Gain Resilience to Overcome Stress: Family Relationships and Roles

Suparna Jain[1], Nupur Singh[2], Sonam Singh[3], Sophia Sharma[4], Mehtab K. Dhillon[5] and Mohini Chaudhary[6]

[1,2,3,4,5,6]Department of Psychology, Daulat Ram College, University of Delhi, 4, Patel Marg, Maurice Nagar, New Delhi Delhi 110007
E-mail: suparna85@gmail.com

Abstract—Resilience is defined as a person's ability to manage stress. The present study explores the stressors related to the institution of family. A mixed methodology is adopted. Quantitatively, along with demographic profiling, two questionnaires were administered namely; the Perceived Stress Scale and Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale on 608 women undergraduate students randomly selected from a women's college in University of Delhi. Qualitatively, each participant was asked to narrate the most common stressors experienced by them in the past six months. Statistical analysis was done using one way ANOVA for quantitative data and content analysis was employed for qualitative data analysis. Factors that may make this institution ideal for development of resilience were revealed. First, Family Structure–intact families (joint or nuclear) and lone families (divorced or widowed parent)–and second, Working Status of Parents, have a significant effect. Third, Sibling Relationships–none to multiple siblings–and the cases of siblings pursuing same academic stream or same extracurricular activities impacts the level of resilience. The optimal level of comparison between siblings and the importance of a good attachment relationship between them is also found. Fourth, Relocation for Studies, which leads to separation from home, was revealed to improve resilience, especially when certain factors such as type of accommodation and satisfaction with roommates are considered. Lastly, Role Focus on gender stereotypical familial roles decreases resilience. The present study hence provides an in depth exploration of factors creating stress and improving resilience for undergraduate female students.

The understanding of the concept of health is incomplete without focussing on Stress and resilience. Stress has become an inevitable ingredient of college life. As a result there has been a significant rise in the mental health problems among college students (Holterman, 2015). It is important to educate them about wise ways of handling stressors so as to develop resilience. Resilience can be defined as the ability to 'rebound' and regain original shape following trauma or shock (Oxford 1989); and the promotion of positive adaptation under stress and adversity (Wagnild 2003). Resilience embodies the personal qualities that enable one to thrive in the face of adversity (Connor and Davidson, 2003). Research has demonstrated that resilience is a multidimensional characteristic that varies with context, time, age, gender, and cultural origin, as well as within an individual subjected to different life circumstances (e.g., Garmezy, 1985; Garmezy and Rutter, 1985; Rutter et al., 1985; Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Werner and Smith, 1992).

Family being one of the most important social units impacts a person's level of stress and resilience especially in a country like India which is characterised by collectivistic culture. Many studies (Bhawuk 2004; House et al. 2004; Sinha 1985; Sinha and Verma 1987; Triandis 1995; Triandis and Bhawuk 1997; Verma 1999; Verma and Triandis 1998 among others) have confirmed that Indians are by and large collectivists. However, changes in the socio-economic-political-cultural milieu of our society have led to changes in the structures, functions, roles, relationships and values of the family (Bharat, 1991).

Much research has been done to assess the changes that are occurring in various facets of family life in India. However, little has been studied in terms of their effect on various family members especially adolescents and young adults. Such changing dynamics of the family system can increase the levels of stress among the undergraduates. Thus the need is to study the factors in the family setup which are emerging as stressors and also the ones which are making the college going students resilient.

Relocation for studies is another factor which is indirectly related to family and can lead to stress. It has become a common scenario among undergraduates to settle away from home to pursue education. However, living away from family can be challenging. Thus, it is also important to find means through which relocated students can minimise stress due to separation from family and rather gain resilience.

1. METHOD

Both quantitative and qualitative research methods were used in the present exploratory study. Focus group discussion was carried among the researchers, based on which the most important facets of the family life which impact undergraduate girls were extracted. On the basis of the shortlisted facets, exhaustive demographic profile was developed to be administered on the participants.

Two standardised tools were also used to assess the level of Stress and Resilience among the participants. To collect qualitative data an open ended question was asked from the entire sample, asking them to describe the most stressful events of their life in past 6 months.

Quantitative data was analysed by employing descriptive and inferential statistics and content analysis was carried out for interpreting the qualitative data.

Tools Used:

Demographic Profile:

It comprised of quantitative questions on family: structure, working status of the parents, time spent with each parent on daily basis, number of siblings, level of perceived attachment with sibling; Relocation: whether or not presently relocated for studies; If relocated, then, type of accommodation, number of roommates, perceived satisfaction with roommates; role focus etc.

The Perceived Stress Scale:

The Perceived Stress Scale is a self-report visual analog scale (VAS) global measure of perceived stress (Hill, Aldag, Chatterton, & Zinaman, 2005, p. 681). The VAS is a unidimensional instrument quantifying intensity of stress. A horizontal line 100 millimetres long with anchors at either end (none, extreme) is used where scores are recorded to the nearest millimetre. Revill, Robinson, Rosen, and Hogg (1976) reported test-retest reliability ranges from .95 to .99 for most visual analog scales.

Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC; Connor and Davidson 2003):

The CD-RISC is a 25-item scale that measures the ability to cope with stress and adversity. Respondents rate items on a scale from 0 (‘‘not true at all’’) to 4 (‘‘true nearly all the time’’). The reliability coefficient in the Indian context of the CD-RISC is 0.89. The internal consistency alpha values of the 4 factors found based on the factor analysis done in the Indian context are: α= 0.80 for factor 1, α= 0.75 for factor 2, α=0.74 for factor 3 and α=0.69 for factor 4. Furthermore, all factors are significantly highly correlated with each other and with total resilience score (Singh, K. and Yu, X, 2010). The scale comprises of four factors/dimensions, namely, Hardiness, Resourcefulness, Purpose and Optimism.

Sample:

The sample comprised of 608 undergraduate female students from a women’s college, University of Delhi. They were randomly selected, incorporating 20% of students from each course.

2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Beginning with the findings related to family structure and parental presence, it has been found that these factors significantly impact the level of stress and resilience among undergraduates.

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation values of varied family structures, working status of the mother and quality time spent with the father for Resilience and its dimensions

	Family Structure								**Working status of the Mother**				**Quality time spent with Father**			
Variables	**Intact (n=582)**				**Lone (n=18)**				**Working (n=156)**		**Non-Working (n=442)**		**Enough Time (n=567)**		**Not Enough Time (n=26)**	
	Nuclear (n=371)		Joint (n=211)		Widowed (n=13)		Divorced (n=5)									
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Hardiness	18.05	5.183	17.12	4.651	17.08	3.201	13	5.339	17.5	5.231	17.66	4.92	17.77	4.874	15.12	6.029
Optimism	17.11	4.619	16.92	4.175	15.08	3.861	14.6	3.578	16.98	4.573	16.91	4.381	17.09	4.296	15.62	5.94
Resourcefulness	16.59	4.234	16.19	3.735	15.69	4.008	12.4	3.435	16.9	3.983	16.21	4.065	16.46	3.972	15.62	5.029
Purpose	14.07	3.796	13.66	3.864	12.92	2.9	11.2	4.97	14	3.813	13.72	3.817	13.89	3.739	13.08	4.979
Overall Resilience	65.49	14.894	63.74	13.156	60.15	8.385	51.2	14.856	65.18	14.507	64.29	14.186	64.98	13.823	58.73	17.455

From analysis of calculated variance (Table 8) it is observed that the level of overall resilience (F=2.220* significant at 0.05) and specifically the extent of Purpose (F=2.567* significant at 0.05) differ among participants from different family structures. Observing the mean values, it is found that intact families have higher mean values for both purpose and overall resilience as compared to the lone families. Segregating further, participants staying in nuclear setup are more purposeful and resilient as compared to the ones staying in joint families. Also participants staying with divorced parents had lower levels of resilience and purpose as compared to the one staying with a widowed parent (Table 1).

It has also been found that there is a significant difference among participants in level of Optimism based on the working status of their mother (F= 3.209 significant at 0.05). The undergraduates with working mothers are having a more optimistic outlook towards life (Table 1). It could be because as the young girls see their mothers working, they gain an understanding of changing society wherein women are gaining independence from clutches of patriarchy.

Further, perception of ample quality time being spent with father has been found to be making the participants Hardy (F=1.478* significant at 0.05) (Table 1&8). This finding shows the importance of a father figure in a young adult girl's life. Qualitative themes in Table 9 displaying the common stressors reported by the participants show that in comparison to mother, issues related to the absence of father are leading to stress (Theme such as Father's death, less time spent with father).

Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation values of 5 point rating scale on economic needs of the family being met for Stress, Resilience and four dimensions of resilience

	Economic needs of the family being met									
	NOT AT ALL (n=11)		**SOME WHAT (n=51)**		**SATISFACTORILY (n=185)**		**TO A GREAT EXTENT (n=194)**		**COMPLETELY (n=153)**	
VARIABLES	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Stress	6.36	3.075	5.41	2.624	5.56	2.746	4.93	2.517	4.54	2.868
Hardiness	16.55	5.222	16.92	5.425	17.26	4.809	17.8	4.733	18.54	5.223
Optimism	14.36	4.478	17.16	4.244	16.63	4.292	16.89	4.133	17.88	4.894
Resourcefulness	14.91	3.33	14.73	4.045	16.11	3.926	16.8	3.617	16.91	4.597
Purpose	13	3.225	13.67	4.769	13.49	3.771	13.99	3.525	14.44	3.888
Overall resilience	58.82	12.96	61.94	14.845	63.24	13.601	65.36	13.156	67.4	15.591

The importance of family for the undergraduate girls is also displayed clearly in the significant values obtained on the levels of Stress and resilience in context to the perception towards the economic needs met of the family. Through analysis of variance it has been found that the participants who felt that the economic needs of their family are not being met were more stressed, hence, depicting their concerns (F= 3.254** significant at .01) They were also found lower in all dimensions of resilience (F= 2.458* significant at .05 for hardiness, F= 3.039** significant at .01 for optimism, F= 3.233** significant at .01 for resourcefulness, F= 2.609* significant at .05 for purpose and F= 3.319** significant at .01for overall resilience) (Tables 2 &8).

Moving on to sibling relationships, results from analysis of variance show that participants who were single child of their parents i.e. were not having siblings were significantly higher in resourcefulness (F= 2.669* significant at .05) and overall resilience (F= 2.812* significant at .05) (Tables 3&8). This finding provides a relief for the modern parents of India wherein the trend is changing from popularly having two children to having a single child. The results from the meta-analyses of research conducted in the Western settings have reported that only-children are either about the same or more advantageous than children who have siblings (Falbo & Polit, 1986, 1987, 1988). Studies of only children in China have reported that they

Table 3: Mean and Standard deviation values of Number of siblings, Same/different academic stream and same/different ECA for Stress, Resilience and its dimensions

Variables	**Number of Siblings**										**Academic Stream**				**Extra Curricular Activities**			
	NONE (n=26)		**1 (n=311)**		**2 (n=193)**		**3 (n=51)**		**>3 (n=13)**		**SAME (n=73)**		**DIFFERENT (n=402)**		**SAME (n=146)**		**DIFFERENT (n=339)**	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
STRESS	5.19	2.514	5.09	2.594	5.07	2.869	4.9	2.975	4.92	3.84	4.95	3.095	5.09	2.605	5.2	2.698	5.02	2.681
HARDINESS	18.31	4.183	18.09	4.962	17.3	4.958	16.94	5.045	15	7.757	16.25	4.913	17.56	5.914	17.62	5.277	17.32	5.004
OPTIMISM	18.08	3.136	17.22	4.408	17.02	4.511	15.94	4.24	14.62	6.789	15.78	4.299	16.92	4.587	17.49	4.074	16.5	4.698
RESOURCEFULNESS	17.04	3.231	16.77	3.917	16.22	4.212	15.35	3.543	14.15	7.034	15.25	4.352	16.32	4.081	16.6	3.825	16.02	4.261

PURPOSE	13.96	3.026	14.13	3.6774	13.77	3.9223	12.76	4.023	12.554	6.1559	12.95	3.8222	13.82	3.8634	13.99	3.7266	13.62	3.9
OVERALL RESILIENCE	67.38	10.9588	65.98	13.9396	63.96	14.2411	60.59	13.664	56.31	25.3955	60.19	14.6388	64.39	14.5341	65.51	13.5509	63.27	14.8558

do better than those who have siblings in academic performance (Falbo & Polit, 1990, 1993), educational expectations, association with conventional peers, and psychological and behavioral adjustments (Liu, Lin & Chen, 2010).

Statistical analysis of responses showed that the ones who were compared occasionally with their siblings were higher in overall levels of resilience (F=2.793 significant at α 0.05) and specifically hardiness (F=2.972 significant at α 0.05) and resourcefulness (F=3.609 significant at α 0.01) as compared to not only the ones who are compared most of the times but also the ones who are not compared at all (Table 4 & 8). These finding shows that a healthy and optimal comparison and competition between the siblings is enriching in terms of resilience. Though it is again important to highlight the finding stated earlier; the siblings competing in same academic streams can suffer from low levels of resilience. It is also supported by a study conducted by McNerney and Usner (2001) in which it was found that 65% of college students in their sample suffered from academic sibling rivalry. Qualitative themes such as jealousy with sibling, comparison with sibling have also emerged in the present study as common reasons for stress (Table 9)

Table 4: Mean and Standard deviation values on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 depicting the lowest and 5 the highest) for Perceived comparison with the sibling, Perceived attachment with the sibling and Attitude towards sibling appreciation on Stress, Resilience and its dimensions

	1						2						3						4						5					
VARIABLES	Perceived Comparison (All the time) (n=)26		Perceived Attachment (Not at all) (n=9)		Sibling Appreciation (Extremely Jealous) (n=5)		Perceived Comparison (Many times) (n=115)		Perceived Attachment (Mildly) (n=57)		Sibling Appreciation (Litte Jealous) (n=48)		Perceived Comparison (Sometimes) (n=164)		Perceived Attachment (Don't Know) (n=35)		Sibling Appreciation (Don't know) (n=41)		Perceived Comparison (Rarely) (n=119)		Perceived Attachment (Quite) (n=155)		Sibling Appreciation (Happy) (n=222)		Perceived Comparison (Never) (n=90)		Perceived Attachment (Extremely) (n=221)		Sibling Appreciation (Extremely Happy) (n=247)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
(S) STRESS	6	2.814	6.33	2.92	6	3.67	5.11	2.746	5.53	2.399	5.52	2.601	4.81	2.63	6.11	2.349	5.39	2.982	5.29	2.545	4.97	2.783	5.06	2.67	4.89	2.98	4.76	2.685	4.93	2.79
(H) HARDINESS	14.5	5.054	16	5.36	13	4.69	17.87	4.219	17.04	4.859	16.12	4.684	17.61	5.376	15.66	4.297	16.2	5.056	17.55	5.138	16.96	5.157	17.49	5.001	17.49	5.43	18.29	5.103	18.43	5.1
(O) OPTIMISM	15.62	4.491	17.56	3.25	16.6	3.85	17.3	3.98	16.09	3.607	16.58	4.104	16.43	4.933	15.03	4.416	15.12	4.951	17.35	4.102	16.42	4.571	16.5	4.381	17.01	5.01	17.51	4.573	17.79	4.53
(R) RESOURCEFULNESS	13.15	4.584	13.89	3.26	15.6	7.02	16.69	3.787	15.91	3.888	15.44	4.182	16.37	4.171	14.71	4.26	14.17	4.499	16.51	4.04	16.05	4.124	16.29	3.858	16.62	4.34	16.85	4.055	17.12	4.02
(P) PURPOSE	12.73	4.423	15.11	2.37	13.6	4.88	14.19	3.316	13.54	3.878	13.1	4.879	13.73	3.889	12.4	3.965	12.24	4.398	14.08	3.697	13.28	3.807	13.64	3.645	13.17	4.43	14.17	3.799	14.42	3.82
(OR) OVERALL RESILIENCE	55.73	14.57	62.33	11.5	58.8	11.9	65.66	11.49	62.16	11.83	60.38	12.92	63.94	15.468	57.6	13.528	57.59	16.17	65.44	13.42	62.51	14.997	63.8	13.749	63.82	17.3	66.65	14.517	67.42	14.6

One's perceived attachment with sibling has also emerged as an important factor impacting stress and resilience. It was found that the participants who rated themselves as extremely attached to their siblings were significantly lower on stress (F=2.432 significant at α 0.05) and were significantly higher on overall resilience as well as all the four dimensions of it (For overall resilience, F=4.376 significant at α 0.01, for Hardiness, F=3.362 significant at α 0.01, for Optimism, F=3.612 significant at α 0.01, for Resourcefulness, F=3.181 significant at α 0.01 and for Purpose F=2.787 significant at α 0.05) as compared to the ones who perceived themselves to be mildly or not at all attached (Tables 4 & 8).

Also the ones who felt happy when some third person appreciated their sibling were found to be significantly more resilient than the ones who felt jealous (For overall resilience, F=5.242 significant at α 0.01, for Hardiness, F=3.794 significant at α 0.01, for Optimism, F=3.770 significant at α 0.01, for Resourcefulness, F=4.882 significant at α 0.01 and for Purpose F=3.071 significant at α 0.01) (Tables 4 & 8). Past research have also found that sibling relationships may play a role in the resilience process, for sibling relationships contribute significantly to shaping of children's beliefs, behaviors and attitudes and have been shown to promote child well-being by serving as a buffer against psychological distress during stressful life events (Gass et al., 2007).

Table 5: Mean and Standard Deviation values for Delhiites and Non Delhiites (Relocated) and type of accomodation occupied by the Non Delhiites on Overall Resilience and its dimension of Purposefulness

	Relocation				**Type of Accommodation, if relocated**									
Variables	**Delhiites (not relocated) (n=313)**		**Non-Delhiites (relocated) (n=290)**		**Hostel (n=120)**		**PG (n=136)**		**With relative (n=18)**		**With sibling (n=8)**		**With local guardian (n=10)**	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Purpose	13.47	3.81	14.25	3.81	14	3.77	14.61	3.57	14	3.61	11.12	6.20	13.3	5.165

Overall resilience	63.51	14.14	65.84	14.29	65.39	13.86	66.83	14.38	63.66	17.57	53.12	16.19	59.7	12.96

As by now we have quite understood the impact of immediate family on undergraduates' levels of stress and resilience. We now move on to the ones who are staying away from for home. In qualitative themes, stressors such as homesickness, unhygienic living conditions, language problems, lack of guidance, adjustment issues with roommates emerged for the girls who have relocated for studies (Table 9). However, when a comparison was made between the participants from Delhi and the ones having their native place outside Delhi, it was found that the non delhiites were significantly higher in overall resilience (F=2.078 significant at 0.05) as well as the purpose dimension of resilience as compared to delhiites (F=3.318 significant at 0.05) (Table5 & 8). It could be that the undergraduates who relocate for studies clearly understand their present aim and purpose for relocation. Thus, they feel more purposeful in terms of sacrificing their family life for higher studies. Further it was also found that the ones living in PGs and hostels were significantly higher in overall resilience and purpose as compared to the ones living with local guardians and relatives (For overall resilience, F=2.378 significant at 0.05 and for Purpose F=2.519 significant at α 0.05) (Tables 5 & 8). Living independently seems to be making them tougher in terms of facing challenges, in PG and hostel accommodation one has to make independent decisions and strive harder to adjust.

Table 6: Mean and Standard Deviation values for a five point likert scale in terms of satisfaction with the roommates (1 depicting least satisfied and 5 depicting most satisfied) on Resourcefulness, dimension of Resilience.

Perceived Satisfaction with Roommates										
Variables	1 (n=12)		2 (n=15)		3 (n=70)		4 (n=43)		5 (n=113)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Resourcefulness	13.83	5.391	15.07	5.203	16.83	3.534	16.7	2.808	17.53	4.305
Overall resilience	58.75	16.977	60.07	21.032	66.36	11.603	65.51	10.313	68.16	15

Table 7: Mean and Standard Deviation values for most focussed role on overall resilience and its dimensions of Hardiness and Optimism

Variables	Daughter And Sister (n=303)		Student (n=197)		Organization And Citizen (n=20)	
	M	S.D	M	S.D	M	S.D
Hardiness	17.16	4.898	17.49	5.042	20.20	4.775
Optimism	16.57	4.440	16.79	4.483	18.70	4.378
Overall Resilience	63.37	14.180	64.18	14.370	68.20	13.991

Interestingly, the role of roommates was found important in terms of making a person both stressed and resilient. Earlier research states that College roommate relationships are unique among students' interpersonal relationships because they live together. Roommates have frequent contact, negotiation of responsibilities, and compromises about the living environment (e.g., noise level, sleep/waking hours, visitors, and decor). Students' roommates are typically the first nonfamily members and first people of equal status (i.e., in contrast to a parent-child relationship) with whom they live. These "firsts" bring added challenges to students' abilities to get along with one another (Erb et. al 2014). In a study of 416 students in residence halls at a Midwestern university, frequent conflict with one's roommate was a significant predictor of overall stress level (Dusselier, Dunn, Wang, Shelley, & Whalen, 2005). As stated above, in the present research also 'adjustment issues with roommates' emerged as a common stressor in the qualitative themes (Table 9). Likewise, in quantitative analysis it was found that satisfaction with roommates impact an individual's resourcefulness and overall level of resilience. Based on analysis of variance, it was observed that with increasing level of satisfaction with roommates, the overall resilience (F=2.785 significant at α 0.05) and resourcefulness of the participant was also increasing (F= 3.895 significant at 0.01) (Tables 6 & 8). Previous research has shown that positive roommate relationships may have longer-term benefits for students' psychological and academic functioning (Waldo, 1986).

Based on the understanding gained by the findings related to relocated undergraduate students, wherein they were found to be more purposeful than students from Delhi (residing with parents). Also the ones staying in PG and hostel accommodation were found to be more resilient than the ones staying with local guardians/ relatives. The research was further taken up (on the entire sample) to find out whether the roles that the undergraduates most focus on impact levels of stress and resilience. It was found that the ones who focus most on the non-gender stereotypical roles such as a citizen, student, member of an organisation scored significantly higher on overall resilience, optimism and hardiness as compared to the ones who mentioned focussing most on gender stereotypical familial roles such as a daughter and a sister (For overall resilience, F=2.307 significant at α 0.05, for Optimism, F=3.260 significant at α 0.01 and for Hardiness F=2.782 significant at α 0.01). It is not implied that familial roles are less important, rather the findings show that if the undergraduates diversify the roles they take up at this age, specially adding non gender stereotypical roles could help them develop as resilient beings.

3. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Overall, the findings of the present study provide an insight about the major stressors related to family life for an undergraduate girl. Moreover, it implies the means of making

them resilient beings such as, that the parents should spend quality time with them as it is a sensitive transition period from adolescence to young adulthood. Also sibling relationships should be tackled carefully, that is, optimal comparison can help them gain resilience but unhealthy competition especially in academics can be very stress provoking. However, not all undergraduates stay with their family, many relocate for studies, it is important for them to choose an accommodation wisely specially in terms of satisfaction with roommates. Also, girls at this stage of life should be given opportunities to explore their individuality by providing them opportunities to create roles outside the family setting such as working with NGO etc.

Table 8: F values depicting significant differences between participants on levels of Stress, Resilience and its four dimensions based on variables such as family structure and parental presence, sibling relationships, relocation and role focus

	F VALUES					
	STRESS	**HARDINESS**	**OPTIMISM**	**RESOURCEFULNESS**	**PURPOSE**	**OVERALL RESILIENCE**
FAMILY STRUCTURE AND PARENTAL PRESENCE						
Family Structure	0.658	2.159	1.674	1.607	2.567*	2.220*
Working status of the Mother	0.726	1.478	3.209*	1.731	2.949	1.032
Quality time spent with Father	0.321	3.577*	2.265	1.343	0.695	2.824
Economic needs of the family being met	3.254**	2.458*	3.039**	3.233**	2.609*	3.319**
SIBLING RELATIONSHIPS						
Number of siblings	0.181	1.766	2.179	2.669*	1.533	2.812*
Pursuing same academic course	0.669	1.375	1.133	0.781	2.755*	6.844**
Pursuing same ECA	0.227	3.182	4.663**	3.608*	1.432	3.976*
Perceived comparison	1.169	2.972*	1.511	3.609**	1.549	2.793*
Perceived attachment	2.432*	3.362**	3.612**	3.181**	2.787*	4.376**
Sibling Appreciation	0.623	3.794**	3.77**	4.882**	3.071**	5.242**
RELOCATION						
Relocated/ not relocated	2.382	2.211	0.604	1.544	3.138*	2.078*
Accommodation for relocated	1.172	1.67	1.076	1.896	2.519*	2.378*
Satisfaction with roommates	1.547	1.878	1.608	3.895**	2.064	2.785*
ROLE FOCUS						
Gender stereotypical/ non-gender stereotypical	0.561	2.782**	3.260**	1.651	0.52	2.307*

Table 9: Themes that emerged through content analysis of qualitative data based on the open ended question on most common stressors

Family (Parents)	**Siblings**	**Relocation**
Fights (19.5%)	**Jealousy (22.2%)**	**Homesickness (33%)**
Family issues (18.8%)	Fights (22.2%)	Roommates (21.70%)
Meeting expectations (15.9%)	Sister's role (18.5%)	Adjustment Issues (14.20%)
Misunderstandings (13.7%)	Concern (11.2%)	Health (11%)
Family problems (13.7%)	Brother's responsibility (7.4%)	Travelling (4%)
Stereotypical restrictions (9.4%)	Misunderstandings (3.7%)	Food (4%)
Parental pressure (3.6%)	Restrictive siblings (3.7%)	Stringent rules and regulations (3%)
Strict parents (2.17%)	Missing them (3.7%)	Lack of guidance (3%)
Working parents (1.44%)	Comparisons (3.7%)	Relatives/local guardians (3%)
Less time spent with Father (0.72%)	Taking care of siblings (3.7%)	Unhygienic living conditions (1%)
Father's death (0.72%)		Language problems (1%)
		Lack of money (1%)

REFERENCES

[1] Bharat S. (Ed.) (1991), Research on Families with Problems in India: Issues and Implications. Vol. 1, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Bombay

[2] Bhawuk, D. P. S. (2004). Individualism and collectivism. In Encyclopaedia of Leadership (Vol. 2, pp. 706–710). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

[3] Connor, K.M. & Davidson, J.R.T. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). Depression and anxiety. 18:76–82

[4] Dusselier, L., Dunn, B., Wang, Y., Shelley II, M. C., & Whalen, D. F. (2005). Personal, health, academic, and environmental predictors of stress for residence hall students. Journal of American College Health, 54(1), 15–24.

[5] Falbo, T. & Poston, D.L. (1987). "Only children and personality development: a quantitative review," Journal of Marriage and the Family, vol. 49, pp. 309–325.

[6] Falbo, T. & Poston, D.L. (1988). "The intellectual achievement of only children," Journal of Biosocial Science, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 275–286.

[7] Falbo, T. & Poston, D.L. (1990). "Scholastic and personality characteristics of only children and children with siblings in China," International Family Planning Perspectives, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 45–54.

[8] Falbo, T. & Poston Jr., D.L. (1986). "Quantitative review of the only child literature: research evidence and theory development," Psychological Bulletin, vol. 100, no. 2, pp. 176–189.

[9] Falbo, T. & Poston Jr., D.L. (1993). "The academic, personality, and physical outcomes of only children in China," Child Development, vol. 64, no. 1, pp. 18–35

[10] Garmezy N. (1985). Stress resistant children: the search for protective factors. In: Recent research in developmental psychopathology, book suppl number 4 to J Child Psychol Psych. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

[11] Garmezy N, Rutter M. (1985). Acute stress reactions. In: M Rutter, L Hersob, editors. Child and adolescent psych: modern approaches. Oxford: Blackwell.

[12] Gass, K., Jenkins, J., & Dunn, J. (2007). Are sibling relationships protective? A longitudinal study. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 48(2), 167-175.

[13] Hill, P.D, Aldag, J.C, Chatterton, R.T & Zinaman, M. (2005). Psychological Distress and Milk Volume in Lactating Mothers. West J Nurs Res 27: 676-693

[14] Holterman, a (July 17, 2015). Mental health problems for college students are increasing. Healthline News. https://www.healthline.com/health-news/mental-health-problems-for-college-students-are-increasing-071715 Accessed on 1st January, 2016.

[15] House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M. J., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). Culture, leadership and organizations: The GLOBE, study of 62 societies. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

[16] Liu, R.X., Lin, W. & Chen, Z-Y. (2010). "School performance, peer association, psychological and behavioral adjustments: a comparison between Chinese adolescents with and without siblings," Journal of Adolescence, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 411–417.

[17] McNerney, A. & Usner, J. (2001). Sibling rivalry in degree and dimensions across the lifespan. Retrieved 12 November 2006 from http://jrscience.wcp.muohio.edu/Research/humannautre01/FinalArticles/SiblingRivalryinD egreeandDimensionsAcrosstheLifespan.html.

[18] Oxford Dictionary 1989. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[19] Poston, D.L. & Falbo, T. (1990). "Academic performance and personality traits of Chinese children: "Onlies" versus others," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 96, pp. 433–45.

[20] Revill, S.I., Robinson, J.O, Rosen, M. & Hogg, M.I.J. (1976). The reliability of a linear analogue for evaluating pain. Anaesthesia. 31:1191-8.

[21] Rutter M. 1985. Resilience in the face of adversity: protective factors and resistance to psychiatric disorders. Br J Psych 147:598–611.

[22] Seligman MEP, Csikszentmihalyi M. 2000. Positive psychology. Am Psychologist 55:5–14.

[23] Singh, K. and Yu, X. (2010). Psychometric Evaluation of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) in a Sample of Indian Students.

[24] Sinha, J. B. P. (1985). Collectivism, social energy, and development. In I. R. Langunes & Y. H. Poortinga (Eds.), From a different perspective of behaviours across cultures (pp. 109–119). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zetlinger.

[25] Sinha, J. B. P., & Verma, J. (1987). Structure of collectivism. In C. Kagitcibasi (Ed.), Growth and progress in cross-cultural psychology (pp. 123–129). Lisse, The Netherlands: Swets & Zetlinger.

[26] Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism and collectivism. Boulder, CO: West View Press.

[27] Triandis, H. C., & Bhawuk, D. P. S. (1997). Culture theory and the meaning of relatedness. In P. Christopher Earley & M. Erez (Eds.), New perspectives on international industrial/ organizational psychology (pp. 13–52). San Francisco: The New Lexington Press.

[28] Verma, J. (1999). Collectivism in the cultural perspective: The Indian scene. In J. C. Lasry, J. Adair, & K. Dion (Eds.), Latest contributions to cross-cultural psychology (pp. 228–241). Lisse: Swets & Zetlinger.

[29] Verma, J., & Triandis, H. C. (1998, August). The measurement of collectivism in India. Paper presented at the Meeting of the International Association of Cross Cultural Psychology, Bellingham, WA.

[30] Wagnild GM 2003. Resilience and Successful Aging among Low and High Income Older Adults. Journal of Gerontological Nursing, 29: 42-49.

[31] Waldo, M. (1986). Academic achievement and retention as related to students' personal and social adjustment. Journal of College and University Student Housing, 16(1), 19–23.

[32] Werner E, Smith R. 1992. Overcoming odds: high risk children from birth to adulthood. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.