



A STUDY OF PERSONALITY TYPES AND SOCIAL SUPPORT FACTORS IN RELATION TO WELL BEING

Dr. Arpita Chaudhary
Associate Professor
Gauri Devi Govt. College For Women, Alwar, Rajasthan
India

Dr. Renu Aggarwal
Research Scholar

ABSTRACT: -

In this study an attempt was made to understand and examine the nature and relation of personality types and social support factors in relation to well-being in elderly population. A sample of 300 elderly people which included both male and female in equal number was taken to accomplish the objectives of the study. Well-being of elderly people is fast assuming alarming concern in our society and nation as their proportion in total population is on the rise. Therefore, this study was undertaken. From the data collected Means and SDs were calculated and further regression analysis was done to see the effect of predictor variable (Personality Types and Social Support Factors) on criterion variable Well-Being). Results indicated that personality Type a has greater influence on Well-Being, though the influence has negative direction. As far as Social Support Factors are concerned Significant Others has the greatest influence followed by Family factor.

Personality: - From the very name Personality type A and B one assumes that it is personality typology but in fact it is not so. It is basically a behavior pattern which people exhibit when they find themselves in stressful conditions of life. It would be more appropriate if we conceptualize it on a trait continuum with type A at one end and Type B at the other end. Friedman and Rosenman (both cardiologists) actually discovered the Type A behavior by accident. Type A individuals happen to be very competitive and self-critical, always striving to achieve their goals without feeling the joy of accomplishment. Their life is imbalanced heavily tilted toward workaholics with tendency to overreact due to heightened sensitivity. Such people show an urgency of time as if the world will go topsy turvy if things do not happen on time. When this behavior is expressed overtly (i.e., physical behavior), it generally involves aggression and possible bullying (Forshaw, 2012). Contrary to Type A, Type B people are relaxed, patient, and easy-going nature. They work steadily and enjoy their accomplishments; they don't lose their sense of balance even if things don't happen or work out as planned. Failures do not lead to frustration and aggression, consequently they experience less stress and have better physical and mental health.

Social support- has also been considered an important factor in fostering physical health (Malinauskas, 2008) and psychological health (Holt & Hoar, 2006). Social support from family, friends, and significant others affects a person's cognitive, emotional, and behavioural aspects in salutogenic manner (Rees, 2007). Given that social support has been broadly reported to be an



essential factor for a person's success, psychology researchers have endeavoured to clarify the functional aspects of the perception of available support. It can be a better predictor of health or well-being outcomes (Sarason, Pierce, & Sarason, 1990); researchers in sport psychology have focused more on the perception of available support. Researches led to the conclusion social support plays a significant role both for success in life (Rees & Freeman, 2010; Rees & Freeman, 2007) and well-being (Tsuchiya, 2012). Social support plays critical role in the lives of aged individuals. It becomes extremely significant resource as they age. Social support also contributes toward well-being even in the presence of high level of stress. It generates the sense of self-worth and positive affect (Cohen & Syme 1985)

Psychological wellbeing-is described as the quality of a life of a person and for a layman it denotes "happiness", "peace", "fulfillment" and "life satisfaction". Huppert (2009) opines that psychological wellbeing is about life going well. It is the combination of feeling good and functioning effectively. Sustainable wellbeing does not require individuals to feel good all the time; the experience of painful emotions (for example, disappointment, failure, grief) is a normal part of life, and being able to manage these negative or painful emotions are essential for long-term wellbeing. Psychological wellbeing is however, compromised when negative emotions are extreme or last very long and interferes with a person's ability to function in his or her daily life (Huppert, 2009). The concept of feeling good incorporates not only the positive emotions of happiness and contentment but also such emotions as interest, engagement, confidence and affection. Functioning well (in a psychological sense) involves the development of one's potential, having some control over one's life, having a sense of purpose and experiencing positive relationships. Kumar (2006) observes that conceptions of wellbeing are integrally related to how one values the nature of man and what perspective is valued. In alignment with Kumar's opinion, psychological wellbeing is a broad term that encompasses different psychological functioning such as general health, life satisfaction, attitudes, just to mention a few. As a consequence, 'psychological wellbeing' is defined as the general health of a person

Old age- is an opportunity for a whole new chapter in life (Hioki & Tanoka 2004). There is no objective criterion for determining a person to be old. Indian census has adopted the age sixty for classifying a person as old. Old age brings various types of changes in physical structure, cognitive abilities, emotions and personality pattern. These changes give rise to various problems in old age. Activities of old people are reduced and the social relationships become lesser with immediate family support reduced. Presently there are 76 million people aged 60 years and over and it is projected to rise to whopping 180 million by the year 2025 (Registrar General of India 2006). As old age is associated with different problems—the increasing number of elderly people is alarming for the society and the nation as a whole.

Objective : The objective of the present study was to understand and examine the relationship between Personality Type, Social Support Factors and Well-Being of elderly people and to see if Personality Type, Social Support Factors contributes to Well-Being of elderly people.



Hypothesis:- 1. There is no relationship between Personality Type and Social Support Factors and Well-Being of elderly people. Besides Personality Type and Social Support Factors do not significantly contribute to predict Well-Being among elderly people.

Methodology: To achieve the purpose of the study a cross sectional design was used with Personality Scale developed by Bortner (1969), Multi-Dimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (Ziment, Dahlem, Zimet & Farley, 1998), (Independent variable) and General Well-Being Scale (Dependent Variable). A sample of 300 elements was collected from amongst people ranging between 55 to 65 yrs. Living in the city of Alwar (Raj.) Both male and female were included, it was taken care of that sample element had minimum Senior Secondary School Education.

TABLE NO. 1. SHOWING MEANS AND SDs

Sr. No.	Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Type "A"	300	50.60	60.00
2	Type "B"	300	39.02	36.52
3	SIGNIFICANT OTHERS	300	20.783	20.30
4	FAMILY	300	21.036	20.39
5	FRIENDS	300	21.313	20.29
6	Well-Being	300	84.25	20.25

TABLE 2. SHOWING REGRESSION OF PERSONALITY TYPE AND SOCIAL SUPPORT ON WELL-BEING

Coefficients ^{a,b}							Model Summary			F	Sig.
Model		Unstand. Coefficient	Std. Error	Stand. Coefficient	t	Sig.	R	R ²	Adjusted R Square		
		B	Std. Error	Beta							
1	(Constant)	95.458	1.157		82.501	.000	.656	.431	.429	225.46	.000b
	Prst. A	-.222	.015	-.656	-15.06	.000					
	(Constant)	78.371	4.935		15.897	.000	.674	.454	.450	123.47	.000
	Prst. A	-.196	.016	-.581	-12.17	.000					
	Sigt. Others	.761	.214	.170	3.558	.000					
	(Constant)	69.757	6.319		11.039	.000	.680	.462	.457	84.89	.000d
	Prst. A	-.187	.017	-.555	-11.34	.000					
	Sigt. Others	.674	.216	.151	3.116	.002					
	Family	.474	.219	.2162	2.162	.031					
a Dependent Variable: Well-Being											
b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Prst. A											
c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Prst. A, Significant Others, Friends, Family											
d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Prst. A, Significant Others, Family											



The present table reveals the regression of Personality types and Social Support Factors on Well-Being. It is clear from the table that the two variables together with their factors explain about 46 % variance in Well-Being. However, Personality type A show rather greater relatedness and influence with $\beta=.555$, and Social Support show an influence to the extent of ($\beta=-.151, .100$). But here the influence of Personality type A is negative. The overall $F=66.73$ and is significant at $\leq .01$. Interestingly F is significant for all the factors individually as well.

Personality types affect the people's Well-Being and people receiving more Social Support are more satisfied and happy hence higher on Well-Being. Though there is limited evidence to show the relationship between personality traits and psychological wellbeing, researchers have found strong relationship between personality and postpartum depression (Saudina, 2014). He found a significant correlation between neuroticism and postpartum depressive symptoms. Other personality traits such as conscientiousness and openness to experience were also found to be significant predictors of postpartum depression (O'Hara & Swain, 1996; Dudley, Roy, Kelk and Bernard, 2001). Therefore personality and psychological wellbeing are associated due to its link with depressive symptoms.

Eriko Katagami & Hironobu Tsuchiya (2016) in a study aimed to examine the impact of received support and perceived support on athletes' psychological well-being. Furthermore, correlations between received support, perceived support, and personality were investigated. Two hundred and thirty-nine Japanese university student athletes (M age = 19.69 ± 1.01 years) completed the questionnaires regarding social support, psychological well-being, and personality. The results indicated that received support was positively correlated with psychological well-being, while perceived support was not found to be a predictor of psychological well-being, received support can be a salient predictor of athletes' psychological well-being.

Thus the hypothesis that there will be significant interrelationship between personality and social support factors and the two predictor variables explains significant amount of variance to well-being stands proved.

REFERENCES:-

1. Eriko Katagami & Hironobu Tsuchiya (2016) Effects of Social Support on Athletes' Psychological Well-Being: The Correlations among Received Support, Perceived Support, and Personality. 7, 1741-1752, <http://www.scirp.org/journal/psych>
2. Holt, N. L., & Hoar, S. D. (2006) The Multidimensional Construct of Social Support. In S. Hanton, & S. D., Mellalieu (Eds.), Literature Review in Sport Psychology. London: Nova Science Publishers.
3. Huppert F. A. (2009) Psychological Well-being: Evidence Regarding its Causes and Consequences. Applied Psychology: health and well-being, 1(2), 137-164



4. Malinauskas, R. (2008). College Athletes' Perception of Social Support Provided by Their Head Coach before Injury and after It. *Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness*, 48, 107-112.
5. Rees, T., & Freeman, P. (2007). The Effects of Perceived and Received Support 5 on Self-Confidence. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 25, 1057-1065. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02640410600982279>
6. Rees, T., & Hardy, L. (2000). An Investigation of the Social Support Experiences of High-Level Sports Performers. *The Sport Psychologist*, 14, 327-347. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/tsp.14.4.327>
7. Rees, T. (2007). Influence of Social Support on Athletes. In S. Jowett, & D. Lavallee (Eds.), *Social Psychology in Sport* (pp. 224-231). London: Human Kinetics.
8. Rees, T., & Freeman, P. (2010). Social Support and Performance in a Golf-Putting Experiment. *The Sport Psychologist*, 24, 333-348. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/tsp.24.3.333>
9. Sarason, B. R., Sarason, I. G., & Gurung, R. A. R. (2001). Close Personal Relationships and Health Outcomes: A Key to the Role of Social Support. In B. Sarason, & S. Duck (Eds.), *Personal Relationships: Implications for Clinical and Community Psychology* (pp. 15-41). West Sussex, England: Wiley.
10. Saudina Udovičić. (2014). Big Five Personality Traits and Social Support as Predictors of Postpartum Depression. *Journal of European Psychology Student*, DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/jeps.ck>
11. Tsuchiya, H. (2012). So-sharu sapo-to wo katsuyou shita supo-tsu kaunseringu.ba-n autoyobou no tame no chi-mu birudhinngu [Sport Counselling Utilising Social Support: Team Building for Burnout Prevention]. Tokyo: Kazama shobo. (In Japanese)