METHODOLOGY

The primary aim of the present investigation was to study the correlates of **Subjective Well-being, Total Psychological Well-being and it’s components** (Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Purpose in Life, Self-Acceptance), **Total Quality of Life and it’s components** ((Physical Quality of Life, Psychological Quality of Life, Social Quality of Life, Environmental Quality of Life) in relation to Gratitude, **Forgiveness and it’s dimensions** (Total Affect Forgiveness, Total Behavior Forgiveness, Total Cognition Forgiveness, Total Forgiveness), Mindfulness, Optimism, Self-esteem, **Parental Bonding and it’s Care dimensions** (Perceived Mother Care, Perceived Father Care), **Parental Bonding and it’s Control dimensions** (Perceived Mother Over-Protection, Perceived Father Over-Protection), Perceived Stress, **Difficulties with Emotion Regulation and it’s components** (Non-acceptance of Emotional Responses, Goal Difficulties, Impulse Difficulties, Awareness Difficulties, Strategies Difficulties, Clarity Difficulties, Total Difficulties with Emotion Regulation), **Aggression and it’s components** (Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger, Hostility, Total Aggression) among adolescents.

For this purpose, 250 adolescents in the age range of 16-18 years were taken. The sample comprised of 125 males and 125 females.

The study also explored the predictors of **Subjective Well-being, Total Psychological Well-being and it’s components** and **Total Quality of Life and it’s components**. The study explored gender differences on measures of **well-being and their correlates**.

For measuring **Subjective Well-being**, two scales were used. **The Satisfaction with Life Scale** by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin (1985) and **Positive Affect and Negative Affect Scale** by Watson, Clark & Tellegen (1988) which measures Positive Affect and Negative Affect.

For measuring **Psychological Well-being**, **Psychological Well-being Scale** by Ryff et al. (1995) was used which measures six dimensions of psychological well-being viz. Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Purpose in Life, and Self-Acceptance.
For measuring Quality of Life, World Health Organization Quality of Life-BREF by WHOQOL GROUP (1998) was used which four dimensions of quality of life viz. Physical Quality of Life, Psychological Quality of Life, Social Quality of Life, and Environmental Quality of Life.

For measuring Gratitude, Gratitude Questionnaire by McCullough et al. (2002) was used.

For measuring Forgiveness, Enright Forgiveness Inventory by Enright and Rique (2004) was used to assess State Forgiveness and its dimensions viz Affect, Behavior and Cognition.

For measuring Mindfulness, Child and Adolescent Mindfulness Measure by Greco, Baer, & Smith (2011).

For measuring Optimism, Life Orientation Test-Revised by Scheier et al. (1994) was used.

For measuring Self-Esteem, Self-Esteem Scale by Rosenberg (1965) was used.

For measuring Parental Bonding, Parental Bonding Instrument by Parker et al. (1979) was used. The scale measured Perceived Mother Care, Perceived Father Care, Perceived Mother Over-Protection, Perceived Father Over-Protection.

For measuring Perceived Stress, Perceived Stress Scale by Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein (1983) was used.

For measuring Difficulties with Emotion Regulation, Difficulties in Emotional Regulation Scale by Gratz et al. (2004) was used. The scale measured Non-acceptance of emotional responses, Goal difficulties, Impulse control difficulties, Awareness difficulties, strategies difficulties, and clarity difficulties.

For measuring Aggression, The Aggression Questionnaire by Buss et al. (1992) was used. The questionnaire measured Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger and Hostility.

SAMPLE

For the present study, a list of Government Model Senior Secondary Schools of Chandigarh was obtained from DPI (Schools). Five Model schools were picked up
randomly. The school authorities were contacted to seek permission for data collection. The total sample size taken was 250. Out of which 125 were males and 125 were females. The age of the subjects ranged from 16-18 years.

**TESTS AND TOOLS**

The following tests and tools were used:

1. The Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985).
2. Positive Affect and Negative Affect Scale (Watson et al., 1988).
3. Psychological Well-being Scale (Ryff et al., 1995).
5. Gratitude Questionnaire (McCullough et al., 2002).
6. Enright Forgiveness Inventory (Enright et al., 1998).
7. Child and Adolescent Mindfulness Measure (Greco et al., 2011).
8. Life orientation Test-Revised (Scheier et al., 1994).
12. Difficulties with Emotion Regulation, Difficulties in Emotional Regulation Scale (Gratz et al., 2004).

Brief description of the tests and tools used is given below:

1. **The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)**
   
   *(Diener et al., 1985)*

   The concept of subjective well-being consists of two main components: affective component and cognitive component. The cognitive component incorporates life satisfaction. The scale consists of 5-items. It measures cognitive judgement of one’s life satisfaction. There are 7 response options: 1- Strongly Disagree, 2- Disagree, 3- Slightly Disagree, 4- Neither Agree or Disagree, 5- Slightly Agree, 6- Agree and 7- Strongly Agree. The range of scores lie from 5-35. It is very easy to score. The scoring is done by summing up scores on each item. The scale has favorable psychometric properties including high internal consistency and high temporal stability. The item
total correlations for the five items of the scale were .81, .63, .61, .75 and .66 which indicates good internal consistency (Diener et al. 1985). It is suitable to be used with range of age-groups (Diener et al. 1985; Pavot, Diener, Colvin, & Sandvik, 1991).

The scale has been used with various age groups in Western and Indian settings (Thapar, 2002; Sehgal, 2003; Mohan, 2006; Salariya, 2006; Singha, 2006; Tripathi, 2008; Yadav, 2010; Neto & Pinto, 2010; Singh, Duggal, & Suri, 2013; Moksnes et al., 2014).

2. Positive Affect and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS)

(Watson et al., 1988)

The scale is used to assess positive affect and negative affect. It is a short measure which has 20 items. There are 10 items for positive affect and 10 items for negative affect. The responses are given by using a 5-point Likert-type rating scale ranging from 1- very slightly or not at all to 5- extremely. The scale has good reliability and validity. For positive affect scale, the Cronbach alpha coefficient ranges from .86 to .90 and for negative affect scale, it is .84 to .87 (Watson et al., 1988). Scoring for positive affect and negative affect is done separately. Scores of positive affect items and negative affect items are summed up separately. There is no reverse scoring.

The scale has been used with adolescents in Western and Indian settings (Mohan, 2005; Salariya, 2006; Tripathi, 2008; Yadav, 2010; Singh et al., 2013; Moreira, Cloninger, Dinis, Sá, Oliveira, Dias, & Oliveira, 2014).

3. Psychological Well-being Scale (PWBS)

(Ryff et al., 1995)

The scale has been developed to measure six dimensions of psychological well-being. The six dimensions measured by the scale are Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Purpose in Life, and Self-Acceptance. A total of 6 measurement scales have been developed to assess psychological well-being. Each scale has been different in length of items. For the present study, 84-item scale has been used. There are 14 items for each dimension. The responses are given using a six-point format: 1- strongly disagree, 2- moderately disagree, 3- slightly disagree, 4- slightly agree, 5- moderately agree, 6- strongly agree.
Scoring is done by adding the scores of 6 dimensions separately. Some items are reverse scored. There are no specific scores or cut-points for defining high or low well-being. Psychometric properties of the scale are good. Internal consistencies for autonomy (alpha=.83), environmental mastery (alpha=.86), personal growth (alpha=.85), positive relations with others (alpha=.88), purpose in life (alpha=.88) and self-acceptance (alpha=.91) (Ryff et al., 1995; Ryff, 2014).

The scale has been used with adolescents in Western as well as Indian settings (Tripathi, 2008; Yadav, 2010; Parveen, Maqbool, & Khan, 2016; Sagone et al., 2014; Vescovelli et al. 2014).

4. World Health Organization Quality of Life-BREF (WHOQOL-BREF)

(WHOQOL GROUP, 1998)

The scale measures quality of life in four domains which are Physical (Domain 1), Psychological (Domain 2), Social Relationships (Domain 3) and Environment (Domain 4). It is a 26 item scale. The responses are given on a 5 point Likert-type scale. The 24 items produce a score across 4 dimensions: Physical, Psychological, Social and Environment. High score on domain scales indicate higher quality of life. The score of 24 items within each domain is used to calculate the domain score. The correlation values ranged from .89 to .95 between 4 domain scales. The values indicate high correlations between the domains. Internal consistency of this brief scale is good i.e. Cronbach alpha values for each of 4 domain scores range from .66 (for domain 3) to .84 (for domain 1).

The scale has been used with adolescents in Western (Chen, Wu, & Yao, 2006; Skevington, Dehner, Gillison, McGrath, Lovell, 2014) and Indian settings (Agnihotri, Awasthi, Chandra, Singh, & Thakur, 2010; Ghoshal, Lahiri, Mandal, Bandyopadhyay, & Majumdar, 2012).

5. Gratitude Questionnaire (GQ)

(McCullough et al., 2002)

The questionnaire is used to assess proneness to feel and experience gratitude in one’s life. It consists of 6 items. The responses are given using a 7 point scale that ranges from 1- strongly disagree to 7- strongly agree. For scoring, the scores for items
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are summed up. Two items (3 and 6) are reverse scored. The range of scores is from 6 to 42. Evidence has indicated promising psychometric properties of GQ-6 with children and adolescents (Froh, Emmons, Huebner, Fan, Bono, & Watkins, 2011). It has high internal consistency and also correlates well with theoretical concept of affective, prosocial and spiritual constructs (McCullough et al., 2002).

The scale has been used with adolescents in Western and Indian settings (Tripathi, 2008; Yadav, 2010; Froh et al., 2011; Kirmani, 2015; Sapmaz, 2015; Sood et al., 2016).

6. Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI)

(Enright et al., 2004)

The inventory is used to assess interpersonal forgiveness. It assesses affective, cognitive and behavioural dimensions of forgiveness. It starts with a description related to the offence where each participant was asked to think of the most recent experience of someone hurting them deeply and unfairly. The participant is required to rate the degree of hurt on a 1(no hurt) to 5(a great deal of hurt) scale. Next, the participant is asked who hurt them (friend, spouse, employer and so forth). Other questions are: Is the person living? How long ago was the offense (in days, weeks, months or years)? The participant is then asked to briefly describe the offense followed by questions in the inventory. The inventory consists of 60 items. The items are equally divided among three subscales i.e. 20 items each assessing affective, cognitive and behavioral dimensions of forgiveness. Subscales measuring affective, cognitive and behavioral dimensions are further divided into two internal subscales consisting 10 positive items and 10 negative items, i.e. positive affect forgiveness, negative affect forgiveness, positive cognition forgiveness, negative cognition forgiveness, positive behavioral forgiveness and negative behavioral forgiveness. Negative items are reverse scored. The 60 items correlated with each other above .65 with its subscale score and below .17 with social desirability. It is a Likert-type 6-point response scale ranging from 1-strongly disagree to 6- strongly agree. High scores indicates more forgiveness. 5 additional items are used to assess ‘pseudo-forgiveness’. A score of 20 and above indicates ‘pseudo-forgiveness’. 1 item also assesses the respondent’s self-report forgiveness. The participants displaying ‘pseudo-forgiveness’ were eliminated from the
data. Cronbach alpha coefficients of the scale are typically higher than .95 (Enright et al., 2004; Subkoviak et al., 1995). Temporal stability ranges from .67 to .91 (Subkoviak et al., 1995). Cronbach alphas for the subscales are .91, .91, and .89, respectively (McLernon, Cairns, Hewstone, & Smith, 2004).

The inventory is used for young adolescents, young adults, and adults (Coyle & Enright, 1997; Maltby et al., 2005; Subkoviak, et al., 1995; Tripathi, 2008).

7. Life Orientation Test-Revised (LOT-R) (Scheier et al., 1994)

The revised scale is known as Life Orientation Test-Revised (LOT-R). It is used to assess optimism. The scale has 10 items with 4 filler items. The filler items are not to be scored. The remaining 6 items are to be scored out of which 3 are positively worded and the other 3 are negatively worded items. The negatively worded items (3, 7 & 9) are to be reverse scored. The respondents have to indicate their responses using a Likert-type rating scale ranging from 4- strongly agree to 0- strongly disagree response items. The scale has good internal reliability (Cronbach alpha .82) and test-retest reliability of .79. The scale is reported to have good internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha .78) and a good test-retest reliability of .68 (over 4 months), .60 (over 12 months) and over 28 months, it is .79 (Scheier et al. 1994). Life orientation test shows adequate predictive validity and discriminant validity (Scheier et al. 1994). The scale has been used in India with various age groups by many researchers (Mohan et al., 2006; Sehgal, 2003; Salariya, 2006; Tripathi, 2008; Yadav, 2010; Moksnes et al., 2014; Praveen et al., 2016).

8. Child and Adolescent Mindfulness Measure (CAMM) (Greco et al., 2011)

It is a short 10 item measure which is used to assess present-moment awareness and non-judgmental, non-avoidant responses to thoughts and feelings in children and adolescents (Greco et al., 2011). The responses are given using a 5 point scale where 0- never true, 1- rarely true, 2- sometimes true, 3- often true, 4- always true. The scale has promising psychometric properties and has been found to be a developmentally appropriate measure. The scale has been cross-validated and has been developed by using multi-method statistical approach. Findings of another study suggested that the
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measure has good internal consistency ($\alpha = .81$) and test-retest reliability (Cunha, Galhardo, & Pinto-Gouveia, 2012). It has good construct and incremental validity (Greco et al., 2011). All the scores of the measure are reverse scored, except item number 2. Total scores on the measure were computed by summing up the responses.

The scale has been used with adolescents in Western (DeBruin, Zijlstra, Weijer-Bergsma, & Bogels, 2011; Kuby, Mclean, & Allen, 2015) and Indian settings (Sharma, Sinha, & Sayeed, 2017).

9. Self-Esteem scale (SES)

(Rosenberg, 1965)

It is a brief 10-item scale. It measures global self-worth by measuring both positive and negative feelings about the self. The responses are given on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 5- strongly agree to 1- strongly disagree. Some of the items are reverse scored. The scores are summed up for all the items to obtain a total score. The scale has good psychometric properties (Rosenberg, 1965; Bagley, Bolitho, & Betrand, 2007).

The scale has been used in Indian settings by many researchers (Joshi & Srivastava, 2009; Sharma & Agrawala, 2015).

10. Parental Bonding Instrument (PBI)

(Parker et al., 1979)

The instrument measures parenting styles as perceived by the child or parent-child relationship. It consists of 25 items i.e. 12 items for ‘care’ dimension and 13 items for ‘overprotection’ or ‘control’ dimension. It has a separate Mother form and Father form. Both forms are to be completed by the respondent. It is retrospective in nature that the respondent has to complete it by remembering their parental attitude towards them during their first 16 years on a Likert-type rating scale. Items measuring care dimension and overprotection dimension are to be scored separately. Some of the items in the scale are reverse scored. The scale demonstrates high internal consistency with split half reliability coefficients of .88 for care and .74 for over protection (Parker et al. 1979).
The scale has been used with adolescent sample in Western (Rigby et al., 2007; Ngai, 2015) and Indian settings (Yadav, 2010; Jayalakshmi et al., 2014).

11. **Perceived Stress Scale (PSS)**
   (Cohen et al., 1983)

   The scale has been used to measure the degree of perceiving aspects of one’s life as uncontrollable, unpredictable, and overloading (Cohen et al., 1983). It is a 10 item scale. The responses are given using a 5 point Likert type scale where 0- refers to Never, 1- refers to Almost Never, 2- refers to Sometimes, 3- refers to Fairly Often and 4- refers to Very Often. The scores range from 0 to 40. Overall, it is a psychometrically sound global measure. It demonstrates good internal reliability i.e. Cronbach’s α values range from 0.84 to 0.86. Further research has also supported internal reliability of the scale (Cohen & Janicki-Deverts, 2012). The scale can be administered to high school students as well as adults. The scoring is done by summing up the scores. Item numbers (4, 5, 7 & 8) are reverse scored. Others are directly scored.

   In India, the scale has been used by Mohan, Sehgal, and Tripathi (2010), Watode, Kishore, & Kohli (2015), Singh (2016).

12. **Difficulties in Emotional Regulation Scale (DERS)**
   (Gratz et al., 2004)

   The scale is used to measure emotional dysregulation. The scale measures six facets viz. Non-acceptance of emotional responses, Goal difficulties, Impulse control difficulties, Awareness difficulties, strategies difficulties, and clarity difficulties. It is a 36 item scale. The response items are 1- Almost never, 2- Sometimes, 3- About half the time, 4- Most of the time and 5- Almost always. The scale provides a total score as well as separate scores for six facets. Some items are reverse scored. Others are directly scored. The scale has promising psychometric properties. All the subscales are moderately to strongly correlated, indicating good internal consistency i.e. Cronbach’s α values ranging from 0.80 to 0.89 and α = 0.93 for the total score. The scale has been translated and validated across a number of countries like France, Portugal, Mexico, Netherlands, Argentina, United States, Spain, Australia, Hungary, Turkey, Italy, in both clinical and non-clinical samples (Gratz et al., 2004).
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The scale can be used with adolescents (Weinberg & Klonsky, 2009; Neumann et al., 2010). It has been used with non-clinical population (Medrano & Trogolo, 2016). The scale has been used in Indian settings (Koul & Shakher, 2014; Kharsati & Bhol, 2016).

13. The Aggression Questionnaire (AGG)
(Buss et al., 1992)

The questionnaire is used to assess aggression. It consists of 29 items. It has 4 subscales measuring Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger and Hostility. The responses are given using a 5-point Likert type scale where 1- refers to extremely uncharacteristic of the individual, 2- refers to somewhat uncharacteristic of the individual, 3- refers to neither uncharacteristic not uncharacteristic of the individual, 4- refers to somewhat characteristic of the individual, 5- refers to extremely characteristic of the individual. The scores for the subscales and a total score is computed by summing up. Total score is the sum of the scores of the subscales. Two items in the scale with the asterisk are reverse scored. The test-retest reliability ranges from 0.72 to 0.80 for the total scale score as well for each subscale with physical aggression at 0.85, verbal aggression at 0.72, anger at 0.83, hostility at 0.77 (Buss et al., 1992; Buss & Warren, 2000). The questionnaire demonstrates good psychometric properties with adolescent sample (Reyna, Lello, Sanchez, & Brussino, 2011).

In India, the scale has been used by Shaheen et al. (2014), Sharma et al. (2014), Singh (2016).

PROCEDURE

Keeping in view the objectives and ethical considerations, following procedure was executed by the researcher:

Informed consent was obtained from the subjects before they were enrolled in the study. All the interested subjects were administered self-reports measures in a booklet form in a group setting and were requested to respond as honestly as possible according to given instructions. They were assured that the information and the results would be kept strictly confidential and used for research purpose only. The testing schedule was started by asking the subjects to fill in the general information form and
then proceed to rest of the tests. The testing sessions were conducted personally in 3-4 sittings. Proper standardized instructions were given to the subjects as specified in the manuals. After the completion, the booklet was collected by the researcher in person.

Exclusion Criteria:

- Subjects with single parent were excluded.
- Subjects high on pseudo forgiveness were excluded from the study.

Ethical considerations:

Informed consent was taken from the subjects before they were enrolled in the study. Anonymity and confidentiality of the responses were ensured. No risks or harms were involved in the study.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE MEASURES:

1. The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)  
   (Diener et al., 1985)

   Following instructions were given:

   “Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1-7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number in the line preceding that item. Please be open and honest in your responding. There are 7 response options: (1) ‘Strongly Disagree’ (2) ‘Disagree’ (3) ‘Slightly Disagree’ (4) ‘neither Agree nor Disagree’ (5) ‘Slightly Agree’ (6) ‘Agree’ (7) ‘Strongly Agree’.

2. Positive Affect and Negative Affect Scale (PANAS)  
   (Watson et al., 1988)

   Following instructions were given:

   “This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then list the number from the scale below next to each word. Indicate to what extent you feel this way right now, that is, at the present moment OR indicate the extent you have felt this way over the past week (circle the instructions you followed when taking this measure)”.
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3. Psychological Well-being Scale (PWB)
   (Ryff et al., 1995)
   Following instructions were given:
   “The following set of questions deals with how you feel about yourself and your life. Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers. The responses are to be given using a six-point format: strongly disagree (1), moderately disagree (2), slightly disagree (3), slightly agree (4), moderately agree (5), strongly agree (6)”.

4. World Health Organization Quality of Life-BREF (WHOQOL-BREF)
   (WHOQOL GROUP, 1998).
   Following instructions were given:
   “This assessment asks how you feel about your quality of life, health, or other areas of your life. Please answer all the questions. If you are unsure about which response to give to a question, please choose the one that appears most appropriate. This can often be your first response. Please keep in mind your standards, hopes, pleasures and concerns. We ask that you think about your life in the last two weeks. For example, thinking about the last two weeks, a question might ask”.

5. Gratitude Questionnaire (GQ)
   (McCullough et al., 2002)
   Following instructions were given:
   “Using the scale below as a guide, write a number beside each statement to indicate how much you agree with it. You have to choose one response option. The responses are given using a 7 point scale that ranges from 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=slightly disagree, 4=neutral, 5=slightly agree, 6=agree, 7=strongly agree”.

6. Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI)
   (Enright et al., 2004)
   Following instructions were given:
   Instructions for this Inventory consisted of the following parts:
   “We are sometimes hurt by people, whether family, friendship, school, work or other situations. We ask you now to think of the most recent experience of someone
hurting you unfairly and deeply. For a few moments, visualize in your mind the events of that interaction. Try to see the person and try to experience what happened”.

“Now, please answer a series of questions about your current attitude this person. We do not want your rating of past attitudes, but your ratings of attitudes right now. All responses are confidential so please answer honestly”.

**Instructions for the Affect subscale:**

“This set of items deals with your current feelings or emotions right now towards the person. Try to assess your actual feeling for the person on each item. For each item please check the appropriate number matching your level of agreement that best describes your current feeling. Please do not skip any item”.

**Instructions for the Behavior subscale:**

“This set of items deals with your current behavior towards the person. Consider how you do act or would act towards the person in answering the questions. For each item please check the appropriate number matching your level of agreement that best describes your current behavior or probable behavior. Please do not skip any item”.

**Instructions for the Cognition subscale:**

“This set of items deals with how you currently think about the person. Think about the kinds of thoughts that occupy your mind right now regarding this particular person. For each item please check the appropriate number matching your level of agreement that best describes your current thinking. Please do not skip any item”.

7. **Child and Adolescent Mindfulness Measure (CAMM)**

(Greco et al., 2011)

**Following instructions were given:**

“We want to know more about what you think, how you feel, and what you do. Read each sentence. Then, circle the number that tells how often each sentence is true for you. The responses are given using a 5 point scale where (0) refers to ‘never true’, (1) refers to ‘rarely true’, (2) refers to ‘sometimes true’, (3) refers to ‘often true’, (4) refers to ‘always true’.”
8. **Life orientation Test-Revised (LOT-R)**

   (Scheier et al., 1994)

   **Following instructions were given:**

   “Please answer the following questions about yourself by indicating the extent of your agreement using the scale: (4) Strongly agree, (3) Agree, (2) Neutral, (1) Disagree and (0) Strongly Disagree. Be as honest as you can throughout and try not to let your responses to one question influence your response to other questions. There are no right or wrong responses”.

9. **Self-Esteem Scale (SES)**

   (Rosenberg, 1965)

   **Following instructions were given:**

   “Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each statement”.

10. **Parental bonding Instrument (PBI)**

    (Parker et al., 1979)

    **Following instructions were given:**

    **For Mother Form:**

    “This questionnaire lists various attitudes and behaviors of parents. As you remember your MOTHER in your first 16 years would you place a tick in the most appropriate box next to each question.”

    **For Father Form:**

    “This questionnaire lists various attitudes and behaviors of parents. As you remember your FATHER in your first 16 years would you place a tick in the most appropriate box next to each question.”

11. **Perceived Stress Scale (PSS)**

    (Cohen et al., 1983)

    **Following instructions were given:**

    “The questions in this scale ask you about your feelings and thoughts during the last month. In each case, you will be asked to indicate by circling how often you felt or
thought a certain way. The responses are to be given using a 5 point scale where (0) refers to ‘Never’, (1) refers to ‘Almost Never’, (2) refers to ‘Sometimes’, (3) refers to ‘Fairly Often’ and (4) refers to ‘Very Often’.

12. Difficulties with Emotion Regulation (DERS)

(Gratz et al., 2004)

Following instructions were given:

“Please indicate how often the following statements apply to you by writing the appropriate number from the scale below on the line beside each item. The response items are 1 (Almost never, 0-10%), 2 (Sometimes, 11-35%), 3 (About half the time, 36-55%), 4 (Most of the time, 66-90%) and 5 (Almost always 90-100%).”

13. The Aggression Questionnaire (AGG)

(Buss et al., 1992)

Following instructions were given:

“Using the 5 point scale shown below, indicate how uncharacteristic or characteristic each of the following statements is in describing you. Place your rating in the box to the right of the statement. The responses are given using a 5-point rating scale where (1) refers to ‘extremely uncharacteristic of the individual’, (2) refers to ‘somewhat uncharacteristic of the individual’, (3) refers to ‘neither uncharacteristic not uncharacteristic of the individual’, (4) refers to ‘somewhat characteristic of the individual’, (5) refers to ‘extremely characteristic of the individual’.”

SCORING AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Scoring for all the given tests was done as per the scoring instructions given in the manuals. The raw scores were tabulated and subjected to various statistical analyses by using Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) Package. Keeping in view the objectives of the study, statistical analysis were applied i.e. Means and Standard Deviations, Kurtosis and Skewness, t-ratios, Correlation Analysis and Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis. Kurtosis and Skewness are tests of normality and were used to check the normality of the data. t-ratios were taken out to see the significant difference between the groups. Correlation analysis was carried out to test the
relationships between two or more variables. Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis was carried out to delineate the significant predictors for the criterion variables.

A comprehensive methodology relies on the use of standardized measurement tools, with uniform instructions to be given to all the subjects. Further, data collection and scoring helps us to get quantitative account of study variables.

The raw scores on study variables, when subjected to statistical analyses reveals meaningful results and inferences which can further be understood and utilized, with reference to past and ongoing trends in research.

The index of generalizability of results, banks heavily on an effective and clearly executed methodology.

The following chapter will highlight the results of the present study in terms of correlates and predictors of subjective well-being, psychological well-being and quality of life among adolescents. Significant gender differences will also be reported.