CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The story of man's quest for happiness and satisfaction begins at the very beginning of time. Milton, in his "Paradise Lost" depicts how Adam, though residing amidst the boundless joys and pleasures of Eden, experiences a vague restlessness and dissatisfaction, and while engaged in a lengthy dialogue with God suddenly blurts out (no doubt taking the Almighty unawares)——-

"......... in solitude, what happiness ?"

Thus, much before exploring the unknown, physical universe, man set forth on his journey towards self exploration and self understanding and the most primary and prominent concern which emerged out of this exercise was the knowledge and appreciation of a phenomenon one may loosely call happiness, sense of well being or satisfaction, coupled with the realisation of an urgency to strive towards its attainment.

Perhaps because this striving is so Inextricably woven into the very deep core structures of the human psyche, that its existence has from the beginning been accepted as an inevitable reality of human life. Absence of any doubt with regard to its
centrality for the human being has probably been the reason for its virtual exclusion from the issues and concerns traditionally taken up by psychologists and it is just in the preceding two decades that one finds the phenomena entering the psychological domain, that too at the molar level of encompassing distal stimuli (socio-economic, political, cultural) rather than the relatively 'molecular' focus of studying the individual, his characteristics and behavioural dynamics. Of course, one reason is that considering the totally experiential and predominantly subjective nature of the phenomena, the psychologist may (justifiably) feel wary of stepping in the area, which may well prove to be as precarious as a patch of quicksand. The aftermath of the behaviourist tradition has made us suspicious of phenomena that smell so strongly of subjectivity, but thankfully the pendulum which at the childhood and adolescent stages of a science swings to extremes of opinions and positions, is settling down in the balanced middle where, within the limits and framework set by the scientific method, all phenomena of pertinence and significance to the human being are accepted as worthy subjects of study.

Primarily because the phenomena formed almost exclusively a part of philosophical and literary deliberations, there was a fluid use of terminology and terms like satisfaction, happiness, contentment etc were used interchangeably, and though
definitions and meanings were expounded, by and large a belief in
the synonymy of the terms appears to be implicit. Broadly
speaking, all positive emotional experiences including relatively
brief ones like joy and pleasure and the more pervasive, longer
lasting ones, like happiness and satisfaction have been discussed
at different times under any of the heads. To this list may be
added the term exuberance', used by Paul Kurtz in his
"Exuberences A Philosophy of Happiness", to indicate what he
calls "one species of the form of happiness". But of all the
terms used to indicate this positive experience, happiness and
satisfaction occur most frequently, happiness being used the more
often. Even as recently as the 1980's, the substitutive usage can
be clearly seen—the classic work of Hadley Cantril (1965), using
the term human satisfaction is reported by Hankiss, 1980, using
the term human happiness for no distinction in the connotation
appears to have crystallized. There is nothing unusual about this
overlapping usage, for the phenomena has only recently been
subjected to the scientific grind. It is customary to initially
attribute some vaguely circumscribed meaning to a term and
subsequently clarify as well as specify it by more research and
reflection. Empirical researches are coming up which will help to
expound the concepts more convincingly. If the present
investigation can contribute a drop in the ocean, it will have
served its purpose.
A valid question in the face of absence of clarity would be why the investigator preferred the term satisfaction to happiness. Is the choice of the term based on considerations of concept and definition or is it just incidental one word had to be chosen, and the dice fell in favour of satisfaction?

It should be clearly stated at the outset that the term satisfaction has been deliberately preferred by the investigator for very valid reasons. A thorough evaluation of existing literature convinces us that the semantic and pragmatic peculiarities of the term 'happiness' places limitations on its applicability to aspects of human experience which the investigator wishes to study, while the term satisfaction is free from such constraints. This will be amply clear from the paragraphs that follow in which the investigator will attempt to expound the meaning of satisfaction.

The term satisfaction is most commonly used to indicate a state of need fulfilment which according to the homeostatic model of motivation is a state which is achieved when the organism after departing substantially from one of its reference standards in some need dimension, returns to the equilibrium state after appropriate activity. The point to be specially noted in this model is that the state of equilibrium, denoting need satisfaction is a state which the individual does not want to
change. It is purely incidental that in the normal course of living, the state of balance inevitably changes and the activity is resumed, but speaking theoretically, considering only the thematic content of the model, if this state was perchance permanent, the individual would continue to experience satisfaction uninterruptedly and would do nothing to change this state.

Satisfaction conceived within the framework of this model leaves much to be desired for it visualizes the human being as a totally biological organism governed by a mechanical system of demand and supply. The model is totally untenable not because need fulfilment is unimportant, but because it overlooks and sidetracks many pertinent and relevant aspects of human behaviour. With regard to the human organism the concept of satisfaction and dissatisfaction operates beyond the limits of mere need fulfilment. The human being with his physical, social and psychological repertoire of limitless possibilities functions at a complex, subtle level. Satisfaction for him cannot be understood as mere drive reduction although drive reduction undoubtedly is a very important part of its picture since fulfilment of certain basic needs is a pre-requisite for survival. However beyond a basic level of need satisfaction, satisfaction for humans becomes a relative concept, dependent more upon social and psychological realities, experiences,
aspirations, achievements, fears and concerns than on any inventoried needs. Terms like homeostasis and cognitive dissonance may be useful in describing certain limited phases of human behaviour but both these accounting models fall far short of the mark by overlooking the larger context of the more enduring, overriding characteristics of man. This over-riding characteristic is designated by Cantril (1965) as a capacity unique to the human species namely the capacity to experience satisfactions that are permeated with value overtones. This leads him to explore, experiment and extend the range of his behaviour to enrich and heighten his value satisfactions together with ensuring the repeatability of the satisfaction already experienced. What Polanyi observes as the 'desire for tension' the 'craving for mental dissatisfaction' and the essential restlessness of the human mind which calls ever-again in question any satisfaction that it may have previously achieved, are fundamentally due to the fact that this tension and restlessness are by products of the built in desire of man to enrich the value satisfaction of living and are instrumented by man's inventive and creative capacities.

Allport (1961) has expounded the point succinctly when he explains why the tension reduction model of the human personality is only partially correct because it does not account for most of the healthy person's motivation. True, human beings need to
maintain a certain level of satisfaction of the biological drives but Allport goes on to say that healthy human beings have a continuous need for variety and challenges. They seek out new experiences, take risks and explore new things. All this activity produces tension. Allport believed, that only through these new tension producing experiences and risks can human beings grow. History records many individuals who were not content with a routine existence that offered no variety and nominal tension. We all know of people who have forsaken pleasure and security for goals like patriotism, who embrace danger by participating voluntarily and joyfully in activities like car racing and skidiving. Why do they do these things? It is not to reduce tension but to increase it. At no time does the individual stop his struggle of trying to reach goals for when he attains some particular goal, he sets new ones. Allport considers of great importance this need of inventing motives if existing ones turn out to be insufficient or no longer appropriate and he proposed the principle of 'organizing the energy level' which suggests that the mature healthy person constantly needs motives of sufficient strength and vitality to consume his energies. The lack of meaningful, constructive goals to consume energies, results in pathological and dissatisfying states. Allport’s theory of motivation of the healthy personality also includes the principle of mastery and competence which holds that it is not sufficiently satisfying for mature, healthy persons to perform or
achieve at mediocre or merely adequate levels. Rather, they are driven to perform as well as they possibly can, to attain high levels of competence and mastery in striving to satisfy their motive.

Rogers (1961) reiterates the views contained in the preceding paragraphs when he points out that the goal of life, is not simply the maintenance of a homeostatic balance or a high degree of ease and comfort, but growth and enhancement. Our direction is forward, toward the goal of increased complexity of functioning, so that we may become all that we are capable of becoming. It may be noted that the goal of increased complexity subsume a high level of tension rather than reduction of tension.

Maslow's (1970) theory of the hierarchical organization of needs and their satisfaction has received wide acclaim over the years. The most distinctive aspect of his theory is the identification of B-needs in contrast to the D-needs. The deficiency or D-motivation is motivation to make up for some deficiency in the organism. For example, if we have gone some time without food there is a deficit in the body, which produces pain and discomfort, both physical and psychological. A tension level is induced in the organism, which it is motivated to reduce. This kind of motivation is designed to attain something we lack. Deficiency motivation refers not only to the
physiological needs but to the needs for safety, belonging and love, and esteem as well. These are the lower needs and they motivate us to attain something specific which we lack. The B-motivation or being-motivation refers to what may be called growth motivation, what Maslow called metamotivation. The prefix 'Meta' means 'after' or 'beyond', and metamotivation moves beyond the traditional idea of motivation, suggesting a state in which motivation plays no role at all. "The highest motive' Maslow wrote, 'is to be unmotivated and nonstriving'. The goal of metamotivation is to enrich and enlarge the experience of living, to increase the joy and ecstasy of being alive. The ideal is to increase tension through new, challenging and diverse experiences. Among the B-needs can be named needs for truth, goodness, beauty, unity, justice, order and so on.

A totally different approach to human need satisfaction is afforded by Frankl(1962). Victor Frankl departs from Maslow, Roger, Allport and other theorists who have emphasized the growth of the self through achieving self realization or self actualization on the fundamental point that the culmination of the highest human motive at the level of the self does not touch upon the highest peaks and levels of satisfaction that man is capable of. A view in which the human striving is to establish a condition or state within the self (whether for power, pleasure or actualization) depicts the person as a closed system concerned
not with interaction with the real world or other persons but only with the self. The pursuit of a goal exclusively within the self is, Frankl believes, self defeating. In Frankl's system, called logotherapy, there is one fundamental motivation, the will to meaning which is so powerful that it is capable of overshadowing all other human motivation. The search for meaning can be a perplexing and challenging task, and one which increases not decreases inner tension. In fact, Frankl sees tension increase as a pre-requisite for satisfaction and psychological health. He goes so far as to say that a life devoid of tension, a life oriented toward stability and equilibrium of internal tension is doomed to noogenic neurosis. Perhaps it was this uninterrupted and prologed stability which provoked the lines--

"Crushed dreams and excruciating heartaches,
Relieve the smoothness of monotony
The same things happening,
So secure, so maddening.....

Frankl is particularly lucid when he talks of the human striving for pleasure, happiness or satisfaction, stating that the more we deliberately strive for pleasure, the less likely we are to find it, satisfaction cannot be pursued and captured, it follows naturally and spontaneously from fulfilling meaning, from attaining a goal outside the self. He therefore talks of self transcendence and not self actualization.
The idea of happiness being attainable through activities beyond the self underlies an interesting programme, not inappropriately called the 'Unself Programme' advocated by William Strong (1974). The term 'unself' is coined to stress the nonotherness of society and involves sharing through patterned reactions and developing the unself through exercises in role playing and empathy so that 'separateness is overcome'. According to Strong through various kinds of such 'outward turning' happiness and satisfaction can be achieved.

Henry Murray (1938), while applying the term press to those elements in the environment which facilitate or impede the individual in satisfying his needs, points out that sometimes an individual deliberately creates a need in order to enjoy tension reduction, suggesting that not only the goal of tension reduction namely pleasure is important but the process itself seems to have appeal for the individual. This is an interesting point and will help us to formulate a comprehensive concept of satisfaction.

It is not necessary to espouse in totality the theoretical framework suggested by the above quoted psychologists, to conclude that the concept of human satisfaction cannot be confined within the tension reduction model. Such an exercise would be like squeezing a structure of gigantic proportions into a very limited space and consequently distorting it in the
attempt. That a complex interaction of biological, social, psychological, tertiary, central, shortterm, longterm factors determine human satisfaction is undeniable. It is also undeniable that satisfaction is not merely the experiencing of pleasure—the hedonistic model is only partly true in the face of mounting evidence that tension is an essential ingredient of the fully functioning person. An important question would be what level of tension? Frankl would insist that as long as the individual was able to perceive meaning in the tension, even if it has reached to the level of causing acute suffering, he was in a position not only to cope with it but to find a sense of fulfilment through it. His experiences as prisoner in the Nazi concentration camps at Auschwitz and Dachau convinced him that "he who has a will to live can bear with almost any How" (Nietzsche). But logic and theory sound though they be, may suffice in the case of metaphysical issues but are poor substitutes for empirical evidence in the study of human behavioural dimensions.

Since there is a profusion of theorizing in the area of happiness and satisfaction with hardly any supporting evidence, we must draw out from the theoretical structure pertinent issues which help to build the concept on a sound, empirical basis.

We must attempt to understand the concept of satisfaction, not in a fragmented form, but as an integrated concept, taking
into consideration that by satisfaction is meant - (a) a state experienced by the individual (b) a process in which the dynamic configurations of many factors and conditions are involved and (c) it is a goal towards which all human beings aspire. The qualification of human aspiring towards the goal is necessary because we have adopted the view that satisfaction is not synonymous with mere tension reduction, but includes what is termed value satisfaction.

And in the delineation of these three important aspects of satisfaction can be understood clearly the difference between satisfaction and happiness.

From Aristotle to Bertrand Russell, happiness has been conceived as an end, a pleasant state which an individual wishes to achieve and retain. Aristotle considers happiness "an activity of the soul in accordance with virtue" and points out that whereas all ends and purposes which the individual sets out to achieve are immediate ends, that is, ends in the immediate context but may become means with reference to another end, "eudaimonia" (conventionally translated to happiness) is always an end, never a means. Bertrand Russell visualizes happiness as the most sought-after goal but wonders if spiritual happiness as distinct from animal happiness is at all possible in the modern world. At moments, Aristotle, extends the concept of happiness to include what he called contemplative happiness (man being a
rational, theoretical and contemplative creature) but primarily
his account of happiness is interwoven with his wider ethical
theory on the nature of man, revolving around the centrality of
the concept of ends and means.

Perhaps the only exception to a tendency to conceptualize
happiness in terms of an end and to indicate its pertinence as a
process was the view put forth by Hobbes (1588 – 1679).

"Felicity......by which we mean continual delight,
consisteth not in having prospered but in prospering". However,
we do not find the opinion being reiterated at any other level.

To describe happiness as a state has been the preferred
position taken up by the utilitarianists, J.S. Mill (1806 – 1873)
defined happiness as presence of pleasure and absence of pain and
unhappiness as presence of pain and the privation of pleasure.

Happiness confined to a state experienced by the individual
brings us to a very pertinent issue of contemporary concern,
namely the question of drugs in relation to happiness. There
certainly are drugs such as tricyclamines that ameliorate
depressive states and produce an experience reported to be
happiness. Epinephrene, too, is associated with producing certain
symptoms of happiness and a large number of persons have begun to
hold the view that since the condition called happiness is so
intimately related to a neuro-chemical state, it will ultimately prove manageable. This quest for biological concommitants of the state of happiness has led to research on the sensations of pain and pleasure on the hedonistic assumption of considering happiness akin to pleasure and unhappiness akin to pain. Pitcher (1970) has done considerable work on the sensation of pain, whereas Puccetti's (1969) researches on the sensation of pleasure have received attention. They have elicited information with regard to certain parts of the brain becoming activated under stimulation of pleasure and others reacting to pain stimuli, but satisfaction is not a momentary state of pleasure or pain, and intense pleasure or intense pain cannot be considered parameters of human satisfaction. This state (satisfaction) may be and usually is experienced without any tangible immediate stimuli and consequent momentary stimulations.

Observations of drug-induced behaviour convince us that happiness as state is a phenomenon replicable by factors having no logical relationship with normal human experiences and cognitions. It is possible to create and manipulate it through extraneous agencies without personal will and involvement, much as a machinery can be programmed to express a behaviour without any "personal" involvement. The concept of human happiness cannot be viewed within the framework of this robotic model of man, for the model contradicts very basic issues of human dignity,
autonomy achievement and self realization. The therapeutic utility of drugs to alleviate human suffering is not being questioned, but the role of drugs is basically supportive in nature, while the ultimate aim is adjustment and happiness emanating from within the self. Unfortunately, a large number of patients are unable to arrive at the self-dependent stage and may continue to need support, but it is doubtful if the artificially induced, temporary state of happiness resulting from drugs is the goal which healthy mature individuals aspire for, and which psychologists perceive to be behaviourally desirable.

Thus, to an overwhelming degree the usage of the term "happiness" has been centred around the concept of pleasure and the philosophical issue of it being the supreme end, both of which are inconclusive from our point of view. It was, therefore, felt that using the term happiness would imply a connotation restrictive to our purpose its extensive use with fluid connotations possibly raising confusion, and the term satisfaction was consequently used.

In defining satisfaction, or any other term for that matter it is necessary to exercise caution and restraint for quite often it seems to transpire that the claim being made is trivially true, because it has been made true by definition. In the face of diverse definitions not only do conceptual problems need to be
sorted out, there also remains the classic problem of whether the evidence is adequate, the research reliable and the argument strong and acceptable in each case. A broad framework of the concept of human satisfaction is emerging, but empirical evidence which would help us to understand its scope, domain and concommitants is wanting. At this juncture, it would be advisable to restrict ourselves to the following observations.....

a) Satisfaction is not a transient state of momentary pleasure but is relatively enduring. It should be distinguished clearly from drug-induced euphoria or pleasure.

b) The tension reduction model does not suffice to explain the various facets of human satisfaction.

c) The concept of value satisfaction is an integral part of human satisfaction.

d) Human beings have higher order motivations and strivings that subsume the presence of tension.

e) Not only is the fulfilment of goal a satisfying experience the process of attaining it also involves the experience of satisfaction.

f) Empirical evidence for all claims needs to be gathered.
If the experience of satisfaction exists as a process, as a distinct state which forms part of a person's perception of himself in relation to the world, accruing in all probability as a consequence of his experiences with the world, then there must exist tangible differences in at least some behavioural dimensions between people who experience satisfaction and those who do not. Costa and McRae, (1980, 1984) found that qualities such as sociability, activity and vigour and social involvement are linked with life satisfaction. They called this pattern 'extroversion'. What they called "neurotic traits" hostility, anxiety and impulsivity were tied to dissatisfaction. All people have a mix of these attributes. The Costa-McRae model suggests that there are many ways to attain a particular level of happiness, e.g. a person who is low both on extroversion and neuroticism may feel the same degree of life satisfaction as one who is high on both. It points out however, that those with both temperament advantages, (high extroversion and low neuroticism) report feeling the most optimistic and happiest of all.

Robinson and Shaver (1978) conclude after reviewing researches in the field that certain correlations of happiness with behavioural dimensions are reasonably well-established. Unhappiness reportedly shows a significant correlation with alienation, depression, anxiety and anomie. Happiness shows a significant correlation with self esteem, successful involvement
Studies focusing on individual distinctivenesses and personality dimensions and their contribution to satisfaction dissatisfaction are very limited. Much more attention has been given to exploring social-cultural conditions which function as causes or sources of happiness and unhappiness. Blishen and Atkinson (1980) studied three independent variables language, age and income in relation to life satisfaction. How language can be a pertinent variable may justifiably appear absurd on the face of it, but since the study was conducted in Canada and a comparison between the English speaking and French speaking residents was intended, language spoken referred to the total distinctive milieu of each of the two groups. Thus the differences observed in the two groups should be interpreted not as a function of language in the absolute sense, but as depicting socio-cultural problems and peculiarities of each of the groups. The investigators found that all the three variables contributed to satisfaction. Income had a linear relationship with satisfaction, satisfaction increases with income, it increases with age too and socio-cultural problems also contribute to it (Francophones reported greater satisfaction than the Anglophones).

The Kettering – Gallup Global survey on Human needs and satisfactions (1976) found a powerful and systematic connection
between the level of economic development of a country and the perceived quality of life of the population. The self ratings of happiness in six world regions (Northe America, Australia, Western Europe, Latin America, Africa and Far East) were compared and it was found that the percentage of individuals reporting high satisfaction in these regions were 40, 37, 20, 32, 18 and 7 respectively. At the middle level, that is those reporting themselves as fairly satisfied, the distribution was more or less even, the pattern predictably tilting in converse to the 'very happy', in the distribution of those reporting themselves as dissatisfied.

The same conclusion is more or less borne out by Inkeles and Diamond (1978) who also found a surprisingly strong connection between the level of economic development of a nation and the sense of well being or personal satisfaction of the population. Comparing the data of 25 cross-national surveys, they found the median of rank correlations between GNP (Gross National Product) and personal satisfaction to be at least 0.58.

Allardt (1977), however in his Scandinavian study found only a weak, positive correlation between economic factors and life satisfaction. He found the coefficient to be .12 in Sweden, .13 in Denmark, .14 in Finland and .17 in Norway. Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976) found a correlation of .19 between family
income and the index of well being. Even more interesting is the fact that in the diachronic dimension, the relationships proved to be inverse; economic growth may entail a decline in the general satisfaction or happiness level of the population. Scitovsky (1976) in a comparison of the self ratings of "very happy" made in the United States on the happiness scale at three points of time (1946, 1956 and 1970) showed that although the per capita personal income rose steadily during this time (to reach from $1,810 in 1950 to $2,542 in 1965), the happiness ratings showed an entirely different pattern. In 1946, 39 per cent of the sample reported very happy; in 1956, the percentage was 52 but in 1970 it went down to 43. The percentage of very happy self ratings rose very considerably between 1946 and 1956, although the increase in the per capita income was very minimal (from $1,810 to 2027). On the other hand, the increase in the per capita income between 1956 and 1970 was considerable (from $2,027 to $2,542+), yet the percentage reporting very happy fell from 52% to 43%. In the synchronic dimension, on the other hand, the relationship is indicated to be by and large more direct at a given point in time and within a country, the higher the living standard of a social class or group, the higher will be the satisfaction level.

The conclusion is however, not beyond controversy for this relationship is often relatively weak as is seen in the studies
of Allardt (1977), Campbell et al (1976), where the economic indicators explain only 2 to 10 percent of the variance in the perceived quality of life, or perceived satisfaction indicators. This relationship is not as clear or as direct as the proponents of the economic viewpoint would have us believe. In a critical review of existing empirical findings, Inkeles & Diamond (1980) show how the highest stages of contemporary economic development may be associated with "backlash" effects, reflecting a loss of optimism concerning prospects for future development and progress in scientific, economic and political life.

The cross-cultural studies conducted by Cantril in the early sixties give strength to the conclusions that may be drawn from the results of studies investigating the relationship between satisfaction and economic factors in the diachronic and the synchronic dimensions of time. Cantril compared the socio-economic developmental index of fourteen countries with their mean self rating on the satisfaction scale. He found considerable ambiguity in the manner in which the two indicators (Developmental index and satisfaction ratings) were connected. For example, the Developmental index of Japan was .60 and that of Egypt .14, yet the mean satisfaction rating of the two countries are on the same level. Likewise the satisfaction index of the Dominican Republic is lower than that of the lesser developed countries while that of Egypt is higher than of much more
developed countries like West Germany, Israel, Japan, Poland, Yugoslavia. Nigeria, too despite a very low developmental index had a higher mean satisfaction rating than countries with much higher developmental indices like Poland, Brazil and Philippines. Cuba, despite being sixth in order of developmental index was second highest in order of satisfaction rating, its rating being 6.4 as compared to USA's highest of 6.6.

When a similarity was suggested in the preceding paragraphs between the conclusions indicated in these studies and those of the same nation at different temporal points, it was because different nations at the same time and the same nation at different times are actually the expression of the same phenomena—change or differences in societal conditions, state of the polity, economic factors, aspirations of the nation and its people. Cantril's observation that both in terms of objective developmental indices and in terms of aspirations expressed by their people, nations might be roughly differentiated into those that are in (a) a stage of pre-mobilization (b) a stage of mobilization and (c) a stage of relative maturity, is an elucidation of the above point.

Inkeles and Diamond (1980) on the basis of review of studies suggest that personal satisfaction is linked with national development and the level of national development exerts a
substantial influence on the attitudes, values and perceptions of its citizens. They feel that certain studies seem to warrant that living in a country that is more highly developed is ego enhancing — it gives individuals a greater sense of personal worth, satisfaction and competence beyond what would be predicted from knowing only their education and occupation. Of note in this regard is the work of Lambert and Klineberg (1967) which points out towards a positive relationship between the economic standards of a nation and expression of tolerance, including tolerance for different races and nations, by its citizens. The work of Meade and Whittaker (1967) indicates a negative relationship between indices of national development and authoritarianism. Ornanes and others (1968) have pointed towards a positive relationship between indices of GNP and sense of personal competence and efficiency. Havighurst, Munnichs, Neugarten and Thomas (1969), Igra (1976) have found positive relationship between development indices and sense of participation among people, and Gillspie and Allport (1955) assert that their results are highly suggestive of a strong, positive association between economic development and a psychological disposition to trust other people.

While there is every reason to believe that economic well being and the state of development of a nation are important indices of the quality of life led by its people and may
facilitate the process of satisfaction yet stretching the conclusion to the extent of declaring that psychological dispositions and personal satisfactions are determined by them is a gross over-simplification.

Poetic verses extolling poverty may be extreme positions, but we cannot dismiss observations like

"Art then poor, yet hath thou golden slumber?
O sweet content.
Art thou rich, yet in they mind perplexed?
O punishment", (Thomas Dekker, "Patient Grissil", Act I)

as mere flights of fancy for it is not uncommon to find wealth keeping company with unhappiness and relative poverty discovering deep satisfaction. Innumerable examples of men and women sacrificing wealth, luxury even their lives in the pursuit of some higher goal, like partiotism and achieving supreme satisfaction in the process depicts a situation where economic well being in the absolute sense, is relegated into the background and complex factors like values and commitments emerge in the forefront.

Grichting (1983) has investigated the happiness satisfaction construct and given valuable information with regard to the issues of its domain, scope and degree. Although the term
happiness has been retained, its ambiguity and vagueness has been pointed out and the enunciation of domain, scope and degree was an attempt to clarify its meaning and concommitants. Alleged causes of avowed degree of happiness were analysed with the help of Goodman's log linear analysis for nominal data. The happy individual emerged as female, married, of mature age and conservative in nature. Grichting's main contribution however, is in terms of the methodology through which the phenomena has been brought within the boundaries of unchallengeably scientific investigative procedures. Another noteworthy feature of this study is that the focus of investigation, if not reaching to the distinctively central characteristics of the individual is approaching towards qualities less distal than broad socio-economic categories. Wilson (1967) did make a valiant attempt to do something similar; in his investigation the ideal type of happy individual emerged as young, healthy, well-educated, well paid extraverted, optimistic, worry free, religious, married, with high self esteem, high job morale, modest aspirations and a wide range of intelligence. A formidable list, speaking of rigorous application, but the distinctive feature of Grichting's study is the combination of sound methodology with focus on the person.

One is, however, struck with the fact that the central concern of all the above endeavours is to present a typology, a classificatory system in which certain categories are associated
with happiness and satisfaction. For example, when Grichting points out to the married, mature, middle-aged conservative female as happy, it gives rise to new doubts and queries. A very justified query could be does being a female by itself increase the chances of happiness or is it merely the tangible, readily observable characteristic whereas the important determining qualities, being less overt, lie underneath? This question is an important one, for if one would carry out a survey of this nature in our country, it is doubtful if womanhood would occupy the pedestal of happiness. Perhaps two or three decades ago, the Indian woman resigned and accepting of her lot might have assessed herself as reasonably happy for the unquestioning inevitability of her secondary and suppressed role (encouraged by misplaced religion and social norms convenient to men) would not have permitted her to perceive her deprivation. Today the country is witnessing the transition phase of the women's assertion of her rights and at the moment it is a particularly sensitive period, for just as old trees with deep roots extending over wide areas on being uprooted give rise to tremors and loud sounds, the uprooting of old and unjust customs is causing reactions in the form of exaggerated acherence, - and sati and dowry deaths occupy the front pages in newspapers. With women issues being given well-deserved priority at the national level, the furore is likely to settle down soon and a more stable picture will probably emerge, but is extremely likely that with
insecurity and injustice looming clear, and awareness of this injustice becoming more and more intense, women would probably perceive themselves as less happy than their male counterparts, rather than more happy. Yet in a different country, in a different context, the female sample emerged as happier. A more intensive study of education, occupational roles, gender roles and other relevant indices as existing in Townsville (from where the sample in Grichting's study was drawn) would help us to get a more clear picture. In a similar fashion, the analysis of other features that have been pointed out as attributive to happiness and satisfaction would perhaps warrant a similar conclusion.

An important fact to be borne in mind in understanding and interpreting research in a particular area is that the journey of knowledge proceeds from the general to the specific. From the initial stage which of necessity must be directed towards discovering broad, wide facts that are within easy reach of the groping hand, we proceed towards less obvious, more specific more deep realities which help us to understand the dynamics of the phenomena. Thus, if earlier researches were largely talking of socio-economic indices or broad type categories it was a natural phase in the fact finding process.

As students of psychology we must proceed towards the study of core characteristics like personality and throw light on the
phenomena of satisfaction through the study of those "possessing" satisfaction and those low on it (not possessing it).

The point has arrived to take up the investigation of the phenomena of satisfaction from a more central and more person directed position. The general perspective has been outlined by earlier studies which provide the canvas on which specific, intensive investigations can be logically contemplated. The present study is a timely step in this direction.

The rationale for the study of personality with reference to satisfaction, together with the objectives and significance of the present work are being expounded in the forthcoming paragraphs.

It is amply clear that unless we view the phenomena of satisfaction from a person-oriented position, we will be oscillating around a vague, typological system bunching people into descriptive, non-explanatory categories in which the role of external situations on the individual may be highlighted, but the individual's own repertoire of reacting, coping and reaching goals is totally ignored. This general bunching and categorization is of course the first step in the hierarchy of measuring and understanding, but the psychologist must proceed, cautiously notwithal, towards more meaningful analyses. All the
work already done and being done in the area of satisfaction is pointing to an overwhelming lacuna, that is the absence of a locus or pivotal point around which the information, floating in scattered forms can be anchored. From the viewpoint of the psychologist the individual is the most logical anchor and pivot around which the social, financial, cultural aspects of satisfaction can be meaningfully juxta-positioned. The communication would then be directed, not merely from objective reality towards the individual, but would then be interactive - some communication emanating spontaneously from within the person, back and forth in this manner - and the final picture of satisfaction would emerge in the form of the individual's balancing of personality actualities and evolved aspirations.

The predominant objective of the study is to hinge the phenomena of satisfaction on the matrix of personality.

The experience of satisfaction, though of unparalleled importance for the human being, has been grossly neglected by the psychologist and has almost exclusively remained the purview of philosophy and lay-writing. It is just recently that concern for phenomena existing primarily at the experiential level has grown considerably with the acceptance that human cognitions and perceptions, whether they are simple, classifiable and easily comprehensible or whether they are unique, complex and difficult
to comprehend are realities that can not be ignored. The subjectivity of personal experiences can not be used as an argument to sidestep their study, rather the focal manner in which such personal experiences and cognitions function, the depth and extent of the force that they exert on the individual should compel us to devise techniques and to apply with creativity and innovativeness our methodology so that the scientific method can encompass within its folds such distinctively human aspects of behaviour.

Asthana (1988) has made reference to this when he points out that rich material on phenomenological observations of self, awareness, motivation which would be of immense significance and utility for the human being lies buried in our ancient learning. If such phenomena could be unentangled from philosophical moorings and placed on footings of empiricistic methodology, it would vastly enrich knowledge.

The Indian psychologist has totally ignored this aspect, basically because it is easier to work in areas where application of methodology has already been upheld by standards set by Western Psychology. Incidentally, Western Psychology has become aware of such issues and, leaving aside rigid adherents to the mechanistic-model suggested by behaviourism, phenomenology is being seriously taken up. Perhaps we, who have in our traditional
knowledge the richest repertoire of theoretical information, will wait for the erst-while west to give its note of sanction before taking it up in a big way for empirical studies and investigations.

The investigator firmly believes that as a branch of knowledge grows, and new issues and concerns enter into its expanding domain, it must grow in terms of methodology to encompass all issues that now form part of it. If conventional methodology is made immovable, we would become imprisoned within a narrow system and create an orbit or fixed path around which we would mechanically revolve. For probing and bringing out into the light of the day unexplored nooks and corners into which the traditional instruments can not enter, we should be ready to sometimes narrow the nozzle, sometimes lengthen the rod in order to enter the crannies and crevices which would otherwise continue to lie in the dark.

With the firm belief that issues pertinent to humanity must be extracted from philosophical and totally subjective moorings and placed in a framework that makes possible their study in as objective and reliable a manner as possible, so that benefit from their knowledge may accrue, the investigator took up this phenomena for study. The experiences emanating from within the individual must be studied in relation to the most representative
indexes of the individual, and the aggregate of the multifarious person-specific characteristics is best provided by the dimension called "Personality". Catell (1977) called personality "the most challenging of all scientific problems" because at the turn of the century the position of "personality" was the same as that of "satisfaction" today – a preoccupation with theorizing without alternative "pragmatic proof" of clinical or other application (Eysenck, 1960). (It is encouraging to recall this to infuse enthusiasm about the future of "satisfaction"). After a long journey in which "personality" was able to get past trivialities, aided undoubtedly by new, sophisticated methodology in the form of multi-variate experimental design, it became representative of the organism's dynamic, organized, psychological, physical systems – receptive as well as reactive. Justifiably, it became the crucial, explanatory point in all research. Without doubt the concept of human satisfaction will be given meaningful dimensions if personality configurations associated with it are probed and understood.

And this is the major objective of the study – to answer the question of what personality dimension or configuration of dimensions are markedly related to satisfaction and dissatisfaction. This will help us to decide whether satisfaction is after all the consequence of social and economic influences/or does it emanate through experiences and situations arising out of
some persisting, relatively permanent personal quality. This will help to throw more light on the "process" of satisfaction rather than talk of it only as a subjective experience and enable us to lift the concept from a vague, generalized typology towards more person-relevant characteristics. Further, it may give us information which will enable us to suggest programmes towards achieving meaningful satisfaction. This may sound absurd to a person who might predictably ask - if satisfaction is related to personality factors, and personality factors are more or less stable characteristics of the individual, how come that we are talking of helping people in achieving satisfaction? Economic, and to some extent, social variables are much more manipulable. To such critics the answer is that running blindly even towards perfectly viable goals, has never been a value upheld by mankind. Knowledge of limitations and constraints is as essential a part of the perfect picture as knowledge of talents and assets. Any intervention strategy, whether devised by the individual himself to live his life meaningfully or whether devised as a counselling or help programme by those in the profession, is bound to become more realistic and effective through objective information. Satisfaction is a universal goal and achieving it is something more than the fulfilling of inventoried needs or leading a well to do life. All such factors are juxtapositioned in an interactive relationship with the central factor of individual predispositions, capacities, temperament. It is the complex
product of aspirations and actualities, balanced in whatever position by the individual's distinctive reactivity and potential.

A study focussing on personality correlates of the satisfied and dissatisfied was therefore a timely and necessary academic endeavour.