

Role Of Spirituality, Mindfulness, Social Support And Psychological Wellbeing Among Elderly

Anjali Verma¹, Dr. Ved Prakash Rawat^{2*}, Dr. Garima Gupta³

¹Former Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi. vermaanjanali592@gmail.com

^{2*}Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Vasanta College for Women, Admitted to the privileges of Banaras Hindu University, Rajghat Fort, Varanasi.

³Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, AMPG College, Admitted to the privileges of Banaras Hindu University, Chetganj, Varanasi. grm.garima2@gmail.com

***Corresponding Author:** Dr. Ved Prakash Rawat

*Email: rawatv704@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Aging is a natural and universal phenomenon in the entire world. In individual's whole life span "AGING" is considered as that period, where they spend one third part of their life in gaining various experiences (both either they are good or bad). The purpose of the study was to examine the role of spirituality, mindfulness and social support in psychological well-being among elderly. The sample of the present study was conducted on Total 200 elderly people with purposive sampling technique, within the age range from 60 to 75 years (Age Mean = 68.80, S.D. = 3.69). Sample was taken from various places of Varanasi and Chandauli district of Uttar Pradesh. Researchers used self-report questionnaires for taking responses of participants for studied variables. Correlational research design was used. The relevant psychometric tools were used to measure the different variables in the present research work. The Spiritual Personality Inventory-Revised (Husain & Anas, 2018), Five-facet mindfulness questionnaire (Mandal, Arya and Pandey, 2016), Social Support Scale (Asthana and Verma (2005), and Psychological Well Being Scale (Sisodia and Chaudhary, 2005) was used. The obtained data were statistically analyzed in terms of primary analysis like recoding of variables, computing variables, categorization of demographic variables, outlier analysis, descriptive analysis, correlation analysis and stepwise regression analysis. The SPSS 20.0 was used for the present study. Stepwise multiple regression analysis using total of spirituality, mindfulness and social support as predictor variables and psychological well-being (total and its dimensions) as criterion variables indicates that social support, mindfulness significantly predicts psychological well-being of the elderly, whereas spirituality significantly predicts only one dimension of psychological well-being viz. interpersonal relations. In conclusion, the present findings summarize that social support as well as mindfulness and spirituality are important for better psychological well-being of elderly people, which provides them motivation to live life with new hope and expectations by bringing about a change at the level of thought.

Key Words: - Social support, Mindfulness Psychological well-being, Elderly, and Spirituality.

The process of aging is a part of the transition from middle adulthood to late adulthood that brings various changes in the life of a person at the physical, psychological and social level. In this way, aging can be defined "as a phase that begins with conception and terminates with death". This phase of life provides an opportunity to the elderly to understand their capabilities and excellence so that they can pass on their norms and values to the coming generation during this period.

Life is full of challenges and problems, the form of which varies with each stage, especially in old age, its effect is seen at physical, social and psychological level. It includes illness, various types of psychological disorders, cognitive decline, adaptation with changes and loss, physical limitation to do any type of work etc. (Erber, 2013).

The cause of these problems is associated with reduced activities of elderly, physical and psychological changes, financial crisis, consequent decline of position in the family and society as well as changed attitude of younger generation towards elderly consequently they start considering them as a burden on themselves and on the society (Thekkedath & Joseph, 2009).

Psychological Well-being

Psychological well-being (PWB) is a broad concept that is reflected in the evaluation of people's lives itself. Such an evaluation covers a wide range of construct like purpose in life, life satisfaction, emotion regulation, self-acceptance and so on. Although psychological well-being refers to the subjective feeling of contentment and happiness, satisfaction with

life, personal growth, control over one's environment, feeling of self-dependence and acceptance, sense of accomplishment etc. (Verma and Verma, 1989).

Psychological well-being is aggregation of self-acceptance, pursuit of meaningful goals, ability to manage complex environments, establishment of quality ties to others, continued personal growth and sense of autonomy. Kovalenka and Spivak (2018) have described psychological well-being as a very complex personal phenomenon that can be characterized by a feeling of satisfaction with life, the quality of life, and personal sense of self fulfillment, creation of objective and subjective values.

Spirituality

In the present day, the effect of spirituality on general well-being and association with healthy aging has been studied extensively in various research and the findings indicated that spirituality tends to help older people to cope with physical or social losses.

The term spirituality is also explained as "search for sacred". The concept "spirituality" generally comes from philosophical thinking but widely used in all disciplines according to the requirement. Spirituality, as a positive factor played a very important role for elderly population and in maintaining and recovering from illness (Mackenzie et al., 2000; Koenig et al., 1999; Parker et al., 2002; Pressman, 1990; Matthews et al., 1998). It takes away them from negativity to positivity and fills new energy to live life happy and peacefully.

Mindfulness

In old age, elderly face various problems as mentioned earlier. Among these problems, lack of acceptance of challenges and problems associated with old age becomes more prominent. In this context Gowri (2003) has also said that "old age is called "dark" not because the light fails to shine but because people refuse to see it". Matecka (2009) also cleared that acceptance of old age contributes to the feeling of happiness and life satisfaction but lack of acceptance of current life situations contributes to arousing feelings of grief, worry and physical suffering. Research evidence shows importance of mindfulness in the aging process.

Kabat-Zinn (1991) has operationally defined mindfulness as a state of awareness that arises through paying attention in a particular way on purpose, in the present moment, non-judgmentally. With a different view, Langer (1992) has defined mindfulness as a trait characterized by such attributes as awareness, openness to novelty, abilities to draw novel distinction etc. Black (2010) has suggested that mindfulness practice helps individuals to become aware of the space between noticing experiences and reacting to them, allowing them to slow down and observe the processes of the mind.

Social Support

At each phase of human life, the individual belongs to a variety of kinship, community and social groups. Thoits (2011) has said that social support refers to positive exchanges with network members that help people stay healthy or cope with adverse events. Furthermore, social support is helpful in social interactions that make people feel better. It is help and comfort supported by a network of caring and interested people, with such support playing a key role in successful aging (Antonucci, 1990; Antonucci & Akiyama, 1991). Social support has been conceptualized as structural integration into a social network of relationship as well as functional resources provided as a part of ongoing interpersonal relationships and these two approaches seem to represent sociological and psychological perspective respectively (Cohen and Syme, 1985, House and Kahn, 1985; Barrera, 1986; Curtona, 1986). Social support is a complex, multifaceted phenomenon.

In this context, Matt & Dean (1993) have reported that social support has long been acknowledged as a factor that influences psychological well-being. Social support can be divided into four categories are widely accepted by the researchers namely emotional support, informational support, instrumental support and companionship support (Wills, 1991; Langford, 1997; Slevin et al. 1996; Taylor, 2011). Another distinction of social support is perceived and received support (Taylor, 2011; Barrera, 1986). Furthermore, Marjorie and Bennet (1980) categorized support system into two – formal and informal. Some other famous psychologists also demonstrated different types such as structural and functional support (Wills, 1998).

Rationale of the study

In old age various physical and psychological challenges (various kinds of disease like blood pressure, diabetes and so on, lack of adjustment, death of spouse, loneliness financial problem etc.) are faced by the elderly people. Hence it adversely affects their psychological well-being. So, it is necessary to examine promoting factors (e.g. spirituality, mindfulness and social support) that lead to better psychological well-being.

Objectives

- 1- To investigate the role of spirituality, mindfulness, and social support in the psychological well-being of elderly people.
- 2- To investigate the relative contribution of spirituality, mindfulness and social support (total and dimensions) in predicting psychological well-being (total and dimensions) of elderly.

Hypotheses

- 1- Dimensions of spirituality would emerge as significant predictor of psychological well-being and its dimensions.
- 2- Dimensions of mindfulness would emerge as significant predictor of psychological well-being.
- 3- Dimensions of social support would emerge as significant predictor of psychological well-being.
- 4- Social support would emerge as significant predictor of psychological well-being.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

Purposive sampling technique was adopted for the selection of participants in the present study. Total 200 (N= 200, Age Mean = 68.80, S.D. = 3.690) elderly people within the age range from 60 to 75 years. Sample was taken from various places of Varanasi and Chandauli district of Uttar Pradesh. The subjects were convinced to participate in the study. Self-report questionnaires was used for taking response of participants.

Measuring Tools-

1-Spiritual Personality Inventory- Revised (SPI-R)

The revised version of the SPI was developed by Husain & Anas in 2018. This self-report inventory is made up of 28 items, used to measure the spiritual personality of individuals on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly Agree. This scale measures spiritual personality with six dimensions labeled as spiritual virtues, positive outlook on life, spiritual disciplines, goodness, spiritual service and moral rectitude. The SPI-R is reported to have very good Cronbach Alpha values for spiritual personality is .893.

2- Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire-H (FFMQ-H) The twenty-eight items Hindi version of Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire developed by Mandal, Arya, and Pandey (2016) was utilised. This scale was used to measure the general tendency of the individuals to be mindful in their daily life on 5-point Likert scale ranging from “rarely true to always true”. The scale covers four dimensions of mindfulness labelled as describing, acting with awareness, non-judgement of inner experience and non-reactivity to inner experiences.

3-Social Support Scale (SSS)

Social Support Scale (SSS), developed by Asthana and Verma (2005). It contains 35 items, and the response was to be obtained on a 5-point response format strongly agree to strongly disagree. The scale provides a total social support score with 3 dimensions of social support such as Emotional Support, Informational Support and Instrumental Support. Test-Retest Reliability of the scale was found .81, indicating high reliability of the scale.

4-Psychological Well Being Scale (PWBS) developed by Sisodia and Chaudhary (2005) for measuring psychological well-being was used. This tool consists of 50 items that were based on the five aspects or areas of well-being such as Life satisfaction, Efficiency, Sociability, Mental health, and Interpersonal relations. PWBS is easy and quick measures rated on a 5-point Likert scale with scores ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Procedure

Participants who served the purpose of this study were contacted from the cities of Varanasi and Chandauli. Initially, the researcher obtained the informed consent for participation in the study. To ensure an honest, correct, and sincere response, the necessary instructions and a brief description of the scales, along with the objectives and importance of the study, were briefed to them. The demographic information was collected, and the related questionnaire was administered to them. After completing each questionnaire, the researcher expressed gratitude to each participant for participating in the study.

Research Design and Statistical Analysis

Correlational research design was used to assess the Role of spirituality, mindfulness, social support for psychological well-being of elderly. For determining the relative contribution of predictors (spirituality, mindfulness and social support) in criterion (psychological well-being) variable separately, stepwise regression analysis was done. The SPSS 20.0 was used for the present study.

Results

In view of the main purpose of the present study to investigated the role of spirituality, mindfulness and social support in psychological well-being of elderly. The obtained findings have been summarized in the following table: -

Table-1:-Result table of stepwise multiple regression analysis using dimensions of spirituality as predictor variable and psychological well-being total and its dimensions as criterion variable

Predictors	R	R ²	R ² change	F Value	Beta (β)	t-value	p-value
Satisfaction (Criterion variable)							
Spiritual discipline	0.657	0.432	0.432	150.676	0.437	7.117	0.001
Positive outlook on life	0.722	0.521	0.089	107.002	0.370	6.033	0.001
Efficiency (criterion variable)							
Spiritual discipline	0.659	0.435	0.435	152.389	0.426	7.036	0.001
Positive outlook on life	0.731	0.535	0.100	113.122	0.393	6.494	0.001
Sociability (criterion variable)							
Spiritual discipline	0.685	0.469	0.469	174.863	0.466	7.886	0.001
Positive outlook on life	0.746	0.556	0.087	123.574	0.368	6.233	0.001
Mental health (criterion variable)							
Spiritual discipline	0.704	0.495	0.495	194.210	0.465	8.034	0.001
Positive outlook on life	0.759	0.576	0.081	133.802	0.344	6.033	0.001
Moral rectitude	0.768	0.590	0.014	93.995	0.123	2.583	0.011
Interpersonal relations (criterion variable)							
Spiritual virtue	0.675	0.455	0.455	165.272	0.504	8.564	0.001
Spiritual discipline	0.716	0.513	0.058	103.638	0.246	4.624	0.001
Moral rectitude	0.729	0.531	0.018	73.995	0.155	2.748	0.007
Psychological well-being (criterion variable)							
Spiritual discipline	0.677	0.459	0.459	167.975	0.413	7.019	0.001
Positive outlook on life	0.745	0.556	0.097	120125	0.375	6.469	0.001
Moral rectitude	0.760	0.577	0.021	89.102	0.152	3.149	0.002

On the basis table-1, the obtained findings reported that spiritual discipline, positive outlook on life and moral rectitude emerged as significant predictors of psychological well-being (total) of elderly people. Table value reveals that spiritual discipline ($\beta = 0.413$, $p < 0.001$), positive outlook on life ($\beta = 0.375$, $p < 0.001$) and moral rectitude ($\beta = 0.152$, $p < 0.001$), dimensions of spirituality were significantly positively associated with psychological well-being of the elderly and accounted 45.9%, 9.7% and 2.1% of the total variance respectively in explaining psychological well-being.

In addition, different subsets of dimensions of spirituality have been found to be significant predictors for different dimensions of psychological well-being, which are as follows:

The first dimension of PWB such as satisfaction, was significantly positively associated with spiritual discipline ($\beta = 0.437$, $p < 0.001$) and positive outlook on life ($\beta = 0.370$, $p < 0.001$), dimensions of spirituality (explained 43.2% and 8.9% of the total variance respectively). Same as before, the second dimension of PWB viz. efficiency, was significantly positively associated with spiritual discipline ($\beta = 0.426$, $p < 0.001$) and positive outlook on life ($\beta = 0.393$, $p < 0.001$), dimensions of spirituality (explained 43.5% and 10.0% of the total variance respectively). In the same way, the third dimension of PWB namely sociability, was significantly positively associated with spiritual discipline ($\beta = 0.466$, $p < 0.001$) and positive outlook on life ($\beta = 0.368$, $p < 0.001$), dimensions of spirituality (explained 46.9% and 8.7% of the total variance respectively). Further, the fourth dimension of PWB such as mental health, was significantly positively associated with spiritual discipline ($\beta = 0.465$, $p < 0.001$), followed by positive outlook on life ($\beta = 0.344$, $p < 0.001$) and moral rectitude ($\beta = 0.123$, $p < 0.001$), dimensions of spirituality (explained 49.5%, 8.1% and 1.4% of the total variance respectively). Lastly, the fifth dimension of PWB viz. interpersonal relations, was significantly positively associated

with spiritual virtues ($\beta = 0.504, p < 0.001$), followed by spiritual discipline ($\beta = 0.246, p < 0.001$) and moral rectitude ($\beta = 0.155, p < 0.001$), dimensions of spirituality (explained 45.5%, 5.8% and 1.8% of the total variance respectively).

Table-2:-Result table of stepwise multiple regression analysis using dimensions of mindfulness as predictor variables and dimensions as well as total of psychological well being as criterion variable

Predictors	R	R ²	R ² change	F Value	Beta (β)	t-value	p-value
Satisfaction (Criterion variable)							
Non judgement to inner experiences	0.676	0.457	0.457	166.720	0.504	6.780	0.001
Non reactivity to inner experiences	0.695	0.484	0.027	92.273	0.237	3.183	0.002
Efficiency (criterion variable)							
Non judgement to inner experiences	0.687	0.472	0.472	177.174	0.439	6.116	0.001
Non reactivity to inner experiences	0.721	0.520	0.047	106.522	0.263	3.481	0.001
Acting with awareness	0.728	0.530	0.010	73.577	0.121	2.052	0.041
Sociability (criterion variable)							
Non judgement to inner experiences	0.672	0.452	0.452	163.085	0.460	6.251	0.001
Acting with awareness	0.702	0.492	0.040	95.455	0.182	3.010	0.003
Non-reactivity to inner experiences	0.710	0.505	0.013	66.577	0.173	2.230	0.027
Mental health (criterion variable)							
Non judgement to inner experiences	0.685	0.469	0.469	174.669	0.592	10.343	0.001
Acting with awareness	0.706	0.499	0.030	98.035	0.197	3.441	0.001
Interpersonal relations (criterion variable)							
Non judgement to inner experiences	0.590	0.348	0.348	105.665	0.453	7.413	0.001
Describing	0.647	0.418	0.070	70.869	0.299	4.886	0.001
Psychological well being (criterion variable)							
Non judgement to inner experiences	0.704	0.495	0.495	194.121	0.516	7.208	0.001
Non reactivity to inner experiences	0.721	0.520	0.025	106.803	0.175	2.316	0.022
Acting with awareness	0.729	0.531	0.011	74.118	0.128	2.172	0.031

On the basis table-2, the obtained findings revealed that PWB (total) of elderly people was significantly positively associated with non judgement to inner experiences ($\beta = 0.516, p < 0.001$) followed by non-reactivity to inner experiences ($\beta = 0.175, p < 0.001$) and acting with awareness ($\beta = 0.128, p < 0.001$), dimensions of mindfulness (accounted 49.5%, 2.5% and 1.1% of the total variance respectively). Further different subsets of dimensions of mindfulness have been found to be significant predictors for different dimensions of psychological well-being, which are as follows:

The analysis reported that dimensions of mindfulness such as non judgement to inner experiences ($\beta = 0.504, p < 0.001$) and non-reactivity to inner experiences ($\beta = 0.237, p < 0.001$) were significantly positively associated with first dimension of psychological well-being namely "satisfaction" (explained 45.7% and 2.7% of the total variance sequentially). Further, dimensions of mindfulness viz. non judgement to inner experiences ($\beta = 0.439, p < 0.001$) followed by non-reactivity to inner experiences ($\beta = 0.263, p < 0.001$) and acting with awareness ($\beta = 0.121, p < 0.001$) were significantly positively associated with second dimension of psychological well-being that is "efficiency" (explained 47.2%, 4.7% and 1.0 % of the total variance successively). In the same way, non judgement to inner experiences ($\beta = 0.460, p < 0.001$) followed by acting with awareness ($\beta = 0.182, p < 0.001$) and non-reactivity to inner experiences ($\beta = 0.173, p < 0.001$), dimensions of mindfulness were significantly positively associated with third dimension of psychological well-being viz. Sociability, (explained 45.2%, 4.0% and 1.3% of the total variance respectively). In addition, dimensions of mindfulness namely non judgement to inner experiences ($\beta = 0.592, p < 0.001$)

and acting with awareness ($\beta = 0.197, p < 0.001$) were significantly positively associated with fourth dimension e.g. mental health of psychological well-being (explained 46.9% and 3.0% of the total variance successively). At last, non judgement to inner experiences ($\beta = 0.453, p < 0.001$) and describing ($\beta = 0.299, p < 0.001$), dimensions of mindfulness were significantly positively associated with fifth dimension of psychological well-being such as “interpersonal relations (accounted 34.8% and 7.0% of the total variance respectively).

Table-3:-Result table of stepwise multiple regression analysis using dimensions of social support as predictor variables and dimensions as well as total of psychological well-being as criterion variable

Predictors	R	R ²	R ² change	F Value	Beta (β)	t-value	p-value
Satisfaction (Criterion variable)							
Instrumental support	0.828	0.685	0.685	430.269	0.725	13.634	0.001
Emotional support	0.835	0.697	0.012	226.948	0.152	2.851	0.005
Efficiency (criterion variable)							
Instrumental support	0.830	0.689	0.689	439.666	0.626	10.340	0.001
Informational support	0.846	0.716	0.027	248.803	0.262	4.3222	0.001
Sociability (criterion variable)							
Instrumental support	0.833	0.694	0.694	449.316	0.708	11.446	0.001
Informational support	0.839	0.704	0.010	234.540	0.161	2.5960	0.001
Mental health (criterion variable)							
Instrumental support	0.855	0.731	0.731	537.800	0.785	15.821	0.001
Emotional support	0.858	0.737	0.006	275.724	0.104	2.098	0.037
Interpersonal relations (criterion variable)							
Emotional support	0.763	0.582	0.582	275.739	0.490	8.830	0.001
Instrumental support	0.819	0.671	0.089	200.706	0.404	7.287	0.001
Psychological well being (criterion variable)							
Instrumental support	0.868	0.753	0.753	604.271	0.425	15.899	0.001
Emotional support	0.882	0.778	0.024	334.201	0.212	4.639	0.001

On the basis table-3, the analysis of obtained scores indicated that PWB (total) of elderly people was significantly positively associated with instrumental support ($\beta = 0.725, p < 0.001$) and emotional support ($\beta = 0.212, p < 0.001$), dimensions of social support (accounted 75.3% and 2.4% of the total variance respectively). Further, different subsets of dimensions of social support have been found to be significant predictors for different dimensions of psychological well-being, which are as follows:

The findings revealed that dimensions of social support such as instrumental support ($\beta = 0.725, p < 0.001$) and emotional support ($\beta = 0.152, p < 0.001$) were significantly positively associated with first dimension of psychological well-being such as satisfaction (accounted 68.5% and 1.2% of the total variance respectively). Further, dimensions of social support such as instrumental support ($\beta = 0.626, p < 0.001$) and informational support ($\beta = 0.262, p < 0.001$) were significantly positively associated with second dimension of psychological well-being viz. efficiency (explained 68.9% and 2.7% of the total variance sequentially). In the same way, Dimensions of social support such as instrumental support ($\beta = 0.708, p < 0.001$) and informational support ($\beta = 0.161, p < 0.001$) were significantly positively associated with third dimension of psychological well-being viz. sociability (accounted 69.4% and 1.0% of the total variance respectively). In addition, instrumental support ($\beta = 0.785, p < 0.001$) and emotional support ($\beta = 0.104, p < 0.001$) were significantly positively associated with the fourth dimension of psychological well-being viz. mental health (explained 73.1% and 0.6% of the total variance sequentially). Finally, dimensions of social support viz. emotional support ($\beta = 0.490, p < 0.001$) and instrumental support ($\beta = 0.404, p < 0.001$) were significantly positively associated with fifth dimension of PWB such as interpersonal relations (accounted 58.2% and 8.9% of the total variance respectively).

Table-4:-Result table of stepwise multiple regression analysis using total of spirituality, mindfulness and social support as predictor variables and dimensions as well as total of psychological well-being as criterion variable

Predictors	R	R ²	R ² change	F Value	Beta (β)	t-value	p-value
Satisfaction (Criterion variable)							
Social support	0.803	0.645	0.645	360.335	0.680	10.919	0.001
Mindfulness	0.811	0.618	0.012	189.293	0.166	2.668	0.008
Efficiency (criterion variable)							
Social support	0.814	0.663	0.663	389.572	0.654	10.924	0 .001
Mindfulness	0.827	0.684	0.021	213.174	0.216	3.613	0.001
Sociability (criterion variable)							
Social support	0.800	0.640	0.640	352.244	0.641	10.36	0.001
Mindfulness	0.813	0.661	0.021	191.867	0.214	3.460	0.001
Mental health (criterion variable)							
Social support	0.814	0.663	0.663	389.626	0.675	11.196	0.001
Mindfulness	0.824	0.679	0.016	218.055	0.187	3.096	0.002
Interpersonal relations (criterion variable)							
Social support	0.791	0.626	0.626	331.306	0.576	10.124	0.001
Spirituality	0.821	0.675	0.044	204.123	0.308	5.423	0.001
Psychological well being (criterion variable)							
Social support	0.856	0.733	0.733	542.404	0.728	13.509	0.001
Mindfulness	0.864	0.747	0.014	290.539	0.178	3.328	0.001

The result illustrated in table-4 indicated the finding obtained from stepwise regression analysis, using total scores of spirituality, mindfulness and social support as predictor variables, and psychological well-being total and its dimensions (D₁.satisfaction, D₂-efficiency, D₃-sociability, D₄-mental health and D₅-interpersonal relations) as criterion variable.

On the basis table-4, the obtained findings revealed that PWB (total) of elderly people was significantly positively associated with social support ($\beta = 0.728, p < 0.001$) and mindfulness ($\beta = 0.178, p < 0.001$), which accounted 73.3% and 1.4% of the total variance respectively in explaining PWB of the elderly. Further different subsets of these predictor variables were found to be significant predictors for different dimensions of psychological well-being, which are as follows:

The findings reported that social support ($\beta = 0.680, p < 0.001$) and mindfulness ($\beta = 0.166, p < 0.001$) were significantly positively associated with the first dimension of psychological well-being viz. satisfaction (explained 64.5% and 1.2% of the total variance respectively). Similarly, social support ($\beta = 0.654, p < 0.001$) and mindfulness ($\beta = 0.216, p < 0.001$) were significantly positively associated with the second dimension of PWB viz. efficiency (explained 66.3% and 2.1% of the total variance respectively). Same as before, social support ($\beta = 0.641, p < 0.001$) and mindfulness ($\beta = 0.214, p < 0.001$) were significantly positively associated with the third dimension of psychological well-being viz. sociability (explained 64.0% and 2.1% of the total variance respectively). In the same way, social support ($\beta = 0.675, p < 0.001$) and mindfulness ($\beta = 0.187, p < 0.001$), were significantly positively associated with the fourth dimension of PWB viz. mental health (explained 66.3% and 1.6% of the total variance respectively). Further, social support ($\beta = 0.576, p < 0.001$) and spirituality ($\beta = 0.308, p < 0.001$) were significantly positively associated with the fifth dimension of psychological well-being namely interpersonal relations (explained 62.6% and 4.9% of the total variance respectively).

With the help of obtained results, it can be noted that social support emerged as significant predictor for overall psychological well-being of elderly people followed by mindfulness (except spirituality). Thus, on the basis of above findings, it can be assumed that social support and mindfulness may play an important role in promoting psychological well-being of elderly people.

Discussion

The obtained results have been discussed in the light of theoretical and empirical evidences in accordance with hypotheses of the present work.

Major Findings of the present Study

➤ *On spirituality*, four dimensions of spirituality viz. spiritual virtue, positive outlook on life, spiritual discipline and moral rectitude (except goodness and spiritual services) formed the best set of predictors for psychological well-being of elderly people. In addition, all or a subset of these predictors were found to be significant in predicting all other dimensions of psychological wellbeing. However, on the basis of above findings, it can be said that following spiritual characteristics like spiritual discipline, positive outlook on life and moral rectitude relatively more important than other dimensions of spirituality as we as can be helpful to maintain good state of psychological well-being of elderly people. Thus, proposed hypothesis *first* of the present study is partially confirmed, due to the emergence of some dimensions of spirituality as a predictor of psychological well-being of elderly.

The findings of the present study supported by the view of Murray and Zenter (1989), which reported that spiritual dimensions, tries to be harmony with the universe, strives for answers about the infinite, and comes into focus when the person faces emotional stress, physical illness or death. In the same context, the finding of Husain and Anas (2018) also thrown light on the fact that spirituality plays a prominent role in the life of a person, specifically in the challenging situations. Person with spiritual personality takes a holistic view and for having it, requires spiritual virtues, positive outlook on life, spiritual discipline, goodness, spiritual services and moral rectitude. Regarding this, the view of Husain and Anas (2018) can be taken, who suggested that spiritual virtues is the starting point of a spiritual person which consists of many qualities, such as fulfilling promises, trustworthy, kindness, purity and clean, truthfulness and good etiquettes and manners, it makes a person stronger internally, which in turn is beneficial for mental health.

➤ *On mindfulness*, non-judgement to inner experiences, non-reactivity to inner experiences and acting with awareness (except describing), dimensions of mindfulness formed the best set of predictors for psychological well-being of elderly people. In addition, all or a subset of these predictors were found to be significant in predicting all other dimensions of psychological wellbeing. However, on the basis of above findings, it can be concluded that following traits of mindfulness like non-judgement to inner experiences, non-reactivity to inner experiences and acting with awareness were found to be relatively more important than other dimension of mindfulness as well as can helps to promote psychological well-being of elderly people. Thus, proposed hypothesis *second* partially confirmed and provides reasonably consistent support for the contribution of dimensions of mindfulness (non-judgement to inner experiences, non-reactivity to inner experiences and acting with awareness) in psychological well-being of elderly people.

The observation clarifies that domain of mindfulness helps to promote psychological well-being of elderly people, non-reactivity to inner experiences helps to enhance the use of adaptive emotion regulation and to reduce the use of suppression (Mandal et al., 2014). Similarly, the increased non-judgmental attitude reduces the willingness to remain in contact with negative experiences (Chambers et al. 2009) and be free from any fixed mental set, preoccupations and prejudices (Langer & Moldoveanu, 2000). The tendency of acting with awareness decreased habitual mode of functioning (Chambers et al. 2009) and increased the level of consciousness towards present activities.

The findings of the present study are supported by a multitude of research findings that have shown beneficial effects of mindfulness and its dimensions for overall psychological well-being in a comprehensive manner, Baer et al., (2006) stated that describing or labelling internal experiences with words leads to clarity in thoughts (Kabat-Zinn, 2014), acting or performing present activities with full consciousness brings awareness towards situation, non-judgmental observation of every phenomenon (Brown et.al (2015) leads to acceptance of the situation and happiness (Shapiro et al., 2006), being non-reactive to situations leads to a tendency to take a different position towards cognitive and affective experiences without engaging in them and imposing any feedback (Baer et al., 2006) therefore, mindfulness meditation nurtures consciousness resulting into behaviour regulation and well-being (Brown et.al (2015). Similarly, Houhas and Spark (2013) also have shown the importance of each facet of mindfulness in predicting PWB of elderly people.

➤ *On social support*, instrumental support and emotional support (except informational support), dimensions of social support formed the best set of predictors for psychological well-being of elderly people. In addition, all or a subset of these predictors were found to be significant in predicting all other dimensions of psychological wellbeing. However, on the basis of above findings, it can be suggested that various forms of social support such as instrumental support and emotional support were found to be relatively more important than other dimension of social support as well as can be helpful to increase psychological well-being of elderly people. So, on the basis of above findings, the proposed hypothesis *third* is partially confirmed and it can be assumed that with all these sources of social support, an emotional, informational and instrumental support system can provide them with the support they can rely on with assurance for their own safety.

The said pattern of findings suggests that instrumental support helps to access practical services and material resources that may help to reduce stress by direct solution of instrumental problems (Asthana & Verma, 2005) that include help with personal and medical care, transportation, meal preparation etc.

The finding of the present study is supported by the finding of Portero and Oliva (2007), which revealed that social support has a significant impact on the psychological well-being of the elderly and this in turn has a greater impact on physical and mental health. In the same way, Kessler and Mcleod (1985) showed the importance of emotional support in

protecting individuals from the harmful effects of stress as compare to structural means of support (e.g. social involvement or activity).

Wong, Yoo & Stewert (2007) highlighted the importance of social support in psychological well-being and reported that more social support significantly contributes in overall psychological well-being.

➤ Stepwise multiple regression analyses demonstrate the predicting effect of social support and mindfulness on psychological well-being along with its four dimensions (satisfaction, efficiency, sociability and mental health), whereas the set of social support and spirituality were found to be the significant predictor for only one dimension of psychological well-being viz. interpersonal relations in elderly people. Therefore, it can be noted that social support emerged as significant predictor for overall psychological well-being of elderly people followed by mindfulness (except spirituality). Thus, on the basis of above findings, it can be assumed that social support and mindfulness may play an important role in promoting psychological well-being of elderly people. However, the said pattern of finding demonstrates the predicting effect of social support and mindfulness on psychological well-being and its four dimensions (satisfaction, efficiency, sociability and mental health), whereas the set of social support and spirituality were found to be the significant predictor for only one dimension of psychological well-being viz. interpersonal relations in elderly people, therefore the obtained finding supports the proposed hypothesis *fourth* of the present study.

The present study shades light on the fact that social support, mindfulness and spirituality have a promoting role in overall psychological well-being of the elderly. The results of the present study on the role of social support in psychological well-being are consistent with the finding of Mishra et al. (2014), in which they examined predicting effect of social support on psychological well-being in elderly with hierarchical regression analysis and explained that elderly people with higher level of social support have higher level of psychological well-being.

Further, Litwin & Shiovitz-Ezra, (2006) also indicated that the quality of social ties and active participation in social activities is a good predictor of health and well-being in elderly people. In the same way, Robinson (2005) also found social support as a strongest predictor of life satisfaction.

The current findings concerning the role of mindfulness in predicting psychological well-being are compatible with the study of Hohaus and Spark (2013), in which they examined the contribution of mindfulness to psychological well-being of older adults and reported mindfulness as a significant predictor of psychological well-being of elderly people. Similarly, this finding also accompanied with the finding of Brown & Ryan (2003).

Further, the finding of Hicks & Mehta (2018) indicates that mindfulness significantly associated with personality in predicting psychological well-being and supports attention to developing programs in mindfulness to help increase psychological well-being.

Similarly, Sharma & Rush, (2014) also reported that regular practice of mindfulness helps to take care of one's emotional needs and overall health leading to an experience of positive emotions and happiness.

Although the findings of the present study explain the less predictive value of spirituality on psychological well-being, but it has significant contribution in the psychological well-being of the elderly. Previous researches also considered spirituality as an element in the well-being of elderly (Papadopoulos, 2020).

Therefore, the findings of the present study revealed that social support is important factor for betterment of psychological well-being of the elderly followed by mindfulness. These positive factors have emerged as the most important protective factors against the challenging life situations of the elderly people, and play a significant role in upgrading their overall psychological well-being. In addition, those promoting factors are important in creating and promoting positive qualities such as adaptation, acceptance, socializing, affectivity etc. to promote psychological health and to be prepared for future challenges not only for this population but for all individuals.

In conclusion it can be said that while social support is more associated with social well-being of the elderly people, mindfulness is significantly related to their emotional well-being and spirituality is more concerned with spiritual well-being, therefore when social support, mindfulness and spirituality come together, they jointly affect the psychological well-being of the elderly in a positive manner. The result of this research is pertinent for healthcare providers and policymakers promoting successful ageing and increasing the well-being of older people.

REFERENCES

1. Antonucci, T.C. (1990). 'Social Supports And Social Relationships', In R.H. Binstock & L. K. George (Eds.) *The Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences*, (3rd Eds.) San Diego, Ca: Academic Press. Ch. 11, Pp. 205-226.
2. Antonucci, T.C., & Akiyama, H. (1991). Convoys of Social Support: Generational Issues. *Marriage and Family Review*, 16, 103-124.
3. Asthana, M. & Verma, K.B., (2005). "Social Support Scale". Rupa Psychological Centre, Bhelupur, Varanasi, Pp. 1-16.
4. Baer, R. A., Smith, G.T., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., & Toney, L. (2006). Using self report assessment methods to explore facets of mindfulness. *Assessment*, 13, 27-45. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1073191105283504>

5. Barrera, M. (1986). Distinction between Social Support Concepts, Measures and Models. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 114 (4), 413-445.
6. Black, D. S. (2010). A 40-Year Publishing History of Mindfulness. *Mindfulness Research Monthly*, 1(5).
7. Brown, D. B., Bravo, A. J., Roos, C. R., & Pearson, M. R. (2015). Five facets of mindfulness and psychological health: Evaluating a psychological model of the mechanisms of mindfulness. *Mindfulness*, 6(5), 1021-1032. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-014-0349-4>
8. Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 84(4), 822. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822>
9. Chambers, R., Gullone, E., & Allen, N. B. (2009). Mindful emotion regulation: An integrative review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 29, 560-572. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.06.005>
10. Cohen, S. & Syme, S.L. (1985). *Social Support and Health*. New York: Academic Press.
11. Cutrona, C. E. (1986). Behavioural Manifestations of Social Support: A Micro analytic Investigation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(1), 201-208.
12. Erber, J.T. (2013), *Aging and Older Adulthood*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
13. Gowri, G.B. (2003). Attitude towards old age and aging as shown by humour. *Gerontologist*, 17(2): 220-226.
14. Hicks, R. E., & Mehta, Y. (2018). The Big Five, Type A Personality, and Psychological Well-Being. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 10(1), 49-58. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v10n1p49>
15. Hohauser, L. C., & Spark, J. (2013). 2672-Getting better with age: do mindfulness & psychological well-being improve in old age?. *European Psychiatry*, 28(S1), 1-1. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-9338\(13\)77295-X](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-9338(13)77295-X)
16. House, J.S. & Kahn, R.L. (1985). Measures and Concepts of Social Support. In S. Cohen and S.L. Syme (Eds.) *Social Support and Health*. New York: Academic Press.
17. Husain, A. and Anas, M. (2018). *Manual for Spiritual Personality Inventory (Revised)*. Agra Psychological Research Cell, Agra.
18. Kabat-Zinn, J. (1991). *Full Catastrophe Living: Using the Wisdom of Your Body and Mind to Face Stress, Pain, and Illness*. New York: Delacorte.
19. Kabat-Zinn, J. (2014). Meditation is everywhere. *Mindfulness*, 5(4), 462-463. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-014-0323-1>
20. Kessler, R. C., & McLeod, J. D. (1985). Social support and mental health in community samples. In S. Cohen & S. L. Syme (Eds.), *Social support and health*, Academic Press, 219-240.
21. Koenig, H. G., Idler, E., Kasl, S., Hays, J. C., George, L. K., Musick, M. & Benson, H. (1999). Religion, spirituality, and medicine: a rebuttal to skeptics. *The International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine*, 29(2), 123-131.
22. Kovalenko, O. H. O., & Spivak, L. M. (2018). Psychological well-being of elderly people: The social factors. *Social welfare: interdisciplinary approach*, 8(1), 163-176. <http://doi.org/10.21277/sw.v1i8.323>
23. Langer, E. J. (1992). Matters of Mind: Mindfulness/Mindlessness in Perspective. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 1(3), 289-305.
24. Langer, E. J., & Moldoveanu, M. (2000). The construct of mindfulness. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00148>
25. Langford, C.P.H., Bowsher, J.; Maloney, J.P.; Lillis, P.P. (1997). "Social Support: A Conceptual Analysis". *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 25 (1): 95-100. <http://doi.org/10.1046/J.1365-2648.1997.1997025095.X>
26. Litwin, H., & Shiovitz-Ezra, S. (2006). The association between activity and wellbeing in later life: what really matters?. *Ageing & Society*, 26 (2), 225-242. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0144686X05004538>
27. Mackenzie, E. R., Rajagopal, D. E., Meilbohm, M., & Lavizzo-Mourey, R. (2000). Spiritual support and psychological well-being: Older adults' perceptions of the religion and health connection. *Alternative therapies in health and medicine*, 6 (6), 37.
28. Mandal, S. P., Pandey, R., & Arya, Y. (2014). Psychometric Evaluation of the range and differentiation of emotional experiences scale. Unpublished Manuscript, Department of Psychology, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi.
29. Marjorie, H.C. & Bennet, S. G. (1980). Mental Health and Community Support System for the Elderly. *Aging: The Process and the People*, 184-199.
30. Matecka M. (2009). Dobrostan Psychiczny W Okresie Starości. In: Talarska D, Wieczorowska-Tobis K (Eds.). *Człowiek W Wiek Podeszłym We Współczesnym Społeczeństwie*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Medycznego Im Karola Marcinkowskiego W Poznaniu. P.21-30 (In Polish).
31. Matt, G. E., & Dean, A. (1993). Social Support from Friends and Psychological Distress among Elderly Person: Moderator Effects of Age. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, 34, 187-200.
32. Matthews, D. A., McCullough, M. E., Larson, D. B., Koenig, H. G., Swyers, J. P., & Milano, M. G. (1998). Religious commitment and health status: a review of the research and implications for family medicine. *Archives of family medicine*, 7(2), 118. <http://doi.org/10.1001/archfam.7.2.118>
33. Mishra, S., Pandey, D., Khan, K.A.Z., Joby, P.A. and Jha, M. (2014). Predicting the effect of social support on psychological well being in elderly. *Indian Journal of Health and Well being*, 5(10), 1188-1190.

34. Murray, R. B. & Zenter, J. P. (1989). *Nursing Concepts for Health Promotion*. Prentice Hall, London.
35. Papadopoulos, D. (2020). The Role of Well-Being, Spirituality, and Religiosity for Successful Aging in Late Life: A Brief Review. *Advances in Aging Research*, 9, 23-31. <https://doi.org/10.4236/aar.2020.92003>
36. Parker, M. W., Bellis, J. M., Bishop, P., Harper, M., Allman, R. M., Moore, C., & Thompson, P. (2002). A multidisciplinary model of health promotion incorporating spirituality into a successful aging intervention with African American and white elderly groups. *The Gerontologist*, 42 (3), 406-415. <https://doi.org/10.1093/geront/42.3.406>
37. Portero, C. F. and Oliva, A. (2007). Social Support, Psychological Well-being, and Health among the Elderly. *Educational Gerontology*, 33:12, 1053 – 1068.
38. Pressman, P., Lyons, J.S., Larson, D.B., Strain, J.J. (1990). Religious belief, depression, and ambulation status in elderly women with broken hips. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 147:758-60. <http://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.147.6.758>
39. Robinson-Daley, V. (2005). The subjective appraisal of wellbeing of aging African American men. Ph.D thesis, the University of Georgia.
40. Shapiro, S. L., Carlson, L. E., Astin, J. A., & Freedman, B. (2006). Mechanisms of mindfulness. *Journal of clinical psychology*, 62(3), 373-386. <http://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.20237>
41. Sharma, M., & Rush, S. E. (2014). Mindfulness-based stress reduction as a stress management intervention for healthy individuals: a systematic review. *Journal of Evidence-based Complementary & Alternative Medicine*, 19 (4), 271-286. <http://doi.org/10.1177/2156587214543143>
42. Sisodia, D. S. & Choudhary, P., (2005). "Psychological Well Being Scale". National Psychological Center, Kacheri Ghat, Agra, INDIA.
43. Slevin, M.L.; Nichols, S.E.; Downer, S.M.; Wilson, P.; Lister, T.A.; Arnott, S.; Maher, J.; Souhami, R.L.; Tobias, J.S.; Goldstone, A.H.; Cody, M. (1996). "Emotional Support For Cancer Patients: What Do Patients Really Want?". *British Journal of Cancer*, 74 (8): 1275–1279. <http://doi.org/10.1038/bjc.1996.529>
44. Taylor, S.E. (2011). "Social Support: A Review". In M.S. Friedman (Ed.). *The Handbook of Health Psychology*, New York: Oxford University Press. Pp. 189–214.
45. Thekkedath, S. H. & Joseph M. V. (2009). Social support system and well being of elderly women- Indian context. *Global Academic Society Journal: Social Science Insight*, 2(9), 17-32.
46. Thoits, P.A. (2011). Mechanisms Linking Social Ties and Support to Physical and Mental Health. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, 52, 145-161.
47. Verma, S. K. & Verma, A. (1989). *Manual for PGI General Well Being Measure*. Lucknow. Ankur Psychological Agency.
48. Wills, T.A. (1991). Margaret, Clark (Eds.). "Social Support and Interpersonal Relationships". *Pro-Social Behaviour, Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, 12: 265–289.
49. Wills, T.A. (1998). "Social Support". In Blechman, E.A.; Brownell, K.D. (Eds.). *Behavioural Medicine and Women: A Comprehensive Handbook*. New York, Guilford Press. Pp. 118–128.
50. Wong, S.T., Yoo, G.J. & Stewart A.L. (2007). An empirical evaluation of social support and psychological well-being in older Chinese and Korean immigrants, *Ethnicity & Health*, 12(1), 43-67. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13557850600824104>