

Resilience and Psychological Wellbeing Among Psychology Students and Engineering Students- A Comparative Study



Social Science

KEYWORDS : Resilience, Psychological well-being, College Students

Dr. Tony P. Jose

Asst. Professor, School of Social Sciences & Languages, VIT University, Vellore

Akhila Thomas

Msc. Psychology Second Year, LISSAH College, Calicut, Kerala

ABSTRACT

The present study examined the difference between resilience and psychological wellbeing among Psychology students and Engineering students. The convenient samples of 120 adolescents were selected for the study which includes 60 males and 60 females from Calicut district, Kerala. Resilience was measured by Sills and Stein' (2007) scale of resilience, and Psychological wellbeing was measured by Carol Ryff' (1998) scale of Psychological wellbeing. The 't' test result shows that there is no significant difference between resilience and wellbeing among Psychology students and Engineering students, whereas there is a significant difference between resilience with respect to the Gender. Males are more resilient compared to females.

INTRODUCTION

Resilience is a positive force in which individuals exhibit positive behavioral adaptation when they encounter significant adversity or trauma in their life (Werner, 1992). According to Neufeldt and Sparks (2003) resilience is achievement of positive outcomes despite risk. Grotberg says (1995) resilience is an individual's capacity to face, overcome and be strengthened by adversities in life. Grotberg (1995) suggests that everyday people experience stressful situations in their life that leave them vulnerable. However, these individuals can be crushed or strengthened by adverse situations depending on their level of resilience.

VanBreda (2001) suggests that an individual's resilience level is calculated by the ratio of protective factors to the presence of hazardous factors. There are four main patterns of resilience found in the literature (Polk, 1997; Vanbreda, 2001): dispositional, relational, situational and philosophical. In the dispositional pattern, the factors that promote resilience include a sense of autonomy or self-reliance, a sense of self-worth, good physical health and well-maintained appearance. The relational pattern encompasses factors related to the quality of relationships with others. The situational pattern includes factors such as being able to solve problems, evaluate a situation and take action in response to stressful situations. Lastly, the philosophical pattern is described as an individual's worldview or life paradigm which can include beliefs that promote resilience such as being optimistic towards life.

Resilience contributes to an easy temperament that promotes positive responses from others, self-esteem, self-efficacy, independence, self-reliance and environmental opportunities (Werner, 1994). Individuals, who are resilient, tend to understand that they cannot control everything in life. Consequently, they are more proactive when faced with challenges and more likely to adapt to difficult circumstances by using both internal and external resources (Alvord, Grados, 2005). Block (2002) suggests that as a result of this adaptive flexibility, individuals with higher levels of resilience are more likely to experience positive effect, have higher levels of self-confidence and display better psychological adjustment than individuals with low levels of resiliency. Students with high level of resilience are likely to exhibit academic resilience and high levels of achievement motivation despite stressful conditions.

Wellbeing is a dynamic concept that includes subjective, social and psychological dimensions as well as health. The negative mental health factors could be manifested as mental disorders like depression, obsession, compulsion, delusions or even negative states like anger, hostility, dissatisfaction, fear and inferiority, etc. Students with wellbeing are confident, emotionally intelligent, and better academic performer. These skills can also

contribute to the creation of strong social bonds and the maintenance of healthy relationships and responsible lifestyles.

Psychological wellbeing means the positive psychological functioning of the individual. Students with psychological wellbeing possess good mental health and maintain good relationship with other individuals. They are productive in nature and maintain positive attitude towards their life.

Need and significance of the study

The present study examines the importance of psychological wellbeing and resilience among college students. The experience of positive emotions helps the resilient individuals in their ability to recover stress effectively in his/her daily life. Other studies also indicated that difference in resilience accounted for meaningful variation in daily emotional responses to stress. This study helps to understand the process of resilience and psychological wellbeing in the development of an individual.

Psychological well-being is also determined by the complex interactions between individual characteristics, social and economic factors and the physical environment. This study is an attempt to understand the process of resilience and psychological wellbeing in development among college students.

OBJECTIVES

1. To find out the significant difference between psychological wellbeing and resilience among Psychology students and Engineering students.
2. To find out the significant difference on the variable psychological wellbeing with respect to gender.
3. To find out the significant difference on the variable resilience with respect to gender.

METHOD

SAMPLE

The subjects for the study included students studying in three colleges belonging to Calicut district, Kerala, India. The total sample of the present study consists of 124 college students, 63 females and 61 males. The age of the subjects ranges from 17 to 22 years old. The researchers used purposive sampling method for this study.

TOOLS

Psychological well-being scale (Carol Ryff, 1989): The aim of the test is to measure the psychological wellbeing of the individuals. It is a 6 point likert scale which consist of 18 items, negative items considered as 4, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. To get the total score of the test add all the items. The test-retest reliability coefficient of psychological wellbeing scales was reported as 0.82 and validity also reported as satisfactory.

Resilience scale (Sills & Stein, 2007): It was developed to measure the resilience of the individuals. The scale consists of 10 items, all of which carry a 5-point range of responses. The item varies the score from 0-4 (not true at all, rarely true, sometimes true often true and true nearly all of the time). Internal consistency of the 10 items was evaluated by calculating Cronbach's alpha. The alpha value of 0.85 indicated good reliability.

RESULTS

Table 1

Mean, S.D. and 't' test difference in wellbeing and resilience among Psychology students

Table 2

Mean, S.D. and 't' test difference of wellbeing and resilience with respect to the gender of the participants.

The results of the independent samples t-test shows that mean scores of wellbeing and resilience differs between Psychology students (M = 72.63, SD = 8.16, n = 62) and Engineering students (M = 72.97 & 22.79, SD = 7.84 & 5.64, n = 62) at the .05 level of significance (t = -.230 & .546, df = 122), p > .05. The 't' test result shows that there is no significant difference between resilience and wellbeing among Psychology students and Engineering students.

The results of the independent samples t-test shows that mean scores of wellbeing differs between males (M = 72.38, SD = 8.16, n = 62) and females (M = 73.21, SD = 8.21, n = 62) at the .05 level of significance (t = -.564, df = .574) p > .05. The 't' test result shows that there is no significant difference in wellbeing with respect to the Gender of the participants.

The results shows that mean scores of resilience differs between males (M = 24.64, SD = 7.44, n = 62) and females (M = 21.63, SD = 5.21, n = 62) at the .05 level of significance (t = 2.6, df = 122 & 107.15) p < .05. The 't' test result shows that there is a significant difference between resilience with respect to the gender.

Variable	Group	No	Mean	SD	t value	df	Sig.
Wellbeing	Psychology	62	72.63	8.534	-.230	122	.818
	Engineering	62	72.97	7.845			
Resilience	Psychology	62	23.44	7.390	.546	122	.586
	Engineering	62	22.79	5.643			

Variable	Gender	No.	Mean	SD	t value	df	Sig.
Wellbeing	M	61	72.38	8.161	-.564	122	.574
	F	63	73.21	8.213			
Resilience	M	61	24.64	7.441	2.611	122	.010
	F	63	21.63	5.213			

The present study examines the importance of psychological wellbeing and resilience among college students. Students with high resilience capacity have the ability to recover stress effectively in his/her daily life. This study helps to understand the process of resilience and psychological wellbeing in development of an individual. The importance of effective responses to stress and having the support of family and friends provides a caring and supportive relationship that seems to act as a buffer to psychological wellbeing.

The key finding of the study is males are more resilient than females. This result shows that gender has a significant effect on protective factors. The genetic effects on resilience may be different for male and female. Males externalize their difficulties while females are more likely to internalize their problems. Men and women are socialized differently, engage in different roles in life, and have differential access to social and material resources. Women are considered to be more sensitive to the problems faced by their friends and family (Kessler & McLeod, 1984). Because they are less resilient to stressors involving friends and family due to their social roles.

Conclusion

The result of this investigation reveals that there is no significant difference between psychological wellbeing and resilience among Psychology students and Engineering students. The result also shows that there is no significant difference between wellbeing with respect to the gender of the participants whereas there is significant difference between resilience with respect to the gender. Males are more resilient compared to females.

REFERENCE

Alvord, M., Grados, J. J. (2005). Enhancing Resilience in Children: A Proactive Approach. *Journal of Psychology*. 36:238-245. | Block, J. (2002). Personality as an affect-processing system Mahwah: Erlbaum. Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). *Authentic happiness*. New York: Free Press. | Grothberg, E. (1995). A guide to promoting resilience in children: Strengthening the human spirit. Retrieved February 1, 2012, from www.resilinet.uiuc.edu/library/groth95b.html | Kessler RC, McLeod JD. (1984). Sex differences in vulnerability to undesirable life events. *American Sociological Review*. 49: 620-631. | Neufeldt, V., Sparks, N. (Eds.) (2003). *Webster's New World Dictionary*. New York: Pocket Books | Polk, L. V. (1997). Toward a middle-range theory of resilience. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 19 (3), 1-13. | Ryff, C. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 5: 1069-1081. | VanBreda, A. D. (2001). Resilience theory: A literature review. Retrieved August 5, 2009, from <http://www.vanbreda.org/adrian/resilience.htm> | Werner, E. E. (1994). Overcoming the odds. *Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics*, 15 (2) 131-136. | Werner, E. E. (1992). The children of Kauai: Resiliency and recovery in adolescence and adulthood. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 13: 262-26. |