Assessing the Vulnerable Stress Level and Coping Mechanism of Residential and Day Scholars of a Nursing College
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Stress is the internal state which can be caused by physical demand on the body or by environmental and social situations which are evaluated as potentially harmful, uncontrollable or exceeding our resources for coping. Stress is not a rare experience but something that all people experience in varying degrees in every day. Life is really about changes. Every day, each person faces some kind of challenge, big or small. Just deciding on petty routine issues can be a challenge for some people, while others find the drive to the work place or school, the most challenging part of the day. There are decisions to be made and changes that will require adapting plans already made.

Objectives
The study attempted to (i) assess the vulnerable stress level & coping mechanism of residential students, as well as day scholars of Shreyas College of Nursing (SCON); (ii) compare the vulnerable stress level & coping mechanism among hostellers and day scholars of SCON, and (iii) associate the vulnerable stress level & coping mechanism among hostellers & day scholars student of SCON with selected socio-demographic variables.

Review of Literature
G Johnson (2004) described the quality of family functioning as an important factor for both psychological well-being and physical health of the individual. This review described family intervention to improve the strength of the parents & student relationship and also the skills that can affect students’ emotional well being.

M Kathleen (2005) investigated the effectiveness of a cognitive-behavioural stress management intervention designed to help college student-athletes understand and utilise various techniques to manage stress better and regulate arousal for optimal performance. The final sample of 30 participants was divided into a treatment and a wait-list control group. The treatment group met for one hour per week for a five-week intervention, where they learned using skills such as relaxation, imagery, and self-talk. Both groups completed measures of competitive sport anxiety, trait anxiety, life stress, coping skills, and positive and negative affect at pre-, post-, and follow-up testing. Competitive anxiety was measured using the Sport Competition Anxiety.

Methodology
Research approach in the present study was the descriptive comparative type. Non-experimental design was chosen for the study. The study population comprised of the day scholars and residential students of BSc(N), both male and female. Purposive sampling technique was used.

Sample size
The sample of the present study had 60 students, 30 students were day scholars and 30 were hostellers in selected Shreyas College of Nursing, Supela, Bhilai.

Inclusion criteria
Student’s between 18-22 years of age studying in Shreyas College of Nursing, and willing to participate were included.

Variables
Age, religion, caste, gender, type of family, monthly family income were the independent variables; while stress level and coping strategies were taken as dependent variables.

Development of Tool
In order to establish the validity and the reliability of the instrument a structured tool for assessing vulnerable stress level and construction of a self structured questionnaire for coping mechanism was established by extensive review of literature and through opinion of subject experts.
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Description of Tool

Selection I, i.e. demographic variables had a total of 6 question on variables like age, religion, caste, gender, type of family, monthly family income.

Selection II, i.e. structured vulnerable stress scale, had 20 questions. This was a five-point scale ranging from always, often, sometimes, rarely and never, scores ranging from 5-1.

Selection III, was a questionnaire on coping mechanism on 20 questions. This was a 3-point rating scale ranging from always, sometimes, never, scores ranging from 3-1.

Interpretation of scores

Structured Vulnerable Stress Scale
- Mildly vulnerable to stress: 0-26
- Moderate vulnerable to stress: 27-52
- Extremely vulnerable to stress: 53-80

Coping Mechanism
- Poor coping: 0-20
- Average coping: 21-40
- Excellent coping: 41-60

Data Collection

The process of data collection was carried out during 29 to 31 March 2011. The investigator collected the data from students of both hostellers and day scholars, by making sitting arrangements in different rows. The investigator gave 30 minutes for filling up the questionnaire. Data analysis was done by calculating the percentage, mean, SD, co-efficient of correlation and t-value.

Results

Maximum residential students (n=13, 43.3%) belonged to the age group of 19-20 years, and 1 student (3.3%) to 21-22 years group. Maximum day scholars students (n=15) were in the age group of 18-19 years (50%) and minimum (n=3, 10%) in the age group of 21-22 years. Most of the hosteller students (n=17, 56.6%) were Hindu and minimum (n=13, 10%) were Christian. All hostellers were female (100%) and maximum day scholars (n=25, 83.3%) were female and minimum (n=5, 16.6%) were males. In hostellers, maximum 18 students (60%) were from joint families and minimum (n=12, 40%) students were from nuclear families. In day scholars (n=15, 50%) were from joint families and rest (n=15, 50%) from nuclear family. Maximum monthly family income in hostellers was less than Rs 10,000 (33.3%) and minimum was Rs 20,000 (20%). In day scholars, maximum monthly family income was less than Rs 10,000 (56.6%) and minimum was more than Rs 20,000 (10%).

Data revealed that majority day scholars (n=26) fall in category of moderate vulnerable stress with (86.6%) and one (n=1) day scholar came in category of vulnerable to stress (3.33%). Maximum day scholar students (n=25, 83.3%), had excellent coping mechanism, rest 5 students (16.6%) had average coping mechanism.

The majority of hostellers (n=29, 96.6%) fell in category of moderate vulnerable stress and minimum (1) in the category of vulnerable to stress. There was 1 hosteller in category of mildly vulnerable to stress (3.33%). Maximum hostellers (n=24, 80%) had excellent coping mechanism and minimum (n=6, 20%) hostellers had average coping mechanism.

Comparison of vulnerable stress level and coping mechanism of hostellers and day scholar students was tested by applying t-test. The results showed non-significant difference in mean score observed for vulnerable stress level in the hostellers and day scholars. The t-value was computed for vulnerable stress level among hostellers and day scholars (t=1.57); the mean score coping mechanism of hosteller students (43.9) was higher than the day scholars students (43.66), the computed t-value was 0.18.

Conclusion

Student life is usually exciting, yet at times it can also be under much pressure and stressful. A lot has to be achieved in the limited time available. So students either day scholars or hostellers, face stressful situation many times. Further, day students have more stress than the
hostellers, perhaps due to their involvement in the family matters along with studies. Among day scholars, female students were having significantly better coping mechanism than male students. Among hostellers, freshers had better coping mechanism. Coping ability decreased as they became senior. Further, Hindus had significantly better coping mechanism than the Christians.

**Recommendations**

- The study needs to be replicated in a larger sample in different settings for making broader generalisations.
- A comparative study may be attempted on adolescents of rural area and urban areas so as to elicit the perceived stress and coping strategies in different settings.
- A study can be done to evaluate the effectiveness of various stress management techniques.
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