

# A Study of Social Support in Three Generations

Nasib Singh<sup>1\*</sup> Dr. Sunita Malhotra<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak

<sup>2</sup> Professor (Retd), Department of Psychology, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak

**Abstract –** The present study was designed to examine the intergenerational differences in social support. A sample of 180 (60 grandparents 60 parents and 60 their young adults) between the age range of 18-76 was selected from rural and urban areas. The participants were administered the measures of Hindi Adaptation (Dogra, 1990) of Social Support Questionnaire was developed by Sarason in 1983. Obtained data were analyzed by applying descriptive statistic, One Way ANOVA. The study revealed that the grandparents have more social support than parents and young adults, while parents were found to have more social support than young adults. Hence, it may be concluded that grandparents were found to have more social support on two domains of social support, while young adults were found to have less social support than grandparents and parents.

**Keywords:** Social Support, Grandparents, Parents, Young Adults

## INTRODUCTION

The term Intergenerational transmission represents the personal experiences and feelings of the parents when they were also in their childhood stage. These very experiences lay a long lasting influence how they up bring their children. According to Feldman and Goldsmith, 1986, "It is the part of the socialization of socializer and the concepts concerns the origin of parenting behaviour and attitudes in the earlier generations". Genetic factors may be included as an influencing factor on Intergenerational parenting behaviour. It is a specific sort of parenting style as it is responsible in building the predispositions and proclivities in upcoming generations in shaping their social as well as physical environment.

Three generations i.e. Grandparents, parents and children are likely to be included in such transmission of parenting pattern. It is here noteworthy that it not only includes parents but also takes account of their children and grandparents as well. The most common and accepted model of Intergenerational parenting may be cut lined by considering discussed generations as  $g^2$  (parents) and  $g^3$  children. This model does not include the direct impact of grandparents'  $g^1$  on the children  $g^3$ . Grand parenting can be defined as socialization process where an interaction between  $g^1$  and  $g^3$  take place.

In the words of Crittenden 1984, "It is not part of the process of socialization of the socializer i.e. the transmission of, because  $g^3$  does not participate in

childrearing." This style of parenting enlists the continuities and discontinuities among the different generations' i.e  $g^1$ ,  $g^2$  and  $g^3$ . It prevents from getting confused between grandparental support in specific and childrearing in general. (Cherlin and Furstenberg, 1986). These models discriminates appropriate intergenerational transmission of parenting and child rearing were influenced by the genetic and contextual factors.

## SOCIAL SUPPORT

The branch positive psychology is considered as "informed by decades of research examining positive emotions, characteristics, values, and institutions that support and enhance individuals" (Beaver, 2008, p. 129). Social Support can be mentioned as enriching agent which has gained notable attention in the literature related to the developmental stages of human beings. Israel and Schurman (1990) has explained social support as, "An expansive construct that describes the physical and emotional comfort given to individuals by their family, friends, and other significant persons in their lives". Various investigations in the field of Positive Psychology revealed that poor social support leads to low level of Psychological, Physical, Social and academic attainments among the adolescents.

Numerous studies stated different sources of social support for youth include parents, family, friends, teachers, peer group, classmates and playmates. Malecki and Demaray emphasized the fact that these social supports strengthen the outcomes of

adolescents. In the early childhood development, support from the parents appears to be the most crucial support. Internalizing and Externalizing behaviours are reciprocally linked to observation of family support. Different studies have confirmed that Social support is directly linked to wellness of an individual.

When the child comes in contact with peer group and teachers, the importance of these two groups subside the parental support. It is quite clear from many researches that positive and intense peer group support can be taken as a protective force to secure mental health; as a result it reduces anxiety and depression among adolescents. It is also described as a closely related with other signs of internalizing psychopathology in adolescents and also occur with psychological wellness among adolescents. In addition to it, many researches has illustrated that teacher's positive perception can lead to better mental wellness. These types of observations by the teachers are linked with the greater level life-satisfaction and well-being of the individual (Suldo, White, Friedrich, Minch et. al. 2009).

## REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES:

**Boram Kim et.al. (2017)** studied, "Relationships between social support and student burnout: A meta-analytic approach". This study is a meta-analysis of 19 relevant studies, with 95,434 participants, investigating the relationships between various types of social support and 3 dimensions of student burnout. The overall results indicate that social support is negatively correlated with student burnout. Specifically, school or teacher supports have the strongest negative relationship to student burnout. Social supports from parents and from peers also have a significant negative relationship with student burnout. Among the 3 dimensions of student burnout, inefficacy was more strongly related to social support than emotional exhaustion or cynicism. The results of a moderation analysis suggest that the type of schools affected the relationships between the overall social support and student burnout.

**Sphoorthi G Prabhu, Rameela Shekhar (2017)**, studied, "Resilience and perceived social support among school-going adolescents in Mangaluru". The objectives of the study were to assess the Perceived Stress, PSS, to understand the gender differences in level of PSS and resilience among school going adolescents in Mangaluru city of Southern India. Data were collected through self-administered scales. Descriptive statistics and t-test were applied. The findings revealed that adolescents had mild level of perceived stress, high PSS, and moderate resilience. Significant difference was noted between boys and girls in the global PSS and PSS from friends and significant others and resilience. The gender differences in the measured competencies

indicate the need to develop gender-specific intervention packages.

**Young, K.W. (2006)** studied, "Social Support and Life Satisfaction". This study aims at exploring the relationship between social support and life satisfaction for people with long-term mental illness. Research sample included 146 subjects, coming from two large residential homes in Hong Kong. Results show that different sources of social support have different effects on individual's life satisfaction. Supports from staff and friends, but not from family, predict individual's life satisfaction well. Emotional and instrumental supports from staff and friend have different predictive power and importance on individual's life satisfaction. These findings suggest that strengthening staff and friends' support could improve life satisfaction for people with long-term mental illness.

## RATIONALE OF THE STUDY:

It is evident from mostly carried out researches that social support is a social interaction which is perceived by its recipient. It is considered as a factor which is helpful in coping with the stress. The relationships and family support in which a child grows up laid a sound foundation for the bonds and relationships that will occur in future life. For example, if a child grows up by observing the prevailing belief of an avoidant person of the family those persons outside the family cannot be relied upon, such child is expected to continue that belief in close relationships and friendship when he or she will be an adult. Such persons never take relationships at deeper levels and take it comparatively at superficial and artificial level. On the other hand an individual deeply attached with his family having a belief that other persons outside the family can be relied upon, then all relationships will be built out in a natural way and the social support generated by such relationships will be long lasting. But in these days, the social support is lessening due to the preference for nuclear families and changing life styles. The present study aims to evaluate the intergenerational differences in social support.

## OBJECTIVE

- To examine and compare the social support of three generations (grandparents, parents and adult children).

## HYPOTHESES

- There exists no significant difference in social support of grandparents, parents and adult children

## METHOD

**Design:** The present study aims to examine and compare the social support of three generations (grandparents, parents and adult children). For this purpose, one way ANOVA was applied.

**Sample:** The sample comprised of 180 (60 grandparents, 60 parents and 60 adult children) between the age group 18-76 yrs was selected from rural or urban area. The participants were selected on the basis of availability and convenience from Rohtak, Jind, Hisar and Kurukshetra districts of Haryana.

### Tool:

**Social Support Questionnaire:** Hindi adaptation (Dogra, 1990) of social support questionnaire was developed by Sarason in 1983. It comprised of 27 items was used for measuring social support. Sarason (1983) have reported that social support questionnaire has a high test reliabilities when compared with extensive structured interview. The scale has test – retest reliability as (0.90)

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To meet the objective of the present study was to find out the difference in adjustment on a sample of 180 (60 grandparents, 60 Parents and 60 young adults), One Way ANOVA was used with the help of SPSS. The results are given as under:

**Table 1**

### Mean, Standard Deviation scores of Adjustment of Grandparents, Parents and Young Adults

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
SSN	Grandparents	60	5.711000	.4348649
	Parents	60	5.287500	.3398436
	Young adults	60	4.513000	.7359032
SSS	Total	180	5.170500	.7254791
	Grandparents	60	2.623167	.3804168
	Parents	60	2.224000	.4938476
SSS	Young adults	60	1.770167	.4689711
	Total	180	2.205778	.5680595

**Table 1.1ANOVA Table of Social Support of Grandparents, Parents and Young Adults**

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
SSN	Between Groups	44.288	2	22.144	78.511	.000
	Within Groups	49.923	177	.282		
	Total	94.211	179			
SSS	Between Groups	21.858	2	10.929	53.879	.000
	Within Groups	35.904	177	.203		
	Total	57.762	179			

\*\*Significant at 0.01 level; \* Significant at 0.05 level

The first section of the table shows that F value 78.511 is significant at 0.01 level of significance with df (2,177). The table shows that there exists a statistically significant difference among the three groups in SSN (number of persons for social support). It indicates that different categories do not belong to the same population in regard to their mean values. Post-hoc test was employed to find out the significant difference in the level of SSN among grandparents, parents and young adults and shown in Table no. 1.1.1 below.

**Table 1.1.1 Post hoc table for SSN of Grandparents, Parents and Young Adults**

Group	N	SSN		
		Tukey HSD		
		Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
Young adults	60	4.513000		
Parents	60		5.287500	
Grandparents	60			5.711000
Sig.		1.000	1.000	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 60.000.

From the Post hoc comparison, it can be concluded that as regard to SSN (Dimension of of Social Support), grandparents, parents and young adults differed significantly with each other. The higher mean score of grandparents on SSN shows that they have more number of persons for social support, while parents were found to have more number of persons for social support than young adults.

The second section of the table 1.1 shows that F value 53.879 is significant at 0.05 level of significance with df (2, 177). So it can be concluded that there exists a statistically significant difference among the three target groups in SSS (degree of satisfaction from the available support). It can be confirmed that different categories do not belong to the same population in regard to their mean values. Post-hoc test was administered in order to calculate the significant mean difference in SSS among grandparents, parents and young adults and is shown in Table no. 1.1.2

**Table 1.1.2 Post hoc table for SSS of Grandparents, Parents and Young Adults**

Group	N	SSs		
		Tukey HSD		
		Subset for alpha = 0.05		
		1	2	3
Young adults	60	1.770167		
Parents	60		2.224000	
Grandparents	60			2.623167
Sig.		1.000	1.000	1.000

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 60.000.

From the Post hoc comparison, it can be concluded that as regard to SSs (Dimension of Social Support), grandparents, parents and young adults differed significantly with each other. The higher mean score of grandparents on SSs shows that they have more degree of satisfaction from the available support than parents and young adults, while parents were found to have more degree of satisfaction from the available support than young adults.

## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The study revealed that the grandparents have more social support than parents and young adults, while parents were found to have more social support than young adults. Hence, it may be concluded that grandparents were found to have more social support on two domains of social support, while young adults were found to have less social support than grandparents and parents.

## REFERENCES

Beaver, B.R. (2008). A positive approach to children's internalizing problems. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 39(2), pp. 129-136.

Bengtson, V.I (1975). Generation and family effects in value socialization. *American Sociological Review*, 40, pp. 358-371.

Boram Kim Sooin Jee Joungwha Lee Sunghee An Sang Min Lee (2017) Relationships between social support and student burnout: A meta-analytic approach. *Stress and Health*, Volume34, Issue1, February 2018, Pages 127-134

Carlton, B. S., Goebert, D. A., Miyamoto, R. H., Andrade, N. N., Hishinuma, E. S., Makini, G. K. J., et al. (2006). Resilience, family adversity and well-being among Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian adolescents. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 52(4), pp. 291-308.

Cherlin, A & Furstenberg, F.F. (1986). Grandparents and family crisis Generations, 10, pp. 26-28.

Crittenden, P.M. (1984). Sibling interaction Evidence of a generational effect in maltreating infants. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 8, pp. 433-438.

Crockett, L.J., Iturbide, M.I., Torres-Stone, R.A., McGinley, M., Raffaelli, M., & Carlo, G. (2007). Acculturative stress, social support, and coping: Relations to psychological adjustment among Mexican American college students. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 13(4), pp. 347-355.

Demaray, M. K., & Elliott, S. N. (2001). Perceived social support by children with characteristics of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 16, pp. 68-90.

Edwards, L. M., & Lopez, S. J. (2006). Perceived family support, acculturation, and life satisfaction in Mexican American youth: A mixed-methods exploration. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 53(3), pp. 279-287.

Feldman, P.H., & Goldsmith, L.T. (1986). Transgenerational influences on the development of early prodigious behaviour. A case study approach. *New Direction for Child Development*, 32, pp. 67-85.

Frey, C. U., & Rothlisberger, C. (1996). Social support in healthy adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 25, pp. 17-31.

Garnefski, N., & Diekstra, R. (1996). Perceived social support from family, school, and peers: Relationship with emotional and behavioral problems among adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 35, pp. 1657-1664.

Hodges, V.E., Boivin, M., Vitaro, F., & Bukowski, W. (1999). The power of friendship: Protection against an escalating cycle of peer victimization. *Developmental Psychology*, 35, pp. 94-101.

Israel, B., & Schurman, S. (1990). Social support, control, and the stress process. In K. Glanz, M. Frances, & B. Rimer (Eds.), *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 187-215). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lagana, M. T. (2004). Protective factors for inner-city adolescents at risk of school dropout: Family factors and social support. *Children & Schools*, 26 (4), pp. 211-220.

LaGreca, A.M., & Lopez, N. (1998). Social anxiety among adolescents: Linkages with peer relations and friendships. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 26, pp. 83-94.

Malecki, C. K., & Demaray, M. K. (2002). Measuring perceived social support: Development of the Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale (CASSS). *Psychology in the Schools*, 39, pp. 1-18.

Prabhu SG, Shekhar R. Resilience and perceived social support among school-going

adolescents in Mangaluru. Indian J Soc Psychiatry 2017;33: pp. 359-64

Richman, J. M., Rosenfeld, L. B., & Bowen, G. L. (1998). Social support for adolescents at risk of school failure. *Social Work*, 43, pp. 309-323.

Rosario, M., Salzinger, S., Feldman, R. S., & Ng-Mak, D. S. (2008). Intervening processes between youths' exposure to community violence and internalizing symptoms over time: The roles of social support and coping. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(1), pp. 43-62.

Suldo, S. M., & Huebner, E. S. (2006). Is extremely high life satisfaction during adolescence advantageous? *Social Indicators Research*, 78(2), pp. 179-203.

Suldo, S.M., & Shaffer, E.J. (2008). Looking beyond psychopathology: The Dual-Factor Model of mental health in youth. *School Psychology Review*, 37(1), pp. 52-68.

Suldo, S.M., Friedrich, A.A., White, T.N., Farmer, J., Minch, D., & Michalowski, J. (2009). Teacher support and adolescents' subjective well-being: A mixed methods investigation. *School Psychology Review*, 38(1), pp. 67-85.

Young, K.W. (2006). Social Support and Life Satisfaction. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*. 10 (2), pp. 155-164.

---

#### **Corresponding Author**

**Nasib Singh\***

Research Scholar, Department of Psychology,  
Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak