CHAPTER V
RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results related to testing of hypotheses 5, 6 and 7 have been presented in this chapter under two sections:

Section I  Multiple Regression

Section II  t-Ratios-Comparison of High and Low Stress Groups

SECTION – I

5.1 MULTIPLE REGRESSION

An attempt in this section has been made to ascertain the predictive efficiency of independent variables of Coping Strategies, Parental Attachment and Social Support (singularly and conjointly) for the criterion variable of Academic Stress. This was accomplished also to decipher the variables, which conjointly best predict Academic Stress. Results obtained through step up regressional analysis led to the testing of the hypotheses no 5 and 6 (chapter I, page 51) which are being reproduced here for ready reference

5. Coping strategies, Parental Attachment and Social Support are differential predictors of adolescent’s Academic Stress.

6. The conjoint contribution due to the independent variables of Coping Strategies, Parental Attachment and Social Support towards adolescent’s academic stress is higher as compared to their three respective contribution when taken singularly.

The independent variables of Coping Strategies included Problem Focused and Emotion Focused coping strategies along with eight sub-variables (coping behaviors) namely, Confrontive Coping, Planful Problem Solving, Distancing, Self-Controlling, Seeking Social Support, Accepting
Responsibility, Escape Avoidance and Positive reappraisal; there were four sub-variables of **Parental Attachment** namely, Parental Trust, Parental Communication, Parental Alienation plus Total Parental Attachment; Social Support constituted three measures namely, Number of Support, Satisfaction with Support and Total Social Support. Thus by involving a total of seventeen variables as independent variables in the step up regression equation, certain models were formulated by keeping in view the guiding principles that: (1) Only those independent variables will be included which either showed significant value of product moment correlation in the bivariate analysis or/and constellated with the criterion variable of Academic Stress in the in general factor or/and group factors in the Factor Analysis (2) the variable which had the strongest positive or negative correlation with the dependent variable, was to be entered first followed by other variable in the descending values of ‘r’ in the model; (3) if the addition of a certain variable or a sub variable did not significantly add up the contributory variance towards criterion variable, it was deleted from further models. Emotion Focused coping and Problem Focused coping strategies were included in the models with a view to get more meaningful picture as stated by **Folkman and Lazarus (1988)**, for examining their contribution towards academic stress.

In the light of these guidelines seven models as described and discussed below were considered in order to examine the variance of independent variables taken singularly and conjointly towards the criterion variable of academic stress. First of all Emotion Focused Coping was taken in Model I because of its highest value of correlation (‘r’=.524) (out of all the variables under consideration) with Academic Stress. Discussion has been taken up along with each model. All these models have been presented in table 5.1.1.
Table 5.1.1
Multiple Regressions Between Various Variables of coping strategies, Parental attachment and Social support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R2Change</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>EF</td>
<td>r=.524</td>
<td>263.742**</td>
<td>r2=.275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>EF+CSS</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>146.224**</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>21.100**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>EF+CSS+CPP</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>104.768**</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>15.750**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>EF+CSS+CPP+CEA</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>81.850**</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>9.265**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>EF+CSS+CPP+CEA+CDG</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>68.33**</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>10.014**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>EF+CSS+CPP+CEA+CDG+PATOT</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>59.067**</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>8.862**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>EF+CSS+CPP+CEA+CDG+PATOT+CPR</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>51.627**</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>4.958*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>CSS+CPP+CEA+CDG+PATOT+CPR+CSC</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>52.686**</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>4.870*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model I:** Table 4.4.1 shows as to how much variance was contributed for by Emotion Focused strategy taken singularly towards the criterion variable of Academic Stress. The value of r between Emotion Focused and Academic Stress is .524, which is significant at .01 level, thereby showing higher the use of Emotion Focused Coping Strategies higher is the Academic Stress. The value of R2 was found to be .275, which shows that the variable of Emotion Focused coping accounts for 27.5% of variance towards the criterion variable of Academic Stress, i.e. 27.5% of differences in the
Academic Stress can be attributed to the difference in Emotion Focused coping strategies.

**Model II:** Model II was architected to show how much variance the criterion variable of Academic stress was accounted for conjointly by Emotion focused Coping and Seeking social support Coping. Values of R2 and R2 change were found to be .296 and .021 respectively, indicating that 29.6% of variance was contributed due to conjoint variance of Emotion Focused and Seeking social support in predicting Academic Stress of adolescents. Both these values are statistically significant.

It may be recalled that the coefficient of correlation between Emotion Focused Coping Strategy and Seeking Social Support taken separately with Academic Stress was .524 and .477 respectively. Seeking Social Support Coping also emerged with positive significant loading of the order of .687 on original Factor I with Academic Stress.

**Model III:** In this Model, the predictability of the three Coping Strategies, namely Emotion Focused, Seeking social support and Planful problem solving coping was examined for the criterion variable of Academic Stress. Planful problem solving coping was added to the previous model II because of its significant correlation with Academic Stress(r=-.078) and its structuring with Academic stress in Factor Analysis (Factor II, III, IV and V). Values of R2 and R2 change were found to be .311 and .016 respectively. This means that 31.1% of variance can be explained by the was conjoint effect of Emotion Focused, Seeking social support and Planful problem solving in predicting academic stress of adolescents. This change is significantly higher as compared to the efficiency of two coping variables of Emotion Focused and Seeking social support coping behavior included in model III.
**Model IV:** In the Model IV, the predictive efficiency towards Academic Stress is seen when the variable Escape avoidance is added to the variables of Emotion Focused, Seeking social support and Planful problem solving. With the stepping up of this variable, the multiple R was boosted from .311 to .321. Proportion of variance (R2) of the criterion measure is 0.09 i.e. 9%.

F test shows that for the criterion measure of Academic Stress, the predictive efficiency of Escape avoidance when added to Model IV is significant at .01 level (F change=9.265). It is may be recalled that the variable of Escape avoidance showed a significant correlation of .442 with academic stress. In Factor Analysis, it showed significant loadings of .679 along with Academic Stress on Factor I.

**Model V:** Addition of variable of Distancing to the regression Model IV has resulted into an increase in the value of R2 from .321 to .330.

The weighted combination of the variables Emotion Focused coping, Seeking social support, Planful problem solving, Escape avoidance and Distancing predicts 33% of the criterion variance which shows an increase of .010 from the value predicted in the Model III. F test confirms significant increase at .01 level.

The variable of Distancing coping had a significant correlation with academic stress (‘r’=.419), and also shared significant loadings with Academic Stress on Factor I and IV (loadings=.702 and .305 respectively).

**Model VI:** Increment of the variable of Total Parental Attachment was made to the a cluster of variables in Model V because of its significant correlation (-.089) with Academic Stress and having commonality, that is (.935) significant loadings with Academic Stress in the original Factor.
II. Addition of Parental Attachment in this Model VI, to five variables in Model V, namely Emotion Focused strategy, Seeking Social Support, Planful Problem Solving, Escape Avoidance and Distancing boosted the value of R² from .330 to .339. The increase is to the tune of .008. The value of F (8.862), for the increase is significant at .01 level. The total variance predicted by this model is 33.9%.

Model VII: Regression Model VII presents the conjoint contribution of seven variables of Emotion Focused coping, Seeking social support, Planful problem solving, Escape avoidance, Distancing, Total Parental Attachment and Positive reappraisal for determining their predictability of criterion variable i.e. Academic Stress. With the accumulation of the variable of Positive reappraisal, (which showed the significant loadings of .552 and .332 with Academic Stress on Factors I and IV respectively), to the six variables in Model VI, the R² has been raised from .339 to .343.

The value of R² change indicates that Positive reappraisal has significantly added to the prediction of Academic Stress (at .05 level).

Model VIII: In this Model, conjoint predictive efficiency of Self-controlling, along with the seven variables included in the Model VII above, was examined for the criterion variable of academic stress. This variable showed a significant correlation of .390 with Academic stress at .01 level. It constellated with Academic Stress with significant loadings of .709 on original Factor I.

With the stepping up of the variable of Self-controlling, R² was boosted from .343 to .348. In other words 5% variance out of total 34.8% was contributed to the criterion variable of Academic stress by Self-controlling to the previous model.
It is seen from these results that out of a total of seventeen variables taken for regression analysis, only eight significantly predicted the criterion variable of Academic Stress. Out of these eight, seven were those of Coping Strategies and eighth was Parental Attachment (totals). Seven Coping strategies include Seeking Social Support, Planful Problem Solving, Escape Avoidance, Distancing, Positive Reappraisal Self-Controlling and Emotion Focused (totals); Planful Problem Solving is a Problem Focused coping strategy whereas the rest belong to the Emotion Focused Coping. Social Support was conspicuous by its absence from the effective predictors (Models).

Academic Stress is a mental stress with respect to some anticipated frustration associated with academic failure, anticipation of such failure or even the awareness of possibility of such failure (Gupta and Khan, 1987). It is characterized by Academic frustration on account of large curriculum, inability to perform up to parental expectations, lowered self-esteem and self-confidence due to parent, teacher or peer rejection. It also includes academic anxiety related to frequency and nature of examinations, heavy curricular demands, fear of poor performance and over expectations of parents and teachers. Further it consists of academic conflict in relation to hours of study, methods of study, choice of subjects and seriousness of efforts. Added to these factors, adolescents these days are expected to synthesize large amounts of information at a much-accelerated rate as compared to earlier times (Patri, 1988).

In such situations of academic conflict, results of the present study clearly indicates that Coping can help a person under stress through the development of a more hyperactive set of strategies. The use of Emotion Focused Coping strategies, which in an attempt to reduce disturbing emotions
and stresses, invariably further accelerates the emotional disturbance associated with academic stress. This seems to explain significant predictability of Emotion Focused coping strategies for Academic Stress. This type of coping behavior, when used by adolescents, becomes instrumental in continuance of stress. The concern to manage one’s emotions, rather than focusing on the source of stress, it seems does not solve the problem. In fact the dominant use of Emotion Focused strategies among adolescents to overcome Academic Stress leads to furtherance of greater stress and this vicious circle continues till steps are taken to alter stress. Carver et al (1989) also stated that the experience of emotional distress has a particular influence on the use of palliative and disengagement coping strategies. They further argue that although intended to alleviate stress, focusing on emotions over time may exacerbate distress. Results of the present study also fall in line with the studies of Kaplan, Samuel and Struthers (2000), Anuradha (2001) and Wan & Yeh (2005) who all found and opined that Emotion Focused coping strategy significantly increased with the increase of stress. They also stated Academic stress is reduced only if an individual works hard and tries to make use of planful problem solving.

The following conclusions may be drawn from the above results:

(i) Emotion Focused Coping Strategy, when taken singularly accounted for 27.5% towards predicting Academic Stress. The addition of more variables in different models accounted for 29.6%, 31.1%, 32.1%, 33%, 33.9%, and 34.3% variance respectively, thereby explaining in all 34.8% variance for the criterion variable of Academic Stress.

(ii) Out of the total seventeen variables and sub-variables considered for the present study, only eight namely, Emotion Focused (totals), Seeking social support, Planful problem solving, Escape avoidance, Distancing, Positive reappraisal, Self-controlling and Total Parental
Attachment came out to be significant predictors of the criterion variable of Academic stress. The sub-variables of Parental Attachment and Social support did not emerge as effective predictors of the criterion variable of Academic stress.

On the basis of these results the hypotheses no.5 i.e.:

“Coping strategies, Parental attachment and Social Support are differential predictors of adolescent’s Academic Stress.” may be accepted.

(iii) The predictive efficiency of Emotion Focused Coping was greatest for Academic Stress. This was followed by the conjoint predictability of coping behavior and Parental Attachment (Model VI). The conjoint contribution of eight variables, namely Seeking social support, Planful problem solving, Escape avoidance, Distancing, Total Parental Attachment, Positive reappraisal, Self controlling accounted for 34.8% of the variance towards criterion variable of Academic stress, which means that the rest 65.2%, explained by the variables other than taken into account in the present investigation.

(iv) The total percentage of variance attributed by the conjoint effect of all eight variables namely Emotion Focused coping, Seeking social support, Planful problem solving, Escape avoidance, Distancing, Total Parental attachment, positive reappraisal and Self-controlling for prediction of Academic Stress is higher than their separate contribution towards Academic Stress.

On the strength of the above results, hypothesis no. 5 i.e.

“The conjoint contribution due to the independent variables of Coping Strategies, Parental Attachment and Social Support towards adolescent’s Academic Stress is higher as compared to their respective contribution when taken singularly.” may be accepted.
SECTION II

5.2 t-RATIOS - COMPARISON OF HIGH AND LOW STRESS GROUPS

The statistical analysis undertaken and presented in the previous three sections of this chapter pertain to the whole sample of this study. In this section, the significance of differences between means (t-ratios) were worked out between the extreme groups that is high and low academic stressed groups on various measures of Coping Strategies, Parental Attachment and Social Support. Top 27 percent and bottom 27 percent cases (Kelley’s, 1939 criterion) on the basis of academic stress (totals) were identified as the high and low extreme groups respectively. The position of these extreme groups (high and low groups) was checked on the measures of (a) Coping strategies that is Problem Focused coping and its constituents, namely Confrontive coping and Planful problem solving and Emotion Focused Coping strategy with its six sub-variables, namely Distancing, Self-controlling, Seeking social support, Accepting responsibility, Escape avoidance and Positive reappraisal. (b) Parental attachment and its three sub-variables namely Parental trust, Parental communication and Parental alienation and (c) Social support with its two sub variables i.e. Number of support and Satisfaction with social support.

These analyses led to test the relevant hypothesis no 7, ‘High and low stressed adolescents differ significantly on Coping Strategies, Parental Attachment and Social Support’

The value of t ratios along with the means and standard deviations of high and low groups on all the variables as stated above, are shown in the tables below:
5.2.1: Coping Strategies

The result showing t-ratios along with the means of high and low stress group on Coping Strategies are shown in the table below.

Table: 5.2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategies</th>
<th>Stress Levels</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t-Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confrontive Coping</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>3.957</td>
<td>3.283**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>3.290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planful Problem Solving</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>2.426</td>
<td>2.658**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>2.657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Focused</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>5.274</td>
<td>.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>23.28</td>
<td>5.210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distancing</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>2.721</td>
<td>11.905**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>3.114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Controlling</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>9.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>4.058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking Social Support</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>3.072</td>
<td>11.782**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>13.70</td>
<td>3.685</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting Responsibility</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>2.311</td>
<td>6.974**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape Avoidance</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>2.790</td>
<td>11.207**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>4.467</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Reappraisal</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>2.782</td>
<td>9.502**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>15.08</td>
<td>4.437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Focused</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>58.06</td>
<td>12.305</td>
<td>13.016**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>78.29</td>
<td>17.485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level,
* Significant at .05 level
The comparison of the means on Problem focused strategies between high and low stressed groups on academic stress have been shown diagrammatically in figure 5.1.1
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**Figure 5.2.1: Problem Focused Coping Strategies in High and Low Academic Stress**

(a) **Problem Focused Coping Strategy**: Table 5.1.1 reveals significant statistical differences (.01 level) between the means of high and low stressed adolescents (t=3.283) in the use of Confrontive coping strategy. Comparison of values of means of both groups show that Confrontive coping was used more by the high stressed groups (M=11.45), as compared to the low stressed groups (M=10.20). It means high stressed groups, when stressed, becomes more assertive often involving anger to change the stressful situation. Some degree of hostility and risk taking is also involved in the anger. Findings of the high stressed groups resorting to the use of Confrontive coping are somewhat similar to those of Folkman and Lazarus (1988) who reported unsatisfactory outcome with the use of Confrontive coping. During adolescence, students are already under stress and strain due to rapid growth and changes occurring to them because of growth process. This is the age
when adolescent tries to be assertive in attempt to establish self-identity. When high stressed group of adolescent is faced with Academic Stress, the assertiveness and risk taking seems to increase and hence the use of Confrontive coping strategy.

Mean differences between high and low groups on academic stress in the use of Planful problem solving were also significant at .01 level (t=2.658). Values of means of high (M=11.87) and low groups (M=12.56), when compared, are in favor of the low stressed groups. In other words, the low stressed group more often makes use of this strategy. As different from Confrontive coping, which involves anger and hostility, in the Planful Problem Solving, a person comes up with action, thinks of available or possible ways to solve the problem. It seems that the low stressed adolescents, because of less emotional disturbance of Academic stress keep their mind more balanced and cool, which helps them in planning their actions better than those who are extremely high stressed. Research indicates that active coping strategies, such as planful problem solving are associated with good adjustment to stressful situations. These results are in congruence with those reported by Holahan & Moos (1987); DeGrauw & Norcross (1989); Terry & Hynes (1998).

Both Confrontive Coping and Planful Problem are sub-variables of Problem Focused Coping. Results clearly show that Planful Problem Solving is used more when stress is low, confrontive coping is more frequently employed when the Academic Stress is high. As regards the Total Problem Focused Strategy as a whole is concerned, it did not show significant difference between the means of high (M=23.28) and low (M=22.76) academically stressed adolescents. However high stressed group has an edge over the low stressed group on this coping behavior. The differences of means
of Problem Focused Coping clearly seem to be related to levels of distress. Similar results were reported in studies by Folkman and Lazarus (1980).

The comparative means of high and low stressed groups on Emotion Focused Coping strategies have been diagrammatically shown in figure 5.2.2
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**Figure 5.2.2: Emotion Focused Coping Strategies in High and Low Academic Stress**

**(b) Emotion Focused Coping Strategy**

Means on Distancing coping differed significantly between high and low groups of academic stress. The values of t came to be 11.905, which is significant at .01 level. The value of mean is in favor of high stress groups (M=12.58) that is distancing that is shirking from the situation as a coping strategy is more often used by adolescents under high academic stress than low group (M=9.02). High stress is characterized by anxiety, aggression, and fatigue, low self esteem, depression, tension, emotional outbursts etc; probably on account of this, one tries to shirk away from stress rather than
focusing on the academic problems. Results lead to state that under high academic Stress as compared to low stress, an attempt is made to meet stress by distancing oneself away to a greater degree from the stressful situation, go along with fate, instead of thinking about the problem, and shirk away from the whole situation. This may not help in removal of stress, although it may give temporary relief. Distancing could even cause an unfavorable outcome, for example, use of this form of coping is not favored, when one should instead be attending to the problem (Katz, Weiner, Gallagher, & Hellman, 1970).

**Self-controlling coping** strategy differed significantly in high and low academic stress with $t=9.01$ which is significant at .01 level. Value of means for this coping behavior is greater in high (M=13.28) academic stress stressed group as compared to the low stressed group (M=10.09). High stress is characterized by excessive concern about errors, in addition to high parental and social expectation, which leads to depression in adolescents. They feel frustrated and are overpowered by the feeling of guilt no matter how well they perform (Lajoie and Shore, 1981). With concerns about their results, many adolescents feel that they are loved only for their grades and abilities and as a result they do not allow themselves to fail or make mistakes. When they do make mistakes, they are overpowered by the feeling of guilt, which in some cases leads to suicide. Adolescents under high group of stress tend to cope with these depressive feelings by employing more Self-controlling coping strategies than those low on stress. Self-controlling coping is the attempt to modulate one’s feeling in response to the stressor by trying not to express oneself, keeping feelings to oneself and not let others know the gravity of the situation. It is used more in times of high stress to keep the feelings of stress under wraps, than by letting everybody know about it.
The difference in the means of **Seeking social support** is significant between high (M=3.70) and low groups (M=9.61) on academic stress. Value of $t=11.782$, is significant at .01 level. The results suggest that seeking of social support is more when the stress is high. In stressful encounters related to academics, adolescent may use social support, even if it is a threat to their self-esteem. High stress group is more prone to use social support to get refuge or simply to win sympathy and cry so as to say on somebody’s shoulders. The type of support may or may not fit the need inputs required to meet the stress, but at least it serves as an emotional solace.

Means on **Accepting responsibility** differed significantly between high (M=9.29) and low groups (M=7.29) on academic stress. The t-ratio equal to 6.974 is significant at .01 level. This strategy is more in use when the stress is high. Academic pressures mount during high school, particularly the last two years (the present sample belongs to class twelve). A very serious stress is here posed by the examination and misinformed educational and vocational choice, resulting in waste of resources and frustrating experiences (Omizo and Suzuki, 1988). High stress is connected with such problems and adolescents accept responsibility for these frustrating experiences and blame themselves for the associated problems. Accepting responsibility is typified by acknowledging one’s role in the problem and criticizing or lecturing oneself for bringing on the problem and promising oneself that things would be different next time. Whereas low stress is set apart by absence of such problems.

The difference in the means on **Escape avoidance**, are significant ($t=11.207$) at .01 level. There is significant difference in the use of Escape Avoidance between the means of high (M=14.37) and low groups (M=10.08) on academic stress, with use of Escape Avoidance being more when the stress was also high. High stress leads to cognitive effects such as inability to make decisions, lack of concentration, frequent forgetfulness and mental blocks.
Such impaired thinking may lead to poor productivity, which may further lead an individual to try to escape the problem by avoiding it. This strategy includes wishful thinking that the situation would go away and somehow be overwith. The behavior efforts to escape or avoid situation in this type of coping is through eating, drinking, smoking, using drugs or medications. This type of coping infact increases stress rather than decreasing it. If students face unbearable stress it might disallow them to think clearly, thus, they may get involved with unhealthy behavior and promote avoidance. Whereas when faced with low stress individual is in a position to think clearly what is right or wrong and may avoid such type of behavior.

The coping strategy of Positive reappraisal differed significantly between high (M=15.08) and low groups (M=11.04) on academic stress. The value of t is 9.302, which is significant at .01 level. The results show that Positive reappraisal is used more when the stress is high. Academically high stressed adolescents on the other hand, have high academic burden, conflicts, frustration and anxiety. Their sources of stress are problems of curriculum load, scarcity of leisure time, fear of examinations, which is constantly reinforced by teachers and parents (Chadha and Sahni, 1988; Verma and Gupta, 1990; Malhotra, 1999). High stress groups make more use of Positive reappraisal than low stress groups. Positive reappraisal describes efforts to create positive meaning by focusing on personal growth. It has a religious tone. Adolescents pray, try to change something about themselves in their attempt to lower their stress. This type of coping it seems acts as a lever to release stress for sometime relieving the adolescents for a while.

On Emotion Focused Coping (totals), mean scores of high and low stressed groups are 78.29 and 58.06 respectively. The difference yielded a t-value equal to 13.016, which is significant at .01 level. It implies that use of Emotion Focused Coping is more, among adolescents in groups with high levels of stress as compared to low stressed group adolescents. In other words students, who are highly stressed, tend to focus on emotional concerns rather than the problem to relieve the emotional impact of stress (Monat and
Lazarus, 1985). High stress makes it unbearable for students to think clearly and hence they may either get involved with unhealthy coping behaviors or may promote avoidance. These are apt to be mainly palliative in the sense that such strategies of coping do not actually alter the threatening or damaging conditions but make the person feel better (Monat and Lazarus, 1985).

Difference between high and low Academic stress on Problem Focused Coping (totals) and Emotion Focused Coping (totals) at a glance can be seen in Figure 5.2.3
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In the light of the above results it can be concluded that:

(i) A mixed picture of differences between high and low groups on Academic stress emerges on sub-variables of Problem focused Coping, with adolescents using more of confrontive coping during high stress and more of planful problem solving during low stress, vis-a-vis their counterpart groups.

(ii) No significant differences were found between mean scores of high and low groups on Problem Focused Coping, taken as a whole. Values of means however were in favor of high stress group.
(iii) Higher is the academic stress greater is the use of Emotion Focused coping strategies. Adolescents in the high group on academic stress are characterized by significantly greater use of Emotion Focused Coping including Distancing, Self-Controlling, Seeking Social Support, Accepting Responsibility, Escape Avoidance, Positive Reappraisal and Emotion Focused (totals) when compared to low stressed group of Adolescents on Academic Stress.

Based on the above results the hypothesis no 7, “High and low stressed adolescents differ significantly on Coping Strategies” stands accepted.

5.2.2: Parental Attachment

Results pertaining to differences between means of parental attachment as perceived by adolescents having high and low stress has been presented in table 5.2.2.

Table 5.2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Attachment</th>
<th>Stress Levels</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t-Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>37.22</td>
<td>5.585</td>
<td>2.847**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>35.46</td>
<td>6.480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>37.15</td>
<td>5.203</td>
<td>3.224**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>6.257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienation</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>4.190</td>
<td>1.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>3.654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>110.07</td>
<td>14.088</td>
<td>2.952*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>105.36</td>
<td>16.972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
*Significant at .05 level
The comparisons of means on the variable of Parental Attachment and its sub-variables, namely Trust, Communication, and Alienation, have been shown diagrammatically in figure 5.2.4.
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**Figure 5.2.4: Parental Attachment in High and Low levels of Stress**

Comparison of the means entered in Table 5.2.2, reveal that Parental Trust is higher when the stress is low. The mean differences of Parental trust between high (M=35.46) and low (37.22) stressed groups on Academic stress are significant at .01 level. Low stressed group outperform high stressed groups in trusting parents. In other words, higher the stress, lower is the trust between parents and adolescents. Under lower levels of stress when adolescent does not have conflicts, frustrations or anxieties, he is able to have strong and secure relationship with parents. Trust can be defined as the secure feelings and beliefs that another person will fulfill certain needs (Armsdern & Greenberg, 1987). Trust is a product of strong relationships, specifically those in which relationship partners feel that they can depend upon one another.
A representation of the ability to trust the attachment figure exists because of positive past situations related to trust. Low stress group tends to relying on parents, feeling that they are always there in times of stress, to overcome the stressful situation effectively. On the contrary, under high stress, adolescent with fear of academic failure and frustrations, with low self concept and inadequate social skills, tend to distrust parental relationship leading to alienation and isolation (Polki, 2001). Under such a situation, parents may also feel helpless. Thus trust, which is a component of a strong relationship between children and their attachment figures, is likely to be a casualty. The secure base phenomenon in parental trust, which emphasizes the knowledge of availability of the attachment figure in times of need, is shattered.

When tested for significance, the mean difference between high (35.25) and low (37.15) stress groups on Parental Communication, submitted a t-ratio of 3.224, which is significant at .01 level. Comparison of values of means indicate that Communication is more during periods of low stress. Segrin and Flora (2005) say that reciprocity, which is defined as mutual communication exchanges, that is knowingly available, that occurs in a harmonious fashion, are aspects of communication that help create strong emotional bonds between parents and children. These bonds are more prominent during times of low stress. Moreover, these strong parent-child relationship exchanges are important throughout life. Adolescents seek proximity and comfort in the form of advice when they feel it is needed (Hazan & Shaver, 1994; Schneider & Younger, 1996). Under high academic stress, when adolescent is anxiety ridden, he/she may come into conflict with parents and teachers, not being able to come up to their expectation, leads to decrease in communication between adolescent and
parents. Decrease in communication may also further add to the stress. Greater is the academic stress, academic frustrations and failures, less is the trust that parents are dependable, that communicating with parents can help. This lack of communication may further add to the stress. Therefore, communication may be extremely important in adolescence. Additionally, openness between parents and adolescents is related to having a “positive emotional climate” (Arnold, Pratt, & Hicks, 2004). More open communication allows for understanding during a time of stress and changes, specifically in terms of acceptance of the new needs and desires adolescents face (Sillars, Koerner, & Fitzpatrick, 2005).

The mean differences between the two groups of high and low stress, on Total Parental Attachment are significant (t=2.952) at .05 level. Value of mean for high stress group is 105.36 and for low stress group is 110.07. This serves to indicate that when academic stress is low the Parental Attachment is high and vice versa. Bowlby (1982) and Ainsworth (1989) conceptualized parental attachment as providing a secure base, that offers the child comfort and security to explore and master the external environment with confidence. Secure attachment relationships to parents can serve as "safe havens" for comfort and reassurance in times of stress and serve as "secure bases" for such nonattachment behaviors as exploration (Hazan & Shaver, 1994). In the research literature, secure attachment to parents has been found to be positively associated with personal, social, and academic success in students (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987; Kenny, 1987; Lapsley, Rice, & FitzGerald, 1990; Rice et al, 1995). On the other hand, insecure attachment stemming from inconsistent or nonresponsive parenting can lead to anxiety or avoidance of exploring the environment and relating to others (Lopez &
Brennan, 2000; Pietromonaco & Feldman Barrett, 2000). Results of the present study fall in line with these studies.

Higher parental attachment among adolescents of low stressed groups is indicative of the feeling of security, which is provided by the close bond between adolescent and parents. Characteristics of secure parental attachment have been associated empirically with indices of adaptive social and psychological functioning across a variety of developmental periods (Kenny & Barton, 2002). For the adolescent, secure parental attachments have been conceptualized as providing a source of security and support as the adolescent negotiates the numerous transitions and challenges of this developmental period. Among early and middle adolescents, secure parental attachments have been found to buffer life stress and to be associated with positive self-worth and low levels of depressive symptoms (Armsden, McCauley, Greenberg, Burke, & Mitchell, 1990; Kenny et al., 1993; Kobak, Sudler, & Gamble, 1991; Papini & Roggman, 1992). Among college students, secure parental attachments have been positively associated with college adjustment (Larose & Boivin, 1997; Rice, FitzGerald, Whaley, & Gibbs, 1995). assertiveness in social relationships (Kenny, 1987). enhanced resources for coping with stress.

Following conclusions can be drawn on the basis of the results:

(i) High and low stressed adolescents differ significantly on Parental Attachment, as also on three sub-areas of Parental Attachment.

(ii) Adolescents in high group on academic stress consistently achieve low score on Parental Attachment. Parental trust and Parental communication than their counterpart adolescents in low stressed groups on academic stress. On the contrary low stressed group of
adolescents perceives greater attachment with parents, exhibits more trust in parents as also is more communicative to parents as compared to high stress groups.

(iii) High and low groups on academic stress do not differ significantly on parental alienation, although parental alienation in respect of values of means is more in case of high stress groups.

Based on the finding of the results the hypothesis:” High and low stressed adolescents differ significantly on Parental Attachment” stands accepted (barring alienation)

5.2.3: Social Support:

The results pertaining to difference between means of high and low stress adolescents on Social Support has been shown in table 5.2.3

Table 5.2.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Support</th>
<th>Stress Level</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t-Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSQ-N</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>124.06</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>144.89</td>
<td>45.350</td>
<td>4.801**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSQ-S</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>117.51</td>
<td>23.843</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>118.74</td>
<td>25.072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS TOT</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>241.57</td>
<td>55.009</td>
<td>3.876**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>263.63</td>
<td>56.162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
*Significant at .05 level
The obtained results have also been presented diagramatically in figure 5.2.5.
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**Figure 5.2.5: Social Support in High and Low levels of Stress**

Table 5.2.3 shows that means on the **Number of Social Support** (a sub-variable of Social Support) of high stress group is 144.89 and that of low group, its value is equal to 124.06. The value of t for significance of difference is 4.801, which is significant at .01 level. High stressed groups had greater number of support available. There are many academic tasks, which have to be done by an adolescent himself, e.g. if examinations are approaching, he has to prepare for the same himself. Stress-inducing academic demands include grade competition, lack of time and issues relating to time or task management (Macan, Shahani, Dipboye & Phillips, 1990; Trueman, & Hartley, 1996); the need to adapt to new learning environments (Van-Rooijens, 1986) in terms of the increased complexity of the material to be learned and the greater time and effort required to do so; and the need to constantly self-regulate and to develop better thinking skills, including learning to use specific learning techniques (Fram & Bonvillian, 2001). But
at the same time, they need social support to work as facilitators in beginning. Social Support is also needed to provide relief, though this support may not be academic in nature. The need and perception of Social Support is more in high groups on stress than the low groups—it may be academic information, sympathetic or practical support. This support may be in terms of giving reassurance, providing physical comforts etc. However, in spite of the perceived Social Support available, in today’s competing world, every adolescent has to work hard to keep up with the rest of the group. So the academic pressure remains as such, in spite of the fact that quantum of support exists. Results of the present study are similar to Cohen and McKay (1984), and Cutrona (1986), who reported that some components of support are required more during periods of high stress. Hirsch (1980), and Barrera et al., (1981), also found that effective support depended on the situation and needs of adolescents in that stressful situation.

There was significant difference ($t=3.876$) at .05 level between the means of high (263.63) and low groups (241.57) Academic Stress in respect of Total Social Support as perceived by adolescents.

Comparison of values of means indicate that the perception of Social Support is higher in high group than in the low group on stress. Social Support is viewed as the mesh of social relationships and transactions (i.e. emotional, cognitive, and behavioral) whose function is to complete the personal resources to allow adaptive coping in situations of need (Sarason & Duck 2001).

Non-significant differences in the means on Satisfaction with Social Support (SSQ-S) have been found between high and low groups on Academic Stress. The trend of differences between means however is similar to Number
of Social Support (SSQ-N) and Social Support totals (SS TOT). Rook (1987), pointed out that social support has differing effects at high and low levels of stress; for those confronted with major life stresses, social support has a beneficial effect, whereas for those with low life stress a reverse buffering effect is seen. Rook further argued that the helper/helpee exchanges may involve a hierarchical structure and can make one feel obligated or less competent than the support provider. That probably explains the findings of the present study that when the perception of support is high, the stress is also felt as high. This may also be due the fact that type of support and relationship of the individual with the support, may mediate the buffering effect of social support.

As opposed to global measures of perceived support, which reflect a basically stable view of the supportiveness of the social world, relationship-specific perceptions of social support are more strongly linked to the accumulated history of experience with particularly close relationships (Davis et al., 1998). Besides, perceptions of support from specific relationships are the consequence not only of past experiences of support from particular individuals, but are also the result of the dynamics of psychological characteristics of individuals and life situations. By focusing on both the psychological characteristics of the person and his or her life experiences, and their mutual influences. It can be understood as to how inspite of having the high perception of Social Support, it may not reduce academic stress effectively. This is confirmed by Sarason (1988), who considered that support may convey negative messages to the recipient relating to personal effectiveness and indebtedness, even if it is useful in the immediate situation.

On the basis of results and discussion under this section it can be concluded that:
(i) The perceived Number of Social Support differs significantly in high and low academically stressed adolescents; number being perceived more in high stressed adolescents.

(ii) There are no significant differences in perceived degree of Satisfaction with Social Support among adolescents with high and low Academic Stress.

(iii) The overall perceived Social Support is significantly higher among adolescents in high group on academic stress than the low group of adolescents on academic stress.

On the basis of the results the hypothesis:” High and low stressed adolescents differ significantly on Social Support” stands partially accepted.