

Personality Traits and Dispositions Predicting Flourishing, Satisfaction with Life, Psychological Well-Being, Positive and Negative Affect, and Happiness

Margarita Bakracheva

Faculty of Educational Studies and the Arts, Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski, Sofia, Bulgaria Email: mbakrachev@uni-sofia.bg

How to cite this paper: Bakracheva, M. (2025). Personality Traits and Dispositions Predicting Flourishing, Satisfaction with Life, Psychological Well-Being, Positive and Negative Affect, and Happiness. *Psychology, 16*, 393-425. https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2025.164023

Received: March 7, 2025 **Accepted:** April 5, 2025 **Published:** April 8, 2025

Copyright © 2025 by author(s) and Scientific Research Publishing Inc. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Abstract

The description of personality predictors of well-being has been studied extensively. The purpose of this study is to outline the direct and indirect effects of personality traits and dispositions on perceived well-being-flourishing, life satisfaction, happiness, positive and negative affect, and psychological well-being. Results from a convenient sample of 455 respondents are used to outline the various models of the predictors of perceived well-being. Personality traits, and to a greater extent personality disposition, predict perceived well-being. Direct and indirect predictors of flourishing, subjective well-being (satisfaction with life, positive and negative affect), psychological well-being, and happiness are highlighted, accounting for the moderating effects of the personality traits extraversion, awareness, neuroticism, and agreeableness, and the meta-traits stability and plasticity, and the mediating effects of mindfulness, proactive and problem-focused coping, self-esteem, learned helplessness, and rumination are accounted for. Results suggest that stability and plasticity not only as metatraits but also as pathways of adaptive behaviors that promote perceived wellbeing, play specific role in the course of self-regulation. It is suggested that perceived well-being is not only an outcome but also a part of the process of effective self-regulation, as it determines perceptions of the environment and behavioral patterns and attitudes that, in the long run, may facilitate or inhibit personality dispositions and traits.

Keywords

Well-Being, Flourishing, Personality Traits, Coping, Mindfulness

1. Introduction

Well-being can be described as a general term that refers to an optimal level of overall satisfaction and happiness. There are several approaches to the study of well-being: research of happiness from the perspective of eudaimonia and hedonic pleasure (Waterman, 1993; Seligman, 2011); subjective well-being (life satisfaction, positive and negative affect) (Diener, 1984, 2000; Diener et al., 2002, 2003), psychological well-being (personal growth, autonomy, self-acceptance, positive relations with others, environmental mastery, purpose in life) (Ryff, 1989; Ryff & Keyes, 1995), social well-being (Keyes, 1998), flourishing (Seligman, 2011), happiness, positive affect and positive emotions (Veenhoven, 1984, 2017; Lyubomirsky et al., 2005a, 2005b). Wellbeing is considered a homeostatic process fluctuating around a relatively stable baseline (Fujita & Diener, 2005; Anglim et al., 2015). Flourishing has been proposed as a comprehensive and integrative theoretical framework for understanding well-being that encompasses subjective, psychological, and social well-being and refers to the optimal level of experienced well-being (Diener et al., 2010; Seligman, 2011).

A large body of research is devoted to well-being and personality traits and in particular, the Big Five. Extraversion and neuroticism have been pointed out to explain about half of the variance in happiness (Costa & McCrae, 1980a; Lyubomirsky et al., 2005b), and psychological well-being is predicted mainly by extraversion and neuroticism (Costa et al., 1987). The Big Five are robustly related to both subjective well-being and psychological well-being and happiness (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998; Steel et al., 2008; Anglim & Grant, 2016; Sun et al., 2018; Anglim et al., 2020). Predictive role of Big Five traits have been outlined with happiness (Steel et al., 2008; Gale et al., 2013), positive and negative affect (Diener et al., 2010; Pavot & Diener, 2011), satisfaction with life (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998; Diener & Lucas, 1999; Wood et al., 2008; Weber & Huebner, 2015). For psychological wellbeing a specific relationship of its components with individual personality traits have also been highlighted (Grant et al., 2009; Anglim & Grant, 2016; Sun et al., 2018; Meléndez et al., 2019). In summary, a review of the literature demonstrates that the Big Five, despite their effects, explain only a portion of the variance in subjective well-being (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998; Diener & Lucas, 1999), as well as specific relationships, e.g., openness to experience is related to eudaemonic rather than to hedonic well-being (Mann et al., 2021). A new area of interest is the applicability of Cybernetic Big Five theory (DeYoung, 2015; DeYoung et al., 2002). Personality is considered a cybernetic system that evolves to make survival more efficient. In this line the two meta-traits, stability and plasticity, are the adaptive pathways and each of the five personality traits plays an independent but interactive role in goal-directed behavior. Stability is the mechanism, by which the cybernetic system maintains goal directedness when confronted with disruptive stimuli and includes emotional stability (low neuroticism), motivational stability (consciousness), and social stability (agreeableness). Plasticity is the mechanism, by which the cybernetic system evaluates and explores the new and unfamiliar cognitively (openness to experience) and behaviorally (extraversion) (DeYoung, 2006, 2015).

The relation of coping and psychological well-being has been confirmed for the active coping, assimilative and accommodative coping (Coffey et al., 2014; Arends et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2019). Despite the different approaches to mindfulness, the relationship of mindfulness with well-being has been confirmed (Brown & Ryan, 2003; Grossman et al., 2004; Carmody & Baer, 2008, Giluk, 2009; Ortet et al., 2020). Mindfulness is reported to be associated with higher levels of satisfaction with life, self-esteem, autonomy, competence, and positive affect (Brown & Ryan, 2003), consciousness (Giluk, 2009), low neuroticism (Giluk, 2009), satisfaction with life, autonomy, competence, positive affect, cooperation, consciousness, and neuroticism (Cheng et al., 2022). Self-esteem is stable construct, which has a specific role in adjustment and personal effectiveness and is related to the personality traits of the Big Five (Robins et al., 2001; Varanarasama et al., 2019), and there is a strong relationship between self-esteem and psychological well-being (Diener & Diener, 1995). The relation of the Big Five is demonstrated for learned helplessness (Maadikhah & Erfani, 2014; Ekeh & Chinenye, 2015) and self-handicapping (Ross et al., 2002; Bobo et al., 2013). There is a wealth of evidence for the strong predictive power of meaning in life for happiness (Park et al., 2010), satisfaction with life (Ryff, 1989), and psychological well-being (Zika & Chamberlain, 1992; Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

2. Research Design

Well-being is described by different models and concepts. They are related but also distinct, each with specific predictors. Our interest was to encompass the different approaches to well-being, in this article referred to as components of perceived well-being: flourishing, subjective well-being (satisfaction with life, positive and negative affect), happiness, and psychological well-being, and to examine the independent and aggregate effect of traits and dispositions as personality predictors of experienced well-being and on this basis to derive a model for the holistic integration of personality in the process of self-regulation.

Aim and hypotheses

The aim of the study was to examine the direct, mediated, and moderating effects of personality traits (extraversion and neuroticism (aggregated in plasticity) and agreeableness, consciousness, and openness to experience (aggregated in stability) and personality dispositions (self-esteem; mindfulness; meaning in life and search for meaning; proactive, preventive, accommodative, and problem-focused coping; learned helplessness; self-handicapping; rumination; and planning) on well-being and its components (**Figure 1**).

H1: Personality traits and personality dispositions predict well-being and its components to a low to moderate degree.

H2: Personality dispositions predict well-being and its components in a specific way and to a higher degree than personality traits.



Figure 1. Research model.

H3: Personality traits and personality dispositions have direct, mediated, and moderating effects on well-being and its components.

H4: The components of perceived well-being have common, but district predictors, that are relatively stable and flexible.

2.1. Sample and Instruments

The survey was realized between January 2021 and December 2022 vial e-platform survey.bg. The convenient sample was recruited by sending 2000 invitations, of which 493 fully completed forms were received. After removing the outliers, the results of 455 respondents were included in the analysis. All respondents were of full age and had given informed consent to participate. Of the 455 respondents, 300 (66%) were female, 105 (23%) were male; 152 (33%) were 18 - 25 years old, 152 (33%) were 25 - 35 years old, 198 (44%) were over 35 years old; 65 (14%) lived alone, 97 (21%) lived with a partner, 243 (54%) lived with family and 50 (11%) preferred not to answer; 94 (21%) only studied, 55 (12%) only worked, 256 (56%) worked and studied and 50 (11%) neither worked, nor studied; 218 (48%) assessed their income sufficient to meet their needs, 150 (33%) assessed their income insufficient to meet their needs and 87 (19%) did not answer.

13 scales were administered (comprising 219 items in total), all with 5-point Likert response scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither disagree nor agree, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree).

1) Meaning in Life Questionnaire (MLQ) (Steger et al., 2006) is a 10-item scale that forms two subscales for meaning in life ($\alpha = 0.885$) and search for meaning in life ($\alpha = 0.898$), each one comprising 5 items.

2) *Planning scale* was created for this study and contains 10 items. The items were selected with an expert panel from a pool of 30 items, following the longand short-term planning model (Lynch et al., 2009). Two subscales were formed, planning considered important ($\alpha = 0.636$) and planning considered unimportant ($\alpha = 0.624$).

3) *Mistake Rumination Scale* (Flett et al., 2020) is a 7-item scale ($\alpha = 0.838$), forming a continuous variable for rumination.

4) Self-Handicapping Scale (Rhodewalt, 1990) is a 25-item scale, used as continuous variable for self-handicapping; in this study 9 items were removed ($\alpha = 0.775$).

5) *Learned Helplessness Scale* (LHS) (Quinless & Nelson, 1988) is a 20-item unidimensional scale measuring the general construct learned helplessness. In this study 2-items were removed ($\alpha = 0.933$).

6) *Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale* (Rosenberg, 1965) is a 10-item scale designed to measure global self-esteem ($\alpha = 0.821$).

7) Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness Scale-Revised (CAMS-R) (Feldman et al., 2007) is a 10-item scale, measuring mindfulness ($\alpha = 0.863$).

For the purposes of this study coping was measured with two subscales for proactive and preventive coping and two subscales for accommodative and problemfocused coping potential. The subscales for proactive and preventive coping are from the 55-items *Proactive Coping* Inventory (PCI): A Multidimensional Research Instrument (Greenglass et al., 1999). 8) *proactive copying subscale* contains 14 items (2 items were removed in this study) ($\alpha = 0.893$), and

9) the *preventive copying subscale* contains 10 items (3 items were removed for this study) ($\alpha = 0.846$).

10) Coping potential was measured as accommodative-focused coping potential ($\alpha = 0.903$) and

11) problem-focused coping potential ($\alpha = 0.927$), each scale includes 12 items (McLain, 2012). One item was removed from the problem-oriented coping scale and two items were removed from the proactive coping scale.

12) *Big Five Inventory* (BFI-2) (Soto & John, 2017a, 2017b) contains 30 items, 6 items for each of the five personality traits *Extraversion* ($\alpha = 0.733$); *Agreeable-ness* ($\alpha = 0.613$); *Conscientiousness* ($\alpha = 0.731$); *Neuroticism* with 1 item removed ($\alpha = 0.780$); *Openness to Experience* with 1 item removed ($\alpha = 0.687$).

The perceived well-being was studied following the different approaches, referred to in this study as components of perceived well-being: flourishing, psychological well-being, happiness, satisfaction with life and positive and negative affect. Different scales were administered for each component:

13) *Flourishing Scale* (Diener et al., 2010) is a unidimensional 8-item scale, measuring perceived success in significant life domains: relationships, self-esteem, purpose, and optimism ($\alpha = 0.908$).

14) Psychological Wellbeing Scale (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). The psychological wellbeing scale comprises 18-items, 3 items for each of the 6 domains: positive relations with others ($\alpha = 0.576$), autonomy ($\alpha = 0.498$), self-acceptance($\alpha = 0.729$), environmental mastery ($\alpha = 0.579$), personal growth ($\alpha = 0.685$), and purpose in life. In this study the items were reduced to 12 by removing the purpose in life sub-scale and one item from autonomy, personal growth, and environmental mastery subscales.

15) Satisfaction With Life Scale, (Diener et al., 1985) is a 5-item scale measuring global assessment of satisfaction with life ($\alpha = 0.848$).

16) The Positive and Negative Affect Scale (SPANE-N) (Diener et al., 2010) is a 12-item scale formed by two subscales for positive affect ($\alpha = 0.897$) and negative affect ($\alpha = 0.869$), each containing 6 items.

17) General Happiness Scale (Lyubomirsky & Lepper, 1999) is a 4-item scale, measuring happiness ($\alpha = 0.845$).

2.2. Data Processing

Data were processed using IBM SPSS Statistics 25 and Process v.3. for descriptive statistics, reliability tests using Cronbach's alpha and item analysis, principal components analysis with rotation, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, analysis of variance, correlation analysis, regression analysis (multivariate linear and multivariate hierarchical with controlled variables), moderation and mediation analyses. All administered scales used were translated with three direct translations and one back-translation. Psychometric properties were validated for each scale used (factor analysis and reliability). Despite the prevalence of non-normal data, especially in the social sciences (Blanca et al., 2017), data were corrected when necessary (log transformation). The steps of the analysis were 1) reliability and component analysis of the scales; 2) correlation analysis (partial); 3) regression analysis; 4) moderation and mediation analyses.

Standard rules for component analysis and reliability were followed (Boateng et al., 2018; Moretti et al., 2019). For all scales, Cattell's scree plot and exploratory analysis by principal components method with varimax rotation were performed. The following rules were followed: the Kaiser-Meier-Olkin (KMO) test for the overall adequacy of the sample, to have a KMO value > 0.600; the result of the Bartlett's test of sphericity to test correlations between variables to be valid (accepted criterion for significance is p < 0.01); the generated component model to explain 50% of the total variance, given extracted factors with eigenvalue > 1.00 (Kaiser normalization criterion) and in view to the sample size, the value of the factor weight to be >0.400 (given the conservative criterion pattern matrix to include only items with factor weights of 0.600 and lower values depending on the sample size). In terms of reliability, the value of Cronbach's alpha to be >0.700 (with adjustment for short scales to 0.600); the correlation between individual items and the entire scale should be greater than 0.400 (Spearman-Brown prediction formula).

Regression models used stepwise regression, starting with the strongest predictor and adding additional predictors that explained a significant amount of additional variance for the criterion, with an inclusion criterion of p = 0.01. All regression analyses had 95% confidence intervals; collinearity was accounted for and outliers were screened for (Cook's distance). Verification for multicollinearity had been performed for the independent predictors, and all variables included in the analyses had small to moderate admissible values. For the mediation analysis, a preliminary screening of the data for assumptions of univariate normality was performed in view to determine the acceptable threshold for skewness (±2) and kurtosis (±7) as recommended (Hair et al., 2010). Mediation analysis followed the standard steps: 1) the independent variable to have a significant relationship with the dependent variable; 2) the independent variable to have a relationship with the putative mediators; 3) the mediator to have a significant relationship with the dependent variable; 4) when controlling for the mediator, there must be a significant change in the effect of the independent variable (Baron & Kenny, 1986). If the effect is reduced to insignificant, there is full mediation, and if it is reduced or increased but remains significant, there is partial mediation. The total effect, which includes a combination of the direct and indirect effects of the variables and unstandardized coefficients were reported in light of the remarks outlined for both (Preacher & Kelley, 2011; Edwards, 2013). The significance of the mediation effect was assessed by the values of the confidence intervals (0 not to fall within the confidence interval). The moderation analysis followed the requirement that changes in the level of the independent variable cause significant changes in the level of the mediator variable (path "a"); variations in the mediator variable cause significant variations in the dependent variable (path "b"); when path "a" and path "b" are controlled, the total effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable (path "c") to differ from the measured direct effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable (path "c") by a residual, denoted by the equation c = c' + ab, where the product "ab" is the indirect effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. For moderation, the procedure of confidence intervals and change in direction/strength of the relationship between predictor and dependent variable was also followed.

3. Results

3.1. Direct and Indirect Predictors of Flourishing

Individual variables family status, age, gender, subjective assessment of incomes and occupational status (working/studying, studying and working and neither studying, nor working) had small effect on the components of well-being and were not individual predictors in regression models, nor moderators of the relations between personality traits and dispositions and well-being. The overall variance of perceived well-being, accounted by the aggregate effect of individual variables is low ($R^2 = 0.058$ for the psychological well-being; $R^2 = 0.090$ for flourishing; R^2 = 0.138 for satisfaction with life; $R^2 = 0.157$ for happiness; $R^2 = 0.093$ for positive affect and $R^2 = 0.123$ for negative affect. Occupation at the highest level, subjective assessment of income and age have an effect on well-being. Gender and marital status have a limited partial effect. Higher well-being is experienced by people who are occupationally and developmentally engaged, assess their income is sufficient to cover their needs and are over 35 years of age. Overall, individual variables have small effect on well-being without explaining it to a high degree.

For flourishing, the model with the highest explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.682$) had predictors self-esteem ($\beta = 0.275$), proactive coping ($\beta = 0.270$), mindfulness ($\beta = 0.220$), agreeableness ($\beta = 0.138$), and meaning in life ($\beta = 0.131$). Mediating effect was accounted for problem-oriented coping potential and moderating effects traits consciousness, stability and plasticity.

Agreeableness had a direct and indirect influence on flourishing, mediated by problem-focused coping potential. The direct effect of agreeableness on the mediator problem-focused coping potential was positive and significant (b = 0.4131; s.e. = 0.0691; p = 0.000, [0.2769; 0.5493] with an explained variance of 14%. The direct effect of the mediator problem-focused coping potential on flourishing was positive and significant (b = 0.7406; s.e. = 0.0561; *p* = 0.000, [0.6301; 0.8511]. The direct effect of agreeableness on flourishing was positive and significant (b =0.2631; s.e. = 0.0626; p = 0.000, [0.1398; 0.3864]. The overall effect ($R^2 = 0.1939$; F = 54.12; df = 453 (p = 0.001) revealed that agreeableness was significantly positively related to flourishing (b = 0.5691; se = 0.0774; p = 0.000 [LLCI = 0.4166; ULCI = 0.7215]). The indirect effect of agreeableness on flourishing, mediated by problem-focused coping potential on flourishing, was positive and significant (b = 0.3059; se = 0.0768 [0.1611; 0.4612]. The fully standardized indirect effect of agreeableness on flourishing mediated by problem-focused coping potential on flourishing was significant (b = 0.2367; [0.1331; 0.3364]. The direct effect of agreeableness on flourishing remained significant (b = 0.2631; s.e. = 0.0626; p = 0.0000, [0.1398; 0.3864]), implying that problem-focused coping potential partially mediates the relationship between agreeableness and flourishing (Figure 2).

The effect of proactive coping, self-esteem and mindfulness on flourishing was





moderated by consciousness, stability and plasticity. All effects were positive irrespective the value of the moderator. Consciousness moderated the relation between proactive coping and mindfulness and flourishing, stability moderated the relation between proactive coping and mindfulness and flourishing, and plasticity moderated the relation between self-esteem and flourishing (Table 1).

Table 1. Moderating effects of consciousness, s	stability and	plasticity
rubic I. moderating cheets of consciousness, s	fulling and	plusticity

	coeff	SE Boot	t	p	LLCI	ULCI
constant	-20.6576	0.8724	-3.0460	0.026	-4.3765	-0.9381
proactive coping	1.5577	0.2293	60.7946	0.000	1.1059	2.0095
consciousness	0.0522	0.2442	4.3096	0.000	0.5711	1.5333
proactive coping*consciousness	- 0.2280	0.0621	-30.6715	0.003	-0.3504	-0.1056
conditional effects of the predictor at v	values of the mo	derator conscio	ousness			
	coeff	SE Boot	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
3.17	0.8357	0.0624	13.0595	0.0000	0.7126	0.9587
3.83	0.6836	0.0592	11.1975	0.0000	0.5669	0.8004
4.50	0.5316	0.0809	60.9425	0.0000	0.3721	0.6911
constant	-20.6008	0.7856	-3.3104	0.0011	-1.1489	-1.0527
mindfulness	10.6483	0.2187	7.5364	0.0000	1.2173	2.0793
consciousness	1.1978	0.2225	5.3838	0.0000	0.7594	10.6363
mindfulness*consciousness	-0.2834	0.595	-40.7607	0.0000	-0.4007	-0.1661
conditional effects of the predictor at v	values of the mo	derator conscio	ousness			
	coeff	SE Boot	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
3.17	0.7509	0.0589	120.75	0.0000	0.6349	0.8670
3.83	0.5620	0.0564	90.96	0.0000	0.4508	0.6732
4.50	0.3731	0.0778	40.80	0.0000	0.2198	0.5263
4.50 constant	0.3731 -20.7748	0.0778 1.1864	40.80 -2.34	0.0000 0.0202	0.2198 -5.1127	0.5263 -0.4369
4.50 constant self-esteem	0.3731 -20.7748 10.6241	0.0778 1.1864 0.3180	40.80 -2.34 5.11	0.0000 0.0202 0.0000	0.2198 -5.1127 0.9975	0.5263 -0.4369 2.2508
4.50 constant self-esteem plasticity	0.3731 -20.7748 10.6241 1.1631	0.0778 1.1864 0.3180 0.3360	40.80 -2.34 5.11 3.46	0.0000 0.0202 0.0000 0.0006	0.2198 -5.1127 0.9975 0.5009	0.5263 -0.4369 2.2508 10.8252
4.50 constant self-esteem plasticity self-esteem*plasticity	0.3731 -20.7748 10.6241 1.1631 -0.2536	0.0778 1.1864 0.3180 0.3360 0.0879	40.80 -2.34 5.11 3.46 -20.89	0.0000 0.0202 0.0000 0.0006 0.0043	0.2198 -5.1127 0.9975 0.5009 -0.4268	0.5263 -0.4369 2.2508 10.8252 -0.0804
4.50 constant self-esteem plasticity self-esteem*plasticity conditional effects of the predictor at w	0.3731 -20.7748 10.6241 1.1631 -0.2536 ralues of the mo	0.0778 1.1864 0.3180 0.3360 0.0879 derator plastici	40.80 -2.34 5.11 3.46 -20.89 ty	0.0000 0.0202 0.0000 0.0006 0.0043	0.2198 -5.1127 0.9975 0.5009 -0.4268	0.5263 -0.4369 2.2508 10.8252 -0.0804
4.50 constant self-esteem plasticity self-esteem*plasticity conditional effects of the predictor at w	0.3731 -20.7748 10.6241 1.1631 -0.2536 ralues of the mo coeff	0.0778 1.1864 0.3180 0.3360 0.0879 derator plastici SE Boot	40.80 -2.34 5.11 3.46 -20.89 ty t	0.0000 0.0202 0.0000 0.0006 0.0043	0.2198 -5.1127 0.9975 0.5009 -0.4268 LLCI	0.5263 -0.4369 2.2508 10.8252 -0.0804 ULCI
4.50 constant self-esteem plasticity self-esteem*plasticity conditional effects of the predictor at w 3.08	0.3731 -20.7748 10.6241 1.1631 -0.2536 ralues of the mo coeff 0.8423	0.0778 1.1864 0.3180 0.3360 0.0879 derator plastici SE Boot 0.0699	40.80 -2.34 5.11 3.46 -20.89 ty t 12.04	0.0000 0.0202 0.0000 0.0006 0.0043 P 0.0000	0.2198 -5.1127 0.9975 0.5009 -0.4268 LLCI 0.7044	0.5263 -0.4369 2.2508 10.8252 -0.0804 ULCI 0.9801
4.50 constant self-esteem plasticity self-esteem*plasticity conditional effects of the predictor at w 3.08 3.67	0.3731 -20.7748 10.6241 1.1631 -0.2536 ralues of the mo coeff 0.8423 0.6943	0.0778 1.1864 0.3180 0.3360 0.0879 derator plastici SE Boot 0.0699 0.0566	40.80 -2.34 5.11 3.46 -20.89 ty t 12.04 12.26	0.0000 0.0202 0.0000 0.0006 0.0043 P 0.0000 0.0000	0.2198 -5.1127 0.9975 0.5009 -0.4268 LLCI 0.7044 0.5827	0.5263 -0.4369 2.2508 10.8252 -0.0804 ULCI 0.9801 0.8059
4.50 constant self-esteem plasticity self-esteem*plasticity conditional effects of the predictor at w 3.08 3.67 4.17	0.3731 -20.7748 10.6241 1.1631 -0.2536 values of the mo coeff 0.8423 0.6943 0.5676	0.0778 1.1864 0.3180 0.3360 0.0879 derator plastici SE Boot 0.0699 0.0566 0.0771	40.80 -2.34 5.11 3.46 -20.89 ty t 12.04 12.26 7.36	0.0000 0.0202 0.0000 0.0006 0.0043 P 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000	0.2198 -5.1127 0.9975 0.5009 -0.4268 LLCI 0.7044 0.5827 0.4156	0.5263 -0.4369 2.2508 10.8252 -0.0804 ULCI 0.9801 0.8059 0.7195
4.50 constant self-esteem plasticity self-esteem*plasticity conditional effects of the predictor at w 3.08 3.67 4.17 proactive coping	0.3731 -20.7748 10.6241 1.1631 -0.2536 ralues of the mo coeff 0.8423 0.6943 0.5676 10.8677	0.0778 1.1864 0.3180 0.3360 0.0879 derator plastici SE Boot 0.0699 0.0566 0.0771 0.3542	40.80 -2.34 5.11 3.46 -20.89 ty t 12.04 12.26 7.36 5.27	0.0000 0.0202 0.0000 0.0006 0.0043 P 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000	0.2198 -5.1127 0.9975 0.5009 -0.4268 LLCI 0.7044 0.5827 0.4156 1.1696	0.5263 -0.4369 2.2508 10.8252 -0.0804 ULCI 0.9801 0.8059 0.7195 2.5658
4.50 constant self-esteem plasticity self-esteem*plasticity conditional effects of the predictor at w 3.08 3.67 4.17 proactive coping stability	0.3731 -20.7748 10.6241 1.1631 -0.2536 values of the mo coeff 0.8423 0.6943 0.5676 10.8677 10.6600	0.0778 1.1864 0.3180 0.3360 0.0879 derator plastici SE Boot 0.0699 0.0566 0.0771 0.3542 0.3910	40.80 -2.34 5.11 3.46 -20.89 ty t 12.04 12.26 7.36 5.27 4.25	0.0000 0.0202 0.0000 0.0006 0.0043 P 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000	0.2198 -5.1127 0.9975 0.5009 -0.4268 LLCI 0.7044 0.5827 0.4156 1.1696 0.8894	0.5263 -0.4369 2.2508 10.8252 -0.0804 ULCI 0.9801 0.8059 0.7195 2.5658 2.4306

proactive coping*stability	-0.3285	0.0990	-3.32	0.0011	-0.5236	-0.1335			
conditional effects of the predictor at values of the moderator stability									
	coeff	SE Boot	t	р	LLCI	ULCI			
3.17	0.8272	0.0666	12.42	0.0000	0.6959	0.9585			
3.61	0.6810	0.0564	12.07	0.0000	0.5699	0.7921			
4.06	0.5353	0.0761	7.04	0.0000	0.3854	0.6853			
constant	-3.5725	1.2625	-20.8296	0.0051	-6.0605	-1.0845			
mindfulness	10.6817	0.3417	40.9216	0.0000	1.0083	2.3550			
stability	1.5508	0.3676	4.2191	0.0000	0.8265	2.2752			
mindfulness*stability	-0.3137	0.0970	-3.2340	0.0014	-0.5048	-0.1225			
conditional effects of the predictor a	at values of the 1	noderator stabi	lity						
	coeff	SE Boot	t	р	LLCI	ULCI			
3.16	0.6881	0.0621	11.08	0.0000	0.5657	0.8105			
3.61	0.5485	0.0559	90.82	0.0000	0.4384	0.6586			
4.06	0.4094	0.0781	5.25	0.0000	0.2556	0.5632			

Continued

For proactive coping moderating effect was positive—an increase of consciousness led to an increase in flourishing for the same values of the predictor proactive coping ($R^2 = 0.5610$; MSE = 0.2010; F = 940.99; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.000; X*W R^2 -chng = 0.0265; F = 13.48; p = 0.03). Consciousness had a significant effect that moderated the relationship of mindfulness with flourishing ($R^2 = 0.7335$; MSE = 0.2116; F = 86.55; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.000; X*W R^2 -chng = 0.0470; F = 220.66; p = 0.000). Plasticity had a significant positive effect that moderated the relationship of self-esteem with flourishing ($R^2 = 0.5555$; MSE = 0.2035; F = 920.91; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.000; X*W R^2 -chng = 0.0166; F = 8.33; p = 0.0043). Stability had a significant effect that moderated positively the relationship of proactive coping with flourishing ($R^2 = 0.5908$; MSE = 0.1874; F = 107; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.000; X*W R^2 -chng = 0.0202; F = 11.02; p = 0.0011). Stability had a significant effect that moderated positively the relationship ($R^2 = 0.5415$; MSE = 0.2100; F = 870.78; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.000; X*W R^2 -chng = 0.0215; F = 10.46; p = 0.0014).

In the general model (**Figure 3**) flourishing was predicted by high self-esteem, proactive coping, mindfulness, agreeableness and meaning in life. Problem-oriented coping potential mediated the relationship between agreeableness and flourishing. Conscientiousness and stability moderated the relationship between proactive coping and mindfulness with flourishing, and plasticity moderated the relationship between self-esteem and flourishing.

3.2. Direct and Indirect Predictors of Satisfaction with Life

For satisfaction with life the model with the highest explanatory power (R^2 =



Figure 3. General model of flourishing.

0.501) was predicted by self-esteem ($\beta = 0.401$), problem-focused coping potential ($\beta = 0.207$), and mindfulness ($\beta = 0.195$). Consciousness moderated the relation between problem-focused coping potential and mindfulness and satisfaction with life and plasticity moderated the relation between problem-focused coping potential and satisfaction with life.

Conscientiousness moderated the relationship of mindfulness and problem-focused coping potential with satisfaction with life ($R^2 = 0.3848$; MSE = 0.3976; F = 46.49; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.000; X*W R²-chng = 0.0247; F = 80.97; p = 0.03). Consciousness had a significant effect moderating the relationship of mindfulness with satisfaction with life. The moderating effect was negative for high values of mindfulness and positive for low and medium values of mindfulness. An increase in consciousness values for high mindfulness values led to a decrease in satisfaction with life values. Plasticity moderated the relationship of problem-focused coping potential with satisfaction with life ($R^2 = 0.3803$; MSE = 0.4005; F = 450.61; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; *p* = 0.00; X*W R²-chng = 0.0186; F = 60.70; *p* = 0.01). Plasticity had a significant effect that moderated the relationship of problem-focused coping potential with satisfaction with life. The moderating effect of plasticity for the effect on satisfaction with life revealed that high values of plasticity decreased the positive effect of problem-focused coping potential at high values of problem-focused coping potential and increased the effect of problem-focused coping potential as plasticity increased at medium and low values of problem-focused coping potential. Consciousness had a significant effect moderating the relationship of

problem-focused coping potential with satisfaction with life ($R^2 = 0.3786$; MSE =
0.4015; F = 45.29; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.000; X*W R ² -chng = 0.0313; F = 11.24;
p = 0.09). The moderating effect was negative for high problem-focused coping
potential—high values of consciousness led to lower satisfaction with life and ac-
counted reverse effect for medium and low values of problem-focused coping po-
tential—satisfaction with life was higher with increase of the value consciousness
(Table 2).

Table 2. Moderating effects of consciousness and plasticity.	

	coeff	SE Boot	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
constant	-3.2780	1.2269	-20.6718	0.0081	-50.6958	-0.8602
problem-focused coping potential	10.7114	0.3224	5.3080	0.0000	1.0760	2.3467
consciousness	1.0965	0.3434	3.1935	0.0160	0.4199	10.7732
problem-focused coping potential * consciousness	- 0.2615	0.0873	-20.9945	0.0310	-0.4337	-0.0894
conditional effects of the predictor at values of the moderator consciousness						
3.17	0.8832	0.0878	10.0597	0.0000	0.7102	1.0562
3.83	0.7088	0.0833	8.5082	0.0000	0.5446	0.8730
4.50	0.5345	0.1138	40.6958	0.0000	0.3102	0.7587
constant	-20.6925	1.0823	-2.4878	0.0136	-40.8253	-0.5597
mindfulness	10.6780	0.3013	5.5687	0.000	1.0842	2.27818
consciousness	1.0686	0.3065	-3.4861	0.006	0.4645	10.6727
mindfulness*consciousness	-0.2750	0.0820	-3.3533	0.009	-0.4366	-0.1134
conditional effects of the predictor at values of the moderator consciousness						
3.17	0.8071	0.0811	90.9481	0.0000	0.6473	0.9670
3.83	0.6238	0.0777	8.0258	0.0000	0.4706	0.7770
4.50	0.4405	0.1071	4.1114	0.0001	0.2293	0.6516
PFCP	-4.3633	10.7916	-2.4354	0.0157	-70.8940	-0.8326
plasticity	10.9141	0.4561	4.1969	0.0000	1.0153	20.8129
PFCP*plasticity	1.4375	0.5097	20.8168	0.0053	0.4313	2.4401
conditional effects of the predictor at values of the moderator plasticity	-0.3264	0.1261	-2.5882	0.0103	-0.5749	-0.0779
3.08	0.9077	0.1038	80.75	0.0000	0.7032	1.1122
3.67	0.7173	0.0864	8.30	0.0000	0.5469	0.8877
4.17	0.5541	0.1152	40.81	0.0000	0.3271	0.7810

In the general model direct predictors of satisfaction with life were only the personality dispositions self-esteem, problem-focused coping potential and mind-fulness, whereas personality traits had indirect effect, with plasticity and consciousness as moderators. Consciousness moderated the relationship between mindfulness and problem-focused coping and life satisfaction, whereas plasticity moderated the relationship between problem-focused coping and satisfaction with life (Figure 4).



Figure 4. General model of life satisfaction.

3.3. Direct and Indirect Predictors of Happiness

For happiness the model with the highest explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.622$) had predictors self-esteem ($\beta = .316$), meaning in life ($\beta = 0.244$), mindfulness ($\beta = 0.199$), and neuroticism ($\beta = -0.195$). Extraversion was moderator of the relationship of self-esteem, neuroticism and mindfulness with happiness. Plasticity moderated the relationship of self-esteem with happiness. Problem-focused coping and rumination mediated the relationship of neuroticism with happiness.

For the mediated effect of neuroticism on happiness the direct effect of the independent variable neuroticism on the mediator problem-focused coping potential was negative and significant (b = -0.8418; s.e. = 0.0515; p = 0.000, [-0.4162; -0.2123] with 14% explained variance. The direct effect of the independent variable neuroticism on the mediator rumination was positive and significant (b = 0.5461; s.e. = 0.0597; p = 0.000, [0.4285; 0.6638] with an explained variance of 27%. The direct effect of the mediator problem-focused coping potential on happiness was positive and significant (b = 0.5978; s.e. = 0.0727; p = 0.000, [0.4679; 0.7411]. The direct effect of the mediator rumination on happiness was negative and significant (b = -0.2416; s.e. = 0.0628; p = 0.0002, [-0.3652; -0.1179]. The direct effect of neuroticism on happiness was negative and significant (b = -0.3381; s.e. = 0.0659; p = 0.0000, [-0.4679; -0.2083]. The model was significant (R² = 0.5251 F = 82.20; df = 451 (p = 0.000). The model for the total effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable was significant: R2 = 0.3080; F = 100; df = 453 (p = 0.000). Neuroticism was significantly negatively related to happiness with a standardized regression coefficient of b = -0.2851. The direct effect of neuroticism on happiness was negative and significant (b = -0.3381; s.e. = 0.0659; p = 0.0000, [-0.4679; -0.2083]. The indirect effect of neuroticism on happiness mediated by problem-focused coping potential on flourishing was negative and significant (b = -0.1881; [0.2951; 0.0981]. The indirect effect of neuroticism on happiness mediated by rumination on happiness was negative and significant (b =-0.1319; [-0.2136; -0.0664]. The overall indirect effect was negative and significant (b = -0.3200; [-0.4591; -0.1974]. The overall effect of neuroticism on happiness was negative and significant (b = -0.6582; [-0.7878; -0.5285]. The direct effect of neuroticism on happiness remained significant, meaning problem-focused coping potential and rumination partially mediate the relationship between neuroticism and happiness (Figure 5).



Figure 5. Mediated effect of problem-focused coping potential and rumination on the relation between neuroticism and happiness. *p < 0.5, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001.

Rumination increased the strength of the negative effect of neuroticism on happiness, and problem-focused coping potential decreased the negative effect of neuroticism on happiness, with low values increasing the negative effect of neuroticism on happiness.

Extraversion moderated the relation between self-esteem and happiness, neuroticism, consciousness and plasticity—the relation between mindfulness and happiness. Extraversion had significant effect that moderated the relationship of

self-esteem with happiness (R² = 0.5460; MSE = 0.3131; F = 89.39; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.000; X*W R²-chng = 0.0161; F = 70.93; p = 0.005). The moderating effect for the relationship with happiness indicated that a decrease in extraversion led to a decrease in happiness values, with the predictor self-esteem remaining unchanged. For the moderating effect of the relationship of mindfulness and happiness the effects of neuroticism and consciousness were accounted. Neuroticism had a significant effect that completely moderated the relationship of mindfulness to happiness (R² = 0.4959; MSE = 0.3476; F = 73.13; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.000; X*W R²-chng = 0.0157; F = 60.96; p = 0.005). Consciousness had a significant effect that moderated positively the relationship of mindfulness (R² = 0.4082; MSE = 0.4081; F = 51.27; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.000; X*W R²-chng = 0.0226; F = 8.50; p = 0.0039). Plasticity moderated positively the relationship of self-esteem with happiness ((R² = 0.3286; 5236 = 0, 3286; F = 51.27; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.000; X*W R²-chng = 0.0098; F = 4.57; p = 0.003) (Table 3).

Table 3. Moderating effects of extraversion, neuroticism, consciousness, and plasticity.

	coeff	SE Boot	t	р	LLCI	ULCI		
constant	-20.9616	1.0996	-20.6932	0.007	-5.1286	-0.7946		
self-esteem	10.6886	0.3014	50.6032	0.000	1.0947	2.2825		
extraversion	1.1074	0.3222	3.4373	0.007	0.4725	10.7422		
self-esteem*extraversion	-0.2407	0.0855	-20.8162	0.045	-0.4092	-0.0723		
conditional effects of the predictor at values of the moderator extraversion								
2.83	1.0065	0.0860	110.6973	0.0000	0.8370	1.1761		
3.67	0.8056	0.0721	11.1804	0.0000	0.6639	0.9480		
4.33	0.6454	0.1036	6.2292	0.0000	0.4413	0.8496		
constant	5.5465	1.0017	5.5371	0.0000	-5.1286	-0.7946		
mindfulness	-0.0614	0.2568	-0.2393	0.8111	-0.5675	0.4446		
neuroticism	-1.1745	0.2911	-4.0347	0.0001	-10.7482	-0.6009		
mindfulness*neuroticism	0.2030	0.0769	20.6381	0.0089	0.513	0.3546		
conditional effects of the predictor at valu	es of the moder	ator neuroticisi	n					
2.17	0.3783	0.1056	3.5816	0.0004	0.1702	0.5864		
3.00	0.5474	0.0699	70.8339	0.0000	0.4097	0.6851		
3.83	0.7166	0.0826	80.6700	0.0000	0.5537	0.8794		
constant	-2.2740	1.0911	-2.0841	0.0383	-4.4241	-0.1238		
mindfulness	1.5802	0.3038	5.2020	0.0000	0.9816	2.1789		
consciousness	1.0177	0.3090	3.2931	0.0012	0.4087	10.6267		
mindfulness*consciousness	-0.2411	0.0827	-20.9157	0.0039	-0.4040	-0.0781		
conditional effects of the predictor at valu	es of the moder	ator consciousr	iess					
3.17	0.8169	0.0818	90.9868	0.0000	0.6557	0.9781		

Continued

3.83	0.6562	0.0784	8.3739	0.0000	0.5017	0.8106
4.50	0.4955	0.1080	4.5873	0.0000	0.2826	0.7083
constant	-3.1319	1.5074	-2.08	0.0389	-6.1025	-0.1613
self-esteem	10.7554	0.4040	4.34	0.0000	0.9592	2.5516
plasticity	1.0722	0.4269	2.51	0.0127	0.2309	10.9135
self-esteem*plasticity	-0.2389	0.1117	-2.14	0.0335	-4.4589	-0.0188
conditional effects of the predictor at valu	es of the moder	ator plasticity				
3.08	1.0189	0.0889	11.47	0.0000	0.8437	1.1940
3.67	0.8795	0.0720	12.22	0.0000	0.7377	1.0213
4.17	0.7601	0.0980	70.76	0.0000	0.5670	0.9532



Figure 6. General model of happiness.

In the general model (**Figure 6**) happiness was predicted by high self-esteem, meaning in life, mindfulness and low neuroticism. Problem-focused coping and mistake rumination mediated the relationship between neuroticism and happiness. Low problem-focused coping and high mistake rumination increased the negative effect of neuroticism on happiness. Moderating effects were found for neuroticism and conscientiousness in the relationship between mindfulness and happiness, and for extraversion in the relationship between self-esteem and happiness. High extraversion and plasticity increased self-esteem. High neuroticism neutralizes the positive relationship between mindfulness and happiness and leads to lower perceived happiness. Higher values of consciousness increase the positive relationship between mindfulness and happiness.

3.4. Direct and Indirect Predictors of Positive Affect

For positive affect the model with the highest explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.398$) had predictors problem-focused coping potential ($\beta = 0.406$), neuroticism ($\beta = -0.207$), and self-esteem ($\beta = 0.151$). Positive affect was predicted by problem-focused coping potential, low neuroticism and high self-esteem. In terms of the mediating effect of neuroticism on positive affect, such had mindfulness and proactive coping potential. Extraversion and plasticity moderated the relationship of problemfocused coping potential and self-esteem with positive affect.

For the mediating effect the direct effect of the independent variable neuroticism on the mediator proactive coping was negative and significant (b = -0.2827; s.e. = 0.0521; p = 0.000, [-0.3853; -0.1801] with explained variance of 12%. The direct effect of the independent variable neuroticism on the mediator mindfulness was negative and significant (b = -0.3949; s.e. = 0.0554; p = 0.000, [-0.5041; -0.286] with explained variance of 18%. The direct effect of the mediator proactive coping potential on positive affect was positive and significant (b = 0.3496; s.e. = 0.0875; p = 0.0001, [0.1771; 0.5221]. The direct effect of the mediator mindfulness on positive affect was positive and significant (b = 0.2341; s.e. = 0.0822; p = 0.004, [0.0721; 0.3961]. The direct effect of neuroticism on positive affect was negative and significant (b = -0.2566; s.e. = 0.0601; p = 0.000, [-0.3751; -0.1381]. The model was significant ($R^2 = 0.3665 \text{ F} - = 43.00$; df = 451 (p = 0.000). The model of the total effect of the independent variable on the dependent was significant (R^2 = 0.1945 F- = 54.33; df = 453 (p = 0.000). Neuroticism was significantly negatively related to positive affect with a standardized regression coefficient of -0.4410. The overall effect of neuroticism on positive affect was negative and significant (b = -0.4479; s.e. = .0608; p = 0.000, [-0.5676; -0.3281]. The direct effect of neuroticism on positive affect was negative and significant (b = -0.2566; s.e. = .0601; p = 0.000, [-0.3751; -0.1381]. The indirect effect of neuroticism on happiness moderated by proactive coping on positive affect was negative and significant (b = -.0988; [-0.1769; -0.0375]. The indirect effect of neuroticism on positive affect moderated by mindfulness was negative and significant (b = -0.0924; [-0.1829; -0.0118]. The overall indirect effect was negative and significant (b = -0.1913; [-0.3175; -0.0814]. The direct effect of neuroticism on positive affect remained significant, meaning mindfulness partially mediates the relationship between neuroticism and positive affect.

There was a significant overall and direct effect of neuroticism on happiness and an indirect effect of neuroticism on happiness with proactive coping and mindfulness as mediators. The negative effect of neuroticism on positive affect was mediated by proactive coping and mindfulness—when these were low, this increased the negative effect (**Figure 7**).

Extraversion and plasticity moderated the relation between self-esteem and



Figure 7. Mediating effect of proactive coping and mindfulness on the relationship between neuroticism and positive affect. *p < 0.5, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001.

problem-focused coping. Extraversion had a significant effect moderating the relationship of self-esteem with positive affect ($R^2 = 0.3119$; MSE = 0.3479; F = 330.69; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.00; X*W R²-chng = 0.0133; F = 4.32; p = 0.005). Extraversion had a significant effect moderating positively the relationship of problem-focused coping potential with positive affect. ($R^2 = 0.3627$; MSE = 0.3222; F = 42.31; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.000; X*W R²-chng = 0.0165; F = 50.77; p = 0.017). Plasticity had a significant effect that moderated the association of problem-focused coping potential with positive affect. High values of plasticity decreased positive affect at high values of problem-focused coping potential and increased positive affect as plasticity increased at medium and low values of problem-focused coping potential ($R^2 = 0.3674$; MSE = 0.3212; F = 420.67; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.000; X*W R²-chng = 0.0246; F = 80.63; p = 0.004). Plasticity had a significant effect that moderated the relationship of self-esteem with positive affect. The moderating effect of plasticity on the effect on positive affect revealed that high values of plasticity do not have significant effect at high values of selfesteem and increase positive affect as the value of plasticity increases at medium and low values of self-esteem ($R^2 = 0.3126$; MSE = 0.3475; F = 330.81; df1 = 3; df2 = 451; p = 0.000; X*W R²-chng = 0.0254; F = 8.25; p = 0.0045) (Table 4).

3.5. Direct and Indirect Predictors of Positive Affect

In the general model positive affect was predicted by problem-focused coping potential, low neuroticism and high self-esteem. In relation to the mediated effect of the relationships between neuroticism and positive affect when mindfulness

Table 4. Moderating effects of extraversion a	and plasticity.
---	-----------------

	coeff	SE Boot	t	р	LLCI	ULCI
self-esteem	1.1571	0.3177	30.6427	0.000	0.5311	10.7832
extraversion	0.8826	0.3396	2.5990	0.010	0.2134	1.5518
self-esteem*extraversion	-0.1873	0.0901	-2.0782	0.038	-0.3648	-0.0097
conditional effects of the predictor at values of t						
2.83	0.6266	0.0907	60.9083	0.0000	0.4479	0.8053
3.67	0.4706	0.0760	6.1929	0.0000	0.3208	0.6203
4.33	0.3457	0.1092	3.1653	0.0018	0.1305	0.5610
problem-focused coping potential	1.3490	0.3052	4.4203	0.0000	0.7476	10.9504
extraversion	0.9283	0.3462	20.6814	0.0079	0.2461	10.6105
problem-focused coping potential*extraversion	-0.2070	0.0862	-2.4028	0.0171	-0.3768	-0.0372
conditional effects of the predictor at values of t	he moderator	extraversion				
2.89	0.7506	0.0892	8.41	0.0000	0.5748	0.9265
3.58	0.6083	0.0772	70.88	0.0000	0.4561	0.7605
4.27	0.4659	0.1048	4.45	0.0000	0.2594	0.6725
PFCP	-30.7363	10.6045	-2.33	0.0208	-60.8981	-0.5745
plasticity	10.8495	0.4034	4.53	0.0000	1.0446	20.6543
PFCP*plasticity	1.3956	0.4564	3.06	0.0025	0.4961	2.2951
conditional effects of the predictor at values of t	he moderator	· plasticity				
3.08	0.8262	0.0929	80.90	0.0000	0.6431	1.0094
3.67	0.6326	0.0774	8.17	0.0000	0.4801	0.7852
4.17	0.4667	0.1031	4.53	0.0000	0.2635	0.6700
self-esteem	-3.2403	1.5503	-2.09	0.0377	-6.2954	-0.1852
plasticity	10.7124	0.4155	4.12	0.0001	0.8935	2.5312
self-esteem*plasticity	1.4280	0.4391	3.25	0.0013	0.5628	2.2933
conditional effects of the predictor at values of t	he moderator	· plasticity				
3.08	0.6951	0.0914	70.60	0.0000	0.5150	0.8753
3.67	0.5027	0.0740	60.79	0.0000	0.3569	0.6485
4.17	0.3377	0.1008	3.51	0.0009	0.1392	0.5363

and proactive coping potential have low values, this decreases the experienced positive affect. Moderators of the relationship between self-esteem and problem-focused coping with positive affect are extraversion and plasticity, especially for low values of self-esteem. Self-esteem and problem-focused coping prognosticate positive affect, depending on the level of extraversion. The effect of self-esteem on positive affect is determined by extraversion and plasticity. High extraversion and

moderate plasticity moderate the relation between problem-focused coping and positive affect. Very high value of plasticity neutralizes the effect of high problem-focused coping and, at moderate values increase of plasticity increases the effect of problem-focused coping. For extraversion increase of values of extraversion increases the positive effect of problem-focused coping on positive affect (**Figure 8**).



Figure 8. General model of positive affect.

3.6. Direct and Indirect Predictors of Negative Affect

For negative affect the model with the highest explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.486$) had predictors rumination ($\beta = 0.413$), neuroticism ($\beta = 0.259$), and meaning in life (β = -0.206). Negative affect was predicted by high rumination, neuroticism and low perceived meaning in life. Mediator for neuroticism was self-esteem. For neuroticism the direct effect of the independent variable neuroticism on the mediator self-esteem was negative and significant (b = -0.4606; s.e. = 0.0488; p = 0.000, [-0.5567; -0.3644] with explained variance of 28% and standardized coefficient of b = -0.5325. The direct effect of the mediator self-esteem on negative affect was negative and significant (b = -0.3852; s.e. = 0.0816; *p* = 0.000, [-0.5460; -0.2243] and standardized coefficient b = -0.2986. The direct effect of neuroticism on negative affect was positive and significant (b = 0.3565; s.e. = 0.0765; p = 0.000, [0.2057; 0.5072] and standardized coefficient b = 0.3196. The model was significant ($R^2 = 0.4090$; MSE = 0.3605; F = 51.45; df = 451 (p = 0.000). The model of the total effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable was significant $(R^2 = 0.3174; MSE = 0.4127; F = 104; df = 453 (p = 0.000).$ Neuroticism was significantly positively related to negative affect with a standardized regression coefficient of b = 0.5634. The overall effect of neuroticism on negative affect was positive and significant (b = 0.6284; s.e. = 0.0614; p = 0.000, [0.5074; 0.7495]. The

direct effect of neuroticism on negative affect was positive and significant (b = 0.3565; s.e. = 0.0765; p = 0.000, [0.2057; 0.5072]. The indirect effect of neuroticism on negative affect, moderated by self-esteem was positive and significant (b = 0.1774; [0.0702; 0.2937]. The overall indirect effect of neuroticism on negative affect moderated by self-esteem was positive and significant (b = 0.2720; [0.1382; 0.4141]. The indirect effect of neuroticism on negative affect moderated by self-esteem, was positive and significant (b = 0.1774; [0.0702; 0.2937]. The direct effect of neuroticism on negative affect moderated by self-esteem, was positive and significant (b = 0.1774; [0.0702; 0.2937]. The direct effect of neuroticism on negative affect remained significant, revealing that self-esteem partially mediates the relationship between neuroticism and negative affect. There was a significant general and direct effect of neuroticism on negative affect and an indirect effect of neuroticism on negative affect mediated by self-esteem.

Self-esteem has a partial mediating effect and its high values reduce the positive effect of neuroticism on negative affect (**Figure 9**).

In the general model high rumination, neuroticism and low perceived meaning in life predicted negative affect. Self-esteem has a mediating effect and its high levels reduce the positive effect of neuroticism on negative affect (**Figure 10**).



Figure 9. Mediating effect of self-esteem on the relationship between neuroticism and negative affect. *p < 0.5, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001.





3.7. Direct and Indirect Predictors of Psychological Well-Being

For *positive relations with others* the model with the highest explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.337$) had predictors self-effect problem-focused coping potential ($\beta =$

0.419) and self-handicapping ($\beta = -0.219$). For *self-acceptance* the model with the highest explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.487$) had predictors self-efficacy self-esteem ($\beta = 0.419$), rumination ($\beta = -0.201$), and problem-focused coping potential ($\beta = 0.170$). For *personal growth* the model with the highest explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.449$) had predictors proactive coping ($\beta = 0.474$) and learned helplessness ($\beta = -0.293$). For *autonomy* the model with the highest explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.260$) had predictors accommodative coping potential ($\beta = 0.337$) and proactive coping ($\beta = 0.209$). For *environmental mastery* the model with the highest explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.564$) had predictors problem-focused coping potential ($\beta = 0.526$) and self-handicapping ($\beta = -0.365$).

For autonomy learned helplessness was a partial mediator of proactive coping-low learned helplessness increased the relationship of proactive coping with autonomy. The direct effect of the independent variable proactive coping on the mediator learned helplessness was negative and significant (b = -0.6391; s.e. = 0.0541; p = 0.000, [-0.7456; -0.5325] with explained variance of 38%. The direct mediator effect of problem learned helplessness on autonomy was negative and significant (b = -0.2965; s.e. = 0.0874; p = 0.008, [-0.4687; -0.1244]. The direct effect of proactive coping on autonomy was positive and significant (b = 0.3145; s.e. = 0.0673; p = 0.0006, [0.1367; 0.4922]. The model was significant ($R^2 = 0.2172$; F = 31.07; df = 452, p = 0.000). The model of the total effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable was significant ($R^2 = 0.1769$; F = 48.36; df = 453 (p = 0.000). The proactive was significantly positively related to autonomy with a standardized regression coefficient b = 0.4206. The overall effect of proactive coping on autonomy was positive and significant (b = 0.5040; s.e. = 0.0725; p = 0.000, [0.3611; 0.6468]. The direct effect of proactive coping on autonomy was positive and significant (b = 0.3145; s.e. = 0.0902; p = 0.001, [0.1367; 0.4922]. The indirect effect of proactive coping on autonomy was positive and significant (b = 0.1895; s.e. = 0.0763 [0.0680; 0.3655], with a fully standardized indirect effect of b = 0.1581. There was a significant general and direct effect of proactive coping on autonomy and an indirect effect of proactive coping on autonomy mediated by learned helplessness (Figure 11).





4. Discussion

The aim of the study is to outline the common and different direct and indirect effect of personality predictors on the components of perceived well-being: flourishing, life satisfaction, happiness, positive and negative affect, and psychological well-being. Overall, our expectations are confirmed.

H1: Personality traits and dispositions directly and indirectly determine the level of perceived well-being.

H2: Personality traits have weak and moderate predictive effects, while at the same time moderate the relationships between personality dispositions and wellbeing.

H3: Personality dispositions are stronger independent predictors of experienced well-being than personality traits and mediate the effect of personality traits.

H4: The components of perceived well-being have common, but distinct predictors that are relatively stable and relatively flexible.

The findings support the conclusion that personality traits and dispositions are robustly related to both subjective and psychological well-being (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998; Steel et al., 2008; Grant et al., 2009; Anglim & Grant, 2016; Sun et al., 2018; Meléndez et al., 2019; Anglim et al., 2020), and that dimensions of well-being are strongly related to each other while reflecting different aspects of well-being (Anglim & Grant, 2016; Sun et al., 2018). To some extent personality traits and to a greater extent personality dispositions determine the importance of personal adaptive potential and developmental resources. This replicates the position that behavior is predicted by evaluation of situations and coping preferences in addition to the accounted life-long and other changes in personality traits that need further research (Bleidorn et al., 2022).

Concerning the perceived well-being:

Flourishing is predicted by high self-esteem, proactive coping, mindfulness, agreeableness and meaning in life. Problem-oriented coping potential increases the relationship between agreeableness and flourishing. Conscientiousness and stability increase the relationship between proactive coping and mindfulness with flourishing. Plasticity increases the relationship between self-esteem and flourishing. Self-esteem is expected to be not only stable and rigid, but also flexible enough to be revised and validated as to fulfil its optimal relationship with self-perception, while proactive coping and mindfulness, as dispositions related to activity in cognitive, emotional and behavioral aspect, are supported by the balance, provided by stability.

Satisfaction with life is predicted by high self-esteem, problem-focused coping and mindfulness, whereas personality traits have moderating effect. Consciousness moderates the relationship between mindfulness and problem-focused coping and life satisfaction, and plasticity moderates the relationship between problem-focused coping and life satisfaction. High consciousness, mindfulness, and problem-focused coping combined with high plasticity do not promote life satisfaction, but hinder it. Satisfaction with life is highest when there is problem-focused coping potential, moderate plasticity, and high mindfulness with moderate consciousness. Excessive organization and distractibility appear to impede problem-focus and goal-directed problem-solving, leading to lower life satisfaction. In other cases, organization, consistency, and flexibility, provide a balanced attitude and steady and purposeful goal-directedness, maintaining at the same time sufficiently broad perspective.

Happiness is predicted by high self-esteem, meaning in life, mindfulness and low neuroticism. Problem-focused coping and mistake rumination mediate the relationship between neuroticism and happiness. Low problem-focused coping and high mistake rumination increase the negative effect of neuroticism on happiness. Neuroticism and conscientiousness moderate the relationship between mindfulness and happiness, and extraversion the relationship between self-esteem and happiness. High extraversion and plasticity increase the effect of self-esteem on happiness. High neuroticism neutralizes the positive relationship between mindfulness and happiness and leads to lower perceived happiness. Higher consciousness increases the positive relationship between mindfulness and happiness.

Positive affect is predicted by problem-focused coping, low neuroticism, and high self-esteem. Regarding the mediating effect of the relationships between neuroticism and positive affect, when mindfulness and proactive coping potential are low, positive affect is reduced. Moderators of the relationship between self-esteem and problem-focused coping with positive affect are extraversion and plasticity, especially for the lowest self-esteem. Self-esteem and problem-focused coping predict positive affect, depending on the level of extraversion. The effect of self-esteem on positive affect is determined by extraversion and plasticity. High extraversion and moderate plasticity are important in the relationship between problem-focused coping and positive affect. Very high levels of plasticity neutralize the effect of high problem-focused coping, whereas moderate and high extraversion increase the positive effect of problem-focused coping. The difference in the moderating effects of extraversion and plasticity appears to be due to the latent effect of openness to experience. Extraversion, which includes energy, assertiveness, and sociability, has only a positive effect, as opposed to the supposed distraction, as an effect of high openness to experience specifically for problem-focused coping, given its nature.

High rumination, neuroticism and low perceived meaning in life predict *negative effect*. Self-esteem has a mediating effect and its high levels reduce the positive effect of neuroticism on negative affect

For the domains of *psychological well-being* maintaining positive relationships with others and environmental mastery have identical predictors—low self-handicapping, but problem focused coping. Self-acceptance is predicted by high selfesteem, lack of rumination and problem focusing, and lack of self-defensive behaviors. Autonomy also excludes self-defensive behavior, which is represented as a predictor in other components and is related to anticipatory behavior and active adaptation to situations. The absence of learned helplessness is important for growth, as is proactive coping.

Self-esteem is the strongest predictor of perceived well-being—it is independent predictor of flourishing, happiness, satisfaction with life, positive affect and self-acceptance for the domains of psychological well-being and has mediating effect for negative affect. Problem-focused coping has also strong role as independent predictor of subjective well-being, psychological well-being and mediates happiness. Mindfulness is independent predictor of flourishing, satisfaction with life, and happiness, and mediates the positive affect. Defensive patterns—self-handicapping, learned helplessness, and rumination are independent predictors of psychological well-being. Proactive coping also predicts only psychological well-being. Meaning in life is independent predictor of negative affect, flourishing, and happiness. For personality traits agreeableness is independent predictor of flourishing neuroticism predicts negative and positive affect and happiness. Extraversion is moderator for positive affect, consciousness satisfaction with life and plasticity satisfaction with life and positive affect.

Personality dispositions and traits have their own independent effects and are also interrelated, so that each variable completes the explanatory model. Personality dispositions can support traits and personality traits have effect on dispositions and their interrelated effect contributes to understanding personality antecedents of self-regulation. The comprehensive model of the dynamic interaction of predictors of self-regulation (**Figure 12**) is based on several positions, outlined in this study and replicating previous research.



Figure 12. Dynamic model of self-regulation.

Personality traits, personality dispositions, and well-being are relatively stable over time (Costa & McCrae, 1980, 1995; McCrae & Costa, 1987, 2008; McCrae et al., 2005; Fujita & Diener, 2005; Schimmack & Oishi, 2005; Anglim et al., 2015). Personality traits influence well-being and dispositions (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998; Diener & Lucas, 1999; Headey & Wearing, 1989; Paunonen & Ashton, 2001; Lyubomirsky et al., 2005b; Steel et al., 2008; Weber & Huebner, 2015). Personality traits can be viewed as moderately stable and moderately plastic constructs (Bleidorn et al., 2022). Adaptation to the environment leads to a change in personality dispositions due to what is perceived as the most adaptive solution for a given context (Anglim & Horwood, 2021; Foa et al., 2022; Ikizer et al., 2022; Kirby et al., 2022; Sutin et al., 2022). A growing number of publications report rapid changes in personality traits within one year in crisis situations (Sutin et al., 2022) and within three months after interventions (Stieger et al., 2021). In the long run personal dispositions, attitudes, and behaviors can modify or support traits (Van den Hurk et al., 2011; Keyes et al., 2015; Stieger et al., 2021).

Well-being is best explained by the inclusion of personality traits and dispositions not as mechanical aggregation, but considering the specificity of the interaction. The individual components of well-being are determined by distinct and common predictors, and their effects can be viewed along the general lines of the two perspectives, stability and plasticity, as determinants of effective personal selfregulation and optimal functioning from the viewpoint of a cybernetic system (DeYoung, 2006, 2015).

Not only does personality matter, but the opposite direction can also be assumed. According to the proposed *positive reciprocity* (Keyes et al., 2015), improvements in well-being, such as increases in self-acceptance and social integration, can lead to change in personality traits. Thus, perceived well-being itself can be seen not only as an outcome but also as part of the process of optimal selfregulation, since it determines the perspective of perception of the environment and the self, stimulating or inhibiting behaviors and attitudes, affecting personality dispositions and personality traits in long run. The model can be seen as a process of effective self-regulation that can be stimulated by learning how to balance flexibility and stability and ensure best accommodation depending on intrinsic and extrinsic factors.

The comprehensive view of reciprocal interrelations and the suggested dynamic model of self-regulation has practical implications. First, based on the individual personality profile, the personality traits, dispositions and perceived well-being can underlie tailored interventions, aimed at promotion of the overall optimal self-regulation. We consider plasticity and stability pathways, ensuring optimal performance. Irrespectively which of the domains is targeted it can promote the other ones. Support of any predictor—self-esteem, meaning in life, mindfulness, reducing avoidance and self-defenses and pursuing problem-focused behavior can promote perceived well-being and have effect on personality traits. Promotion of perceived well-being and any of its domains or components can lead to change in coping dispositions, behavioral patterns and attitudes and on their hand support or change traits as well. We have piloted training, involving volunteers who had no specific concern in view to test can learning as preventive and proactive step facilitate self-regulation. The training included 3 months and 10 sessions, aimed to promote reflection and self-reflection as proactive mindfulness. Compared to the participants in the control group after the training and six months after completion of the training the volunteers had significantly higher scores for meaning in life. This is just a first step, trying to test the role of training for people who are not interested in a change and do not need support, so we consider this a small piece of support for the suggested direction.

Limitations and Future Research

Despite the unavoidable limitations inherent to cross-sectional study with a convenient sample, in our opinion, this study leads to the suggestion of a general framework that outlines the specifics and commonalities in the interaction of personality factors in a general framework of perceived well-being as process in the course of self-regulation. In line with positive psychology and with a view to lifelong development, learning to flourish can be mastered, not as a need, but on a need-to-know basis, as part of education, like learning for life, based on conclusions for both a predetermined baseline of well-being and at the same time taking into account targeted and life changes. We see this possibility of the suggested model and promotion of meaning in life and proactive attitude and problem-focused coping, as well as in mindfulness: the parallel search for meaning and maintenance of meaning in life, proactive coping aimed at new possibilities, and problem-focused coping as providing stability, perception of all possibilities, and their acceptance of them, or the proactive mindfulness mindset. Training in forming these dispositions can be used to promote plasticity and stability as two mutually supportive lines of development. From research point of view personality dispositions can also be considered from these two perspectives.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- Anglim, J., & Grant, S. (2016). Predicting Psychological and Subjective Well-Being from Personality: Incremental Prediction from 30 Facets over the Big 5. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 17, 59-80. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-014-9583-7</u>
- Anglim, J., & Horwood, S. (2021). Effect of the COVID-19 Pandemic and Big Five Personality on Subjective and Psychological Well-Being. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 12, 1527-1537. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620983047</u>
- Anglim, J., Horwood, S., Smillie, L. D., Marrero, R. J., & Wood, J. K. (2020). Predicting Psychological and Subjective Well-Being from Personality: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146, 279-323. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000226</u>
- Anglim, J., Weinberg, M. K., & Cummins, R. A. (2015). Bayesian Hierarchical Modeling of the Temporal Dynamics of Subjective Well-Being: A 10 Year Longitudinal Analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 59, 1-14. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2015.08.003</u>
- Arends, R. Y., Bode, C., Taal, E., & van de Laar, M. A. F. J. (2016). The Longitudinal Relation between Patterns of Goal Management and Psychological Health in People with Arthritis: The Need for Adaptive Flexibility. *British Journal of Health Psychology, 21*, 469-489. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/bjhp.12182</u>

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in

Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 1173-1182. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.51.6.1173

- Blanca, M., Alarcón, R., Arnau, J., Bono, R., & Bendayan, R. (2017). Non-Normal Data: Is ANOVA Still a Valid Option? *Psicothema*, 4, 552-557. https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2016.383
- Bleidorn, W., Schwaba, T., Zheng, A., Hopwood, C. J., Sosa, S. S., Roberts, B. W. et al. (2022). Personality Stability and Change: A Meta-Analysis of Longitudinal Studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 148, 588-619. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000365</u>
- Boateng, G. O., Neilands, T. B., Frongillo, E. A., Melgar-Quiñonez, H. R., & Young, S. L. (2018). Best Practices for Developing and Validating Scales for Health, Social, and Behavioral Research: A Primer. *Frontiers in Public Health, 6*, Article No. 149. <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149</u>
- Bobo, J. L., Whitaker, K. C., & Strunk, K. K. (2013). Personality and Student Self-Handicapping: A Cross-Validated Regression Approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 55, 619-621. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.04.010</u>
- Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The Benefits of Being Present: Mindfulness and Its Role in Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 822-848. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822</u>
- Carmody, J., & Baer, R. A. (2008). Relationships between Mindfulness Practice and Levels of Mindfulness, Medical and Psychological Symptoms and Well-Being in a Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction Program. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *31*, 23-33. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10865-007-9130-7
- Cheng, X., Zhang, H., Cao, J., & Ma, Y. (2022). The Effect of Mindfulness-Based Programs on Psychological Distress and Burnout in Kindergarten Teachers: A Pilot Study. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 50*, 1197-1207. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-021-01254-6
- Coffey, L., Gallagher, P., Desmond, D., & Ryall, N. (2014). Goal Pursuit, Goal Adjustment, and Affective Well-Being Following Lower Limb Amputation. *British Journal of Health Psychology, 19,* 409-424. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/bjhp.12051</u>
- Costa Jr., P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1995). Domains and Facets: Hierarchical Personality Assessment Using the Revised NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 64, 21-50. <u>https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa6401_2</u>
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1980). Influence of Extraversion and Neuroticism on Subjective Well-Being: Happy and Unhappy People. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *38*, 668-678. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.38.4.668</u>
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1980a). Still Stable after All These Years: Personality as a Key to Some Issues in Adulthood and Old Age. In P. B. Baltes, & O. G. Brim (Eds.), *Life Span Development and Behavior* (pp. 65-102). Academic Press.
- Costa, P. T., McCrae, R. R., & Zonderman, A. B. (1987). Environmental and Dispositional Influences on Well-Being: Longitudinal Follow-Up of an American National Sample. *British Journal of Psychology, 78*, 299-306. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1987.tb02248.x
- DeNeve, K. M., & Cooper, H. (1998). The Happy Personality: A Meta-Analysis of 137 Personality Traits and Subjective Well-Being. *Psychological Bulletin*, *124*, 197-229. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.124.2.197
- DeYoung, C. G. (2006). Higher-Order Factors of the Big Five in a Multi-Informant Sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 1138-1151. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.91.6.1138</u>

- DeYoung, C. G. (2015). Cybernetic Big Five Theory. *Journal of Research in Personality, 56,* 33-58. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2014.07.004</u>
- DeYoung, C. G., Peterson, J. B., & Higgins, D. M. (2002). Higher-Order Factors of the Big Five Predict Conformity: Are There Neuroses of Health? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33, 533-552. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(01)00171-4</u>
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective Well-Being. *Psychological Bulletin, 95*, 542-575. https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.95.3.542
- Diener, E. (2000). Subjective Well-Being: The Science of Happiness and a Proposal for a National Index. *American Psychologist*, *55*, 34-43. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.55.1.34
- Diener, E., & Diener, M. (1995). Cross-Cultural Correlates of Life Satisfaction and Self-Esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 653-663. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.68.4.653</u>
- Diener, E., & Lucas, R. E. (1999). Personality and Subjective Well-Being. In D. Kahneman,
 E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-Being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology* (pp. 213-229). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49,* 71-75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Diener, E., Lucas, R. E., & Oishi, S. (2002). Subjective Well-Being: The Science of Happiness and Life Satisfaction. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 63-73). Oxford University Press.
- Diener, E., Napa Scollon, C., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). The Evolving Concept of Subjective Well-Being: The Multifaceted Nature of Happiness. In Advances in Cell Aging and Gerontology (pp. 187-219). Elsevier. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/s1566-3124(03)15007-9</u>
- Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S. et al. (2010). New Well-Being Measures: Short Scales to Assess Flourishing and Positive and Negative Feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, 97, 143-156. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9493-y</u>
- Edwards, M. C. (2013). Purple Unicorns, True Models, and Other Things I've Never Seen. *Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research & Perspective, 11*, 107-111. https://doi.org/10.1080/15366367.2013.835178
- Ekeh, P. U., & Chinenye, N. R. (2015). Personality Traits as Correlates of Learned Helplessness among Low Achieving Students in Mathematics. *European Journal of Psychological Research, 2*, 7-13.
- Feldman, G., Hayes, A., Kumar, S., Greeson, J., & Laurenceau, J. (2007). Mindfulness and Emotion Regulation: The Development and Initial Validation of the Cognitive and Affective Mindfulness Scale-Revised (CAMS-R). *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 29, 177-190. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-006-9035-8</u>
- Flett, G. L., Nepon, T., Hewitt, P. L., Zaki-Azat, J., Rose, A. L., & Swiderski, K. (2020). The Mistake Rumination Scale: Development, Validation, and Utility of a Measure of Cognitive Perfectionism. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 38*, 84-98. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282919879538
- Foa, R. S., Fabian, M., & Gilbert, S. (2022). Subjective Well-Being during the 2020-21 Global Coronavirus Pandemic: Evidence from High Frequency Time Series Data. *PLOS ONE,* 17, e0263570. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0263570</u>
- Fujita, F., & Diener, E. (2005). Life Satisfaction Set Point: Stability and Change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 158-164. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.1.158</u>

- Gale, C. R., Booth, T., Mõttus, R., Kuh, D., & Deary, I. J. (2013). Neuroticism and Extraversion in Youth Predict Mental Wellbeing and Life Satisfaction 40 Years Later. *Journal* of Research in Personality, 47, 687-697. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.06.005
- Giluk, T. L. (2009). Mindfulness, Big Five Personality, and Affect: A Meta-Analysis. Personality and Individual Differences, 47, 805-811. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.06.026
- Grant, S., Langan-Fox, J., & Anglim, J. (2009). The Big Five Traits as Predictors of Subjective and Psychological Well-Being. *Psychological Reports*, *105*, 205-231. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.105.1.205-231
- Greenglass, E., Schwarzer, R., & Taubert, S. (1999). The Proactive Coping Inventory (PCI): A Multidimensional Research Instrument. 20th International Conference of the Stress and Anxiety Research Society (STAR), Cracow, 12-14 July 1999. https://doi.org/10.1037/t07292-000
- Grossman, P., Niemann, L., Schmidt, S., & Walach, H. (2004). Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction and Health Benefits: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 57, 35-43. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-3999(03)00573-7</u>
- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2010). Multivariate Data Analysis. Pearson.
- Headey, B., & Wearing, A. (1989). Personality, Life Events, and Subjective Well-Being: Toward a Dynamic Equilibrium Model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*, 731-739. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.57.4.731</u>
- Ikizer, G., Kowal, M., Aldemir, İ. D., Jeftić, A., Memisoglu-Sanli, A., Najmussaqib, A. et al. (2022). Big Five Traits Predict Stress and Loneliness during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Evidence for the Role of Neuroticism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 190,* Article ID: 111531. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2022.111531</u>
- Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social Well-Being. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 61*, 121-140. https://doi.org/10.2307/2787065
- Keyes, C. L. M., Kendler, K. S., Myers, J. M., & Martin, C. C. (2015). The Genetic Overlap and Distinctiveness of Flourishing and the Big Five Personality Traits. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16, 655-668. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-014-9527-2</u>
- Kirby, L. D., Qian, W., Adiguzel, Z., Afshar Jahanshahi, A., Bakracheva, M., Orejarena Ballestas, M. C. et al. (2022). Appraisal and Coping Predict Health and Well-Being during the Covid-19 Pandemic: An International Approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, *57*, 49-62. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12770</u>
- Lee, T. S., Tzeng, W., & Chiang, H. (2019). Impact of Coping Strategies on Nurses' Wellbeing and Practice. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, *51*, 195-204. https://doi.org/10.1111/jnu.12467
- Lynch, J. G., Netemeyer, R. G., Spiller, S. A., & Zammit, A. (2009). A Generalizable Scale of Propensity to Plan: The Long and the Short of Planning for Time and for Money. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *37*, 108-128. <u>https://doi.org/10.1086/649907</u>
- Lyubomirsky, S., & Lepper, H. S. (1999). A Measure of Subjective Happiness: Preliminary Reliability and Construct Validation. *Social Indicators Research, 46*, 137-155. <u>https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1006824100041</u>
- Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005a). The Benefits of Frequent Positive Affect: Does Happiness Lead to Success? *Psychological Bulletin, 131*, 803-855. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.6.803
- Lyubomirsky, S., Sheldon, K. M., & Schkade, D. (2005b). Pursuing Happiness: The Architecture of Sustainable Change. *Review of General Psychology, 9*, 111-131. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.9.2.111

- Maadikhah, E., & Erfani, N. (2014). Predicting Learned Helplessness Based on Personality. *Interciencia, 39*, 339-341.
- Mann, F. D., DeYoung, C. G., Tiberius, V., & Krueger, R. F. (2021). Stability and Wellbeing: Associations among the Big Five Domains, Metatraits, and Three Kinds of Wellbeing in a Large Sample. *Journal of Personality*, *89*, 720-737. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12611
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the Five-Factor Model of Personality across Instruments and Observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 81-90. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.52.1.81</u>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (2008). The Five-Factor Theory of Personality. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research* (pp. 159-181). The Guilford Press.
- McCrae, R. R., & Terracciano, A. (2005). Universal Features of Personality Traits from the Observer's Perspective: Data from 50 Cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*, 547-561. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.547</u>
- McLain, T. (2012). *Refining a Measure of Appraisal Style*. Honors Thesis, Dr. Craig Smith & Dr. Leslie Kirby. <u>https://ir.vanderbilt.edu/bitstream/handle/1803/5085/McLain%20Final%20Hon-ors%20Thesis.pdf?sequence=4&isAllowed=y</u>
- Meléndez, J. C., Satorres, E., Cujiño, M., & Reyes, M. (2019). Big Five and Psychological and Subjective Well-Being in Colombian Older Adults. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 82, 88-93. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2019.01.016</u>
- Moretti, E. d. A., Anholon, R., Rampasso, I. S., Silva, D., Santa-Eulalia, L. A., & Ignácio, P. S. d. A. (2019). Main Difficulties during RFID Implementation: An Exploratory Factor Analysis Approach. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management, 31*, 943-956. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2019.1575351
- Ortet, G., Pinazo, D., Walker, D., Gallego, S., Mezquita, L., & Ibáñez, M. I. (2020). Personality and Nonjudging Make You Happier: Contribution of the Five-Factor Model, Mindfulness Facets and a Mindfulness Intervention to Subjective Well-Being. *PLOS ONE, 15*, e0228655. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0228655</u>
- Park, N., Park, M., & Peterson, C. (2010). When Is the Search for Meaning Related to Life Satisfaction? *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being, 2*, 1-13. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2009.01024.x</u>
- Paunonen, S. V., & Ashton, M. C. (2001). Big Five Factors and Facets and the Prediction of Behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 524-539. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.81.3.524</u>
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (2011). Personality and Happiness. In T. Chamorro-Premuzic, S. von Stumm, & A. Furnham (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of Individual Differences* (pp. 699-717). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Preacher, K. J., & Kelley, K. (2011). Effect Size Measures for Mediation Models: Quantitative Strategies for Communicating Indirect Effects. *Psychological Methods*, *16*, 93-115. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022658</u>
- Quinless, F. W., & McDermott Nelson, M. A. (1988). Development of a Measure of Learned Helplessness. *Nursing Research, 37*, 11-15. https://doi.org/10.1097/00006199-198801000-00003
- Rhodewalt, F. (1990). Self-Handicappers: Individual Differences in the Preference for Anticipatory Self-Protective Acts. In R. Higgins, C. R. Snyder, & S. Berglas (Eds.), *Self-Handicapping: The Paradox That Isn't* (pp. 69-106). Guilford Press.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-0861-2_3

Robins, R. W., Tracy, J. L., Trzesniewski, K., Potter, J., & Gosling, S. D. (2001). Personality Correlates of Self-Esteem. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *35*, 463-482. <u>https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.2001.2324</u>

Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the Adolescent Self-Image. Princeton University Press.

- Ross, S. R., Canada, K. E., & Rausch, M. K. (2002). Self-Handicapping and the Five Factor Model of Personality: Mediation between Neuroticism and Conscientiousness. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32*, 1173-1184. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(01)00079-4</u>
- Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness Is Everything, or Is It? Explorations on the Meaning of Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*, 1069-1081. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.57.6.1069
- Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The Structure of Psychological Well-Being Revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *69*, 719-727. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.69.4.719</u>
- Schimmack, U., & Oishi, S. (2005). The Influence of Chronically and Temporarily Accessible Information on Life Satisfaction Judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*, 395-406. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.3.395</u>
- Seligman, M. E. (2011). *Flourish: A New Understanding of Happiness and Wellbeing and How to Achieve Them.* Nicholas Brealey.
- Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). Short and Extra-Short Forms of the Big Five Inventory-2: The BFI-2-S and BFI-2-Xs. *Journal of Research in Personality, 68*, 69-81. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.02.004
- Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). The Next Big Five Inventory (BFI-2): Developing and Assessing a Hierarchical Model with 15 Facets to Enhance Bandwidth, Fidelity, and Predictive Power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *113*, 117-143. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000096</u>
- Steel, P., Schmidt, J., & Shultz, J. (2008). Refining the Relationship between Personality and Subjective Well-Being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134, 138-161. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.1.138</u>
- Steger, M. F., Frazier, P., Oishi, S., & Kaler, M. (2006). The Meaning in Life Questionnaire: Assessing the Presence of and Search for Meaning in Life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *53*, 80-93. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.53.1.80</u>
- Stieger, M., Flückiger, C., Rüegger, D., Kowatsch, T., Roberts, B. W., & Allemand, M. (2021). Changing Personality Traits with the Help of a Digital Personality Change Intervention. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 118*, e2017548118. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2017548118
- Sun, J., Kaufman, S. B., & Smillie, L. D. (2018). Unique Associations between Big Five Personality Aspects and Multiple Dimensions of Well-Being. *Journal of Personality*, *86*, 158-172. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12301</u>
- Sutin, A. R., Stephan, Y., Luchetti, M., Aschwanden, D., Lee, J. H., Sesker, A. A. et al. (2022). Differential Personality Change Earlier and Later in the Coronavirus Pandemic in a Longitudinal Sample of Adults in the United States. *PLOS ONE*, *17*, e0274542. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0274542</u>
- van den Hurk, P. A. M., Wingens, T., Giommi, F., Barendregt, H. P., Speckens, A. E. M., & van Schie, H. T. (2011). On the Relationship between the Practice of Mindfulness Meditation and Personality—An Exploratory Analysis of the Mediating Role of Mindfulness Skills. *Mindfulness, 2*, 194-200. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-011-0060-7</u>

Varanarasama, E. A., Singh, A. K. A. G., & Muthu, K. A. N. (2019). The Relationship between Personality and Self-Esteem towards University Students in Malaysia. In Proceedings of the 4th ASEAN Conference on Psychology, Counselling, and Humanities (AC-PCH 2018). Atlantis Press.

Veenhoven, R. (1984). Conditions of Happiness. Reidel.

- Veenhoven, R. (2017). Measures of Happiness: Which to Choose? In G. Brulé, & F. Maggino (Eds.), *Metrics of Subjective Well-Being: Limits and Improvements* (pp. 65-84). Springer International Publishing. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-61810-4_4</u>
- Waterman, A. S. (1993). Two Conceptions of Happiness: Contrasts of Personal Expressiveness (Eudaimonia) and Hedonic Enjoyment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychol*ogy, 64, 678-691. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.64.4.678</u>
- Weber, M., & Huebner, E. S. (2015). Early Adolescents' Personality and Life Satisfaction: A Closer Look at Global vs Domain-Specific Satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 83, 31-36. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.03.042</u>
- Wood, A. M., Joseph, S., & Maltby, J. (2008). Gratitude Uniquely Predicts Satisfaction with Life: Incremental Validity above the Domains and Facets of the Five Factor Model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45, 49-54. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.02.019</u>
- Zika, S., & Chamberlain, K. (1992). On the Relation between Meaning in Life and Psychological Well-Being. *British Journal of Psychology, 83,* 133-145. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1992.tb02429.x</u>