CHAPTER III
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

An attempt is made, here, to review the literature on modernity, subjective well-being and self-esteem of college students. The chapter has been divided into six sections, viz.:

Section I: Review of studies related to modernity with reference to demographic variables.

Section II: Review of studies related to subjective well-being with reference to demographic variables.

Section III: Review of studies related to self-esteem with reference to demographic variables.

Section IV: Review of studies related to modernity in relation to subjective well-being.

Section V: Review of studies related to modernity in relation to self-esteem.

Section VI: Review of studies related to subjective well-being in relation to self-esteem.

Section VII: Focus of the study

SECTION - I: Review of Studies Related to Modernity with Reference to Demographic Variables

Inkeles (1973) definition of a modern man includes readiness for new experience and openness to innovation; disposition to form opinions over problems and issues; awareness of diversity of attitudes and opinions around him; orientation to time, acceptance of fixed hours; efficacy, or belief that he can dominate his environment and confidence in one's ability to organize one's life and master its challenges; planning; calculability (or trust); belief in distributive justice, or that reward is proportional to skill; belief in science and education; and respect for the dignity of others. And he states that modernity is nothing but progress of an individual along with his society it enhances overall personality of an individual. Hence individual modernity is influenced by demographic variables like gender, education, socio-economic status, religion and domicile. To study the influence of demographic variables on individual modernity is very important.
Modernization is the process of social transition, which includes not only modernization of social objects but also that of social subjects. The modernization of social objects – which means democratization in politics, industrialization in agriculture, multiplicity in culture and internationalization in education and so on – reflects an overall transformation of social politics, economy, culture, education, and so on. The modernization of social subjects – which means the modernization of people’s thoughts, opinions, attitudes and behavior – reflects the individual modernization or individual modernity. Each complements another, as there is an interaction between them. Owing to the modernization of society, some sections in the traditional personality structure (a set of psychological and behavior styles, such as submission to authority, hardworking, thrifty, conservatism, endurance, fatalism and defensiveness, which were formed in the traditional agriculture society to permit adaptability to the agriculture civilization) cannot meet the needs of such a modern society, so they will be reduced or renewed gradually, while those helpful to modern society will continue developing. Yet, the modernization of society never keeps pace with that of individuals. People from different cultural backgrounds often show differences in the process of modernization. Regarding a nation, individual modernization begins from the people in a certain class and then extends gradually to all social strata. However, the modernization of ordinary people’s attitudes and behavior needs to be accelerated by reform of the social system. After the systems of politics, economy, culture and education are reformed in a certain society, individual modernization will be necessarily accelerated by the outside world.

Individual modernity refers to the modernization of people’s thoughts, viewpoints, attitudes and behavior. With the increasing modernization of international society, scientists have started to make inquiries into the factors responsible for the social transitions of humans since the 1960s. Among the scientists, Inkeles (1985) represents those who probe into the influence of some social factors (such as educational levels, occupations, social mobility, mass media, employment experience) on individual modernity in terms of cross-culture, which represents the social psychology approach to modernity studies in sociology. Since then, psychologists in the West gradually decreased their interest in modernity studies. In contrast, Kuo-shu Yang (1974, 1989), a psychologist in Taiwan, has systematically researched modernity in terms of native psychology for more than 20 years since 1969. Kuo-shu
Yang (1989) plays close attention to the principal psychological components of personality traits and value concepts, which affect an individual’s style of behavior and the psychological mechanism and possible directions of individual behavioral changes in the process of social modernization (Yi-yin Yang, 2001). Their research represents the social psychology approach to modernity studies in psychology. The two approaches of Inkeles and Yang will help us understand, from both the macrocosmic and the microcosmic aspects, the influence of social modernization on human beings, and the evolution of personality traits during the process of modernization. However, while Inkeles focused on the investigation of social attitudes and values, Kuo-shu Yang paid closer attention to the measurement of the psychological components of individual modernity and individual traditionality and formed an operational concept system. There is inevitably a gap between Inkeles’ framework, which was built on the basis of the Western cultural background of 30 years ago, and present-day society, which has greatly changed. Comparatively, Kuo-shu Yang’s theory is more suitable to explain the changes of modern Chinese personality, as it was based on Chinese culture. There has been much research on modernity in China since the 1990s. However, there has been more concern with the modernization of social objects, while individual modernization of social subjects has been ignored. There has also been far more qualitative research than quantitative research on individual modernization. Of the researchers in individual modernity, Dr Kuo-shu Yang has been studying the modernity of the Chinese in Taiwan for more than 20 years and has reached many important conclusions from the results of research that are considered classic studies on modernity in Asia (Yang 1989, 1993, 1995). From 1990, some researchers have carried out a series of quantitative studies on individual modernity of the Chinese on the mainland (Xia, 1998; Cai, 1999, 2000; Xu, 2000). Through a comparative research of undergraduates in east and west China, Xia (1998) discovered that there was no difference in individual modernity, but that students in west China were more traditional than those in east China. Cai (1999; 2000) carried out a series of research on modernity notions of students in Chongqing, Guangzhou and Lanzhou and found that students’ modernity was at the middle level of modernization. Research on the modernity awareness of the young students in Guangdong showed that the students’ cognition about modernization included five aspects, such as politics, economy, technology, environment and education. Xu (2000) carried out a survey among undergraduates in Beijing and Hong Kong, and
found that the personality of the students was transforming from traditionality to modernity. There was no difference between the students in these two cities. All of this research plays a significant role in realizing the contents, characteristics and special features of individual modernity of students from different areas in China. Xing-gui Zhang et al. (2003) conducted study on 300 young students of China was carried out. The results indicated that there was a significant difference in individual modernity between the students from town and those from the countryside, as well as between males and females. There were also differences in individual modernity between each two of the levels of education. The students from town were more modern than those from the countryside (Cai 1999; Inkeles1985; Xing-gui Zhang et al. 2003). The males were more traditional than the females. With the rising educational level, the students’ traditionality will decrease and modernity will increase.

Gender plays a very important role in modernity. A few studies that reveal the importance of gender are reviewed:

In a study conducted by Chengati (1993) reveal that the percentage of ‘modern’ scores is higher in female students (14.07) on total modernity than that of male students (10.74%). A similar trend is also seen on Socio-cultural modernity, political modernity and health modernity dimensions. However, both the sub-groups have the same percentage 11.85% of ‘modern’ scorers on personality modernity dimension. The study indicate that female sub-group has a large number and a higher percentage of ‘modern’ scorers than the male sub-group. Inculcation of traits that are called dispositions of modern man to be slightly more in females.

Another study conducted by Angira (1992) examined the impact of education on the attitudinal modernity. The data collected from a random sample of 100 undergraduate students studying science (25 males and 25 females) and Arts (25 males and 25 females) from Govt. RAZA P.G. College, Rampur (U.P.), were analysed using 2×2 analysis of variance, the independent variable being sex. The analysis of results indicated that sex produced significant effects on attitudinal modernity. The main effect of the independent variable, i.e. Sex of the subjects was observed significant. This obviously shows that sex of the subjects is an attribute in modernization. The modernization was more in male students (M=258.16) than female students.
(M=243.84). This might be explained in terms of role expectations. Different roles are prescribed for males and females in each society (Medinick and Tangri, 1972) and Indian society is no exception to it. Due to differences in roles male and female possess different attitudes to social and political problems. Females tend to follow the norms of society and don’t try to violate them, and therefore, males and females differ in their attitudinal modernity.

Prasad.R and Rai.R (1990) conducted study on a sample of 150 students (75 Males and Females) drawn randomly from the U.G. (Under-Graduate) and PG (Post Graduate) Classes of Siwan and Chapra Distt., of Bihar University, Muzaffarpur with an objective of seeing the effect of sex on modernisation. The result indicated that sex does not affect modernisation. The analysis of modernisation scores on sex and education denote that with rise in educational level there is rise in modernisation scores. On sex criteria modernisation scores do not differ significantly. There is an increasing trend of modernisation scores in each sex with education but neither sex is significantly higher on educational level. This trend of data denotes that both sexes are getting modernized with some what equal pace. They concluded that students of both sexes are being modernized with their educational advancement.

Xing-gui Zhang, et al. (2003), conducted study on adolescent students. It shows that male students are more traditional than female students, and female students are more modern than male students. The prior research on the influence of gender difference on modernity described inconsistent phenomena. For instance, statistics conducted by Inkeles (1985) and Yang and Qu (1974) revealed that males were more modern than females. However, the study conducted by Xu (2000) on the undergraduates of Beijing discovered that male students had higher traditionality. But they also indicated that there was no significant difference in modernity, despite female students having higher sex equality and male students having higher social isolation and self-reliance. According to the survey, the scores of the female students were higher not only in modernity but also in egalitarianism and open-mindedness, optimism and assertiveness and sex equality. Traditional Chinese females have fewer opportunities to be exposed to modern experience, because they receive a more traditional and stricter education and are, therefore, more traditional than males. But things have changed greatly. Modern adolescents are greatly disgusted with traditional culture and
personality, especially females. Gender difference no longer exists regarding levels of exposure to modern experiences. The modern culture pursuing novelty and change has less restriction and prohibition on females. This tendency meets the needs of young intellectual females advocating sex equality and self-liberation. So, females have higher modernity than males. Because of the traditional ideas that men are superior to women, males are inclined to be conservative and satisfied with the present situation, so male students are more traditional than female students.

Level of (study) education is another independent variable which greatly influences modernity.

Many investigations carried out by both western and Indian scholars have distinctly shed light on the phenomenon that education is strongly associated with the extent of modernity. It is reported that children with schooling exposure display significantly greater modernity than similar children without schooling (Holsinger, 1973). Further, it is believed that the level of education is positively related to the amount of modernity (Xing-gui Zhang et al., 2003). The value-orientations, attitudes and behaviour of individuals are likely to be shaped as a result of increasing educational attainments. Thus, higher the levels of education attained by individuals, greater the modernity they display, independent of other alternative modernizing forces.

In another study conducted by Chengati (1993) on college students reveled that the percentage of ‘modern’ scorers on total modernity are higher in the third –year degree sub-group (13.88%) than those in the second year (13.33%) and first –year degree (10%) students. And, the percentage of ‘modern’ scorers in the second-year degree students is more (13.33%) than that of the first-year degree (10%) students on total modernity. A similar trend is also noticed on personality modernity dimension. On this dimension of modernity, the percentage of ‘modern’ scorers of the third-year degree students group is higher (15.55%) than those of the first-year degree (8.33%) and second –Year degree (11.66%) student groups. The percentage of ‘modern’ scorers in second-year degree students are higher (11.66%) than those of the first-year degree (8.33%) students. This clearly indicates that the percentage of ‘modern’ persons is higher in the third-year degree sub-group than those of the second-year degree and first-year degree sub-groups on personality modernity dimension and on total modernity. It clearly indicates that third-year degree students are more modern than the students of other two years. And it appears that the additional year of
education has led to an improved rationality, work ethics, and internal locus of control, higher aspiration and greater openness to change.

A study conducted by Armer and Youtz (1971) reveal that, educational level with “high” and “low”, individual modernity for respondents result indicates a strong positive association between the two variables at statistically significant level. More than four out of five (83.8 percent) of the respondents with some secondary education score in the upper half of the modernization scale, while less than two of five (37.8 percent) of those with no formal education do so. The difference in percentages is stronger between respondents with primary and those with no education. And hence reported a positive association between education and individual modernity.

Prasad and Rai (1990) conducted study on a sample of 150 students (75 Males and Females) drawn randomly from the U.G. (Under-graduate) and PG (Post graduate) Classes of Siwan and Chapra Distt., of Bihar University, Muzaffarpur with an objective of seeing the effect of educational level on modernisation. The analysis of modernisation scores on education criteria denote that with rise in educational level there is rise in modernisation scores. The modernisation scores of Post graduate students are significantly higher than Intermediate students ($t$-ratio= 3.53; $p>0.1$) and Graduate students ($t$-ratio= 2.14; $p>0.5 .01$). The mean modernisation of Intermediate, Graduate and Post graduate students are 169.63, 173.05 and 178.74 respectively. Higher modernisation scores have been observed in Post-graduate students. There is an increasing trend of modernisation scores in each sex with education but neither sex is significantly higher on educational level. This trend of data denotes that both sexes are getting modernized with some what equal pace. The students of both sexes are being modernized with their educational advancement. With increase in education there is increase in modernisation.

Sinha (1973) has considered education as one of the important variables of modernity. Lauterbach (1974) has pointed out motivational and background variations in the process of modernity. They concluded that modernity and traditionalism are the opposite poles of same dimension. There are researches related to different factors of modernisation (Rai, 1988; Sudhir and Lalrinkimi, 1986).
Streams of education is another variable which influences modernity immensely. It has been established that education exerts its influence on individuals in making them more modern. However, researchers have investigated the effects of curricular content on Socio-political and soci-psychological orientations of the students. The content of education i.e., the faculty of study is believed to be an important factor in influencing student modernity. Certain types of courses are more favourable in acquisition of modern qualities than others. Sack (1973) has observed that students (in Tunisia) obtained higher mean scores on modernity in courses like Economics and Business Administration than Scientific and Technical ones. This indicates that student modernity is influenced by courses (faculties) of study. A study by Chengati (1993) revealed that the percentage of ‘modern’ scores on total modernity is higher in commerce faculty (20%) than in arts (9.44%) and science (7.77%) faculties of study. The percentage of ‘modern’ scores is high on total modernity in arts faculty (9.44%) than in the faculty of science (7.77%). Thus there is higher percentage of ‘modern’ students in the commerce faculty on total modernity. A similar pattern is seen on all the four dimensions of modernity. On all these dimensions, again the faculty of commerce claims a higher percentage of ‘modern’ scorers than the arts and science faculties. It is believed that commerce faculty prepares the students in terms of acquisition of skills that are necessary for entry in to the modern sector of economy, particularly the large- scale organization. It also prepares the individual for demands of the industrial system. Consequently, there is a possibility that students acquire a sense of efficacy that constitutes modernity. Thus, It can be argued that commerce faculty facilitates modernity in students. Though modernity draws its idioms and ethos from science, the contribution of science faculty is not as great as that of commerce faculty. The commerce faculty that involves business administration and commercial dealings etc., the core elements of modern sectors-seems to facilitate individual modernity of the students.

Angira (1992) examined the impact of education on the attitudinal modernity. The data collected from a random sample of 100 undergraduate students studying science (25 males and 25 females) and Arts (25 males and 25 females) from Govt. RAZA P.G. College, Rampur (U.P.), were analysed using 2×2 analysis of variance, the independent variables being Education. The analysis of results indicated that education produced significant effects on attitudinal modernity. The science students
were found to be more modern in attitude than those of Arts. The possible explanation is that education in science broadens mental horizons more than education in Arts. This broadened mental horizons permit absorption of new attitudes on a large scale. It may be used to unfold a chine of false rationalization. It includes values, certain new ways of thinking feeling and acting that we come to consider them, truly modern.

Socio-economic status (SES) is another important variable which greatly influences modernity. Armer and Isaac (1978) reported that there is high correlation between socioeconomic status and psychological modernity, which is close to unity (0.977).

Kahl (1968) observed that SES is one of the more powerful predictors of modernity. It is believed that there are more ‘modern’ scorers in high Socio-economic Status (SES) group than in the middle and low SES groups. Individuals belonging to different SES levels have been exposed to different conditions of life. Therefore, they are likely to develop different attitudes and values that are appropriate to their living conditions of life. The findings of Chengati (1993) revealed that the percentage of ‘modern’ scorers in high SES groups is higher (21.66%) than those of middle SES (7.22%) and low SES (8.33) sub-groups, on total modernity as well as on all the dimension of modernity. However, the low SES group has higher percentage of ‘modern’ scorers than the middle SES group on total modernity and on all the dimension of modernity. The results clearly reveal that the percentage of ‘modern’ scorers are higher in high SES than in the other two SES groups on all the dimensions of modernity. The high SES, being a combination of high education, caste, income and occupation provides better opportunities for exposure to various modernizing agencies. The inculcation of traits that are considered as dispositions of modern man like rationality, secularism, democracy, internal locus of control etc., are highly dependent upon an individual’s conditions of life. Hence students of high SES are more likely to develop more modern qualities. (Inkeles and Smith, 1974; Holsinger, 1973; Portes, 1973; Halyal and Mallappa, 1985). The low SES group represents the stratum of Indian society, suppressed for a long time. Values like equal status, achievistic orientations etc., have motivated them to be more modern and informative. Therefore, low SES has a large number of ‘modern’ scorers than the middle. The middle class still follows the traditional values, and hence appears to be less modern (Chengati, 1993).
Srivastava, R (2009) examined the impact of parental occupation on attitude towards modernization of 1000 adolescent girl students of Lucknow city. Results showed a remarkable difference on total attitude towards modernization in favour of group 7 (Doctor/Advocate/Engineer and other). This group was found higher than group 2, 3 and 4 (Fourth class employees, clerk/third grade employee and teacher). Daughters of fourth class (group 2) employee were found poorer than group 3, 4, 5 and 7 (i.e. Clerk/third grade employee. Teacher, officer, Doctor/Advocates/Engineers and other), hence it reflects that individual modernity is influenced by parents’ occupation as well as socio-economic status. And also he reported that modernity of daughters (adolescent girls) of working and non working house hold mother were not significantly differ.

Religion is another independent variable that influences modernity. A study conducted by Ashraf (1989) on 150 male students of final year degree course from different colleges of Ranchi, belonged to different religious groups (Hindu, Muslim and Christian). Each group consisted of 50 students. And found that the students of Christian Community scored significantly higher on the four dimensions of modernity as well as overall modernity than the respondents of Muslims and Hindu communities. On the contrary, the Hindu group has scored significantly less on the different dimensions of modernity than the Muslim group. The obtained t-values (ranging from 2.02 to 8.93) are found to be significant at 0.5 and 0.1 level of significance. Similar findings have been observed in the studies conducted by (Azim, 2000; Bellah, 1957; Inkeles, 1983; Singer, 1966; Weber, 1969). As the different religion is giving different outlooks to their followers which ultimately influences the attitudinal patterns.

Domicile i.e urban or rural stay has significant influence on modernity. According to the survey, conducted by Xing-gui Zhang et al., (2003) reveal that the students from town have more modernity than those from the countryside. This agrees with the study of Cai (1999). The statistics conducted by Inkeles (1985) show that city experience plays an important role in the development of individual modernity. City and rural areas belong to two different subculture systems with great diversity in the structure of society, the pattern of production (produce of both town and countryside), the lifestyle, the economic level and the cultural traditions. Rural areas are more
backward in economy and education; the culture in rural areas bases itself upon agricultural civilization, in which collectivism is the essence. The culture’s basic contents are obedience, reliance and behaving oneself, so people are comparatively more traditional. However, a more open environment, with immediate access to information and more advanced education, produces more opportunities for people in cities to learn new skills and ideas, as well as become acquainted with a modern framework. The city culture embodies the industrial civilization whose essence is individual culture, which advocates such personality traits as equality, independence, self-protection and enterprise; thus, people are more modern. Hence, the difference of culture is the chief reason for the difference of individual modernity between town and countryside.
Section VI: Review of studies related to subjective well-being in relation to self-esteem.

Self-esteem plays an important part in promoting well-being and individuals need to have self-esteem to be satisfied and happy with their lives. The feeling of high self-esteem implies having more control over life and more confidence. Self-esteem is a measure of self-acceptance and the ability of self-actualization which has an influence on the well-being of an individual. Individual with high self-esteem also have increased motivation, high activity level, persistence and an enhanced level of functioning which are indicators of positive sense of self. The positive image of oneself is very vital in experiences of well-being. Self-esteem is the value and worth one ascribes to oneself. These feelings of value, worth, respect, contentment and success and positive evaluation of oneself are important components of self-esteem that influence the experience of subjective well-being and mental health. High self-esteem is one of the strongest predictor of subjective well-being. There exists a strong relationship between self-esteem and subjective well-being (Anderson, 1977; Czaja, 1975; Kozma and Stones, 1978; Muhlenkamp and Sayles, 1986; Patil, 1999). People who have important goals in life are positively correlated with happiness, self-esteem and life satisfaction (Wei-Lin Tseng, 2008). Rosenberg et al. (1995) illustrate that global self-esteem refers to an individual’s positive or negative attitude towards the self in totality, and is related to measurements of psychological well being (such as life satisfaction and happiness).

Another concept which is relevant and integral to well-being is that of competence (Sinha, 1990). It is an offshoot and outgrowth of the concept of self-esteem. It is an individual’s capacity to control and master the environment. It is the skill to deal with the environment in such a way as to satisfy his needs, as well as maintain a state of balance or equilibrium with himself and his environment. A sense of competence, a term coined by White (1959, 1963) describes the feelings of confidence in one’s abilities based on the successful mastery of one’s environment. Sense of competence is an intrapsychic feeling of goodness that arises from the confidence that one builds to engage in further action based on one’s success in the ventures already undertaken by the individual. Self-esteem and self-competence are interrelated in the sense that both the concepts convey and imply the feeling of
success, worth, mastery, confidence and an overall feeling of well-being and life satisfaction (Patil, M, 1999).

A wide range of research focuses on the enhancement of self-esteem (people’s positive perceptions of self) on an individual’s well-being. Previous studies indicate that self-esteem is a key source of happiness. According to much research, individuals in the high self-esteem group are generally reported to have a higher level of happiness than the low self-esteem group (Diener, 1984; Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000; Taylor & Brown, 1988). Contemporary self-esteem studies also imply that there is a significant connection between low self-esteem and low well-being (Brown & Dutton, 1995; Diener & Diener, 1995).

There is nothing unusual that most people often instinctively approve the importance of high self-esteem meaning an increase in well-being. We also tend to trust individuals who are highly self-aware of their self-worth. Therefore, most people do their best to protect or enhance self-esteem, which has created an environment where self-esteem is becoming a popular issue with the public at large. It is believed that the self is the centre of psychological resources, with any positive effects originating from high self-esteem and the origin of social problems, and bad effects resulting from low self-esteem. Therefore, in recent decades, many ambitious social activities continue to exist, including many self-esteem-enhancing organisations and leagues.

In support of the critical role self-esteem plays in an individual’s well-being, Dutton & Brown (1997) compared people with high and low self-esteem. They found that individuals with low levels of self-esteem face stronger emotional disturbances than those with high self-esteem when facing failure, with negative incidents quickly making people with low self-esteem feel horrible, compounded by the fact that they have a higher risk of depression. Diener & Diener (1995) explored the predictability of self-esteem and interpersonal relations on an individual’s sense of well-being from a cross-cultural perspective. The results indicate that positive predictability of high self-esteem leads to well-being in individualist cultures (Western countries) that is larger than in collectivist cultures (Eastern countries). Furthermore, Baumeister et. al. (2003) suggest that individuals with high self-esteem often treat one’s self positively, considering themselves better than others in many aspects. The benefit of high self-esteem is that it helps people quickly bounce back after failures and to try again.
In other words, when people with high self-esteem face failure, they are more confident, tend to change the situation, and cope with any questions directly. However, there is stronger evidence concerning the relation between self-esteem and individuals’ well-being, which argues that high self-esteem is not uniformly more adaptive than low self-esteem. For example, studies by Raskin and Terry (1988) report significant associations between high self-esteem and subjective well-being, as well as narcissism. It is obvious that this suggestion about self-esteem is inconsistent and shows contrary results with the findings concerning well-being. Researchers have started to question whether the idea that high self-esteem is an unmitigated, and universal good trait is accurate (Baumeister, Tice & Hutton, 1989; Dawes, 1994; Baumeister, 1998; Baumeister, Campbell, Krueger & Vohs, 2003; Crocker & Park, 2004). Furthermore, according to a study at the University of Illinois, it was discovered that the differences between high and low self-esteem students showed identical levels of a sense of well-being, results being within just one percent. In addition, researchers also found that high, unwarranted self-esteem can lead to problems such as divorce (Myers, 1993). Along similar lines, Emler (2001) concludes that low self-esteem (measured by Rosenberg’s global self-esteem scale) is generally not associated with criminal misdeeds, violence or racial prejudice, after undertaking a wide ranging review of research evidence. Many other researchers have further proposed that externalising problems is related to high self-esteem, with the results all originating from a threatened ego (Baumeister, Smart, & Boden, 1996). Salmivalli and colleague (1998) assess “defensive egotism” by asking adolescents to rate their own self-esteem while collecting ratings from their peers by asking them the following three questions: “Does your classmate constantly need to be the centre of attention?” “Does he think too highly of himself?” and “Can he face criticism?” Those who scored high on self and peer-rated self-esteem, and on defensive egotism, were more apt to be bullies. Surprisingly, bullies have been discovered to highly rate themselves in their academic-performance and interpersonal relationships, and typically hold unrealistically positive self-esteem (Gresham et al., 1998). An investigation by Josephs, Larrick, Steele, & Nisbett (1992), provides some support for these assertions. They found that high self-esteem individuals are more prone to taking risks, overestimating their capabilities and failing as a consequence of biting off more than they can chew (Heatherton & Vohs, 2000).
Thus, researchers understood that not only did they have to take the level of self-esteem seriously but also more importantly they needed to focus on the process of individual pursuits of self-esteem and the emotional and motivational consequences during the self-esteem-pursuing process. Crocker & Park (2004) warn that there is a cost individuals have to pay during the whole process of pursuing higher self-esteem. Crocker (2002a) demonstrates that the process of pursuing high self-esteem may possibly lead to the weakening of an individual’s self-adjustment and decrease mental health. In daily life, failure to pursue self-esteem objectively can potentially result in the passive consequences of shame and anger, while those with high self-esteem tend to show very strong defensive reactions. As such, researchers believe that through the use of the splitting theory defence mechanism (Kernberg, 1975; Klein, 1957), individuals with higher self-esteem may manage to keep the two conflicting feelings about one’s self away from conscious awareness. An alternative approach supporting the relation between self-esteem and well-being explores it from a cross-cultural perspective, with researchers considering whether high or low levels of self-esteem and what kind processes used during the pursuit contribute to well-being. From the recent cross-cultural psychology perspective, Heine et al. (1999) argue that the need for self-esteem or self-enhancement is a concept present in western individualist societies and not in eastern societies. Oriental people do not, or wish not to, have high self-esteem (Heine, Kitayama & Lehman, 2001); and, if anything, they self-criticise rather than self-enhance (Heine, Kitayama & Lehman, 2001). According to Markus and Kitayama’s (1991) theory of self-construal, and a series of studies carried out in the USA and Japan (Heine & Lehman, 1995, 1997a, 1997b; Heine, 2001; Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto, & Norasakkunkit, 1997), self-construal refers to an individual’s sense of self in relation to others. Markus and Kitayama (1991) recognise and explain that different cultures (Eastern collectivism and Western individualism) have different cultural missions and standards for what is considered having a good self (seeking harmony in the East compared to seeking the self in the West). Hence, two primary types of self-construal are identified: interdependent self-construal and independent self-construal. Markus and Kitayama (1991) propose that Westerners focus more on personal subjective experience, promote personal characteristics, unique attributes, autonomy (the independent self-construal; i.e., ‘I am busy, I am kind’), whereas Easterners concentrate more on interpersonal attributes, seeing one’s self as more flexible and intertwined with the social context, valuing the maintenance of group
harmony, and fitting in (interdependent self-construal; i.e., ‘my family thinks I am too busy, my colleagues think I am kind’). Since enhancing well-being or seeking happiness is human nature, the need for high self-esteem comes from independent self-construal to express the positive self, attributes, and abilities because according to Heine et al. (2001), high self-esteem is the attainment of a positive self. Whereas interdependent self-construal tries to join other people’s lives, suggesting that it concerns self-criticising and the continual correcting of oneself (lowering their self-esteem) to fit in because people belonging to the interdependent self-construal group think that happiness originates from keeping harmonious relations with others in society (Kwan, Bond, Boucher, Maslach, & Gan, 2002; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Markus, Mullally & Kitayama, 1997; Triandis, 1989). No matter how integration and harmony are processed through self-criticism and self-correction, it can be inferred that the interdependent self (low self-esteem) should still have positive correlations with integration and harmony because the interdependent self mostly obtains well-being and happiness through integrating and having harmonious relations with others. Following this logic, Triandis (1989) further explains the relationship between self and culture, arguing that each person’s self has several dimensions, such as the private, public and collective self. Which dimension an individual adopts depends on the self’s complexity and existing context, with different cultures having a different impact on the development of the self. In an individualist culture, the private self has better development, which means higher complexity. In a collectivist culture, the collective self has better development. Furthermore, the different contexts also affect personal requirements. Culture affects personal behaviour by influencing an individual’s self-concept and context definition. These different dimensions of the self are possibly saved separately in different areas of the individual (Trafimow, Triandis & Goto, 1991). Trafimow et al.’s (1991) research concludes that: 1) Compared with collectivist culture, Americans in their individualist culture collect more information about the ‘private self’. 2) The private self-prime more easily induces cognition related to the private self, while the collective-prime is likely to induce cognition related to the collective self. 3) If previously collected information is related to certain self cognition, then the chances of collecting that self-related information are higher. In other words, if participants collected information in the private self last time round, then the next information about the self will possibly be processed by the private self. This conclusion supports the notion that “different selves are saved
separately in different positions” (Triandis, 1989). Further along the same line, other interesting research suggests that individuals can have interdependent self-construal and independent self-construal at the same time. Both ways of viewing one’s self can appear to coexist within an individual regardless of culture (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Taken together, the above research describes that the relationship between self-esteem and well-being may enhance our understanding of the role of self-esteem, which includes an individual’s positive or negative subjective evaluation to some extent (Sedikides & Gregg, 2003). Self-esteem is the central construct in the selfenhancement of the independent self-construal theory and seeking harmony between one’s self and others in independent self-construal theory. Both theories demonstrate that no matter what level or which dimension of self-esteem exists in whatever form, positive experiences do lead to individual well-being and happiness.

There are both empirical and conceptual contributions concerning the relationship between self-esteem and enhanced well-being. However, self-esteem theory has its own set of complicated features. Specifically, there may be other characteristics in an individual’s self-esteem make up that influences the outcomes of an individual’s optimal functions beyond the current review. Kernis, Grannemann & Mathis’s (1991) study, for example, based on the negative relationship between self-esteem and oppression, suggest that researchers cannot be confined to just one self-esteem dimension but should expand the angle of self-esteem stability to include short-term fluctuations. Paradise & Kernis (2002) also explore the relationship between the level of self-esteem, self-esteem stability, and well-being, suggesting that people scoring high and stable self-esteem are more likely to have higher psychological well-being. Kernis & Goldman (2003) demonstrate that there are no significant correlations between the level and stability of self-esteem; however, study results indicate that unstable self-esteem is often related to anger and hostility, particularly for unstable and high self-esteem individuals. This reflects on an individual’s overexcited reactions to social incidents that are expressed by an unstable high self-esteem individual in order to maintain a fragile self-concept that looks positive (Kernis, Grannemann & Barclay, 1989), while stable self-esteem individuals’ global evaluation towards themselves is consistent with their level of self-esteem. In addition, possessing certain types of self-esteem may be more or less influential on well-being. Kernis (2003) characterises optimal and high self-esteem, demonstrating
that high self-esteem can be fragile and secure, while optimal self-esteem is genuine, stable, and consistent. This however, depends on whether it is a defensive attribute or genuine self-esteem. Tafarodi (1998) developed the concept of “paradoxical self-esteem” after investigating selectivity in dealing with self-related social information. He discovers a comparison between low self-like and self-competence, showing that the former’s memory of passive personality feedback is more easily distorted, while high self liking individuals express stronger positive deviance. On the other hand, other researchers believe that more dimensions need to be explored and examine the relationship between self-esteem and well-being from an implicit social cognition angle. Another concept that starts playing a role in well-being is a seldom explored topic: implicit self-esteem. Implicit self-esteem is an automatic, non-conscious form of self-esteem where an individual’s attitude towards the self influences self-evaluations and evaluations of self-relevant objects. It is believed to develop unconsciously and be automatically stimulated without an individual’s effort and conscious control (Baccus, Baldwin & Packer, 2004; Bargh & Burrows, 1996; Greenwald & Banaji, 1995; Greenwald & Farnham, 2000). Studies indicate that implicit and explicit self-esteem are generally weakly correlated, suggesting that both are different dimensional forms of self-esteem (Baccus et al., 2004; Bosson, Swan & Pennebaker, 2000). Implicit social cognition research suggests that the process of the formation of the implicit psychological structure is relatively slow and requires substantial learning and experience. Compared to explicit attitudes, an implicit attitude is very stable and hard to change (Greenwald, Banaji, Rudman, Farnham, Nosek & Mellott, 2002). However Bosson et al. (2000) examined the reliability of the implicit self-esteem and found that implicit self-esteem failed to show the predictive validity for well-being. In contrast, explicit self-esteem was a better predictor of well-being than implicit self-esteem. Similarly, Schimmack & Diener (2003) investigate the predictability of implicit and explicit self-esteem on subjective well-being, showing that an individual’s explicit self-esteem is significantly related to subjective wellbeing, while the implicit self-esteem has a low correlation with subjective well-being.

Since implicit and explicit self-esteem are separate, it does not mean the level of self-esteem or the stability of self-esteem, or even that other characteristics of self-esteem can be fully known if explicit self-esteem is understood. Therefore Spencer & Jordan (2004) divided high self-esteem individuals into two categories into secure
high self-esteem and defensive high self-esteem groups. Secure high self-esteem means that an individual’s explicit and implicit self-esteem are both high. Defensive high self-esteem refers to an individual with high explicit but not low implicit self-esteem (Kernis, 2003). These two types of individuals both demonstrate high self-esteem, but defensive high self-esteem is more easily affected by passive feedback and tends to change in the face of failure. In addition, Baccus et al. (2004) suggest that people with high levels of explicit self-esteem and low levels of implicit self-esteem seem to have greater defensive behaviours and higher levels of narcissism (Baccus et al., 2004; Jordan, Spencer & Zanna, 2003).


Previous studies have shown that the impact of self-esteem on subjective well-being is stronger in North America than in East Asia. Self-esteem is more strongly associated with subjective well-being in societies with high, rather than low, relational mobility (Sato, Yuki., Takemura, Schug, & Oishi, 2008). This was supported by the results from two previous studies both using cross-societal comparison (Sato et al. 2008) and situational priming (Yuki, Sato, Takemura, Horikawa, & Schug, 2007).

On the basis of above literature, it is evident that self-esteem plays an important role in promoting well-being. And individual need to have self-esteem to be satisfied and happy in his/her life. But no prior empirical study was conducted to establish the relationship between self-esteem and subjective well-being with respect to college students. Hence present study is an attempt to fill this gap between knowledge. Once the relationship between subjective well-being and self-esteem is established, it will help to understand adolescents and train them in a better manner to improve their adjustment level with the challenges of the modern world.
Section VII: Focus of the study:

A perusal of the literature indicate that very few efforts are being made in empowering adolescents through modernity interventions, thereby enhancing their subjective well-being and self-esteem.

Youths face a lot of problems in this process. Saritha and Singh (1998); Fitzpatrick and Deehan (1999); Slobodskaya (1999); Tyagi and Kaur (2001) found in their studies that more personal as well as adjustment problems are associated with the adolescents and suggest the need for a global approach to this problem.

Studies by various researchers have shown that adolescents have problems with personal adjustments Wig, Adela and Noreen (1999); Veena and Gaonkar (2003) found problem of student youth such as inferiority feelings, emotional immaturity, personal adjustment, academic difficulty and problems related to sex.

According to Grant (1994), improving children’s lives is the key to all development. Says Grant “When you educate children, make them healthy, you are laying foundation for a vibrant economic future for the nation” (UNICEF, 1994). This is only possible when we train our youths. Youths are the building blocks of the nation. Educating youth is the essential process of development. We have to train youths through education, to enhance their productivity. Along with formal education, providing scientifically correct information, attitudes and behavioural practices in various aspects of life is very essential for the overall development of youth. This is possible only through modernity. Modernity helps in transforming personality. It has an impact on important variables of personality like self-esteem and subjective well-being.

The present study is an attempt to study the modernity in relation to self-esteem and subjective well being of college students. Once the relationship between modernity and subjective well being and self esteem is ascertained, different ways of developing skills based on modernity can be taught to the individuals to improve their level of adjustment in life.
Section V: Review of studies related to modernity in relation to self-esteem (SE).

Adolescence is an important period of personality development. Personality development and modernity process have drawn the attention of social scientists considerably. The process of transition from tradition to modernity is called modernization. It is a process of social change which brings about qualitative change in the society and in individuals (Smith and Inkeles, 1966).

The modernization process involves enormous institution building in various facets of life of people. The institutionalization of change or development and crystallization of new institutional settings require the internal transformations of the societies of groups within which it occurs (Eisenstadt, 1965). Thus, institution building and nation building are only empty exercises unless the attitudes and capacities of people keep pace with other forms of development (Inkeles and Smith, 1974). Hence, modernization is viewed as a sociopsychological phenomenon that induces alterations in the individuals’ ways of perceiving, expressing and valuing. Modernization is a process and modernity is an end product. Individual modernity involves internalization of achievistic norms, role specifications, secular and scientific outlook, belief in the efficacy of human efforts, loyalty to national community and readiness to play new roles. As Learner (1958) puts it, Modernity is the development of empathetic skills and modern man is empathic, rational, mobile and participant.

Modernity is multi-dimensional, as it is a combination of various aspects like Rationality, Aspiration, Openness to change, Locus of control, Women’s rights, Social equality, Family planning, Democracy, Civic rights, Secularism, Political identification, Political participation, Scientific v/s Supersticious beliefs, Nutrition and Diet, Scientific understanding of Physical and Mental Health. These psychological qualities and attitudes are helpful for personal growth and quality of life of an individual. Hence modernity enriches the quality of life of people (Singh, 1984; Attar. and Halyal 2001). According to Balkrishnan and Babu, (2004), the quality of life revolves around self-esteem, Hygiene and safety, De-addiction, lovingness, Learning, Health and Nutrition. And quality of life enhanced by modernity, develops self confidence in an individual. And this self-confidence develops high self-esteem in individual. Hence modern man is imbued with high self-esteem.
A Study conducted (Balkrishnan, 2004) on male and female medical college students showed both male and female students physical well-being was related to De-medication, De-addiction, Exercise, Nutrition, Hygiene and safety; their mental well-being was connected to the factors of Learning, Self-esteem, Ethics, Happiness, Kindness and Empathy; and for their spiritual well-being, the contributing factors were found to be Faith, Devotion, Awareness, Harmlessness, Lovingness, Transcendence and Joy. And these qualities are framed in modernity and these qualities can be developed in an individual through modernity intervention. Because modernity is core of combinations of scientific knowledge and themes related to human development. And another study conducted (Balkrishnan and Babu, 2004) on women under graduate students in Arts, Science, and Commerce faculty, revealed that their health modernity practices bearing on De-medication, Kindness and Empathy, Harmlessness, Transcendence and Joy, Awareness and Happiness. The health modernity practices of them were enhanced their self-esteem.

And the empirical tests conducted on modernity by several authors (Kahl, 1968; Schnaiber, 1970; Armer, 1972; Inkeles and Smith, 1974) have revealed that modernity is a pre requisite for individual and social development. And opined that modernity enrich the quality of life of the people (Singh, 1984). Modernity is connected fairly to a wide variety of psychological traits like intelligence and personality. Subjective well-being and self-esteem are a part of personality (Armer and Youtz, 1971). Hence there may be positive relation exits between modernity and self-esteem. According to Chengati. And Halyal, (1993) the extent to which individuals attain modernity proves to an index of social change occurring at the level of personality and society. The experience of social change tends to enhance one’s self-awareness, self-evaluation, and need for self-esteem successively (Faunce, 2003). In this study an attempt has been made to see the relation between modernity and self-esteem of college students

James first talked about self-esteem in 1890; he described it as a ratio or relationship between our achievements and our aspirations. Rosenberg (1965) defined self-esteem as the “evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself, expressed as an attitude of approval”. And a similar opinion has been expressed by Priyadhrshini and Velayudhan (2008). The National Association for Self-esteem defined self-esteem as, “The experience of being capable of meeting life’s challenges and being worthy of happiness.” Self-esteem includes a
person’s subjective appraisal of himself or herself as intrinsically positive to some degree (Sedikides & Gregg, 2003). Self-esteem is affected by a variety of influences, ranging from formation of childhood experiences in relation to our parents to our own standards or ideal self. People differ in the degree to which they like or dislike themselves. For instance, self-esteem is directly related to expectations for success. People with high self-esteem believe that they possess the ability they need in order to succeed at work, where as people with low self-esteem depend on the receipt of positive evaluations from others.

Healthy self-esteem is an individual’s armour against the challenges of the world. A person with high self-esteem is fundamentally satisfied with the type of person he is; yet he may acknowledge his faults while hoping to overcome them (Rosenberg, 2001). Greater levels of self-esteem can affect many aspects of children’s lives, such as improving school performance and efforts toward achieving goals (Guest & Biasini, 2001). People with high self-esteem report more positive attitudes, feelings and life satisfaction and less anxiety, hopelessness and depressive symptoms (Crocker & Wolfe, 2002). Children with a healthy sense of self-esteem feel that the important adults in their lives accept them, care about them, and would go out of their way to ensure that they are safe and well (Salmond & Fleshman, 2005). On the other hand children with low self-esteem feel that the important adults and peers in their lives do not accept them, do not care about them very much, and would not go out of their way to ensure their safety and well-being (Schoenberg, Salmond & Fleshman, 2005). Lower self-esteem in childhood can lead to the development of a variety of emotional and psychological disturbances and an increased risk of suicide (Thompson, 2005; Turner, Kaplan & Badger, 2006). Hence there is a need to raise the self esteem of adolescents. Modernity interventions that increase self-esteem of adolescents is the need of the hour. The central idea behind it is adolescents should be aware of their power (Agarwala S, Verma M, Singh S, 2008).

Basak R and Ghosh A (2008) conducted study on self-esteem of urban and rural college students. The study states that urban students appraised their own worth in more positive ways than rural students. They had positive thinking about themselves. Rural students scored lower on self-esteem in comparison to urban students. Which showed that they evaluated their attributes and self-worthiness not so positively.

Formative research, including the Population Council’s ‘Adolescent and Social Change in Egypt Survey’ carried out in 1997, suggested that special efforts must be
directed to help younger adolescent girls who reside in rural areas. This group of girls had particularly low self-esteem and often described themselves as being “ignorant” and “doing nothing” with their lives. Hence in order to enhance their self esteem, we have to bring change in their personality, which is possible by conducting modernity interventions for students.

Modernity is an enduring process to bring profound change in cognitive, conative and affective behaviour of the individual with changing scenario of the individual world. Modernity enhances self-esteem because modernity is imbibed with scientific knowledge and information; already studies on learning (Experiment on knowledge of results and learning of paired associates) have proved that ‘learning’ with knowledge of results have revealed that knowledge of results promotes confidence. In the sense it guides him to know how much he has to learn in each trial and the subject puts forth more efforts to learn the subject. Hence the knowledge of results have been said to make learning better and quicker. According to the above theory knowledge and information build confidence and, thereby a highly confident man is imbued with high self-esteem. Hence individual modernity develop confidence and there by self-esteem in individual. Diagrammatically it may be represented as follows.

Figure -4
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Modernity helps in transforming personality. It has an impact on important variables of personality like self-esteem. It may be because modernity gives exposure to more open-minded and more secular, positivist, rational, activist, and achievement orientation.
Section IV: Review of studies related to modernity in relation to subjective well-being (SWB).

According to Ashraf (1989) Modernity is an aggregate of certain, personality-cum-attitudinal traits which facilitate individual growth and development with social responsibility and make political developments. Modernity is not a single trait of man but a syndrome of complex qualities. It is reflected in attitudes, values and behaviours of modern man. Modernity may be defined as scientific knowledge, attitude, practices and behaviours which is reflected in subjective well-being and self esteem of modern man. Modernity is related to all aspects of well-being. It includes psychological growth of individual physical perception, language, skills, intelligence, sociability and social sensitivity, emotional maturity, learning enduring aspects of personality and cultural values (Sinha, 1990). Individual modernity involves internalization of achievement norms, role specifications, secular and scientific outlook, belief in the efficacy and readiness to play new roles. As Learner (1958) puts it, modernity is the development of empathetic skills and modern man is empathic, rational, mobile and participant.

Modernization is a process, a movement from traditional and quasi-traditional to certain desired types of technology and the resultant change in the social structure, value orientations, motivations, achievement and aspirations. It means a value-change, significant institutional modification and improvement of standards of performance and achievement. It involves the substitution of old images and reorientation of man’s belief, outlook and attitude, According to Inkeles (1974) the outstanding marks of the modern man are: firstly, his readiness for new experiences. and his openness to innovation and change; secondly, he must be capable of forming or holding opinions over a large number of problems and issues that arise not only in immediate environment but also outside of it; thirdly his orientation to opinion realm is more democratic; fourthly, he is oriented to the present or future, rather than to the past; lastly, he believes that a man can learn to a substantial degree to dominate his environment in order to advance his own purposes and goals, rather than being dominated entirely by the environment. Majority of behavioural scientists Lerner (1963); Kahl (1974); Armer and Youtz (1971) have come to recognize modernity as essentially a process of value change. Qualitative meaning of modernity is, particular outlook or perspective of mind and quantum of particular ideas and values, which are
emerged in the course of social development (Attar and Halyal, 2001). And also it is believed that modernity is a pre requisite for individual and social development, which leads to enrich the quality of life of the people (Singh, 1984). According to Armer and Youtz (1971) modernity is connected fairly to a wide variety of psychological traits like intelligence and personality. Subjective well-being and self-esteem are a part of personality. Thus a strong positive correlation exits between modernity and subjective well-being and self esteem. Subjective Well-being has been described as a complex, multifaceted construct. Well-being has been defined as a dynamic state characterized by a reasonable amount of harmony between an individuals abilities, needs and expectations and environmental demands and opportunities. It includes self-acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life and personal growth (Ryff and Keyes, 1995). Subjective well-being (SWB) represents people’s evaluations of their lives, and includes happiness, pleasant emotions, life satisfaction, and a relative absence of unpleasant moods and emotions. In other words, we gauge a person’s evaluation of his or her life by his cognitive and emotional reactions (Diener, 2000). The growth of interest in the topic of “psychological well-being” or simply “happiness” reflects the knowledge that this issue is central to our quality of life and mental health. Much of the research is directed at finding direct and indirect influences on the increase or decrease of individuals’ psychological well-being (Diener, 2000). The term well-being is often used interchangeably with terms like ‘happiness’ or ‘quality of life’. According to Veenhoven (2007) “The word 'happiness' is used in various ways. In the widest sense it is an umbrella term for all that is good. In this meaning it is often used interchangeably with terms like ‘wellbeing’ or 'quality of life’. The above defined concept of ‘overall happiness’ is denoted with different words. In the 1950s the words adjustment and morale were sometimes used in this meaning and since the 1960s the term life-satisfaction came into use for this purpose. In 1984 Ed Diener introduced the term subjective well-being, abbreviated as SWB, and this term is still dominant in psychology. The term life-satisfaction is mostly used for ‘overall happiness’, but refers in some cases particularly to its cognitive component and is then synonymous with ‘contentment’. In such context, the term happiness is typically used for the affective appraisal of life and then synonymous with ‘hedonic level of affect’. The term subjective well-being is also used in wider meanings than happiness as defined here. Sometimes the term refers to good mental functioning and then denotes the
meaning of life-ability. At other occasions the term is used as a generic for all subjective enjoyment (Veenhoven, 2007). Within this broad topic, the present research focuses on the influence of the traditionality/modernity continuum on well-being, a topic barely studied until now (Ahuvia, 2001). The possible theoretical effect of modernity on well-being is not obvious. The process of modernization encompasses a change from collectivism to individualism (Triandis, 1995). This change may contribute positively by enabling individuals to “be themselves”. However, with this new freedom, there is a loss of social support and loss of shared norms that may be valuable for well-being. Empirical cross-national studies provide a clear-cut answer to this dilemma. They found a strong positive relationship between modern individualization and subjective well-being (Diener et al., 1995; Veenhoven, 1999). Modernity is committed to individual dignity, equality and freedom (Singh, 1984) and the extent to which individuals attain modernity proves to an index of social change occurring at the level of personality and society (Chengati and Halyal, 1993). The experience of social change tends to enhance one’s self-awareness, self-evaluation, and need for self-esteem successively (Faunce, 2003).

Adolescence is the crucial stage to develop; during this stage lots of physiological as well as psychological changes disturb the subjective well-being. Modernity is very important in transforming personality of an individual. Modernity may be defined as personality and attitudinal traits, which facilitate the wholesome development of an individual. It has been established that the process of modernization creates positive attitudes, rational outlook, activistic orientation, a mobile sensibility and empathic skills in the individuals (Halyal, 1984). And it enhances subjective well-being.

Peri Kedom-Friedrich and Maged Al-Atawneh (2004) conducted study on Bedouin Women, undergoing a Socio-Cultural Transition. The effect of modernization on the well-being of Bedouin women (n = 150) was investigated. Results show that the more modern the objective circumstances of the women's lives, and/or the more modern the husbands' attitudes (as perceived by their wives), the greater their subjective well-being (SWB). The results fit the latest theoretical developments on SWB, and reflect the changes taking place within Bedouin society (Peri Kedom-Friedrich and Maged Al-Atawneh, 2004).
Thomas Bulmahn (2000) worked on the research question, whether modern societies enable the individual to lead a happier life. It was hoped during the Age of the Enlightenment that rationally designed social conditions would lead in the future to greater prosperity, more security and increased happiness for all. Only a little of this optimism has survived into the twentieth century. In their studies on anomie, sociologists such as Durkheim, Merton and Sennett have drawn attention to the darker sides of progress. Current theories of anomie – explicit social critiques – entirely ignore the successes of modernity and discuss only its crises. In these theories, anomie is described as a structural feature of modern societies, whose destructive consequences are manifested by growing alienation, increasing social isolation and rising suicidality. Empirical analyses of data from Germany show, however, that these diverge from the reality. Despite rapid processes of modernisation, anomic patterns of perception and behaviour have not become more widespread over the last 20 years; on the contrary, in some areas anomie has decreased significantly. Proceeding from this insight, the article by Thomas Bulmahn (2000) proposes a correction of those models of anomie that are blind to progress. The crises of modernity are confronted with its successes, which have helped considerably to reduce anomic reactions and to stabilise subjective well-being at a high level. Finally, the article points out that this is not a stable equilibrium, rather that temporal and structural imbalances may occur in the course of modernisation processes, whose magnitudes may, however, be curbed – albeit not entirely or in every respect. The study conducted by Thomas Bulmahn (2000) may be summarized as follows. The link between modernization and well-being becomes even more complex when psycho-social factors are taken in to consideration: for instance, views on what constitutes a good life, ideas about an adequate standard of living and belief concerning the rights, freedoms and securities that should be given in a society. These ideas change- albeit relatively slowly- in the course of modernization. To cite one example, when material living conditions improve, pretensions also increase, expectations grow and, on the basis of a secure standard of living, new ideas emerge about what is important in life and what is not. The consequences are well known: after a specific saturation point has been reached, higher incomes, greater freedom and increased consumption no longer yield satisfaction or happiness. Increasing pretension and changing needs neutralize every further purely quantitative improvement in the standard of living. In the first place, modernity and happiness are not mutually exclusive. The widely feared increase in
anomic patterns of perception and behaviour has not materialized over the last 20 years in the Federal Republic of Germany. The happiness and the satisfaction of the people have remained at a high level, and the suicidal mortality rate has fallen sharply, during the course of extremely rapid modernisation processes in eastern Germany.

Secondly, modernization is an ambivalent process. The social upheavals in eastern Germany have made it clear that modernisation not only leads to exclusion and disintegration, but that it is also accompanied- provided it is successful- by the creation of new mechanisms of inclusion and integration. Increased wealth, development of citizenship, expansion of opportunities and autonomy are some of the aspects of successful modernization.

Thirdly, the successes and crises of modernity have complex effects on well-being. The level and stability of well-being depend substantially on the possibilities for limiting the social consequences of exclusion and disintegration. Wealth, citizenship and autonomy are essential requirements for the development of such possibilities, whatever their constellation-whether in the form of a welfare state, social commitment or personal provision.

Fourthly, structural imbalances are indications of the need to further development of the existing institutions and mechanisms of social equality. The consequences of exclusion and disintegration cannot be eliminated by the welfare state, by social commitment or by private provision; they can only be limited. Financial means cannot substitute participation in society- at best they can facilitate it. The evolution of the link between modernization and well-being depends not least on the extent to which more effective mechanisms of social participation and integration are developed in the future.

According to Veenhoven (2005) human society has changed much over the last centuries and this process of 'modernization' has profoundly affected the lives of individuals; “currently we live quite different lives from those are forefathers lived only five generations ago. There is difference of opinion as to whether we live better now than before and consequently there is also disagreement as to whether we should continue modernizing or rather try to slow the process down.” Quality-of-life in a society can be measured by how long and happy its inhabitants live. Using these indicators Veenhoven assessed; whether societal modernization has made life better or
worse. Firstly he examined findings of present day survey research. And he started with a cross-sectional analysis of 90 nations and found that people live longer and happier in today's most modern societies. Secondly he examined trends in 10 modern nations over the last 30 years and found that happiness and longevity have increased in most cases. Thirdly he considered the long-term and review findings from historical and comparative anthropology, which show that we lived better in the early hunter-gatherer society than in the later agrarian society. Together these data suggest that societal evolution has worked out differently for the quality of human life, first negatively, in the change from a hunter-gatherer existence to agriculture, and next positively, in the more recent transformation from an agrarian to an industrial society. We live now longer and happier than ever before.

According to Veenhoven (2006, 2005a) the present day world counts about 150 nations and for 90 of these we know how long and how happy its citizens lived in the 1990s. These cases represent more than half of the nations in the present day world and cover about two-thirds of the world’s population, since all the big countries are included. The level of modernity or ‘development’ of these nations can be measured in different ways; since there are different views on the essence of modernity, there are also different indicators of the matter. Some focus on the mode of production and measure modernity by the ratio of agrarian and industrial production, whereas others see mental development as the core and measure modernity using the average level of education. There are also several multi dimensional indicators of modernity, such as the Human Development Index mentioned above and the Index of Social Progress (Estes, 1984). All these measures appear to be highly correlated with buying power per head (UNPD, 2000).

There is a strong correlation, HLY (HLY- happy life years- A high HLY means that citizens live both long and happily; a low HLY implies that the life of the average citizen is short and miserable. Medium HLY values can mean three things: 1 moderate length-of-life and moderate appreciation-of-life, 2 long but unhappy life, and 3 short but happy life. Veenhoven (2006) treated these intermediate outcomes as equal, but one can of course prefer one to the other.) being systematically higher in rich nations than in poor ones. The correlation is +0.77. The use of other indicators of
modernity yields similar results. HLY is also positively correlated with industrialization (r = +.43), informatisation (r = +.70) and urbanization (r = +.55), and also with individualization (r = +.66). The correlations are strong and leave no doubt that people live longer and happier in the most modern societies. This finding is supported by other researchers (Heylighen & Bernheim, 2000; Diener & Diener, 1996).

The pattern is similar if we consider happiness and longevity separately. The correlation of modernity, as measured by income per head, with average happiness is +.72 and the correlation with life-expectancy +.65. These effects are largely independent; controlling for life expectancy, the partial correlation of modernity with happiness is still +.64 and controlling for happiness, the partial correlation of modernity with life-expectancy is +.75. This independence of the effects is another justification for the use of this combined measure of happy life years. The observed growth of years lived happily and healthily can be attributed to several factors. One is obviously that several common evils of the past have been overcome in modern societies or at least much abated. For instance, few in the West die of hunger anymore and the chance of being killed is greatly reduced. A second factor is in the increased freedom in modern individualized society. The social system allows us more opportunity to choose and we have also become more capable of making choices which, taken together, has increased our chance that we will live a life that fits our individual needs (Veenhoven 1999). This links up with a third explanation, which is that modern society provides a challenging environment that fits an innate human need for self-actualization. In this view, the human species evolved in rather tough conditions and therefore typically thrives in modern society with its complexities, competition and choices. Probably, increased self-understanding has also contributed to the quality-of-life of modern man. Lastly, a more 'critical' explanation could be that the modern nations successfully exploit the rest of the world. There may be some truth in this contention, but life is also getting better in most non-western nations. Most of the poor countries became less poor over the last decade and life expectancy is also rising in most countries (UNDP, 2002; 2004).

As we all know, the industrial revolution has been followed by an unprecedented rise in longevity that still goes on today and that also involves a steady rise in the number of years lived in good health. Less well known is the fact that subjective well-being
has also risen. This rise appears in the comparison of more and less modern nations at the present time and also is the trend in modern nations over the last 40 years (Veenhoven, 2005a, 2006b). Modernization appears to have boosted subjective well-being (Veenhoven, 2008).

Research conducted by Arthur St. George and Patrick H. McNamara (1984) confirms Hunter's observation that "modernity is here to stay; its structures, processes, and symbols continue to be predominant in American society and culture" (1983). This means that most Americans take their cues from the surrounding nonreligious culture which offers them alternative means for achieving a sense of well-being, deriving satisfaction from life and so on. It is relatively easy for "mere" attendance and strength of affiliation to be overridden by the powerful secular interpretive schemes transmitted by higher education and the media. But for the 22% of Americans who are evangelicals, religion escapes the pressures to privatization, resists the corrosive counterinfluences of secular wisdom, and has definite impact on their sense of well-being and life-satisfaction (Hunter, 1983).

No single quality can adequately define modernity. Modernity is not single trait. Rather modernity is multidimensional in nature involving a number of psychological qualities and attitudes that are helpful for personal growth and social responsibility. Several scholars have reached a consensus regarding the multi-dimensional nature of modernity (Inkeles and Smith 1974; Rogers 1969; Kahl, 1968; Schnaiberg, 1970; Armer and Youtz 1971; and Singh; 1975). Thus modernity is an aggregate of certain personality cum attitudinal traits which facilitate individual growth and development. As Singh (1964) puts it as a prerequisite for the overall development of people and society which enrich the quality of the life of individuals...quality of life is now a common issue in psychological research and is often referred to as “subjective well-being” (Diener et al. 1999).

Studies on the effect of modernity on subjective well-being are few. This is evident from perusal of relevant literature. Therefore, the focus of the present study is to investigate the importance of modernity and subjective well-being and their relationship with respect to adolescents.
SECTION-III: Review of Studies Related to Self-esteem with Reference to Other Demographic Variables

A number of theorists have proposed that self-esteem is the outcome of a comparison between the perceived characteristics of the actual self and a self-evaluation standard or guide. William James (1890) suggested that self-esteem reflects the “ratio between our actualities and our potentialities”. He noted that an outstanding knowledge of psychology was critical to his own sense of self-esteem; yet he recognized that this attribute is probably not a universal determinant.

Two assumptions are common to James (1890), Rosenberg’s (1979) and Cooper Smith (1967) models of self-esteem.

A) Self-esteem reflects the perceived discrepancy between the actual self and ideal state.

B) Individuals differ in the importance they place on actual self attribute in the type of ideal self standard they hold.

Intuitively it would seem that, one’s clarity of self-concept also would be a potential contribution factor to one’s stress and depression. This is because clarity of self-concept is correlated positively to self-esteem (Campbell, Katz, Lavallee and Trapnell, 1991; Campbell Trapnell, Katz and Lavallee, 1992) and self-esteem is correlated negatively to both stress and depression (Abel, 1996; Kreger, 1995; Wrong and Whitaker, 1994). According to Ryan and Deci (2000) self-esteem and open-mindedness are attributes indicating personality strength, mental health, subjective well-being, and even human development. These orientations emerged in the course of modernization (Inkeles and Diamond, 1980; Welzel, 2007; Deutsch, 1963). By this review we can predict that modernity enhances self-esteem and subsequently overall personality.

Gender is one of the independent variable that influences self-esteem.

Generally, gender differences are not apparent in the global or total score which measure a number of domains of self-esteem or self concept (Moby, 1994; Osborne and LeGette, 1982; Piers, 1984; Marsh, 1985). And reported that only 0.66 percent of gender difference was noted over 3,500 Australian students of self-esteem. Gender difference was noted when subjects were asked to indicate positive attributes. Males were more likely to indicate positive attributes.
Hattie and McInman’s quantitative review of literature also supported the need to use a multidimensional model rather than a global model of self. (Shavelson, Hubner and Staton, 1976). Marsh (1985) identified the specific dimensions in which boys tended to indicate higher self-esteem as achievements, leadership, physical abilities and appearances. Girls tended to regard themselves better in the area of verbal skills, schools and moral facets of the self.

Basak and Ghosh (2008) conducted study on self-esteem of urban and rural college students. Final sample size was 590, out of which there were 353 male and 237 female students. The age range of the students varied from 18 to 22 years. The results reveal that both urban (M=28.76) and rural (M=28.14) males had higher self-esteem than females. It indicated that they appraised their own worth in more positive ways than females. They had positive thinking about themselves. Rural females (M=27.39) also scored slightly lower on self-esteem in comparison to urban females (M=27.61) which showed that they evaluated their attributes and self-worthiness not so positively.

Priydhashini S.K. and Velayudhan.A (2008) conducted another study on Day Scholars and Hostellers. The sample consists of 60 Hostellers (30 Women and 30 Men) and 60 Day scholars (30 Women and 30 Men) studying in the various departments of Bharathiar University, Coimbatore. Reported that there is no significant difference between boys and girls students in their self-esteem.

David Watkins and Jaiyuan Yu (1990) examined possible gender differences in the source and level of self-esteem of 99 male and 90 female undergraduates from mainland China. There was very little evidence of a gender difference in the level of overall self-esteem.

Abbas Tashakori et al., (1991) consider self-esteem to be an attitude towards self, with components of self-beliefs that associate or dissociate self with a desired or undesired attitude. It was hypothesized that the structure of self-beliefs underlying self-esteem is different across ethnic and gender boundaries. This hypothesis was tested by measuring the overall self-esteem and specific self-belief components in a rural southern town. In a series of regression analysis with ethnicity by gender groups,
the self-esteem measure was predicted from indices representing specific self beliefs associating self with different attributes, substantial differences were found between ethnicity by gender groups in the type of beliefs that best predicted self-esteem.

Lesley Demello, Tony Imms (1999), conducted a study, the aim of the study was to increase an understanding of the relationship between self-esteem, locus of control and coping styles and their relationship to school attitude of adolescents. Such an understanding could prove useful in the development of more effective personal development courses for students. The 18 item self-esteem scale (Trivantham, 1992), (Nowicki and Strickland, 1973) and the adolescent coping scale (Frydenberg and Ledwis, 1990) was completed by 146 male and female adolescent students ranging in age from 14-18 years. Those with high self-esteem and internal locus of control scores and coping styles were high users of the productive problem solving coping style and showed significantly more positive attitudes towards school and positive perceptions of their academic performance. There was no gender difference in the scores for tests of self-esteem, locus of control or coping styles. Locus of control or coping styles are themes of individual modernity scale (Singh, 1975). Hence we can predict that there might be a positive correlation between self-esteem and locus of control and there by individual modernity.

Most adolescents’ self-esteem is relatively stable, with a decline in early adolescence but a gradual increase in the later adolescent years (Robins et al., 2002; Verschueren, Marcoen & Buyck, 1998). The decline of self-esteem in early adolescence can be attributed to the fact that adolescents are more knowledgeable and realistic than younger children about their strengths and weaknesses and they may realize that they are not as good at something as they have been told (Jacobs et al., 2002; Robins et al., 2002). Another reason for this decline in the level of self-esteem could be the fact that adolescents are temporarily unsure of themselves. As an adolescent matures and develops, she forms and shapes her own identity and her level of self-esteem rises again in later adolescence (Cole et al., 2001). Self-esteem is an important aspect of an adolescent’s overall functioning and seems to relate to other areas, including psychological health and academic performance (Hewitt, 1998). During adolescence self-esteem is based on evaluation of self-worth in several contexts namely: within the family, school, leisure setting and peer group (Harter,
Harter (1983) carried out detailed analyses to determine what makes adolescents experience positive self-esteem. He found that the following factors form the bases of a positive self esteem: Adolescent’s relationship with her parents. The adolescent’s self-control of negative affect, Self-acceptance, Social conduct, Parental involvement and willingness to give adolescents autonomy and freedom positively correlate to high self-esteem in adolescents (Coopersmith, 1967; Mbyoa, 1998; Rosenberg, 1965; Van Wyk, 1998; William, 1999). These all qualities are characterized by the modernity hence modernity leads to better self esteem among adolescents.

In a South African study, Wild and colleagues (2004) investigated associations among adolescents’ self-esteem in six domains. Results from this study show that grade 8 boys scored higher on global self-esteem than grade 8 girls. Grade 11 boys scored significantly higher than grade 11 girls. This study reveal gender has significant impact on self-esteem.

Wei-Lin Tseng (2008) Conducted study on Multiple Facets of Self-Esteem. Participants were 206 students and staff from Leicester university campus (male= 92, female=114). The age range was 18-67 years (Mean age= 27.41, SD= 8.94). Most of the Sample (66.50%) were white Caucasian, with 4.37% of Black ethnic origin, 24.27% Asian ethnic origin, 2.91% of a mixed ethnic origin, and 1.94% of respondents reporting to be of an other ethnic origin. He administered all the self-esteem scales (Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale (SE), Self-Liking and Competence Scale (SLCSR), Self-Liking (SL), Self-Competence (SC), IAT -Implicit Association Test [IAT Greenwald et al., 1998]) on sample. And processed the data statistically,Two-factorial between-subjects analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to examine gender differences among all the self-esteem scales (Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale (SE), Self-Liking and Competence Scale (SLCSR), Self-Liking (SL), Self-Competence (SC), IAT -Implicit Association Test [IAT Greenwald et al., 1998] ). Significant ethnic differences were found by Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale ($F=4.45, p < 0.05$) and for Self-Liking ($F=11.461, p = 0.001$). Asian people showed higher levels of uni-dimensional global self-esteem and self-liking. However, there was no statistical significant in gender differences found for any of the self-esteem scales.
Level of (study) education is another variable that influences self-esteem. Baumeister, reported that children who do well in school have slightly higher self-esteem than those who do poorly. And in fact anyone who believes in the value of education should wish for a stronger effect simply on the basis that successful students deserve higher self-esteem. Across multiple studies, the average correlation between grades and self-esteem is 0.24, which means about 6 percent of the variance. In other words, moving from the very highest self-esteem scores to the very lowest would yield about a 6 percent difference in school performance. A small increase in self-esteem, such as might be produced by a school program aimed at boosting self-esteem, would probably make only a percent difference or less. And even that assumes that self-esteem is the cause, not the effect, contrary to many indications. To the extent that it is school success or failure that alters self-esteem and not the other way around, any independent effort to raise self-esteem would have no effect at all on school performance.

And in another study conducted by Demo and Savin-Williams (1983) replicated and extended Rosenberg and Pearlin's findings, and demonstrated that (Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, plus two others to assess reflected appraisals and academic self-esteem) self-esteem was greater among eighth-graders than among fifth-graders.

Streams (faculty) of education is also one of the variable that influences self esteem of college students. Brave (2003) has made research on self-esteem of 150 Professional and 150 Non-professional college students. And found no significant difference in their level of self-esteem. Hence there is no difference in self-esteem of students, of professional and Non-professional stream of education. Mean self-esteem score of professional students is 172.13 and SD is 18.48 and for non-professional students it is 176.20 and SD is 18.21.

SES (Socio-economic Status) is another important variable that influences self-esteem.

The most famous investigation into the relationship of self-esteem and SES is Rosenberg and Pearlin's (1978) assessment of social class and self-esteem among
children and adults. In an effort to clarify decades of inconclusive work on what many thought would be an obvious connection between one's social status or prestige and one's personal sense of worth, Indeed, they found virtually no association between social class of parents (measured by the Hollingshead Index of Social Position) and self-esteem among younger children, a modest association among adolescents, and a moderate association among adults based on their own social class. They rely on theories about social comparison processes, reflected self-appraisals, self-perception theory, and psychological centrality to explain the age graded relationship. Because the salience of class in the interpersonal context differs for children and adults, and because the social class of children is ascribed while that of adults is generally considered achieved, Rosenberg and Pearlin argue, the extent to which the sense of inequality inherent in the meaning of social class is mirrored within individuals is not the same for children as it is for adults.

Rosenberg and Pearlin (1978) and Coopersmith (1967), others have explored the relationship of self-esteem to SES, especially among adolescents. With some exceptions, Rosenberg and Pearlin's results have been replicated (though it appears that more people have studied adolescents than adults). Filsinger and Anderson (1982) found no relationship between own SES (Duncan SES Index) and self-esteem (Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale) among adolescents, but a significant relationship between the SES of the person's best friend and self-esteem. They attribute this to a heightened sense of self-efficacy among those who interact with friends who are of a higher social status than themselves, as it may be the social status of significant others from which adolescents derive their own sense of social status. Demo and Savin-Williams (1983) replicated and extended Rosenberg and Pearlin's findings, and demonstrated that the relationship between SES (father's occupation) and self-esteem (Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, plus two others to assess reflected appraisals and academic self-esteem) was greater among eighth-graders than among fifth-graders.

In a study of 711 sixteen-year-olds in England, Francis and Jones (1995) found that the relationship of SES and self-esteem varied with the measure of self-esteem. There was a significant relationship between SES and the Coopersmith Self-
Esteem Inventory (r = -.122, p <.001) and a moderate relationship with the Rosenberg (r = .063, p <.05).

A study conducted by Twenge, J M and Keith Campbell, W. (2002), reveal that Socioeconomic status (SES) has a small but significant relationship with self-esteem (d = .15, r = .08) in a meta-analysis of 446 samples (total participant N = 312,940). Higher SES individuals report higher self-esteem. The effect size is very small in young children, increases substantially during young adulthood, continues higher until middle age, and is then smaller for adults over the age of 60. Gender interacts with birth cohort: The effect size increased over time for women but decreased over time for men. Asians and Asian Americans show a higher effect size, and occupation and education produce higher correlations with self-esteem than income does. The results are most consistent with a social indicator or salience model.

Li-fang Zhang and Gerard A. Postiglione (2001) conducted a study on nature of thinking styles the sample size was six hundred and ninety-four students (ages ranging from 17–45) from the University of Hong Kong participated in the study. The participants responded to the Self-Esteem Inventory (Adult Form) and provided a range of socio-economic status (SES) indicators. It was found that students who reported higher self-esteem tend to be students from higher SES families. Race is one of the independent variable that influences self-esteem of college students, a few studies are reported here under.

Wei-Lin Tseng (2008) Conducted study on Multiple Facets of Self-Esteem. Participants were 206 students and staff from Leicester university campus (male= 92, female=114). The age range was 18-67 years (Mean age= 27.41, SD= 8.94). Most of the Sample (66.50%) were white Caucasian, with 4.37% of Black ethnic origin, 24.27% Asian ethnic origin, 2.91% of a mixed ethnic origin, and 1.94% of respondents reporting to be of an other ethnic origin. He administered all the self-esteem scales (Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (SE), Self-Liking and Competence Scale (SLCSR), Self-Liking (SL), Self-Competence (SC), IAT -Implicit Association Test [IAT Greenwald et al., 1998]) on sample. And processed the data statistically, Two-factorial between-subjects analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to examine ethnic-racial differences among all the self-esteem scales (Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (SE), Self-Liking and Competence Scale (SLCSR),
Self-Liking (SL), Self-Competence (SC), IAT -Implicit Association Test [IAT Greenwald et al., 1998]. Significant ethnic differences were found by Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale (F=4.45, p < 0.05) and for Self-Liking (F=11.461, p = 0.001). Asian people showed higher levels of uni-dimensional global self-esteem and self-liking.

Richman, Clark, and Brown (1985) conducted study on adolescents and his study demonstrate complicated interactions of gender, race, and social class: white females (including high SES individuals) were significantly lower in general self-esteem than white males and black males and females. There has been considerable research on the relationship between race and self-esteem. As for social class, in which the expectation is that the social order will be reflected in individual self-assessments, people of color are hypothesized to have lower self-esteem than are white people. In research comparing whites and blacks, blacks often have equal or higher self-esteem than whites, and a number of theories, including those related to self-protection and disidentification, have been offered to explain these findings (Crocker, Voelkl, Testa, & Major, 1991; Steele, 1992).

Domicile is another variable that influences self-esteem of an individual.

Basak and Ghosh (2008) conducted study on self-esteem of urban and rural college students. Final sample size was 590, out of which there were 353 male and 237 female students. The age range of the students varied from 18 to 22 years. The results reveal that both urban male (M=28.76) and female (M=27.61) had higher self-esteem than rural male (M=28.14) and female (M=27.39) students. It indicated that they appraised their own worth in more positive ways than rural students. They had positive thinking about themselves. Rural students scored slightly lower on self-esteem in comparison to urban students. Which showed that they evaluated their attributes and self-worthiness not so positively.

Formative research, including the Population Council’s ‘Adolescent and Social Change in Egypt Survey’ carried out in 1997, suggested that special efforts must be directed to help younger adolescent girls who are not in school and reside in rural areas. This group of girls had particularly low self-esteem and often described themselves as being “ignorant” and “doing nothing” with their lives.
SECTION-II: Review of Studies Related to Subjective well-being with Reference to Other Demographic Variables.

There are different opinions among researchers on whether subjective well-being, happiness, life satisfaction, and quality-of-life are all the same, or if they capture different dimensions, that are analytically important. Veenhoven (1997) explicitly states that they are the same and can be used interchangeably. So does Easterlin (2001, 2005), while Hird (2003) claims that the terms are not synonymous, but that in practice the differences may not be so important. In this research, we will follow Veenhoven and Easterlin, and use the terms happiness, life satisfaction and subjective well-being interchangeably.

Demographic variables such as age, gender, ethnicity, education, socioeconomic status and geographical location have been found to correlate with happiness and life satisfaction (Myers & Diener, 1995; Triandis, 2000; Watson, 2000; Basson, 2008).

Ben-Zur (2003) found gender to be the only demographic or background variable contributing to subjective well-being. Argyle (1999) suggests that older men are happier than older women and subjective well-being of men tend to increase steadily over the life span whereas subjective well-being of women increases up to age 25, slightly decreases between ages 25 to 35 and only shows a steady increase from age 35 (Mroczeck & Kolarz, 1998). In a South African study, Roothman, Kirsten and Wissing (2003) found differences between men and women in regard to their self-evaluated overall experience of psychological well-being. According to Compton (2005) research does not support the cultural myth that young people are happier than older people, although young people experience more intense emotions. Experiencing intense emotions does not produce higher levels of subjective well-being. Some studies have however indicated a contradictory view and suggest that older people are indeed happier and more fulfilled than younger people (Argyle, 1999).

Frey and Röthlisberger (1996) found that girls receive higher levels of support from their peers than boys do. Another study conducted by Liu (2002) indicates that the peer group and the family play a greater role in protecting and guarding adolescent girls from depression, whereas in the case of boys, the peer group and the family only act as a shield and don’t provide as much protection against depression. But a studies by Bergman & Scott (2001); Kling et al. (1999); Quatman & Watson (2001) reveal
that there is a marked gender difference in well-being with boys reporting higher positive self-esteem, lower negative self-efficacy, less unhappiness, and fewer past worries, compared to girls. Thus in adolescence, girls’ well-being is significantly lower than boys’ well-being. Contradictory to these findings, Natvig, Albreksten and Qvarnstrom (2003) found no significant differences between boys and girls with respect to their reported degree of happiness.

According to Ryff (1995) in the case of age differences, the theoretical starting points offered few insights regarding possible differences between men and women on various dimensions of well being. Across multiple sets of data, however, they have found that women of all ages consistently rate themselves higher on positive relations with others than do men, and that women tend to score higher than men on personal growth. The remaining four aspects of psychological well-being have consistently shown no significant differences between men and women. These findings are particularly relevant in light of prior mental health research, which has repeatedly documented a higher incidence of certain psychological problems, such as depression, among women. When the positive end of the mental health spectrum is considered, however, it seems that women have greater psychological strengths than men in certain aspects of well-being, and comparable profiles with regard to other dimensions.

Gender in the WVS/EVS (World Values Survey/ European Values Survey) global sample, overall life satisfaction is slightly higher among males than females (6.84 compared with 6.73, on the 10-point scale, in the first three waves of the WVS), but this masks offsetting national differences. For example, in Scandinavia, Asia and North America, life satisfaction is slightly higher among women than men, whereas the reverse is true, and to a larger extent, in the countries of the former Soviet Union. In more fully specified models, a gender effect sometimes arises and some times does not, depending on the specification of the model. One reason for the appearance of a negative male effect in some cases is that self-reported health status is worse among women than men in the WVS global sample (3.64 for women and 3.80 for men, where 5.0 is the best health status), and health status takes a strong coefficient in the life satisfaction and happiness equations. To get a more specific explanation for gender differences, they estimated gender-specific equations. The general finding from these gender-specific equations is that the responses of males and females to
different events and circumstances are strikingly similar; much more so, for example, than occurs when we model gender differences in the determinants of suicide. The only gender differences in happiness that are significant at the 1% level are that strong belief in God increases happiness more for females than males, that living in a country with a high quality of government increases happiness more for females than males, and that females are happier than males in Asia and some non-Asian developing countries. In short, unlike many other factors in their analysis, gender appears to have no strong and straightforward effect on subjective well-being. (John F. Helliwell and Robert D. Putnam 2004).

Level of (study) education is another important independent variable that influences subjective well-being very much. A few studies are reviewed hereunder. One does not have to look far to find plenty of evidence of the influence of education on many important aspects of people’s lives. So, if ‘happiness’ is understood in the robust eudaimonist sense of overall human wellbeing, then education evidently has an enormous impact. Without providing any particular order or categorization, here is a brief sample of impact statements drawn from Hayward, Pannozzo and Colman (2005) and others as indicated.

• “the well-being of modern society is dependent not only on traditional capital and labour but also on the knowledge and ideas possessed and generated by individual workers. Education is the primary source of this human capital” (Crocker, 2002).

• “Educational attainment is positively associated both with health status and with healthy lifestyles. For example, in the 1996-97 [Canadian] National Population Health Survey, only 19% of respondents with less than high school education rated their health as ‘excellent’, compared with almost 30% of university graduates. Self-rated health, in turn, has been shown to be a reliable predictor of health problems, health-care utilization, and longevity. From a health determinant perspective, education is clearly a good investment that can reduce long-term health care costs”.

• “According to Statistics Canada, workers with higher education were more likely to have secure, high-wage, high-benefit jobs. Employees with less than high school education were more likely to have insecure work, low wages and no benefits. .
Poverty and inequality are acknowledged to be the most reliable predictors of poor health outcomes, and they are also closely linked to low educational attainment and unhealthy lifestyles.

In another study among other features of an individual's social location that have been shown to be predictive of subjective well-being are marital status, race, education, employment and age (Glenn & Weaver 1985; Gove & Shin 1985; Gove et al. 1985; Coombs 1991; Clark & Oswald 1994; Clark et al. 2003). An early review of the literature nearly four decades ago profiled the happy person as 'young, healthy, well-educated, well-paid, extroverted, optimistic, worry-free, religious, married person with high self-esteem, job morale and modest aspirations, of either sex and of a wide range of intelligence' (Wilson 1967; Diener et al. 1999). A more recent review of many subsequent studies in the US and Europe concluded that people who are married, white, better educated, employed, but not middle-aged and have higher incomes are happier (Oswald 1997). This summary, although not identical with Wilson's initial findings 35 years earlier, is sufficiently similar to suggest that most of the key patterns seem to be relatively robust.

Education has also been found to be a virtually universal correlate, although often its effects are substantially reduced or even absent, when other variables are included. This suggests that education may be largely instrumental, acting mainly through its effects on human and social capital. Unemployment seems to be a strong negative predictor of happiness.

Education remains what might be referred to as an instrumental variable, being associated with higher levels of subjective well-being by simple correlations, but the effects tend to drop out (especially in equations in which health status is included) for higher levels of education in more fully specified models. Education improves health and thus indirectly improves subjective well-being, but net of that effect (and of the other factors in our analysis), education appears to have no direct impact on subjective well-being (Helliwell and Putnam, 2004).

The stream of education is also one of the variable that influences subjective well-being.

Jadhav (2008) conducted study on 250 BNYS (Bachelor of Naturopathy and Yogic Sciences) and 250 MBBS (Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery) students to study the impact of yoga on self-concept, anxiety and subjective well-being using
Nagpal & Sell (1985) scale of Subjective well-being. In this study the BNYS students were compared to MBBS students on overall subjective well-being and on its eleven sub-dimensions. The study revealed that BNYS students’ scores on all the sub-dimensions and overall Subjective well-being are higher compared to MBBS students. Higher the scores on Subjective well-being better the Subjective well-being and lower the scores on Subjective well-being lower the Subjective well-being. By this study we can predict that Streams (Faculty) of education also influence subjective well-being. And different faculty students’ subjective well-being also differ according to their streams (faculty) of education.

SES (Socio-economic) status is another variable that also has its impact on Subjective well-being.

Researches by scholars suggest that individuals that live in countries with higher socioeconomic conditions are happier than those individuals that live in countries with low socio-economic conditions. These higher levels of happiness could be attributed to more material goods, high levels of human rights, greater longevity and more equality which are experienced by people in wealthier countries (Diener & Diener, 1995; Snyder & Lopez, 2002). Diener, Suh and Oishi (1997) suggest that income only influences subjective well-being at lower levels where physical needs are at stake, but that increasing levels of wealth above this level make little difference to well-being. Higher levels of subjective well-being were found in individuals that reside in countries with a stable democracy, social equality and institutions that run smoothly (Diener & Diener, 1995; Suh, 1999; Triandis, 2000).

Diener, Sandvik, Seidtitz & Diener (1999) have found a positive correlation between income and subjective well-being but Clark & Oswald (1994) did not find a statistically significant effect of income in respective sample from Britain. Smith & Razzel (1975) found that the effects of income often led to an increased level of distress. Recently Diner et al. (1999) in a review article have reported that over the years there is a linear increase in the income in America but did not find any increase in the well-being scores. Therefore, there appears to be a lack of consistency in the findings over the relationship between income and well-being. Bradley and Corwyn (2002) revealed that for children, SES influences well-being at multiple levels including both family and neighbourhood. Its effects are moderated by children’s own characteristics, family’s characteristics and external support systems. Evans,
Kantrowitz and Eshelman (2002) found that elderly residents of higher quality homes, independent of multiple demographic factors (e.g. income, gender), feel more attached to their home, which in turn, appears to account for the relation between housing quality and positive effect of well-being. Bookwalter and Delenberg (2004) found that important differences exist among groups based upon their economic status. For the poorest quartiles, transposition and housing groups based upon their economic status. For the poorest quartiles, transposition and housing play the most important role in determining well-being while for richest quartiles sanitation, water, energy, education and health are relatively more important.

SES is the position that an individual or family occupies with reference to the prevailing average standards of cultural possession, effective income, material possession and participation in group activity of the community. Social status can be thought of as a continuous variable as economic factors play an important part in determining the social status, it is better to label this variable as indicating their socio-economic status. It is very important to clarify the relationship between SES and well-being. Therefore, the present study was conducted to determine the relationship between Socio-Economic status and Subjective well-being.

Culture has direct effects on subjective well-being. People living in individualistic, rich and democratic cultures have higher levels of subjective well-being than do those living in collectivistic, poor and totalitarian cultures (Diener et al., 1999; Veenhoven, 1993). Culture also moderates the relation between hedonic balance and life satisfaction (Suh et al., 1998). Individualistic cultures emphasize the independence of individuals, whereas collectivistic cultures emphasize the interdependence of individuals and their close others (Kashima, Yamaguchi, Kim, Choi, Gelfand & Yuki, 1995; Triandis, 2000). Individualistic cultures emphasize freedom of choice and individuals’ needs, whereas collectivistic cultures emphasize duties, others’ needs and acceptance of one’s fate. For collectivists, following cultural norms is more important than maximizing pleasure (Suh et al., 1998). Hence, collectivists tend to pay less attention to the emotional consequences of events and emotions feature less prominently in their life-satisfaction judgments. It is important though to ensure that research studies on cultural differences in life satisfaction are not just a reflection of differences in socio-economic conditions that might influence the exposure to stressors and resources.
Religion is another independent variable that influences subjective well-being. Religiosity is often found to be associated with subjective well-being, although there is considerable debate about whether believing or belonging is more important; that is, whether what matters for subjective well-being is religious faith or rather participation in a religious community (Pollner 1989; Moberg & Taves 2000).

Pollner (1989) and Ellison (1991) examined the extent to which relationship with “divine others” affects psychological well-being. And they reported that individuals may construct divine relations much as they build social relationship, engaging a divine other in a quest for solace and guidance. The positive influence of religion certainly on well-being is, however, direct and substantial: individuals with strong religious faith report higher levels of life satisfaction, greater personal happiness, and fewer negative psychological consequences of traumatic life events.