CHAPTER - V
Before attempting a discussion on the results of the present study, it would be worthwhile to recaptitulate the main aims of the study which were as follows:

a) to identify the behavioral correlates of stress;

b) to study the relationship between stress and academic performance;

c) to study stress and academic performance in the context of type of school, sex and class factor;

d) to explore the nature of relationship between
   i. stress and organisational climate and
   ii. academic performance and organisational/ climate.

Nine specific hypotheses relating to the above mentioned aims were set up. The discussion of results is attempted in terms of verification of these hypotheses, and also in terms of other related research findings.
BEHAVIORAL CORRELATES OF STRESS

Factor analyses of the 25 items in the behavior checklist designed to measure stress, yielded eight factors. Thus, 'stress' as measured in the present study, was found to be constituted by eight factors. Hypothesis 1 which stated that, "stress will be constituted by a number of behavioral factors", was thus validated.

The results of the present study corroborate the findings of earlier researchers (Lapouse and Monk 1958; Cox 1978; Davids 1979; Medeiros et al 1983; and Connell 1985), who also held that stress was reflected through a number of behavioral indices. These behavioral indices have been described by them in detail. (the specific factors advanced by each of them have already been mentioned in the review chapter).

The eight, behavioral factors of stress which emerged in the present study, were as follows:

1. **Factor 1** which consisted of the behavioral items - disruptiveness attention seeking, restlessness, destructiveness and hyperactivity was named the *Psychomotor symptoms factor*. The reason behind giving it this specific name was, that all the items included in this factor were representative of motor
or muscular activity, resulting from a psychological cause.

2. **Factor 2** which consisted of anxiety, inability to have fun, depression, lack of interest in the environment and tension was named as the Mental symptoms factor. The reason for attributing this particular name to this factor, was in lieu of the fact that, all the constituent variables reflected states of the mind and therefore the name, mental symptoms factor. Here, there was no motor activity involved as in the case of the earlier factor.

3. **Factor 3** which consisted of the variables, nervousness, lack of self confidence and emotional lebility was named as a the low self-esteem factor. The reason for naming this factor as low self-esteem factor was, that all the component variables were reflective of self doubt and a poor and somewhat negative self-concept, and thus the term low self-esteem, representing a poor opinion of oneself.

4. **Factor 4** which consisted of the variables inattentiveness and shortness of attention span was named as the attention symptoms factor. The reason behind selection of this particular name was, that both the
variables in this factor were indicative of attention deficits and thus the name — attention symptoms factor.

5. **Factor 5** which consisted of the variables thumb sucking, social withdrawal, tics and nail biting was named as the **conversion symptoms factor**. The reason for attributing this particular name to this factor was, that the variables constituting it reflect physical symptoms serving a defensive function, enabling individuals to escape or avoid a stressful situation. Coleman (1976), described conversion reactions as the appearance of some physical illness without any underlying organic pathology.

6. **Factor 6** which consisted of the variables truancy and constant physical ailments was named as the **Withdrawal symptoms factor**. The reason for naming it such was, that both truancy and constant physical ailments were seen as specific attempts to avoid a stressful situation. The withdrawal reaction is described by Coleman (1976), as the attempt made by a child to minimize his anxiety — in effect detaching himself from a seemingly dangerous and hostile world. Thus, since both the constituent variables in the factor reflect specific avoidance attempts to minimize stress, the factor is named as withdrawal
symptoms factor.

7. **Factor 7** which consisted of the variables proneness to become flustered and stuttering was named as the **hostility factor**. Stuttering and stammering, according to experts in the field of psychiatry and psychology (Freedman & Kaplan, 1967) are manifestations of extreme repressed hostility against the loved ones, who in one way or the other have been punitive and domineering in their approach to the child. Hence these two variables together have been named as "Hostility" factor.

8. Factor 8 which consisted of irritability and argumentativeness was named as "**anger symptoms factor**" because both the constituent variables were seen as verbal expressions of anger. Coleman (1976), has also mentioned 'anger' as an important index of stress.

**BEHAVIORAL FACTORS OF STRESS AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE**

There is considerable paucity of research in the area of the behavioral factors of stress in terms of academic performance and thus, the results of the present study in this context cannot be discussed in the light of other research findings.
The results of the regression analysis in terms of each of the eight factors of stress revealed, that only two complete factors namely, attention symptoms factor and anger symptoms factor, were significant predictors of stress. In the remaining 6 factors, only some constituent variables were found to predict academic performance. Thus, hypothesis 2 which stated that "the academic performance of students will vary in terms of each of the identified behavioral factors of stress" was partially validated. For instance, in factor 1 (Psychomotor symptoms factor), the variables restlessness, destructiveness, attention seeking and disruptiveness were found to be significant predictors of academic performance, while the fifth constituent variable, namely, hyperactivity was not found to do so.

In factor 2 (Mental symptoms factor), while the variables lack of interest in the environment, anxiety and tension were found to predict academic performance, the remaining two variables, namely, inability to have fun and depression were not found to affect it.

In factor 3 (low self-esteem factor), only one variable, namely, lack of self confidence was found to predict academic performance. The other two variables in the factor, emotional lability and nervousness were not found to do so.
In factor 5 (conversion symptoms factor), only one constituent variable, namely tics was found to predict academic performance. The remaining three variables in the factor - thumb sucking, nail biting and social withdrawal were not found to be related to it.

In factor 6 (withdrawal symptoms factor), while truancy was found to predict academic performance, constant physical ailments was not found to do so.

In factor 7 (Hostility symptoms factor), while proneness to become flustered was found to predict academic performance, stuttering was not found to do so.

**STRESS INTENSITY**

The analysis of stress intensity scores in terms of type of school, sex and class factors and their interactional effects, revealed very significant findings.

**STRESS INTENSITY AND TYPE OF SCHOOL**

Stress intensity of students was found to vary as a function of the type of school in which they studied. Thus, hypothesis 3a, which stated that "stress intensity will vary as a function of the type of school in which
children study" has been validated. Although there are no research studies which focus on stress in terms of type of school, some studies have demonstrated that the type of school attended influences pupil behavior and outcome. For instance, according to Rutter et al (1979), the characteristics of a school powerfully affect the behavior and achievement of its pupils. Differences between schools in children's achievements and behaviors can be shown to be related to differences in school and classroom characteristics.

Emphasising the importance of school effects on a pupil's outcome, Brookover, Beady, Flood, Schweitzer and Wisenbaker (1979), demonstrated that schools can make a difference. Halsey, Heath and Ridge (1980), found that the type of school attended is enormously consequential, especially for less able children. In the light of the above mentioned studies, it may be said that the findings of the present study in regard to type of school and stress to some extent corroborate their findings.

The mean stress intensity scores in general demonstrated that children of the Government run schools showed greater stress, than children studying in private and aided schools. Specifically, the highest mean stress intensity score was obtained in the Government school,
followed by the N.D.M.C. school and Central school respectively. The lowest mean stress intensity score was obtained in the Missionary school. The statistical differences between the eight types of schools have already been computed and interpreted in the Analysis chapter.

The reasons for the mean stress intensity scores of Government run schools being higher than Private and Aided schools may be explained in terms of some earlier research studies. Earlier studies, which undertook a comparison between Government and Privately managed schools demonstrated, that the input and output of Government and Private schools varied a great deal (Heim and Watts; Sinha, 1980).

Gupta and Sharma (1980), found that adolescents studying in privately managed schools had significantly higher self concept as compared to adolescents in government managed schools.

Ranganathan (1984), in her study on teachers' job satisfaction found that teachers of Government schools reported poor student motivation and poor value ascribed to education by students, as the reasons for their
dissatisfaction with their jobs. Public school teachers in contrast reported good student response and motivation as factors, responsible for their job satisfaction. Thus, this study shows that the nature of students attending these two types of schools, differs considerably.

Sen Gupta and Veeraraghavan (1985) demonstrated that the achievement motivation of Public and Missionary school students was higher than Government school students.

Apart from these differences in regard to school features it may be argued, that children in Government run schools especially the Government School (Delhi Administration) and N.D.M.C. School hail from a poorer socio-economic background than those from the Private schools. Very often, their poor socio-economic condition is a source of stress for them. Colletta (1983), suggested that deprivation in income is one of the key factor in family stress. Also, the contradiction in values between schools and home, could lead to stress in these children.

Brenner (1984), demonstrated that the most severe of the ordinary life stresses faced by children are those which result from being poor.

In addition, most of the children attending Government schools belong to the working class. For children
of the working class, the process of growing up is generally very rapid. They are from a very early age exposed to the stresses and strains of their families and are compelled to participate in them and improve the family's life situation.

According to Elkind (1981), the normal stress of growing up is increased when children are hurried into taking on adult behaviors and responsibilities. He believed that today's middle class parents push their children to grow up too quickly. This creates unnecessary stress, and children often display emotional problems, psychosomatic complaints and appear to be hyperactive or lethargic.

Another finding, which may be useful in interpreting why government run schools display more stress than the private schools is, that the prevalence of child abuse and neglect is found to be a phenomenon of the lower class (Opinions of clinical psychologists and psychiatrists). Thus in the Government school and N.D.M.C. school which cater to the lower class children, there is greater likelihood of there being cases of child abuse than the private schools.

According to Connell (1985), the spectrum of child abuse includes a variety of traumas which children face causing great stress to them.
As for the reason why the Central school children should display more stress than the private schools, I feel, that children studying in Central schools being basically from the middle class are prone to tremendous achievement pressure from their parents right from the elementary school stage, and this thus becomes a source of stress for them. The fact that the lowest stress intensity score was recorded in the Missionary school can be attributed to the nature of the Missionary school selected for the present study. The school although large in terms of the number of children enrolled, had one class teacher and two assistants in all sections of classes I and II, and so the children received good individual attention. Apart from this, there was no pressure of examinations, and the curriculum included an array of activities for children. Also, at the time of admission, one important criterion observed by the school was insistence on educated parents - only children who had educated parents were admitted to the school. These then can be said to be some of the factors contributing to lower stress intensity in the Missionary school.
STRESS INTENSITY AND SEX FACTOR

The results of the present study revealed that boys and girls differed significantly in terms of their stress intensity. Thus, hypothesis 4a which stated that "the intensity of stress will vary as a function of the sex factor" has been validated.

Earlier studies by Julka (1963), in the realm of anxiety and Bisht (1984), in terms of academic stress, demonstrated no sex differences. However, the fact that these studies were conducted on high school students, while the present study focused on primary school children may account for the contrary findings.

Further analysis of sex differences in terms of type of school showed that boys differed significantly from girls only in three schools namely, Government school, Public school and Private management school. In all these three schools, boys showed significantly greater stress intensity than girls. The findings of the present study corroborate the findings of Rutters' studies (1970, 1981), and those of Dunn et al (1981), Hetherington (1980), and Wallerstein and Kelly (1980), wherein boys were found to experience and display more stress than girls.
However, studies by Dale (1969) and Siddiqui and Akhtar (1983), in contrast showed that girls were more anxious than boys. Bisht (1984), also found that girls showed greater institutional stress than boys. The reasons for this contradiction may be because while Dale (1969), and Akhtar (1983), focused on anxiety, the present study focused on stress. Anxiety was only one of the behavioral indicants of stress. Secondly, once again, these studies were based on high school children, while the present study was conducted on primary school children. As for the study by 'Bisht (1984), the focus was only, on institutional stress, while the present study took stress to be a wider concept encompassing all types of social, economic and psychological factors in the family, school, peer group and other environmental situations of the child.

**STRESS INTENSITY AND CLASS FACTOR**

In the context of the present study, children of Class-I and II were not found to differ significantly in terms of their stress intensity. Thus, hypothesis 5a which stated that "stress intensity will vary in terms of children studying in Class I & II, has been rejected. The reason for no difference between students of Class I
and II, despite it being the first exposure of schooling for many of them in Class I, can be attributed to the fact that, the data on their classroom behavior was collected in the last term of the academic year, by which time most of the students of class I had adjusted to the school and settled down to their new life style. Probably, if the data had been collected earlier in the year, there would have been greater intensity of stress in class I students as compared to those of class-II, because school would have been a novel experience in their lives thus impinging strain upon them.

STRESS INTENSITY IN TERMS OF THE INTERACTIONAL EFFECTS BETWEEN TYPE OF SCHOOL, SEX AND CLASS FACTORS:

The interactional effects between type of school and sex, and type of school and class factor respectively, were found to be significant. Thus, hypothesis 6a, which stated that, "stress intensity will vary in terms of the interaction amongst variables such as type of school, sex and class in which the child studies", was partially validated.

The interactional effect between sex and class factors, was however, not found to be significant. Similarly, the interactional effect between type of school, sex and class was also not found to be significant.
In regard to type of school and sex factor, the Aided school, Central school and Missionary school were found to account for the maximum interaction. The effect was somewhat less in other schools.

In regard to type of school and class factor the N.D.M.C. school, and Aided school accounted for the maximum interactional effect. In the remaining schools the interactional effect was somewhat less.

STRESS SYMPTOMS SCORE

As in the case of stress intensity, the analysis of stress symptoms scores in terms of type of school, sex and class factors and their interactional effects, yielded some significant findings.

STRESS SYMPTOMS AND TYPE OF SCHOOL

The eight types of schools were found to differ significantly in terms of their stress symptoms scores. Thus, hypothesis 3b which stated that, "the number of stress symptoms will vary as a function of the type of school in which children study", has been validated.

Although there is no direct research evidence to suggest that type of school as a factor will affect
the number of stress symptoms manifested by students, some studies do emphasize the importance of school characteristics in determining the behavior of students.

For instance Rutter et al (1979), in a study on school influences demonstrated that schools have been found to vary markedly in rates of disruptive behavior and absenteeism, and it has been shown that these variations are systematically related to the characteristics of the schools themselves.

Emphasizing the significance of the school environment, Patterson (1975), held that children developed both positive and negative behaviors in large part because of the environment in which they existed. Mehrabian (1976), suggested that the environment in which a group of children operated had much to do with the presence or absence of disruptive behavior.

Olds (1977), demonstrated that many discipline problems in children could be traced directly to the physical set up the classroom. She further advocated that poorly arranged classrooms were the prime cause of many behavior problems of children.

Marion (1981), contended that unhealthy classrooms characterized by physical and social disorganization led children into many difficult behavior patterns.
Although the above mentioned studies are not in the context of type of school, yet they bring out certain important aspects of schools which influence the behavior of students. These aspects, such as school environment, class rooms, physical and social structure of schools were found to vary a great deal in the eight types of schools studied in the present research. Thus, to some extent the factors suggested by these studies can be said to explain why schools were found to vary in terms of the number of stress symptoms manifested by their respective students.

The mean stress symptoms scores for the eight types of schools showed that once again as in the case of stress intensity scores, the government run schools had higher stress symptoms scores. The Government school followed by the Central school and N.D.M.C. school, in that order respectively, showed higher stress symptoms scores than the remaining schools. The lowest stress symptoms score, as in the case of stress intensity was obtained in the Missionary school. This trend may be due to the fact that Missionary schools make it clear as to what their expectations from students are. Thus children have no confusion about what is expected of them in terms of class work and other out of classroom behaviors. Such clarity is not present in any other school.
The possible reasons for the government run schools showing greater stress in terms of manifestation of symptoms than private schools, can be taken to be the same as have already been discussed in the section on 'stress intensity and type of school'.

STRESS SYMPTOMS AND SEX FACTOR

Boys and girls in the eight types of schools were found to differ significantly in terms of the number of stress symptoms which they manifested. Thus, hypothesis 4-b which stated that, "the number of stress symptoms in children, will vary as a function of sex factor", has been validated.

Although, once again there is no direct research evidence in the past to suggest that, stress reflected in terms of the number of stress symptoms manifested will vary as function of the sex factor, some studies do throw light on sex differences in the expression of certain problem behaviors and stress symptoms. For instance, Verma (1961), found that boys showed significantly more problems than girls specially in aggression, delinquency and non-compliance Treffert (1970), and Schriebman and Koegel (1975), demonstrated that autism occurred 4 to 5 times more frequently in boys than girls.
Solomon (1972), and Getze (1974), demonstrated that the hyperactive syndrome is much more frequent among boys than girls.

Jenkins (1968), in his study on overanxious and withdrawal reactions in children, found that both these reactions are more common in boys than girls.

According to Sheehan (1970), and Steinberg (1975), the incidence of stuttering is more in boys than girls; the ratio being 4 or 5 to 1.

Studies directly in the realm of stress in terms of specific life events (Dunn et al 1981; Hetherington, 1980; and Wallerstein and Kelly 1980), which have already been discussed in an earlier section on "stress intensity and sex factor", also gave evidence of sex difference, and specifically emphasized that boys showed more stress than girls.

In the present study also, in the three schools where the sex differences were significant, boys showed a greater number of stress symptoms than girls. These three schools were the Government school, Public school and Private management school, respectively.

Thus, the present study can be said to corroborate the findings of earlier researches, as has already been highlighted.
STRESS SYMPTOMS AND CLASS FACTOR

The results of the present study showed that the class factor was not found to be significant. Thus, hypothesis 5-b which stated that, "the number of stress symptoms manifested, will vary in terms of children studying in Class I and II" has been rejected.

The possible reason for no significant difference having emerged between Class I and II, has already been explained in the section on "stress intensity and class factor". However, it may be reiterated here, that since the data relating to stress was collected in the final term of the academic year, children of Class I who were expected to otherwise exhibit stress owing to schooling being a novel experience for some of them, had settled down and adjusted to school. Probably, if the data had been collected when children of Class I had just entered school, there would have been evidence for them manifesting more behavior disturbances than children of Class II. It may also be emphasized here, that for children in Private schools, schooling begins at the Kindergarten stage and thus transition to Class I, does not impinge upon them to such an extent, as to cause stress to them. They learn to accept an annual progression in classes.
STRESS SYMPTOMS IN TERMS OF INTERACTIONAL EFFECTS BETWEEN TYPE OF SCHOOL, SEX AND CLASS FACTOR

The interactional effect between type of school and sex factor was found to be significant. The remaining interactional effects, however, were not found to affect the number of stress symptoms manifested by children. Thus hypothesis 6-b which stated that, "the stress symptoms shown will vary in terms of the interaction amongst variables such as type of school, sex and class in which the child studies", was partially validated. The interactional effect between type of school and sex factor was found to be most prominent in the Aided school, and Missionary school. In the remaining schools, the effect was negligible. Probably in the Aided school, and Missionary school, boys and girls are treated with equality, and thus there is less sex typing. Thus, the behavior patterns of both boys and girls are also similar.

STRESS AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

A significant negative relationship between stress and academic performance, was a major finding of the present study. Both in the case of stress intensity scores and stress symptoms scores, a significant negative relationship was obtained. A similar trend was observed in the case of boys and girls in general, too. The obtained
correlation coefficients in the case of both; (i) stress intensity and academic performance and (ii) stress symptoms with academic performance scores were significantly negative.

At the school level, it was found that the correlation coefficients for stress intensity and academic performance scores, and stress symptoms and academic performance scores were significant in only three schools, namely, N.D.M.C. school, Missionary school and Private Management school. In all these three schools the nature and magnitude of relationship between stress and academic performance was significantly negative.

The results of the U test also revealed that the academic performance of stressful students was significantly poorer than the stress free group thereby implying a significant negative relationship between stress and academic performance. Thus hypothesis 8 which stated that, "(a) stress intensity; and (b) the number of stress symptoms will influence the academic performance of children", has been validated. The results of the present study have corroborated the findings of Singh (1967), Shankar and Brar (1973), Srivastava et al (1980), and Lahey (1984), who also in their respective studies, between anxiety and achievement, demonstrated a negative relationship between the two variables.
Some studies in the realm of stress and performance (Anderson 1976; and Srivastava and Naidu 1982) have demonstrated that a curvilinear relationship exists between the two variables. This contradiction in findings from those of the present study can be attributed to the fact, that these studies were conducted in the experimental setting and with secondary school level and college level students, while the present study related stress and academic performance in the educational setting and also focused only on primary school children. Similarly, some studies relating anxiety and academic achievement by Sinha (1966), and Siddiqi and Akhtar (1983), showed a curvilinear relationship between the two variables while some others by Contractor (1981), and Singh and Nigam (1984), demonstrated a positive relationship between them. These contradictions in findings can be attributed to the differences in the subjects under study, differing contexts under which anxiety was evoked and differences in the tools used to measure anxiety.

**ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE**

The academic performance of students was studied in terms of type of school and sex factor, and their interactional effect. The obtained results were as follows:
Academic Performance and Type of School

The type of school attended was found to be significant in affecting the academic performance of students. Thus, hypothesis 9-a which stated that the academic performance of children will vary as a function of type of school, has been validated. Earlier studies, by Sengupta (1984), Samal (1986) and Veeraraghavan and Bhattacharya (1986), also demonstrated the significance of type of school, as a factor in students' achievement. Thus, the present study has corroborated the findings of earlier research in this area.

The mean academic performance scores, revealed that the performance of private schools, namely Private management school, Public school and Missionary school, specifically in that order was better than that of Government run and Aided schools, respectively. The lowest level of academic performance was found in the Government school. The findings of the present study have corroborated the findings of an earlier study by Veeraraghavan and Bhattacharya (1986) wherein, Public school children, and Missionary school children were found to have a better level of academic performance than the Government school children.
Earlier studies by Rao (1978), Opal and Sen (1979) and Veeraraghavan (1983) also demonstrated the significant impact of type of school on academic performance. For instance, Rao (1978) had compared the privately managed school with public and government schools and found the students from the privately managed schools had performed significantly better than students from all other schools. In the present study also, the Private Management school was found to have the highest mean academic performance.

Veeraraghavan (1983) compared the students from Public schools, Government school and Corporation run schools and found that the Public school students not only performed better but also had higher ambitions and more ambitious future plans as compared to students from other schools.

In an unpublished work, Singh (1981), had found certain distinguishing features between the public and government schools which included differences in (a) reliance on text books, (b) political awareness amongst the teachers, (c) extra curricular activities, (d) the socio-economic status of teachers, (e) Parent - teacher Association, (f) leadership training and (g) socio-economic status of students. She had also argued that these differences influenced to a great extent the performance of students,
and as such she concluded that the type of school a student attends has a very significant influence over the performance in class. Thus, the above factors can be taken as possible explanations for better academic performance on the part of Private management and Public school students as compared to the Government school.

**Academic Performance and Sex Factor**

The analysis of academic performance scores in terms of the sex factor showed that boys and girls did not differ significantly. Thus, hypothesis 9-b which stated that, "the academic performance of children will vary as a function of sex factor", has been rejected. Studies, by Veeraraghavan and Bhattacharya (1986) and the results of the 1986-1987 C.B.S.E. examinations for classes 10 and 12 respectively, showed that girls performed better than boys. In the present study however, this trend was not obtained. This may be attributed to the fact, that while the study by Veeraghavan and Bhattacharya (1986) and the C.B.S.E. results were based on high school students, the present study dealt with academic performance scores of class I and II children. Probably at this tender age children are still not completely socialized into sex-typed attitudes and behavior.
and secondly, the pressure to achieve is also not completely built up. These factors thus, can account for, there being no difference in the academic performance of boys and girls.

**ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE AND STRESS**

The results of the present study revealed that in general, the organisational climate of the school was not related to stress in children. The specific analysis of students' stress in terms of the group behavior characteristics of teachers also showed an insignificant relationship. However, both stress intensity and stress symptoms scores were found to be significantly related to the organisational climate measured specifically in terms of leadership characteristics offered by teachers. Thus hypothesis 7 which stated that, "(a) stress intensity; and (b) number of stress symptoms will be a function of the organisational climate", has been partly validated. Although, there are no research studies which relate school organisational climate in general with students' stress, some researchers like Patterson (1975); Mehrabian (1976), Olds (1977), and Marion (1981), have emphasized the importance of the school environment in determining the behavior problems of children. However, these studies have focused more on
the physical environment of schools and classroom, which is only one facet of the total organisational climate of a school, and thus the contradiction in findings from those of the present study.

Brookover et al (1979) and Rutter et al (1979) demonstrated that, school climate or ethos to a large extent determines pupil behavior and outcome. However, these studies talked about pupil behavior and outcome in general and did not specifically think of them in terms of stress. This once again explains why the same results were not obtained in the present study, which specifically related stress in children to the general school organisational climate.

The reasons for the school organisational climate, measured in terms of the group behavior characteristics of teachers, not being related to stress in children especially at the Class-I and II levels are that in most schools students are taught all the subjects or at least most of the subjects by a single teacher. These children are thus pre-occupied with their relationship vis-a-vis their own teacher. Secondly, they are too young to be sensitive to the socio-political climate of the school and know the friendship patterns among various teachers. They are instead more involved with their own friends and peers.
The finding that school organisational climate, specifically measured in terms of leadership behavior of teachers, being related to stress in children is not surprising either and can be attributed to the fact that primary school children regard teachers as their surrogate mothers. Thus the manner in which they are handled by their teachers as has been emphasized by Connell (1985), greatly influences their liking/disliking the school and their adjustment to it.

Rutter (1980), recognizing the significance of the leadership role of the teacher vis-a-vis the primary school child has emphasized the importance of teachers themselves being good models of behavior being skilled in controlling group interaction and functioning cohesively with other faculty members.

ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

The correlational analysis between school organisational climate and academic performance revealed that the two variables were not in any way related. The specific analysis of school organisational climate measured as group characteristics of teachers, and leadership behavior of principals in terms of academic performance, also showed no evidence of any relationship. Thus hypothesis 9-c which stated that, "the academic performance of children
will vary as a function of organisational climate", has been rejected. The findings of the present study corroborate the findings of some earlier studies. For example Sterling (1977), in a study of the relationship between teacher perception of elementary school organisational climate and student achievement, found that there was no significant relationship between the two variables.

Haggard (1982), in his study noticed a weak to moderate relationship between school climate and students' achievement. Whitaker (1982), and Rier Franklin (1983), also demonstrated that school climate was not strictly a determinant of students' academic achievement.

In contrast, Pillai (1973) found that organisational climate was positively related to pupils' performance. Pillai's study was based on high school students and this is probably the reason why his findings differ from those of the present study.

Martin (1983), demonstrated that differential organisational climates led to differential achievements in Mathematics. The contradiction in findings here vis-a-vis the present study can probably be attributed to the fact that while Martin's study deals specifically with
achievement in mathematics, the present study dealt with the overall academic performance of students.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Thus, while some research has been conducted in the area of stress, and its relationship with performance has also been studied, the present study has emerged with some novel and significant findings. Firstly, it has clearly identified eight behavioral factors, indicative of stress in children attending normal schools. Then, it has demonstrated the relationship of each of the eight identified factors of stress with academic performance.

The phenomenon of 'stress' both in terms of its intensity and number of symptoms manifested has been highlighted. The degree to which stress differs in terms of type of school, sex and class factors and their interactional effects has also been highlighted.

Further, the nature of the relationship between stress and academic performance has been established.

The relationships between stress and organisational climate and academic performance have also been demonstrated.

Apart from this, the findings of many earlier studies in the context of academic performance varying
as a function of type of school and sex factor have also been either corroborated or refuted, through the findings of the present study.

Thus, the present study has contributed significantly to the existing theories and literature in the realm of stress in schools, relating the same to academic performance and organisational climate. The study has been able to make a valuable contribution in identifying the factors of stress as well as demonstrating which of the variables constituting the factors affect academic performance. The study has also been able to corroborate and substantiate the findings related to sex dichotomy and stress related and academic performance related factors. Time and again, the performance of certain types of schools has been highlighted, and the rush for admission to these schools has drawn the attention of the public and academicians. The present study, by clearly delineating the contribution of type of schools to stress and academic performance has indicated what type a school should be so that it has the lowest stress and the most favourable organisational climate so as to facilitate the teaching-learning process and be more beneficial to children and the public.