_____

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RESILIENCE AMONG COLLEGE GOING STUDENTS

Dr. Mohan R. Nimbalkar
Associate Professor , Shardabai Pawar Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Shardanagar ,
Tal. Baramati Dist. Pune.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to examine the influence of gender on Resilience and their dimensions. Sample 100 students of college going students from Baramati region were selected by purposive sampling technique for this assessment (male students = 50 & female students = 50). The Data was analyzed by descriptive statistic; Mean, Standard Deviation (SD) and 't' Test. The data were collected using Resilience Scale set up by Gartland (2006). This scale contains five factors namely individual, family, peer, school and social. The factor wise reliability is as follows 0.80, 0.81, 0.81, 0.88 and 0.88 respectively. The findings revealed that, there is no gender difference was found for present study regarding Resilience and their dimensions.

KEY WORDS: *Resilience, Gender.*

INTRODUCTION:

The concept of resilience has a quite different starting point. It has its origins in the universal finding from all research, naturalistic and experimental, human and other animals, that there is huge heterogeneity in response to all manners of environmental hazards: physical and psychosocial (Rutter, 2006). It is argued that the systematic investigations of the causes of this heterogeneity should not just throw light on the specifics of different responses to a particular hazard but, in addition, might throw light on a broader range of causal processes.

Accordingly, resilience can be defined as reduced vulnerability to environmental risk experiences, the overcoming of a stress or adversity, or a relatively good outcome despite risk experiences (Rutter, 2006). Thus, it is an interactive concept in which the presence of resilience has to be inferred from individual variations in outcome among individuals who have experienced significant major stress or adversity (Rutter, 1987).

Particularly during the last two decades, there has been a marked tendency for researchers, clinicians, and policy makers to shift their focus from risk to resilience (e.g., Mohaupt, 2008). The aim was to emphasize the positive rather than the maladaptive. This was seen in the emergence of "positive psychology," as a major movement (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) and Layard's (2005) "happiness" agenda. The valuable aspect of this movement was the recognition that eudaimonic socioemotional well-being (including a sense of purpose and direction) was as important as economic success (Keyes, 2007). The less helpful aspect was the triviality of relabeling family conflict as a risk and family harmony as a protective

_____

_____

factor. The most crucial point is that there was the downgrading of the seriousness of mental disorder in order to concentrate on variations in degree of happiness in the general population, and hence the downgrading of resilience in the face of severe stress and adversity. In addition,

Insofar as resilience is concerned, there is the misleading implication that it requires generally superior functioning, rather than relatively better functioning compared with that shown by others experiencing the same level of stress or adversity. There are also methodological problems that are inherent in the concept of "positive mental health" (Jahoda, 1959) and difficulties in differentiating between hedonic pleasure and excitement and the quiet satisfaction of a job well done (see Rutter, 2011).

While some people are more resilient when they encounter certain troubles, others may give up more readily when facing problems. Psychological resilience has been the focus of various researchers because it is an interesting subject. Many definitions of psychological resilience exist. For instance, psychological resilience has been defined as the process of successfully adapting faced with difficult or threatening situations (Howard & Johnson, 2000), the skill of adapting to and coping with negativity (Block & Kremen, 1996), the relatively good outcome despite experiencing situations that have been shown to carry significant risk for developing psychopathology (Luthar, Cicchetti, & Becker, 2000) and the resistance of an individual despite the negative effects of difficulties (Gilligan, 2001). According to all these definitions, psychological resilience expresses continuing to live strongly despite the hardships encountered. Psychological resilience includes coping with difficult situations (Dumont & Provost, 1999) psychological adjustment (Ong, Bergeman, Bisconti, & Wallace, 2006), and having life satisfaction (Cohn, Fredrickson, Brown, Mikels, & Conway, 2009). Psychological resilience develops in a large time span. In order to psychological resilience to develop the individual needs to encounter risky or dangerous situations. A strong psychological resilience can protect the individual against physical and mental distress. Since resilience brings about positive physical and psychosocial conditions, it facilitates faster recovery after illness or loss (Felten, 2000; Felten, & Hall, 2001). In other words, resilient people are those who can sustain their normal development despite difficult environmental conditions and difficulties in life. Individuals with psychological resilience confront their problems and rather than avoiding their problems they deal with their problems by providing efficient and successful solutions (Martin, 2002). Psychological resilience has a potential of preventing the development of psychiatric disorders as depression (Hjemdal, Aune, Reinfjell, Stiles, & Friborg, 2007; Rutter, 1987). Multiple studies found a meaningful negative relation between high psychological resilience and depression (e.g. Roy, Sarchiapone, & Carli, 2007; Vaishnavi, Connor, & Davidson, 2007).

METHODOLOGY
Design for study:
Two independent group design was adopted for the present study.

Statistical Treatment of the data:
Descriptive statistics used for assessing the Mean and Standard Deviation and inferential statistics (t test) were used for analyze the obtained data.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:
Following main objectives were framed for the present study:
1. To measure the level of Resilience and it's various factors between boys and girls students.
2. To compare the level of Resilience and it's various factors between boys and girls students.

HYPOTHESIS:
To serve the objective of the study, following several hypotheses are framed and these were tested. Assuming that other variables are kept constant
1. Females are significantly greater than males in Resilience.

_____

Available online at www.lbp.world

_____

2. There is significant difference between males and females regarding individual resilience.
3. There is significant difference between males and females regarding family resilience.
4. There is significant difference between males and females regarding peer resilience.
5. There is significant difference between males and females regarding school resilience.
6. There is significant difference between males and females regarding social resilience.

VARIABLES UNDER STUDY:
1. Independent Variables:
A) Gender
2. Dependent Variables:
A) Resilience

Sample
The sample comprised of one hundred college going students. 50 were male students and 50 female students from various colleges from Baramati region were assigned by purposive sampling technique for the present study.

Instruments
One measure are used in this study,
A. Resilience Scale: devised by Gartland (2006) this is five point rating scale contains 88 items. This scale contains five factors namely individual, family, peer, school and social. The factor wise reliability is as follows 0.80, 0.81, 0.81, 0.88 and 0.88 respectively.

Procedure
Participants were asked to sit comfortably and a good rapport was established with the general brief talk with them. They were told to answer each question with a tick mark in the place corresponding to the one which they consider suitable. They were told that there is no right or wrong answers and there is no fixed time to finish the test. But ordinarily they can take test 25-30 minutes for completing the tests. It was ensured that the answers would remain confidential. As soon as they finished their work, test materials were collected.

RESULTS
Table No. 1: Comparison of male and females on Resilience factor

Variable	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	't' value	Significance level
individual	Female	50	148.48	14.329	98	1.236	NS
	Male	50	144.76	15.745			
family	Female	50	46.00	4.998	98	0.498	NS
	Male	50	45.54	4.210			
peers	Female	50	53.78	8.786	98	0.403	NS
	Male	50	54.42	6.993			
school	Female	50	59.80	8.056	98	0.198	NS
	Male	50	60.14	9.046			
social	Female	50	28.36	5.580	98	0.547	NS
	Male	50	29.00	6.111			
Resilience	Female	50	336.42	26.885	98	0.476	NS
	Male	50	333.86	26.872			

Note: NS- Not Significant

_____

Available online at www.lbp.world

_____

Table no 1 shows the Comparison of male and females on Resilience factor. Here, female students has the mean score of individual dimension of Resilience is 148.48 with 14.329 SD and male students has the mean score of 144.76 with 15.745 SD. The 't' value for the difference between these two means is 1.236; t(98)=1.236, p>0.05. This value is less than minimum required value for significance. Hence, 't' value is found statistically not significant. It means these two groups do not differ significantly to each other. Hence, we could conclude that, no gender difference found for the Individual resilience. Thus the hypothesis, 'There is significant difference between males and females regarding individual resilience' is rejected

The same fact is found for resilience and their all remaining dimension. Over all its seems that gender difference was not found for the present study.

CONCULSION:
1.   There is no gender difference was found for present study regarding Resilience and their dimension.

REFERENCES
Dr.mahasan G (2017),The resilience, suicidal Ideation Depression among & ways to build Resilience, Journal of contemporary psychological Research,ISSN-2349-5642,volume-4(1),page no-93 to 98.

Myreen et al (2017), the psychological Resilience & Desfressive symptom : Exploring their presence &Relationship among selected Filipino collegiate Athletes, Journal of contemporary psychological Research , ISSN-2349-5642,ISSN-2455-0981, vol-4(1), page no-28 to 40.

Panchal et al (2016) optimism in relation to well – being, resilience perceived stress, international journal of Education and Psychological research (JEPR), Vol. 5 (2) page no 1 to 6.

Souri, H., & Hasanirad, T. (2011). Relationship between Resilience, Optimism and Psychological Well-being in Students of Medicine. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *30*, 1541-1544.

Wagnild, G. M., & Young, H. M. (1993). Development and psychometric evaluation of the Resilience Scale. *Journal of Nursing Measurement, 1*, 165-178.

Ryff, C.D., & Singer, B. (2003). Flourishing under fire: Resilience as a prototype of challenged thriving. In C. L. M. Keyes & J. Haidt (Eds.), *Positive psychology and the life well-lived* (pp. 15–36). Washington, DC: APA.

Ryff, C.D., Keyes, C.L.M., & Schmotkin, D. (2002). Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 1007-1022.

Sagone, E., & De Caroli, M. E. (2013). Relationships between resilience, self-efficacy and thinking styles in Italian middle adolescents. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 92*, 838-845.

Schmutte, P. S., & Ryff, C. D. (1997). Personality and well-being: Reexamining methods and meanings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *73* (3), 549–559.

Schwarzer, R., & Warner, L. M. (2013). Perceived self-efficacy and its relationship to resilience. In A. Prince-Embury, & D.H. Saklofske (Eds.). *Resilience in Children, Adolescents, and Adults: Translating Research into Practice* (pp.139-150). New York: Springer.

Smith, C., & Carlson, B.E. (1997). Stress, coping, and resilience in children and youth, *Social Service Review*, *71*(2), 231-256.

_____