Study of Relationship between Intimacy and Social Support among Students

F. Roshani, F. Mosazade, B. Mosavi, A. Ghasemi[*]

Aliabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran

ABSTRACT

Introduction: The main purpose of this research is the relationship of social support and cordiality and its comparison among married male and female students.
Method: by means of Morgan-Gorges table 262 students of university randomly were selected.
Results: To collect information it was used from two questionnaires of 1- social support and 2- cordiality. These groups of students answered to two questions of the questionnaires and they mentioned demographical information at the top page of Social Support's questionnaire.
Conclusion: The results showed that there is a positive correlation between social support and cordiality among married students:

KEYWORDS: Social support; intimacy; students

1. INTRODUCTION

To understand our social world were rely on a set of concepts. Some concepts are related to personality attributes as intimacy or responsibility and some concepts are associated with social events as social support. Our perception of social world is affected by receptions, beliefs and theories, goals and our feeling (Kaviani, 2009). Childhood growth is coordinated with other growth manifestations as the first signs of child intelligence development in relation with other people are observed. The unity of people is vivid as it doesn't need any explanation. This clarity made some of the psychologists believing to its natural nature. It is obvious that if we were living individually, we couldn't see, hear, speak well and we were deprived of thinking power as the only advantage of human being to other animals. Because seeing, hearing, speaking and thinking are meaningful when a person detects their relation with other affairs and they say something to us and if this relation is interrupted, there is no difference between human being and animal (Shoarinejad, 1995). Intimacy is of great importance in most of traditional theories of personality as psychotherapy and social psychology. In these theories and based on a general perception, some items as romantic sexual activities, intimate close friendships, parent-child relations are considered as intimacy examples and it is believed that such activities play important role in formation of personality, behavior and significant existence of human being (Henley & register,1992). Kob defined social support as benefit of affection, helping and consideration of family members, friends and other people (Alipour, 1992). Intimacy is occurred via establishment of mutual relations (with a romantic partner) as self-disclosure is occurred. A person in this group is described via self-information, true interest to others and the lack of defensive state in interaction with others (Gaya, 2002).

Researches considered social support a strong barrier against the agitations of working and life. This support resource can be via relatives and friends. Social friendship and support in work place can be very valuable (Kuper 2000, Madihi 1992). Social support performances are including listening (active listening without advice or judgment), technical support (a person is skillful in his work and his friendship and honesty is proved), emotional support (a supporter without being agree to support us), emotional challenge (a person who has problem can deceive himself), technical challenge (the lack of rival namely in work place, etc). Scientific discussion regarding social changes on personal life of Europe or Northern America was emerged at the end of 20th century. Morgan (2011) emphasized that practice can include innovative behavior and habitual behaviors with pre-existing structures with consistency. By observing experiences and practice in families, people enter normally into a structure of experiences and methods being formed before that by economical and cultural conditions as legally. This is expected that most of family styles are turned into a process providing supporting common decorations to support child bringing up and partnership receiving cultural and legal supports (Lyn Jamson, 2011). Different kinds of social supports: Structure social support: People roles in communication networks and other characteristics of communication network as the number of members, members' consistency, communication continuance, reliance, contact frequencies and people consistency. Thus, social support in this concept is consisting of a network consisting of family members, friends and co-workers. The theories considering directly the social support. Social coherence theory of Durkim said that social coherence has two main elements: 1- Social support, 2- Social control in which social support by providing social bands made the people

---

Corresponding Author: A. Ghasemi, Aliabad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran
Email: torbatinezhad@gmail.com

attached to common aim and interested in social issues and when a person is not supported, no control is applied on him and in such conditions, social rejection is done. In social support family helps its member via some ways: First as information source about the world and a system for mutual control and correction, second as a practical source and correct guidance and third a shelter for rest and as control group. Co-workers as a support source can act as a substitute of family members. Active participation in the work means to be more productive, work satisfaction, less movement, social support and a person gets capable against anxiety and the lack of active participation is with the job dissatisfaction and family dissatisfaction, low motivation to work and increasing leave of work, and leave intention (Kuper,2000; Madihi,2000). Social support is care, affection, self-esteem and helping others or groups to a person. This support is done from various sources as spouse, fiancé, family, relatives, friends, co-workers, physician or social organizations (Qarchedaqi and Shariatzadeh, 1994). Thus, from the view of Sideny, Kob, people with social support feel somebody loves them. They consider them respected and valuable people and consider themselves a part of social networks as family or social organizations to be the source of materialistic and spiritual helps and mutual services in need. All people cannot benefit their required social supports. Various factors in determining these factors are related to the person himself. If a person is not sociable, doesn't help others and don't allow others they need help, they don't benefit any support. Another factor of support benefit is the social network structure of a person. The links the family and society have. The need of people to their support and ability is changed in the life (Mirsepasi, 1990). Intimated relations are a kind of personal relations being experienced mentally and are recognized socially as close relations. Intimacy can be believed as physical intimacy. Although an intimate relation requires physical and sexual intimacy, the intimacy can be occurred without physical or sexual intimacy (Lynn Jamison, 2011). Intimacy as an important aspect of couples has a long history and the attempt to its classification dates back to Aristotle and now some of the existing knowledge, supports his observations but the scientific study is started since 1990 (Burnes, cited in Hosseinian and Khamseh, 2008). Different meanings are considered for intimacy including in revised dictionary of Webster (1973), intimacy is close relation with friendship and recognition and is synonym with acquaintance and friendship (cited in Amiri, 2005). The term intimacy is derived of intima meaning the internal and the most internal part. To be intimate with others means achieving the most internal characteristics and its perception. The psychologists defined intimacy the ability to be friend with others and expressing emotion and know it the natural right of human being (Blume, 2006). Intimacy is an abstract concept. Most of the theorists studying intimacy believe that some of the common elements in intimacy are self closure, frequent interaction, values and needs consistency, deep love, " to be us", recognizing the deepest issues of the addressee, dependency to others, reliance, commitment and consideration (Christen & Hamill, 1991). According to Christen & Hamill, intimacy is the emotional relation being achieved of mutual process of self-closure, emotional support and physical contact. Intimacy is related to seeing and recognizing others of their deep feeling and its close relation, love and emotion to the friends, family, close relations and even neighbors. We should say that both traditional and modern concepts about intimacy in love all have philosophical, social and cultural structures. But its traditional and ancient concept has ideal and morale framework. Intimacy in psychotherapy from the view of Freud is one of the side effects (even an unnecessary complex outcome) in treatment. Because psycho patients based on transfer issue transfer their psycho methods about controlling the anxiety of separation and intimacy to the therapist. By changing his theory, he considered intimacy as an important treatment factor in treating process. Intimacy from the view of Frum and Sullivan is the most important aspect of ability to achieve mental positive health. For Sullivan (1953), the need to intimacy shows itself in pre-adolescence period. It is prior to sexual interests. Thus, a kind of change is occurred in people to their peers and they are called intimate friends. Thus, for Sullivan, intimacy is a close and dual relation in which the two parties valuate each other. Frum in his debate about productive love (in which responsibility and consideration are the main elements) emphasized on similar aspect of intimate relations. Klein believed that (1975) Fairbairn (1952) or Vinikot (1958-1956-1971) the communication forms the basis of objects relation. This theory believed that any disorder in intimate relations of infant, causes some pathological and mental problems in the next interpersonal relations. Erickson (1950) described intimacy as an identify link between two people considering deeply. Sullivan (1953) believed that intimacy is a need being raised of pre-adolescence period and can be satisfied via mutual relations (not necessarily sexual) and mutual collaboration. Intimacy is divided into three groups in humanity approaches: A. intimacy as experience, feeling that is normal. Intimacy as a two people relation they risk some of the feeling. The self is at risk in this meaning and it is possible there is no experience or feeling of intimacy. Intimacy as an integration and ability to bend with other is a symbol of highest intimacy level. Crowe & Ridley (1990) divided intimacy simply into four groups as 1- Sexual intimacy, 2- Physical intimacy, 3- Emotional intimacy, 4- Functional intimacy. From the view of Robert Sternberg, the three components of love, according to the triangular theory, are an intimacy component, a passion component, and a decision/commitment component." He formed eight kinds of love of these three components: 1- nonlove, 2-liking- friendship, 3- Infatuated love, 4- Empty love, 5- Romantic love, 6- Fatuous love 7- Compassionate love, 8- Consummate love . It should be said that one of the important factors separating different kinds of relations is intimacy. In social psychology, intimacy is a state in which a

person shares his valuable feelings and information during a process called self-closure. Self-closure increases intimate feeling in the relationship. Brehm Sharon (1992) as a social psychologist, considered the intimate relations in which at least there are three aspects:

Emotional attachment, fulfilling the needs and interdependence. Having some friends or generally close friends provides physical, mental and change health and it can be said that the problems of intimacy are the first reason of people attendance to psychotherapy centers. Some of the theoretical analyses about intimacy raise that the amount of intimacy a person experiences in his personal relations help his mental health. Sharp Sheila (2000) proposed 7 universal models for intimate relations, The three main patterns promoting connection are (1-nurturing, 2-merging, and 3-idealizing). The four main patterns fostering separateness are (1-devaluing, 2-controlling, 3-competing for superiority and 4-competing in love triangles. The study was a descriptive-correlative method.

Statistical population and sampling method

The study populations of the current study were Islamic Azad University students of Ali Abad. In the current study, four fields were randomly selected (state management, trading management, art, literature) and they were exclusion criterion. The samples were 262 people. In selection of the studied sample, sampling method was used. The people in each group were 63.

Instrument

1- Sherborn & Stewart social scale. This test evaluates the social support being received by the subject, 19 items and 5 sub-scales. The reliability of sub scales of this test by Cronbach's' alpha was reported in the range of 0.74 to0.93.

2- Alexis .J . vaker and Linda Thompson intimacy scale. This is a 17-item scale being used to evaluate intimacy. This scale is a part of greater tool covering some aspects of intimacy but it is reported as an independent scale by its providers. Intimacy is defined as the consideration of family members for each other and covering emotional intimacy in affection, self-lessness, and satisfaction. It is a feeling that the important relation is with self-esteem, correlation and mutual commitment. The score of the subject "intimacy scale" is achieved via adding the scores of questions and dividing it by 17. The scores are ranging between 1 to7 and higher score shows high intimacy. Intimacy scale with alpha coefficient 0.91 to0.97 has high internal consistency.

METHOD

By Krejcie and Morgan's Table,262 people were selected among 900 MA students as sample and the questionnaires were distributed. After collection, they were evaluated and based on the scores of girls and boys, were compared separately.

RESULTS

In sum, total mean and the mean of sub scales in the current study were not different considerably with the results of other studies. The results were analyzed by SPSS software. At first, two descriptive tables were used for social support and mean chart of social support among the students in various majors were dealt. Seven hypotheses were considered in this study and in the first three hypotheses, R-Pearson method and two hypotheses independent – t was used and in two final hypotheses, one-way variance was applied.

Based on three hypotheses were have:

Table 1

Variable	N	Correlation coefficient (r pearson)	Significance level	Degree of Freedom)df(
Social support Intimacy	126	0.828	0.000	124
Social support Intimacy	126	0.892	0.000	124
Social support Intimacy	126	0.866	0.000	1124

In the investigation of statistical index of Table 1, first row between social support and intimacy of 126 people with degree of freedom 124 shows that there is a relation and the married people in intimacy have social support. Thus, there is not significant different between social supports and married people intimacy. It seems that in the second and third row of table 1, there was no significant difference between women and men (girls and boys) and there is a relation between intimacy and social support and intimate people have social support.

Table 2

Variable	Groups	Number	Mean	SD	Degree of freedom	t-score	Significance level
Intimacy	Girl	126	4.9094	2.20507	250	2.535	0.012
	Boy	126	5.5056	1.45097			
Social support	Girl	126	69.65	19.237	250	1.932	0.055
	Boy	126	73.86	15.079			

Based on the results in Table 2 and the mean intimacy between girls and boys 4.9094 and5.5056 with degree of freedom of 250 of t-table (t=2.535),(t=1.932) showing that the first row was different between girl and boy students, the intimacy was different among men and women. But in the second row of social support, there was no significant difference, both groups of girls and boys had social support and there was no significant difference between them.

Table 3

	Total sum	Degree of freedom	Total mean	F	Sig
Intergroups	10.271	3	3.424	0.961	0.412
Intragroups	883.075	248	3.561		
Total	8931.345	251			
Intergroups	1374.270	3	458.90	1.527	0.208
Intragroup	74418.477	248	300.075		
Total	75792.746	251			

In Table 3, two hypotheses shows the comparison between intimacy and social support in various academic fields and show that as degree of freedom of intragroups and intergroups is 3,248 (df=0.961) is different between various intimacy fields. As is shown in the tables, in the first row shows that intimacy in art group is higher than other rows and is low in literature. But in other fields, their mean difference is ignored. The second row of the table shows the difference of social support between the groups and fields and again in art group with (df=1.527) shows high social support and social support of literature group is low but the mean difference is ignored (P>0.05).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The data analysis showed that change in marriage intimacy has significant difference in terms of gender. The correlations between the sub scales are significant and their values were not high and among the fields, only two fields had significant difference and they were not high. The results showed that some hypotheses were consistent with the hypotheses of other researches. For example, the first hypothesis among the students was in line with the study performed by Akram Khamseh. It can be said that there is a positive correlation between social support and intimacy. The sample group was the students. Thus, the findings of the current study cannot be generalized to other class of the society and other age groups. Thus, doing the research on vivid samples and non-student population of total society can achieve more generalization. Namely regarding the intimacy, doing the research on the people at early adolescence and youth (18-30) is necessary. It is proposed that in future studies, other instruments are used for evaluation and the results are compared. Finally, the results of the current study can support the relation between social support and intimacy in various classes of the society and improving people mental health. The results of this study showed that these two variables can determine high amount of mental health change among students and adults.

REFERENCES

Shoari nejad,A .(1978). Developmental psychology. Tehran : publication of information. (Persian).

Mirsepasi , N. (1990) . sistemdtic approach in human resource. Theran .(Persian).

Cooper, carry . (2000) . Life with anxiety. Translated by madihi,M .(2000). Tehran . (Persian)

Khamse, A . (2009) . New strategies of Couples Therapy . Tehran : publication of arjmand .(Persian)

Blume . Thomas. w. ,(2006) . Becoming a family counselor :A bridge to family therapy and practice . USA : Wiley & sons.

Butler mark H: stont. Julie A & Gardner . Brandt G ,(2002)

Bagarozzi , Dennis , A (2001) . Enhancing intimacy in marriage: clinical Hand book , Brunner / Rutledge , Inc.

MORGAN, D. (2011) Rethinking Family Practices. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. [doi::://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230304680]

JAMIESON, L., Morgan, D., Crow, G., Allan, G. (2006) 'Friends, Neighbors and Distant Partners: Extending or Decentering Family Relationships?' Sociological Research Online 11.