Stressful Behaviour In Relation To Psychological Capital

Shyama Kumari*

This study was planned to study the effect of optimistic-Passimistic attitude and locus of control on stressful behavior. For this 200(100 urban 100 rual) female and male college youths were selected through incidental- cum-purposive sampling technique from the colleges of Kaimur district. Four measures were administered namely; personal Data sheet, optimistic-pessimistic attitude scale, locus of control scale and personal stress source inventory. The findings reveal that habitat, optimistic- pessimistic attitude4, and locus of control affect the stressful behavior. Psychological capital like, optimism, self- efficacy and locus of control have significant impact on stressful behavior.

Key words: *stressful behavior, relation, psychological capital.*

Optimistic is an outlook on life such that one maintains a view of the world as a positive place. Optimists generally believe that people and. Events are inherited good, So that most situations work out in the end for the best. It can be defined as expectations of positive outcome and having hope and a strong belief and confidence to deal with situation.

Optimists are life's big winners, pessimists have poorer resistance, weaker immune systems, are more susceptible to depression, and age physically faster than the optimists (Clark, 1997). Optimism plays an important role in the adjustment to stressful life events (scheier et al. 2001). Greater optimism has been found to be associated with less mood disturbance in response to a variety of stressors (carver et al. 1993; scheier et al. 2001). Optimists cope more effectively with their stressors than do pessimist. There is substantial evidence that optimists use different coping strategies to cope than do pessimists and that these coping differences contribute to the positive association between optimism and better adjustment and well –being (scheier et al. 2001).

***Research scholar, Dept of psychology Bhupesh Gupta College, Ram Lal Nagar Bhabua Kaimur (Bihar)**

Locus of control refers to whether or not individuals believe that the events of their lives are related to their own behavior. It means the effects of reward or reinforcement on preceding behavior depend in part on whether the person perceives the reward as contingent on his own behavior or independent of it (Rotter 1966) .an individual who believe that an outcome of reinforcement is a function of fate or chance under the control of others or unpredictable may be described as having an external locus of control. The person who expects an outcome or reinforcement to be contingent upon his or her own behavior (e. g. amount of effort he/she expends; amount of preparation /training) may be described as embodying an internal locus of control. (car and McNutty, 2006).

It is estimated that 70%visits to doctor's clinic are directly or indirectly related to stress (Agrawal, 2001). Blood pressure and heart rate are easily impaired by prolonged stress. Imagine the plight of residents of the three mile island who lived in constant fear of radioactive material contamination. McGrath (1970), after analyzing pre and post-accident bold pressure data of residents from previous visits to doctors in the three mile island area of the USA, concluded that both systolic and diastolic blood pressure of people residing near the nuclear facility had increased. Thus, prolonged stress shad altered the health of the residents. And ,it is not blood pressure alone that gets altered with stress. Stress is known to precipitate a variety of physical health problems, ranging from mild insomnia to sexual impotency and even to the entire gamut of what has been called psychosomatic disorders i.e., asthma, ulers, skin disorders, allergies, etc. (selye, 1936; 1956; 1974).

After noticing that a wide variety of toxins caused some identical effect, selye (1974) offered a biological approach to study stress. According to him, stress is a response to a harmful agent and its effect takes place effect takes in three stages. It begins with an alarm reaction. In the second stage the person shows of exhaustion. Although sely's theory, called general adaptation syndrome or GAS, remained very popular for a long time. It failed to answer a major psychological question: why does the same stimulus cause stress to one person but not to another? Realizing the limitations of biological explanations of stress, Lazarus and Folkman (1984) offered a cognitive approach to show how stress is related to the way in which a person appraises a given situation. If the incoming threat is perceived as being harmless, it is dismissed by

individuals at their primary appraisal level. However, when individuals expect a damage "or" loss, they become involved in a threat appraisal. At the end, individuals make a secondary appraisal to cope with th3e challenge. (Campbell, and wolf, 2003; McGrath, 1970; Pepitone, 1967).

Both biological and psychological explanations have been ;further advanced and refined since the pioneering work of Selye and Lazarus. For a useful review of work in the field of stress, (Agrawal, 2001). From the point of view of social psychology and its applications, psychological and social factors related to stress. (Carand McNtty, 2006).

Stress is a problem for all types of society. Stress is a threat to the quality of life, and to physical and psychological well- being. If this is so then every effort must be made to understand its nature, its causes and effects and the different ways in which it can be dealt with much has been written about stress, and from many different points of view and relate one to another. Here treats stress at the level of the individual, as a member of a developed industrial society as for example an Australasian, a European or a North American It is important to keep this in mind.

The stress experienced by man today must be different from that experienced in the past, and the stress experienced by a member of a developed industrial society different from that experienced by a member of a developing and predominantly rural society. Perhaps in the past men were mainly concerned for their physical survival; they worried about the source of their next meal, about shelter, and about not being killed. Their most pressing wants were basic physical needs. In some societies this changed with development, and today ,for some, physical needs are not day-to-day concern. Industrialised man worries about problems of a more psychosocial nature, problems which are perhaps higher in his hierarchy of need. This is probadly not so for those, or at least some of those, living in developing societies.

1. If today's problems for industrialized man are indeed higher – order problems the an interesting argument can be advanced. The removal of physical threat has allowed this type of man to become concerned with threats which were hitherto perceived as of Secondary importance is it possible that is type of man is actually experiencing less stress than ever before? He now lives longer (for various reasons) and enjoys a relatively high standard of living. His luxuries and comforts would far exceed the

imagination of his ancestors. However, living longer does not necessarily mean a healthier life, simply a medico social system that is effective in keeping people alive (wheaton 1985 Zakowski et al (1992).

2. A high standard of living does not necessarily guarantee that the quality of life is good a surfeit luxuries can be as harmful as a shortage of necessities. The laboratory rat is longer living than his wild cousin. He is generally housed in a hygienic plastic and metal cage and is fed on a carefully balanced diet. Given a plentiful water supply and the cage of regularly cleaned out possibly he is occasionally petted and fed the odd morsel of chocolate or condensed milk. He lives in an environment with controlled and optimum conditions of lighting, noise, temperature and humidity. It never reins on the laboratory rat. Despite all these apparent benefits of laboratory life it can not be argued that the laboratory rat is stress free compared with his wild cousin. His life is unstimulating and unvaried in most if not all of its aspects, from his opportunities for activity through to his diet. His sex life is unnatural.

Objectives :

(1) To assess the level of stress among male and female college youths.

(2) To examine the impact of optimism on stressful behavior.

(3) To see the effect of locus of control on stressful behaviour.

Hypotheses :

In the life of literature reviewed following hypotheses were deduced-

H_1 There would be significant difference in the stress level of male college youths.

H_2 Optimists and pessimists would significantly differ in terms of stressful behaviour.

H_3 Internal and external locus of control would have significant impact on stressful behaviour.

Method :

(a) Sample:

the study was conducted on 200 (100male &100 female) under graduate college youths selected through incidental-cum- purposive sampling technique from the colleges of Kaimur city under V.K.S.U. ARA.

(b) Research Tools :

The following tests scales were applied for this study.

(1) Personal Data Blank : A suitable personal data blank was developed to know the gender and other background variables of the respondents.

(2) Locus control scale : Hasnain and josh's (2010) locus of control scale in Hindi version was applied. It is generalized measure of internal vs. external locus of control, which assess the perceived control in youths.

(3) Singh's personal stress source inventory : To measure the level of stress in college youths Singh's (2004) personal stress source inventory in Hindi version was applied.

(4) Optimistic –pessimistic Attitude Scale:

Parashar's (1998) scale was applied to assess the optimistic and pessimistic attitude of youths.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

TABLE-1

Mean, SD and t-value of stressful Behaviour score of male and Female

General	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	P
Male	100	50.89	7.33	2.33	198	<.05
Female	100	56.98	6.75			

Table -1 shows that the mean score of stressful behaviour of female is higher than the male. The difference between the group is statistically significant (t=2. 33,df =198, p<.05). The Hypothesis has been accepted. This may be due to environmental insecurity, family restrictions, marriage problem and parental indifferent attitude towards girls education (Agrawal, 2001; Selye, 1974).

TABLE-2

Mean. SD and t-value Optimists and pessimists on stressful Behaviour

Group	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	P
Optimists	100	46.56	6.72	3.11	198	<.01
Pessimist	100	54.15	7.86			

Table 2 - Reveals that the mean score on stressful behaviour of optimists is lower than the pessimist. The mean difference between the group is statistically significant (t=3. 11, df= 198, p<.01). The hypothesis is sustained. In the era of globalization unemployment and insecurity of educated youths are greater. Inspite of these youths who are hopeful, hard working, sincere and puinctual, they perceive the situation in a positive way. Perhaps these are the response optimists are lesser stressed than pessimists.

TABLE-3

Mean, SD and t-value of stressful Behaviour scores with Regard to locus of control

Locus of control	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	P
Internal	100	49.82	6.39	3.75	198	<.01
External	100	55.98	7.65			

A perusal of Table 3 indicates that internally controlled respondents are less stressed than the externally controlled respondents. The difference between the group is statistically significant (t=3.75, df=198, p<.01). The hypothesis has been approved. Internal people have better control over their behaviour, more active in seeking information and knowledge concerning their situation than than do externals. External people are less willing to take risks, to work on self-improvement and to do better themselves through remedial work than internals.

Internals derive greater benefits from social support (Car and Mcnully, 2006; Rotter, 1966; Weaton, 1985).

The present piece of research reveals the role of gender optimism and locus of control on stressful behaviour. Future researches are required to further strengthen and gereralize the findings and also to find out the role of mediating variables.

References :

1. Agrawal, r. (2001) Stress in life and at work. New Delhi : Response Books.
   Compbell, J.C . & Wolf, A.D. (2003). Risk factors for femicide in abusive relationships : Results from a multisite case control study. American Journal of Public health, 93(7).
2. Car, A. and McNutty, M. (2006). The handbook of adult clinical psychology. London : routtedge.
3. Caraves, C.S. et al. (1993). How coping mediates he effect of optimism on distress: A study of women with early stage breast cancer. Journal of personality and social psychology, 65, 375-390.
4. Clark, A. (1997). Being three: putting brain, body and world together again. MIT press Cambridge, Massachusetts.
5. Hasnain, N. and joshi, D.D. (2010). Locus of control scale - HJ(Hindi version). Agra: national psychological corporation.
6. Lazarus,R.s. and folkman, s. (1984). Stress, appraisal and copying. New York: springer.
7. Parshar, H,J. (1998). Optimistic- pessimistic attitude scale agra: National psychological corporation.
8. Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological monographs, 33, 300-303.
9. Selye, H. (1936). Thymus and adrenals in the response of the organism to injuries and intoxificatons. British journal of experimental psychology ,17,234-2448.
10. Selye, H. (1956). The stress of life, (1sted.) new York: Mc Graw -Hill.
11. Selye, H. (1974). Stress without distress. London : Hodder Stoughton.
12. McGrath, J.E. (1970). Social and psychological factors in stress. New York; Holt Rinehart &Winston.

13. Pepitone, A. (1967).self, social, environment and stress. In Mortimar, H.P. et al. 9Eds.). psychological stress: issues in Research. New York : Appleton century crofts.
14. Sherry, p. et at. (2003) Traffic accidents, job stress, and supervisor support in the trucking industry. Paper presented at the international institute for inter modal transportation at the University o Denver, CO.
15. Singh, A.K.(2004). Singh's personal stress source inventory. Agra : National psychological corporation.
16. Wheaton, B. (1985). Models for the stress buffering functions of coping resources. Journal of health and social Behaviour, 26. 352-364.
17. Zakowski, S. et al. (1992). Stress, stress management and the immune system. Applied and preventive psychology, 1, 1-13.