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Abstract

The present empirical investigation entitled "a study of parental expectations, attributional styles and coping strategies of students experiencing psychological distress" sought to identify a set of predictors that contributed to the experience of psychological distress among students population. India which is the largest democracy and is increasingly viewed as a strong global player due to its exploring economic growth, is facing problems of increasing insecurity and uncertainty among its youth. A great majority of students population is suffering from symptoms of distress. The problem has acquired a new gravitas with newspapers and T.V. channels reporting student suicides nearly every day (Lal, 2008). There is ample evidence that factors like unrealistic parental expectations and other psychological variables have serious impact on students experiencing psychological distress, but no systematic efforts have been made to explore the role of such factors in Indian students. The present research work was an humble effort in this direction.

The criterion variable in our study was psychological distress. Parental expectations, attributional styles and coping strategies together with academic achievement and other demographic variables constituted the predictor variables.
The following hypotheses were formulated:

1. Parental expectations will positively predict psychological distress.

2. Attributional style will emerge as an important predictor of psychological distress. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4).
   2.1 Composite attributional style for positive events will be negative predictor of psychological distress.
   2.2 Internal, stable and global dimensions of attribution for positive events will negatively predict psychological distress.
   2.3 Composite attributional style for negative events will positively predict psychological distress.
   2.4 Internal, stable and global dimensions of attribution for negative events will positively predict psychological distress.

3. Coping strategies will also be the important predictor of psychological distress.
   3.1 (a) Problem focused coping style will negatively predict psychological distress.
   3.1 (b) All the dimensions of problem focused coping (i.e. active coping, planning, suppression of competing activities, restraint coping and seeking social support for instrumental
reasons,) will not be equally useful predictors of psychological distress.

3.2 (a). Emotion focused coping will positively predict psychological distress.

3.2 (b). Different dimensions of emotion focused coping (i.e. seeking social support for emotional reasons, positive reinterpretation and growth, acceptance, turning to religion and focus on & venting of emotions) will not be equally useful predictors of psychological distress.

3.3 (a). Avoidant coping will positively predict psychological distress.

3.3 (b). Different dimensions of avoidant coping (i.e. denial, behavioral disengagement and mental disengagement) will not be equally significant in predicting psychological distress.

4. Academic achievement will negatively predict psychological distress.

5. Predictors of psychological distress for boys and girls will be different.

6. Predictors of psychological distress for Science and Arts students will be different.
7. Predictors of psychological distress for students of nuclear and joint family will be different.

The sample of the present investigation comprised of 300 senior secondary school students studying at Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, India. Average age of the students was 17.6 years.

The following self report measures were used by the investigator:

1. Perceived Parental Expectations Scale (developed by the investigator).
2. Attributional Style Questionnaire.
3. COPE Scale for measuring coping strategies.
4. PGI Health Questionnaire for measuring psychological distress.

Stepwise multiple regression analyses were conducted to identify the set of variables predicting psychological distress in the sample as a whole, amongst boys and girls and in two stream groups. Regression analyses for nuclear and joint family groups were not carried out because the two groups did not significantly differ on psychological distress. Before conducting regression analyses, descriptive statistics like mean, SD, t-test analyses for group comparisons, and simple correlations were also calculated.
The following results were obtained:

1. For the total sample stepwise multiple regression analysis yielded nine predictors which accounted for as much as 62.4% of the total variance in psychological distress. These variables were avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, composite attribution for positive events, active coping, mental disengagement, restraint coping, academic achievement, global versus specific negative and focus on & venting of emotions.

2. Seven variables emerged as useful predictors of psychological distress for male students. These were composite attribution for negative events, avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, behavioral disengagement, internal versus external positive, academic achievement and restraint coping.

3. For female students six predictors were identified. These were avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, active coping, denial, focus on & venting of emotions and academic achievement.

4. Avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, and academic achievement were the common predictors of psychological distress among boys and girls.

5. Attributional style (composite attribution for negative events and internal versus external dimension of attribution for positive events) predicted psychological distress only for boys.
6. For boys group behavioral disengagement and restraint coping had negative predictive relationship with psychological distress.

7. For girls group denial had negative predictive relationship with psychological distress. While focus on & venting of emotions emerged as a positive predictor only for girls.

8. Regression analysis for the Science students led us to four predictors viz mental disengagement, perceived parental expectations, composite attribution for negative events, and focus on & venting of emotions.

9. For the Arts group a set of six predictors was obtained i.e. avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, composite positive, restraint coping, academic achievement and mental disengagement.

10. A comparison of predictors in Science and Arts groups revealed two variables to be common. These were perceived parental expectations and mental disengagement. Mental disengagement was the most important predictor for the Science group while its contribution was least in the Arts group.

11. For the Science students composite attribution for negative events predicted psychological distress whereas for the Arts students composite attribution for positive events was an important predictor of psychological distress.
12. Focus on & venting of emotions was a significant predictor only for the Science students.

13. Restraint coping and academic achievement predicted psychological distress only in Arts students.

14. Girls experienced more psychological distress as compared to boys.

15. Science students reported less symptoms of psychological distress as compared to Arts students.

16. No significant difference in psychological distress could be obtained between the students belonging to nuclear and joint families.

In conclusion, this study was an humble but first attempt to examine the predictive relationship between parental expectations, attributional styles, coping strategies and psychological distress systematically among students. The results of the study indicated significant relationship between predictor variables and criterion variable. The study has also provided valuable direction for future researches in this area. Further researches may be required to study the problem of psychological distress in students more intensively to know the relationship among the variables and the direct and indirect impact of these variables on psychological distress.
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Chapter-I

Introduction
Introduction

People of all ages in all kinds of engagements are bound to experience psychological distress in varying degree at different points of time and adolescents are no exception to it. The developmental changes, process of adjusting to these changes and the changing surrounding, coping with pressure of studies, increasing competition, parental pressure, tensions of interpersonal relationships with parents, elders and peer groups are all serious challenges and pose threats to child’s mental health. A large number of students who are unable to withstand this pressure, develop symptoms of psychological distress. The World Health Report published by WHO in year 2000 estimated that worldwide up to 20% children and adolescents suffer from a disabling mental disorder and nearly one out of five children need some kind of psychological help. Present study is undertaken to study the parental expectations, attributional styles and coping strategies of students experiencing psychological distress. Before deliberating on the factors that have their impact on student’s level of distress we have to examine the nature of distress, the theoretical viewpoints regarding its origin and the important empirical studies that have bearing on it.

Phenomenon of Psychological Distress:-

The existence of psychological distress has been recognized since the time immemorial. For example, the book of Job illustrates a classic case of psychological distress. Job is seen as a profoundly distressed man, he lost interest
in things he used to like doing, became hopeless; he became withdrawn, self blaming, self depreciating and had sleep disturbance. Kovacs and Beck (1978) states that even 3,900 years old Egyptian manuscript provides an accurate picture of the distressed person’s pessimism, his losing faith in others, his inability to carry out everyday tasks of life and his serious consideration of suicide. These historical descriptions are congruent with some of the present accounts of the phenomenon of psychological distress.

Understanding of psychological distress has been controversial for many years. The major dispute among students of psychological distress has been over the meaning of the concept, and about what actually is meant by the assertion that a person is psychologically distressed. (Torkington, 1991).

Halling & Nill (1989) proposed three basic questions, which should be answered in the context of psychology and psychiatry when trying to make sense of behavior:

(a) What kinds of behavior are judged to be abnormal, whether by professionals or laypersons?
(b) What are the various patterns or forms of disturbed behavior?
(c) How can one make sense of apparently senseless or irrational behavior of disturbed person?

These are important questions that affect who is seen as psychologically distressed as well as how being distressed is interpreted and how treatment is carried out (Phatares, 1988). According to the social control perspective,
psychological distress refers to a category that observers use to classify particular individuals, thus the concept psychological distress is located in observers categories rather than actor’s symptoms. (Torkington, 1991).

A brief description of different theoretical models of psychological distress is presented below:

1. **Medical Model**: The medical model is a prevailing or dominant view of pathology in the present day world (Novello, 1999; Kaplan & Sadock, 1998). Psychological distress is regarded as a disease in the same category as any other physical illness. This model uses similar model in defining psychological distress as that used by medical practitioners. In other words, psychological distress is some form of neurological defect responsible for the disordered thinking and behaviour, and requires medical treatment and care (Carson, Butcher & Mineka, 1996).

2. **Interpersonal Theory**: Interpersonal theories attribute psychological difficulties to dysfunctional patterns of interaction (Carson et al. 1996). They emphasize that we are social being, and much of what we are is a product of our relationships with others. Psychological distress is described as the maladaptive behavior observed in relationships, which is caused by unsatisfactory relationships of the past or present.

Psychological distress is identified when examining the distressed person’s different patterns of interpersonal relationships. According to this perspective, distress is alleviated through interpersonal therapy, which
focuses on alleviating problems existing within relationships and on helping people achieve more satisfactory relationships through learning of new interpersonal skills.

3. **Psychodynamic Theory:** Traditional psychoanalytic model looks at pathology (Psychological distress) from an intrapsychic view. They emphasize the role of unconscious processes and defense mechanisms in the determination of both normal and abnormal behavior. Early childhood experiences are imperative in later personality adjustment; in other words, they understand the expression of present symptom as an extension of past conflicts (Box, 1998; St. Clair, 1996).

Therefore, psychological distress in a person’s life may be described as his attempt to cope with present difficulties using past childhood defense mechanisms, which may seem maladaptive and socially inappropriate for the present situation.

4. **Cognitive Theory:** According to the cognitive model, negatively biased cognition is a core process in psychological distress (Barlow & Durand, 1999). This process is reflected when distressed persons typically have a negative view of themselves, their environment and the future (Weinrach, 1988). They view themselves as worthless, inadequate, unlovable and deficient. According to cognitive theorists, people’s excessive affect and dysfunctional behavior is due to excessive or inappropriate ways of interpreting their experiences. The essence of the model is that emotional
difficulties begin when the way we see events gets exaggerated beyond the available evidence. This manner of seeing things tend to have a negative influence on feelings and behavior in a vicious cycle.

**Operational Definition of Psychological Distress:**

Decker (1997) and Burnette and Mui (1997) conceptualized psychological distress as lack of enthusiasm, problems with sleep (trouble falling asleep or staying asleep), feeling downhearted or blue, feeling hopeless about the future, feeling emotionally bored (for example, crying easily or feeling like crying) or losing interest in things and thoughts of suicide (Weaver, 1995).

Lerutla (2000) defined psychological distress as the emotional condition that one feels when it is necessary to cope with upsetting, frustrating or harmful situations.

Mirowsky and Ross (1989) add that psychological distress is the unpleasant subjective state of depression and anxiety (being tense, restless, worried irritable and afraid), which has both emotional and psychological manifestations. They further added that there is a wide range of psychological distress, ranging from mild to extreme, with extreme levels being considered as mental illness such as schizoaffective disorder.

In another study of Chalfant et al, (1990) psychological distress is defined as a continuous experience of unhappiness, nervousness, irritability and problematic interpersonal relationships.
Difference between Stress, Eustress and Distress:

Stress is a normal part of life and most people experience stress at one time or the other. It is an individual physical and mental reaction to environmental demands.

Stress is sometimes conceptualized as environmental stimulus or life events that impinge on individuals (Holmes and Rahe, 1967, life events model), sometimes as particular reactions to stressful events (Selye’s model), or a mismatch between demands placed on the individual and the perceived ability to cope with the demands (Lazarus, 1966).

Selye (1974) presented a four dimensional model of stress - low stress/ high stress, eustress/ distress which is presented in figure-I.

Figure I: A Four Dimensional Model of Stress

A certain amount of stress is necessary for survival and a moderate/ optimal level of stress is normal and healthy. An optimal level of stress is required for success in jobs, high academic achievement, higher productivity and effectiveness. When stress level is extreme, and unchecked and unmanaged, can create problems in performance and can be detrimental to health and wellbeing of the individual.

Selye (1974) also differentiated between positive and negative stress. He called these positive reactions to stress as eustress. Eustress can enhance longevity, productivity and life satisfaction.

The negative feelings and reactions that accompany threatening and challenging situation are termed by Selye as distress. When this unpleasant and harmful stress becomes too great and lasts too long, we may experience distress. Distress is a state in which our coping abilities begin to breakdown.

A three dimensional model was presented by Hariharan and Rath (2008) to show the cyclic nature of stress. The model is presented in figure II. This figure shows three different angles or dimensions of stress.
Figure II: A Three Dimensional Model of Stress

The **left triangle** represents the initial experience of stress as presented by external factors and translated into primary appraisal. They are the situations of change, conflict, criticism, ambiguity, imbalance, timeliness, unexpectedness or discomfort.

The **right angle** indicates the ‘distress factor of stress’. If we examine the right angle, it is very obvious that each one of the expressions under distress—such as tension, anxiety, frustration, strain, trauma, fear, pressure and hatred—connotes something unpleasant. The **third triangle** at the bottom of the figure consists of expressions such as challenge, opportunity, progress, success, achievement and excitement that are pleasant. When an individual experiences ‘stress’, whether he would move to ‘distress’ or ‘eustress’ from that point, depends on various factors such as the general personality disposition and past experience. Whether a stress situation is considered positive or negative, depends upon the interpretations attached to the situation. This happens through cognitive mediation of appraisal.

Stress becomes distress when it is unwanted, unexpected, ongoing, due to serious life changing events or situations (e.g. Family violence, death of a family member, divorce, separation, a jail term, etc.). When we experience distress, we are out of balance. In this case, our bodies and minds cry out for some kind of help. This call for help may take many forms such as moodiness, irritability, depression, anxiety, insomnia, or physical symptoms such as stomach upset or headache.
A detailed description of the other variables involved in the present study is presented in the following pages.

**Parental Expectations:**

Family is the primary unit where the child is born, nurtured, socialized and thus foundation of his adult personality is laid. Parents have the most significant and differential influence over mental, emotional, and social development of children and adolescents. The most important force comes in the form of parental expectations. Though they bring up their children with great love and affection, make big sacrifices for them, but at the same time they expect a lot from their children. These expectations are particularly related to the attainment of educational and professional goals. Most of the parents desire that their children accomplish what they could not achieve in their own lives. They set their children’s educational and vocational goals themselves having no consideration for their interest, attitudes and abilities. In India which is predominantly a country of traditions, moral and religious values parents and children want to remain interdependent. The latitude of parents expectations is wide. Parents want their children also to conform to the social and cultural values and develops skills which would help them in achieving success in every endeavor of life. It is a reality that some parents have different expectations about their children’s performance in school than others and may express their expectations to their children in both healthy (i.e. supportive, realistic expectations) and unhealthy ways (i.e. unrealistic expectations, pressure to excel). An important question for
researchers, however, is what influence parental expectations have on the
cognitive, social, and emotional development of adolescents. It is a widely
accepted and intensively researched notion that parental expectations have positive
influences on their children’s development. For example, many studies have
consistently revealed that Taiwanese parents, relative to Euro- American have
higher involvement (Chen and Uttal, 1999; Huntsinger, 1992; Goyette and
Xie, 1999; Liu, 1998; Okagaki and frensch, 1998), and have higher educational
expectations (H.Chen and Lan, 1998; Dai, 1999; Huntsinger, 1992; Goyette and
Xie, 1999; H. Lin, 1999; C.C. Lin and Fu, 1990; Okagaki and
Frensch, 1998). Therefore these children tend to have better academic development,
such as mathematical performance (Stevenson, Chen and Lee, 1993; Stevenson. 
Lee, and Stinger, 1986). Moreover, their gender identity and career development
may also be significantly influenced by their parents (M. Yang, 1983). There is
also some evidence that parental expectations affect Taiwanese college student’s
decisions. P. Chen and Liaw (1993), evaluated individual counseling services in a
university counseling center in Taiwan. They reported that parental expectations
were most considered and important factors as college students were making their
career and dating decisions. Most developmental theories of children and
adolescents have recognized that parental expectations are one of the most
significant influences on psychological and personality development (Burbach and
Borduin, 1986).
All parents have expectations for their children and there is nothing intrinsically harmful about that. However, the unrealistic expectations (pressure to excel) are likely to cause more harm to the children’s development. The results from previous studies with child and adolescent samples have appeared very promising in examining the relationships between parental expectations and psychological adjustment (Belsky, 1990; Burbuch & Borduin, 1986; H. Lin, 1999; McKenna, 1999). When the students feel that the demands made upon them by their parents are beyond their capabilities, they experience a kind of ‘pressure’ on them. Corsini (1999), defined pressure as “excessive or stressful demands made on an individual”, giving an example of parental pressure for achievement. Thus when students perceive the demands (e.g. high expectation) from their parents as excessive, they feel the ‘pressure’ to achieve.

On the other hand, Frost, Marten, Lahart, and Rosenblate, (1990), defined parental expectations as a “tendency to believe that one’s parents set very high goals and are overly critical” (p.453). Perceiving high parental expectations itself may not necessarily be perceived as pressure but when students perceive such expectations as excessive or stressful, it becomes a pressure for them.

Parental pressure is defined as behavior(s) and attitudes that children perceive as expectations of unobtainable standards (Leff & Hoyle, 1995). Parental pressure is related to children’s lack of enjoyment (Smith, 1986), stress associated
with the evaluation of performance outcomes (McElroy, 1982; Ogilvie, 1979; Scanlan & Passer, 1979), and negative appraisals of self-worth (Smith et al, 1978).

Psychologists and educators have expressed concern over the possible psychological costs of academic achievement expectations and pressure placed on students. Mc. Kenna (1999) found that there is a consistent relationship between adults depression and parenting style for Chinese–Americans. Thus parental expectations do play a very important role in mental, emotional and social development of Taiwanese college students. Though the dynamics between parental expectations and psychological distress have not been explicated, it may be that parental expectations may serve as one of the significant personal stresses on college students adjustment (Anderson & Yuenger, 1987; Archier & Laminin, 1985; P. Chen & Liaw, 1993; Duncan & Anderson, 1986; Liu, 1998). On the other hand Wang & Heppner (2002) found that the discrepancies between perceived parental expectations and actual self performance are a better predictor of psychological distress.

Several theorists have postulated that the discrepancies between one’s actual self and ideal self developed from countless interactions with parents, produce emotional difficulties (e.g. Freud, 1923/1961; Horney, 1942; Rogers, 1961). For example, Horney (1942, 1950) illustrate that neurotic personality was developed from interaction with parents. Thus, the family unit is one of the most important factors in shaping human development. The way that parents interact
with their children profoundly influences the way children think and act, as well as that they believe about themselves and world around them (Roberts and Magrab, 1991).

Parental expectations can affect children’s emotional and cognitive development. Though there is a little research on how parental expectations affect children emotionally, there are some studies dealing with extreme cases of emotionality such as the role of parental expectations in children’s suicidal behavior (Miller and Day, 2002), and self injurious behavior (Yip, Ngan, and Lam, 2003). A review of literature, however, indicates mixed findings on the impact of parental pressures or expectations on mental health of Indian students (reported by Smith, 2007). Several cultural studies have found that parental expectation is not a better predictor of psychological distress for Asian than for American students in general (Crystal et al; 1994). Some studies reported significant correlations between parental pressures for achievement and psychological distress. Tomiki (2001) found a significant positive correlation between anxiety, depression and parental pressure in Asian Americans. In a study conducted by Crystal et al, parental pressure was significantly correlated with somatic complaints and academic anxiety in Japanese and somatic complaints and depressed mood in Chinese students.

Researchers have also examined the factors more likely to cause parents to have unrealistic expectations about their children. Alexander, Entwistle, and Bedinger (1994) found that parents with a higher level of education had
expectations that better matched their children’s school performance than parents with less education. However, Raty, Leinonen, and Snellman (2002) found that parents with more education tend to expect their children to go on to higher education regardless of ability, while parents with vocational training tended to look at their child’s ability and use that to develop their expectations as to their child’s likely level of school performance and level of academic achievement. In addition to parental education, higher social standing can also lead to unrealistic parental academic expectations. Rice, Lopez, and Vergara (2005) found that the children in families with a high social standing place more importance on fulfilling their parent’s expectations. However, when the expectations of parents are not matched by the school performance of the child, it can potentially cause the child to have problems such as depression (Castro and Rice, 2003), and maladaptive perfectionism (Rice, Lopez and Vergara, 2005).

**Attributional Styles:**

The term attribution is used to refer to the individual perception of causations, that is his explanation as to why the experiences and events have taken place. These attributions are on the one hand his explanations of causation, on the other they gradually constitute his perspective and framework through which he views life. There is significant evidence which point towards the fact that causal explanation which the individual considers relevant with regard to various events experienced by him, has a marked effect on his actions and behavior.
Attribution theory is concerned with how people make causal explanations, about how they answer questions beginning with 'why'. It deals with the information they use in making causal inferences and what they do with this information to answer causal questions. The theory has developed within social psychology, primarily, as a means of dealing with questions of social perception and also self perception (Festinger, 1954; Schachter, 1959; Schachter & Singer, 1962; Bem, 1965, 1967, 1972).

**Theories of Attribution:**

1. **Fritz Heider’s (1944, 1958) Theory:** Attribution theory in social psychology began with Fritz Heider’s (1944, 1958) seminal analyses of how people perceive and explain the actions of others. How one person thinks and feel about another person, how one perceives another, what one expects another to do or think, how one reacts to the actions of another – these were some of the phenomena with which Heider was concerned. It is important to note that his early analysis of social perception and phenomenal causality represent more of a general conceptual framework about commonsense, implicit theories people use in understanding the underlying causes of events they observe in their daily lives, than a set of systematic hypotheses & empirical findings. Heider explains attribution in terms of impersonal and personal causes. Personal causes when seen in the context of intent, cover the everyday occurrences that determine much of our surroundings. Concept of intentionality has been given importance by Heider. He states that the behavior should be attributed to personal causes.
(such as ability or effort) if its outcome is seen to have been intended by the actor rather than to environmental causes (such as luck or difficulty of task). Heider’s main contribution to attribution theory is his conception of the processes and variables involved in a person’s attribution of causality. Heider suggests that people operate very much like quasi scientist in their attributional activities. They observe an event and then, often in a logical analytical way, attempt to discover the connections between the various effects and possible causes. Heider does not argue that people are always objective and rational in their behavior. He points out that sometimes people make attributions that are not based on enough information, that are not based on an adequate analyses of information, or that are distorted by psychological needs and motivations.

2. Jones and Davis (1965) Theory of Correspondent Inference: Another important theory, the theory of correspondent inference was developed by Jones and Davis (1965) to explain attribution. On the basis of Heider’s analyses, they formulated a description of a process of inferring personal characteristics from behavior. The theory is concerned with how we decide on the basis of other’s overt actions, that they possess specific traits or dispositions which they carry with them from situation and which remain stable over time. This task seems to be simple because other’s behavior provide us with rich source of information on which to draw conclusion, so if the behavior is carefully observed, much can be learnt about individual’s characteristics. But sometimes the situation is complicated by certain facts
such as that often individuals act in a particular way not because of own traits or preferences but because external factors leave them with little choice. An example would be a situation in which specific instruction or suggestion has been given to behave in a particular manner. In such situations, according to Jones and Davis (1965) and Jones and Mc Gills (1976), attention should be focused on actions that may be most informative; behavior to be observed should be **freely chosen**. Those that produce **unique or non common effect** (outcomes that should not be produced by any other actions) and those **low in social desirability** can help us to learn more about personality traits or distinctive causal attributions in such situations. The theory leads to the conclusion that others behavior reflect their stable traits (i.e. we are likely to reach correspondent inference about them). Jones and Davis’s theory of correspondent inference considers how observers take a small part of a person’s behavior and use it to determine how representatives that sample is of the person’s underlying traits and other characteristics.

3. **Kelley’s Theory of External Attribution (1967-1973):** The third theory of attribution is Kelly’s theory of external attribution (1967-1973) which is related to the theory of correspondent inference (Jones Davis, 1965). Both are derived from Heider’s work which leads to a perceiver to attribute cause to environmental entity with which an actor or group of actors interact. Thus Kelley defines attribution as the process of perceiving the dispositional properties of entities in the environment. His theory not only explains our
perception of others but also perception of our own behavior. He assumes that attributions are based on a new version of J.S. Mill’s method of difference, the effect is attributed to that condition which is present when the effect is present and absent when the effect is absent. This is most easily understood if we take the ‘effect’ as the specific impression that a perceiver has formed concerning an actor on the basis of his behavior. According to Kelley while assuming the question ‘why’ about the others behavior, information about the three dimensions is kept into consideration.

The first dimension is consensus, which is the extent to which others react in the same manner to stimulus or event, or the individual who is being observed. The second is distinctiveness, which is the extent to which a person reacts in the same manner to other different stimuli or events. Consistency, is the third dimension which refers to the extent to which the person reacts to the stimulus or event in the same way on other occasion. Kelly’s theory states that other’s behavior is likely to be attributed to internal cause if consensus and distinctiveness are low but consistency is high. External cause is attributed to the behavior of others under conditions in which consensus, distinctiveness and consistency are all high. Behavior may be attributed to combination of factors (internal and external) if consensus is low but consistency and distinctiveness are high. If the attribution of people fulfill the three criteria they are confident that they have a valid picture of external world. Thus it can be said that these criteria are indices of person’s state of information regarding the world.
The three classical attribution theories are in a way information processing models of attribution. They presume that all humans are rational, utilizing the available information to draw certain causal inferences to seek the truth but if the perceiver does not process the information in an unbiased manner the use of theories is restricted. According to Miller and Ross (1975), a large number of studies reveal self-serving biases in attribution of causality. These theories focus on antecedents of attribution, i.e. what kind of attribution is made and when, they do not predict the behavioral consequences of perceived causality.

4. *Bem's Contribution to Attribution Theory*: The importance of Daryl Bem’s (1967a-1972) contribution to the attribution area first was fully recognized by Kelley (1967) in his perspective, integrative review. Kelly recognized Bem’s work on self perception as a necessary complement to the work by Jones and Davis & other on person perception. Bem’s (1972) claim that people come to know their own attitudes, emotions, and other internal states partially by inferring them from observations of their own overt behavior and the context in which this behavior occurs. That is people “look back” to and imagine their acts together with the relevant situations in which they occurred, then infer their internal states by means of logical deduction (e.g. “if I was eating scallops, & no one was influencing me to eat them, then I must like scallops”). The strikingly unorthodox implication of Bem’s analysis is that people do not know what they think, feel or believe before they act. Bem asserted that people infer their internal states such as attributions and attitudes after they behave.
and that they cannot remember internal states that are discrepant with their behavior (Bem & Mc Connel, 1970). Bem’s central proposition is: “Individuals come to ‘know’ their own attitudes, emotions, and other internal states partially by inferring them from observation of their own overt behavioral and/or the circumstances in which their behavior occurs. Thus to the extent that internal cues are weak, ambiguous or uninterpretable, the individual is functionally in the same position as an outside observer who must necessarily rely upon those same external cues to infer the individual’s inner states” (1972, p.2)

Bem traces much of his work to Skinner’s (1957) operant behavioristic analysis of human verbal behavior.

5. Weiner’s (1980, 1986) Theory of Attribution: Weiner (1980-1986) conceptualized an attributional theory of achievement behavior, suggesting that causal attribution to success and failure influences self esteem and future expectations in important ways. Weiner focused on structure of causal attributions. The cause of success and failure have been subsumed within a three dimensional taxonomy, that are locus, stability and controllability. The first dimension is locus of control (Rotter, 1996). It includes internal and external causes. Ability and effort are internal whereas task difficulty, luck etc. are external. The locus of control is associated with self esteem related effects. If internal cause is given for success, self esteem enhances but if failure is attributed to internal cause, self esteem may decrease. The second dimension is
stability which refers to whether the cause is stable or unstable. Ability, task difficulty and patience are stable while luck and effort are unstable.

Stability dimensions helps in predicting future success. Controllability is the third dimension, which was proposed by Heider (1958) and then incorporated within achievement scheme by Rossenbaum (1972). Effort or bias of teacher are controllable while ability, mood or chance are uncontrollable. In case of globality, Weiner (1986) assumes that it is related to generalizability. It refers to consistency over situations.

The Attributional Style: Attributional style (AS) is an individual differences variable that refers to the habitual ways in which people explain their positive and negative life experiences (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978). The attributional style (AS) construct emerged from the attributional reformulation of the learned helplessness model, which posited that a person’s explanatory style determines the extent to which learned helplessness is stable, pervasive, and undermining of self esteem (Abramson et al, 1978; Peterson, 1991b). Learned helplessness is the belief that one can exert no control over one’s environment. When people hold such a belief, they feel unable to escape their environment and may simply give-up leading, in some cases, to profound feeling of depression (Seligman, 1975). According to learned helplessness model, causal attributions vary on three critical dimensions: locus, stability and globality.
1. Locus: Internal vs. External Causes: Locus of causality refers to whether the outcome was due to something about the person (internal) or something about the situation or circumstances (external).

2. Stability: Stable vs. Unstable Causes: Stability refers to whether the cause will again be present (stable) or is temporary (unstable).

3. Globality: Global vs. Specific Causes: The third dimension is globality.

   Globality, refers to whether the cause influences just this particular situation (specific explanation) or whether it influences other areas of respondent’s life (global explanation) (Tenner & Herzberger, 1985).

   A pessimistic (or depressive) attributional style is the tendency to explain negative life events with internal, stable and global causes and to explain positive events with external, unstable and specific causes. In contrast, an optimistic attributional style is the tendency to explain negative events with external, unstable and specific causes and to explain positive events with internal, stable and global causes (Abramson et al, 1978).

   “Positive Attributional Styles”: Optimists have a positive explanatory style, or positive way of explaining events in their lives. Optimists explain positive events as having happened because of them (internal). They also see them as evidence that more positive things will happen in the future (stable), and in other areas of their lives (global). Conversely, they see negative events as not being their fault (external). They also see them as being flukes (isolates) that have nothing to do with other areas of their lives or future events (local). For example, if an optimist
gets a promotion, she will likely believe its because she’s good at her job (internal), and will receive more benefits and promotion in the future (global and stable). If she is passed over for the promotion, it’s likely because she was having an off-month (local and unstable) because of extenuating circumstances (external) but will do better in the future. It is known as positive explanatory style.

**Negative Attributional Style:** Pessimists have a negative explanatory style or negative ways to explain the events in their lives. They believe that negative events are caused by them (internal), believe that one mistake means more will come (stable), and mistakes in other areas of life are inevitable (global) because they are the cause. They see positive events as flukes (local), that are caused by things outside their control (external) and probably won’t happen again (unstable). A pessimist would see a promotion as a luck event (external), that probably won’t happen again (unstable and local), and may even worry that she will now be under more scrutiny! Being passed over for promotion would probably be explained as not being skilled enough (internal and global) and therefore expect to be passed over again (stable). It is known as negative explanatory style.

Pessimists are more likely than optimists to display helplessness deficits when they experience a negative event (Schulman, Castellon and Seligman, 1989). Attributional style has been demonstrated to play a mediating role between negative events and problems in living such as depression (Sweeney, Anderson and bailey, 1986), loneliness (Anderson, 1983 b), and shyness (Alfano, joiner and Perry, 1994).
For example, a pessimistic attributional style appears to increase the risk for depression through the negative impact of the attributions on self-esteem (locus attributions) and expectations about future events (stability and globality attributions) (Peterson and Seligman, 1984).

By definition, depressive attributional style is related to prolonged exposure to uncontrollable aversive events, which result in motivational, cognitive, and behavioral deficits. In lay terms, it is ‘learned helplessness’, and occurs when individuals believe positive outcomes or the avoidance of aversive consequences is unobtainable (Seligman, 1975). Research has shown that depressive attributional style is strongly related to depression (Seligman, Abramson, Semmel and Von Baeyer, 1979; Metalsky and Joiner, & Abramson 1993). Researchers believe that attributional style can help provide a better understanding of behaviors and consequences that affect one’s performance and actions (Peterson, 1991).

The three dimensions are continuous and can be grouped together in different combination which may result in eight types of causal attributions (Siddiq, 1997):

1. Internal-stable- global
2. Internal-unstable-global
3. Internal-stable- specific
4. Internal-unstable- specific
5. External-stable-global
6. External-unstable-global
7. External-stable-specific

8. External-unstable-specific

Each of these combinations has different implications for the future expectation of people, and their performance on subsequent tasks.

**Coping Strategy:**

Individual cannot remain in a continuous state of tension. Even if a deliberate or conscious strategy is not adopted, some strategy is certainly adopted, these strategies are called coping strategies. The dictionary meaning of cope is ‘to deal’/or ‘manage’ successfully. The word coping has two connotations in stress literature, firstly it denotes the way of dealing with stress and secondly the effort to master conditions of harm, threats or challenge when a routine or automatic response is not readily available. According to Lazarus (1966), stress consists of three processes primary appraisal, secondary appraisal and coping.

Primary appraisal is the process of perceiving threat to oneself. Secondary appraisal is the process of bringing to mind a potential response to the threats. Coping is the process of executing that response.

Other psychologists defined coping as “the minimization of emotional distress” (Pinkerton et al. 1985); “an individuals attempted response to reduce feeling of discomfort” (Dewe & others, 1979), “as a response or responses whose purpose is to reduce or to avoid psychological distress” (Houston, 1986). According to Billings and Moos (1984), “coping consists of the cognition and
behavior that people use to assess and reduce stress and moderate the tension that accompanies it”.

A very inclusive view of coping was presented by Matheney and his associates (1986). According to them coping is “any effort, healthy or unhealthy, conscious or unconscious, to prevent, eliminate or weaken stressors, or to tolerate their effect in the least hurtful manner”.

The following crucial elements are highlighted in the above definition:

**First:** People do not always use the healthiest coping strategies. **Second:** A person does not have to be consciously aware of a strategy he is using to cope in order that the strategy may be considered a coping method. **Third:** Coping strategies do not have to eliminate a stressor altogether. **Fourth:** Coping strategies are used to reduce emotional and physical hurt.

**Individual Differences in Coping:** coping as a strategy to deal with a stress differs from one person to another and across the situations in the same person. There are two ways to think about how individual differences might influence coping.

The **first** and the more obvious possibility is that there are stable coping “traits”, “styles” or “dispositions” that people bring to the stressful situations that they encounter (Byrne, 1964; Goldstein, 1973). According to this view, people do not approach each coping context anew, but rather bring to bear a preferred set of coping strategies that remains relatively fixed across time and circumstances.
Coping traits refer to a disposition to respond in a specific way in situations that are stressful. Coping traits are thus stable characteristic of persons who transcend all stressful situations. Coping style implies a broader, more encompassing disposition. Trait and style are fundamentally similar ideas. They refer to a characteristic way of handling situations. On the basis of which inferences can be drawn about how an individual will cope in some or all types of stressful situations.

The idea that such coping styles exist is opposed by some investigators who preferred to study the active ongoing strategies in particular stressful situations. Folkman and Lazarus (1980, 1985; Folkman et al. 1986) have repeatedly emphasized that coping should be thought of as a dynamic process that shifts in nature from stage to stage of a stressful transaction. Such a view suggests that the development of coping style would at best be counterproductive, because it locks the person into one mode of responding rather than allowing the person the freedom & flexibility to change responses with changing circumstances.

The second possibility goes a step further in arguing that preferred ways of coping with stress is derived from more traditional personality dimensions (Mc Crae, 1982). That is perhaps certain personality characteristics predispose people to cope in certain ways when they confront adversity.

**Types of Coping Strategy:** Although there are many ways to classify the coping responses (Moos and Billings, 1982), the most approaches distinguish between strategies that are active in nature and oriented toward confronting the problem,
and strategies that entail effort to reduce tension by avoiding or dealing with problem.

Moos and Billings (1982) categorized dimensions of appraisal and coping into three domains:

1. **Appraisal Focused Coping**: It involves attempts to define the meaning of the situation and includes such strategies as logical analysis and cognitive redefinition.

2. **Problem Focused Coping**: This seeks to modify or eliminate the source of stress to deal with the tangible consequences of the problem or actively change the self and develop a more satisfying situation.

3. **Emotion Focused Coping**: Emotion focused coping includes responses whose primary function is to manage the emotions aroused by stressors and thereby maintain effective equilibrium.

Lazarus (1975) suggested two categories of coping: direct action and palliative approach.

1. **Direct Action**: In direct action coping an individual tries to alter his behavioral interactions with the environment by demolishing, avoiding, or fleeing the threatening person or event. In addition an individual may take action to meet the threat.

2. **Palliative Approach or Coping**: Palliative coping result when direct action is too costly or difficult. Here potential stress reactions are reduced
by altering the internal environment through the use of tranquilization, defense mechanism, or alcohol or through engaging in behavior such as relaxation training, meditation and hypnosis. Palliative form of coping are directed at reducing the affective (feeling), motor and physiological disturbances, that are distressing an individual.

Compass and his Colleagues (1988) proposed that coping with stress is a process consisting of two levels:

1. **Emotion Focused Coping:** The first level involves emotion focused coping, which attempt to reduce the negative emotional response elicited by the threat and to increase positive affect (Steiner et al., 2002). Even if the threat is there, we prefer to feel less anxious and less angry, and we seek ways to increase our positive feelings.

2. **Problem Focused Coping:** At the second level is problem focused coping, which involves an attempt to deal with the threat itself and to gain control of the situation. The distinction between “problem focused” and “emotion focused” coping has been made by Mechanic (1974), Kahn et al. (1964) and White (1974). Problem focused coping refers to efforts directed at doing something constructive about the conditions that cause stress or that harm, threaten or challenge. Emotion focused coping refers to efforts directed at regulating the emotion itself, whether the focus of such regulation is in behavior and expression.
Wilder and Plutchick (1982) have proposed eight basic coping styles to reduce stress:

i. **Suppression** (avoid stressors),

ii. **Help seeking,**

iii. **Replacement** (engage in direct stress reducing activities),

iv. **Blame** (another and system),

v. **Substitution** (engage in indirect stress reducing activities),

vi. **Mapping** (collect more information),

vii. **Reversal** (act opposite to the way one feels), and

viii. **Minimization** (minimize the importance of the stressful situation).

Pareek (1983b) has proposed two styles of coping which people generally adopt in order to deal with perceived stress:

a. **Functional Coping Style:** In functional coping style the focal person confronts and makes some efforts to deal with stressful situations. This style may also be referred to an “approach” mode of coping. Pareek has suggested four ‘approach’ coping strategies, which are:

i. **Impersistive:** In this strategy individual hopes that time or normally expected circumstances will bring about the solution of the problem.

ii. **Intropersistive:** In this strategy individual himself takes action in relation to the faced stress.
iii. **Extrapersistive:** In this strategy the individual requests some one to solve the problem.

iv. **Interpersistive:** In this strategy the individual makes joint effort with others to deal with stress.

**b. Dysfunctional Coping Style:** In this coping style the individual denies the stress or tries to escape from it; this style is denoted as the “avoidance” mode of coping. Pareek has suggested also four avoidance coping strategies, which are:

i. **Impunitive:** In this strategy the individual blames others for the stress situation and simply admits stress as an unavoidable situation with a belief that nothing can be done about it.

ii. **Intropunitive:** In this strategy the individual directs the blame and aggression to himself.

iii. **Extrapunitive:** In this strategy the individual expresses irritation and aggression towards external factors, and blames other for creating stress.

iv. **Defensive:** In this strategy the focal person either denies the stress or gives rationalization to the stressful situation in order to defend his superego.

**Maddi and Kobasa (1984)** talked about two forms of coping:

a. **Transformational Coping:** It involves altering the events so that they are less stressful. To do this one has to interact with the events, and by
thinking about them optimistically and acting towards them decisively, change them in a less stressful direction.

b. **Regressive Approach:** It includes a strategy where one thinks about the events pessimistically and acts evasively to avoid contact with them.

Carver, Scheier and Weintraub (1989) suggested that **problem focused** coping, **emotion focused** coping and **avoidant** coping can involve several distinct activities. These responses are very different from each other and they may have very different implications for a person's success in coping (Carver et al., 1989). They presented 13 diverse coping responses and which can be grouped into three broad coping strategies. Which are possible in the face of stressful situations. These are as follow:

1. **Active Coping:** Active coping is the process of taking active steps to try to remove or circumvent the stressor or to ameliorate its effects. Active coping includes initiating direct action, increasing one’s efforts, and trying to execute a coping attempt in stepwise fashion.

2. **Planning:** Planning is the thinking about how to cope with a stressor. Planning involves coming up with action strategies, thinking about what steps to take and how best to handle the problem. The activity clearly is problem focused, but it differs conceptually from executing a problem-focused action. Moreover, planning occurs during secondary appraisal, whereas active coping occurs during the coping phase.
3. **Suppression of Competing Activities**: Another aspect of certain kinds of problem focused coping is a constriction in the range of one’s phenomenal field. The person may suppress involvement in competing activities or may suppress the processing of competing channels of information, in order to concentrate more fully on the challenge or threat at hand. Suppression of competing activities mean putting other projects aside, trying to avoid becoming distracted by other events, even letting other things slide, if necessary, in order to deal with the stressor.

4. **Restraint Coping**: Restraint coping is waiting until an appropriate opportunity to act presents itself, holding oneself back, and not acting prematurely. This is an active coping strategy in the sense that the person’s behavior is focused on dealing effectively with stressor, but it is also a passive strategy in the sense that using restraint means not acting.

5. **Seeking Social Support for Instrumental Reason**: Another coping response that can be considered as relevant to problem focused coping, is the seeking out of social support. People can seek social support for either of two reasons, which differ in the degree to which they imply problem focus. Seeking social support for instrumental reasons is seeking advice, assistance, or information. This is problem focused coping.

6. **Seeking Social Support for Emotional Reasons**: Seeking social support for emotional reasons is getting moral support, sympathy, or understanding. This is an aspect of emotion focused coping.
7. **Positive Reinterpretation and Growth:** This is a type of emotion focused coping, aimed at managing distress emotions rather than at dealing with the stressor per se. Clearly, however, the value of this strategy is not limited to reduction of distress. That is, construing a stressful transaction in positive terms should intrinsically lead the person to continue active, problem-focused coping actions. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) used the term positive reappraisal for this coping strategy.

8. **Acceptance:** It is arguable that acceptance is a functional coping response, in that a person who accepts the reality of a stressful situation would seem to be a person who is engaged in the attempt to deal with the situation. Acceptance impinges on two aspects of the coping process. Acceptance of a stressor as real occurs in primary appraisal. Acceptance of a current absence of active coping strategies relates to secondary appraisal – one might expect acceptance to be particularly important in circumstances in which the stressor is something that must be accommodated to, as opposed to circumstances in which the stressor can easily be changed.

9. **Turning to Religion:** Turning to religion in times of stress is one of the coping responses that many people adopt. Mc. Crae and Costa (1986) also suggest that such a coping tactic may be quite important to many people.

10. **Focus on and Venting of Emotions:** The tendency to focus on whatever distress or upset one is experiencing and to ventilate those feelings (Cf. Scheff, 1979). Such a response may sometimes be functional. For
example, if a person uses a period of morning to accommodate to the loss of a loved one and move forward. There is reason to suspect, however, that focusing on these emotions particularly for long periods can impede adjustment.

11. **Denial**: Denial is a response that sometimes emerges in the primary appraisal. It is opposite to acceptance. It is a refusal to believe that the stressor exists or of trying to act as though the stressor is not real.

12. **Behavioral Disengagement**: Behavioral disengagement is reducing one’s effort to deal with the stressor, even giving up the attempt to attain goals with which the stressor is interfering. Behavioral disengagement is reflected in phenomena that are also identified with terms such as helplessness. In theory behavioral disengagement is most likely to occur when people expect poor coping outcomes.

13. **Mental Disengagement**: Mental disengagement occurs via a wide variety of activities that serve to distract the person from thinking about the behavioral dimension or goal with which the stressor is interfering. The tactics that reflect mental disengagement include using alternative activities to take one’s mind off a problem (a tendency opposite to the suppression of competing activities), day dreaming, escaping through sleep, or escape through immersion in T.V.

Coping can have an effect on three kinds of outcomes – psychological, social and physiological. From a psychological perspective, coping can have an
effect on the person’s moral (i.e., the way one feels about oneself and one’s life), emotional reaction, e.g., levels of depression or anxiety or balance between positive and negative feelings (Bradburn, 1969), the incidence of a psychiatric disorder and even performance. From the social perspective, one can measure its impact on functional effectiveness, such as employability, community involvement, and sociability (Ranne, 1974), the effectiveness of interpersonal relationships, or the degree to which useful social roles are filled (and acting out anti-social behavior, etc. are avoided). From a physiological perspective, outcome includes short term consequences, such as the development and progression of a particular disease.

College can be a difficult experience, and it is not unusual for students to experience problems, the most common of which are related to depression and anxiety. While just about everyone gets depressed from time to time, persons suffering from significant levels of depression or distress exhibit an array of symptoms. The symptoms of depression or distress are: insomnia or change in sleep pattern, inability to concentrate, change in appetite, loss of ability to experience happiness or pleasure, apathy, sloppiness, crying, poor personal hygiene, feelings of worthlessness, no desire to socialize, loss of self-esteem and preoccupation with death. Having only one symptom is usually not enough to describe someone as severely depressed. However, when several of these symptoms occur for an extended period of time, a person may be experiencing a
depressive episode. Although many students experiences high stress at college. Some develop emotional problems related to anxiety.

News papers and news channels are replete with the news of exam stress, anxiety, depression, suicide attempts or actual suicide cases among students. In a newspaper report (T.O.I., 21February 2005) only in Delhi hundreds of cases of attempted suicide were reported. The T.O.I. quoted a prominent psychologist Broota as saying that "I have already got nearly 300 cases of attempted suicide by those appearing for boards and six have already taken their lives" (Broota, 2005. feb.21, T.O.I.).

In yet another report published in March 18, 2008 issue of T.O.I., the statistics of suicide was provided, which stated that “in 2006, 5,857 students or 16 a day committed suicide across India. And these are just official figures (of National Crime Record Bureau). Disquietingly, those who are not pushed to the brink still have to grapple with acute anxiety and depression.” The young generation who will inherit the earth and who hold the future of the country is passing through a tough time in this competitive world. "Parental and peer pressure, rising ambitions and fierce competition are brewing a deadly cocktail for these young minds. Moreover, a nation racing towards affluence, an economy on a remarkable upward growth trajectory and sky rocketing salaries are putting unprecedented pressure on youth to succeed." (Lal, 2008). Their stress is generally manifested in physical symptoms e.g. headache, stomach problems; psychological symptoms e.g. feeling hopelessness about future, feeling
downhearted, unhappiness, nervousness, irritation; problematic interpersonal relationship, some are even led to experiment with macabre stress busting recipes. While “some students from science stream are even making their own drugs from chemicals and salts available in their school labs”, says Agrawal a cardiologist and president of the Heart Care Foundation of India.

What is pushing today’s Indian students, a bright generation with a global reputation and high intellectual level to the brink? If we want to find a partial answer to this question we will have to strive to explore the factors that contribute to the feeling of distress among this adolescents group.

Media and experts link students problems to “parental pressure”. Parental pressure in the form of their expectations about their children regarding academic achievement, complying with the family rules and social norms, fulfilling the responsibilities and many more, cost on their children’s mental health.

According to Delhi based clinical psychologist Deb, “parental expectations have also risen enormously over the years which is propelling these kids to breaking point (2008, South Asian News).

An editorial “Are Parents to Blame” was published in T.O.I. (2008, March 18) which blamed ‘pushing parents’ for aggravating the already existing stress caused by the exam. A student was quoted as saying that “parents compare us with our friends whenever our scores are low. We are expected to perform excellently in board exams and are always reminded about their importance, which adds to the tension. The relentless pressure sometimes get to you.”
Another factor that seems pertinent in this context is the attributional style i.e. the characteristic way of attributing the cause of events. Attributing the causes of academic success and failure have a role to play in determining not only the expectancies for future performance but also the experience of affective reactions/states.

In the present study an attempt will be made to find an association between different dimensions of attributions (locus, stability, and controllability/globality) to positive and negative events and psychological distress experienced by the students.

Adolescence is considered as a stage of stress and storms. Coping skills that a person learns during his developmental period are mobilized to preserve ones physical and emotional wellbeing. Coping includes all attempts to reduce stress, whether they are successful or maladaptive. Some coping strategies may be more predictive of the experience of psychological distress at this crucial stage as compared to the other coping strategies. The functional style of their coping may reduce their stress and help them in meeting the challenges of life, on the other hand, if they adopt the dysfunctional coping style, it may put them in further troubles by making the expression of stress in the form of physical and psychological symptoms.
Chapter-II

Review of Literature
Review of Literature

Survey of researches is indispensible part of any study to justify the novelty of the problem, hence it is mandatory for the researcher to present extensive review of related studies. Present investigation was carried out to study the parental expectations, attributional styles and coping strategies of students experiencing psychological distress.

The review of literature revealed that family atmosphere, particularly the relation among family members, parental attachment, parental support and attitudes of parents toward the child has as significant impact on the child’s psychological functioning and can predict psychological distress among children and adolescents.

Freaj, Iobin and Beesley (2004) examined psychological distress and relation patterns in college male and female students. They found family experiences as one of the four predictors of psychological distress.

Family support has been found by many researchers to be significantly related to psychological distress. Newcomb and Micheal (1997) examined 12 years prospective data from a community sample assessed in late adolescence (age 18 years), again in adulthood (age-23 years). Both psychological distress and general deviance was significantly predicted by family support.
Ngai et al., (2000), in a study of 2142 Chinese secondary school students, found family quarrel and family support, among other factors, to be significantly related to psychological distress.

Zuway (2005) investigated predictors of psychological distress among secondary school boys (n=779) and girls (n=893). Gender, GPA, parenting practices, self esteem, and personality/satisfaction were significantly correlated with psychological distress. Significant gender differences were found in students psychological distress, GPA, stereotyped thinking, academic self expectations, parental expectations, parenting practices, and mother’s education level. Stepwise regressions revealed that self esteem was the only significant predictor for boys; it accounted for 40.9% of the variance in their psychological distress. GPA, family income, self esteem, and parenting practices were significant predictors for girls; they accounted for 42.6% of the variance in girls psychological distress.

Attachment of the parents i.e. the affective quality of the attachment (Kenny et al., 2002), and specially attachment to mother (Hannum & his colleagues, 2004), is found to be the potential predictors of the children’s academic achievement as well as the psychological distress experience by them. Family conflict reduces the attachment and attachment to mother mediates the relationship between conflict and psychological distress.

Elaborating on the links between family functioning and psychological distress, Mothersead, Kivlighan and Wynokoop (1998) reported that as family
dysfunction increased, participants reported less parental attachment and more interpersonal distress.

Research has documented that securely attached individuals display less emotional distress and negative affect (Simpson, 1990).

Frey, Beesley and Miller (2006) examined relational health, attachment, and psychological distress in college women and men from the perspective of the relational-cultural model. They found that secure parental attachment predicted decreased distress for both women and men.

In a study of young adults Narayanan and Rao (2004) found that 48% reported high distress and a large percentage of the sample had insecure attachment styles. Other studies showed that the attachment dimension of anxiety and avoidance are positively linked to indices of psychological distress such as emotional distress and nervousness (Collins, 1996), general distress symptoms (Lopez, Mitchell and Gormley, 2002) and depression and anxiety (Wei et al., 2004).

Kapanee and Rao (2007) examined the attachment style in relation to family functioning and psychological distress among 327 undergraduate college students. They found that the securely attached students reported lower distress and perceived their families as higher on the adaptive dimensions of family functioning.

Social support which is referred to as perceived comfort, caring, esteem, or help a person receives from other people or groups, makes individuals less
vulnerable to stress (Sarafino, 1994). Social support has been found to play positive role in psychological adjustment; it contributes to positive personal development and provides a buffer against the negative effects of distress.

Social support was found to be significantly related to psychological functioning by Hadgson et al., (1995), in a group of 529 graduate students.

Parental expectations have very powerful effect on children’s psychological as well as physical health. Few people would disagree that parents play an important role in their children’s achievement. However, some people would argue that parents of high achieving students play a detrimental role by pressurizing their children to achieve at unrealistically high level or to satisfy the parent’s needs. Parents of academically talented children are accused of pushing their children to achieve at exceptional levels. Though there is empirical evidence that parent factors like early parenting behaviors and parental expectations facilitate children’s academic achievement (Englund et al., 2004; Boocock, 1972; Vollmar, 1986), and has a powerful impact on the development of inner drive for achievement (Liu, 1998), there has also been serious concern that parent’s unrealistic expectations create pressure and foster performance anxiety in their children. This has been evidenced in many research studies.

However, Salimi et al., (2005) found a negative significant relation between parental self esteem and expectations and students anxiety about education.
In a study conducted by Cho, Seokhee & Yoon (2005), problems such as distractibility, inattentiveness aggressiveness or psychiatric symptoms were reported for children aged 04-10 years, when parents pressure was high or when father was not involved in education or parents did not discipline children’s behavior.

Reynolds et al., (1994) investigated the influence of parents attitude and behavior on the scholastic and social adjustment of 729 low income black school children. They found parents educational expectations to be significantly associated with teacher ratings of problem behaviors above and beyond family/child background factors.

Sia et al., (1998) also gave indication about the effect of parental expectancies on helplessness behavior among children (age, 13-15, years).

Some studies reported significant correlations between parental pressures for achievement and anxiety, depression, (Tomiki, 2001), somatic complaints and academic anxiety (Crystal et al., 1994).

Though several studies indicated the role of parental expectations in causing anxiety and other behavioral problems among children, Wang and Heppner (2002), found that the children’s perception about their living up to parental expectations, rather than the parental expectations as such, was the better predictor of psychological distress.

Few studies, though not directly intended to measure the effect of parental expectations, pointed to the consequences of unrealistic expectations of parents
particularly in affluent societies. These studies indicate that parental expectations are positively related to SES and the youth from affluent society feel more achievement related stress (*Levine, 2006; Luthar, 2003; Luthar & Latendresse, 2005; Zand, Gouwens & Evenson, 2006).

*Csikszentmihalyi & Schneider, (2000)* found that problems associated with achievement pressures were in high concentrations in communities with higher than average household income levels, as compared to communities with lower income levels. They attributed these findings to high income communities higher priority for academic success among affluent adolescents. Link of parental achievement expectations and socio economic status is supported by the studies on substance use among students which is found to be more rampant in affluent school.

Alcohol (*Luther, 2003*) and stimulant like Ritalin and Adderal (*McMahon, 2007*) were found to be used more in affluent school and college.

*Luthar & Latendresse, (2005)* emphasized that this substance use is directly linked with depression and anxiety and it more likely indicates a habitual and lasting behavior than teenage social experimentation with drugs, which is usually abandoned soon after adolescence.

*Zand et al., (2006)* also found that most strongly and endorsed complain by psychologically distressed students were related to achievement pressure and depression.
Amongst affluent adolescents, the expectation to maintain good grades, pursue advanced classes, attend highly selective colleges and go on to prestigious careers was very strong (Csikszentmihalyi & Schneider, 2000; Hardy, 2003; Pope & Simon, 2005). For many students, these high expectations could produce damaging results.

In a yearlong study of five high-achieving adolescents, Pope and Simon (2005) documented the challenging schedules and lofty expectations these students lived by, as well as some consequences of these demands: these were found to be the sacrifice of sleep, healthy eating and physical exercise in the face of huge homework loads, and symptoms of depression and anxiety. Hardy (2003) and Levine (2006) corroborated this evidence, indicating that students under extreme pressure to succeed in academics often exhibit somatic symptoms in addition to depression and anxiety.

An extensive body of research data reveal a link between psychological problems such as depression, negative affectivity, anxiety and the causal attributions.

Seligman et al., (1979) on the basis of research studies suggested the presence of a depressive attributional style i.e. depressed subjects are characterized by attributing bad outcomes to internal, stable and global causes and good outcomes to external, unstable and specific causes.

Sweeney, Anderson and Bailey (1986) also reported that for negative events, attributions to internal, stable, and global causes had reliable and
significant association with depression. The relation between attribution factors of ability and luck was also significant but it was stronger for negative events.

Pessimistic attributional style was found by many researchers to be associated with depression, and negative affectivity and anxiety. Luten, Ralph and Mineka (1997) carried out two studies with college students and explored the relationship of a pessimistic attributional style to positive and negative affect, as well as to depressed and anxious mood. Both studies revealed that a pessimistic attributional style was correlated with negative affect and depressed mood, but was unrelated to low levels of positive affect. The second study also showed a correlation with anxiety, and that the association of pessimistic attributional style with emotional distress occurs for both depression relevant (i.e. loss/failure) as well as anxiety-relevant (i.e. threatening) events. Results support the hypothesis that pessimistic attributional style is a nonspecific diathesis for symptoms of both anxiety and depression.

Haugen et al., (2002) examined that how self concept and attributional style are related to depression in a students group. They found that pessimistic attributions to both positive and negative events resulted in higher depression, than pessimistic attributions to either kind of events to neither kind of events

Fazio and his colleagues (1998) examined the attributional style and depression among students. They found that students with pessimistic attributional style had higher depression scores than students with optimistic attributional style and those with higher depression score had lower grade point averages (G.P.As).
Ralph et al., (1998) examined whether students' attributional style for negative achievement events interacts with self-esteem and a lower-than-expected exam grade to predict changes in measures of specific and nonspecific depression and anxiety among 141 students. They found that a pessimistic attributional style for negative events interacted with self-esteem and outcome to predict residual changes in a combined measure of nonspecific distress and anxious arousal but not a combined measure of specific depressive symptoms. Unexpectedly, the greatest residual increases in distress occurred among low-self-esteem pessimists who experienced a non failure outcome. These effects did not appear to be mediated by changes in hopelessness.

In a study of college students, Corr and Gray (1996) found that trait anxiety was positively correlated with negative attributional style and negatively correlated with positive attributional style.

Anshel & Brinthaupt (2006) examined relationships among components of attributional style and trait anxiety for 428 boys and girls, (grades 4-6). Results showed a small but significant relationship between negative attributional style and trait anxiety. In addition, girls reported higher trait anxiety than boys, and attributional style and trait anxiety were strongly correlated for girls, but not for boys. Compared to younger students, older students reported more internal attributions for negative events and higher overall scores on negative attributions.
However Rodrignez and his colleagues (1998), in a study to examine the relationship among attributional style, depression and anxiety in a sample of 69 New Zealand children (age 8-14 years), concluded that depression but not anxiety significantly predicted overall attributional style.

Dixon and Ahrens (1992) carried out a longitudinal study to assess the ability of interaction of attributional style and daily negative events to predict self reported depression in 84 children. The self reported depression symptoms were assessed before and after exposure to stressful event. It was found that attributional style did not predict change in self reported depression symptoms following stressful events, the interaction of attributional style with stress did predict them. Stress predicted depression symptoms as well.

Alfano, Joiner and Perry (1994) conducted a study in which they found that the shy subjects were more depressed and had negative attributional style than non shy subjects, this difference was not found when effect of attributional style was removed. Thus the findings suggest that negative attributional style is a mediator of shyness-depression relationship.

Fresco et al., (2006) also found that the tendency to see negative events arising from internal, stable, and global causes and positive events arising from external, unstable, and specific causes, was associated with higher levels of clinician assessed depression symptoms.

Gladstone et al., (1995) examined the association between attributional style and depressive symptoms in children and adolescents. Their results support
the association between attributions and depression. They found that higher levels of depressive symptoms were associated with internal-stable-global attributions for negative outcomes and external-unstable-specific attributions for positive outcomes. Overall composite attributional style are associated negatively with depressive symptoms.

Bodiford et al., (1988) also found that children with depressive symptoms tended to attribute bad outcomes to internal, stable, and global factors and good outcomes to external, unstable, and specific factors. Thus, they indicated the explanatory styles of depressed children were similar to that of depressed adults.

Similarly, Mc Cauley et al., (1988) showed that depressed children relative to non depressed children tended to have a more helpless explanatory style especially with regard to how they explained positive events.

The study of Curry and Craighead (1990) also indicated that adolescents with a diagnosis of major depression differed from non depressed adolescents with regard to their explanatory style for positive events. That is, they made significantly fewer internal, stable, and global explanations for positive events. Both the studies of McCauley et al. (1988) and Curry and Craighead (1990) supported the role of explanatory style for positive events in relation to depression.

Hull and Mendolia (1991) examined the relations of explanatory style, expectancies and depression in college sample, they found that explanatory style for negative events was both indirectly (through expectations) and directly
associated with depression. They also found that explanatory style for negative events was indirectly related to depression by means of expectancies.

Similarly, Peterson and Vaidya (2001) in their study with college students indicated that expectations for future outcomes mediated the link between stability and globality of explanatory style and depression.

Thus, both of the studies provided support for the reformulated model’s prediction that expectancies for future outcomes mediated the association between explanatory style and depression (Abramson et al., 1978).

Longitudinal studies in this field examined the role of helpless explanatory style in predicting depression and also examined whether it was a stable, trait-like character as Peterson and Seligman (1984) suggested. Most of the studies provided support for both the role of this style in predicting depressive symptoms and its’ trait-like nature (e.g., Eaves & Rush, 1984; Nolen-Hoeksema et al., 1986; Metalsky, Halberstadt, & Abramson, 1987; Seligman et al., 1988; Hilsman & Garber, 1995; Robinson, Garber, & Hilsman, 1995: Reilly-Harrington et al., 1999). For example, Metalsky et al., (1987), examining the interaction of the explanatory style of college students with outcomes received on a midterm exam in predicting depressive mood responses, found that the most enduring depressive mood reactions occurred after receiving low midterm scores among students who had helpless explanatory style.

Although most of the studies cited above provide evidence for the reformulated learned helplessness model of depression there are also some studies
that yield findings which are inconsistent with the results of earlier studies (e.g., Cutrona, 1983; Persons & Rao, 1985; Gotlib, et al., 1993).

A review of the literature about explanatory style bring forth a number of studies that indicate an association between helpless explanatory style and other psychological symptoms such as anxiety (Ganellen, 1988; Ralph & Mineka, 1998; Johnson & Miller, 1990), general distress and psychosomatic complaints (Nezu, Nezu, & Nezu, 1986); and self-esteem (Zautra, Guenther, & Chartier, 1985; Kao & Nagata, 1997; Chandler & Lee, 1997; Ralph & Mineka, 1998).

Chang and Sanna (2001), while examining an integrative model, which included perfectionism and attributional style as predictors of depressive symptoms, found that there was a positive correlation between sub-dimensions of perfectionism, helpless explanatory style for negative events- which was termed by the researchers as negative attributional style- and depression with the exception of other-oriented dimension. They figured out that other-oriented perfectionism was associated negatively both with negative attributional style and depression. Moreover, in support of their model they found that negative attributional style added a significant amount of variance (16 to 24%) in predicting depressive symptoms even after controlling for the variance already accounted for each perfectionism dimension.

Similarly, Koçak (1998) indicated that helpless explanatory style was associated positively with depression scores both for positive events and negative events in a college sample.
Elliott (1987) conducted a study on depressive symptoms, attributional style, social avoidance and distress, and family structure among high school students. Their result supported that depressive symptoms were positively associated with a style of attributing negative events to internal, stable-global factors. They also found that depressive symptoms were positively associated with social avoidance/distress, and social avoidance/distress were positively associated with a style of attributing negative events to internal-stable-global factors. They also found that females reported more depressive symptoms than males.

Chan et al., (1987) also found a significant correlation between negative life events and psychological distress among first year university students who explained negative outcomes in terms of internal, stable, and global factors. This correlation was not significant for those who explained negative outcomes in terms of external, unstable, and specific factors.

Sanjuan et al., (2008) examined the relationships between attributional styles for positive and negative situations and positive and negative affect among 436 undergraduates students. Their results showed that people with negative attributional style (NAS) or tendency to explain negative situations through internal, stable, and global causes reported higher negative affect and lower positive affect. According to the reformulated learned helplessness model, individuals with NAS who explained positive events with external, unstable, and specific causes scored highest on negative affect. Moreover, the enhancing attributional style or tendency to explain positive situations by internal, stable, and
global causes was associated with the report of positive affect. They also found that NAS has an association with psychological distress and suggest that direction of attributional style for positive situations may play an important role in the distress or well-being of individuals.

In a meta analytic review of studies of children and adolescents, Joiner and Wagner (1995) found that attributional style and depression are clearly correlated. In particular, whereas positive attributional styles were associated with reduced depression, negative attributional styles were associated with increased depression.

Attributional style was also found to be a mediating variable between defensive maturity and depressive symptoms, (Kwon et al., 2000), and perfectionism and depressive symptoms among college students (Chang et al., 2001).

Researches in the field of health and illness have provided evidences with regard to the association between attributional style and physical and mental health and illness and psychological wellbeing. Attributions of bad events predicted most of the problems related to health. Peterson (1988), found that individuals who believed that stable plus global factors caused bad events, experienced more days of illness in a month and visited physicians more frequently in a year. They also reported more unhealthy habits, and more stressful occurrences than subjects who explained bad events with unstable plus specific causes.
Similar findings were reported by **Peterson (1995)**. He found that optimist individual who explained bad events with external, unstable, and specific causes experienced better health than the pessimist, who explained bad events with internal, stable and global causes.

**Dua (1994)** observed that attributions for bad events were better predictors of health than those for good events and global attributions were best predictors of health. Thus it can be said that internal, stable and global causes are responsible for poor health.

In a study, **Lin and Peterson (1990)** investigated this possibility and found that subjects who explained bad events pessimistically (with internal, stable and global causes) reported more frequent illness during the past years and related their overall health more poorly than those who habitually favored external, unstable and specific explanations. When ill, pessimistic subjects were less likely than their optimistic counterparts to take active steps to combat their illness.

**Cheng and Furnhaum (2001, 2003)** examined to what extent attributional style (internal, stable, and global) predicts positive affect, self reported happiness, mental health or psychological wellbeing on college students. Their results indicated that optimistic attributional style in positive situations was a stronger predictor of self reported happiness than mental health and pessimistic attributional style in negative situations was a predictor of both happiness and mental health.
Khan and Jahan (2006) in their study found that persons experiencing high sense of well being differed from those experiencing low sense of wellbeing on attributional style. Persons having high sense of well being had more internal attributions for the positive events and more unstable and specific attributions for the negative events. On the other hand, the attribution of the persons having low sense of wellbeing were found more external for positive events and, more stable and global for negative events.

Coping is the process of adapting to the environment using strategies and resources (Williamson, Zeitlan, & Szczepanski, 1989). It has also been defined as “flexible and changing reactions to normative challenges” (Skinner & Edge, 1998, p. 357). The acquisition of coping skills is an integral part of development in that coping skills can be used to preserve one’s own physical and emotional well being. Kenny (2000) points out that coping includes all attempts to reduce stress, whether they are successful or maladaptive. Therefore, as children acquire coping skills as they develop, it is possible for them to acquire both adaptive and maladaptive coping responses to deal with the people and events in their lives. Maccoby (1983; as cited in Kenny, 2000) found that young children need external cues from their parents to learn coping behaviors in stressful situations. As children age, they begin to internalize these responses and incorporate them into their patterns or styles of coping. Having a secure attachment to a primary caregiver is one of the most important factors in developing an understanding of how to deal with stressors (Fonagy et al., 1994; as cited in Kenny, 2000).
Insecure attachments have been strongly linked to maladaptive coping responses including depression and withdrawal (Main & Solomon, 1990; as cited in Kenny, 2000) as well as social incompetence (Zeanah, 1996; as cited in Kenny, 2000). These maladaptive coping responses that can result from insecure attachments to primary caregivers can impair children’s attempts to initiate and maintain social support networks and potentially lead to psychopathology (Kenny, 2000).

Most of the researches conducted on various groups reveal that problem focused coping responses are healthy and adaptive ways of dealing with most of the stressful conditions while emotion focused coping responses and avoidant coping, though temporarily helpful, are detrimental in the long run. A review of studies on psychological distress in relation to coping strategies is presented in the following pages.

Studies conducted on students show distinct differences between effective and ineffective copers (Schill et al., 1984). College students are found to use problem solving coping behavior more frequently (Albuquerque et al., 1990). Folkman and Lazarus (1985) found that in time of stress, college students tend to use a combination of problem focused and emotion focused coping. Fraunknecht et al., (1996), in a study on high school students found that an increase in the social problem solving score was related to a decrease in distress and personal problems. Coping efforts that are mainly directed toward reducing emotional distress than dealing with the problems appear to be counter productive in the long
run. A positive correlation between emotion oriented coping, psychiatric symptomatology, depression and social symptomatology has been reported by Ender and Parker (1990). Similarly, significant positive associations between emotion oriented coping and various measures of psychopathology have been reported by Endler et al., (1993).

Higgins and Endler (1995) examined the interaction between stressful life events and 3 styles of coping (emotion oriented, task oriented and avoidance oriented) to physical and psychological distress among 101 male and 104 female undergraduates. Their results revealed that task oriented coping was negatively related to distress, but this finding was significant only for females, while emotion oriented coping significantly positively predicted distress for both males and females.

Hasida (2005) conducted a study to examine the association between demographic variables, problem focused and emotion focused coping and distress, among 510 adults. They found that emotion focused coping showed strong positive associations with distress, whereas problem focused coping was negatively related to distress.

Murberg and Bru (2005) explored the main and interactive effect of approach and avoidant like coping styles, as well as school-related stress on depressive symptoms in a sample of 327 (167 females, 160 males) students. The results showed that seeking parental support as a coping style served as a negative
predictor of later depression, and results give some support for aggressive coping styles being a risk factor for depressive symptoms. A significant interaction between aggressive coping style and stress in relation to depressive symptoms was found.

Neill (2007) investigated the extent to which participants experienced psychological distress during outdoor education programs and whether the use of non-productive coping strategies could help to explain the degree of psychological distress. They found that the best predictor of psychological distress was the use of avoidant coping strategies.

In a study Doing et al., (2005) examined the interrelationships of anger, the experience of stress, perceived support and coping strategies along with their relationship to health. They found that avoidance coping strategies were related to lower psychological well being and greater psychological distress. Psychological distress was in turn, related to poorer physical health. In contrast active and reappraisal coping were in turn related to better psychological and physical health.

Suzuki et al., (2003) investigated the effect of coping process on psychophysiological and psychological responses in stressful settings particularly focusing on the effect of a combination of active and avoidant coping processes among 40 healthy undergraduate males students. Their findings suggested that active coping process and avoidant coping process independently affected different response system and distress scores.
Prakash and Bhogle (1994) examined the sex differences in coping styles and relationship between coping and psychological distress among 232 students. They found that female students used significantly more emotion oriented coping techniques and psychological distress was significantly related to use of emotion oriented coping.

Studies conducted on depression and coping strategies also reveal a positive relation between emotion focused and avoidant coping and depression, and a negative relation between active coping and depressive symptoms. Highhatgou & Peterson (1995) conducted a study on high school students (age-15 years), to measure depressive symptoms and coping style regarding a difficult academic event. The result of their study revealed that students who have active coping style reported fewer depressive symptoms than did those who had a passive coping style.

Renland et al., (2000) examined the relationship between possible selves, depression and coping style among 287 students (mean age 25 years). Their results revealed that depressed students reported more avoidance coping strategies than non depressed students.

Gonzales, and his colleagues (2001) examined the interactive effects of the four coping dimensions of active coping, avoidance, distraction, and support on conduct problem, depression and academic achievement among 445 7th and 8th grade students (age 12-15 years). Their results showed that in females, active coping interacted with community stress to predict depression. For males active
coping interacted with community and peer stress to predict depression. They also found that avoidant coping was positively associated with depression only at low level of stress.

Ogul et al., (2003) examined the importance of match between control appraisals and coping responses as relating to psychological symptoms of anxiety and depression among 391 students (age 11-18 years). Their results indicated that greater use of problem focused coping than emotion focused coping was associated with alleviated depression symptoms of adolescents.

Coping style was found by many researchers to be associated to psychological and physical health. Steiner et al., (2002) examined the relationship between adolescent coping style and health outcomes, on 1,755 9th and 12th grade students (mean age 16 years). Their results showed that approach coping correlated negatively with indicators of health problems and health risk behavior, while avoidance coping correlated positively with these domains.

Rector et al., (1996) examined the moderating influence of self esteem, coping styles, emotion control and other dimensions of cognitive style on physical and psychological well being on 121 first year university students. They found that self esteem, interpersonal locus of control and emotion oriented coping predicted poor health status and distress.

Dunkley et al., (2000) in a study conducted on 233 university students (mean age-21 years) measured perfectionism, self criticism, autonomy and coping (emotion oriented, task oriented and avoidance oriented), hassles (academic, social
and general) and distress. Their results supported a cognitive theory of psychological distress and inferred that coping strategies associated with self-critical perfectionism may have important consequences for the experience of both distress and hassles.

**Dunkley et al., (2000)** examined the role of hassles, avoidant and active coping and perceived available social support in the relation between evaluative concerns and personal standards perfectionism and distress symptoms (i.e. depression, anxiety), in university students (136 men and 307 women). Their results indicated that hassles, avoidant coping and perceived social support are each unique mediators that can fully explain the strong relation between evaluation concern perfectionism and distress.

**Connor and Connor (2003)** investigated an integrative model involving the relationship between perfectionism and coping to predict changes in hopelessness and general psychological distress among college students. Their results indicated that changes in psychological well-being were predicted by socially prescribed perfectionism, and, as theorized, avoidance coping moderated the link between perfectionism and psychological well-being beyond initial levels of distress.

**Mclean et al., (2007)** investigated the potential differing effects of causal attributions on both psychological distress and coping in response to a hypothetical exam failure among 99 male and 90 female students. Their findings showed that exam failures attributed to internal and unstable causes are linked to
lower levels of anticipated psychological distress. Causes that were rated as stable were strong predictors of avoidance and "wishful thinking" coping strategies. As expected, women anticipated significantly more psychological distress than men did. Women also reported to a greater extent than men that they would adopt a social support coping strategy if they had to cope with failing an exam.

Farrokhi et al., (2006) examined the relation of coping style and attributional style with depression among 140 undergraduates students. They found that for female students coping style and attribution for negative event to global and stable causes were significantly correlated with depression. They also found that problem focused coping was more important than attributional styles for predicting depression.

Coping strategies as mediator variable has also been studied by many researchers. Lee, and his colleagues (2001) examined indirect and direct coping strategies as potential mediators in the relationship between intergenerational family conflict and psychological distress in Asian American, Hispanic and European American college students. They found only indirect coping mediated the effect of family conflict on distress for Asian American and European Americans. For these two culture groups, indirect coping fully account for the variance shared between family conflict and psychological distress. For Hispanics indirect coping partially mediated the effect of family conflict on psychological distress.
Lopez et al., (2001) examined relations among adult attachment orientation, maladaptive problem coping styles and a composite measure of current distress within a sample of 55 undergraduates. Results indicate that each adult attachment orientation and each problem coping style measure was related in expected directions to students distress.

Vaughn et al., (2003) examined the relationship between coping and psychological/physical health in a sample of minority adolescent. They found that for Mexican American, positive reinterpretation, focus on and venting of emotions, instrumental social support, active coping, religion, restraint, emotional support, acceptance and planning form of coping were all associated with positive psychological and physical health. However for African Americans, no coping method was found to be significantly associated with psychological and physical health. For Asian Americans, positive reinterpretation, active coping, religion, restraint, acceptance and planning forms of coping were associated with only psychological health.

Seiffge et al., (2001) compared stress perception and coping style in 77 early and late adolescents (age 12-17 years) differing in psychological health. Clinically referred adolescents experienced higher levels of school related and family stress and also exhibited more dysfunctional coping style when dealing with both types of stressors.
Jong et al., (1999) examined a complex theoretical model regarding the stress-distress relationship. The various components in the model included experienced stress (daily hassles), psychological distress, neuroticism, problem-focused coping, avoidant coping, satisfaction with received social support and unassertiveness. On the basis of various previous findings, experienced stress was assumed to have a direct effect on psychological distress. In addition, neuroticism was assumed to have a direct effect on psychological distress as well as an indirect effect through its association with experienced stress, problem-focused coping, avoidant coping, satisfaction with social support and unassertiveness. Further, both problem-focused and avoidant coping were assumed to affect the level of psychological distress directly as well as indirectly through their influence on experienced stress. Similarly, satisfaction with social support was assumed to have a direct beneficial effect on psychological distress in addition to an indirect effect through its association with coping and experienced stress. Finally, unassertiveness was assumed to have a direct effect on psychological distress as well as an indirect effect through its influence on experienced stress and coping. Results showed a considerable predictive power of the model. Experienced stress and neuroticism turned out to be most predictive of psychological distress. The effects of social support, coping and unassertiveness on psychological distress were seriously attenuated by their common association with neuroticism.

Based on the literature review, it is contended that there is a set of variables that can predict psychological distress of senior secondary students. Specifically,
the purpose of the present study is to identify these predictors. For this purpose the
following hypotheses were formulated.

**Hypotheses:**

In the present study an attempt will be made to find out the extent to which
the psychological distress among students (class XI and XII) can be predicted by
parental expectations, attributional style, and coping strategies. The following
hypotheses will be tested.

1. Parental expectations will positively predict psychological distress.

2. Attributional style will emerge as an important predictor of psychological
distress. (2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4).

   2.1 Composite attributional style for positive events will be negative
       predictor of psychological distress.

   2.2 Internal, stable and global dimensions of attribution for the positive
       events will negatively predict psychological distress.

   2.3 Composite attributional style for negative events will positively predict
       psychological distress.

   2.4 Internal, stable and global dimensions of attribution for negative events
       will positively predict psychological distress.

3. Coping strategies will also be the important predictor of psychological distress.

   3.1 (a) Problem focused coping style will negatively predict psychological
       distress.
3.1 (b) All the dimensions of problem focused coping (i.e. active coping, planning, suppression of competing activities, restraint coping and seeking social support for instrumental reasons,) will not be equally useful predictors of psychological distress.

3.2 (a). Emotion focused coping will positively predict psychological distress.

3.2 (b). Different dimensions of emotion focused coping (i.e. seeking social support for emotional reasons, positive reinterpretation & growth, acceptance, turning to religion, and focus on & venting emotions) will not be equally useful predictors of psychological distress.

3.3 (a). Avoidant coping will positively predict psychological distress.

3.3 (b). Different dimensions of avoidant coping (i.e. denial, behavioral disengagement, and mental disengagement) will not be equally significant in predicting psychological distress.

4. Academic achievement will negatively predict psychological distress.

5. Predictors of psychological distress for boys and girls will be different.

6. Predictors of psychological distress for Science and Arts students will be different.

7. Predictors of psychological distress for the students of nuclear and joint family will be different.
Chapter-III

Methodology
Methodology

In any scientific research methodology plays a very significant and crucial role. Edwards (1971) believed that “in research we do not haphazardly make observation of any or all kinds, but rather our attention is directed towards those observations that we believe to be relevant to the question we have previously formulated. The objective of the research, as recognized by all sciences, is to use observation a basis for answering questions of interest”.

Methodology has its own importance in scientific investigation because objectivity in any research investigation cannot be obtained unless it is carried out in a very systematic and planned manner. Scientific investigation involves careful adoption of appropriate research design, use of standardized tools and tests, choosing adequate sample by using appropriate sampling techniques, undertaking sound procedures for collecting data, it’s tabulation and then use of appropriate statistical techniques for analyzing the data.

The purpose of the present research was to study parental expectations, attributional styles and coping strategies of students experiencing psychological distress. The details of the methodological steps follows:

**Sample:**

In general, sample is a small proportion of a specific population or universe as representative of that particular population or universe. Mohsin (1984) stated that “a sample is a small part of total existing events, objects, or the information”.
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For selecting appropriate sample, random sampling technique was adopted in conducting present investigation. In this sampling technique every individual had the equal probability of being selected. It was an appropriate sampling technique to be opted in the very context of present research problem. For the present research investigation the sample was randomly drawn from the students population studying in senior secondary schools for boys and girls, A.M.U. Aligarh. Age of the subjects ranged between 16 to 19 years, the mean age being 17.6 years. All the students came from middle class (moderate) socio-economic background. The characteristics and breakup of the sample is as follows:

### Table-1: Sample breakup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Arts</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table-2: No. of the subjects belonging to nuclear and joint family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of family</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint family</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table-3: Categorization of the subjects according to father’s educational level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational level of father</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uneducated</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.G. or Non Professional</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.G. or Professional</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-4: Categorization of the subjects according to mother’s educational level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational level of mother</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uneducated</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.G. or Non Professional</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.G. or Professional</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tools:

To measure and understand human behavior, psychological tests are developed and used. It is a matter of fact that there is not a single tool or psychological instrument, which may tell about all aspect of behavior because of complex and varying psycho-emotional attributes of personality and human behavioral dimensions. Hence, there is a need for developing psychological instrument for each specific purpose that should be continually revalidated in accordance with the changing time and situations.
The following tools were used to measure parental expectations, attributional styles, coping strategies and psychological distress of senior secondary school students.

(1) Perceived parental expectations scale (PPES, developed by the investigator)
(2) Attributional style questionnaire (ASQ)
(3) Coping strategies scale (COPE) and
(4) PGI Health questionnaire N-1.

A detailed description of these scales is as follows:

**Perceived Parental Expectations Scale:**

The researcher developed a scale to measure student’s perceptions of their parent’s expectations. In applying Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) themes to the mechanism between parental expectations and psychological distress, parental expectations may be conceived as a stress when students perceive them to be something that they can not meet (i.e. threat). Thus, parental expectations per se are not stressful but it is the students perception’s of the parent’s expectations that is important in causing distress. Therefore a measure was developed which could be used to assess student’s perceptions of their parent’s expectations.

**Development of the Scale:**

A description of the procedure for the construction of the scale is as follows:
**Initial item development:**

The researcher first of all formulated 60 items related to parental expectations by talking to students, and experts and by consulting literature on parental expectations. The items were related to different areas of life such as social conformity, academic/ professional achievement, personal maturity, extra curricular activities and general life achievements.

**Content and face validity check:**

The items were sent to 5 experts to evaluate their relevance to measuring parental expectations. After their evaluations were received one item was dropped and some items were reformulated as suggested by the judges. Then all the 59 items were rewritten to have the final scale. A five point scale was provided against each statement. These five ratings were as follows:

(a) "5" for extremely high expectations.
(b) "4" for high expectations.
(c) "3" for moderate expectations.
(d) "2" for low expectations.
(e) "1" for very low expectations.

**Pilot study:**

A pilot study was conducted to determine the psychometric properties of the scale. For this purpose a sample of 300 students was randomly selected from senior secondary schools (both boys and girls), of Aligarh Muslim University. The
sample consisted of 150 boys and 150 girls from Science, Arts and Social Science streams. Average age of the students was 17.6 years.

Perceived parental expectations scale was administered to them in small groups. 

(5 to 10 subjects in a group). They were asked to read the instructions carefully and give their responses by putting any one of the five ratings against each statement.

Total score was obtained by summing up all the ratings for 59 items. Three out of 300 subjects were dropped as they did not complete the scale.

**Analysis:**

Inter item correlations were calculated for 59 items for 297 scores. All the items yielded high reliability.

Factor analysis was also done using principal component analysis method by compressing for five factors. The results of the factor analysis revealed that the first factor was the largest factor. The item distribution on different factors was quite uneven. It was also observed that items overlapped on different factors.

A careful observation of the analysis revealed that perhaps students perceived all the items in the context of academic achievement. Therefore it was decided that the parental expectations should be considered as a single dimension. The final scale consisted of 59 items. The coefficient alpha (α) was found to be .9274. The split half reliability of the scale was also calculated. It was found to be .877.
Attributional Style Questionnaire (ASQ):

The Attributional Style Questionnaire (ASQ) was used to measure student’s attributional style. It was developed by Peterson et al., (1982), and revised by Peterson and Seligman (1984). The ASQ is a self-report measure of patterns of explanatory style which is the tendency to select certain explanations for good and bad events.

The ASQ consists of 12 hypothetical events, out of which 6 are good and 6 are bad events. Additionally, half of the events are interpersonal/affiliative while the other half are achievement-related.

Few changes in the original scale items were made by Siddiq, H. (1997) due to the unsuitability of these items in the Indian cultural milieu. The changes were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Original Item</th>
<th>Changes Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Your spouse (boyfriend/girlfriend has been treating you more lovingly.</td>
<td>Your friend has been treating you more lovingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>You go out on a date and it goes badly.</td>
<td>You go on a tour and it goes badly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>You get a raise.</td>
<td>You are awarded a prestigious scholarship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The present researcher used in her study this modified version of the scale.
The instructions of the ASQ are brief and clear. Each event is followed by four questions that are always in the same order. In case of first question, respondents have to imagine the event and give one major cause of it. On the following 3 questions rating on 7 point scale has to be done, one number is circled which is in correspondence to the causal belief of the respondents. The second question is related to whether the outcome was due to something about the respondent or something about the other people or circumstances (Locus). The third question is related to dimension of stability i.e. will the cause again be present. The fourth question is about globality—whether the cause influences just the particular situation or other areas of life.

The three attributional dimensions rating scales associated with each event description are scored in the direction of increasing internality, stability and globality. Scores are derived by simply averaging within dimension and across events for individual dimension scores and across dimension and across events for composite scores. Each individual dimension score ranges from 1 to 7. Therefore, composite scores range from 3 to 21 for both composite positive and composite negative.

Several studies have explored the ASQ’s internal consistency. Peterson et al., (1982) found that the three scales i.e., locus, stability and globality have modest reliability with Cronbach’s alpha ranging from 44 to 69.

There is a large literature supporting the criterion and construct validity of ASQ. Seligman and his associates (Peterson et al., 1982) followed correlational
approach and devised several methods of demonstrating the criterion validity of ASQ. The results of the study conducted by Peterson et al., (1982) demonstrated the construct validity for the ASQ in that it both taps spontaneously generated attributions and relates to theoretically relevant symptomatology. Three recent studies conducted by Zullow and Seligman (1985), Kamen and Seligman (1985) and Seligman and Shulman (in press) have further supported the construct validity of ASQ.

**Scale for Measuring Coping Strategies: (COPE Scales):**

The multidimensional coping strategies scale (COPE) developed by Carver, et al., (1989) was used to assess the different ways in which people respond to stress (dispositional coping strategies). The scale consists of 52 items measuring 13 dimensions of coping strategies. These 13 dimensions measure different aspects of problem focused coping, emotion focused coping and avoidant coping strategies. The subscales of the multidimensional coping strategies scale are as follows:

**I. Problem Focused Coping:**

(a) Active coping

(b) Planning

(c) Suppression of competing activities.

(d) Restraint coping

(e) Seeking social support for instrumental reasons.
II. Emotion Focused Coping:

(a) Seeking social support for emotional reasons.
(b) Positive reinterpretation and growth.
(c) Acceptance
(d) Turning to religion
(e) Focus on & venting of emotions

III. Avoidant Coping:

(a) Denial
(b) Behavioral disengagement
(c) Mental disengagement

There are four items each in different subscales. Each item in the scale has to be rated on a four point scale- from “1” (usually don’t do this at all) “never” to 4 (usually do this a lot) “most of the time”, and the measure is obtained summing up the ratings for each of the “4” items. This scale has shown good reliability and validity with Cronbach’s alpha ranging from .62 to .92.

There are two ways to think about how individual differences might influence coping. The first possibility is that there are stable coping “styles” or “dispositions” that people bring with them to the stressful situations that they encounter. According to this view people do not approach each coping context anew, but rather bring to bear a preferred set of coping strategies that remain relatively fixed across time and circumstances.
The other idea, such as that of Folkman & Lazarus (1980, 1985; Folkman et al. 1986) emphasizes that coping should be thought of as a dynamic process that shifts in nature from stage to stage of a stressful transaction. Such a view suggests that the development of coping style would at best be counterproductive, because it locks the person into one mode of responding rather than allowing the person the freedom & flexibility to change responses with changing circumstances.

Investigating questions pertaining to dispositionally preferred coping styles required that one be able to measure coping dispositions as well as situational coping responses. Operationally, this is not difficult. It is like the state-trait strategy used by Spielberger, Gorsuch & Lushene (1970). The present inventory i.e. COPE is constructed in a manner that it can be used to examine both coping dispositions and situation specific coping tendencies.

The result of the factor analysis revealed that the scale measures relatively distinct and clearly focused aspects of coping.

Studies also provide useful evidence of both the convergent and discriminate validity of the COPE, (Carver, Scheier and Weintraub, 1989).

**Psychological Distress Scale:**

In the present investigation psychological distress was measured through PG1 Health Questionnaire (N-1), an instrument developed by Verma, Wig and
Pershad (1985). It is 38 items questionnaire based on Cornell Medical Index. The items yield scores on A (physical) and B (psychological) sections.  

(1). The respondent is required to put a tick (✓) mark against questions he/she agrees with. The number of ticks on section A and B indicate the respective scores which can be then added up to give a total distress score also.

(2). There is no fixed number of questions (a cut off point) above which all neurotics should score on this test but in his studies of over 500 persons Verma et al. (1975) found that if a person ticks more than 10 items (questions) chances are high that he has got marked neurotic trends.

(3). A high score does not always indicate neurosis, but (a) it shows a propensity to develop neurotic symptoms under stress and (b) Neurotics score higher than normal’s.

**Advantages of P G I Health Questionnaire N-I:**

This test has definite advantages over other similar tests in Hindi as:

(1). It is a short, simple test with low difficulty value for items,

(2). It can be used with illiterate, unsophisticated population also.

(3). It is medically oriented, hence more acceptable to the patients population.

---

1 PD is used for Psychological Distress.
(4). It has high discriminatory power to separate the psychiatric population from the normal group and

(5). It has high internal consistency, reliability and validity.

(6). Its utility has been demonstrated in a number of studies with varied populations viz. Normal, neurotic, chronic uremia, vasectomy cases etc.

**Data Collection Procedure:**

The data were collected from senior secondary students studying in senior secondary schools of Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh. The investigator met the subjects in groups of 5 to 10 students. They were asked to volunteer to participate as the subjects of the study. After getting their consent subjects were given a set of questionnaires, in which Attributional Style Questionnaire, Perceived Parental Expectations Scale, Coping Strategies Scale and P.G.I. Health Questionnaire were attached as a booklet form. The researcher established a rapport with the subjects and requested them to fill the demographic information first. After that the Attributional Styles Questionnaire was administered. The researcher read the instructions loudly to the subjects and explained how to fill the questionnaire. If any difficulty was encountered by any subject, the researcher explained the events of Attributional Style Questionnaire verbally and helped her/him to give the correct response. After completing Attributional Style Questionnaire, the researcher explained about Perceived Parental Expectations
Scale and asked subject’s to give their frank responses. Similarly other two questionnaires were also filled by the participants.

The researcher assured the subjects that their information would be kept confidential and it would be used only for research purpose. Subjects generally took 25 to 35 minutes time to complete all the scales. When all participants completed the questionnaires, they were thanked by the researcher for their cooperation.

Scoring of the responses was done according to the procedures described for each questionnaire.

Tabulation of the data was done very carefully for analyzing the data.

**Statistical Analyses:**

Once the data are collected, researcher transforms and summarizes data so that result can be interpreted and communicated in a briefly comprehensive manner. So, statistical methods are very important as Kerlinger (1983) opined that “statistics, via its power to reduce data to manageable forms and its power to study and analyze variance, enable scientists to attach probability estimates to the inferences they draw from data”.

Statistics, using probability theory and mathematics, simply make the process more exact. In other words it is to say that through statistics we always make inferences, attach probabilities to various outcomes or hypotheses, and make decision on the basis of statistical reasons. Selection of appropriate statistics is a
very important objective for the study which helps in drawing the precise and accurate inferences.

The following statistical analyses were used to analyze the data:

1. Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to identify the significant predictors of psychological distress.
2. t-test was used to find out the significant difference between gender groups (male-female), stream groups (Arts-Science), and type of family (joint-nuclear).
3. Correlation was used to find out the relationship between independent variables and the dependent variable and between different demographic variables and all the psychological variables.

Regression analyses are a wonderfully powerful set of statistical techniques that allow one to assess the relationship between one criterion variable and several predictor variables.

Regression allows specific prediction to be made from the independent variables about the dependent variable for individual participants. Simple regression involves a single independent variable. Multiple regression allows more than one independent variables to be used to predict the dependent variable and so improve the accuracy of the prediction.

The terms regression and correlation are used more or less interchangeably to label these procedures, with regression generally used when the intent of the
analysis is prediction, and correlation used when the intent is to measure degree of association.

There are three major types of multiple regression analyses: standard multiple regression, hierarchical multiple regression and stepwise multiple regression.

In the present study stepwise multiple regression was used. Stepwise multiple regression is typically used to develop a subset of predictor variables that is useful in predicting the criterion variable, and to eliminate those predictor variables that do not provide additional prediction given this basic set. Stepwise regression is the procedure in which order of entry of variables is based on statistical rather than theoretical criteria. At each step the variable that adds most to the prediction equation in terms of increasing $R^2$ is entered. The process continues until no more useful information can be gleaned from further addition of variables.
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Results

The purpose of the present investigation was to study the parental expectations, attributional styles, and coping strategies of students experiencing psychological distress. The main objective of the study was to identify the significant predictors of psychological distress in student population. Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the data. Multiple regression analyses were done for total group, gender groups, and for stream groups (Science and Arts). The results of the regression analyses are preceded by descriptive statistics for the total sample and statistics for the group differences on different variables, simple correlations between demographic variables and all psychological variables and simple correlations between independent variables and the dependent variable. Results of these analyses are presented for a perusal. These findings may also be helpful in interpreting and discussing the results of the main analyses of the study i.e. stepwise multiple regression analyses.

Mean and SD of total sample on all the variables and their dimensions are presented in following table:
Table 1. Total Sample’s Means and SDs on the Variables Under Study
(N=300).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Psychological Distress</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations (PPE)</td>
<td>217.00</td>
<td>28.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Composite Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Internal-External (Positive)</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Stable-Unstable (Positive)</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Global-Specific (Positive)</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Composite Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Internal-External (Negative)</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Stable-Unstable (Negative)</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Global-Specific (Negative)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Problem Focused Coping (Composite)</td>
<td>58.51</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Active Coping</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Suppression of Competing Activities</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Restraint Coping</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Seeking Social Support for Instrumental Reasons</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Emotion Focused Coping (Composite)</td>
<td>57.56</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Seeking Social Support for Emotional Reasons</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Positive Reinterpretation and Growth</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Turning to Religion</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Focus on &amp; Venting of Emotions</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Avoidant Coping (Composite)</td>
<td>27.65</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Behavioral Disengagement</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Mental Disengagement</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyses for Group Comparisons: Results of the analyses for group differences are presented in tables 2 to 4.

Gender group differences on all the variables are presented in tables 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4.

Table 2.1: Comparison of Psychological Distress Scores of Male and Female Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Distress</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 shows mean and SD of boys and girls on psychological distress. The values in the table indicate that there is significant difference between male and female students on psychological distress. Female students as compared to male students scored significantly higher on psychological distress.

Table 2.2: Comparison of Perceived Parental Expectations (PPE) Scores of Male and Female Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>220.89</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>213.13</td>
<td>31.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2 indicates that there is significant difference between male and female students on perceived parental expectations. Male students (mean=220.89)
scored significantly higher as compared to female students (mean=215.13) on perceived parental expectations scale.

**Table – 2.3: Comparison of Attributional Style Scores of Male and Female Students.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributional Style and their Dimensions</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite Positive</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal-External (Positive)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable-Unstable (Positive)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global-Specific (Positive)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Negative</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal-External (Negative)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable-Unstable (Negative)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global-Specific (Negative)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From table 2.3 it is observed that there is no significant difference between male and female students on 7 out of 8 dimensions of attributional style. The significant difference is found in only one dimension of attributional style that is internal versus external dimension of negative attributional style. Female students (mean=4.05) as compared to male students (mean=3.68) scored significantly higher on internal versus external negative dimension of attributional style.
Table-2.4: Comparision of Coping Strategies Scores of Male and Female Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategies and their Dimensions</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Focused Coping (Composite)</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>60.91</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>56.10</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Coping</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>11.49</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suppression of Competing Activities</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restraint Coping</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seeking Social Support for Instrumental Reasons</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotion Focused Coping (Composite)</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>58.75</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>57.03</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seeking Social Support for Emotional Reasons</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Reinterpretation and Growth</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptance</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turning to Religion</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus on &amp; Venting of Emotions</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoidant Coping (Composite)</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>26.99</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denial</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Disengagement</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental Disengagement</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table-2.4 depicts the Means, SDs and t-values for male and female students on different coping strategies. The significant difference is observed between male and female students on composite problem focused coping, and 4 out of 5 dimensions of problem focused coping. Male students as compared to females scored significantly higher on active coping, planning, suppression of competing activities, restraint coping and composite problem focused coping. Thus, it is found that male students tend to use more problem focused coping than female students.

This table (table-2.4) also indicates that there is no significant difference between male and female students on composite of emotion focused coping and its 4 dimensions. The significant difference is found on only one dimension i.e. positive rereinterpretation and growth. Male students (mean=12.63) as compared to female students (mean=11.84, t-value=2.85, p<.01) scored significantly higher on positive rereinterpretation and growth.

The values in the table also indicate the significant difference between male and female students on composite of avoidant coping and its 2 out of 3 dimensions. It is found that female students as compared to male students (mean=28.33) scored significantly higher (mean=26.99, t-value=1.96, p<.05) on composite avoidant coping, and its two dimensions, namely, behavioral disengagement and mental disengagement. It shows that female students tend to use more avoidant coping strategies as compared to male students.
Analyses for the Comparison of Nuclear and Joint Family Groups:

Mean, SD and t-values of students belonging to nuclear and joint families on all the variables are presented in tables-3.1, 3.2, 3.3, & 3.4.

**Table-3.1: Comparison of Psychological Distress Scores of Nuclear and Joint Family’s Students.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Distress</td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 shows mean and SD of the nuclear and joint family’s students on psychological distress. t-value indicates that there is no significant difference between means of the two groups on psychological distress scale.

**Table-3.2: Comparison of Perceived Parental Expectations Scores of Nuclear and Joint Family’s Students.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations</td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>217.62</td>
<td>27.73</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>215.56</td>
<td>30.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 3.2 it is observed that there is no significant difference between nuclear and joint family’s students on perceived parental expectations scale.
Table-3.3: Comparision of Attributional Style Scores of Nuclear and Joint Family’s Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributional Style and their Dimensions</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t- value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composite Positive</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>16.42</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal-External (Positive)</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stable-Unstable (Positive)</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global-Specific (Positive)</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composite Negative</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal-External (Negative)</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stable-Unstable (Negative)</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global-Specific (Negative)</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 indicated that there is no significant difference between nuclear and joint family’s students in attributional style. In other words we can say that nuclear and joint family’s students do not differ significantly in their attributional style on both positive and negative dimensions.
Table-3.4: Comparison of Coping Strategies Scores of Nuclear and Joint Family’s Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategies and their Dimensions</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Focused Coping (Composite)</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>58.86</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>57.68</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Coping</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suppression of Competing Activities</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restraint Coping</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seeking Social Support for Instrumental Reasons</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotion Focused Coping (Composite)</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>58.18</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>57.19</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seeking Social Support for Emotional Reasons</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Reinterpretation and Growth</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptance</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turning to Religion</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus on &amp; Venting of Emotions</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoidant Coping (Composite)</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>27.33</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>28.43</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denial</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral Disengagement</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mental Disengagement</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The values in table 3.4 indicates that there is no significant difference between nuclear and joint family’s students on any coping strategy except seeking social support for instrumental reasons and behavioral disengagement. While nuclear family’s students scored significantly higher on seeking social support for instrumental reasons, joint family’s students scored significantly higher on behavioral disengagement.

**Stream Group (Science vs Arts) Comparisons:** Stream group (Science and Arts) differences on all the variables are presented in tables 4.1 to 4.4.

**Table-4.1: Comparison of Psychological Distress Scores of Science and Arts Students.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Distress</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 shows means and SDs of Science and Arts students. t-value indicates that there is significant difference between Science and Arts students on psychological distress. In other words Arts students as compared to Science students scored significantly higher on psychological distress.
**Table-4.2: Comparison of Perceived Parental Expectations Scores of Science and Arts Students.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>223.97</td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>209.94</td>
<td>29.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 reveals that there is significant difference between Science and Arts students on perceived parental expectations. Science students (mean=223.97) as compared to Arts students (mean=209.94) scored significantly higher on perceived parental expectations scale.

**Table-4.3: Comparison of Attributional Style Scores of Science and Arts Students.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributional Style and their Dimensions</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composite Positive</strong></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>16.47</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal-External (Positive)</strong></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stable-Unstable (Positive)</strong></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global-Specific (Positive)</strong></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composite Negative</strong></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal-External (Negative)</strong></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stable-Unstable (Negative)</strong></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global-Specific (Negative)</strong></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this table (table-4.3) it is observed that there is no significant difference between Science and Arts students on 6 out of 8 dimensions of attributional style. The significant difference is found only in two dimensions of attributional style, i.e. composite negative and specific-global negative dimension. Science students (mean=10.10) as compared to Arts students (mean=9.38) scored significantly higher on these dimensions.
Table-4.4: Comparison of Coping Strategies Scores of Science and Arts Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategies and their Dimensions</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Focused Coping (Composite)</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>60.45</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>56.54</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Coping</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Competing Activities</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restraint Coping</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking Social Support for Instrumental Reasons</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>12.01</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Focused Coping (Composite)</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>57.79</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>57.99</td>
<td>12.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking Social Support for Emotional Reasons</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Reinterpretation and Growth</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>10.89</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning to Religion</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on &amp; Venting of Emotions</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant coping (Composite)</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>28.99</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Disengagement</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Disengagement</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table-4.4 displayed that there is significant difference between Science and Arts students on composite of problem focused coping and 4 out of 5 dimensions of problem focused coping i.e. active coping, planning, restraint coping and seeking social support for instrumental reasons. Significant difference is not found on only one dimension of problem focused coping i.e. suppression of competing activities. In other words Science students as compared to Arts students scored significantly higher on composite of problem focused coping and 4 dimension of problem focused coping, except suppression of competitive activities.

Table-4.4 also indicates that there is no significant difference between Science and Arts students on emotion focused coping strategies.

The significant difference is observed between Science and Arts students on composite of avoidance coping with its three dimensions i.e. denial, behavioral disengagement and mental disengagement. In other words Arts students as compared to Science students scored significantly higher on avoidance coping and its dimensions.

**Correlations between Demographic and Psychological Variables:**

Correlations between different demographic variables and psychological variables are presented in table-5, for a perusal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Academic achievement</th>
<th>Stream Sc./Arts</th>
<th>Gender Male/female</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Father’s Education</th>
<th>Mother’s Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Distress</td>
<td>-.161**</td>
<td>.114*</td>
<td>.187**</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.127*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations</td>
<td>.194**</td>
<td>-.246**</td>
<td>-.136*</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution for Positive Events (Composite)</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal versus External (Positive)</td>
<td>-.151**</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>-.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable versus Unstable (Positive)</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.131*</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global versus Specific (Positive)</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution for Negative Events (Composite)</td>
<td>.231**</td>
<td>-.161**</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.119*</td>
<td>.158**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal versus External (Negative)</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.165**</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable versus Unstable (Negative)</td>
<td>.163**</td>
<td>-.137*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.140*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global versus Specific (Negative)</td>
<td>.299**</td>
<td>-.237**</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.189**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at .05 level,
**Correlation is significant at .01 level (two tailed test).

Continue to next page....
Table 5: Correlations between Demographic Variables and All Psychological Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Academic achievement</th>
<th>Stream Sc./Arts</th>
<th>Gender Male/female</th>
<th>Family Nuclear/joint</th>
<th>Father’s Education</th>
<th>Mother’s Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem Focused Coping (Composite)</td>
<td>287**</td>
<td>-.250**</td>
<td>-.307**</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>059</td>
<td>227**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Coping</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>-.213**</td>
<td>-.298**</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.236**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>.263**</td>
<td>-.258**</td>
<td>-.146*</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.176**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Competing Activities</td>
<td>.124*</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.339**</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.210**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restraint Coping</td>
<td>.169**</td>
<td>-.153**</td>
<td>-.165**</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking S. Support for Instrumental Reasons</td>
<td>.156**</td>
<td>-.114*</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.124*</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion Focused Coping (Composite)</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.128*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking S. Support for Emotional Reasons</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Reinterpretation and Growth</td>
<td>.131*</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.163**</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.124*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning to Religion</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on &amp; Venting of Emotions</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant Coping (Composite)</td>
<td>-.250**</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.180**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>-.151**</td>
<td>.201**</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Disengagement</td>
<td>-.266**</td>
<td>.174**</td>
<td>.148*</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-.234**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Disengagement</td>
<td>-.143</td>
<td>.130*</td>
<td>.172**</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>-.123*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An inspection of table-5 reveals that psychological distress is significantly negatively related to academic achievement and mother’s education while it is positively related to course stream and gender- indicating high level of psychological distress among Arts students and female students.

Parental expectation is significantly positively related to academic achievement and negatively related to course stream and gender, signifying high PPE for Science students and male students.

Attribution for positive events composite is not significantly related to any demographic variable. Internal versus external positive is significantly negatively related to academic achievement and positively related to course stream, i.e. Arts students score high on internal attributions for positive events. Stable versus unstable positive is significantly negatively related to gender, indicating that male students score high on this dimension.

Attribution for negative events composite is significantly positively related to academic achievement, father’s education and mother’s education. It is negatively related to course stream (indicating high score for Science students). Internal versus external negative is positively related to gender (females score high on internal dimension for negative events).

Stable versus unstable and global versus specific dimension for negative events are significantly positively related to academic achievement and mother’s education while it is negatively related to course stream (i.e. Science students scoring high on stable and global dimensions of negative events).
Problem focused coping composite as well as its five dimensions are significantly positively related to academic achievement, while they have significant negative correlations with course stream and gender, (indicating that science students and male students make more use of problem focused strategies). Only seeking social support for instrumental reasons dimension is not significantly related to gender while it is significantly negatively related to family type. (Indicating more social support for instrumental reasons seeking in nuclear families.

Mother’s education is also significantly positively related to problem focused coping and three of its dimensions.

As far as emotion focused coping is concerned most of the correlations are insignificant.

Emotion focused composite is significantly related to mother’s education. Positive reinterpretation and growth is significantly positively related to academic achievement but negatively related to gender (males using more of positive reinterpretation and growth strategies). Acceptance is significantly positively related to mother’s education.

Avoidant coping and all its dimensions are significantly negatively related to academic achievement while they are positively related to course stream (Arts students using more avoidant coping strategies). Avoidant coping and its dimensions- behavioral disengagement and mental disengagement are significantly positively related to gender (female students using more of these
strategies) while they have significant negative correlations with mother’s education.

**Simple Correlations between Independent Variables and the Dependent Variable:**

The objective of the present study was to identify the predictors of psychological distress among students. Before analyzing the data by using stepwise multiple regression analysis, simple product-moment coefficient of correlations between independent variables and the dependent variable were also conducted. Theses coefficient of correlations are provided in the following tables 6.1, to 6.3:

**Table-61: Correlation between Perceived Parental Expectations and Psychological Distress.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Computed value of ‘r’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations</td>
<td>.525**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at .01 level.

In table 6.1 it is observed that there is a strong positive relationship between perceived parental expectations and psychological distress of students. The value of r is significant at .01 level.
Table-6.2: Correlation between Attributional Styles and Psychological Distress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Computed value of 'r'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attribution for Positive Events (Composite)</strong></td>
<td><strong>-.310</strong>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal versus External (Positive)</td>
<td>-.243**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable versus Unstable (Positive)</td>
<td>-.272**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global versus Specific (Positive)</td>
<td>-.284**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attribution for Negative Events (Composite)</strong></td>
<td><strong>.284</strong>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal versus External (Negative)</td>
<td>.152**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable versus Unstable (Negative)</td>
<td>.211**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global versus Specific (Negative)</td>
<td>.253**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at .05 level, and
**Correlation is significant at .01 level (two tailed test).

This table shows that there is significant negative relationship between attribution for positive events (composite as well as three dimensions) and psychological distress. It is also observed that there is significant positive relationship between attribution for negative events (composite as well as three dimensions) and psychological distress.
Table-6.3: Correlations between Coping Strategies and Psychological Distress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables (Coping Strategies and their Dimensions)</th>
<th>Computed value of ‘r’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem Focused Coping (Composite)</strong></td>
<td>-.167**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Coping</td>
<td>-.217**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>-.172**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression of Competing Activities</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restraint Coping</td>
<td>-.189**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking Social Support for Instrumental Reasons</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotion Focused Coping (Composite)</strong></td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking Social Support for Emotional Reasons</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Reinterpretation and Growth</td>
<td>-.124*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning to Religion</td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on &amp; Venting of Emotions</td>
<td>.238**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avoidant Coping (Composite)</strong></td>
<td>642**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>.444**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Disengagement</td>
<td>.420**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Disengagement</td>
<td>.620**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at .05 level, **Correlation is significant at .01 level (two tailed test).
A perusal of the values in table-6.3 shows that there is significant negative correlation between problem focused coping (composite) and psychological distress. There is also significant negative correlation between 3 dimensions of problem focused coping and psychological distress except of suppression of competing activities where it is positive but negligible.

It is also observed from the table that emotion focused coping composite is not significantly related to psychological distress (r=.022, p>.05). Only two of its dimensions have significant correlation with psychological distress. There is significant negative correlation between positive reinterpretation & growth and psychological distress, while the significant positive relationship is found between focus on & venting of emotions and psychological distress.

The table also shows the correlations of avoidance coping and its 3 dimensions with psychological distress. The values in the table indicate that there is significant positive correlation between avoidant coping and its dimensions (i.e. denial, behavioral disengagement and mental disengagement) and psychological distress of students.

**Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis:**

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted to find out the significant predictors of psychological distress (PD) among students. The analysis was done for the total sample, two gender groups (male and female) and for two stream groups (Arts and Science). Regression analysis for the groups belonging to
nuclear and joint families was not undertaken as there was no significant
difference between the means of the two groups on psychological distress. Table
7.1 and 7.2 show the summary figures of the regression analysis done for the total sample.
Table-7.1: Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis for Total Sample.

Model Summary and Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No</th>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>‘R’</th>
<th>‘F’ value for ‘R’</th>
<th>Sig. of ‘F’</th>
<th>‘R’²</th>
<th>Standard Error of ‘R’</th>
<th>‘β’ value</th>
<th>‘t’ value of β</th>
<th>Sig. of ‘t’</th>
<th>constant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Avoidant Coping</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>208.502</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>4.13987</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>154.603</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>3.78413</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Composite Positive</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>118.679</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>3.64873</td>
<td>-.284</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Active Coping</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>99.293</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>3.54136</td>
<td>-.270</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mental Disengagement</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>84.271</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>3.48350</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Restraint Coping</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>73.597</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>3.43761</td>
<td>-.271</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>64.721</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>3.41339</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Global versus Specific (Negative)</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>58.984</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>3.37326</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Focus on &amp; Venting of Emotions</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>53.434</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>3.35565</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2: Description of Variance in Psychological Distress Accounted for by the Predictors for Total Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No.</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>‘R’</th>
<th>Increase in ‘R’</th>
<th>‘R²’</th>
<th>% of variance</th>
<th>Increase in % of variance</th>
<th>Change in ‘R²’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Avoidant Coping</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Composite Positive</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Active Coping</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mental Disengagement</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Restraint Coping</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Global versus Specific (Negative)</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Focus on &amp; Venting of Emotions</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables-7.1 & 7.2 indicate that nine independent variables have entered in the regression model in a hierarchical manner. These variables are avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, composite attribution for positive events, active coping, mental disengagement, restraint coping, academic achievement, global versus specific attribution for negative events and focus on & venting of emotions. All of these variables collectively account for approximately 62.4% of the total variance in psychological distress (PD).

A perusal of the values in the table shows that the first independent variable i.e. avoidant coping is the most useful and significant predictor of psychological distress which accounts for 41.2% of the total variance in psychological distress. Beta value for this variable is .241, that signifies a positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and avoidant coping. In other words, if we increase avoidant coping by 1 unit, the level of psychological distress will be increased by .241 units (provided that the effect of all other variables is held constant). t-value and its significance shows that beta significantly differs from zero and in the slope of regression line is positive and significant.

The second most important predictor is perceived parental expectations. It along with avoidant coping accounts for 51% of the total variance in psychological distress. However, its individual contribution is 9.8% (R² change=.098). The beta value for this variable is .060, that signifies a positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and perceived parental expectations. In other words, if we increase perceived parental expectations by one unit, the level of
psychological distress will be increased by .060 units (provided that the effect of all other variables is held constant). t-value and its significance shows that beta significantly differs from zero and in the slope of regression line is positive and significant.

The third important predictor is composite attribution for positive events. It along with avoidant coping and perceived parental expectations, accounts for 54.6% of the total variance in psychological distress. However, its individual contribution is 3.6% ($R^2$ change=.036) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is -.284, that signifies a negative predictive relationship between psychological distress and composite attribution for positive events.

The fourth significant predictor is active coping. It along with avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations and composite attribution for positive events, accounted for 57.4% of total variance in psychological distress. However its individual contribution is 2.8% ($R^2$ change=.028) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is -.270, that signifies a negative predictive relationship between psychological distress and problem focused coping.

The fifth significant predictor is mental disengagement. It along with avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, positive attribution, and active coping, accounted for 58.9% of the total variance in psychological distress. Its individual contribution is 1.5% ($R^2$ change=.015) of the total variance in
psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is .489, that signifies positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and mental disengagement.

The sixth important predictor is restraint coping. It along with avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, composite attribution for positive events, active coping, and mental disengagement, accounted for 60.1% of the total variance in psychological distress. However, its individual contribution is 1.2% ($R^2$ change=.012) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is -.271, that signifies negative predictive relationship between psychological distress and restraint coping.

Our seventh significant predictor is academic achievement. It along with avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, composite attribution for positive events, active coping, mental disengagement, and restraint coping accounted for 60.8% of the total variance in psychological distress. However, its individual contribution is only 0.7% ($R^2$ change=.007) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is -.055, that signifies negative predictive relationship between psychological distress and academic achievement.

Our eighth significant predictor is global versus specific attribution for negative events. It along with other predictors, accounted for 61.9% of the total variance in psychological distress. Its individual contribution is 1.1% ($R^2$ change=.011) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for
this variable is .582, that signifies positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and global versus specific attribution for negative events. Our ninth and last significant predictor is focus on & venting of emotions. It along with avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, composite attribution for positive events, active coping, mental disengagement, restraint coping, academic achievement, and global versus specific attribution for negative events, accounted for 62.4% of the total variance in psychological distress. However, its individual contribution is as low as 0.5% ($R^2$ change=.005) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is .145, that signifies positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and focus on & venting of emotions. t-value and its significance shows that the beta significantly differs from zero and in the slope of regression line is positive and significant.

Ultimately, we see that the total contribution of or the variance accounted for by the nine variables is 62.4%, the remaining 37.6% of the total variance in psychological distress is due to some other variables which are out of the scope of the present regression analysis.

If we look at the results of the regression analysis in the light of the hypotheses formulated for the present study, it is revealed that the first hypothesis is proved to be true, as parental expectation emerged as significant predictor ($R^2=.510$, $\beta=.060$, t-value=7.70, sig. $p<.01$) of psychological distress and accounted for 9.8% ($R^2$ change=.098) variance in the dependent variable.
Our second hypothesis stated that attributional style will be an important predictor of psychological distress (PD). This was further specified as hypotheses 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4. Results reveal that our second hypothesis is partially confirmed.

The hypothesis 2.1 stated that composite attributions for positive events will be negatively related to psychological distress. This hypothesis was confirmed as composite attributional style for positive events entered at third step in stepwise regression analysis table ($R^2=.546$, $R^2_{\text{change}}=.036$, $\beta=-.284$, $t$-value=3.13, $p<.001$).

Hypothesis 2.2 stated that internal, stable and global attributions for positive events will be negatively related to psychological distress. This hypothesis was not confirmed as none of the dimensions (internal, stable, and global), emerged as predictor of psychological distress.

Hypothesis 2.3 and 2.4 stated, respectively that composite attributions for negative events will be positively related to psychological distress and internal, stable and global attributions will also be positively related to psychological distress. The hypothesis 2.3 was not confirmed while hypothesis 2.4 was partially confirmed as global versus specific dimension of attribution for negative events significantly predicted psychological distress. ($R^2=.619$, $R^2_{\text{change}}=.011$, $\beta=582$, $t$-value=2.59, $p<.001$).

Our third hypothesis was classified as 3.1 (a, b), 3.2(a, b), and 3.3.(a, b). Hypothesis 3.1 (a, & b) stated, respectively, that problem focused coping will be
negatively related to psychological distress, but all the dimensions of problem focused coping will not be equally useful predictors. **Hypothesis 3.1** (a) was not confirmed but **hypothesis 3.1** (b) proved to be true as only two out of five dimensions of problem focused coping i.e. active coping ($R^2=.574$, $R^2_{\text{change}}=.028$, $\beta=-.270$, $t$-value=2.68 $p<.001$), and restraint coping emerged as significant predictors of psychological distress ($R^2=.601$, $R^2_{\text{change}}=.012$, $\beta=-.271$, $t$-value=2.98, $p<.001$).

**Hypotheses 3.2**- a & b, respectively, stated that emotion focused coping will be positively related to psychological distress and different dimensions of emotion focused coping will not be equally useful predictors of psychological distress. **Hypothesis 3.2** (a) was not confirmed while 3.2 (b) proved to be true as only one dimension i.e. focus on & venting of emotions entered in the regression table at ninth step. ($R^2=.624$, $R^2_{\text{change}}=.005$, $\beta=.145$, $t$-value=2.06, $p<.05$).

**Hypotheses 3.3**- a & b respectively, stated that avoidant coping will be positively related to psychological distress, and different dimensions of avoidant coping will not be equally significant in predicting psychological distress. Our results in table-1 revealed that avoidant coping emerged as the most significant of all predictors ($R^2=.412$, $\beta=.241$, $t$-value=4.26, $p<.000$) and accounted for 41.2% variance in psychological distress. In this way **hypothesis 3.3** (a) was confirmed. **Hypothesis 3.3** (b) was also confirmed as only one of the three dimensions of avoidant coping i.e. mental disengagement predicted ($R^2=.589$, $R^2_{\text{change}}=.015$, $\beta=.489$, $t$-value=3.64, $p<.000$) psychological distress.
Our **fourth hypothesis** stated that academic achievement will be negatively related to psychological distress. This hypothesis was also confirmed as it entered at the 7th step in the regression table ($R^2=.608$, $R^2_{change}=.007$, $\beta=-.055$, $t$-value=2.96, $p<.00$).

**Multiple Regression Analysis for Gender Groups:**

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was done for boys and girls, separately, to find the predictors of psychological distress for the two gender groups. Results of these analyses are presented in tables 8 and 9.
Table-8.1: Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis for Male Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No.</th>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>‘R’</th>
<th>‘F’ value for ‘R’</th>
<th>Sig. of ‘F’</th>
<th>‘R’²</th>
<th>Standard Error of ‘R’</th>
<th>‘β’</th>
<th>‘t’ value of β</th>
<th>Sig. of ‘t’</th>
<th>constant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Composite Negative</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>90.88</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-4.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Avoidant Coping</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>83.14</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>70.46</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Behavioral Disengagement</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>59.65</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>3.027</td>
<td>-.550</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Internal versus External (Positive)</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>52.019</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>-.968</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>47.086</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Restraint Coping</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>42.703</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table -8.2: Description of Variance in Psychological Distress Accounted for by the Predictors for Male Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step. No.</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>‘R’</th>
<th>Increase in ‘R’</th>
<th>‘R^2’</th>
<th>% of variance</th>
<th>Increase in % of variance</th>
<th>Change in ‘R^2’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Composite Negative</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Avoidant Coping</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Behavioral Disengagement</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Internal versus External (Positive)</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Restraint Coping</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 8.1 and 8.2 indicate that for boys seven independent variables have entered in the regression model in a hierarchical manner. These variables are composite attribution for negative events, avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, behavioral disengagement, internal versus external attribution for positive events, academic achievement, and restraint coping. All these variables collectively accounted for approximately 67.8% of the total variance in psychological distress (PD).

A perusal of the values in the table shows that the first independent variable i.e. composite attribution for negative events is the most significant predictor of psychological distress for boys which accounts for 38% of the total variance in psychological distress. Beta value for this variable is .489, that signifies a positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and composite attribution for negative events.

Our next useful and significant predictor is avoidant coping. It along with composite attribution for negative events, accounted for 53.1% of the total variance in psychological distress However, its individual contribution is 15.1% \((R^2_{\text{change}}=.151)\). The beta value for this variable is .540, that signifies a positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and avoidant coping.

The third useful predictor is perceived parental expectations. It along with composite attribution for negative events, and avoidant coping, accounted for 59.1% of the total variance in the psychological distress However, its individual contribution is 6% \((R^2_{\text{change}}=.06)\) of the total variance in psychological distress.
The beta value for this variable is .058, that signifies a positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and perceived parental expectations.

The fourth important and significant predictor is behavioral disengagement. It along with other predictors, accounted for 62.2% of total variance in psychological distress. However its individual contribution is 3.1% (R$^2_{\text{change}}=.031$) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is -.550, that signifies a negative predictive relationship between psychological distress and behavioral disengagement.

The fifth significant predictor is internal versus external attribution for positive events. It along with other predictors, accounted for 64.4% of the total variance in psychological distress. However, its individual contribution is 2.2% (R$^2_{\text{change}}=.022$) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is -.968, that signifies negative predictive relationship between psychological distress and internal versus external attribution for positive events.

Our sixth useful predictor is academic achievement. It along with other predictors accounted for 66.4% of the total variance in psychological distress. However, its individual contribution is 2% (R$^2_{\text{change}}=.02$) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is -.055, that signifies negative predictive relationship between psychological distress and academic percent.

Our seventh and last significant predictor is restraint coping. It along with composite attribution for negative events, avoidant coping, perceived parental
expectations, behavioral disengagement, internal versus external attribution for positive events and academic achievement, accounted for 67.8% of the total variance in psychological distress. However, its individual contribution is 1.4% ($R^2_{\text{change}} = .014$) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value -.264, signifies negative predictive relationship between psychological distress and restraint coping.
Table 9.1: Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis for Female Students.

Model Summary and Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No.</th>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>‘R’</th>
<th>‘F’ value for ‘R’</th>
<th>Sig. of ‘F’</th>
<th>‘R^2’</th>
<th>Standard Error of ‘R’</th>
<th>‘β’</th>
<th>‘t’ value of ‘β’</th>
<th>Sig. of ‘t’</th>
<th>constant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Avoidant Coping</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>112.057</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>4.3234</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-6.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>87.515</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>3.8852</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Active Coping</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>67.728</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>3.7311</td>
<td>-0.415</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>54.310</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>3.6633</td>
<td>-0.464</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Focus on &amp; Venting of Emotions</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>46.569</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>3.5916</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>41.054</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>3.5335</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.2: Description of Variance in Psychological Distress Accounted for by the Predictors for Females Student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No.</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>( R^2 ) Increase</th>
<th>( R^2 ) in % of variance</th>
<th>% of Change in ( R^2 )</th>
<th>( R^2 ) Variance in % of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Avoidant Coping</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Active Coping</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Focus on &amp; Venting of Emotions</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tables 9.1 and 9.2 depict the results of stepwise multiple regression analysis for girls. An inspection of the values in these tables indicate that for girls six independent variables have entered in the regression model in a hierarchical manner for predicting psychological distress. These variables are avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, active coping, denial, focus on & venting of emotions and academic achievement. All of these variables collectively account for approximately 63.3% of the total variance in psychological distress (PD).

From the tables it is observed that the first independent variable i.e. avoidant coping is the most significant predictor of psychological distress in girls which accounted for 43.1% of the total variance in psychological distress. Beta value for this variable is .512, that signifies a positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and avoidance coping.

Our next useful predictor is perceived parental expectations. It along with avoidant coping, accounted for 54.4% of the total variance in psychological distress However, its individual contribution is 11.3% (R^2change=.113). The beta value for this variable is .072, that signifies a positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and perceived parental expectations.

Active coping entered as the third important predictor. It along with other predictors, accounted for 58.2% of the total variance in the psychological distress However, its individual contribution is 3.8% (R^2change=.038) of the total variance
in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is -.415, that signifies a negative predictive relationship between psychological distress and active coping.

The fourth useful predictor of psychological distress for girls is denial. It along with other variables, accounted for 60% of total variance in psychological distress. However its individual contribution is 1.8% (R² change=.018) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is -.464, that signifies a negative predictive relationship between psychological distress and denial.

The fifth significant predictor is focus on & venting of emotions. It along with other predictors, accounted for 61.8% of the total variance in psychological distress. However, its individual contribution is 1.8% (R² change=.018) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is .303, that signifies positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and focus on & venting of emotions.

Our sixth and last significant predictor is academic achievement. It along with other predictors, accounted for 63.3% of the total variance in psychological distress. However, its individual contribution is 1.5% (R² change=.015) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is -.065, that signifies negative predictive relationship between psychological distress and academic achievement.

A careful analysis of the above results reveal that our fifth hypothesis that predictors of psychological distress for boys and girls will be different, was
partially confirmed. Three factors namely avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, and academic achievement emerged as common predictors of psychological distress among boys and girls. However other predictors are different for the two groups. Their order of entry in the regression table is also different. Avoidant coping ($R^2=.431$, $\beta=.512$, t-value=6.67, p<.000) emerged as the most significant predictor of psychological distress for girls accounting for 43.1% of variance while it entered on second place for boys ($R^2=.531$, $\beta=.540$, t-value=6.71, p<.000) and accounted for only 15.1% of the variance. Composite attribution for negative events ($R^2=.380$, $\beta=.489$ t-value=3.69 p<.000) emerged as the most useful predictor of psychological distress for boys accounting for 38% variance. Perceived parental expectations entered as the second most useful predictor ($R^2=.544$, $R^2$ change=.113, $\beta=.072$, t-value=6.63, p<.000) for girls while it entered at third step in the hierarchy of predictors for boys ($R^2=.591$, $R^2$=change.06, $\beta=.058$, t-value=5.45, p<.000).

Behavior disengagement was fourth important predictor for boys ($R^2=.622$, $R^2$=change.031, $\beta=-.550$, t-value=3.93, p<.000) and had negative correlation with psychological distress. For girls active coping ($R^2=.582$, $R^2$=change.038, $\beta=-.415$, t-value=3.06, p<.000) emerged as third significant predictor with negative correlation with psychological distress. For boys internal/external dimension of attribution for positive events emerged in the stepwise regression table as the 5th predictor ($R^2=.644$, $R^2$=change.022, $\beta=-.968$, t-value=3.44, p<.000). While for girls denial ($R^2=.600$, $R^2$=change.018, $\beta=-.464$, t-value=2.90, p<.000) and focus on
& venting of emotions ($R^2=.618$, $R^2_{change}=.018$, $\beta=.303$, t-value=2.80, $p<.01$) emerged as 4th and 5th significant predictors of psychological distress. Academic achievement entered at the 6th place in the hierarchy of predictors for both boys ($R^2=.664$, $R^2_{change}=.02$, $\beta=-.055$, t-value=2.49, $p<.00$) and girls ($R^2=.633$, $R^2_{change}=.015$, $\beta=-.65$, t-value=2.40, $p<.05$) of psychological distress. For boys one more predictor was found to be useful which entered at the 7th place. This predictor was restraint coping ($R^2=.678$, $R^2_{change}=.014$, $\beta=-.264$ t-value= 2.48, $p<.00$) having negative relationship with psychological distress.

**Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis for Two Stream Groups:** Our sixth hypothesis stated that the predictors of psychological distress for Science and Arts students will be different. Stepwise multiple regression analysis was done for both groups, separately, to study the above hypothesis. Result of these analyses are organized and presented in tables-10.1, 10.2, 11.1 & 11.2.
### Table-10.1: Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis for Science students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No.</th>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>‘R’</th>
<th>‘F’ value for ‘R’</th>
<th>Sig. of ‘F’</th>
<th>‘R^2’</th>
<th>Standard Error of ‘R’</th>
<th>‘β’</th>
<th>‘t’ value of β</th>
<th>Sig. of ‘t’</th>
<th>constant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mental Disengagement</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>83.04</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-14.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>68.65</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Composite Negative</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>59.22</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Focus on &amp; Venting of Emotions</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>49.09</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table -10.2: Description of Variance in Psychological Distress Accounted for by the Predictors for Science Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No.</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>‘R’</th>
<th>Increase in ‘R’</th>
<th>‘R^2’</th>
<th>% of variance</th>
<th>Increase in % of variance</th>
<th>Change in ‘R^2’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mental Disengagement</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>.481</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Composite Negative</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Focus on &amp; Venting of Emotions</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results in tables-10.1 & 10.2 indicate that for Science students four independent variables have entered in the regression model in a hierarchical manner. These variables are mental disengagement, perceived parental expectations, composite attribution for negative events, and focus on & venting of emotions. All of these variables collectively account for approximately 57.4% of the total variance in psychological distress (PD).

The first independent variable i.e. mental disengagement is the most significant predictor of psychological distress in Science students which accounted for as large as 35.8% of the total variance. Beta value for this variable is .693, that signifies a positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and mental disengagement.

Second most important predictor is perceived parental expectations. It along with mental disengagement, accounted for 48.1% of the total variance in the psychological distress However, its individual contribution is 12.3% (R^2 change=-.123) The beta value for this variable is .051, signifying a positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and perceived parental expectations.

The third useful predictor is composite attribution for negative events. It along with mental disengagement, and perceived parental expectations accounted for 54.7% of the total variance in psychological distress However, its individual contribution is 6.6% (R^2 change=.066) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is .469, that signifies a positive predictive
relationship between psychological distress and composite attribution for negative events.

Focus on & venting of emotions emerged as fourth significant predictor of PD for science students. It along with other variables, accounted for 57.4% of total variance in psychological distress. However its individual contribution is 2.7% ($R^2_{\text{change}}=.027$) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is .274, that signifies a positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and focus on & venting of emotions.
Table-11.1: Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis for Arts Students.

Model Summary and Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No.</th>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>‘F’ value for ‘R’</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Standard Error of ‘R’</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>‘t’ value of β</th>
<th>Sig. of t</th>
<th>constant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Avoidant Coping</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>132.78</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>4.4248</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>4.399</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perceived Parental</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>97.21</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>4.0126</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Composite Positive</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>83.19</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>3.728</td>
<td>-.587</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Restraint Coping</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>73.44</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>3.539</td>
<td>-.483</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>62.43</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>3.471</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mental Disengagement</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>54.89</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>3.411</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table -11.2: Description of Variance in Psychological Distress Accounted for by the Predictors for Arts students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step No.</th>
<th>Variables Entered</th>
<th>'R'</th>
<th>Increase in 'R'</th>
<th>'R'²</th>
<th>% of variance</th>
<th>Increase in % of variance</th>
<th>Change in 'R'²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Avoidant Coping</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Perceived Parental Expectations</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Composite Positive</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Restraint Coping</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mental Disengagement</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results shown in tables-11.1 and 11.2 indicate that for Arts students six predictors have entered in the regression model in a hierarchical manner. These predictors are avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, composite attribution for positive events, restraint coping, academic percent, and mental disengagement. All of these variables collectively accounted for approximately 69.7% of the total variance in psychological distress (PD).

A perusal of the values in the table shows that the first independent variable i.e. avoidant coping is the most significant predictor of psychological distress which accounted for 47.3% of the total variance in psychological distress. Beta value for this variable is .338, that signifies a positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and avoidant coping. t-value and its significance shows that beta significantly differs from zero and in the slope of regression line is positive and significant.

Our next useful significant predictor is perceived parental expectations. It along with avoidant coping, accounted for 56.9% of the total variance in psychological distress However, its individual contribution is 9.6% (R^2change=.096). The beta value for this variable is .070, that signifies a positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and perceived parental expectations.

The third important significant predictor is composite attribution for positive events. It along with avoidant coping and perceived parental expectations accounted for 63.1% of the total variance in psychological distress However, its
individual contribution is 6.2% ($R^2_{\text{change}}=.062$) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is -.587, that signifies a negative predictive relationship between psychological distress and composite attribution for positive events.

The fourth significant predictor of psychological distress in Arts students is restraint coping. It along with other variables, accounted for 67% of total variance in psychological distress. However its individual contribution is 3.9% ($R^2_{\text{change}}=.039$) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is -.483, that signifies a negative predictive relationship between psychological distress and restraint coping.

The fifth significant predictor is academic achievement. It along with other variables, accounted for 68.4% of the total variance in psychological distress. However, its individual contribution is 1.4% ($R^2_{\text{change}}=.014$) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is -.095, that signifies negative predictive relationship between psychological distress and academic achievement.

Our sixth significant predictor is mental disengagement. It along with other predictors, accounted for 69.7% of the total variance in psychological distress. Its individual contribution is 1.3% ($R^2_{\text{change}}=.013$) of the total variance in psychological distress. The beta value for this variable is .457, that signifies positive predictive relationship between psychological distress and mental
disengagement. t-value and its significance shows that the beta significantly differs from the zero and in the slope of regression line is positive and significant.

The results of stepwise multiple regression analysis for the two stream groups show that our sixth hypothesis was partially confirmed. Mental disengagement emerged as the most potential predictor of psychological distress for Science students accounting for 35.8% of variance while avoidant coping emerged as the most significant predictor for Arts students accounting for 47.3% of variance. Two factors namely mental disengagement and perceived parental expectations, emerged as common predictors of psychological distress among Science and Arts students. However other predictors are different for the two groups. Their order of entry in the regression table is also different. Mental disengagement ($R^2=.358$, $\beta=.693$, $t$-value=5.53, $p<.000$) emerged as the most significant predictor of psychological distress for Science students accounting for 35.8% of variance while it entered on sixth place for Arts students and accounted only 1.3% variance ($R^2=.697$, $R^2$change=.013, $\beta=.457$, $t$-value=2.47, $p<.05$). Perceived parental expectation emerged as the most useful predictor of psychological distress for both groups. As it entered as the second place ($R^2=.481$, $R^2$change=.123, $\beta=.051$, $t$-value=4.62, $p<.000$) for the Science while it was also at the same second number in the hierarchy of predictors for Arts ($R^2=.569$, $R^2$change=.096, $\beta=.071$, $t$-value=6.68, $p<.000$).

Composite attribution for negative events was the third important predictor for Science ($R^2=.547$, $R^2$change=.066, $\beta=.469$, $t$-value=4.18, $p<.000$) and had
positive correlation with psychological distress. For Arts group composite attribution for positive events ($R^2=.631$, $R^2_{change}=.062$, $\beta=-.587$, $t$-value=-5.23, $p<.000$) emerged as the same third significant predictor with negative correlation with psychological distress. For Science students focus on & venting of emotions emerged in the stepwise regression table as the 4th and last predictor ($R^2=.574$, $R^2_{change}=.027$, $\beta=.274$, $t$-value=3.01, $p<.000$). While for Arts group restraint coping ($R^2=.670$, $R^2_{change}=.039$, $\beta=-.483$, $t$-value=3.84, $p<.000$) and academic achievement ($R^2=.684$, $R^2_{change}=.014$, $\beta=-.095$, $t$-value=2.64, $p<.01$) emerged as 4th and 5th significant predictors of psychological distress.

As far as our seventh hypothesis is concerned, regression analysis was not carried out because the students belonging to nuclear and joint families did not significantly differ on psychological distress.
Chapter-V

Discussion
Discussion

It may be recalled that the objective of the present investigation was to predict psychological distress in students population. The predictor variables were parental expectations, attributional styles and coping strategies. Some demographic variables were also used as predictors. Stepwise multiple regression analysis for the total sample yielded a set of nine predictors i.e. avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, composite positive attribution, active coping, mental disengagement, restraint coping, academic achievement, global versus specific negative, and focus on & venting of emotions. A close scrutiny of the results of the present study revealed that avoidant coping as a composite emerged as the most significant positive predictor of psychological distress experienced by senior secondary students. This finding corroborates the results of earlier studies (Billing & Moos, 1981; Endler and Parker, 1999; Steiner et al., 2002; Renland et al, 2000; Dunkley et al 2000; Suzuki, 2003). Neil (2007) also found in his study that the best predictor of psychological distress was the use of avoidant coping strategies. Renland et al., (2000), while examining the relationship between possible selves, depression and coping style among students revealed that depressed students reported more avoidant coping as compared to non depressed students. Highbhatgou & Peterson (1995) also found that students who had active coping style reported fewer depressive symptoms than did those who had an avoidant coping style.
Though avoidant coping as a composite was the most useful predictor, all of the three dimensions involved in avoidant coping were not equally important. Only mental disengagement emerged as significant predictor having a positive relation with psychological distress. This result is supported by previous studies which indicate that disengagement coping is positively associated with more symptoms of distress (e.g., Blalock & Joiner, 2000; Carver & Scheier, 1994; Rudnicki, Graham, Habbushe, & Ross, 2001; Terry & Hynes, 1998). Mental disengagement serves to distract the person from thinking about the behavioral dimension or goal with which the stressor is interfering. Tactics that reflect mental disengagement include multiple activities like alternative activities to take one’s mind off a problem, daydreaming, escaping through sleep or immersion in T.V. etc. This type of response often impede adaptive coping (Aaldwin & Revanson, 1987).

As was expected, perceived parental expectations also emerged as the significant predictor of psychological distress among students. This finding is supported by earlier findings on parental expectations. These studies are mostly conducted on Taiwanese students e.g., Wang and Heppner (2002) also found that parental expectations is a better predictor of Taiwanese college students psychological distress. Asian parents value high academic achievement and they put pressure on them by having high expectations from them. These high expectations seen in Asian parents may be the cause of psychological distress (Pang, 1991; Toupin and Son, 1991). Freaj, Iobin and Beesley (2004), also
found family experiences as one of the four predictors of psychological distress. Indian society which was earlier an agriculture based society is now almost transformed into an urbanized and industrialized society. Parents have high expectations from their children to achieve high in academics and professional courses. Most of them want their children to do what they could not accomplish in their own lives. The data were collected from the students of A.M.U. which is a residential university, and students from far off places are sent by their parents with lot of hopes and expectations about their children. Most of the parents decide the courses of studies and careers for them (Shakeela, 1987). Also, they desire and value certain occupations for their children. Though parental expectations are necessary for high academic achievement, as is evidenced from significant correlations between the two variables obtained in the present investigation and also supported by other researches, these expectations are sometimes unrealistic and perceived by the children as pressure. A relationship in which parents have unrealistic expectations that their children are unable to meet can lead to abusive behavior on the part of the parents which put the child at greater risk for both physical and emotional danger (Azar et al., 1984). It was earlier found that parent’s unrealistic expectations create pressure and foster performance anxiety in children (Liu, 1998; Salimi et al., 2005) and is also associated with children’s inattentiveness, aggressiveness and psychological symptoms (Cho, Seokhee & Yoon, 2005) and other problem behavior above and beyond family/child background factors (Reynolds et al., 1994). Significant correlations were also
found between parental pressures for academic achievement and anxiety and depression (Tomiki, 2001), somatic complaints and academic anxiety (Crystal et al., 1994).

Composite attributional style for positive events also emerged as the third significant and negative predictor while its different dimensions such as internal/external, stable/unstable, global/specific could not successfully predict psychological distress. It means that those who attribute positive events to internal, stable and global causes tend to experience less distressed. These findings have support from earlier findings for example Cheng and Furnhaum (2001, 2003) reported that optimistic attributional style in positive situations was a strong predictor of self reported happiness and mental health and pessimistic attributional style in negative situations was a predictor of both happiness and mental health.

Mc Cauley et al., (1988) also showed that depressed children relative to non depressed children tended to have a more helpless explanatory style especially with regard to how they explained positive events. Curry and Craighead (1990) also indicated that adolescents with a diagnosis of major depression differed with regard to their explanatory style for positive events i.e. they made significantly fewer internal stable and global explanations for positive events.

On the other hand, only global versus specific dimension for negative events successfully predicted psychological distress. It had positive predictive relationship with psychological distress. This findings indicates that students experiencing psychological distress have more helpless explanatory style. It is the
tendency of the depressed persons that they perceive the impact of the negative events as pervasive, and do not see any hope/expectancies in the future (Peterson et al., 1982.). This result corroborates some of the earlier findings. For example Hull and Mendolia, (1991), while studying the relations of explanatory style, expectancies and depression in college sample, found that explanatory style for negative events was indirectly related to depression by mean of expectancies. This helplessness behavior among students may be explained in terms of parental pressure as Sia et al., (1998) gave indications that parental expectations lead to helplessness behavior among children.

As for problem focused coping two of its five dimensions emerged as significant negative predictors of psychological distress. Active coping responses and restraint coping entered as the fourth and sixth predictors, respectively, in the stepwise regression analysis table. It means that those who generally take active steps- like initiating direct actions, increasing one’s efforts and executing coping attempts in stepwise fashion to remove the stressor or to ameliorate its effects- or those who wait until an appropriate opportunity to act become available and/or do not act prematurely, feel less distressed. This finding gets support from the study conducted by Higgins and his colleagues (1995), who found that task oriented coping was negatively related to distress.

From amongst emotion focused coping dimensions only one i.e. focusing on and venting of emotions emerged as a significant predictor having a positive predictive relationship with psychological distress. This is a tendency to focus on
whatever distress or upset one is experiencing and to ventilate those feelings (Scheff, 1979). Focusing on negative emotions particularly for longer periods impede adjustment (Felton et al., 1984) and phenomenological salience to distress may exacerbate distress (Scheier & Carver, 1977). These findings do not fully corroborate the earlier studies which indicate a positive relationship between emotion focused coping and symptoms of distress and depression (Hasida, 2005; Prakash and Bhogle, 1994; and Ogul et al., 2003). The use of emotion oriented coping strategies was found by Higgins and Endler, (1995) also to be a significantly positive predictor of distress in both men and women.

Academic achievement was also hypothesized by the researcher to be an important predictor of psychological distress in students. This hypothesis also proved to be true as academic achievement (in terms of the percentage of marks obtained in senior secondary exam) significantly negatively predicted psychological distress. This finding is supported by Malik and Balda (2006), they assessed academic achievement on the basis of marks obtained in last three examinations and found that academic achievement was significantly negatively correlated with all types of stress except existential stress.

Anzi (2005) examined the relationship between academic achievement and anxiety, self esteem, optimism, and pessimism among 400 male and female students and found the significant positive correlation between academic achievement and both optimism and self esteem whereas the correlations between academic achievement and both anxiety and pessimism, were negative.
Relationship between anxiety and academic achievement has also been studied by some Indian investigators. Sinha (1965) in a study to find out the relationship between anxiety and academic achievement at university level, found that low achievers were significantly more anxious than the high achievers. Pandit (1969) also concluded that an overall negative relationship existed between anxiety and achievement. Singh (1965) found that academic achievement was significantly and positively related to intelligence, concept formation ability and academic motivation, while it was negatively related to anxiety.

Results of the regression analyses for boys and girls revealed that composite attributions for negative events was the most important and significant positive predictor of psychological distress only for male students but not for females. On the basis of present findings it is apparently clear that male students who had a more pessimistic attributional style for bad events experienced more psychological distress. It was also found in the present study that internal versus external positive was the negative predictor of psychological distress only for boys i.e. students who attributed good events in terms of internal causes experienced less psychological distress. Though many studies explained with a wide range of participants including children, adolescents, and college students that examined the association between explanatory style and depression provided support for the reformulated learned helplessness model of depression (e.g., Bodiford et al., 1988; Mc Cauley, Mitchell, Burke, & Moss, 1988; Brown & Siegel, 1988; Pinto & Francis, 1993; Curry & Craighead, 1990; Hull & Mendolia, 1991;
Peterson & Vaidya, 2001), our findings showed such a relationship only for boys and not for girls.

Avoidant coping was found to be the common predictor of psychological distress for both boys and girls. It significantly positively predicted psychological distress in both the groups, but its contribution for prediction was higher for girls as compared to boys. These findings suggest that students who use more avoidant coping strategies tend to experience more distress and women particularly use more avoidant strategies. Earlier Haarr and Morash (1999) had also found in their study that women reported significantly higher use of avoidant strategies than men.

Perceived parental expectations was also one of the common predictors of psychological distress for both the groups. Though for boys its contribution was higher as compared to girls and the boys also reported significantly higher perceived parental expectations, the results make it apparently clear that parental expectations are equally important for boys and girls and can be predictive of distress in both the group.

One very important finding that emerged in this study is that for boys behavior disengagement and for girls denial entered as the negative predictors of psychological distress, though both are taken as dimensions of avoidant coping. It means that for boys behavioral disengagement helped in reducing the experience of distress while for girls denial of the existence of the problems was associated with reduced distress. Avoidant coping as a composite, which included behavioral
disengagement, mental disengagement and denial, was associated with increased level of psychological distress both for boys and girls. It means all types of responses related to avoidant coping do not predict psychological distress in the same way and also it is different for both boys and girls.

From amongst the problem focused coping strategies dimensions restraint coping emerged as the significant negative predictor of psychological distress for boys while for girls active coping was the 3rd most useful negative predictor. It means that active coping among girls and restraint coping among boys was related to reduced feeling of distress. Focus on & venting of emotions significantly positively predicted psychological distress only for girls. This finding is partially supported by Higgins & Endler's (1995) study, they found that undergraduate male students who use task oriented coping techniques report experiencing less distress while the use of emotion oriented coping strategies was a significant positive predictor of distress in both men and women.

Rao et al (2000) found that majority of students used a combination of problem focused, emotion focused and support seeking strategies to deal with stress. Albuquerque et al (1990) reported similar behaviors in the coping repertoire of college students. Folkman and Lazarus (1980) stated that in virtually every stressful encounter individuals tend to use both problem focused and emotion focused strategies.

Academic achievement was the important and significant negative predictor of psychological distress for both the groups. It may be recalled that sample of the
present study was senior secondary school students. Students at this stage are at the verge of planning and preparing for a career. In the present day scenario both boys and girls are seriously concerned about their academic achievement because it may have an impact on their selection in important courses of studies and ultimately affect the career choice.

The regression analyses for the two stream groups i.e. Science and Arts yielded different sets of predictors for the two groups.

Four predictors were identified for the Science group. These were mental disengagement, perceived parental expectations, composite negative, and focus on & venting of emotions while for Arts group six predictors were identified viz avoidant coping, perceive parental expectations, composite positive attribution, restraint coping, academic achievement and mental disengagement. For the Science group mental disengagement and for Arts group avoidant coping emerged as the most useful predictors of psychological distress. Perceived parental expectations was an important predictor in both Science and Arts students having positive predictive relationship with psychological distress. However, it accounted for the larger variance in psychological distress in Science group as compared to that in the Arts group. For the Science group composite attribution for negative events emerged as significant positive predictor while for Arts group composite attribution for positive events had negative predictive relationship with psychological distress. Avoidant coping was the largest positive predictor of psychological distress in Arts students. Restraint coping and academic
achievement also had negative predictive relationship with distress in Arts students.

If we look at the results of t-test analyses for gender group comparisons we find that female students experienced more distress as compared to male students. A comparison of Science and Arts students reveal that Arts students experienced more distress as compared to Science students, while no significant difference could be obtained between the students belonging to nuclear and joint families. Though the gender group difference is in the expected direction, stream group difference is contradictory to our expectations. A careful analysis of the results reveal that Arts students as compared to Science students used significantly more avoidant coping strategies which is negatively related to academic achievement (C.f. table-5). These results may suggest that Arts students by way of their tendency to use avoidant coping strategies remain distressed resulting in low achievement in examination. They linger on this emotional experiencing and carry this distress in later stage when they come to senior secondary school. The result of the present analysis find some support from earlier study (Mustafa, 2004), which found that academic stress affected the adjustment of Arts students more as compared to Science students but this effect was found only for girls and not for boys.
Chapter-VI

Conclusions, Implications, Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research
Conclusions

From the discussion of the above results it is concluded that a set of nine predictors was identified which contributed to the experience of psychological distress in senior secondary school students. These were avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, composite attribution for positive events, active coping, mental disengagement, restraint coping, academic achievement, global versus specific negative and focus on & venting of emotions.

Stepwise regression analyses for the two gender groups yielded different sets of predictors for boys and girls. For male students composite attribution for negative events, avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, behavioral disengagement, internal versus external positive, academic achievement, and restraint coping predicted psychological distress. For female students a set of six predictors was identified. These were avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, active coping, denial, focus on & venting of emotions and academic achievement.

A comparative analysis of the predictors for the two groups revealed that avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations and academic achievement were the common predictors in both the groups. Another important observation was that for male students attributional styles emerged as the most significant predictor while for female students none of the dimensions of attributional style contributed to psychological distress.
Regression analyses for Science and Arts students also yielded different sets of predictors. For Science students four predictors were identified viz mental disengagement, perceived parental expectations, composite attribution for negative events and focus on & venting of emotions. For Arts students six predictors were identified, i.e. avoidant coping, perceived parental expectations, composite attribution for positive events, restraint coping, academic achievement, and mental disengagement. A comparison of the predictors for the two groups revealed that perceived parental expectations, and mental disengagement emerged as the common predictors in the two groups. Another important observation was that for the Science group attribution for the negative events composite predicted psychological distress, whereas for the Arts group attribution for positive events composite had negative predictive relationship with psychological distress. Academic achievement and avoidant coping were the important predictors only for the Arts group.

An overall analysis of the results make it amply clear that perceived parental expectations is the only predictor which contributed to the prediction of psychological distress in all the groups of students of senior secondary school. Second most important predictors were avoidant coping and academic achievement, they predicted psychological distress in all the groups of students except Science group. These were followed by mental disengagement, restraint coping, and focus on & venting of emotions. Attributional style for positive events composite was found to be an important predictor for the total sample and for the
Arts group while attributional style for negative events (composite) emerged as potential predictor for male students and also for Science students. Two predictors which were specific to the two gender groups were behavioral disengagement and denial. Behavioral disengagement predicted psychological distress only in the boys group whereas for the girls group denial of the problem was the potential predictor of psychological distress.

**Implications:**

Research and explorations are continuous process but, they always open the ways for future endeavors, therefore, researches have a developmental nature where, one after the other, new things are likely to emerge. The present study is an humble effort in the same direction. As the results of the present investigation advocate the relationship of three important psychological variables- i.e. parental expectations, attributional styles and coping strategies of students with psychological distress, the study will have the following implications:

1. It will contribute to the repertory of researches in the field of counseling psychology.
2. It will help the health-care professionals to understand how parental expectations are related to experiencing of psychological distress among students.
3. It will also help the health-care professionals in understanding how a person’s own characteristic ways of explaining the causes of the events and
dealing with stress situations contribute to the experience of psychological distress.

4. The results of the present study, to a great extent, may also have implications for parents who pressurize their children for achieving unrealistic expectations and set very high goals for them. The parents may understand that pushing the children too much can be detrimental for their children’s health.

5. The results of the present study may also have implications for the counselors who can develop intervention strategies which will facilitate the students to change their negative (pessimistic) attributional style and maladaptive coping responses.

Limitations:

Any investigation inspite of sincere efforts on the part of the investigator, has certain limitations. The present investigation also suffers from some shortcomings or loopholes.

1. The investigator feels that the major drawback from which this work suffers is that it was confined to the students of Aligarh Muslim University schools. Therefore the generalizability of this study may be limited. But “individual research ventures, even when confined to a particular segment of society are irreplaceable in their own way. Through
them the direct ways for more broad based and meaningful research becomes clear” (Ahmad, 1989).

2. Secondly, all variables in this study are represented by self report data. Particularly this study involved a self report measure of psychological distress, and there may be a possibility that students under report their symptoms of distress due to the stigma and shame associated with mental illness. This is perhaps not a major drawback because the questionnaire included both physical and psychological symptoms and it is pointed out by Verma et al., (1985) that neurotic illnesses in India where insight and ego strength is retained, disturbances are expressed more through physical complaints rather than emotional/psychological complaints.

Suggestions for the future research:

Present investigation has the following implications for the future researches in this area:

1. Replication of the study may be required which should include the students from diverse sociocultural background like students from metropolitan cities and from remote areas.

2. Further research may be conducted to explore mediating role of coping strategies in the relationship between parental expectations and psychological distress.
3. Further research may be undertaken to make the models and examine the relationship among variables simultaneously and look for the direct and indirect effects.

4. Another way to incorporate the rich contextual information would be to combine a quantitative study with a qualitative study. This may be achieved by providing participants with extra space to share their responses as to how they feel about their parents expectations or comment about survey. A lot of complex information underneath what may appear numerically, can only be captured qualitatively. Thus qualitative analyses will best add the rich information to the study.
Summary
Summary

The entire empirical research work on the problem “A Study of Parental Expectations, Attributional styles, and Coping Strategies of Students Experiencing Psychological Distress” has been presented systematically in six different Chapters.

In Chapter-I, the first part deals with the concept, phenomenology of psychological distress, different theoretical perspectives, definitions of psychological distress, and difference between stress and distress. The next part of this chapter describes the concept of perceived parental expectations, realistic and unrealistic expectations and its relationship with physical and psychological health. The third part of this chapter describes the concept and definition of attribution, attribution theories, meaning of attributional style and its relation to physiological as well as psychological health related functioning. The last part of the chapter is concerned with the concepts and definitions, types, and dimensions of coping strategies.

Chapter-II deals with the review of the literature so that the issues and problems related to the phenomenon are clarified and highlighted. The second chapter is divided into three parts. The first part includes a review of research studies on parental issues like parental attachment, parental expectations in relation to psychological distress. The second part is concerned with the review of researches conducted in the field of attributional style and health related
functioning such as anxiety, depression, and distress. The third part, more remarkably, deals with the review of studies on coping strategies as related to psychological distress. In the light of aims and objectives of the present investigation, 7 hypotheses were formulated. These hypotheses are presented in the last section of the second chapter.

Chapter-III was designed for describing methodology, where the sample, tools, procedure and statistical analyses opted in carrying out the investigation have been comprehensively enumerated. The sample consisted of 150 boys and 150 girls of senior secondary school students Aligarh Muslim University (Aligarh, U.P.). The tools used were Perceived Parental Expectations Scale (developed by the investigator), Attributional Style Questionnaire (ASQ) (Peterson and Seligman, 1984), Coping Strategies Scale, (Carver, Scheier and Weintraub, 1989), and PG1. Health Questionnaire N-1, (Verma, Pershad and Wig, 1985).

In chapter-IV, the results have been presented systematically in various tables. Descriptive statistics have been provided which follows the results of the main analyses that is stepwise regression analyses.

In chapter-V, the results are discussed in the light of earlier research studies.

In chapter-VI, the conclusions, implications, limitations and suggestions for further studies are presented.
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Appendices
Demographic Information Sheet

Name:

Age:

Sex:

Class:

Percentage of Marks in SSC/High School Examination:

Stream: (Science/Arts/Soc.)

No. of Brothers:

No. of Sisters:

Family: (Nuclear or Joint)

Father’s Qualification:

Mother’s Qualification:
Appendix-I

PPE-SCALE

**Instruction:** Below are given some statements. Please read them carefully and indicate how strong you perceive the following expectations from your parents

Put [5] if your parents expect **very strongly** from you.
Put [4] if your parents expect **strongly** from you.
Put [3] if your parents expect **moderately** from you.
Put [2] if your parents expect **to some extent** from you.
Put [1] if your parents expect **not at all** from you.

In the future my parent expect me that

1. I should be the best student among my classmates. (Ac.ach.) [ ] [ ]
2. I should get very good job after completing my education. (Ac.ach.) [ ] [ ]
3. I should successfully compete in my professional courses. (Ac.ach.) [ ] [ ]
4. I should be absorbed in job after completing my studies. (Ac.ach.) [ ] [ ]
5. I should be able to solve routine problems. (G.ach) [ ] [ ]
6. I should be able to face criticism. (P.m) [ ] [ ]
7. I should learn how to adjust easily in any situation. (G.ach) [ ] [ ]
8. I should learn how to overcome failures in life. (G.ach) [ ] [ ]
9. I should make good impression on people. (Social) [ ] [ ]
10. I should achieve higher social status as compared to that of my parents (G.ach.) [ ] [ ]
11. I should outshine our neighbour’s children (Ac.ach) [ ] [ ].
12. I should achieve status and power in society. (G.ach) [ ] [ ]
13. I should be more highly educated than my parents. (Ac.ach) [ ] [ ]
14. I should select a spouse as desired by my parents. (Social) [ ] [ ]
15. I should lead a more luxurious life than my parents. (G.ach) [ ] [ ]
16. I should pay respect to the parent’s desires. (Social) [ ] [ ]
17. I should get a job as desired by my parents. (Ac.ach) [ ] [ ]
18. I should adapt according to their socio-cultural milieu. (Social) [ ] [ ]
19. I should be highly competitive. (Ac.ach.) [ ] [ ]
20. I should be able to accomplish the goals of life. (Ac.ach.) [ ] [ ]
21. I should be competent in learning new things. (G.ach.) [ ] [ ]
22. I should not experience failures in life. (G.ach.) [ ] [ ]
23. I should excel in all endeavors that I desire. (G.ach.) [ ] [ ]
24. I should strive to succeed at most things in my life. (G.ach) [ ] [ ]
25. I should attain the career goals as parents have set for me. (Ac.ach) [ ] [ ]
26. I should achieve recognition in my profession. (Ac.ach) [ ] [ ]
27. I should try best to achieve that parents expect me to achieve. (Ac.ach) [ ] [ ]
28. I should do those things that make my parents feel good. (P.m) [ ] [ ]
29. I should discharge my responsibilities successfully. (P.m)
30. I should be successful in working out personal life. (G.ach)
31. I should accomplish what my parents could not achieve. (Ac.ach)
32. I should excel in sports.  (Ex..cur)
33. I should successfully compete in extra curricular activities. (Ex. cur)
34. I should choose courses and careers as my parents want. (Ac.ach)
35. I should fulfill the dreams of my parents. (Ac.ach)
36. I should appreciate the efforts that parents are making for me. (P.m)
37. I should not offend parents verbally/vocally. (P.m)
38. I should not do the kind of things that may disappoint the parents (P.m)
39. I should behave maturely. (P.m)
40. I should not embarrass the parents [‘loseface’].(P.m)
41. I should spend money wisely (pm)
42. I should not waste money on unnecessary things. (P.m)
43. I should be modest and polite. (P.m)
44. I should have excellent academic performance to make the parents proud (Ac.ach)
45. I should honor parents and family’s ancestors. (Ac.ach)
46. I should study at parents ideal college/university. (Ac.ach)
47. I should pursue parents ideal careers [doctors, teacher...]. (Ac.ach)
48. I should study as per the parents program/subjects. (Ac.ach)
49. I should myself take crucial decisions about the future. (G.ach)
50. I should leave home for seeking higher education. (Ac.ach)
51. I should be brave. (G.ach)
52. I should be bold. (G.ach)
53. I should be frank. (G.ach)
54. I should be the best at every thing. (G.ach)
55. I should fulfill very high standard which parents have set for me. (Ac.ach)
56. I should have very high expectations for my future. (Ac.ach)
57. I should change or control my bad temper. (P.m)
58. I should take care of my physical health. (P.m)
59. I should share the financial burden of the family. (Ac.ach)

1. Ac.ach- Academic achievement
2. G.ach - General achievement
3. Social – social conformity
4. P.M. – Personal maturity
5. Extra curricular activity
Appendix-II

ASQ

Instruction:

1. Read each situation and vividly imagine it happening to you.
2. Decide what you believe would be the one major cause of the situation if it happened to you.
3. Write this cause in the blank provided.
4. Answer three question about the cause by circling one number per question. Do not circle the words.
5. Go on the next situation.

Situations:

You meet a friend who compliments you on your appearance.

1. Write down the one major cause: _________________________________________

2. Is the cause of your friend’s compliment due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?
   Totally due to other people 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Totally due to me or circumstance?

3. In the future when you are with your friend, will this cause again be present?
   Will never again be 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Will always be present.

4. Is the cause something that just affects interacting with friends or does it also other areas of your life?
   Influence just this particular situation 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Influences all situations in my life.

You have been looking for a job unsuccessfully for sometime

5. Write down the one major cause: _________________________________________

6. Is the cause of your unsuccessful job search due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?
7. In the future when you look for a job, will this cause again be present?

Will never again be present.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Will always be present

8. Is the cause something that just influences looking for a job, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influence just this particular situation  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Influences all situations in my life

**You become very rich**

9. Write down the one major cause: ________________________________________________

10. Is the cause of you becoming rich due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to other people or circumstance?  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Totally due to me

11. Is your financial future, will this cause again be present?

Will never again be present.  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Will always be present

12. Is the cause something that just affects obtaining money, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influence just this particular situation  
1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Influences all situations in my life

**A friend comes to you with a problem and you don’t try to help him/her**

13. Write down the one major cause: ________________________________________________

14. Is the cause of your not helping your friend due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. In future when a friend comes to you with a problem will this cause again be present?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will never again be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Is the cause something that just affects what happens when a friend comes to you with a problem, or does it also influence other areas of your life?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Influence just this particular situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Write down the one major cause:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You give an important talk in front of a group and the audience reacts negatively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Is the cause of the audience’s negative reaction due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totally due to other people or circumstance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. In future when you give talks, will this cause again be present?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will never again be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Is the cause something that just influence giving talks, or does it also influence other areas of your life?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Influence just this particular situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Write down the one major cause:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You do a project which is highly praised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Is the cause of your being praised due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total due to other people or circumstance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. In future when you do a project, will this cause again be present?

Will never again be present.

24. Is the cause something that just affects doing projects, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influence just this particular situation

25. Write down the one major cause: ____________________________________________________________________________________________

26. Is the cause of your friend acting hostile due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to other people or circumstance

27. In future when interacting with friends, will this cause again be present?

Will never again be present.

28. Is the cause something that just influences interacting with friends, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influence just this particular situation

29. Write down the one major cause: ____________________________________________________________________________________________

30. Is the cause of your not getting the work done due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

You meet a friend who acts hostility towards you.

You can't get all the work done that other expect of you.
31. In future when doing work that others expect, will this cause again be present?

Will never again be present.

32. Is the cause something that just affects doing work that others expect of you, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influence just this particular situation

33. Write down the one major cause:

34. Is the cause of your friend treating you more lovingly due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

35. In future interactions with friend, will this cause again be present?

36. Is the cause something that just affects how your friend treats you, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

37. Write down the one major cause:

You apply for a position that you want very badly (e.g. important job, graduate school admission, etc.) and you get it.
38. Is the cause of your getting the position due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to other people or circumstance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Totally due to me

39. In the future when you apply for a position will this cause again be present?

Will never again be present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Will always be present

40. Is the cause something that just influences applying for a position, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influence just this particular situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Influences all situations in my life

**You go on a tour and it goes badly.**

41. Write down the one major cause:

42. Is the cause of the tour going badly due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

Totally due to other people or circumstance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Totally due to me

43. In the future when you go on a tour, will this cause again be present?

Will never again be present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Will always be present

44. Is the cause something that just influences tour, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

Influence just this particular situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Influences all situations in my life

**You are awarded a prestigious scholarship.**

45. Write down the one major cause:
46. Is the cause of your getting a scholarship due to something about you or something about other people or circumstances?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally due to other people</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>or circumstance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. In the future in your academic career, will this cause again be present?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will never again be present</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will always be present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. Is the cause something that just affects getting a scholarship, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence just this particular situation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influences all situations in my life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix-III

COPE-SCALE

Instructions: we are interested in how people respond when they confront difficult of stressful events in their lives. There are lots of ways to try to deal with stress. This questionnaire asks you to indicate what you generally do and feel when you experience stressful events. Obviously, different events bring out somewhat different responses, but think about what you usually do when you are under a lot of stress.

Please give your responses as indicated below:

Encircle (1) if you usually don’t do this ‘at all’ (never)
Encircle (2) if you usually do this ‘sometime’.
Encircle (3) if you usually do this ‘often’.
Encircle (4) if you usually do this ‘most of the time’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. I take additional action to try get rid of the problem.</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometime</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. I concentrate my efforts on doing something about it.</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometime</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. I do what has to be done, one step at a time.</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometime</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. I take direct action to get around the problem.</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometime</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. I try to come up with a strategy about what to do.</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometime</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. I make plan of action.</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometime</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. I think hard about what step to take.</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometime</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. I think about how I might best handle the problem.</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometime</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. I put aside other activities in order to concentrate on this.</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometime</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. I focus on dealing with this</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometime</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
problem, and if necessary let other things slide a little.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. I keep myself from getting distracted by other thoughts or activities.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I try hard to prevent other things from interfering with my efforts at dealing with this.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I force myself to wait for the right time to do something.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I hold off doing anything about it until the situation permits.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I make sure not to make matters worse by acting too soon.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I restraint myself from doing anything to quickly.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I ask people who have had similar experiences what they did.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I try to get advice from someone about what to do.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Talk to someone to find out more about the situation.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I talk someone who could something concrete about the problem.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I talk to someone about how I feel.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I try to get emotional support from friends or relatives.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Discuss my feelings with someone.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I get sympathy and understanding from some one.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I look for something good in what is happening.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I try to see it in a different light, to make it seem more positive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I learn something from the experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I try to grow as a person as a result of the experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I learn to leave with it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I accept that this has happened and that it cannot be changed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I get to the idea that it happened.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I accept reality of the fact that it cannot be changed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I seek God's help.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I put my trust in God.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I try to find comfort in my religion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I pray more than unusual.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I get upset and let my emotions out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I let my feelings out.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I feel a lot of emotional distress and I find myself expressing those feelings a lot.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I get upset from and am really aware of it.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I refuse to believe that it has happened.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I pretend that it has not really happened.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I act as though it has not even happened.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>I say to myself (this is not real).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>I give up the attempt get what I want.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I just give up trying to reach my goal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I admitted to myself that I cant deal with it, and quit trying.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>I reduce the amount of effort I m putting into solving the problem.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I turned to work or other substitute activities to take my mind off things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I go to movies or watch TV, to think about it less.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I day dream about things other than this.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>I sleep more than usual.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PGI Health Questionnaire N-1**

**Area-A**

**DIRECTIONS:** Here are few questions about your physical and mental health. Read them carefully and tick [✓] those items which are applicable on you.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I get tired easily.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I often remain sick.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I am much worried.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I worry a lot about my health.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My appetite is always poor.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I frequently suffer from headaches.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I frequently have colds.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I have to clear my throat frequently.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I often have giddiness.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I have to go frequently for passing urine.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I have difficulty in falling a sleep.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I suffer from breathlessness.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I suffer from frequent indigestion.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I often have thumping of heart.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I have body aches.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I pass worms in stool.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I am of shy nature.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I am very sensitive.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area-B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I get easily upset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I worry a lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I usually ask for advice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I cannot take decision quickly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I get upset by slight criticism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I get upset if I am asked to hurry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I deliberately work slowly because of fear of mistakes in my work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I get disturbed meeting new persons or going to new place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I usually feel depressed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I cry easily.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I feel hopeless and in despair.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I am fearful of loud noise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I get upset easily when someone appears suddenly before me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I feel nervous and anxious before superiors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I get easily irritated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I often lose my temper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I am afraid of the darkness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I get frightening dreams.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>My life seems useless.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>It is better to die than to live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>