, reliable and direct measure of self-concept is not available. Most of the instruments are sampled on children and young adults. No measure deals with areas of self-concept which are of more significance to identify self-concept of old individuals. Moreover, no standardized scale has been developed as yet based on Indian adult and old population.
With all these, the crucial requirement to develop the present scale to measure phenomenal self-concept of adult and old individuals is felt.

2. PARENTING

The term “parenting”, rooted in the Latin word “pario” meaning life-giver, captures the focused and differentiated relationship that the young child has with the adults who are most emotionally invested in and consistently available to him or her (Scher & Sharabany, 2005; Shonkoff & Phillips, 2002). Biological and adoptive mothers, fathers, single-parents, divorced and remarried parents can be children’s principal caregivers, but when siblings, grandparents and non-familial caregivers mind children their parenting is pertinent as well (Bornstein, 2005).

Parenting is carried out by members of a species that function to ensure the reproduction, survival, nurturance, and socialization of the next birth cohort or generation of that species (Lerner et al., 2002). It refers to the set of behaviours that work individually or together to influence child outcomes (Sharma, 2004), beginning with the assumption of responsibility, wherein the primary object of attention and action is the child and involving giving birth to, and caring for a child's physical, psychological, emotional, moral and intellectual development (Baumrind & Thompson, 2002; Karraker & Coleman, 2005). It includes genetic endowment and direct effects of experience that manifest themselves through parents’ beliefs and behaviors as well as indirect influences take place through parents’ relationships with each other and their connections to community networks (Bornstein, 2005). Thus, parenting encompasses a number of different aspects, including beliefs, attitudes, values, expectations, goals, practices and behaviours (Bornstein, 2002; Wise & da Silva, 2007).
The findings depict that though children were an important and integral part of the family, they were not the sole focus (French, 2002). Parenting and parenting research has come a long way since earlier times. In the field of psychology it was only during the 1960s and 1970s that parenting began to become widely recognized as an important element in family relationships with a sudden increase of publications with parenting as the subject (Couchman, 1983; French, 2002). Interest in parental influence on child development stemmed from the Freudian and behaviourist theories (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). The Freudian contention was that the basic determinants of development were biological and inevitably in conflict with parental desires and societal requirements. The interaction between the child's libidinal needs and the family environment was presumed to determine individual differences in children's development. While child behaviorists were interested in how the patterning of reinforcement in the near environment shaped development (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).

Despite their differences both theories illustrate the influence of parenting on child development. But, it was not until Baumrind’s (1966) seminal work that a theoretical model emerged that incorporated the emotional and behavioral processes that underlie earlier models of development into a conceptualization of parenting style that was anchored in an emphasis on parents' belief systems. Her model profoundly altered subsequent thinking about parenting (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Since then parenting has been a centerpiece of developmental inquiry, reflecting the firm belief that childrearing makes the child (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2002). Consequently, opinions about parenting abound.

Parenting has emerged as playing a critical role in child development and family well-being (Kotchick & Forehand, 2002). Contemporary parenting studies are diversified, pluralistic, and specialized (Bornstein, 2005). Based on the accumulating empirical and
theoretical work, contemporary parenting researchers have developed a keen awareness of the inherent complexity of this area of study. These studies illustrate that, not only are multiple factors involved in determining parenting and its effects, but many relations among the relevant factors are bi-directional, multidirectional, and nonlinear (Karraker & Coleman, 2005).

Parenting can influence, and be influenced by, child characteristics such as temperament (Chen & Luster, 2002), as well as aspects of the macro social system in which children grow up, such as war, the political climate and policies of multiculturalism and assimilation (Rosenthal, 2000). It is affected by physical and social contexts, childrearing customs, socio-economic status and the psychological characteristics of adults (Boushel, 2000; Rosenthal & Roer-Strier, 2001).

Parenting style reflects how parents select to monitor their offspring's behavior and allows researchers to capture suites of the specific qualities that characterize parent-child relationships within a categorical framework (Darling et al., 1997; Patock-Peckham & Morgan-Lopez, 2007). It represents trait model of child rearing that suggest stable, recurrent patterns of behavior embodied by parents, consistent across time, situation and children as the core of parenting (Holden, 1997).

Parenting style is generally perceived as a constellation of attitudes (that form the context in which parenting behaviour occurs), characteristics of parents, their behaviour which describe the parent child interactions, alters the efficacy of socialization efforts for the child, over a wide range of situations thus creating an emotional and interactional climate reflecting their global pattern of style (Bee & Boyd, 2004; Brown et al., 1993; Darling and Steinberg, 1993). This climate, as reflected in global patterns of style (e.g., Baumrind’s authoritative and authoritarian styles), is thought to help children be more open to the parental input and
direction that are reflected in specific practices (Wu et al., 2000). Moreover, in addition to representing the emotional climate, parenting styles, also, reflect parental control of parent–child relationships (Carlo et al., 2007).

2.1.1 The Psychodynamic view:

According to Darling and Steinberg (1993) the psychodynamic theorists focused their efforts on the emotional relationship between the parent and child and its influence on the child's psychosexual, psychosocial, and personality development. Their models were unidirectional. They posited that individual differences in the emotional relationships between parents and children must necessarily result from differences in parental attributes, and many researchers focused on attitudes as the attributes of importance (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). They reasoned that as attitudes help determine both parental practices and the more subtle behaviors that give those practices meaning, assessing parental attitudes would capture the emotional tenor of the family milieu that determined the parent–child relationship and influenced the child's development (Baldwin, 1948; Darling & Steinberg, 1983, Orlansky, 1949; Schaefer, 1959).

2.1.2 The Learning model:

Theorists from behaviorist and social learning perspectives categorized parenting style according to parental behaviors and focused on parental practices rather than attitudes (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). According to them differences in children's development reflect differences in the learning environment to which they had been exposed. Consequently, measures of parenting style were designed to capture the patterning of behaviors that defined these environments (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Sears et al., 1957; Whiting & Child, 1953). They employed factor analysis to identify control as a behavioral attribute underlying the pattern of correlations among such practices as a parent's use of physical punishment, failure
to enforce rules, tolerance of masturbation, sanctions against aggression and rules for use of common living areas (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Teti & Candelaria, 2002). Behaviorist used the concepts of conditioned and unconditioned stimuli, reinforcement and reinforcement schedules, punishment, and extinction to explain the manner in which parents shaped behavior in children, with a focus on actual behaviors practiced by parents (Teti & Candelaria, 2002).

2.2 Models of Parenting Style

Earlier parenting theories differed in their emphasis on control (Watson, 1928) and nurturance (Freud, 1933; Rogers, 1960). Consequently, the particular dimensions that went into parenting style varied across studies (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). According to Symonds (1939), the various dimensions of parenting style included acceptance/rejection and dominance/submission.

Baldwin (1955) postulated emotional warmth/hostility and detachment/involvement as dimensions of parenting style. Sears et al. (1957) contended warmth and permissiveness/strictness to be the dimensions of parenting style. For Schaefer (1959), love/hostility and autonomy/control; and for Becker (1964), warmth/hostility and restrictiveness/permissiveness served as the particular dimensions of parenting style. In their seminal paper, Darling & Steinberg (1993) pointed out the similarity among the dimensions proposed by various researchers.

Despite these varied conceptualizations of parenting style and its dimensions, the most sweeping and influential treatment of the construct is reflected in the work of Baumrind (1966; 1967; 1970; 1980; 1989; 1991; 1996), who made great strides towards identifying components of parenting style.
2.2.1 Baumrind’s Model

Diana Baumrind (1966), with her pivotal model, proffered an operationalization of parenting style that set her apart from earlier researchers. Her paradigm of parenting style not just encompasses the parenting practices but also focus on the parents' values and the beliefs they hold about their roles as parents and the nature of children. Baumrind’s conceptualization of parenting style was configurational in nature, taking into account patterns of parenting behaviors across four parenting dimensions (Baumrind, 1966; 1971). These dimensions were: 

- **Control**, included use of specific disciplinary techniques used by parents. 
- **Clarity of communication** reflected the effectiveness and directionality of communication between the parent and the child.

- **Maturity demands**, defined as parental expectations, conveyed directly to children, so that they function at a level that is commensurate with their developmental level. 
- **Nurturance**, reflecting the degree to which parents express warmth, concern, involvement, and pleasure in parenting.

However, further factor analyses yielded two orthogonal factors, **responsiveness** and **demandingness** (Baumrind, 1991; 1996).

1. **Responsiveness** refers to the extent to which parent fosters individuality and self-assertion by being attuned, supportive, and acquiescent to children’s needs, demands and requests. Emotional neglect and the absence of parental responsiveness have been found to be even more important than restrictive, coercive discipline in the etiology of behavioural problems among children. Important facets of responsiveness include warmth; reciprocity; clear communication and person-centered discourse; attachment; and autonomy support (Baumrind, 1991; 1996). **Warmth** refers to the parent’s emotional expression of love. The
notion of *reciprocity* encompasses processes of synchrony or attunement in parent-child interaction.

*Parental communication* can be either *position-centered* or *person centered*.

Position-centered parental communication legitimizes parental authority on the basis of assigned roles and, as such, is often experienced by the child as coercive, whereas elaborated and person-centered parental communication legitimizes parental authority by persuasion and, therefore, tends to be better accepted by the child. Person-centered communication has been shown to be more effective form of parent-child social interaction than position-centered communication. Person-centered reciprocal interactions between parents and children produce transformations in thought and action for both.

*Attachment* refers to an affective bond between parents and children. The notion is that children form affective bonds with parents that have continuity over time, and that parents form reciprocal relationships with their children. Moreover, relations between attachment and children’s and adults’ functioning have been repeatedly reported (Baumrind, 1991; 1996).

*Parental autonomy support* can be defined in terms of promotion of independence or in terms of promotion of volitional functioning among children.

The degree of psychological autonomy granting or democratic participation allows children to express themselves. It is found to be an optimal factor in advancing children’s competence and character (Baumrind, 2005; Baumrind & Thompson, 2002).

2. **Demandingness** refers to the claims parents make on children to become integrated into the family and society by their behavior regulation, disciplinary efforts, and willingness to confront a disruptive child, maturity demands (behavioral control) and supervision of children’s activities (monitoring). Demanding parents supervise and monitor their children’s
activities by directly confronting rather than subtly manipulating them, and, thus, may engage in open conflict with their children at points of disagreement.

Demandingness is also referred to as “parental control” as it includes direct confrontations; monitoring; and consistent, contingent discipline (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

Confronting parents are involved and firm but not necessarily coercive, although they may be. A confronting parent takes a stand even when to do so provokes conflict. Confrontational social control techniques deter internalization of prosocial attitudes, whereas covert influence techniques do not. Power assertive confrontational parenting does not undermine prosocial behavior, among children, when parents are (a) supportive; (b) nonpunitive; (c) authentic {i.e. when parents do not attempt to disguise inconsiderate and demeaning remarks to children as friendly conversation}; and (d) sensitive {i.e. parents take into account the extent to which a particular child can profit from their confrontation without becoming anxious or overwhelmed} (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

Coercive parents, on the other hand, consistently issue superfluous commands accompanied by threats and promises, but not by reasons. They focus the child’s attention on the powerful status of the parent rather than on the harmful consequences of the act that the parent wishes to correct. Such coercive cycles tend to escalate into ineffectual and mutually hostile disciplinary encounters that provoke defiance and undermine internalization (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

Monitoring imposes restrictions on children, but these restrictions need not be intrusive or overly directive. To be successful, monitoring and close supervision require considerable investment of time and energy, as well as the provision of an orderly consistent regimen. Though monitoring and overly directive intrusion are highly correlated, monitoring
is positively associated with children’s self-assertiveness, while intrusiveness is negatively associated (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

*Parental control*, through the use of *consistent, contingent discipline* is intended to orient the child towards goals selected by the parents; modify expression of immature, dependent, hostile behaviour; and promote compliance with parental standards. The crucial factor in behavioural management is contingent use of positive or negative reinforces immediately following desired or prohibited child behaviour, respectively. A non contingent caregiver produces a defiant child who induces the caregiver to punish harshly and who coercively controls other family members by temper tantrums and physical attacks (Baumrind 1983; 1991; 1996).

A high level of parental demandingness is best accepted by children when accompanied by an equally high level of responsiveness. Baumrind (1967; 1971; 1981) used these dimensions to derive a classification of parenting behaviour that describe how parents reconcile the joint needs of children for nurturance and limit setting. The three parenting configurations – *authoritative, authoritarian* and *permissive* - emerged from the pilot study as empirical descriptions of how parents of children differ from each other on responsiveness and demandingness variables.

1. *Authoritative parenting style* is described by high levels of control, nurturance, clarity of communication, and maturity demands. *Authoritative parents* are both demanding and responsive. They exert firm control over their children’s behaviour and set clear stands of conduct for the child. At the same time they openly acknowledge and incorporate the child perspective in disciplinary matters, within limits that are acceptable to the parents. Their disciplinary method is very supportive and involves combined use of reason and power, rather than harsh physical punitive discipline or severe restriction of the child’s autonomy. They
attempt to direct the child's activities but in a rational, issue-oriented manner with reference to established standards of conduct (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

Authoritative parents encourage verbal give and take, share with the child the reasoning behind their policy, and solicit his/her objections when s/he refuses to conform. Both autonomous self-will and disciplined conformity are valued. They value both expressive and instrumental tributes, and exert firm control at points of parent-child divergence, but do not hem the child in with restrictions. They enforce their own perspective as an adult, but recognize the child's individual interests and special ways and also set standards for future conduct. They use reason, power, and shaping by regime and reinforcement to achieve their objectives, and do not base their decisions on group consensus or the individual child’s desires (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

2. **Authoritarian parenting style** is identified by high levels of control and maturity demands, and lower levels of nurturance and clarity of communication. **Authoritarian parents** are highly demanding and directive, but are not responsive and warm. They are obedience oriented expect their orders to be obeyed without explanation. They attempts to shape, control, and evaluate the behavior and attitudes of the child in accordance with a set standard of conduct, usually an absolute standard, theologically motivated and formulated by a higher authority. They favor punitive, forceful measures to curb self-will at points where the child's actions or beliefs conflict with what they think is right conduct and regard the preservation of order and traditional structure as a highly valued end in itself. They believe in keeping the child in his place, in restricting his autonomy, in assigning household responsibilities in order to inculcate respect for work; and they do not encourage verbal give and take, believing that the child should accept her word for what is right (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).
3. **Permissive parenting style** is characterized by high levels of nurturance and clarity of communication, and low levels of control and maturity demands. *Permissive parents* are more responsive than demanding. They allow the child great freedom in choosing activities, are openly accepting and supportive of the child’s behaviour, and make little effort to exert control over it or set standards of conduct. Discipline involves the use of reason and manipulation, but not overt power to accomplish their ends. They are lenient, lax, do not demand mature behaviour, allow considerable self-regulation and avoid confrontation. They attempt to behave in a nonpunitive, acceptant and affirmative manner towards the child's impulses, desires, and actions. They allow the child to regulate his/her own activities as much as possible, avoid the exercise of control, and do not encourage him/her to obey externally defined standards (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

*Permissive parents* actively seek out the child for input regarding household rules and regulations, policy decisions and give explanations for family rules. They make few demands for household responsibility and orderly behavior. They present themselves to the child as a resource for him/her [the child] to use as he wishes, not as an ideal for him/her to emulate, or as an active agent responsible for shaping or altering his/her [the child] ongoing or future behavior (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

Each of the three parenting style patterns exemplify the distinctive features of the group, as well as explicit description of parenting behaviors that characterize each group member, categorizing a particular parent-child relationship at a specific time. However, moderate pattern stability is a likely consequence of continuity in the child’s qualities and the parents’ values, personality, and expectations. Flexible application of disciplinary practices across domains and infractions varies by pattern, with authoritative and democratic parents
likely to be more flexible than authoritarian or disengaged parents in how they regulate a child’s behavior (Baumrind, 2005).

Further, Baumrind (1996; 2005) posits that parenting style has proven power to predict children’s competence and to qualify effects of (observed) parenting practices other than abuse. Thus, variables representing the demandingness factor have a more beneficial effect when embedded in an authoritative configuration than when embedded in an authoritarian configuration. Similarly, high responsiveness affects children positively when conjoined with high demandingness in an authoritative configuration, but not when conjoined with low demandingness in a permissive pattern (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

Authoritative parenting style conjoins firm behavioral control and monitoring with warmth and autonomy control and has shown to assist young children and adolescents develop instrumental competence which is characterized by psychosocial maturity, cooperation with peers and adults, responsible independence, and academic success. By contrast, despite the appearance of being diametrically opposite rearing styles, authoritarian and permissive parenting hold in common the propensity to minimize opportunities for children to learn to cope with stress. Authoritarian parents do this by curtailing children’s pursuits of their own initiatives (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005). Permissive parents do this by giving their children free rein and failing to establish and enforce standards of conduct. The result is a reduction in the capacity to cope with frustration and disappointment and to deal adaptively with everyday life challenges (Baumrind, 1971, 1989, 1991, 2005; Teti & Candelaria, 2002).

The cumulative results of Baumrind’s work are well known (Baumrind, 1967; 1973; 1989; 1996; 2005). Her authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive typologies are currently widely employed models of parenting style and has yielded a consistent picture of the types of
parenting thought to enhance or mitigate the successful socialization of middle-class children. Research testing her typology during the past four decades has been remarkably consistent. The benefits of authoritative parenting and the detrimental impact of authoritarian and permissive parenting to children’s social and academic competence from early childhood through adolescence, both in the United States and abroad, are well documented (Robinson et al., 2002; Teti & Candelaria, 2002).

2.2.2 Maccoby and Martin’s Model

In a review published in the Handbook of Child Psychology, Maccoby and Martin (1983) attempted to modify Baumrind’s configurational approach by attempting to capture parenting style as a function of two dimensions, which they labeled responsiveness and demandingness. They defined parenting style as reflecting two specific underlying processes: (a) the number and type of demands made by the parents and (b) the contingency of parental reinforcement.

Analogous to Baumrind, they posited that authoritative parents are high in both demandingness and responsiveness; and authoritarian parents are high in demandingness but low in responsiveness. But where empirically, Baumrind had found the “permissive” type, Maccoby and Martin (1983) distinguished two distinct patterns of permissive parenting.

Permissive–indulgent parents are high on responsiveness and low on demandingness and are highly involved with their children. Permissive-neglectful parenting is characterized by low demandingness and low responsiveness. These parents are emotionally and physically disengaged from their children, showing little monitoring, supervision, and support of their children’s behavior. This fourth dimension is also referred to as “uninvolved” on “neglecting”.
They posited that, compared to children of authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive-indulgent parents, children of permissive-neglectful parents appeared to be at highest risk for instrumental incompetence, a finding that was later replicated by Baumrind and others (Baumrind, 1991; Radziszewska et al., 1996).

Thus, abject abdication of parental responsibilities, as reflected in permissive-neglectful homes, appears to have even worse consequences for children than in homes in which parents lack warmth, discourage dialogue, and are harsh and restrictive, as reflected in authoritarian homes. These data suggest that, generally speaking, some kind of parental involvement with children, even if it is of poor quality, is better than none at all (Teti & Candelaria, 2002).

This move by Maccoby and Martin (1983) away from the configurational approach toward one that defined configurations on the basis of orthogonal dimensions marked an attempt—reminiscent of earlier attempts to differentiate underlying dimensions of parenting style—to tease apart the processes that underlie the influence of style (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).

2.2.3 Robinson, Mandleco, Hart and Olsen’s Model

Robinson et al. (1995; 2001) in their study attempted to develop an empirical means of assessing global typologies consistent with Baumrind’s main conceptualizations for parents of preadolescent children and also attempted to identify specific parenting practices that occur within the context of the typologies. According to them conceptualization of parenting styles is primarily framed in reference to parental control or demandingness as well as parental warmth.

They posited that authoritative parenting, as it is commonly defined, is a mix of appropriate behavioural control (demandingness) and parental warmth. Dimensions of
Authoritative parenting typically consists of such parenting strengths as *connection*, *reasoning-oriented regulation*, and *autonomy granting* (Nelson et al., 2006). *Connection* exists when parents are warm and responsive to the needs and feelings of the children, comfort them when they are upset and encourage them to share their troubles and problems and give praise when the child is good. *Regulation* occurs when parents impose rules and regulations and monitor the behavior of their children with emphasis on reason making the child understand his/her behavior by explaining its consequence.

*Autonomy* transpires when parents allow children to manage and plan their own time, activities and encourage them to express their opinions and ideas, taking into account child’s preferences in making plans for the family or before asking the child to do something (Robinson et al., 1995; 2001). This parenting style is commonly associated with competent child and adolescent outcomes (Nelson et al., 2006).

*Authoritarian parenting*, in contrast, is defined by high levels of excessive behavioral control and lower levels of acceptance (Robinson et al., 1995; 2001). This style is epitomized by frequent engagement in physical and verbal coercion, punitiveness, and restriction of autonomy (Nelson et al., 2006).

*Physical coercion* involves use of physical force by parents, in form of spanking, slapping, grabbing etc, in order to correct the child’s behavior. *Verbal hostility* entails parent’s yelling, shouting, criticizing a child in anger so as to control or discipline a child. *Punitive* parenting implies parent’s use of punishment, threats without any justification to discipline and control the child.

Such parents may also take away privileges from child or may even put child off somewhere alone with little if any explanations (Robinson et al., 1995; 2001). These elements
may communicate parental rejection of the child and, accordingly, is more often associated with child behavioral difficulties (Nelson et al., 2006).

**Permissive parenting** is associated with *indulgence* on part of the parents. These parents give into child when s/he causes a commotion about something; threaten/state punishments to child but do not actually carry it out. They spoil the child and find it difficult to discipline him/her (Robinson et al, 1995; 2001).

In addition, they also paid a lot of attention to the construct of *psychological control* (Hart et al., 1998, 2003; Nelson et al., 2006; Olsen et al., 2002). *Psychological control* is deemed to be composed of stylistic dimensions reflecting a parental attack on the child’s developing need for psychological autonomy. It is a form of control that potentially inhibits or intrudes upon psychological development through manipulation and exploitation of the parent child bond {e.g., love withdrawal and guilt induction}, negative, affect laden expressions and criticisms {e.g., possessiveness, protectiveness} and is considered harmful to the child’s individuation (Nelson et al., 2006).

Furthermore, they identified an *over solicitous* approach to parenting that is both excessively warm and excessively controlling. These parents are overly protective and controlling to the point of being intrusive. Although these parents may often have their children’s best interest in mind (i.e., safety, learning, social interaction), the constraints that over solicitous parents place on their children may actually limit children’s opportunities to practice social skills, learn how to

regulate their own emotions, and build their own cognitive constructions (Nelson et al., 2006).

They also found cross cultural similarities in the dimensions of parenting styles. Factor structures of authoritative and authoritarian parenting dimensions have been found to be
similar in United States, Australia, China and Russia (Hart et al., 2000; Porter et al., 2006; Russell et al., 2003).

According to them parenting styles might be closely associated with child maladjustment in cultures the world over. Moreover, parenting practices, though they may be differentially emphasized across cultures, likely communicate parental acceptance or rejection and thus contribute to overall style, or pervasive interaction climate, which is the essence of parenting style (Nelson et al., 2006).

2.3 Factors affecting Parenting Style

There are considerable variations in parenting styles among individuals. Theorists posit that this results from various psychosocial and environmental determinants. It is opined that parenting is influenced by the unique characteristics of the parents, such as their personality, childrearing beliefs, educational background, and psychological wellbeing. These factors affect parents’ day-to-day interactions with their children and how the relationships with their children evolve (Bronfenbrenner 1979, 2000).

In addition, the context in which the relationship is occurring also incurs an impact. It includes aspects of the immediate setting such as other relationships in the household, including the parent’s relationship with a spouse or partner, relatives and friends etc. Network members provide informational, instrumental (e.g., child care), and emotional support for parents; they can also be sources of stress and take time away from child care activities. Also, other contexts such as the parents’ work place and the neighborhood context may influence parents’ values and childrearing beliefs, their concerns for their children, and their perceptions of the opportunities available to their children.

The transactions that occur in the home environment and other important setting are also influenced by socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and culture. In addition, parenting
behavior is influenced by parent education and family support programs designed to enhance the quality of care that parents provide. Clearly, many factors play a role in the way parents care for their children (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 2000; Luster & Okagaki, 2005).

Drawing on Bronfenbrenner’s work, Belsky (1984) identified three main determinants of parenting: (a) characteristics of the parent {e.g., personality, psychological functioning, attachment history}; (b) characteristics of the child {e.g., temperament}; and (c) contextual sources of stress and support {e.g., financial strain, divorce, social network}.

**Goodness of fit** occurs when parents’ approach to their child is sensitive and responsive to the child’s presentation while **poorness of fit** occurs when there is dissonance between a child’s temperamental individuality (i.e. his or her presentation and behavior) and parents’ way of handling the child (i.e. their response to the child’s presentation and behavior) (Thomas & Chess, 1991). If a child’s characteristics of individuality provide a good fit (or match) with the demands of a particular setting, adaptive outcomes will accrue in that setting. In turn, of course, poorly fit, or mismatched, children—those whose characteristics are incongruent with one or most settings—should show alternative developmental outcomes. Such characteristics of individuality involve what the children do, why the children show a given behavior, and/or how the children do whatever they do (Thomas & Chess, 1991; Lerner et al., 2002).

The goodness of fit model was originally proposed to describe how parents, can adapt their parenting styles to suit the different temperaments of children, in order to promote healthy emotional development (Berk, 2007). Recent researches have shown that a child’s physical distinctiveness and psychological individuality, his or her temperament will prompt varying reactions in parents based on the parents’ attitudes, values, stereotypes, and behavioral style, and on the physical characteristics of the setting (Lerner et al., 2002). For
instance, it has been found that children with more adaptable, sociable, and easy-to-soothe temperaments are likely to elicit warm and responsive parenting (Putnam et al., 2002). Findings with children in early middle childhood indicated that maternal reports of children’s high irritable distress and low effortful control were associated with children’s reports of maternal hostility (Morris et al., 2002).

These findings suggest that the challenges inherent in parenting a temperamentally difficult child may cause many parents to invest minimal energy in parenting and emotionally withdraw from the relationship which in turns hampers optimal child development and behaviour, leading to a “circular function” in individual development (Lerner et al., 2002; Schneirla, 1957).

The parent shapes the child, but part of what determines the way in which parents do this is children themselves. Children shape their parents—as adults, as spouses, and of course as parents per se—and in so doing children help organize feedback to themselves, feedback that contributes further to their individuality and thus starts the circular function all over again {that is, returns the child effects process to its first component} (Karraker & Coleman, 2005; Lerner et al., 2002).

With regard to parenting style, the goodness of fit model can be of further use when discussing, raising and supporting children regarding to their other qualities, not just in relation to temperament. Parents can use this model to adapt their parenting styles to suit the individual needs and interests of their children. Thus, parents need to understand their children so as to enhance their contributions to their children’s well-being and development (Karraker & Coleman, 2005).
Developmental psychologists have been interested in how parents influence the development of children’s social and instrumental competence since at least the 1920s. One of the most robust approaches to this area is the study of what has been called "parenting style." Parenting style is a complex activity that includes many specific behaviors that work individually and together to influence child outcomes. Although specific parenting behaviors, such as spanking or reading aloud, may influence child development, looking at any specific behavior in isolation may be misleading. Many writers have noted that specific parenting practices are less important in predicting child well-being than is the broad pattern of parenting. Most researchers who attempt to describe this broad parental milieu rely on Diana Baumrind’s concept of parenting.

Parenting captures two important elements of parenting: parental responsiveness and parental demandingness (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Parental responsiveness (also referred to as parental warmth or supportiveness) refers to "the extent to which parents intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation, and self-assertion by being attuned, supportive, and acquiescent to children’s special needs and demands" (Baumrind, 1991, p. 62). Parental demandingness (also referred to as behavioral control) refers to "the claims parents make on children to become integrated into the family whole, by their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys" (Baumrind, 1991, pp. 61-62).

The construct of parenting is used to capture normal variations in parents’ attempts to control and socialize their children (Baumrind, 1991). Two points are critical in understanding this definition. First, parenting style is meant to describe normal variations in parenting. In other words, the parenting style typology Baumrind developed should not be understood to include deviant parenting, such as
might be observed in abusive or neglectful homes. Second, Baumrind assumes that normal parenting revolves around issues of control. Although parents may differ in how they try to control or socialize their children and the extent to which they do so, it is assumed that the primary role of all parents is to influence, teach, and control their children.

3. NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT (n-Ach)

The term achievement motivation or need for achievement (n-Ach) was introduced by the psychologist, David McClelland (1958). Achieving a goal or obtained something is rewarding thing for almost everyone. For some people, the achievement of goal takes on a special importance. They enjoy working to achieve something whether it is in school, in work or in community service. When they achieve a goal, they immediately, set a new one. Such people may be said to have a strong need for achievement.

Students with a strong need for achievement are frequently overachievers. That is, they make better grades than their intelligence and ability test scores, would lead one to expect. Need for achievement is a valuable kind of motivation in a society that strongly values individual achievement.

The study of motivation gained importance since early fifties with the efforts of McClelland and his associates at Wesleyan University, USA. The term motivation refers to any organismic state that mobilizes activity which is in some sense selective or directive. According to Newcomb (1964) achievement motivation is the acquired tendency and one of the most important social needs. It has been defined by McClelland and his associates (1953) and also by Decharms (1968) as a disposition to strive for success in competition with others with some standard of excellence, set by the individual. Motive to achieve requires an act of
some norm of excellence, long term involvement and unique accomplishment. These are the criteria set by McClelland and his associates (1953). Intact, this is one of the most important manifest and social needs and personality variable enlisted by Murray (1938).

Achievement motive is one of the important psychological motives. It concerned with setting goal and achieving them. It is concerned with becoming successful in whatever activity one undertakes and avoiding failure. People with strong achievement motive not only like to excel others, but also try to do better than what they did in past. People with a strong achievement motive choose tasks which are neither very easy not very difficult but the one which they are confident of accomplishing through their best efforts.

Achievement motive or need for achievement (N-Ach) refers to an individual's desire for significant accomplishment, mastering of skills, control, or high standards. David McClelland and his associates' investigations of achievement motivation have particular relevance to the emergence of leadership. McClelland was interested in the possibility of deliberately arousing a motive to achieve in an attempt to explain how individuals express their preferences for particular outcomes- a general problem of motivation. In this connection, the need for achievement refers to an individual's preference for success under conditions of competition.

Need for Achievement is related to the difficulty of tasks people choose to undertake. Those with low N-Ach may choose very easy tasks, in order to minimize risk of failure, or highly difficult tasks, such that a failure would not be embarrassing. Those with high N-Ach tend to choose moderately difficult tasks, feeling that they are challenging, but within reach.

n- Ach is one of the important social motives. It refers to the desire to meet standards of excellence, to accomplish difficult tasks and to do better than the others. McClelland claims
that the level of achievement motivation differs from one individual to another. People in whom achievement motivation is strong want to excel, accomplish and constantly improve their own performance. Such individuals want to do well in whatever situation they are placed.

Individual differ greatly in their levels of achievement motivation. Achievements motivation is not inborn but learned. Studies have found that children with high n-Ach have parents in occupations that demand individual achievement. However in certain cultures such as Zuni Indians, individual achievements are looked down.

3.1 Characteristics of people with high n-Achievement:

• A person with high n-Ach likes to take personal responsibility:

When he undertakes a task, he prefers to have it clearly understood that he will see it through. He wants the credit for the success of the undertaking, but he is equally prepared to accept the blame should it fail. The high n-Ach individual, then, is not a ‘buck passer’. When he is successful he does not rail against the unkind fate, nor lays the faults at his superiors, competitors, subordinates or the government. He likes games of skill. Games of chance do not appeal to him because he feels no control over their outcome.

• High achiever prefers to work on challenging task and like to take moderate risks which promises success:

He does not like either excessive odds against his success or to easy a task. The reasonable possibility of failure excites him to increase his efforts he wants to make extra efforts to achieve his goal, on the other hand the person with low need for achievement prefer an easy task, where his likelihood of succeeding is quite high and where he can avoid a
reasonable chance of failure. Such a person values security, and generally attempts goals that are to difficult to achieve. However, a chance success may catapult him to glory. But such successes are rare. Since he can not be sure of succeeding, he wants to make it clear to the whole world that the task was so difficult that no one could really have succeeded. His failure is not due to him but success, even if by chance, is only due to him; Isn’t he great? A high n-Ach person enjoys a calculated risk where he feels that he is pitting himself against a worthy adversary, be this a human competitor or the conditions of the game.

A person with high n-Ach wants to know the results of his efforts:

They like tasks with their performances can be compared with that of others. They like feed-back on how they are doing. They prefers that this be objective, and that it be available soon after he has finish the job. Not only is this ‘feedback’ stimulating and satisfying to him; He uses to adjust and improve his efforts. We find the high n-Ach person seeking task an occupations where this type of feedback is available, such as in sails or production rather than in industrial relations or research.

A high n-Ach person tends to persist in the face of adversity:

He tends to raise his level of aspiration in a realistic way so that he will move on slightly more challenging and difficult task. He is not easily discouraged by failure. His underlying self-confidence leads him to carry on despite setbacks. He looks at failures as temporary and as a natural part of the game. He uses the knowledge of his failures as a learning experience. The achievement motivated individual is not content to live the task unfinished. He feels tension so long as there is something undone. Some step must be taken to achieve the goal. So he tends to carry on or go back to the unfinished task and put forth extra efforts to carry it through to a definite conclusion. This is not to say, however, that he will
continually hit his head against the wall. When it becomes clear that the odds are too much against him, he readily shifts tactics or ever objectives, it is noticeable, however, that he is not quick to abundant a task simply because he has encountered difficulties.

- A high n-Ach person tends to be innovative:

  Once he has determined his goals, he is prepared to try. First one approach and then another, we may say that he is more goal-oriented than technique-oriented. For him, the method of choice is the method which will work best. If the commonsense approach does not work, he will invent new ones. He is not a creative person in the sense that a painter or writer is. He is, however, ingenious at adapting and modifying whatever is at hand to solve the problem or achieve the objectives. He like to work situations in which he has some control over the outcome, n-Ach peoples are not gamblers.

- A high n-Ach person usually demonstrates some interpersonal competence:

  He recognizes the importance of interpersonal relationships in achieving objectives. Therefore, he devotes responsible effort to developing and maintaining adequate relations with others. Because he is task oriented, he selects experts as work colleagues, rather than friends and people of high status.

- A high n-Ach motivated individual is oriented towards the future:

  He tends to be persistent in working on tasks on which he perceive as career related. While he may not necessarily have a clear idea of his long-term goal, he addresses himself with maximum efforts to his task with the underlying feeling that his successful accomplishment of this task will prepare him for more important activities in the future. Perhaps we can say that he has some sense of destiny, that is, the belief that he is destined for
bigger things. Accordingly, each current task, no matter how, insignificant it may be is perceived as important in itself because of its relationship to his own growth process and preparation for the future.

3.2 Factors influencing the strong need for achievement

The need for achievement is considerably influenced by the following factors:

1. Independence Training in Childhood: Several studies show that early childhood experience has a lot to do with it. Individual who are high in need for achievement come from families where they have been trained to be independent right from childhood. Some individual are given enough freedom to do their task. Parents differ in how much they value independence in their children. Parents expect children to learn different things on their own. In some studies it is found that parent expect their children to act independently at an earlier age than did parents of people with less need for achievement.

2. Socio-cultural Environment: In some societies like the Arapesh of New Guinea and Zuni Indians, this motive is absent. In average American is high in need for achievement as compared to an average Indian. McClelland (1969) has shown how learning influences the n-Ach. Achievement motivation is a learned motive and is influenced considerably by our upbringing and socio-cultural environment. One’s socio-cultural environment also influences the need for achievement. (Ruth Benedict, 1934) and (McClelland, D.C. 1969)

3. Past Success: Individual who has a past history of success in a given task is likely to be high in need for achievement as compared to those who have a past history of failure.

4. Sex: Another factor is the sex of the individual. It is said that sex influences need for achievements. Women generally show low level of n-Ach as compared to men. There is a
greater-emphasis on achievement by makes than by females in the American society. According to Maslow’s (1954) theory people are not free to emphasize achievement needs unless psychological safety and belongingness needs are reasonably well met. Thus people who live constantly with deprivation threat and loneliness are less likely to have strong achievements needs.

5. Economic Growth: McClelland, D.C. et al. (1953) have done considerable work on the need for achievement. McClelland has observed that need for achievement is related to economic growth. Research studies have found relation between achievement motivation and economic progress in society. It has found that achievement is followed by economic progress in the society. Societies with a high need for achievement have a high rate of economic growth than societies with a low need for achievement.

3.3 N-Ach theoretical description

David C. McClelland’s and his associates' investigations of achievement motivation have particular relevance to the emergence of leadership. McClelland was interested in the possibility of deliberately arousing a motive to achieve in an attempt to explain how individuals express their preferences for particular outcomes—a general problem of motivation. In this connection, the need for achievement refers to an individual's preference for success under conditions of competition. The vehicle McClelland employed to establish the presence of an achievement motive was the type of fantasy a person expressed on the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), a series of pictures that subjects were asked to interpret by writing stories about them.

The procedure in McClelland's initial investigation was to arouse in the test audience a concern with their achievement. A control group was used in which arousal was omitted. In
the course of this experiment, McClelland discovered through analyzing the stories on the TAT that initial arousal was not necessary. Instead, members of the control group—individuals who had had no prior arousal—demonstrated significant differences in their stories, some writing stories with a high achievement content and some submitting stories with a low achievement content. Using results based on the TAT, McClelland demonstrated that individuals in a society can be grouped into high achievers and low achievers based on their scores on what he called "N-Ach".

McClelland and his associates have since extended their work in fantasy analysis to include different age groups, occupational groups, and nationalities in their investigations of the strength of need for achievement. These investigations have indicated that the N-Ach score increases with a rise in occupational level. Invariably, businessmen, managers, and entrepreneurs are high scorers. Other investigations into the characteristics of the high achievers have revealed that accomplishment on the job represents an end in itself; monetary rewards serve as an index of this accomplishment. In addition, these other studies found that the high achievers, though identified as managers, businessmen, and entrepreneurs, are not gamblers. They will accept risk only to the degree they believe their personal contributions will make a difference in the final outcome.

These explorations into the achievement motive seem to turn naturally into the investigation of national differences based on Max Weber's thesis that the industrialization and economic development of the Western nations were related to the Protestant ethic and its corresponding values supporting work and achievement. McClelland and his associates have satisfied themselves that such a relationship, viewed historically through an index of national power consumption, indeed exists. Differences related to individual, as well as to national,
accomplishments depend on the presence or absence of an achievement motive in addition to economic resources or the infusion of financial assistance. High achievers can be viewed as satisfying a need for self-actualization through accomplishments in their job assignments as a result of their particular knowledge, their particular experiences, and the particular environments in which they have lived.

3.4 The measurement of N-Ach

Psychologists have developed tests to measure social motives in general and need for achievement in particular. Projective tests are generally used to measure the need for achievement. The techniques McClelland and his collaborators developed to measure N-Achievement, N-Affiliation and N-Power (McClelland et al, 1958) can be viewed as a radical break with the dominant psychometric tradition. However, it should be recognized that McClelland's thinking was strongly influenced by the pioneering work of Henry Murray, both in terms of Murray's model of human needs and motivational processes (1938) and his work with the OSS during World War Two. It was during this period that Murray introduced the idea of "situation tests" and multi-rater/multi-method assessments. It was Murray who first identified the significance of Need for Achievement, Power and Affiliation and placed these in the context of an integrated motivational model.

Whilst trait-based personality theory assume that high-level competencies like initiative, creativity, and leadership can be assessed using “internally consistent” measures the McClelland measures recognize that such competencies are difficult and demanding activities which will neither be developed nor displayed unless people are undertaking activities they care about (strongly motivated to undertake). Furthermore, it is the cumulative number of independent, but cumulative and substitutable, components of competence they bring to bear
while seeking to carry out these activities that will determine their success. Accordingly, the N-Ach, N-Aff and N-Pow scoring systems simply count how many components of competence people bring to bear whilst carrying out activities they have a strong personal inclination (or motivation) to undertake.

An important corollary is that there is no point in trying to assess people’s abilities without first finding out what they care about. So one cannot (as some psychometricians try to do) assess such things as “creativity” in any general sense. One has always to ask “creativity in relation to what?” So McClelland’s measures, originally presented as means of assessing “personality”, are best understood as means of measuring competence in ways which break radically with traditional psychometric approaches.

4. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (AA)

AA has become an index of a child’s future in this highly competitive world. It is only a drop in the vast sea of education. A great many students seem not to get credit commensurate with their known or rated abilities. Many a time, we often find students with average abilities who excel. The baffling facts, which have come into the limelight, are that in spite of having similar educational facilities, environment, aspiration and even intelligence, the AA of students differs from one another (Subramanyam, Shreenivasa Rao, 2008, p. 224, 225).

“The pupils’ knowledge attainment and skills developed in the school subjects and is assessed by the authorities with the help of achievement tests in the form of communication (Bajwa, Sukwant, Setia et al; 1994 cited by Sarode, 1995, p.102). Jain & Audichya (2008, p. 186) quoted the following authors: Subramanyam (1984) found that academic environment of
a school, which consists of qualified teachers, and good and healthy interaction between teachers and students, has a positive relationship with the achievement of the rural students.

*Atkinson and Green (1990)* stated that teachers must help to develop a positive attitude in children during schooling. They must also help in the development of self discipline, self-confidence and encourage the children to actively participate in school activities.

The ability to think abstractly and logically permits adolescents to study academic subjects such as Science and Mathematics in greater detail. They may establish favorite subjects and excel in particular classes. Such expertise may be motivated by an admired parent or teacher who is a model of academic success. Parents often express greater interest in their children’s performance in school during adolescence, due in part to curriculum choices (Roedigat, Rushton, Capaldi & Paris, 1987, p. 367).

*Adeniyi & Ayebami (2008, p. 113)* quoted the following authors: Achievement is a job done successfully with effort and skill. Thus, academic achievement can be held as the measurable success in academics after instruction.

The achievement of students has been a source of great concern for many educators, parents, guardians, curriculum planners, counseling psychologists and researchers (*Adeyemo & Torubeli, 2007; Emeke and Adeoye & Torubeli, 2007*).

This general concern stems from prevailing poor achievement recorded by students almost each succeeding year at the end of their secondary school course (*Ezeazor, 2003*). Therefore, attaining a high level of AA in what, every parent or guardian, wishes for his/her child. Teachers wish the same high achievement for their students.

Schools and teachers are generally graded by the achievement of their products.

In fact, the parents, students and teachers want to associate themselves with schools that have a record of high level of achievement.
Aremu & Oluwole (2001), Odedele (2000) and Wuensch & Lao (1987) have submitted that the way and manner the child perceives himself could affect his academic performance.

Wentzel (1991) found that there was correlation between student social responsibility and AA and this is instrumental in the acquisition of knowledge and the development of cognitive abilities.

This finding corroborates Torubeli’s (2007) finding that the child is in a unique position in determining his/her scholastic achievement. Thus, AA is based on the ‘will’ and ‘ability’ of the child to achieve.

Aremu (2001) and Nwagu (1995) have stressed the importance of the home’s psychological climate on a child’s emotional state and academic performance. A healthy home offers emotional security to children. The school cannot simply provide a continuation of the home environment, but it plays an inestimably important role in laying the foundation for the students to learn and achieve academically. Therefore, poor communication between parents and their children frequently leads to learning and behavioral problems in schools.

Obanya (1999) asserts that societal demands like political economy could determine the learners’ readiness to meet his/her environment’s expectations. The society, to which the students belong, has a great impact on their exposure and AA. Students from an enlightened society see high academic performance as a challenge and competition that has to be won.

Adolescent girls and boys do not achieve identically in secondary schools, even though there are no significant differences, in intelligence. The reason may be that girls and boys value achievement in different areas. Girls tend to see their achievement in terms of interpersonal competencies and skills, while boys look for achievement in the more objective, academic- oriented areas. Girls do not expect to do as well as boys in maths and science, even
though they may have done well previously (Richmond-Abbott, 1983 cited by Kaplan, 1986, p. 584-585).

Morrow and Wilson (1961) found that high-achieving adolescents as compared to a group of low achievers, tended to come from families where they were involved in family decisions, and where parents give praise for the adolescent’s performance and show trust in the adolescent’s competence. In turn, low-achieving adolescents came from families marked by parental dominance and restrictiveness.

Show and White (1965) found that high achieving adolescents tend to identify with their parents while low-achieving adolescents do not.

5. ADOLESCENCE

Adolescence is derived from the Latin word ‘adolescere’, meaning, “To grow into maturity”. It is the transition period from childhood to adulthood during which the individual learns the skills needed to flourish as an adult. It can be a time of self-doubt, loneliness, fear of failure and conflict with people all around (Darley et al., 1988, p. 456).

Adolescence is probably the most challenging and complicated period of life to describe, study and experience (Berger, 1983, p. 355).

Young people go through a series of biological and psychological changes at the end of childhood, as they enter adolescence (Clarke-Stewart & Friedman, 1987, p. 528).

Adolescence is a time of change, as biological and psychological factors interact to accelerate development and open up new horizons (Carlson, 1988, p. 151).

Dogra (2007, p. 4) claims that adolescence is the period between childhood and adulthood. But, finding a precise definition of adolescence is difficult. Biologically, it is the time of sexual maturation and the completion of growth. More than mere biological,
adolescence is psychosocially the period between childhood dependency and being a functionally independent autonomous adult. ‘Adultum ‘is the past participle of the Latin verb *adolescere* ‘to grow (up).’ The senses of growth, transition, and incompleteness are therefore historically embedded in the adolescent, while an adult indicates both completion and completeness (cf. Herdt & Leavitt 1998). The World Health Organization (WHO) considers ‘adolescence’ as the period between 10-19 years of age, which generally encompasses the time from the onset of puberty to the legal age of maturity.

Adolescence is a culturally rather than a biologically defined phase of development.

In general, adolescence begins with the onset of puberty, and ends somewhat indefinitely, with the transition to young adulthood. This passage of adulthood is marked by a number of small changes in status during or near the end of adolescence (Darley, et al., 1988, *p*.456, 457). Gallatin, citing from Horrocks’ book, education, says that adolescence is both a way of life and span of time in the physical and psychological development of an individual.

It represents a period of growth and change in nearly all aspects of the child’s physical, mental, social and emotional life. It is a time of new experiences, new responsibilities, and new relationships with adults as well as peers (Gallatin, 1975, *p*. 218).

Adolescence is a process rather than a period, a process of achieving the attitudes and beliefs needed for effective participation in society. Adolescence may be further defined in a number of ways – for example, as a period of physical development, as a chronological age span, as a socio cultural phenomenon, or even as an abstract concept, suggesting an idea or an attitude toward life (Rogers, 1972, *p*. 9).

Adolescence is a period in which the young person must learn new ways of behaving, must develop new ideas about himself and other people, and must make decisions that will determine the course of the rest of his life (Hill, 1970).
Horrocks (1951, p. 3), states that adolescence is a descriptive term for the period during which an emotionally immature individual in his teens approaches the culmination of his physical and mental growth. Although, potentially an adult, he still plays the role of an inexperienced child, bound and restricted by the culture in which he lives. He is often forced to act like a child and is denied the experience and status as an adult or fully responsible member of his community.

As cited by Berger (1986, p. 463), Hall says “Adolescence is a time of rebirth: a physical and maturation change, not only the adolescent’s size and physiology, it also changes the young person’s way of seeing the world. Each generation surpasses the old in moral and intellectual leadership because they are idealistic, altruistic and self satisfying. According to Jersild (1963) as cited by Pandey & Ahmad (2008, p. 34), “Adolescence is the period of time when the surge of life reaches its highest peak. The adolescent’s life is, or might be, full of opportunity to enter into a new experience, to explore new relationships, to find new resources of inner strength and ability.”

Jersild, et al. (1978, p. 4) states that adolescence is a time of great possibility; it is also a time when most young people must pay a price for the privilege of growing up. Their freedom to seize that life offers is curtailed both from without and from within. The outer restraints – the rules they must follow the conditions they must conform to- are obvious, and they are strong.

Adolescence is a time of change, exploration, exuberance, and youthful searching.

It can also be a time of worry and problems, especially in today’s world. It might even be fair to describe adolescence as “the best of times, the worst of times” (Coon, 1992, p.425).

Gallagher and Harris (1961) cited by Swansi (1993, p. 2) have pointed out that adolescents’ emotional and behavioral problems baffle their parents more than they do for
other adults because there are such close ties between parents and children that it is very
difficult for them to be objective. At the same time, however since many adults may really
slip into their parents’ place in an adolescent’s mind, these others may also experience all the
bewildering vagaries of behaviors, which confuse and upset parents. So it is that teachers,
ministers, or coaches may become involved in the adolescent’s rebellion, crushes, thievery,
or school failure.

may be characterized as trying to develop toward an ‘endpoint’, that is, an identity or self
definition.

Adolescence is the period in the individual’s life when he struggles with the notion of
acceptance. The adolescent lives in the present and the present itself constitute his terms and
conditions for the acceptance of life (Cantwell & Svajian, 1974, p. 86, 87).

According to Mangal (2006, p. 69), adolescence period is a sort of repetition and
recapitulation of what has been done during infancy. The observation of Ross reflects the
above idea when he says, “Adolescence is best regarded as a recapitulation of the first period
of life, as second turn of the spiral of development”. Like infancy the adolescence is the
period of too much restlessness and disturbance or as Stanley Hall regards it, “a period of
great stress and strain, storm and strife.”

5.1 Characteristics of Adolescents

Crow & Crow (1956) stated few characteristics of adolescents. They claimed that
adolescents are restless, talkative, active in games, enjoy jokes, friendly, sociable, initiates
games and activities, enjoys a fight, willing to take a change, neat and clean, likes opposite
sex, enjoys joke on self, acts older than age, seeks attention, popular with others, cheerful and
happy, good-looking, enthusiastic and bosses others. The adolescent characteristics exercise a potent influence upon the total life pattern of those who possess them.

This inner turmoil finds external expression. It is a period of lusts warring with purity, of self-consciousness, identity-seeking, idealism, religious conversion, moodiness and changes of mood, despair, inner turmoil, rebellion and iconoclasm. Since World War II, adolescence has been taken for granted as a status, the way people are from the time of pubertal changes until that ill-defined moment when they assume the new status of adulthood (Stone & Church, 1973, p. 418, 425).

5.2 Urban and Rural Adolescents

Jushchuk (1999, p. 8, 9, 11, 12) explained that the rural adolescent deals with the proximity difficulty and low population density that would account for more knowledge of activity and decreased anonymity developing societal influences. Social learning can also be provided for with the media and television or music. This influence is extremely significant, but cannot be wholly liable for the outcome in behavior of the child. The cognitive realization of goals and morals also changes according to the settings, where rural adolescents value their hard work accomplished. For the urban dwelling adolescent, it will be more likely that coping with methods will take the form of information gathered on the Internet; an informative and practical means of information that should be available in local libraries and throughout the school system. The sexually explicit material and violent bomb-teaching outlines that could be researched, would pose an enormous threat to this form of communication.

The adolescent uses deviant behavior as a means for attention and when it goes unnoticed, the level of deviance will increase to dangerous levels threatening to the adolescent as well as society. Consultation with school officials and teachers is necessary for identifying and implementing appropriate crisis intervention and prevention programs (Chimonides &
Frank, 1998 cited by Jushchuk). With this in place, fewer problems of adolescents will blow up on society in such a starting manner as currently circulated examples in the media.

Jushchuk further stated that media proves to be a very harmful proponent of social deviance, where seemingly drastic measures taken by adolescents tend to result in glamorized outcomes. This is the case with the influence of television and music on adolescent behavior, both of which are not the absolute cause, but at the same time not wholly innocent of the guilt. The worst aspect of the media coverage is that of scope; much of the circumstances continually present in urban areas go completely unnoticed because of the general acceptance of such in an urban society. If media is to continue such coverage of instances that occur in the most un-thought of locations in the rural community, which is, then similar coverage should be managed for urban communities so that the problem can be addressed directly and solutions can be provided for.