CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

Well-being is a ubiquitous term. The state of being healthy, happy, and prosperous can be termed meaningfully as well-being. It refers to the state of optimal psychological functioning and individual experience. Well-being is an idea of being or feeling good, to conclude “a good life”. In this approach we see happiness as one of the goals cherished by human beings, in conversational terms well-being is sometimes labeled as happiness. Veenhoven, (2006) found the word happiness synonymous with 'quality of life' or 'well-being'. In this meaning it denotes that life is good, but does not specify what is good about life. The subjective perception of happiness and satisfaction with life, differ for individuals, e.g. Kitayama, Oyserman, Heather, and Markus, (2002) theorized that for an individual of individualistic culture (Western Culture) happiness is a subjective state that belongs to an individual and thus experienced as a personal property where as for an individual of collectivistic culture (Like India) happiness is mediated by harmonious belief.

Today, in the competitive world people are quite disturbed and dissatisfied. The individual’s experience of discomfort, depression disease, and dissatisfaction is leading lives of people to world of uncertainty and rage. This negative focus is only a little part of the story, today the aim of psychologists is to net the threads of positive feelings, experiences and evaluation of own lives in the light of positivity with proper understanding. It is a challenge for modern psychologists and researchers to explore the determinants for a happy life. The harmonization between the different components of life is just like giving a beautiful shape to our own life. The well-being can be distinguished in to two notions: Objective well-being (OWB) and Subjective well-being (SWB). While OWB is a record of individuals own retrospective evaluation of achievement and experiences of remembered moments, SWB is a subjective evaluation and judgement of life in terms of events and satisfaction with life in present episodes.

*Happiness or well-being are the terms used interchangeably in this thesis.

The relation between SWB and OWB is like the relation between the remembered evaluation of experience and constructed evaluation of episodes of life (Kahneman, 1999). The OWB is ultimately based on subjective data: the good/bad experiences of moments of life. Parducci (1995) offered a similar definition of well-being as an “a theoretical summation over separate momentary pleasures and pains”.
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General well being have been defined as the subjective feeling of contentment, happiness, satisfaction with life’s experiences and of one’s role in the world of work, sense of achievement, utility, belongingness, and no distress, dissatisfaction or worry, etc. A Person is said to have high SWB if she or he experiences life satisfaction and frequent joy, and only infrequently experience unpleasant emotions such as anger and fear. Contrariwise a person is said to have a low SWB if he/she is dissatisfied with life, experiences little joy and affection, and frequently feels negative emotions such as anger and anxiety.

The cognitive and affective components of SWB are highly interrelated and only recently we are beginning to understand the relations between various types of SWB. Diener, (1984) described several cardinal characteristics in the study of SWB. On the basis of such description different characteristics can be focused with two concepts for defining and describing the term SWB: First, it does not focus only on undesirable states such as depression or helplessness. Instead, individual differences in levels of positive well-being are also considered important. Secondly, SWB is defined in terms of the internal experience of the respondent. In the field of SWB, a person’s beliefs about his or her own well-being are of paramount importance.

**Personality and Subjective Well-Being**

The reality of the world is people are striving for food on the streets while others are using luxurious cars. The world is full of distress, depression, dissatisfaction and diseases undergoing threats of war and rage of nature. Still our nation is enjoying all the festivals and events of life, inspite of diversities in every domain of life. It’s very interesting to know which type of glass Indians are using to perceive the world, which enhance the belief that future is bright. Miracles may happen not the misfortune, a popular belief in Indian hearts. Question arises what enables us to view life as positive, which in turn makes life worth living. It can be also questioned that why some people are consistently happier than others (Lu & Shih, 1997). Some investigations explained the sources of happiness and focused on determining the strongest predictors of SWB. Three general categories of Subjective well-being determiners have been identified: (1) life circumstances and demographics, (2) traits and dispositions, and (3) intentional behaviors (Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005).

Subjective well-being includes a cognitive appraisal of one's general state, and there are two approaches. One of the approaches is based on the idea that there are basic and universal human needs and that people will be happy if one's circumstances allow a person to fulfill these needs. The other approach to subjective well-being assumes that life satisfaction is seen as the product of internal traits. Within the light of researches, till today, personality dimensions have been considered as powerful determinant of Subjective well-being of the
individual. Recently, several studies have proposed interpretative tendencies or thinking styles to be alternatives of personality traits. A particular thinking style may explain how individuals select and process information while interpreting life events, which may account for individual differences in evaluating their Subjective well-being for their life.

Other than the demographic and circumstantial variables, personality traits account for a large portion of the variance in individual differences in SWB – as much as 40–50% (Diener et al., 1999) and appear to be critical to well-being. Traits are biologically-based, enduring dispositions (McCrae and Costa, 1996) that include attitude and behavior complexes, which are consistent across time and situations (Allport, 1955). DeNeve and Cooper, (1998) with their researches, they have repeatedly shown that certain personality traits are related to subjective well-being. Such as McCrae and Costa (1991) documented the relations between the five-factor model of personality and the individual components of subjective well-being – that is, positive affect, negative affect, and life satisfaction. Which component regulates an individual’s SWB may be another curiosity for the researchers in the field of subjective well-being. The regulation of SWB may be due to combined effect of cognitive affect through personality and affective behaviours. Cummins and Nistico (2002) explained that the individual’s cognitive buffers supply a counterbalancing force that ensures the maintenance of SWB and motivation. Veenhoven (1994) discussed on the necessity of SWB to support the adequate levels of motivation toward life. In the similar pattern Cummins and Nistico (2002) found that SWB is important in avoiding the debilitating motivational consequences of depression.

One avenue of research that has attracted much attention is the relationship between personality and subjective well-being. Personality is the integrated system of behaviour that is characteristics of an individual. Research has revealed the link between personality and SWB, and personality is one of the most stable and powerful predictors of SWB (Diener, 1984). Diener further suggested that individuals have a global tendency to experience life in a positive or negative way under the influence of personality. Among the personality traits related to SWB, extroversion and neuroticism have generated most of the research (Argyle & Lu, 1990; Brebner, Donaldson, Kirby, & Ward, 1995; Chan & Joseph, 2000; Diener, Sandvik, Pavot, & Fujita, 1992; Furnham & Brewin, 1990; Lu, 1995; Lu & Shih, 1997; Myers & Diener, 1995). In contrast, personality, although being an important correlate of Subjective well-being, typically accounts for no more than 30% of the variance on well-being measures. Therefore it is important to know what are the other potential factors related to Subjective well-being. It should also be viewed that because most of the research till now, has been conducted in Western countries, whether personality is a significant predictor/determiner of
SWB in non-western cultures remains to be tested. Recently study of SWB is the focused on cognitive and social orientations. Larsen, Diener, and Cropanzano (1987) found that one can dampen or amplify one’s emotions by what one thinks, and thereby experience more or less intense emotions. Happy people are likely to experience more events that are considered desirable in the culture, but also have a tendency to interpret and recall ambiguous events as good (Seidlitz & Diener, 1993). People with high SWB are also more likely to perceive “neutral” events as positive. Thus, people with high SWB may not only experience more positive events, but may also seem to perceive events more positively than do people who are low in SWB.

At the basic level of explanation for reason why personality is related to SWB can be answered as, because personality traits provide a useful method for categorizing people and their behaviors for example happy individuals are more likely to experience pleasant affect than unhappy individuals. There is a scientific understanding to specify the process that relate traits to SWB. Diener, and Lucas (1999) suggested some models to explain this relation with empirical support: Temperament models, Congruence models, Cognitive models, Goal Models, Emotion socialization models.

SEX AND SWB: There are two important perspectives for explaining relation of Sex with SWB; Firstly, Lippa (2005) stated gender differences in SWB could be explained by the universal sex differences. Female’s greater vulnerability to depression and anxiety was related to hormonal level estrogen and progesterone production (in puberty, menstrual cycle, or post-partum period). Although such biological explanations for lower SWB for females are not supported empirically (Nolen-Hoeksema & Rusting, 1998; Nydegger, 2004), still the influence of sex on SWB cannot be denied. Secondly, factors related to gender differences in SWB may be due to different living conditions of females and males. In many societies the average living situation of females is indeed disadvantaged as compared to that of males (Ruso & Green, 1993). There is a larger literature on gender differences in experience and expression of every day positive moods. A number of studies found females experience greater happiness and more positive emotions in comparison to males (Cameron, 1975; Diener, Sandvik, & Larsen, 1985; Fujita, Diener, Sandvik, 1991; Grossman & Wood, 1993; Wood, Rhodes, & Whelan, 1989). The findings from self report studies of emotion yielded a consistent pattern that females reported experiencing more frequent and intense internally focused emotion in comparison to males (Allen & Haccoun, 1976; Balswick & Avertt, 1977; Brody, Hay, & Vandewater, 1990; Croake, Myers & Singh, 1987; Dillon, Wolf, & Katz, 1985; Highlen & Gilles, 1978; Highlen & Johnston, 1979; Kirkpatrick, 1984; McDaniel & Richards, 1990; Scherer, Wallbott, & Summerfield, 1986; Staple & Haviland, 1989). Men were likely to
enjoy a significantly higher level of life satisfaction compared to women, consistent with results from other studies (Kehn, 1995; Fuller et. al.2004).

In contrary some other studies reported either no gender difference nor a greater SWB for male and females was found (Diener, 1984; Gurin, Verhoff, & Feld, 1960; Larson, 1978). Sahoo and Mohapatra found in their study, valuable information on comparative value of gender with SWB. No difference has been found between male and females in regard Women have been found to be as happy as men are. The findings of this study reveal a gender pattern for subjective well-being. Joshi (2010) found in her investigation that there was no significant gender difference occurs in the level of subjective well-being of the male and female IT employees and their results can be compared regarding male and female employees’ perception about their well-being was also found to be similar.

Gender differences on the basis of personality can be explained on the basis on the variety of traits, behavioural styles, cognitive styles and coping styles. These styles influence males and females in experiencing and expressing their moods and behaviour differently

**Statement of Problems**

Although there is good amount of research in the field of SWB the real concept and the determinants of SWB so far has not been clearly understood, therefore the present research has been undertaken and an attempt has been made to examine the personality determinants of SWB. After a critical observation of the previous studies done in the field of SWB it has been found that SWB is important aspect for positive development of satellite generation. Still a lot of research is still a requirement in the hedonic field of positive psychology to reveal the relation of SWB with different personality traits in different culture, economic status, gender, age and many other demographic variables.

Thus for the present study following are the problems and their relevant hypotheses:

i) The first problem of the present study was to examine whether Reserved, and Outgoing (Factor-A) subjects show different SWB. It was hypothesized that Outgoing subjects would show higher SWB as compared to Reserved subjects.

ii) The second problem of the present study was to examine whether the Less intelligent, and More intelligent (Factor - B) subjects would show different SWB. It was hypothesized that More intelligent subjects would show higher SWB than the Less intelligent subjects.

iii) The third problem of the present study was to examine whether the Emotionally less stable, and Emotionally stable (Factor-C) subjects would
show different SWB. It was hypothesized that Emotionally stable subjects
would show higher SWB as compared to Less emotionally stabled subjects.

iv) The fourth problem of the present study was to examine whether Humble
and Assertive (Factor-E) subjects would show different SWB. It was
hypothesized that Assertive subjects would show higher SWB as compared
to humble subjects.

v) The fifth problem of the present study was to examine whether Sober and
Happy-go-lucky (Factor-F) subjects would show different SWB. It was
hypothesized that Happy-go-lucky subjects would show higher SWB as
compared to Sober subjects.

vi) The sixth problem of the present study was to examine whether Expedient
and Conscientious (Factor-G) subjects would show different SWB. It was
hypothesized that Expedient subjects would show higher SWB as compared
to Conscientious subjects.

vii) The seventh problem of the present study was to examine whether Shy and
Venturesome (Factor-H) subjects would show different SWB. It was
hypothesized that Venturesome subjects would show higher SWB as
compared to Shy subjects.

viii) The eighth problem of the present study was to examine whether the Tough
minded and Tender minded (Factor-I) subjects would show different SWB.
It was hypothesized that Tough minded subjects would show higher SWB
as compared to Tender minded subjects.

ix) The ninth problem of the present study was to examine whether the
Suspicious and Trusting (Factor-L) subjects would show different SWB. It
was hypothesized that Trusting subjects would show higher SWB as
compared to Suspicious subjects.

x) The tenth problem of the present study was to examine whether the
Practical and Imaginative (Factor-M) subjects would show different SWB.
It was hypothesized that Practical subjects would show higher level of
SWB as compared to Imaginative subjects.

xi) The eleventh problem of the present study was to examine whether the
Forthright and Shrewd (Factor-N) subjects would show different SWB. It
was hypothesized that Forthright subjects would show higher SWB as
compared to Shrewd subjects.

xii) The twelfth problem of the present study was to examine whether the
Placid and Apprehensive (Factor-O) subjects would show different SWB. It
was hypothesized that Placid subjects would show higher SWB as
compared to Apprehensive subjects.

xiii) The thirteenth problem of the present study was to examine whether the
Conservative and Experimenting (Factor-Q1) subjects would show
different SWB. It was hypothesized that Conservative subjects would show
SWB as compared to Experimenting subjects.
xiv) The fourteenth problem of the present study was to examine whether the Group-dependent, and Self sufficient (Factor-Q2) subjects would show different SWB. It was hypothesized that Group-dependent subjects would show higher SWB as compared to Self sufficient subjects.

xv) The fifteenth problem of the present study was to examine whether the Self conflict, and Self controlled (Factor-Q3) subjects would show different SWB. It was hypothesized that Self controlled subjects would show higher level of SWB as compared to Self conflict subjects.

xvi) The sixteenth problem of the present study was to examine whether the Relaxed, and Tense (Factor-Q4) subjects would show different SWB. It was hypothesized that Relaxed subjects would show higher SWB as compared to Tense subjects.

xvii) The last and the seventeenth problem of the present study was to examine the role of Sex in SWB. It was hypothesized that male subjects would show higher SWB than the female subjects.

xviii) The eighteenth problem of the present study was to examine the relationship of different personality factor with SWB of the subjects.

xix) The last and nineteenth problem of the study was to examine the contributing predictor role of different personality factors for SWB of the subjects.

Method

Subjects

Initially a large number of subjects studying in different colleges of Raipur city and in the age range between 20-25 years were randomly selected as sample. The SWLS and 16 PF were administered to 1600 participants out of which 1168 (one thousand one hundred and sixty eight) subjects were served as final sample. The final subjects were such that 592 of them were females and the remaining 576 were males. Finally as per the requirement of 2x2 factorial designs were selected for analysis of data.

Design

The present study is a research employing type –s independent variables. The present study investigated the role of personality and sex in the Subjective well-being of the subjects. In the present study the personality and sex were taken as independent variable and the scores SWB as the dependent variable.

The 16 personality factors from both sexes (female and male) were considered in the present study. Since each personality factor is independent in determining the SWB of the subject, thus, sixteen 2x2 ANOVA were computed taking personality (high and low) and sex (female and male) as independent
variables and as mentioned earlier, SWB scores of the subjects were considered as the dependent variable. In order to compute 2x2 factorial design, the sample was divided in extreme high or low personality groups. To get high and low groups, the scores were arranged in ascending order. Finally the quartiles Q1 and Q4 are used as high and low personality groups.

**Measures**

1. *Personality 16PF*

   The 16 PF, a test devised by Cattell (1966) was used to measure the different dimensions of personality of the subjects. In this study Form C was used, having 105 questions. It is an objectively scorable test useful in psychological research for complete coverage of personality of the subject in a brief time. It covers all the psychometric properties.

2. *Subjective Well-Being with life satisfaction scale (SWLS)*

   The Subjective well-being of the subject was measured through a scale developed by the researcher. Thus with the help of self-report scale, the respondents judged and reported their Subjective well-being accordingly. This scale consists of twenty-statement, which scores wider range of SWB of the subject. The items have a 7-point rating scale, ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. The total score is obtained according to the ratings made by respondent. Higher the scores reflect higher levels of SWB of the respondent.

**Procedure**

First of all the head of the institutions were contacted and objectives of investigation was discussed. With the permission of the head of the institutions a convenient time were sought with the help of the class conductors or teachers.

Each individual had taken almost 1 to 1 and 1/2 hours to complete the test materials, 16PF questionnaire and self developed SWLS scale. Subjects were asked to think about what they have been doing and experiencing during the past four weeks. Then they were asked to report how much they experienced each of the following statements, using the scale provided. Before starting the procedure, all the doubts were clarified and were instructed regarding the test taking method. They were convinced about the confidentiality that was observed. Later on, all the printed test materials were personally administered. The test was conducted with small group of about in the permitted time slot. After completion of the questionnaires answer sheets and scales were collected. Finally scoring was completed and the obtained datas were computed with the help of SPSS (16.0) version.
Results and Conclusions

In the present study, role of personality as determiner of SWB was investigated among the individuals of age between 20- 25 years, both male and females in different colleges of Raipur city.

To test the proposed hypothesis, the obtained raw scores were subjected to 2x2 factorial design (two way ANOVA). Thus the results obtained can be concluded on the basis of significant, not significant results on different factors of personality, sex and their interaction as concluded below:

Summary of significant results with different personality factors are:

According to the ANOVA statistic the obtained results show that there was significant difference in SWB specific to personality Factors-B (More Intelligence V/s Less Intelligence), Factor-C (Emotionally less stable V/s emotionally stable), Factor E (Humble V/S Assertive), Factor-F (Sober V/s Happy go-lucky), Factor-G (Expeditious V/s Conscientious), Factor-H (Shy V/s Venturesome), and Factor-Q1 (Conservative V/s Experimenting).

Summary of non significant results with different personality factors are:

The obtained results show that there was no significant difference in SWB specific to personality Factor-A (Reserved V/s Outgoing), Factor-I (Tough minded V/s Tender minded), Factor-L (Suspicious V/s Trusting), Factor-M (Practical V/s Imaginative), Factor-N (Forthright V/s Shrewd), Factor-O (Placid V/s Apprehensive), , Factor-Q2 (Group-dependent V/S Self sufficient), FactorQ3 (Self conflict V/S Self controlled), FactorQ4 (Relaxed V/S Tensed).

Summary of non significant results with both the sex are:

The obtained results show that there was no significant difference in SWB specific to sex. The F-ratio for sex has been found to be non significant with all 16 factors of personality. This indicates that sex has no effect on SWB of the subjects. Either the Male subjects or Female subjects do not show any difference in SWB with different personality factors in the present research study.

Summary of significant interaction results with different personality factors and sex are:

The obtained results show the significant interaction with personality Factors-B (More Intelligence V/s Less Intelligence), Factor-C (Emotionally less stable V/s emotionally stable),, Factor-I (Tough minded V/s Tender minded), Factor-O(Placid V/s Apprehensive), FactorQ4 (Relaxed V/S Tensed).

Summary of non significant interaction results with different personality factors and sex are:
The obtained results show the non significant interaction with personality Factor-A (Reserved V/s Outgoing), Factor-E (Humble V/S Assertive), Factor-F (Sober V/s Happy-go-lucky), Factor-G (Expedient V/s Conscientious), Factor-H (Shy V/s Venturesome), Factor-L (Suspicious V/s Trusting), Factor-M (Practical V/s Imaginative), Factor-N (Forthright V/s Shrewd), Factor-Q1 (Conservative V/s Experimenting), Factor-Q2 (Group-dependent V/S Self sufficient), and Factor-Q3 FactorQ3 (Self conflict V/S Self controlled).

In other words it can be interpreted that the difference in SWB exhibited are not determined by sex and personality Factor-A, Factor-D, Factor-E, Factor-F, Factor-G, Factor-H, Factor-L, Factor-M, Factor-N, Factor-Q1, Factor-Q2, and Factor-Q3 jointly. In other words sex and personality Factor (mentioned here specifically) are independent in determining their influence on SWB of the subjects.

The present investigation also revealed that personality Factor-B (More Intelligence - Less Intelligence), Factor-C (Emotionally less stable - Emotionally stable), Factor-F (Sober – Happy-go-lucky), Factor-G (Expedient - Conscientious), Factor-H (Shy - Venturesome), and Factor-Q1 (Conservative - Experimenting) significantly positively correlated with the evaluated subjective well-being.

While Factor-E (Humble - Assertive), and Factor-N (Forthright – Astute/Shrewd), indicated a significant negative correlation with SWB.

Moreover with the present findings the investigator concluded that there is no significant correlation of some personality Factor-A (Reserved - Outgoing), Factor-I (Tough minded - Tender minded), Factor-O (Self assured - Apprehensive), Factor-L (Suspicious - Trusting), Factor-M (Practical - Imaginative), Factor-Q2 (Group-dependent - Self sufficient), Factor-Q3 (Undisciplined Self conflict - Self controlled), Factor-Q4 (Relaxed – Tense/Frustrated), age and sex with evaluated subjective well-being.

However with the help of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis, it was revealed that Personality Factor C (Emotional stability) contributed most significantly in predicting SWB of the subjects in comparison to other significant contributing personality Factor-E (Humble – Assertive), Factor- N (Forthright-Astute), Factor- H (Shy- Venturesome), Factor- L (Trust ing- Suspicious), Factor-Q1 (Conservative- Experimenting), Factor- O (Self assured- Apprehensive), Factor- F (Sober- Happy-Go-Lucky), Factor- A (Reserved- Outgoing), and Sex(male-female).