

VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Živilė Šarakauskienė

SCHOOLCHILDREN'S PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING: STRUCTURE AND  
SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC AND PERSONALITY FACTORS

Summary of the Doctoral Dissertation

Social Sciences, Psychology (06S)

Vilnius, 2012

The dissertation was prepared during the period of 2003–2011 at Vilnius University.

**Scientific supervisor** Prof. Dr. **Albinas Bagdonas** (Vilnius University, Social Sciences, Psychology – 06S)

**The dissertation will be defended at Vilnius University Council of Psychology Research.**

**Chair:**

Prof. Dr. **Gintautas Valickas** (Vilnius University, Social Sciences, Psychology – 06S)

**Members:**

Prof. Dr. **Audronė Liniauskaitė** (Klaipeda University, Social Sciences, Psychology – 06S)

Prof. Dr. **Mindaugas Rugevičius** (Klaipeda University, Social Sciences, Psychology – 06S)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. **Dalia Bagdžiūnienė** (Vilnius University, Social Sciences, Psychology – 06S)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. **Rasa Barkauskienė** (Vilnius University, Social Sciences, Psychology – 06S)

**Opponents:**

Prof. Habil. Dr. **Vytautas Gudonis** (Siauliai University, Social Sciences, Psychology – 06S)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. **Laimutė Bulotaitė** (Vilnius University, Social Sciences, Psychology – 06S)

The dissertation will be defended at the open meeting of the Council of Psychology Research at 12 noon 13 January, 2012, in room 201 Faculty of Philosophy. Address: Universiteto str. 9/1, LT–01513, Vilnius, Lithuania.

The summary of the doctoral dissertation was sent on \_\_ December 2011.

Full text is available at the Library of Vilnius University (Universiteto 3, LT–01122, Vilnius, Lithuania).

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

Živilė Šarakauskienė

**MOKINIŲ PSICHOLOGINĖ GEROVĖ: STRUKTŪRA IR  
SOCIODEMOGRAFINIAI BEI ASMENYBĖS VEIKSNIAI**

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka  
Socialiniai mokslai, psichologija (06 S)

Vilnius, 2012

Disertacija rengta 2003 – 2011 metais Vilniaus universitete

**Mokslinis vadovas** prof. dr. **Albinas Bagdonas** (Vilniaus universitetas, socialiniai mokslai, psichologija – 06 S)

**Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Psichologijos mokslo krypties taryboje:**

**Pirmininkas:**

Prof. dr. **Gintautas Valickas** (Vilniaus universitetas, socialiniai mokslai, psichologija – 06 S)

**Nariai:**

Prof. Dr. **Audronė Liniauskaitė** (Klaipėdos universitetas, socialiniai mokslai, psichologija – 06 S)

Prof. Dr. **Mindaugas Rugevičius** (Klaipėdos universitetas, socialiniai mokslai, psichologija – 06 S)

Doc. Dr. **Dalia Bagdžiūnienė** (Vilniaus universitetas, socialiniai mokslai, psichologija – 06 S)

Doc. Dr. **Rasa Barkauskienė** (Vilniaus universitetas, socialiniai mokslai, psichologija – 06 S)

**Oponentai:**

Prof. Habil. Dr. **Vytautas Gudonis** (Šiaulių universitetas, socialiniai mokslai, psichologija – 06 S)

Doc. Dr. **Laimutė Bulotaitė** (Vilniaus universitetas, socialiniai mokslai, psichologija – 06 S)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Psichologijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2012 m. sausio mėn. 13 d. 12 val. Filosofijos fakulteto 201 auditorijoje. Adresas: Universiteto g. 9/1, LT-01513, Vilnius, Lietuva

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2011 m. gruodžio mėn. \_\_ d. Su disertacija galima susipažinti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje (Universiteto g. 3, LT-01122, Vilnius, Lietuva).

## INTRODUCTION

**Relevance of the topic.** The understanding of the importance of psychological well-being is increasing; even the top-level EU-wide politicians begin to acknowledge it (Europos paktas dėl psichinės sveikatos ir gerovės, 2008). Psychological well-being is important not only because the person feels good, but also because it is associated with positive consequences (Diener, Seligman, 2004): individuals with high well-being earn more, better perform work assignments, have better social relationships, do not suffer from bullying at school (Konu *et al.*, 2002). Studies also show that it promotes and maintains optimal mental health (Park, 2004), is associated with health and longevity. One of the important features of psychological well-being research is that some of the psychological well-being indicators enable the survey participants to evaluate their lives based on their own criteria rather than external observers', who might have different values and priorities, assigned criteria considered as indicating "good life" (European Foundation, 2010).

However, psychologists working with adolescents and other professionals have less knowledge about the schoolchildren's mental health status and strengths than about the disorders or pathologies (Vera *et al.*, 2008). This situation is due to the fact that for a long time striving to improve the lives of children and young people, researchers and practitioners have focused only on psychopathology, creating strategies for the treatment and prevention programs for at risk groups. Almost all the studies did not examine the positive functioning; instead the absence of symptoms was considered as a significant sign of health. Meanwhile, the concept of psychological well-being includes the positive aspects rather than the absence of the negative aspects. Psychological well-being's research in conjunction with the experienced negative emotions assesses the amount of the positive aspects – the degree of life satisfaction, possession of the goals in life and so on.

The foundation of mental health is being laid during the childhood and adolescence. The majority of adult mental disorders (e. g. depression, alcohol and drug use, nutrition, behavior, post-traumatic stress, attention deficit and hyperactivity disorders) comes from the childhood and adolescence, and requires early intervention and treatment (Florence Declaration, 2007; Psichikos sveikata, 2009). As shown by the 2003 and 2007 European

Quality of Life Research (European Foundation, 2005, 2010) Lithuanians are among the least satisfied with their lives, but those studies did not include youth under 18 years old, so there is a lack of knowledge about the life satisfaction levels of adolescents. This dissertation is aimed not only to provide a comprehensive examination of Lithuanian schoolchildren's psychological well-being, but also to better understand the phenomenon itself: its structure and links with sociodemographic and personal factors.

**Scientific novelty.** This dissertation is one of the first attempts to conduct a comprehensive study on schoolchildren's psychological well-being. Up to date just a few scientific articles were published on psychological well-being. The following aspects were studied: subjective well-being of men and women (Šilinskas, Žukauskienė, 2004; Žukauskienė *et al.*, 2005; Daukantaitė, Žukauskienė, 2006, 2011); subjective quality of life after sensory disorders (Багдонас, Биеляускас, 1983); servicemen's satisfaction with the obligatory military service (Žakaitis, Rugevičius, 2004); subjective well-being of medical personnel involved in clinical work (Grigaliūnienė ir kt., 2007). As it can be easily noticed, all of them were done in the scope of only one approach to psychological well-being – hedonistic approach. We didn't find any Lithuanian scientific study which included both approaches to psychological well-being – hedonistic and eudaimonic, as it is done in this dissertation. The hedonistic approach is usually represented by subjective well-being. It consists of positive affect, negative affect and satisfaction with life. We also included into our study the fourth component – satisfaction with important domains of life, which is usually either rarely included into well-being's studies in general or only one of the life domains is being measured. The eudaimonic approach to well-being is represented by C. Ryff's (1989) model, which covers six components: autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance.

Other drawbacks of previous psychological well-being's studies are that the majority of them measured only individual components of psychological well-being and to a different depth (Butkovic *et al.*, 2011; Abbott *et al.*, 2008); they have been based on adult samples. So the findings are quite fragmentary and can't be easily generalized and applied to younger populations. Our study aimed to tackle those drawbacks by measuring 14

components of psychological well-being from two different approaches in 14–19 year old schoolchildren's sample. We also aimed at the exploring the structure of psychological well-being as there is no unanimously agreed concept at the moment. Our study aimed not only to fill the existing scientific literature on students' psychological well-being the lack of research, but also extend previous findings of researchers in different sociodemographic and personality variables, psychological well-being of importance to young people, collecting and analyzing complex data.

**Practical implications.** Adolescence is a period of transition from childhood to adult life, lasting nearly a decade. Whole period of adolescence involves important biological, cognitive, emotional, and life circumstances changes (Крайр, 2000; Holmbeck *et al.*, 1995; Lerner, 2002). Given the many changes experienced by teenagers, it should be noted that not all pass the same changes at the same speed and with different consequences. The main source of diversity comes from an environment in which adolescents live and evolve – family, school, living environment and so on (Lerner, 2002). Thus, in practice it is very valuable to determine the prevailing trends of psychological well-being changes related to age.

World health organization (WHO) estimates that one in five adolescent has cognitive, emotional and behavioral problems, and one adolescent out of eight suffers from diagnosed mental disorder (Florence Declaration, 2007). This prevalence is increasing every decade. Given the extent of adolescent psychiatric disorders, together with reduced investment, and access to services – the question of prevention and early treatment interventions capable of promoting healthy development and psychological well-being arises (Caffo, Forresi, 2008). The most effective programs should be implemented in schools, where teenagers spend most of their time. Effective programs not only reduce the presence of the risk factors, but also underline the positive characteristics, valuable qualities and abilities of adolescents.

The three factor structure and the links of the components of psychological well-being with sociodemographic and personality variables are thoroughly analyzed in the dissertation by taking into account multiple characteristics of schoolchildren at the same

time. Our findings provide the professionals working in schools or with adolescents with valuable information which improves the understanding of the phenomenon itself and can be used not only in consulting the schoolchildren, but also helps to increase the effectiveness of prevention programs being developed.

**Goal of the study:** to determine the peculiarities of 14–19 schoolchildren’s psychological well-being, its structure and to measure its relationships with sociodemographic and personality factors.

**Objectives of the study:**

- To review and analyze the situation of psychological well-being research.
- Perform a comparative analysis of hedonic and eudaimonic approaches to psychological well-being.
- Identify the structure of students' psychological well-being.
- Assess psychological well-being’s differences and peculiarities of various student groups formed according to different sociodemographic variables.
- To determine the specific relationships of each dimension of psychological well-being with sociodemographic and personality variables.

**Defended statements:**

1. 14–19 year old schoolchildren’s psychological well-being has more complex structure than the existing hedonistic and eudaimonic approaches to well-being suggest.
2. Sociodemographic variables have weaker links with 14–19 year old schoolchildren’s psychological well-being than Big Five personality traits.
3. 14–19 year old schoolchildren’s Big Five personality traits Extraversion and Neuroticism are strongly linked with psychological well-being.
4. Locus of control significantly predicts psychological well-being and even after controlling for the Big Five personality traits.

## **METHOD**

**Participants.** The study was carried in November–December, 2006. The students filled the



questionnaires during the lesson at school. The study results are based on the filled questionnaires of 655 students from 21 secondary and professional training schools (14–19 year old; 8, 10, 12 classes) (see Table 1).

**Table 1. The distribution of the participants according to gender, class and plane of residence.**

		Gender		Total		
		Girls	Boys			
Class	8 class	N	104	73	177	
		% of total sample	15,9%	11,2%	27,1%	
	10 class	N	126	81	207	
		% of total sample	19,3%	12,4%	31,7%	
	12 class	12	N	130	91	(221)
			% of total sample	19,9%	13,9%	(33,8%)
		Prof.	N	20	29	(49)
			% of total sample	3,1%	4,4%	(7,5%)
		Total	N	150	120	270
			% of total sample	22,9%	18,3%	41,3%
Total	N	380	274	654		
	% of total sample	58,1%	41,9%	100,0%		
Place of residence	City	N	163	110	273	
		% of total sample	24,9%	16,8%	41,7%	
	Regional town	N	140	101	241	
		% of total sample	21,4%	15,4%	36,9%	
	Village	N	77	63	140	
		% of total sample	11,8%	9,6%	21,4%	
	Total	N	380	274	654	
		% of total sample	58,1%	41,9%	100,0%	

\* Schoolchildren from professional education schools.

In order to more fully geographically represent the schoolchildren's population the whole area of Lithuania was divided into four regions (based on data from statistics department 1<sup>st</sup> of January, 2005). Participants were from at least one school based in five major cities, regional towns ( $\geq 5000$  habitants) and villages ( $< 5000$  habitants) in each geographical region (Vilnius, Kaunas, Klaipeda, Siauliai-Panevezys) (see Table 1 and 2).

**Table 2. The distribution of the participants according to age, class and place of residence.**

	Class	8 class	10 class	12 class		Total
				12	Prof.*	
	Average age	14±0,4	16±0,5	18±0,4	18±0,6	16±1,7
	Age min.	13	15	17	17	13
<b>Place of residence</b>	Age max.	16	18	19	20	20
<b>City</b>	N	66	68	90	50	274
				140		
	% of total sample	10,1%	10,4%	13,7%	7,6%	41,8%
				21,4%		
<b>Regional town</b>	N	78	86	77	0	241
	% of total sample	11,9%	13,1%	11,8%	0%	36,8%
<b>Village</b>	N	33	53	54	0	140
	% of total sample	5,0%	8,1%	8,2%	0%	21,4%
<b>Total</b>	N	177	207	221	50	655
				271		
	% of total sample	27,0%	31,6%	33,7%	7,6%	100,0%
				41,4%		

\* Schoolchildren from professional education schools

**Measures.** All psychometric properties of all the measures used in our study are indicated in table 3. **Questionnaire of sociodemographic variables:** The following variables were measured: age, gender, grade, place of residence, learning success (the last year's grade average of all subjects), family composition (N=491 lived in intact family with both parents, N=130 – in single-parent family), economical recourses (the amount of money received from parents for the minor expenses per month: 0–50LTL – N=327; 51–100 LTL – N=177; 101 LTL and more – N=146), participation in the extracurricular activities (N=228 – don't participate; N=425 – participate).

**Measures of psychological well-being:** *Positive affect and Negative affect schedule* (PANAS) created by D. Watson, L. A. Clark and A. Tellegen (Watson, Clark, 1994); *Multidimensional Students' Life Satisfaction Scale* (Huebner, 2001) allowed to evaluate schoolchildren's satisfaction with the important domains of life, such as family, friends, school, living environment and self; Satisfaction with life scale (Diener et al., 1985); C.

**Table 3. The psychometric characteristics of the measures used in the study (number of items, average score and standard deviation, Cronbach's  $\alpha$ , Shapiro-Wilk test statistic, coefficients of asymmetry and excess)**

Measure	Component of psychological well-being	Item no.	Average score $\pm$ SD	Cronbach $\alpha$	Shapiro-Wilk		Asymmetry coef.	Excess coef.
					W	p		
PANAS schedule	Positive affect	10	3,38 $\pm$ 0,55	0,77	,993	,006	-0,11	-0,19
	Negative affect	10	2,11 $\pm$ 0,66	0,87	,972	,000	0,52	-0,15
Multidimensional Students' Life Satisfaction Scale	Satisfaction with family	7	4,23 $\pm$ 0,87	0,83	,976	,000	-0,58	0,31
	Satisfaction with friends	9	4,83 $\pm$ 0,72	0,83	,960	,000	-0,71	0,23
	Satisfaction with school	8	3,63 $\pm$ 0,96	0,87	,988	,000	-0,28	-0,16
	Satisfaction with living environment	9	3,93 $\pm$ 0,92	0,82	,988	,000	-0,32	-0,28
	Satisfaction with self	7	4,58 $\pm$ 0,63	0,77	,976	,000	-0,59	0,86
	Satisfaction with life	5	4,15 $\pm$ 0,90	0,79	,984	,000	-0,38	-0,12
C. Ryff psychological well-being scales	Autonomy	9	4,07 $\pm$ 0,69	0,72	,996	,055	0,03	0,14
	Environmental mastery	9	4,08 $\pm$ 0,60	0,62	,995	,031	0,02	-0,06
	Personal growth	9	4,24 $\pm$ 0,63	0,60	,996	,089	0,03	-0,18
	Positive relations with others	9	4,12 $\pm$ 0,73	0,72	,991	,001	-0,25	-0,18
	Purpose in life	9	4,28 $\pm$ 0,69	0,67	,987	,000	-0,33	-0,26
	Self acceptance	9	3,94 $\pm$ 0,71	0,74	,994	,014	-0,22	0,02
Locus of control	Externality – internality	22	3,96 $\pm$ 0,61	0,82	,995	,034	0,13	-0,39
Lithuanian adjective check list	Extraversion	6	3,71 $\pm$ 0,66	0,75	,983	,000	-0,37	0,01
	Agreeableness	6	3,89 $\pm$ 0,58	0,77	,981	,000	-0,32	0,24
	Conscientiousness	6	3,67 $\pm$ 0,65	0,78	,987	,000	-0,15	-0,05
	Openness to experience	6	3,68 $\pm$ 0,54	0,71	,987	,000	0,09	0,08
	Neuroticism	6	3,20 $\pm$ 0,66	0,69	,990	,000	-0,23	-0,03

Ryff's (1989) *psychological well-being scales*: self-acceptance, personal growth, autonomy, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and environmental mastery. The 9 item per scale version was used, so total amount of items was 54.

**Measures of personality variables:** the *Lithuanian adjective check list* for measuring Big Five personality traits: extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism (in our study higher scores indicate higher emotional stability), openness, and conscientiousness (Gurkšnytė, 2004), six pairs of adjectives were used to measure every trait; *Externality–Internality scale* (Bagdonas, Pociūtė, 1988), the shortened version consisting of 22 items was used.

**Data analysis.** SPSS statistical software (IBM SPSS Statistics 19) was used to calculate descriptive statistics, internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha), exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, Multivariate and Univariate analysis of variance (MANOVA and ANOVA), *Post hoc* Tukey HSD and Tamhane T2 criteria, Student t-test for independent samples, hierarchical multiple regression.

## RESULTS

In order to determine the structure of psychological well-being's construct we conducted exploratory factor analysis. Bartlett's sphericity criterion  $\chi^2(91)=4014,211$ ,  $p < 0,001$ , indicated that the factor analysis can be applied to the data. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin sampling adequacy measure was equal to 0,90, thus the data well suited for the factor analysis (Čekanavicius, Murauskas, 2002). Principal components analysis with Varimax rotation identified three factors which had eigenvalues greater than 1. All three broad, general factors jointly explained 60,79 % of variance: the first – 42,24 %, the second –

**Table 4. Factor loadings of psychological well-being components after principal component analysis' Varimax rotation, ranked by their absolute size.**

Component of well-being	Factor		
	1	2	3
Satisfaction with friends	,725		
Self acceptance	,707	,416	
Satisfaction with self	,689		
Positive relations with others	,669	,435	
Autonomy	,603		,408
Environmental mastery	,593		
Positive affect	,560		,460
Negative affect	-,557		
Satisfaction with family		,781	
Satisfaction with living environment		,729	
Satisfaction with life	,521	,666	
Personal growth			,823
Purpose in Life			,765
Satisfaction with school			,556

11,05 %, the third – 7,51%. Principal component weights after rotation are shown in 4 table. They are sorted by size and only those with absolute size not less than 0,4 are shown. Eight of the fourteen components were attributed to the first factor. Such finding confirms the idea that the hedonistic and eudaimonic well-beings are linked and overlap. The first factor was labeled as subjective well-being, according to its composition and the long tradition of well-being research. The second principal factor is composed of three scales – satisfaction with family, life and living environment (4 table). It was named as the satisfaction with life and its context. Life satisfaction scale according to its factor loadings could be attributed to two factors – subjective well-being's and satisfaction with life and its context, but we attributed it to the second factor because its loading was bigger there. The third general factor is also composed of three scales – two components of the psychological of well-being distinguished by C. Ryff (personal growth and purpose in life) and one scale measuring satisfaction with the domain of life, in particular – with the school. This factor was labeled as self-actualization, as the scales which compose it emphasize the pursuit of individual self-realization. All further analysis of the data is performed according to those three principal factors. We decided not to calculate one general index out of all scales as we might lose valuable information: specific components of the factors might be associated with differentiated sociodemographic and personality variables, and the trend of change related to age may vary in different directions.

The hierarchical linear regression using Enter method was performed in order to determine the specific links of each component of psychological well-being with the sociodemographic and personality variables. For each of the fourteen dependent variables (autonomy, personal growth, self-acceptance, purpose in life, environmental control, positive relations with others, satisfaction with living environment, self, life, family, friends, school, positive and negative emotionality) separate multilevel regression equations were calculated (see tables 5–19). The independent variables in the regression model were included in three steps. The first step included a block of independent variables accounted for all sociodemographic variables: gender (female), age / class (Class 10, Class 12, students of professional school), location (city, regional town), educational success, family structure

(intact family), economical resources (51-100 LTL, 101 LTL and more), extracurricular activities (attending extracurricular activities). A block of independent variables of the Big Five personality traits (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience, and neuroticism) was entered at the second step. Only one independent variable – locus of control was included at the third step of the hierarchical regression model. Hierarchical regression allowed to assess how much of the “variance in the dependent can be explained by one or a set of new independent variables, over and above that explained by an earlier set” (Garson, 2009).

**Table 5. Summary table of hierarchical regression analysis' variables, predicting satisfaction with friends.**

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	4,527	,220		2,988	,305		2,691	,325	
Gender (girls)	,112	,065	,078	,056	,064	,039	,068	,064	,047
10 class / 16 y.	-,038	,078	-,025	,003	,074	,002	,009	,073	,006
12 class /18 y.	-,042	,078	-,028	,025	,074	,017	,019	,074	,012
Prof. school /18 y.	,031	,143	,010	,073	,136	,024	,088	,135	,029
Place of residence (city)	-,018	,084	-,012	,037	,080	,026	,032	,079	,022
Place of residence (regional town)	,030	,081	,021	,106	,077	,072	,097	,077	,066
Learning success	,022	,026	,040	,023	,026	,042	,007	,027	,013
Intact family	,027	,074	,015	-,021	,070	-,012	-,004	,070	-,002
51–100 LTL	,163	,072	<b>,102*</b>	,092	,069	,058	,095	,068	,059
101 LTL and more	,181	,078	<b>,105*</b>	,162	,075	<b>,094*</b>	,163	,075	<b>,094*</b>
Attending extracurricular activities	-,008	,065	-,005	-,055	,061	-,037	-,054	,061	-,036
Extraversion				,403	,051	<b>,369***</b>	,392	,051	<b>,358***</b>
Agreeableness				-,017	,063	-,014	-,010	,063	-,008
Consciousness				,046	,060	,041	,042	,060	,038
Openess to experience				-,107	,069	-,081	-,118	,069	-,089
Neuroticism				,112	,047	<b>,104*</b>	,106	,047	<b>,098*</b>
Locus of control							,123	,048	<b>,105*</b>
$R^2$	,024			,149			,159		
$\Delta R^2$	,024			,125***			,01*		

Level of statistical significance: \* – p<0,05; \*\* – p<0,01; \*\*\* – p<0,001

**Table 6. Summary table of hierarchical regression analysis' variables, predicting satisfaction with Self-acceptance**

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	3,426	,215		1,157	,285		,810	,303	
Gender (girls)	-,125	,063	<b>-,087*</b>	-,136	,060	<b>-,095*</b>	-,123	,060	<b>-,085*</b>
10 class / 16 y.	-,157	,076	<b>-,104*</b>	-,095	,069	-,063	-,088	,068	-,058
12 class /18 y.	-,066	,076	-,044	,010	,069	,006	,002	,069	,001
Prof. school /18 y.	-,196	,140	-,066	-,137	,127	-,046	-,120	,126	-,040
Place of residence (city)	-,053	,082	-,037	-,009	,074	-,006	-,015	,074	-,011
Place of residence (regional town)	-,171	,079	<b>-,117*</b>	-,113	,072	-,077	-,123	,071	-,084
Learning success	,070	,025	<b>,126**</b>	,029	,024	,053	,011	,025	,020
Intact family	,151	,072	<b>,086*</b>	,097	,065	,055	,116	,065	,067
51–100 LTL	,148	,070	<b>,093*</b>	,118	,064	,074	,122	,064	,076
101 LTL and more	,159	,076	<b>,092*</b>	,189	,070	<b>,110**</b>	,190	,070	<b>,110**</b>
Attending extracurricular activities	,055	,063	,037	,020	,057	,014	,021	,057	,014
Extraversion				,286	,048	<b>,263***</b>	,273	,048	<b>,251***</b>
Agreeableness				-,063	,059	-,050	-,053	,058	-,043
Consciousness				,084	,056	,075	,079	,056	,071
Openess to experience				,197	,064	<b>,149**</b>	,184	,064	<b>,139**</b>
Neuroticism				,219	,044	<b>,204***</b>	,212	,044	<b>,197***</b>
Locus of control							,144	,045	<b>,124**</b>
$R^2$	,065			,251			,264		
$\Delta R^2$	<b>,065***</b>			<b>,185***</b>			<b>,013**</b>		

Level of statistical significance: \* – p<0,05; \*\* – p<0,01; \*\*\* – p<0,001



**Table 7. Summary table of hierarchical regression analysis' variables, predicting satisfaction with self**

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	4,722	,187		2,497	,236		2,423	,253	
Gender (girls)	,057	,055	,047	-,012	,050	-,010	-,010	,050	-,008
10 class / 16 y.	-,039	,066	-,030	,010	,057	,008	,012	,057	,009
12 class /18 y.	-,081	,066	-,064	-,024	,057	-,019	-,026	,057	-,020
Prof. school /18 y.	-,146	,121	-,058	-,137	,105	-,054	-,133	,105	-,053
Place of residence (city)	-,126	,071	-,102	-,074	,062	-,060	-,076	,062	-,062
Place of residence (regional town)	-,169	,069	- <b>,136*</b>	-,114	,060	-,092	-,116	,060	-,093
Learning success	-,015	,022	-,032	-,071	,020	<b>-,150***</b>	-,075	,021	<b>-,158***</b>
Intact family	,047	,063	,032	,005	,054	,004	,010	,055	,006
51–100 LTL	,104	,061	,077	,075	,053	,056	,076	,053	,056
101 LTL and more	,080	,066	,055	,105	,058	,072	,105	,058	,072
Attending extracurricular activities	,054	,055	,042	,026	,047	,021	,026	,047	,021
Extraversion				,254	,040	<b>,275***</b>	,251	,040	<b>,272***</b>
Agreeableness				,017	,049	,016	,018	,049	,018
Conscientiousness				,186	,046	<b>,198***</b>	,185	,046	<b>,197***</b>
Openness to experience				,187	,053	<b>,167***</b>	,185	,053	<b>,164**</b>
Neuroticism				,086	,037	<b>,094*</b>	,085	,037	<b>,093*</b>
Locus of control							,031	,038	,031
$R^2$	,023			,287			,288		
$\Delta R^2$	,023			<b>,264***</b>			,001		

Level of statistical significance: \* – p<0,05; \*\* – p<0,01; \*\*\* – p<0,001

**Table 8. Summary table of hierarchical regression analysis' variables, predicting positive relations with others**

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	3,546	,220		1,027	,279		,771	,298	
Gender (girls)	,128	,065	<b>,088*</b>	,033	,059	,023	,043	,059	,030
10 class / 16 y.	-,074	,078	-,048	-,021	,068	-,014	-,015	,067	-,010
12 class /18 y.	-,012	,078	-,008	,069	,068	,046	,063	,068	,042
Prof. school /18 y.	-,023	,143	-,008	,013	,124	,004	,026	,124	,009
Place of residence (city)	-,019	,084	-,013	,049	,073	,033	,044	,073	,030
Place of residence (regional town)	-,042	,081	-,028	,049	,071	,033	,042	,070	,028
Learning success	,044	,026	,079	,037	,024	,065	,023	,024	,041
Intact family	,160	,074	<b>,090*</b>	,108	,064	,061	,122	,064	,069
51–100 LTL	,189	,072	<b>,117**</b>	,114	,063	,071	,117	,063	,073
101 LTL and more	,144	,078	,083	,164	,069	<b>,094*</b>	,164	,069	<b>,094*</b>
Attending extracurricular activities	,015	,065	,010	-,053	,056	-,035	-,053	,056	-,035
Extraversion				,497	,047	<b>,451***</b>	,487	,047	<b>,442***</b>
Agreeableness				,148	,058	<b>,117*</b>	,154	,057	<b>,123**</b>
Conscientiousness				,074	,055	,066	,071	,055	,063
Openess to experience				-,172	,063	<b>-,129**</b>	-,182	,063	<b>-,136**</b>
Neuroticism				,176	,043	<b>,162***</b>	,171	,043	<b>,157***</b>
Locus of control							,106	,044	<b>,090*</b>
$R^2$	,044			,298			,306		
$\Delta R^2$	,044**			,254***			,007*		

Level of statistical significance: \* – p<0,05; \*\* – p<0,01; \*\*\* – p<0,001

**Table 9. Summary table of hierarchical regression analysis' variables, predicting autonomy**

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	3,149	,210		1,601	,289		1,441	,310	
Gender (girls)	-,010	,062	-,007	-,023	,061	-,017	-,017	,061	-,012
10 class / 16 y.	,050	,075	,034	,096	,070	,066	,100	,070	,068
12 class /18 y.	,106	,075	,073	,180	,070	<b>,123*</b>	,176	,070	<b>,121*</b>
Prof. school /18 y.	,013	,136	,005	,087	,128	,030	,095	,128	,033
Place of residence (city)	-,067	,080	-,048	-,033	,075	-,023	-,036	,075	-,025
Place of residence (regional town)	,001	,077	,001	,047	,073	,033	,042	,073	,030
Learning success	,106	,025	<b>,197***</b>	,092	,025	<b>,170***</b>	,083	,025	<b>,154**</b>
Intact family	-,018	,071	-,010	-,073	,066	-,043	-,064	,067	-,038
51–100 LTL	,094	,069	,060	,026	,065	,016	,027	,065	,018
101 LTL and more	,212	,075	<b>,126**</b>	,176	,072	<b>,105*</b>	,176	,071	<b>,105*</b>
Attending extracurricular activities	,036	,062	,025	-,002	,058	-,002	-,002	,058	-,001
Extraversion				,338	,048	<b>,318***</b>	,331	,049	<b>,312***</b>
Agreeableness				-,098	,060	-,081	-,094	,060	-,077
Conscientiousness				-,047	,057	-,043	-,049	,057	-,045
Openess to experience				,177	,065	<b>,138**</b>	,171	,065	<b>,133**</b>
Neuroticism				,101	,045	<b>,097*</b>	,098	,045	<b>,094*</b>
Locus of control							,066	,046	,058
$R^2$	,061			,188			,191		
$\Delta R^2$	<b>,061***</b>			<b>,128***</b>			<b>,003</b>		

Level of statistical significance: \* – p<0,05; \*\* – p<0,01; \*\*\* – p<0,001

**Table 10. Summary table of hierarchical regression analysis' variables, predicting environmental mastery**

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	3,685	,180		1,738	,231		1,496	,246	
Gender (girls)	-,074	,053	-,062	-,133	,049	<b>-,111**</b>	-,123	,049	<b>-,103*</b>
10 class / 16 y.	-,124	,064	-,099	-,077	,056	-,061	-,072	,056	-,057
12 class /18 y.	-,154	,064	<b>-,123*</b>	-,104	,056	-,083	-,109	,056	-,087
Prof. school /18 y.	-,226	,117	-,091	-,230	,103	<b>-,093*</b>	-,219	,102	<b>-,088*</b>
Place of residence (city)	-,128	,069	-,105	-,065	,060	-,054	-,070	,060	-,058
Place of residence (regional town)	-,177	,066	<b>-,145**</b>	-,100	,058	-,082	-,107	,058	-,087
Learning success	,071	,021	<b>,154**</b>	,026	,020	,057	,013	,020	,029
Intact family	,108	,061	,074	,072	,053	,049	,086	,053	,058
51–100 LTL	,051	,059	,038	,041	,052	,031	,043	,052	,033
101 LTL and more	,134	,064	<b>,093*</b>	,184	,057	<b>,128**</b>	,185	,057	<b>,128**</b>
Attending extracurricular activities	-,028	,053	-,022	-,049	,046	-,039	-,049	,046	-,039
Extraversion				,228	,039	<b>,251***</b>	,219	,039	<b>,240***</b>
Agreeableness				-,035	,048	-,034	-,029	,047	-,028
Consciousness				,276	,045	<b>,298***</b>	,273	,045	<b>,295***</b>
Openess to experience				,010	,052	,009	,001	,052	,001
Neuroticism				,158	,036	<b>,175***</b>	,153	,036	<b>,170***</b>
Locus of control							,101	,037	<b>,103**</b>
$R^2$	,066			,296			,306		
$\Delta R^2$	<b>,066***</b>			<b>,230***</b>			<b>,009**</b>		

Level of statistical significance: \* – p<0,05; \*\* – p<0,01; \*\*\* – p<0,001

**Table 11. Summary table of hierarchical regression analysis‘ variables, predicting positive affect**

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	2,988	,164		1,529	,206		1,440	,220	
Gender (girls)	,020	,048	,018	-,070	,043	-,064	-,067	,043	-,061
10 class / 16 y.	-,069	,058	-,060	-,035	,050	-,030	-,033	,050	-,029
12 class /18 y.	-,028	,058	-,025	,032	,050	,028	,030	,050	,026
Prof. school /18 y.	-,064	,107	-,028	-,048	,091	-,021	-,044	,091	-,019
Place of residence (city)	-,030	,063	-,028	,026	,054	,024	,025	,054	,022
Place of residence (regional town)	-,044	,060	-,039	,016	,052	,014	,013	,052	,012
Learning success	,043	,019	<b>,103*</b>	,011	,018	,026	,007	,018	,015
Intact family	-,072	,055	-,054	-,122	,047	<b>-,091*</b>	-,117	,047	<b>-,087*</b>
51–100 LTL	,167	,054	<b>,137**</b>	,087	,046	,071	,087	,046	,072
101 LTL and more	,183	,058	<b>,139**</b>	,124	,051	<b>,094*</b>	,124	,051	<b>,094*</b>
Attending extracurricular activities	,136	,048	<b>,119**</b>	,105	,041	<b>,092*</b>	,105	,041	<b>,092*</b>
Extraversion				,355	,034	<b>,426***</b>	,351	,035	<b>,422***</b>
Agreeableness				-,079	,042	-,083	-,076	,042	-,081
Consciousness				,120	,040	<b>,142**</b>	,119	,040	<b>,140**</b>
Openess to experience				,144	,046	<b>,142**</b>	,140	,047	<b>,139**</b>
Neuroticism				-,066	,032	<b>-,081*</b>	-,068	,032	<b>-,083*</b>
Locus of control							,037	,033	,041
$R^2$	,068			,332			,334		
$\Delta R^2$	,068***			,264***			,002		

Level of statistical significance: \* – p<0,05; \*\* – p<0,01; \*\*\* – p<0,001

**Table 12. Summary table of hierarchical regression analysis' variables, predicting negative affect**

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	2,365	,201		4,517	,258		4,558	,277	
Gender (girls)	,155	,059	<b>,117**</b>	,124	,054	<b>,093*</b>	,123	,055	<b>,092*</b>
10 class / 16 y.	,115	,071	,082	,046	,062	,033	,045	,063	,032
12 class /18 y.	,189	,071	<b>,137**</b>	,106	,063	,076	,107	,063	,077
Prof. school /18 y.	,134	,130	,049	,049	,115	,018	,047	,115	,017
Place of residence (city)	,020	,077	,015	-,027	,067	-,020	-,026	,067	-,020
Place of residence (regional town)	,112	,074	,083	,032	,065	,024	,033	,065	,024
Learning success	-,050	,024	<b>-,097*</b>	-,041	,022	-,081	-,039	,023	-,076
Intact family	-,140	,068	<b>-,087*</b>	-,085	,059	-,052	-,087	,060	-,054
51–100 LTL	-,065	,066	-,044	-,044	,058	-,030	-,045	,058	-,030
101 LTL and more	-,087	,071	-,055	-,148	,064	<b>-,093*</b>	-,148	,064	<b>-,093*</b>
Attending extracurricular activities	,046	,059	,033	,089	,052	,065	,089	,052	,065
Extraversion				-,326	,043	<b>-,323***</b>	-,324	,043	<b>-,321***</b>
Agreeableness				,087	,053	,075	,086	,053	,074
Consciousness				-,044	,051	-,043	-,044	,051	-,043
Openess to experience				,036	,058	,030	,038	,058	,031
Neuroticism				-,392	,040	<b>-,394***</b>	-,391	,040	<b>-,393***</b>
Locus of control							-,017	,041	-,016
$R^2$	,048			,284			,284		
$\Delta R^2$	,048**			,235***			,000		

Level of statistical significance: \* – p<0,05; \*\* – p<0,01; \*\*\* – p<0,001

**Table 13. Summary table of hierarchical regression analysis‘ variables, predicting satisfaction with family**

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	3,904	,264		1,585	,365		1,323	,390	
Gender (girls)	-,014	,078	-,008	-,067	,077	-,038	-,056	,077	-,032
10 class / 16 y.	-,412	,094	<b>-,221***</b>	-,365	,088	<b>-,196***</b>	-,359	,088	<b>-,193***</b>
12 class /18 y.	-,273	,094	<b>-,148**</b>	-,227	,089	<b>-,123*</b>	-,233	,088	<b>-,126**</b>
Prof. school /18 y.	-,117	,172	-,032	-,116	,162	-,032	-,104	,162	-,028
Place of residence (city)	-,193	,101	-,108	-,151	,095	-,084	-,156	,095	-,087
Place of residence (regional town)	-,144	,097	-,080	-,092	,092	-,051	-,100	,092	-,055
Learning success	,068	,031	<b>,099*</b>	,021	,031	,031	,007	,032	,011
Intact family	,080	,089	,037	,053	,084	,025	,068	,084	,031
51–100 LTL	,195	,086	<b>,099*</b>	,199	,082	<b>,101*</b>	,202	,082	<b>,103*</b>
101 LTL and more	,115	,094	,054	,197	,090	<b>,093*</b>	,197	,090	<b>,093*</b>
Attending extracurricular activities	,092	,078	,050	,063	,073	,034	,063	,073	,034
Extraversion				,184	,061	<b>,137**</b>	,174	,061	<b>,129**</b>
Agreeableness				,128	,075	,083	,135	,075	,088
Consciousness				,183	,072	<b>,134*</b>	,180	,072	<b>,131*</b>
Openess to experience				,050	,082	,031	,040	,082	,024
Neuroticism				,193	,056	<b>,145**</b>	,188	,056	<b>,141**</b>
Locus of control							,108	,058	,075
$R^2$	,075			,195			,200		
$\Delta R^2$	<b>,075***</b>			<b>,120***</b>			<b>,005</b>		

Level of statistical significance: \* –  $p < 0,05$ ; \*\* –  $p < 0,01$ ; \*\*\* –  $p < 0,001$

**Table 14. Summary table of hierarchical regression analysis' variables, predicting satisfaction with living environment**

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	3,667	,272		1,760	,380		1,345	,405	
Gender (girls)	-,229	,080	<b>-,125**</b>	-,242	,080	<b>-,132**</b>	-,225	,080	<b>-,123**</b>
10 class / 16 y.	-,248	,097	<b>-,129*</b>	-,189	,092	<b>-,098*</b>	-,180	,091	-,093
12 class /18 y.	-,363	,097	<b>-,190***</b>	-,286	,092	<b>-,150**</b>	-,295	,092	<b>-,155**</b>
Prof. school /18 y.	-,370	,177	<b>-,097*</b>	-,314	,169	-,083	-,294	,168	-,077
Place of residence (city)	-,008	,104	-,004	,053	,099	,029	,045	,099	,025
Place of residence (regional town)	,021	,100	,011	,110	,096	,059	,098	,096	,053
Learning success	,039	,032	,056	,025	,032	,035	,003	,033	,004
Intact family	,353	,092	<b>,158***</b>	,298	,087	<b>,134**</b>	,322	,087	<b>,144***</b>
51–100 LTL	,104	,089	,051	,067	,086	,033	,071	,085	,035
101 LTL and more	,040	,097	,018	,070	,094	,032	,070	,093	,032
Attending extracurricular activities	,007	,080	,004	-,031	,076	-,016	-,030	,076	-,016
Extraversion				,351	,064	<b>,252***</b>	,335	,064	<b>,240***</b>
Agreeableness				-,115	,078	-,072	-,104	,078	-,066
Consciousness				,129	,075	,091	,123	,074	,087
Openess to experience				-,056	,086	-,033	-,071	,086	-,042
Neuroticism				,268	,059	<b>,196***</b>	,260	,058	<b>,189***</b>
Locus of control							,172	,060	<b>,116**</b>
$R^2$	,081			,183			,194		
$\Delta R^2$	<b>,081***</b>			<b>,102***</b>			<b>,012**</b>		

Level of statistical significance: \* – p<0,05; \*\* – p<0,01; \*\*\* – p<0,001



**Table 15. Summary table of hierarchical regression analysis‘ variables, predicting satisfaction with life**

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	3,936	,262		1,383	,355		,995	,378	
Gender (girls)	-,071	,077	-,040	-,109	,075	-,062	-,094	,075	-,053
10 class / 16 y.	-,315	,093	<b>-,169**</b>	-,253	,086	<b>-,136**</b>	-,245	,085	<b>-,131**</b>
12 class /18 y.	-,289	,093	<b>-,157**</b>	-,207	,086	<b>-,112*</b>	-,215	,086	<b>-,117*</b>
Prof. school /18 y.	-,477	,170	<b>-,130**</b>	-,418	,158	<b>-,114**</b>	-,399	,157	<b>-,109*</b>
Place of residence (city)	-,114	,100	-,064	-,066	,093	-,037	-,073	,092	-,041
Place of residence (regional town)	-,205	,096	<b>-,114*</b>	-,142	,090	-,079	-,153	,089	-,085
Learning success	,029	,031	,042	-,005	,030	-,008	-,026	,031	-,038
Intact family	,339	,088	<b>,157***</b>	,283	,082	<b>,131**</b>	,305	,081	<b>,141***</b>
51–100 LTL	,206	,085	<b>,105*</b>	,157	,080	,080	,161	,080	<b>,082*</b>
101 LTL and more	,240	,093	<b>,113*</b>	,265	,088	<b>,125**</b>	,265	,087	<b>,125**</b>
Attending extracurricular activities	,073	,077	,039	,024	,071	,013	,024	,071	,013
Extraversion				,368	,060	<b>,274***</b>	,353	,059	<b>,263***</b>
Agreeableness				,028	,073	,018	,038	,073	,025
Consciousness				,049	,070	,036	,044	,069	,032
Openess to experience				,139	,080	,085	,125	,080	,076
Neuroticism				,203	,055	<b>,153***</b>	,195	,055	<b>,147***</b>
Locus of control							,161	,056	<b>,112**</b>
$R^2$	,088			,235			,246		
$\Delta R^2$	<b>,088***</b>			<b>,147***</b>			<b>,011**</b>		

Level of statistical significance: \* – p<0,05; \*\* – p<0,01; \*\*\* – p<0,001

**Table 16. Summary table of hierarchical regression analysis‘ variables, predicting satisfaction with personal growth**

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	3,268	,185		2,120	,264		1,675	,278	
Gender (girls)	,065	,055	,052	,040	,056	,032	,058	,055	,046
10 class / 16 y.	,064	,066	,049	,090	,064	,069	,099	,063	,076
12 class /18 y.	,149	,066	<b>,115*</b>	,185	,064	<b>,143**</b>	,175	,063	<b>,135**</b>
Prof. school /18 y.	-,003	,120	-,001	,023	,117	,009	,045	,115	,017
Place of residence (city)	,093	,071	,074	,111	,069	,088	,102	,068	,081
Place of residence (regional town)	,059	,068	,046	,076	,067	,060	,064	,066	,050
Learning success	,105	,022	<b>,218***</b>	,083	,022	<b>,173***</b>	,060	,023	<b>,124**</b>
Intact family	-,104	,062	-,068	-,129	,061	<b>-,085*</b>	-,104	,060	-,069
51–100 LTL	,056	,060	,041	,027	,059	,020	,032	,059	,023
101 LTL and more	,081	,066	,054	,077	,065	,051	,077	,064	,052
Attending extracurricular activities	,085	,054	,066	,065	,053	,050	,065	,052	,050
Extraversion				,161	,044	<b>,170***</b>	,143	,044	<b>,151**</b>
Agreeableness				,020	,054	,019	,032	,054	,029
Consciousness				,001	,052	,002	-,004	,051	-,004
Openess to experience				,147	,060	<b>,128*</b>	,130	,059	<b>,113*</b>
Neuroticism				,035	,041	,038	,026	,040	,028
Locus of control							,185	,041	<b>,182***</b>
$R^2$	,083			,151			,181		
$\Delta R^2$	<b>,083***</b>			<b>,069***</b>			<b>,029***</b>		

Level of statistical significance: \* – p<0,05; \*\* – p<0,01; \*\*\* – p<0,001

**Table 17. Summary table of hierarchical regression analysis‘ variables, predicting satisfaction with purpose in life**

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	3,214	,202		1,460	,274		,847	,285	
Gender (girls)	-,097	,060	-,070	-,183	,058	<b>-,133**</b>	-,159	,056	<b>-,115**</b>
10 class / 16 y.	-,044	,072	-,031	-,011	,066	-,008	,001	,064	,001
12 class /18 y.	,142	,072	<b>,099*</b>	,179	,067	<b>,125**</b>	,165	,065	<b>,116*</b>
Prof. school /18 y.	-,013	,131	-,004	-,032	,122	-,011	-,002	,118	-,001
Place of residence (city)	-,026	,077	-,019	,023	,072	,017	,012	,069	,008
Place of residence (regional town)	-,097	,074	-,069	-,047	,069	-,034	-,064	,067	-,046
Learning success	,135	,024	<b>,255***</b>	,086	,023	<b>,162***</b>	,053	,023	<b>,101*</b>
Intact family	-,037	,068	-,022	-,064	,063	-,038	-,029	,061	-,017
51–100 LTL	,038	,066	,025	,017	,062	,011	,023	,060	,015
101 LTL and more	,108	,072	,065	,130	,068	,079	,131	,066	<b>,080*</b>
Attending extracurricular activities	,141	,059	<b>,099*</b>	,122	,055	<b>,085*</b>	,123	,053	<b>,086*</b>
Extraversion				,197	,046	<b>,189***</b>	,173	,045	<b>,166***</b>
Agreeableness				,050	,057	,042	,066	,055	,056
Consciousness				,219	,054	<b>,207***</b>	,211	,052	<b>,199***</b>
Openess to experience				,095	,062	,075	,072	,060	,057
Neuroticism				,020	,042	,020	,007	,041	,007
Locus of control							,255	,042	<b>,228***</b>
$R^2$	,099			,243			,289		
$\Delta R^2$	<b>,099***</b>			<b>,144***</b>			<b>,046***</b>		

Level of statistical significance: \* – p<0,05; \*\* – p<0,01; \*\*\* – p<0,001

**Table 18. Summary table of hierarchical regression analysis' variables, predicting satisfaction with school**

Variable	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Constant	2,421	,282		,422	,397		,001	,422	
Gender (girls)	,114	,083	,058	,103	,084	,053	,120	,083	,061
10 class / 16 y.	-,168	,100	-,082	-,111	,096	-,054	-,102	,095	-,050
12 class /18 y.	,013	,100	,006	,078	,096	,039	,069	,096	,034
Prof. school /18 y.	,120	,183	,030	,160	,176	,039	,181	,175	,045
Place of residence (city)	-,447	,108	<b>-,227***</b>	-,395	,103	<b>-,200***</b>	-,403	,103	<b>-,204***</b>
Place of residence (regional town)	-,239	,104	<b>-,120*</b>	-,167	,100	-,084	-,178	,100	-,090
Learning success	,168	,033	<b>,222***</b>	,135	,034	<b>,178***</b>	,112	,035	<b>,148**</b>
Intact family	,097	,095	,041	,051	,091	,021	,075	,091	,031
51–100 LTL	,007	,092	,003	-,006	,089	-,003	-,002	,089	-,001
101 LTL and more	-,107	,100	-,046	-,058	,098	-,025	-,057	,097	-,024
Attending extracurricular activities	,205	,083	<b>,101*</b>	,178	,080	<b>,087*</b>	,179	,079	<b>,088*</b>
Extraversion				,252	,066	<b>,170***</b>	,235	,066	<b>,158***</b>
Agreeableness				-,086	,082	-,051	-,075	,081	-,044
Consciousness				,165	,078	<b>,109*</b>	,159	,078	<b>,106*</b>
Openess to experience				,054	,090	,030	,038	,089	,021
Neuroticism				,251	,061	<b>,172***</b>	,243	,061	<b>,166***</b>
Locus of control							,175	,063	<b>,110**</b>
$R^2$	,135			,220			,230		
$\Delta R^2$	,135***			,085***			,011**		

Level of statistical significance: \* – p<0,05; \*\* – p<0,01; \*\*\* – p<0,001

**19 table. Summary table of prognostic values of sociodemographic and personality variables from final regression models predicting components of psychological well-being.**

Prognostic variable	Subjective well-being factor									Satisfaction with life and its context factor				Self-actualization factor			
	SF	SA	SS	PR	AU	EM	PA	NA	SWBF	SF	SLE	SL	SLCF	PG	PL	SSc	SAF
Model 1, $\Delta R^2$	,024	,065***	,023	,044**	,061***	,066***	,068***	,048**	<b>,061***</b>	,075***	,081***	,088***	<b>,099***</b>	,083***	,099***	,135***	<b>,140***</b>
Gender (girls)		-,085				-,103		,092			-,123		<b>-,084</b>		-,115		
10 class / 16 y.										-,193		-,131	<b>-,169</b>				
12 class / 18y..					,121					-,126	-,155	-,117	<b>-,161</b>	,135	,116		<b>,123</b>
Prof. school/ 18 y.						-,088						-,109	<b>-,086</b>				
Place or residence (city)																-,204	
Learning success			-,158		,154									,124	,101	,148	<b>,162</b>
Intact family							-,087				,144	,141	<b>,127</b>				
51-100 LTL									<b>,076</b>	,103		,082	<b>,089</b>				
101 LTL and more	,09	,110		,094	,105	,128	,094	-,093	<b>,130</b>	,093		,125	<b>,100</b>		,080		
Attending extracurricular activities							,092								,086	,088	<b>,097</b>
Model 2, $\Delta R^2$	<b>,125***</b>	<b>,185***</b>	<b>,264***</b>	<b>,254***</b>	<b>,128***</b>	<b>,230***</b>	<b>,264***</b>	<b>,235***</b>	<b>,302***</b>	<b>,120***</b>	<b>,102***</b>	<b>,147***</b>	<b>,167***</b>	<b>,069***</b>	<b>,144***</b>	<b>,085***</b>	<b>,149***</b>
Extraversion	,36	,251	,272	,442	,312	,240	,422	-,321	<b>,424</b>	,129	,240	,263	<b>,254</b>	,151	,166	,158	<b>,206</b>
Agreeableness				,123													
Conscientiousness			,197			,295	,140		<b>,153</b>	,131			<b>,102</b>		,199	,106	<b>,130</b>
Openness to experience		,139	,164	-,136	,133		,139							,113			
Neuroticism	,10	,197	,093	,157	,094	,170	-,083	-,393		,141	,189	,147	<b>,192</b>			,166	<b>,088</b>
Model 3, $\Delta R^2$	<b>,01*</b>	<b>,013**</b>	<b>,001</b>	<b>,007*</b>	<b>,003</b>	<b>,009**</b>	<b>,002</b>	<b>,000</b>	<b>,012**</b>	<b>,005</b>	<b>,012**</b>	<b>,011**</b>	<b>,013**</b>	<b>,029***</b>	<b>,046***</b>	<b>,011**</b>	<b>,045***</b>
Locus of control	,11	,124		,090		,103			<b>,116</b>		,116	,112	<b>,122</b>	,182	,228	,110	<b>,225</b>

Level of statistical significance: \* –  $p < 0,05$ ; \*\* –  $p < 0,01$ ; \*\*\* –  $p < 0,001$

SF – satisfaction with friends; SA – self acceptance; SS – satisfaction with self; PR – positive relations with others; AU – autonomy; EM – environmental mastery; PA – positive affect; NA – negative affect. SWBF – derivative indicator of subjective well-being factor; SF – satisfaction with family; PGA – satisfaction with living environment; SL – satisfaction with life; SLCF – derivative indicator of satisfaction with life and its context factor; PG – personal growth; PL – purpose in Life; SSc – satisfaction with school; SAF – derivative indicator of self-actualization factor.

## **DISCUSSION**

The concept of hedonic approach to psychological well-being in addition to the assessment of positive and negative emotions, and satisfaction with life has been extended with the fourth component – satisfaction with important domains of life. We were unable to find published scientific studies, which would re-assess the structure of psychological well-being, the points of hedonic and eudaimonic approaches diversity and overlap. So in this dissertation the work of other researchers was extended by incorporating the satisfaction with important life domains into the testing of the psychological well-being structure. The principal component analysis revealed a unique psychological well-being structure of 14–19 year old schoolchildren's, consisting of three separate, but related, dimensions: subjective well-being, life satisfaction and its context, and self-actualization. These results highlighted the three existing sources of psychological well-being, which have distinct links with different sociodemographic and personal factors. Given the unique characteristics of those three sources it is possible to improve schoolchildren's psychological well-being more effectively. Our analysis of the results of the different components of psychological well-being allowed identifying areas that require more attention from the professionals who work with schoolchildren. For example, the analysis of subjective well-being components revealed that even a quarter of students surveyed were dissatisfied with themselves, want to be different, are concerned about their individual characteristics, and a fifth of surveyed students have little close, trust-based interpersonal relationships, it is difficult for them to be warm, open, they feel isolated, and are concerned about other people's expectations, make decisions based on the opinion of others, are susceptible to social influences to think and behave in a certain way. Looking at the estimates of the components of satisfaction with life and its context, we can see that almost one-fifth of surveyed students indicated that they are more or less dissatisfied with life and family, and even a third – with their living environment. It should be noted that our study didn't find the link between satisfaction with family and family composition, i. e. they live in intact or in single-parent families. If to compare our study's results with those obtained by other authors, we see that the proportions of 14–19 year old schoolchildren's dissatisfaction with family (17,7%) and life

(22,7%) are similar (respectively 17,8 % and 22,6 % of 12–19 year old adolescents were dissatisfied, Kwan, 2008), but dissatisfaction with living environment (30,7% ) differed significantly (18,9%, Kwan, 2008). It would be interesting to study what specifically causes the schoolchildren's dissatisfaction with living environment. Our study also revealed that 14–19 year old schoolchildren are the least satisfied with school compared with other areas of satisfaction with life domains. The same trend was found in the United States in grades 6–8 (Antaramian et al., 2008), but the percentage of dissatisfied with school schoolchildren (38.5% of surveyed students indicated that they are more or less dissatisfied) in our study was well above other authors' obtained results among adolescents (12–19m. 20,2%, Kwan, 2008; 23% of schoolchildren in grades 9–12, Huebner et al., 2000). Part of those results can be explained by characteristics related with age, as research shows that only 5% of 18–23 year old college students are dissatisfied with the school and this is associated with the fact that the students themselves choose in which colleges they will study (Zullig et al., 2009). However, it is worth recalling that dissatisfaction with school experiences among adolescents is associated with a variety of interpersonal, internal and academic problems (Huebner and Gilman, 2006), including but not limited to, dropping out of school (Elmore, Huebner, 2010). Meanwhile, research was conducted which found that students who like school are more involved in class activities and later learn better (Ladd et al., 2000), and the frequent positive emotions arising in school are linked with greater student involvement in school activities and enhance the relationships with adults (e. g., teachers) (Reschly et al., 2008). Thus, school psychologists need to explore in more detail what exactly causes schoolchildren's dissatisfaction with school, as this component was grouped with other two components of eudaimonic approach – personal growth and goals in life. It might be that schoolchildren feel that school doesn't provide enough possibilities for self-actualization.

"Bottom-up" theory states, for example, that happiness is a sum of small amounts of pleasure (Diener, 1984). The "top-down" theory postulates that there is a general tendency to experience events in a positive way, and this tendency influences the individual's momentary interactions with the world. According to this approach, a person is experiencing pleasant things, because he is happy, but not vice versa. Our study showed that

the sociodemographic variables explain only little variance of psychological well-being components, considerably more explain Big Five personality traits, which relate diversely to the psychological well-being components. These results suggest that psychological well-being is indeed influenced by various factors, and confirms the benefits of the assessment of different psychological well-being components, not one general indicator (Ryan and Deci, 2001). Factors related to components of psychological well-being analysis provides valuable information, which helps to assess more accurately the schoolchildren's weak and strong points, and to target psychological or other necessary assistance more precisely.

Extraversion emerged as the strongest predictive factor in hierarchical models from all of the Big Five personality traits. It was significantly linked with all psychological well-being factors' derived indicators and components. Neuroticism, to a lesser degree than extraversion, but still was significantly linked with a majority of the psychological well-being components. Our study showed that the strength of the extraversion's links with psychological well-being components varies depending on to which of the three factors of psychological well-being it is linked. Extraversion personality trait often emerged as the strongest predictive variable in the predictive models of subjective well-being and satisfaction with life and its context, but the links were weaker with the latter. The predictive values of self-actualization were even weaker, but to a significant extent, though not the strongest. These results are coincident with the top-down theory, the approach to personality and subjective well-being link (Costa, McCrae, 1980) which postulates that extroverts have characteristics that predispose them to experience more positive emotions and neurotic's characteristics predisposes one in advance to experience more negative affect. Our research also showed that extraversion was negatively related with negative affect. This indicates that extraversion in the schoolchildren's sample acted as a protective factor after controlling for the effects of gender, economic resources and neuroticism. The higher the extroversion scores were the less the respondent indicated experiencing negative emotions.

Neuroticism was associated with a majority of the psychological well-being's components, but to a lesser degree than extraversion. Neuroticism was a non-significant



prognostic factor when predicting self-actualization components – personal growth and purpose in life. Discussing the relationship of neuroticism with psychological well-being it is important to recall that in this study, higher neuroticism scores indicate more emotional stability. We found that emotionally stable schoolchildren have higher psychological well-being. Neuroticism was the strongest prognostic factor of negative affect, the results coincided with the above-mentioned top-down theory and the results obtained by other researchers (Costa, McCrae, 1980; Emmons, Diener, 1985). The stronger neuroticism was expressed in schoolchild, the bigger score of negative affect was predicted. The same direction and the link was found in predicting positive affect, but the large sample could influence the fact that we get small but statistically significant differences from zero (Čekanavicius and Murauskas, 2002). Thus, future studies should determine whether that link will be repeated in schoolchildren's sample. This idea is reinforced by the fact that neuroticism didn't emerge as significant predictor of derived indicator of subjective well-being.

Conscientiousness has emerged as the third strongest predictor on psychological well-being together with extraversion and neuroticism. These results suggest that conscientiousness is associated with a higher 14–19 year old schoolchildren's psychological well-being. In future research it is important to consider the effects of conscientiousness on other phenomenon's links with schoolchildren's psychological well-being.

According to our results of hierarchical regression modeling agreeableness personality trait is not related with psychological well-being, except for positive relations with others component. This significant link coincided with the results obtained by other researchers in the adults' sample (Schmutte, Ryff, 1997).

Openness to experience is to the least extent related with the subjective and psychological well-being in general. Openness to experience was not linked significantly with any derived indicator of psychological well-being factors, though, for example, it was a significant predictor of subjective well-being factors' five components – self-acceptance, satisfaction with self, positive relations with others, autonomy, and positive affect. Thus, openness to experience is linked with the individual subjective well-being's components,

but its relationship with subjective well-being in general indicator's terms is too small to become significant. These results lead to the idea that one minor trait from those constituting openness to experience is linked with subjective well-being, which has a stronger link with subjective well-being than a more general openness to experience personality trait.

Our study also examined the link of psychological well-being with locus of control, a more specific personality characteristic than Big five personality traits. It was found that locus of control does not lose predictive power of psychological well-being, even taking into account all the Big Five personality traits and sociodemographic variables at the same time. So it makes sense to measure locus of control in psychological well-being studies and in particular self-actualization factor. This valuable information can help to develop effective psychological well-being's improvement programs. Internal locus of control in all cases was associated with greater psychological well-being. Locus of control strongly predicted all three self-actualization factor components – personal growth, purpose in life and satisfaction with school. Though locus of control is a multi-facet variable, in this study we measured only general aspect of externality-internality. As in the case of specific personality traits, so knowledge of the links of specific aspects of locus of control with psychological well-being would help to better understand the phenomenon of psychological well-being.

In general this dissertation adds new insights to the better understanding of the concept of psychological well-being and helps researchers or other specialists who work with the 14–19 year old schoolchildren to choose more precisely which specific sociodemographic and personality factors one should consider and evaluate depending on which psychological well-being factor or component is of specific interest to him/her.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

1. Exploratory factor analysis revealed a unique structure of 14–19 year old schoolchildren's psychological well-being, instead of two dimensions, as hedonistic

and eudaimonic approaches suggest, were identified three: the subjective well-being, satisfaction with life and its context, and self-actualization.

2. The findings of the present study show that after taking into account personality factors all derived indices and individual components of the psychological well-being factors are diversely related to sociodemographic factors such as sex, age / grade, place of residence, learning success, family composition, economic resources, and attendance of extracurricular activities:

- None of the above-mentioned sociodemographic factors were significantly related to satisfaction with friends and self.
- Girls have lower scores than boys in self acceptance, environmental mastery, satisfaction with living environment and purpose in life, experience more negative emotions.
- Our study showed age-related trend that satisfaction with life of 14 year old schoolchildren is significantly higher than the older ones. 18 year old students from general education schools have significantly higher scores than 14 year olds in personal growth, purpose in life, autonomy. Scores of the same components of psychological well-being of schoolchildren from the professional schools are lower than their peers' and even than 14 year olds'.
- Unifactorial and multifactorial analysis showed that psychological well-being is not related to the place of residence, except for the self-actualization factor's component – satisfaction with school. Schoolchildren living in cities have lower levels of satisfaction with school than those living in villages.
- Learning success of the schoolchildren must be taken into account when evaluating the differences of self-actualization components of boys and girls.
- Family composition variable is related only with psychological well-being's factor of satisfaction with life and its context (except its satisfaction with family component).

- Economic resources variable is related to subjective well-being and satisfaction with life and its context factors' derived indices and some of the components, but was not related to self-actualization factor.
  - Schoolchildren who receive more than 51 LTL per month from their parents for minor expenses have higher subjective well-being than those who receive up to 50 LTL per month.
  - Attendance of the extracurricular activities is linked with experiencing more positive emotions, purpose in life and greater satisfaction with school.
3. After controlling for the effects of sociodemographic and personality factors at the same time, sociodemographic variables have weaker links with 14–19 year old schoolchildren's psychological well-being than Big Five personality traits, except for personal growth and satisfaction with school components of self-actualization factor, of which they both explained equal parts of the variance, respectively 14% and 15%.
4. After controlling for the effects of sociodemographic variables and locus of control, personality traits are associated with different components of 14–19 year old schoolchildren's psychological well-being:
- Extraversion was significantly related with all components and derived indicators of psychological well-being. Extraversion was negatively related with negative affect.
  - Neuroticism was associated with a majority of the psychological well-being's components, but to a lesser degree than extraversion.
  - Conscientiousness has emerged as the third strongest predictor on psychological well-being together with extraversion and neuroticism.
  - Agreeableness personality trait is not related with psychological well-being.
  - Openness to experience is the least related with the subjective and psychological well-being in general. Openness to experience predicts subjective well-being's components, but is not associated with psychological well-being's derived indicators.

5. Internal locus of control predicted greater psychological well-being. It was found that locus of control does not lose predictive power, even after taking into account all the Big Five personality traits. Locus of control strongly predicted all three components of self-actualization factor– personal growth, purpose in life and satisfaction with school.

## REFERENCES

1. Abbott R. A., Croudace T. J., Ploubidis G. B., Kuh D., Richards M., Huppert F. A. The relationship between early personality and midlife psychological well-being: evidence from a UK birth cohort study. *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*, 2008, vol. 43, no. 9, p. 679-687.
2. Antaramian S. P., Huebner E. S., Valois R. F. Adolescent Life Satisfaction. *Applied psychology: an international review*, 2008, vol. 57, p.112–126.
3. Bagdonas A., Pociūtė L. Eksternališkumo–internališkumo skalė. *Psichologija. Mokslo darbai*, 1988, t. 8, p. 105–121.
4. Butkovic A., Brkovic I., Bratko D. Predicting Well-Being From Personality in Adolescents and Older Adults. *Journal of happiness studies*, 2011, Online First<sup>TM</sup>, p. 1-13
5. Caffo E., Forresi B. Promoting Resilience and Psychological Well-Being in Vulnerable Life Stages. *Psychotherapy and psychosomatics*, 2008, vol. 77, p. 331–336.
6. Costa P. T., McCrae R. R. Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: happy and unhappy people. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 1980, vol. 38, no. 4, p. 668–678.
7. Čekanavičius V., Murauskas G. *Statistika ir jos taikymai 2*. Vilnius: TEV, 2002.
8. Daukantaitė D., Žukauskienė R. Swedish and Lithuanian employed women’s subjective well-being. *International journal of social welfare*, 2006, vol. 15, p. 23-30.
9. Daukantaitė D., Žukauskienė R. Optimism and Subjective Well-Being: Affectivity Plays a Secondary Role in the Relationship Between Optimism and Global Life Satisfaction

- in the Middle-Aged Women. Longitudinal and Cross-Cultural Findings. *Journal of happiness studies*, 2011, Online First<sup>TM</sup>, p. 1-16.
10. Diener E. Subjective well-being. *Psychological bulletin*, 1984, vol. 95, no. 3, p. 542–575.
  11. Diener E., Emmons R. A., Larsen R. J., Griffin S. The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of personality assessment*, 1985, vol. 49, p. 71–75.
  12. Diener E., Seligman M.E.P. Beyond money: Toward an economy of well-being. *Psychological science in the public interest*. 2004, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 1-31.
  13. Elmore G. M., Huebner E. S. Adolescents' satisfaction with school experiences: relationships with demographics, attachment relationships, and school engagement behavior. *Psychology in the schools*, 2010, vol. 47, no. 6, p. 525–537.
  14. Emmons R. A, Diener E. Personality Correlates of Subjective Well-Being. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 1985, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 89–97.
  15. „Europos paktas dėl psichinės sveikatos ir gerovės“. ES aukščiausiojo lygio konferencija „Bendros pastangos siekiant psichinės sveikatos ir gerovės“. 2008 m. birželio 12–13 d., Briuselis. Prieiga per internetą [žiūrėta: 2011-02-18]: [http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental\\_health/docs/mhpact\\_lt.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/mental_health/docs/mhpact_lt.pdf)
  16. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. *First European Quality of Life Survey : Life satisfaction, happiness and sense of belonging. Social Science Research*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. 2005, 102 p.
  17. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. *Second European Quality of Life Survey: Subjective well-being in Europe*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2010 – VIII, 86 p.
  18. Florence Declaration. Mental Well-Being of Children in Europe. Plans and Perspectives, 13th European Society for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry Congress, Florence, Italy, August 25–29, 2007. Prieiga per internetą [žiūrėta 2011-03-23]: [http://www.escap-net.org/index34e2.html?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=17&Itemid=31](http://www.escap-net.org/index34e2.html?option=com_content&task=view&id=17&Itemid=31)

19. Garson G. David „Multivariate GLM, MANOVA, and MANCOVA“, from *Statnotes: Topics in Multivariate Analysis*. 3/6/2009. Prieiga per internetą [žiūrėta 2011–10–13]: <http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/pa765/statnote.htm>
20. Grigaliūnienė V., Burba B., Šlioža V., Ramanauskas I. Medikų, dirbančių klinikinį darbą, subjektyvios gerovės (laimingumo) ir psichosocialinių veiksnių ryšys. *Visuomenės sveikata*, 2007, 2 (37), p. 30-36.
21. Gurkšnytė V. Penkių faktorių modelio taikymas lietuviškajam Apibūdinimų sąrašui. Bakalauro darbas. Darbo vadovė: doc. G. Gintilienė. Vilnius: Vilniaus Universitetas, 2004, 79 p.
22. Holmbeck G.N., Paikoff R.L., Brooks-Gunn J. Parenting adolescents. In Bornstein M.H. (ed.) *Handbook of Parenting, Vol.1: Children and parenting*. Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1995, p. 91-118.
23. Huebner E. S. Manual for the multidimensional student's life satisfaction scale. 2001, p. 1–9. Prieiga per internetą [žiūrėta 2010–05–09]: <http://www.psych.sc.edu/pdfdocs/huebslssmanual.doc>
24. Huebner E. S., Drane J. W., Valois R. F. Levels and demographic correlates of adolescent life satisfaction reports. *School psychology international*, 2000, vol. 21, p. 281–292.
25. Huebner E. S., Gilman R. Students Who Like and Dislike School. *Applied research in quality of life*, 2006, vol. 1, p. 139–150.
26. Konu A.I., Lintonen T.P., Rimpelä M.K. Factors associated with schoolchildren's General subjective well-being. *Health education research. Theory & Practice*. 2002, vol. 17, no. 2, p. 155-165.
27. Kwan Y.–K. Life satisfaction and family structure among adolescents in Hong Kong. *Social indicators research*, 2008, vol. 86, p. 59–67.
28. Ladd G. W., Buhs E. S., Seid M. Children's initial sentiments about kindergarten: Is school liking an antecedent of early classroom participation and achievement? *Merrill–Palmer Quarterly: Journal of developmental psychology*, 2000, vol. 46, no. 2, p. 255–279.

29. Lerner R. M. *Adolescence: development, diversity, context and application*. Pearson education, Inc., 2002, 461 p.
30. Park N. The role of subjective well-being in positive youth development. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 2004, vol. 591, no. 1. p. 25-39.
31. Psichikos sveikata (2008/2209(INI)), P6\_TA(2009)0063. 2009 m. Vasario 19 d. Prieiga per internetą [žiūrėta 2011-02-25]: <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P6-TA-2009-0063+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN>
32. Reschly A. L., Huebner E. S., Appleton J. J., Antaramian S. Engagement as flourishing: the contribution of positive emotions and coping to adolescents' engagement at school and with learning. *Psychology in the schools*, 2008, vol. 45, no. 5, p. 419–432.
33. Ryan R. M., Deci E. L. On happiness and human potentials: a review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual review of psychology*, 2001, vol. 52, p. 141–66.
34. Ryff C. D. Happiness Is Everything, or Is It? Explorations on the Meaning of Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 1989, vol. 57, no. 6, p. 1069–1081.
35. Schmutte P. S., Ryff C. D. Personality and well-being: reexamining methods and meanings. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 1997, vol. 73, no. 3, p. 549–559.
36. Šilinskas G., Žukauskienė R. Subjektyvios gerovės išgyvenimas ir su juo susiję veiksniai vyrų imtyje. *Psichologija. Mokslo darbai*, 2004, t. 30, p. 47-58.
37. Vera E., Thakral Ch., Gonzales R., Morgan M., Conner W., Caskey E., Bauer A., Mattera L.-A., Clark St., Bena K., Dick L. Subjective Well-Being in Urban Adolescents of Color. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 2008, vol. 14, no. 3, p. 224–233.
38. Watson D., Clark L. A. The PANAS–X: manual for the positive and negative affect schedule – expanded form. 1994, 24 p. Prieiga per internetą [žiūrėta 2010–05–09]: <http://www.psychology.uiowa.edu/Faculty/Clark/PANAS-X.pdf>



39. Zullig K. J., Huebner E. S., Pun S. M. Demographic Correlates of Domain-Based Life Satisfaction Reports of College Students. *Journal of happiness studies*, 2009, vol. 10, no. 2, p. 229–238.
40. Žakaitis P., Rugevičius M. Karių pasitenkinimo privalomąja karo tarnyba ir jų kovinio pasirengimo sąsajų ypatumai. *Psichologija. Mokslo darbai*, 2004, t. 29, p. 16-30.
41. Žukauskienė R., Navaitienė J., Kanapinskaitė J. Social demographic and personality factors related to woman's subjective well-being. *Socialinis darbas*, 2005, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 5-13.
42. Крайг Г. Психология развития. Питер, Санкт-Петербург. 2000, с. 988.

## REZIUMĖ

**Darbo aktualumas.** Vis labiau yra suvokiama psichologinės gerovės svarba net aukščiausio lygio ES politikų mastu. Psichologinė gerovė yra svarbi ne vien dėl to, kad žmogus gerai jaučiasi, bet ir todėl, kad ji yra susijusi su teigiamomis pasekmėmis: asmenys, kurių gerovė aukšta, vėliau uždirba daugiau, geriau atlieka užduotis darbe, turi geresnius socialinius santykius, nepatiria priekabiavimo mokykloje, nei asmenys, kurių gerovė žema. Tyrimai taip pat rodo, kad ji skatina ir palaiko optimalią psichinę sveikatą, yra susijusi su sveikata ir ilgaamžiškumu. Vienas iš svarbių psichologinės gerovės tyrimų ypatumų yra tai, kad kai kurie psichologinės gerovės rodikliai leidžia tiriamiesiems patiems įvertinti savo gyvenimus, remiantis savo pačių kriterijais, o ne išorinių stebėtojų, turinčių skirtingas vertybes ir prioritetus, priskirtais kriterijais, laikomais indikuojančiais „gerą gyvenimą“.

Vis dėlto, su paaugliais dirbantys psichologai ir kitų profesijų atstovai turi nesubalansuotai mažiau žinių apie jų psichinės sveikatos būseną ir stipriąsias puses, nei kad apie sutrikimus ar patologijas. Tokia situacija susidarė dėl to, kad ilgą laiką siekdami gerinti vaikų ir jaunimo gyvenimą, tyrėjai ir praktikai daugiausiai dėmesio skyrė tik psichopatologijai, kurdami gydymo strategijas ir prevencijos programas rizikos grupėms. Beveik visi tyrimai nenagrinėjo pozityvaus funkcionavimo ir vietoj to, simptomų nebuvimą laikė reikšmingu sveikatos žymeniu. Tuo tarpu, psichologinės gerovės samprata aprėpia ir teigiamus aspektus, o ne vien neigiamų aspektų nebuvimą. Psichologinės gerovės tyrinėjimuose šalia patiriamų neigiamų emocijų kiekio siekiama įvertinti ir teigiamus aspektus – pasitenkinimo gyvenimu laipsnį, gyvenimo tikslų turėjimą ir pan.

Vaikų ir paauglių psichinė sveikata yra svarbi, nes būtent šiame amžiuje yra formuojamas ilgalaikis jos pagrindas. Dauguma suaugusiųjų psichinių sutrikimų (pavyzdžiui, depresija, alkoholio ir narkotikų vartojimas, mitybos, elgesio, potrauminio streso, dėmesio trūkumo ir hiperaktyvumo sutrikimai) kyla iš vaikystės ir paauglystės, bei reikalauja ankstyvos intervencijos ir gydymo. Kaip rodo 2003 ir 2007 m. Europos gyvenimo kokybės tyrimai lietuviai yra vieni mažiausiai patenkintų savo gyvenimu, tačiau šie tyrimai neapėmė jaunesnių nei 18 m. amžiaus asmenų, tad stokojama žinių apie paauglių pasitenkinimo gyvenimu lygį. Manome, kad mokinių psichologinės gerovės išsamus

ištyrimas suteiktų daugiau žinių ne tik apie Lietuvos mokinių psichologinės gerovės lygį, bet ir leistų geriau suprasti patį reiškinį, jo struktūrą, sąsajas su sociodemografiniais ir asmenybės veiksniais.

**Mokslinis naujumas.** Lietuvoje psichologinės gerovės tyrimų yra atlikta labai mažai, ypač stokojama tyrimų, kurie suteiktų duomenų apie paauglių psichologinės gerovės struktūrą, esamą jos lygį. Apskritai gerovės tema Lietuvoje yra paskelbta tik keletas mokslinių straipsnių ir dauguma atliekamų mokslinių tyrimų daugiausiai analizuoja tik vieną požiūrį į psichologinę gerovę – hedonistinį, įvertindami pasitenkinimą gyvenimu apskritai, bei svarbiomis gyvenimo sritimis, vieno klausimo pagalba, tiria vyresnius, nei 18 m., amžiaus tiriamuosius. Su tuo, kad moksliniuose tyrimuose dažniausiai yra vertinami tik atskiri psichologinės gerovės komponentai, yra susiduriama ir užsienyje, bei pabrėžiama kompleksiškesnių tyrimų stoka, kurie įvertintų kelis skirtingus požiūrius į gerovę vienu metu. Dar vienas tokių tyrimų trūkumas, kad jų rezultatų negalima apibendrinti ir pritaikyti jaunesniems asmenims. Taigi yra stebimas akivaizdus paauglių psichologinės gerovės tyrimų trūkumas. To pasekoje, susiduriama su aiškios paauglių psichologinės gerovės struktūros sampratos problema. Stokojama teorinių modelių, kuriuose būtų detalai aprašyta paauglių psichologinė gerovė, nustatyti su ja susiję sociodemografiniai ir asmenybės veiksniai. Apie sociodemografinių ir asmenybės kintamųjų ryšius ir reikšmę suaugusiųjų psichologinei gerovei turima daugiau duomenų, tačiau jie dažniausiai surinkti atskirų, nekompleksinių tyrimų pagalba, apimančių skirtingą kintamųjų kiekį. Pavyzdžiui, analizuojant asmenybės bruožų ir psichologinės gerovės matmenų sąsajas, tyrėjai dažnai rėmėsi vienanare analize, kuomet skirtingus asmenybės bruožus analizuodavo atskirai, po vieną. Dėl to tampa neįmanoma palyginti skirtingų tyrimų rezultatų tarpusavyje, palyginti, kurie kintamieji yra stipriausiai susiję su psichologine gerove, padaryti apibendrinančias išvadas.

Mūsų tyrimu siekta ne tik užpildyti mokslinėje literatūroje egzistuojantį mokinių psichologinės gerovės tyrimų trūkumą, bet ir praplėsti ankstesnius tyrėjų gautus rezultatus apie skirtingų sociodemografinių ir asmenybės kintamųjų reikšmę paauglių psichologinei gerovei, surenkant ir analizuojant duomenis kompleksiskai. Detali, daugianarė psichologinės gerovės matmenų sąsajų su sociodemografiniais, asmenybės ir kitais

kintamaisiais analizė praplėstų su paaugliais dirbančių specialistų supratimą ir suteiktų jiems naudingų žinių apie dabartinę Lietuvos paauglių psichologinės gerovės padėtį, bei jos skirtumus skirtingo amžiaus grupėse.

Atliktas tyrimas išsiskiria iš kitų šios srities tyrimų šiais aspektais:

- Kompleksiškai, išsamiai išanalizuoti hedonistinis ir eudemoninis požiūriai į psichologinę gerovę.
- Nustatyta juos apjungianti psichologinės gerovės struktūra.
- Nustatytos skirtingo amžiaus paauglių psichologinės gerovės sąsajos su sociodemografiniais ir asmenybės kintamaisiais.
- Ištirtas mokinių pasitenkinimas ne tik apskritai gyvenimu, bet ir pasitenkinimas svarbiomis gyvenimo sritimis.
- Įvertintas platus sociodemografinių kintamųjų spektras – amžius, lytis, gyvenamoji vieta, šeimos sudėtis, mokymosi sėkmingumas, popamokinės veiklos lankymas, gaunamos pajamos iš tėvų, smulkioms išlaidoms.
- Plati tiriamųjų gyvenamųjų vietų geografija. Atskiri psichologinės gerovės komponentai buvo įvertinti užduodant ne po vieną klausimą, o skalių pagalba, kas suteikia gautiems įvertinimams patikimumo ir tikslumo.
- Išskirtos perspektyviausios mokinių psichologinės gerovės tyrimų kryptys.

**Praktinė reikšmė.** Paauglystė – tai pereinamasis laikotarpis iš vaikystės į suaugusio žmogaus gyvenimą, besitęsiantis beveik visą dešimtmetį. Viso paauglystės laikotarpio metu įvyksta svarbūs biologiniai, kognityviniai, emociniai, gyvenimo aplinkybių pokyčiai. Atsižvelgiant į daugybę pokyčių, kuriuos patiria paaugliai, reikia pastebėti, kad ne visi vienodai praeina tuos pokyčius, ne vienu greičiu ir su skirtingomis pasekmėmis. Pagrindinis šios įvairovės šaltinis – tai aplinka, kurioje paaugliai gyvena ir vystosi – šeima, mokykla, gyvenamoji aplinka ir kt. Tad praktiškai yra labai vertinga nustatyti vyraujančias psichologinės gerovės pokyčių su amžiumi tendencijas.

PSO duomenimis vienas paauglys iš penkių turi kognityvinių, emocinių ir elgesio sunkumų, ir vienas paauglys iš aštuonių kenčia nuo diagnozuotų psichinių sutrikimų. Šis paplitimas kas dešimtmetį vis didėja. Problemos atsiradimo prevencija negarantuoja, kad paaugliams suteikti vertingi dalykai, kurių jiems reikia pozityviai raidai (Lerner, 2002). Tad jaunimas, kuris nedemonstruoja diagnozuojamų problemų, nebūtinai išaugs laimingu, gerai prisitaikiusiu ar produktyviu suaugusiuoju (Catalano *et al.*, 1999, pgl Vera *et al.*, 2008).

Atsižvelgiant į paauglių psichinių sutrikimų mastą, kartu su ribotomis investicijomis, bei paslaugų prieinamumu – kyla prevencijos ir ankstyvo gydymo intervencijų, gebančių skatinti sveiką raidą ir psichologinę gerovę klausimas (Caffo, Forresi, 2008). Efektyviausia būtų poveikio programos vykdyti mokyklose, kur paaugliai praleidžia didžiąją savo laiko dalį. Efektyvios programos ne tik sumažina rizikos veiksnių buvimą mokinių aplinkoje, bet ir pabrėžia stipriąsias paauglių puses bei turimas vertingas savybes, gebėjimus.

Psichinė sveikata – tai gerovės būseną, kuriai esant asmuo suvokia savo gebėjimus, gali įveikti normalius gyvenimo stresus, produktyviai ir vaisingai dirbti, geba įnešti indėlį į savo bendruomenę (WHO, 2005a, p.42). PSO psichinės sveikatos apibrėžimas parodo, kad psichinė sveikata negali būti pasiekta vien tik užkertant kelią ligoms ir gydant sutrikimus (WHO, 2005a, p. 42). Vaikai ir paaugliai, kurių psichinė sveikata yra gera, geba pasiekti ir išlaikyti optimalų psichologinį, bei socialinį funkcionavimą ir gerovę. Jie turi identiškumo, savivertės jausmus, sveikus santykius su šeimos nariais ir bendraamžiais, gebėjimą būti produktyviais ir mokytis, bei gebėjimą susidoroti su raidos pokyčiais ir panaudoti kultūrinius resursus raidos optimizavimui. Be to, gera vaikų ir paauglių psichinė sveikata yra esminė jų aktyviam socialiniam ir ekonominiam dalyvavimui (WHO, 2005b).

Mūsų darbe surinkta ir išanalizuota išsami informacija suteikia su vyresnių klasių mokiniais dirbantiems specialistams vertingą informaciją, kurią galima panaudoti ne tik konsultuojant mokinius, bet ir sudarant efektyvias prevencines programas. Įvairiapusiškai ir išsamiai išnagrinėta mokinių psichologinė gerovė, nustatyta jos struktūra; atlikti svarbūs palyginimai, išskiriant įvairias paauglių grupes, atsižvelgiant į daugialypes mokinių charakteristikas; nustatytos psichologinės gerovės lygių skirtumai skirtingo amžiaus grupėse

leidžia padidinti kuriamų prevencinių programų efektyvumą; gauti vertingi moksliniai rezultatai; pateiktos praktinės rekomendacijos.

**Tyrimo tikslas:** nustatyti 14–19 m. mokinių psichologinės gerovės ypatumus, struktūrą ir įvertinti jos sąsajas su sociodemografiniais bei asmenybės kintamaisiais.

**Tyrimo uždaviniai:**

- Apžvelgti ir išanalizuoti psichologinės gerovės tyrimų situaciją.
- Atlikti hedonistinio ir eudemoninio požiūrių į gerovę lyginamąją analizę.
- Nustatyti mokinių psichologinės gerovės konstrukto struktūrą.
- Įvertinti mokinių grupių, sudarytų remiantis įvairiais sociodemografiniais kintamaisiais, psichologinės gerovės skirtumus ir ypatumus.
- Nustatyti atskirai kiekvieno psichologinės gerovės matmens ir sociodemografinių bei asmenybės kintamųjų sąsajas.

**Ginamieji teiginiai:**

1. 14–19 metų mokinių psichologinės gerovės konstrukto struktūra yra sudėtingesnė negu pateikia vyraujantys hedonistinis ir eudemoninis požiūriai.
2. 14–19 metų mokinių psichologinės gerovės ir sociodemografinių kintamųjų sąsajos yra silpnesnės, nei jos ir Didžiojo penketo asmenybės bruožų.
3. 14–19 metų mokinių Didžiojo penketo asmenybės bruožai ekstraversiškumas ir neurotiškumas yra stipriausiai susiję su psichologine gerove.
4. Internalus kontrolės lokusas reikšmingai prognozuoja didesnę psichologinę gerovę net ir įtraukus į analizę Didžiojo penketo asmenybės bruožus.

**METODIKA**

**Tyrimo dalyviai.** Tyrimo rezultatai remiasi 14-19m. 655 mokinių iš 21 bendrojo lavinimo ir profesinio rengimo mokyklų (8, 10, 12 klasių). Naudoti šie tyrimo instrumentai: sociodemografinių veiksnių, PANAS klausimynai, Daugiamatė mokinių pasitenkinimo gyvenimu skalė, Pasitenkinimo gyvenimu skalė, C.Ryff psichologinės gerovės skalės,

Eksternališkumo-Internališkumo skalė, Lietuviškasis Didžiojo penketo asmenybės bruožų apibūdinimų sąrašas.

## **REZULTATAI IR IŠVADOS**

1. Atlikta tiriančioji faktorinė analizė atskleidė savitą 14–19 m. mokinių psichologinės gerovės struktūrą, vietoj dviejų matmenų buvo išskirti trys: subjektyvios gerovės, pasitenkinimo gyvenimu ir jo kontekstu, bei saviaktualizacijos. Užsienio tyrėjų atliktų tyrimų praplėtimas įtraukiant į psichologinės gerovės struktūrinę analizę pasitenkinimą svarbiomis gyvenimo sritimis paaiškina trijų faktorių struktūros susidarymą, bei rodo, kad jų vertinimas apima dvejopus informacijos, kuria remiasi priimdami sprendimus mokiniai, šaltinius. Pasitenkinimas mokykla pateko į saviaktualizacijos faktorių kartu su tokiais eudemoninio požiūrio komponentėmis kaip Gyvenimo tikslas ir Asmeninis augimas. Išskirti psichologinės gerovės matmenys leidžia aiškiau identifikuoti galimas mokinių psichologinės gerovės problemines sritis, kurioms skiriant daugiau dėmesio galima tikėtis, kad padidės mokinių psichologinė gerovė.
2. Mūsų gautų rezultatų analizė pagal atskirus psichologinės gerovės komponentus leido nustatyti sritis, kurios reikalauja didžiausio specialistų, dirbančių su mokiniais, dėmesio:
  - analizuojant subjektyvios gerovės komponentes nustatyta, kad net ketvirtadalis apklaustų mokinių yra nepatenkinti savimi, norėtų būti kitokie, yra susirūpinę dėl savo tam tikrų savybių, o penktadalis apklaustų mokinių turi mažai artimų, pasitikėjimu grįstų tarpasmeninių santykių, jiems sunku būti šiltais, atvirais, besirūpinančiais kitais, jaučiasi esą izoliuoti tarpasmeniniuose santykiuose, bei yra susirūpinę dėl kitų žmonių lūkesčių ir įvertinimų, priimdami sprendimus remiasi kitų nuomone, pasiduoda socialinei įtakai galvoti ir elgtis tam tikru būdu.
  - Apžvelgiant pasitenkinimo gyvenimu ir jo kontekstu komponentių įverčius matome, kad beveik penktadalis apklaustų mokinių nurodė, kad yra stipriau ar silpniau nepatenkinti gyvenimu ir šeima, o net trečdalis – savo gyvenamąją aplinką.
  - 14–19m. mokiniai yra mažiausiai patenkinti mokykla (net 38,5% apklaustų mokinių nurodė esą stipriau ar silpniau nepatenkinti mokykla), lyginant su pasitenkinimo kitomis gyvenimo sritimis lygiais.

- Popamokinės veiklos lankymas yra susijęs su didesniu teigiamų emocijų patyrimu, gyvenimo tikslų turėjimu ir pasitenkinimu mokykla.
3. Visi psichologinės gerovės išskirtų faktorių išvestiniai rodikliai ir atskiros komponentės yra diferencijuotai susiję su lyties, amžiaus/klasės, gyvenamosios vietos, mokymosi sėkmės, šeimos sudėties, ekonominių resursų ir popamokinės veiklos lankymo sociodemografiniais veiksniais. Tad priklausomai nuo to, kuris psichologinės gerovės faktorius ar komponentė konkrečiai domina tyrėją ar su mokiniais dirbantį specialistą, jis turi atsižvelgti ir įvertinti skirtingus sociodemografinius veiksnius, bei tokie rezultatai rodo, kad psichologinė gerovė iš tiesų yra veikiama įvairių veiksnių ir patvirtina atskirų psichologinės gerovės komponentų įvertinimo naudą ir poreikį. Sociodemografiniai kintamieji yra silpniau susiję su 14–19 m. mokinių Psichologine gerove nei Didžiojo penketo asmenybės bruožai, išskyrus Asmeninį augimą ir pasitenkinimą mokykla saviaktualizacijos faktoriuje, kur paaiškino vienodo dydžio saviaktualizacijos dispersijos dalį, atitinkamai po 14% ir 15%:
- nė vienas iš aukščiau paminėtų sociodemografinių veiksnių nebuvo reikšmingai susiję su pasitenkinimu draugais ir savimi.
  - Merginų įvertiniai žemesni už vaikinų savęs priėmimo, aplinkos kontrolės, pasitenkinimo gyvenamąja aplinka ir gyvenimo tikslų skalėse, merginos patiria daugiau neigiamų emocijų nei vaikinai. Merginos labiau nei vaikinai yra nepatenkintos savimi, norėtų pasikeisti, turi sunkumų įveikiant kasdienes reikalavimus, yra mažiau patenkintos gyvenamąja aplinka, joms trūksta prasmės gyvenime, turi mažiau gyvenimo tikslų, neturi aiškios krypties ko siekti gyvenime. Taip pat vertinant vaikinų ir merginų saviaktualizacijos skirtumus yra svarbu atsižvelgti į jų mokymosi sėkmę.
  - Išryškėjo su amžiumi susijusi tendencija, kad 14 m. mokinių pasitenkinimas gyvenimu reikšmingai aukštesnis už vyresnių mokinių, o 18 m. mokiniai iš bendrojo lavinimo mokyklų turi reikšmingai didesnę už keturiolikmečius nenutrūkstamą raidos jausmą, mato save kaip tobulėjančius, realizuojančius savo potencialą, turi tikslus ir kryptį gyvenime, bei vertina save pagal vidinius standartus, gali atsispirti socialiniam



spaudimui galvoti ar elgtis tam tikru būdu. Tuo tarpu bendraamžiai iš profesinių mokyklų tuo nepasižymi.

- Vienfaktorinės ir daugiafaktorinės analizių pagalba buvo nustatyta, kad psichologinė gerovė nėra susijusi su gyvenamąja vieta, išskyrus saviaktualizacijos faktoriaus pasitenkinimo mokykla komponentę. Didmiestyje gyvenančių mokinių pasitenkinimas mokykla yra žemesnis už kaime gyvenančių mokinių.
- Šeimos sudėties kintamasis yra susijęs tik su psichologinės gerovės pasitenkinimo gyvenimu ir jo kontekstu faktoriumi, tačiau buvo nesusijęs su pasitenkinimu šeima komponentu.
- Iš visų įvertintų sociodemografinių kintamųjų, tik ekonominiai resursai yra susiję su mūsų išskirtu subjektyvios gerovės faktoriumi. Mokinių, kurie gauna daugiau nei 51 LTL per mėnesį iš tėvų smulkioms išlaidoms, subjektyvi gerovė yra aukštesnė už mokinių, kurie iš viso negauna pinigų smulkioms išlaidoms arba gauna iki 50 LTL per mėnesį. Su saviaktualizacija ekonominiai resursai nebuvo susiję.

4. Asmenybės bruožai diferencijuotai susiję su 14-19m. mokinių psichologinės gerovės komponentėmis:

- Iš visų tirtų Didžiojo penketo asmenybės bruožų ypač išsiskyrė Ekstraversiškumas, kuris buvo reikšmingai susijęs su visomis psichologinės gerovės komponentėmis ir išvestiniais faktorių rodikliais, tačiau jo sąsajos stiprumas su psichologinės gerovės komponentėmis kito priklausomai nuo to kuriam iš trijų psichologinės gerovės faktorių ji priklauso. Mūsų tyrimu nustatyta, kad Prognozuojant Subjektyvią gerovę ir pasitenkinimą gyvenimu ir jo kontekstu, Ekstraversiškumo asmenybės bruožas dažniausiai iškildavo kaip stipriausias prognozuojantis veiksnys, tačiau antruoju atveju jo sąsajos būdavo šiek tiek silpnesnės nei pirmuoju. Šiuo tyrimu nustatėme, kad Ekstraversiškumas neigiamai susijęs su Neigiamu emociingumu. Tai rodo, kad Ekstraversiškumas mokinių imtyje veikė kaip apsauginis veiksnys, fiksavus lyties, ekonominių resursų ir neurotiškumo reikšmes, kuo didesnis ekstravertas buvo mokinys, tuo mažiau neigiamų emocijų jis teigdavo patiriaš.

- Neurotiškumas mažesniu laipsniu nei Ekstraversiškumas, tačiau buvo susijęs su didžiąja dalimi psichologinės gerovės komponenčių. Prognozuojant Saviaktualizacijos komponentes – Asmeninį augimą ir Gyvenimo tikslą, Neurotiškumas nebuvo reikšmingas prognostinis veiksnys.
  - Sąmoningumas iškilo kaip stipriausiai susijęs su psichologine gerove šalia Ekstraversiškumo ir Neurotiškumo. Tokie rezultatai rodo, kad Sąmoningumas yra susijęs su didesne 14-19 m. mokinių psichologine gerove, ir jo įtaką yra svarbu įvertinti tiriant kitų reiškinių sąsajas su mokinių psichologine gerove.
  - Sutariamumo asmenybės bruožas nėra susijęs su psichologine gerove.
  - Atvirumas patirčiai yra silpniausiai susijęs su subjektyvia ir apskritai psichologine gerove. Atvirumas patirčiai prognozuoja atskiras subjektyvios gerovės komponentes, tačiau nėra susijęs su psichologinės gerovės bendrais matmenimis.
5. Internališkas kontrolės lokusas prognozuoja didesnę psichologinę gerovę. Kontrolės lokusas nepraranda prognostinės psichologinės gerovės galios net ir atsižvelgiant į visus Didžiojo penketo asmenybės bruožus. Kontrolės lokusas stipriausiai prognozavo visas tris saviaktualizacijos faktoriaus komponentes – Asmeninį augimą, Gyvenimo tikslą ir pasitenkinimą mokykla.

## **DOCTORAL STUDENT RESUMÉ**

Živilė Šarakauskienė has studied Psychology at Vilnius University since 1996. She was awarded a Bachelor's degree in Psychology in 2000 and a Master's degree in Psychology in 2002. From 2003 to 2011 she was a doctoral student at Department of General Psychology.

From 2001 to 2002 she worked as a lecturer at Panevėžys A. Domaševičius higher medical school. Živilė Šarakauskienė gave lectures on Psychology, General and medical psychology, General and developmental psychology, Developmental and personality psychology, Crisis intervention, Family dynamics and psychology, conducted seminars.

During her doctoral studies she was actively involved in scientific and academic activities. She published her studies on psychological well-being, made a presentation at scientific conference, and raised her qualification in various scientific training courses.

Scientific interests: developmental psychology, educational, positive psychology, sport psychology.

Contact e-mail: zarakau@gmail.com

## **TRUMPA INFORMACIJA APIE DOKTORANTĘ**

Živilė Šarakauskienė studijavo psichologiją Vilniaus universitete. 2000 m. įgijo psichologijos bakalauro, 2002 m. – psichologijos magistro laipsnį. 2003–2011 m. buvo Vilniaus universiteto Bendrosios psichologijos katedros doktorantė.

2001 – 2002 m. dirbo Panevėžio m. A. Domaševičiaus aukštesniojoje medicinos mokykloje dėstytoja. Skaitė psichologijos, bendrosios ir medicinos psichologijos, bendrosios ir raidos psichologijos, raidos ir asmenybės psichologijos, krizių intervencijos, šeimos dinamikos ir psichologijos paskaitas ir vedė seminarus.

Doktorantūros studijų metu Živilė Šarakauskienė vykdė mokslinę ir pedagoginę veiklą. Doktorantė rengė mokslines publikacijas psichologinės gerovės tema, skaitė paskaitas, vedė seminarus, vadovavo studentų kursiniams darbams, skaitė pranešimą mokslinėje konferencijoje, dalyvavo kvalifikacijos kėlimo kursuose.

Mokslinių interesų sritys: raidos psichologija, pedagoginė psichologija, pozityvioji psichologija, sporto psichologija.

Kontaktinis el. paštas: [zsarakau@gmail.com](mailto:zsarakau@gmail.com)

### **PUBLIKACIJOS DISERTACIJOS TEMA**

Šarakauskienė Ž., Bagdonas A. Vyresniųjų klasių mokinių subjektyvios gerovės komponentų ir sociodemografinių kintamųjų sąsajos. *Psichologija*, 2010, t. 41, p. 18–32.

Šarakauskienė Ž., Bagdonas A. Vyresniųjų klasių mokinių psichologinės gerovės prognostiniai kintamieji. *Psichologija*, 2011, t. 44, p. 7–25.

### **PRANEŠIMAI KONFERENCIJOSE DISERTACIJOS TEMA**

Šarakauskienė Ž. "Asmens gerovės samprata ir komponentai". Psichologijos mokslo taikymas Lietuvoje: iššūkiai ir galimybės: III Jaunųjų mokslininkų psichologų konferencija, konferencijos medžiaga. 2006, p.91-94.