Perceived Social Support: A Comparative Study of Riot Affected and Non-Affected Adolescents

Abstract

The aim of the present study was to examine the significant difference of overall perceived social support and its various dimensions among the two groups adolescents viz; affected and non-affected adolescents. The participants of this study consisted of N=100 comprising n=50 affected and n=50 non-affected adolescents. A multidimensional scale of perceived social support scale was used to collect the data. Results revealed that affected and non-affected adolescents were not found significantly different on perceived social support and on its various dimensions as well. The findings of the study have been rationally discussed in detail.

Keywords: Perceived Social Support, Friend, Family and Significant Others.

Introduction

Social support may be considers to that type of support including general support and specific support by which an individual can be able to cope up with the undesirable or negative circumstances and can be able to get better life (Malecki & Demaray, 2002). There are some important aspects of social support which are defined in the model of Tardy (1985), such as social support includes that support which may come from the family members, friends, neighbors, school and teachers by which it can be called that social support is an one's social network. Social support may include many types like emotional support, instrumental support, informational support, and appraisal support. Moreover, receiving support from others and giving support to others are also included in the concept of social support.

According to Brandt and Weinert (1981) social support is the communication within the set of social connections and how the individuals are distinguished their supportiveness.

The National Cancer Institute's Dictionary of Cancer Terms defines social support as "a network of family, friends, neighbors, and community members that is available in times of need to give psychological, physical, and financial help". (www.cancer.gov).

Albrecht and Adelman (1987) described social support as helping behavior in reducing doubts regarding the circumstances, the person, their relationship with others by the verbal and non verbal communication between the recipient and the providers and also play a vital role in improving the perception of personal control on one's life experience.

Vollhardt (2009) proposed a model of social support in which the strengthening act of motivation as a result of victimization facilitates prosocial reaction in supportive social perspective. By the help of social support the victims are able to change their feeling of helplessness and to make more optimistic attitude in their life and are able believe in themselves (Ervin & Vollhardt, 2008). After the exposure of violence supportive relationship and understanding within the group make it easy to change their prior distress into selfless behavior, which has been associated to enlarged political involvement (Fowler 2006; Fowler & Kam 2007).

Types of Social Support

Schaefer, Coyne and Lazarus (1981) illustrated five different types of social support:
1. Emotional support
2. Esteem support
3. Network support

Samyya
Research Scholar,
Deptt.of Psychology,
Aligarh Muslim University,
Aligarh

Munnoo Khan
Research Scholar,
Deptt.of Psychology,
Aligarh Muslim University,
Aligarh

Asian Resonance

4. Information support
5. Tangible support

Emotional Support

Individual's emotional and affective needs are meets by the help of communication, is known as emotional support.

Esteem Support

Second type of social support is esteem support that include that type of communication by which an individual feels strengthen about their self-esteem or belief about his/her ability to grip the problem or perform the given task.

Network Support

Another type of social support is network support that refers to communication which asserts that an individual belongs to that group or they got reminder about the available support from the network.

Information Support

Information support is the type of social support which includes that communication by which we get the useful or needed information about the situation.

Tangible Support

Tangible support is the type of social support which includes the physical support that is provided by the other person. Like someone who is unwell we can help them in making the food for him and take him to the doctor all these actions come under the tangible support.

Review of Literature

Singh and Kishore (2018) conducted a study on schizophrenic and manic persons N=150, examined the comparison of perceived social support between schizophrenic and manic persons. They found that persons with schizophrenia (PWS) group has less perceived social support in comparison to persons with mania (PWM) group.

Shahry, Kalhori, Esfandiyari and Zamani-Alavijeh (2016) examined the difference of social support and self efficacy between wanted and unwanted pregnancy. They found that the difference between wanted and unwanted pregnancy on self efficacy and social support is statistically significant.

Nurullah (2012) reviewed the received and perceived social support and the effect of such support in promoting better health and well-being. It is suggested on the basis of previous studies that were conducted in the past ten years that receiving social support has mixed effects on physical and mental health in that the context of support receipt, provider motivation, reciprocity, and the appropriateness of a match between the nature of stressors and the kind of support provided all determine the outcome of support receipt and provision. Moreover, the benefit of received support is also dependent upon the cultural context in which support provision and receipt occurs.

Ikiz and Cakar (2010) conducted a study on the perceived social support and self-esteem among 257 adolescents. Results revealed that according to gender, there is a statistically significant difference on the perceived peer and teacher support levels however there is no difference on self-esteem levels. Moreover, a statistically significant positive relation between perceived social support levels and self-esteem levels of adolescents was found.

Bradshaw (2004) conducted the two studies on the social-cognitive mediators of the link between social-environmental risk factors and aggression in adolescence. The first study examined the association among general knowledge structures, information processing, and aggression in older adolescents. Results show that there was a stronger link between overt aggression and negative views of others. The second study examined the influence of community violence exposure and social rejection by parents and peers on aggression in 184 adolescents. Results revealed that the effect of these two social-environmental risk factors on aggression was partially mediated by negatively biased social-cognitive factors.

Demaray and Malecki (2002) examined the critical levels of perceived social support associated with student adjustment on 1,711 students. Results revealed that there is a significant, positive relationship among perceived social support and a variety of positive indicators. Furthermore there is a significant, negative relationship among perceived social support and a variety of problematic behavioral indicators (e.g., internalizing and externalizing behaviors) were found. Moreover, students with low perceived support obtained significantly higher scores on problematic behavior indicators (e.g., internalizing and externalizing behaviors) and significantly lower scores on positive behavior indicators than students with average or high perceived support.

Objective of the Study

To examine the difference on perceived social support between affective and non-affective adolescents.

Hypothesis

There will significant difference on perceived social support between affective and non-affective adolescents.

Methods

Participants

Participants of the study consisted of N=100 that comprises of n=50 affected & n=50 non-affected adolescents. The participants were selected through purposive sampling technique, from Muzaffarnagar, district Utter Pradesh India.

Measure

The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support was developed by Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley (1988). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS) is a 12-item scale that measures perceived support from three domains: family, friends, and a significant other each item is rated on 7 point scale ranging from very strongly disagree to very strongly agree. Reliability of the scale is .93. And for sub scales .91, .89, and .91 respectively Family, Friends, and significant others subscales.

Procedure

The respondents were approached in a group and before administering the scale good rapport was established. After that they were asked to read instructions carefully given on the cover page of

Asian Resonance

the scale and to give their response to each statement of the scale. And respondents were told that their responses will be kept confidential a well as will be used for research purpose only. Finally, with special thanks the data were collected from them.

Statistical Analysis

Independent sample t-test was used to examine the significance difference of social support between affected and non-affected adolescents.

Results and Discussion

Table
Showing Significance Difference between Affected and Non-Affected Adolescents on Social Support and on Its Various Dimensions

Variables	Groups	N	Mean	SD	t-value	p-value
Perceived Social Support	Affected	50	44.16	5.336	15.84	.01
	Non-affected	50	62.49	6.179		
Family	Affected	50	16.71	2.566	12.08	.01
	Non-affected	50	23.12	2.732		
Friends	Affected	50	15.88	3.395	14.37	.01
	Non-affected	50	25.10	3.015		
Significant Others	Affected	50	14.41	2.806	12.11	.01
	Non-affected	50	22.25	3.632		

Table of results show that there is a significant difference between affected and non-affected adolescents on perceived social support as a whole and on its various dimensions as mean scores given in the table for comparing groups are not similar resulting eliciting difference. Hence, t-values for overall perceived social support (t=15.84) and for its various dimensions viz; family (t=12.08), friends (t=14.37) and significant others (t=12.11) are statistically found significant on .01 level of significance.

It is very important to mention that to mean scores of overall perceived social support and of its various dimensions are found to be leaning towards higher side which is indicative that the adolescents of non-affected group have high perceived social support than affected group. Affected group for adolescents face may problems during riot, there was no one to support them to save from community violence in their village whereas, and non-affected adolescents show good social support because they did not face any problems during riot.

Conclusion

In view of the findings, it is concluded that the differences in group elicit difference in their perceived social support. It clearly reveals to the fact that affected adolescents faced many problems during the riot and reveal low level of social support however non-affected adolescents reveal high level of perceived social support because they did not faced community riot.

References
1. Albrecht, T. L., & Adelman, M. B. (1987). Communicating social support. Sage Publications, Inc.
2. Bradshaw, C. P. (2004). Social-cognitive mediators of the link between social-environmental risk factors and aggression in adolescence. Cornell University.
3. Brandt, P. A., & Weinert, C. (1987). A social support measure: PRQ 85. Nursing Research. 36. 273-277.
4. Demaray, M. K., & Malecki, C. K. (2002). Critical levels of perceived social support associated with student adjustment. School Psychology Quarterly, 17(3), 213.
5. Demaray, M. K., & Malecki, C. K. (2002). The relationship between perceived social support and maladjustment for students at risk. Psychology in the Schools, 39, 305-316.
6. Fowler, James H, and Cindy D. Kam. 2007. "Beyond the Self: Social Identity, Altruism, and Political Participation." Journal of Politics, 69(3): 813–27.
7. Fowler, James H. 2006. "Altruism and Turnout." Journal of Politics, 68 (3): 674–83.
8. Ikiz, F. E., & Cakar, F. S. (2010). Perceived social support and self-esteem in adolescence. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 5, 2338-2342.
9. Nurullah, A. S. (2012). Received and provided social support: A review of current evidence and future directions.
10. Schaefer, C., Coyne, J. C., & Lazarus, R.S (1981). The health- related functions of social support. Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4, 381-406.
11. Shahry, P., Kalhori, S. R. N., Esfandiyari, A., & Zamani-Alavijeh, F. (2016). A comparative study of perceived social support and self-efficacy among women with wanted and unwanted pregnancy. International journal of community based nursing and midwifery, 4(2), 176.
12. Singh, N. K., & Kishore, A. (2018). A Comparative Study of Perceived Social Support among Persons with Schizophrenia and Mania. Indian Journal of Psychiatric Social Work, 9(1), 24-28.
13. Staub, Ervin, and Johanna Vollhardt. 2008. "Altruism born of suffering: The roots of caring and helping after victimization and other trauma." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 78, No. 3: 267–280.
14. Tardy, C. H. (1985). Social support measurement. American Journal of Community Psychology, 13, 187-202.
15. Vollhardt, J. R. (2009). The role of victim beliefs in the Israeli–Palestinian conflict: Risk or potential for peace? Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 15(2), 135-159.