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ABSTRACT

Lakshadweep is the smallest Union Territory of India. These are the islands scattered in the Arabian Sea between 111 to 222 Nautical Miles off the coast of Kerala. Like other places of our country, in Lakshadweep, the scholastic achievement is the predominant term in the evaluation of the education system in recent days. Achieving good academic achievement is the main objective of the students, parents wish their children to climb the highest level as other part of the country. Parents wish their children to climb the highest level as the success or failure is controlled by mere luck or chance and (c) Locus of Control (Individual Control) in which he believes that his success or failure is controlled by mere luck or chance. The construct of Locus of Control is the contribution of Julian Rotter's (1954) social-learning theory of personality. The Locus being the Latin word for place, the Locus of Control is nothing but place of Control. The Locus of Control refers to perception of an individual about the underlying main causes of events in his/her life. Rotter (1975), in his social learning theory, has stated that some people believe that they are responsible for failure or success, whereas others believe in the environment and opportunities. Those who hold themselves accountable for their own success or failure use an internal Locus of Control; however those who believe in the environment and opportunities use an external Locus of Control. It is presumed that there is a relationship between external Locus of Control and pro-social behavior (Malby, et al., 2007). In a research, a relationship between Locus of Control and academic achievement has been observed; others have reported a negative relationship between external Locus of Control and academic achievement (Wood, Saylor, & Cohen, 2009). The present study considered three aspects of Locus of Control namely (a) Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) in which he believes that his success or failure is controlled by some other persons who have authority over him (b) Locus of Control (Chance Control) in which he believes that his success or failure is controlled by mere luck or chance and (c) Locus of Control (Individual Control) in which he believes that he himself is responsible for his success or failure. With regards to their Locus of Control (Chance Control).
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Introduction

Lakshadweep is the smallest Union Territory of India. These are the islands scattered in the Arabian Sea between 111 to 222 Nautical Miles off the coast of Kerala. The islands have been developing by leaps and bounds since independence. The scholastic achievement is the predominant term in the evaluation of the education system in recent days. Achieving good academic achievement is the main objective of the students, parents wish their children to climb the highest level as other part of the country. Parents wish their children to climb the highest level as the success or failure is controlled by mere luck or chance and (c) Locus of Control (Individual Control) in which he believes that his success or failure is controlled by mere luck or chance. The construct of Locus of Control is the contribution of Julian Rotter's (1954) social-learning theory of personality. The Locus being the Latin word for place, the Locus of Control is nothing but place of Control. The Locus of Control refers to perception of an individual about the underlying main causes of events in his/her life. Rotter (1975), in his social learning theory, has stated that some people believe that they are responsible for failure or success, whereas others believe in the environment and opportunities. Those who hold themselves accountable for their own success or failure use an internal Locus of Control; however those who believe in the environment and opportunities use an external Locus of Control. It is presumed that there is a relationship between external Locus of Control and pro-social behavior (Malby, et al., 2007). In a research, a relationship between Locus of Control and academic achievement has been observed; others have reported a negative relationship between external Locus of Control and academic achievement (Wood, Saylor, & Cohen, 2009). The present study considered three aspects of Locus of Control namely (a) Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) in which he believes that his success or failure is controlled by some other persons who have authority over him (b) Locus of Control (Chance Control) in which he believes that his success or failure is controlled by mere luck or chance and (c) Locus of Control (Individual Control) in which he believes that he himself is responsible for his success or failure. With regards to their Locus of Control (Chance Control).

Methodology of the Study

This is a descriptive study. The 'normative survey' method is used to find out the Locus of Control of underachieving students at secondary level. The population of the present study involves all the IXth standard students of secondary school students in Lakshadweep following Malayalam medium Kerala state syllabus. There were three stages in the sampling procedure of the present study. In the first stage, the investigator selected 9 schools, three schools from each BRC, by lottery method. That constitutes 80% of the schools. In the second stage of the sampling, about 40% (total of 509 students consisting of 196 boys and 311 girls) of the students were taken from each selected school using stratified proportionate random sampling method. In the third stage, 222 Underachievers were identified with the help of an intelligence test and the achievement test score obtained from the school register. This achievement score is converted to student T-score for the standardisation and it is compared with the percentile rank in the intelligence test. The Underachiever is a student whose achievement T-score is one standard deviation or more below their equivalent intelligent percentile score. The tools used for the present study are, 1. Raven's standard progressive matrices developed by J.C.Raven in 2000 (edited) updated in 2004. This tests is used to know the intelligence of the students which is considered as the proven ability or potential of the children. The investigators evaluated the based on the table SPMD of percentile norms for Indian student standardized in New Delhi given in the page number SPMD of the manual.

1. In this study investigator adopted Levenson's Locus of Control Scale developed by Sanjay Vohra in the year 1992 for measuring the Locus of Control. This tool is a Likert Type Scale, with multiple choice responses presented in a continuum. The original tool is translated in Malayalam and standardisation procedures have been applied to get final version of Levenson's Locus of Control Scale. There are 24 statements in the test, 8 for P- powerful others, C-Chance control and I-Individual control. The test was administered and scored according to the instructions given in the manual. The obtained scores for each component are converted to Sten scores.
Analysis of Data

Descriptive and differential statistics are employed for the analyses of the data. The descriptive statistics such as percentage, mean, standard deviation etc. are used for analyzing each variable. The t-test is used for differential analysis to find out the significance of difference between Underachieving boys and girls with regard to their achievement. Pearson’s product moment correlation was employed to find out relationship between academic achievement of Underachievers and their Locus of Control.

(a) Descriptive Analysis

Table 1 - Descriptive Statistics for Locus of Control of Underachievers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistical Parameters</th>
<th>Powerful Others Control</th>
<th>Chance Control</th>
<th>Individual Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>1.742</td>
<td>2.598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table-1 it is very clear that the mean score obtained for the Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) and Locus of Control (Chance Control) are much higher than the Locus of Control (Individual Control). It indicates that the Underachievers scored more in external Locus of Control than internal Locus of Control.

(b) Differential Analysis

Hypothesis H: There is no significant difference between underachieving boys and girls with regards to their Locus of Control.

Table 2 – t-test for Locus of Control of Underachieving boys and girls in Lakshadweep

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus of Control</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powerful Others</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>2.216</td>
<td>Significant at 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance Control</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Control</td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>Not Significant at 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table-2 it is clear that the difference between underachieving boys and girls with regards to their Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) is significant at 0.05 level because obtained t-value 2.216 for Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) is greater than the critical value 1.96. Hence the null hypothesis “There is no significant difference between underachieving boys and girls with regards to their Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control)” is rejected. Hence there exists a significant difference between underachieving boys and girls with regards to their Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control). The Underachieving boys have scored more in Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) than Underachieving girls. It is also clear from the above table-2 that the difference between underachieving boys and girls with regards to their Locus of Control (Chance Control) and Locus of Control (Individual Control) are not significant at 0.05 level because obtained t-values 0.990 and 1.285 respectively for Locus of Control (Chance Control) and Locus of Control (Individual Control) are less than the critical value 1.96.

(c) Correlation Analysis

Hypothesis H: There is no significant correlation between Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) and academic achievement and of Underachievers in Lakshadweep.

Table 3: Correlation between Academic achievement and Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>53.47</td>
<td>9.681</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>(Significant at 0.05 level)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table-3 it is clear that there is a significant negative correlation between Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) and academic achievement of Underachievers in Lakshadweep. Hence the null hypothesis “There is no significant correlation between Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) and academic achievement and of Underachievers in Lakshadweep” is rejected. It shows that increase in Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) leads to decrease in academic achievement of Underachievers in Lakshadweep.

Hypothesis H: There is no significant correlation between Locus of Control (Chance Control) and academic achievement and of Underachievers in Lakshadweep.

Table 4: Correlation between Academic achievement and Locus of Control (Chance Control).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>53.47</td>
<td>9.681</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control (Chance Control)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>1.742</td>
<td>(Not Significant at 0.05 level)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table-4 it is clear that there is no significant correlation between Locus of Control (Chance Control) and academic achievement of Underachievers in Lakshadweep. Hence the null hypothesis “There is no significant correlation between Locus of Control (Chance Control) and academic achievement and of Underachievers in Lakshadweep” is accepted.

Hypothesis H: There is no significant correlation between Locus of Control (Individual Control) and academic achievement and of Underachievers in Lakshadweep.

Table 5: Correlation between Academic achievement and Locus of Control (Individual Control).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>53.47</td>
<td>9.681</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control (Individual Control)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>2.598</td>
<td>(Significant at 0.05 level)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table-5 it is clear that there is a significant positive correlation between Locus of Control (Individual Control) and academic achievement of Underachievers in Lakshadweep. Hence the null hypothesis “There is no significant correlation between Locus of Control (Individual Control) and academic achievement of Underachievers in Lakshadweep” is rejected. It shows that increase in Locus of Control (Individual Control) leads to increase in academic achievement of Underachievers in Lakshadweep.

Result and Discussion

The analyses of the data regarding the underachieving students of Lakshadweep lead the investigator to several conclusions. The major findings of the study are enlisted below

1. The mean score obtained for the Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) and Locus of Control (Chance Control) are much higher than the Locus of Control (Individual Control). It indicates that the Underachievers scored more in external Locus of Control than internal Locus of Control.
2. Only 4.5 % of Underachievers are having Internal Locus of Control and 95.5% of Underachievers are having External Locus of Control comprising of 36.94% Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) and 58.56% Locus of Control (Chance Control).
3. There is a significant difference between underachieving boys and girls with regards to their Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control), Boys have scored more in Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) than girls.
4. There is no significant difference between underachieving boys and girls with regards to their Locus of Control (Chance Control) and Locus of Control (Individual Control).
There is a significant negative correlation between Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) and academic achievement of Underachievers in Lakshadweep. It shows that increase in Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) leads to decrease in academic achievement of Underachievers in Lakshadweep.

There is no significant correlation between academic achievement of Underachievers in Lakshadweep and Locus of Control (Chance Control) and Locus of Control (Individual Control).

There is a significant positive correlation between Locus of Control (Individual Control) and academic achievement of Underachievers in Lakshadweep. It shows that increase in Locus of Control (Individual Control) leads to increase in academic achievement of Underachievers in Lakshadweep.

The Locus of Control is one of the most important variables influencing academic achievements of the Underachievers in Lakshadweep. The Underachievers who are achieving lesser than their actual capacity are having external Locus of Control. Only 4.5% of the Underachievers are having internal Locus of Control. This academic achievement has a significant negative correlation with the Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control). Hence this is needed to be replaced with Locus of Control (Individual Control).

**Educational Implications and Conclusion**

The Underachievers who are achieving lesser than their actual capacity will be a loss for the educational system. So it is the responsibility of all the stakeholders of education to resolve the problem of Underachievement. Locus of Control is one of the variables affecting the academic achievement of the Underachievers. Hence all the stakeholders should take a measure to replace Locus of Control (Powerful Others Control) with Locus of Control (Individual Control) because Locus of Control (Individual Control) is an indicative of Internal Locus of Control. Internal Locus of Control has been linked with academic success (Gifford, Briceño-Perrott & Mianzo, 2006), higher self-motivation and social maturity (Nelson & Mathias, 1995). External Locus of Control is correlated with higher levels of stress (Garber & Seligman, 1980), and Grob (2000) notes that stress is often caused because an individual perceives the situation as beyond his or her control. A proper training may be planned and given to these Underachievers to make them believe in their own capacities. A self-concept development programme may also be organized to them to enhance internal Locus of Control.
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