In the current research titled: Influence of perceived attributes and perceived emotional climate on academic performance of students - An exploratory study. An attempt is made to understand the underpinning thought patterns that may not just accompany but determine academic performance at various level of achievement. The current research study looks in to the role of select non academic cognitive factors namely – explanatory style, mindset, low frustration tolerance, metacognitive awareness, perceived peer empathy and perceived teacher empathy on academic performance of I pre university students in the urban city of Bangalore. The previous chapters have presented the need for the study, the interrelatedness of the independent variables in determining academic performance, the research design used to collect suitable data and the analysis of the resultant data.

The current chapter presents the conclusions drawn from the analysis of the data. The following hypotheses were tested. The research unfolded in two sequential phases, while phase I was exploratory in nature, phase II was experimental in nature. Phase I attempted to study which of the independent variables were significant to academic achievement, while phase II followed an experimental design to test out the effectiveness of the skill building program founded on the proposed model interrelating the variables.

**Phase I:**

1. Hypothesis 1, is rejected owing to highly significant and positive correlation between explanatory style and academic performance. Indicating that a student’s optimistic explanatory style is instrumental in his /her academic performance.

2. Hypothesis 2, is accepted owing to lack of significant correlation between mindset and academic performance. Suggesting that a growth mindset could be irrelevant for sustaining efforts for improving academic performance, especially so in the presence of an optimistic explanatory style.
3. Hypothesis 3, is accepted owing to absence of significant correlation between low frustration tolerance and academic performance. Denoting that high frustration levels do not impinge on academic performance, especially with optimistic explanatory style cushioning its adverse effects.

4. Hypothesis 4, is rejected considering the highly significant and positive correlation between metacognitive awareness and academic performance. Indicating the determining role played by the knowledge and regulation of effective study strategies.

5. Of the four beliefs working in the intrapersonal realm of a student, namely – explanatory style, mindset, low frustration tolerance and metacognitive awareness. Only explanatory style and metacognitive awareness have found to be highly significantly and positively correlated to academic performance. Suggesting that an optimistic explanation bolstered by effective study strategies buffers students against increasing frustration and bypasses the requirement of a growth mindset training which could be a more embedded attitude acquired as a result of hope garnered from an optimistic explanatory style.

6. Hypothesis 5, is rejected, owing to highly significant but negative correlation between perceived peer empathy and academic performance. Suggesting that though empathetic relations with peers could provide an emotional buffer to students. It could be counterproductive to academic performance by being an active source of distraction.

7. Hypothesis 6, is rejected considering the significant and positive correlation between perceived teacher empathy and academic performance. Indicating that a positive appreciation of their academic potential from their teachers bolsters students’ academic performance.

8. Both the components proposed to comprise the emotional climate of academic learning were found to be correlated to academic performance albeit differently. While perceived teacher empathy seems to influence academic performance positively. This relationship is not as strong as compared to perceived peer empathy’s negative influence on academic
performance. Thus having an empathetic teacher may not necessarily always improve academic performance but having many friends does most often impact negatively on one’s academic performance.

9. The proposed model strength of the interconnected predictors accounts for 59.5% of academic performance. Of the individual predictors, explanatory style emerges as the strongest predictor of academic performance. Indicating that irrespective of presence or absence of conducive interpersonal dynamics (perceived teacher and peer empathy) and academic relevant intrapersonal skill (metacognitive awareness) an optimistic explanatory style ensures that academic performance sustains and improves.

10. Considering the above results, when planning a remedial program for improving academic performance. It must be inclusive of assessment and if necessary skill training in optimistic explanatory style.

11. Looking further into purer groups of high academic achievers and low academic achievers. Again, optimistic explanatory style emerges as a significant discriminator followed by perceived teacher empathy, in discriminating high academic achievers from low academic achievers.

12. The high and low academic achievers possess distinct non-academic cognitive profiles. While high academic achievers possess an optimistic explanatory style and their academic efforts have the scaffold of metacognitive awareness. They tend to have more empathetic relationships with their teachers as compared to their peers. Whereas the low academic achievers, are predominantly pessimistic in their explanatory style and are not metacognitively aware of their academic efforts. Also, they do not share empathetic relationship with their teachers and are highly influenced by their peers.
Phase II:

1. Hypothesis 1 is rejected as pre and post skill building program the Optimism scores of the experimental group are not significantly different. It was observed that the program was most effective in raising the scores of individuals who recorded high pessimism. While not much influencing individuals who already possessed healthy optimism levels.

The statistically different pre and post skill building optimism scores of control group indicate the nature of optimism to self-regulate. When, the post control group optimism scores are compared to the statistically different and higher optimism score of the experimental group in post skill building condition. It indicates the effectiveness of the program in raising the mean optimism score by a higher margin and educating individuals in voluntary use of these skills.

2. Hypothesis 2, is partially accepted as pre and post skill building program the mindset scores of the experimental group are not significantly different but the post experimental and control groups are significantly different. While the mindset scores have not increased in the post experimental condition, the program has probably maintained the scores from dipping as seen in the control group.

Perhaps the dip in the control group’s and the no increase in the experimental group’s mindset scores, could be due to the reason that. Mindset is an intrapersonal skill of assessing one’s ability as fixed or growing with effort and is facilitated through communication patterns in the interpersonal context. Through, the content of criticism and praise. Reinforcing the concept of growth mindset would be essential when interacting with concerned adults like parents and teachers and could determine the effectiveness of the skill building program.
3. Hypothesis 3 of phase II, is accepted as there is a very significant difference between pre and post skill building frustration tolerance scores of the experimental group. It could also be indicative of the nature of effectiveness of the program, with the component taught first emerging as the most influential.

Rather, than a simple primacy effect explaining the effectiveness of the program. It can be attributed to the importance of the emotional concerns of an individual requiring addressal before reaching out to the deeply embedded belief system.

4. Hypothesis 4 of phase II, is accepted as there is a significant difference in metacognitive awareness in the experimental group in the post skill building condition as compared to the pre skill building condition. This could be attributed to a simple recency effect or a more strategic understanding of placing the study skill component after the more rigorous training in ‘belief awareness and regulation’ that has already primed participants for metacognitive awareness training.

5. Of the four components taught in skill building program, the first, third and last component namely, frustration tolerance, mindset and metacognitive awareness have been effective in lowering the frustration levels in participants, sustaining their mindset scores from declining and improving their metacognitive awareness of learning strategies. While optimism training has proven effective in cases of participants who were (very) low on optimism in the pre experimental condition, but did not affect participants who had a healthier optimism scores.

6. Hypothesis 5 of phase II, is rejected as there is no significant difference in perceived teacher empathy. The perceived teacher empathy score could tap a more general perception of teachers than being reflective of or accounting for any exceptions. The skill building program does not directly train participants in improving their interpersonal relationships with teachers rather stands on the rationale that when empowered by intrapersonal skill of being aware and regulating one’s belief system
with relation to academics, would ease the stress of academic concerns from straining interpersonal relationships.

7. Hypothesis 6, of phase II is rejected as there is no significant difference in perceived peer empathy. As in the case of perceived teacher empathy, the skill building program did not account for training participants in improving their interpersonal relations with their peers. The researcher worked on the assumption that improving participants’ intrapersonal skills in managing academic issues would alleviate stress regarding academic concerns from related interpersonal relationships. Also considering that peers already share a relationship that allows for discussion of various issues including academic concerns. In the aftermath of the skill building program it was assumed that the peer relationship would improve owing to a better understanding of their academic concerns and also owing to probable disclosures during the skill building program.

8. Hypothesis 5 & 6 of Phase II tested for perception of empathy based constructs. These constructs were thought to be incidental to the effectiveness of the skill building program but the data analysis has revealed that though empathy of a group can be improved owing to nature of the program. To improve the empathetic skills themselves would require direct training in expression (verbal/non-verbal communication skills) of empathy.

9. Hypothesis 7, of phase II is rejected as there is a significant correlation between expectation (of improvement in academic performance owing to participation in the skill building program) and academic performance. The expectation of a change could be working on the motivational level of the participants and facilitating behaviours like attendance, receptivity towards the program and application of the skills learnt in the duration of the program.
10. The academic performance of both the experimental and control group though follow the similar trend of an initial dip in the academic performance and then a steady improvement with highest mean recorded for the final examinations. The control group’s performance does not significantly differ from its initial performance while the experimental group does significantly differ from its initial performance. Thus affirmatively answering the last research question of phase II that the skill building program intending to improve academic performance of the participants does fulfill its intention successfully.