

**CLARIFYING THE INTERPERSONAL COMPONENT OF  
PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING**

Lynette Nel

Mini-dissertation (manuscript format) submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Magister Artium in Clinical Psychology at the Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education

**Supervisor:** Dr. M. du Toit  
**Assistant Supervisor:** Prof. M.P. Wissing

Potchefstroom  
September 2003

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Acknowledgements	iii.
Summary	iv.
Opsomming	vi.
Letter of Consent	viii.
Intended Journal and Guidelines for Authors	ix.
Manuscript	x.

## 1. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express sincere gratitude to the people whose support, supervision and excellence has made the presentation of this mini-dissertation possible:

- ❖ To my Heavenly Father in whom all things are possible.
  
- ❖ The financial assistance of the National Research Foundation towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed in this report and conclusions arrived at are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the National Research Foundation (Grant to Prof M.P. Wissing, Ref. Nr.15/1/3/19/0049).
  
- ❖ To my supervisor, Dr. Marietjie du Toit who consistently and thoughtfully guided me in the preparation of this manuscript.
  
- ❖ To my assistant supervisor, Prof. Marié Wissing for her incredible patience, support and encouragement.
  
- ❖ To my family, for their support, love and encouragement over the years.

### 3. OPSOMMING

#### Verheldering van die interpersoonlike komponent van psigologiese welsyn

**Trefwoorde:** Psigologiese welsyn, interpersoonlike verhoudings, emosionele intelligensie, fortaliteit, insiklikheid, ekstraversie, gehegtheidstyle, affekbalans, lewenssatisfaksie, koherensiesin.

Die doel van hierdie ondersoek was om die interpersoonlike komponent van psigologiese welsyn te verhelder. Vanuit die literatuur is dit duidelik dat psigologiese welsyn 'n interpersoonlike komponent bevat, maar ook dat dit op verskillende wyses gekonseptualiseer word. Die aard van interpersoonlike welsyn is dus nog nie duidelik nie, en dit is ook nie duidelik in watter mate indikatore van interpersoonlike welsyn oorvleuel met indikatore van algemene psigologiese welsyn nie.

In 'n empiriese ondersoek het 'n multi-kulturele beskikbaarheidsteekproef van 384 persone, 8 meetinstrumente of hul sub-skale voltooi ter meting van algemene psigologiese welsyn en konstruë wat interpersoonlike welsyn verteenwoordig. Interpersoonlike welsyn is geoperasionaliseer met behulp van die BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) van Bar-ON (1997), die Fortitude Questionnaire (FORQ) van Pretorius (1998), die Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) van Costa & Mc Crae (1992) en die Attachment Style Questionnaire (AS) van Feeney, Noller & Hanrahan (1994). Psigologiese welsyn is geoperasionaliseer vanuit 'n fortigene perspektief met die Sense of Coherence Scale (SOC) van Antonovsky (1989), die Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) van Diener, Emmons, Larsen en Griffen (1985), en die Affectometer 2 (AFM) van Kammann en Flett (1983), sowel as vanuit 'n patogene perspektief, met behulp van die General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) van Goldberg en Hillier (1979).

Goeie betroubaarheidsindekse is vir alle skale en subskale gevind. Gemiddeldes van all skale en subskale was vergelykbaar met dié wat in die literatuur gerapporteer is vir ander soortgelyke groepe.

Die resultate toon dat interpersoonlike welsyn in 'n mate oorvleuel met algemene psigologiese welsyn, maar at dit ook 'n afsonderlike komponent of dimensie van

psigologiese welsyn vorm. Bevindings toon ook twee onderskeibare patrone van interpersoonlike welsyn. Die eerste een word primêr uitgedruk in die uitreiking na ander, omgee-gedrag, 'n houding van nederigheid in nabye verhoudings asook verantwoordelikheid teenoor ander in die groter sosiale konteks. Die tweede patroon word gekenmerk deur 'n geniet van sosiale interaksie en 'n houding van gemak en assertiwiteit in nabye sowel as wyer sosiale kontekst. Hierdie onderskeid hou moontlik verband met persoonlikheidsverskille soos insiklikheid versus ekstraversie. Implikasies van die bevindinge vir psigoterapie en lewensvaardigheidsontwikkeling word aangedui.

#### **4. LETTER OF CONSENT**

##### **Permission Statement to Submit Article for Degree Purposes**

**We, the co-authors, M. Du Toit and M.P. Wissing hereby declare that the input and effort of Lynette Nel, in writing this article, is of sufficient scope to be a reflection of her own efforts. We hereby grant permission that she may submit this article for examination purposes in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Magister Artium in Clinical Psychology.**

**Signed on this day \_\_\_\_\_ Potchefstroom, at the Potchefstroomse  
Universiteit vir Christelike Hoër Onderwys.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Dr. M. du Toit**  
Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Prof. M.P. Wissing**  
Co-supervisor

## **5. INTENDED JOURNAL AND GUIDELINES FOR AUTHORS**

### **Personal Relationships**

**Or**

### **Journal of Social and Personal Relationships**

The International Association for Relationship Research (IARR) sponsors both journals, seeking to stimulate and support the scientific study of personal relationships as well as encourage cooperation amongst scientists worldwide. The IARR was founded on June, 1, 2002 and resulted in a merger of the International Network on Personal Relationships (INPR) and the International Society for the Study of Personal Relationship (ISSPR).

The manuscript as well as the reference list has been styled according to the above journals specifications.

### **Instructions to contributors**

1. E-mail the editor (Susan Sprecher) with the Title and Abstract pages. You will then be advised to send four copies of the paper, a corresponding diskette and (if possible) an e-mail attachment of the paper. It should be directed to
2. APA format is required, other comments include, (a) discourage long lists of citations; (b) Papers from graduate students and recent PhD's are especially welcomed and will receive extra attention.

## 6. MANUSCRIPT

**Clarifying the interpersonal component of  
psychological well-being**

**L. Nel\*, M.M. du Toit, & M.P. Wissing  
School for Psychosocial Behavioral Sciences:Psychology  
Potchefstroom University for CHE, Potchefstroom, South Africa.**

**\*Corresponding author :** Me L. Nel  
School for Psychosocial Behavioral Sciences: Psychology  
Private Bag X6001  
Potchefstroom  
2520  
  
e-mail:  
fax: 27-018-299-1730

## **Clarifying the interpersonal component of psychological well-being**

### **Abstract**

The aim of this study was to clarify the interpersonal component of psychological well-being. A multicultural availability sample of 384 respondents completed 8 measuring instruments or sub-scales thereof, measuring general psychological well-being and constructs broadly comprising an interpersonal relationship component. The interpersonal relationship component was operationalized, using three subscales of the BarOn Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) of Bar-ON (1997), the Fortitude Questionnaire (FORQ) of Pretorius (1998), the Attachment Style Questionnaire (AS) of Feeney, Noller & Hanrahan (1994) and two subscales of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) of Costa & Mc Crae (1992). Psychological well-being was operationalized using the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) of Goldberg and Hillier (1979) Sense of Coherence Scale (SOC) of Antonovsky (1989), the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) of Diener, Emmons, Larsen and Griffen (1985) and the Affectometer 2 (AFM) of Kammann and Flett (1983). The results indicated that interpersonal psychological well-being overlaps to some degree with general psychological well-being, but that it also forms a separate dimension of psychological well-being. Two patterns of interpersonal well-being were distinguished. The first one is primarily characterized by minding, caring behavior and an attitude of modesty in close relationships as well as responsibility in the greater social context. The second one is primarily characterized by enjoyment of social interaction, with an attitude of comfortableness and assertiveness in close as well as wider social contexts. This distinction maybe linked to differences in patterns of personality functioning, related to agreeableness versus extraversion. Implications for counselling and life-skills development are indicated.

### **Clarifying the interpersonal component of psychological well-being**

The aim of the present investigation was to clarify the nature of the interpersonal component of psychological well-being and to determine to what degree the interpersonal component overlaps with general psychological well-being.

Psychological functioning has been the subject of scientific study for a century, viewed mostly from a deeply entrenched pathological approach, focusing on understanding mental illnesses and vulnerabilities (Aspinwall & Staudinger, 2003; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). However, in the recent past, a new psychological paradigm developed, focusing on the origins, nature, manifestations and consequent enhancement of well-being and human capacities (Aspinwall & Staudinger, 2003; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Wissing & Van Eeden, 1998). Antonovsky, (1987) coined the construct *salutogenesis* and proposed the study of health instead of disease. Strümpfer (1995) then proposed the more embracing construct *fortigenesis*, which mean the origin of strengths, to indicate a broader focus.

Researchers in diverse fields of psychology called for more attention to resilience, strengths and resources or capacities of people (Wissing & Van Eeden, 1998). Several holistic models of health highlighted psychological well-being as an aspect of general health/well-being as well as emphasize a social component in their definitions of health, for example, Ryff & Singer, 2000; Adams, Bezner & Steinhardt, 1997; and Witmer & Sweeney, 1992).

According to Ryff & Singer (2000), psychological health encompasses diverse aspects of flourishing, including having quality ties to others. Adams et al. (1997) proposed a model in which physical, spiritual, psychological, social, emotional and intellectual health were identified as important aspects of psychological well-being. Witmer and Sweeney (1992)

see the characteristics of wellness expressed through five life tasks of spirituality, self-regulation, work, love and friendship.

Attempting to define psychological well-being, Ryff (1994) identified six components namely, having a positive attitude towards oneself and one's past life (self-acceptance); having goals and objectives that give life meaning (purpose in life); being able to manage complex demands of daily life (environmental mastery); having a sense of continued development and self-realization (personal growth); possessing caring and trusting ties with others (positive relations with others); and being able to follow one's own convictions (autonomy). In recent years, within the field of positive psychology, Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) translated subjective well-being into contentment, and satisfaction (in the past), hope and optimism (for the future), and flow and happiness (in the present).

Conceptualizations of the nature of psychological well-being proved to be diverse, and without a coherent framework (Wissing and Van Eeden, 2002). To clarify the construct of psychological well-being, Wissing and Van Eeden (1998) conducted research from a fortigenic perspective and empirically identified a general psychological well-being factor. This factor was identified in empirical data obtained with, amongst others, measures of sense of coherence (Antonovsky, 1993), self efficacy (Bandura, 1977), satisfaction with life (Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin, 1985), constructive thinking (Epstein, 1992), coping (Amirkhan, 1990; Zeidner & Endler, 1996), social support (Procidano & Heller, 1983), reality orientation (Jackson & Jeffers, 1989) and self actualization (Knapp, 1976). According to Wissing and Van Eeden (1998), general psychological well-being consists of self, affective, cognitive, interpersonal, and behavioural components. Sense of coherence (Antonovsky, 1987), satisfaction with life (Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffen, 1985) and affect balance (Kammann & Flett, 1983) were found to be good indicators of general psychological well-being.

In their search to identify the core components of psychological well-being, both Ryff (1994) and Wissing and Van Eeden (1998) made mention of an interpersonal component

of psychological well-being. Other research not only substantiates but also supports this claim. Ryff and Singer (2000) found interpersonal flourishing to be a core feature of quality living. Attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969) subscribes to the view that close, meaningful ties to others is an essential feature of what it means to be fully human. Research conducted as early as 1958 identified the ability to love as a key feature of 'positive mental health' (Jahoda, 1958). Recent years showed an increase in research on the quality of interpersonal relationships as an important component of human well-being (Meyers, 1999). Baumeister and Leary (1995) described the need to form and maintain strong, stable interpersonal relationships as a fundamental human motive. Interpersonal or social well-being has been identified as a key component in the above mentioned holistic models of health and psychological well-being. There are, of course other studies (Lightsey, 1996, Bandura, 1977) that do not provide counterpoint studies, but simply do not include a social or interpersonal component in their review of psychological well-being.

Relationships as a field of study touches upon diversified bodies of literature. From a developmental perspective, Erikson (1959) described 'developmental tasks' focusing on concepts such as intimacy and generativity. From the field of personology, Maslow (1968) conceptualized the self-actualizing person, one who has feelings of empathy and affection for others, a capacity for love, deep friendship and identification with the human condition. Allport (1961) formulated the concept of 'maturity', described as a capacity for great intimacy in love, showing of compassion, respect and appreciation for others. Bowlby (1969) formulated attachment theory, giving fundamental importance to the first, and according to his belief, most important relationship an individual will experience in life, i.e. the early ties between infant and care-giver. Many other studies have confirmed a relationship between attachment security and well-being broadly construed. Some theorists have argued that secure attachments themselves are an indicator of well-being (Simpson, 1990). According to Hazan and Shaver (1994), attachment theory provides a useful framework to organize and extend the large literature on close relationships in general.

Shifting to adult social interaction, Reis (2000) probed the kinds of relational interactions that promote or hinder secure attachments, adult intimacy and a sense of emotional well-being. According to Reis (2000), the strongest predictor of 'affirmative social interactions' (i.e. satisfying needs for autonomy, relatedness and competence - identified by Ryan and Deci, (2001) in their Self-determination theory) were ones in which the individual felt understood and appreciated by others. Related to, and sometimes intersecting with the attachment field (e.g. Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Reis & Patrick, 1996) are studies of intimacy, love and attraction as a feature of close interpersonal relationships. Bercheid and Reis (1998) provided a comprehensive overview of the field of relationship science and showed how relationships begin, develop, what makes them satisfying and stable, as well as what kinds of relationships contribute to well-being. Relationships have also been studied for their contributions to 'happiness' (Argyle, 1987; Myers & Diener 1995).

From a sociological perspective, Keyes (1998) described multiple dimensions of 'social well-being', for example being integrated in a community and contributing toward social good. Social support literature focuses on the perception that a person experiences emotional, instrumental support and assistance within a social network of interpersonal relationships (Cohen, 1988, Cohen & Wills, 1985). The study of emotion (Lewis & Haviland, 1993) identified 'interpersonal emotions' such as love, desire, hate, jealousy, shame within a social and interpersonal sphere. The concept of 'love' is seen to involve a fusion of many positive emotions (Fredrickson, 1998) broadening the scope of thought and action, but more importantly, instrumental in building interpersonal and social connectedness. Collectively, these enquiries point to the emotional upside of significant social relationships in all its joyful, nurturing, meaningful and loving splendour.

Witmer and Sweeney (1992) conceptualized the interpersonal component of well-being in terms of the life tasks of friendship and of love. The life task of friendship refers to all the social relationships that involve connection with others, but do not have a marital, sexual, or familial commitment. Relationships that are formed on the basis of a commitment to one another and involve emotional intimacy, sexual intimacy, or both,

Two subscales of the NEO-PIR developed by Costa and Mc Crae (1992) underscore personality attributes beneficial to the understanding of interpersonal relationships. Their Extraversion facet contains concepts relevant to interpersonal functioning such as warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, excitement-seeking and the experience of positive emotions. Their Agreeableness facet highlights attributes such as trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty and tender-mindedness.

Pretorius (1998) contends that fortitude or strengths include a very strong social component and include an appraisal of the self, support from friends, and support from family. Furthermore, Harvey, Pauwels and Zickmund (2002) developed a 'minding model' where 'minding' is defined as "a reciprocal knowing process, involving the non-stop, interrelated thoughts, feelings and behaviours of persons in a relationship (p 424)". They focus on five important aspects of 'minding' such as 'knowing and being known', attribution, acceptance and respect, reciprocity in minding, and finally, continuity in minding.

It is important to note that optimal relational well-being is probably not well characterized by simple models, slightly disjointed constructs or specific bodies of inquiry. However, it is clear that the quality of interpersonal relationships may be related to the level of psychological well-being. It is not yet clear whether different conceptualizations of interpersonal well-being actually refer to the same or different phenomena on an empirical level. This needs more clarification.

The aim of the present investigation was therefore to clarify the nature of the interpersonal component of psychological well-being, and to determine to what degree the interpersonal component overlaps with general psychological well-being.

## METHOD

### *Design*

A single cross-sectional survey design was implemented with an availability sample of participants..

### *Participants*

Participants consisted of pre- and post-graduate students of a tertiary education institution (200) and other adults (184) selected with the use of the snowball method. Three hundred and eighty four (384) participants took part in this study with six questionnaires judged incomplete. The total sample comprised 90 men and 288 women. Four different age groups were identified: 18-25 years ( $n = 257$ ), 26-40 years ( $n = 69$ ), 41-50 years ( $n = 30$ ), and 51-65 years ( $n = 23$ ). Five respondents did not indicate their age. Four respondents did not indicate their gender. Marital status categories were defined as married ( $n = 72$ ), unmarried ( $n = 275$ ), cohabiting ( $n = 14$ ), divorced ( $n = 11$ ) and widowed ( $n = 6$ ). Six participants did not indicate marital status. Four ethnic/cultural groups were represented, European ( $n = 313$ ), African ( $n = 56$ ), Coloured ( $n = 4$ ) and Indian ( $n = 8$ ). Three respondents did not indicate their ethnic/cultural status. Completion of secondary school (Grade 12) was the minimum educational qualification for all participants except 20 African women who held a grade 10 qualification.

### *Measuring Instruments*

The original FORT research project (Wissing, 1998) included various measuring instruments designed to assess various facets of psychological well-being. For the purposes of this study, those instruments deemed relevant to measure a general psychological well-being factor as well as instruments deemed to measure the interpersonal relationship component, were included.

### Biographical Information

#### Biographical Questionnaire

A Biographical Questionnaire was developed to indicate variables such as: age, gender, marital status, ethnic/cultural status and level of education.

#### Interpersonal Well-Being component

##### *Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i): Interpersonal Component (Bar-On, 1997)*

The Interpersonal Component of the Bar-On Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) of Bar-On (1997) was implemented consisting of the Empathy subscale (EQ-EM), Interpersonal Relationship subscale (EQ-IR) and the Social Responsibility subscale (EQ-RE). The Empathy and Social Responsibility subscales measure the expression of affect, whilst the Interpersonal Relationship subscale refers to a capacity for intimacy and the giving and receiving of affection. More specifically, the Empathy subscale refers to sensitivity, interest or caring for others. Social Responsibility refers to the ability to conduct oneself as a cooperative, contributing and constructive member of one's social group. In an investigation done on a South African sample, Bar-On (1997) found Cronbach alpha coefficients for the Interpersonal Component as follows: Empathy 0.74; Interpersonal relationship 0.62; and Social Responsibility 0.74.

##### *Fortitude Questionnaire (FORQ) (Pretorius, 1998)*

The Fortitude Questionnaire (FORQ) measures strengths that assist an individual in meeting the stressful demands of daily life. Components include Self-Appraisal (FORQ-S), Family Appraisal (FORQ-F), Support Appraisal (FORQ-SF) and a Total (FORQ-T) score. The Self Appraisal subscale measures global appraisal of the self, as well as more specific aspects such as problem solving, efficacy, mastery and competence. The Family Support and Support from Friends subscales operationalize the interpersonal aspect of psychological well-being. The Family Appraisal subscale evaluates perceived support from the family as well as family conflict, cohesiveness and values. The Support from Friends subscale measures perceived support from others, incorporating both the amount of support perceived and the satisfaction derived from the support. In a South African study, Pretorius (1998) reported a Cronbach alpha of 0.74 (Self-Appraisal), 0.82 (Family Support) and 0.76 (Support from Friends).

*Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R): Extraversion and Agreeableness (Costa & Mc Crae, 1992)*

Two domain scales, Extraversion (NEO-E)- and Agreeableness (NEO-A) subscales were used as a measure of personality traits (Costa & McCrae, 1992). The Extraversion subscale includes facets such as warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, excitement-seeking and the experience of positive emotions. The Agreeableness facet highlights attributes such as trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty and tender-mindedness. Costa & Mc Crae (1992) reported Cronbach alpha indices ranging between 0.63 and 0.77 on the Extraversion subscale as well as Cronbach alpha indices of between 0.59 and 0.79 on the Agreeableness subscale.

*Attachment Style Questionnaire (Feeney, Noller & Hanrahan (1994)*

The Attachment Style Questionnaire (Feeney, Noller & Hanrahan (1994) clarifies issues concerning the dimensions central to adult attachment and the number of styles needed to define essential individual differences. Five subscales were identified, Confidence (AS-C); Discomfort with Closeness (AS-D); Need for Approval (AS-NA); Preoccupation with Relationships (AS-P) and Relationships as Secondary (AS-RS). Cronbach alpha's obtained were 0.80 (Confidence), 0.84 (Discomfort with Closeness), 0.79 (Need for Approval), 0.76 (Preoccupation with Relationships) and 0.76 (Relationships as Secondary) respectively (Feeney, Noller & Hanrahan, 1994).

*General Psychological Well-Being*

*General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) (Goldberg & Hillier, 1979)*

The GHQ is aimed at detecting common symptoms, which are encountered in the various syndromes of mental disorders and will thus differentiate individuals with psychopathology as a general class from those who are considered to be normal. The questionnaire therefore gives indication of the person's present mental condition and does not measure personality characteristics or their susceptibility to psychological illness. The original version of the questionnaire consisted of 140 items. A shortened version of

GHQ was later devised composed of only 28 items has been utilized in this investigation. Subscales are Somatic Symptoms (SS), Anxiety and Sleeplessness (AS), Social Dysfunction (SD) and Symptoms of Depression (SD). A South African study reported good reliability indexes and Cronbach coefficients (Wissing and Van Eeden; 2002).

*Sense of Coherence Scale (SOC) (Antonovsky, 1987, 1993)*

The Sense of Coherence Scale (SOC) of Antonovsky (1987, 1993) measures a global, pervasive orientation to life according to three core components of the sense of coherence, identified as comprehensibility, manageability and meaningfulness. Antonovsky (1993) reports internal consistency indices ranging from 0.74 to 0.93. Strümpfer & Wissing (1998) reported a mean alpha coefficient of 0.91 obtained in 27 South African Studies. The higher the SOC score the stronger the person's sense of coherence. In addition, according to Antonovsky (1993) the person with a strong sense of coherence will select the particular coping strategy that seems most appropriate to deal with the stressor being confronted.

*Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) (Diener, Emmons, Larsen and Griffen, 1985)*

This scale measures global life satisfaction. Diener et al. reported an alpha coefficient of 0.87 whereas Wissing and Du Toit (1994) obtained a Cronbach alpha of 0.85 in a South African study.

*Affectometer 2 Short Form (AFM) (Kammann & Flett, 1983).*

The AFM was designed to measure general happiness or a general sense of well-being based on measuring the balance of recent positive and negative feeling. The overall level of well-being is conceptualized as the extent to which positive feelings predominate over negative feelings (Kammann & Flett, 1983). Two subscales, Positive Affect (AFM-PA) and Negative Affect (AFM-NA) as well as a Total score (AFM-PNB) reflecting the positive-negative affect balance can be distinguished. Kammann and Flett (1983) reported high reliability and validity indices for the AFM with a Cronbach alpha index ranging from 0.88 to 0.93. In an investigation done on a South African population,

Wissing and van Eeden (1997) reported Cronbach alpha indices of 0.86 (Positive affect) and 0.90 (Negative affect).

### *Procedure*

All the questionnaires were presented to respondents in book form. Informed consent was obtained in writing from respondents and the questionnaires were administered in one or two sessions by trained psychometrists. Ethical aspects, according to the criteria set out by Neuman (1997) were taken into consideration. Respondents were free to withdraw from the study at any time and their anonymity was preserved. Individual feedback could have been requested, and was offered as a means of empowerment. The results of the research are intended for the promotion of knowledge within the field of Psychology.

## RESULTS

### *Descriptive statistics*

Descriptive statistics and Cronbach alpha reliability indices were computed for each scale and/or subscale. The means, standard deviations, range of scores as well as the Cronbach alpha reliability indices of all measuring instruments are presented in Table 1.

{Table 1 approximately here}

As indicated in Table 1 all the measuring instruments display acceptable reliability indices (Cronbach alpha's ranging from 0.72 to 0.88). Means and standard deviations are similar to those reported in the literature using more or less comparable groups.

### *Factor Analyses*

Two separate factor analyses were conducted. The first was conducted on scores of all (sub)scales measuring facets of interpersonal wellbeing. The second was conducted on all

scales measuring general psychological wellbeing as well as (sub)scales measuring interpersonal wellbeing.

Factor analysis on scales measuring interpersonal psychological well-being. The results of a factor analysis conducted to clarify the nature of the interpersonal component of psychological well-being are represented in Table 2. The maximum likelihood method of factor extraction was used and two factors were extracted.

{Table 2 approximately here}

These factors can be interpreted as follows:

Factor 1- 'Minding others' or Seeking to know the other

This factor has an eigenvalue of 4.14 and explains 31.8% of the total variance. Subscales that loaded highly and positively on this factor measure empathy (EQ:EM), interpersonal relationship qualities (EQ:IR), degree of openness to social responsibility (EQ:RE) and agreeableness (NEO:A). One subscale loaded highly negatively on this factor, namely relationships as secondary (AS:RS). An analysis of the relevant subscales reveal that all these refer to attributes helpful in reaching out to others, deeming social contact important and seeking interpersonal relations with the external world. A person with the abilities highlighted by this factor would be experienced as a 'giver' with a well developed measure of emotional intelligence in both close relationships and social/work groupings. They would be able to respond appropriately to the feelings of another, give and receive affect, compromise and cooperate effectively if need be, and finally, display altruistic tendencies.

Factor 2 – Comfortability in interpersonal relationships

An eigenvalue of 1.87 explains 14.39% of the total variance. Subscales with the highest load were confidence and comfortability in social relations (AS:C), positive self-appraisal (FORQ:S), experience of support from friends (FORQ:SF), experience of support from family (FORQ:F) and extraversion (NEO:E). Subscales that loaded highly negatively on

this factor refer to discomfort with closeness within interpersonal relationships (AS:D), preoccupation with relationships (AS:P) and need for approval (AS:P). An analysis of the relevant sub-scales reveal that these subscales refer to interpersonal attributes such as an enjoyment of closeness, confidence within relationships, having positive attitudes toward one's own abilities, and experience of social support. This factor highlights a potential to seek, receive and accept the benefits of social interaction. Social groups are experienced to be a source of excitement and fun. Basic trust in the caring capabilities of significant social others and a tendency to enjoy friendship can be distinguished.

Factor analysis on scores of scales measuring general psychological well-being and interpersonal psychological well-being. Three factors were revealed, using the maximum likelihood method of extraction.

The results of the factor analysis conducted to determine to what degree, if at all, the interpersonal component overlaps with general psychological well-being is presented in Table 3.

{Table 3 approximately here}

These factors can be interpreted as follows:

#### Factor 1 – Intra-personal psychological well-being

This factor has an eigenvalue of 6.94 and explains 40.87% of the total variance. Subscales that loaded highly and positively on this factor measure the degree of sense of coherence (SOC), positive self-appraisal (FORQ:S), affect balance (AFM:PNB). Subscales that loaded highly negatively on this factor refer to symptomatology (GHQ: T), need for approval (AS:NA) and preoccupation with relationships (AS:P). An analysis of the contents of these sub-scales reveals that they all refer to intra-personal aspects of psychological well-being. Indicators of general psychological well-being (SOC and AFM) were also present.

### Factor 2 – ‘Minding others’ or Seeking to know the other

Factor 2 had an eigenvalue of 2.23 that explained 13.1% of the total variance. Subscales that loaded highly and positively on this factor measure the degree of empathy (EQ:EM), the level of interpersonal relationship qualities (EQ:IR), degree of openness to social responsibility (EQ:RE) and agreeableness (NEO:A). Relationships as secondary (AS:RS) loaded highly negative on this factor. An analysis of the relevant sub-scales reveals that the subscales refer to tendencies helpful to reach out to others, to deem social contact important and to be agreeable in interpersonal relations. (See also Factor 1 in Table 2).

### Factor 3 – Comfortability and satisfaction in interpersonal relationships

This factor had an eigenvalue of 1.18 explaining 6.95% of total variance. Subscales that loaded highly and positively on this factor measure confidence and comfortability in social relations (AS:C), satisfaction with experience of support from friends (FORQ:SF), satisfaction with experience of support from family (FORQ:F), extraversion (NEO:E), and satisfaction with life (SWLS). A subscale that loaded highly negatively on this factor refers to discomfort with closeness within interpersonal relationships (AS:D). Taken together these subscales refer to facets that may be linked with the degree of satisfaction experienced in interpersonal relationships. (See Factor 2 in Table 2).

## DISCUSSION

The results indicated that interpersonal psychological well-being overlaps to some degree with general psychological well-being, but that it also forms a separate cluster or component of well-being.

Insofar as the overlap is concerned, the findings support holistic models of psychological well-being in which interpersonal well-being is one component, for example the model

by Eberst (1984) which distinguishes five dimensions of health, namely, physical, emotional, mental, social and spiritual. The interpersonal and social dimensions can be viewed as comparable. Ryff and Singer (2000) distinguished Positive Relations with Others as an important dimension of well-being, in addition to the dimensions of Self-Acceptance, Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Purpose in Life, and Personal Growth, that form subscales of their measure of psychological well-being.

In the current study, two different facets of interpersonal well-being have been found. The first refers more to the 'minding' of others and an attitude of modesty, manifested in close relationships as well as in a wider context as social responsibility. The second facet refers to a degree of comfort and assertiveness in interpersonal relationships and an enjoyment of social bonds whether they manifest in a close family context or in the wider social sphere.

Previous theories on interpersonal relationships tend to distinguish between close and more remote social relationships, for example Witmer and Sweeney (1992) who distinguished between the life task of developing friendship and the life task of developing close relationships. Pretorius (1998) also distinguished between support from a closer family circle and support from a wider circle of friends in his conceptualization of fortitude. The current findings suggest that within each of these two categories of interpersonal relationships different patterns or qualities of relating can be distinguished, namely the minding of others and the enjoyment of what is being received from others.

This difference may be related to personality traits. In the case of the first factor, minding or caring for others, the Agreeableness construct identified by Costa and McCrae (1992) features strongly. In the second factor, comfort in interpersonal relationships, the Extraversion construct features. The current findings suggest that interpersonal relationship well-being may be manifested differently in people displaying different patterns of personality traits. It is a question whether people scoring high in Agreeableness and people scoring high in Extraversion would also differ with regard to intra-personal patterns of psychological well-being.

The finding of two patterns of interpersonal well-being may have implications for counselling as well as life skills enhancement programmes. It is important to take cognisance of different skills necessary to function in close versus remote social relationships as traditionally has been done, but also to facilitate the development of both patterns of minding and giving versus enjoyment and satisfaction in social relationships, if optimal psychological well-being is to be obtained. The enhancement of both facets of interpersonal well-being may contribute to higher general psychological well-being. Different preferable patterns of being well in interpersonal relationships may also have implications for career choice.

Following findings of Lopez (1996) in which attachment predictors were related to constructive thinking in college students, it can be hypothesized that enhancement of both types of interpersonal relationship wellness, especially in young people, may enhance positive feelings which facilitate cognitive flexibility and constructive thinking. This is in line with Fredrickson's (2002) Broaden and Build model of positive emotions. This hypothesis needs to be verified in further research.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

1. The financial assistance of the National Research Foundation (NRF) of South Africa towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed in this report and conclusions arrived at are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the National Research Foundation (Grant to Prof M.P. Wissing, Ref. Nr.15/1/3/19/0049).
2. This research is based on a masters degree study by Lynette Nel, which was part of a larger multi-disciplinary research project under leadership of Wissing (1998).

## REFERENCES

- Adams, T., Bezner, J., & Steinhardt, M. (1997). The conceptualization and measurement of perceived wellness: Integrating balance across and within dimensions. *American Journal of Health Promotion, 11*(3), 208-218.
- Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. In Ryff, C.D. & Singer, B. (2000). Interpersonal Flourishing: A positive agenda for the new millennium. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*(1), 30-44.
- Amirkhan, J. (1990). A factor analytically derived measure of coping: The coping strategy indicator. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*(5), 1066 – 1074.
- Antonovsky, A. (1989). *Unravelling the mystery of health: How people manage stress and stay well*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Antonovsky, A. (1993). The structure and properties of the Sense of Coherence Scale (SOC). *Social Science and Medicine, 36*(6), 725-733.
- Argyle, M. (1987). *The psychology of happiness*. London: Methuen.
- Aspinwall, L. G. & Staudinger, U. M. (eds.). (2003). *A Psychology of Human Strengths: Fundamental Questions and Future Directions for a Positive Psychology*. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behaviour change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215.

- Bar-On, R. (1997). *Development of the BarOn EQ-I: A measure of emotional and social intelligence*. 105<sup>th</sup> Annual Convention of the American Psychologist Association, August 1997, Chicago, USA.
- Baumeister, R. F. & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
- Berscheid, E., & Reis, H. T. (1998). *Attraction and close relationships*. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology*. Vol. 2, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 193-281). Boston: Mc Graw-Hill.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cmich, D.E., (1984). Theoretical Perspectives of Holistic Health. *JOSII*, 54(1): 30-32.
- Cohen, S. (1988). Psychosocial models of the role of social support in the etiology of physical disease. *Health Psychology*, 7, 269-297.
- Cohen, S. & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98, 310-357.
- Costa, P.T. & Mc Crae, R.R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R., Larsen, R. J., & Griffen, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.
- Eberst, R. M. (1984). Defining Health: a multidimensional model. *Journal of School Health*, 54(3), 99-104.

- Epstein, S. (1992). *Constructive thinking and mental and physical well-being*. In L. Montada, S. H. Filipp, & M. J. Lerner (Eds.), *Life crises and experiences of loss in adulthood*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Erikson, E. (1959). Identity and the life cycle. *Psychological Issues, 1*, 18-164. In Ryff, C.D. & Singer, B. (2000). Interpersonal Flourishing: A positive agenda for the new millennium. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*(1), 30-44.
- Feeney, J.A., Noller, P. & Hanrahan, M. (1994). Assessing Adult Attachment. In Sperling, M.B. & Berman, W.H. (1994). *Attachment in Adults*. The Guilford Press: New York.
- Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). What good are positive emotions. *Review of General Psychology, 2*, 271-299.
- Frederickson, B. L. (2002). Positive Emotions. In *Handbook of Positive Psychology*. Oxford: University Press.
- Goldberg, D. P. & Hillier, V. F. (1979). A scaled version of the General Health Questionnaire. *Psychological Medicine, 9*, 139-145.
- Harvey, J. H., Pauwels, B. G., & Zichmund, S. (2002). *Relationship Connection: The role of Minding in the Enhancement of Closeness*. *Handbook of Positive Psychology*. Oxford: University Press.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 522-524.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry, 5*, 1-22.

- Jackson, L. A. & Jeffers, D. L. (1989). The attitudes about Reality Scale: A new measure of personal epistemology. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 53(2), 352-365.
- Jahoda, M. (1958). *Current concepts of positive mental health*. New York: Basic Books.
- In Ryff, C.D. & Singer, B. (2000). Interpersonal Flourishing: A positive agenda for the new millennium. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(1), 30-44.
- Kammann, R., & Flett, R. (1983). Affectometer 2: a scale to measure current levels of general happiness. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 35(2), 259-265.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61, 121-140.
- Knapp, R. R. (1976). *Handbook for the Personal Orientation Inventory*. San Diego: EdITS.
- Lewis, M. & Haviland, J. M. (1993). *Handbook of emotions*. New York: Guilford.
- Lightsey, O. R. (Jr.) (1996). What leads to Wellness? The Role of Psychological Resources in well-being. *The Counselling Psychologist*, 24(4), 589-735.
- Lopez, F.G. (1996). Attachment-Related Predictors of Constructive Thinking Among College Students. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 75, 58-63.
- Maslow, A. H. (1968). *Toward a psychology of being*. New York: D van Nostrand.
- Myers, D. G., & Diener, E. (1995). Who is happy? *Psychological Science*, 6, 10-19.
- Neuman, W.L. (1994) *Social Research Methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Boston. Allyn and Bacon.
- Pretorius, T.B. (1998). *Fortitude as stress-resistance: Development and validation of the Fortitude Questionnaire (FORQ)*. Bellville: University of the Western Cape.
- Procidano, M. E. & Heller, K. (1983). Measures of perceived social support from friends and family: Three validation studies. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 11(1) 1-24.

- Reis, H. T. (2000). *Relationships experiences and emotional well-being*. In C. D. Ryff & B. Singer (Eds.), *Emotion, social relationships and health*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reis, H. T. & Patrick, B. C. (1996). *Attachment and intimacy: Component processes*. In E. T. Higgins & A. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 367-389). Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Ryan, R.M. & Deci, E.L. (2001). On Happiness and Human Potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review Psychology*, 52, 141 – 166.
- Ryff, C. D.(1994). Psychological Well-Being in Adult Life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 12, 29-37.
- Ryff, C. D. & Singer, B. (2000). Interpersonal Flourishing: A Positive Health Agenda for the New Millennium. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4(1), 30-44.
- Schutte, P.S. & Ryff, C.D. (1997). Personality and well-being: reexamining methods and meanings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 549-559.
- Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 44-55, Jan.
- Simpson, J.A. (1990). Influence of attachment styles on romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Relationships*, 59, 971-980.
- Sperling, M.B. & Berman, W.H. (1994). *Attachment in Adults*. The Guilford Press: New York.
- Strümpfer, D. J. W. (1995). Salutogenesis: A new paradigm. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 20(4), 265-276.

- Strümpfer, D. J. W. (1995). The origins of health and strength: From salutogenesis to fortigenesis. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 25(2), 81-89.
- Strümpfer, D. J. W., & Wissing, M.P. (1998). Review of South African data on the sense of coherence scale as a measure of fortigenesis and salutogenesis. Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Congress of the Psychological Society of South Africa. Cape Town, 9-11<sup>th</sup> Sept.
- Wissing, M.P., & Du Toit, M.M. (1994). Relations of NEO-PI-R dimensions (NEO-FFI) to sense of coherence (SOC) and other measures of psychological well-being. Paper. 23<sup>rd</sup> International Congress of Applied Psychology, Madrid, Spain, 17<sup>th</sup> – 22<sup>nd</sup> July.
- Wissing, M. P., & Van Eeden, C. (1997). *Facing the challenge to explicate mental health: salutogenically: sense of coherence and psychological well-being*. Paper presented during the 55<sup>th</sup> annual convention of the International Council of Psychology. 14-18 July, 1997, Graz, Australia.
- Wissing M.P., & Van Eeden, C. (1998). *Psychological well-being: A Fortigenic conceptualization and empirical clarification*. In L. Schlebusch (Ed.). *South Africa Beyond Transition: Psychological Well-being*. (pp. 379-399). Proceedings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual Congress of the Psychological Society of South Africa, PsySSA: Pretoria.
- Wissing, M.P. & Van Eeden, C. (2002). Empirical clarification of the nature of psychological well-being. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 32, 32-44.
- Witmer, J. M. & Sweeney, J. (1992). A holistic model for wellness and prevention over the life span. *Journal of Counselling and Development*, 71, 140-146, Nov/Dec.

Zeidner, M. & Endler, N. S. (Eds.) (1996). *Handbook of coping: Theory, research, applications*. Wiley: New York.

**Table 1:** Descriptive statistics and reliability indices for all measuring instruments (N = 382)

Variable	Means	Standard Deviations	Range		Cronbach alpha
			Min.	Max	
EQ EM	33.06	4.36	17.00	40.00	0.72
EQ IR	43.28	6.39	24.00	55.00	0.80
EQ RE	42.20	5.12	21.00	50.00	0.73
FORQ S	2.95	0.82	1.00	4.00	0.85
FORQ F	2.96	0.84	1.00	4.00	0.85
FORQ SF	2.88	0.94	1.00	4.00	0.85
FORQ T	2.83	0.87	1.00	4.00	0.85
NEO E	2.42	1.28	0.00	4.00	0.81
NEO A	2.41	1.01	0.00	4.00	0.79
AS C	4.30	1.03	1.00	6.00	0.78
AS D	3.58	1.35	1.00	6.00	0.76
AS RS	2.74	1.40	1.00	6.00	0.76
AS NA	3.40	1.35	1.00	6.00	0.76
AS P	3.75	1.36	1.00	6.00	0.76
AS T	3.56	1.30	1.00	6.00	0.76
GHIQ SS	1.52	1.86	0.00	0.00	0.78
GHIQ AS	1.62	2.02	0.00	0.00	0.82

GHQ SD	1.12	1.65	0.00 - 0.00	0.77
GHQ DS	0.84	1.65	0.00 - 0.00	0.85
SOC	137.52	22.06	54.00 - 195.00	0.88
SWLS	24.85	5.89	5.00 - 35.00	0.85
AFM PA	37.59	5.73	18.00 - 50.00	0.83
AFM NA	20.76	6.71	10.00 - 48.00	0.84
AFM PNB	16.83	11.01	-23.00 - 40.00	-

Note: (-) - Cronbach Alpha cannot be calculated because this value consists of the sum of NA and PA. EQ - Emotional Quotient Inventory, EM - Empathy, IR - Interpersonal Relationship, RE - Social Responsibility; FORQ - The Fortitude Questionnaire, S - Self-SF - Support from Friends, F - Family support; NEO - NEO-PI-R, E - Extraversion, A - Agreeableness; AS - Attachment Style Questionnaire, C - Confidence, D - Discomfort, RS - Relationships as Secondary, NA - Need for Approval, P - Preoccupation; GHQ - General Health Questionnaire, SS - Somatic Symptoms, AS - Anxiety and Sleeplessness, SD - Social Dysfunction and DS - Symptoms of Severe Depression; SOC - Sense of Coherence; SWLS - Satisfaction with Life Questionnaire; AFM - Affectometer, PA - Positive Affect, NA - Negative Affect, PNB - Positive-Negative Affect Balance.

**Table 2:** Factor analysis using the maximum likelihood method of extraction on all subscales measuring facets of interpersonal psychological well-being.

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2
EQ-EM	<b>.91</b>	
EQ-IR	<b>.56</b>	<b>.50</b>
EQ-RE	<b>.83</b>	
AS-C		<b>.77</b>
AS-D		<b>-.64</b>
AS-RS	<b>-.50</b>	
AS-NA		<b>-.60</b>
AS-P		<b>-.57</b>
FORQ-S		<b>.67</b>
FORQ-SF		<b>.62</b>
FORQ-F		<b>.38</b>
NEO-E		<b>.57</b>
NEO-A	<b>.44</b>	<b>.35</b>
Eigenvalue	4.14	1.87
% Var. explained	31.8%	14.39%

**Note:** (-) - Only factor loadings >0.30 are shown. Factor loadings where the scale loads strongest are in bold. EQ - Emotional Quotient Inventory, EM - Empathy, IR - Interpersonal Relationship, RE - Social Responsibility; AS - Attachment Style Questionnaire, C - Confidence, D - Discomfort, RS - Relationships as Secondary, NA - Need for Approval, P - Preoccupation; FORQ - The Fortitude Questionnaire, S - Self, SF

- Support from friends, F – Family, NEO - NEO -PI-R, E - Extraversion, A - Agreeableness.

**Table 3** : Principle components method of factor analysis with varimax rotation of all subscales scores of scales measuring general psychological well-being and interpersonal well-being.

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
EQ-FM		.84	
EQ-IR		.60	.48
EQ-RE		.81	
GHQ -T	-.65		
AS-C	.37		.68
AS-D	-.39	-.33	-.42
AS-RS		-.71	
AS-NA	-.84		
AS-P	-.83		-.03
SOC-T	.75		.36
FORQ-S	.60		.52
FORQ-SF			.70
FORQ-F			.57
AFM-PNB	.67		.55
NEO-E			.65
NEO-A		.63	
SWLS	.50		.55
Eigenvalue	6.94	2.23	1.18

% Var. explained      40.87%                      13.1%                      6.95%

Note: (-) - Only factor loadings >0.30 are shown. Factor loadings where the scale loads strongest are in bold. EQ - Emotional Quotient Inventory, EM - Empathy, IR - Interpersonal Relationship, RE - Social Responsibility; GHQ - General Health Questionnaire, SS - Somatic Symptoms, AS - Anxiety and Sleeplessness, SD - Social Dysfunction and DS - Symptoms of Depression; AS - Attachment Style Questionnaire, C - Confidence, D - Discomfort, RS - Relationships as Secondary, NA - Need for Approval, P - Preoccupation; SOC T - Sense of Coherence Total; FORQ - The Fortitude Questionnaire, S - Self, SF - Support from Friends, F - Family; AFM - Affectometer, PA - Positive Affect, NA - Negative Affect, PNB - Positive-Negative Affect Balance; NEO - NEO-PI-R, E - Extraversion, A - Agreeableness; SWLS - Satisfaction with Life Questionnaire.