



Original Researcher Article

THE STUDY OF PERSONALITY AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING AMONG YOUNG ADULTS

Article History:

Name of Author:

Smriti Singh^{1*}, Shalini Agarwal²

Affiliation: ¹*Research Scholar, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, School of Home Science, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow- 226025 Uttar Pradesh, India,

²Professor, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, School of Home Science, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow- 226025 Uttar Pradesh, India,

Corresponding Author: Smriti Singh

Email: smriti.rs.hdfs@email.bbau.ac.in

Received: 5th November 2025

Revised: 17th November 2025

Accepted: 18th December 2025

Published: 29th December 2025

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

Abstracts: Individual differences in personality play a crucial role in shaping how young adults perceive, cope with, and adapt to life challenges. At the same time, socio-demographic contexts can either strengthen or weaken these personality–well-being linkages. Psychological well-being in young adulthood is shaped by a complex interplay of stable personality traits and socio-demographic factors. Understanding how these individual differences contribute to well-being is essential for designing effective mental health interventions during this critical developmental phase. In this context this study explored at how the association between personality traits and psychological well-being translates to a larger sample of young adults, as well as how demographic variables like gender, age, and family structure influence the relationship. Correlation and regression analyses revealed that Conscientiousness and Agreeableness emerged as the strongest positive predictors across multiple dimensions of psychological well-being. Emotional Stability demonstrated moderate associations with Personal Growth, while Openness to Experience and Extraversion showed weaker relationships with well-being outcomes.

Gender effects were notably absent across all six psychological well-being dimensions, indicating comparable well-being levels between men and women in this sample. However, family structure differences emerged, with individuals from nuclear families scoring significantly higher on Positive Relations with Others and Purpose in Life compared to those from joint families. The absence of age-related differences suggests that psychological well-being remains relatively stable throughout early to middle adulthood (ages 20-35).

These findings underscore the critical importance of Conscientiousness and Agreeableness in promoting well-being among young adults and provide valuable insights for developing personality-informed interventions aimed at enhancing mental health and resilience during this developmental period. However, other limitations should be considered, including the cross-sectional design and the relatively modest fraction of variance explained solely by personality factors.

Keywords: Personality traits, psychological well-being, young adults, mental health, Personality.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Concept and Scope of Psychological Well-Being

Psychological well-being is a multifaceted construct encompassing psychological, emotional, and social dimensions linked to effective stress coping (Chaudhry et al., 2024). It emphasizes skill development and self-actualization (García & Calvo, 2017), contributing to thriving in personal and social contexts (Supriatna & Septian, 2021; Park et al., 2022).

Ryff's paradigm has six dimensions: self-acceptance, personal growth, life purpose, positive relationships, environmental mastery, and autonomy (Yurayat & Seechaliao, 2021; Mustafa et al., 2020; Kinderen et al., 2020; Lin et al., 2022). Subjective well-being is measured by life satisfaction, emotional responses, and cognitive appraisals (Chen et al., 2022; Malkoç, 2011).

Flourishing includes pleasant feelings, life satisfaction, a lack of negative emotions, and eudaimonic components (Park et al., 2022; Nisbet et al., 2020). Well-being represents feeling good and functioning well, including positive emotions, potential development, life control, purpose, and positive relationships (Pikó, 2023; Duckworth et al., 2009; Huppert & So, 2011). WHO defines it as realizing abilities, coping with stress, working productively, and contributing to community (Livingston et al., 2022; Aulia et al., 2020).

1.2 Young Adults as Study Population

Mental well-being in young adults is crucial for developing healthier future populations (Bjørnsen et al., 2017). High subjective well-being improves functionality and quality of life (Ateş, 2020), motivating self-improvement and social harmony (Zhang et al., 2022). Compromised well-being leads to functional decline, morbidity, and premature mortality (Andreasen et al., 2022; Kotera et al., 2020).

Economic challenges including rising living costs necessitate financial management skills (Bhatia & Singh, 2023; Sabri et al., 2023). Fostering mission and purpose impacts well-being and prosocial behavior (Chen et al., 2019). Life satisfaction aids developmental milestone navigation (Nainee et al., 2021; Evans et al., 2022; Azpiazu et al., 2021).

Young adults face vulnerabilities including loneliness, social isolation, employment instability, and developing emotion regulation (Bell et al., 2023). This period features significant brain development and receptivity to positive influences (Schwarz, 2009).

1.3 Personality and Well-being

Personality traits influence psychological well-being as protective assets promoting health and longevity (Hernández et al., 2017). Prosocial behaviors enhance well-being through self-worth and positive interactions (Megawati & Herdiyanto, 2016). Young adulthood involves complex self-affirmation and identity consolidation (Palenzuela-Luis et al., 2022; Mastorci et al., 2024).

Diversifying attachment forms and peer relationships make young adults unique for well-being studies (Tan et al., 2023). The Big Five model offers a comprehensive framework for analyzing personality-well-being links.

1.4 Research Focus

Objectives: Examine relationships between Big Five personality dimension and psychological well-being in young adults aged 20-35.

Research Questions:

1. How does gender influence different dimensions of psychological well-being among young adults?
2. What role does family structure (nuclear vs. joint) play in shaping psychological well-being?
3. How does age variation within young adulthood affect psychological well-being dimensions?
4. What is the nature and strength of the relationship between Big Five personality traits and psychological well-being?
5. To what extent do personality traits predict psychological well-being dimensions among young adults?

Hypothesis

H₀₁: There is no substantial difference between male and female young adults in any category of psychological well-being.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference in psychological well-being dimensions between individuals from nuclear and joint family backgrounds.

H₀₃: Psychological well-being dimensions do not differ significantly across the three age categories of young adults, namely 20–25 years, 25–30 years, and 30–35 years.

H₀₄: There is no significant correlation between the Big Five personality traits and the dimensions of psychological well-being.

H₀₅: Personality traits do not significantly predict dimensions of psychological well-being.

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Psychological Well-being in Young Adults

Well-being research has surged over two decades, though definitional consistency lags behind usage growth (Bautista et al., 2023). Terms like wellness, health, happiness, and satisfaction are often used interchangeably, creating conceptual confusion.

Well-being encompasses social, psychological, and environmental influences beyond physical health (Sears et al., 2013; Andreassen et al., 2022). WHO defines health as total physical, mental, and social well-being (Capio et al., 2014; Gautam et al., 2024; and Srivastava, 2011).

Subjective well-being incorporates thoughts and feelings about life quality (Das et al., 2020). Post-WWII fields like sociology and psychology examined happiness through population studies, emotion research, and cognitive science (Yang & Chun-lei, 2022; Baryshev & Kashchuk, 2016).

Psychological well-being encompasses life satisfaction and positive affect from social, psychological, and freedom-related needs (Othman et al., 2020; Sarkar et al., 2024; Srivastava, 2011). Social support relationships are critical for positive young adult development (Evans et al., 2022; Azpiazu et al., 2021; Mecha et al., 2023).

Brain development and positive influence receptivity during young adulthood necessitate focused mental health attention (Schwarz, 2009; Neinstein & Irwin, 2013). Developmental variability requires understanding at-risk youth pathways (Burt & Paysnick, 2012). Healthcare professionals need strong communication skills for health promotion (Kim & White, 2017).

2.2 Personality Traits

The Big Five model represents the most accepted personality framework, encompassing extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness. Research demonstrates significant personality-well-being relationships.

Prosocial behaviors in adolescence and early adulthood enhance well-being through self-worth and positive interactions (Megawati & Herdiyanto, 2016). Personality-well-being relationships are particularly important during young adult transitions involving significant physical and

psychological changes (Azpiazu et al., 2021; Peng et al., 2025).

2.3 Young Adults as Developmental Group

Young adulthood involves complex self-affirmation and identity consolidation processes (Palenzuela-Luis et al., 2022). Physical, emotional, cognitive, and social changes require adaptive coping strategies (Mastorci et al., 2024).

Diversifying attachment forms and peer relationship importance make young adults unique for well-being research (Tan et al., 2023). Friendships become crucial for intimacy and support, contributing substantially to well-being (Khullar et al., 2021).

Vulnerabilities include loneliness, social isolation, employment instability, and developing emotion regulation skills (Bell et al., 2023). Understanding young adult experiences provides insights into adaptive behaviors and help-seeking promotion (Hellström & Beckman, 2021).

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a quantitative, correlational approach to investigate the links between personality traits and psychological well-being in young adults. The correlational approach was selected to investigate naturally occurring associations between personality traits and well-being without variable manipulation.

3.2 Participants

The sample comprised 348 college students aged 20-35 years, recruited from various academic programs to ensure diversity. This age range captures the young adult developmental period characterized by significant psychological and social transitions.

Inclusion criteria: Ages 20-35, currently enrolled students, informed consent provided. **Exclusion criteria:** Severe mental health conditions affecting assessment completion ability.

3.3 Sampling

The study was carried out on a sample of Lucknow district, selected through multistage purposive random sampling. Despite generalizability limitations, this method was chosen for practical accessibility and resource considerations. Diverse academic backgrounds were targeted to enhance sample representativeness.

3.4 Instruments

3.4.1 Ten-Item Personality Inventory (TIPI)

The TIPI (Gosling et al., 2003) assessed Big Five personality traits through ten items on a 7-point Likert scale. It measures Extraversion (sociability/enthusiasm), Agreeableness (kindness/cooperation), Conscientiousness (organization/responsibility), Emotional Stability (calmness/stress tolerance), and Openness to Experience (curiosity/creativity). The TIPI is valued for brevity and acceptable validity in large-scale studies.

3.4.2 Ryff's Psychological Well-being Scale Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scale (1989) is a standardized instrument comprising 18 items, with three items assigned to each of six dimensions, administered using a 7-point Likert scale. The scale

evaluates autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance, and is recognized for its strong reliability and frequent application in psychological research.

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

Following ethical approval, participants were recruited through classroom announcements, online platforms, and faculty referrals. After obtaining informed consent, participants completed both instruments in quiet settings within 20-30 minutes. Data were stored securely with maintained confidentiality and anonymity.

RESULTS

Table 3.1: Socio-Demographic Profile of the Participants

Variable	Category	Gender	Frequency (Percentage)	Total
Age	20–25	Male	125 (35.9%)	251 (72.1%)
		Female	126 (36.2%)	
	25–30	Male	55 (15.8%)	89 (25.6%)
		Female	34 (9.8%)	
	30–35	Male	4 (1.1%)	8 (2.3%)
		Female	4 (1.1%)	
Education	Intermediate	Male	25 (7.2%)	56 (16.1%)
		Female	31 (8.9%)	
	Graduation	Male	62 (17.8%)	123 (35.3%)
		Female	61 (17.5%)	
	Postgraduation	Male	41 (11.8%)	83 (23.9%)
		Female	42 (12.1%)	
	Other	Male	56 (16.1%)	86 (24.7%)
		Female	30 (8.6%)	
Family Type	Nuclear	Male	64 (18.4%)	149 (42.8%)
		Female	85 (24.4%)	
	Joint	Male	120 (34.5%)	199 (57.2%)
		Female	79(22.7%)	

Table 3.1. It reports the frequency and percentage distribution of participants according to their aged, education level, family type as follows: Most majority 72.1% were belongs to age group 20–25

years with nearly equal number of male (35.9%) and female (36.2%). RESULTS 25–30 AGE GROUP This age group comprised 25.6% of the sample (15.8% males and 9.8% females) whereas the 30–35

age subgroup accounted for only for 2.3% of the total in a balanced distribution between genders. The educational background of the participants was graduation (35.3%), postgraduation (23.9%), other qualifications (24.7%) and intermediate education (16.1%). For graduation level, there was a near balance between genders but for postgraduation variety of subjects chosen by females. 16.1% males

were in the 'other' education category in contrast to only 8.6% females. Very well distributed job level was found among the study subjects based on their family type, 57.2% came from joint families and were equally distributed among male (34.5%) and female (22.7%), while 42.8% had nuclear family status with slightly more female (24.4%) than male (18.4%).

Table 3.2: Gender-Wise Comparison of Psychological Well-Being Dimensions

Dimension	Gender	Mean $\pm$ SD	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Autonomy	Male	14.07 $\pm$ 3.11	-0.225	346	0.822
	Female	14.14 $\pm$ 3.11			
Environmental Mastery	Male	13.97 $\pm$ 3.65	-1.133	346	0.258
	Female	14.38 $\pm$ 3.16			
Personal Growth	Male	16.58 $\pm$ 4.08	-1.713	346	0.088
	Female	17.30 $\pm$ 3.68			
Positive Relations with Others	Male	13.06 $\pm$ 3.80	-1.602	346	0.110
	Female	13.74 $\pm$ 4.09			
Self-Acceptance	Male	15.89 $\pm$ 6.00	0.425	346	0.671
	Female	15.66 $\pm$ 3.45			
Purpose in Life	Male	13.06 $\pm$ 3.80	-1.602	346	0.110
	Female	13.74 $\pm$ 4.09			

Table 3.2 displays the findings of an independent samples t-test carried out to assess gender-based differences in the various dimensions of psychological well-being. The findings indicate that the mean scores for males and females are relatively similar across all dimensions, with no statistically significant gender differences observed. For Autonomy, males had a mean of 14.07 (SD = 3.11) and females 14.14 (SD = 3.11), $t(346) = -0.225$, $p = 0.822$. In Environmental Mastery, males scored 13.97 (SD = 3.65) and females 14.38 (SD = 3.16), $t(346) = -1.133$, $p = 0.258$. In Personal Growth, males reported a slightly lower mean (16.58 $\pm$ 4.08) than females (17.30 $\pm$ 3.68), but this difference was not significant, $t(346) = -1.713$, $p = 0.088$. Positive Relations with Others similarly indicated no

significant difference, with males scoring 13.06 (SD = 3.80) and females scoring 13.74 (SD = 4.09), $t(346) = -1.602$, $p = 0.110$. For Self-Acceptance, males (15.89 $\pm$ 6.00) and females (15.66 $\pm$ 3.45) showed minimal difference, $t(346) = 0.425$, $p = 0.671$. Similarly, Purpose in Life mirrored the results of Positive Relations, with males scoring 13.06 (SD = 3.80) and females 13.74 (SD = 4.09), $t(346) = -1.602$, $p = 0.110$. Overall, the findings indicate that gender does not have a statistically significant impact on psychological well-being aspects in this group. Male and female young adults did not differ significantly in any of the psychological well-being characteristics. Since all p-values were above 0.05, this hypothesis was accepted

Table 3.3: Independent Samples t-Test for Psychological Well-being Dimensions by Type of Family

Dimension	Family Type	Mean $\pm$ SD	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Autonomy	Nuclear	14.37 $\pm$ 3.31	1.400	346	0.162
	Joint	13.90 $\pm$ 2.93			
Environmental Mastery	Nuclear	14.12 $\pm$ 3.52	-0.202	346	0.840
	Joint	14.20 $\pm$ 3.37			
Personal Growth	Nuclear	17.36 $\pm$ 3.90	1.834	346	0.067
	Joint	16.59 $\pm$ 3.89			
Positive Relations with Others	Nuclear	13.99 $\pm$ 3.89	2.501	346	0.013 *
	Joint	12.92 $\pm$ 3.94			
Self-Acceptance	Nuclear	15.99 $\pm$ 6.71	0.680	346	0.497
	Joint	15.63 $\pm$ 3.05			
Purpose in Life	Nuclear	13.99 $\pm$ 3.89	2.501	346	0.013*
	Joint	12.92 $\pm$ 3.94			

Table 3.3 displays the findings of an independent samples t-test conducted to assess differences in psychological well-being dimensions across family types (nuclear and joint). The results indicated statistically significant differences in the dimensions of Positive Relations with Others and Purpose in Life between the two groups. Individuals from nuclear families reported higher scores in Positive Relations with Others ($M = 13.99$, $SD = 3.89$) compared to those from joint families ($M = 12.92$, $SD = 3.94$), $t(346) = 2.501$, $p = 0.013$. Similarly, for Purpose in Life, participants from nuclear families scored higher ($M = 13.99$, $SD = 3.89$) than those from joint families ($M = 12.92$, $SD = 3.94$), with the same statistical values, indicating significance at p

< 0.05 . The other dimensions, including Autonomy ($t = 1.400$, $p = 0.162$), Environmental Mastery ($t = -0.202$, $p = 0.840$), Personal Growth ($t = 1.834$, $p = 0.067$), and Self-Acceptance ($t = 0.680$, $p = 0.497$), showed no significant differences based on family type. These findings suggest that family structure may influence certain aspects of psychological well-being, particularly interpersonal relationships and sense of purpose. Individuals from nuclear families scored significantly higher in *Positive Relations* and *Purpose in Life* compared to those from joint families. Hence, this hypothesis was partially rejected.

Table 3.4: Mean, Standard Deviation, and ANOVA Results for Psychological Well-being Dimensions Across Age Groups

Dimension	Age Group	N	Mean $\pm$ SD	F	p-value
Autonomy	20–25	251	14.14 $\pm$ 3.10	0.099	0.906
	25–30	89	14.02 $\pm$ 3.25		
	30–35	8	13.75 $\pm$ 1.16		
Environmental Mastery	20–25	251	14.14 $\pm$ 3.40	0.751	0.473
	25–30	89	14.09 $\pm$ 3.53		
	30–35	8	15.63 $\pm$ 3.42		
Personal Growth	20–25	251	17.10 $\pm$ 3.69	1.089	0.338
	25–30	89	16.39 $\pm$ 4.47		

	30–35	8	17.25 ± 3.96		
Positive Relations with Others	20–25	251	13.36 ± 3.95	0.010	0.990
	25–30	89	13.42 ± 4.02		
	30–35	8	13.50 ± 3.55		
Self-Acceptance	20–25	251	16.09 ± 5.43	1.809	0.165
	25–30	89	14.93 ± 3.33		
	30–35	8	15.63 ± 3.54		
Purpose in Life	20–25	251	13.36 ± 3.95	0.010	0.990
	25–30	89	13.42 ± 4.02		
	30–35	8	13.50 ± 3.55		

Table 3.4 presents the means, standard deviations, and ANOVA results for the different dimensions of psychological well-being across three age groups (20–25, 25–30, and 30–35 years). The analysis revealed no statistically significant differences among the age groups in any of the well-being dimensions. For Autonomy, the mean scores were 14.14 (SD = 3.10) for ages 20–25, 14.02 (SD = 3.25) for 25–30, and 13.75 (SD = 1.16) for 30–35, with an F-value of 0.099 and $p = 0.906$. In Environmental Mastery, the 30–35 age group had the highest mean (15.63 ± 3.42), but the difference was not significant ($F = 0.751$, $p = 0.473$). For Personal Growth, scores ranged from 16.39 (25–30) to 17.25 (30–35), with $F = 1.089$, $p = 0.338$. Positive Relations with Others

showed almost identical means across all groups (13.36 to 13.50), resulting in $F = 0.010$, $p = 0.990$. Self-Acceptance scores varied modestly, with the youngest group scoring highest (16.09 ± 5.43), but again the difference was not statistically significant ($F = 1.809$, $p = 0.165$). Lastly, Purpose in Life followed the same pattern as Positive Relations, with negligible variation and $F = 0.010$, $p = 0.990$. The results suggest that psychological well-being dimensions are similar across the three age groups, with no statistically significant differences observed. Therefore, this hypothesis was accepted.

Table 3.5: Correlation Matrix of Psychological Well-being and Personality Variables

Variables	Autonomy	Environmental Mastery	Personal Growth	Positive Relations with Others	Self-Acceptance	Purpose in Life
Conscientiousness	.035	.181**	.124*	.190**	.106*	.190**
Agreeableness	.056	.050	.194**	.218**	.110*	.218**
Emotional Stability	-.074	.018	.111*	.059	.041	.059
Openness to Experiences	.009	.066	.004	.073	-.025	.073
Extraversion	-.097	.039	-.097	-.035	-.005	-.035

Table 3.5 presents the correlation matrix between the dimensions of psychological well-being and personality traits. The analysis revealed that Conscientiousness is significantly and positively associated with Environmental Mastery ($r = .181$, p

< .01), Personal Growth ($r = .124$, $p < .05$), Positive Relations with Others ($r = .190$, $p < .01$), Self-Acceptance ($r = .106$, $p < .05$), and Purpose in Life ($r = .190$, $p < .01$). Likewise, Agreeableness showed significant positive correlations with Personal

Growth ($r = .194$, $p < .01$), Positive Relations with Others ($r = .218$, $p < .01$), Self-Acceptance ($r = .110$, $p < .05$), and Purpose in Life ($r = .218$, $p < .01$). Emotional Stability demonstrated a weak but significant positive correlation with Personal Growth ($r = .111$, $p < .05$). In contrast, Openness to Experience and Extraversion did not show significant correlations with any of the

psychological well-being dimensions, indicating limited associations in this context. Overall, significant positive relationships were found between certain personality traits (Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, and Emotional Stability) and multiple well-being dimensions, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Table 3.6: Predictive Analysis (Regression) of Personality Traits on Dimensions of Psychological Well-Being

Personality (Predictor)	Trait	Autonomy	Envioron mental mastery	Personal Growth	Positive Relation With Others	Self Acceptance	Purpose _in_life
P1 Consciousness	B	.077	.446	. -020	.539	.376	.539
	SE	.120	1.30	.150	.150	.190	.150
	β	0.35	.446	-.349	.190	.106	.190
	R^2	.001	.033	.015	.036	.011	.036
	<i>Sig.</i>	.000	.001	. -020	.000	.049	.000
P2 Agreeableness	B	.071	.070	.000	.353	.223	.353
	SE	.068	.076	.085	.085	.109	.085
	β	.056	.070	.312	.218	.110	.218
	R^2	.003	.002	.194	.047	.012	.047
	<i>Sig.</i>	.299	.355	.000	.000	.041	.000
P3 Emotional stability	B	-.163	.044	.305	.163	.143	.163
	SE	.117	.130	.147	.149	.187	.149
	β	-.074	.018	.111	.059	.041	.059
	R^2	.006	.000	.012	.003	.002	.003
	<i>Sig.</i>	.166	.735	.039	.274	.447	.274
P4 Open to Experiences	B	-.163	.204	.013	.260	-.110	.260
	SE	.117	.166	.190	.191	.241	.191
	β	-.074	.066	.004	.073	-.025	.073
	R^2	.006	.004	.000	.005	.001	.005
	<i>Sig.</i>	.166	.221	.944	.176	.647	.176
P5 Extraversion	B	-.242	.107	-.303	-.109	-.021	-.109
	SE	.133	.148	.168	.170	.214	.170
	β	-.97	.039	-.097	-.035	-.005	-.35
	R^2	.009	.002	.009	.001	.000	.001
	<i>Sig.</i>	.070	.468	.072	.520	.920	.520

Table 3.6 displays the results of a regression analysis investigating the impact of the five personality traits—Conscientiousness, Agreeableness, Emotional Stability, Openness to Experience, and Extraversion—on the six dimensions of psychological well-being: Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Self-Acceptance, and Purpose in Life. Conscientiousness significantly predicted Environmental Mastery ($B = .446$, $\beta = .446$, $R^2 = .033$, $p = .001$), Positive Relations ($B = .539$, $\beta = .190$, $R^2 = .036$, $p = .000$), Self-Acceptance ($B = .376$, $\beta = .106$, $R^2 = .011$, $p = .049$), and Purpose in Life ($B = .539$, $\beta = .190$, $R^2 = .036$, $p = .000$). Agreeableness was a strong predictor of Personal Growth ($B = .000$, $\beta = .312$, $R^2 = .194$, $p = .000$), Positive Relations ($B = .353$, $\beta = .218$, $R^2 = .047$, $p = .000$), Self-Acceptance ($B = .223$, $\beta = .110$, $R^2 = .012$, $p = .041$), and Purpose in Life ($B = .353$, $\beta = .218$, $R^2 = .047$, $p = .000$). Emotional Stability was positively associated with Personal Growth ($B = .305$, $\beta = .111$, $R^2 = .012$, $p = .039$), but its relationships with other well-being dimensions were non-significant. Openness to Experience and Extraversion showed no significant associations across most domains, though Extraversion approached significance for Autonomy ($B = -.242$, $\beta = -.097$, $R^2 = .009$, $p = .070$) and Personal Growth ($B = -.303$, $\beta = -.097$, $R^2 = .009$, $p = .072$). Overall, Conscientiousness and Agreeableness emerged as the most consistent predictors of psychological well-being dimensions, although the R^2 values indicated that each trait accounted for a small proportion of the variance. Thus, this hypothesis was also rejected.

DISCUSSION

The current study investigated the influences of personality traits and demographic factors on psychological well-being dimensions for young adults. These results shed light on how some genes work and how they contribute to flourishing at this important time in human development.

Conscientiousness and Agreeableness emerged as the most consistent predictors of the various psychological well-being dimensions, showing significant associations with all domains except Autonomy. Specifically, Conscientiousness was significantly and positively associated with Environmental Mastery, Positive Relations with Others, Self-Acceptance, and Purpose in Life. These findings are congruent with our understanding of psychological well-being as a multi-faceted construct inclusive of effective coping behaviours and personal growth (Chaudhry et al.,

2024). Of particular interest is the relationship between conscientiousness and environmental mastery, which suggests that people who are organized, disciplined, and goal-directed are better at arranging their physical surroundings in ways that promote their well-being.

Similarly, Agreeableness demonstrated strong predictive effects on Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Self-Acceptance, and Purpose in Life. These findings align with Ryff's foundational model of psychological well-being, which highlights positive interpersonal relationships as a central aspect of human flourishing (Yurayat & Seechaliao, 2021; Mustafa et al., 2020). The finding that agreeable individuals report higher levels of positive relations with others reinforces the importance of interpersonal harmony in achieving optimal psychological functioning, as emphasized in positive psychology research (Azpiazu et al., 2021).

Emotional Stability demonstrated a more limited but significant association with Personal Growth, suggesting that emotional regulation capabilities contribute to an individual's capacity for continued development and self-actualization (García & Calvo, 2017). This finding supports the notion that psychological well-being involves not merely the absence of negative emotions but the active cultivation of personal potential (Park et al., 2022).

Interestingly, Openness to Experience and Extraversion showed minimal associations with well-being dimensions in this sample. This finding contrasts with some expectations, as openness might be expected to relate to personal growth and extraversion to positive social relationships. The limited associations may reflect the specific characteristics of the young adult population studied or suggest that these traits operate through different mechanisms in promoting well-being.

The absence of significant gender differences across all psychological well-being dimensions is noteworthy and suggests that male and female young adults in this sample experience similar levels of autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations, self-acceptance, and purpose in life. This finding challenges some traditional assumptions about gender-based differences in psychological functioning and aligns with contemporary understanding that well-being outcomes are influenced more by individual differences than by gender categories.

Results indicative that certain domains of QOL (Positive Relations with Others and Purpose in Life) are lower among individuals belonging to joint

families relative to those from nuclear family setup are intriguing from a cultural as well as social point of view. This finding could be attributed to the difference in interpersonal relationship and role expectation in nuclear and joint family systems. This in line with researchers that examine this age group (Azpiazu et al., 2021), stating that nuclear family structures provide more chances to grow autonomy in relationships and individuation at individual level, which are part typical developmental tasks during emerging adulthood.

Nonetheless, one must interpret these findings cautiously as life in a multi-generational joint family system also confers specific advantages like broader social support networks and common pool of resources. The differences observed might rather reflect adaptation to different social contexts than superior outcomes in either family type.

The findings that the variances of all variables were similar across the three age groups (20–25, 25–30, and 30–35 years) except for some changes supporting conceptualization of stability of psychological well-being dimensions throughout young adulthood in this sample. This is consistent with the idea that at least while young people are no longer in the process of transitioning, there will not necessarily be a change crisis in psychological well-being levels when they move over from this stage (Palenzuela-Luis et al., 2022).

CONCLUSION

This study emphasizes the influence of personality traits, particularly Conscientiousness and Agreeableness, on the psychological well-being of young adults. The findings highlight the importance of interventions that focus not only on enhancing organizational abilities, goal-setting, and interpersonal skills but also on attention training, reflecting the multidimensional nature of psychological well-being. Overall, the lack of strong demographic effects across most analyses supports the broad application of personality-based approaches to promoting well-being in young adult populations as it relates to gender, age and family structure subgroups.

IMPLICATIONS FOR UNDERSTANDING YOUNG ADULT DEVELOPMENT

This is an important consideration when designing mental health promotion programs targeting young adults due to the large proportion of those who fall into this derailment group (Bell et al., 2023). Targeting conscientiousness and agreeableness as principal antecedents of mental health gives unique

tools for psychological interventions directed to improve mental function under these evolving circumstances. Given that young people are particularly susceptible to risks such as loneliness, social isolation and insecure labour market positions, understanding the personality traits that contribute towards resiliency becomes important.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

This study highlights several significant findings; it also has certain limitations. The low R^2 values suggest that personality traits explain only a small proportion of the variance in psychological well-being, indicating that other unexamined factors may play a substantial role. Future research should consider additional variables, such as social support, economic conditions, and life stressors, which may influence well-being outcomes. Furthermore, the cross-sectional design of this study precludes causal inferences, and longitudinal research is necessary to better understand how the relationships between personality traits and psychological well-being may evolve during young adulthood.

REFERENCES

1. Aghamiri, N., & Vaziri, S. (2019). Prediction of psychological well-being based on marital intimacy, resilience, and mental health of couples in Tehran. *Avicenna Journal of Neuro Psych Physiology*, 203. <https://doi.org/10.32598/ajnp.6.4.6>
2. Alsarrani, A., Hunter, R. F., Dunne, L., & Garcia, L. M. T. (2022). Association between friendship quality and subjective wellbeing among adolescents: A systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-14776-4>
3. Andrade, V., Quarta, S., Tagarro, M., Miloseva, L., Massaro, M., Chervenkov, M., Ivanova, T., Jorge, R., Maksimova, V., Smilkov, K., Ackova, D. G., Ruskovska, T., Philippou, E., Deligiannidou, G.-E., Kontogiorgis, C., García-Conesa, M., & Pinto, P. (2022). Exploring hedonic and eudaimonic items of well-being in Mediterranean and non-Mediterranean countries: Influence of sociodemographic and lifestyle factors. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(3), 1715. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19031715>
4. Andreasen, A. J., Johnson, M. K., & Tranel, D. (2022). Stability of psychological well-being following a neurological event and in the face of a global pandemic. *Rehabilitation Counseling*

- Bulletin*, 67(3), 190.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00343552221139878>
5. Ateş, B. (2020). The effect of solution-focused brief approach on adolescent subjective well-being: An experimental study. *Journal of Family Counseling and Education*, 5(2), 26.
<https://doi.org/10.32568/jfce.817517>
6. Aulia, F., Hastjarjo, T. D., Setiyawati, D., & Patria, B. (2020). Student well-being: A systematic literature review. *Buletin Psikologi*, 28(1), 1.
<https://doi.org/10.22146/buletinpsikologi.42979>
7. Azpiazu, L., Fernández, A. R., & Palacios, E. G. (2021). Adolescent life satisfaction explained by social support, emotion regulation, and resilience. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.694183>
8. Baryshev, A. A., & Kashchuk, I. (2016). Socio-economic, psychological and ecological aspects of lifelong well-being. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 28, 1118.
<https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20162801118>
9. Bautista, T. G., Roman, G., Khan, M., Lee, M. S., Sahbaz, S., Duthely, L., Knippenberg, A., Macias-Burgos, M. A., Davidson, A., Scaramutti, C., Gabrilove, J., Pusek, S. N., Mehta, D. H., & Bredella, M. A. (2023). What is well-being? A scoping review of the conceptual and operational definitions of occupational well-being. *Journal of Clinical and Translational Science*, 7(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1017/cts.2023.648>
10. Bell, I., Nicholas, J., Broomhall, A., Bailey, E., Bendall, S., Boland, A., Robinson, S., Adams, S., McGorry, P. D., & Thompson, A. (2023). The impact of COVID-19 on youth mental health: A mixed methods survey. *Psychiatry Research*, 321, 115082.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2023.115082>
11. Bhatia, S., & Singh, S. (2023). Exploring financial well-being of working professionals in the Indian context. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, 29(2), 474.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/s41264-023-00215-x>
12. Bjørnsen, H. N., Espnes, G. A., Eilertsen, M. B., Ringdal, R., & Moksnes, U. K. (2017). The relationship between positive mental health literacy and mental well-being among adolescents: Implications for school health services. *The Journal of School Nursing*, 35(2), 107.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1059840517732125>
13. Büchi, M. (2021). Digital well-being theory and research. *New Media & Society*, 26(1), 172.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211056851>
14. Burt, K. B., & Paysnick, A. (2012). Resilience in the transition to adulthood. *Development and Psychopathology*, 24(2), 493.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954579412000119>
15. Capio, C. M., Sit, C. H. P., & Abernethy, B. (2014). Physical well-being. In *Springer eBooks* (p. 4805). Springer Nature.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_2166
16. Chaudhry, S., Tandon, A., Shinde, S., & Bhattacharya, A. (2024). Student psychological well-being in higher education: The role of internal team environment, institutional, friends and family support and academic engagement. *PLoS ONE*, 19(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0297508>
17. Chen, X., Huang, Z., & Lin, W. (2022). The effect of emotion regulation on happiness and resilience of university students: The chain mediating role of learning motivation and target positioning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1029655>
18. Chen, Y., Kim, E. S., Koh, H. K., Frazier, A. L., & VanderWeele, T. J. (2019). Sense of mission and subsequent health and well-being among young adults: An outcome-wide analysis. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 188(4), 664.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwz009>
19. Cherewick, M., Dahl, R. E., Bertomen, S., Hipp, E., Shreedar, P., Njau, P., & Leiferman, J. A. (2023). Risk and protective factors for mental health and wellbeing among adolescent orphans. *Health Psychology and Behavioral Medicine*, 11(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1080/21642850.2023.2219299>
20. Das, K., Jones-Harrell, C., Fan, Y., Ramaswami, A., Orlove, B., & Botchwey, N. (2020). Understanding subjective well-being: Perspectives from psychology and public health. *Public Health Reviews*, 41(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40985-020-00142-5>
21. Demiessie, H., & Shirin, S. (2021). The gateway to well-being and happiness: Redefining individualism, voluntary simplicity and civilization. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Legal Studies*, 59.
<https://doi.org/10.34104/ajssls.021.059074>

22. Duckworth, A., Quinn, P. D., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2009). Positive predictors of teacher effectiveness. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 4(6), 540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760903157232>
23. Evans, R., Katz, C. C., Fulginiti, A., & Taussig, H. N. (2022). Sources and types of social supports and their association with mental health symptoms and life satisfaction among young adults with a history of out-of-home care. *Children*, 9(4), 520. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children9040520>
24. García, G. M., & Calvo, J. C. A. (2017). Relationship between psychological capital and psychological well-being of direct support staff of specialist autism services: The mediator role of burnout. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02277>
25. Gautam, S., Jain, A., Chaudhary, J., Gautam, M., Gaur, M., & Grover, S. (2024). Concept of mental health and mental well-being, its determinants and coping strategies. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 66. https://doi.org/10.4103/indianjpsychiatry.indianjpsychiatry_707_23
26. Ghanbari-Afra, L., Adib-Hajbaghery, M., & Dianati, M. (2022). Human caring: A concept analysis. *Journal of Caring Sciences*, 11(4), 246. <https://doi.org/10.34172/jcs.2022.21>
27. Govorova, E., Benítez, I., & Muñoz, J. (2020). How schools affect student well-being: A cross-cultural approach in 35 OECD countries. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00431>
28. Hellström, L., & Beckman, L. J. (2021). Life challenges and barriers to help seeking: Adolescents' and young adults' voices of mental health. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(24), 13101. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182413101>
29. Hernández, R., Bassett, S. M., Boughton, S. W., Schuette, S., Shiu, E., & Moskowitz, J. T. (2017). Psychological well-being and physical health: Associations, mechanisms, and future directions. *Emotion Review*, 10(1), 18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073917697824>
30. Huppert, F. A., & So, T. T. C. (2011). Flourishing across Europe: Application of a new conceptual framework for defining well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, 110(3), 837. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-011-9966-7>
31. Khullar, T. H., Kirmayer, M. H., & Dirks, M. A. (2021). Relationship dissolution in the friendships of emerging adults: How, when, and why? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 38(11), 3243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02654075211026015>
32. Kiefer, R. A. (2008). An Integrative Review of the Concept of Well-Being [Review of An Integrative Review of the Concept of Well-Being]. *Holistic Nursing Practice*, 22(5), 244. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.hnp.0000334915.16186.b2>
33. Kim, B., & White, K. (2017). How can health professionals enhance interpersonal communication with adolescents and young adults to improve health care outcomes?: systematic literature review. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 23(2), 198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2017.1330696>
34. Kinderen, S. der, Valk, A., Khapova, S. N., & Tims, M. (2020). Facilitating Eudaimonic Well-Being in Mental Health Care Organizations: The Role of Servant Leadership and Workplace Civility Climate. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(4), 1173. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17041173>
35. Kotera, Y., Ting, S. H., & Neary, S. (2020). Mental health of Malaysian university students: UK comparison, and relationship between negative mental health attitudes, self-compassion, and resilience. *Higher Education*, 81(2), 403. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00547-w>
36. Lin, P. T., Vu, T. T., Nguyen, V. P., & Wu, Q. (2022). Self-Determination Theory and Accountant Employees' Psychological Wellbeing: The Roles of Positive Affectivity and Psychological Safety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.870771>
37. Lipari, R. N., & Hedden, S. L. (2014). Serious Mental Health Challenges among Older Adolescents and Young Adults. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK385056/>
38. Livingston, V., Jackson-Nevels, B., & Reddy, V. V. (2022). Social, Cultural, and Economic Determinants of Well-Being. *Encyclopedia*, 2(3), 1183. <https://doi.org/10.3390/encyclopedia2030079>
39. Malkoç, A. (2011). Big five personality traits and coping styles predict subjective well-being: A study with a Turkish Sample. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 12, 577. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.02.070>

40. Mastorci, F., Lazzeri, M. F. L., Vassalle, C., & Pingitore, A. (2024). The Transition from Childhood to Adolescence: Between Health and Vulnerability [Review of The Transition from Childhood to Adolescence: Between Health and Vulnerability]. *Children*, 11(8), 989. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children11080989>
41. Mecha, P., Romero, N., & Sánchez-López, Á. (2023). Associations between Social Support Dimensions and Resilience Factors and Pathways of Influence in Depression and Anxiety Rates in Young Adults. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 26. <https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2023.11>
42. Megawati, E., & Herdiyanto, Y. K. (2016). Hubungan antara Perilaku Prosocial dengan Psychological Well-Being pada Remaja. *Jurnal Psikologi Udayana*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.24843/jpu.2016.v03.i01.p13>
43. Mustafa, M. B., Rani, N. H. M., Bistaman, M. N., Salim, S. S. S., Ahmad, A., Zakaria, N. H., & Safian, N. A. A. (2020). The Relationship between Psychological Well-Being and University Students Academic Achievement. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10(7). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v10-i7/7454>
44. Nainee, S., Tan, S. A., Tan, C., Gan, S.-W., & Tan, J. (2021). Asian “Guan” Parenting and Life Satisfaction Among Adolescents in Malaysia: The Mediating Role of Filial Piety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.746540>
45. Neinstein, L. S., & Irwin, C. E. (2013). Young Adults Remain Worse Off Than Adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 53(5), 559. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.08.014>
46. Nguyen, T. H. T., & Cicea, C. (2021). Green Space and Its Role to Improve Social and Economic Development for a Better Quality of Life. *MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS REVIEW*, 6(1), 49. <https://doi.org/10.24818/mer/2021.06-04>
47. Nisbet, E. K., Shaw, D. W., & Lachance, D. G. (2020). Connectedness With Nearby Nature and Well-Being. *Frontiers in Sustainable Cities*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frsc.2020.00018>
48. Othman, W. N. W., Zainudin, Z. N., Amat, M. A. C., & Mokhtar, M. Y. O. (2020). Religious Appreciation and Psychological Well-Being Among Malaysian Army. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 10(11). <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v10-i11/8079>
49. Palenzuela-Luis, N., Climents, G. D., Gómez-Salgado, J., Gómez, J. Á. R., & Gómez, M. B. S. (2022). International Comparison of Self-Concept, Self-Perception and Lifestyle in Adolescents: A Systematic Review [Review of International Comparison of Self-Concept, Self-Perception and Lifestyle in Adolescents: A Systematic Review]. *International Journal of Public Health*, 67. Springer Science+Business Media. <https://doi.org/10.3389/ijph.2022.1604954>
50. Park, C. L., Kubzansky, L. D., Chafouleas, S. M., Davidson, R. J., Keltner, D., Parsafar, P., Conwell, Y., Martin, M. Y., Hanmer, J., & Wang, K. H. (2022). Emotional Well-Being: What It Is and Why It Matters. *Affective Science*, 4(1), 10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42761-022-00163-0>
51. Peng, B., Chen, W., Wang, H., & Yu, T. (2025). How does physical exercise influence self-efficacy in adolescents? A study based on the mediating role of psychological resilience. *BMC Psychology*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-02529-y>
52. Pikó, B. (2023). Adolescent Life Satisfaction: Association with Psychological, School-Related, Religious and Socially Supportive Factors. *Children*, 10(7), 1176. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children10071176>
53. Putra, A. S. B., Kusumawati, E. D., & Kartikasari, D. (2023). Unpacking the Roots and Impact of Workplace Well-being: A Literature Review [Review of Unpacking the Roots and Impact of Workplace Well-being: A Literature Review]. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Approach Research and Science*, 2(1), 312. <https://doi.org/10.59653/ijmars.v2i01.433>
54. Rothman, A., Yücesoy, Z. B., & Yalçın, E. (2024). Early Muslim Scholars' Conceptions of Character Development and Contemporary Applications in Mental Health and Well-being. *Journal of Muslim Mental Health*, 18(1). <https://doi.org/10.3998/jmmh.6027>
55. Sabri, M. F., Anthony, M., Law, S. H., Rahim, H. A., Burhan, N. A. S., & Ithnin, M. (2023). Impact of financial behaviour on financial well-being: evidence among young adults in Malaysia. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, 29(3), 788. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41264-023-00234-8>
56. Sarkar, S., Menon, V., Padhy, S. K., & Kathiresan, P. (2024). Mental health and well-

- being at the workplace. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 66. https://doi.org/10.4103/indianjpsychiatry.in dianjpsychiatry_608_23
57. Schwarz, S. W. (2009). Adolescent Mental Health in the United States. <https://doi.org/10.7916/d8d50wp6>
58. Sears, L. E., Shi, Y., Coberley, C., & Pope, J. E. (2013). Overall Well-Being as a Predictor of Health Care, Productivity, and Retention Outcomes in a Large Employer. *Population Health Management*, 16(6), 397. <https://doi.org/10.1089/pop.2012.0114>
59. Sorgente, A., Atay, B., Aubrey, M., Bhatia, S., Crespo, C., Fonseca, G., Güneri, O. Y., Lep, Ž., Lessard, D., Negru-Subtirica, O., Portugal, A., Ranta, M., Relvas, A. P., Singh, N., Sirsch, U., Zupančič, M., & Lanz, M. (2024). One (Financial Well-Being) Model Fits All? Testing the Multidimensional Subjective Financial Well-Being Scale Across Nine Countries. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-024-00708-z>
60. Srivastava, K. (2011). Positive mental health and its relationship with resilience. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal*, 20(2), 75. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-6748.102469>
61. Şulea, C., Beek, I. van, Sârbescu, P., Virgă, D., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2015). Engagement, boredom, and burnout among students: Basic need satisfaction matters more than personality traits. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 42, 132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2015.08.018>
62. Supriatna, E., & Septian, M. R. (2021). The Influence of Religiosity and Spirituality Towards Students' Psychological Well-Being During Covid-19 Pandemic. *Deleted Journal*, 7(1), 51. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jpi.v7i1.10850>
63. Syahril, S., & Janna, S. R. (2023). Religiosity and Psychological Well-Being of School Counselors. *AL-ISHLAH Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(2), 1549. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v15i2.2365>
64. Tan, R., Yang, Y., Huang, T., Lin, X., & Hua, G. (2023). Parent-child attachment and mental health in young adolescents: a moderated mediation analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1298485>
65. Yang, Y., & Chun-lei, W. (2022). Research on the effects of family rituals on subjective well-being of Chinese college students. *Current Psychology*, 42(32), 28549. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03858-6>
66. Yurayat, P., & Seechaliao, T. (2021). Effectiveness of Online Positive Psychology Intervention on Psychological Well-Being Among Undergraduate Students. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 10(4), 143. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v10n4p143>
67. Zhang, S., Deng, X., Xin, Z., Xuebin, C., & Hou, J. (2022). The Relationship Between Postgraduates' Emotional Intelligence and Well-Being: The Chain Mediating Effect of Social Support and Psychological Resilience. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.865025>
68. Zhang, W., Balloo, K., Hosein, A., & Medland, E. (2024). A scoping review of well-being measures: conceptualisation and scales for overall well-being [Review of A scoping review of well-being measures: conceptualisation and scales for overall well-being]. *BMC Psychology*, 12(1). *BioMed Central*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-024-0207>