The present study aims to identify major source of stress, perceived impact of the stress and coping strategies used by individuals with reference to their sense of well-being. Since sense of well-being is an important objective of human existence and stress appears to contradict achievement of this objective, the study was undertaken to enlarge understanding of the phenomena by taking into consideration dimensions like source of stress, its perceived impact and coping styles. The topic of our study is therefore "source of stress, perceived impact, management styles amongst individuals experiencing sense of well-being".

To serve this purpose some tolls for investigation were needed. Sense of well-being was measured by Psychological Well-being Scale (PWB Scale) developed by Bhogle & Parkash (1995). In order to obtain information about the major sources of stress, perceived impact of stress and coping styles used by the subjects, an open ended questionnaire was developed. Life Experience Survey (LES) developed by Sarason, Johnson and Siegal (1978) was used to obtain positive, negative and total stressful experience scores of the subjects. To assess the individuals own reality world, Cantril’s (1965) Self Anchoring
Ladder Scale (SALS) was used for to evaluate perceived stress and perceived coping efficacy.

A sample of 127 subject participate in our study. Subjects were drawn through purposive sampling. Age range of subject was 20-40 years.

The total sample was divided into three groups on the basic of the well-being scores namely high well-being (N=44), moderate well-being (N=41) and low well-being (N=42 groups. Inter group comparisons were made on the various dimension under study ‘t’ test and significance of difference between percentages were used for analysing the data.

Results reveal that there is no significant difference between any of the three well-being groups on their L.E.S. positive, negative and total scores. Bereavement followed by occupation is the major sources of stress in the whole sample. There is no statistically significant difference between H.W.B and L.W.B groups on sources of stress. Some significant difference were observed between M.W.B and other two groups. ‘Occupational’ stress is greater in H.W.B. as compared to M.W.B., and greater in L.W.B. as compared to M.W.B. group. On the impact of stress L.W.B. shows a greater emphasis on ‘becoming religious’ and H.W.B. group show higher scores is ‘opportunity for psychological growth’ and ‘no specific impact’ compared to M.W.B. group. However M.W.B. group had ‘become religious’ and ‘shows poor academic
performance' as compared to H.W.B. group. No significant difference has been observed in M.W.B. and L.W.B. groups regarding the impact of stress. On the coping strategies H.W.B. and L.W.B. groups do not differ. Some difference exists between M.W.B. and the other two groups. H.W.B. group make greater use of 'sublimation' and lesser use of 'helplessness' as compared to M.W.B. group. L.W.B. group show higher scores in the use of 'sublimation' and 'problem solving' and lower scores in 'spiritualism' as compared to M.W.B. group as their coping strategies.

The overall picture indicates that none of these variables, such as sources of stress, perceived impact of stress and coping style have any influence on the sense of well-being. However, self-evaluation of stress and coping efficacy made by the subjects provides a different picture. L.W.B. group evaluate their life very highly stressful where as H.W.B. group see their life very slightly stressful. No difference was observed in H.W.B. and M.W.B. and M.W.B and L.W.B groups in terms of their perceived evaluation of stress. H.W.B group show significantly greater coping efficacy as compared to both L.W.B and M.W.B groups.

The results support a humanistic model of stress experience, pointing out towards meaning and perception of the individual, being of primary importance.