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ABSTRACT: The purpose of the study was to explore the level of resilience and life satisfaction among nomadic. The sample consisted of 100 nomadic (50 males nomadic, 50 females nomadic) belonged to the different profession, age; marital status were taken from Multan and Bahwalnagar. The resilience scale and the life satisfaction scale was used to measure the level of resilience and life satisfaction respectively. Statistical analysis indicated that the resilience and life satisfaction was positively correlated. The results indicated that there was significant difference among males nomadic have higher level of life satisfaction as compared to females nomadic, but there was no significant difference that females nomadic have higher level of resilience as compared to males nomadic. Further findings indicated that there were no significant differences that working nomadic have higher level of resilience and life satisfaction as compared to nonworking nomadic. Another finding indicated that there were no significant differences married nomadic have higher level of resilience and life satisfaction among unmarried nomadic.
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1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 RESILIENCE

“Resilience simply stated, is positive adaptation in response to adversity” (Waller, 2001). Resilience in psychology refers to the idea of an individual’s ability to cope with stress and adversity. This coping may result in the individual “bouncing back” to a previous state of normal functioning, or experience the exposure of adversity to produce a “steeling effect” and function better than expected. Resilience can indicate a capacity to resist a sharp decline in functioning even though a person temporarily appears to get worse (Masten, 2009).

Resilience is basically a two-dimensional construct which is concerning the exposure of adversity and the positive adjustment outcomes of that adversity. It is different from strengths or developmental assets which are a characteristic of an entire population, regardless of the level of adversity they face. Under adversity, assets function differently like a good school, or parental monitoring, have a more influence in the life from a poorly resourced background than one from a wealthy home with other options for support, recreation, and self-esteem (Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000).
These two-dimensional construct can described the two judgments: one about a "positive adaptation" which is considered behavioral or social competence or success at meeting any particular tasks at a specific life stage, and the other about the significance of risk adversity which can be define it as any risks associated with negative life conditions that are related to adjustment difficulties, such as poverty, children of mothers with schizophrenic, or experiences of disasters. Resilience is as a process and not a trait of an individual (Masten & Obradovic, 2006).

1.2 Concepts and Terminology of Resiliencies

Resilience is a term derived from the physics of materials that has been applied in ecology, developmental psychology and psychiatry. In materials science, resilience refers to the ability of something to return to its original form after having been bent or compresses (Laurence & Kirmayer, 2009). In organism biology, resilience refers to the capacity of the individual organism to respond to physiological challenges by restore maintaining bodily mechanisms. For ordinary fluctuations or small challenges, the body has mechanisms to restore balance (McEwan, 1998). In psychology Resilience refers to the idea of an individual's tendency to cope with stress and adversity. This coping may result in the individual bouncing back to a previous state of normal functioning, or using the experience of exposure to adversity to produce a steeling effect and function better than expected future exposure to disease (Masten, 2009).

Ecological views of resilience emphasize the ability of natural systems to respond to a stress or challenge by self-correcting processes that restore pre-existing patterns and populations of plants and animals. Ecosystems show resilience through three broad mechanisms: buffering disturbances to reduce their impact, Self-organization to maintain crucial system functions, and learning or adaptation (Abel, Stepp & Trosper, 2003).

According to Smith & Ward (2009) developmental psychologists have adopted a more interactional view, seeing resilience in the interactions of children with their caretakers or peers. Researchers have suggested that these individual centered models because they tend to ignore the larger social and cultural context in which individual development and adaptation takes place. In psychiatry, the concept of resilience emerged from clinical observations and recognized that many children do well despite very difficult childhood experiences (Rutter, 2001).

According to Holling (2001) there are different types of systems which have different structures and processes, but there are some general features of the dynamics of systems that are relevant to understanding resilience. At this abstract level, resilience is “the capacity of a system to absorb disturbance and re-organize while undergoing change so as to still retain essentially the same function, structure, identity and feedbacks” (Waller, Okamoto, Hankerson & McIntyre, 2002).

Resilience reflects the ability of individuals to maintain stable mental function even though they experience risk factors. These Risk factors are related to poor or negative outcomes. For example, poverty, low socioeconomic status, and mothers with schizophrenia are coupled with lower academic achievement and more emotional or behavioral problems. These positive outcomes are attributed to some protective factors, such as good parenting or positive school experiences (Masten, Best & Garmezy, 1990).

1.3 Community Resilience

According to Allen (1999) communities foster individual resilience. Community resilience’ has two interpretations. Firstly, it may look at how people overcome stress, trauma and other life challenges by drawing from social networks and cultural resources embedded in communities. Secondly, it may consider the ways in which communities themselves exhibit resilience, responding to stresses and challenges in ways that tend to restore their functioning.

Resilience of the community itself involves the dynamics of the social response to challenges that threaten to damage or destroy the community. These dynamics may involve adaptations and adjustments of individuals, groups and organizations with the community as well as interactions of the whole community with its surrounding environment, including especially other social, economic and political entities (Masten, 2001).

Resilience has been described in terms of an outcome, such as a child rose in poverty that despite the odds stays in school and experiences academic achievement. There are different types of resilience both in terms of pathways and outcomes, individuals may apply specific abilities to achieve different desired outcomes (Benard, 2007).

1.4 Patterns or Strategies of Individual Resilience

The studied on resilience described four patterns or strategies of individual resilience: Firstly, The dispositional pattern is characterized by features of self-worth, sense of mastery and self-efficacy, as well as constitutional features such as
intelligence, health, appearance, and temperament. Secondly, the relational pattern reflects the person’s ability to seek comfort, support or inspiration from others (Polk, 1997).

Thirdly, the situational pattern involves approaching circumstances using appropriate cognitive skills and problem solving abilities. Finally, the philosophical pattern emphasizes the role of personal beliefs, the construction of meaning and self-knowledge in enhancing life experience. Resilience is the result of individuals being able to interact with their environments and the processes that either promote well-being or protect them against the overwhelming influence of risk factors (Zautra, Hall & Murray, 2010).

1.5 Steps for building resilience

There are some steps or strategies which build resilience in individual and showing that resilience can be built and learned, it’s not just an innate ability. These seven steps for building resilience include:

Learning the ABCs: To recognize the impact of your ‘in the moment’ thoughts and beliefs on behavioral and emotional consequences of adversity. Thinking traps recognizing the errors in thinking we are often unaware of; for example, jumping to conclusions. Detecting icebergs building an awareness of the deep-seated beliefs we have of how the world works and how this can impact upon our emotions and behavior (Ungar, 2008).

Challenging beliefs: It is a process by which the breadth and thus accuracy of our understanding of events can be enhanced, leading to more effective and sustained problem-solving behaviors. Putting it in perspective learning to stop the spiraling of catastrophic thinking and turn it into realistic thinking. Real-time resilience putting it all into practice in the moment; this skill is reliant on mastering the others and offers a ‘fast skill’ which does not rely on having the time to think through a resilience reaction in depth (Jackson & Watkin, 2004).

Calming and focusing: Finding ways to step back from adversity create breathing space and think more resiliently. Resilience is not a simple linear causal process in which limited to the strength that leads directly to a good developmental outcome; instead, resilience involves interactions among multiple processes or strategies giving rise to alternate constant input to maintain, or they may be self-sustaining of the development. Resilience often involves tradeoffs, in which something is gained and something lost. Resilience has models which recognize the risk and protective factors that is linked and interact to creating a situations of greater risk or greater protection (Waller, 2001).

1.6 Key dimensions of Resilience

Resilience is not static, but rather a dynamic outcome resulting from the interaction of risk and protective factors that reside both within and outside the individual. Resilient individuals should not be identified as “stress-resistant” and superhuman in their ability to handle stress. Resilience does not convey a form of invulnerability to the individual. Resilient individuals who are able to function competently remain vulnerable to negative outcomes if their situation changes (Cicchetti & Garmezy, 1993).

A circumstances within and outside the individual change so does their corresponding potential for resilience. There are multiple domains to the construct of resilience, such as social, academic/work, and relational these domains of resilience are connected to an individual’s developmental level and change as one grows and transitions through various developmental life stages. Resilient functioning in one domain does not guarantee resilient functioning in another domain. Inconsistency across domains suggests that resilience is not an all-or-none phenomenon (Tusaie & Dyer, 2004).

1.7 Model of resilience

Richardson and Waite (2002) propose a resiliency model that describes how individuals can be resilient in facing adversity. According to the resiliency model, when an individual experiences adversity, they may experience little to severe disruption in his/her life. Four possible outcomes can occur when the individual reintegrates the disruption. First, the individual might reintegrate back to the homeostasis, the comfort zone. That is, the individual returns to the same levels of functioning as before experiencing the event, they did not gain any skills, knowledge, strengths, or competence from the experience.

Second, the individual might reintegrate the disruption with resiliency. The individual has gained some skills, knowledge, strengths, or competence from the process of coping with the event that, in turn, increases the individual’s abilities to cope with life adversity in the future. Third, the individual may reintegrate with loss. They reintegrate to a lower level of functioning than before experiencing the event. They have fewer protective skills or traits after experiencing the event and
experience a loss of self-esteem or withdraw from social relationship. Fourth, the individual may reintegrate with dysfunctional strategies such as becoming alcoholic, committing suicide (Ungar, 2008).

1.8  Life Satisfaction

Satisfaction is a Latin word that means to make or do enough. Satisfaction with one’s life implies contentment with or acceptances or the fulfillment of one’s wants and needs for one’s life as a whole. In essence, life satisfaction is a subjective assessment of the quality of one’s life, because it is inherently an evaluation judgment of life satisfaction. Life satisfaction has a large cognitive component (Sousa & Lyubomirsky, 2001).

Accordingly to the individual’s overall life satisfaction reports are based upon personal comparisons between self determined criteria and perceived life circumstances. Similarly, life satisfaction refers to a person’s subjective evaluation of the degree to which his/her most important needs, goals and wishes have been fulfilled (Frisch, 1998).

1.9 Life Satisfaction and Related Concepts

Life satisfaction is used with a number of related concepts. Life satisfaction has been defined as a cognitive evaluation of the quality of a person’s overall life or with specific aspect of life such as family, friends and community (Pavot, Diener, Colvin & Sandvik, 1991). It probably serves as the umbrella under which other terms are covered.

Quality of life: The concept of quality of life is frequently used to describe “the good life” within several disciplines such as economy, sociology, psychology, medicine, and health-care. The contents and specific measures of quality of life vary both between and within disciplines (Bishop, Frain & Tschopp, 2008). Quality of life as an individuals perceptions of their position in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards, and concerns (Frain, Berven, Chan & Tschopp, 2008).

Well-being It is sometimes referred as "subjective well-being and social psychological well-being (George, 2000).

1.10 Distinction from Created Constructs

Life satisfaction vs. subjective well being: According to Deiner and his colleague (2002), subjective well being or happiness has both an affective (i.e. emotional) and a cognitive (i.e. judgment) component. The effective component consists of low frequently an individual reports experiencing positive and negative affect. Life satisfaction is considered to be the cognitive component of this broader construct.

Life satisfaction vs. life domain: Researcher differentiate between life domain satisfaction with specific areas of an individual’s life such as work, marriage, and income, where judgments of global. Life satisfaction is much broader consisting of an individual’s comprehensive judgment of her life (Sousa & Lyubomirsky, 2001).

Personal strength for life satisfaction: Now you are aware of your unique strength, he question is how to take advantage of them, to bring you happier, more fulfilling life. Your goal is here to unique talents and strength to your advantage by using them each and every day. This may take some thing creativity, but its your advantage to focus on your strength (Sosusa & Lyubomirsky, 2001).

1.11 Elements of Life Satisfaction

The vast majority of researches on life satisfaction investigate the extent to which various elements which is the predictor of life satisfaction. However, the researcher are not able to perform he true experiments by randomly assigning participant to demographic group (e: g gender, income, age) all of this research has been correlation much of the work has focused on the objective determines of life satisfaction (Kahneman, Deiner & schwarz, 1999).

Culture: Before describing the research on the cultural influence, we must revisit the question of whether life satisfaction can be measured across the cultures. Fortunately, satisfaction appears to be a universal terms, and cross cultural researches have not had any defaulting translating measure of life satisfaction into any different language. People from different cultural are able to distinguish b/w such term as ‘happiness”, “satisfaction with life”, “best possible life”, and “worst possible life” and there does to be the linguistics bias (Kahneman, Deiner & schwarz, 1999).

Employment: An individual’s employment status regardless of income’, appears to predict life satisfaction, such that the employed report significant diminished satisfaction compared with employed when gender is taken into account, it appears
that employment is more strongly associated with life satisfaction than women. This finding is not surprising, given that there is less cultural pressure on women to work outside the home (Deiner & Biswas, 2002).

**Education**: Overall, researcher has found small correlation b/w education and life satisfaction. However, the correlation appears to disappears when income and occupation are satisfactorily controlled. That is the relationship b/w education and life satisfaction is probably due to the fact that higher level of education is associated with higher incomes. Education also appears to be more highly related satisfaction for individual's with lower incomes and in poor nations. Perhaps poorer persons obtained greater satisfaction from education because the achievement surpasses there expectation of what is attainable influence life satisfaction (Carson, 1978).

**Age**: Life satisfaction generally remained stable throughout the life span, showing just a slight increasing trend between the ages of 20 and 80 years. Accommodative coping does tend to increase with age. Alternatively, as women age, they may achieve goals with greater frequency (i.e family, career success, and financial comfort) moving closer to there ideal self. Life satisfaction levels across the life span are that people have an extraordinary capacity to adapt to significant life changes (Deiner & Biswas, 2002).

**Social relationship**: Human relationship doubles our joys and has our sorrows. Many studies have suppers this contention. High level of social support have been shown to be strongly associated with high level of in western nations, marriage appears to be even more predictive of life satisfaction than relationship with friends and family In addition to the number of social contacts, it appears that gender is a factor in the quality of intimate relationships as well. Women tend to provide greater and more meaningful support than men. That is, both women and men report that their friendships with women are more intimate, nurturing, and supportive than their friendships with men (Pinquart & Sørensen, 2000).

According to Veenhoven, (1996) life-satisfaction can be fairly well measured, they consider how satisfied people are with life and to determine the extent to which their judgments may differ. They are described the four pattern of life satisfaction.

### 1.12 Theories of satisfaction

Life satisfaction is prompted by the hope of finding ways to create greater happiness for a greater number for this purpose the researches may confirm theories of satisfaction which imply that the improvement in living conditions does not reduce discontent.

**Life satisfaction is relative**: According to Veenhoven (1995b) this theory evaluate life assumes that satisfaction is the result of a comparison between life-as-it-is to conceptions of how-life-should-be. Standards of how-life-should-be are seen to draw on perceptions of what is feasible and on comparison with others. These standards of comparison are thought to vary. These imply that it is not possible to create lasting satisfaction; neither at the individual level, nor the societal level.

At the individual level, this theory predicts that satisfaction is a short lived phenomenon. People would be satisfied when life comes close to ideal, but as people come closer to the ideal they would tend to set higher demands and hence end up as dissatisfied as before. At the societal level, this theory implies that average satisfaction tends to neutral as well (Heady, & Veenhoven, 1989).

If satisfaction and dissatisfaction balance out in the lives of individual citizens, the average in the country cannot be far from zero. The empirical evidence for the theory that life-satisfaction is relative. One implication of this theory is that changes in living conditions, from good to bad, or vice versa, will have no lasting consequences for life-satisfaction (Veenhoven, 1994b).

**Life satisfaction is a trait**: This theory suggests that the hope of creating greater happiness for the greater number is futile, holds that satisfaction is a fixed disposition. This theory figures at the individual level as well as the societal level. The individual level variant sees satisfaction as a personal trait, a general tendency to like or dislike things. This tendency can stem from an inborn temperament as well as early experience. This trait is believed to shape the perception of life-experiences (as well as the overall evaluation of life. Improvement of living conditions will not result in greater satisfaction with life (Veenhoven, 1995).

Life satisfaction does not appear to be a stable trait. The results can be summarized as follows: Firstly, life-satisfaction does not remain the same over a period of time; particularly not over the length of a lifetime. Secondly, life-satisfaction is not insensitive to change in living conditions. Thirdly, satisfaction is not entirely an internal matter. It is true that evaluations of life are influenced by personal characteristics and collective orientations. The societal variant of this theory assumes that tendency to like or dislike life is part of a common national-character. Some cultures would tend to have a gloomy outlook on life, whereas others are optimistic (Veenhoven, 1994).
1.13 NOMADIC

The word “nomad” is etymologically identical with “pastoralism”, and derives from a Greek term nomas meaning “to pasture” (wandering shepherd). “Pastoralism”, in turn derives from the Latinic term pastor and refers to raising livestock.

Semi-nomads: Those who raise herds and have one or more permanent dwellings and often engage in small-scale agriculture. Nomadic people are communities of who move from one place to another, rather than settling permanently in one location. Many cultures have traditionally been nomadic, but nomadic behavior is increasingly rare in industrialized countries. Nomadic cultures are having three categories: hunter-gatherers, pastoral nomads, and peripatetic nomads (Sutherland, 1986).

Hunter-gatherers: Nomadic hunting and gathering, also known as foragers moved from campsite to campsite, following game and wild fruits and vegetables. Hunting and gathering was the ancestral subsistence mode of Homo, and all modern humans were hunter-gatherers until around 10,000 years ago. The invention of agriculture, hunter-gatherers was displaced by farming or pastoralist groups in most parts of the world. Only a few contemporary societies are classified as hunter-gatherers, and many supplement, sometimes extensively, their foraging activity with farming and/or keeping animals Mostly they are present in Africa, Americas, Asia, Australia, Europe, India (Ender & Morton, 2002).

Pastoral nomads: They are nomads moving between pastures. Nomadic pastoralism is thought to have developed in three stages that accompanied population growth and an increase in the complexity of social organization. Nomadic pastoralism seems to have developed as a part of the secondary products revolution, also began using animals for their secondary products, for example, milk and its associated dairy products, wool and other animal hair, hides and consequently leather, manure for fuel and fertilizer, and traction. Pastoralism is a mixed economy with a symbiosis within the family. Agropastoralism is when symbiosis is between segments or clans within an ethnic group. True Nomadic is when symbiosis is at the regional level, generally between specialized nomadic and agricultural populations (Vigo, Julian, 2005).

Patterns of Pastoralist: Societies most often have matrilineal descent patterns and are male dominated. Men usually make the important decisions and own the animals, while women primarily care for children and perform domestic chores. Compared to pedestrian foraging societies, the economic and political power of most pastoralist women is very low. However, the division of labor is based primarily on gender and age in both foraging and pastoralist societies (Oberfalzerova, Alena, 2006).

Peripatetic minorities: They are mobile populations moving among settled populations offering a craft or trade. Each existing community is primarily endogamous, and subsists traditionally on a variety of commercial and/or service activities. All or a majority of their members were itinerant, and this largely holds true today. Migration generally takes place within the political boundaries of a single state these days (Kaushik, 2008).

Each of the peripatetic communities is multilingual; it speaks one or more of the languages spoken by the local sedentary populations, and, additionally, within each group, a separate dialect or language is spoken. Peddling and the sale of various goods were also practiced by men and women of various groups, such as the Jalali, the Pikraj, the Shadbaz, the Noristani, and the Vangawala. Many Biblical characters, such as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David and others, lived a nomadic lifestyle. A nomad lived in tents and traveled from location to location in search of water and pastures for their livestock (Vigo, Julian, 2005).

1.14 LIFE STYLE OF NOMADS

The Wilderness The home of the nomad was the wilderness often dry and arid but with an occasional oasis, river, water basin and pastures. The nomad lived in home in the wilderness They also knew the area which he traveled in very well and where all the water sources were, where pastures were located at different times of the year and all the landmarks which directed they travels (Rao & Casimir, 2003).

Possessions The nomad lived a very simple life and because of their constant travels they could not carry a great amount of supplies and equipment. His major possession is the tent made of goat hair, the poles, stakes and ropes for supporting the tent, a curtain to divide the tent into two parts (male and female sides) and a carpet for the floor. The nomad’s wealth was measured by the size of his flocks and herds which supplied him with most of his needs including milk, meat, skin, hair for tents, horns for trumpets and liquid containers and many other odds and ends (Schaetti, 2000).

Family: A nomadic camp consisted of about 25 to 50 members. Any less and it would be difficult to protect the family and any more would be difficult to feed. Usually the oldest member of the family was the head, or chief, of the clan. The
removal of the rest of the clan would consist of brothers, sons, nephews and grandsons as well as their wives. Each clan was an independent entity with the chief as judge and ruler (Rao & Casimir, 2003).

**Social Activities:** The men would often gather together, usually at meal times, to discuss past events, needs, locations and other details of operating the camp. The women gathered together to prepare foods, make clothing and make tent repairs. Story telling was probably one of the most important forms of entertainment. The older members of the clan would tell the stories of their history to the children in order to pass on the experiences of the tribe and clans to the next generation. One of the major responsibilities of the clan is to provide hospitality to anyone who comes to them. This may be a member of a related clan or even an enemy of another tribe. In both cases it was the responsibility of the clan to provide food, shelter and protection as long as they were within their camp (McLachlan, 2005).

**Religion:** The religion of the nomads is very different from the understanding of religion. The whole of the nomad’s life was his religion. They very existence was dependent upon rain he understood that his life was in God's hands at all times. The nomad saw the power, justice, love and mercy of God in all things and covertly all of his activities, from eating to making shelter, were seen as a service to God. The nomad lived in harmony with his surroundings and understood as being one with God who created all things. In short, his life was one long prayer to God (Hall, 1996).

Resilience is the capacity to withstand stress, and happiness is an emotional state reflecting positive feelings. A number of studies have examined the relationship between positive emotions and resilience. Multiple methodologies e.g., self-report, observation and longitudinal studies demonstrate that resilient individuals are characterized by positive emotionality. They have an energetic approach to life, and are curious and open to new experiences (Masten, 2001). Studied showed that resilient individuals use positive emotions to achieve effective outcomes such as humor, creative exploration, relaxation and optimistic thinking (Anthony, 1987).

The relationship between life satisfaction and the 24 character strengths appears to be consistent across the general population and college students. Park, Peterson, and Seligman (2006) examined the relationship between life satisfaction and the 24 character strengths with on-line participants. They found that Hope, Zest, Gratitude, Curiosity, and Love were most strongly related to life satisfaction. However, the relationships between life satisfaction and Humility/Modesty, Appreciation of Beauty and Excellence, Creativity, Open-Mindedness, Love of Learning, and Prudence were weak.

Ratnagar (2004) studied on nomads and writes that even rural economies cannot be reduced to agricultural production; “The livestock input, extent of nomadic or agro pastoralist, or specialized pasturals takes on a special relevance in times of drought or famine. Pastoralist production can also impinge on urban economies when it comes to markets and trading for meat, leather products or wool. According to Rao (2006), South Asia has the world’s largest nomadic population. Nowhere else is there such a variety of creatures systematically herded nor is the diversity of peripatetic professions to be matched. The relation between pastoralists with settled groups have a significant impact on trade, for political processes, as well as for detrabilization.

1.15 **RATIONALE AND OBJECTIVES OF STUDY**

Through the resilience and life satisfaction in this study identify the coping strategies and satisfaction with life among nomadic. Resilience has impact on life satisfaction. Recently few studies have done on the resilience and life satisfaction. Life satisfaction is positively related to many personal characteristics and protective factors for resiliency. It is reasonable to assume that people who adapt well to changes/demands in the environment, experience less negative emotions in the face of adversities, and possess characteristics related to both resiliency and life satisfaction are more likely to be content or satisfied with their overall life. Both resilience and life satisfaction are positively related with the extrovert personality. Resiliency significantly predicted life satisfaction; people who have a higher level of resilience will gain benefits in many life domains from their positive state of mind, including larger social rewards, superior work outcomes and more activity, energy, satisfaction with their life (Gardiner, 2006). Life satisfaction was positively related to hope, self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control, and seeking social support. Hope, self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control, and seeking social support are protective factors for resiliency. Therefore, the present study hypothesizes that there is a relationship between life satisfaction and resiliency (Bailey & Snyder, 2007). The purpose of the study is to access the level of resilience and life satisfaction among nomadic.
Main objectives of the study are as under:
1. To check the relationship of resilience and life satisfaction among nomadic.
2. To assess the level of resilience among nomadic.
3. To investigate the level of life satisfaction among nomadic.
4. To study the effect of different variable (gender, marital status, profession) on main scales (resilience & life satisfaction).

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Garmezy (1973) was the first person who published the first research findings on resilience. In his research he used epidemiology which is the study of who gets ill, who doesn’t, and why, to uncover the risks and the protective factors which is now help to define resilience. Garmezy & Streitman (1974) then created tools to look at systems that support development of resilience. Werner (1971) was one of the early scientists to use the term resilience in the 1970s. She studied a cohort of children from Kauai. Kauai was quite poor and many of the children in the study grew up with alcoholic or mentally ill parents, she noted that the children who grew up in very bad situations, two-thirds exhibited destructive behaviors in their later teen years, such as chronic unemployment, substance abuse.

Resilient children and their families had traits that made them different from non-resilient children and families. Resilience emerged as a major theoretical and research topic from the studies of children of schizophrenic mothers in the 1980s. The results showed that children with a schizophrenic parent may not obtain comforting care giving compared to children with healthy parents, and such situations had an impact on children’s development. Some children of ill parents perform well (Werner, 1982). Resilience refers to a class of phenomena characterized by good outcomes in spite of serious threats to adaptation or development. Resilience has been characterized as the ability to bounce back and cope effectively in the face of difficulties, to bend, but not break under extreme stress, and to maintain equilibrium following highly aversive events. Resilience describes that people who are expected to adapt successfully even though they experience risk factors that ‘stack the odds’ against them experiencing good development (Masten & Reed, 2002).

Resilience is a multidimensional concept. The concept of resilience is different from recovery. Resilience denotes the ability to maintain competent functioning in the face of adversity whereas recovery suggests a return to normal functioning after a period of disruption. It is believed that there is no single means of maintaining competent functioning in the face of adversity but rather multiple pathways to resilience has been defined in a number of ways (Bonanno, 2004).

Research on the relationship between life satisfaction and resiliency is consistent. Fredrickson, et al. (2003) found that resiliency was correlated to life satisfaction. Life satisfaction also was significantly related to resiliency. Resilient students’ levels of life satisfaction were significantly higher than those of low-resilient students. King (2000) concluded that not only was resiliency positively related to life satisfaction among individuals experiencing divorce, but also resiliency significantly predicted life satisfaction.

According to Luthar & Cicchetti (2000) describe resilience as “a construct connoting the maintenance of positive adaptation by individuals despite experience of significant adversity.” Resilience is described as the capacity for successful adaptation, positive functioning or competence despite high-risk status, chronic stress, or severe trauma (Egeland, Carlson, & Stroufe, 1993).

Life-satisfaction is the degree to which a person positively evaluates the overall quality of life as-a-whole. In other words, how much the person likes the life that they lead? Life-satisfaction is one of the indicators of ‘apparent’ quality of life. Together with indicators of mental and physical health, it indicates how well people thrive. High satisfaction suggests that the quality of life, in the population concerned, is good. Low satisfaction marks serious shortcomings with life means that something is wrong (Veenhoven, 1984).

The line of research is rooted in 18th century Enlightenment thinking. From this perspective, the purpose of existence is life itself, rather than the service of King or God. Self-actualization and happiness become central values. Society itself is seen as a means for providing citizens with the necessities for a good life. In the 19th century, this conviction manifested itself in the Utilitarian Creed that the best society is one which provides ‘the greatest happiness for the greatest number’ (Saris, Veenhoven & Scherpenzeel, 1996).

The first survey studies which used measures of life-satisfaction were performed in the USA in the 1960’s. The emphasis at that time was on mental health. The results from some of this research appeared in books by Gurin (1960) and Bradburn (1969). In the 1970’s, life-satisfaction was a central theme in several American Social Indicator studies. Landmark books were published by on life-satisfaction (Campbell, Converse & Rodgers, 1976).
In the 1980's the first large-scale longitudinal survey on life-satisfaction was performed in Australia by Heady and Ruut Veenhoven. Recently a bibliography has appeared, which includes 2475 contemporary studies on subjective appreciation of life. This bibliography is part of the 'World Database of Happiness,' which also involves the ongoing cataloguing of new data on life-satisfaction and its correlates (Veenhoven, 1993).

Life satisfaction is a personal judgment about how satisfied an individual is with his/her current life compared to his/her own standard, a standard not imposed by any external sources (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin 1985). Life satisfaction appears related to positive characteristics. Cafasso (1998) found that there was no relationship between resiliency and life satisfaction. That is, resilient individuals' levels of life satisfaction did not differ significantly from non-resilient individuals.

Bailey & Snyder (2007) studied on life satisfaction and finding indicated that life satisfaction was positively related to hope, self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control, and seeking social support. Hope, self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control, and seeking social support are protective factors for resiliency. Therefore, the present study hypothesizes that there is a relationship between life satisfaction and resiliency.

Usually nomads do not rely on agriculture, with some exceptions. In Sudan, all nomads depend on domesticated animals of various species, as dictated by ecological conditions. Some nomads engage in small-scale agriculture at fixed points or along their migration routes. However, their main income is derived from their animals. Among some tribes, some nomadic groups have a permanent dwelling, for temporary and occasional use (Ender & Morton, 2002).

Nomads cooking supplies and equipment consisted of bags made of skins for carrying food reserves such as grains and dried fruits, a few utensils such as spoons, knives and bowls and a grinding mill for making flour out of grains. He also carried some harvesting supplies such as sickles and mattocks to gather crops when available. For defense he also carried weapons such as the bow and arrow, spears and knives. Many of his weapons were used for other purposes such as butchering knives, mattocks and the tent poles which were sharp at one end for spears (Mclachlan, 2005).

The nomad term varies from country to country. It was the groups of people who for one reason or another had to move in pursuit of their livelihood, and did not have a fixed dwelling. Being nomadic does not imply wandering aimlessly. They are experts at maximizing the use of rangelands, a capability demonstrated by numerous research studies (Galaty & Johnson, 1990).

The reach of nomadic pastoralist is immense. While nomadic is perhaps most widespread today in far-flung, remote and unpopulated regions, it is also found in more crowded and developed regions. Some nomadic populations occupy remote regions, environmentally marginal and distant from centers of civilization and power, but other nomadic pastoral populations like the Bakkarwals, Gaddis and Gujjars migrate through regions of agricultural settlements and pass, and even stop at, major cities and towns (Galaty and Johnson, 1990).

Rao and Casimir (2003) write that in times when settlements were few, roads limited, and communication over long distances rare, nomads were seen to be the carriers of news, goods and resources from other societies. Nomadic itself emerges from an environmental and cultural context and may or may not be exclusively practiced.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 PARTICIPANTS

The sample consisted of 100 nomadic (50 nomadic female and 50 nomadic males). Nomadic males and females were taken from the different areas of Multan. Participants were taken through the purpose sampling. They were belonged to different age, gender and socioeconomic status.

3.2 INSTRUMENTS

The following scales were used to accomplish the objectives of the study:

3.3 THE RESILIENCE SCALE

The Resilience Scale (RS) was used to measure the level of resilience of the participants (Wagnild & Young, 1993). The Resilience scale used to measure five characteristics which included: equanimity, self-reliance, perseverance, meaningfulness of life, and existential aloneness between nomadic males and females. Which is based on the 7 point Likert Scale indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements. It comprised on 25 items with 7 preferences or option.
Strongly Disagree, Disagree, slightly disagree, Strongly Agree, agree, slightly agree, neutral). The high levels of resilience scores are considered 147-175.

3.4 **The Satisfaction with Life Scale**

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) is a measure of life satisfaction developed by (Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1985). Life satisfaction is distinguished from affective appraisal in that it is more cognitively than emotionally driven. Life satisfaction can be assessed specific to a particular domain of life (e.g., work, family) or globally. The SWLS is a global measure of life satisfaction. It is based on the 5 point scales. The 5 point scales assesses the degree of agreement or disagreement of the individual. It is comprised on the 5 items. The score range from 31 – 35 high score which denote the extremely satisfied, 5 - 9 score range is low score denote the extremely dissatisfied.

3.5 **Operational Definition**

*The resilience:* The term resilience operationally defines as the mean score of the respondents on the resilience scale. High score indicated the higher level of resilience.

*Life Satisfaction:* The term life satisfaction operationally defines as the mean score of the respondents on life satisfaction scale. High score indicated the higher level of life satisfaction.

3.6 **Procedure**

The booklet including consent from with demographic variable sheet was given to the nomadic males and nomadic females. Nomadic males and females where taken from different areas of Multan and Bahwalnager. There were no specific place where nomadic lived. Therefore, it was difficult to approach nomadic people. The language of nomadic people have changed in different place because of the variation in their languages it was difficult to fill the questionnaires. They were given the brief introduction of the purpose of the study and were assured that information would be kept confidential and will only be used for statistical enumeration. Necessary explanation was provided to the respondents to make the questionnaire easy and understandable. Statistical analysis was done by using SPSS. Descriptive and inferential statistics was computed for this data obtained from the participant.

4 **Hypothesis**

1. Resilience is positively correlated with life satisfaction.
2. Females nomadic have higher level of resilience as compared to males nomadic.
3. Females nomadic have lower level of life satisfaction as compared to males nomadic.
4. Married nomadic have higher level of resilience as compared to unmarried nomadic.
5. Unmarried nomadic have higher level of life satisfaction as compared to married nomadic.
6. Working nomadic have higher level of resilience as compared to non working nomadic.
7. Nonworking nomadic have higher level of life satisfaction as compared to working nomadic.

5 **Results and Discussion**

5.1 **Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Correlation coefficients for scores of resilience and life satisfaction among nomadic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: p*>0.05

Result depicted in the table 1 is to be found that there is strong positive correlation between resilience and life satisfaction.
Table 2. Mean, Standard deviation, t and p value on the score of resilience among male and female nomads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>103.2800</td>
<td>24.83664</td>
<td>-.763</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>106.6600</td>
<td>19.07088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=100. df =98, p<0.05

The result of the table 2 shows that there is no significant difference among males and females nomadic (t=-.763, df= 98, p<0.05). The result does not support our hypothesis that females nomadic have higher level of resilience as compared to males nomadic.

Table 3. Mean, Standard deviation, t and p value on the score of life satisfaction among male and female nomads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17.8000</td>
<td>5.93502</td>
<td>-3.140</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21.5200</td>
<td>5.91173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=100. df =98, p<0.05

The result of the table 3 shows that there is significant difference among males and females nomadic (t= -3.140, df= 98, p<0.05). The result does support our hypothesis that females nomadic have lower level of life satisfaction as compared to males nomadic.

Table 4. Mean, Standard deviation, t and p value on the score of resilience between married and unmarried nomads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>103.90</td>
<td>24.11550</td>
<td>-.519</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>106.2174</td>
<td>19.65731</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=100. df =98, p<0.05

The result of the table 4 shows that there is no significant difference among married an unmarried and nomadic (t= -.519, df= 98, p<0.05). The result does not support our hypothesis that married nomadic have a higher level of resilience as compared to unmarried nomadic.

Table 5. Mean, Standard deviation, t and p value on the score of life satisfaction between married and unmarried nomads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18.8889</td>
<td>6.54640</td>
<td>-1.357</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20.5652</td>
<td>5.66334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=100. df =98, p<0.05

The result of the table 5 shows that there is no significant difference among married an unmarried and nomadic (t= -1.357, df= 98, p<0.05). The result does not support our hypothesis that unmarried nomadic have higher level of life satisfaction as compared to married nomadic.

Table 6. Mean, Standard deviation, t and p value on the score of resilience between working and non working nomads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>104.9245</td>
<td>25.25702</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non working</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>104.8605</td>
<td>18.67591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=100. df =98, p<0.05

The result of the table 6 shows that there is no significant difference among working and non working nomadic (t=.014, df= 94, p<0.05). The result does not support our hypothesis that working nomadic has higher level of resilience as compared to non working nomadic.
Table 7. Mean, Standard deviation, t and p value on the score of life satisfaction between working and non working nomads.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.7547</td>
<td>6.17609</td>
<td>-1.359</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non working</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20.4884</td>
<td>6.26164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=100, df=98, p<0.05

The result of the table 7 shows that there is no significant difference non working and working nomadic (t= -1.359, df= 94, p<0.05). The result does not support our hypothesis that non working nomadic has higher level of life satisfaction as compared to working nomadic.

5.2 DISCUSSION

This research was undertaken to investigate the role of resilience and life satisfaction among nomadic. The purpose of the study was to find out the relationship of resilience and life satisfaction and their impact on nomadic. The finding regarding to the effect of different demographic variables including gender, marital status, profession and age have significant effect on the level of the resilience and life satisfaction among nomadic.

The concept of resilience refers to the capacity of individual to cope well under adversity. Resilience is better understand as the opportunity and capacity of individual to navigate their way to psychological, social, cultural and physical resource that may sustain their well being and capacity individually and collectively experience meaning full ways (Unger, 2008). Different researches suggested that resilience and life satisfaction was associated with personality. Life satisfaction refers to the person’s subjective, global evolution of the positively of his/her life as whole or specific life domain (Diner, Suh, Lacus & Simth, 1999).

The 1st hypothesis pertaining to the correlation of resilience and life satisfaction was supported by the findings. In this way there was positive correlation between resilience and life satisfaction. Individual with high level of resilience cope the life adversity well and have a higher level of life satisfaction. Resilience was positively correlated to the life satisfaction. Resilient individual level of life satisfaction was higher than those of resilient individual (Fredrickson, 2002).

The 2nd hypothesis was that females nomadic will be a higher level of resilience as compared to the males nomadic. Findings of the result do not support that females nomadic have higher level of resilience as compared to males nomadic. Norms and cultural was impact on the resilience, but he results of the study do not support the hypothesis cause of rejection of hypothesis can be the cultural differences.

The 3rd hypothesis was that males nomadic will be a higher level of life satisfaction as compared to the females’ nomadic. Findings of the results support that females nomadic have lower level of life satisfaction as compared to males nomadic. Pinquart and Sorsen (2000) found additional support for the assertion that men and women derive satisfaction from different sources. Life satisfaction was more highly related to income for men than for women. The finding of the results was suggested that life satisfaction vary by gender.

The 4th hypothesis was that married nomadic have higher level of resilience as compared to the unmarried nomadic. But the results of the study do not support that married nomadic have higher level of resilience as compared to the unmarried nomadic. Married persons report lower level of resilience than persons who have never been married or have been divorced, separated or widowed. the hypothesis cause of rejection of hypothesis can be the cultural variation.

The 5th hypothesis was that unmarried nomadic will be a higher level of life satisfaction as compared to the married nomadic. Satisfaction with life seems to birelated to marital status. Women who are married or live with partners were more satisfied with life than those who are single, separated, widowed and divorced. Unmarried adults attribute being single to both barriers and choices. Men desire marriage more than do women and the never married want to marry more than the divorced (Bailey & Synder, 2007).

The 6th hypothesis was that Working nomadic will be a higher level of resilience as compared to nonworking nomadic. Poverty has been long focused on resilience. The poor household identify the family and social support, respectful, attitudes, and behaviors of services provides an opportunity to engage in actively that bolster the resilience (Derse & Varda, 2009).

The 7th hypothesis was that non working nomadic will be a higher level of life satisfaction as compared to working nomadic. But the result of the study do not support that non working nomadic have higher level of life satisfaction as compared to working nomadic. From additive models of overall quality of life, was derived about the relationships among work family conflict, work leisure conflict, job satisfaction, family satisfaction, leisure satisfaction and global life satisfaction.
were non significant among non working (Deiner & Biswas, 2002). The hypothesis cause of rejection can be the cultural variation.

6 CONCLUSION

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the level of resilience and life satisfaction among nomadic. Statistical analysis indicated that resilience is positively correlated to life satisfaction. Results further disclosed that there is no significant difference found in that males nomadic have higher level of resilience as compared to females nomadic, but there was significant difference found in that females nomadic have lower level of life satisfaction as compared to males nomadic. An interesting findings regarding martial status was that there was no significant difference found in that married nomadic have a higher level of resilience as compared to unmarried nomadic. Results further indicated that there was no significant difference found in that unmarried nomadic have higher level of life satisfaction as compared to married nomadic. Another findings regarding profession indicated that there was no significant difference found in that working nomadic have higher level of resilience as compared to non working nomadic. Further findings also indicated that there was no significant difference regarding non working nomadic has higher level of life satisfaction as compared to working nomadic.

7 LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

1. As the sample was taken from only the Multan and Bahwalnager, so the results can not be generalized to all people of the whole countries.
2. Time limit for conducting this whole study is limited to get the results requires.
3. Sample techniques were not the best representative of sample taken.
4. The researcher found some difficulties in collection of the data that most of the people showed non cooperative behaviors.
5. The scale was difficult to understand for illiterate people.
6. In order to generalize the results, a much longer and nationally representative sample should be used and convenient random sample should be avoided.
7. In order to obtain more accurate results and lesson the possibilities of errors.
8. Few variable age, education etc also be taken into account and result should be analysis on the basis of there variable as well.
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