Chapter-I

INTRODUCTION

Life would be simple indeed if all of our needs automatically satisfied. In reality however many obstacles, both personal and environmental prevent this ideal situation. Such obstacles place demands on us for adjustment and can lead to stress. The term stress has typically been used to refer both to these demands placed on an organism and to the organism internal biological and psychological responses to such demands. In other words these “demands” can be referred to as stressors, to the effects they create within an organism as stress.

It is probably not necessary to point out that life can be stressed. Everyone faces a different mix of these demands in life and anyone of us may break down if the situation gets tough enough. Under conditions of overwhelming stress, even a previously stable person may develop temporary psychological problems and lose the capacity to gain pleasure from life. This breakdown may be sudden e.g, death of a dear one or accident of own or dear one, or it may be gradual, for example, in deteriorating intimate relationship, one who has been subjected to prolonged periods of tension and challenges to his/her self esteem. In some cases stressors can create long lasting damage to self concept and an increased vulnerability to certain types of stressors. Today’s stress can be tomorrow’s vulnerability.

Stress has many definitions, different psychologists defined stress from their different angle. According to Lazarus (1993) “stress is the anxious or threatening feeling that comes when we interpret or appraise a situation as being more than our psychological resources can adequately handle.” In other words stress refers to the psychological state which derives from the person’s appraisals of the success with which he/she can adjust to the demands of their environments. Hence stress can not be defined simply in terms of the occurrence of events determined by consensus to be stressful nor can it be defined in terms of responses that are sometimes consequences of stress, such as physiological mobilization or performance dysfunctions. Three major definitions of
stress have been advanced, that of a response pattern elicited in an individual, a stimulus external to the individual in the environment, and a dynamic interactional process between the individual and the environment. The latter two approaches conceptualize stress as an independent variable and the former categorize it as a dependent variable.

**Stress as a Response**

Stress as an adjustment process constitutes the response definition. Stress, seen as a dependent variable, is in the form of an appropriate fight or flight reaction necessary to return the organism to homeostasis. Following this, stress can be defined as a non-specific physiological response elicited in an organism which followed three sequential stages. This process can be termed as the general adaptation syndrome that consists of an alarm (initial shock and counter shock), a resistance, and an exhaustion phase. The inverted-U shape relationship between stress and performance, as previously observed by Yerkes and Dodson (1908) and so called the "Yerkes-Dodson Law", has highlighted the possible existence of both negative stress (distress) and positive stress (eustress).

**Stress as a Stimulus**

Situations external to an individual function as a stimulus. The orientation is toward identifying causes of stress within the environment. Stress, therefore, was viewed as an independent variable. The stimulus-based model of stress was based on an engineering analogy of stress: People have variable in-built resistance to stress, but if the stress becomes too great, it can cause permanent damage.

Out of the above discussion it can be said that 'stress' lies in the persons perception of the balance or "goodness of fit" between the demands on them and their ability to cope with those demands. Stress is simply the body's response to changes that create taxing demands. Dr. Lazarus (building on Dr. Selye's (1978) work) suggested that there is a difference between Eustress and Distress. Eustress a term which denotes positive stress, and Distress refers to negative stress. In daily life, we often use the term "stress" to
describe negative situations. This leads many people to believe that all stress is bad for them, which is not true.

Eustress, or positive stress can

- motivate the person,
- encourage to focus energy,
- help perceived target as within coping abilities,
- lead feelings of excitement,
- improve performance etc.

In contrast, Distress, or negative stress has the following characteristics:

- causes anxiety or concern,
- can be short term or long term,
- is perceived as beyond coping abilities,
- feels unpleasant,
- decrease performance,
- can lead to physical or mental problem.

It is somewhat hard to categorize stressors into objective lists of those that cause eustress and those that cause distress, because different people will have different reactions to particular situations. However, by generalizing, we can compile a list of stressors that are typically experienced as negative or positive to most people, most of the time. It is generally accepted that the amount of psychological stress experienced by an individual at any given moment is determined interactively by the current environmental demands and the characteristics individual possesses. Stressors are situations that are experienced as a perceived threat to one's wellbeing and/or position in life, when the challenge of dealing exceeds the person's perceived available resources. When one encounters stressors, the stress response is triggered, and a series of physiological changes take place to allow the person to fight or run. Basically
stressors lead to the body’s stress response, and the experience of stress, that can vary from person to person. Not every potential stressor causes stress in everyone. This is because everyone has a unique set of resources, understanding of the world, and way of perceiving things, what seems like a threat to one person may be perceived as a challenge to another. Among the physiological stressors some of them are body injury, pain, fever, fatigue or exhaustion and sleep loss. Thus a state of ill health of an individual can act as a significant source of stress by reducing his or her ability to cope. How we perceive a given stress make it more or less stressful. Many situational factors may contribute to our experience of stress. Probably the most important is the combined effect of various life changes or transition in life which force us to cope in a new way.

Basically, the term stressor is taken to mean an environmental demand, stress is seen as a subjective perception of demands that are received, strain implies the responses to these demands, and the term moderator means the attributes of influences on an individual that can influence at any stage the stress-strain process that the individual is experiencing.

Life-Event Approach

Some stress researchers have adopted a “life-events” approach. The life-event approach has been a recognized methodology for studying complex psychological processes. A life event is defined as an incidence in the recent life of a person which may have been associated with the experience of stress. It is a life change that involves some form of social adjustment. With excessive changes, adjustment efforts become more difficult to make and so strain may be experienced by an individual. The purpose of life-events research was to establish the relationship between increases in the number and perceived impact of life events which were presumed to have additive effects, and strain or illness onset.

Objective vs subjective fit

The first element of the P-E fit model is the clear distinction made between objective and subjective fit. Experiencing stress from a misfit between individual and
environmental characteristics is a function of cognitive appraisal. Studies using commensurate objective and subjective measures have shown that an individual’s perceptions of stressors serve as the intervening variables between objective stressors and the resultant strains. Potential organizational stressors become actual stressors only if they are perceived as being stressful or representing a threat. The subjective environment is that which is formed by the individual’s perceptions or cognitions of the external objective environment.

The objective environment alone cannot significantly alter the stress levels experienced by individuals; the person’s perception or translation of the objective environment has to be included when examining stress. P-E fit theory has identified that cognitive distortion of the objective environment occurs; the important component is the subjective assessment of P-E fit. The relationship between the objective environment and the subjective environment (i.e., how the person perceives the environment to be) is influenced by the “contact with reality” that the person has and the relationship between the objective and the subjective person is influenced by the “accuracy of self assessment” that the person possesses. However, research has indicated that there is a correlation between subjective and objective measures of both person and environment, and that subjective P-E fit bears a stronger association with the psychological and physiological consequences of person-environment interactions than objective P-E fit does. The pivotal concept in the P-E fit model arises, then, as the subjects’ cognitive appraisal of themselves, their environment, and the perceived match between the two.

**Person-Environment (P-E) Fit Theory**

An individual’s interaction with the work environment has been conceptualized as person-environment (P-E) fit.....The P-E fit theory is based on two central features of organizational stress, first, the characteristics of the person and second, the potential source of stress in the work environment. The idea is that stress increases in an individual as the degree of fit decreases and this misfit can be in both directions (i.e., underload and overload can be stressful). Central to this thinking is that people are viewed as active agents in their environment, so that behaviours are seen as a function of the characteristics of both the person and the environment. In this way, an
individual's experience of organizational stress is a function of the interaction between personal and environmental characteristics. Therefore, P-E fit (or misfit) depends on individuals' perceptions of their abilities, needs, personality, and resources interacting with their perceptions of the situation within which they find themselves. P-E fit also includes the ability of individuals and work environments to change in an ongoing process. Obviously this P-E stress concept should not be limited to the organizational environment only but can be used to define other environmental stress.

Studies on adolescent concerns have been widely researched in both Western and Asian countries. In Western countries like America, adolescents have identified school, friends, the opposite sex, family, money, substance abuse, lack of interest in education and the future to be their main areas of concerns (Smith 1980; Isralowitz and Singer 1982; Stark et al., 1989). In England and Northern Ireland, problems relating to employment, self-confidence and adequacy, and school performance were found to be the main worries of adolescents, while issues of material deprivation, physical inadequacy and relationships with family and friends were regarded as the least of their worries (Porteous 1979). For Australian adolescents, although educational adjustment was deemed to be a major area of concern for them, issues relating to their future in terms of vocation and higher education were considerably less important (Collins and Harper 1974; Harper and Marshall 1991).

In Asian countries similar trends were observed. In addition, some differences observed appear to centre around concerns relating to school. School adjustment, future and career have often been identified as Asian adolescents' top concerns.

Academic grades and failure in finding a satisfying job were the major concerns of youths in China while Chinese adolescents in Hong Kong indicated school performance, proper conduct, and issues in learning and psychological wellbeing as some of their top concerns (Dodds and Lin 1992).

In Korea, graduating from a high ranking university was of utmost concern to the Korean adolescent as it is a means of securing a good job, high wages, high social status and even a good marriage (Bae and Lee 1988). Like their Asian counterparts, adolescents in Singapore also ranked issues related to education such as academic
achievement and worrying about the future as their top concerns (Isralowitz and Ong 1990).

The present research work uses the concept of person-environment stress considering the academic field as environment and the perception of students toward that stress as reflected in the academic field.

Based on the studies reviewed, it may be said that academic-related concerns appear to be relevant to adolescents from both Western and Asian countries (Stark et al., 1989; Isralowitz and Ong 1990). Specifically it is seen for the Asian societies, the pressure to perform in school is even more acutely felt (e.g. Korea, Hong Kong, and Singapore). For example, research with adolescents in Korea showed that they devoted large amounts of time to studying and many attended private cram schools after school and on weekends just to do well in the entrance examination in order to be placed in a high ranking university (Chung et al., 1993). Twelfth-grade Koreans were also found to spend twice the time completing homework when compared with their twelfth-grade American counterparts while the latter was found to spend twice as much time socializing and taking part in leisure activities (Lee and Larson 2000).

In Hong Kong for example, the adolescent is socialized to understand that academic excellence enables a young person to enter a well-paid profession (e.g., business or medical professions), which in turn provides the opportunity for upward social mobility (Ho and Kang 1984; Shek and Chan 1999). Students in Hong Kong were found to be highly competitive with strong drives to achieve academic excellence. These students also face strong pressures from their parents and themselves to excel academically (Gow and Kember 1990; Smith 2001). Thus, it is not surprising to find that students in Hong Kong rated school demands as one of their main sources of stress (Hui 2001).

Similarly in Singapore, adolescents also face a highly stressful educational environment. Ang and Huan (2006) found that adolescents experienced academic stress arising from both their own expectations to excel as well as expectations arising from their parents and teachers.
When stress is perceived negatively or become excessive, students may experience physical as well as psychological impairment (Murphy & Archer 1996). Findings from studies conducted with Asian adolescents (e.g., Korea, Hong Kong, Singapore) indicate that while academic achievement is high in these countries, negative consequences such as excessive stress and mental health problems are also clearly evident (Shek 1995). In Indian culture there is a common academic demand to identify the factors those are most prevalent in their lives and perception of stress, and find out the way or find out some correlated factors that enable them to cope with that stressors in a healthy way.

A disturbing trend in college student's health is the reported increase in student stress nationwide (Sax 1997). Stressors affecting students can be categorized as academic, financial, time or health related and self imposed (Goodman 1993). Academic stressors include the student's perception of the extensive knowledge base required and the perception of an inadequate time to develop it (Carveth 1996). Students report experiencing academic stress at predictable times each semester with the greatest sources of academic stress resulting from taking and studying from exams, grade competition and the large amount of content to master in a small amount of time (Abouseric 1993). Towbes and Cohen (1996) created the College Chronic Life Stress Survey in which they found that in regard to chronic stress, first-year students scored higher than other students. Similar studies have examined sources of stress among both undergraduate (Gadzella, 1994) and graduate students by Rocha-Singh (1994). While many specific events and situations have been implicated as stressors for college students, more research is needed to investigate the nature of these stressors for college students, and particularly, in Indian culture there is a common academic demand to identify the factors those are most prevalent in their lives and perception of stress. It is unclear whether most stressors result from interpersonal relationships or academics.

The academic stress faced by college students these days is perhaps higher than ever before. Going to college might be very exciting, making new friends and being independent is the best part. On the other hand it is time to get adjusted to a new lifestyle with responsibilities and pressure, followed by self imposed stress. Many college students begin to feel worthless. They measure themselves only by academic success.
This can distort their perception of reality and cause them to blow things out of perception. These feelings can become a big problem in situations where students are expected to perform at a very high caliber for a long period of time. There are many things that cause stress for college students; school-related issues, relationships, and peer pressure.

One of the main causes of stress is adapting to the new life which have suddenly landed in, may also create stress in college student. Along with this uncertainty and lack of identity might be a common cause of stress for students. The first tasks that should undertake is to find out an identity and effectively test the rules that were set out by their parents. It can not be denied that school-related issues also cause stress for students these days but it can be caused by them doing so badly in college that they gave up all hope of doing something worthwhile with their lives, or it could be caused by just not living up to their own standards. Stress also creates the way people deal with things like smoking and drinking, which create worse effect in students’ health.

Another cause of college stress may be based on relationships. Relationship stress can be caused by not living up to their partner's expectation or just plainly by breaking up with someone that they really did care for. Also, it can be caused by either an individual liking someone a lot or the feeling is not mutual. All of these aspects can cause students to feel like they are in way over their heads. Most students use alcohol, tobacco, or drugs to relieve stress. As a result some college students’ stress makes them sick and their immune system gets run down.

It can not be denied that peer pressure is an important stress which is based on relationship. Peer pressure is occurred when "friends" persuade one to doing something that he/she do not want to do. But maybe they want to do it but they just don't have the courage to do it. Peer Pressure can be broken down into two areas; good peer pressure and bad peer pressure. Bad peer pressure is being coerced into doing something that one didn't want to do because his/her friends said that this should be done. Many students are vulnerable to bad peer-pressure because they are afraid of being rejected, losing friends, being teased and they don't know how to say "NO". Some students don't think about the consequences and they can't explain why they are not interested that's
why peer-pressure can cause stress. Another cause of stress that might occur due to the faulty interaction with the faculty members. Because, stress levels of faculty members vary due to personal and organizational behaviours (Pretorius, 1994) that may affect their interactions with students. Although stress-causing stimuli are often similar in the lives of professors and students (Brown, 2005; Pretorius, 1994), teachers also bring stress into the classroom in the form of inherent personality traits (Kagan, 2004). A few studies have examined faculty perceptions of students' behaviours. Studies indicate that student behaviour is linked to the attitudes of faculty members (Williams & Winkworth, 1974). Faculty members' accurate perceptions of student academic stress are important for effective communication with them. Gender differences were also anticipated as had been indicated in previous research (Allen & Hiebert, 1991) in which researchers argued that women not only perceived more stress and anxiety in their environment, but they actually experienced more symptoms of depression and anxiety.

College students, especially freshmen, are a group particularly prone to stress (D'Zurilla & Sheedy, 1991) due to the transitional nature of college life (Towbes & Cohen, 1996). They must adjust to being away from home for the first time, maintain a high level of academic achievement, and adjust to a new social environment. Campbell et al. (1992) showed that Freshmen and Sophomores have higher mean value of stress than juniors and seniors. According to him, freshmen had stress related to change and conflicts, while sophomores were more stressed due to pressure and self imposed stress. Although support is provided to freshmen students (through freshman orientation, special programs, advising, and counselors), students of freshmen status had high stress due to change, conflict and frustration. This could possibly explain high behavioural, emotional, and physiological reactions to stress among them. Within a college social system, freshmen and sophomores lack the strong social support networks and they have not yet developed the coping mechanisms used by older students to deal with college stress (Allen & Heibert, 1991). Hence, they have fewer resources for managing stress and the anxiety of demanding school work and tasks.

A freshman faces more stress due to some important reasons. It is not surprisingly, the workload of college is significantly more involved than the high school workload, with
challenging classes, scheduling issues to coordinate, difficult tests and others academic obstacles, coupled with the more independent nature of the college learning structure.

There are also many miscellaneous stressors that often come from college life. Many students keep crazy hours from studying up late to study, getting up early for classes, and trying to cram in all the work and fun that can possibly fit. Most students struggle with those who they are and where they did like to be, at least at some point in their college career. College students experience a range of consequences from stress, from mild to severe, such as feeling of being overwhelmed, gain or loose weight etc. It would be very surprised to hear that roughly 50% of American students who enter college don’t end up graduating though some of them have high achievement need. Because they were also more likely to worry about their studies and to be overwhelmed by the amount of work given them. The dynamic relationship between the person and environment in stress perception and reaction is especially magnified in college freshmen. The problems and situations encountered by students may differ from those faced by their non student peers (Hirsch & Ellis, 1996). The environment in which college students live is quite different. Though the pressure to earn good grades and to earn a degree is very high (Hirsch & Ellis, 1996) but not the only source of stress for college freshmen. Other potential sources of stress include excessive homework, unclear assignments, and uncomfortable classrooms (Kohn & Frazer, 1986), a totally different environment from school, relatively unstructured teaching including completion of syllabus etc. In addition to academic requirements, relations with faculty members and time pressures may also be sources of stress (Sgan-Cohen & Lowental, 1988). Relationships with family and friends, sudden independence and maturity demand by the surroundings, eating and sleeping habits, and loneliness may affect some students adversely (Wright, 1967).

The gender difference found for stressors and reactions to stressors among students. Female students reported to be experiencing more stressors and reactions to stressors than did male students. This probably reflects not an actual inequality in number of stressors by gender, but possibly indicates females rating their experiences as more stressful. Females tend to report having been affected by negative events more often and more markedly than males (Allen & Hiebert, 1991). Self-imposed stress among
females than males indicated that females liked to compete, be noticed, loved, and worry for others, sometimes seeking perfect solutions that lead to higher anxiety and stress. Possibly, female students attempt to do several activities such as achieve academic excellence, take care of families, and work at one time. It is said that females reactions to stress is high than males (Allen & Hiebert, 1991). Gender differences in reactions to stress may result from the socialization of males, which teaches them that emotional expression is an admission of weakness and not masculine (Davidson, 1991). It is evident male students seemed to be less stressed and have less reaction to stressors. These findings may help students to understand their experiences, attitudes, and behaviours. The most common stressors among the students were due to conflict, pressures, and self-imposed stress. It is also found that both male and female students had higher scores on their cognitive appraisal, indicating the use of problem-solving ability to lower stress levels. Previous studies have shown that problem solving is an important coping strategy that can reduce, minimize, or prevent stress by enabling a person to better manage daily problematic situations and its emotional effects (D'Zurilla & Sheedy, 1991).

Instead, stress results from the interaction between stressors and the individual's perception and reaction to those stressors (Romano, 1992). The amount of stress experienced may be influenced by the individual's ability to effectively cope with stressful events and situations (D'Zurilla & Sheedy, 1991).

Assessment of stress levels in college students is a topic often examined by researchers. As Lazarus and his colleagues have asserted, some evidence suggests that stressful events perceived as amenable to change (i.e., controllable) are less likely to be accepted (Schwartz & Stone, 1993) and more likely to result in the use of problem-focused coping strategies (Carver et al, 1989; Folkman & Lazarus, 1980, Folkman et al., 1986; Terry, 1994). Situations thought to be relatively unchangeable are associated with emotion-focused strategies (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980, 1985; Folkman, Lazarus, 1986 & Gruen, 1986). While a great deal of evidence (some of which is presented later in this special issue) has emerged over the past decade or so linking
personality and coping, a fundamental characteristic of the transactional perspective is that it downplays the role of dispositions in stress management.

In addition to the renewed interest in and scientific credibility of studying personality traits, the accumulating body of evidence indicated that situational factors do not explain all of the variation in coping but, both situations and personality explain significant amounts of variation in coping behaviour (e.g., Parkes, 1990, Terry, 1991). Parkes (1990) found that personality, environmental characteristics, and situational factors predicted a wide range of cognitive and behavioural strategies, while personality and situational factors predicted direct attempts to change stressful circumstances. Neurotic person generally experience considerable distress when interacting with others, may consequently be less apt to use empathic responding when they are trying to deal with interpersonal stressors. Kobasa and her colleagues presented a series of studies examining what they labelled psychological "hardiness." This personality construct was conceived as an orientation composed of three characteristics—a sense of control in life, commitment to various aspects of life such as work and family, and a tendency to view change as a challenge rather than a threat (Kobasa, 1979; Kobasa, Maddi, & Kahn, 1982; Kobasa, Maddi, & Puccetti, 1982). Persons who were high in this orientation (measured with a self-report instrument) were assumed to handle stressful life events better and, as a result, were less likely to become psychologically or physically ill than people who were low in hardiness.

After all, college students have a lot of stress. There's no denying it, but college is what we make of it. If we stay focused and balance our life, we'll feel much more relaxed and healthier when it's time to wear our cap and gown. Now, that's an achievement we have earned for life. In addition, research is needed to clarify whether these stressors are mostly major live events. The purpose of this study was to determine what sources of stress are the most prevalent among college students, to examine the nature of these stressors and other psychological correlates which may influence the individual's ability to cope effectively with stressful events and situations.

Method to reduce stress by students often include effective time management, social support, positive reappraisal (Blake & Holden, 1998). Whether such experiences crush
or strengthen an individual depends, in part, on his or her quality and magnitude of resilience.

Resilience is the positive capacity of people to cope with stress and catastrophe. It is also used to indicate a characteristic of resistance to future negative events. In this sense "resilience" corresponds to cumulative "protective factors" and is used in opposition to cumulative "risk factors". Resilience is defined as a dynamic process that individuals exhibit positive behavioural adaptation when they encounter significant adversity or trauma (Luthar et al., 2000). Resilience is a two-dimensional construct concerning the exposure of adversity and the positive adjustment outcomes of that adversity (Luthar et al., 2000). Adversity refers to any risks associated with negative life conditions that are statistically related to adjustment difficulties, Positive adaptation, on the other hand, is considered in a demonstration of manifested behaviour on social competence or success at meeting any particular tasks at a specific life stage,

_Resilience can be described by viewing:_

- good outcomes regardless of high-risk status,
- constant competence under stress, and
- recovery from trauma.

There is currently sufficient agreement on many of the factors that contribute to resilience or define resilience in certain populations for discussion and study. These factors are as trusting relationships, emotional support outside the family, self esteem, encouragement of autonomy, hope, responsible risk taking, a sense of being loveable, believe in God and morality, school achievement, unconditional lone for someone and so on. But there is insufficient understanding on the dynamic interaction of these factors, their roles in different contexts, their expression and their sources. It is believed that child’s own genetic make-up and temperament are fundamental to his resilience, i.e. a child’s vulnerability to anxiety, challenges, stress or unfamiliarity determine his or her self-perception, has he or she interacts with others and has he or she addresses adversities. So it can be said that resilience is a universal capacity which allows a
person, group or community to prevent, minimize or overcome the damaging effects of adversity.

_This universal capacity for resilience is developed and nurtured from:_

- **Factors of external support and resources**: i.e., trusting relationships, access to health, education, welfare and security service or their equivalent, emotional support outside the family, structure and rules at home, parental encouragement of autonomy, stable school environment, role models and religious organizations/morality (Grotberg, 1998).

- **Inner personal strengths**: i.e., a sense of being lovable, autonomy, appealing environment, achievement oriented, self esteem, hope, faith, belief in god, morality trust, empathy/altruism; and locus of control (Grotberg 1995c).

- **Social interpersonal skill**: i.e., creativity, persistence, humor, communication, problem solving, impulse control, seeking trusting relationship, intellectual skill. (Grotberg, 1998).

To overcome adversities, children _draw from three sources of resilience features labelled:_ I HAVE, I AM, I CAN. What they draw from each of the sources may be described as follows:

**I HAVE**

- People around me I trust and who love me, no matter what people who set limits for me so I know when to stop before there is danger or trouble.

- People who show me how to do things right by the way they do things.

- People who want me to learn to do things on my own

- People who help me when I am sick, in danger or need to learn.
I AM

• A person people can like and love

• Glad to do nice things for others and show my concern.

• Respectful of myself and others

• Willing to be responsible for what I do

• Sure things will be all right.

I CAN

• Talk in others about things that frighten me or bother me.

• Find ways to solve problems that I face.

• Control myself when I feel like doing something not right or dangerous.

• Figure out when it is a good time to talk to someone or to take action.

• Find someone to help me when I need it. (Web Ref.3, 4).

Resilience may also be treated as an effective coping mechanism when people are under stress. In this context, resilience is relevant with sustained competence exhibited by individuals who experience challenging conditions. Literally, Coping can be defined “as the cognitive and behavioural efforts made to master tolerate or reduce external and internal demands and conflict among them” (Folkman et al., 1980). Coping strategies refer to the specific efforts, both behavioural and psychological, that people employ to master, tolerate, reduce, or minimize stressful events. Thus coping primarily refers to action taken with the aim of minimizing the adverse impact of a problematic or stressful situation. The term coping encompasses at least two fairly distinct concepts—

Coping resources, which refers to personal material and social assets that people have in a varying quantities? Another is Coping strategies which refers to habitual behaviour
and cognitive styles in approaching problems. Coping was conceptualized as a transactional process or exchange between person and environment with an emphasis on process (i.e., change) rather than on personality traits (Folkman & Lazarus, 1985; Lazarus, 1966; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The transactional perspective posits that there are two broad types of coping:

**Problem focused coping** is the process that seeks to modify or eliminate the sources of stress to deal with the tangible consequences of a problem or actively change the self and develop a more satisfying situation. Problem-solving strategies are efforts to do something active to alleviate stressful circumstances. Research has demonstrated that the use of problem focused coping strategies can enhance the uncontrollability of thoughts about stressors. There are various methods included in problem focused coping:

- **Seek information or advice:** responses in this category involve seeking more information about the situation and obtaining direction and guidance from an authority that would help to solve the problem.

- **Take problem solving action:** These strategies include making alternative plans, taking specific action to deal directly with the situation, learning new skill directed at the problem and negotiating and compromising to try to solve the issue.

- **Develop alternative rewards:** This strategy involves attempts to deal with the problematic situation by changing one's activities and creating new sources of satisfaction.

- **Logical analysis:** Strategies in this category include trying to identify the cause of the problem, paying attention to one aspect of the situation at a time, drawing on relevant past experiences, taking possible action and their consequences.

- **Cognitive redefinition:** This category includes cognitive strategies by which an individual accepts the reality of the situation but restructure it to find something favourable.
Emotion focused coping involves attempt to regulate or reduce the emotional consequences of the stressful event. It involves effort to regulate the emotional distress that is a consequence of threat.

Emotion-focused coping strategies involve efforts to regulate the emotional consequences of stressful or potentially stressful events. Research indicates that people use both types of strategies to combat most stressful events (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980). The predominance of one type of strategy over another is determined, in part, by personal style (e.g., some people cope more actively than others) and also by the type of stressful event; for example, people typically employ problem-focused coping to deal with potential controllable problems such as work-related problems and family-related problems, whereas stressors perceived as less controllable, such as certain kinds of physical health problems, prompt more emotion-focused coping.

An additional distinction that is often made in the coping literature is between active and avoidant coping strategies. Active coping strategies are either behavioural or psychological responses designed to change the nature of the stressor itself or how one thinks about it, whereas avoidant coping strategies lead people into activities (such as alcohol use) or mental states (such as withdrawal) that keep them from directly addressing stressful events. Generally speaking, active coping strategies, whether behavioural or emotional, are thought to be better ways to deal with stressful events, and avoidant coping strategies appear to be a psychological risk factor or marker for adverse responses to stressful life events (Holahan & Moos, 1987). In adolescents, the problem-focused coping mode has been shown to be more functional (seeking information or advice, accepting social support, making efforts to solve the problem), whereas the emotion-focused or avoidant coping method is dysfunctional and can lead to withdrawal, fatalistic attitudes, and avoidance of the problem. An important findings is that stress differed across year in school corresponds with research on coping behaviour and social support. Coping behaviour and social support structures moderate the effects of stress and anxiety on the individual (Allen & Hiebert, 1991).

Finally, it won’t be unfair if is assumed that resilience can be viewed as the phenomenon of recovery from a prolonged or severe adversity, or from an immediate
danger or stress. The people who are resilient expected to adapt successfully even though they experience risk factors that are against good development. Risk factors are related to poor or negative outcomes.

Two factors are found to modify the negative effects of adverse life situations.

The first factor is vulnerability which includes any indices aggregating the negative effects of difficult circumstances. For example, children with low intelligence are more vulnerable than those with high intelligence when both groups experience severe adversities (Rutter 2000).

Another protective factor is related to moderating the negative effects of environmental hazards or a stressful situation in order to direct vulnerable individuals to optimistic paths is external social support.

So again it is assumed that resilience had a greater impact on our psychosocial life. Hildon, (2008) conducted a study considering the role of resilience on psychosocial life, and found that adversity was typified by functional limitation, life getting worse in the domains of health, stress and general living circumstances, and experiencing negative life events. The resilient tended to report fewer multiple adversities. Indicator of protective attributes, which also characterized resilient outcomes related to quality of life, included good quality relationship, integration in the community, developmental coping and adaptive coping style overall result indicate that all of these factor are ultimately related to resilience.

- Good psychosocial life depends on individual’s better adjustment with their inner and outer environment. If resilience and psychosocial life are positively correlated to each other, then, it would not be wrong to say that resilience has a positive effect on our adjustment.

Resilient people are expected to adapt successfully even though they experience risk factors that are against good development. Risk factors are related to poor or negative outcomes. For example, poverty, low socioeconomic status, and mothers with schizophrenia are coupled with lower academic achievement and more emotional or
behavioural problems. Risk factors may be cumulative, carrying additive and exponential risks when they co-Occur. When these risk factors happen, according to a study conducted on children, resilient children are capable of resulting in no behavioural problems and developing well. Additionally, they are more active and socially responsive. These positive outcomes are attributed to some protective factors, such as good parenting or positive school experiences.

Resilience can be viewed as the phenomenon of recovery from a prolonged or severe adversity, or from an immediate danger or stress. In this case, resilience is not related to vulnerability. People who experience acute trauma, for example, may show extreme anxiety, sleep problems, and intrusive thoughts. Over time, these symptoms decrease and recovery is likely. This realm of research shows that age and the supportive qualities of the family influence the condition of recovery.

Resilience is the capacity of human and natural/physical systems to adapt to and recover from change. To continue to enjoy living and receiving the benefits these coastal areas have to offer, there is a need to make the natural, built, and social environments more resilient. Enhancing resilience requires adjustments to day-to-day living, as well as adjustments to processes of long-term settlement and development of coastal areas.

Personality is another important factor which might influence resiliency. It is proved by the research findings that personality type and resilient behaviours provide protection from the experience of depression, anxiety etc (Edward 2005). Surtees et al. (2006) examined resilience factors or characteristics that assist individuals to thrive from and in adversity. These protective factors are part of an individually general make up.

Davey (2002) examined the potential for different associations of two correlates of resilience (self-worth and coping) with a third one (personality dimensions). Specifically, the authors used cluster analysis to identify three discrete personality profiles. Function analysis was then used to investigate the association of these three personality profiles with two variables that have characterized resilient youth: self-worth and coping. The combination of being extroverted, agreeable, and open to new
experiences was associated with high self-worth. Additionally, positive coping was also associated with compensatory mechanisms for adolescents who were high on disagreeableness and emotional instability.

Campbell (2006) conducted a study on the relationship of resilience to personality traits, coping styles, and psychiatric symptoms in a sample of college students. This study shows that

Resilience was negatively associated with neuroticism, and positively related to extraversion and conscientiousness. Coping styles also predicted variance in resilience above and beyond the contributions of these personality traits. Task-oriented coping was positively related to resilience, and mediated the relationship between conscientiousness and resilience.

Another study by Treichel (2007), have identified some of the personality traits and one of the coping styles that resilient individuals seem to possess. They selected for their study 132 college students. Subjects were also asked to fill out the NEO Five Factor Inventory, which measures the "big five" dimensions of personality—neuroticism (defined as a trait that includes negative emotions, poor coping, and difficulty controlling impulses), extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness; the Coping Inventory for Stressful Situations, which reveals whether a person reacts to difficult situations with emotions, avoidance, or active problem-solving; The researchers then examined subjects' results on the resilience scale and on the personality scale to see whether they could find any association between the two. Resilience, they discovered, had a highly significant, positive relationship with both extraversion and conscientiousness, and a highly significant, negative one with neuroticism. Resilience was also found to have a small, but statistically significant, positive relationship with openness and a non significant positive link with agreeableness.

Some studies confirmed the association between positive emotion and resilience (e.g., Ong et al, 2006). Examining the role positive emotion plays in resilience, Ong et al. (2006) found that widows with high levels of resilience experience more positive (e.g., peaceful) and negative (e.g., anxious) emotions than those with low levels. The former
group shows high emotional complexity which is the capacity to maintain the differentiation of positive and negative emotional states while underlying stress. Ong et al. (2006) further suggest that the adaptive consequence of resilience is a function of an increase in emotional complexity while stress is present. Moreover, high resilient widows showed the likelihood of controlling their positive emotional experiences to recover and bounce back from daily stress. Indeed, positive emotions were found to disrupt the experience of stress and help high resilient individuals to recover efficiently from daily stress (Fredrickson et al., 2003).

A study (Fredrickson et al., 2003) further suggests that positive emotions are active elements within resilience. Fredrickson et al. (2003) suggests that positive emotions are critical elements in resilience and as a mediator that buffer people from depression after the crises. Moreover, high resilient people were more likely to notice positive meanings within the problems they faced (e.g., felt grateful to be alive), endured fewer depressive symptoms, and experienced more positive emotions than low resilient people after terrorism attacks. People with high levels of resilience are likely to show low levels of depression (Bonanno et al., 2007). Moreover, low resilient people exhibit the difficulties of regulating negative emotions and demonstrate sensitive reaction to daily stressful life events (e.g., the loss of loved one) (Ong et al, 1995). They are likely to believe that there is no end for the unpleasant experience of daily stressors and may have higher levels of stress. In general, resilient people are believed to possess positive emotions, and such emotions in turn influence their responses to adversity.

Resilience is also related with Impulse control. Temperament forms the foundation of personality dimensions, that have patterns of heritable and environmental variance that are similar to temperament and similar implicated in the development of resilience. (Costa et al., 1995). Rothbart (2000) said that temperament is particularly helpful as an organizing framework for considering connection between individual differences. Effortful control includes enjoyment of low intensity stimulation, greater perceptual sensitivity, and more control over impulses and attention. Children who are higher in effortful control show less negative affectivity, which indicating an important connection between cognitive and attentional control and the regulation of negative emotion (Rothbard 2000).
Effortful control is very likely important to resilience. People, who are better able to regulate their attention and other cognitive process show better cognitive performance (Petrill 2004). In addition those who are better able to control cognitive and perceptual processing of information may also be better at regulating their emotions and behaviours so that they are less likely to develop pathologies that are associated with poor self regulation (Rothbart 2000).

In sum good self regulation helps children cope with stressful situations in more constructive ways. Persistence may help the child find appropriate coping strategies which is very useful except in stressful situations that are beyond the control of the individual. So, in the midst of an adversity, resilient people may be able to control their impulse. The purpose of the present study is to identify resilient freshmen, their adjustment pattern and some relevant psychological variables which are assumed to be contributory for their resilience or vice versa.
OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. Construction of a life event scale FOR THE STUDENT POPULATION.

2. To see the effect of perceived life events stress on
   2a) Problem focused coping strategy.
   2b) Emotion focused coping strategy
   2c) Social support coping strategy.
   2d) Neuroticism.
   2e) Extraversion.
   2f) Agreeableness.
   2g) Openness.
   2h) Conscientiousness.
   2i) Home, Health, Social, Emotional and Educational adjustment.
   2j) Impulse Control.

3. To see the effect of Problem focused Coping on aforesaid variables no 2b – 2j.

4. To see the effect of Resilience on all aforesaid variables except
   Problem focused Coping and Perceived Life stress event.

5. To see whether aforesaid variables influenced by gender variation.