Socio personal factors affecting academic performance of undergraduate students of Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana

■ Anjana Rai*, Kanwaljit Kaur and Preeti Sharma

Department of Home Science Extension and Communication Management, Punjab Agricultural University, LUDHAINA (PUNJAB) INDIA

ABSTRACT

The present study was conducted to know and compare the factors affecting academic performance and aspirations of undergraduate students of Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana. A sample of 150 students was selected through purposive sampling technique from three colleges of PAU, Ludhiana having Government funded programmes namely B.Sc. (Hons.) Home Science, B.Sc. (Hons.) Agriculture, B. Tech. (Agricultural Engineering and Technology). Data were collected with the help of specially prepared questionnaire. The findings revealed that 53 percentage of students had medium and 19 per cent had high level of academic performance. Significant relationship was observed between academic performance of the students and their health status. Family type, family size, use of internet were significantly associated with academic performance of the students. Significant variations were found among students of different colleges in relation to father's education, father's occupation and health status. Health status of students had significant and positive relationship with academic performance of the students. Students should be encouraged to improve their health status.

INTRODUCTION

Students are the key assets of universities. The students' performance plays an important role in producing best quality graduates who will become great leaders and manpower for the country thus responsible for the country's economic and social development. Academic performance is one of the major factors considered by employers in hiring workers especially for the fresh graduates. Thus, students have to put the greatest effort in their study to obtain good grades and to prepare themselves for future opportunities in their career at the same time to fulfill the employer's demand. The social and economic development of the country is directly linked with student academic performance. The students' academic performance plays an important role in producing the best quality graduates who will become great leader and manpower for the country thus responsible for the country's economic and social development. Academic performance is the competence of students actually shown in the discipline in which they have received instructions.

The educational performance does not always depend on intelligence, but there are many other factors

also which determine their performance. Keeping this in mind the study was conducted with the following objectives:

– To compare socio-personal profile of students of different colleges of PAU, Ludhiana.

– To study socio-personal factors affecting academic performance of the students.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study was conducted in three colleges of PAU, Ludhiana having government funded undergraduate programmes namely B.Sc. (Hons.) Home Science, B.Sc. (Hons.) Agriculture, B.Tech. (Agricultural Engineering and Technology). A sample for study was selected through purposive sampling technique. Further 50 students of final year class of each programme were selected randomly. Thus total 150 students from three selected programmes comprised the sample for the study. The data for the study was collected through questionnaire.

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Keeping in view the objectives of the study, the results have been reported under the following sub-headings.

– Socio - personal profile of the students and comparison among students of different colleges

– Relationship of socio- personal factors with the academic performance of the students

Socio - personal profile of the students and comparison among different colleges :

Table 1 presents data related to the distribution of students according to their socio personal profile.

As data in Table 1 indicated that the age of students ranged from 20 to 23 years, the highest percentage of the students *i.e.* 54.7 per cent fell in age group of 20-21 years followed by 45.33 per cent in the age group of 21-22 years. The highest per cent of the students *i.e.* 68 per cent were female and 32 per cent were male.

The findings revealed that 53 percentage of students had medium and 19 per cent had high level of academic performance.

It was found that 54.66 per cent of students were first born, 34.66 per cent were second born a eight per cent third and negligible per cent were fourth born.

The majority of the students (74%) were from nuclear family whereas only 26 per cent belonged to joint families. Seventy per cent of students had family size upto five members whereas 30 per cent had more than five members.

Seventy four per cent students belonged to general caste category whereas 12 per cent were from other backward class and only 14 per cent students belonged to Scheduled Caste/ Scheduled Tribe category.

Seventy four per cent students fathers had higher education and 25.33 per cent had medium education. Mother's education of 50 per cent students was higher followed by 42 per cent had medium and seven per cent had lower mother's education.

About 34.00 per cent of students' fathers were in Government service followed by private service (36%), 33 per cent were farmers and 16 per cent were businessmen. The occupation of students' mothers showed that 74.66 per cent mothers were housewife only while 18 per cent were in government service, six per cent were self-employed and only negligible per cent were in private service.

Health status of the students was seen as good, average and poor. Out of total students 38 per cent students had good and 49 per cent had average health status, only 12.66 per cent had poor health status. Among all three colleges, nearly half (48%) of the students of college of Agriculture had good health status. Whereas more than half (56%) of the students of college of Agricultural Engineering and Technology and half of the students (52%) of college of Home Science had average health status. Fourteen per cent students of College of Agriculture had poor health status.

The percentage of students who had habit of doing daily exercise was 54.66, while, the percentage of students who did not do exercise was forty five. Among all three colleges of Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, seventy two per cent of students of college of Agricultural Engineering and Technology were doing daily exercise, while 64 per cent students of college of Home Science were not doing daily exercise.

It is given in Table 1 that thirty eight per cent of students were under stress. Among all three colleges the maximum students (40%) from college of Home Science followed by (38%) Agricultural Engineering and Technology were under stress.

The highest percentage of the students (60.66%) were hostlers and 36.0 per cent were day scholars while

Table 1 : Socio personal profile of the students				(n =150)
Profile	College of Agril.Engg. n $_1$=50	College of H.Sc. n $_2$=50	College of Agri. n $_3$=50	Total n =150	Krushkal wallis H value
	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	f (%)	
Age (years)					
20-21	20 (40.0)	22 (44.0)	40 (80.0)	82 (54.7)	4.49 NS
22-23	30 (60.0)	28 (56.0)	10 (20.0)	68(45.33)	
Academic performance					
Low (below 7.0)	19 (38.0)	15 (30.0)	7 (14.0)	41 (27.33)	12.64*
Medium (7.0 -8.0)	23(46.0)	24 (48.0)	33 (66.0)	80 (53.33)	
High (above 8.0)	8 (16.0)	11 (22.0)	10(20.0)	29 (19.33)	
Gender					
Male	37 (74.0)	-	11 (22.0)	48 (32.0)	
Female	13 (26.0)	50 (100.0)	3 9 (78.0)	102 (68.0)	
Order of birth					
First	27 (54.0)	27 (54.0)	28 (56.0)	82 (54.66)	0.48 NS
Second	23 (46.0)	16 (32.0)	13 (26.0)	52 (34.66)	
Third	-	7 (14.0)	6 (12.0)	13 (8.66)	
Fourth	-	-	3 (6.0)	3 (6.0)	
Family type					
Joint	14 (28.0)	10 (20.0)	15 (30.0)	39 (26.0)	0.44 NS
Nuclear	36 (72.0)	40 (80.0)	35 (70.0)	111(74.0)	
Family size					
Upto five members	36 (72.0)	34 (68.0)	35 (70.0)	105 (70.0)	0.40 NS
Above five members	14 (28.0	16 (32.0)	15 (30.0)	45 (30.0)	
Family caste					
SC	5 (10.0)	2 (4.0)	13 (26.0)	20 (13.33)	3.01 NS
ST	-	-	1 (2.00	1 (0.66)	
OBC	6 (12.0)	6 (12.0)	6 (12.0)	18 (12.0)	
General	39 (78.0)	42 (84.0)	30 (62.0)	111 (74.0)	
Father's education					
Low	-	-	-	-	51.4**
Medium	-	19 (38.0)	19 (38.0)	38 (25.33)	
High	50 (100.0)	31 (62.0)	31 (62.0	112 (74.66)	
Mother's education					
Low	2 (4.0)	3 (6.0)	6 (12.0)	11 (7.33)	1.20 NS
Medium	21 (42.0)	19 (38.0)	23 (46.0)	63 (42.0)	
High	27 (54.0)	28 (56.0)	21 (42.0)	76 (50.66)	
Father's occupation					
Govt. service	23 (46.0)	12 (24.0)	23 (46.0)	58 (38.66)	8.03*
Private service	10 (18.0)	6 (12.0)	2 (4.0)	18(12.0)	
Business	7 (14.0)	16 (34.0)	1 (2.0)	24 (16.0)	
Farming	10 (20.0)	16 (32.0)	24 (48.0)	50 (33.33)	
Labour	-	-			
Mother's occupation					
Govt. service	13(26.0)	7 (14.0)	7 (14.0)	27 (18.0)	3.05 NS
Private service	1 (2.0)	1 (2.0)	-	2 (1.33)	
Housewife	35 (70.0)	34 (68.0)	43 (86.0)	112 (74.66)	
Self employed	1 (2.0)	8 (16.0)	-	9 (6.0)	
Labour	-	-	-	-	

Table 1 contd...

Contd... Table 1

Health status					
Good (29-32)	15 (20.0)	18 (36.0)	24 (48.0)	57 (38.0)	13.1*
Average (25-28)	29 (56.0)	26 (52.0)	19 (38.0)	74 (49.33)	
Poor (21-24)	6 (12.0)	6 (12.0)	7 (14.0)	19 (12.66)	
Daily exercise	36 (72.0)	18 (36.0)	28 (56.0)	82 (54.66)	11.4*
Stress	19 (38.0)	20 (40.0)	12 (24.0)	51 (34.0)	2.7 NS
Taking daily meal	20 (40.0)	9 (18.0)	20 (40.0)	49 (32.66)	3.4 NS
Place of residence					
Hostel	33 (66.0)	23 (46.0)	35 (70.0)	91 (60.66)	2.1 NS
PG	1 (2.0)	-	1 (2.0)	2 (1.33)	
Rented Accommodation	2(4.0)	-	1 (2.0)	3 (2.0)	
Own home	14 (32.0)	27(54.0)	13 (26.0)	54 (37.33)	
Relatives home	-	-	-	-	
Preference of students for residence					
Hostel	34 (68.0)	18 (36.0)	27 (54.0)	79 (52.7)	3.1 NS
PG	2 (4.0)	-	2 (4.0)	4 (2.66)	
Rented Accommodation	-	-	2 (4.0)	2 (1.33)	
Own home	14 (28.0)	32 (64.0)	19 (38.0)	65 (43.33)	
Relatives home	-	-	-	-	

* and ** indicate significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively   NS=Non-significant

only negligible percentage of students were living in rented accommodation (2%) and in paying guest accommodation (1.33%). Further 70 per cent of students from college of Agriculture were living in hostel followed by 54 per cent students of college of Home science were day scholars. On the other hand, only negligible per cent students of College of Agricultural Engineering were living in paying guest accommodation and in rented accommodation.

More than half of the students (52.7%) perceived that hostel would be best residence for students and after that own home (43.33%) and negligible percentage of students favoured paying guest accommodation and rented accommodation. While students of Agricultural Engineering and Technology preferred for hostel (64%) and students of College of Home Science (64%) preferred for own home as best residence for students.

Krushkal Wallis H test was applied to see the significant variations of socio personal profile of the

student among three colleges. Significant variations were found in the factors like father's education and occupation, health status of the students, exercise habits among the students of three colleges and academic performance of the students.

It is clear from data depicted in Table 2 that the highest percentage of the students (54.66%) used internet when they felt need. A variation in duration and use of internet by students of different colleges was also significant.

The co-efficient of correlation was applied to see the relationship between socio- personal profile (age and health status) and academic performance of the students.

Age :

The data about relationship of socio personal profile of students with academic performance (Table 3) revealed that age of the students was found non-significant

Table 2: Distribution of students according to their duration of using internet (weekly)							(n =150)
Hrs. per week	Less than 2 hrs. f (%)	2-4 hrs. f (%)	4-6 hrs. f (%)	6-8 hrs. f(%)	8-10 hrs. f(%)	Need based f (%)	Krushkal wallis H value
College of Agril. Engg.	3 (6.0)	4 (8.0)	8 (16.0)	1 (2.0)	4 (8.0)	30(60.0)	
College of H.Sc.	14(28.0)	8 (16.0)	3 (6.0)	7 (14.0)	4 (8.0)	14(28.0)	
College of Agri.	3 (6.0)	5 (10.0)	-	2 (4.0)	2 (4.0)	38(56.0)	
Total	20(13.33)	17(11.33)	11(7.33)	10(6.66)	10(6.66)	82(54.66)	19.2*

* indicates significance of value at P=0.05

as the correlation co-efficient value (0.020) came to be non-significant. There is no relationship between age and academic performance of the students. Ali *et al.* (2013) reported that age had significantly contributed the academic performance of graduate students and contradict findings of present study.

Health status :

A close look at data presented in Table 3 revealed that the co-efficient of correlation came to be 0.205 which was significant at 1 per cent level. This indicated that there was positive correlation between health status and academic performance of the students.

Hershner and Chervin (2014); Bellisle (2004) and Brown (2008) had also reported significant relationship between academic performance and health status of students and thus supported the findings of present study. To see the association between socio- personal factors and academic performance chi- square was applied.

Gender :

As shown in Table 4, the academic performance of the students was non-significantly associated with the gender as indicated by the chi- square value (0.122).

The finding of the present study is supported by Nathuna (2007) who found no association between gender and academic performance. On the other hand, Mlambo (2011) found significant association of gender and academic performance which contradicted the findings of present study.

Order of birth :

As data in Table 4 indicated that order of birth of the students was not associated with the academic performance as the chi-square value was 0.704 which was found to be non-significant.

Onabarniro *et al.* (2010) indicated a significant relationship between later-born adolescents and low academic performance which contradicted the findings of present study.

Family type :

Chi- square value (5.99) given in Table 4 concluded that the academic performance of the students was significantly associated with the type of family.

Family size :

As shown in Table 4 that the academic performance of the students was significantly associated with family size. Sharma and Tahira (2011) also found the significant association between family size and academic performance and which supported the findings of present study.

Family caste :

The findings given in Table 4 indicated that caste had non-significant effect on the academic performance of the students, as indicated by chi- square value (2.603).

Johal (2006) also found that family caste was not significantly associated with academic achievement and supported the findings of present study. While, Uniyal and Shah (1984) contradicted the findings of present study and found significant association between family caste and academic performance.

Father's education :

The data given in Table 4 revealed that the father's education not affected the academic performance of the students. The chi-square value came to be 0.768 which was non-significant indicating no association between

Table 3 : Relationship of socio personal profile of students with academic performance					(n = 150)
	Academic performance				
Personal profile of students	Low f (%)	Medium f (%)	High f (%)	Total f (%)	r value
Age (years)					
20-21	16 (10.66)	44 (29.33)	22(14.6)	82(54.7)	0.020[NS]
22-23	25 (16.66)	36 (23.33)	7 (4.7)	68(45.33)	
Health status					
Good (29-32)	24(16.0)	20(13.33)	13(8.6)	57(37.96)	0.205**
Average (25-28)	13(8.6)	53(35.3)	8(5.3)	74(49.28)	
Poor (21-24)	4(2.7)	7(4.66)	8(5.3)	19(12.65)	

** indicates significance of value at P=0.01   NS=Non-significant

Table 4 : Association of socio-personal factors with academic performance				(n = 150)
	Academic performance			
Personal profile of students	Low f (%)	Medium f (%)	High f (%)	Total f (%)	Chi - square value
Gender					
Male	8(5.33)	31(20.66)	9(6.0)	48(32.0)	0.122[NS]
Female	33 (22.0)	49(32.66)	20(13.33)	102(68.0)	
Order of birth					
First	26(17.33)	42 (28.0)	14(9.33)	82(54.7)	
Second	20(13.33)	27(18.0)	5(3.33)	52(34.7)	0.704[NS]
Third	1 (0.66)	9(6.0)	3(2.0)	13(8.7)	
Fourth	2(1.33)	-	7(0.66)	9(6.0)	
Family type					
Joint	5 (3.33)	19 (12.7)	15(10.0)	39 (26.0)	5.99*
Nuclear	36(24.0)	61 (40.7)	26(17.3)	111 (74.0)	
Family size					
Upto five members	36(23.9)	49(32.63)	20(13.32)	105 (70.0)	6.135*
Above five members	5(3.33)	31(20.64)	9(5.0)	45(30.0)	
Family caste					
SC/ST	3(8.7)	10(6.7)	8(5.33)	21(14.0)	
OBC	12(2.0)	10(6.7)	6(4.0)	28(18.7)	2.603[NS]
General	26(17.33)	60(39.33)	15(3.33)	101(67.33)	
Father's education					
Low	-	-	-	-	
Medium	10(6.7)	22(14.7)	6(4.0)	38(25.33)	0.768[NS]
High	31(20.6)	58(38.7)	23(15.33)	112(74.7)	
Mother's education					
Low	2(1.33)	8(5.33)	1(0.7)	11 (7.33)	
Medium	13(8.7)	38(25.3)	12(8.0)	63 (42.0)	0.067[NS]
High	26(17.3)	34(22.6)	16(10.6)	76(50.6)	
Father's occupation					
Govt. service	12 (8.0)	30(20.0)	16(10.7)	58 (38.7)	
Private service	3(2.0)	14(9.33)	-	17 (11.33)	
Business	9(6.0)	12(8.0)	3(2.0)	24 (16.0)	0.070[NS]
Farming	16(10.7)	24(16.0)	10(6.7)	50 (33.33)	
Labour	1(0.7)	-	-	1 (0.7)	
Mother's occupation					
Govt. service	7(4.7)	16(10.7)	4(2.7)	27 (18.0)	
Private service	-	2(1.33)	-	2 (1.33)	
Housewife	32(21.33)	58(38.7)	22(14.7)	112 (74.7)	0.745[NS]
Self employed	2(1.33)	4(2.7)	3(2.0)	9 (6.0)	
Labour	-	-	-	-	
Daily exercise					
Yes	27 (18.0)	47 (31.33)	7 (4.66)	81 (54.0)	5.56[NS]
No	14 (9.33)	33 (22.0)	22 (14.66)	69 (46.0)	
Residence					
Hostel	25 (16.7)	50 (33.33)	16(10.66)	91 (60.7)	
Paying guest accommodation	-	-	2(1.33)	2(1.33)	2.616[NS]
Rented accommodation	-	3(2.0)	-	3 (2.0)	
Own home	16 (10.7)	27(18.0)	11(7.33)	54 (36.0)	
Stress					
Yes	12 (8.0)	31(20.7)	7(4.7)	50(33.33)	3.61[NS]
No	29(19.33)	49(32.7)	22(14.7)	100(66.6)	
Taking daily meal					
Yes	13(8.66)	27(18.0)	9 (6.0)	49 (32.66)	0.661[NS]
No	28(18.66)	53(35.33)	20(39.33)	101(67.3)	
Use of internet(hrs weekly)					
Less than 2 hours	5(3.33)	5(3.33)	10(6.7)	20(13.33)	
2-4 hours	6(4.0)	4(2.7)	7(4.67)	17(11.33)	
4-6 hours	3(2.0)	4(2.7)	4(2.7)	11(7.33)	19.18**
6-8 hours	4(2.7)	4(2.7)	2(1.33)	10(6.7)	
8-10 hours	4(2.7)	4(2.7)	2(1.33)	10(6.7)	
Need based	19(12.7)	59(39.33)	4(2.7)	82(54.7)	

* and ** indicate significance of values at P=0.05 and 0.01, respectively   NS=Non-significant

academic performance and father's education.

Kohl *et al.* (2000); Nyipir (2006); Tiwari (2002) and Johal (2006) contradicted the findings of present study and found significant association between academic performance and father's education.

Mother's education :

The data given in Table 4 revealed that the mother's education was not affecting the academic performance of the students. The chi-square value came to be 0.067 which was non-significant indicating non-significant association between academic performance of the students and mother's education.

Acharya and Shobhna (2009) and Coulon (2008) found the significant association between academic performance and mother's education and contradicted the findings of this study.

Father's occupation :

It is clear from Table 4 that the association between father's occupation and academic performance of the students found to be non- significant.

Sharma and Tahira (2011); Johal (2006) and Tiwari (2002) contradicted the findings of this study and found association between academic performance and father's occupation.

Mother's occupation :

Perusalof data given in the Table 4 indicated that there was no association between academic performance of the students and mother's occupation.

Daily exercise :

As data in Table 4 indicating that the chi – square value was 5.56 and there was no association observed between academic performance of the students and habit of doing daily exercise among students.

Bellar *et al.* (2014) found significant association between their habit of doing routine exercise and academic performance which contradicted the findings of present study.

Type of residence :

It can be observed from the data given in Table 3 that the chi- square value came to be non - significant. This shows that academic achievement is non-significantly associated with type of accommodation in which students were residing.

Ali *et al.* (2013) and Johal (2006) contradicted the findings of present study and they found significant association between academic performance and kind of residential area.

Stress :

It is clear from Table 4 that non- significant association between academic performance and stress perceived among students.

Khurshid *et al.* (2015) showed that there was negative effect of stress on student's academic performance and contradicted the findings of present study.

Taking daily meal :

As data in Table 4 indicate that chi-square value came to be non-significant. So there was no association between academic performances and taking daily meals.

Use of internet :

The use of internet among the students was significantly associated with the academic performance as the chi-square value came to be 19.18 and it was significant at 1 per cent level of significance. The trend of data in Table 4 showed that six per cent of student who used internet less than two hours had high academic performance.

Kumar and Manjunath (2013), Siraj (2014) and Kim (2011) found that students who were using internet for more hours had high academic performance, it acted as supplement thus supported the findings of present study.

Conclusion and Suggestions:

The socio personal factors affect the academic performance of the students. Significant relationship observed for the factors like family type, family size and duration of using internet. Only nineteen per cent of students had high academic performance, So there is need to motivate the students to achieve high academic performance in their studies so that they can get merit certificate given by the Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana on achievement of 8.00 Overall Credit Point Average.

REFERENCES

Acharya, R. and Shobhna, P. (2009). The influence of parental

education level on achievement motivation of adolescents. Retrievedfrom Error! Hyperlink reference not valid..

Ali, S., Haider, Z., Khan, A. and Ahmed, A. (2013). Factors contributing to the student's academic performance. *J. Edu. Res.,* **8**: 283-289.

Bellar, D., Judge, L. and Peterson, J. (2014). Exercise and academic performance among nursing and kinesiology students at US colleges. *J. Edu. Heal Promot.,* **3**: 9-19.

Bellisle, F. (2004). Effects of diet on behaviour and cognition in children. *British J. Nut.,* **92**(2):227–32.

Coulon, D. (2008). Fathers' impact on their children learning and achievement. Retrieved from

Hershner, S.D. and Chervin, R.D. (2014). Causes and consequences of sleepiness among college students. *Nat. Sci. Sleep.,* **6** : 73–84. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles.

Johal, K. (2006). The factors affecting academic achievement of undergraduate students of PAU, Ludhiana. M.Sc. Thesis, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, India.

Kohl , G., Lengua L. and Mcmohan, R. (2010). Parent involvement in school conceptualizing multiple dimensions and their relations with family and demographic risk factor.*J SchPsycho.,* **l6** : 501–23.

Khurshid, S., Parveen, Q., Yousuf, M.I. and Chaudhry, A.G. (2015). Effects of depression on students' academic performance. *Sci. Int.(Lahore),* **27**(2) : 1619-1624, Retrieved from http://www.sci-int.com/pdf.

Kumar, B.T. Sampath and Manjunath, G. (2013). Internet use and its impact on the academic performance of university teachers and researchers: A comparative study. *Higher Education, Skills & Work-based Learning*, **3** (3) : 219 - 238.

Mlambo, V. (2011). An analysis of some factors affecting student academic performance in an introductory biochemistry course at the University of the West Indies. *J. Edu.,* **1**:79-92.

Nathuna (2007). Gender analysis of academic achievement among high school students.M.Sc. Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, (Karnataka) India.

Nyipir, C. (2006). Factors affecting the performance of pupils in primary schools in paidha town council. Ph.D. Dissertation. Makere University.

Onabarniro, A.A., Ositoye, A.O. and Adeyemi, M. (2010). Influence and relationship of birth order and secondary school students' academic achievement. *Academic Leadership: The Online J.,* **8**(4), no pages listed. 15337812**.**

Tiwari, M.K. (2002). Problems and overall performance of undergraduate agricultural students in relation to their socio-personal characteristics.M.Sc.Thesis, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, India.

Uniyal, M.K. and Shah, B. (1984). Caste and academic achievement of university. *School Cha., 32V2nge,* **14** : 41-44.

Webliography

Brown J. (2008) Impact of school breakfast on children's health and learning. Retrieved from http://*www. sodexofoundation.org*/hunger_us/Images/Impact%20of %20School%20Breakfast%20Study_tcm 150-212606.pdf.

Kim, S. (2011) Effects of internet use on academic achievement and behavioural adjustment among South Korean adolescents. Retrieved from http://*surface.syr.edu.*

http://www.fatherhoodinstitute.org/2013/fatherhood-institute-research.

Sharma, A. and Tahira, H. (2011). The influence of parental education, parental occupation and family size on science achievement of the secondary school students. Retrieved from http://*shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/.pdf.*

Siraj, H. (2014) Internet usage and academic performance. Retrieved from *https://www.academia.edu.*