



To See The Impact Of Resilience Among Young Adults

First Author

Shinu Kochhar

Final Year Post Graduate Student

Department of Psychology

Registration number- 12011646

Lovely Professional University

Contact number: 9888949929

Email id- kochharshinu@gmail.com

Second Author

Dr. Sanjay Ghosh

Assistant Professor

Department of Psychology

Lovely Professional University

UID- 26173

Contact No: 9674056152

Email id- sanjay.26173@lpu.co.in

ABSTRACT

Resilience is referred to as the way of adapting well at the time of trauma, crisis, threats, adversity, tragedy, or symbolic sources of stress—such as family and relationship issues, serious health problems, or work and financial stressors. (American Psychological Association,2012) Resilience revolves around the process of “bouncing back” from difficult experiences. The route to resilience is probably going to link one with a lot of emotional distress. Being resilient doesn’t mean that an individual won’t experience distress or difficulty. In contrast, few specific factors might make some individuals more resilient than others. Resilience consists of the components like behaviors, thoughts, and actions that one can learn and develop.

In the world today, every generation faces and has its own struggles. Young adults among them are vulnerable to numerous life-challenging issues. These issues also highlight their resilience level. It is potentially important to study the comprehensive development of resilience across the lifespan, which is also vital for mental health promotion. Resilience has been immensely understudied compared to disease and vulnerability. (Campbell-Sills, et al,2006,).

So, in the present study, an attempt has been made to see the impact of res among young adults. 20 males and 20 females have been taken for this study and Psychological Resilience Scale for Youth by Rizwan Hassan Bhat and Shah Mohd. Khan have been used.

Results indicate that the mean score of male subjects are higher compared to the female subjects (male= 75.45, female= 69.55). Which indicates that male subjects have shown more resilience compared to female subjects. Female subjects also showed slightly greater variability of scores compared to males (Male= 14.86, Female=15.17), has been reflected from their SD scores. t value has been found significant (t value= 1.24)- Mean scores are statistically significant at 0.05 level. The mean scores of both groups indicate that they belong to category D of this test which means they are both moderate in psychological resilience.

Therefore, it maybe concluded that both the groups of males and females have shown average in psychological resilience where males have shown more resilience than females in the present study. The mean scores have been statistically significant.

Introduction

According to Merriam-Webster Dictionary, For the first time in the 1620s, the word resilience, referring to "the act of rebounding," was derived from "resiliens," which is the present participle of the Latin word "resilire," which refers to recoil or rebound. Resilience is termed in a different way by most researchers, but the basic depictions are conceptually analogous. When defining resilience, researchers use terminology such as "maintaining stability", "positive adjustment" "adaptation or development," "recovery or growth from adverse conditions," and "positive adjustment" (Bonnano, 2008; Ong et al., 2006). Rutter (1990) described resilience as "maintaining adaptive functioning despite serious risk hazards. Whereas Masten (2001) referred to resilience as "a class of phenomena characterized by good outcomes despite serious threats to adaptation or development." Despite the variances in these definitions, the majority of them agree that resilience is a normative experience. Resilience was labeled as a normal characteristic that is inborn or innate to all individuals.

Roadway to resilience varies, and many factors influence the resilience path (Bonnano, 2008). Protective factors and risk factors affect the route to resilience. Personal attributes, situational experiences, and environmental factors influence the ability to adapt successfully during opposing situations (Ong et al., 2006). Young Adulthood is the time of development between ages 18-25 and is neither adolescence nor Adulthood characterized by recurrent changes and exploration (Arnett, 2000).

The development of gender differences at an early age and go along into adolescence impact the way in which individuals reach resilience (Blatt-Eisengart et al., 2009). Males and females use different techniques as coping mechanisms to deal with stressful situations (Blatt Eisengart et al., 2009; Bonanno et al., 2007; Cohen et al., 2003; Galambos, Barker, & Krahn, 2006; Hankin et al., 1998; Lopez, Campbell, & Watkins, 1986; Ong et al., 2006; Orth et al., & Sneed et al., 2006). When males experience adversity, they tend to rely on their own, or they independently face the situations, whereas females rely on their support systems (Sneed et al.). Hence, when exposed to adversity, stress, tragedy, trauma, and hardships, males and females vary in their way of coping, and, thus, their pathway towards resilience is different. Young adults experience changeovers that start from attending high school to college or the professional field. They also change their lifestyle from living under their guardian's care to independent life (Arnett, 2000). According to Nota et al. (2004), there is an imperative relationship between resilience, self-regulation, and academic achievement. One of the studies highlights the significance of maintaining resilience-related coping skills in the emerging adult population but directs those various psychological processes regulate resilience across the lifespan. (Gooding, P. A., et al. 2011)

In accordance with the studies mentioned above, a highlight also arises which suggests previous research has evaluated resilience in children and youths, but among the young adults, the studies probing the gender differences in the growth of resilience are limited. (E. Bezek, 2010) In 2006, research was conducted on depression, self-esteem, and anger in the developing adulthood population. The research study discovered that the average direction of the three measures of psychological well-being generally improved from ages 18-25. Both depressive symptoms and expressed anger declined, while self-esteem improved. (Galambos et al., 2006). According to the authors of the Medical Journal of Australia, women are frailer, tend to have deteriorated health status, but are more resilient than men. The existing literature does not deliver a strong and clear outline of data that shows the impact of resilience among young adults. For instance, some researchers suggest that ill health may not wear away psychological resilience in older adults (Lamond et al., 2008; Netuveli et al., 2008). Another study directs that there is a degree of association or link between high physical health and high resilience among adults (Wells, 2009).

Methods

- Objectives

- 1) To determine Psychological Resilience of young adults aged between 19-25 years.
- 2) To see the comparison between male and female subjects aged between 19-25 years in respect to Psychological Resilience.

- Hypothesis

- 1) There will be no significant relation in resilience among young adults aged between 19-25 years. (Ho)
- 2) There will be no significant difference in comparison with male and female subjects aged between 19-25 years in respect to Psychological Resilience. (Ho)

- Samples

20 males and 20 females have been taken for the present study whose ages range from 19-25 years. All the subjects belong to undergraduate and post graduate level of education. All subjects belong to middle socio- economic status.

- Inclusion Criteria

1. All the subjects aged between 19-25 years.
2. All the subjects belong to middle socio-economic status.
3. All the subjects belong to under graduate and post graduate level of education.

- Exclusion Criteria

1. No subject has been taken whose age is below 19 years and above 25 years.
2. No subject has been taken who is either below or above middle socio- economic status.
3. No subject has been taken who does not belong to UG or PG level of education.

- Tools

Psychological Resilience Scale by Rizwan Hassan Bhat & Shah Mohd Khan. It consists of total 21 items on a 5- point Likert scale with value anchored (1= Strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree). It is available in various languages- English, Hindi and Urdu.

It consists of 5 dimensions: Self-Perception, Single Mindedness, Task Orientation, Organized and Self Restraint. The time duration of this test is 10-12 minutes. The age group of the test is 19-25 years. For scoring the scale, scores were given as per the responses i.e., 1= Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3= Uncertain, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree. The tables in the manual are used for the scoring and interpretation of the result.

This scale is reliable and valid to measure the psychological resilience among young adults.

- Procedure

For the present study 20 male subjects and 20 female subjects were selected to see the impact of resilience among young adults The Psychological Resilience scale by Rizwan Hassan Bhat and Shah Mohd. Khan was used on the subjects. Instructions were given to the subjects and the questionnaire were distributed. Responses were collected and the scoring was done according to the scoring pattern

and table given in the manual. the. As per the statistical analysis and scoring, results were interpreted. Discussion and conclusion were made accordingly.

Result and discussion

Table 1- Showing different scores of male subjects in Psychological Resilience Scale

S.NO.	Scores	Mean	S.D.	Grade	Remark
1	87	75.75	14.86	D	Moderate
2	68				
3	71				
4	94				
5	86				
6	67				
7	37				
8	77				
9	57				
10	79				
11	67				
12	96				
13	74				
14	93				
15	75				
16	94				
17	60				
18	82				
19	82				
20	63				

Table 2- Showing different scores of female subjects in Psychological Resilience Scale

S.NO.	Scores	Mean	S.D.	Grade	Remark
1	83	69.55	15.17	D	Moderate
2	57				
3	79				
4	77				
5	54				
6	43				
7	90				
8	90				
9	63				
10	83				
11	72				
12	74				
13	88				
14	41				
15	45				
16	71				
17	73				
18	62				
19	74				
20	72				

Table 3- Showing comparison of scores between male and female subjects in Psychological Resilience Scale.

Males	Females	t-values	p-values	Remarks
Mean= 75.45	Mean= 69.55	1.2425	0.2217	Significant at 0.05 level
S.D.= 14.86	S.D. = 15.17			

Discussion

Results indicate that both the group mean scores fall in the category “D” which means they show moderate ability of psychological resilience. Mean score of male subjects is higher than the mean score of female subjects which indicate that within this category male subjects have shown better resilience in compared to female subjects. From the S.D scores, it may be said that female subjects’ scores are more variable than that of male subjects ‘scores. t-value has been found significant which implies that the difference of mean scores is statistically significant.

These findings are very much in line with the findings of the previous researchers (Sneed et al., 2006). Contradictory findings have also been traced (E. Bezek, 2010).

Finally, it may be stated that both the groups fall under the same category “D” i.e., moderate ability of psychological resilience and among this category male subjects have shown greater resilience under the same category. The findings have been statically significant.

Conclusion

From the above results, it may be concluded that there is a statistically significant comparative relation among the scores of male and female subjects. So, in this case, null hypothesis has been rejected and alternative

hypothesis has been accepted. However, mean scores of both groups indicate that they belong to category D of this test which means they are both moderate in psychological resilience. In this study, psychological resilience of both male and female subjects has been studied where male subjects have scored slightly better than the female subjects.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2020, February 1). *Building your resilience*. <http://www.apa.org/topics/resilience>
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55(5), 469–480. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.55.5.469>
- Bezek, E. (2010). *Gender Differences in Resilience in the Emerging Adulthood Population* [E-book]. Rochester Institute of Technology.
- Blatt-Eisengart, I., Drabick, D. A. G., Monahan, K. C., & Steinberg, L. (2009). Sex differences in the longitudinal relations among family risk factors and childhood externalizing symptoms. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(2), 491–502. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014942>
- Bonanno, G. A. (2008). Loss, trauma, and human resilience: Have we underestimated the human capacity to thrive after extremely aversive events? *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 5(1), 101–113. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1942-9681.s.1.101>
- Bonanno, G. A., Galea, S., Bucciarelli, A., & Vlahov, D. (2007). What predicts psychological resilience after disaster? The role of demographics, resources, and life stress. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 75(5), 671–682. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006x.75.5.671>
- Campbell-Sills, L., Cohan, S. L., & Stein, M. B. (2006). Relationship of resilience to personality, coping, and psychiatric symptoms in young adults. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 44(4), 585–599. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2005.05.001>
- Cohen, P., Kasen, S., Chen, H., Hartmark, C., & Gordon, K. (2003). Variations in patterns of developmental transmissions in the emerging adulthood period. *Developmental Psychology*, 39(4), 657–669. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.39.4.657>
- Galambos, N. L., Barker, E. T., & Krahn, H. J. (2006). Depression, self-esteem, and anger in emerging adulthood: Seven-year trajectories. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(2), 350–365. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.2.350>
- Gooding, P. A., Hurst, A., Johnson, J., & Tarrrier, N. (2011). Psychological resilience in young and older adults. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 27(3), 262–270. <https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.2712>
- Lamond, A. J., Depp, C. A., Allison, M., Langer, R., Reichstadt, J., Moore, D. J., Golshan, S., Ganiats, T. G., & Jeste, D. V. (2008). Measurement and predictors of resilience among community-dwelling older women. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, 43(2), 148–154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2008.03.007>
- Leipold, B., & Greve, W. (2009). Resilience. *European Psychologist*, 14(1), 40–50. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.14.1.40>
- Lopez, F. G., Campbell, V. L., & Watkins, C. E. (1986). Depression, psychological separation, and college adjustment: An investigation for sex differences. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 33(1), 52–56. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.33.1.52>
- Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 227–238. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.56.3.227>
- Netuveli, G., & Blane, D. (2008). Quality of life in older ages. *British Medical Bulletin*, 85(1), 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bmb/ldn003>

Nota, L., Soresi, S., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2004). Self-regulation and academic achievement and resilience: A longitudinal study. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 41(3), 198–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2005.07.001>

Ong, A. D., Bergeman, C. S., Bisconti, T. L., & Wallace, K. A. (2006). Psychological resilience, positive emotions, and successful adaptation to stress in later life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(4), 730–749. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.4.730>

resilience. (n.d.). The Merriam-Webster.Com Dictionary. Retrieved September 23, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resilience>

Rutter, M. (1985). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 57(3), 316–331. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.1987.tb03541.x>

Sneed, J. R., Johnson, J. G., Cohen, P., Gilligan, C., Chen, H., Crawford, T. N., & Kasen, S. (2006). Gender differences in the age-changing relationship between instrumentality and family contact in emerging adulthood. *Developmental Psychology*, 42(5), 787–797. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.42.5.787>

Swannell, C. (2020, January 27). *Women more frail but more resilient than men*. The Medical Journal of Australia. <https://www.mja.com.au/journal/2020/women-more-frail-more-resilient-men>

Wells, M. (2009). Resilience in Rural Community-Dwelling Older Adults. *The Journal of Rural Health*, 25(4), 415–419. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-0361.2009.00253.x>

