

## CHAPTER II

## THE PREVIOUS STUDIES

---

  
CONTENTS

- 2.0 THE BACKGROUND
- 2.1 PREVIOUS RESEARCHES ON CLASSROOM CLIMATE
- 2.2 PREVIOUS RESEARCHES ON ACADEMIC MOTIVATION
- 2.3 PREVIOUS RESEARCHES ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS  
AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT
- 2.4 CONCLUSION

## 2.0 BACKGROUND

The social and economic change throws up new challenges and new problems and brings in its train a complexity in the social fabric.

The study of factors related to academic achievement has been a problem of continuing interest to researchers. One of the earliest comprehensive review of studies in the field was made by Harris (1931). He summarized the results of past investigations dealing with school as well as college grades, concentrating on factors other than intelligence. Such factors as attitudes, study habits, interest, extra-curricular activities, age, health, outside work, recreation and personality etc. were attempted. Over years many more correlates of academic performance have been studied by a large number of researchers.

In this chapter, a review is presented of some records dealing with the personality and other non-academic factors, which have relevance to the present study. While reviewing the studies, results, or findings, rather than theories and methodologies have been given greater weightage.

The important question is as Thelen (1968) put it: "How can the 'resources' of teachers and students be utilized more effectively for educational purposes in the classroom?" In order to answer this question, it is essential to conduct researches on various issues and educational alternatives.

Society is changing and that produces various educational alternatives. From time to time, scientific research on the educational practice has been attempted. The purpose of the present chapter is to survey and review the research literature on classroom climate, pupils' academic motivation and academic achievement with a view to finding out what has been so far investigated and what is yet to be investigated. Such an attempt is likely to help in formulating the objectives, areas, tools and methodology of the present investigation.

It should be made clear at the outset that the investigator would try to identify trends in related research and focus on the findings and conclusions of the researches that have some bearing, direct or indirect on the present investigation.

The purpose of the present investigation is to yield some concrete dimensions and give perceptible directions to effect improvement of education in the secondary schools through classroom climate and academic motivation.

The most fundamental issue of any educational practice to be successful is the maintenance of the classroom climate with respect to psychological, social, cultural and economical problems prevailing in society. Many useful findings are found by the recent studies on classroom climate.

Philip Jackson (1968) systematically observed and inferred life in classroom from the actual incidents occurring in the classroom. In his book "Life in Classroom" he revealed the picture of actual classroom life. According to him the classroom life is too complex an affair to be viewed or talked about from any single perspective.

Smith and Geoffrey (1968) present in their book, "the complexities in an urban classrooms' interaction" studies with reference to rural culture and urban culture reveals that the urban classroom life is much more complex than rural classroom life, in the book "Left Outs".

Sandra Warden (1968) throws light, how the wrong notion about a particular students in the minds of the teachers make the life of the pupil a miserable. The work of Kounin (1970), "discipline and group management in classrooms" presents a very remarkable experiment called "Ripple Effect".

He reveals that the effect of anger on the students is attitude of truancy in pupils. Desai (1972)

called these students as "turned off" students. They behave as if they are discontented with studies and they have lost their faith from the educational institutions.

Many psychological approaches have been tried to understand the learning in classrooms. Various psychological issues have been put forth by Morse and Wingo (1971) in their special book on "Classroom Psychology". "The Psychology of Learning in the Classroom" is also a similar work by Crag (1969). The most remarkable exposition in the field of learning is of Frazier (1959) where he has attempted to evolve a theory of teaching contained in his book entitled "Learning more about Learning". Waetjan (1961) observed that each student has his own pace of learning and emphasized the factor of human variability in learning. The publication of N.E.A. (1966) "The Way Teaching In" and the publication of UNESCO "Exploring New Approaches" and "Methods in Education in Asia" provide important innovations in classroom teaching "The Dynamics of Instructional Groups" by N.S.S.E. (1960) highlights the group life aspect of classroom.

The Novel Concept of Academic Motivation by Jack Frymier (1965) in his book "The Nature of Educational Method" aroused interest in many research workers. The famous work of Robert Rosenthal (1968) "Pygmalion in the Classroom" coined new terms of "expectation boosting", "self-fulfilling prophecy", etc. On the similar basis,

Mehta (1968) conducted a study as is described in his book entitled "Achievement Motive in High School Pupils" where he found that the development of achievement and motive leads to the better self-image of the pupils.

Many attempts have been made regarding the future courses in education by well-known authors like Huxley's "Brave New World", Goodman's "Universal Trap" and Margaret Mead's "Thinking Ahead". The recent remarkable exposition of future educational system is contained in the "Future Shock" of Alvin Toffler (1970). George Leonard (1970) portrayed education in classrooms for future in "Education and Ecstasy". UNESCO's report "Learning To-Be" and Tarsten Hussain's "Education in 2000 A.D." are notable publications which describe the system of primary, secondary and university education in the years to come from Futurologists' point of view.

These publications tends one to conclude that at no other time the studies were in this number as it is now. Thinkers have begun to think, researchers have begun to research in classroom life and as a result to find quite a number of studies and new thinking generated towards understanding "life in classrooms" or classroom climate.

## 2.1 PREVIOUS RESEARCHES ON CLASSROOM CLIMATE

### (A) Researches Abroad

#### The Appraisal of Classroom Ethos

Any collection of people meeting for an hour or more a day in the same location and for the same general purposes, will come to know what to expect from each other. In short, the group develops its 'way of life' and this way of life has potentially all the dimensions of the way of life in the family, business or club. But each group pattern has the various dimensions in its own way, and the way reflects the particulars of group composition, environment, etc.

Teachers' participate, of course, in this way of life, and through their participation, they modify it, the process which engender mutual accommodation of students. Teachers and the sense of direction that guides these processes constitute the operation of the 'hidden' or socializing curriculum. These group developing or culture-building processes constitute the background, the context, the personal-social frame of reference within which the meanings of the fore-ground planned activities are sought by each student. As everyone knows by now, learning to multiply may be accompanied by learning to hate maths by learning that one isn't very bright, by developing attachments to other pupils, by learning to deceive one's

parents, and so on. It is probable that the educative significance of the planned activities - things like whether the learnings will ever be used outside the classroom depend both on the nature of the way of life and so on the way of foreground activities are embedded in it.

Wright, et al. (1951) established that seventy per cent of classroom episodes in the school-day of a boy involved the interaction, in some way or another, with one or more persons thus emphasising the importance of classroom climate in the development of social attitudes and behaviour.

Bovard and Everett (1951) state that "the social interaction in the classroom will influence the individual student's perception, feelings and interpersonal relations and even his personality development".

Classroom teaching is a social interaction. The acts of teaching evoke reciprocal contacts between the teacher and the students, and it is this interchange in self which is termed as 'teaching'.

Social climate or the atmosphere for learning that obtains in any given classroom, is a function in part at least, of the individual teacher.

Research of the fifties has shown that learning in both its qualitative and quantitative aspects is related to the kinds of personal relations which obtain in the



classroom. These are two important dimensions involved in such relations, one is the degree of rapport that exists between the teacher and students, and the other is the nature of the relations among the students themselves at least as manifested in the classroom.

It is now well established that good personal relations in the classroom depend on the ability of the teacher to relate in some wholesome fashion to students, accepting them emotionally and being capable to understanding and appreciating their problems and aspirations.

It is also becoming increasingly evident that good climate for learning in the classroom depends on the type of the social relations among the students. It appears that acceptance of a student by his teacher is necessary but not a sufficient condition for his adjustment in the classroom and hence for his learning. The student must also gain a reasonable degree of acceptance from his peers.

Studies by Anderson (1939), Lewin (1948), Withall (1949) and Flanders (1970) serve to highlight, the two distinctly contrasting aspects of teacher behaviour. Subsequent research is evidenced by what follows, points to the possibility of capturing classroom communication and also calls for a permissive and favourable teacher influence in the classroom such that it leads to effective learning by pupils.

Haggerty (1932) says that the relation between the teacher and students is a crucial factor in the teaching process and must be considered as important aspect of methodology.

Perkins (1950) remarks that children tend to be conscious of a warm acceptance by the teacher and to express greatest fondness for the democratic teacher. To him, again, the role of classroom climate is crucial to the learning process.

Canter (1951) elaborating on the advantage of student centred approach to teaching urges that the teacher should focus his service 'to' the student and not 'on' the student.

McKeachy (1951) says that maximum learning results from a reduction of anxiety, channels for which could be provided through constructive learning activities. He feels that there is greater interaction and spontaneity in the group-centred class.

Glidewell (1951) found that a denial of feeling by the leader was accompanied by a reduction of leader effectiveness while the acceptance of feeling led to an increase in his effectiveness.

Flanders (1951) has demonstrated that students in a general are more concerned with the problems of adjusting to the teacher than with the problem of learning and

achieving. He states that learning proceeds only when the relationship has been demonstrated to carry little or no threat to the students. He says that in a teacher centred classroom there is more student hostility towards themselves, other students or the teachers; more tendency to withdrawal, more apathy, aggressiveness or even emotional disintegration.

Jenkins (1951), agreeing with Perkins (1951), believes that greater learning takes place depending on the pupil getting his emotional needs satisfied.

Singletary (1951) diagnoses as one of the difficulties in teacher-pupil relationship. the lack of understanding of each other's values and motives.

Bills (1952) perhaps is the one of the most significant findings in this realm. He remarked that to the effect that student centred and non-directive teaching analogues to client centred psychology rather than the traditional lecture discussion method was found to be of personal value and aid to the students in their problems of adjustment.

Maccia (1965) in the course of her attempts to descriptively theorize about instruction speaks the need for two specific bases for effective influence to be exerted. She describes them as content basis and motivational basis. Interaction and sociograms after, she concedes limited possibilities with respect to observing

the motivational basis. It should be clear that Maccia's 'motivational basis' of influence in the classroom is nothing but the social-emotional climate that is generated by and is sought to be measured through the type of teacher verbal behaviour in the classroom.

Flanders (1970) discusses study of the ideas of others and relates these ideas to the theory underlying his category system for assessing the social-emotional climate of the classroom.

Johns (1968) revealed that indirect teacher influence results in a greater incidence of thoughtful provoking questions by students and is also more problem-solving in its orientation.

Leathers (1968) found that shorter the interest between the que-stimulus and reinforcement better the learning would be. Flanders later has introduced his nomenclature 'direct vs. indirect' teacher behaviour.

Altogether these various research studies reviewed while providing a basis for a theory of social-emotional climate in the classroom, clearly identify the two teacher behaviour patterns that create the contrasting classroom climates.

Their results, however, should be interpreted with caution. They do not suggest that there is a single pattern of teacher behaviour that should be continually maintained

in the classroom. Anyone with teaching experience recognizes that integrative teacher behaviour pattern is less appropriate than a dominative pattern, further more, it is possible that identical acts by the teacher may in one situation be perceived by pupils as dominative and in another situation as integrative. These research results do show that, over a period of time, integrative rather than dominative teacher-pupil contacts will establish desirable pupil attitude and superior patterns of work. The work of Anderson et al. ( 1946 ) and Cogan ( 1956 ) present evidence that a desirable climate results in more learning although additional evidence is needed to confirm the conclusion.

The unequivocal evidence emanating from the studies cited above establishes the crucial role of classroom interaction between the teacher and the pupil as also amongst the pupils themselves and serves to point out how the classroom behaviour of the teacher plays a significantly decisive role therein. The research findings relating to the prevalence of two contrasting climates and the empirical evidence relating to positive association between a conductive classroom climate and pupil learning promoted researches to undertake studies learning to the exploration of interaction process and teacher behaviour in the classroom and the identification of several variables affecting what come to be desired as teacher effectiveness.

A question may arise as to what research work is

done in India on classroom climate. Research work done in India is mentioned in the later section.

(B) Indian Researches

A Research Work on Tools of Classroom Climate

The main objective of Indira Desai's (1976) study was to construct tools to measure classroom climate to suit Indian conditions. The former tool standardized by Thelen (1974) is based on American school sample. Based on the discussions with school principals and eminent professors regarding the factors which affect the classroom climate and also keeping in perspective, the tool is prepared by Desai (1976). She selected the components for the tool, conducted the detailed statistical analysis of responses their validity and reliability as certain. The major findings of Indira Desai's (1976) research study are as follows:

1. There are three aspects of classroom climate according to pupils: (i) Authenticity, (ii) Legitimacy and (iii) Productivity.
2. There are twentyfour components of classroom climate according to pupils.
3. There are four criteria for classroom climate according to teachers.
4. There are twentytwo components of classroom climate according to teachers.

Miss Madhu Puri (1977) conducted a useful study on 'classroom climate' and academic motivation of three Gujarati medium schools of Baroda employing the tools classroom climate scale of Sister Marie De Sales (1976) and pupils' academic motivation scale (1961).

Sister Elvira (1977-79) constructed the test on classroom climate on Indian conditions. The present investigator has used her test to measure classroom climate.

## 2.2 PREVIOUS RESEARCHES ON ACADEMIC MOTIVATION

Studies reported on students' motivation are limited because this is a developing field. The relationship is existing between classroom climate and pupils' motivation. One of the reason for designing the present investigation is to make an attempt in the direction of minimizing the deficiency of research in this sphere.

The pioneering work in this area in India and specially in Gujarat is done by Desai. Desai (1970) obtained the permission of Frymier to adopt his tool the JIM scale in Gujarati and administered it to the pupils of the schools in Gujarat State. The most important finding of Desai's study is that healthy classroom climate and school climate increase pupils' motivation towards their school at a significant level.

Sharma did some studies at the Centre of Advanced Study in Education, M. S. University of Baroda. He (1971)

studied organizational climate and its relationship with pupil's performance, and arrived at the finding that there was positive relationship between organizational climate and school academic index. In a study (1972) he found that principal's effectiveness is related by teachers and teacher's satisfaction were positively related to school climate and pupils motivation.

Inamdar (1974) found that the pupils with high JIM scores manifested greater achievement motive and that they liked learning very much. It was also found that the pupils with high JIM scores on "My Aim" items showed greater concern for power and excellence compared to pupils having low scores.

Pillai (1974) found that pupils' performance was significantly better in open and autonomous schools than in those of other climate types. There is a positive correlation between openness of climate and performance of pupils in the schools. It was also found that 'esprit' and 'thrust' influenced performance positively and 'disengagement' and 'hindrance' negatively.

Shelat (1974) found a significant relationship between organizational climate and pupils' academic motivation. A significant finding of her research is that pupils' academic motivation was not found to be the direct function of leadership behaviour. Pupils' motivation was found to have been affected jointly by the size of the



school and sex of pupils.

Darji (1975) studied the JIM scores with other variables of hundred secondary schools of Panchmahals District. He found that there is no direct relationship between motivation of students and leadership behaviour of principal. And the relation between academic status of the school and the leader behaviour dimensions of the principal is not significant.

Puri (1977) studied of classroom climate and academic motivation found the mean of JIM score is 102.57.

Dholakia (1978) studied the factors affecting fluctuations in classroom climate. She found that the pupils' academic motivation is about average in both the classes. It does not show any difference between the boys and girls. The distribution is also non-homogeneous and discontinuous.

The investigator took up academic motivation as a variable in order to study the level of academic motivation in school pupils of missionary schools and private schools.

The identification of meaningful research studies of the motivation of individuals to achieve in school, can be a frustrating task, if one is aware of the current lack of both useful definitions and a comprehensive theory of academic motivation. Attempts at organizing such a general theory have been made by McClelland, Farquhar, Frymier and

others, but little research has set out to speak specially to questions of motivation to achieve in school. So motivation is a concept worthy of primary consideration for study and that its ramifications are implicit in much educational research.

(A) Personality Factors

These factors influence academic motivation. Motivation to achieve is basically and inevitably a personal matter. Personality and related motivational patterns are in large measure, a product of social and cultural influences.

Kaunser (1953) found that low socio-economic white males, had lower self-concept than others in higher socio-economic strata, while Caliguri (1966) found that the responses of 425 poverty level Negroes to open ended questions dealing with self-concepts had only minimal relationship to academic concerns. Beard (1965) found that intelligence, socio-economic status and academic achievement differentiated dropouts from non-dropouts more adequately than did patterns of measured self-concept.

Martire (1956) found that subjects with high need achievement scores had a greater discrepancy between ideal and actual self-concept under both neutral and achievement motivating conditions.

Gay (1966) tried to determine the relationship

P/Th 3973



between the self-concepts of 207 Negroes, eighth graders and their intelligence and academic achievement. The relationships among these variables were significant for both sexes and the best predictor of academic achievement was found to be teacher's estimate of 5.5 self-concept. Self-concept was apparently a greater motivational factor in achievement than intelligence.

The self-concept studies reviewed support directly or indirectly the contention that positive self-concepts are related to high achievement and vice versa.

(B) Studies of School Dropouts

Dropping out is perhaps the most drastic manifestation of lack of school motivation. When student has reached the point of dropping out, his accumulation of negative experiences is probably so great that only massive effort could reverse the trend. These negative experiences may in some cases have little to do with dislike of school work. In general, however, school experience is a major factor in negative motivation leading to dropping out.

In David's study (1969) a deliberate attempt was made to inculcate feelings of worth in an experimental group of 21 ninth grade students by using field trips, discussions and extra guidance and counselling when this group was compared with a control group receiving no special treatment, it was found to have fewer dropouts,

higher marks and fewer referrals for disciplinary action.

Lichter (1962) conducted an intensive individualized case work service for a sample of 195 intellectually capable high school students who were potential dropouts. The service resulted in improvement in personality functioning for about half of the sample, many of whom stayed in school. A higher percentage of boys than girls stayed in school and all improved in their school adaptation.

Jackson (1966) found the grades of 190 junior high school students counselled over a three year period to be consistently better than the control group.

Blocher (1967) also raised the grade point average of tenth grade, underachieving boys, with negative attitude towards school, through intensive counselling.

Dickson and Truax (1966) found significant improvement in the mean grade point average of underachieving college freshmen who were exposed to 'high' therapeutic conditions as opposed to students who underwent normal therapy.

Ryan (1967) used reinforcement counselling to improve attitudes towards study and academic achievement with 928 students.

#### (C) Classroom Atmosphere and Educational Practice

Veroff and Schell (1967) revealed that there was

some indication of two possible types of achievement motivation operating to influence children's performance appeared quite independent of each other, while achievement motivation and past performance were likely to show a relationship. These findings complicate the problem of identifying precisely those methods and teaching styles, which lead to greater motivation and better performance in the classroom.

Wachs (1969) study of free recall learning with three motivation extrinsic - motivation and mixed motivation yielded some evidence for an interfering effect of extrinsic motivation upon learning on the other hand.

Evans (1967) found that college students with high achievement motivation performed at a high level in a discovery learning task regardless of the incentive conditions provided for them. The fact that they were willing to spend more time on the learning task helps to explain their superior performance. Intelligence was a more significant factor in both discovery and incidental learning than motivation to achieve.

#### (D) Studies of Overachievement and Underachievement

Engel (1964) found that certain personality traits, peculiar to over and underachieving elementary students, might be related partly to parental attitudinal patterns.

Family factors are further reflected in studies by McCillivray (1964) and Shore and Leiman (1965). McCillivray

found that among other things, overachievers have more dominant mothers and parents with more college ambition for their children, while underachievers' families dominated by the father, showed less interest in their children.

(E) Parent and Peer Group Influence

The influences of parents and the influences of peer groups in motivating children to achieve academically have not been clearly differentiated by researches. Some conclude that the greater influence comes from the family and some that it comes from peer group.

Studies by McDonald (1962-63) and Drews and Teahen (1957) suggest that strictness, as opposed to either apathy or authoritarianism, is related to high academic achievement, while a study by Teahen (1963) reports that parents of low achievers rank higher in Domination sub-scale of the 'Parental Attitude Scale' with parent occupation, IQ and age controlled. Drews and Teahen (1957) found that children of high academic achievement came from strict families where mothers were even authoritarian in their attitudes towards rearing.

Children's educational and status aspirations seem to be related positively to these aspirations in their parents. Rosen (1959) says, in effect that children whose parents have high aspirations for them are trained for academic achievement and to aspire to excellence. Galper

(1963) found that current family social status was significantly related to the status aspirations of 263 male of ninth graders and that material social mobility was also related.

(F) Researches by Frymier and Others

Frymier (1965) conducted a number of researches in this area. He gives detailed results of various student population on JIM scales in his journal TIP (Theory into Practice). The entire issue of the journal is based on the academic motivation. Frymier gives this observation that pupils, low on JIM, are unhappy and thing oriented, they lack confidence in themselves, they resist change and new ideas, they are unduly concerned with the objects and are materialistic and they dislike school intensely. As a result, there are greater number of dropouts. He also gives the characteristics of pupils on high JIM. These pupils are gifted and have high aspirations. They possess greater amount of divergent thinking and at the same time they feel greater involvement in the school activities.

Researches reviewed by Scott, Bower, Joe Bayer and Elinor Scheiner ( 1961 ) indicate quite a considerable research work has been done in the area of (a) personality factors influencing learning, (b) school dropouts, (c) classroom atmosphere and (d) parent influence, etc. Cohen (1964) suggests that very high and very low goal setting

are both related to a high degree of self-rejection. Martire (1956) found that subjects with high need achievement scores had a greater discrepancy between ideal and actual self-concept under both neutral and achievement motivating conditions.

Whitstone (1963) found that self-concept apparently contributed to school motivation as measured by achievement.

The Ar'kansans Department of Education Report (1962) suggests that most reasons for quitting school can be listed under the heading 'lack of motivation'. Two major contributions to this lack of motivation are poor parent attitude and lack of peers' acceptance.

(G) Researches by Desai and Others

Desai (1970) took JIM as one of the variables in his research project. He tried to find out the JIM score of the Kaira District. The highest JIM score obtained from the schools was 119.6 and the lowest 79.3. Dave (1973) studied the correlation of achievement motivation. It was found from her study that JIM is positively correlated with the socio-economic status of pupils and the performance of the students.

Choksi (1973) studied JIM in relation to the variables like perception, adjustment, motivation, socio-economic status and anxiety. JIM was found to be positively related with the variables taken except anxiety. The study shows positive relations of JIM with the variables



perception, SES, PACTS (Pre-Adolescent Classroom Trusts) and performance. It tells us that students having high JIM score have good perception of themselves and others, better socio-economic status, have good classroom trust and good performance in their scholastic achievement.

Sex differences in JIM score is also an interesting point. The results of the studies do not give any conclusive evidence. In Dave's study, the JIM score of boys (88.83) are higher than girls (88.54) and in Choksi's study also the JIM score of boys are higher than girls (the JIM score of boys is 93.53 and girls is 91.90). In Frymier's study of JIM score of girls (126.12) is higher than boys (116.69). So, in the schools of Baroda city JIM score of boys is higher than girls. According to the Indian conditions, the girls are less motivated from their homes than boys, as the families give more importance to the boys. But, perhaps further researches on various samples might enable the researchers to give a definite conclusion.

Socio-economic status also plays an important part in the pupils motivation towards school. In Dave's study, high SES students scored higher on JIM, i.e., 91.58 than low SES 90.50 and average 87.73, while in Choksi's study low SES scored higher on JIM (93.17) than high (92.46) and low (92.39). The variation in JIM score may be due to different influences. In other words, SES does not seem to be interacting with JIM scores.

The mean JIM scores is shown in table below:

TABLE 1  
Mean JIM Scores in Various Studies

| Sr.<br>No. | Dave  | Choksi | Desai | Frymier |
|------------|-------|--------|-------|---------|
| 1.         | 90.51 | 82.81  | 79.3  | 116.32  |
| 2.         | 87.81 | 90.53  | 82.6  | 120.98  |
| 3.         | 84.78 | 93.17  | 86.5  | 130.28  |
| 4.         | 98.80 | 97.59  | 90.0  | 135.38  |
| 5.         | 86.22 | 98.54  | 119.6 | 142.90  |

There is a class in Baroda city school which has as low as 82.81 JIM score, whereas there is also a school with little higher (as compared to norm) JIM score also. The JIM score of a particular class would lead to a better atmosphere towards study. This variation is due to many factors which causes the variation in JIM score. The organizational climate of the school, classroom ethos, parental influence of the children, socio-economic status of the pupils may cause the variation in JIM score. To what degree does a student's motivational pattern vary according to the kinds of programmes and methods used in the schools? A student's motivational pattern may vary according to the general institutional environment in which he finds himself. Studies have been conducted in order to assess the influence of differing college and high school environments upon

student motivation and performance. Several studies indicate the schools pay little attention to the psychological needs of their students.

The influence of parents and the influence of peer groups in motivating the pupils is an important factor. Studies by Wevy (1933), Barwick and Arbuckle (1962), Van Zaut (1964) and Elder (1965) suggest that children achieve higher when parents are accepting, democratic, supportive. Elder (1965) suggests that parental dominance negatively affects school attainment.

The Socio-Economic Status (SES) of the pupils may also cause variation. The students coming from higher socio-economic strata may have higher motivation towards the school as they are more encouraged by their parents, have clear perception about their work.

These are some of the effects of low JIM score on pupils. Researches convey that a picture of low motivated students also cause variation. Low motivated students are down hearted, pessimistic and sad. They do not like formal education. Whether these feelings are cause or effects (e.g. students do not like teachers because they are low motivated or are they low motivated because they dislike teachers?) is a problem to be studied.

Students who leave school represent a valuable source of information about school motivation. There are

many dropout studies which will give the reasons for students' quitting school. Some dropouts when questioned about their reasons for leaving school, say that they dislike certain teacher, their lessons were insufficiently explained, and they did not get enough help from the teacher.

Most frequently what is implied in all the studies is that youngsters who quit school are from homes in which friction or lack of love is evident, their home conditions include separated parents, unemployed father, exceptionally large family or overcrowded living conditions. Many students leave school in Baroda to marry, most of these are girls. Boys frequently dropout of school to enter the armed services. Ability is another factor which evidently affects students' motivation towards school. The reasons that appear obvious is that either they cannot succeed with the educational opportunities available, or they get no satisfaction from the experiences even if they can succeed.

The variation in mean JIM score may be due to the factors discussed namely parental influence, classroom climate, socio-economic status, ability of the pupils' low motivation, dropout, etc.

The factors which contribute to academic motivation are as follows:

(i) Personality factors influencing academic

motivation; (ii) Counselling; (iii) Class atmosphere and educational practice; (iv) Parental influence; (v) Pupils' self-concept; (vi) Social relationships; and (vii) Values, personality structure and curiosity.

Weiner (1966) assessed the relationships among anxiety, achievement motivation and reports about success or failure and learning tasks. He found that high SES pupils in achievement motivation performed better in easy tasks but worse on a more difficult task.

Gilliland (1968) raised the academic achievement, specifically in the area of language by counselling black high school students. Names (1963) found that children in classes with low creative, dominant teachers show significantly different scores on several creativity variables from children with high creative teachers.

Waetjen (1970) reviewed several studies observed the varying impact parents had in affecting their children's motivation. High achievers tend to come from homes in which the parents are approving, affectionate and less restrictive. Pupils who come from home of higher socio-economic status have fewer maladjustments.

Geisler (1968) found a strong correlation between self-concept and academic achievement. Two studies suggest that a large perceived discrepancy between actual self and ideal self may be a motivator, at least with certain kinds

Friedman (1969) studied the relationship between the self-concept reflected in an index of self-ideal, self-disparity and scholastic achievement and intellectual ability. A trend was noted towards higher self-ideal self-disparity score as ability increased for middle and high achievers and towards lower scores for low achievers. From the studies cited one can say that self-concept affects motivation.

### 2.3 PREVIOUS RESEARCHES ON SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

Number of studies conducted both abroad and in India, have revealed that children with low socio-economic status differ from children with high socio-economic status, on cognitive, personality and achievement tests. Socio-economic background has been found to have greater influence in educational achievement of pupils than any other factor (Moken Kopf, 1956; Ramsey, 1961; Coleman, 1961 and Turner, 1964). Evidence demonstrate that middle and upper class children at all levels of education are more achievement oriented and do better than low class children in school (Douvan, 1956; Levin, 1965; Rose, 1956; Swift, 1970 and Watto, 1970). Contrary evidence, however, have also been reported across countries. Nemzek (1940) found that educational level of the parent was positively related to school achievement. White (1967) concluded that there were no major differences in high school achievement between children whose mothers were highly educated and children

whose fathers were highly educated.

Osborn (1971) in a study on the impact of differential parental educational level on the educational achievement of the child found that high school seniors achieved in the direction of educational level of the like-sex parents. Boys with father who were college graduates had higher grades than boys whose fathers were school graduates, as did girls whose mothers were college graduates. The results of the study concur with those of Hood (1967) and Michael (1971). They do suggest that differing educational levels of parents are influential to the children, and that a child would be expected to achieve and aspire educationally in the direction of the educational level of the same sex parents.

Gorden (1969) in a study of the "Educational Achievement and Aspirations of Mexican-American Youth in a Metropolitan Context" observed that family educational level was the most important factor with family income level contributing less.

Chatterjee, Mukherjee and Banerjee (1972) concluded that economic condition of the family have no effect on scholastic achievement. Father's occupation also was found to be not consistently related to the achievement. However, parents' educational level was found to be directly related to the achievement of their children. Similarly, Stevenson, Parker and Wilkinson, Hegin and Fish (1976) in a study of individual differences in cognitive development and

scholastic achievement of 255 children enrolled in seventeen Kindergarten classes and four elementary schools reported that educational attainments of parents had more influence on the scholastic achievement and cognitive development of their sons and that parental education was significantly related to pre-Kindergarten reading and arithmetic scores for both boys and girls.

Two studies concerned with the success and failure of college students reported that underachievers came from houses where parents were poorly educated (Sinha, 1965; Wig and Nagpal, 1972). Saxena (1972) in a similar type of study with a sample of 1769 boys of higher schools found that parents' education was associated with academic achievement in mathematics and biology streams.

Sharply contrasted with these finding is the finding of Gupta (1968) who in a study of the relationship between environment factors and academic achievement found no relationship between parents' educational status and pupil achievement. George and Tharakon (1977) confirmed Gupta's findings. One objective of the study was to find out the influence of economic status of parents on the achievement of 1038 pupils in class X of 14 high schools of Trivandrum. The t-ratio for economic in total achievement scores was significant at 1 per cent level indicating the influence of economic status on achievement. The mean achievement scores indicate that the higher economic group



scored more than the lower economic groups.

Colence (1940) found a relationship between economic status and school adjustment for junior high school students.

Lokitaksham (1961), Pal and Saxena (1970) and Worthington and Grant (1971) observed a relationship between family income and achievement.

Taking father/guardian's occupation as the indicator of socio-economic background, Chopra (1969) studied 433 pupils of (Science) class X in Lucknow to explore the relationship of SES with academic achievement. The main findings were: (i) the mean marks scored by the students in the higher socio-economic background were significantly higher than those of the students from the middle and lower socio-economic groups. (ii) There is a positive relationship between socio-economic background and achievement in English, Mathematics and Science but achievement in Hindi, Biology and Art was relatively free from the influence of socio-economic background. (iii) The pattern of relationship between socio-economic background and academic achievement was the same at all the three intellectual ability levels.

Mathur (1960) observed that the students of higher socio-economic status show significantly higher achievement. Occupation was conceptualized as the indicator of SES. The results related that the phi-coefficiency between achievement and SES .70. Similarly, in a sample of first year

university undergraduates, the study by Kennett and Grant (1978) reports that even after high school academic selection process, verbal meaning (IQ subject) and verbal expression were significantly correlated with father's occupation (SES) and home environment possession in favour of the upper SES individuals.

French (1959) reported that unexpectedly Father's occupation and education showed little or no relationship to test scores. Kulkarni and Naidu (1970) taking samples from Haryana, Gujarat and Central Schools found low positive correlation between SES and achievement only in case of Central School. There was no clear trend to suggest relationship between education of parents and achievement of children, whereas occupational level of parents showed no relationship with achievement of their children.

But Singh (1965) came out with a different finding. He reported that academic achievement has significant positive relationship with the father's education and occupation.

Identical findings were those of Barks and Finlayson (1973). They reported that father's occupation had significant relation with academic achievement. Rehbord and Rosenthal (1976), however, could find no relationship between socio-economic status and achievement.

Jones (1968) reports a significant finding. In a

study designed to examine the influence of the students background, on his performance in terms of academic success and attitude change during his first year in college. Jones found that the students from low SES background performed better than other students.

In an earlier study, Srinivasan (1969) too found that the parents of middle class children took more interest in the education of their children than the other two classes. It was further observed that children of middle class family got better scores in the language ability tests than the other two classes. The mark secured by the middle children in terminal examination were higher than those secured by the students belonging to lower social class. Currie (1974) reports an almost random correlation between parental socioeconomic status and Uganda Secondary school performance in the years 1954, 1959 and 1964.

To test the question of influence of SES on academic achievement Heyneman (1976) took a sample, consisting of a random selection of 67 primary school from five diverse districts and all three urban areas in Uganda. There was no relationship between any of the measures of child's SES and his total academic achievement score on the National Primary Learning Examination.

In India, Barial (1966), Jain (1965), Jha (1970), Khasin (1970), Naidu and Aaron (1969), Pavitran (1969), Rao (1965) and Reddy (1973) found no relationship between

SES and achievement. But Benner (1967), Girija and Bhadra (1976), Mathur and Hundal (1972) and quite a few others reported significant relationship.

Mishra (1960) who studied students from both rural and urban schools in Orissa found a correlation of .59 between home environment indices and achievement scores, whereas intelligence test scores and school achievement scores correlated to the extent of .31.

In a major study involving 1357 students of class X Chopra (1964) has examined the relationship between SES and academic achievement. His findings are: (i) None of the sons of fathers engaged in professional, administrative, executive and managerial job expected to discontinue education, the corresponding figures for the agriculturist and unskilled workers group were as high as sixtyfour and sixty-six per cent, 96.09 per cent of the students who discontinued education gave the reason of poor economic condition of the family. (ii) The percentage of the failure among the students from the professional, administration and managerial groups was twentyseven, while that for the other groups ranged between fifty-nine and sixtyone. (iii) On the basis of father's educational, occupation, family income<sup>,type</sup>/of lodging, size of the family, cultural level of house, students belonging to the higher qualitative group showed significantly higher mean achievement than students coming from lower categories. (iv) The difference between the

academic achievement of different castes was significant at .05 level.

Rameji Rao (1976) found that the socio-economic status of pupil was the most important single predictor of academic achievement. The correlation remained high even when variables like intelligence and study habits were partialled out. The result was the same both when SES of the individual pupil was correlated with the achievement score and also when the mean SES score of pupils in a given school was correlated with the index of performance of the school.

In Phillippines, Younhood (1976) found that students from middle and upper social class backgrounds, regardless sex consistently received higher grades in school.

Lord Robbins and his colleagues (Report, 1963) have observed close association between a father's level of occupation and the educational achievement of his children at school. The association with parental occupation is if anything, still closer where higher education is concerned. It was found that the proportion of young people who entered full-time higher education was 45 per cent for those whose fathers were in the 'skilled manual occupations' category. The underlying reasons for this are complex but differences of income and of the parents' educational level and attitudes are certainly among them. The link is even more marked for

girls than for the boys. The report concludes that "the numbers who are capable of benefitting from higher education are a function not only of heredity but also of a host of often influences varying with standards of educational provision, family incomes and attitudes and the education received by previous generation.

#### 2.4 CONCLUSION

Research findings reported so far are of the contradictory and inconclusive. The generalizations drawn are tentative at best. The results are inconclusive, because of several reasons such as, (i) Variation in the criteria of achievement chosen and used in the study, (ii) use of tools, which are not very much reliable and valid, (iii) inadequate and heterogenous samples used in research, (iv) effect of situational variables on the test administration, (v) application of inadequate and inappropriate statistical design, (vi) variations in the tools used for measuring the same variable, and (vii) subjectivity of the examiner in scoring the test answer sheet, etc.

On the relationship between SES and academic achievement, ample evidences has been furnished by a large number of studies from different corners of the world which would lead one to conclude that children of higher SES do perform better than those of lower SES scholastically but not vice versa. A few studies, however, have shown that inspite of limited educational attainment and occupational

status of their parents, children from low SES are excelling in school and colleges. There have been studies too, which indicated no relationship between SES and academic attainment. Though consistent relationship between all the psychological social variables and academic achievement have been found. The review has revealed the significant of these correlates. The review has shown that most of the studies have been conducted at the school level.

In the present study, all these variables are taken as the investigator wanted to know the level of:

- (a) classroom climate
- (b) academic motivation
- (c) SES
- (d) academic performance

and their relationship with each other. Another objective of the investigator was to know the effect of these variables on performance.

The next chapter deals with the conceptual foundations of these variables.