



CODEN [USA]: IAJPBB

ISSN: 2349-7750

INDO AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES

<http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.847721>

Available online at: <http://www.iajps.com>

Research Article

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HARDINESS AND METACOGNITIONS WITH WAYS OF COPING WITH STRESS AMONG FEMALE HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

Leyla Karimi¹and Dr. Seyed Ahmad Mirjafari^{2*}

¹Department of Psychology, Islamic Azad University, Arsanjan Branch, Arsanjan Iran

²Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Arsanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University,
Arsanjan Iran

Abstract:

In order to investigate the aforementioned, a sample of 170 high school female students selected by multi-stage cluster based on the Gregory-Morgan table They answered meta-cognitive questionnaires, Endler and Parker coping strategies and psychological hardiness of Ahvaz. Data were analyzed using Pearson correlation coefficient and multiple regression simultaneously. The findings showed that there is a significant positive correlation between metacognitive beliefs and problem-centered approach from the psychological hardiness and coping strategies. But then, after a thrill-axis and avoidance of psychological hardiness, there is a significant negative relationship with stress coping styles. Regression analysis also showed that the dimensions of uncontrolled, risk and cognitive and positive beliefs of the metacognitive variable and the problem-based dimension are the psychological hardiness predicting stress coping styles. In this regard, the metacognitive dimensions have a stronger role. The findings escaped with previous research. An explanation was needed and suggestions for further research were presented.

Key Words: Psychological Hardiness, Metacognitive Beliefs, Stress Coping Styles, Female High School Students

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Seyed Ahmad Mirjafari

Department of Biochemistry,

Assistant Professor,

Department of Psychology, Arsanjan Branch, Islamic Azad University,

Arsanjan Iran

QR code



Please cite this article in press as Leyla Karimi and Seyed Ahmad Mirjafari, Relationship between Hardiness and Metacognitions with Ways of Coping with Stress among Female High-School Students , Indo Am. J. P. Sci, 2017; 4(08).

INTRODUCTION:

Life in the current century is associated with a special complexity and difficulty. Socio-familial changes, the emergence of dangerous diseases, all-encompassing biological pollution, war and competition, and so on, each one alone, can cause a lot of stress and anxiety. Living in such a world requires having the ability, skill and proper planning that can increase the ability and ability of a person to stand up to the hardships and health of her[1]. Adaptation and health of people may be reduced by entering new environments such as schools. Because students are confronted with unfamiliar people and environments, the demands and shortcomings and the onslaught of various thoughts can be considered as the most important source of pressure. Which can be used to reduce the number and sometimes to eliminate the agent or its agents, to individuals, facilities and various ways? But which method of success will guarantee his health? [2]. Obviously, it cannot be totally destroyed by pressure factors, because the struggle and pressure (tension) are fundamentally necessary for the growth of human flourishing and human health. So, they have to get people out of the inside and teach them how to interpret issues and how to use them efficiently to deal with problems. Also, the attention of psychologists to cognitive theories and the evolution of the views of the past few decades have been so great that they have been called cognitive revolution [3]. One of the issues raised in these psychological developments is metacognition [4]. Metacognitive activities are of an operational nature and are only used when planning, reviewing and evaluating a cognitive strategy. As a result, they are often referred to as self-regulating activities. In other words, cognitive strategies help a person achieve a certain goal, but metacognitive strategies make it possible for a person to know whether he has achieved that goal [5]. In addition, psychological hardness is a set of personality traits that act as a source of resistance in the face of stressful life events. This personality variable consists of three components, including commitment, control and

combat. Extreme people are more dedicated and devoted to what they are losing (commitment), they also feel that they are decisive (controlling) and controlling themselves and changing life as challenges and opportunities for growth and they see progress, not restrictions and threats [6]. Since the characteristics of hardline people are more resistant to life pressures, there is a relationship between psychological hardness and anti-stress methods. Hardness is a personality trait that everyone has to some degree. This structure, with three components of commitment, containment and struggle, can save a person in spite of life in a completely stressful condition [7]. In sum, according to the above mentioned, the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between psychological hardness and meta-cognitive beliefs with stress coping methods among female students in Shiraz. In sum, according to the above mentioned, the purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between psychological hardness and meta-cognitive beliefs with stress coping methods among female students in Shiraz.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

The present research is purposeful, applied and methodological, descriptive and correlational. This study was carried out to investigate the relationship between psychological hardness and meta-cognitive beliefs with coping strategies.

Statistical Society

The statistical population of this study included all 9th grade high school girl students (district 3) in Shiraz (300 people) who were studying in 2015-2016.

Sample and sampling method

The sampling of this research was a multi-stage cluster, so that it was first selected from the four educational areas of Shiraz, District 3, there were 4 high schools among the high school girls in that district, which had 20 high schools, and 170 students from these high schools, numbering 300, were selected and available for testing.

Table 1: Distribution of respondents by age category

Average	Abundance	Ages	
16 years	16 years	Between 15 until 18 years	
	170	Total	

Measuring tool

To collect the required information, the Ahwaz hardness questionnaire, metacognitive beliefs questionnaire, and stress coping strategies questionnaire were used.

1-Psychological Hardiness Questionnaire

The Ahwaz Hardness Questionnaire is a self-measuring scale of paper pencil that has 27 items. This scale was measured by factor analysis by Keimarsi, Najarian and Mehrabizadeh Honarmand (1998) in a sample of 523 students and evaluates stubbornness.

2- Metacognitive Questionnaire 30 (MCQ-30):

To measure metacognitive beliefs, this questionnaire has been used which has a 30-point self-report scale and measures people's beliefs about their thoughts.

3- Stress Coping Strategies Questionnaire

This questionnaire was prepared by Andler & Parker (1990) and translated by Akbarzadeh (1998).

Information analysis method

In this study, two methods of descriptive statistics and inferential statistics of extracted data and data were investigated. In the descriptive statistics section of the mean and standard deviations and inferential statistics for analyzing the data and data obtained in the first and second hypotheses, Pearson correlation test and for analyzing the third hypothesis of multiple regressions in SPSS software Used.

Analysis of research hypotheses:

First hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between metacognitive beliefs and coping strategies.

Table 3: The Relationship between Metacognitive Beliefs and its Dimensions with Stress

Coping with Stress - Total Score				
0.647**	r	Metacognitive beliefs - total score		
0.001	Sig			
0.582**	r	Inconvenience and Risk - dimension 1		
0.001	Sig			
0.553**	r	Positive Beliefs - dimension 2		
0.001	Sig			
0.476**	r	Cognitive ceremony - dimension 3		
0.001	Sig			
0.361**	r	Secure Memory - dimension 4		
0.001	Sig			
0.357**	r	Need to control thoughts. dimension 5		
0.001	Sig			
**Significance level less than 0.01				
Sample number: 170 people				

Table 4: Summary of the model, the variance level explained by the variables of coping strategies with total score by metacognitive beliefs dimensions

Estimate the standard error	Adjusted coefficient of determination	coefficient of determination	Correlation	Model
15.560	0.433	0.450	0.671	1
Predictive variables: metacognitive beliefs				

Table 5: Analysis of variance using a meta-cognitive beliefs dimension with meta-stress coping methods							
significance level	F	average of squares	Degrees of freedom	sum of squares	Model		
0.001	26.795	6487.724	5	32438.618	regression	1	
		242.123	164	39708.229	remainder		
			169	72146.847	Total		
Predictive variables: metacognitive beliefs dimensions							
Criterion variable: Stress coping strategies							

Table 6: Model summary, variance level of variables of stress coping methods (dimensional problem-based coping method) by psychological hardness variable

Estimate the standard error	Adjusted coefficient of determination	coefficient of determination	Correlation	Model
9.028	0.066	0.072	0.268	1

Table 7: Statistical Characteristics of regression coefficients between psychological hardness and coping with stress (dimensional problem-coping problem coping method)

Sig	t	Standard coefficients	Non-standard coefficients		Model	
		Beta	standard error	B		
0.001	9.944		4.356	43.309	Constant	1
0.001	3.604	0.268	0.095	0.343	Psychological Hardiness	

Criterion variable: The variable of stress coping methods (dimensional problem-oriented coping method)

Table 8: Model summary, variance level of variables of stress coping methods (dimension of coping with stress-induced stress) by psychological hardness variable

Estimate the standard error	Adjusted coefficient of determination	coefficient of determination	Correlation	Model
10.383	0.145	0.150	0.387	1

Table 9: Analysis of variance by using variance of variables of coping with stress (dimension of coping with stress-excitement) and psychological hardness

significance level	F	average of squares	Degrees of freedom	sum of squares	Model	
0.001	29.678	3199.318	1	3199.318	regression	1
		107.802	168	18110.805	The remainder	
			169	21310.124	Total	

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION:

First hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between metacognitive beliefs and coping strategies. The results showed that there is a direct relationship between the metacognitive beliefs of the total score as an independent variable and coping with stress - total score as a dependent variable, and this relationship with the coefficient of 0.647 **at the level of 0.001(less than 0.01) Has been meaningful and the intensity of the relationship is strong. Therefore, with increasing metacognitive beliefs, coping with stress in students has increased. And also between all dimensions of the metacognitive beliefs variable with the variable of direct coping with stress Established and at a level less than 0.01.

This research is in line with researches such as Bahrami et al. (2015), Pourmardan et al. (2014), Saharei Ghamesh et al. (2014), Mohammadian, Kurdy et al. (2014), Deyri et al. (2014), Bahadori et al. (2012), Molazadeh Esfanjani et al. (2009), Delayehayeh, Gaylard & Wendam (2010), Kobasa et al. (1983), Hadlika (2005). Explaining: Metacognition or in terms of individual awareness of learning and self-awareness is important. Which has been seriously addressed in studies of target orientation and is often briefly discussed in the form of approaches in which metacognition is considered as part of self-regulatory structure. In fact, metacognitive strategies are tools for guiding cognitive strategies and monitoring them (Dambo, 1996).

Second hypothesis: There is a meaningful relationship between psychological hardiness and its dimensions, and methods for coping with stress, The results showed that there is a reverse relationship between psychological hardiness of the total score as an independent variable and coping with stress - total score as a dependent variable, and this relationship with the coefficient of * -0.173 at the level of 0.024, less than the level of 0.05 is meaningful and the severity of the relationship is weak. Therefore, with increasing psychological hardiness, coping with stress in students is reduced. This research is in line with researches such as Bahrami et al. (2015), Pourmardan et al. (2014), Sahrai Ghamesh et al. (2014), Mohammadian Akardi et al (2014), Deyri et al. (2014) Bahadori et al. (2012) Molazadeh Esfanjani et al. (2009), Delayehayeh, Gayard & Wendam (2010), Kobasa et al. (1983). Explanation: One of the most prominent personality traits that have come to be considered by scholars is the psychological hardiness that was considered more

2.Kobasa. S. (1982). The hardy personality: Toward a social psychology of stress and health.In Sander, G.S.Social psychology of health and illness.Hillsdale, N.I: Erbium.

carefully in Cubasa's research in the late '70s. In his research, Kobasa sought to demonstrate that some people who are not in a stressful state have a personality trait called psychological hardiness. He posited psychological hardiness as an orientation towards himself and the world. Kobasa showed in her research that the change in instability in life is quite normal. An arrogant person considered change and stressed life as an opportunity to grow and learn more, not a threat to safety (Kobasa, 1988); he considered the role of personality as an intervening change in relation to stress and illness.

Hypothesis 3: Metacognitive beliefs (dimensions) can predict part of the variance of stress coping methods. The results showed that in this analysis, the rate was 0.433; the equivalent of 43% of variance of variance of stress coping methods has been explained by dimensions of meta-cognitive beliefs. And the result of the analysis of variance at significance level was less than 0.01 in the value of 0.001, as well as the results showed; according to the coefficient Regression has been possible among the dimensions of meta-cognitive beliefs, the dimension of uncontrollability, and the cognitive dimension for a standard deviation, 34% and 28%, respectively, according to the significance level of less than 0.01, have a positive effect on the variable of stress coping methods and, as well as positive beliefs, they can be considered for a standard deviation 17% with respect to the significance level of less than 0.05 has a positive effect on the variable of stress coping methods. Therefore, it is concluded that the dimensions of uncontrolled and cognitive dimensions of the predictor are stronger than the variables of methods Coping with stress is relative to positive beliefs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This article is extracted from my thesis under the title of "Relationship between Hardiness and Metacognitions with Ways of Coping with stress among Female High-School Students". Hereby, I extend my sincere appreciation to Islamic Azad university of Arsanjan for the efforts and supports they provided to me.

REFERENCES:

1. Carver, CH. Scheier, M.F. Weintraup, J.K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: a theoretically based approach. Journal of personality and social psychology, Vol. 56. No. 2, 267-283.
- 3.Lambert, C.E. & Lamber, V. A (1987). Hardiness: its development and relevance to nursi image: journal of nursing scholarship, 19(2), 92-95.

4. Matthews G, Hillyard EJ & Campell SE. Meta cognition and maladaptive Copying as components of text anxiety]. J Clinical psychology and psychotherapy 1999 ; 6(1) : 111-126.
5. Hukenbry, M. (1998). Coping with stress acuate in sport as a function of gender , Explanatory study. Journal of sport behavior, 21. 4, 363-37.
6. Lazarus RS. Psychogical stress and the coping process. 1st ed. New York : Me grow-Hill; 1979; 100.
7. Shepperd Aj, Kashani HJ. The relationship of hardiness, gender and health outcomes in adolescents. J Pers 19910;59:747-768.
8. Sheard M, Golby J.(2007). Hardiness and undergraduate academic study. Journal of Personality and Individual Differences ;35:579-588.
9. Roussis P, wells A. Post- traumatic stress symptoms: test of relationships with thought control symptoms: Test of relationships with thought control strategies and beliefs as predicted by the metacognitive model. Perso and Indivi Diff, 2006; 40 (1): 111- 122.
10. Lazarus, R.S., & Launier , R. (1978). Stress and adaptional measures. American psychologist. July, 770-779.
- 11.Lazarus, R. S. , & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, Appraisal and coping. New York: Springer.
- 12.Flavell.J.H.(1988).Cognitive development(2th edition).prentice-hall.
- 13.Kobasa, S., Maddi, S. (1983). The personality construct of hardiness, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol.67,354-359
14. Relationship with Comprehensive Tests of Personality and psychopathology.Journal of Research in Personality, 30, 72-85
15. Lazarus, R (1981). Stress, appraisal and coping capacities, coping theory and research psychosomatic medicine. No 55/p 234-247.