



Emotional Impact, Social Support and Intolerance among University Students

Vanshika Garg, *Master of Arts Clinical Psychology, Amity Institute of Psychology and Allied Sciences, Amity University, Noida, India*

vanshikagarg132@gmail.com

Abstract: The current study aims to investigate the influence of emotional impact on social support and intolerance among university students. The 100 person sample was rigorously selected using both random and intentional selection to ensure that it included both men and women. Most people fell between the ages of 18 to 25 years. The “Emotional Regulation Questionnaire” by J.J. Gross and O.P. John, “Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support” by G.D. Zimet, N.W. Dahlem, S.G. Zimet and G.K. Farley and “Intolerance of Uncertainty” by Josee Rheume, Michel J. Dugas and Robert Ladouceur in addition to demographic questionnaire were used to collect data for this research. Regression analysis, Descriptive Statistics and Pearson Correlation was used for statistical analysis. The regression and correlation studies showed that the results demonstrated little link between these variables. With p-values over 0.05 in both cases, the regression analysis revealed that Emotional Impact had no appreciable impact on either Social Support or Intolerance. Weak positive correlations between Emotion Regulation and Social Support ($r = 0.14176$) and Emotion Regulation and Intolerance ($r = 0.160003$) were further supported by the Pearson correlation analysis; Social Support and Intolerance showed a weak negative correlation ($r = -0.20301$). These findings imply that although social support, emotional control, and intolerance may be associated, in this study their correlation is not statistically significant.

Keywords: *Emotional Impact, Social Support, Intolerance*

1. Introduction

University life can be a period of personal development and exciting new experiences, but it also presents obstacles that affect students emotionally, socially, and mentally.

Emotional impact, social support, and intolerance are three key characteristics that influence how students enjoy university life. These elements may have an impact on students' social interactions, academic performance, and general well-being. Universities may establish environments that promote student success and mental health by having a better understanding of how these factors interact.

Emotional Impact

The psychological and emotional repercussions that a circumstance, event, or experience has on a person are referred to as emotional impact. It can affect a person's general well-being, mental health, and behavior and can manifest as feelings of happiness, anxiety, or tension. When making decisions and developing coping mechanisms, emotional impact frequently plays a critical role. Academic demands, interpersonal interactions, and personal struggles can all have a big impact on university students' emotions and increase their risk of developing stress, anxiety, or depression.

Example: Imagine a person recently lost their job. The emotional impact might be overpowering; they may feel depressed, anxious, or concerned about how to pay bills. These emotions may lead to lose motivation or even harm their health if the stress lasts too long. On the other hand, if a person receive a promotion, the emotional impact could be really positive, making them feel pleased and excited while also increasing your confidence and happiness. According to James – Lange Theory, which was given by Carl Lange and William James (1884) emotions are the outcome of physiological reactions to outside stimuli. This hypothesis states that our bodies react first, which is why we experience emotions. To put it another way, emotional experience results from the body's response rather than the other way around.

Social Support

Help, consolation, and encouragement from friends, family, classmates, or even mentors is referred to as social support. It can take many different forms, such as Emotional support includes empathy, affection, trust, and caring (for example, listening to someone's concerns). Instrumental support entails providing concrete assistance, such as financial aid, transportation, or task assistance. Informational support is defined as providing advice, direction, or relevant knowledge to assist someone in overcoming obstacles.

Example: A person feeling stress due to academic pressure might rely on friends for emotional support, study help, and reassurance, relieving part of the emotional strain and improving coping strategies. In another case, during a difficult breakup, having a person who listen to you and offer advice can make you feel understood and less anxious, giving you the strength to go forward. According to the Social Support Theory, by Cohen and Wills (1985) social connections give people access to a range of support that improves their health and

well-being, including practical, emotional, and informational support. This assistance can enhance coping strategies, lessen the effects of stress, and encourage favourable outcomes for both mental and physical health.

How Social support helps with Emotional Impact

Strong social support helps mitigate the negative emotional effects of stress. When you have individuals that believe in you, they can help you cope with the emotional impact of a challenging scenario.

For example, a person who has lost a loved one may feel extremely sad. However, having a close friend or family member offer support or simply listening makes the emotional burden easier to bear. Social support does not relieve pain, but it does make it easier to deal with.

Intolerance

The difficulty or unwillingness to accept other people's differing opinions, convictions, or actions is referred to as intolerance. It may show up as bias, discrimination, or a refusal to interact with or comprehend different points of view. Intolerance can be social, cultural, or religious, and it frequently fuels conflict and division in society.

Example: Consider a workplace in which employees refuse to welcome someone because of their religion or ethnic heritage. This intolerance may lead to exclusion or even bullying. The person who is being treated unfairly may feel upset, and lonely, which can lead to emotional tension and lower self-esteem. According to Intolerance of Uncertainty (IU) Theory given by M.J. Dugas and K. Buhr (2002) those who have trouble with uncertainty frequently exhibit tension, worry, and avoidant behaviours. They could respond negatively to unclear or unfamiliar circumstances since they desire predictability.

How Emotional Impact, Social Support and Intolerance Are Connected

These three variables are interrelated. For instance, if you have great social support, the emotional toll of something like losing a job can be mitigated. Encouragement from someone in your life may make you feel less anxious and more optimistic. A person who is bullied because of their appearance may experience significant distress, including feelings of sadness, anxiety, or worthlessness. It is much more difficult to deal with these emotions if they do not have supportive friends or relatives. However, if they have a close circle of supporting friends who will speak up for them or simply provide emotional comfort, this can help them feel better and lessen the emotional impact of the bullying.

1.1 Aim

The aim of the research is to investigate the influence of emotional impact on social support and intolerance among university students.

1.2 Research Objectives

1. To analyse the impact of emotional impact on social support among university adults.
2. To examine the impact of emotional impact on intolerance among university adults.
3. To assess the relationship between emotional impact, social support and intolerance among university students.

1.3 Hypotheses

1. There is significant impact of emotional impact on social support among university adults.
2. There is significant impact of emotional impact on intolerance among university adults.
3. There is significant relationship between emotional impact, social support and intolerance among university students.

2. Review of Literature

Celen and Doganer (2025) the purpose of this study is to ascertain how caregiver burden is impacted by social support, sleep quality, and intolerance of ambiguity in parents of children with chronic illnesses. Parents of children with chronic illnesses ($n = 144$) who were admitted to a Turkish medical faculty hospital were the subjects of this cross-sectional study. The average scores of the participants were 38.97 ± 10.25 on the Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale, 66.06 ± 13.87 on the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support, 8.37 ± 3.25 on the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index, and 37.5 ± 14.43 on the Caregiver Burden scale.

This study found that the number of hospitalizations for the kid, financial status, and intolerance of ambiguity were all associated with parental caregiver strain. Ozgul et al. (2024) the study's objective is to investigate the connections among anxiety, unstable adult attachment (anxious and avoidant), perceived social support, and intolerance of uncertainty. 880 college students between the ages of 18 and 25 make up the sample. The results showed that intolerance of uncertainty acted as a mediator in the association between anxiety and anxious attachment, but not in the relationship between anxiety and avoidant attachment. Anxious attachment and anxiety, as well as avoidant attachment and anxiety, were mediated by the family and important other sub-dimensions of perceived social support.

Paralkar et al. (2023) College students' academic performance is hampered by stress, and the special resilience benefits of ambiguity and uncertainty tolerance have not yet been investigated. It hypothesized that there are differences between the relationship between academic stress and tolerance of ambiguity and uncertainty, with 158 undergraduate students from a Midwestern public university of moderate size. The findings showed that, in

comparison to intolerance of uncertainty, intolerance of ambiguity is a higher predictor of approach and avoidance academic stress coping mechanisms.

Smith et al. (2023) the purpose of this study was to evaluate the relationship between early teenage girls' and boys' impressions of the emotional impact of COVID-19 on their mental health and the sources of social support at the school and parental levels in Appalachia. The study survey was completed by 1349 people. 80.7% of respondents responded altogether. Higher degrees of despair, anxiety, and anger were reported by those who felt that COVID-19 had a bigger emotional impact. Better mental health outcomes were linked to social support at the school and parental levels. Zheng et al. (2021) The current study investigated at the primary and interrelated effects of resilience and social support on people's mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic in three age groups: adults, older adults, and emerging adults. 23,192 people between the ages of 18 and 85 participated in the study. The BCH command analysis revealed notable variations in these profiles' mental health. Finally, interaction analyses showed that mental health and resilience were positively correlated, and that social support mitigated the detrimental effects of low resilience on mental health.

3. Methodology

3.1 Sample Size

The 100-person sample was rigorously selected using both random and intentional selection methods to ensure that it included both men and women. Of the people there, most fell between the ages of 18 and 25.

3.2 Research Design

The study employed a quantitative research design to examine the influence of emotional impact on social support and intolerance among university students. Data were collected from 100 participants, including both males and females.

3.3 Measures

Emotional Regulation Questionnaire: Cognitive reappraisal and expressive suppression are the two halves of this 10-item scale that assess the extent to which respondents are able to manage their emotions. There is a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) that respondents use for each problem.

Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS): A person's social support system may be assessed using the 12-item Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS). Zimet et al. created the MSPSS in 1988 using a 5-point Likert scale, where 0 signifies strongly disagree and 5 signifies strongly agree.

Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale: An individual's emotional, cognitive, and behavioural reactions to uncertain situations may be measured using the Intolerance of Uncertainty Scale (IUS), a psychological evaluation instrument. The IUS assesses how much people experience painful uncertainty, how much they believe uncertainty reflects negatively on a person, and how much irritation and inaction it causes. Its purpose is to investigate how people perceive and manage with uncertainty. On a 5-point Likert scale, from 1 ("not at all characteristic of me") to 5 ("entirely characteristic of me"), the original IUS rates 27 items. The next questions probe several aspects of aversion to ambiguity: the idea that it's unjust, that it prevents one from taking action, and that it's fundamentally distressing and unpleasant.

4. Results

Table1: Regression analysis of impact of emotional impact on social support among young adults

Regression Statistics	
Multiple R	0.14176
R Square	0.020096
Adjusted R Square	0.010097
Standard Error	1.044262
Observations	100

Anova					
df		SS	MS	F	Significance F
Regression	1	2.191652	2.191652	2.009797	0.159458
Residual	98	106.8674	1.090484		
Total	99	109.0591			

H1: There is significant impact of emotional impact on social support among university adults.

The regression analysis examines the impact of Emotional Impact on Social Support among university adults. The R Square value of 0.0201 indicates that only 2.01% of the variance in social support is explained by emotional impact, suggesting a weak relationship between the two variables. The Significance F value is 0.159, which is greater than the standard significance level of 0.05. This indicates that the regression model is not statistically significant. Since the p-value is not below the threshold for significance.

Therefore, the hypothesis (H1: There is a significant impact of emotional impact on social support among university adults) is rejected, suggesting that emotional impact does not have a significant effect on social support in this study.

Table2: *Regression analysis of impact of emotional impact on Intolerance among university adults*

Regression Statistics	
Multiple R	0.160003
R Square	0.025601
Adjusted R Square	0.015658
Standard Error	20.57244
Observations	100

Anova					
<i>Df</i>		<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	1	1089.725	1089.725	2.574811	0.111795
Residual	98	41476.07	423.2252		
Total	99	42565.79			

H2: There is significant impact of emotional impact on intolerance among university adults. The regression analysis explores the impact of Emotional Impact on Intolerance among university students. The R Square value of 0.0256 indicates that only 2.56% of the variance in intolerance is explained by emotional impact, suggesting a weak relationship between the two variables. The Significance F value is 0.111, which is greater than the standard significance level of 0.05. This means that the regression model is not statistically significant. Since the p-value is above the threshold for significance. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (H2: There is a significant impact of emotional impact on intolerance among university adults) is rejected, indicating that emotional impact does not have a significant effect on intolerance in this study.

Table 3: *Pearson correlation analysis of relationship between emotional impact, social support and intolerance among university students*

	Emotion Regulation	Social Support	Intolerance
Emotion Regulation	1		
Social Support	0.14176	1	

Intolerance	0.160003	-0.20301	1
--------------------	----------	----------	---

H3: There is significant relationship between emotional impact, social support and intolerance among university students.

The Pearson correlation analysis examines the relationship between Emotional Impact, Social Support, and Intolerance among university students. The correlation coefficient between Emotion Regulation and Social Support is 0.14176, indicating a weak positive relationship, meaning that as emotional regulation increases, social support slightly increases. The correlation between Emotion Regulation and Intolerance is 0.160003, also suggesting a weak positive relationship, implying that higher emotional impact is associated with slightly higher intolerance. However, the correlation between Social Support and Intolerance is -0.20301, indicating a weak negative relationship, meaning that as social support increases, intolerance slightly decreases.

Since the correlation values are relatively low, the strength of the relationships is weak. However, given the weak correlations, it suggests that the relationships are not strong enough to confirm a meaningful connection. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (H3: There is a significant relationship between emotional impact, social support, and intolerance among university students) is rejected, indicating that no strong or significant relationship exists among these variables in this study.

5. Discussion

The present study sought to investigate among university students the relationships among emotional impact, social support, and intolerance. The regression and correlation studies showed that the results demonstrated little link between these variables. With p-values over 0.05 in both cases, the regression analysis revealed that Emotional Impact had no appreciable impact on either Social Support or Intolerance. Weak positive correlations between Emotion Regulation and Social Support ($r = 0.14176$) and Emotion Regulation and Intolerance ($r = 0.160003$) were further supported by the Pearson correlation analysis; Social Support and Intolerance showed a weak negative correlation ($r = -0.20301$). These findings imply that although social support, emotional control, and intolerance may be associated, in this study their correlation is not statistically significant.

The results of this study can be contrasted with those of Javdan (2023), who compared the levels of social anxiety, inadequate emotion regulation, and intolerance of ambiguity in students. Unlike the current study, which concluded that emotional control had no appreciable

effect on social support or intolerance, Javdan (2023) discovered a notable discrepancy between students with and without social anxiety in terms of emotional regulation problems and uncertainty intolerance. Students with social anxiety found it more difficult to manage their emotions, including problems with impulse control, emotional awareness, and access to regulating techniques, the study found. Social anxiety also connected to increased stress in unknown circumstances, avoidance behaviors, and negative attitude towards unanticipated events.

The study approach and population of the two studies differ significantly from one another. Whereas the current study examined general university students using regression and correlation analysis, Javdan (2023) employed a causal-comparative design and concentrated on students with and without social anxiety. Given that the sample in the current study was not categorized according to social anxiety levels, this difference might help to explain the smaller correlations reported there. Javdan's study, on the other hand, looked at a particular subset of pupils, therefore enabling more definite differences in tolerance of ambiguity and emotional control. Furthermore, despite the present study did not show a clear relationship between emotional impact and social support or intolerance, Javdan's (2023) study supports the theory that emotional control challenges are more marked in students experiencing social anxiety. One theory is that social support could be a protective element only in acute emotional turmoil, as in cases of social anxiety disorder, not in the typical university student population. Moreover, the absence of a significant correlation between emotional control and intolerance in this study implies that other external elements, like cultural attitudes, personal views, and prior experiences, might rather affect intolerance than only emotional regulation.

The results of this study show that although Emotional Impact, Social Support, and Intolerance are all significant psychological concepts, the exact nature and significance of the interactions between them may be complicated. To further grasp the subtleties of these associations, future studies might take into account moderating factors such anxiety degrees, personality characteristics, and coping strategies. Studies comparable to Javdan (2023), which separate students with and without certain psychiatric disorders, might also produce more definitive findings on the function of emotional control in social and behavioral spheres. Future studies might also use other approaches, including experimental designs or longitudinal studies, to evaluate the causal links among these factors. Future research should combine qualitative techniques or physiological measurements (such as heart rate variability or cortisol levels) to provide better understanding of emotional control and intolerance responses as the present work depended on self-reported data.

6. Conclusion

The current study sought to investigate among university students the relationships among emotional impact, social support, and intolerance. Emotional Impact had no appreciable influence on either Social Support or Intolerance, according to results of regression and correlation studies. Emotion Regulation and Social Support ($r = 0.14176$) and Emotion Regulation and Intolerance ($r = 0.160003$) showed minor relationships; Social Support and Intolerance showed a slight negative connection ($r = -0.20301$). Furthermore, the regression analysis revealed that Emotional Impact had no appreciable effect on either Social Support ($p = 0.159$) or Intolerance ($p = 0.111$), therefore negating the hypotheses of the study. These results imply that, although emotional control, social support, and intolerance may be linked, they do not show a strong or significant correlation in the whole university student population. This suggests that these associations may be shaped in great part by other elements like personality characteristics, coping strategies, and individual variations in psychological resilience. Unlike earlier studies, such as Javdan (2023), which revealed a strong link between emotional control problems and intolerance of uncertainty in students with social anxiety, the present study's findings highlight that these relationships may not be as clear in a general student population. The absence of a strong correlation between emotional control and social support implies that social support might function as a protective element mainly in circumstances of intense emotional discomfort, like that observed in clinical populations. Likewise, the limited association between emotional control and intolerance suggests that intolerance might result from outside elements beyond emotional control alone, including cognitive biases, cultural views, and personal experience. In conclusion, whereas Emotional Impact, Social Support, and Intolerance are major psychological notions, among university students their correlations seem to be weak and statistically negligible. The results imply that these factors could interact in more intricate ways needing additional research. Future studies should seek to investigate these dynamics in more detail using more sophisticated approaches and focused populations to better grasp the part emotional control and social support play in controlling intolerance and psychological well-being among students.

6.1 Limitations

One of the study's many drawbacks is its small sample size of 100 students, which restricts the findings' applicability to larger or more varied groups. Using self-reported data only could result in biases like socially acceptable answers. It is difficult to draw conclusions about the causal linkages between intolerance, social support, and emotional impact because of the cross-sectional design. Furthermore, important psychological factors including personality

traits, coping mechanisms, and resilience were not taken into account. Results may have been impacted by cultural and contextual elements unique to the university setting, underscoring the need for more longitudinal and mixed-method studies including varied and cross-cultural groups.

6.2 Suggestions for future research

Universities should incorporate emotional regulation training through mindfulness, cognitive reappraisal, and stress management strategies into academic programs to improve students' emotional health and tolerance. Improving social support through faculty-student interactions, counseling groups, and peer mentorship can lessen loneliness and enhance mental health. To fight stigma, institutions must increase access to and knowledge of counseling services through digital tools and marketing. Empathy and acceptance are increased when candid conversations about diversity and inclusion are promoted. Finally, students can preserve emotional equilibrium and resilience in college life by incorporating stress-relieving practices like yoga, meditation, and flexible study schedules.

References

- Celen, Y., & Doganer, A. (2025). The impact of social support, sleep quality, and intolerance of ambiguity on caregiver burden in parents of children with chronic illnesses. *Journal of Pediatric Nursing*, 60, 123-130.
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 98(2), 310-357. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.310>
- Dugas, M. J., & Buhr, K. (2002). The role of intolerance of uncertainty in the etiology and maintenance of generalized anxiety disorder. In R. G. Heimberg, C. L. Turk, & D. S. Mennin (Eds.), *generalized anxiety disorder: Advances in research and practice* (pp. 143-163). Guilford Press.
- Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(2), 348-362. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.348>
- James, W., & Lange, C. (1884). *The emotions*. Williams & Wilkins.
- Javdan, M. (2023). Comparison of social anxiety, emotion regulation difficulties, and intolerance of uncertainty in students. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 94, 102678. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2023.102678>
- Ozgul, S., et al. (2024). The mediating role of intolerance of uncertainty and perceived social support in the relationship between adult attachment and anxiety. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 80(3), 456-470.

- Paralkar, U., et al. (2023). Academic stress and coping mechanisms: The role of tolerance for ambiguity and uncertainty in college students. *Educational Psychology Review*, 35(1), 78-92.
- Smith, J., et al. (2023). Emotional impact of COVID-19 on adolescent mental health: The role of school and parental social support in Appalachia. *Journal of School Psychology*, 84, 101-115.
- Zheng, L., et al. (2021). Resilience and social support as protective factors for mental health during the COVID-19 pandemic across age groups. *Psychology and Aging*, 36(4), 456-468. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pag0000598>
- Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52(1), 30-41. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_2