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0. Preface

This research aims to explore challenges or stressors youngsters in the state of Pondicherry have to face in their daily life as a part of their family, community or society. Two different communities were targeted: firstly youngsters, teachers and professionals working with youngsters were interviewed to form a view on the general population of youngsters in Pondicherry, secondly people from a gypsy community outside the city characterized by extensive poverty. By targeting two communities with different social-economic status, habits and even another culture, the researcher tried to unravel possible cultural sensitive stressors.

This master’s thesis is part of an associated thesis conducted in Pondicherry, India together with Valerie Nys while fulfilling a six months internship. This thesis focuses on the concept of psychosocial stress and its cultural sensitive conceptualization, while the other one lays its focus on the concept of resilience and the participants’ understanding of this concept. As participants’ perceptions of and meaning attributed to both concepts in a specific context had high priority in this research, we opted for empirical research methods.

The first chapter describes the results of the literature review. The literature involving the concept of stress and stressors was subjected to a thorough review, resulting in the discussion of subjects as youth at risk, adolescent stress, daily stressors and major life events, and an ecological view on stress. The latter reviews stress from an environmental, relational and individual level and points out the importance of contextual factors in the prevalence and experience of stress. Furthermore, characteristics of the Indian culture are scrutinized as their presence might possibly have an influence on perceived stress or function as a stressor itself.

In the second chapter, the research design is specified. This research used mixed methods, both qualitative and quantitative. The two methods of Free Listing Task with its attendant Free Sorting Task and Participatory Ranking Method are discussed as well as their participants, data collection and analysis.

Third, the qualitative and quantitative results of data analysis are described.

Fourth chapter concerns the discussion of results to try answering the research questions. Research results of the different communities are compared to each other and to the examined literature.

Fifth and sixth chapters give word to the research’s conclusions, research limitations and implications and directions for future research.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. ADOLESCENT STRESS AND YOUTH AT RISK

The past decades have been marked by an evolution towards studying risk in children and youths (Schonert-Reichl, 2000). Adolescence is a life stage that might cause young people to be highly vulnerable to life changes and stress (Mullis, Youngs, Mullis, & Rathge, 1993). Four decades of research in developmental psychology contributed to the conclusion that various factors influence children’s development at multiple domains (Fernando, Miller, & Berger, 2010). Impact can be seen on intrapersonal variables as biology and psychology of the child as well as on the level of family, community and society (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2000; Cooper & Guthrie, 2007; Fernando et al., 2010). In children’s development, the life stage of adolescence is agreeably the one characterized by accelerated and possibly turbulent transformation from childhood to a fully functioning adult (Brockman, 2003; Byrne, Davenport, & Mazanov, 2007; Cook & Furstenberg, 2002; Moksnes, Moljord, Esnes, & Byrne, 2010) and involves biological (Seifert & Hoffnung, 2000), social, cognitive (Eccles, Wigfield, & Byrnes, 2003), psychosocial (Muzi, 2000) and psychological maturity changes including a shifting self-concept (Byrne et al., 2007). The physical changes, separation-individuation from the parents, and search for identity in relation to oneself, one’s family, peers and society are all developmental tasks adolescents have to realize. This can result in unique developmental stress (Aro, Hanninen, & Paronen, 1989) because the transition is inevitable (Price, 1985) and young people’s ability to cope is oftentimes overreached by its speed and magnitude (Collins, 2001; Davis, 2003; Jessor, 1993). The developmental burden and consequential developmental pressure make adolescents more vulnerable to life stressors than older people and therefore differentiate adolescence from adulthood (Aro et al., 1989). The phenomenon of adolescent stress is well recognized (Byrne & Mazanov, 2002).

Beside the developmental pressure, adolescent stress can be aggravated by a variety of obstacles disconcerting their transitioning from being a child to becoming a healthy, responsible and productive adult rendering them the at-risk label (Brambring, Losel, & Skowronek, 1989; Dryfoos, 1990; Haggerty, Sherrod, Garmezy, & Rutter, 1994; Rutter, 1980). This label is used to describe a range of problems that threaten youth’s present and future adjustment to challenges still to come (Schonert-Reichl, 2000) resulting in a vulnerability to a spectrum of negative life outcomes such as school failure, learning difficulties, dropping out of school, social relationships, poor health, criminal activities, unemployment and poverty (Dryfoos, 1990; Hawkins, Catalano, & Miller, 1992; Rutter, 1980; Schonert-Reichl, 2000).

Recognizing their negative outcomes, Dryfoos (1990) acknowledged both major and minor consequences as well as short- and long-term consequences of risk. The youngsters for whom those consequences are highly probable form the target population of the risk research era (Dryfoos, 1990). Therefore also young people who have not shown negative life outcomes, but show demographic, personal or social characteristics that determine vulnerability are also included in interventions (Dryfoos, 1990).

From his research on life stress and psychosomatic symptoms in Finnish adolescents, Aro (1987) concluded that life stress is associated with psychological symptomatology in adolescence (Aro et al.,
Research on stress frequently involved adults (Band, Eve, & Weiz, 1988). Whenever youths were involved, research focused on the extraordinary: young people having an illness or handicap (Shapiro, 1984), young people facing socioeconomic and psychological risks (Garmezy, 1985) and young people who have lost significant caregivers (Rutter, 1981; Band et al., 1988). From research on adults the conclusion can be drawn that everyday stressors can be important and that a multiplier effect can be distinguished (Band et al., 1988), making numerous simultaneous everyday stressors more menacing than individual episodes of major stress (Band et al., 1988; Kanner, Coyne, Schaefer, & Lazarus, 1981; Rutter, 1979).

1.2. **Daily Stressors versus Major Life Events**

Major life events such as armed conflict and natural disaster like tsunami, are proven to account for a great amount of stress in young people’s and adult’s lives (Fernando et al., 2010). Those events do not only expose people to potentially traumatic stressors, but also give rise to abiding, stressful conditions in day-to-day life (Fernando et al., 2010). Daily stressors can be seen as continuous immediate events or happenings that persistently and negatively influence young people and can be altered (Fernando et al., 2010). Fernando et al. (2010, p. 1193) describe daily stressors deriving from disaster-related events:

> Poverty caused or worsened by the loss of family livelihoods, displacement into crowded and impoverished refugee camps with a corresponding loss of privacy and autonomy, a loss of social support caused by the weakening of social networks through the death of family members, alterations in family structure or functioning when family members are killed or disabled, and a lack of access to basic goods and services such as health care and schooling (Barenbaum et al., 2004; Kalksma-Van Lith, 2007; Miller & Rasco, 2004; Wessells & Monteiro, 2006).

There is a growing support for the theory that the liability of such daily stressful social and material conditions for predicting mental health status is equal or bigger than the actual degree of exposure to emergency settings (Al-Krenawi, Lev-Wiesel, & Sehwail, 2007; Fernando et al., 2010; Miller, Ommidian, Rasmussen, Yaqubi, & Daudzai, 2008; Wessels & Monteiro, 2006). Even in situations of complex emergency, sources of daily stress unrelated to war or disaster such as family violence and sexual abuse can influence youngster’s lives (Fernando et al., 2010). Their relation to poorer physical, psychosocial and psychological functioning and mental health outcomes may exceed the influence of exposure to both major life events and disasters (Compas, Davis, Forsythe, & Wagner, 1987; DeLongis, Coyne, Dakof, Folkman, & Lazarus, 1983; Fernando et al., 2010; Kanner et al., 1981; Monroe, 1983). Therefore it is relevant to include daily stressors in research to (traumatic) stress in young people’s lives instead of focusing solely on disaster-related variables (Fernando et al., 2010). According to this, even though young people in Pondicherry might have suffered a great deal from the 2004 tsunami, a terrifying natural disaster, this research focused mainly on stressors in the daily life.

Alongside the roles that the life stage of adolescence, individual characteristics, obstacles and different daily or major stressors play in the development of stress, the influence of context and
specifically culture in relation to stress is undeniable (Coffey, Samuel, Collins, & Morris, 2012; Ungar, 2008). As this research’s goal was to determine any possible cultural sensitivity in the experience of stress, contextual factors will probably be some of the most important aspects in understanding and interpreting research results and paint a broader picture. Therefore the matter of cultural and contextual influence on stress will be further explored in the next section, which casts a view on stress from an ecological paradigm.

1.3. STRESSORS: AN ECOLOGICAL MODEL

To study the complex phenomenon of stress (Laungani, 1996) and stressors, one needs a clear understanding of the concepts. Both adults and youngsters encounter troublesome, psychologically minacious situations called stressors (Chokkanathan, 2009; Mullis et al., 1993) conceivably opposing the prosperity of the individual and resulting in negative consequences (Chokkanathan, 2009; Pearlin, Lieberman, Menaghan, & Mullan, 1981; Pearlin, Mullan, Semple, & Skaff, 1990). Stressors directly influence psychological distress by causing or increasing it (Chokkanathan, 2009). It is not to be forgotten that an individual can evaluate an event as having an overall negative but also positive impact. This is what Mullis et al. (1993) call the distinction between positive and negative stress. In this research only negative stress will be further explored.

Various stressors can be organized into an encompassing framework, using a socio-ecological model that divides stressors into three levels: an environmental, a relational and an individual stratification (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

1.3.1. ENVIRONMENTAL LEVEL

Variables related to community, culture or society are clustered under the environmental level (Thompson & Light, 2011). Even though concepts related to stress have always been described in terms of universalized, internationalized and Westernized concepts, they should be considered as cultural, local and indigenous elements (Coffey et al., 2012; Ungar, 2008). Culture can be seen as shared values, norms, traditions, customs, history and institutions of a community (Pedersen, 1994; Stampley & Slaght, 2004) and includes all conscious and unconscious rules and regulations that govern one’s life (Crapo, 1990). Subjective measures might be culture dependent (Nachreiner, 1999) and culture as a universal background influences the individual and people coming from the same socio-cultural environment will share common world conceptions derived from the process of socialization into cultural and social mechanisms (Olah, 1995). Olah (1995) stated that this process inseparably links a person’s perceptions of the situational events he comes across with the interpretations of other individuals coming from the same cultural setting (Olah, 1995).

Olah’s cross-cultural research (1995) brings forth the interrelatedness of the concept of stress with an individual’s perception or appraisal of stressful events. Stress can be viewed from different perspectives such as a stimulus-oriented or a cognitive approach (Mullis et al., 1993). A stimulus-orientation model only appraises stress as either individual or environmental forces that influence the person (Mullis et al., 1993) and views experienced stress as an equitation of separate events experienced (Johnson, 1986). However using a cognitive-orientation approach or the commensurate psychological approach to stress, stress can be appointed not only as an environmental process, but
also an intrapersonal movement between the stimulus of an event and its response (Cox, Griffiths, & Rial-Gonzalez, 2000; Mullis et al., 1993). The level of distress that environmental circumstances can generate is in this approach heavily dependent on the individual's perception (Johnson & McCutcheon, 1980; Mullis et al., 1993; Swearingen & Cohen, 1985; Zautra & Reich, 1983). Numerous authors tend towards this cognitive psychological approach and emphasize the interdependence and interaction of stress and a person’s appraisal (Coffey et al., 2012; Cox et al., 2000; Lazarus, 1966; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Lazarus & Launier, 1978; Lind, Delmar, & Nielsen, 2014; Mueller, Edwards, & Yarvis, 1977; Vinokur & Selzer, 1975; Payne, 1999). According to this approach, the physical state of stress only arises when one appraises a situation as threatening or demanding (stressor) but lacks an appropriate coping response (Cohen & Willis, 1985; Coffey et al., 2012; Lazarus, 1966; Lazarus & Launier, 1978; Payne, 1999; Sells, 1970). This stressor evaluation depends on former life experiences, memories, emotions and coping resources (Antonovsky, 1979; Cannon, 1914; Folkman, 1997; Lazarus, 1993; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Lind et al., 2014; Selye, 1955). Likewise, as spoken of earlier in this section, the appraisal also depends on the process of socialization into cultural and social mechanisms (Olah, 1995). This again emphasizes the possible influence of culture and context in the conceptualization of stress and suggests the need of viewing stress through a socio-ecological framework.

Consequently it was important for the researcher to gain a certain insight in the Indian culture before conducting her groundwork. This insight was obtained during her six months stay in India while completing her internship working with people from several positions and classes.

The following paragraphs provide insight in certain conditions and elements characterizing the Indian culture.

1.3.1.1. Caste
The social, economic, ritualistic and political life in Tamil Nadu and the whole of India is characterized by caste. Social hierarchy is locally classified starting at the bottom with Dalits (Scheduled Castes), afterwards lowest-middle castes (Most Backward Castes), next come middle castes (Backward Castes) and on top of the hierarchy the Forward Castes can be found (Guérin, D'Espallier, & Venkatasubramanian, 2013). In this caste-system, discrimination, economic and social exclusion and stigmatized identity are pertinent matters imposed particularly upon the untouchable caste and several tribal groups (Dhespade, 2011; Navsarjan Trust, 2010; Sharma, 2015; Thorat & Newman, 2010). Lower castes are victims of crimes and atrocities such as rape, harassment, forced evictions etc. (Human Rights Watch, 1999) committed by upper castes (Sharma, 2015). Also young people from lower castes show lower school enrolment and a higher chance of dropouts as they report to experience more discrimination than other classmates (Artic, Doobay, & Lyons, 2003).
1.3.1.2. SES / Poverty

As the researcher could experience during her six months stay in India, poverty is an undeniable component of the Indian culture. Low social status and continuous economic adversity can be accounted as versatile stressful conditions (Gustafsson, Larsson, Nelson, & Gustafsson, 2009). This economic hardship confines people's lives in all aspects; they control choice of neighbourhood, school, recreational activities and job opportunities (Gustafsson et al., 2009; McLoyd, 1990) and elevate the hazard of encountering negative life events (Gustafsson et al., 2009; Liem & Liem, 1978; Turner, Wheaton, & Lloyd, 1995).

1.3.1.3. Gender Inequality

In Indian society, an extensive discrepancy still exists between male and female status (Weitzman, 2014). Society sees dominating and securing the economic future and security of his family as a man's duty (Anand, 2007; Kapadia, 2005; Vera-Sanso, 2000; Verma, et al., 2006; Weitzman, 2014). Contrarily it is desired of women to engage in menial chores, marry and reproduce an offspring (Dube, 1988; Ghose, 2004; Osella & Osella, 2000; Weitzman, 2014). Gender norms are rigid and employed or financially independent women oftentimes don’t fit the bill (Weitzman, 2014). Another example of the gender contrast, is the fact that like in certain other cultures (Lin & Adserà, 2013), Indian parents show a preference for sons over daughters. Sons are often favoured out of cultural or spiritual considerations, but also for their conceivably higher contribution to household earnings and parental sustenance as mentioned above. As a result of this phenomenon, girls are often discriminated on various levels (Lin & Adserà, 2013). Researchers discovered that parents are less likely to make human capital investments in their daughter’s health or education together with other matters (Connely & Zheng, 2003; Lee, 2008; Lin & Adserà, 2013; Mishra, Roy, & Retherford, 2004; Pande, 2003). For instance, Lin & Adserà (2013) proved that girls are more engaged in housework, especially in countries preferring male offspring. This results in less remaining time to undertake more productive investments and eventually in lower educational accomplishments and earlier marriages. Those labour activities called household chores are a non-negligible part of child labour (Lin & Adserà, 2013). Male preference and its impact on girls’ well-being might possibly be demonstrated more thoroughly in further research to its translation in actual differences in treatment in nutrition, health care access, and education (Pande, 2003; Griffiths, Matthews, & Hinde, 2002; Kurosaki, Ito, Fuwa, Kubo, & Sawada, 2006; Mishra et al., 2004).

1.3.1.4. Conclusion

Though the above-mentioned cultural conditions might generate environmental stressors, they influence people on both the relational and individual level. Income and status inequality and discrimination based on class, race and gender can be labelled as repeated and chronic stressors (American Psychological Association, 2007; Belle & Doucet, 2003; Kessler & Neighbors, 1986; Garcia Coll, et al., 1996; Gustafsson et al., 2009). For adolescents, environmental stressors have proven to be linked with low well-being. They evoke disturbed social processes, physiological disorganization and internalization of a weak self-image (Boardman, Finch, Ellison, Williams, & Jackson, 2001; Brook, Rubenstone, Zhang, Morojele, & Brook, 2011; McEwan, 2008; Murali & Chen, 2005; Sampson, 1992; Taylor, 2000; Ward, 2007).
1.3.2. RELATIONAL LEVEL

Among the relational-level factors, peer and family variables can be found. Suicide research provided some factors on the relationship-level associated with suicide attempts (Thompson & Light, 2011). Several of those can also be viewed as stressors in general. Experiencing child maltreatment (Gould, Greenberg, Velting, & Schaffer, 2003), having low levels of family connectedness (Borowsky, Ireland, & Resnick, 2001), experiencing limited parental involvement (Borowsky et al., 2001) and the loss of parents (Agerbo, Nordentoft, & Mortensen, 2002; Overholser, 2003; Thompson & Light, 2011) are only a few examples of how youngsters’ lives can be influenced by interpersonal factors. The measure of psychosomatic symptoms among children and adolescents has proven to be inherently associated with the relationship’s quality with parents and friends (Aro et al., 1989).

When discussing relational variables, aforementioned environmental issues also have to be considered because they expand to the relational stratum. The discrepancy between male and female status for instance, has its influence on the parents’ appreciation of their sons and daughters (Lin & Adserà, 2013) and consequently on the way they treat their children (Connely & Zheng, 2003; Lee, 2008; Lin & Adserà, 2013; Mishra et al., 2004; Pande, 2003). Caste system on the other hand defines the way social climate is organized (Guérin et al., 2013) and might even define the youngsters’ relationships with peers. These are examples of how environmental stressors have their influence on the relational level.

Family status can have an influence on relationship-level; adolescents in intact families thus maintaining a good relationship with one or both parents have shown to display less psychosomatic symptoms than those in non-intact families (Aro et al., 1989; Aro, Patronen, & Aro, 1987). Inadequate family support is also reported to be connected to life stress (Tyerman & Humphrey, 1983). In non-supportive, maltreating environmental circumstances, when youth is agitated by some stressor, emotion regulation might be reduced, resulting in limited emotion control (Cook, Chaplin, Sinha, Tebes, & Mayes, 2012).

On the relationship with peers, Kumar et al. (2009) discovered that competition with peers to acquire good marks can be regarded as stressors of significant importance. Research of Davis-Kean (2005) suggested that children’s achievement is influenced by parents’ socio economic status (SES), expectations, beliefs, behaviour and education. A possible explanation for this phenomenon could be that parental pressure to achieve is somehow related to this fact, or the belief inherent to the India culture that education is the stepping stone to a better future (Borah, 2012).

1.3.3. INDIVIDUAL LEVEL

Research on suicide distinguished several individual-level risk factors for elevated probability of committing suicide (Thompson & Light, 2011) including gender, age, skin colour, having somatic symptoms (Borowksy et al., 2001) or a physical disability (Evans, Hawton, & Rodham, 2004), the level of self-esteem (Bearman & Moody, 1994; Esposito-Smythers & Spirito, 2004; Mehlenbeck, Spirito, & Barnett, 2003) and signs of substance abuse (Bridge, Goldstein, & Brent, 2006) and delinquent behaviour (U.S. Public Health Service, 1999; Goldsmith, Pellmar, Kleinman, & Bunney, 2002; Evans et al., 2004; King, Schwab-Stone, & Flisher, 2001; Thompson, Ho, & Kingree, 2007; Thompson, Kingree, & Ho, 2006; Thompson & Light, 2011). These are a few examples of individual factors that can influence people in the development of psychosocial stress or symptomatology. Especially age and
gender play a role in stress research as they influence the structural anatomy in humans (Kumar, et al., 2015; Taki, et al., 2011) and play a role in cognitive and emotional development (De Bellis, Keshavan, Beers, Hall, & Frustaci, 2001; Nagy & Martin, 1999). A specific example can be found in the fact that more evidence of adverse brain development is shown by maltreated males with PTSD than their female counterparts (De Bellis et al., 1999; De Bellis et al., 2001). The factors summed up on this individual level might not be seen as individual stressors on their own, but rather as an individual factors that are indisputably intertwined with the exposure to the social context, and that influence the subjective experience of relational and environmental stressors (Lind et al., 2014).
1.4. RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

Research on risk in youths requires an open view on concepts related to stress. Researchers need to abandon the universalized, internationalized and Westernized concepts and view concepts of stress in relation to local culture and indigenous elements (Coffey et al., 2012; Ungar, 2008). Qualitative studies are mandatory and research would benefit from using qualitative interviews or focus groups to involve more culturally specific stressors (Ungar, 2008). Also (Compas et al., 1987) emphasize that researchers have to take into account the following fact:

The views of adult professionals and researchers may not accurately reflect the experiences of children and adolescents because they are hindered by differences in age, by the limits of existing knowledge in the field, by theoretical biases, and by the differences in perspective between individuals who report on their own behaviour and external observers who judge that behaviour (Jones & Nisbett, 1971). (p. 534)

This research’s purpose was to identify culturally-sensitive indicators of stress and stressors so it tried to maintain this mandatory open view on the possible stressors experienced by youths in Pondicherry, India. By using open-ended qualitative methods as Participatory Ranking Methodology, Free Listing Task and Free Sorting Task methods as illustrated in sections 2.3 and 2.4, the participants were not granted any prearranged concepts to describe their experiences and conceptualization could originate from own perception and knowledge. Still any structure was necessary to guide the research’s course. That’s why to investigate stressors, three research questions were put forward:

1) Which are the stressors young people in Pondicherry experience being a member of their community?

2) Which are the stressors young people coming from the Narikuravar Colony, a minority group of impoverished gypsies, experience being a member of their community?

3) Is there a significant difference in reported problems between people coming from the minority impoverished gypsy community and the majority society?

These first two research questions illustrate the exploratory nature of the research, leaving openness for anything participants might mention. Eventually, the third question explores possible differences in the way participants of both populations are exposed to daily stressors. Even though they come from the same area, both populations might not experience the same troubles, as their cultural heritage might differ (Olah, 1995). Divergences between experienced stressors indicate the importance of contextualisation in understanding stress when researching the matter, and eventually might mean that stressors have to be seen in terms of culturally sensitivity.
2. METHODS

This chapter discusses the methodology used in this research. First the choice of ‘Mixed Methods’ is legitimized and a brief description of the different methods (Free Listing Task, Free Sorting Task and Participatory Ranking Method – FLT, FST and PRM) is offered. Secondly the recruitment of participants and the composition of the final samples are clarified and eventually the ethical procedure that this research followed is demonstrated.

2.1. SETTING

This research was conducted in Pondicherry, India during the period October 2014 - February 2015. India is located in the South of Asia. The original inhabitants were part a one of the world’s oldest civilizations. Indian history knows several dynasties but those began to erode when European explorers began to set foot in India. By the 19th century, Great Britain had established political dominance and India became part of its kingdom. After years of nonviolent resistance to British rule, India was granted independence in 1947 (CIA, 2015).

Pondicherry is located on the East coast of India, south of Chennai alias Madras. The region is rich in culture and religion of which Hinduism is represented above all, followed by Muslims and Christians (Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, 2001). Due to India’s history of colonisation, Pondicherry is formerly known as a French trading post (CIA, 2015) and therefore imbued by French culture. It is perhaps the only state in India speaking French. The state of Pondicherry, with its capital Pondicherry, was founded by the French in 1676 (CIA, 2015).

Census data in 2011 showed the population of the Pondicherry district amounted 1 247 953 with 31,67% living in the rural area and 68,33% living in the more developed city. The density in 2011 is 2547/km2 but with a population growth rate of nearly 30% over ten years, the population is quickly expanding and density increasing. Sex ratio was 1037 females to 1000 males. Literacy rates are 88,49% in urban area and 80,10% in rural areas, both exhibiting a gender difference in literacy. Male literacy is considerably higher than female literacy (93,03% to 88,11% in the former and 87,44% to 75,29% in the latter area) (Indian Population Census 2011, 2011).

As aforementioned, in Pondicherry, as well as in the whole of India, citizens suffer a great deal from caste system and poverty. Especially the target population of the researcher’s internship, the people from the gypsy Narikuravar Colony, can be considered as important victims of both phenomena. By society, these people are considered as the untouchable caste, lowest of the low castes. They have been living in this colony since 40 years, practically isolated from the rest of Pondicherrian society (Reynders, 2012-2013). This research also included participants from this population.
2.2. PREFERENCE OF BOTH QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH METHODS

To explore the indicators of psychological stress in youth of two communities, this study integrated both qualitative and quantitative research methods. By opting for mixed methods, we acknowledged Creswell’s (2012) allegation that by using a combination of both types of data we might obtain a better understanding and formulate a better answer on the research question.

Since this research had an explorative character, we didn’t put forth any hypothesis that could be checked against the participants’ answers (Vanhee, Laporte, & Corveleyn, 2001). This research aimed to explore difficulties or stressors in the Pondicherrian youngsters’ lives. Initiating this research from a presented hypothesis that stressors differ according to culture would mean that the researcher would be prejudiced in interpreting results.

For the assessments among youths and youth representatives, we used two qualitative interviewing methods: Free Listing Task (FLT) and Participatory Ranking Methodology (PRM). The use of two or more qualitative interviewing approaches to assess the same variables within one study is called within-methods triangulation and is used as a way to enhance the chance of valid findings (Kimchi, Polivka, & Stevenson, 1991). PRM itself can be seen as a ‘mixed methods’ approach to data collection, as it engages both quantitative and qualitative methodologies; though it generates rich, contextualized data, still data can be counted, ranked an compared (Ager, Stark, & Potts, 2010).

2.3. FREE LISTING TASK: IDENTIFYING DIFFICULTIES/STRESSORS

2.3.1. FLT DATA COLLECTION

An individual written inquiry called Free Listing Task or FLT in short was the first method used to collect data on cultural sensitive indicators of stress youngsters experience in the Indian socio-cultural context of Pondicherry, and their relation to resilience, a subject further explored by the co-researcher of this associated master’s thesis. This method has been proven to be culturally valid and efficient in Uganda (Betancourt, Speelman, Onyango, & Bolton, 2009; Vindevogel, De Schryver, Broekaert, & Derluyn, 2012).

Since the researchers were not familiar with Tamil, the FLT was drawn up in English and translated to Tamil, the target language. As a quality measure, the target version was back-translated to English independently. This process has shown to be both desirable and necessary for assuring the quality of the final version (Guillemin, Bombardier, & Beaton, 1993; Berkanovic, 1980).

The FLT consisted of two sections: a socio demographic part and a second part with three open-ended questions asking about their greatest problems in everyday life as being a part of their community. The socio demographic element was meant for mapping the individual characteristics of the youths such as age, sex, living situation, school, religion etc. The following part of this questionnaire contained three questions, of which only one was used for this research: ‘Which are the difficulties/troubles that you experience as a member of your community/region/family/...?’ In summary youths were asked to name at least one significant stressor in their daily life. This part produced a whole series of answers. The average duration of one FLT was one and a half hours.
2.3.2. FLT PARTICIPANTS

As Mack, Woodson, MacQueen, Guest & Namy (2005) suggested for the recruitment of potential participants, the researchers worked together with a gatekeeper. This person was also responsible for the internship they were conducting in that same period of time. As head of Samugam Foundation he came in contact with different organizations and schools, he harboured both official as unofficial authority and was also highly respected by many people and communities. This person paved the way to the collaboration with different schools, organizations and individual participants. In addition to his cooperation, the researchers themselves had close contact with the inhabitants of the Narikuravar Colony since their internship required them to go there every day and they eventually built up a close relationship with these people.

For FLT, the participating schools were contacted by the gatekeeper. He informed several schools about this research arranged meetings between the researchers and headmasters to obtain official permission. Only one government school didn’t participate, lacking the approval of the government itself. The schools themselves randomly selected the youths participating in this research, only taking into account the strata of boys-girls and age groups as well as their consent to participate.

The FLT surveyed 264 youths between the age of 14 and 24. Both boys and girls, living in the city of Pondicherry as well as in villages, the countryside or suburbs participated.

Sex: The group of participants was approximately equally divided gender-wise; 51,1% (n=135) of the participants were male, 48,5% (n=128) female and 0,4% (n=1) didn’t answer the question.

Age: The average age was 15,22 with a variance of 3,85.

Living area: Half of the participants lived in the city of Pondicherry (51,5%, n=136), 37,9% (n=100) lived in a village; 6,4% (n=17) lived in the suburbs and 0,8% (n=2) were countryside residents. 3,4% (n=9) left this question unanswered.

Religion: Based on religion, the sample can be divided into three groups. The majority were Hindus (93,6%, n=247), 3,4% (n=9) were Muslim and 2,3% (n=6) followed Christian beliefs. Again some people didn’t answer this question (0,8%, n=2).

Caste: Indian culture is based on a caste system characterized by many classes and subdivisions. A major proportion of the participants was part of 5 castes; ‘Most Backward Class’ counting 38,9% (n=103) of the participants, ‘Scheduled Class’ representing 21,1% (n=56), ‘Backward Class’ amounting 9,8% (n=26) and ‘Other Backward Class’ and ‘Fisherman Class’ both representing 6,8% (n=18) of the participants. A remaining 11,7% (n=31) belonged to 16 subdivisions and again 4,9% (n=13) skipped this question.

Living situation: According to the FLT results, 78,8% (n=208) of the youngsters lived with both parents, 11,7% (n=31) lived with their mother, 3% (n=8) lived with their father and 4,6% (n=12) reported to live with other family members, a guardian or a home. Of 1,9% (n=5) of the participants we received no response.
School: 72.7% (n=192) of the participants went to a private school, the other 27.3% (n=72) went to a governmental school.

Occupation parents: On both questions on father’s and mother’s occupation, we received several answers. For father’s occupations, 30.2% (n=80) of the participants reported coolie (labourer), 6.8% (n=18) reported fisherman, 6.8% (n=18) driver, 3.8% (n=10) farmer and 3.8% (n=10) owner of a private company. Another 53 other occupations accounted for 35.7% (n=95). Participants with unemployed fathers accounted for 11% (n=29) and 1.9% (n=5) reported nothing on this question. Unemployment had struck 54.3% (n=144) of the participant’s mothers and 21.1% (n=56) reported daily wager as their mother’s job. 5.7% (n=15) of the participant’s mothers were housemaid, and 18.1% (n=48) worked 19 other jobs. Only 0.8% (n=2) didn’t answer this question.

SES: To make an assessment on socio economic status, the Free Listing Task contained an open-ended question about the biggest source of income of the participant and his family. 66.7% (n=176) reported their father’s income as biggest source and 14.8% (n=39) reported their mother’s. Another 11.7% (n=31) implied both incomes of significant importance. Other sources of income accounted for 4.3% (n=11), 2.3% (n=6) didn’t fill in this question and one participant (0.4%) reported to have no income.

2.3.3. Free sorting Task: Categorizing difficulties/stressors

2.3.3.1. Data collection

The second part of the Free Listing consisted of a Free Sorting Task. Its goal was to assemble the answers given in the Free Listing Task, into several categories (Vindevogel et al., 2012). The gatekeeper contacted possible participants, preferably people of both sexes and professionally involved with children on different levels. He gauged their interest in taking part in this process, and a sample was put together based on voluntary participation.

2.3.3.2. Participants

This sample was heterogeneous in sex, age and area of work and also including people with different perspectives and opinions on the ‘stress’-theme and on the Indian culture. The sample consisted of five men and five women living in Pondicherry, ages ranging from 21 to 75 and all working with children in various professions. Participants were a youngster(F¹), a volunteer for Samugam Foundation(F), founder and Head of Samugam Foundation(M), head of ChildLine Pondicherry(M), a religious person of the Hindu community(F), a psychologist(M), a social worker(M), a fieldworker working in a gypsy community(M), a caretaker who provides medical aid to youngsters(F) and a social counsellor(F).

2.3.4. FLT Analysis

The analysis process for FLT consisted of two stages. In this process only information collected through the first of three questions was integrated, as this research was only based on the latter. In the first phase, most mentioned answers were selected and categorized using the results of the Free

¹ Female focus groups are indicated with (F), male groups with (M).
Sorting Task. During this process, ten participants were asked to cluster the answers into a self-selected amount of categories of own choice. Thereafter a group discussion followed, deliberating the individual assessments until consensus about final categories was reached.

The second phase consisted of the researcher coding the 514 unique answers given by 261 out of 264 participants (98.9%) into the 26 categories resulting from the FST. Nine of the answers could not be subdivided under any problem category so they were assigned to the “no category” category. Among the participants, 32 claimed to experience no problems at all. Still those participants claiming not to experience problems were taken into account. A category for having “no problem” was formulated. Eventually 28 categories were derived.

Because some participants gave several unique answers, but sometimes resulting in the same category, for the analysis as a measure of frequency the number and percentage of cases of 261 filled in FLT-forms that the category was named in was used. It is of interest to know which proportion of the population experienced a problem rather than to know how many sub-problems are listed under one main category. In that way the answer’s frequency could be examined and used in statistical software SPSS to investigate whether or not a connection exists with socio-demographic characteristics. Eventually, 261 of the participants named the 28 categories 450 times.

2.4. Participatory Ranking Method: Focus Group Discussions with Representative Groups of Stakeholders

2.4.1. PRM Data Collection

This research opted for the PRM, which stands for ‘Participative Ranking Methodology’ and resembles working with focus group discussions (Ager et al., 2010). It is a ‘mixed method’ process in which groups of representative stakeholders were guided into answering specific questions on three research questions – the same questions posed by FLT - of which only the records concerning psychosocial stressors were used in this research. These questions were posed somewhat differently than in FLT questionnaires, as participants were not only youngsters and questions sought to uncover general patterns instead of personal experiences (Ager, Stark, Sparling, & Ager, 2011). Questions were formulated as the following: “Which are the difficulties/troubles that young people experience as a member of their community, region, family or...?”.

The method is built upon a three-step model; Pile, Rank, Account or Meaning. The first phase is called the Pile-phase. The research question is posed by the facilitator and participants get the chance to share their experiences and answers on this question. Subsequently for every theme that comes up in this session, the participants choose an object that symbolically represents this theme and put it on a pile in front of the group. This is an iterative process; the group discussion systematically continues until every possible theme has its object assigned to (Ager et al., 2011). Secondly a continuum is created, preferably by drawing a line on which participants can rank their objects of the pile according to importance. Every time an object is placed on this continuum, the facilitator asks the group if they agree with that arrangement. This phase can only by terminated
when all objects are ranked and all group members agree with this positioning (Ager et al., 2010). The third step could rather be called a continuous phase throughout the whole session. For this the note taker has a crucial role in recording statements, justifications and experiences participants use to explain their choice of themes. The note taker notes down these “accounts” fully, which helps the researchers in gaining a rich understanding of the local circumstances, attitudes and challenges (Ager et al., 2010; Ager et al., 2011)

Openness but also specificity of the research questions are simultaneously of great importance. In case of any ambiguity, the researcher can clarify the question or formulate simplified explanations (Ager et al., 2011). The interpreter was of great value in this process. He had to address the question to the participants in that way the researchers acquired replies that actually answered the questions. This was established by formulating his questions to the researchers prior to presenting them to the participants and always formulating them to the participants in a standardized manner.

For each of the three questions, this whole process needed to be repeated. One session in which the three research questions were posed took approximately two hours.

2.4.2. PRM Participants

To compose the different samples of PRM sessions, a strategy called quota sampling and sometimes viewed as a purposive sampling technique was used (Mack et al., 2005; Tongco, 2007). Quota were youngsters of at least 14 years old, both male and female and both gypsy and non-gypsy. Also professionals had to be included, as well as parents and teachers. In that way people who were most likely to have a vivid image on the research topics were chosen (Mack et al., 2005).

PRM participants inside the gypsy community were brought together by convenience sampling, the approaching of participants who fit the researcher’s criterion and who were promptly available (Ager et al., 2011) because of their affiliation with Samugam and the research topic. They were asked without obligation to participate in group discussions inside the crèche, a local building reconstructed by Samugam volunteers. PRM participants outside the gypsy community were brought together by the same strategies. As indicated above, the gatekeeper played an important role in contacting these participants.

For PRM sessions participants were divided into key groupings (Ager et al., 2011) based on their function. Furthermore the groups were homogenous in gender. Dividing participants into these so-called strata (Ager et al., 2011) made it possible to discern different viewpoints in people of different gender, age and function. Only in the social workers groups the gender homogeneity could not be established.

With a total of 103 participants, 12 groups were formed, all involved in PRM session of each three questions. 50 participants, divided into 6 groups originated from a local gypsy community in Pondicherry, the Narikuravar Colony joined the PRM sessions. The residents of this colony all originated from Andhra Pradesh, a northern state of India and settled down in this area 40 years ago (Reynders, 2012-2013). The positions based on which the different PRM key groups were divided were the following: Young girls (n=10, age m=17,5, age var=12,5), and young boys (n=9, age m=19,7,
age var=6.8), taking the positions of youths. Mothers (n=8, age m =25.8, age var=14.5), fathers (n=9, age m =28.6, age var=9.5), grandmothers (n=8, age m =56.1, age var=69) and grandfathers (n=6, age m =64.3, age var=97.1) all took the position of parents.

Beside these groups formed by people living in the gypsy community, the researchers also formed six other groups including stakeholders and youngsters. Those groups consisted of eight female teachers from the suburbs (age m=34.3, age var=54.8) and 15 social workers, both men and women divided into two mixed gender groups. The first group’s participants were four men and four women who were part of the Samugam staff (age m=29.3, age var=94.2) residing in the suburbs. Four men and three women working for ChildLine located in the city (age m=28.7, age var=20.2) formed the other group of social workers. Social workers were assigned as professionals. The last three groups all took the role of youngsters; ten boys (age m=18.5, age var=1.2) and ten girls (age m=17.3, age var=1.1) studying at a private secondary tutorial school, a second-chance school in the city. Ten girls (age m=14.7, age var=0.5) lived in a home for deprived children located in the suburbs.

2.4.3. PRM Analysis

As indicated above, PRM participants formed 12 groups of which 6 groups were composed of participants coming from a gypsy community and 6 composed of non-gypsy participants. For the analysis both populations together were first considered as a whole to generate universal answers. Afterwards they were subdivided into two categories to explore possible divergence in their views on stress.

The analysis of PRM data followed a four-step course. First all answers relating to a common indicator were gathered into categories. Secondly the frequency of every category was determined by counting the number of times an answer concerning the category came up in different sessions. Afterwards for every category an average rank was weighed by adding up the ranks of the separate answers residing within the category and dividing by the amount of separate answers. The average rank indicates the weight participants assigned to the issues. A rank of 1 indicates high priority whereas 10 represents lowest priority. The fourth step included incorporating the qualitative data derived from PRM sessions to provide context for and a deeper qualitative insight in the quantitative rankings (Ager et al., 2011).

Since working with a methodology demanding open-ended questions made it challenging to gain exactly 10 answers on each question, the amount of given answers ranged from 7 to 12 answers (7-11 for gypsies participants and 10-12 for non-gypsies). As for each set of answers the rankings would have been impossible to compare to other sets, for the analysis the rankings were brought back to relative rankings ranging from 1 to 10 by dividing every separate answer’s rank by the total amount of answers given in that session and multiplying this number by 10.

On the first question, the PRM sessions provided a total of 119 answers of which 87 unique answers that were listed under 19 broader clusters. Four unique answers could not be divided under any category, so they represent the “No category”-cluster. To obtain a more elaborated view, focus group results were sorted according to their containing gypsy or non-gypsy participant groups. We obtained respectively 53 and 66 answers of which 40 unique answers of the former groups
subdivided into 14 of the categories and 52 of the latter listed under 18 categories. For both groups, two individual answers could not be listed under broader clusters.

2.5. Ethical Procedure

At the beginning of every FLT and PRM session, various measures concerning the ethical correctness of the research were taken. An Informed Consent was being used to thoroughly explain the research and its goals to all participants. Afterwards the participants were informed that participation in this research was entirely voluntary and non-binding and that they had the right to break off their collaboration at any time, for any reason and without any consequences (Neuman, 2011). The approximate duration of the process was accounted for and the anonymity and confidentiality of the research and its processing were clarified. At last the statement was made that through the researchers people could apply for professional help of for example employees of Samugam in case of need of any psychosocial support during and after the research.

The participants of the FLT questionnaire completed it mainly in Tamil. Because the standardized questionnaire was in English, only the second language of the participants, during all sessions a translator accompanied both researchers and explained in Tamil the incomprehensible words. The answers of the FLT were back translated to English by an independent interpreter.

For the PRM sessions, we used voice recorders, in case some valuable information might get lost through translation in time of heavy discussions. Also the use of a voice recorder allowed the researchers to pay more attention to tacit language, an important tool for communicating emotions, thus meaningful component in this research. Permission of all participants was asked. During those sessions, both researchers were present, one taking on the role of panel chairman and one making a written registration of the whole process. Afterwards, the most important matters were noted down in a log book, for example important observations, the course of the session, the situation etc. According to Glesne (1992) it is very important to reflect on the researcher’s own subjectivity and its possible influence on the research.

During PRM sessions the two researchers were accompanied by an informal interpreter who mastered both the native language as the English language and was familiar with troubled youth in all its aspects. The sessions were executed mainly in Tamil, the local language, and translated instantaneously to English by the interpreter.
3. Results

FLT results were listed in table 1. The first column shows different problem clusters derived from the Free Sorting Task, on the basis of the FLT data. Second and third columns show respectively the number of unique answers given and its according percentage. Fourth and fifth column show the number of participants giving an answer residing under the problem cluster in question and its respective percentage.

Table 1: FLT Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Name</th>
<th>Unique answers per category</th>
<th>Percent Responses</th>
<th>N Responses</th>
<th>Percent of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Disputes</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial problems</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational pressure/problems</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse by others</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caste discrimination</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Problem</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social community problems</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving/loss/absence of important person</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe environment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence towards child</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health related/physical problems of other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship problems</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teasing, bullying, scolding</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Category</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison with peers by parents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental pollution</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender discrimination</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extramarital relationships of parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of governmental provision</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence towards others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse by non-family</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse by child</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion problems</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child marriage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health related/physical problems of child</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems because of media</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid rules for girls</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below (Table 2) was derived from participatory ranking exercises with 12 groups and summarizes the issues identified in PRM sessions as affecting children and youth in their daily life as a member of their community, region or family. As previously indicated all answers relating to a common indicator were gathered into categories. The first column shows the broader clusters of the issues identified. The second column shows the number of times an answer concerning the category came up in different sessions. The third column represents the average rank given to problems belonging to the category. Fourth and fifth as well as sixth and seventh column portray the same values as the second and third column but data is divided over gypsy and non-gypsy participants.

The issues identified by only one group or impossible to connect to any of the clusters were divided under the “No category” label and won’t be further discussed.
Table 2: PRM results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All participants</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-gypsy</th>
<th></th>
<th>Gypsy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># answ(^a)</td>
<td>m rank(^b)</td>
<td>n answ(^a)</td>
<td>m rank(^b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>m rank(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Child) marriage problems</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5,86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social stigmatization</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4,42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender based discrimination</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of education/training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation/lack of children’s rights</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational problems</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,86</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of governmental integrity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family relationship troubles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of motivation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents as bad examples</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No category</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of general knowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern (social) technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orphanage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship difficulties</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teasing/bullying</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) number of answers

\(^b\) mean rank

3.1. FAMILY DISPUTES

Family disputes accounted for the greatest number of participants of the FLT (n=88, 33.7%). Problems mostly involve parental fights, other relatives fighting or fights between the child itself and its relatives. “I do not know what to do whenever my parents quarrel with each other very often”, “There is property dispute in our father’s side. Hence frequent quarrels in the family” and “My parents love my younger sister more than me so they scold me” are some illustrations of this.

PRM participants also reported youngsters to experience disputes with family as a big source of stress in young people’s lives. Five groups mentioned problems clustered under this subjects resulting in a 6,49 average rank. Only one of those five groups consisted of gypsy participants, grandfathers, ranking divorce with the highest rank of 10. Non-gypsy participants allocated more gravity to family relationship problems, resulting in a 5,61 rank. Divorce was also named by the girls from Jaly Home. Other problems clustered were parental fights, extramarital affairs and family relationship troubles.

3.2. DISCRIMINATION

3.2.1. CASTE DISCRIMINATION AND SOCIAL STIGMATISATION

The second theme that emerged from the research data was social stigmatisation concerning caste discrimination. This theme was mentioned in both methods and by both gypsy and non-gypsy participants. In FLT questionnaires, 12,6% of the participants (n=33) mentioned problems concerning caste discrimination. This problem appeared in various ways, influencing different life domains and is illustrated by the following citations: “We have caste problems and we are looked down upon”, “The villagers talk bad about my caste. It’s everywhere at bus-stop, market and even at school” and “Due to this problem I didn’t get the required certificate”. In PRM-sessions, social stigmatisation was
mentioned 11 times with an average rank of 4.42. Eight of those answers came from four gypsy groups, three answers were given by two non-gypsy groups resulting in respectively ranks 3.92 and 5.76. Social stigmatisation appeared to be a bigger burden for young people living in the Narikuravar Colony and participants were able to testify from own experience as gypsies belong to the untouchable caste, the lowest in Indian society. Often they are accused of crimes and offences they didn’t commit.

3.2.2. GENDER BASED DISCRIMINATION

Another variation on the discrimination theme that appeared from using both methodologies was discrimination on gender basis. Especially in PRM groups this theme came forward, but also a few FLT participants mentioned problems residing under this theme (n=6, 2.3% of the cases). “I am facing problems as I am a girl. Parents deprive freedom, never allow to go out” and “My mother doesn’t allow me to talk or mingle with others. She doesn’t allow me to participate in functions, if I participate she scolds me”. But also the fact that there are rigid rules for girls can be viewed from the gender based discrimination theme. One participant mentioned this: “A girl should not talk with a boy. I should die as soon as I do so is the threat before me, imposed by society”.

Half of the PRM groups acknowledged this problem, equally divided between being member of the gypsy community or not (3/6 gypsy and 3/6 non-gypsy groups mentioned gender discrimination). In the gypsy community, only female groups acknowledged this problem. In total, nine answers given were sorted under the gender discrimination theme with an according rank of 6.77. Gypsy participants gave a little more priority to the theme than non-gypsy participants (6.22 to 7.46). Problems that were named among gender discrimination in PRM sessions could be called more excessive than those of FLT. Participants not only named facts like the impossibility for women to be employed on their own or to do things on their own and the fact that male children are preferred over female children but also facts like tremendous amounts of danger, physical, verbal and sexual abuse or intimidation by males over females. One noteworthy answer was this one from the all-male group from a tutorial school: they claimed that women have more rights than men in India and that the law would protect women more than men. A specific example was given of a woman complains about a man to the police; the woman always will be proven right. This observation greatly contrasted to other answers concerning gender discrimination.

3.3. CHILDREN’S RIGHTS

3.3.1. (CHILD)MARRIAGE PROBLEMS

Problems related to marriage, and especially child marriage accounted for the second largest category that came out of PRM sessions with 11 answers residing under this cluster, and an average rank of 5.86. These problems were named by 10 out of 12 groups. The two groups that didn’t mention problems in relation to marriage were both all-male, one coming from the gypsy community and one from a tutorial school in the city. Average ranks were 6.39 for gypsy participants and 5.23 for non-gypsy participants. Out of the 11 answers clustered under this category, seven discussed child marriage. Participants of the Samugam staff discussed the fact that not only the child marriage itself is bad because of the age, but also if children are married, they cannot continue to go to school and
their future only depends on the wishes of their husband. In most PRM-sessions child marriage was discussed in terms of young girls getting married. Also the pressure to marry was named by the group of female teachers. Parents in India feel the pressure to wed off their children as soon as possible. Another issue is the dowry system that is still current in India. This was mentioned twice, both by gypsy participants. Whenever it is financially possible to marry, it means that the family is very rich because of their ability to pay the dowry. That is why some parents force their children in premature weddings. Also a lot of families are not able to pay the dowry. In that case a girl should stay unmarried until they can. It is looked upon as a shame for the whole family. A group of male youngsters of the gypsy community stated that they understand child marriage is a tradition intertwined with the culture they grow up in, but that they don’t agree with the way things are handled and the young age. Their counterpart was the group of grandfathers coming from the gypsy community stating that “the legal age of marriage set by the government is too high” (it is set on 18 for girls and 21 for boys) (Ministry of Women and Child Development, n.d.).

In FLT questionnaires, the subject of child marriage was only named once.

3.3.2. VIOLATION OR LACK OF CHILDREN’S RIGHTS

Participants of PRM also gave other answers illustrating the violation or lack of children’s rights in Pondicherry. Remarkably was that all answers clustered under this category came from four PRM groups consisting of non-gypsy participants (n=8, average rank=4,28). Also only youths (2/5) and professionals (2/2) mentioned problems like this. Main themes residing under this category were sexual or physical abuse inflicted on young people, and child traffic and child labour (n=2). One group of female youngsters from a tutorial school mentioned the fact that there are not enough rights for youths, for example when going to a provision store to collect food, even with the right identification documents, they are sent home empty handed. More substantial problems were child labour, understood as the fact that children often have to work because their family has financial problems, and child traffic. The group of Samugam Staff indicated that this is a problem of daily occurrence. Children are kidnapped and sold as (sex) slaves and sometimes they are physically mutilated.

Regarding the FLT data, the category of domestic violence towards the child can also be considered as a violation of a child’s right to protection of its physical development (Walther, 2003). Physical abuse was mentioned by 13 of the FLT participants (5% of the cases), “I personally don’t have any problems except that my elder brother hits me often for reasons unknown to me”.

3.4. POVERTY

Poverty can be seen as one of the biggest problem youngsters in Pondicherry have to face. In PRM sessions, this subject also considered financial problems under the same cluster, FST participants decided on separate categories. PRM clustered ten problems under this theme, with according rank 5,00. Five problems were mentioned by four gypsy groups (rank= 4,47), five by five non-gypsy groups (rank=5,25). Problems linked with poverty ranged from food shortage, over begging, homelessness and prostitution, to tax and credit problems.
In FLT, three participants (1.1% of the cases) specifically mentioned the word poverty as a problem interfering with daily life.

3.4.1. Financial problems

On the other hand, in FLT, the broader theme of financial problems accounted for approximately one fourth of the cases (N=64, 24.5% of the cases). Financial problems generate the impossibility to pay for necessary means as food, medical care or education: “My parents feed us well but they remain in hunger most of the time”, “We have no money to meet medical expenses”, “I stay at my auntie’s house. She pays my school fees. But for her I cannot continue my studies”. This results in borrowing money and eventually large debts: “We’re not able to repay the money borrowed by us. We face problems due to this”.

3.4.2. Unemployment

Another problem that should be mentioned in relation to poverty is unemployment. Though only mentioned in PRM sessions and missing in the FLT answers, this theme is of great importance. Six out of 12 PRM groups thought this problem worth mentioning resulting in a 4.91 rank. Two problems under this cluster were mentioned by the two groups of professionals, having an average rank of only 8.58. Six of the clustered problems belonged to four gypsy community groups of which three male and one female group and added up to rank 3.68, which is seen as considerably higher. Problems mainly discussed shortage of jobs as the culprit of unemployment. That is why according to male youngsters from the Narikuravar Colony the problem of lack of job opportunity has a greater weight than the unemployment itself, evolved from this problem. The group of grandmothers stated that even when young people had a good education, they find it difficult to get a good source of income.

3.4.3. Lack of education or training

In the light of unemployment, several PRM participants named the lack of training or education as another cause. Lack of education clustered eight problems resulting in an average rank of 4.80. Of these eight problems, seven were mentioned by five gypsy participant groups with a 6.05 average ranking. Among those groups were youngsters, parents and grandparents. They believed that without the appropriate training, the chance to get a job is minimal and that the shortage of training or educational possibilities is a serious obstacle. PRM discussions with gypsy participants showed that often parents in their community don’t want their children to go to school so they can wed them off at an early age, even if they profoundly desire to go to school. Not only is there a lack of training possibilities, also parents prohibit their children to use educational facilities. One group of fathers revealed a universal trend in general society: education provides a brighter future. They reported to witness a transformation in educated people. Referring to the illiteracy rate they stated: “Education means possibility, no education means no possibility to change one’s life”. Along with lack of education or training, they equalled lack of experience. If people don’t get an education, they lack experience, so the things they do fail, which is demotivating.
3.5. EDUCATIONAL PRESSURE AND OTHER PROBLEMS

FLT data signified that a lot of young people in Pondicherry struggle with educational pressure or problems (n=50, 19,2%). Problems differ between children; some are weak at certain topics “I'm very weak at mathematics”, others have problems with their teachers “The tuition teacher is non-cooperative and put me down whenever I raise doubts. She will ask me to repeat me doubts and asks me to solve the problem myself which I cannot do” and a lot of pressure is put on the students by their parents “But my father insists that I should score high marks to go for higher studies”. Also a lot of children suffer from concentration problems due to several causes: “My father lives with another lady. I'm shocked about my father's character. I lost my concentration in my studies due to this problem”, “my father is an alcoholic. I'm not able to concentrate on my studies even if I go to school” and “Financial crisis arose when we were in a joint family. My father got nothing but debts. My studies got affected due to this” are several quotations fortifying this statement.

PRM sessions showed similar results. Educational problems were mentioned six times with an average rank of 5,86 by five groups consisting of non-gypsy participants and particularly in relation to dropping out of school before finishing their degree. For this, several reasons are provided by the participants: teachers claimed it is because of financial problems in their family, that children will go looking for a job, so they have to leave school. Others female participants from the tutorial school named the fact that parents don’t support the education of their children. The girls in Jalyhome acknowledged both causes and added alcohol abuse of the parents to this list. Boys from the tutorial stated that the educational system of the government is not adapted to the youngsters’ level. Because it’s too high, students will drop out. These allegations are based on the boys’ own experience as they attended tutorial school, a school for dropouts seeking help to get a second chance and complete their public exams after all.

Remarkably the gypsy participants left the theme of educational problems untouched. This can be explained by the fact that the majority of them never set foot in an educational institution and that only in the last years a few of them started to go to school.

3.6. SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Substance abuse also accounted for a large proportion of the answers. In FLT, the theme was divided into substance abuse by the child itself, and substance abuse by its environment. PRM sessions considered both under one cluster. In PRM sessions, items clustered under substance abuse were named nine times with an average rank of 3,86. Seven of those answers came from five non-gypsy groups, ranking it with an average of 3,44, which is slightly higher than the rank 5,32 in two gypsy participant groups. The theme mainly clustered answers about alcohol abuse, but also drug abuse and smoking were divided under this category. Drinking mostly concerned the child’s environment; a lot of traffic accidents and fights or menace on the streets are due to drinking, while smoking referred to the child’s own behaviour that is bad for health.

In FLT, only three responses (1,1% of the cases) involved substance abuse of the child itself in the shape of smoking and drinking, while 38 cases mentioned substance abuse by others (14,6%)
involving only cases of alcohol abuse, mainly by the child’s father and one case of smoking and no cases of drug abuse.
4. DISCUSSION

This chapter sought to formulate an answer to the research questions by letting several aspects of the literature review shed a light on the research results. This research’s aim was to assess the cultural-sensitive indicators of the concepts of stress and stressors. For this purpose, two populations were involved: the general population of young people in Pondicherry and participants from a smaller subculture, a gypsy community from a rural area, reporting on the general questions about youth’s experienced daily stressors.

As Olah (1995) stated, individuals coming from the same socio-cultural environment are influenced by culture as a universal background, and through the process of socialization into cultural and social mechanisms, they will eventually share common world conceptions. Several authors named the individual’s appraisal or stressor evaluation as a concept interrelated with concepts of stress (Antonovsky, 1979; Cannon, 1914; Folkman, 1997; Johnson & McCutcheon, 1980; Lazarus, 1993; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Lind et al., 2014; Olah, 1995; Selye, 1955) and as depending on former life experiences and emotions, but indirectly also on the above mentioned process of socialization in the culture an individual grew up in (Antonovsky, 1979; Cannon, 1914; Folkman, 1997; Lazarus, 1993; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Lind et al., 2014; Olah, 1995; Selye, 1955).

Since participants in this research shared a common universal background, the Indian heritage, but still were part of divergent socio-cultural groups, it might have been expected that there would be similarities but also several differences in their appraisal of situations. Some might have perceived a situation as threatening or demanding, as a stressor, while people of the other group might not (Cohen & Willis, 1985; Coffey et al., 2012; Lazarus, 1966; Lazarus & Launier, 1978; Payne, 1999; Sells, 1970). Throughout the results, both general as distinct patterns in stressors were found, indication the cultural-sensitiveness of the latter.

The cluster of answers on gender based discrimination could be considered as a rather general problem. As the literature review predicted, participants reported discrimination on gender basis as a problem interfering with youths’ daily life, in particular girls’ lives (Lin & Adserà, 2013). Girls often reported to be deprived from freedom and to be restricted in many ways, and even to be subjected to a great amount of danger, physical, verbal and sexual abuse or intimidation. This reaffirms the issues of male preference by parents due to cultural, spiritual or economic reasons and the discrepancy between male and female status expressed by Lin and Adserà (2013). In PRM sessions, an equal division between gypsy and non-gypsy participants mentioning the problems could be observed. Inequality and discrimination based on gender has also been reported as repeated and chronic stressors in other research (American Psychological Association, 2007; Belle & Doucet, 2003; Kessler & Neighbors, 1986; Garcia Coll, et al., 1996; Gustafsson et al., 2009). Other themes revealed by results from FLT and PRM like poverty and financial problems could also be considered as general chronic stressors, as they were labelled as versatile stressful conditions in the extensive literature review (Gustafsson et al., 2009).

Equally important in this respect, the same could have been concluded for social stigmatisation in form of caste discrimination and (child) marriage problems. Caste system has proven to define the
way social climate is organized (Guérin et al., 2013). Both populations recognised problems concerning caste, however, a modest difference could be derived from PRM session. Gypsy participants reported more caste related problems, accounting them a higher severity than non-gypsy participants. This might result from the fact that gypsies are considered as the lowest or even without caste, which has proven to be a risk factor for being victim of discrimination, economic and social exclusion and stigmatized identity (Dhespade, 2011; Navsarjan Trust, 2010; Sharma, 2015; Thorat & Newman, 2010). Even worse, they are also victimized of crimes and atrocities such as rape, harassment, forced evictions etc. (Human Rights Watch, 1999) committed by upper castes (Sharma, 2015). This proves that even though caste discrimination is a generally recognised cause of stress in India, it is infused with a cultural factor. Still, the problem of caste discrimination is a problem that only occurs in India, which inherently makes this problem a cultural specific stressor. The cluster of (child) marriage problems can also be related to this phenomenon as problems under this cluster were mentioned by both groups of participants, but still subtle differences could be noticed. Dowry system for example was only mentioned by gypsies, and though child marriage was named equally by both samples, this problem is known to be more present in lower castes and poorer families (Unicef India, n.d.) and specifically in the Narikuravar Colony. This, and the fact that child marriage only appears in certain cultures, also makes child marriage related problems culturally-sensitive stressors.

Still one needs to be cautious in drawing conclusions on culturally sensitivity from differences between two populations with a partially shared background. It is rather appropriate to consider these differences in stressors as an reaffirmation that stressors should be considered with a sensitivity for (sub) cultural differences in mind and to talk about cultural specificity when discussing differences between subcultures.

In other clusters, this socio-cultural specificity of problems really came forward. Some issues mentioned by FLT participants and non-gypsy participants of PRM sessions, were left nearly untouched by gypsies. This was the case for family disputes, educational pressure and other educational problems, children’s rights and physical abuse. To none of these problems any importance was accounted by the gypsy participants. This might have to do with the way people in this community live. During her extensive work with these people the researcher saw that their lives were organised on the foundation of economic and other hardships concerning poverty. Oftentimes inhabitants had to beg to bring any food on the table. Might this way of living influence the way they look upon problems and make them focus on problems more related to these hardships, leading them to overlook other problems or categorize them as irrelevant or at least with less priority? An extreme example in this case might be found in the fact that gypsy youngsters might not have discussed educational problems principally for the reason that they do not even go to school at all due to their nomadic culture or financial background. Another example of how culture influences one’s appraisal of events as stressful or not is the factor of children’s rights that was completely overlooked by gypsy participants. Furthermore, even though the researcher herself observed the – from a western point of view – rather harsh physical way in which parents communicated with their children, none of the gypsy participants mentioned physical abuse as a stressor. As Nachreiner (1999) recognized subjective measures to likely be culture dependent, concerning the issue of physical abuse, it needs to be said that Indians might have other standards on what is considered as tolerable in the relation between parents and children. This might render an insensitivity to for instance physical encounters and influence youngsters’ reports on domestic violence in comparison to universalized, internationalized and Westernized conceptualization (Coffey et al., 2012; Ungar, 2008).
The same could be said about **substance abuse** in the child's environment, and alcoholism in particular. Alcohol abuse was mentioned far less by gypsy participants. It might be possible that the colony knows an equal amount of alcohol abuse, but that it is just not accounted as stressful for the youths in this community. From a broader view also the Indian mentality on alcohol abuse needs to be scrutinized because the stance and attitude towards substance abuse can be shaped by socio-cultural ideas (Abbott & Chase, 2008). Heath (2001) stressed the fact that culture plays a substantial role in the individual’s formation of expectations about drug use. From personal experience the researcher found that the use of alcohol is frowned upon in Indian society. This might—contrary to the previous example—encourage the participants to report on alcohol abuse in PRM and FLT.

Vice versa, some clusters were much more accentuated by gypsy participants. **Unemployment or shortage of jobs** and **lack of education or training** was reported significantly more by gypsy participants to be a stressor in young people’s lives. This again illustrates how being part of a certain sub-culture, and in this case being part of the lowest class in society influences both the kind of stressor people experience, and the importance they attach to equivalent stressors.
5. CONCLUSION

In respect of the research questions, we can conclude that both populations reported youngsters to experience several stressors as a member of their community, region or family. Some of these stressors might be seen as general patterns, both present in the Narikuravar Colony as well as in the general population of Pondicherry, as possibly even being globally insensitive to cultural fluctuations. Furthermore based on the results, with any prudence it might be said that other difficulties demonstrated a more cultural specificity towards the populations.

Themes that accounted as rather generally present in several cultures were gender based discrimination, poverty and financial problems. Clusters of stressors that illustrated a possible more cultural specific significance were caste based discrimination, family disputes, educational pressure and other problems, children’s rights, substance abuse and child marriage related problems, unemployment or shortage of job and lack of education or training as they seemed of different importance for both groups or did not come up in literature on stressors in other cultures. In this light, the use of “culturally sensitivity” as a term to classify stressors might be too radical. Cultural specificity of stressors could be a more appropriate term.

Although certain themes in this research also came up in earlier research in Westernised context, arguably proving their universality, still the aspect of cultural sensitivity needs to be kept in mind. Based on the fact that stressors still have to be seen in the light of their undeniable connection with the person’s appraisal, and this appraisal might be associated with a person’s cultural heritage, the claim of stressors’ generality has to be approached with cautiousness. Further research on the concepts is advised to be able to generalize statements on stressors’ either contextual, cultural specific, either general or global characteristics.
6. Research Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The study should be interpreted with some limitations in mind.

First, participants were recruited on the basis of willingness, so samples could not be called randomised. Future research should try to recruit participants randomly to minimize bias on results and provide a legitimate view on Pondicherry’s population.

Furthermore the PRM gypsy participants knew the researcher from her presence in the Narikuravor Colony as a part of her internship. This could have influenced the participants’ answers and behaviour. Moreover the researcher’s personal knowledge about this population might have influenced her interpretation of the results. On the other hand, the researcher’s affiliation with this reticent group might have been in favour of this research’s execution, as she knew from her own experience how difficult it is to win their trust and to have open conversations. This might indicate the importance of working with local partners and gatekeepers in conducting research with communities that are reluctant to engage with non-indigenous researchers.

Language also formed a limitation in the research: data needed to be translated to English by an interpreter and were subjected to an intermediary interpretation. This might have had an influence on the results.

Another limitation is that by working with the FLT method, a written inquiry, we excluded illiterates from this part of the methodology, thus the people from lower SES. For this, gypsy participants could only be included in PRM sessions.

Because governmental schools are difficult to get access to because of the several governmental requirements and approval needed from higher government officials before being able to do research, only about one fourth of the FLT participants came from a government school. A more equal division between private and government schools would have been a more ideal research sample.

The research might have benefitted from including participants other than secondary students to fill in the questions of the FLT. Because we relied on the ability to read and comprehend the survey, only students in secondary schools were included, younger children were left out. Future research could include a wider age range, using other methods to obtain similar information from younger children. Also the sample might have included a proportion of parents, grandparents, teachers and professionals, just as in PRM sessions.

To be able to make more generalised conclusions for the state of Pondicherry, PRM sessions might have benefitted from including other minority groups like other gypsy communities or participants from tribal castes. In future research it also might be considered to include participants from other castes, especially higher castes as this research lacks on participants of the latter. In that way an even more wide-ranging view can be created of divergences in the problems young people experience as stressors and the cultural sensitivity of some stressors can be further explored.
7. RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY AND PRACTICE

This study increases our understanding of the understudied nature of stress among youths in everyday life. The results obtained in this study might signify the identification of both general as cultural sensitive stressors. This indicates target areas for improvement and represents an important step towards developing preventive interventions for youngsters in Pondicherry, India. The opportunities for young people to experience a healthy development may vary considerably, resulting in segregation. Knowledge about how adversities differently impact young people from different communities can aid in the understanding of how preventive interventions should be divided over populations and minority groups.

The identification of culturally sensitive indicators is the foundation for the identification of young people in need for particular intervention and the development of preventive strategies adjusted to the cultural background of the youngsters and their specific problems. Caste-system for example, differently affects some populations in negative ways, especially people from lowest caste, as the inhabitants of the Narikuravar Colony participating in this research. The fact that they did or did not mention specific problems other participants did, for example the educational and unemployment and other related themes, signifies the neglect of the government for this specific group.

Minority groups would benefit from changes, not only from a governmental angle on the individual level, but also from a societal angle. Not only opportunities need to be provided to cater for the difficulties young people experience, the difficulties themselves need to be approached. This research indicated that a lot of the problems originated from a structural sense of inequality in Indian people’s mindsets. Effort needs to be put in paving the way towards societal and cultural change and towards closing or at least partially bridging the societal gap. Altering people’s attitude would seem like an interminable process of great cost and endeavour, but still worth its while. Both awareness campaigns as well as particular interventions should be established. By redistributing resources and focussing interventions on general themes resulting from this research, as well as accounting specific significance to the minority groups’ problems, positive evolutions in populations might arise. Youngsters from both groups might get the chance to grow up in less stressful situations but also with more similar life opportunities in their own socio-economic culture, enhancing their development and eventually narrow the social gaps between them.
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8. APPENDICES

8.1. Free Listing Task: Blanc FLT Data collection form

8.2. Participatory Ranking Method: Blanc PRM Data collection form
8.1. FREE LISTING TASK: BLANC FLT DATA COLLECTION FORM

Age: ...........(Fill in)

MARK THE SECTION THAT APPLIES FOR YOU AND FILL IN IF NECESSARY.

Sex
○ Girl   ○ Boy

Where do you live?
○ City   ○ Suburbs   ○ Village   ○ Countryside

Religion
○ Catholic   ○ Muslim   ○ Protestant   ○ Hindu
○ Others.............................................................................(Fill in)

In which caste are you? ...........................................................................................................(Fill in)

With whom do you live? (Fill in only one of the answers)
○ My parents   ○ Mother   ○ Father
○ Others ...........................................................................................................................(Fill in)

Which school are you studying?
○ Private   ○ Government

Does your father have a job?
○ Yes   ○ No
If yes, what is his job?...........................................................................................................(Fill in)

Does your mother have a job?
○ Yes   ○ No
If yes, what is her job?...........................................................................................................(Fill in)

What is the biggest source of income in your family? Even if you don't live with your parents, please fill in this question.
............................................................................................................................................
............................................................................................................................................
FILL IN (You may give several answers, but give at least one. Give the most essentials and be accurate in your answers):

- Which are the difficulties/troubles that you experience as a member of your community/region/family/...?

- Which problems may you develop because of those difficulties/troubles? When you have difficulties/troubles, how do you notice it in your thoughts, feelings and behaviour?

- How did you succeed in overcome/cope with those difficulties/troubles? Which behaviour did you show, what did you do? What did you feel? And what did you think about?

Thank you for your time!
8.2. **PARTICIPATORY RANKING METHOD: BLANC PRM DATA COLLECTION FORM**

Location:

Date:

**Group details:** *(make a list of this information for all participants)*
- Gender:
- Ages:
- Living area: ...... urban; ...... peri-urban; ...... rural
- Role: youths/parents/teachers/professionals
- Number of participants in group:

1. **Stressors**

- **Framing question:** "Which are the difficulties/troubles that young people experience as a member of your community/region/family/...?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issues Identified:</th>
<th>Free list: Rank Order:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11..........................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of the process / quotes of the participants:**
2. Indicators op psychosocial problems

Framing question: "Which problems may young people develop because of those difficulties/troubles? When you have difficulties/troubles, how do you notice it in your thoughts, feelings and behavior?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issues Identified:</th>
<th>Free list: Rank Order:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.........................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of the process / quotes of the participants:

3. Indicators of resilience

Framing question: "How do young people succeed in overcome/cope with those difficulties/troubles? Which behavior do they show, what do they do? What do they feel? And what do they think about?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Issues Identified:</th>
<th>Free list: Rank Order:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9..........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.........................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of the process / quotes of the participants: