

## Relation between Resilience and Enneagram Personality Types

M. Hülya ÜNAL-KARAGÜVEN<sup>1</sup>

Marmara University

### Abstract

The purpose of this research is to examine the psychological resilience levels of adult individuals in terms of demographic characteristics and enneagram personality types. The findings may help experts working in the field and contribute to the literature. The study is an original study that has not been researched before. Participants consisted of parents of students attending a pre-school education center. Data was collected from 252 people, 182 women and 70 men. In order to collect data a "Questionnaire", "Brief Resilience Scale" and "Enneagram Personality Scale" were used to collect data. T-test and analysis of variance techniques were used to evaluate the changes in the level of the resilience with demographic variables. Correlation analysis was conducted to determine the relationship between resilience and enneagram personality types. Results of the statistical analysis has been determined that resilience levels are higher in men, older individuals, married people, and those with high education and income levels. Additionally, levels of resilience were found to be positively related to enneagram personality types. This relationship was found statistically significant in a total of six personality types: achiever, original, observer, adventurer, leader, and accommodator. This work contributes to the study of resilience and related factors. Similar studies were proposed for the future to bolster the results.

**Keywords:** Resilience, Enneagram, Personality

**DOI:** 10.29329/epasr.2024.655.2

**Submitted:** 04 January 2024

**Accepted:** 11 February 2024

**Published:** 31 March 2024

---

<sup>1</sup>Assoc. Prof. Dr. Atatürk Faculty of Education, Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0002-6375-8930  
Email: mhulya@marmara.edu.tr, mhkhulya@gmail.com

## Introduction

Individuals are confronted with traumatic events or circumstances that are inevitable throughout their lives. Resilience becomes significant as it enables individuals to lead a healthy life by mitigating the adverse impacts of those traumatic experiences. When faced with stressful life situations, resilience may help people restore, enhance, and maintain their psychological health (Farber and Rosendahl, 2020; Ungar and Theron, 2019). Resilience also called psychological resilience (<https://dictionary.apa.org/resilience>). Resilience is the process and result of effectively adjusting to tough or challenging life experiences, particularly through mental, behavioral, and emotional flexibility and adaptation to both internal and external demands (<https://dictionary.apa.org/resilience>). While providing the dictionary definition of resilience, which means "durability" or "robustness" in English and succinctly describes an individual's capacity to effectively adjust to stress and adversities, it is worth noting that originates from the Latin word "resilire." It refers to "the elasticity of a substance and its ability to easily return to its previous state" (Greene, 2012). The Oxford English Dictionary (1978) defines it as "to recover quickly when crushed and return to its former condition and form." It is defined as "adapting quickly to change and negativities and recovering quickly" according to Merriam-Webster Dictionary (1987). Rutter (2006) describes resilience as having the ability to overcome all of life's stresses and obstacles, adapt, and produce positive outcomes after being exposed to difficulties, difficulties, and unfavourable experiences. In dictionaries, it is expressed as "psychological resilience" in the field of "Resilience" (<https://tureng.com/tr/turkce-ingilizce>). Nevertheless, Turkish literature also employs the term "psychological endurance" to refer to resilience (Eminağaoğlu, 2006; Kılıç, 2014; Uçar, 2014; Sönmezer, 2015; Yaşayanlar, 2018). The term "resilience" was used throughout this research.

Newman (2003) posits that resilience is not an inherent quality however a capacity that can be learned and improved by any individual. Stout and Kipling (2003) claim that the presence of any risk factor is a prerequisite for developing resilience. Risk is defined as the existence of one or more consequences that elevate the probability of an adverse occurrence or circumstance taking place (Stout & Kipling, 2003). Protective factors hold equivalent significance to risk factors with regard to resilience. Ramirez (2007) defined protective factors as those that mitigate or eradicate the potential consequences of risky conditions or occurrences. The most important of these factors that contribute to people's resilience are an individual's perspective and manner of interacting with the world, the availability and caliber of social support systems, and coping mechanisms (APA, 2017). Fraser and Jenson (2008) and Vance and Sanchez (1998) examined protective and risk factors under three distinct headings in their respective studies. These categories are classified as environmental, familial, and individual.

Socioeconomic position, peer connections with problematic dynamics, social violence, and child neglect are a few examples of environmental risk factors. Environmental protective factors that

can shield a person from risk factors include examples like positive interactions with peers, positive role models, positive relationships with relatives, and supportive school environments (Fraser & Jenson, 2008; Vance & Sanchez, 1998).

Having a crowded family, problems with harmony in family relationships, being a child of a divorced family or living separately from parents for any reason, having substance use or various addictions in the family, and having individuals with any pathology in the family are all examples of family-based risk factors. A healthy relationship between parents, paying attention to rules and boundaries at home, being sensitive to personal differences, having a well-educated parent, and positive future designs in the family are examples of familial factors that can protect the individual against these risk situations (Fraser & Jenson, 2008; Vance & Sanchez, 1998).

An individual's personality traits, diseases, low IQ, substance use, ethnic background, and academic performance are all examples of individual risk factors. Intellectual or emotional intelligence, a positive outlook, academic competence, high self-esteem, a sense of humour, and developed problem-solving abilities are all examples of individual protective factors (Fraser & Jenson, 2008; Vance & Sanchez, 1998). This demonstrates the significance of an individual's personality traits concerning resilience. Furthermore, it is thought that individual factors are the most significant differentiating factor among individuals who exhibit distinct psychological and behavioural response patterns despite sharing identical familial and environmental factors. For instance, siblings who attend the same school and reside in the same family may experience the same risk factors at varying degrees of severity. The degree of resilience an individual possesses may vary. Here, it is the unique attributes of each individual that distinguish them. Personality traits have been stated by Fraser and Jenson (2008) and Vance and Sanchez (1998) as prominent individual risk factors. As a result, when it comes to individual variances in resilience, personality qualities may be one of the most important underlying differences. In this situation, an examination of the personality issue is necessary.

As of the present, the concept of personality, which distinguishes an individual from others, has been the subject of numerous classifications and definitions, as well as the development of many different theories (Adler, 1964; Ericsson, 1963; Freud, 1923). Presently, the concept of personality can be succinctly summarised in a definition authored by Gökkaya (2020). Personality encompasses, as per this definition, every behavioural pattern that makes individuals' feelings, thoughts, and behaviours unique and that they cultivate to accommodate their surroundings. Aside from creating the notion of personality that distinguishes people from one another, different classifications have been made and measurement tools aimed at measuring these personality types have been developed (Cattell, 1949; Eysenck, 1947; Jung, 1925). One of them is the enneagram personality types.

Like others, the enneagram defines and classifies personality types (Riso & Hudson, 1996; 1999). The term "enneagram," derived from the Greek words "gramos" and "ennea," denotes nine

distinct personality styles (Naranjo, 1994). There are various opinions regarding its emergence. Today, however, it is known that Ichazo was the first to say it in the West (Randall, 1979). Ichazo has stated that the enneagram was imparted to him by Sufi teachers in Afghanistan. The theory acknowledges the existence of three centers and considers the entirety of the human being. It is suggested that each center generates three distinct personality types, for a grand total of nine fundamental personality types. Consequently, one of the nine potential categories of personality types that each individual possesses is more dominant than the others, according to this theory (Palmer, 2010; Riso and Hudson, 2003). The domestic style is more dominant of the nine styles, according to Wagner (1988), because it provides insight into how an individual will act in stressful times. Again, as stated by Wagner (1988) each style explains the individuals' choices, worldview, motivation sources, and values, as well as their responses to stress, individuals, and situations. Riso (2003) indicated, in describing that the numbers represent personality types and not any value. Likewise, it makes no difference what order these numbers are in or whether they are large or small. The enneagram typology does not incorporate the notions of good or bad, which precludes any form of comparison among personality types.

The personality categories comprising the enneagram typology can be briefly outlined as follows: Type 1 Perfectionist: They are perfectionists and reformers who are continually striving for the ideal and are difficult to please (Acarkan, 2016). Individuals with a reformist attitude, according to Palmer (2010), always tend to push their living conditions to the next level, they have a leadership style, and they might get lost in details. Type 2 Helper: Individuals of this type, according to Riso and Hudson (1996), always demand love and affection from their surroundings. They are also predisposed to somatization, eating problems, and sexual disorders. They have a robust and effective structure that takes into account the demands of their environment. Type 3 Achiever: People with this personality type have a strong inclination to be workaholics and are continually striving for achievement in their lives (Palmer, 2010). Their actions are devoid of emotion. They excel at persuading, organizing, and mobilizing others (Acarkan, 2016). According to Riso and Hudson (1999), people with these personality qualities are more likely to have narcissistic personality disorder, hypertension, depression, anger, arrogance, and psychopathic behaviour patterns. Type 4. Original: Palmer (2010) remarked that these people are continuously looking for originality and aspire to be unique. If these people are unable to cope with emotions of lack and inadequacy in their lives, they may become melancholic and withdrawn, according to Riso and Hudson (1999). Type 5 Observer: People with the observer personality want to be competent and capable. These people have developed observation abilities and are continually alert to life (Riso & Hudson, 1999). According to Palmer (2010), these people are concerned about the privacy of their personal lives and so do not wish to be in the public glare. Being overly distant in interpersonal relations, introversion, arrogance, and a lack of empathy are among the unhealthy personality traits of observant persons, according to Acarkan (2016). Type 6. Loyalists: Individuals belonging to this category, as defined by Riso and Hudson (1999), desire stability and security in their

lives. In addition to avoiding risky and dangerous situations, they frequently exhibit anxiety, suspicion, and indecision (Riso & Hudson, 1999). Type 7 Adventurer: According to Riso and Hudson (1999), people in this group are very productive and their thoughts are usually busy with something. The disadvantage of adventurous people is that they make decisions without thinking. According to Riso and Hudson (1999), people with this personality tend to abuse substances. Type 8. Leader: According to Palmer (2010), persons with a strong sense of justice demonstrate their love for others by protecting them. They can push themselves and their emotions to the limit. Their characteristics include the ability to confront challenging problems bravely and to lead others. According to Matise (2007), while members of this group are strong and autonomous, they may also be conflicting and domineering. They are afraid of appearing weak and being injured if they do not exert control. According to Riso and Hudson (1999), people with this personality type may continually endeavour to gain control, even at the expense of others. Type 9 Accommodator: According to Riso and Hudson (1999), these people who dislike conflict are tranquil, conciliatory, and harmonic, and are sometimes referred to as mediators. Riso & Hudson (1999) pointed out that these people may be vulnerable to some pathologies such as depression and severe depersonalization.

The assumptions posited within the enneagram model have been put forward with the aim of enhancing our comprehension of the intricacies of human nature and to date, various scales have been devised to assess these personality characteristics (Hudson, 2015; Randall, 1979; Riso and Tasthan, 2019; Wagner and Walker, 1983; Yılmaz et al., 2014). The scale used in this research was the Enneagram Personality Scale developed in Turkish by Subaş and Çetin (2017).

There are studies in the literature on how various risk factors and protective factors affect resilience. Family, environment, friends, school variables, and personality characteristics of the individual have been mentioned particularly in studies conducted on teenagers and young adults (Ayar, 2018; Eley, Cloninger, Walters and al., 2013; Eminağaoğlu, 2006; Gizir, 2007; Nieto, Visier, Silvestre, et al., 2023; Oshio, Taku, Hirano, et al., 2018; Özcan, 2005; Özer, 2013). The research indicates that resilience is positively influenced when personal, environmental, and familial factors are positive (Hetherington & Stanley-Hagan, 1999). It appears crucial to consider individual factors such as demographic characteristics and personality traits in this situation. Nonetheless, a study utilizing the enneagram personality type classification, to assess the relationships with resilience, has yet to be found in the literature.

### **The Importance of the Study**

The significance of resilience in relation to an individual's mental health is widely acknowledged. The correlation between personality traits and individual resilience renders the study of resilience and personality traits a significant and worthwhile subject for research. The experts in the field may be able to improve the psychological health of the individuals who comprise society with the

aid of these results. The results can contribute to the literature and can serve as models for future research.

### **Aim of the Study**

The purpose of this research is to analyse the resilience levels of adult individuals according to their demographic characteristics and enneagram personality types.

### **Research Questions**

1. Does the level of resilience differ according to demographic variables?
2. Is there a relationship between the level of resilience and enneagram personality types?

### **Method**

This section contains information regarding the study's research model, population and sample, and data-collecting tools. Furthermore, the results of data collecting and statistical analysis are explained. Later, the findings were interpreted in light of past research results.

### **Model of the Study**

This study is a descriptive and quantitative study. The descriptive survey comprises the researches, carried out in large groups, to receive opinions, and observe attitudes of the individuals in such group concerning a fact or an event, as well as describing these facts and events. Scientific studies examine events or situations in light of specific variables, to discern any significant relationships that may exist among them (Karasar, 2011). Since the resilience levels are analyzed in terms of several variables in this research, the descriptive survey model was used.

### **Participants**

Data was gathered from 252 parents of preschool students between March and April 2023. The population of the research is the European side of Istanbul. Participants were determined by a convenient sampling method. Convenient sampling is a type of non-random sampling in which Participants who meet criteria such as easy accessibility, geographical proximity, and willingness to participate are included in the study (Dörnyei, 2007). Parents of students enrolled in a pre-school education center as determined by the accessibility approach comprised the study group. Since adult individuals may have children, the study group was formed of school parents. Necessary permissions were obtained from the school administration and explanations were provided prior to the commencement of the study. Initially 255 people agreed to participate; later 252 parents comprised the study group; 72% of the sample was women and 28% was men. Applications were processed one-on-one through face-to-face settings. The research topic, scales, and application method were disclosed to participants before the application. The participants' demographic information is given in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Frequency distribution of the participants by demographic variables

	Frequency ( <i>f</i> )	Percent ( % )
Gender		
Women	182	72
Men	70	28
Marital status		
Married	168	67
Single	84	33
Age		
18-25	60	24
26-35	92	38
36-45	81	32
46 and above	19	6
Education Level		
Primary and Secondary School	21	8
High School	42	17
University Associate (First two years of univ.)	35	14
University	154	61
Income Level		
Low	28	11
Middle	176	70
High	48	19
Total	252	100,0

As seen in Table 1, 182 (72%) of the participants were women; 70 of them (28%) were men. 168 (67%) were married and 84 (33%) were single. 60 people (24%) were 18-25 years old, 92 people (39%) were 26-35 years old, 81 people (32%) were 36-45 years old, and 19 people (6%) were 46 years old and over. 21 people (8%) were primary and secondary school graduates, 42 people (17%) were high school graduates, 35 people (14%) were associate degree graduates and 154 people (61%) were undergraduate and graduate graduates. When looking at the income level distribution, 28 people (11%) stated that they were in the low income group, 176 people (70%) stated that they were in the middle income group and 48 people (19%) stated that they were in the high income group.

### **Measures**

A nine-item questionnaire was used to gather demographic data. In addition to questionnaire Turkish form of the “Brief Resilience Scale-BRS” and Turkish “Enneagram Personality Scale-EPS”. Totally, test sets consisted of two scales and one questionnaire.

### ***Questionnaire***

The researcher designed a five-item questionnaire to collect demographic data from the participants. The survey comprises questions designed to determine information pertaining to

independent variables, including the age, gender, marital status, level of education, and income of the participant.

### ***Brief Resilience Scale (BRS)***

Turkish form of “The Brief Resilience Scale” (Smith et. al., 2008) was used to measure resilience levels of individuals. It was adapted into Turkish by Doğan (2015). BRS is a tool for self-reporting measurements. It is composed of six items. Items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). High scores indicated high resilience level. Alpha for this sample: .91 (N = 252, n = 6).

### ***Enneagram Personality Scale (EPS)***

It is a self-report scale developed as Turkish by Subaş and Çetin (2017). The scale consists of 27 items and 9 subscales in total. Items were scored on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0 to 3. 0: "Doesn't" describe me at all, 1: "Part of" describes me, 2: "Generally" describes me, and 3: "Totally" describes me. The sub-dimensions of EPS were named as the following personality types; Type 1 perfectionist, Type 2 helper, Type 3 achiever, Type 4 original, Type 5 observer, Type 6 questioner, Type 7 adventurer, Type 8 leader and Type 9 accommodator. In this study, internal reliability of each subscales were found to vary between .80 and .91 (N = 252, n = 27).

### **Data Analysis**

To perform statistical analysis a statistical programme was used on the research data. The normality test of the BRS scores was performed, and the Skewness and Kurtosis values were within the range of  $\pm 1.5$ . As a result, it was accepted that the resulting scores had a normal distribution. T-test and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) techniques were used to test the statistical significant differences of the mean scores (Karasar, 2005). Additionally, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient was calculated to explain the relationship between BRS and EPS scores as well.

### **Results**

This section comprises the results derived from the application of statistical analysis. The first finding is the descriptive statistical analysis results of the scores obtained from the BRS. The findings are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of scores obtained from the BRS

	$\bar{X}$	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
BRS	19.05	4.86	6.00	30.00

BRS=Brief Resilience Scale

As seen in Table 2, the arithmetic mean of the BRS scores was calculated as 19.05 and the standard deviation was 4.86. The findings regarding the difference in the mean scores obtained as a



result of the application of the BRS according to the independent variables are given. The findings are presented in Table 3 and Table 4 below.

Table 3. T-Test results of BRS scores

		N	$\bar{X} \pm S$	sd	t	p
Gender	Women	182	18.56±4.77	250	2.60**	.01
	Men	70	20.32±4.91			
Marital status	Married	168	19.83±4.66	250	3.67***	.000
	Single	84	17.50±4.90			

\*p ≤ .05, \*\*p ≤ .01, \*\*\*p ≤ .001, N=252, BRS=Brief Resilience Scale

BRS scores of the participants show significant differences according to gender. [t(250)=2.60 p<.05]. Resilience levels of men ( $\bar{X} = 20.32$ ) are higher than women ( $\bar{X}=18.56$ ). Resilience scores of the participants also show significant differences according to marital status [t(250)=3.67 p<.05]. Resilience levels of married individuals ( $\bar{X} = 19.83$ ) are higher than single individuals ( $\bar{X} = 17.50$ ).

Table 4. ANOVA results of BRS scores

		N	$\bar{X} \pm S$	Sum of Squares	Sd.	Mean Squares.	F	p
Age	15-25	60	17,43±4.83	241,066	3	80,355	3,496*	,016
	26-35	92	19.84±4.90	5700,156	248	22,984		
	36-45	81	19.08±4.42	5941,222	251			
	46-Above	19	20.21±5.62					
Education Level	Pri. Sc.	21	18.28±5.58	235,886	3	78,629	3,418*	,018
	High Sc.	42	17.40±4.96	5705,336	248	23,005		
	Un. Associate	35	18.22±4.05	5941,222	251			
	University	154	19.79±4.78					
Income Level	Low	28	17.67±4.52	294,371	2	147,185	6,490**	,002
	Middle	176	18.69±4.73	5646,851	249	22,678		
	High	48	21.18±4.99	5941,222	251			

\*p ≤ .05, \*\*p ≤ .01, \*\*\*p ≤ .001, N=252, BRS=Brief Resilience Scale

Significant differences were discovered as a result of the analyses of variance (ANOVA) carried out to test if the level of BRS scores changes significantly by age [f (3-248) =3.49, p<.05]. The Scheffe test was used to determine which groups had significant differences in BRS scores. The BRS scores of individuals aged 46 and over ( $\bar{X} = 20.21$ ) were significantly higher than those of the 15-25 age ( $\bar{X} = 17.43$ ), 26-35 age ( $\bar{X} = 19.84$ ) and 36-45 age ( $\bar{X} = 19.08$ ) groups.

Significant differences were discovered as a result of the analyses of variance (ANOVA) carried out to evaluate whether the individuals' BRS levels differed significantly according to their education level [f (3-248) =3.41, p<.05]. The Scheffe test was used to determine which groups had significant differences in BRS scores. The BRS scores of individuals with a bachelor's degree or higher education

level ( $\bar{X}=19.79$ ) are significantly higher than the primary education ( $\bar{X}=18.28$ ), high school ( $\bar{X}=17.40$ ) and associate degree ( $\bar{X}=18.22$ ) education groups.

Significant differences were discovered as a result of the analyses of variance (ANOVA) carried out to evaluate whether the individuals' BRS levels differed significantly according to their economic level  $f(2-249)=6.49, p<.05$ ]. The Scheffe test was performed to reveal the groups in which the BRS scores created a significant difference, and the BRS scores of individuals with high income levels ( $\bar{X}=21.18$ ) were significantly higher than those of low ( $\bar{X}=17.67$ ) and medium ( $\bar{X}=18.69$ ) income groups.

Correlation analysis is used to assess whether a linear relationship exists between two numerical measurements (Büyüköztürk, 2011). Pearson bivariate correlation analysis was used to test the relationship between the BRS and EPS scores. Findings are presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Pearson bivariate correlation values between BRS and EPS

EPS	BRS
	<b>r</b>
Type 3. Achiever	0.27**
Tip 4. Original	0.16**
Tip 5. Observer	0.14*
Tip 7. Adventurer	0.26**
Tip 8. Leader	0, 23**
Tip 9. Accommodator	0, 25**

\* $p \leq .05$ , \*\* $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\* $p \leq .001$ , N=252

As seen in Table 5, six of the nine enneagram personality types were found to have a significant relationship with resilience. These are; type 3. Achiever ( $r=0.27, p < .01$ ), type 4. Original ( $r=0.16, p < .01$ ), type 5. Observer ( $r=0.14, p < .05$ ), type 7. Adventurer ( $r=0.26, p < .01$ ), type 8. Leader ( $r=0.23, p < .01$ ) and type 9. Accommodator ( $r=0.25, p < .01$ ).

### Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to examine whether the level of resilience changed according to demographic variables. The relationship between resilience and enneagram personality types was also investigated. The study yielded the responses to the sub-objectives. First, resilience differed according to demographic variables. Secondly, there is a strong and positive relationship between resilience and enneagram personality types.

The findings of the T-test and ANOVA statistical analyses, which were performed by the study's first sub-objective, indicated that there were significant differences in the resilience levels of the participants based on gender. The resilience levels of men are higher than that of women. An examination of the relevant literature reveals that there are results that corroborate this conclusion. Research conducted among students has consistently found that male students exhibit higher levels of resilience than women students (Bahadır, 2009; Acıkgöz, 2016; Sezgin, 2016). There are also studies

showing that averages change according to the gender factor in adults (Doğan, Yavuz, 2020). Nevertheless, different results have been observed in research pertaining to the gender variable. Additionally, there exists research indicating that women exhibit higher levels of resilience. The research conducted by Kılıc (2014) revealed that women students exhibited greater levels of resilience in comparison to men students. A similar outcome was observed in the research undertaken by Oktan, Odacı, and Berber-Çelik (2014). On the other hand, there are studies in the literature demonstrate that the level of resilience does not differ based on gender (Ayar & Egemberdiyeva, 2018; Aydın, 2010; Aydoğdu, 2013; Bolat, 2013; Özer, 2013;). An apparent discrepancy arises in the results concerning the gender variable. If the level of resilience varies according to the gender factor, it can be concluded that there is no consistency. This could potentially be attributed to the influence of numerous uncontrollable factors on resilience.

There are also significant differences in the resilience scores of the participants based on their marital status. The resilience of married individuals is higher than that of single individuals. There are studies that substantiate this conclusion in the literature. Ucar (2014) discovered in a study of teachers that married teachers possessed higher resilience than their unmarried counterparts. Dane (2015) reached the conclusion in his research that married people possess significantly higher levels of resilience in comparison to single individuals. In the study conducted by Yaşayanlar (2018), it was concluded that married individuals have high resilience levels. This condition can be attributed to a variety of variables, including marital support, the ability to share bitter or joyful moments with the spouse, overcoming issues together with the spouse, and building problem-solving skills together. Conversely, some research indicates that resilience does not change according to the marital status variable (Sezgin, 2012; Sonmezer, 2015). Thus, it can be argued that further research is warranted regarding the subject of marital status.

According to research data, Resilience scores show significant differences according to age. Resilience was found to be higher among those aged 46 and older compared to other age categories. This result is consistent with those of previously conducted studies (Gooding, Hurst, Johnson, & Tarrier, 2012; Varicier, 2019). Individuals aged 65 and up were shown to be three times more resilient than those aged 18-24 in a study conducted by Bonanno et al. (2006). Gooding, Hurst, Johnson, and Tarrier (2012) investigated the levels of resilience in adult groups under the age of 26 and over the age of 64, and discovered that older adults were more resilient than young adults. This can be interpreted as elderly people becoming psychologically stronger than younger people as a result of having faced challenging living conditions numerous times during their lives.

It was observed that individuals with a bachelor's degree and above have higher resilience, according to the research results. Individuals with higher education levels have significantly higher resilience levels. An examination of the literature reveals that there is no common result with regard to

educational level. Research involving university students revealed no significant difference (Varicier, 2019). Thus, it can be asserted that further research involving participants with varying levels of education is required.

When examining the relationship between income level and resilience, it is observed that individuals with higher income levels exhibit a significantly higher level of resilience than those with medium and low-income levels. This result is in line with the findings of prior research. This result, for instance, provides support for the research conducted by Gizir (2007), who concurs that a high-income level is a protective factor for the resilience of the individual. According to the findings of a study involving adult participants conducted by Bektaş and Ozben (2016), resilience differs significantly in magnitude in accordance with the perceived economic situation. Individuals' resilience increases when their assessments of their economic condition improve. This has been interpreted as favourable economic circumstances that psychologically strengthen the individual.

Regarding the second research question, a correlation analysis was performed to examine the relationship between resilience and enneagram personality types. The results indicated that resilience was positively correlated with all enneagram personality types. In other words, an increase in resilience corresponds to an augmentation in personality type characteristics. Nevertheless, an analysis of resilience did not reveal a significant relationship with the following three personality types: Type 1 Perfectionist, Type 2 Helper, and Type 6 Loyalist. Six of the nine personality categories in which significant relationships were determined can be seen in the table below. These are; Type 3. Achiever, Type 4. Original, Type 5. Observer, Type 7. Adventurer, Type 8. Chief (leader) and Type 9. Accommodator. This general result is similar to previous studies. The results of a recent study by Nieto et al. (2023) also showed that there is a positive relationship between resilience and personality traits.

Resilience was found to be significantly and positively correlated with the Type 3, Achiever personality type. These traits are associated with an increase in resilience in individuals with the achiever personality type, and conversely, a reduction in these traits is correlated with a decline in resilience. According to Palmer (2010), people with this personality type do not act on their feelings, are success-oriented, and can be workaholics. They are adept at persuasion, organisation, and mobilisation (Acarkan, 2016). According to the findings of this study, it can be interpreted that the high resilience levels of people with a high level of education and a good economic condition are compatible with the fact that the achiever personality types and resilience are associated.

Positive and significant relationships were discovered between type 4, original personality type, and resilience. In individuals with an original personality type, resilience increases with these characteristics, or as these characteristics decrease, resilience also decreases. According to Palmer (2010), people with this personality type are continually looking for originality and wants to be unique.

Its association with resilience may be attributed to their ability to observe the fine details in life and their efforts to take a unique stand in the face of life's many difficulties and responsibilities.

The observer personality type, type 5, was discovered to be positively and significantly related to resilience. In individuals with an observer personality type, resilience increases with these characteristics, or as these characteristics decrease, resilience also decreases. People with the observer personality desire to be capable and competent, and they are continually alert to life (Riso & Hudson, 1999). As a result, it can be concluded that the resilience of people who are always sensitive to life and wish to be sufficient improves.

Type 7, Adventurer, was discovered to be favourably and strongly connected to resilience. Resilience increases with these attributes in individuals with the adventurer personality type, and decreases with these characteristics. When we look at adventurous people, we see that they are always productive in life and have a strong imagination. They are not afraid to seek adventure and to take risks in their lives. It can be suggested that this circumstance aids in the development of their resilience.

Type 8, leader personality type was found to be positively and significantly related to resilience. In individuals with the leader personality type, resilience increases with these characteristics, or as these characteristics decrease, resilience also decreases. As stated by Matise (2007), members of this group are strong and autonomous yet they fear damage; therefore, it is possible to conclude that this trait is associated with resilience. Facing difficult situations fearlessly and leading people can enhance the resilience of those involved.

Type 9, accommodator personality type was found to be positively and significantly related to resilience. In individuals with the agreeable personality type, resilience increases with these characteristics, or as these characteristics decrease, resilience also decreases. Riso and Hudson (1999) posit that individuals who dislike conflict are peaceful, conciliatory and harmonious; they are also referred to as mediators. There is evidence to suggest that individuals who possess the ability to resolve conflicts amicably and composedly are, generally, more resilient from a resilient. Being peaceful can be interpreted as being related to resilience.

When considering the findings of the research as a whole, it is possible to conclude that individuals who are success-oriented, value uniqueness, exhibit alertness and competence in life, are willing to take risks, demonstrate strength, possess problem-solving abilities, establish strong interpersonal relationships, maintain composure in crisis situations, and exhibit peacefulness are also resilient.

As a result, the study achieved its goal, and the sub-objectives were addressed. The level of resilience was found to vary according to demographic factors. Specifically, men, older individuals, married individuals, those with higher levels of education, and individuals with higher incomes

demonstrated higher levels of resilience. Additionally, positive relationships were observed between resilience and Enneagram personality types. This study contributed to the examination of factors related to resilience by seeking to understand the roles of demographic factors and Enneagram personality types.

The study contains some advantages and limitations that have been observed in prior similar investigations. One strength is the utilization of standardized scales and methods. Another strength is the sample size. The vast majority of scales utilized enable individuals' objective self-evaluation and possess satisfactory validity and reliability. However, the subjectivity of a portion of the scale items is one of its limitations. A further limitation is that the research can only be conducted with the parents of a particular institution. To enhance the generalizability of findings, it is advisable that forthcoming studies incorporate distinct and larger groups.

### **Policy Implications**

This study examined the psychological resilience levels of adult individuals in terms of demographic characteristics and enneagram personality types among a group of parents of students. The results obtained from this study show that resilience was related to personality types, and the level of resilience varies according to demographic factors. This work contributes to the study of resilience and related factors, which may assist experts working in the field and contribute to the literature. The study is original and has not been researched before.

The purpose of education is to cultivate individuals who can think critically, express their thoughts, conduct research, read, interpret, and transfer knowledge to others in the information age. Moreover, the primary goal of education is to ensure the continuity of society by fostering psychological strength in its members. Psychological resilience may serve as a solution for a society comprised of psychologically robust individuals. In this regard, it is essential to integrate this issue into educational plans and programs so that students can develop strong psychological foundations. This approach may pave the way for creating a psychologically resilient society for the future.

### **Conflict of Interest**

Author declares no conflicts of interest.

### **Funding Details**

This article has not been funded by any institution.

### **Ethical Statement**

Participation was arranged voluntarily, with informed consent obtained from all participants. Necessary permissions were obtained for the scales used in the study. Ethical approvals were obtained before conducting the present study. Participants were informed about the confidentiality of their

responses through a consent form before filling in the questionnaire. They provided informed consent by choosing “I agree to participate” and signing consent statements.

### **Credit Author Statement**

Author have contributed in multiple roles.

### **References**

- Acarkan, İ. (2016). Kişiliğin DNA'sı. İstanbul: Kurtuba Kitap.
- Ayar, D. (2018). Gençlerde psikolojik sağlamlık. *Gençlik Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(15), 91-112. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/genclikarastirmalari/issue/66476/1040700>
- Aydın, B. (2010). Üniversite öğrencilerinin duygusal zekâ ve umut düzeyleri ile psikolojik sağlamlıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Trabzon.
- Aydoğdu, T. (2013). Bağlanma stilleri, başa çıkma stratejileri ile psikolojik dayanıklılık arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Bektaş, M., & Özben, Ş. (2016). Evli bireylerin psikolojik dayanıklılık düzeylerinin bazı sosyo-demografik değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *CBÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 14(1), 216-240.
- Bolat, Z. (2013). Üniversite öğrencilerinin psikolojik sağlamlık ve öz-anlayışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Konya.
- Bonanno, G. A., Galea, S., Bucciarelli, A., & Vlahov, D. (2006). Psychological resilience after disaster. *Psychological Science*, 17(3), 181– 186. <http://doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01682.x>
- Cattell, R.B. (1949): *The sixteen personality factor questionnaire*, Institute for Personality and Ability Testing. New York: Harcourt.
- Çelik, B. N. (2021). Kalp yetmezliği olan hastaların D tipi kişilik özellikleri ve psikolojik sağlamlıkları. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Ordu Üniversitesi, Ordu.
- Dane, E. (2015). Hemodiyaliz hastalarının psikolojik dayanıklılık durumları ve etkileyen faktörlerin değerlendirilmesi. (Yayınlanmış yüksek lisans tezi). Acıbadem Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Doğan, T. (2015). Kısa psikolojik sağlamlık ölçeğinin Türkçe uyarlaması: geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being*, 3(1), 93-102.
- Doğan, T., & Yavuz, K. E. (2020). Yetişkinlerde psikolojik sağlamlık, olumlu çocukluk deneyimleri ve algılanan mutluluk, *Psikiyatride Güncel Yaklaşımlar*, 12, 312-330. <http://doi:10.18863/pgy.750839>.
- Dörnyei, Z (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. New York; Oxford University Press.
- Eley, D. S., Cloninger, C. R., Walters, L, Laurence, C., Synnott, R., & Wilkinson, D. (2013). The relationship between resilience and personality traits in doctors: implications for enhancing wellbeing. *PeerJ*, (1) 216. <http://doi:10.7717/peerj.216>. PMID: 24282675; PMCID:

PMC3840414.

- Eminağaoğlu N. (2006). Güç koşullarda yaşayan sokak çocuklarında dayanıklılık (sağlamlık). (Yayınlanmış doktora tezi). Ege Üniversitesi, İzmir
- Eysenck, H. J. (1947). *Dimensions of personality*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Farber, F., & Rosendahl, J. (2020). Trait resilience and mental health in older adults: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Mental Health*, 14, 361–375. <http://doi:10.1002/pmh.1490>
- Fraser M., & Jenson JM. (2008). A Risk and Resilience Framework for Child, Youth, and Family Policy. URL: [Http://Www.Sagepub.Com/UpmData/5975\\_Chapter\\_1\\_Jenson\\_Fraser\\_I\\_Proof.Pdf](Http://Www.Sagepub.Com/UpmData/5975_Chapter_1_Jenson_Fraser_I_Proof.Pdf),
- Gizir, C. A. (2007). Psikolojik sağlamlık, risk faktörleri ve koruyucu faktörler üzerine bir derleme çalışması. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, (3), 113-128.
- Gooding, P. A., Hurst, A., Johnson, J., & Tarrier, N. (2012). Psychological resilience in young and older adults. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 27(3), 262-270. <https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.2712>
- Gökkaya, A. (2020). Anne babaların; enneagram bilgisi, ebeveyn tutumları ve affedicilik düzeylerinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Maltepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Greene, R. R. (2012). *Resiliency: An integrated approach to practice, policy and research*. Washington, DC: NASW Press,
- Hetherington E. M, Stanley-Hagan M. (1999). The adjustment of children with divorced parents: a risk and resiliency perspective. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*; 40, 129-140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-7610.00427>
- Hoşoğlu, R., Kodaz, A. F., Bingöl, T. Y., & Batık, M. V. (2018). Öğretmen adaylarında psikolojik sağlamlık. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, 8(14), 217-239. <http://DOI:10,26466/opus.405751>
- Jung, C. G. (1925). *Analytical psychology: Notes of the seminar given in 1925*. (W.McGuire, Ed.). London: Routledge.
- Kılıç, Ş. D. (2014). Üniversite öğrencilerinin yalnızlık ve psikolojik dayanıklılıklarının incelenmesi. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Atatürk Üniversitesi, Erzurum.
- Matise, M. (2007). The enneagram: An innovative approach. *Journal of Professional Counseling Practice Theory & Research*, 35(1), 38-58. <http://DOI:10.1080/15566382.2007.12033832>
- Merriam-Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary (1987). Springfield: Merriam Webster Inc.
- Naranjo, C. (1994). *Character and neurosis: an integrative view*. CA:Gateways Inc.
- Newman, R. (2003). *Providing direction on the road to resilience*. www.Behavioral.Net
- Nieto, M., Visier, M.E., Silvestre, I.N., Navarro, B., Serrano, J.P., & Martínez-Vizcaíno, V. (2023). Relation between resilience and personality traits: The role of hopelessness and age.



- Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 64, 53-59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12866>
- Oktan, V., Odacı, H., & Berber-Çelik, Ç. (2014). Psikolojik doğum sırasının psikolojik sağlamlığın yordanmasındaki rolünün incelenmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14(1), 140-152.
- Oshio, A., Taku, K., Hirano, M., & Saeed, G. (2018). Resilience and big five personality traits: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, Volume 127(1), 54-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.01.048>
- Özcan B. (2005). Anne-babaları boşanmış ve anne-babaları birlikte olan lise öğrencilerinin yılmazlık özellikleri ve koruyucu faktörler açısından karşılaştırılması. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Özer, E. (2013). Üniversite öğrencilerinin psikolojik sağlamlık düzeylerinin duygusal zekâ ve beş faktör kişilik özellikleri açısından incelenmesi. (Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Konya.
- Palmer, H. (2010). *Ruhun aynası Enneagrama yansıyan insan manzaraları*. (O. Gündüz, Çev.). İstanbul: Kaknüs Yay. (Orijinal Basım 1991).
- Ramirez, M. (2007, April). Resilience: A concept analysis. In: *Nursing forum*, (Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 73-82). Malden, USA: Blackwell Publishing Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6198.2007.00070.x>
- Randall, S. (1979). The development of an inventory to assess enneagram personality type. (PhD Dissertation). California Institute of Asian Studies, CA.
- Riso, D. R., & Hudson, R. (1996). *Personality types: using the enneagram for self-discovery*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Riso, D. R., & Hudson, R. (1999). *The wisdom of the enneagram: The complete guide to psychological and spiritual growth for the nine personality types*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Riso, D. R., & Hudson, R. (2015). *Enneagram ile kişilik analizi*. (G. Aksoy, Çev.). İstanbul: Butik Yayınları (Orijinal Basım 1996).
- Riso, D. R. (2003). *Kişilik tipleri enneagramla kendinizi keşfedin*. (T. Köker, Çev.). İstanbul: Kuraldışı Yayıncılık.
- Rutter, M. (2006). Implications of resilience concepts for scientific understanding. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1094 (1), 1-12. <http://https://Doi.Org/10.1196/Annals.1376.002>
- Sezgin, F. (2012). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin psikolojik dayanıklılık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*. 20(2), 489-502.
- Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Jennifer Bernard, J. (2008). The brief resilience scale: Assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 15, 194–200. <https://doi:10.1080/10705500802222972>.
- Sönmezer, B. (2015). Öğretmenlerin tükenmişlik ve psikolojik dayanıklılık düzeylerinin incelenmesi.

- (Yayınlanmış yüksek lisans tezi). Erciyes Üniversitesi, Kayseri.
- Stout M. D., & Kipling G. (2003). Aboriginal people, resilience and the residential school legacy. *Aboriginal Healing Foundation*. URL: [Www.Ahf. Ca/Pages/ Download/28\\_46](http://www.Ahf.Ca/Pages/Download/28_46).
- Tastan, K. (2019). Development and Validation of a personality type inventory based on enneagram. *Konuralp Tıp Dergisi*. 11(1), 112-120. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/693284>
- Uçar, T. (2014). Özel eğitim okulu öğretmenlerinin psikolojik dayanıklılık düzeylerinin ve mesleki sosyal destek düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. (Yayınlanmış yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Ungar, M., & Theron, L. (2019). Resilience and mental health: How multisystemic processes contribute to positive outcomes. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 7, 441–448. [http://DOI:10,1016/S2215-0366\(19\)30434-1](http://DOI:10,1016/S2215-0366(19)30434-1)
- Vance E., & Sanchez H. (1998). Creating A service system that builds resiliency. [Http://Www.Dhhs.State.Nc.Us/Mhddsas/Childandfamily/Technical assistance/ Riskresiliency.Htm](http://Www.Dhhs.State.Nc.Us/Mhddsas/Childandfamily/Technical%20assistance/Riskresiliency.Htm).
- Varıcıer, Ş. E. (2019). Yetişkin psikolojik sağlamlığı üzerine bir inceleme. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). İbni Haldun Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Wagner, J. P. (1988). *Two windows on the self: the enneagram and the Myers-Briggs*. MO: National Catholic Reporter Publishing. <https://Doi.Org/10.1080/15566382.2007.12033832>
- Wagner, J. P., & Walker, R. E. (1983). Reliability and validity study of a sufi personality typology: the enneagram. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 39(5), 712-717. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679\(198309\)39:5<712::AID-JCLP2270390511>3.0.CO;2-3](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(198309)39:5<712::AID-JCLP2270390511>3.0.CO;2-3)
- Wagner, J.P. (1996). *The enneagram spectrum of personality styles: an introductory guide*. Portland: Metamorphous Press.
- Yaşayanlar, E. (2018). Evli ve boşanmış bireylerin psikolojik dayanıklılıklarının karşılaştırılması. (Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Nişantaşı Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Yılmaz, E. D., Kesebir, S., Ünal, Ö., Örek, A., & Bilici, M. (2014). Dokuz tip mizaç ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenilirliği. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 171(39), 115-137.