CHAPTER – 1

INTRODUCTION
In modern world, human being is going through different phases of adaptation of situation throughout their life. In this process of adaptation and changes human being is facing problems which affect its happiness in turn affecting the quality of life. The main motive for human being has become success and gratification of one’s desire, but the success and gratification is not the key to happiness, but happiness is definitely a key to success and good life.

Veenhoven (2004) explained that in present era scientific researchers are providing more practical view on the conditions for happiness. Further it was specified that happiness is commonly understood as how much one likes the life one lives, or more formally, the degree to which one evaluates one’s life-as-a-whole positively. A central element in this definition is subjective ‘evaluation’ or ‘liking’ of life, also referred to as ‘satisfaction’ with life (Veenhoven, 2004).

Developing The science of well-being

It is very important to know history of happiness and well-being, so as to bridge the past and the present, and to put the findings of current well-being researches into context. Democritus (~460BC --370BC), suggested that a happy life is not exclusively product of favourable fate or external circumstances but rather of a man’s cast of mind. His subjectivist view seems not to have been endorsed by Socrates or by his students Plato, they conceptualized happiness in more objective and absolute terms, like “secure enjoyment” of what is good and beautiful (Norman, 1998a, Plato, 1999). Whereas Aristotle, in his work “Nicomachean Ethics”, happiness (eudemonia) was the central issue. He asserted that happiness was not out of one’s hand’s but is realizable for anyone willing to lead a life in accordance with the most valued virtues (Norman, 1998 b). In the ancient world, since the time of the ancient Greeks and Romans, a good life devoid of reason and morality was simply not achievable. Even before that people have wondered about the nature of “the good life”. Throughout history, philosophers considered happiness to be the highest good ultimate motivation for human action. The conceptualization of happiness primarily depends on the world view one holds that leads to differing assumptions on the nature of reality and of human nature. In India many of the notions of quality of life and well-being, which are researched today, were formulated during Vedic and Upanishad period dating back to approximately 3000BC. The Vedic and Upanishadic seers and sages were fascinated by the quest for ultimate truth with reference to that, which is permanent “satya” and eternal (nitya) rather than that which is momentary (kshanika), transient (anitya) and liable to undergo decay and destruction.
They applied this distinction in understanding everything in the universe: physical biological, psychological, ethical, moral, and so on. They made use of the same distinction even in defining happiness and well-being too (Kiran Kumar, 2003).

In the middle ages, Christian philosophers also considered a life of virtue as indispensable to the good life, nonetheless, virtue was no longer considered to be sufficient for well-being of people. Well-being then became an ethereal, spiritual matter, it now lay in the hands of God, attainable only means of devoted faith and the grace of God (Tatarkiewicz, 1976).

In the Enlightenment Age, the idea of well-being grew more secular and less other worldly. On the other hand, there was a great emphasis on the pleasure as a path to well-being in western culture. English philosophers viewed the maximum surplus of pleasure over pain as the cardinal goal of human striving and advocated that the greatest number of people should be the basis of morals and legislation.

In Modern Era, the idea that humans are entitled to pursue and attain well-being gained widespread acceptance. Classical and Medieval conceptions of well-being as virtue or perfection have been largely ignored or rendered in recent centuries. In McMahon’s words “humans in this day and age think of happiness more as feeling good than being good”. Philosophical treatments of the issue of Human well-being are rare in this era in comparison to the past, where as both behavioural and social-sciences have begun to devote considerable attention to the topic (Hayborn, 2007b).

During the first half of the 20th century, a few scientists studied happiness, typically conducting surveys on people’s moods. However, after 1960 several large scale surveys of happiness emerged, some sampling the average happiness in entire nations (Cantril, 1965; Gallup, 1976). Overall, this work was focused on trying to broadly describe who is happy. In a review of this work, Wilson (1967) described the happy person as a “young, healthy, well-educated, well-paid, extroverted, optimistic, worry-free, religious, married person with high self-esteem, high job morale, and modest aspirations, of either sex and of a wide range of intelligence”. However scholars also begin to notice that the “happiness” is not a single thing, but can be broken down into its constituent elements. For example, Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965) conducted large surveys that led them to plot the distinction between “positive affect” and “negative affect,” which they found not to be bipolar opposites has been assumed. Similarly, Bradburn and Caplovitz (1965) also found that the two types of affects formed separate dimensions and were caused by different factors.

Large surveys on happiness were often based on the sociological tradition, and therefore emphasized the casual role of demographic factors such as income, sex, education, marital status, and age as the correlates of well-being. At the same
time, others worked in the tradition stemming from personality psychology. For example, Wessman and Ricks (1966) collected intensive data on Harvard students, studying their moods on the daily basis. In the contrast to the surveys studies, this classic research focused on internal factors related to psychological dynamics, such as defense mechanism and personality traits.

One reason that sociologists and other behavioral scientists begin studying happiness was to assess how well societies were performing, with the assumption that happiness levels reflect whether the nation is meeting human needs. Thus, measures of well-being would provide social indicators much like crime, income, and education statistics that would monitor the progress of nations. If modern countries were to make progress, they needed measures against which to gauge it, and subjective well-being (SWB) was argued to be one such measure. However many anthropologists and sociologists questioned the idea that “happiness” would reflect true human progress. One argument was that the nature of “happiness” varies so subsequently across societies that they cannot be compared with respect to it.

Another objection to using measures of well-being to gauge societal progress was the theory that the people will adapt to the circumstances of their societies so that eventually all people will be equivalent in terms of happiness. Moreover, the very nature of happiness as an outcome was criticized on the ground that it was a western idea that should not be imposed on other cultures.

Diener in his research from 1984 to 2008 described several of the questions about happiness raised by the thinkers over thousands of years, and also addressed questions about happiness raised recently. According to Diener, “Happiness” is even more deeply reflective of well-being of societies then the utilitarian philosophers had imagined.

[*SWB is the psychological term for happiness and is preferred because of the many connotations of the latter term (Diener, 1984). Within the literature, the terms are used interchangeably.]*

**Happiness and well-being according to transcendental perspective in Indian tradition:**

Happiness and well-being according to transcendental perspective is “subjective” in the sense that does not depend on any objective conditions of reality, including one’s state of body-mind. The transcendental view involves an analysis of the nature and conditions of happiness, satisfaction and fulfillment. The Indian thinkers have provided an elaborate understanding of what is truly satisfying or fulfilling, what are limitations of “arth” (wealth) and “Kama” (desires), how human beings experience frustration and anger, what is the role of temperament and personality in the feeling of well-being. “Ananda” and “stitaprajnatva” are the defining characteristics’ of happiness and well-being from the transcendent perspective. It is ideal goal in our traditions as the ultimate goal in achieving well-being (Kiran Kumar, 2003, 2004).
The collectivist perspective lies in between the hedonistic and the transcendent perspectives. It is socially oriented and is governed by the concept of the “dharma”. It is a derivation from the Sanskrit root “dhar”- which means "to fasten, to support, to hold”. The collectivist perspective takes in to account the fact that there are enormous individual differences in the needs and aspirations of people. While some are purely hedonistic in their approach and few are spiritual, a vast majority falls in between. Keeping this in sight the Indian thinkers established a social framework and ground rules for good life, which ensures the well-being of all in a society by giving equal importance to dharma, “artha”, and “Kama” (Kiran Kumar, 2004).

Material enjoyment (Ihika Bhoga), this criterion of happiness and satisfaction means maximum enjoyment or experiencing pleasure and experiencing minimum pain. Globally this is the hedonic perspective on happiness and well-being. Though the hedonism could not find place for spreading its root in Indian tradition, as Indian seers and sages rooted belief in heart of Indians the value of happiness for all –“sarve santu sukhinaha, sarve santu niramaya, sarve bhadrani pashyantu, ma kaschid dukhabhagbhavet”; surve janaha sukhino bhavantu (let all persons be happy); lokaha samastaha sukhino bhavantu” (let the whole universe become happy).

Global traditions of subjective well-being

Hedonic happiness and Eudaimonic happiness

Most people would likely hope a happy and satisfying life, a life with good things and pleasant experiences, comparatively more than the unpleasant ones. Particularly in American culture, happiness seems to be an important part of how people define good life. Defining good life in terms of personal happiness is the general thrust of the hedonic view of well-being (Kahneman, Diener, & Schwarz, 1999; Ryan & Deci, 2001; Waterman, 1993). Hedonic well-being is very subjective, very personal, a feeling of an individual for his/her life in present condition. Greeks, a general version of hedonism holds that the chief goal of life is the pursuit of happiness and pleasure. Subjective well-being (SWB) takes a broad view of happiness beyond the pursuit of short term or physical pleasures defining a narrow hedonism (Diener, 1984).

If with the help of a hypothetical example, questioned by Seligman (2002) “What if an individual could be hooked to an “experience machine” that would keep him/her in a constant state of happiness, or whatever positive happiness, positive emotion one desired, no matter what happened in one’s life in his/her life? Fitting in the hedonic view, individual would experience a lot of happiness all the time. Would he/she like to be hooked up for all the time? People might like it for
awhile, but to experience only one of the emotions and to have some cheerful reactions to the diversity of life events and challenges might impoverish the experience of life. For example, negative emotions like fear; help people to make choices that avoid threats to one’s well-being. Further Seligman (2002a) argued that people would likely also reject the “experience machine” because each one wants to feel what is entitled to one’s positive emotions, and to believe that the condition reflects one’s “real” positive qualities and behaviors. Pleasure, disconnected from reality, does not affirm or express one’s identity as a person. Emotions are comparative and people feel it with the comparison. One cannot define sweetness until he/she has not experienced sourness.

Thus it can be concluded that hedonic happiness can be defined as the enjoyment of life and its pleasures. The hedonic view captures a major element of what people mean by happiness in everyday terms, people enjoy their life, people are satisfied with their present lives and good events outnumber bad events.

In contrast, Eudaimonic conceptions of happiness, Aristotle explained “happiness as self-realization, which reflects the expression and fulfillment of inner potentials of an individual”. From this perspective, the good life results from living in accordance with one’s daimon (one’s true self). It can be summarized that happiness results from striving toward self-actualization—a process in which one’s talents, needs, and deeply held values direct the way people conduct their lives. “Eudemonia” results from realization of one’s potentials. Eudaimonic happiness has much in common with humanistic psychology’s emphasis on the concepts of self-actualization (Maslow, 1968) and fully functioning person (Rogers, 1961) as criteria for healthy development and optimal functioning. Eudaimonic measures of happiness also ask why people are happy. However, Ryan & Deci, (2001); Ryff, (1989); Waterman, (1993) stated that though the argument that SWB represents “hedonic” well-being which contrasts with the Aristotelian concept of “eudaimonia,” in which well-being is derived from self-realization of human potentials (Ryan & Deci, 2001; Ryff, 1989, Waterman, 1993). Overall it is found that the two well-being conceptions are indeed distinct and yet maintain intriguing relations that facilitate multiple paths for people to optimize their well-being (Keyes, Shmotkin, & Ryff, 2002).

**Individualist and Collectivist**

An important tradition in culturivistic tradition of SWB are individualist-collectivist, it is the concept of the self. Recent literature on this topic describes that individualist and collectivist orientations are nor independent nor purely dependent in nature. Singelis, Bond, Sharkey, and Lai (1999) suggested that, Self-construal is culturally bound and contains both interdependent and independent features. Relationships, belonging, and “fitting in” are the interdependent aspects of the self, whereas thoughts, feelings, and uniqueness are aspects of the
independent self. Kagitcibasi (1996) later argued that these two features of the self are often synthesized into the autonomous–relational self, in which the separate individualistic self (autonomous self) and the interdependent, collectivistic self (relational self) coexist in harmony in the individual. Two personalities attribute—inner motivations and esteem needs—are closely related to the concept of self. Further, Lucas, Diener, and Suh (1996) in their study found that self-esteem was correlated with measures of SWB. Similarly, in their cross-cultural study, Diener, Suh, Smith, and Shao (1995) found a correlation of 0.47 between self-esteem and SWB and inferred that the more individualistic a culture is, the more powerful the relation between esteem needs and SWB.

The area of subjective well-being (SWB) has three hallmarks. First, it is subjective. According to Campbell (1976), it resides within the experience of the individual. Notably absent from the definitions of SWB are necessary objective conditions such as health, comfort, virtue, or wealth (Kammann, 1983).

Second, subjective well-being (SWB) includes positive measures. It is not just the absence of negative factors, as is true of most measures of mental health. However, the relationship between the positive and negative indices is not completely understood.

Third, subjective well-being (SWB) measures typically include a global assessment of aspects of person’s life. Although affect or satisfaction within a certain domain may be assessed, the emphasis is usually placed on an integrated judgement of the person’s life.

At a general level, well-being is conceived, from this perspective, as involving the two broad dimensions of emotional well-being (EWB) and positive functioning (Keyes & Magyar-Moe, 2003). Emotional well-being (EWB) is defined by the three component view of SWB. It includes life satisfaction and positive and negative affect. A psychological dimension and a social dimension define positive functioning. Well-being, psychological well-being (PWB) and Social well-being collectively meant to serve as a more complete description of SWB.

Psychological well-being or happiness is a multidimensional construct that includes both emotional and cognitive elements. The origin of this construct can be traced back to Bradburn (1969), who considered well-being in terms of positive affect, as opposed to negative affect. In this sense, Bradburn stated that an individual who scored higher in positive affect than in negative affect would score high in psychological well-being, and vice versa. Costa and McCrae (1980) pointed out that positive and negative affect are balanced by a person, achieving a global subjective well-being index. Thus, positive and negative affect contribute independently to subjective well-being. It was also investigated by Andrews and Withey (1976) who stated that a third variable should be added to psychological well-being: a cognitive element referring to satisfaction with life. When referring
to satisfaction with life, we mean a mental process by which individuals appraise
the quality of their lives using their own personal criteria. Although there may be
some agreement about the most important components of satisfaction with life,
individuals probably also assign different weights to each component. Diener,
Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985) subsequently asserted that satisfaction with
life refers to a global appraisal of well-being. Pavot, Fujita, and Diener (1997) also
pointed out that the experience of subjective well-being includes both the presence
of positive affect and the absence of negative affect, as well as the cognitive
element of satisfaction with life (Diener, 1984).

Happiness and Well-Being

Most of the Philosophers of happiness agreed that it was difficult to define
term happiness. It is puzzling to understand, what people mean by happiness,
psychologists pioneering the scientific study of happiness proposed the term well-
being (WB), (Diener, 1984). Veenhoven (2006a) explained the happiness in a
broad sense, “the word happiness is 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”.

In this way happiness is used interchangeably with well-being in recent
studies by researchers in the field of well-being or subjective well-being and
quality-of-research. Where the state of being healthy, happy, and prosperous can
be termed meaningfully as well-being, the term Subjective well-being (SWB)
refers to people’s evaluation of their lives and encompasses both cognitive
judgments of satisfaction and affective appraisals of moods and emotions (Diener,
1984). This concept describes the subjective nature of happiness and holds
individual human beings to be best judges of their own happiness. Modern
psychologists and sociologists perhaps cannot hope to define happiness to
everyone’s satisfaction nor any discovery regarding separate components of
Subjective well-being (SWB) that cohere in understandable ways. SWB’S
acknowledgement of subjective life satisfaction as a crucial ingredient of
happiness on the contrary a contemporary philosopher Sumner’s ideas, for whom
“happiness (or unhappiness) is a response by a subject to his/her life conditions as
he/she sees them”(1999). It is important to emphasize that most of the empirical
studies in the field of psychology and social sciences regarding happiness,
conceive of happiness not in the eudaimonic sense-embodied a value judgement
about whether a person is leading a commendable life-but rather in the sense of
subjective well-being. It is clear that high subjective well-being and eudaimonic
happiness are not necessary interchangeable concepts, and it is easily imaginable
that a person could feel subjectively happy without leading a virtuous life. Many
contemporary philosophers and modern psychologists believe and agree that
subjective well-being and eudaimonic well-being are sufficiently close. It is
reasonable to use subjective well-being as a proxy for well-being, even if it is not a perfect match (Kesebir & Diener, 2008). It can be admitted that the ancient philosophical question of how to live well, cannot be perfectly answered with the current empirical psychological research. Researchers of subjective well-being, hope to answer this question indirectly by illuminating a *sine qua non* of the good life—namely, subjective well-being. Well-being is a notion that people and policymakers generally aspire to improve. Well-being is an ambiguous concept and lacks universal acceptance. Thus the word is reviewed and is studied deeply regarding its definition. Well-being is generally viewed as a description of the state of people’s life situation (McGillivray, 2007). Well-Being is a dynamic state in which the individual is able to develop his/her potential, work productively and creatively, build strong and positive relationship with others and contribute to their community (Govt. Office for Science, 2008).

McGillivray and Clarke (2006) pointed out that concepts such as “quality of life, welfare, well-living, living-standards, utility, life satisfaction, prosperity, needs fulfillment, development, empowerment, capability expansion, human development, poverty, human poverty, land and, more recently, happiness are often used interchangeability with well-being without explicit discussion as to their distinctiveness. McGillivray (2007), again defined – “Well-being is a notion that people and policymakers generally aspire to improve. However, it is an ambiguous concept, lacking a universally acceptable definition and often faced with competing interpretations. Still, Well-being is generally viewed as a description of the state of people’s life situation”. Ed Diener, also known as “Dr. Happiness” is a leading researcher in positive psychology who coined the expression “subjective well-being” or SWB as the aspect of happiness that can be empirically measured. Bruni and Porta (2007) provide some clarification on the differences between happiness and SWB. Bruni and Porta (2007) pointed out that “Psychologists distinguish SWB and happiness among, 1) life satisfaction, which is a cognitive element 2) affection, the affective element and 3) subjective well-being (SWB), as a state of well-being, synthesis of long duration which includes both the affective and cognitive component.” Other explanations by different psychologists: SWB is comprised of four components i) pleasant emotions ii) unpleasant emotions iii) global life judgment (life evaluation) and iv) domain satisfaction (marriage, health, leisure etc). Some are of the view that happiness is a narrower concept than SWB and different from life satisfaction: although both happiness and life satisfaction are components of SWB, life satisfaction reflects individuals’ perceived distance from their aspirations while happiness results from a balance between positive and negative affect.

In this approach, SWB is a synonym of “being happy” (the Aristotelian approach of happiness as eudaimonia) whereas concepts such as “satisfaction” and “happiness” are considered “feeling happy” (a hedonic approach) (Bruni & Porta,
2007). Despite these differences, some economists have used the terms “happiness” and “life satisfaction” interchangeably as measures of subjective well-being (Easterlin, 2004). There is no clear consensus on what “happiness” means. Therefore, instead of trying to define happiness from an outside perspective, economists try to capture it through other means. According to Frey and Stutzer (2000) there are two extreme concepts of happiness (subjective and objective happiness) and ways to capture them and one in the middle—experience sampling measures. There is an old view of the nature of happiness that is decidedly not merely psychological and quite consistent with the broad, two-variable account sketched above. It is based on the Greek word Eudaimonia, which literally means something like ‘favoured’ by the Daimones (near-gods or gods). It is usually translated as ‘happiness’ but it connotes something closer to what people nowadays would call well-being rather than happiness. Today, in common parlance ‘happiness’ is frequently and perhaps more often than not psychologized. It is often taken to mean something very close to an extended feeling of pleasure or an extended good mood or pleasant affect. Because the English ‘happiness’ is linguistically more versatile than ‘well-being’, translators of ancient Greek texts typically prefer the former, e.g., we can talk about happy people, happy lives and happy gardening, but not well-being people, lives and gardening. Nevertheless, readers should remember that our modern notion of ‘well-being’ is closer to the ancient Greeks’ notion of ‘happiness’ than to our modern notion of ‘pleasure’, and our modern notion of ‘happiness’ is closer to our modern notion of ‘pleasure’ than to the ancient Greeks’ notion of ‘happiness’.

An attempt to answer another question can people be happy, it is believed that a distinction between ideal happiness and actual happiness would be beneficial at the outset. Ideal happiness can be defined as happiness that is complete and lasting and that touches the whole of life. Such a happiness-perfect, pure, and perpetual has extremely high standards and may indeed be beyond anyone’s reach. It is still possible for people to experience predominantly positive emotions and be satisfied with their lives. In scientific inquiries psychologists are interested in knowing “actual happiness”. This is attainable happiness, need of human being. In the spectrum of happiness on one end of the spectrum, Leibniz (1646-1716), stated “that we are living in the best of all possible worlds”. On the other end of the spectrum Hegesias, also known as Peisithanatos (the death persuader) as he believed that happiness was unattainable, life was not worth living, and that the sage would choose death (Matson, 1998).

Since long psychologists and philosophers have recognized and given importance to negative emotions like anger, anxiety, depression, fear etc., make people focused on situational problem or immediate threat, there by contributing to evolutionary fitness. It is only recently psychologists have learned to understand the adaptive advantages engendered by positive feelings. Barbara Frederickson’s
“broaden-and build theory” (2004) proposed that positive feelings allow individuals to broaden their thought-action repertories and build intellectual, psychological, social, and physical resources over time. One can say that positive affect and general well-being generate a state from which individuals can confidently explore the environment, situation and approach new goals, thus allowing them to build important personal resources. This not just a phenomenal to follow happiness, it is adaptive, which in long term brings various benefits to an individual. The concept of “good life” varies considerably among individuals. For some, this ideal state is one of wealth and luxury. For others, it is attained through meaningful relationships with friends and family. For still others, the physical comforts of wealth and security are forgone to provide better lives for those in need. These different kinds of individuals would appear to be quite different in external circumstances, yet they might all share a subjective feeling of well-being.

Different fields of Well-Being

Research investigating the sources of happiness has focused on determining the strongest predictors/determinants of happiness and life satisfaction. Three general categories of happiness predictors have been identified accordingly, firstly, life circumstances and demographics, secondly, traits and dispositions, and finally, intentional behaviors (Lyubomirsky, Sheldon, & Schkade, 2005)

On the basis of such categorization to live up to the most as a human being, as an individual, in all situational and environmental factors which affect one’s behaviour, Well-being is the process of living at one’s highest possible level, as a whole person. Well-being is not a state that is attained, but is an ongoing, dynamic and fluid process through time (Misra & Gupta, 2009). It is found as an important factor, influencing individual’s various behaviour, activities, happiness and performance and the adjustmenitive ability to the environment on the platform of realm. In this way a definition for General Well-being was proposed by Heider (1997) “General Well-being (GWB) is a fundamental component of wealth through which one realizes one’s own cognitive, affective and relational abilities. It is governed by two important factors: personal powers one possesses and environmental powers for exhibition of any behaviour”. But well-being is not only a matter of an individual, but also of the society at large.

Well-being can be constitutedly described. Well-being cannot be taken alone. All the aspects which constitute well-being should be defined in terms of global measures of subjective well-being (SWB). Ryff (1989) questioned: what are the features of a person’s life that provide the basis and meaning of well-being? Further it was argued that if the well-being is based on human strengths, personal striving and growth than well-being should be source of resilience at the time of adversity and should reflect positive functioning, personal strengths, and mental health. If researchers think about condition of people who are suffering
from depression or anxiety disorders, how such individuals can be considered as happy people. Thus one can question “are happy people also mentally healthy people?” People with delusional belief system or people getting pleasure by hurting others might be happy and can also be mentally ill. This reveals that SWB is not synonymous with mental health or psychological health. A delusional person might be happy and satisfied with his life, and yet we would not say that he possesses mental health. A person who is out of touch with his/her own motives and emotions might say she/he is happy, but we would not consider his/her to possess complete psychological health. Ryff and Keyes (1995) outlined additional characteristics beyond SWB (environmental mastery personal growth, and purpose in life) that is important, it is not identical to mental health.

Thus on the basis of positive mental health within personality and clinical psychology, Ryff and his colleagues developed a model called psychological well-being (PWB) based on descriptions of positive psychological and social functioning, across the life span. There are factors that are included in measuring PWB can be listed self-acceptance, personal growth, purpose of life, environmental mastery, autonomy, and positive relationship with others. The perspective view that at a general level well-being is conceived, Emotional well-being (EWB) and social well-being (ScWB) were also taken as dimensions for defining positive functioning. Emotional well-being (EWB) is defined by the three components of SWB. It includes life satisfaction, happiness and positive and negative affect. Social Well-being (ScWB) is defined by components like Social Acceptance, Social-Actualization, Social- Contribution, Social- Coherence, and Social- Integration. All together, well-being can be described as a global combination of Emotional well-being (EWB), Social well-being (ScWB) and Psychological well-being (PWB). Despite the complexity of this model, a large number of large scale studies were provided by Keyes, Keyes and Lopez (2002); Keyes and Merger-Moe (2003), Keyes, Shmotkin and Ryff (2002).

It was also found by Andrew and Lars (2004) that Social well-being can best help individuals to come to reasonable answers about social choices if information is presented in a way that highlights the objective trends in major dimensions of well-being and thereby helps individuals to come to summative judgments – but also respects differences in values. Although it may not be possible to define an objective index of societal well-being, individuals still have the problem (indeed, the moral responsibility) of coming to a subjective evaluation of social states, and they need organized, objective data if they are to do it in a reasonable way. However, if society is composed of diverse individuals living in an uncertain world who typically “live in the present, anticipating the future”, each individual’s estimate of societal economic well-being will depend on the proportion of national income saved for the future. On the other hand Community well-being ranges in levels of engagement from just living in a strong community
to being actively engaged in that community and then ultimately giving back to that community. It all points to feeling safe, secure, and connected.

Later other researchers also worked in this field and found a direct influence of socio economic status (SES), health and social participation. They establish a clear positive link between average levels of subjective well-being and GDP per capita across countries, and find no evidence of a satiation point beyond which wealthier countries have no further increases in subjective well-being. Examining the relationship between changes in subjective well-being and income over time within countries, we find economic growth associated with rising happiness Together these findings indicate a clear role for absolute income and a more limited role for relative income comparisons in determining happiness. In both types of analysis he finds little significant evidence of a link between aggregate income and average happiness. In contrast, there is robust evidence that within countries those with more income are happier. Although findings show that income is an important predictor of individual happiness, yet it is found irrelevant for average happiness in different studies.

Economic well-being is an important factor in well-being of human thus in this way we find Career well-being a path for economic well-being. It means waking up every morning with something to look forward to that day. Goal of everyone every day is to strive to earn or to achieve a daily target of any activity. Starting from the school till college and it goes on till one can strive. For Career well-being (CWB) it is Interesting to know, that the most disengaged workers in the whole spectrum are not those with a manager, who focuses on weaknesses of the subordinates, it’s those who have managers don’t even pay attention. Indifference is the killer of career well-being. In order to have strong well-being in the area of carrier, one needs motivation, strong level of achievement, several close relationships (not just one) that help him/her to achieve and enjoy the life. Spending up to six hours a day working to earn, socializing with friends and family through various forms such as email, work, phone, and at shop, office or home is key to building one’s career well-being connectively increasing social well-being at the same time. Contrary to the popular belief that people who thrive most in financial area are not the highest earners. The individuals who learn to manage their debt load so that they don’t worry about money on a daily basis can maintain a stress-free relationship with money, and can experience an overall satisfaction with their standard of living and thus normalizing their financial well being.

Bhalerao (2008) defined mental health as the ability of a person to balance one’s desires and aspirations to cope up with life stresses and to make psychosocial adjustment, where as if a person has good level of psychological well-being can survive and adjust with severe physical problems and disabilities, one can take different responsibilities of family members and work place too, can
come out and can make better understanding with proper problem solving methods, better future plan constructions, social adjustment and adjustment with the surrounding and people. Psychological well-being, physical well-being of the individuals differ at different stages of life cycle. In each stage of development of every individual faces different kinds if situation and challenges that helps in learning new skills to deal with life. With the example of delusional person mental health it can be suggested that a person who is out of touch with his/her own motives and emotions might say she/he is happy, but they can’t be considered to possess complete psychological health. Ryff and Keyes (1995) outlined additional characteristics beyond SWB such as environmental mastery personal growth, and purpose in life, that is important yet it is not identical to mental health. Physical Well-being is a state of physical fitness. Physical well-being encompasses both one’s body and environment. But the effect on the body of the symptoms of mental illness, along with the side effects of medications such as antipsychotics or antidepressants, can also have an effect one’s physical health. Movement disorders, weight gain and changes to heart function are some of the more extreme side effects experienced by some people, which have the potential to make one physically ill. The way one thinks and feel can become a cause for becoming prey to illness and disease; people those who are highly stressed often find that they have more colds and other minor illnesses; this is because stress over long time periods reduces the ability of one’s immune system which protects the body. Thus the physical well-being is a triangle of environment, physical and mental state.

Personal well-being is a social issue as the Thai Buddhist Chah (2005) observed, that people "have been born as human beings. It should be possible to live with happy minds". According to him humans are programmed to seek happiness by using it as a motivational device and enjoying the pleasures of food and sex. He questioned why is it so hard to find happiness? Some experts of the similar trend suggested that people are looking for well-being too much inside and not enough outside, to the world around them. There is no question that human beings can learn to train their feelings, to reduce negativity and improve personal well-being. For example, Buddhist meditation teaches detachment, so that one can observe an emotion such as anger and not let it dominate. The mystic traditions in Christianity, Judaism and Islam also include valuable spirit-focused practices.

Various approaches from psychology have been adapted by people looking for well-being. There is a large literature and many self-help books on challenging negative thoughts and positive goal-setting. Sports and performing arts gurus have popularized the idea of the "flow". Hodge (2005), described the different approaches for attaining happiness, this as "an emotionally enjoyable experience that occurs when there is a perceived balance between one’s competencies and the demands of the task". Layard (2002-2003) emphasized in his happiness research, well-being as the implication of people being "deeply social beings". Using
measurements of happiness obtained from survey research and medical science (such as measurements of electrical activity in the brain), he strongly suggested the importance of family, community and work relationships, the level of trust between people and issues such as stability and safety from violence.

Layard (2002-3) argues for working towards a societal well-being, while observing that "society is not likely to become happier unless people agree that this is what we want to happen". And yet, despite of all these approaches to self-actualizing and finding the inner balance, many people do not consider themselves to be happy. Layard (2005) acknowledged that “continuous re-optimization is the real enemy of happiness”. With his observations he found effect of genetic influence, without stating the degree of effect. It was further stated that "many genetic effects are only triggered by bad situations and vice-versa.

In the field of subjective well-being (SWB) three primary barriers to well-being have been identified by positive psychology researchers: destination addiction, the hedonic treadmill, and cynicism. Holden (2007), founder of the United Kingdom’s Happiness Project, described destination addiction is a focus on what one wants tomorrow versus what one has now. It can contribute to feelings of depression and frustration when people don’t achieve an objective, which often involves material wealth. Holden describes the condition as “living in the not now' and likens it to eating a banana to get to its end instead of enjoying it while eating. Closely related to destination addiction is the hedonic treadmill. This is permanent dissatisfaction with acquiring material goods. As individuals earn more money, they look at their current standard of living and always believe they can –do better. Their expectations are constantly changing and when they reach the next level, they find that they want more. Cynicism is a general attitude of negativity marked by a distrust of the integrity or professed motives of others. It perpetuates negative thinking, which has detrimental psychological and physical effects. Cynicism contributes to a state of chronic mental unhealthiness. The negative thinking generated by it also damages neurons and may actually kill them, according to researchers at Stanford University, impairing vital functions of the brain including memory and problem-solving.

Although psychology has traditionally been dominated by a focus on distress and dysfunction (Diener, 1984), there is a growing interest in understanding the causes and consequences of positive functioning. Despite earlier theoretical and empirical work distinguishing between psychological well-being and psychological distress (Bradburn, 1969; Bryant & Verhoff, 1982, 1984; Campbell, 1980), investigations of domains of positive functioning remain rare compared to research on psychopathology. However, the recent emergence of positive psychology as an integrative research domain (Seligman, 2002; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) has sparked renewed interest in understanding basic domains of positive subjective experience. Central to this re-emerging orientation
is the notion that subjective well-being is not simply the absence of subjective distress (Bryant & Verhoff, 1984; Campbell, 1981; Ryff, 1989). Being able to handle negative events in ways that reduce distress does not guarantee one will experience positive events in ways that promote well-being. Along these lines, Bryant (1989) has shown that people make separate self-evaluations of their ability to avoid and cope with negative outcomes and to obtain and savour positive outcomes. Differences in the capacity to savour positive experiences may well lead to differences in positive well-being. For example, it is difficult to get pleasure from anticipating positive events, if one is unsure about whether or not one will enjoy them. Likewise, the sense that joy is fleeting may undermine present enjoyment, especially if one feels incapable of rekindling such pleasure afterwards. Thus, an understanding of individual differences in beliefs about savoring may contribute to our understanding of differences in positive functioning.

**Happiness as life-satisfaction**

Satisfaction with life is the quality in the eye of the perceiver. Life is something as one perceives. When conscious humans are referred this quality connects an individual to subjective appreciation of life. This can be commonly termed as 'subjective well-being', 'life-satisfaction' and also ‘happiness’. Veenhoven described it as life satisfaction. Similarly, Diener's definition of subjective well-being could be seen as a process of judging life positively and feeling good. Thus a person is said to have high SWB if she/he experiences life satisfaction and frequent joy, and only infrequently experiences unpleasant emotions such as sadness or anger. Contrariwise, a person is said to have low SWB if she/ he is dissatisfied with life, experiences little joy and affection and frequently feels negative emotions such as anger or anxiety" (Diener, Suh, & Oishi, 1997).

**Veenhoven’s classification of satisfaction**

It is very important to define precisely the term 'satisfaction'. Because this is a word with multiple meanings and in with a simple schematic theme, term can be defined; satisfaction with 'parts' of life versus satisfaction with life 'as-a-whole', and between 'passing' satisfaction and 'enduring' satisfaction. Thus the two binominal division classify in to four parts.
Four kinds of satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passing</th>
<th>Enduring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part of life</strong></td>
<td>Pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life-as-a-whole</strong></td>
<td>Top-experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1(a) Veenhoven’s classification of satisfaction*

(Source: Veenhoven, 2000)

On the basis of different definitions the life satisfaction may be linked with mental processes. Thus with different components such as Affective, Cognitive, Attitudinal and Combinative definitions are as follows (Veenhoven, 2006):

Affective definitions Several definitions reveal happiness as an affective process. Such as Wessman & Ricks (1966) described “Happiness appears as an overall evaluation of the quality of the individual’s own experience in the conduct of his vital affairs. As such, happiness represents a conception abstracted from the flux of affective life, indicating a decided balance or positive affectivity over long periods of time” (Wessman & Ricks, 1966). In a similar way Fordyce (1972) defined “Happiness as a specific emotion. Satisfaction is an overall evaluation made by the individual in accounting all his pleasant and unpleasant experiences in the recent past. These definitions are found to be attached with Bentham’s (1789) important definition of happiness as ‘the sum of pleasures and pains’, which also involves the notion of an ‘affect balance’. Kahneman’s (2000) on this theme is proposed a notion of ‘objective happiness’, which is the ‘raw’ affective experience that underlies the overall evaluation of life. Cognitive definitions: In this context happiness can also be defined as a cognitive phenomenon. Which means happiness is a result of a deliberate evaluation process. Similarly, McDowell & Newell (1987: 204) described life-satisfaction as a “Personal assessment of one’s condition compared to an external reference standard or to one’s aspirations”. Another criterion based definition by Shin & Johnson (1978) - life-satisfaction as a “global assessment of a person’s quality of life according to his chosen criteria”. Where Annas (2004), used stress as a facet for defining satisfaction, by lining the stress for the active achievement of life goals, while others defined rather stress the absence of unfulfilled aspirations, such as Schmitz (1930) who defined happiness as: a “.. state of being without desires”. In all conceptualizations happiness is deemed to be higher, the smaller the distance between standard and reality. Attitudinal definitions: Veenhoven selected some definitions as attitudinal in nature, where happiness is depicted as a happy disposition and as a positive attitude towards life. In this vein Lieberman (1970) stated “.. at some point in life, even before the age of 18, an individual becomes geared to a certain stable level of satisfaction with life, which can be experienced – within a rather broad range of environmental circumstances ,or which an
individual maintains throughout his/her life. The definitions of this kind explain the consistency in affective response, while other part of it depicts satisfaction as a belief system. It is also necessary to know other elements regarding happiness and satisfaction, such definitions can be grouped under Combinative or Mixed definitions: Several definitions combine one or more of the above elements. If Diener and Fujita (1997) defined Subjective Well-Being (SWB) as being satisfied with life (attitude), while feeling good (affect), in his own words: “Thus a person is said to experience high SWB if she or he experiences life satisfaction and frequent pleasant emotions, and infrequent experiences of unpleasant emotions such as sadness or anger. While, a person is said to experienced low SWB if she or he is dissatisfied with life, experiences little joy and affection and frequently feels negative emotions such as anger or anxiety” (Diener & Fujita, 1997). In Chekola’s (1974: 2002) definition of happiness as all three elements are used “.. realization of a life-plan and the absence of seriously felt dissatisfaction and an attitude of being displeased with or disliking one’s life’. Similarly, Sumner’s (1999) defined ‘being happy’ as “having a certain kind of positive attitude toward one’s life, which in the fullest form has both a cognitive and an affective component.” The cognitive aspect of happiness consists in a positive evaluation of one’s life, a judgment that at least on balance moreover it measures up favorably against one’s standard or expectations. The affective side of happiness consists in what researchers commonly call a sense of well-being, finding one’s life enriching or rewarding or feeling satisfied or fulfilled by it.” Veenhoven’s (2000) conceptualization of ‘overall’ happiness and ‘components’ in terms of Life satisfaction, similar distinctions in happiness can be used in a systematic way: ‘overall’ happiness and ‘components’ of happiness. It can be further distinguished on the basis of assumptions that the latter function as ‘sub-totals’ in the overall evaluation of individual’s life( Veenhoven, 2006).

**Subjective Well-Being**

Individual’s relationship between external world and his/her internal state makes well-being complex. Thus the field of subjective well-being (SWB) comprises the scientific analysis of how people evaluate their lives, both at the moment and for longer periods such as for the past year and internal satisfaction with life. These evaluations include people’s emotional reactions to events, their moods, and judgments they form about their life satisfaction, fulfillment, and satisfaction with domains such as marriage and work. Thus, SWB concerns the study of what lay people might call happiness or satisfaction. General reviews of SWB can be found in Argyle, (2001); Diener, (1984); Diener, Suh, Lucas and Smith, (1999); and Kahneman, Diener, and Schwarz, (1999). The “subjective well-being” (SWB) refers to people’s evaluations of their lives. These evaluations include both cognitive judgments of life satisfaction and affective evaluations of
moods and emotions. If a person reports that her life is satisfying, that he/she is experiencing frequent pleasant affect, and that he/she is infrequently experiencing unpleasant affect, he/she is said to have high subjective well-being (SWB). Although life satisfaction, pleasant affect and unpleasant affect are related, they are empirically separable and must be studied individually to gain a complete picture of overall subjective well-being” (SWB) (Lucas, Diener, and Suh, 1996). In the similar vein Argyle and Crossland (1987) portrayed SWB as a judgement, an evaluation, and appraisal.

Subjective well-being can be simply defined as the individual’s current evaluation of his/her happiness. Such an evaluation is often expressed in affective terms, suppose if it is asked about subjective well-being, participants will often say, “I feel good” or “I am happy” (Schwartz and Strack, 1999). Subjective well-being is thus, at least in part, a proxy for a global affective evaluation.

Researchers discovered early on that many economic and social indicators of a person’s “objective” life circumstances (e.g., income, age, and occupation) were only weakly related to people’s own judgments of their well-being (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976). In a major review of this research, Diener (1984) argued that “subjective well-being” (SWB), defined by ratings of life satisfaction and positive emotional experience, was a critical component of well-being that was missing from equation. Subjective well-being (SWB), or happiness, in everyday terms, reflects an individual’s own judgment about the quality of his or her life. From subjective well-being (SWB) perspective, economic and social indicators are incomplete because they do not directly assess how happy or satisfied people are with their lives (Diener & Suh, 1997). Although these indicators describe the “facts” of a person’s life, they do not reflect how a person thinks and feels about these facts. Personal, subjective evaluations are important for several reasons: First, different individuals may react to same circumstance (as described by economic and social statistics) in very different ways because of the different in the expenditures, values and personal histories. Subjective evaluations help psychologists to interpret the “facts” from an individual’s point of view. Second, happiness and life satisfaction are important goals in their own right.

Subjective well-being (SWB) is defined as life satisfaction, the presence of positive affect. Together, the three components are often referred to as well-being. Research based on the SWB model has burgeoned in the last five years (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Studies have delineated a variety of personality characteristics and life experiences that helps in answering the questions about who is happy and what makes people happy.
Well-Being Is A Trait or A State:

It is an argumental topic among researchers since long time, regarding the properties of happiness or well-being. It was questioned whether happiness is a trait or a state (Veenhoven, 1998). In favour of the questions some answers can be categorized as explained by Diener, by stressing that happiness is a trait with the perspective as it is supported by top-down approach, further it was also suggested that the happiness and the propensity to feel happy is predisposed (Diener, 1984). In contrary to bottom-up approach some explanations regarding the question of trait versus sate suggests that a happy person is one with many pleasurable moments (Diener, 1984), it was also stated that the strength of positive emotion / affect will be equal to their collective positive or negative experiences. (Alloy & Ahrens, 1987; Aluoja, Leinsalu, Shlik, Vasar, & Luuk, 2004; Sanna & Chang, 1996).

Desirability of well-being subjectively

SWB is desirable as it is a need. Subjective well-being is the only ingredient for a good life (Diener, Sapayta & Suh, 1998). Diener, Oishi, and Lucas, (2002) questioned regarding the desirability of SWB. Most of researches conducted in western nations, suggests that the experience of positive emotions leads to a syndrome of related behavioral characteristics such as sociability, feelings of self-confidence and energy, engaged activity, altruism, creativity, and immune functioning and cardiovascular fitness. Since these are longitudinal and formal experimental studies on the effects of positive emotions it can be predicted that these emotions may cause the listed attributes, and thus they are not simply a result of them. It should be noted that several of the characteristics associated with positive emotions sound similar to empowerment in that the happy individual is self-confident and likely to pursue approach-goals in an active way. In the similar vein it was found by the researchers that Chronically happy people exhibit the above characteristics, and individuals who are in a temporary positive mood also exhibit the same characteristics mentioned. Thus it can be concluded that happy people are more successful in a number of life domains: they have more friends, are more likely to get married and stay happily married, they make more money on average, are more likely to receive superior ratings from their supervisors at work, are more likely to be involved in community and volunteer activities, are more likely to fill leadership roles; and possibly they live longer. (It is very important to mention that virtually all of the research findings are from western nations, especially the USA, and therefore the degree to which happy people are more successful in other cultures is not clearly known).
The Importance of Subjective Well-Being

The area of SWB is of fundamental importance to the behavioral sciences. SWB is one measure of the quality of life of an individual and of societies at the same time. Philosophers have debated the nature of the good life and after qualitative debate it was concluded that the good life is happy (although philosophers often differ on the definition of happiness). It can be considered that positive SWB is necessary for the good life and good society, but not sufficient for it. Dissatisfied individuals and depressed culture cannot confirm an ideal society, although other desirable aspects may be related with it. An individual or a society that has high SWB might miss an ingredient such as fairness, which people might consider to be essential for a high quality of life. Diener and Suh (1998) worked on the philosophical notion of utility and suggested that SWB is one of three major ways to assess the quality of life of societies, along with economic and social indicators. How a subject can feel and think about his/her own lives is essential for understanding well-being of any society that grants importance not just to the opinions of experts or leaders, but to all people in the society. Therefore to maintain that abundant SWB is a necessary, and one of the characteristic of the good society and the good life.

SWB helps to maintain the appropriate conditions in which human functioning flows smoothly as SWB acts as a favorable psychological environment. It can be concluded as a positive contribution of SWB in managing the life within the rival environments of a hostile world. A favorable psychological environment is a quality of SWB can be seen as positive state of mind that accelerates ongoing behavior by shielding individuals from unexpected disturbances. It should not be confused with more generalized constructs of psychological fitness such as adjustment and mental health. More recent observations show a rising tide of depression (Seligman, 1998) along with escalating aggression, crime, family breakdown, loneliness, and suicide in most modern societies (Lane, 2000). Still in an article titled “Most People Are Happy,” Diener, E. and Diener, M. (1995) stated the evidence that the vast majority of individuals worldwide reported above-medium levels of SWB. Thus, mean levels of SWB do not converge at a neutral point but prove to be positively biased (Veenhoven, 1991a).

Importance of Subjective Well-being on Life Satisfaction

In this section of introduction various definitions regarding SWB and Life satisfaction have been mentioned. An individual’s evaluation of his or her life is termed as SWB (Diener and Lucas, 1999). Subjective well-being includes both affective and cognitive components (Hart, 1999; Pavot & Diener, 1993). Affective component of SWB centers around the definition of happiness. The simplest composite definition of happiness might be the greater influence of positive over
negative affect (Argyle, Martin, & Crossland, 1989; Bradburn, 1969); positive over negative affect (Hart, 1999); pleasant versus unpleasant affect (Pavot & Diener, 1993). Where as the "cognitive" component centralise an individual's overall life satisfaction with his/her life (Pavot & Diener, 1993). Pavot and Diener (1993) also stated that "conscious cognitive judgments of one’s life are up to the person" that shapes SWB. As an artist give shape to an undefined piece so as one’s judgement shapes his/her SWB. In words of Veenhoven (1984) “life satisfaction cannot be seen as a mere cognitive appraisal but as an overall judgment of life that draws on two sources of information: cognitive comparison with standards of the good life (contentment) and affective information from how one feels most of the time (hedonic level of affect). In Veenhoven’s language "overall happiness" is synonymous with life satisfaction and subjective well-being”.

Analysis of Subjective well-being (SWB)

SWB can be analysed on the basis of integrative approach on the basis of satisfaction, pleasant and unpleasant moments.

To be pleased and unpleased is an attribute of experience of the particular moment. This experience of the moment is termed as “instant utility” (Kahneman, 1999). This is for understanding the strength of the disposition to continue or to interrupt the current experience. The global evaluation of well-being by the individuals, on the basis of past episodes, or to a situation or situations, in which similar experiences recur. This evaluation was termed as “remembered utility” (Kahneman, 1999). Emotional responses can be traced only when recurrence of similar experiences occur with the individual. Satisfaction refers to more retrospective and evaluative judgments to different domains of life, family, work, social life etc. The highest level of integration of SWB encompasses all domains of life.

Judgmental process of Subjective well-being (SWB)

The principles that govern the evaluation of a specific episode of life can be applied by the individual to evaluate the similar episodes of life in the future. The individuals retrospective evaluation (remembered utility) can be viewed as falliable estimate of the constructed evaluation (total utility) of the episode (Kahneman, Wakker, & Sarin, 1997).

Diener and Larsen (1984) found average levels of pleasant mood in recreation situation, unpleasant affect in work situation, and pleasant affect in recreation situations. A consistent correlation was found between the different situations. Similarly, levels of consistency for pleasant and unpleasant affect were also between social versus alone situation and also across novel versus typical situations. Mean levels of life satisfaction were more consistent with stability
coefficients with 0.95 ranges. Therefore, well-being judgments reflect more than just momentary influences – this further exhibit that individuals have characteristics emotional responses to their environments that are consistent inspite of enviornmental changes.

According to Kahneman, Wakker and Sarin (1997) the summing of molecular judgments does not reflect the global judgments actually.

Kozma (1996) investigated on life satisfaction with various domains of respondent’s life, such as work, home, relationships. Later he reported satisfaction and judgments were correlated. It was found that different domains showed no significant difference, when overall happiness was controlled. Kozma’s investigation, suggested a top-down model in which trait like construct of overall happiness influences feelings about specific domains of life. Thus it can be concluded that specific life- domain may be due to specific factors in that domain, moreover it may be due to individual’s general level of SWB.

To summarize, evaluation of one’s life, affective and cognitive components, do not result from a purely “bottom-up” approach. That is because individual’s judgments are not on the basis of effects of various external circumstances; happiness is found to be moderately stable inspite of changing environments and changing circumstances.

Self-reports and Evaluation of Subjective well-being (SWB)

It is very clear that individual’s Subjective well-being evaluation is based on self-reports of happiness and life satisfaction. Campbell (1981) clearly noted, that the use of self report is based on the use of self-report is based on the countless experiences which people go through in their everyday life. The global feelings of well-being remains constant over extended periods and people describe them with candor and accuracy.

Different sources of information for evaluation of Subjective well-being (SWB)

It is important to know how an individual or people determine whether they are happy with their life/lives as a whole or they are unhappy. When individual is asked to assess the subjective quality of their lives it is not surprising, they may draw on the wide information they stock. Ross, Eyman and Kishehuck (1986) explored the wide range of information about the process of arriving at a judgement of SWB by respondents. The results can be analysed on different levels: i) Momentary affective state- these sates account 41 to 53 % while arriving at judgments .ii) Future expectations- accounts 20 to 40% .iii)Past Events- 5 to 20 %. Iv) Social comparison- accounts 5 to 13 % only. This literature confirms the
relevance of such different sources of information regarding judgmentive approach towards SWB.

Intraindividual and interindividual comparisons: Mostly Comparison-based evaluative judgments require a mental representation of the object to be judged—can be called as “target”, mental representations can be referred as “standard”, with which the target can be compared. The standard choice can be of two types, firstly, Intraindividual and secondly, interindividual comparisons. Intraindividual refers a previous state of one’s life or one’s expectations. While interindividual is the situation of close proximity of others or a relevant reference group. The result of this kind of comparison process depends on the type or kind of information used in constructing judgement; the target; and finally the standard (Schwarz & Bless, 1992a).

While examining the individuals’ evaluation of their lives, the subjective element depends on the individual expectations, values and past experiences. Thus the evaluation of SWB can be cognitive or affective (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Lucas, Diener & Suh, 1996; Kozma, 1996).

Lucas and Diener (1998) reported that judgments of well-being are based primarily on the frequency of pleasant affect, and less on the intensity of affect.

Levine and Emmons (1985); Larsen and Diener (1987); Schimmack and Diener (1997) found similar findings regarding individuals who experience pleasant emotions intensely also have a tendency to experience unpleasant emotions intensely as well. According to Diener, Colvin, Pavot, and Allman (1991) intense pleasant emotions often occur because of the same process that may cause intense unpleasant emotions. In the same vein Zautra (1991); Magnus, Diener, Fujita, and Pavot (1993) also suggested that the people who experience many positive events are also more likely to experience more negative events. Life histories of persons who had intense “highs” often reveal intense “lows” (Diener, Sandvik, & Pavot, 1991). It can be concluded, in the light of available literature, that individuals appear to weigh frequency of positive emotional experiences most heavily in determining overall well-being.

**Personality and subjective well-being**

Subjective well-being (SWB) refers to how people evaluate their lives, and includes variables such as life satisfaction, positive emotions and lack of negative emotions. Over the past decade, psychologists have become increasingly interested in knowing what makes people happy. One avenue of research that has attracted much attention is the relationship between personality and well-being. Research has revealed the link between personality and SWB, and personality is one of the most stable and powerful predictors of SWB (Diener, 1984). In the similar vein Diener (1984) suggested that individuals have a global tendency to experience life in a positive or negative way under the influence of personality.
Some findings in the field of SWB is that the components of SWB are moderately related to Personality (Lucas, Diener, & Suh, 1996). Among the personality traits related to SWB, extroversion and neuroticism have generated most 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). However, the relationship between psychoticism and SWB has virtually been neglected. One possible reason is that psychoticism, being characterized as ego-centrism and is not related with others welfare, moreover it is not conducive to the formation of a good relationship (an important resource of SWB according to Myers & Diener, 1995). In other words, it may be predicted that psychoticism is negatively associated with SWB. In contrast, personality, although being an important correlate of well-being, typically accounts for no more than 30% of the variance on well-being measures. Therefore it is important to discover what other potential factors are related to 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 well-being is the focused on cognitive and social orientations. Larsen, Diener, and Croponzano (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 it seems that people with high SWB may objectively experience more positive events, further it also seems that such people may perceive events more positively than do people who are low in SWB. One can trigger up SWB by being optimistic about one’s future (Scheier & Carver, 1993). On the basis of these findings, it may be expected that cognitive and social orientations make an additional contribution to the explanation of SWB, and they mediate the association between personality and SWB.

Aside from the numerous predictors mentioned above, research has also focused attention on the relationship between personality and well-being. Research today shows that personality, in the psychological sense, remains constant and stable throughout a person's life (Diener & Lucas, 1999; Labouvie-Vief & Diehl, 1999). Some research, show that the relationship between an individual’s personality and his/her subjective well-being, may remain constant throughout an individual’s life. Headey (2006) however, suggests that the environment influences personality. For example, identical twin study (Lykken & Tellegen, 1996); older generations today, who may have grown up in a less prosperous period are working for long hours and having little to no time for leisure activities.
The traits were correlated with age and life satisfaction and well-being (Headey, 1999).

Personality traits can be an excellent measure of stability and possible change through adulthood (Labovivie-Vie & Diehl, 1999). Many studies found a decrease in negative affect and a stable or slight increase in positive affect with increase in age (Kunzmann, Stange and Jordan; 2005); while Carstensen, Gottman, and Levenson (1995), Carstensen, Gross and Fung (1998) found in their studies that despite changes in one’s emotional lives, personal goals and sources of one’s happiness across the life span SWB was not found related with the age. Researchers predicted about the relationship of positive affectivity to the personality traits. Chan & Joseph (2000), explained extraversion as positively associated with well-being, while neuroticism as negatively associated. Furthermore, Headey (1999) believed that older individuals are perhaps less extraverted than younger people. Many more researchers found "differential association between aspirations and well-being," community feelings being associated with happiness, self-acceptance being associated with self-actualization, and financial success being associated with self-esteem (Chan & Joseph, 2000).

Researchers reported that when self-esteem was found positive among individuals, their well-being was also positive (Diener & Lucas, 1999). Additionally, research also illustrate that positive self-esteem is correlated with measures of SWB (Lucas, Diener, & Suh, 1996). Researchers however have struggled with the idea that self-esteem may not in fact cause happiness, but that happiness and a sense of positive life satisfaction actually influences a person's self-esteem (Diener & Lucas, 1999). Therefore, researchers have found that questions regarding personality and the SWB relationship remain unanswered correctly (Diener & Lucas, 1999).

Many personality traits have been linked with SWB (DeNeve & Cooper 1998), much theoretical and empirical work has focused on the moderate to strong correlations between SWB and the traits of extraversion and neuroticism (Costa & McCrae 1980, Tellegen 1985, Headey & Wearing 1992, Watson & Clark 1992). Lucas & Fujita (2000), for example, conducted a meta-analytic review and found that on average, extraversion correlated 0.38 with pleasant affect at the zero-order level. Furthermore, when multiple, diverse methods of measurement were used to model the association between extraversion and pleasant affect, the correlation often approached 0.80. Similarly Fujita (1991) also found similar strong correlations when he used structural equation modeling techniques to assess the strength of the correlation between neuroticism and negative affect. Because of the consistency of these findings, many researchers have suggested that extraversion and neuroticism provide the primary links between personality and SWB.
Evidence for a Personality-Subjective well-being relation:

Stability and Consistency of SWB and Personality

Like personality traits, SWB is found to consistent in different situations and also stable across life span, even after many intervening life events. This shows some biological influences on SWB, characteristic emotional responses appear in the early developmental age of life of an individual and there are substantial heritability coefficients for the different components of SWB (Diener & Lucas, 1999). In the field of heritability and SWB, the process linking genes to well-being is indirect and is changeable. Even stable biological characteristics can be changed under right circumstances (Davidson & Fox, 1982).

The affective components of SWB (pleasant and unpleasant affect), also exhibit stability across time. Watson and Walker (1996) investigated and reported that the trait affect scales showed a moderate level of temporal stability when assessed over a six-year interval; here it should be emphasized that these stability coefficients are impressive because they are measured at two times using different methods, and measurement error was not controlled.

Roberts and Del Vecchio stated that life satisfaction is substantially lower in stability than the personality traits considered (2000). Because psychologists as well as lay people have intuitive notions about the stability of physical characteristics and personality traits, these variables give people a feeling for the stability of individual’s life satisfaction. The finding that personality traits are more stable than well-being suggests that although temperament might influence both variables, bottom-up environmental factors, which are more unstable than genetic influences, exert a larger influence on well-being than on personality traits. Because life satisfaction and subjective well-being are influenced by personality and yet is less stable than personality, the influence of changeable environmental factors appears to substantially influence well-being, again pointing to the fact that the set point for well-being is not set in concrete. In the debate about whether well-being is a trait or state, some findings alongside Roberts and Del Vecchio’s (2000) results suggest that well-being is somewhat stable but less so than the average personality trait. It is also interesting to compare well-being stability with that of other measures. Height, not surprisingly, is extremely stable. Weight, body mass index, systolic and diastolic blood pressure, and personality traits are all fairly stable. Only income matches the moderate stability levels of well-being, which is a helpful comparison, because some researchers have intuitive notions about income. In some investigations it was found that relative income has some stability because of education, one’s profession, and other factors, but it was also found that some people lose their jobs and income, whereas others find lucrative new opportunities. Like relative income, well-being appears to be relatively stable for most individuals most of the time, but it does change substantially in some cases. Here it is important to know the stable set point for well-being of an
individual. In some studies it was found, life satisfaction as low or fluctuating even over a period as long as 17 years. It is investigatable that both in-born temperament and life circumstances link with the stability of SWB. Since SWB is a judgment and evaluation by the individual and can take different information into account on different occasions, it might follow a set-point model less than would average levels of positive and negative affect, which depend more heavily on genes and temperament. People’s set-point levels of SWB change over time. Some findings explained with regard to marital status changes by Lucas, Clark, Georgellis, and Diener, (2003) suggest that factors such as widowhood can create long-lasting downward pressures on SWB. Although Lucas, Clark, Georgellis, and Diener, (2004) did not find that an average marriage permanently increased SWB, they did find that this was true for some individuals but not for all the cases. Some respondents increased their set point after marriage, even though they adapted to the event over time to some degree, whereas other people decreased in their long-term life satisfaction (LS) after marriage. Although empirical studies might not show long-lasting mean changes after important life events, this in some cases seems to be due to the fact that some people change upward and others change downward in reaction to the same event. Another event that appears capable of moving people’s SWB downward is unemployment (Lucas, Clark, Georgellis, and Diener, 2004). The personality and life circumstance changes that can alter a person’s baseline level of well-being is a top priority for the science of well-being. The stability of well-being is often high and is substantially influenced by one’s inherited predispositions. The challenge is to discover what life changes produce only short-term changes in well-being and are followed by a return to the set point and what types of events cause long-term changes in well-being of the individual’s life.

The comparative studies reported that SWB variables, while moderately stable over long periods of time, tend to be less stable than other established personality traits (Vaidya, Gray, Haig, & Watson, 2002).

In this vein some important information were gathered about stability coefficients which provided an important piece of information regarding extent to which personality can change. Many studies were conducted to know whether major life events have lasting effect on SWB, long-term levels of SWB before and after the life events. Diener and Larsen, (1993) drew three important conclusion from such longitudinal studies: first, life events can have important effects on long-term levels of SWB (eg. studies on Divorce, unemployment, long term disability by Lucas, 2003, 2001).Secondly, there is no simple and straight explanation regarding whether people adapt to major life events. Finally, there are significant and considerable individual differences in the amount of changeability that are followed by life events. The alternative approach explains that stability in SWB results totally from stability in people’s external conditions is not borne out
by investigation that have examined changing conditions across the lifetime. Costa, McCrae and Zonderman (1987) researched both the people who lived under relatively stable circumstances and people who lived in more changing conditions, like under the condition of being in the process of divorce, or widowed. In the similar vein Diener and Larsen, (1993) found that individuals with stable, up or down income, for a ten-year period had approximately the same levels of SWB.

Campbell, Converese and Rodgers (1976), concluded that most of the demographic factors, such as age, sex, race, education, and marital status, accounted less than 20% of variance in SWB; similarly wealth (Diener and Larsen, 1993), physical attractiveness (Diener, Wolsic, & Fujita, 1995), objective health (Okun & George, 1984) reported no or bare correlation with SWB. Even with the investigation of effects of specific important life events, personality is found to play very important role beyond them. Some longitudinal studies showed that SWB like personality maintains stability across time. The amount of pleasant, unpleasant affect, and life satisfaction an individual experiences in his/her school/college life remains moderately stable in later period of life whether the person is married/divorced, employed/unemployed. If characteristic emotional style predict such stabilities then a consistency in the diverse situations can also be expected in the individual’s life.

Process involved in relation of SWB with Personality

Kahneman, Diener, and Schwarz (1999) stated that 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 (extraverts) individuals are more likely to experience pleasant affect than unhappy (introverts) individuals. There is a scientific understanding to specify the process that relate traits to SWB. Some models explain this relation with empirical support:

- Temperament models: People turn to emotional set point after experiencing positive or negative life events (Set point theories). Individuals differ in their reaction towards different stimuli (reactivity theory). Different behaviours of individuals in conducing to SWB due to temperament (behavior theories).
- Congruence models: People experience high SWB when their personalities fit with the environment.
- Cognitive models: Inborn temperament causes differential propensities to attend and react to positive stimuli, and these thoughts are causes of SWB.
- Goal Models: The types of goals for which people strive, the ways in which people attempt to attain their goals, and the success with which these goals are met, all influence SWB.
• Emotion socialization models: Through classical conditioning, instrumental learning, imitation, instrumental learning, etc, individuals learn appropriability of particular emotion to feel and express. These socialization process lead to differences in affect.

Research is still needed to determine which of the personality traits influence SWB, and considerable investigation is needed to be undertaken to reveal the mechanisms behind these relations, levels of SWB are clearly related to personality.

Influence of Personality on levels of SWB

It is not perfect to say that personality is the only factor that influences SWB, although the relation between personality and SWB is strong and consistent. Lykken et al. provided evidences regarding genetic effect on SWB of the individual, 50% for immediate SWB and 80% for long-term SWB. Thus, estimating 20-50% of variance in Short-term, and long-term well-being, in regard with environment (Lykken and Tellegen 1996). Argyle (1987) provided information regarding environmental influences on SWB. Stones and Kozma (1991) stated happiness is influenced by current status, which included events while long-term influence on SWB is by personality. Individuals clearly react to momentary stimuli in their environments, and only by aggregating over multiple occasions, to eliminate these variances and revealing influence of personality on SWB scores. The influence of genetics and personality sets a limitation on determining the kind of policy used for enhancing SWB of the individual.

David and Stilwell, (2006) found that family or spousal ratings of personality characteristics as desirable influenced SWB only if the ratings corresponded to the individuals' rating.

Structure of Well-being and Personality

Influence of personality on levels of SWB, relation between personality and SWB and Causes for the relation between personality and SWB provides important information regarding the structure of well-being and personality. Previous research on the relations between personality and subjective well-being (SWB) often overlooked the distinction between the affective and cognitive components of SWB. Thus Jovanovic et al. aimed to study the role of personality traits in predicting separately affective well-being and satisfaction with life. With the use of Zuckerman’s Alternative Five Factor Model of Personality, (which is rarely used as a framework to operationalize personality traits in the field of SWB). Investigation clearly showed that personality traits have different predictive power in explaining individual differences in affective well-being and satisfaction with life. None of the personality traits had a unique contribution in
explaining satisfaction with life, showing that they do not have a direct effect on the cognitive aspect of well-being (Zuckerman, Kuhlman, Teta, Joireman, & Kraft, 1993). On the other hand, Neuroticism-Anxiety and Activity proved to have a direct effect on the affective component of SWB (Jovanovic & Djindjica, 2011).

Diener and Emmons, (1984); Watson and Walker, (1996) studied consistency of unpleasant affect in different life situations. Diener, (1996 a) studied the cultural influence on pleasant affect more than the unpleasant affect. Baker, Bamberg, Bishop, Gillick, Helman, Huang, Ito, Lowe, Peskin, and Scattone, (1992) suggested that the pleasant affect may be more influenced by environment because it’s social nature.

Other than pleasant and unpleasant affect, emotions are of the structural concern. Larsen and Diener (1987) suggested that an important individual difference in emotional experience is affect intensity-the typical strength of an individual’s emotional responsiveness. Eid and Diener (1984) found that emotional variability is stable over time and emotions are assessed individually and as per as emotional factors individuals are consistent in their reaction. Affect intensity is uncorrelated with indicators of well-being. Thus the affect intensity reflects the quality of SWB rather than the level of SWB, which an individual experiences.

Morgan, Melissa, Vera, Gonzales, Conner, Vacek, & Coyle, (2011) examined the relationship between subjective well-being criteria (negative affect, positive affect, and subjective well-being) and individual, family, friend, school, and neighborhood predictor variables in ethnically diverse, urban adolescents. The results indicated that negative affect was significantly predicted by family variables, positive affect was significantly predicted by individual, school, and friend variables, and satisfaction with life was significantly predicted by individual and family variables.

Factors like home environment, life events, may influence personality and are possibly amenable to policy interventions. Because of large impact of personality on SWB as well as adaptation, SWB cannot be used as the sole measure of quality of life (Qol) and thus can be supplemented by social indicators (Kahneman, Diener, & Schwarz, 1999, 224-25).

After research of many years on SWB it is concluded that personality is an important factor in determining the SWB of the individual with which he/she is born. The four lines of research provide evidence for the conclusion: firstly the objective life circumstances (factors such as person’s income, age, education level, doctor-related health, and social relationships), secondly, SWB is moderately heritable. Thirdly, SWB is stable over time. Finally, when effect sizes are compared directly, correlations with personality traits tend to be much larger than correlations with external circumstances. Although we believe that personality plays an important role in SWB a careful examination of existing evidence
suggests that life circumstances also matter and that there is room for change (Lucas & Diener, 2009).

**Personality determinant of Subjective well-being (SWB)**

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 people 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 happiness and life satisfaction. Three general categories of well-being determiners have been identified: (1) life circumstances and demographics, (2) traits and dispositions, and (3) intentional behaviors (Lyubomirsky, Sheldon, & Schkade, 2005). In contrast to demographic and circumstantial variables, personality traits account for a large portion of the variance in individual differences in happiness – as much as 40–50% (Diener & Lucas, 1999) – and appear to be critical to well-being. Traits are biologically-based, enduring dispositions (McCrae & 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 satisfaction with life to support the adequate levels of motivation toward life. In the similar pattern Cummins and Nistico (2002) found that satisfaction with life is important in avoiding the debilitating motivational consequences of depression.

To understand SWB it is important to know about its determinants. Cummins (2000) discussed a model of homeostasis in which the psychological process that paves towards SWB, is comprised of two levels of determinants. The first order determinant is referred as the genetic capacity of an individual to
achieve SWB through personality. It was further stated that as in positive and negative affect, affect incorporates the propensity to experience positive and negative mood states. Similarly the cognitive dimension of SWB influences the pattern of thinking and processing of positive and negative experiences. The interaction between the cognition and affect may accelerate the level of SWB positively. Costa and McCrae (1980, 1986) stated the strong evidence of the stability of personality dispositions and it was further explained that well-being may be a disposition rather than just as an indicator of an individual’s present situation, as personality traits predict to be strong indicators of SWB. In contrast the other school of psychology states that the level of SWB experienced is caused by the interaction between the individual (personality and the affective components) and the environmental factors such as life events, Lu (1999). In the similar stream of investigation Lu (1999) found that personality traits are significantly correlated with SWB and positive life events are also positively correlated with SWB.

According to Diener (1984), psychological theories of SWB can be differentiated based on whether they emphasize bottom-up (external/situational) or top-down (internal traits and processes) influences on SWB. In bottom-up theories, SWB is the product of summed pleasurable and unpleasurable moments (Diener, 1984)—a person is happy because he or she experiences more pleasurable moments than unpleasurable moments (Brief, Butcher, George, & Link, 1993). Summed external correlates of SWB (e.g. material comforts and social connectedness) typically account for only 10–15 per cent of the SWB variance (Argyle, 1999), however. In top-down approaches, SWB is seen as the product of internal traits and psychological processes (Diener, 2000; Watson, 2000), such as dispositions, goals, coping styles, and adaptive processes (Diener & Lucas, 1999). Top-down research has found that temperament and personality dimensions such as neuroticism and extraversion are powerful determinants of SWB (Diener, 2000). Neuroticism, conceptualized as the opposite of emotional stability, embodies a broad range of negative emotional traits such as anxiety, irritability, sadness, moodiness, and nervous tension (Benet-Martinez & John, 1998). Extraversion incorporates more specific traits related to activity and energy, expressiveness, dominance, sociability, surgency, and warmth (Diener, 1998).

Neuroticism is associated both with negative affect and (inversely) with positive affect, while extraversion is associated only with positive affect (DeNeve and Cooper, 1998; Diener & Lucas, 1999; Watson, 2000; Watson & Clark, 1992). Some (Fujita, 1991, as cited by Diener, 1996) have argued that neuroticism and negative affect on the one hand, and extraversion and positive affect on the other, may be factorially inseparable. Others (Watson, 2000) have maintained that these personality dimensions are related to a broad range of attitudinal, cognitive, and behavioural characteristics and cannot be reduced to affect. In this regard,
evidence suggests that personality traits lead to actions and events and thereby shape affect (Watson, 2000).

The fact that high-neuroticism persons tend toward unhappiness and extraverted people tend toward happiness, however, provides little guidance about how to promote or foster SWB. Personality is difficult to change; up to 80 per cent of the variance in SWB may be heritable (Lykken & Tellegen, 1996; Tellegen Lykken, Bouchard, Wilcox, Segal, & Rich, 1988); and one’s affect is highly stable across widely varying situations (Watson, 2000). Pinpointing malleable factors that help to explain the link between personality and SWB, then, is the formidable task that faces current researchers.

Constructive thinking, personality, and subjective well-being

Erez, Johnson, and Judge, (1995) proposed that cognitive styles or tendencies may be helpful in explaining the relationship between Personality and SWB. Scheier and Carver (1987) found that the dispositional optimism, predicts SWB and may help in maintaining SWB at the time of stress. Similarly, Lightsey (1994), positive automatic thoughts may influence the impact of negative life events, in other words the higher the level of positive thoughts or optimism, the weaker the relationship between increasing stress and depression of an individual although the buffering effect occurs consistently only in cross-sectional analyses (Lightsey, 1999). Taylor & Brown, (1988) investigated the positive correlation between illusory self-enhancing thought processes and SWB. Haaga, Dyck, & Ernst (1991) found that dysfunctional thinking styles such as perfectionism and overgeneralization were linked to greater unhappiness, and negative thoughts were found to be related with depression, the similar results were discussed by Abramson, Metalsky, and Alloy (1989); Beck, Rush, Shaw, and Emery, (1979); moreover in the similar vein Lightsey, (1994) investigated that thinking styles predict future depression. However there are only few studies in this field, which explain about the types of thought or belief that link personality to SWB. One of the few studies in this domain by Brief, Butcher, George, and Link, (1993) found that both objective life circumstances and personality traits indirectly predicted SWB through their effects on the interpretation of life events and circumstances. Erez Johnson, and Judge, 1995), support the findings and stated that the effects of personality on SWB may be explained by consideration of interpretative tendencies or ‘thinking styles’.

Some of the researchers in this domain regard SWB stability as a function of a dispositional system, Kozma referred this as “propensity model” (Kozma, Stone, & Stones, 2000). However, it was also found that the propensity for stability could not be entirely explained through personality variables alone, and that the best predictor of future SWB was the level of past SWB. (Kozma, Stone, & Stones, 2000).
Subjective well-being and Personality with common genetic structure

Weiss, Bates, and Luciano (2008) stated that however- “Subjective well-being is known to be related to personality traits. However, to date, nobody has examined whether personality and subjective well-being share a common genetic structure”. The explanation for the correlation between personality and subjective well-being has yet not been explored as it has been investigated and studied for Neuroticism and depression (Kendler, Gardner, Gatz, & Pedersen, 2007; Kendler, Gatz, Gardner, & Pedersen, 2006), personality and subjective well-being may be correlated because they link with genes. According to an investigation by Alexander and Headey, (2008) studied with the sample of 973 twin pairs to test the hypothesis that heritable differences in subjective well-being are entirely accounted for by the genetic architecture of the Five-Factor Model’s personality domains. The findings of the investigation indicated that the subjective well-being is found to be linked to personality by common genes and that personality may form an “affective reserve” relevant to set-point maintenance and changes in set point over time. Alexander and Heady, (2008) explained that not only there are individual differences in the subjective well-being set point, but also that environmental events can result in long lasting changes in this set point of SWB and they also revealed that that the degree of adaptation to circumstances differs from an individual to individual the study was supported by similar studies in the domain by Lucas, Clark, Georgellis, and Diener, (2003); Lucas, Clark, Georgellis, and Diener, (2004). Moreover the results also suggest that genetic effects of personality may affect the rate at which well-being returns to the set-point after a disturbance, and the extent to which the set point undergoes lasting change in response to environmental events. Thus, personality may create what might be termed an affective reserve, which can be called upon in times of stress and recovery. Headey and Wearing (1989) also explained the impact of personality and affect on one’s disposition to experience emotion and partly determines the set-point level of SWB.

Affect is a trait or a state

According to Russell and Carroll (1999) “Affect is considered to be based on genuine subjective feelings and moods rather than thoughts or cognitions about specific events”. A long standing argumentive issue whether happiness is a trait or state, Veenhoven (1998), discussed whether affect is a trait or a state. The perspective that happiness is a trait suggests that happiness and the propensity to feel happy is predisposed, this proves the top-down approach (Diener, 1984). While bottom-up approach suggests that a happy person is one who have many pleasurable moments (Diener, 1984), further he added that the strength of positive emotion experienced by an individual is equal to the summation of one’s positive or negative experiences.
Stones, Hadjistavopolous, Tuuko, and Kozma, (1995); Veenhoven, (1994, 1998) responded to dissolve the argument with a proper approach. Veenhoven (1994) explained that the term “happiness” was criticized on the ground of its subjective state which fails to fulfill the basic criteria of a trait, the basic criteria are: i) temporal stability, ii) cross-situational consistency and finally, iii) inner causation. Thus considering happiness as dependent on one’s current affective condition, it is logical that happiness has state like properties. In long-term perspective SWB has close proximity with personality variables, therefore it is also logical to define happiness as trait-like in nature. Therefore using the term SWB instead of happiness lessens the ambiguity and controversy regarding the trait/state argument. Similarly, affective states seem to be related with short periods of time and independent over long-term, thus it seems that affect is a state rather than a trait (Veenhoven, 1994). Stones (1995) argued the independence of affective state, he justified his statement by explaining that positive affect and negative affect can appear state-like or trait-like, it depends on the timeframe of measurement and across the situations. Charles, Reynolds and Gatz, (2001), Mroczek and Kolarz, (1998) added complexity to this argument by reporting an investigation which stated that in a long-term study there is a general decrease in negative affect over time. So a conclusion can be drawn on the basis of the studies reported by Kozma, Stone, Stones, Hannah and McNeil (1990), that it may be possible that individuals have a pure and momentary state of affect, while also having a dispositional and stable affect level trait.

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. Some more theories like, Homeostasis theory of Subjective well-being, The Broaden-and-Build Theory of Positive Emotions, Social Comparison theory, Adaptation Theory, Pleasure and Pain Theory etc. explain the process of SWB.