METHOD

The primary aim of the present investigation was to study the relationship between parents and their off-springs on Well Being measures viz. Psychological Well Being and Subjective Well Being, Gratitude scores, Oxford Happiness Inventory, Stress Symptoms, Psychoticism, Neuroticism, Extraversion, Social Desirability, Measures of Mental Health viz. Being Comfortable with Self, Being Comfortable with Others and Perceived Ability to Meet Life Demands. In addition they were also related on Optimism, types of Coping viz. Task Focused Coping, Emotion Focused Coping and Avoidance Focused Coping, Anger Experienced i.e. State Anger and Trait Anger, and Anger Expression styles viz. Anger In, Anger Out and Anger Control, dimensions of Forgiveness namely Forgiveness of Self, Forgiveness of Others and Forgiveness of Situations, Total Forgiveness score, dimensions of Hope viz. Pathways and Agency, Total Hope score, Perceived Health Status and Perceived Happiness Status. This analysis was conducted across four possible Parent-Child Gender dyads (which were Father-Son, Mother-Son, Father-Daughter and Mother-Daughter) and not by clubbing parents and adolescents in one group.

Well Being measures viz. Psychological Well Being and Subjective Well Being and Gratitude score were related to Eysenckian dimensions of Personality, measures of Happiness, Optimism, Coping, Stress, Anger, Forgiveness, Mental Health, Hope and dimensions of Perceived Health Status.

In addition, gender differences in Well Being, Gratitude score and its correlates were also investigated.

For measuring Psychological Well Being, the Psychological Well Being test devised by Ryff and Keyes (1995) was used. It measures six dimensions viz. Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Purpose in Life and Self Acceptance.
Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) developed by Watson et al. (1988) was used to measure Positive Affect and Negative Affect. Satisfaction with Life was measured using Satisfaction with Life scale developed by Diener et al. (1985). The two totals yielded Subject Well Being score.

Gratitude Questionnaire devised by McCullough et al. (2002), was used to assess the grateful disposition.

To measure Stress, the Stress Symptoms Rating Scale developed by Heilbrun and Pepe (1985) was used. In addition to this, the Life Event Stress Scale by Albuquerque et al. (1990) was used to measure stress among adolescents.

For measuring Personality, Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire – Revised (EPQ-R) devised by Eysenck et al. (1985) was used. It measures four dimensions of Personality viz. Psychoticism, Neuroticism, Extraversion and Social Desirability. To measure Happiness, Oxford Happiness Inventory devised by Argyle et al. (1989) was used. Optimism was measured using Life Orientation Test by Scheier and Carver (1985).

The Coping Styles Inventory by Carver et al. (1989) was used to measure three types of Coping viz. Task Focused Coping, Emotion Focused Coping and Avoidance Focused Coping. The Spielberger State – Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI) devised by Spielberger (1988) was used to measure State Anger, Trait Anger and Total Anger Expressed.

For measuring Forgiveness, Heartland Forgiveness Scale devised by Thompson et al. (2003) was used to measure dimensions of Trait Forgiveness viz. Forgiveness of Self, Forgiveness of Other and Forgiveness of Situations. In addition to this, the test also yielded Total Forgiveness Score. Mental Health was measured using WHO Measure of Mental Health adopted for use in India by Wig (1999) was used which has three dimensions viz. Being Comfortable with Self, Being Comfortable with Others and Perceived Ability to Meet Life Demands. All the three dimensions totaled to give Total Mental Health sore.
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Hope was measured using Adult Trait Hope Scale, developed by Snyder et al. (1991) which yielded scores on two dimensions viz. Pathways and Agency. The test also gave Total Hope score. Adolescents Perceived Parental Bonding was measured using Parental Bonding Instrument by Parker et al. (1979). It has two dimensions viz Perceived Parental Care and Perceived Parental Overprotection.

SAMPLE

The sample consisted of 200 adolescents (100 male and 100 females). Further the parents of the adolescents were also included in the sample, thereby making the total sample to be 600. The age-range of the adolescents was 16-18 years and they were selected randomly from Public and Model schools of the tri-city of Chandigarh, Panchkula and Mohali. All the subjects were explained about the nature and aim of the investigation and were requested to volunteer as respondents. Their informed consent was obtained before they were enlisted as subjects.

TESTS AND TOOLS

The following standardized instruments were used for the present investigation:

1. Eysenck’s Personality Questionnaire (Eysenck et al., 1985)
2. Oxford Happiness Inventory (Argyle et al., 1989)
3. Life Orientation Scale (Scheier and Carver, 1985)
4. Coping Styles Inventory (Carver et al., 1989).
5. Gratitude Questionnaire (McCullough et al., 2002)
6. Stress Symptom Scale (Heilbrun and Pepe, 1985)
7. The State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (Spielberger, 1988)
8. Heartland Forgiveness Scale (Thompson et al., 2003)
9. WHO Measure of Mental Health (Wig, 1999)
10. Adult Trait Hope Scale (Snyder et al., 1991)
11. Parental Bonding Instrument (Parker et al., 1979)
12. Life Events stress Scale (Albuquerque et al., 1990)
13. Psychological Well Being Scale (Ryff and Keyes, 1989)
14. Subjective Well Being was assessed using two scales:
   a) Satisfaction With Life (Diener et al., 1985)
   b) Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) (Watson et al., 1988)

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE TESTS
1. Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-Revised (Eysenck et al., 1985)
   The test of personality Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-Revised has been developed by Eysenck et al. (1985). The EPQ-R was originally constructed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) to measure varied dimensions of personality viz. Extraversion (E), Neuroticism (N) and Psychoticism (P). It also consists of Lie (social Desirability) Scale. The scale was revised by Eysenck et al. (1985) to improve psychometric weakness of the Psychoticism scale. EPQ-R comprises of 90 items measuring afore mentioned dimensions of personality. P-scale (25 items), E-Scale (21 items), N-Scale (23 items) and L-scale (21 items).
   Eysenck and Eysenck (1968) proposed that extraversion refers to the outgoing, uninhibited, impulsive and social inclinations of person. The typical extravert is sociable, likes parties, has many friends, needs to have people to talk to and does not like reading or studying by himself.
   The second major personality dimension deduced by Eysenck (1947) was neuroticism/stability. Neuroticism refers to a general, emotional over responsiveness, emotional liability and liability to neurotic breakdown under stress. According to Eysenck and Eysenck (1968), neuroticism as contrasted to emotional stability is very much similar to anxiety.
   The third dimension of Personality proposed by Eysenck is Psychoticism. Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) and Howarth (1986) reported that a high scorer on Psychoticism possesses the following traits: Impulsiveness, lack of cooperation, oral pessimism, rigidity, lower super
ego controls, low social sensitivity, low persistence, lack of anxiety, egocentric, impersonal, lack of feelings of inferiority, unempathic, creative, aggressive, cold, antisocial and tough minded.

The lie (social desirability) scale (L) was first incorporated in the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) to measure a tendency on the part of the subjects to fake good responses. It is being considered as a tendency to respond in a socially desirable way; it is variously described as a desire to conform to social norms (Edwards, 1954); nice personality (Skinner et al., 1970); ideal self and ideal responses (Choudhary, 1972).

The alpha reliabilities for the revised scale have been found to be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. Oxford Happiness Inventory
   (Argyle et al., 1989)

   This is 29 item questionnaire, based on a seven point rating scale from (7) agree to (1) disagree. It has a test-retest reliability (over four months) of 0.78 and a Cronbach coefficient of between 0.64 to 0.87. According to Furnham and Brewin (1990), some of the items are almost identical to the Beck Depression Inventory but reversed on content and it has sub-categories of personal achievement, enjoyment and fun in life,
and vigor and good health. It has reported validity of 0.43 with friends’ ratings of happiness on a 10-point scale. It has been found to correlate with Positive Affect, Life Satisfaction, and Depression with correlation ranging from 0.40 to 0.60. High scores indicate high state happiness.


3. Life Orientation Test (Optimism Scale)
(Scheier and Carver, 1985)

Dispositional Optimism was assessed by the Life Orientation Test. It provides a self report measure of individual differences in global optimism, defined in terms of the favorability of the person’s generalized outcome expectancies. Optimism Scale is intended to reflect a pervasive orientation to the experiences of life. Thus the items do not focus on any particular content domain, nor is there a built in confound between optimism and perceptions of personal efficacy or locus of causality dimensions more generally. The Scale contains 12 items, in which four items are filler items.

They are to be rated on a five-point scale ranging from ‘strongly agree = 4’ to ‘strongly disagree = 0’. The scale has an internal reliability (Cronbach alpha) of 0.76 and a test-retest reliability of 0.79. The test has been successfully used in India by Opara (1999), Mohan et al. (2000), Shourie (2003), Sehgal (2003), Sharma (2005), Salariya (2006), Caur (2006), Kaur (2007), Haobam (2007) and Tripathi (2008) among others.

4. Coping Styles Inventory
(Carver et al. (1989)

Coping styles were assessed using Carver et al.’s (1989) (Shorter version). The inventory measures three broad coping dispositions-task
focused, emotion focused and avoidance coping. Items were conceptually grouped into three scales with 10 items in each scale. Each item was answered on a 4 point rating scale ranging from ‘I usually don’t do this at all’ to ‘I usually do this a lot’. The scores on each of the scales may range from 10 to 40.

Internal consistency of each scale was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha. For task Focused Coping, it was .78, Emotion Focused Coping, it was .76 and for Avoidance Coping, it was .77. Task & Emotion Focused Coping were correlated (r=.46). Neither task nor Emotion Focused Coping were associated with Avoidance coping (r=.16). This scale was used in India by Sehgal (2003), Salariya (2006) and Haobam (2007).

5. Gratitude Questionnaire (GQ6) (McCullough et al., 2002)

Gratitude was assessed using the Gratitude Questionnaire 6 (GQ6; McCullough et al., 2002). This measures trait Gratitude through self-reports of items that measure emotional intensity (e.g. “I feel thankful for what I have received in life”), frequency (e.g. “Long amounts of time can go by before I feel grateful to something or someone”), and density, or the number of events or people that can elicit the emotion (e.g. “I am grateful to a wide variety of people”). Six items (two reverse coded) are rated on a 7-point scale, ranging from Strongly disagree to Strongly agree, which are summed to give a single score between 6 and 42.

It has been successfully used in West by McCullough et al. (2004), Miley and Spinella (2006), Watkins et al. (2006), Andersson et al. (2007) and Tripathi (2008).

6. Stress Symptoms Ratings Scale (Heilbrun and Pepe, 1985)

Heilbrun & Pepe (1985) constructed the Stress Symptoms Rating Scale which is a response-defined measured of stress in construct to the
stimulus – defined measures being used in earlier stress research. The Stress Symptom Rating Scale is an inquiry into the amount of stress experienced without regard to what provoked them. They selected 25 symptoms of stress from a list that Selye (1976) identified as readily detectable by the individual. The subject is required to rate the frequency of each stress symptom (for the previous year) alone on a six-point scale ranging from ‘Not at all’ the ‘More than once per day (i.e. ranging from 0 to 5). The stress score is the summation of scores obtained over all the ratings.

The alpha reliability for the scale has been found to be 0.93 by Heilbrun and Pepe (1986). Evidence for validity has come from differential elevations of stress found in groups, otherwise identified as more stressful. The test has been successfully used in India by Saini (1998), Opara (1999), and Mohan (2000, 2006), Shourie (2003), Sharma (2005), Salariya (2006), Malhotra (2006), Caur (2006), Kaur (2007), Haobam (2007), Bala (2007), Mohan et al. (2007) and Tripathi (2008).

7. The Spielberger’s State Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI) (Spielberger, 1988)

This is a self rating questionnaire. There are 44 questions in a 3 part questionnaire and it requires 15-20 minutes to complete. It assesses self reported feelings (experiences) of anger and its expression. It has 10 items to assess State Anger (how you feel right now). The subject chooses from the response format. (1) Almost never (2) Sometimes (3) Often (4) Almost always.

It also has another 10 questions to measure Trait Anger (how you generally feel) and 4 response options: (1) Almost never (2) Sometimes (3) Often (4) Almost always. The range of possible scores for the 2 sub-scales varies from minimum of 10-40.

The third part has 24 questions measuring three dimensions of Anger Expression viz. Anger Out, Anger In and Anger Control. Anger Out, Anger In and Anger Control sub-scales’ scores were computed by
summing the column of items scores for each scale. The range of possible scores for the 3 subscales varies from a minimum of 8 to maximum of 32. A total of Anger Expression Score was also obtained by the formula:

\[
\text{Anger Expression} = \text{Anger Out + Anger In} - \text{Anger Control} + 16 \text{ (a constant of } 16 \text{ is added).}
\]


8. Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS)
(Thompson et al., 2003)

Heartland Forgiveness Scale is an 18-item self-report measure of Dispositional Forgiveness. It consists of three subscales, with six items in each scale, measuring Forgiveness of Self, Forgiveness of Others, and Forgiveness of Situations. Items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale from Almost always false of me to Almost always true of me. Scores are summated to produce scores for Forgiveness of Self, Forgiveness of Others, and Forgiveness of Situations respectively.

Satisfactory internal consistency reliabilities have been reported with alphas between 0.84 and 0.87 for the HFS Scale and between 0.71 and 0.83 for the subscales. Test-retest reliabilities were reported to be 0.83 at three weeks interval and 0.77 at three months interval. Concurrent validity has been demonstrated with three other scales measuring Forgiveness viz Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivation Inventory (McCullough et al., 1998), Enright Forgiveness Inventory (Enright and Human Development Study Group, 1994), Interpersonal Relationship Resolution Scale (Hargrave and Sells, 1997) and other related constructs (Thompson et al. 2003).

9. The WHO Measure of Mental Health  
(Wig, 1999)

This scale has 16 items and is designed to measure mental health. It has three categories: Being Comfortable with self, Being Comfortable with others and Perceived Ability to Meet Life's Demands. The subject obtains 3 scores on Mental Health dimensions and a summated score on total Mental Health. The response format has two categories, Yes or No. A score of one is given if subject ticks ‘Yes’, Zero if he ticks ‘No’. The test has adequate reliability & validity. This scale was used in India by Sehgal (2003), Shourie (2003), Sharma (2005), Salariya (2006), Malhotra (2006), Caur (2006), Kaur (2007), Bala (2007), Haobam (2007) and Tripathi (2008).

10. Adult Trait Hope Scale  
(Snyder et al., 1991)

Adult Trait Hope scale is a self-report, 12-item inventory designed to tap dispositional hope in adults, aged 15 and older. It has two subscales: (1) Agency (goal-directed determination), and (2) Pathways (planning of ways to meet goals). The factor structure identifies the agency and pathways components and, as predicted, these two components are positively correlated.

This scale has 12 items; 4 items were distracters and were not used for scoring. The Agency subscale score was the sum of 4 items; the Pathways subscale score was the sum of 4 items. Hope is the sum of the Pathways and Agency items. Respondents indicate how well each of the 8 Likert-type items describes them, with response possibilities ranging from Definitely false to Definitely true. Score on this scale can range from 8 to 32, with higher scores reflecting higher levels of Hope. Regarding the psychometric properties of the Hope scale, Cronbach alphas for the total Hope score have ranged from .74 to .84. Test-retest reliability has been reported to be 0.80 or higher over time periods exceeding 10 weeks (Snyder et al., 1991). It has been successfully used in West by

11. Parental Bonding Instrument
   (Parker et al., 1979)

The PBI is a 25 item self-report measure of respondents’ recollections of parents’ attitudes and behaviors during the first 16 years. Respondents are asked to answer the questions based on how they remember their parent, using a Likert type scale ranging from 0 (‘very like’) to 4 (‘very unlike’). The PBI was developed using factor analysis from self-reports of experiences with parents in childhood. The scale consists of two factors: Maternal/Paternal Care (i.e. care vs. indifference and rejection) and Maternal/Paternal Overprotection (i.e. overprotection vs. encouragement of autonomy). Higher scores on the two scales indicate higher perceived paternal care and overprotection, respectively. The 12 items of Maternal/Paternal Care factor allow a maximum score of 36 and the 13 item of the overprotection factor permit a maximum score of 39. The two factor scores are negatively correlated (r = -0.24) suggesting that the two dimensions are not independent (Parker et al., 1979), i.e. ‘overprotection’ is associated with lack of ‘care’.

Adequate internal consistency has been demonstrated in numerous studies using split-half technique. The scale also has high test-retest reliability over a 3-week period of both care scale (r = 0.76; p<.001) and overprotection scale (r = 0.63; p<.001) (Parker et al., 1979; Parker, 1989). The scales’ interrater reliability and concurrent, convergent, criterion and predictive validity are also established (Parker, 1989). The test has recently been used by Kaur (2007) and Haobam (2007).

12. Life Event Stress Scale (LES)
   (Albuquerque et al., 1990)

This measure is one of the best known widely used life stress measure for adolescent age group, originally developed by
Hiesel et al. (1973) and adapted for use in India by Albuquerque et al., (1990). This measure is similar to Holmes and Rahe (1967) measure in terms of its constructions format and method of scoring. This measure consists of a simple listings of events judged to be frequently experienced by adolescents. It has 42 events. In completing the measure, subjects are requested to indicate which of the events listed have been experienced during the recent past (usually last one year) and the number of times the event has been experienced. As in adult version, life stress scores are derived by summing values termed life change units that are associated with various events that have been experienced.

Validity data was provided by a large member of studies investigating relationship between life change (as assessed by this measure) and indices of health & adjustment. (Greene et al., 1985, Watson, 1983, Brand et al., 1986). Authors report adequate reliability. This scale was used in India by Kaur (2002), Sehgal (2003), Mohan et al. (2006) and Haobam (2007).

13. Psychological Well Being Scale
(Ryff and Keyes, 1995)

Psychological Well Being was measured by using Ryff and Keyes (1995) scale of Psychological Well Being with six dimensions: Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Purpose In Life, Self Acceptance, Personal Relations With Others and Personal Growth. Each subscale of this scale has three items measuring each of these six dimensions. Some items are worded positively and some are worded negatively. Individuals rate themselves on a 6 point Likert-type scale with response pattern ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree”.

Negative items are reversed so that a high score indicates that the person has a positive perception of their own Psychological well being. Thus the scores on each subscale can range from 3-18. Scale inter-correlations are modest ranging from .13 to .46. Estimates of internal consistency coefficients are low to modest, ranging from .33 to .56.
It has been successfully used in West by Cooper et al. (1995), Schmutte and Ryff (1997), Rye et al. (2001), Frazier et al. (2005), Lawler and Peferi (2006), Mohan et al. (2007) and Tripathi (2008).

14. Satisfaction with Life Scale
   (Diener et al., 1985)

   It is a five-item scale that is designed around the idea that one must ask subjects for an overall judgement of their life in order to measure the concept of life satisfaction. Individuals indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement on a 7-point Likert scale with 7 = strongly agree to 1 = strongly disagree scores range from 5 to 35. Diener et al. (1985) reported a 2-months test-retest correlation coefficient of 0.82 and an alpha coefficient of 0.82 and an alpha coefficient of .87 for undergraduates. Diener et al. (1985) also reported it to be a valid test. This scale was used in India by Maini (2001), Kaur (2002), Sehgal (2003), Mohan (2006), Caur (2006), Bala (2007), Haobam (2007) and Tripathi (2008).

15. Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS)
   (Watson et al., 1988)

   Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) was developed by Watson et al. (1988). While developing the scale the greatest concern of the authors was to select terms that were relatively pure markers of either Positive Affect (PA) or Negative Affect (NA). Finally 20 items scale, which were internally consistent and had excellent convergent and discriminant validity with lengthier measures of the underlying mood factors were developed. They also demonstrate appropriate stability over a two-month time period. The alpha reliabilities range from 0.86 to 0.90 for PA and from 0.84 to 0.87 for NA. The scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Each word is rated on a 5-point rating scale, according to the extent to which the subject felt that way during the past few weeks. The scale ranges from 1- ‘very slightly or not at all’ to 5- ‘extremely’.
The scales correlates at predicted levels with measures of related constructs and shows the same pattern of relations with external variables that have been seen in other studies. E.g., the PA scale (but not the NA scale) is related to social activity and show significant diurnal variation, whereas the NA scale (but not the PA scale) is significantly related to perceived stress and shows no circadian pattern (Watson et al., 1988). Thus the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule is a reliable and efficient mean for measuring these two important dimensions of mood. This scale was used in India by Maini (2001), Mohan (2005), Salariya (2006), Bala (2007), Haobam (2007) and Tripathi (2008).

PROCEDURE

All the respondents for the testing sessions were contacted personally and requested to volunteer for the testing schedule. These respondents were then given the questionnaires in a booklet form and were requested to respond to them truthfully according to the instructions. They were assured that the information they give about themselves and their results would be kept strictly confidential and used for research purpose only.

The testing schedule was started by firstly asking the participants to fill in the general information portion and then proceed to respond the tests one after the other until all tests and all questions have been responded to. The testing schedule was conducted personally in 3-4 sittings. All the respondents were given instructions to each question as specified in the respective manuals, as follows:

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE QUESTIONNAIRES

1. **Eysenck Personality Questionnaire**

   The Eysenck Personality Questionnaire has the following instructions—“Please answer each question by putting a circle around the `Yes` or `No` alternatives following the question. There are no right or wrong answers and no trick questions. Work quickly and do not think too
Method

long about the exact meaning of the question. Please check that you have answered all questions”.

2. Oxford Happiness Inventory

The instructions given were, “Below there are groups of statements about personal happiness. Please read all the four statements in each group and then pick out one statement of each group that best describes the way you have been feeling in the past week, including today. Circle the letter (a, b, c, d) besides the statement you have picked”.

3. Life Orientation Scale

The Life Orientation Scale has the following instructions- “Choose any one of the following alternatives to indicate your degree of agreement with the statements: (5) To a very great extent; (4) To a great extent; (3) To some extent; (2) To a small extent; (1) Almost no extent.”

4. Coping Styles Inventory

Instructions given for Coping Styles Inventory were, “Rate your responses each item along the following 4-point rating scale. (0) Don’t do it at all (1) Rarely do it (2) Often do it (3) Usually do this a lot”.

5. Gratitude Questionnaire

Instructions for the Gratitude Questionnaire were as follows- “Read each item carefully. Using the scale below, please select the number that best describes you and put that number in the blank provided”. 1-Strongly Disagree; 2-Disagree; 3-Slightly disagree; 4- Neither agree not disagree; 5- Slightly agree; 6- Agree and 7-Strongly Agree.

6. Stress Symptoms scale

The following instructions were given for the Stress Symptoms Rating Scale. “Rate the frequency of each item for the previous year along the following scale: (0) Not at all, (1) Less than once per month, (2) Between once per week and once per month, (4) About once per day (3) Between once per day and once per week, (5) More than once per day.
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Indicate your answers by circling a number for each item. Be sure to answer each item. All your responses will be kept strictly confidential.

7. Spielberger State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory

The test consisted of 3 parts. Part 1 measured State Anger, Part 2 measured Trait Anger and Part 3 measured Anger Expression Styles.

Instructions for Part 1

A number of statements that people use to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement and then fill in the circle with the number which indicates, “how you feel right now”. Remember that there is no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement, but give the answer which seems to best describe your present feelings using the following scale: 1- Not at all; 2- Somewhat; 3- Moderately so; 4- Very much so.

Instructions for Part 2

Instructions for Part 2 were the same as Part 1 except the subjects were told to describe how they generally feel using the following scale: 1- For almost never; 2- Sometimes; 3- Often; 4- Almost always.

Instructions for Part 3

“A number of statements are listed below which people use to describe their reactions when they feel angry or furious. Read each statement and other fill in the circle with the number which indicates how often you generally react or behave in the manner described when you are feeling angry or furious. Remember that there is no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement. The response categories are:-1-Almost never; 2-Sometimes; 3-Often; 4-Almost Always.”

8. Heartland Forgiveness Scale

Instructions for the Heartland Forgiveness Scale were as follows- "Next to each of the following items write the number (from the 7 point scale below) that best describes how you typically respond to the type of
negative situation described. There is no right or wrong answers. Please be as open as possible in your answers”.

9. WHO Measure of Mental Health
The following instructions were given, “Kindly tick the response which is true for you by putting a circle or tick mark around the “Yes” or “No” alternatives following the question. Your answer will be kept strictly confidential.”

10. Adult Trait Hope Scale
Instructions for the Adult trait Hope scale were as follows- “Read each item carefully. Using the scale below, please select the number that best describes you and put that number in the blank provided”. 1 - Definitely False; 2 - Mostly False; 3 - Mostly True; 4 - Definitely True.

11. Parental Bonding Instrument
This questionnaire lists various attitudes and behaviors of parents. As you remember your Mother or Father in your first 16 years would you place a tick in the most appropriate column next to each question. The columns are: (1) Very like, (2) Moderately like, (3) Moderately unlike, (4) Very unlike.

12. Life Event Stress Scale
Following instructions were given for the Life Event Stress Scale, “Given below is a set of life events that take place normally during the course of life. Some of these may apply to you also. Please tick the following life events happened to you in last one year and tell their frequency.”

13. Psychological Well Being scale
The subjects were given the following instructions-“Below are the statements that you may agree or disagree with. Using the 1-7 scale below,
indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item”. 1-Strongly disagree; 2-Slightly disagree; 3-Disagree; 4-Slightly agree; 5-Agree; 6- Strongly agree.

14. Satisfaction With Life Scale
The subjects were asked to read each statement and choose from one of seven alternatives. They were instructed-“There are a number of statements written below. Read each statement carefully and choose one of the seven alternatives- 1-Strongly disagree; 2-Disagree; 3-Slightly disagree; 4-Neither Agree nor disagree; 5-Slightly Agree; 6-Agree; 7-Strongly Agree”.

15. Positive and Negative Affect Schedule
The subjects were given the following instructions-“Read each word carefully and rate it on a 5- point scale, according to the extent to which you have felt during the past weeks”. The scale ranges from: Very slightly or not; 2- A little; 3-Moderately; 4-Quite a bit; 5-Extremely.

SCORING AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS
Scoring for all the given tests was done as per the instructions provided in the scoring manuals of the tests. The scores were then subjected to various statistical treatments and analysis. Means, Standard Deviations t-ratios, Correlations, and Regression Analysis were done to assess the data.