

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES
SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

**BIRTH ORDER, PERSONALTY AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION
AMONG ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY SOCIAL SCIENCE COLLEGE STUDENTS**

By: Ambachew Tarekegn

JUNE, 2014
ADDIS ABABA

**BIRTH ORDER, PERSONALITY AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION
AMONG ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY SOCIAL SCIENCE COLLEGE STUDENTS**

By: Ambachew Tarekegn

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ART
IN COUNSELLING PSYCHOLOGY**

JUNE, 2014

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES

SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY

**BIRTH ORDER PERSONALITY AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION
AMONG ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

By: Ambachew Tarekegn

Approval of the board of Examiners

Name, Advisor

Signature

Date

Name, Internal examiner

Signature

Date

Name, External examiner

Signature

Date

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude for my adviser Mulat Asnake for his patience, scholarly and indefatigable assistance from the commencement up until the consummation of the research.

My gratitude also goes to my classmates Aselefech Wolde and Mahlet Mekuria for their priceless material contribution without which this research wouldn't have been finished the way It did now

I do also thank the student representatives of the Social Science College and social science college students whom I don't know in names for their kind co-operation during the data gathering process.

I am also grateful to my cousin Aklilu Hailu for his meticulous editing of this paper.

Last but not least, I would like to express my sincere gratitude for my mother Taytu Aliyu ,my brother Andualem Zerihun and my sister Birtukan Tarekegn for their unreserved moral and financial support for the whole gamut of my research.

Abstract

This study is attempted to examine the effects of birth order on academic achievement motivation and personality. There has been a great debate among researchers regarding this area of concern. It is also one of the least researched areas in Ethiopian context; hence, it gave inspiration for the researcher to investigate the effects of birth order on academic achievement motivation and personality of Addis Ababa University Social Science College Students. The specific objectives of this study were to investigate the effects of birth order on academic achievement motivation and personality, to examine whether a relationship exist between personality and academic achievement motivation and to investigate whether gender difference exist in academic achievement motivation .To conduct the study, Survey research design was employed on 160 participants (104 male and 56 female) students from Social Science College took part in the study. A self report questionnaire with items background information and adopted tests that help to measure academic achievement motivation and personality was used. The reliability of the academic achievement motivation and personality were 0.723 and 0.871 respectively. Kruskal Wallis test, Man- Whitney U test and Spearman rho were employed to analyze the data. Results shows that birth order did not have statistically significant effect both on academic achievement motivation and personality. But there is a statistically significant relationship between personality and academic achievement motivation. Eventually, the researcher concludes that birth order does not have a significant effect both on academic achievement motivation and personality. There are many factors which may influence academic achievement motivation and personality of individuals there for, further comprehensive study is recommended.

Table of content

Contents	page
Acknowledgment	i
Abstract	ii
Table of content	iii
BACHGROUND OF THE STUDY	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	4
1.3 Objective of the Study	5
Specific Objectives.....	6
1.4 Significance of the Study.....	6
1.5 Delimitation of the Study.....	7
1.6 Limitation of the Study.....	7
1.7 Operational Definition of Important Terms	7
CHAPTER TWO	8
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITRATURE	8
2.1. Basic Concepts of Birth Order	8
2.2. Types of Birth Order.....	8
2.3. <i>Theories of Birth Order</i>	11
2.4. Personality.....	14
2.4.1. The “Big Five” Traits.....	17
2.5. Academic Achievement Motivation.....	20
2.6. Birth Order and Personality	23
2.7. Birth order and Academic Achievement Motivation	34
2.8. Personality and Achievement Motivation.....	39
2.9. Gender and Academic Achievement Motivation	40
2.10. Summary of the review	42
CHAPTER THREE	44
3. METHODOLOGY	44
3.1. Design of the Study	44
3.2. Population	44

3.3. Sample and Sampling Procedure.....	44
3.4 Instruments of Data Collection	45
3.5 Procedure of Data Collection	46
3.6 Method of Data Analysis	47
3.7 Ethical consideration.....	47
CHAPTER FOUR.....	48
4. RESULT	48
4.1 Back Ground Information of Participants.....	48
4.2 Birth order of Respondents	51
4.3 Descriptive Analysis of the Data.....	51
4.3.1 Mean and Standard deviation of each Birth position Achievement motivation	51
4.2.3. Mean comparison between sex.....	53
4.3 Kruskal Wallis Test Result of the Data	53
4.3.1. Results of Kruskal wallis Test.....	54
4.4 Results of Mann-Whitney test.....	56
4.5 Correlation between Achievement Motivation and Personality	56
CHAPTER FIVE	58
5. DISCUSSION.....	58
5.1 Birth Order and Personality	58
5.2 Birth Order and Achievement Motivation	59
5.3 The Relationship between Personality and Academic Achievement Motivation.....	60
5.4 Gender Difference on Achievement Motivation.....	60
CHAPTER SIX.....	62
6. SUMARRY, CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATION	62
6.1 Summary.....	62
6.2. Conclusions.....	63
6.3 Recommendations	63
REFERENCES	65
APPENDICICES	

List of Tables

Table 1 Frequency table of Background Information of Respondents-----	59
Table2: Frequency Table of Birth Order of Respondents-----	61
Table3: Mean and Standard Deviation Score of each Birth Order Category Achievement Motivation-----	62
Table4: Mean and Standard Deviation scores of Personality for each Birth Order Category-----	63
Table5:Meancomparison table of sex of Respondents-----	63
Table6:Kruskal Wallis test summary table-----	66
Table7: Man-Whitney test summary table-----	64
Table8: Results of Spearman's rho Correlation on the Relationship between Achievement Motivation and Personality-----	67

CHAPTER ONE

BACHGROUND OF THE STUDY

People are intrigued by the fact that children of a family behave differently although they were raised in the same environment, such as neighborhood and parents. On top of this siblings do differ in terms of personality characteristics, intelligence, familial sentiment and others (Ha & Tam, 2011).

In the 1920's, Adler was one of the first modern psychologists to research birth order and associate how birth order is influential on personality. Many researchers have based their theories around Adler's research but they have added modern opinions and new findings (Klas, 2002). In addition, some of those studies confirm his theory while other refuted his study.

There has been extensive research into birth-order theory which conducted after Adler theory. Many of those studies look at how specific traits, such as intelligence or creativity, relate to birth order and some of them have confirmed Adler's theory in regard to specific traits while others do not support Adler's theory. These findings may lead to revisions or improvements of the theory. According to these studies the interactions that infants have with adults are a foundational influence on the development of personality because it is the beginning of the development of relationship skills.

Different researchers explain the personality and achievement motivation of each birth position. Accordingly, First- born, having the first choice of niche attempt to please their parents in traditional fashion via success in school and responsible behavior, but, as other siblings arrive, first

born must deal with threats to their natural priority in the sibling status hierarchy. The resulting adult character is conscientious and conservative. Later born must resist the higher status of first born, while seek alternative ways of distinguishing themselves in the eyes of their parents. Accordingly, they develop an adult character marked by an empathic interpersonal style, a striving for uniqueness, and political views that are both egalitarian and anti authoritarian. In short, they are born to rebel (Paulhus et al, 1999).

In addition, First-born children are also said to be powerful and influential, they respect authority and follow the rules, they have higher self esteem, and they are very ambitious. First-borns are also said to have higher academic achievement motivation, cognitive abilities than other later-born children, and they can relate to parental authority more closely (Kalkan, 2008; McGuirk & Perrijohn, 2008). Middle children on the other hand may feel out of place because they are squeezed in between the oldest and the youngest siblings. They are seen as the peacemakers of the family even though they are trying to stay ahead of the younger siblings as well as trying to keep up with the oldest. Because of this the middle children may feel that it has taken them longer to find their place and role within the family (Kalkan, 2008; McGuirk & Perrijohn, 2008). Youngest children meanwhile are the social more free spirited children and have a special position in the family. They can be charming and have been known to be babied and pampered (Kalkan, 2008; McGuirk & Perrijohn, 2008). The last of the birth orders is only children; they are always the center of attention and because of this are continuously protected by their parents. They have traits of both first- and last-born but are under more pressure from their parents (Kalkan, 2008; McGuirk & Perrijohn, 2008).

In addition to personality, birth order research has also largely focused on its relation to achievement motivation. The literature in this area reveals inconsistent results that have stemmed largely from confounding variables present in many birth order studies, including socioeconomic status, race and ethnicity, and age of participants (Rodgers et al.2000). Additionally, much of the research in this area indicates that birth order effects are inextricably related to family size, with stronger effects appearing in larger families (Sputa and Paulson 1995).

Black, Devereux and Salvanes (2005) examined the effects of birth order on educational achievement, using a Norwegian population, and found that earlier birth position was associated with a significantly greater number of years in education (as cited by Fergusson, Horwood & Boden, 2006). There was a similar finding in a study by Sputa and Paulson (1995) in a sample of adolescents, which found a relationship between earlier birth order and school achievement (as cited by Fergusson et al., 2006). Marjoribanks (2001) believes this is due to the fact that any family has a given set of resources, and with increasing family size, families have decreasing resources to provide for the education and development of children (as cited by Fergusson et al., 2006). However, the study by Fergusson et al., (2006) found that increasing birth order was associated with declining achievement independent of family size. They found that earlier-born individuals were more likely to follow a path that led to gaining educational qualifications at the secondary and tertiary level.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

As Hotz and Pantano, (2011) reported personality traits are attributed to birth order. Birth order is an observable characteristic that all human beings possess and are capable of discussing. Frequently, there appears to be a marked difference in individual of different birth order.

Theories about birth order effect on personality have received only mixed support in scientific research. Such research is a challenge because of the difficulty of controlling all the variables that are statistically related to birth order.

The issue of birth order and its impact is a matter of great debate among researchers. Some researchers contend that first- born are the smartest out of all the other siblings while other argue that they are not. Therefore, It is evident that empirical research is useful to further out knowledge and understanding about this phenomenon by investigating it from diversified perspective.

The issue of birth order concerns every one of us as no one can escape from being in a particular birth positions. As a result the need for empirical research about the influence of birth order is unquestionable. By empirically test the effects of birth order on personality and academic achievement, this study aim to help counselors, instructors, parents and other researchers as a source of information. Another rationale behind doing this research lies on helping instructors to explain the effects of birth order within our context. It is not uncommon to see instructors especially in psychology department to ask their student's birth order and attempt to explain his or her personality by taking for granted what is stated in the western culture.

From the existing research reports, one can understand that most birth order research has been conducted in contemporary western culture, where there is growing parental awareness about birth order effect. Little has been known so far about the effects of birth order in Ethiopian context. There is only one study conducted by Desta, 2006 on birth order and achievement motivation. Therefore, this study would fill the gap by adding another variable in addition to personality and examine the matter in more comprehensive way. Therefore, the study of effects of birth order on personality and achievement motivation looks in to the problem by raise the following research questions:-

1. Is there any statistically significant difference exists among first born, middle born, only child & later born in terms of personality?
2. Are there any statistically significant difference exists among first born, only child, middle born and later born in terms of academic achievement motivation?
3. Is there any statistically significant relationship between personality and academic achievement motivation?
4. Do boys and girls differ in academic achievement motivation?

1.3 Objective of the Study

The general objective of this study is to examine the effects of birth order on individual's personality and academic achievement motivation among Addis Ababa university Social Science College students.

Specific Objectives

1. To explain whether statistically significant differences exist among first born, middle born, only Childs & later born in terms of personality.
2. To assess whether statistically significant difference exist among first born, middle child, only child, and later born in terms of academic achievement motivation.
3. To examine whether a statistically significant relationship exist between personality and academic achievement
4. To assess whether gender difference exist in academic achievement motivation.

1.4 Significance of the Study

This study would help as a source of information for parents, teachers & counselors and gives insight about the effect of birth order on the individual's personality and achievement motivation.

The research would contribute a lot in settling the debate a round birth order by gathering empirical evidence on points in question. The findings may also have an effect on the family setting; results could help parents understand their child's behavior, it could also help to broaden their understanding whether birth order make a difference on their children's academic achievement motivation and personality. This could also be a benefit for student as well as instructors enhancing their knowledge about birth order. The research would add knowledge to the area of the study. Scholars can share knowledge about the effects of birth order and can use it as a reference for further study. As very little has been known so far about the effects of birth order in

the Ethiopian context, this research would help counselors to use it during assessment of their client.

1.5 Delimitation of the Study

The scope of this study is demarcated to participant students from Addis Ababa University Social Science College. In terms of its spatial scope, only Addis Ababa University main campus was taken. The participants are from the Social Science College. They are found in their youth stage. The variable delimitation of this study is delimited only to actual birth order meaning the study do not include psychological birth order. It has also looked in to only big five personalities.

1.6 Limitation of the Study

The major limitation of this study was it fails to incorporate the data from only child. The researcher found only two respondents from the only born category.

1.7 Operational Definition of Important Terms

Birth order: is defined as a person's rank by age among his or her siblings or it is the position a family member holds within the family such as: only born, first-born, second born, middle born and last born.

Academic achievement motivation: It refers to the individual's desire to excel in academic pursuits which is measured by score on the academic achievement test.

Personality: is the set of psychological traits and mechanisms within the individual that are organize and relatively enduring and that influence his or her interactions with, and adaptations to, the intra psychic, physical, and social environments.

CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITRATURE

2.1. Basic Concepts of Birth Order

Birth order refers to the ordinal positioning within a family. Many researchers believe that where we are in relationship to our siblings, or being the only child in a family, would influence how we develop. According to them, as each child is born, they enter into a different environment than the previous child. Because parents are more experienced upon arrival of a second child, they may be calmer, yet now, the children need to compete for their parent's attention and resources (Zajonc, 2001). Almost everyone has some preconceived notion of the stereotypical personality of the first-born verses the later-born. Birth order is believed to influence many aspects of one's personality.

The results of those researches conducted on birth order have fascinated parents, researchers and others for a century. Even today, birth order and family niches more generally are among the environmental sources of personality because they cause siblings to experience the family environment in dissimilar ways, (Desta, 2006).

2.2. Types of Birth Order

There are four types of birth order. These are first born, middle born, last born and only child. The characteristics of each birth group reviewed in the next section.

First Born Children

Children under the category of first born tend to identify themselves with the role of their parents. These children are extremely adult oriented because they interact with adults the most. Most of the time they imitate the role of their parents and try to be responsible for younger siblings. Often the oldest child tends to 'parent' their younger siblings as they assume a position of control. They have a unique advantage over their siblings because they have first choice of their particular niche in the family. Most of the time, oldest child try their best to please their parents in traditional way by succeeding in school and responsible behavior. These children are perceived as more conscientious and achieving (Paulhus et al, 1999). This might be because parents put expectation on this child to be a model for younger siblings by being conscientious and higher achiever in school.

Middle Children

Lacking the primacy of the first child and the often narcissistic and recent youngest child, children in the middle born often feel they are "squeezed" out of their family. Relative to first and last born children, middle children are thought to experience less interaction and receive significantly less attention. They inevitably suffer consequent negative self-esteem issues in response and almost always experience jealousy because they were at one point the middle child (Tashakkori 1990 cited in Collins, 2006). Those children that react negatively to this position, often do not feel special in comparison with their siblings and therefore not worthy of their families' attention. These middle children may become discouraged and rejected. However, those middle children that react and assimilate well to their position, often develop excellent interpersonal skills and

enjoy spending time with others. These children can be very personable and popular because they learn valuable skills of how to get along with varying group of people.

Youngest Children

The youngest children in a family is considered to be the most outgoing and secure children, but least academic (Herrera et al, 2003).The youngest born is perceived as the least capable or least experienced among the siblings, which may result in the youngest child being provided for, indulge , or even spoiled . Some youngest children may use this to their advantage and learn skills of manipulating others to do or provide things for them (Herrera et al, 2003).

Due to the extra attention by parents, in particular by the maternal figure in the child's life, the youngest child is provided with an extra dose of motherly participation that feeds the extraverted ego and stimulates the intellect, which is probably the reason that the younger child is consider most creative (Nakaos,et al.,2000).

The youngest child also possesses natural strength that other siblings do not. These children have personal skills with a personality that is caring, outgoing, thoughtful, and emphasizing. The youngest child often has a drive for passion in their lives. They strive for a different type of success that their siblings, by being inclined to new and innovative ideas. Later born children tend to be perceived as acting more sociable in peer situations than first and only born children. These later born children have had invaluable experiences with their siblings and more opportunity to develop social skills from peer interaction inside the home.

Only children

Only children are associated with being the most academically successful and diligent, spoiled and least likable among peers (Herrera et al,2003).Only children are in a special situation

because they often spend most of their time in the presence of adults which is both positive and negative for the child. On the positive side, the only child is rarely ignored and usually provided with adequate time and support compared to other children. However, only children “are generally more autonomous in terms of personal control, have higher levels of initiative or personal aspiration or motivation, are more industrious in terms of educational or occupational achievement, and have stronger identities” (Collin, 2006).

Only children are also predisposed to many negative connotations due to images of over-protective and over-involved parents that seek to live vicariously through their child that may affect their development. Only children often feel their lives are under careful scrutiny and control by their families. They lack the necessary amount of autonomy and independence that children in other positions enjoy.

2.3. Theories of Birth Order

There are different theories that explain characteristics of each birth order group. These are dethronement theory, family -niches model, intrauterine theories, confluence hypothesis, and resource delusion hypothesis. The detail of each theory explained next.

Dethronement theory

Dethronement theory was proposed to explain birth order effects on personality development. Before the birth of the younger sibling, the eldest child had his or her parents’ complete attention but he or she was later dethroned by a newborn. As a consequence of dethronement, the child would struggle to regain parental attention. This led the firstborn to develop such characteristics as conscientious, conservative, independence and competence which would later facilitate one’s academic attainment (Paullous et al, 1999).

Family-niches model

Another theory that describes birth order effect on personality development is family-niches model (Sulloway, 1996). According to Sulloway, children are motivated to solicit parental investment when they perceive differential parental investment within the family. They compete for parental investment by creating distinctive niches. Sulloway also hypothesized that firstborns are less agreeable as compared to the later born because they dominate the younger siblings to minimize the diversion of parental investment. In contrast, the younger siblings avoid confrontation with the firstborns to solicit parental investment, which in turn leads them to be more agreeable. Besides, he also suggested that firstborns correlate negatively with openness as compared with later born because openness is the factor that assists the later born children to create alternative approaches to compete for parental investment. Furthermore, he concluded that firstborn are more conscientious than the later born because firstborns echo their parents' attitudes, beliefs, and personality characteristics. On the other hand, later born may develop attitudes, beliefs, and personality characteristics that are apart from the elder siblings and parents. Therefore, Sulloway describes the later born as born to rebel.

Intrauterine theories

Some of the intrauterine theories claim that young mother is able to provide a "rich uterine environment" for her earlier born children, and this result in greater health and intelligence in the earlier-born (Ha & Tam, 2011). However, there are intrauterine theories that suggest the otherwise because mothers experience less labor and less likely to use forceps in subsequent delivery, which in turn reducing the possible damaging to the child's health and intelligence.

Confluence hypothesis

Another theory that explains the relationship between birth order and academic performance or college attendance is confluence hypothesis (Zajonc & Markus, 1975 as cited in Ha&Tam, 2011). Zajonc and Markus claimed that the impact of birth order on cognitive achievement is largely influenced by the attention one receives from his parents and siblings and the opportunity to serve as intellectual resource. As expected, firstborns usually get the most attention from their parents. Once the sib ship size grows bigger, the amount of attention that the subsequent siblings receive is getting lesser and lesser. Thus, intelligent quotients (IQ) amongst the siblings decrease steadily with birth order. Therefore, firstborns who had the most attention should have higher IQ as compared to the later born. However, this is largely depended on the age gap between the siblings. Zajonc and Markus proposed that when the older siblings take up the role of teaching, it would actually enhance their intellectual development. However, this effect does not happen until the older siblings are 11 years, plus or minus 2 years. On the other hand, the youngest and only children never have the opportunity to serve as an intellectual resource and hence, they do not perform as well as firstborns academically as the baby of the house and are mostly spoiled children (McGuirk & Pettijohn, 2008). As a result, these differences among siblings have attracted the attention of researchers over the past decades.

Resource dilution hypothesis

The last theory that explains the association between birth order and academic achievement is resource dilution hypothesis. Downey, (2001) describes resources as money, personal attention and cultural objects, such as books, music, pictures and others. He also suggests that parental

resources are finite and will be diluted by the addition of siblings. According to resource dilution model, parents are able to allocate their time and resources fully to their only child or firstborn whose sibling(s) has yet arrive. However, the arrival of new child makes the parents to divide their resources accordingly. For example, parents may not be able to send all of their children to university due to limited education fund and this explains the overrepresentation of only child or firstborns in colleges or universities. Besides, resource dilution model also claims that the relative richness of parental resources also affects one's educational success. As a result, only child and firstborn, who had the full parental resources before the arrival of new sibling, achieve better academic attainment than do later born. The above theories explained their assumption of each birth group's achievement motivation and personality. In the next the concept of personality reviewed in detail.

2.4. Personality

Human Personality is the result of the interplay of a multitude of factors. One of these fundamental factors is the role of one's position in the family as an individual may be treated differently depending on his/her birth order. Birth order is an extensively researched and controversial concept in the social science literature. Ernst and Angst, (1983) reported that many birth order studies are both confounding and poorly executed, and a number of researchers echo their opinion by minimizing the importance of birth order. However, Sulloway, (1996) brought renewed energy to birth order research.

There has been extensive interest in the individual differences that exist in personality, and how personality is analyzed, understood and defined. All personality psychologists use the term 'personality' to refer to "psychological qualities that contribute to an individual's enduring and distinctive patterns of feeling, thinking, and behaving. It is assumed that there are considerable individual differences in personality and that these differences will be revealed by difference of behaving and in reaction in a given situation (Eysenck, 1994, p. 8 as cited by Shalabi & Nodoushan, 2009).

Personality also refers to stable internal factors or traits which underlie consistent individual differences in behavior. These internal factors, according to Eysenck, are called traits (Shalabi & Nodoushan, 2009). It is expected that any given individual will behave in a reasonably consistent manner on different occasions. Eysenck (1994) believes that our everyday experience indicates that most people have non-extreme personalities, and he claims that this view is supported by personality research (as cited by Shalabi et al., 2009).

Everyday conceptions of personality traits make two key assumptions. First, traits are stable over time. Most people would accept that an individual's behavior naturally varies somewhat from occasion to occasion, but would maintain also that there is a core of consistency which defines the individual's 'true nature': the unchangeable spots of the leopard. In other words, there are differences between individuals that are apparent across a variety of situations. We might expect a student we have noted as a 'worrier' to be particularly disturbed and worried in several different contexts such as examinations, social occasions and group discussions. Stability distinguishes traits from more transient properties of the person, such as temporary mood states. Second, it is

generally believed that traits directly influence behavior. If a person spontaneously breaks into cheerful song, we might 'explain' the behavior by saying that he or she has a happy disposition. Such lay explanations are, of course, on shaky ground because of their circularity.

Features of personality make people different from one another, and these features usually take the form of adjectives we use to speak about a particular person, such as John is lazy and unreliable, Mary is optimistic, and Fred is anxiety-ridden. Adjectives that can be used to describe characteristics of people are called trait-descriptive adjectives. There are more than 20,000 such trait-descriptive adjectives in the English language. This astonishing fact alone tells us that, in everyday life, there are compelling reasons for trying to understand and describe the nature of those we interact with, as well as compelling reasons for trying to understand and describe ourselves.

Notice that the adjectives describing personality refer to several very different aspects of people. Words such as thoughtful refer to inner qualities of mind. Words such as charming and humorous refer to the effects a person has on other people. Words such as domineering are relational and signify a person's position, or stance, toward others. Words such as ambitious refer to the intensity of desire to reach our goals. Words such as creative refer both to a quality of mind and to the nature of the products we produce. Words such as deceitful refer to the strategies a person uses to attain his or her goals. All of these features describe aspects of personality.

2.4.1. The “Big Five” Traits

Personality has been conceptualized from a variety of theoretical perspectives, and at various levels of abstraction or breadth McAdams, (1995). Each of these levels has made unique contributions to our understanding of individual differences in behavior and experience. Researchers, as well as practitioners in the field of personality assessment, have been faced with a bewildering array of personality scales from which to choose, with little guidance and no overall rationale at hand. To make matters worse, scales with the same name often measure concepts that are not the same, and scales with different names often measure concepts that are quite similar. Although diversity and scientific pluralisms are useful, the systematic accumulation of findings and the communication among researchers has become difficult amidst the Babel of concepts and scales.

What personality psychology needed was a descriptive model, or taxonomy, of traits. One of the central goals of scientific taxonomies is the definition of overarching domains within which large numbers of specific instances can be understood in a simplified way. Thus, in personality psychology, taxonomy would permit researchers to study specified domains of personality characteristics, rather than examining separately the thousands of particular attributes that make each human being individual and unique. Moreover, a generally accepted taxonomy would greatly facilitate the accumulation and communication of empirical findings by offering a standard vocabulary, or nomenclature.

After decades of research, the field is finally approaching consensus on a general taxonomy of personality traits, the "Big Five" personality dimensions. These dimensions do not represent a particular theoretical perspective but were derived from analyses of the natural language terms people use to describe themselves and others. Rather than replacing all previous systems, the Big Five taxonomy serves an integrative function because it can represent diverse systems of personality description in a common framework. It thus provides a starting place for vigorous research and theorizing that can eventually lead to an explication and revision of the descriptive taxonomy in causal and dynamic terms.

The five-factor model of personality is a hierarchical organization of personality traits in terms of five basic dimensions: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience. Research using both natural language adjectives and theoretically based personality questionnaires supports the comprehensiveness of the model and its applicability across observers and cultures.

The importance of these five factors remained hidden from most personality psychologists throughout the 1960s and 1970s. In the 1980s, however, researchers from many different traditions were led to conclude that these factors were fundamental dimensions of personality, found in self-reports and ratings, in natural languages and theoretically based questionnaires, in children, college students, and older adults, in men and women, and in English, Dutch, German, and Japanese samples (John, 1990). All five factors were shown to have convergent and discriminant

validity across instruments and observers, and to endure across decades in adults (McCrae & Costa, 1990).

Much of what psychologists mean by the term "personality" is summarized by the FFM (Five Factor model), and the model has been of great utility to the field by integrating and systematizing diverse conceptions and measures. In a broader sense, the FFM refers to the entire body of research that it has inspired, amounting to a reinvigoration of trait psychology itself. Research associated with the FFM has (1) included studies of diverse populations (McCrae, Terracciano, et al, 2005), often followed over decades of the lifespan (Terracciano, Costa, & McCrae, 2006); (2) employed multiple methods of assessment (Funder, Kolar, & Blackman, 1995); and (3) even featured case studies (Costa & McCrae, 1998a). The FFM "is the Christmas tree on which findings of stability, heritability, consensual validation, cross-cultural invariance, and predictive utility are hung like ornaments" (Costa & McCrae, 1993, p. 302). After decades of floundering, personality psychology has begun to make steady progress, accumulating a store of replicable findings about the origins, development, and functioning of personality traits (McCrae, 2002)

Although the FFM is not a theory of personality, McCrae and John (1992) argued that it implicitly adopts the basic tenets of *trait theory*: that individuals can be characterized in terms of relatively enduring patterns of thoughts, feelings, and actions; that traits can be quantitatively assessed; that they show some degree of cross-situational consistency; and so on. The hundreds of studies of personality correlate that employ measures of the FFM both presume and confirm that personality traits exist.

The FFM could provide a common language for psychologists from different traditions, a basic phenomenon for personality theorists to explain, a natural framework for organizing research, and a guide to the comprehensive assessment of individuals that should be of value to educational, industrial/organizational, and clinical psychologists.

McCrae and Costa,(1990) state that there are five “traits that are known as the Big Five”:

1. **Extraversion:** Associated with being outgoing, sociable, confident, enthusiastic
 2. **Neuroticism:** associated with being moody, worrying, insecure, and inhibited
 3. **Openness to experience:** associated with being broad minded, imaginative, original and curious.
 4. **Agreeableness:** associated with being cooperative, good natured, forgiving and generous
 5. **Conscientiousness:** associated with being responsible, ambitious, and industrious and through.
- Having said this much about personality let us see in detail academic achievement motivation.

2.5. Academic Achievement Motivation

The original definition of achievement motivation was from Atkinson (1964) as cited in Singh,(2011) , who defined it as the comparison of performances with others and against certain standard activities. Atkinson and Feather suggested that achievement motivation is a combination of two personality variables: tendency to approach success and tendency to avoid failure. Singh,(2011) defined achievement motivation as the drive to work with diligence and vitality, to constantly steer toward targets, to obtain dominance in challenging and difficult tasks and create

sense of achievement as a result. This definition consists of three elements: the stimulation of personal capabilities, constant efforts with drive and obtaining of sense of satisfaction.

According to definition proposed by Atkinson 1964, achievement motivation is a subjective, internal, and psychological drive, enabling individuals to pursue work they perceive to be valuable and eventually achieve their goals. Sparrow (1998) found that motivations have influence on the formation of psychological contracts. Motivations include meaningful work, job security, and a sense of achievement, promotional channels, and opportunities.

Over the years, behavioral scientists have noticed that some people have an intense desire to achieve something, while others may not seem that concerned about their achievements. This phenomenon has attracted a lot of discussions and debates. Scientists have observed that people with a high level of achievement motivation exhibit certain characteristics. Achievement motivation is the tendency to endeavor for success and to choose goal oriented success or failure activities.

Achievement motivation forms to be the basic for a good life. People who are oriented towards achievement, in general, enjoy life and feel in control. Being motivated keeps people dynamic and gives them self-respect. They set moderately difficult but easily achievable targets, which help them, achieve their objectives. They do not set up extremely difficult or extremely easy targets. By doing this they ensure that they only undertake tasks that can be achieved by them. Achievement motivated people prefer to work on a problem rather than leaving the outcome to chance. It is also

seen that achievement motivated people seem to be more concerned with their personal achievement rather than the rewards of success Singh (2011).

Theories on achievement motivation are quite diverse. The possibility of success and failure is associated with every achievement related action. The strength of these anticipated emotions determined whether an individual will approach or avoid achievement oriented activities (Weiner,1992 cited in Desta,2006)

The need for achievement is stable and learned characteristics in which satisfaction is obtained by striving for excellence (Feldman 1996) cited in Desta (2006).People high in achievement motivation are apt to choose tasks that are of intermediate difficulty. In contrast people with low in achievement motivation tend to be motivated primarily by desire to avoid failure. As a result they seek out easy tasks, being sure to avoid failure or they seek out very difficult tasks for which failure has no implications. Atkinson and Feather (1986) cited in Desta, 2006 explained that a person with a fear of failure does not want to take any risk but when forced will choose either easy tasks which cannot be failed a task so difficult that cannot be expected to be accomplished.

One of the most important factors that lead one to their goals is the drive. This drive is known as motivation. It is a zest and determination with a kind of excitement that leads one to persevere to reach greater heights, in no matter what avenue of their life; be it – personal or professional. The drive may come from an internal or external source. The individual determines this. The factors that motivate an individual keep changing as one climbs the ladder of age and maturity. And also,

achievement of one goal sets the ball rolling for another one to be achieved. Thus, to be motivated is a constant need. There are times when one faces a period of de-motivation and everything seems bleak. It is then that they need to find what would motivate them back into action.

The word motivation is coined from the Latin word "movere", which means to move. Motivation is defined as an internal drive that activates behavior and gives it direction. The term motivation is concerned with the processes that describe why and how human behavior is activated and directed. It is regarded as one of the most important areas of study in the field of psychology.

Motivation is the activation of goal-oriented behavior. Motivation is said to be intrinsic or extrinsic. The term is generally used for humans but, theoretically, it can also be used to describe the causes for animal behavior as well. According to various theories, motivation may be rooted in the basic need to minimize physical pain and maximize pleasure, or it may include specific needs such as eating and resting, or a desired object, hobby, goal, state of being, ideal, or it may be attributed to less-apparent reasons such as altruism, selfishness, morality, or avoiding mortality. Conceptually, motivation should not be confused with either volition or optimism. Motivation is related to, but distinct from, emotion.

2.6. Birth Order and Personality

The most prominent topic of birth order studies is its impact on personality. Over the decades, a large number of studies have been carried out to examine personality differences among siblings. Alfred Adler, one of the pioneers of this topic of interest, has theorized that each birth position has

a set of personality traits. According to Adler (as cited in McGuirk & Pettijohn, 2008), firstborns are always seen as leaders, high-achievers, ambitious, and conforming. They attempt to please their parents via traditional way, which is through academic performance and responsible behaviors (Paulhus, Trapnell, & Chen, 1999). Middle birth children, on the other hand, may experience difficulty finding a position of privilege and significance in the family because they never have the opportunity to monopolize parents' attention. Thus, they constantly fight to stay ahead of their younger siblings and uphold or perhaps, surpass their older brothers or sisters. In contrast, lastborns and only children are frequently viewed as the baby and spoiled kid of the family. It is because both of these birth positions are the only focus of the family. However, unlike the only children, the later born children, including the middle birth and last birth children, are aware of the higher status of the firstborn, so, they will seek alternative strategies to outstand their siblings (Paulhus *et al.*, 1999).

It is important to note that although siblings do share environmental context, there is one context that is impossible to be shared with – birth order (Dixon, Reyes, Leppert, & Pappas, 2008). This is the variable that makes the child a unique individual in a family. Generally, parents are excited and anticipated about their first child and hence, tend to be overly protective and pay more attention, investment, as well as expectation on this first child. However, parents' attention, investment, and expectation vary across children (Michalski & Shackelford, 2002). As the second child arrives in the family, the firstborn may experience dethronement and the same happens to the second born once a third child arrives and so forth. Besides, Downey (2001) also suggested that parental resources that a child receives decrease as the sib ship size grows bigger. Therefore, every child

experiences different levels of parental resources and investment as a result of their birth order, while these unique experiences will in turn shape their developmental course. According to Carlson and Kangun (as cited in Claxton, 1994), such differential treatment by parents has been a “centuries old phenomenon that extends across cultures”.

Firstborns are believed to be more conservative. They are viewed as leaders who follow rules. They submit to authority. They are often more ambitious than other birth order positions and also more conforming. Adler suggested that firstborns tend to be more motivated to achieve than later born. They are usually good at pleasing adults and behaving in socially appropriate ways. They typically adhere to rules and expect the same from others. They are also the dethroned child who must deal with the birth of a second sibling. Because of this, they work hard to stay ahead of the other siblings and keep their special place (Gustafson, 2010)

As Gustafsun explained middle born are considered more rebellious and more likely to challenge authority. They often have a more difficult time finding their place of significance in the family. Because of their middle position they are often the peacemakers in the family and become experts at negotiation. They learn to be competitive because they have to keep up with their older sibling while trying to stay ahead of younger siblings. Adler believed as cited in Gustafsun, 2010 the middle child was particularly at risk for becoming discouraged. The second child must find a way to measure up to the accomplishments of the firstborn or find a place of significance through other means. For example, if the firstborn finds significance through academic achievement and pleasing, the second may compete with the older sibling or find significance through another area

such as sports, music, or an ability to develop strong social relationships. Adler described this child as appearing to be in a race in order to overtake the firstborn child. Youngest siblings are often viewed as pampered, dependent, immature, and irresponsible. They tend to be more sociable and usually get the most attention. Others often do things for them. They learn to use this to their advantage and often use charm and manipulation to get people to do things for them.

Adler described only children as often being the center of attention and striving for attention from adults more than peers. Only children are often leaders and have a more difficult time going along with others, especially in groups of their peers. They typically carry feelings of entitlement. A typical characteristic of an only child is the carefulness that results from the extreme amount of attention they receive growing up. It is believed that independence, sociableness, responsibility, and thoughtfulness are qualities associated with the only child position (Gustafsun, 2010).

The role of children in early childhood within their family is also believed to be a foundational influence on development of personality. In the Mendelson and Gottlieb (1994) study as cited in Gustafsun 2010, mothers were asked to evaluate nine qualities of first and second born sibling roles – help, protection, nurturance, affection, getting along, friendliness, approval, companionship, and identification. They found that mothers rated firstborns higher on helping than the second born child. This difference between the children became smaller as the children got older. Firstborns were also rated higher than second born for protection and nurturance. Older firstborns tended to be rated more highly on approval, and affection. Firstborns whose younger

siblings were in the older age ranges rated higher on identification than those with younger siblings (Gustafsun,2010).

Second born were rated higher than firstborns on identification, approval, friendliness, and companionship. The older second born were also more likely to be rated high on protection, nurturance, and help, but low on friendliness. Older second born and second born with relatively young older siblings were more likely to be rated high on getting along. Second born with older siblings tended to be rated higher on protection, affection, and approval. Older second born were rated more similar to their sibling than were younger second born on protection, nurturance, help, and friendliness (Gustafsun,2010).

Maternal interaction was related to the consistent quality of the sibling relationship. Differential maternal interaction has been systematically associated with differences in the quality of the relationship between school-aged siblings. Maternal interaction did not enhance positive sibling behavior and was associated with a less positive sibling relationship. In fact, maternal interaction with either child was negatively related to friendly sibling relations. A mother's interaction with the firstborn child was associated with less child-baby play, and was associated with less caretaking by the firstborn child. The mothers interaction with the second born child was associated with less positive interaction and with less negative interaction between the children (i.e. prohibit, protest, or touch negatively such as hitting or poking (Gustafsun,2010).

During childhood people develop their concept of such things as what they believe men are like, Women are like, and what is expected of them. This helps us to develop our concept of success. As

we grow up we also develop an idea of what different birth ranks are like and how this may both pressure and limit us to live up to our perceived expectations.

Herrera, Zajonc, Wieczorkowska, & Cichomski (2003) investigated these perceived expectations in their study by asking participants to rate firstborns, only children, middle born, and lastborns, on 11 personality traits. They were not rating specific first born people, but rather their general concept of firstborn people. Their results indicated that firstborns are commonly believed to be the most intelligent, responsible, stable, the least emotional, and the least creative. Middle born children are believed to be the most envious and the least bold and talkative. Lastborns are believed to be the boldest, most creative, emotional, extraverted, disobedient, irresponsible, envious, and talkative, and the least stable. Firstborns believed themselves to be the most agreeable, while middle born also believed them to be the most agreeable. Lastborns rated themselves low in agreeableness. Only children ranked themselves low in agreeableness but highest in creativity (Herrera,Zajonc,Wieczorkwska,&Cicchomsky 2003).

In this study occupations were evaluated for personality traits that would be required. The findings of Herrera et al. (2003) indicate that the occupations believed to be held by firstborns were consistent with the personality traits attributed to them. Firstborns are believed to have qualities that are regarded as necessary in occupations requiring leadership and stability.

Another part of the Herrera et al. (2003) study was done in two different settings, one urban and the other rural and study found that individuals of higher birth rank and of smaller families actually do

attain positions of higher prestige. In this study jobs were evaluated for level of prestige. This was then used to determine the level of prestige for participants according to their birth order. Occupational prestige was found to vary slightly with birth order as well as with family size. In both settings the average prestige rank of occupations to firstborn was significantly higher than that of lastborns. A consistent decline in occupational prestige was found with increasing family size, and with increasing birth order rank. There was also a consistent decline in years of schooling with increasing family size, and with increasing birth order, which correlates with occupational prestige (Herrera et al, 2003).

These results show that people have definite beliefs about birth rank differences in occupation and personality and that these beliefs correspond to actual differences in occupational prestige and academic attainment. This is evidence that people's beliefs have important psychological, behavioral and social consequences.

The Freese, Powell, & Steelman (1999) study as cited in Gustafsun (2010) tests the hypothesis that firstborns are more conservative, supportive of authority and “tough-minded than later born. This study tested for birth-order differences within families using data from a contemporary survey of adults in the United States to examine the relationship between birth order and social attitudes. They concluded that their data do not support the hypothesis. The means of most of the variables that were studied differ only slightly between firstborns and later born, and none of the observed differences were statistically significant. Most of the observed differences were in the opposite direction of what was predicted. Firstborns actually identified themselves as more liberal than later

born, although this result also was not significant. They concluded that parents' education, race, sex, age and sib ship size are all more powerful predictors of social attitudes than birth order.

The Zweigenhaft and Von Ammon, (2000) study tested the hypotheses that later born are more rebellious than firstborns. To do this they examined the birth order of a group of U.S. college students who had been arrested for engaging in civil disobedience in a labor dispute. The dispute lasted more than two years. During this time over 150 people were arrested. Among those arrested were 20 college students, some of whom were arrested more than once. For this study there were able to contact 17 of the 20. The study found that 6 of the 12 (50%) who had been arrested once were later born, and that all 5 (100%) of those who had been arrested more than once were later born. They determined that birth order accounted for this effect. Later born were more likely than firstborns to have been arrested. This provides evidence that later born are more likely than firstborns to rebel.

The Paulhus, Trapnell, & Chen (1999) study asked university students to compare themselves and their siblings on various personality and achievement dimensions. This study was conducted using within-family data in four studies using both student and adult samples.

Results of this study indicated firstborns were nominated by their siblings as most conscientious as well as most achieving. The relative proportion of achievers to non achievers is 2.28 times higher among firstborns than among later born. This also extended to financial and prestige achievement. Later born were more frequently nominated as most liberal, agreeable, and rebellious. The proportion of rebels to non rebels is twice as high in later born as it is in firstborns. Extraversion

and creativity showed no significant difference in either direction. The results in this study, however, only reached significance when there were two siblings. The Phillips and Phillips (2000) study evaluated individuals' self-attributions for both good and poor performance. Their findings indicate that firstborns have a greater tendency than later born to internal self-attributions for good performance, with no difference in their self-attributions for poor performance. This means that when a first born believes he has performed well he will be more likely to believe that he alone deserves the credit based on his internal qualities. When someone of another birth rank believes he has performed well he is more likely to credit help from others, circumstances or other external factors as contributing to his success. This means that firstborns may not give as much credit to other people or recognize situational factors that have helped them succeed, which could have an impact on things like teamwork, leadership and interpersonal relations. This also means firstborns will be more independent. Feeling more personal responsibility for good performance, they may not be as able to recognize or as willing to accept help available from others or from aspects of the situation. Consequently, when overworked they may experience higher stress levels than their later-born peers (Phillips and Phillips, 2000).

Regardless of birth order, attributions for good performance were more internal, meaning people are likely to take the credit for a good job, while attributions for poor performance were more external, meaning people are more likely to blame others when things go wrong. Birth order is one of several major variables that greatly influence parents' expectations of their children. In turn, it has an impact upon the formation of the child's personality and behavior patterns, which tend to be pseudo-permanent for the rest of the individual's life. "Birth order is the single most obvious factor

that makes the shared family environment different for each sibling. Birth order sums up several variables, not just one. It is a surrogate for differences in age, size, power, and privilege among siblings (Rink, 2010).

With first-born, parents tend to overspend affection and attention in order to atone for their lack of experience. Parents' actions are more inconsistent toward the initial child. Displaying their own fears of inadequacy through cautious, overprotective, and inconsistent behavior, the child's dependence needs are frustrated by the parents. The result is a dependent, anxious, and cautious first-born child. Because first-born lack a reference point for evaluating their emotional state, they will seek to affiliate with others when anxious. First-born, therefore, use a process of social comparison to achieve a basis for self-evaluation. Research has confirmed that under stressful situations, first-born want to be with others especially others older than themselves (Rink, 2010).

The later-born siblings are more affected by changes in family structure, e.g., divorce, since later born children are more likely to spend more of their lives exposed to such family disruptions. Last, but not least, first-borns may enjoy higher parental investment for insurance purposes or simply because parents are more likely to enjoy utility from observing their eventual success in life. While all the above theories predict that earlier born siblings will do better, it is worth noting that it is possible that the effect can go in the other direction. For example, parents might learn to teach better. In this case, parents commit mistakes with those born earlier but they are more proficient, experienced parents when the later born siblings need to be raised. It also can be the case that, if

there are financial constraints, the later-born siblings might be raised at time in which parental resources are more abundant.

In the past, studies that were carried out to examine the relationship between birth order and personality have generated inconsistent findings. Some studies succeeded to find significant birth order effects on personality differences between siblings (Healey & Ellis, 2007; Paulhus *et al.*, 1999), while some others have failed to support Adler's predictions and Sulloway's theory (Parker, 1998). For instance, Healey and Ellis who studied university sample ($n = 161$ sibling pairs) and older adults ($n = 174$ siblings pairs) reported that there were significant differences between firstborn and second born siblings in their personality traits. Firstborns scored significantly higher on conscientiousness and lower in openness to experience than their second born siblings, which supported the dethronement theory and family-niche model. Moreover, Paulhus and others had their participants to nominate the most achieving and conscientious sibling within their family and found that the firstborns were rated as more achieving and conscientious than later born. Similar findings were replicated in Michalski and Shackelford's (2002) study, where they found that firstborns correlated negatively with agreeableness. Furthermore, Tharbe and Harun, (2000), who examined personality differences amongst 161 form five students in Kuala Lumpur, also reported that birth order theory was applicable to Malaysians. They found that there were certain dominant trait patterns although no significant relationship between birth order and personality was reported.

There were also studies that found no relationship between birth order and personality traits. For instance, Jefferson, Herbst, and McCrae, (1998) administered brief measures of neuroticism,

extraversion, and openness to experience to 9964 participants and reported that the self-report of personality dimensions were unrelated to birth order. However, the authors found that peers did rate the younger siblings as higher in agreeableness and openness.

Yet, spouse ratings failed to replicate such findings. On top of that, Parker (1998) also administered a short form of NEO-PI to 593 only children, firstborns, middle born, and lastborns, but found no relationship between birth order and personality traits. The inconsistency of birth order effects on personality had led Ernst and Angst (as cited in Dixon *et al.*, 2008) to conclude that the birth order effect on personality traits were artifacts of poor research designs where confounding variables, such as socioeconomic status (SES) and sib-ship size, were not controlled. The results were biased because families of higher SES and smaller in size would constitute of more firstborns whereas families of lower SES but larger in size would constitute of more later born. Furthermore, Michalski and Shackelford (2001) also claimed that the use of within-family designs would provide more advantages over the use of between-family designs as it decreased the variation of SES, sib ship size, and parental personality traits.

2.7. Birth order and Academic Achievement Motivation

Alfred Adler was a personality psychologist who was the first psychologist to do major research about birth order. His research generated a lot of interest in the study of birth order and birth order has been researched for many years. Adler's idea was that second born children were the most academic-minded because the older sibling is the pacemaker and the second born child has to learn to keep up and compete with the sibling. However, other research has shown that first born tend to

be more academic-minded when compared to other birth orders. First born tend to be serious, goal-oriented, people pleasers, and achieving. They tend to be more of a perfectionist than later born because of the full attention that is given to them when they are born and when they are growing up (Leman, 2002). Parents also tend to be more anxious and critical of first born and first born are typically given more responsibility and feel large amounts of pressure to live up to the expectations of the parents.

Phillips and Phillips (2000) found that first-borns attributed somewhat more responsibility for their good performance to factors internal to themselves. This finding fits with other research which, taken together, presents a profile of first-born and only children as having a greater sense of personal responsibility, being more achievement oriented and more serious, and being less socially oriented than later-born. Firstborns are over-represented in occupations characterized by higher educational levels and more competitive professional requirements.

Herrera and Zonjanc,(2003) found that the number of years of schooling decreased for each successive child in a family. For example, first-borns completed an average of 12 years of schooling in this study, while 4th born completed only 10 years. Additionally, Zonjanc and Mullally,(1997) found that as the birth rank of a child increases (the later born they are born) the child's SAT score decreased. Other researchers, however, have found no difference in intelligence between children of different birth order. Rodgers (2001) has failed to find a connection between intelligence and birth order. This discrepancy between Zonjanc and Rodgers seems to be primarily due to the way data is gathered. Zonjanc used cross-sectional data, where a large number of

first-borns across many families are compared to large numbers of later-born across many families.

Rodgers claims this is flawed because it ignores intra-family effects of birth order on IQ. Instead Rogers compares first-borns to later-born within families. As it turns out, cross-sectional data supports the association between birth order and intelligence .Rodgers claims that within family data do not support such conclusions (Rodgers 2001).

Joseph Rodgers and colleagues (2000) analyzed the relationships of birth order and family size to the intelligence quotient (IQ) within families using data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth. Their results suggest that neither birth order nor family size directly affects IQ; rather, it is the parents' IQ that is more likely to influence both family size and children's IQ levels.

Several studies found achievement motivation, rather than intelligence, to be associated with ordinal position in the family. Later research on birth order and achievement began to focus on aspiration levels and achievement attributions more than simply on academic achievement. Firstborns attribute success or failure to internal causes and may even underestimate how their situations might have affected success, compared to later born (Phillips and Phillips1994).

In recent years, this topic of educational accomplishment in relation to the role birth order might play have been a popular topic of research. Almost any angle possible has been taken to explain the consistent phenomenon seen, one example being that first born are more academically gifted than

later born. Many of the studies have struggled with confounding factors that again can explain away significant results. An example of this being that families of lower socioeconomic status tend to have more children making them biased to later born. With each subsequent birth the parents child care time goes up, in turn making their time used to earn money for the family at a job go down; adding to the economic strain (Gugl and Welling, 2010).

Where it would seem that these later born are not as educationally astute as firstborns, the results may be better explained by a lack of access to resources like better schools or materials based in a lack of economic ability and not the child's potential. This said, studies that can manage to control for these issues still find that oldest children are more likely to be higher achieving than younger siblings in families. These findings are not unique to studies done in the United States either, but similar results have been seen in Great Britain and Korea (Cho, 2011). All this data seems to point to an unequal distribution of the family's resources and parental time, much like with behavior development. Both of these examples actually illustrate Charles Darwin's principle of divergence, where siblings will diversify themselves from the others in order to stand out and get a better share of the family's supplies (Sulloway, 1996) cited in Govek, 2012.

Younger siblings may choose to focus on other skills outside of academics as a means to gain parental attention and approval, leaving schooling as a shining point for the older sibling. Another explanation for the findings of the research is that as the oldest, firstborns are simply the first to need such articles as money for college, leaving less and less for the proximal siblings. Researchers do place a great deal of emphasis on the lack of achievement for later born as a result

of less parental involvement and not something about the children's genuine academic ability or disability. The research is not concerned with determining how birth order affects the prevalence of learning disabilities, but rather looking at achievement within children of appropriate cognitive levels at their ages. Again, later born are biased to be part of larger families, making it harder to ensure that each child is receiving equal parental attention as it is split amongst more children and outside factors like jobs and spouses. The success of older children also gives parents a sense that they are doing a good, or at least sufficient, job at helping their children subsequently leading to a decline in the effort paid to the younger children who will be in more need of help.

In reality, that firstborn may be higher academically achieving because he or she has a more driven personality and is less likely to act out in school so attendance to classes is better, making the parental investment a small or not influential piece at all. With so many possibilities as to how to explain the impact birth order can have on educational adherence, more research must be done and is being done on the topic. Nevertheless, birth order most certainly appears to have a very real impact on the opportunities a child has to be academically successful, just as does on other areas of development.

Some other exemplary birth-order research includes a summary of a 25-year longitudinal study of birth order and eventual academic achievement from 1977 through 2002 (Fergusson, Horwood, & Boden, 2006). Fergusson and colleagues found that descending birth order was related to higher achievement as measured by high school completion, entrance into a university, and university degree obtainment. Paulhus et al. (1999) conducted four studies (two in Canada, two in California)

using a within-family design. In all four research studies, first-born children were rated as being higher scholastic achievers as well as being more conscientious.

2.8. Personality and Achievement Motivation

Interestingly, personality characteristics seem to play a part in one's academic achievement as well. Conscientious individuals are well-organized, focused, persistent, and efficient and hence, they have their own revision schedule. Open individuals are said to have divergent thinking style, which helps these individuals in terms of creativity (Musgrave-Marquart, Bromley, & Dalley, 1997). Individuals who are highly agreeable are gentle, cooperative, and are able to maintain social connection. These characteristics are highly favorable in situations when group project assignments and collaborative learning are involved (Chowdhury & Amin, 2006). In contrast, extraverts are outgoing and are interested in social and impulsive activities. Therefore, they spend fewer hours in revision. Last but not least, neurotics usually experience stress or anxiety more than non-neurotics and hence, these perceived stress and anxiety may impact students' performance during stressful events, for instance examinations (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2003).

Relationships between personality factors and academic achievement have been confirmed by tremendous research evidence. For instance, Musgrave-Marquart *et al.* (1997) examined the relationship between personality and academic achievement amongst 161 undergraduates. Their results showed significant relationships between academic achievement and personality factors, such as neuroticism, conscientiousness, openness, and agreeableness. Chowdhury and Amin, (2006), who studied a sample comprised of 105 students taking Introductory Economics, also

reported that conscientiousness, agreeableness, and the interaction of conscientiousness and agreeableness correlated significantly to students' performance in the course. Students who were highly conscientious and agreeable achieved better performance than those who scored low in conscientiousness and agreeableness subscales. In addition, Chamorro-Premuzic and Furnham (2003) also found that personality traits such as neuroticism, conscientiousness, psychoticism, and extraversion correlated significantly with exam marks, which accounting to about 10-17% unique variance in overall exam grades. A study on medical students by Chamorro-Premuzic and Furnham (2003) also investigated the effects of personality on academic performance, and found that the personality trait 'conscientiousness' is a predictor of academic success in undergraduate.

2.9. Gender and Academic Achievement Motivation

In higher education women are often found to outperform men. Hyde and Kling (2001) state this to be the case irrespective of the measure of success used. Betts and Morell (1999) report that sex remains a significant predictor of CGPA after controlling for various individual attributes such as ethnic background, SAT scores and the high school attended. Women are also found to obtain better grades than would be predicted from their SAT scores (Leonard and Jiang, 1999; Hyde and Kling, 2001; Bridgeman and Wendler, 1991; Wainer and Steinberg, 1992). Many researchers claim that a large part of the under-prediction derives from the difference in course taking patterns of male and female college students. Ruling out differential course selection as an explanation for the under-prediction of female grades, Leonard and Jiang (1999) suggest that females have better study skills than the male students. Other researchers have argued that women receive higher

grades than men because they work harder and attend class more frequently (Wainer and Steinberg, 1992).

Research examining gender differences in achievement motivation has yielded inconsistent findings. Some researchers have found that constructs related to achievement motivation differ significantly between males and females (e.g., Linenbrink & Pintrich, 2002; Wigfield & Eccles, 2002), while others have found no differences between males and females on constructs related to achievement motivation (Ligon, 2006).

Linenbrink and Pintrich (2002) examined research pertaining to student motivation and four key components that included academic self-efficacy, attributions, intrinsic motivation, and achievement goals. Males and females were found to have different competence-related beliefs during childhood and adolescence (as cited in Wigfield & Eccles, 2002). Results revealed that boys had higher competence beliefs in sports activities and math compared to girls. However, girls had higher competence beliefs in reading, English, and social activities compared to boys. Linenbrink and Pintrich posited that competence beliefs are important because they predict performance and task choice. These beliefs also affect the student's motivation to succeed and achieve a goal.

In another study, researchers examined gender differences in achievement motivation while evaluating the psychometric properties of the *Academic Motivation Scale* (Cokley, Bernard, Cunningham, & Motoike, 2004). Participants in this study consisted of 263 undergraduate

psychology students at a Midwestern university. The instrument used to assess academic motivation was the *Academic Motivation Scale*, which measures intrinsic, extrinsic, and a motivation. No gender differences were found in this study.

Another study investigated achievement motivation of boys and girls to determine if any differences were apparent (Houtte, 2004). The participants in the study consisted of 3,760 adolescents from general and technical/vocational schools in Belgium. The study found that boys' academic culture is consistently less study oriented than girls' academic culture. The results also indicated that boys had higher achievement motivation in the technical/vocational schools than the general schools. One possible explanation is that the technical/vocational school is clearly linked to a goal (e.g., getting a specific type of job), whereas the general schools have a model that is less clearly linked to a goal. The researcher concluded that the type of school environment can have a tremendous impact on achievement motivation.

2.10. Summary of the review

This review encompassed several work done about birth order, academic achievement motivation and personality. According to the literatures birth order play a significant role in influencing achievement motivation and personality. There are different types of birth order first born, middle born, last born and only born. There are different theories developed to explain each types of birth order. Some of these are dethronement theory, intrauterine theory, confluence hypothesis, resource delusion model. Another topic reviewed in detail is personality.

The other variable reviewed is personality. Personality also refers to stable internal factors or traits which underlie consistent individual differences in behavior. The big five personality is the modern theory that develop to explain and measure personality. Achievement Motivation is also reviewed in this literature. Atkinson 1964, as cited in Desta 2006 define achievement motivation as a subjective, internal, and psychological drive, enabling individuals to pursue work they perceive to be valuable and eventually achieve their goals. In addition the birth order and personality, Birth order and achievement motivation, Personality and achievement motivation, and gender difference in achievement motivation reviewed in detail.

CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Design of the Study

In this study, survey research design was employed with the purpose of investigating the effects of birth order on personality and academic achievement motivation of individuals. This design is chosen because it allows the researcher to have room for making inference about the population based on a representative sample of participants.

3.2. Population

Participants of the study were students from Addis Ababa University 6 Killo campus Social Science College. Developmentally the participants are found in their youth stage.

3.3. Sample and Sampling Procedure

The researcher randomly selected 3 Departments from eight departments in social science college A.A.U 6 killo campus. Social work, Social Anthropology and sociology departments were selected accordingly. The sampling frame consists of all students from the selected department. The total number of student in the identified departments is 633. Then the population stratified based on gender, department and year level. After the strata made, proportional sampling used to select participants of the study. There are 422 male and 211 female students. Accordingly 115 male and 58 females were included. There are 263 students in social work department, 214 students in sociology department and 156 students in social anthropology department. Based on their proportion 72 students from social work department, 58 students from sociology department

and 43 students from social anthropology department took part in the study. In terms of year level there are 267 students in first year, 140 students in second year and 226 students in third. Again based on their proportion 73 students from first year, 38 students from second year and 62 students from third year took part in the study. Accordingly 173 participants were included in the actual study. However, 11 students did not return the questionnaire and another 2 questionnaires were discarded because the researcher found only two respondents from the only child category. In order to select each individual to participate in the actual study, the researcher used simple random sampling technique.

3.4 Instruments of Data Collection

A self-report instrument was used to collect the required data. The instrument has three parts. Part one has structured items mainly designed to gather background information about the participants such as their sex, age, birth order, family and sibling size and socio economic background of their family. The second part of the instrument is an adopted test on Big five personality inventory. It is a likert-type of five point scale with response option ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The scale was developed by (Jones, 2009). The third part of the questionnaire is an adopted test on academic achievement motivation, a Likert type of five point scale with response option ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The scale was adapted by Desta (2006) from three other researchers conducted on high school and college students, i.e. 13 items were drawn from Gottfrid (1985) Academic self efficacy scale, 18 items from Pintrich and DeGroot (1990) motivation and learning strategy scale and 15 items from Daniel (1990) Academic Achievement motivation self report inventory. Each item focuses on various themes pertinent to students' academic achievement motivation. According to Desta the adapted items were given to two

instructors in the department of psychology to verify the construct validity of items. Accordingly, some items were modified and rephrased based on the comments forwarded on the original items. Desta also reported that the reliability coefficient of the scale was $r = 0.84$. Then the present researcher tested both the personality and achievement motivation tests on a randomly selected 20 students.

Based on the results of the pilot test, reliability of the scale was computed using SPSS version 20. As a result, the Chronbach alpha result of the achievement motivation and personality testes were ($r=0.723$ and 0.871) respectively. The results obtained on both instruments are proved to be dependable.

3.5 Procedure of Data Collection

The researcher with the support of the representatives of the student from each selected Department set the time and place convenient to the participants to collect the data. Then, the researcher gave orientation for research participants about the purpose of the study and how to fill the questionnaire. The researcher distributed the questionnaire to the participant accordingly. Data are collected from participant afterward.. The data gathered checked out and coded for entry in to SPSS software version 20.0 for analysis. In the scoring procedure, response options on items yielding qualities of academic achievement motivation and Big five personality tests were given values from high(5) to low (1) on the Likert five point scale corresponding to the response ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Some of the items reversely scored if the statements are negatively written.

3.6 Method of Data Analysis

Different statistical methods were utilized (ranging from simple descriptive ones to more complex statistical procedures of inferential statistics). The type statistical tests were selected on the basis of the nature of data available and the type of research questions were set in order to be answered at the end of the study. The initial part of the analysis provided general description and explanation about major background data using frequency distribution, mean and standard deviations about the study population.

Kruskal-wallis test was employed to test the effects of birth order against mean difference on academic achievement motivation and personality among different birth order groups. Man-Whitney test was also employed to test whether gender difference exists in terms of academic achievement motivation. Eventually, Spearman rank order correlation was used to know the relationship between personality and academic achievement motivation.

3.7 Ethical consideration

Before commencing data collection, a letter written by Addis Ababa University submitted to the college of social science dean to proceed with the study.

After explaining the objectives of the study in detail, informed verbal consent was sought from all study participants, Date and time of the data collection decided as per the convenience of the study participants, Participants assured about the confidentiality of the communicated information and Participants informed of their choice to withdraw at any point during the study period, if they wished so.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. RESULT

4.1 Back Ground Information of Participants

Table1: Frequency table of background of respondents

Characteristics	option	frequency, (%)
Sex of respondents	male	104, (65)
	Female	56, (35)
	Total	160(100)
Age of respondents	<20	27(16.9)
	20—22	97(60.6)
	23---25	31(19.4)
	>26	5(3.1)
	Total	160(100)
Respondents were living with	both parents	111(69.4)
	Mother	25(15.6)
	Father	5(3.1)
	Relative	8(5)
	Others	11(6.9)
	Total	160(100)
Family size	<4	6(3.8)
	4---6	87(54.4)
	7---9	51(31.9)
	>10	16(10)
	Total	160(100)
	Parents educational status	Illiterate
Primary education (1—8)		57(36.77)
Secondary education (9—12)		45(29.03)
College and university		38(24.51)
Total		155(96.9)
Parents income	<1000birr	50(31.3)
	1000—2000birr	23(14.4)
	2000—3000birr	25(15.6)
	3000—4000birr	25(15.6)
	>4000	32(20)
	Total	155(96.9)
Grade 12 national exam result	<300	5(3.1)
	300—349	10(6.3)
	350—399	58(36.3)
	400---449	51(17.5)
	450---499	28(17.5)
	500---700	6(3.8)
	Total	158(98.8)
Cumulative GPA	<2.5	20(12.5)
	2.5---2.99	56(35)
	3-----3.49	53(33.1)
	3.5----4	28(17.5)
	Total	157(98.1)

As it can be shown from the Table1, the majority of the participants are male, which account for 65% of the total population while the rest 35% are female.

Table 1, also shows the majority of the participants were youths whose age composition ranges from 18 to 28 of which 20-22 accounts for 60% of the total population. The next largest age category is 23-25 which account for 19.4% of the total population.\A small number of students found within the age category of >26 which accounts for only 3.1%..

As can be observed from Table one, 69.4% of the total participants were living with their both parents. The next largest number of participant which accounts for 15.6% live with their mother followed by participants who were living with their relative and other which accounts for 5.0% and 6.9% respectively. The least number of participants were living with their father which account for only 3.1%.

As it can be seen from Table 1 , the majority of the participants were from the family size group of 4-6 which accounts for 54.4%.The next largest family size group was 7-9 followed by family size group greater than ten which accounts for 31.9% and 10 % respectively. The least family size group is less than four which accounts for only 3.8%.

As it is indicated in table 1, 20 research participants or 12.9% of the total participant came from parents who are illiterate and 36.7% of participants came from parents whose educational status is from grade 1-8.The rest 29.03% and 24.05%of participants came from parents whose educational status are 9-12 and college and university completed respectively.

As can be seen from Table1, 31.3% respondents came from parents whose income was less than 1000 birr followed by respondents who come from parents whose income was above 4000. Equal numbers of respondents came from parents whose income bracket is 2000-3000 and 3000-4000 each account for 15.6%. The rest of respondents come from parents whose income bracket was 1000-2000 which account for 14.4%.

Table 1 indicates that, 36.3% of respondent's grade 12 national exam result falls in the category of 350-399 and 31.9% of respondents grade 12 national exam result falls in the exam score category of 400-449 followed by respondents grade 12 national exam falls in the exam score category of 450-499 and 300-399 which account for 17.5% and 6.3% respectively. The least number of respondents grade 12 national exam score falls in the exam category of below 300 which account for only 3.1%.

As Table 1 shows, 35% of respondent's cumulative GPA falls between 2.5—2.99 and 33.1% of respondents cumulative GPA falls between 3-3.49 followed by respondents whose cumulative GPA falls between greater than 3.5 and less than 2.5 each accounts for 17.5 and 12.5 respectively.

4.2 Birth order of Respondents

Table2: Frequency table of Birth order of Respondents

Birth order	Number	Percent
first born	47	29.4
middle born	77	48.1
last born	36	22.5
Total	160	100.0

As Table 2 shows the majority of respondents were middle born which accounted for 48.1% of the total respondent followed by first born and last born which accounted for 29.4% and 22.5% respectively.

4.3 Descriptive Analysis of the Data

4.3.1 Mean and Standard deviation of each Birth position Achievement motivation

Table3: Mean and Standard Deviation Sore of each Birth Order Category Achievement motivation

Birth Order	N	Mean	std.deviation
first born	47	2.9	.43
middle born	77	2.9	.36
last born	36	2.8	.35
Total	160	2.7	.36

The summary Table of means and standard deviations of scores on achievement motivation among each birth groups was presented in table 3. As can be seen from this table, the mean score of each birth position achievement motivation is nearly the same. The data also indicated that the middle born scored 2.8 which is relatively the least among all the birth order categories.

4.3.2. Mean and Standard deviation of each Birth position personality

Table4: Mean and Standard Deviation scores of Personality for each Birth Order Category

Birth Order	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
first born	47	3.0	.60
middle born	77	3.1	.54
last born	36	3.3	.38
Total	160	3.1	.53

As can be shown from Table 4, the mean personality score of each birth order category is nearly the same. The relatively highest mean score was obtained by last born (3.3209) and the relatively least mean score was obtained by first born (3.0257). The highest standard deviation was scored by first born ($s=0.60088$) and the lowest standard deviation was scored by last born ($s=0.37259$)

4.2.3. Mean comparison between sex

Table5: Mean comparison table of sex of respondents

sex of respondents		Achievement motivation	Personality
Male	Mean	2.8	3.1
	N	104	104
	Std. D	.37	.55
Female	Mean	2.9	3.2
	N	56	56
	Std. D	.38	.51
Total	Mean	2.8	3.2
	N	160	160
	Std. D	.37	.53

As it is exhibited in Table 5, the mean score of male and female on both achievement motivation and personality is nearly the same. A slightly higher mean score was obtained by female on both achievement motivation and personality with mean score of 2.9 and 3.1 respectively. Females have scored a relatively higher standard deviation on achievement motivation ($s=0.38$) where as males scored a relatively higher standard deviation on personality ($s=0.55$).

4.3 Kruskal Wallis Test Result of the Data

It has been observed that the descriptive summary results have uncovered some differences in terms of mean and standard deviation scores existing among various birth order categories. This difference alone, however, does not confirm whether statistically significant differences exist or

not. In order to answer the research questions, it is worthwhile to test the mean difference with the kruskal wallis test.

4.3.1. Results of Kruskal wallis Test

Table6: kruskal wallis test summary table

	your ordinal position in the family	N	Mean Rank
Personality	first born	47	68.78
	middle born	77	82.46
	last born	36	91.61
	Total	160	
Achievement motivation	first born	47	85.48
	middle born	77	78.68
	last born	36	77.90
	Total	160	

Test Statistics^{a,b}

	Achievement motivation	Personality
Chi-Square	.776	5.219
Df	2	2
Asymp. Sig.	.678	.074

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: ordinal position
in the family

Table 6 gives the evidence of no significant difference among the different birth order categories on achievement motivation with chi-Square 0.776, degree of freedom 2 and p-value 0.0678 which is greater than 0.05, $p > 0.05$. This means that each birth order categories are the same in terms of the mean score result and the differences are not statistically significant. This on the other hand implies that birth order entail no effect on the variations in academic achievement motivation of participants. The result also indicated that there is no significant difference among the different birth order categories on personality with chi-Square 5.219, degree of freedom 2 and p-value 0.074 which is greater than 0.05, $p > 0.05$. This means that each birth order category does not have significant difference in terms of personality.

4.4 Results of Mann-Whitney test

Table7: Man-Whitney test summary table

Test Statistics^a

<i>Achievement motivation</i>	
<i>Mann-Whitney U</i>	<i>2753.500</i>
<i>Wilcoxon W</i>	<i>8213.500</i>
<i>Z</i>	<i>-.567</i>
<i>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	<i>.57</i>

a. Grouping variable: sex of respondents

As indicated in table 7 ,the outcome of the Mann-Whitney test shows that there is no statistically significant difference between male and female on both achievement motivation with p-valu.0.571 which is greater than 0.05,p>0.05. This entails in other words that sex of respondents do not make any difference on their achievement motivation.

4.5 Correlation between Achievement Motivation and Personality

In order to see ,whether a relationship exist between achievement motivation and personality of respondents, spearman rank correlation was computed.

Table8: Results of spearman's rho correlation on the relationship between achievement motivation and personality

		Correlation	
		Achievement motivation	Personality
Achievement motivation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.302**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
	N	160	160
Personality	Correlation Coefficient	.302**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
	N	160	160

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As indicated in the Table8, the outcome of spearman rho correlation show significant positive correlation between achievement motivation and personality ($r=0.302, p<0.01$). In general, it appears that moderate relationship exist between the two variables. This implies that a certain type of personality associated with a corresponding degree of achievement motivation.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. DISCUSSION

In this section, results presented in the previous section are revisited and discussed in detail from various perspectives. Possible explanations and adequate reasons are given depending on how the research questions answered. Besides, the results are also compared with the similar research findings on the issue under study.

5.1 Birth Order and Personality

This research came up with empirical evidence that refute the effects of birth order on personality. On basis of respondent's response, birth order has no bearing on personality. There are also some other empirical studies which are consistent with the present study in sense that they refuted the effect of birth order on personality. For instance, Jefferson, Herbst, and McCrae (1998) administered brief measures of neuroticism, extraversion, and openness to experience to 9964 participants and reported that the self-report of personality dimensions were unrelated to birth order. On top of that, Parker (1998) also administered a short form of NEO-PI to 593 only children, firstborns, middle born, and lastborns, but found no relationship between birth order and personality traits. The inconsistency of birth order effects on personality had led Ernst and Angst (as cited in Dixon *et al.*, 2008) to conclude that the birth order effect on personality traits were artifacts of poor research designs where confounding variables, such as socioeconomic status (SES) and sib ship size, were not controlled. The results were biased because families of higher SES and smaller in size would constitute of more firstborns whereas families of lower SES but larger in size would constitute of more later born.

On the other hand, There are also studies whose results are inconsistent with this research. For example, Healey and Ellis who studied university sample ($n = 161$ sibling pairs) and older adults ($n = 174$ siblings pairs) reported that there were significant differences between firstborn and second born siblings in their personality traits. Firstborns scored significantly higher on conscientiousness and lower in openness to experience than their second born siblings, which supported the dethronement theory and family-niche model. Such striking difference between the present research and Healey and Ellis research may result from the nature of participants in that Healey and Ellis used siblings as their research participant while this study used participants who are not siblings.

5.2 Birth Order and Achievement Motivation

One of the major research questions for empirical testing in this research was the effect of birth order on achievement motivation of respondents. The data generated from this study depicted that birth has no effect on achievement motivation. Like some other research conducted in this area, the out come of this study revealed that birth order has no connection with achievement motivation. In short ordinal position in family does not bring about any change on academic achievement motivation of individuals. Hauser and Sewell (1985) as cited in kim (2009) do not find any significant effect of birth order on schooling. This study also generates data that refute the effect of birth order on achievement motivation..

On the other hand, Black, Devereux and Salvanes (2005) come up with a research finding which are not not in line with this research findings. They examined the effects of birth order on

educational achievement, using a Norwegian population, and found that earlier birth position was associated with a significantly greater number of years in education (as cited by Fergusson, Horwood & Boden, 2006). There was a similar finding in a study by Sputa and Paulson (1995) in a sample of adolescents, which found a relationship between earlier birth order and school achievement (as cited by Fergusson et al., 2006). The discrepancy between the above mentioned studies and the present study may occur because of the fact that the present study conducted on university students who have a relatively higher academic achievement motivation.

5.3 The Relationship between Personality and Academic Achievement Motivation

The data gathered to assert the relationship between personality and academic achievement motivation demonstrated that personality and academic motivation are found to have moderate relationship. The finding of this study is in line with the study conducted by Musgrave-Marquart *et al.* (1997) examined the relationship between personality and academic achievement amongst 161 undergraduates. Their results showed significant relationships between academic achievement and personality factors, such as neuroticism, conscientiousness, openness, and agreeableness. Chowdhury and Amin (2006), who studied a sample comprised of 105 students taking Introductory Economics, also reported that conscientiousness, agreeableness, and the interaction of conscientiousness and agreeableness correlated significantly to students' performance in the course. Students who were highly conscientious and agreeable achieved better performance than those who scored low in conscientiousness and agreeableness subscales.

5.4 Gender Difference on Achievement Motivation

The study showed that being male and female does not make any difference on personality and academic achievement motivation .A similar result was found in research conducted by

Desta(2006),on the effect of birth order on academic achievement motivation on 164 high school students in Addis Ababa. On the contrary, a study conducted by Houtte,2004 with the participants of 3,760 adolescents from general and technical/vocational schools in Belgium found that boys' academic culture is consistently less study oriented than girls' academic culture. The results also indicated that boys had higher achievement motivation in the technical/vocational schools than the general schools. One possible explanation for the difference might be that the area difference in which the study conducted. The technical/vocational school is clearly linked to a goal (e.g., getting a specific type of job), whereas the general schools have a model that is less clearly linked to a goal..

CHAPTER SIX

6. SUMARRY, CONCLUSION and RECOMMENDATION

6.1 Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the effects of birth order on individuals' personality and academic achievement motivation of Addis Ababa University Social Science College Students. Under this general objective, the examination of birth order difference on personality, the assessment of birth order difference on academic achievement motivation, the investigation of the relationship between personality and achievement motivation and the examination of gender difference on achievement motivation were set us a specific objectives. To this end, a survey research design with the total number of 160 sample participants was used. To measure the academic achievement motivation and personality of participants an adopted self report tests with likert-type five point scales was employed. The pilot test was pretested on 20 participants. The reliability of the achievement motivation and personality tests were found to be $r=0.723$ and $r=0.871$ respectively..During the Analysis, SPSS package Version 20 was used to facilitate organization of the data. Descriptive statistics, Kruskal wallis test, Man-Whitney u test and spearman rank order correlation were employed to analyze the data and to find out statistical results.

According to the findings, there is no significant difference among the different birth order groups in their academic achievement motivation and personality. The study also depicted that no significant gender difference exist between male and female in terms of their academic

achievement motivation .Significant relationship between academic achievement motivation and personality was found in the outcome the research.

6.2. Conclusions

Based on the findings analyzed and interpretation of result discussed earlier, the following conclusions could be drawn.

1. In general, birth order does not have a significant effect on the academic achievement motivation of individuals. Putting differently, the level of academic achievement motivation of individuals can not vary on account of their ordinal position they hold in their family. It was also ascertained that first born do not excel participants in other ordinal position in terms of academic achievement motivation.
2. Birth order can not also bring about a significant effect on the personality of individuals. In other words ,the personality of individuals can not vary on account of their ordinal position they hold in the family.
3. Males and females are the same in their level of academic achievement motivation .In nutshell; gender difference has nothing to do with academic achievement motivation.
4. A significant relationship does exist between academic achievement motivation and personality.

6.3 Recommendations

Based on the result obtained in the study the following recommendations are suggested:

- 1 Ordinal position in a family may not matter. It might be the other factor in the family environment that puts children of a particular birth position in advantage and disadvantage. One

needs to be cautious for not taking what is stated in different literature about birth order for granted. Hence, parents should strike a balance in allocating their time and resource at their disposal so that they will be able to provide proper care affection and attention for the development of their children's achievement motivation and personality irrespective of their ordinal position.

2. Instructors and counselors in the university and other counseling setting should be conscious enough to consider other factors other than ordinal position when addressing problems related to academic achievement motivation and personality of students.

3. There are many factors which influence academic achievement motivation and personality of individuals. A whole range of these variable works together to impact on the level of academic achievement motivation and personality of individual. Once these variables are understood and considered, then it usually makes sense why individual differences occur in achievement motivation and personality. However, these variables were not included in this study which may limit the scope of knowledge that may be generated out of it. In addition, few studies are done in Ethiopian context on the effects of birth order on academic achievement motivation and personality; therefore, further comprehensive study should be done to broaden the insight in this area of concern.

REFERENCES

- Adler, A. (1920). Characteristics of the first, second, and third Child . *Children*, 3, 14-52. Retrived August 23, 2013 from <http://www.queendom.com/index.html>
- Black, S., P. Devereux and K. Salvanes (2005) "The More the Merrier? The Effect of Family Size and Birth Order on Children's Education", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, CXX, 669 Retrieved September 12,2013 from <http://www.rapidnet.com/~jbeard/bdm/Psychology/birtho.htm>
- Betts, J. R. and Morell, D. (1999) The Determinants of Undergraduate Grade Point Average: The Relative Importance of Family Background, High School Resources, and Peer Group Effects, *The Journal of Human Resources*, 34, pp. 268-293.
- Bridgeman, B. and Wendler, C. (1991) Gender Differences in Predictors of College Mathematics Performance and in College Mathematics Course Grades, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, pp. 275-284.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2003). Personality Traits and Academic Examination Performance. *European Journal of Personality*, 17, 237-250.0 2 .
- Cho .H. (2011).Birth order and Education: Evidence from a Korean Cohort. *Economics Letters*. 110(3),200-2

Chowdhury, M. S., & Amin, M. N. (2006). Personality and students' academic achievement: Interactive effects of conscientiousness and agreeableness on students' performance in principles of economics. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 34, 381-388.

Claxton, R. P. (1994). Empirical relationships between birth order and two types of parental feedback. *Psychological Records*, 44, 475-487.

Cokley, K. O., Bernard, N., Cunningham, D., & Motoike, J. (2004). A psychometric investigation of the academic motivation scale using a United States sample. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 34, p. 109-119.

Collin,(2006). The Relation Ship between Birth Order and Personality and Career Choices
http://digitalcommons.providence.edu/socialwrk_students/13

Costa, P. T, Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1993). Bullish on personality psychology. *The Psychologist*, 6,302-303

Desta Ayoda (2006). Effects of Birth Order on Students Academic motivation: The case of two selected high school. Unpublished MA Thesis. AAU.

Dixon, M. M., Reyes, C. J., Leppert, M. F., & Pappas, L. M. (2008). Birth order and personality in large families. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44, 119-128

Downey, D. B. (2001). Number of siblings and intellectual development. The resource dilution explanation. *American Psychologist*, 56, 497-504.

Ernst, C., & Angst, J. (1983). *Birth order: its influence on personality*. New York:Springer-Verlag.

Fergusson, D.M., Horwood, L.J., & Boden, J.M., (2006). Birth order and educational achievement in adolescence and young adulthood. *Australian Journal of Education*, 50(2), 122-139.

Govek, 2012. Birth order impact Real or Imagined? A Review of Literature past and present
Marquette University.

Gugl, E., & Welling, L., (2010). The early bird gets the worm? Birth order effects in a dynamic family model. *Economic Inquiry*, 48(3), 690-703.

Gustafsun (2010). The effect of birth order on personality. Unpublished MA Thesis. Adler Graduate School

Ha.T.S and Tam.C.L. (2011). *A study of Birth order, Academic performance and Personality*.
International conference on Social Science and Humanity IPEDR vol.5 (2011) IACSIT Press, Singapore Retrieved SEPTEMBER 14,2013 from http: www.ipear.com

- Healey, M. D., & Ellis, B. J. (2007). Birth order, conscientiousness, and openness to experience: Tests of the family-niche model of personality using a within-family methodology. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 28, 55-59.
- Herrera, N. C., Zajonc, R. B., Wieczorkowska, G., & Cichomski, B. (2003). Beliefs about birth rank and their reflection in reality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 85 (1), 142-150.
- Hotz & Pantano (2011) Strategic parenting, Birth order and school performance. Retrieved October, 22 2013 from http://www.avenis.com/main/order_center/download/E_Future_1_2011.pdf
- Houtte, M. V. (2004). Why boys achieve less at school than girls: The difference between boys' and girls' academic culture. *Educational Studies*, 30 (2), p. 159-173.
- Hyde, J. S. and Kling, K. C. (2001) Women, Motivation and Achievement, *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 25, 364-378
- Jefferson, T., Herbst, J. H., & McCrae, R. R. (1998). Associations between birth order and personality traits: Evidence from self-reports and observer ratings. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 32, 498-509.
- John. O. P. (1990). The "Big Five" factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality theory and research* (pp. 66-100). New York: Guilford.

- Kalkan, M. (2008). The relationship of psychological birth order to irrational relationship beliefs .
Social Behavior and Personality, 36(4), 455-466.
- Klas,.(2002). A closer Look at ordinal positioning within the family system.
Retrieved October, 14, 2013 from <http://www.umext.maine.edu/onlinepubs/htmpubs/4359.htm>
- Leman, K. (2002). *The new birth order book*. Grand Rapids, MI: Fleming H. Revell.
http://allsands.com/Kids/birthorderpers_rgw_gn.htm
- Leonard, D. K. and Jiang, J. (1999) Gender Bias and the College Predictors of the SATs: A
Cry of Despair, *Research in Higher Education*, 40, pp. 375-407.
- Ligon, N. Y. (2006). Assessing the achievement motivation across grades and gender.
Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: *Humanities and Social Sciences*,
67(6-A), p.2052.
- Linnenbrink, E. A. & Pintrich, P. R. (2002). Motivation as an enabler for academic success.
School Psychology Review, 31, p. 313-327.
- Marjoribanks, K. (2001). Sibling dilution hypothesis: A regression surface analysis. *Psychological
Reports*, 89(1), 33-40M
- McAdams, D.P. (1995). What do we know when we know a person? *Journal of personality*.
63.365-396.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1990). *Personality in adulthood*. New York: Guilford Press.
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., Jr., del Pilar, G. H., Rolland, J. P., & Parker, W. D. (1998). Cross
BIRTH cultural assessment of the Five-Factor Model: The Revised NEO Personality
Inventory. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29, 171-188.

- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist, 52*, 509-516
- McCrae, R. R. and John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five factor model and its application. *Journal of Personality, 60*, 175-215.
- McCrae, R. R. (2002). The maturation of personality psychology: Adult personality development and psychological well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*, 307-317.
- McCrae, R. R., Terracciano, A., & 78 Members of the Personality Profiles of Cultures Project. (2005). Universal features of personality traits from the observer's perspective: Data from 50 cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 547-561.
- McGuirk, E. M., & Pettijohn, T. F. (2008). Birth order and romantic relationship styles and attitudes in college students. *North American Journal of Psychology, 10*, 37-52. Retrieved October, 16 2013 from http://allsands.com/Kids/birthorderpers_rgw_gn.htm
- Michalski, R. L., & Shackelford, T. K. (2001). Methodology, birth order, intelligence, and personality. *American Psychologist, 56*, 520-521.
- Michalski, R. L., & Shackelford, T. K. (2002). An attempted replication of the relationships between birth order and personality. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*, 182-188.
- Musgrave-Marquart, D., Bromley, S. P., & Dalley, M. B. (1997). Personality, academic attribution, and substance use as predictors of academic achievement in college students. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 12*, 501-511.
- Nakao, K., Takaishi, J., Tatsuta, K., Katayama, H., Iwase, M., Yorifuji, K., et al. (2000).

- The influences of family environment on personality traits. *Psychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, 54, 91-95.
- Parker, W. D. (1998). Birth order effects in the academically talented. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 42,29-38.
- Paulhus, D.L., Trapnell, P.D., & Chen, D. (1999). Birth order effects on personality and achievement within families. *American Psychological Society; Psychological Science*, 10(6). Retrieved september10,2013 from <http://www.gale.cengage.com>
- Phillips, A. S., & Phillips, C. R. (2000). Birth-order differences in self-attributions for achievement. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, 56,474-480.
- Phillips, A. S., & Phillips, C. R. (1994). Birth order and achievement attributions. *Individual Psychology: Journal of Adlerian Theory, Research and Practice*, 50, 119-124.
- Rink, 2010.The impact of Birth order upon customers decision making, Buying and post purchase process: A conceptualization
- Rogers, J. L., Cleveland, H. H., van den Oord , E., & Rowe, D. C. (2000). Resolving the debate over birthorder, family size, and intelligence. *American Psychologist*, 56,599-612.
- Rogers, J. L. (2001). What causes birth order-intelligence patterns? *American Psychologist*, 56, 505-510.
- Schultz,D. & Schultz S. E. (2005). *Theories of personality* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Shalabi M.F,& Nodoushan, M.A.S.,(2009).Personality theory and TESOL. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 3(1).
- Sputa and Paulson.(1995). Birth order family size: influences on adolescents' Achievement and related parenting behaviors. *Psychological reports*, 76(1), 43-51.

- Sulloway, F. (1996). Born to Rebel: Birth Order, Family Dynamics & Creative Lives. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Terracciano, A., Costa, P. T, Jr., & McCrae, R.R. (2006). Personality plasticity after age 30. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 2,999-1009.
- Tharbe, I. H. A., & Harun, L. M. H. (2000, July). *Birth order position and personality traits*. Paper presented at the Faculty of Educational Studies, University Putra Malaysia National Conference in Education, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia.
- Wainer, H. and Steinberg, L. S. (1992) Sex Differences in Performance on the Mathematics Section of the Scholastic Aptitude Test: A Bidirectional Validity Study, *Harvard Educational Review*, 62, pp. 323-336.
- Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2002). *Development of achievement motivation*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Zajonc, R. B. (2001). The family dynamics of intellectual development. *American Psychologist*, 56, 490–496.
- Zajonc, R.B., & Mullally, P.R. (1997, July). Birth order: Reconciling conflicting effects. *American Psychologist*, 52 (7), 685-699. Retrieved September 14, 2013 from the Psych ARTICLES database.
- Zweigenhaft, R. L., & Von Ammon, J. (2000). Birth order and civil disobedience: a test of Sulloway's "born to rebel" hypothesis. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 140,624-627.

Addis Ababa University

College of Education and Behavioral Studies

School of Psychology

Self- Report Questionnaire

Dear Respondents,

This questionnaire involves items presented in three parts. The first part is about your biographic information and the second part consists of 42 items -with your academic achievement motivation and the third part consists of 45 items that help us to know about your personality. I would like to appreciate your willingness to participate in the research. Feel free to provide genuine information your response will be kept confidential. There is no need of putting down your name or identification number. Thus, you are kindly requested to fill out the questionnaire carefully and return it after responding each item,

Thank you for your cooperation.

Part II

Instruction: In the following rating scale, 42 items are presented about your academic achievement motivation, for each item, five responses are given, please put a “√” sign in the box for your response given against each item once again I request you to give free frank and real response to each item.

No	Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
1	I believe that luck determines ones success more than hard work does.					
2	The thought of going to class make me feel bored					
3	When good things happen to me, I feel that they happen because of my hard work.					
4	Compared with other students in the class I always score least.					
5	I do not feel comfortable when asked to answer difficult questions.					
6	I often do something to prove that I can do it myself.					
7	I regard myself as more consistent and hard worker in the classroom assignments than other students in my class.					
8	I am certain that I will receive a good grade in my class.					
9	It important for me to learn what is being thought in the class.					

10	I am so nervous during a test for I can't remember facts I have read					
11	I often prefer assignments which are challenging so that I can learn new things out of them.					
12	My intention is to get good grade though I don't understand the lesson.					
13	My study skills are better compared with others in my class.					
14	I usually feel the time is going fast while in school.					
15	The thought of approaching exam days make me nervous.					
16	Even when I do poorly in a test, I try to learn from my mistakes.					
17	Unless I understand the subject matter very well, getting good grades alone doesn't make sense to me.					
18	When I am given difficult assignment, I enjoy finding a solution to it.					
19	When I often take exams, I feel unnecessarily upset.					
20	Failure discourages me from trying as hard as possible the next time.					
21	I don't like challenging questions.					
22	The future is too uncertain for me to make serious plan.					
23	Compared with other students in the					

	class, I believe I do better.					
24	When I take a test, I think about how poorly I am doing.					
25	I wish grade promotion were given without exams.					
26	Since the future is uncertain, there is no reason to try to do things in a hurry.					
27	I am very much afraid of exams.					
28	I give attention to those activities which involve chance factors.					
29	Getting lower marks makes me feel unhappy					
30	It is better to fail exams than asking for favor to pass.					
31	I feel unhappy if another student makes better grades than I do.					
32	I don't prefer to toil a lot to get better results.					
33	I enjoy learning new things in class.					
34	I don't give up an assignment until I understand it very well.					
35	I often don't like to attend class when given difficult homework / assignments.					
36	Answering questions in class really makes me fell delighted.					
37	I prefer to have friends who perform					

	less than me.					
38	I sometimes wish I had gone straight work than spending time in school.					
39	If I find the work has no immediate feedback but distant reward, I would rather not do the work.					
40	I think it is impossible to get good grades in class where there is fierce competition among students.					
41	I give more weight to the reward I get from my parents than the success I achieve.					
42	I prefer an exam having easy items only.					

Part 2 : In the following rating scale, 45 items are presented about your personality, for each item, five responses are given, please put a “√” sign in the box for your response given against each item once again I request you to give free frank and real response to each item.

No	I see myself as...	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly agree
1	talkative					
2	Tends to find fault with others					
3	Does a thorough job					
4	Is depressed, blue					
5	Is original, comes up with new ideas					
6	Is reserved					
7	Is helpful and unselfish with others					

8	Can be somewhat careless					
9	Is relaxed, handles stress well					
10	Is curious about many different things					
11	Is full of energy					
12	Starts quarrels with others					
13	Is a reliable worker					
14	Can be tense					
15	Is ingenious, a deep thinker					
16	Generates a lot of enthusiasm					
17	Has a forgiving nature					
18	Tends to be disorganized					
19	Worries a lot					
20	Has an active imagination					
21	Tends to be quiet					
22	Is generally trusting					
23	Tends to be lazy					
24	Is emotionally stable, not easily upset					
25	Is inventive					
26	Has an assertive personality					
27	Can be cold and aloof					
28	Perseveres until the task is finished					
29	Can be moody					
30	Values artistic, aesthetic experiences					
31	Is sometimes shy, inhibited					
32	Is considerate and kind to almost everyone					
33	Does things efficiently					
34	Remains clam in tense situations					
35	Prefers work that is routine					

36	Is outgoing, sociable					
37	Is sometimes rude to others					
38	Makes plans and follows through with them					
39	Gets nervous easily					
40	Likes to reflect, play with ideas					
41	Has few artistic interests					
42	Likes to cooperate with others					
43	Is easily distracted					
44	Is sophisticated in art, music, or literature					

DECLARATION

This thesis is my original work, has not been presented for a degree in any other university and that all source of materials used for the thesis duly acknowledged.

Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as university advisor.

Advisor

Signature

Date