UGC APPROVED JOURNAL - 47746

© INNOVATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS | Refereed | Peer Reviewed | Indexed

ISSN : 2454 – 308X | Volume : 03 , Issue : 10 | October – December 2017

PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING IN RELATION TO SELF-ESTEEM, PERSONALITY, EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND FAMILY ENVIRONMENT

Poonam

M.Phil(Psychology) Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra (Haryana), India; mail2psychologist@gmail.com

Abstract: The concept of well-being plays an important role in a number of disciplines. It appears not only in the field of psychology but also in field of philosophy, economics, psychiatry, public health, gerontology and elsewhere. Psychological research has also begun to examine how layperson conceptualize and think about the nature of well-being, often focusing on the degree to which individuals define well-being in hedonic (the experience of pleasure) and eudaemonic (the experience of meaning) terms. The present study (N=200) was conducted to study the well-being in relation to self-esteem, personality family environment and emotional intelligence. Participant completed a questionnaire comprising Psychological well being, Self esteem scale, Neo-Five Factor Inventory, Multidimensional measures of emotional intelligence, Family environment scale. Descriptive statistics, Pearson Correlation and Stepwise regression analysis were work out. Self-esteem, personality, emotional intelligence and family environment are likely to contribution substantially for psychological well-being. The study is useful to judge the Psychological Well-Being of the college students which is an indicator of mental health. It evaluates the factors that characterize and influence mental health and well-being, nurturing our understanding of culture, social and economic contexts in which me develops.

Keywords : Psychological well being; Self esteem; Personality; Family Environment; Emotional intelligence

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of well-being plays an important role in a number of disciplines. It appears not only in the field of psychology but also in field of philosophy, economics, psychiatry, public health, gerontology and etc. It is true that variety of physical attributes such strength, agility, skilled coordination, good posture, endurance, good proportions of body etc indicate physical health. In aging population, good memory, good eyesight, good hearing sense, good sleep, good mood, delayed graying, delayed wrinkling of skin etc. constitute indicators of good physical health. Well-being are intended to reflect mental status such as happiness, satisfaction, engagement and so on, Conceptions of well-being are individuals' cognitive representations of the nature and experience of well-being.

Psychological research has also begun to examine how layperson conceptualize and think about the nature of well-being, often focusing on the degree to which individuals define well-being in hedonic (the experience of pleasure) and eudaemonic (the experience of meaning) terms. The concept of well-bing tends to revolves around two distinct but related philosophies: (1) hedonism and (2) eudaimonism. A hedonic view of well-being equates well-being with pleasure and happiness (Kahneman et. al 1999; Ryan and Deci 2001). Alternativeiy, a eudaimonic view of well-being conceptualizes well-being in terms of cultivation of personal strength and contribution to the greater good (Aristole, 2000).

Well-being can be defined in terms of: (i) objective well-being and subjective well-being; Objective well-being refers to the material and social circumstances believed to foster or detract from – an individual's community's sense of well-being. Subjective well-being refers to an individual's self assessment of their own well-being. The aim of well-being theory is to explain why some people are happier than others. Any sensible theory ought to account for linkages among at least three sets of variables: stable person characteristics (including personality traits), major life events, and measures of well-being (life satisfaction, positive affects) and ill being (anxiety, depression, negative affects).

The relationship between well-being and positive psychology has been proven by many social scientists to be strong and positive. McNulty (2012) according to positive psychology at the subjective level is about valued subjective experiences". Well-being is an important factor in this subjective experience, as well as contentment, satisfaction with the past, optimism for the future and happiness in the present. People are more likely to experience positive psychology if they take in the good things in each experience or situation. Even with regard to the past, if a person only focuses on the negative the brain will only be able to recognize the negative. The more the brain has access to the negative, the easier it becomes, because that is what is more memorable. It takes more effort for the brain to remember the positive experiences because typically it is the smaller actions and experiences that are the positive ones.

High self-esteem and strong self-efficacy beliefs, contribute to personal strength and resilience (Mruk, 1999; Bandura, 1997). We have better health and well-being when we evaluate ourselves positively and belive that we will succeed at takes we attempt. Various studies have found high self-esteem is linked to better overall functioning. Self-esteem is positively associated with subjective well-being (Diener & Diener, 1995) and satisfying social relationships (Leary & Baumeister, 2000).

Well-being is associated with a range of bodily state effort relations and economically related profit. High level of well-being is linked with decrease risk of disease, sickness, and damage; improved immune working; speedier recovery; and better durability. Individuals with high levels of well-being are extra creative at work and are more probable to add to their community. The lower level of well-being is strongly related with neuroticism and that positive affect component has a similar association with extraversion. The whole members of family are very vital factor influencing continued existence; strong emotional bondings go forward to foster protracted commitment among its members. Vanwel (2000) study suggests that a conflict in families is linked with adolescent's lack of confidence and mental distress, as well as, violent behavior and behavior disorder (Wissinket al. 2006).

Grant et al. (2009) looked at Big Five personality traits as predictors of subjective and psychological well-being. They found that overall relationship between personality and well-being was larger for psychological well-being than for subjective well-being. Also, neuroticism showed similar strong relationship to both subjective and psychological well-being, while extraversion and conscientiousness were correlated more with psychological well-being than with subjective well-being. The present study is an attempt to examine the relationship of self-esteem, personality, emotional intelligence and family environment with psychological well-being.

2. Hypothesis

1.There is likelihood of positive relationship between self-esteem and psychological well-being.

2.There is likelihood of positive relationship between personality and psychological well-being.

3.Emotional intelligence is likely to correlate positively with psychological well-being.

4.There exists the positive relationship between family environment and psychological well-being.

5.Self-esteem, personality, emotional intelligence and family environment are likely to contribution substantially for psychological well-being.

3. Material and Methods

3.1 Participant and Procedures

The present study was conducted on a sample of 200 students. The sample was selected from three academic institutions i.e. F.C College for women, D.N. College and Guru Jambheshwar University of

Science & Technology, Hissar (Haryana). The age range of the selected subjects was between 17 and 25 years with the mean age of 22 years. The selected sample involves the students from all walks of the society. Only those participants were included in the sample who had given the consent to participant. The overall health of the participants was good.

3.2 Measures

The measures used for this study are well known and have often been used in various studies. The following tests were used in the present study.

Psychological Well-being (Ryff, 1995)

Self-Esteem Scale(Coopersmith, 1989)

NEO-Five Factor Inventory (Costa & McCrace, 1991)

Multidimensional Measures of Emotional Intelligence (Darolia 2003)

Family Environment Scale (Bhatia & Chadha, 1993)

3.3Administration and scoring of test

The subject was contacted in their respective educational institutions to seek their willingness for the participation in the study. After getting the willingness of the participants the report was established. Tests were administered in single session in a group of 10 to 15 participants. Proper setting arrangements were taken care of during the tests administration. Tests were administered strictly in accordance with the procedure specified in the respective test manual. Although there is no time limit to complete the tests yet participant were to complete them as soon as possible. The procedure was uniform all through.

They were assured that they should respond on the tests without any fear or hesitation. There is no right or wrong answers because every behavioural aspect has its own advantages. They were also told that information obtained through these tests would be used for research purpose only and would be kept confidential. Responses for each test were obtained as given performs in the concerned. The participants were instructed to check whether responses to all the items were given and no item was left unanswered. All the participants responded to all the items and helped whenever they encountered and difficulty. The participants were generally very co-operative and seemed very much interested in the tests.

The test was scored strictly according to the procedures mentioned in respective manuals by using separate keys or scoring instructions. Psychological Well-Being was scored on five Point Rating-scales i.e. Strongly Disagree (1), Disagree (2), Not Sure (3), Agree (4), and Strongly Agree (5) for six subscales. Some items of Psychological Well-Being are positive scored and some items are negatively scored. The positively scored items are assigned 1 to 5 scores and negatively scored assigned scores in reverse i.e. 5 to 1. The total scores of each dimension were computed by adding the scores from all the items included in the subscale.

Self-Esteem inventory was scored for single score. The participants responded on like me and unlike me alternates. One score was given to the response matched with scoring key. Total score of the inventory was obtained by adding the scores of the participant on all the items.

The NEO-FFI is scored for five dimensions. Some items of NEO-FFI are positively scored and some items are negatively scored. The positively scored items are assigned 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 scores and negatively scored of the items are assigned scores in reverse i.e. 4, 3, 2, 1, 0. Total scores of the inventory was obtained by adding the scores of the participant on all the items.

Multidimensional Measure of Emotional Intelligence (MMEI) was scored for five measures: Self Awareness, Managing Emotions, Motivating Oneself, Empathy and Handling Relationships. Score of each positive statement were assigned from 5 to 1 negative statements from 1 to 5. Total scores of the subject ranged from 80 to 400 on these tests. The scoring can be accomplished by using stencil keys as well as manually.

Family Environment Scale was scored for eight subscales on 5 point Likert-scale i.e. strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree (5 to 1 score for positive items and 1 to 5 score for negative items). The items are scored for eight dimensions i.e. Cohesion, Expressiveness, Conflict, Acceptance and caring, Independence, Active-Recreational Orientation, Organization and Control.

3.4 Statistical Analysis:

To meet the objectives of the study. The analysis was done with the help of SPSS. The obtained data was analyzed for Descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation and Multiple regression.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to meet the research objectives, the scores on all twenty five variables were subjected to various statistical analyses. Descriptive statistics, Pearson Correlation and Stepwise regression analysis were work out. The results of these analyses are reported as under:

Descriptive Statistics

The means, standard deviations, skewness and kurtosis of the observed variables are shown in Table-1. These values were worked out to examine the pattern of score distribution on all the measured variables. The number of respondents being 200, the standard error of skewness comes out to be .17. Therefore, a skewness coefficient of .33 (.17* 1.96) is significant at .05 probability level. An inspection of skewness coefficients for the variable reveal that distribution of scores are non significant for overall psychological well-being scale, emotional intelligence scale and some measures of personality i.e. extraversion and conscientiousness, and family environment scale i.e. expressiveness and active recreational orientation. The distribution of scores are slightly skewed on the measures of Self-Esteem (-.37), Neuroticism (-.43), Openness (-.39), Agreeableness (-.48), Empathy (-.37) measures of personality. Cohesive (-.86), Conflict (-.37), Acceptance & Caring (-.37), Independence (.40), Organizational (-.86) and Control (-.46) measures of family environment scale.

The kurtosis coefficients reported in last column of the Table-1. The standard error of kurtosis being .34 kurtosis coefficient of .66 (.34* 1.96) is significant at .05 probability level.

It may be noted that the kurtosis coefficients of all twenty five variables range between .04 and .90. Kurotosis values are non significant for overall Psychological well-being, self-esteem, emotional intelligence and some measures of personality and family environment. This indicates that the distributions of scores are approximately normal.

UGC APPROVED JOURNAL - 47746

© INNOVATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS | Refereed | Peer Reviewed | Indexed

ISSN : 2454 – 308X | Volume : 03 , Issue : 10 | October – December 2017

TABLE-1

DESCRIPTIVE STASTISTICS

S.NO	Variable	Code	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
1	**Psychological Well-Being**					
I	Autonomy	AN	8.25	1.82	.40	-.26
Ii	Environmental Mastery	EM	9.60	1.84	-.69	.67
Iii	Personal Growth	PG	9.33	1.82	.54	.05
Iv	Positive Relationship	PR	10.31	2.17	-.37	.57
V	Purpose inLife	PL	10.16	1.98	-.25	.70
Vi	Self-Acceptance	SA	10.30	2.11	-.54	.74
vii	Psychological Well-Being Total	PWBT	57.96	5.34	.22	-.19
2	**Self-Esteem**	**SE**	**15.19**	**3.62**	**-.37**	**-.29**
3	**Personality**					
I	Neuroticism	N	22.14	7.68	-.43	.25
Ii	Extraversion	E	29.38	4.60	.00	-.74
Iii	Openness	O	26.60	4.81	-.39	.19
Iv	Agreeableness	A	28.50	4.66	-.48	.84
V	Conscientiousness	C	33.16	6.15	.22	-.07
4	**Emotional Intelligence**					
I	Self-Awareness	SA	48.84	5.71	-.21	-.58
Ii	Managing Emotions	ME	50.57	6.75	-.21	-.27
Iii	Motivating Oneself	MO	57.23	6.67	.04	.46
Iv	Empathy	EP	54.63	5.77	-.37	.05
V	Handling-Relationship	HR	56.71	6.77	.28	-.15
Vi	Emotional Intelligence Total	MMEIT	2.67	18.34	.09	-.38
5	**Family Environment**					
I	Cohesive	COH	54.38	5.99	-.86	.47
ii	Expressiveness	EXP	33.43	6.93	.20	.90
iii	Conflict	COF	42.82	5.95	-.37	.66
Iv	Acceptance &Caring	A&C	44.17	5.44	-.37	.86
V	Independence	INDP	32.45	5.59	.40	.28
Vi	Active-Recreational-Orientation	ARO	30.43	4.50	-.30	.23
Vii	Organizational	ORG	8.09	1.77	-.86	-.30
Viii	Control	CON	16.14	2.65	-.46	-.83

Note : Skewness = .33 is significant at .05 level.
Kurtosis = .66 is significant at .05 level.

Correlation Analysis:

The correlations among all the twenty five variables were computed by employing Parson Product Movement Correlation method. The obtained correlations are reported in Table -2. The degrees of freedom being 198 (N= 200), the correlation coefficients of .14 and .18 are significant at .05 and .01 level, respectively. The intercorrelations among different sets of variables have been described under separate headings.

Intercorrelation among the measures of Psychological well-being:

An inspection of Table-2 reveals that the intercorrelations among the measures of psychological well-being ranged between -.09 to -.19. Out of total 15 correlations, 7 are significant at or above .05 level of significance. Out of significant correlations 5 are positive and 2 are negative. Autonomy is negatively correlated with EM ($r = -.16$ $p < .05$), and PG ($r = -.19$ $p < .01$). The negatively significant relationship between the measures shows that individuals high on autonomy scores are tend to low on EM scores and PG scores. EM is positively correlated with PL ($r = .17$ $p < .05$), and SA ($r = .28$ $p < .05$). The positively significant relationship shows that individuals high on environmental mastery scores are tend to high on PL scores and SA scores. PG is positively correlated with PL ($r = .13$). PR and PL are positively correlated with SA ($r = .23$) and overall Psychological well-being ($r = .26$). The significant intercorrelation among the total and dimension shows the measures share common variance.

Correlation between measure of Self-esteem and Psychological well-being:

Correlation between measure of Self-esteem and those of Psychological well-being are ranging from .02 to .16. Self-esteem is correlated positively with SA ($r = .14$ $p < .05$) and overall PWB ($r = .16$ $p < .05$). The positive significant relationship between the measures indicates that individuals high on self-esteem are tend to be high on Self acceptance and overall Psychological well-being measures. It may be interpreted as those who are high on Self- esteem are having the tendency to be high on Self-acceptance sense of autonomy in thought and action, ability to manage complex environments to suit personal needs and values.

Intercorrelation among the measures of Personality:

Intercorrelations among five factors of personality indexed by NEO-FFI are general low ranging from .05 to -.48. Seven of ten correlations are significant at or above .05 level of significance. Neuroticism has correlated negatively with all the remaining four factors i.e. Extraversion ($r = -.33$ $p < .01$), Openness ($r = -.21$ $p < .01$), Agreeableness ($r = -.15$ $p < .05$), and conscientiousness ($r = -.48$ $p < .01$). Extraversion has marked significant positive correlations with conscientiousness ($r = .35$ $p < .01$). Openness and Agreeableness have correlated significantly with conscientiousness with respective coefficients of .16 ($p < .05$) and .27 ($p < .01$). Obtained significant correlations among the factors of NEO-FFI may be because of their association with some higher order factors of personality.

Correlation between measures of Personality and Psychological well-being:

Correlation between measures of personality and psychological well-being are ranging from .00 to .20. Out of 30 correlations 4 are significant at or above .05 level of significance. A is correlated negatively with AN ($r = -.13$ $p < .05$). The results indicate that individuals lows on agreeableness are tend to be high on autonomy. It may be interpreted as those who are high on autonomy are able to resist social pressures, regulates behavior by personal standard. Individuals low on agreeableness tends to be cynical, skeptical and suspicious of a low opinion of human nature. E is correlated positively with EM ($r = .15$ $p < .05$). The results indicate that individuals high on extraversion are tend to be high on environmental mastery. It may be interpreted as those who are high on environmental mastery controls complex array. Individuals high on extraversion tends to be very warm and affectionate toward and usually enjoys large and noisy crowed. O is correlated negatively with PG ($r = -.14$ $p < .05$). The results indicate that individuals low on openness are tend to be high on personal growth. It may be interpreted as those who are high on personal growth sense of realizing one's potential, improvement in self and behaviour over time, and changing the self-knowledge and effectiveness and tend to low on perceived as being reasonably effeciant and sensible, and rational in making decision.

Intercorrelation among the measures of Emotional intelligence:

Correlation among the measures of Emotional Intelligence ranges from .04 to .69. Twelve of Fifteen correlations are significant at or above .05 level of significance. SA shows positively correlation with MO (r = .15 p < .05), HR (r = .18 p < .01), and overall Emotional Intelligence (r = .49 p < .01). The positively significant relationship shows that individuals high on self-awareness scores are tend to high on MO scores, HR scores and overall EI. ME has also shown the significant positive correlation with MO (r = .35 p < .01), HR (r =.15 p < .05), and overall EI (r =.53 p < .01). The positively significant relationship shows that individuals high on Managing Emotions scores are tend to high on MO scores, HR scores and overall EI scores. MO has also shown the significant positively correlation with EP (r = .14 p < .05), HR (r = .29 p< .01), and overall EI (r = .69 p < .01). The positively significant relationship shows that individuals high on Motivating- Oneself scores tend to high on EP scores, HR scores and overall EI scores. EP has also shown the significant positively correlation with HR (r = .26 p < .01), and overall EI (r = .46 p < .01). The positively significant relationship shows that individuals high on Empathy scores tend to high on HR scores and overall EI scores. HR has shown the significant positively correlation with overall EI (r = .67 p < .01). The positively significant relationship shows that individuals high on Handling-Relationship scores are tend to high on overall Emotional Intelligence scores. The significant intercorrelation among the measures shows the measures share common variance.

Correlation between measure of Emotional intelligent and Psychological well-being:

Correlation between measures of Emotional intelligence and Psychological well-being are ranging from -.00 to .19. Out of 42 correlations 6 are significant at or above .05 level of significance. ME is correlated positively with AN (r = .17 p < .05). The result indicate that individuals high on managing emotions are tend to be high on autonomy. It may be interpreted as those who are able to resist social pressures and regulates ones behavior by personal standards are tend to be high on managing emotions and handling feelings. They are appropriate in realizing what is behind a feeling, finding the way to handle tears and anxiety anger and sadness. HR is correlated positively with EM (r = .15 p < .05). The result indicate that individuals high handling relationship are tend to be high on environmental mastery. It may be interpreted as those who are able to manage emotions, social competence and social skills are tend to high on environmental mastery is able to control complex array of external activity, personal needs and values. PG is correlated positively with MO (r = .19 p < .05), HR (r = .13 p < .05), and overall EI (r = .15 p < .05). It may be interpreted as those who are high on Motivating Oneself are channeling emotions in the service of a goal, emotional self control and stifling impulses, Handling-Relationship are managing emotions in others, social competence and social skills and Overall Emotional Intelligence tend to be high on Personal Growth sense of realizing his or her potential, improvement in self and behaviour over time, and changing the self-knowledge and effectiveness. The positive significant relationship between the measures indicates that individuals high on personal growth are tend to be high on motivating oneself, handling relationship and overall being measures.

Intercorrelation among the measures of Family environment:

Correlation among the measures of Family environment range from .05 to .51. Twenty seven of twenty eight of correlation are significant at or above .05 level significance. COH shows the positive correlation with EXP (r = .26 p <.01), COF (r = .45 p < .01), A&C (r = .50 p < .01), IND (r =.48 p < .01), ARO (r =.51 p < .01), ORG (r =.43 p < .01), and CON (r =.51). EXP has shown the significant positive correlation with A&C (r = .19 p < .01), IND (r = .42 p < .01), ARO (r = .33 p < .01), ORG (r = .21 p < .01), and CON (r= .29 p < .01). COF has also shown the significant positive correlation with A&C (r = .44 p < .01), IND (r = .36 p < .01), ARO (r = .36 p < .01), ORG (r = .42 p < .01), and CON (r = .35 p < .01). A&C has also shown significant positive correlation with IND(r = .47 p < .01), ARO (r = .43 p < .01), ORG (r = .35 p < .01), and CON (r = .45 p < .01). IND has also shown significant

positive correlation with ARO (r = .48 p < .01), ORG (r = .28 p < .01), and CON (r = .39 p < .01). ARO has also shown significant positive correlation with ORG (r = .36 p < .01), and CON (r = .41 p < .01). ORG has also shown significant positive correlation with CON (r = .44 p < .01). All the measures of family environment are significantly correlated to each other except Conflict. It can be interpreted as the measure shared the common variance.

Correlation between measure of Family environment and Psychological well-being:

Correlation between measures of family environment and psychological well-being are ranging from -.01 to -.16. Out of 56 correlations 8 are significant at or above .05 level of significance. COH (r = -.14 p < .05) and ORG (R = -.16 P < .05) are correlated negatively with AN. The result indicate that individuals low on choesive and organization are tends to be high on autonomy. It may be interpreted as those who are high on Autonomy are able to resist social pressures and regulates one behaviour by personal standards are tend to be low on Cohesive degree of commitment, help and support family members provide for one members, Organizational structure in planning family activity and responsibly. EXP (r = .14 p < .05) and CON (r = .16 p < .05) are correlated positively with PR. The results indicate that individuals high on positive relationship are tends to be high on expressiveness and control. It may be interpreted as those who are high on Positive Relationship are capable of strong empathy, affection and intimacy, and understands of human relationships are tend to be high on Expressiveness are express their fellings and thoughts directly and Control degree of limit setting within a family. COH (r = .18 p < .05), ORG (r = .16 p < .05), and CON (r = .20 p < .01) are correlated positively with SA. The positive significant relationships between the measures indicate that individuals high on self-acceptance are tend to be high on cohesive, organizational and control. It may be interpreted as those who are high on Self-Acceptance including good and bad qualities, feels positive about past life, tend to be high on Cohesive degree of commitment, help and support family members provide for one members, Organizational structure in planning family activity and responsibly, and Control degree of limit setting within a family.

Multiple Regression Analysis:

In order to examine the extent to which self-esteem, personality, emotional intelligence and family environment can predict psychological well-being, multiple regression analysis was employed on the obtained data. Undoubtedly, the multiple regression provides an opportunity, with little ambiguity, to assess the importance of each of the genuine contributors to the individual differences in the dependent measure. Multiple regression has been employed to find the subtest of independent variables that are useful in predicting the dependent variable and to eliminate those do not provide additional prediction to the independent variables already in equation. The model that suits this aim is stepwise multiple regression.

The stepwise regression equation starts out empty and independent variables are added in steps, one at a time, provided they meet the statistical criteria for entry (F with < .05). At each step, the independent variable not in the equation with a smallest probability of F is entered in the equation may be removed if they lose significant contribute towards multiple R^2. The method terminates when no more variables are eligible for inclusion or removal. The stepwise regression is the suggest path to the prediction equation when one is interested in identifying a subset of potent predictors are eliminating those which do not provide additional prediction to the predictors already entered (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). The results of regression analysis are presented in Table-2.

The results reported in Table-2 show that independent variables used in analysis jointly contribute substantial proportion of variance in Psychological Well-Being of college students. The multiple correlations equal to .33, the F statistics being 6.06 (df = 4 / 195), it is significant at .001 probability level. It may be noted that the multiple R square equals to .111. Therefore 11.1 % of variance in Psychological Well-Being is counted by the measures of Self-Esteem, Personality, Emotional

Intelligence and Family Environment. It is clear from these results that though 88.9 % of the variance in Psychological Well-Being remained unaccounted, a substantial proportion of variance has been explained predominantly by four of twenty five predictors in the equation. The adjusted R square being .092, which fairly close to .111, the results represent the population parameters to the satisfactory level.

Managing emotions being the most pertinent predictor of psychological well-being, it entered in the equation at step one. The R for this variable equals to .179 and R^2 = .032, F entering being 6.55, it is significant at .01 probability level. It indicates that managing emotions is very strong predictor of psychological well-being among adolescents. The cohesive is another potent predictor which was entered at step two, multiple R increased to .241 (R^2 =.058) with the entry of cohesive in the equation after managing emotions. The F ratio computed for the significance of multiple R, at step two equals to 6.09, which is significance at probability level .01. The expressiveness is another potent predictor which was entered at step three, multiple R increased to .297 (R^2 = .088) with the entry of expressiveness in the equation after cohesiveness. The F ratio computed for the significance of multiple R, at step three, equals to 6.32, which is significant at a probability less than .001.

TABLE-2

SUMMARY OF STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

DEPENDENT VARIABLE: PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

Step	Variable	R	R Square	Adjusted R^2	Df	F	Sig.
1.	ME	.179	.032	.027	1,198	6.55	.01
2.	COH	.241	.058	.049	2,197	6.09	.01
3.	EXP	.297	.088	.074	3,196	6.32	.001
4.	C	.333	.111	.092	4,195	6.06	.001

Hence it indicates that expressiveness is also a strong predictor of psychological well-being.The last variable entered in regression equation is conscientiousness. With the entry of this predictor at step four, the multiple R become .333 and R^2 =.111. The F ratio at this step equals to 6.06, which it is significant at .001 probability level.

The results of stepwise regression analysis revealed that the linear combination of four measures i.e. managing emotions, cohesive, expressiveness and conscientiousness accounts for significant proportion of variance (11.1%) in psychological well-being among college students.

Main Findings of the Study

1. Intercorrelation between the measures of self-esteem and psychological well-being between .02 to .16. Out of total six correlations one are significant at above .05 level of significance. The hypothesis no. one regarding the relationship between self-esteem and psychological well-being is accepted.
2. The correlations between the measure of personality and psychological well-being ranges from .05 to -.48. Out of total ten correlations, seven are significant at or above .05 level of significance. The hypothesis no. two regarding the relationship between personality and psychological well-being is partly accepted.
3. The correlation between the measure of emotional intelligence and psychological well-being ranges from .04 to .69. Out of total fifteen correlations, twelve are significant at or above .05 level of significance. The hypothesis no. three regarding the relationship between emotional intelligence and psychological well-being is accepted.

4. The correlation between the measure of family environment and psychological well-being ranges from .05 to .51. Out of total twenty eight correlations, twenty seven are significant at or above .05 level of significance. The hypothesis no. four regarding the relationship between family environment and psychological well-being is accepted.
5. Managing emotions, cohesive, expressiveness and conscientiousness jointly explain the variance of 11.1% in psychological well-being among college students. The hypothesis no. five is accepted.

REFERENCES

1. Adkins, G., Martin, P., & Poon, L. W. (1996). Personality traits and states as predictors of subjective well-being in centenarians, octogenarians, and sexagenarians. *Psychology and aging*, *11*(3), 408-545.
2. Augusto Landa, J. M., Martos, M. P., & Lopez-Zafra, E. (2010). Emotional intelligence and personality traits as predictors of psychological well-being in Spanish undergraduates. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *38*(6), 783-793.
3. Balastsky. G. and Diener, E. (1993). Subjective Well-Being among Russian Students. *Social Indicators Research*, 28 (3), 225-243.
4. Bhatia, H. & Chadha, N.K. (1993). Family Environment Scale Manual. Luknow: Ankur Psychological Agency.
5. Bradburn, N. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being. Chicago: Aldine. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69 (4), 719-727.
6. Coopersmith, S. (1981). SEI, Self-Esteem Inventory. Counsulting Psychologist Press.
7. Costa , P. T., Jr., and McCrae, R.R.Z. (1987). *Journal of Personality*, 55, 229-316.
8. Costa Jr, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1995). Domains and facets: Hierarchical personality assessment using the Revised NEO Personality Inventory.*Journal of personality assessment*, *64*(1), 21-50.
9. Costa. P. T., McCrae. R. R. (1991) NEO-FFI Mannual, Florido: *Psychological Assessment Resources*, Inc.
10. Diener, E. (1998). Subjective Well-Being and Personality. Advanced Personality. *The Plenum series in social/ clinical psaychology*. 311-334.
11. Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). Personality, culture, and subjective well-being: Emotional and cognitive evaluations of life. *Annual review of psychology*, *54*(1), 403-425.
12. Drolia, C.R. (2003). Multidimensional Measure of Emotional Intelligence. Ambala Cantt: Jagson India.
13. Emmons, R. A., & Diener, E. (1985). Personality correlates of subjective well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *11* (1), 89-97.
14. Gallagher, E. N., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2008). Social support and emotional intelligence as predictors of subjective well-being. *Personality and individual differences*, *44*(7), 1551-1561.
15. Guindon, M. H. (2002). Toward accountability in the use of the self-esteem construct. *Journal of Counseling and Development: JCD*, *80* (2), 204.
16. Gutiérrez, J. L. G., Jiménez, B. M., Hernández, E. G., & Pcn, C. (2005). Personality and subjective well-being: Big five correlates and demographic variables. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *38* (7), 1561-1569.
17. Leary, M. R., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). *The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer theory*. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, *Vol. 32* (p. 1–62).

18. Lyubomirsky, S., Tkach, C., & DiMatteo, M. R. (2006). What are the differences between Happiness and Self-Esteem. *Social Indicators Research*,*78*(3), 363-404.
19. Man, D. (1999). *Objective happiness.* In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (p. 3–25). Russell Sage Foundation.
20. Mruk, C. (1999). *Self-esteem: Research, theory, and practice* (2nd ed.). Springer Publishing Co.
21. Mäkikangas, A., & Kinnunen, U. (2003). Psychosocial work stressors and well-being: Self-esteem and optimism as moderators in a one-year longitudinal sample. *Personality and individual differences*, *35* (3), 537-557.
22. *McNulty, James; Frank D. Fincham (February 2011). "Beyond Positive Psychology".American Psychologist* ***67****, 101–110*
23. Murthy, R. K. (2014). Psychological Well-Being, Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *Global Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, *3*(9), 607-899.
24. Paradise, A. W., & Kernis, M. H. (2002). Self-Esteem and Psychological Well-Being: Implications of fragile self-esteem. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *21*(4), 345-361.
25. Quevedo, R. J. M., & Abella, M. C. (2011). Well-being and Personality: Facet-level analyses. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *50* (2), 206-211.
26. Rask, K. & Kurki (2003). Adolescent Subjective Well-Being and family dynamics. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*: 17 (2), 129-138.
27. Rask, K., Åstedt-Kurki, P., Paavilainen, E., & Laippala, P. (2003). Adolescent subjective
28. well-being and family dynamics. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, *17* (2), 129-138.
29. Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*(4), 719–727.
30. Ryan, J. (1981). Marital status, happiness, and anomia. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 643-649.
31. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research
32. on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual review of psychology*, *52*(1), 141-166.
33. Sarkova, M., Bacikova-Sleskova, M., Madarasova Geckova, A., Katreniakova, Z., van den
34. Heuvel, W., & van Dijk, J. P. (2014). Adolescents' psychological well-being and self-esteem
35. in the context of relationships at school.*Educational Research*, *56* (4), 367-378.
36. Sillik, T.J., & Schutte, N.S. (2006) Emotional Intelligence and Self-Esteem Mediate Between Perceived Early Parental Love and Adult Happiness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2 (2), 38-48.
37. Van Wel, F., Linssen, H., & Abma, R. (2000). The parental bond and the well-being of adolescents and young adults. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *29*(3), 307–318.
38. Vitterso, J. Nilsen, F. (2001). The conceptual and Relational Structure of Subjective Well-Being, Neuroticism, and Extraversion: Once Again, Neuroticism is the important Predictor of Happiness. *Social indicators Research*, 57, 89-118.
39. Zeidner, M., Matthews, G., & Roberts, R. D. (2012). The Emotional Intelligence,
40. Health,andWell-Being Nexus: What Have We Learned and What Have We Missed?. *AppliedPsychology: Health and Well-Being*, *4*(1), 1-30