

## The Role of Area of Living and Family Environment in the Development of Psychological Resilience among College Going Students

Ashwini P. Patil<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. R. K. Adsul<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The present study examined the role of area of living and family environment in the development of psychological resilience among college going students. The sample consisted of 160 students were selected for the present study which includes 80 urban and 80 rural college going students from Kolhapur District. Purposive sampling method was used for the data collection. Family environment assess by using Family Environment Inventory (FES) developed by Bhatia and Chadha (1993) and Resilience was measured by Adolescents Resilience Questionnaire Scales (ARQS) by (Deidre Gartland, 2006). The collected data was statistically calculated by using Mean, SD and ANOVA. The results indicated that, there was no significant difference found between urban and rural students on psychological resilience. Family environment is significant indicator of resilience. Area of living and family environment is not jointly influence on psychological resilience among college going students.

**Keywords:** *Psychological Resilience, Urban, rural area, Family Environment.*

Many of people strives the stressful situations very easily and they recover quickly from adverse events this is a positive capacity we called as 'resilience'. In the field of positive psychology 'resilience' is relative new concept which researchers have taking interest in it. Resilience means the capacity of 'bounce back' from adverse situations in the life. Resilience has a long history and deep roots. In 1970's and 1980's researchers focus their attention on resilience and studied scientifically manner. The concept of resilience introduced of the world with the study of psychopathology, medicine and education field (Masten, 1998; Masten Coatwort, 1988). Werner (1993) refers to resilience is positive capacity in which individuals exhibit positive behavioral adaptation when they faced significant adversity or trauma in their life. Richardson (2002) defined resilience as the process of coping with adversity that

<sup>1</sup> (Research Scholar of Psychology, Shivaji University, Kolhapur, India)

<sup>2</sup> (Head, Dept. of Psychology, Smt.Mathubai Garware Kanya Mahavidyalaya, Sangli, India)

\*Responding Author

Received: March 25, 2018; Revision Received: May 15, 2018; Accepted: May 20, 2018

## **The Role of Area of Living and Family Environment in the Development of Psychological Resilience among College Going Students**

contributes to development of protective factors. Resilience consisted two components that is resistance against destructions (as personal capacity to protect his or her integrity under stressful situations), and the ability to constructed a positive life in spite of adversity (Vanistendael, 1995). According to Ann Masten (2001) Resilience is an “ordinary magic.” Masten’s concept of ordinary magic identified two aspects of resilience research. First aspect explored that many people show resilient responses to significant life challenges, in other words, resilience is not a rare and extraordinary capacity but it is common characteristics found in every individuals’. Second aspect is a lack of extraordinariness. Resilience is not from superman ability but it is arises from everyday features of people’s lives. Resilience is “pattern of behavior and functioning indicative of positive adaptation in the context of significant risk and adversity” (Masten and Coatsworth, 1998).

### **Area of Living**

Area of living has influence directly or indirectly on human personality. Man as a social animal, he lived in society. People spend their life in different area in the world. There are two main categories who people lead their life to different ways, one is urban and another is rural. In rural area people living in small community and lead their life including with many of religion, cultures, beliefs, customs and moral issues. Their life style is very simple and they accepting these life style very easily. The earning source available in rural area is agriculture; most of people depend on natural resources and agriculture and its related occupation. However, urban area shows different situation than rural

In urban area people live in large community and many of facilities available in this area, but urban area family size is small and nuclear pattern and rural area mostly we see larger family size or joint family structure they closely related to emotionally or morally to each others. In urban area people get better education and other sources available on them such as modern educational facilities; hospital facilities, availability many of carrier opportunity, satellite service and economic sources, transportation etc. Urban area fully developed with technological bases and rural area available few technological aspects.

### **Area of Living and Resilience**

According to Gortberg, (1992) the children who were living in Sudanese culture having specific traits like solve difficulties without involving their parents, parents encourage them for solving their problems themselves and these factors associated with resilience. Urban area rich with many of facilities and that resources positive influence on urban adolescents (Riddle and Romans, 2010) concluded that American adolescent who located in urban region found higher level of resilience. Individuals who accept the culture and values, norms and accepted new culture without any hesitation they have more resilient than others (Stutman et al, 2002). In recent literature of resilience found that resilience is capacity to cope with difficulties and this is a common ability in every individuals and the study revealed that no any significant different found in respect to area of living. Additionally study suggests that urban and rural individual’s resilience level is equal (Kelly and Liles, 2013, Leonard and Bariola, 2015).

## **The Role of Area of Living and Family Environment in the Development of Psychological Resilience among College Going Students**

### **Relationship between Resilience and Family Environment**

In current literature of resilience researchers focus on family factors which gives valuable contribution for building resilience of children, adolescents and adults. Resilient family faced this stressful situation with positively. Numerous children are exposed to difficulties during their physical as well as emotional development. Parental support and good home environment are fundamental factors to the development of resilience. The family environment is influenced by many of factors like nature of family structure, parental socio-economic status, family members, sibling relationship, and religious background of the family. Warmth family relationship of parents helps to reduce family conflict and children mental illness (Luther & Zingler, 1991). Positive family environment and warmth parenting play a fundamental role for promoting resilience. According to Flener (2005) children having highly educated parents, grown up in positive environment tend to more resilient and they have better physical as well as psychological health. Children who perceived good peer support, positive connection in school, higher family perception and positive feedback of teachers showed more resilient than other children who do not perceived these types of factors (Gonzalez and Padilla, 1997). According to Sameroff, et.al (1993) proposed that adolescent with higher level of self-esteem, effective parenting teaching, better internal locus of control and lower level of parenting criticism, product higher level of resilience.

### **SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

The present study examines the role of family environment and area of living to the development of psychological resilience among college going students. Adolescence is very colorful period in the human development. During the life course individuals face many of difficulties and stressful life events and resilience is a very important capacity to recover quickly from these negative life events. Family environment play a lead role to the development of resilience. Positive family environment and warmth parenting is always beneficial for adolescents and negative family environment function to the development of unhealthy personality. In this present study author identify to what extent in Indian context family environment play an important role to the formation of resilience with respect to urban and rural living area. To reveal above fact I undertook the present study.

### **Objectives**

- 1) To examine the influence of area of living in the development of on psychological resilience among college going students.
- 2) To examine the role of family environment to the building of psychological resilience among college going students.
- 3) To examine the interaction effect of area of living and family environment on psychological resilience among college going students.

### **Hypotheses**

- 1) There will be significant difference between urban and rural college going students with respect to psychological resilience.

## The Role of Area of Living and Family Environment in the Development of Psychological Resilience among College Going Students

- 2) There will be significant difference between higher and lower family environment in the development of psychological resilience among college going students.
- 3) There will be significant interaction effect between area of living and family environment on psychological resilience among college going students.

### *Sample:*

The present study sample was selected from Junior College students of Kolhapur districts in Maharashtra. A total 160 adolescents were selected which was 80 from urban area and 80 from rural area. The age range of the participants was 16 to 19 years. The purposive sampling method was used for data collection.

### *Tools:*

The data was collected with help of following instruments.

- 1) **Adolescent Resilience Questionnaire (ARQ):** This scale was constructed by Dr. Deirdre Gartland (2006) was used to evaluate resilience. The scale has 88 items with five domains: Individuals, Family, Peers, School and Community. Items comprise statements with five point Likert responses from 1- Never, 2-Not often, 3- Sometimes, 4- Most of the time, 5- all the time. Higher score indicated greater resilience. The Cronbach Alpha reliability was 0.81 to 0.88. In the present study pilot study has done and calculated the Split-Half reliability with the help of Spearman Brown Formula and it is 0.77.
- 2) **Family Environment Scale (FES):** This scale was constructed and standardized by Bhatia and Chadha (1993). The present scale consists of three major dimensions 1) Relationship, 2) Personal Growth, 3) System Maintenance. The scale consists of 69 items and each item is associated with 5 alternatives. The overall reliability of the scale reported by the author is 0.95. Both face and content validity were tested for this. The scale was given to 18 experts to evaluate the test items. Thus adequate validity was found.

### *Procedure:*

Details information about the purpose of the study was given to the principal of the college and permission was sought. After obtaining the permission from the principal, participants met and they clearly explain the objectives of the study and researcher established good rapport of them. After that participant called 10 to 15 each group and given test and asked them how to respond each question. Participants were given 20 to 30 minutes for each questionnaire and data was collected. Using the manual appropriate raw score was given. The following statistical analysis was done.

### *Variable of the Study*

#### **Independent Variables:**

- 1) Area of Living (Urban and Rural)
- 2) Family environment (High and Low)

#### **Dependant Variable**

Psychological Resilience

## The Role of Area of Living and Family Environment in the Development of Psychological Resilience among College Going Students

### *Data Analysis*

First the data were treated by mean and standard deviation and ANOVA were used to assess the difference between two means.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:**

*Table No. 1. Mean and SD values for Resilience with respect to, Area of living and Family Environment*

Total	Area of Residency		Family Environment	
	URBAN	RURAL	HIGH-FE	LOW-FE
Mean	315.71	321.07	327.66	306.17
SD	24.95	28.09	22.68	26.64
N	80	80	91	69

Table no. 1 indicates that mean and SD values of area of living and family environment among college going students. Results indicate the mean of rural area is higher than the mean of urban area and the mean of higher family environment is greater than the lower family environment.

*Table No. 2. Complete Summery of Two way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for Resilience*

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Sum Square	F	P value
AOR (A)	1312.714	1	1312.714	2.250	0.136
FES (B)	18562.537	1	18562.537	31.820	<b>0.000</b>
A x B	1782.398	1	1782.398	3.055	0.082
Error	91004.303	156	583.361		
Total	112708.194	159			

\*\* Significant at 0.01 level, \* significant at 0.05 level

Main effect A represents area of living. There are two levels of area of living which is urban and rural. Results of the present study showed that the main effect area of living was not significant ( $F= 2.25$ ,  $df = 1$  and  $159$ ,  $p$  value is  $.0136$ ). It means Ss grown up in urban area and those grown up in rural area do not differ significantly from each other on psychological resilience. On the basis of area of residency classified groups were divided in to two groups. The urban Ss and rural Ss mean score were computed. The mean of urban Ss is 315.71 with 24.95 SD and the mean of rural Ss is 321.09 with 28.09 SD. So it could be concluded that, area of living was not significantly influence on psychological resilience among students. The present findings supported by previous evidences, Dasgupta (2009) reported that there was no significant difference found the resilience characteristics and area of living among adolescents. Fircloth (2017) reveled that there was no significant difference found among rural and non-rural students with respect to psychological resilience. Leonard and Bariola (2015) indicated that also no significant difference found between urban and rural living lesbian and gay men.

## **The Role of Area of Living and Family Environment in the Development of Psychological Resilience among College Going Students**

Family environment was strong indicator which was significantly influence on resilience. The main effect of B represents the Family Environment; also varied at two levels namely high family environment and low family environment. The main effect of Family Environment yielded an F ratio of  $F = 31.82$   $df = 1$  and  $159$ ,  $p$  value is  $.000$ . It means that the Ss brought up in higher family environment and those brought up in lower family environment differ significantly on resilience. The mean score of higher family environment Ss is  $327.66$  and SD value is  $22.68$  and the mean score of low family environment is  $306.17$  with  $26.64$  SD. The difference between these two means was so large. So it concluded that Ss reared up in higher family environment significantly higher on psychological resilience than Ss reared up in lower family environment. Finally it revealed that family environment play a key role to building resilience among adolescents. Current findings consisted with previous studies Zakeri, et al. (2010) investigated that, positive association found between acceptance-involvement parenting style and resilience. However, warmth and supportive family environment were boost resilience of adolescents. Mairean and Turliuc (2011) addressed that, caring and loving parents who believe their children's abilities and provide positive emotional support was essential for development of resilience.

Interaction effect A x B obtained no significant results ( $F=3.05$ ,  $df =1$  and  $159$ ,  $p$  value is  $0.082$ ). This interaction effect shows that area of residency and family environment was not dependant to each other. In other words area of living and family environment failed to function in collaboration with each other in contribute to the development of psychological resilience among students.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

1. There is no significant difference found between urban and rural college going students on psychological resilience.
2. There is significant difference found between higher family environment and lower family environment on psychological resilience among college going students.
3. There is no significant interaction effect found between area of living and family environment with respect to psychological resilience among college going students.

### **LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:**

There are some limitations of the current study

- 1) This study was done exclusively in Kolhapur District. Resilience level of other districts is not reflected in the study. Hence the above results cannot be generalized.
- 2) The sample size was small. There was two categories were taken in to urban and rural area however, suburban area was not integrated in the study.
- 3) The present study questionnaire used were lengthy, it took approximately 30 minutes for every subjects to test completion. If the questionnaire was developed with less time than one used in present investigation, then it would be easier to collect large number a subjects.

### IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE SEARCH

- 1) There is several studies address that the impact of resilience on adolescents but not many studies on old age individuals. It would be beneficial for researchers to study the impact of resilience on older.
- 2) Many of factors like happiness, emotional intelligence, quality of life, self-esteem, parenting bonding, altruism; personality traits etc. may prove that best predictor of resilience. Further research taken into consideration such variables can be conducted.

### REFERENCES:

- Dasgupta, C (2009). Resilience of adolescents living with political violence in Kasmir: role of religious meaning system and political ideology. (Doctoral Thesis), Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Deonar, Mumbai.
- Faircloth, A. N. (2015). Resilience as a mediator of the relationship between negative life events and psychological well-being. Unpublished doctorsl dissertation). M.S., Georgia Southern University, Georgia.
- Felner, R. D. (2005). Poverty in childhood and adolescents. In s. Goldstein & R. B. Brooks (Eds.) *Handbook of resilience in children*. (PP. 125-147). New York Plenum.
- Gonzalez, R. & Padilla, A.M.(1997). The academic resilience of Mexican American high school students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Science*, 19, 309-317.
- Gortberg, E and Badri, G. (1992). Sudanese children in the family and culture. *Psychology in International Perspective*.
- Kelly, T., Liles, R. G.(2013). The effect of birth order on psychological resilience among exposed to domestic violence. Annual VISTAS project. American Counseling Association Knowledge Center, 1-14. [http:// counselingotfittere=s.com/vistas-Home.htm](http://counselingotfittere=s.com/vistas-Home.htm).
- Leonard, A. W., Bariola, E. (2015). Mental health and resilience among Australian lesbians and gay men. *Rural society*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10371656>
- Luthar, S.S., & Zigler, E. (1991). Vulnerability and Competence: A review of research on resilience in childhood. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 61, 6-22.
- Mairean, C., Turliuc, M. N. (2011). Research Review Risk and Resilience in children. The role social support. *Journal of the National Network for professionals in preventing child Abuse and Neglect*, 30-31.
- Masten, A. S. & Coatworth, J.D. (1998). The development of competence in favorable and unfavorable environments, *American Psychologist*, 53(2), 205-220.
- Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary Magic: Resilience process in development. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 227-238.
- Masten, A.S. (1989). Resilience in development: Implications of the study of successful adaptation for developmental psychopathology. In D. Cicchetti (Ed.), *The emergence of a discipline: Rochester symposium on developmental psychopathology* (vol. 1, pp 261-294). Hillsdate, NJ: Erlbaun.

## The Role of Area of Living and Family Environment in the Development of Psychological Resilience among College Going Students

- Rana, N. 7& Kapoor, S. (2017) Academic achievement of female students at college level in relation to their family environment and locale. *MIER Journal of Educational Studies Trends & Practices*, 7 (1), 51-65.
- Richardson, G.E. (2002) The meta-theory of resilience and resiliency, *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 58 (3), 307-321.
- Riddle, G. S., & Romans, John. S. C. (2010). Resilience among urban American Indian adolescents: Exploration into the role of culture, self- esteem, subjective well -being and social support. *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental health research*. 19, (2) 1-19.
- Sameroff, A. J., Seifer, R., Baldwin, A., Baldwin, C. (1993) stability of intelligence from preschool to adolescence *child development* 64; 80-97.
- Seligman, M.E.P. (2000). *Authentic happiness*. USA: Fress Press.
- Seligman, M.E.P., & Csikszentmihalyi. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5-14.
- Stutman, S., Baruch, R., Grotberg, E. & Rathore, Z. (2002). Resilience in Latino Youth. Working paper, *Institute of Mental Health Initiatives*.ashhgtn DC: The Gorge Washington University.
- Vanistendael .S (1995). Growth in middle of life. Resilience on people's strengths. Internetal Catholic Child Bureau, Geneva.
- Wells, M. (2010) .Resilience in older Adults Living in Rural, Suburban, And Urban Areas. *Online Journal of Rural Nursing and Health Care*, 10, (2), 45-54.
- Werner, E. E. (1993). Risk, resilience and recovery: Perspectives from the Kauai Longitudinal Study. *Development and Psychopathology*, no. 5, 503-515.
- Zakeri, H., Jowkar, B. & Razmjoe, M. (2010). Parenting style and resilience. *Procedia Social Behvioral Sciences*, 5, 1067-1070.

**How to cite this article:** Patil A P & Adsul R K (2018). The Role of Area of Living and Family Environment in the Development of Psychological Resilience among College Going Students. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Vol. 6, (2), DIP: 18.01.224/20180602, DOI: 10.25215/0602.224