

Happiness Study: Multiple Regression Analysis Of Demographic Characteristics And Subjective Well Being In Jorhat, Assam

Dr. Ankita Dutta¹, Dr. Juri Baruah², Dr. Rupjyoti Bhattacharjee^{3*}, Shubhangi Bordoloi⁴

¹*Assistant Professor, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Community Science, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat, Assam, India

²Retired Professor, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Community Science, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat, Assam, India

³Associate Professor, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Community Science, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat, Assam, India

⁴Project Staff, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Community Science, Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat, Assam, India

*Corresponding Author: Dr. Rupjyoti Bhattacharjee

*Email: rupjyoti.bhattacharjee@aau.ac.in, Contact No: 9435063843 (M)

ABSTRACT

The present study entitled “Happiness study: Multiple regression analysis of demographic characteristics and Subjective well-being in Jorhat, Assam” was undertaken in the Jorhat town area, Assam during 2020-2023 with the aim to analyze the relationship between demographic variables and subjective well-being. The sample consisted of 384 numbers of adults selected through Cochran’s formula for infinite population. Explanatory research design was adopted to conduct the present investigation. Demographic data was collected from the respondents using a self-constructed questionnaire. Subjective well-being count of the sample was collected using ‘Satisfaction with Life Scale’ and ‘Positive Affect and Negative Affect Scale’. Upon completion of data collection and analysis, the results indicated that the demographic variables explain 68.50% of the variability of Subjective well-being of the total respondents. The demographic variables found to be highly significant ($p < 0.001$) to the prediction of Subjective well-being were ‘age groups’, ‘marital status’, ‘family type’, ‘number of family members’, ‘parent’s education qualification’, ‘respondent’s education qualification’, ‘types of duties at work’, ‘expectation of working at the same place in future’ and ‘participation in professional development activities’. ‘Presence of dependent family members’, ‘supporting people around work’, ‘suffering from any chronic diseases by the respondent’ were found to be significantly contributing to the prediction of SWB at $p < 0.01$ level. ‘Working hours’ was significant to the prediction of SWB at $p < 0.05$ level of significance.

Keywords: Happiness, Subjective well-being, Marital status, Life satisfaction, Emotions, Self-evaluation

INTRODUCTION

Subjective well-being (SWB) is people’s cognitive and affective evaluation of their lives (Diener, 2000). It is the value of self-evaluation about how good one feels and how well one thinks his or her life is going on. SWB can also be described as the scientific term for happiness. Professor Ed Diener is one of the world’s foremost SWB researchers who coined the construct in his seminal 1984 article. Ed Diener developed a tripartite model of subjective well-being, which describes how people experience the quality of their lives and includes both emotional reactions and cognitive judgments to it. It posits three distinct but often related components of wellbeing: Frequent positive affect, Infrequent negative affect; and Cognitive evaluations of one’s life satisfaction.

There are many external and internal factors discussed by studies across countries that may affect the development of subjective well-being in an individual. Researches around the globe have found many demographic variables as predictors of well-being, such as gender, age, income etc. Women in their self-reports showed higher levels of happiness than men (Diener et al. 1997; Blanchflower and Oswald 2004). Subjective well being was reported to have a U-shaped relationship with age between 30 and 50 years (Blanchflower and Oswald 2004). Married individuals perceived higher levels of happiness than those in other states of relationships (Diener et al., 1997; Blanchflower and Oswald 1998). Positive emotions are also linked with increase in longevity, decrease in stress and a high subjective well-being in many research studies. Research indicates that wealth is related to many positive outcomes in life, such as improved physical and mental health and experience of fewer stressful life events (Wilson et al., 1995). A research study by Schult (2014) found that when holding finances and time costs constant, people with families and children are happier and show increased life satisfaction than the others. On the other hand, people in more individualistic cultures tend to rate themselves as higher in subjective well-being compared to people in more collectivistic cultures (Suh and Koo, 2008). In Western cultures, predictors of happiness include elements that support personal independence, a sense of personal agency, and self-

expression. In Eastern cultures, predictors of happiness are generally focused on an interdependent self that is inseparable from significant others.

Purpose of the study:

As Subjective well-being (SWB) is an individual approach, it provides the actual level of satisfaction a person feels and the current positive and negative emotions one is going through. With a view to maximize subjective well-being, many researchers have explored several domains that may affect one’s subjective well-being and have found wide ranges of contradictory findings. The data of World Happiness Report, 2016 revealed that developed nations, measured in terms of GDP, are happier than poor nations. The top most happy countries are developed, such as, Denmark, Switzerland, Iceland, Norway, Finland, Canada, Netherlands, New Zealand, Australia, and Sweden. Whereas, the ten countries with the lowest average happiness are poor nations. On the contrary there are some studies that states otherwise, that income has lower effect on subjective well-being in developed nations, because most of the significant drivers of subjective well-being are not directly related to income (Easterlin, 2005; Stiglitz et al., 2009). Similarly, in a study by Siedlecki et al (2014), there were no significant differences in predictors of subjective well-being across age groups. Results of such studies also emphasize that predictors of subjective well-being may be dynamic and depends on various other co-variables. Thus, more researches on the correlates of subjective wellbeing are needful, to bring into light a clear picture of how we can improve people’s quality of life by catalyzing possible predictors of SWB.

Objectives of the study: 1. To explore the demographic characteristics of the sample. 2. To explore the subjective well being of the sample. 3. To analyze the relationship between demographic variables and subjective well-being of the sample.

Methodology: An explanatory research design was adopted for conducting the present study. The sample size of 384 numbers of working adults of age 18 years and above was determined by Cochran’s formula (1977) for infinite population (n=384, confidence level=95%).

A self-constructed questionnaire was used to collect demographic and related data of the sample. ‘Satisfaction with Life Scale’ was used to determine the levels of life satisfaction; and ‘PANAS’–to find out the levels of positive affect and negative affect experienced by the sample. Summation of both the scale scores was the total subjective well-being count of each sample.

Respondents were assured that no individual data that links the respondents or their organizations’ identity would be disclosed/published anywhere. Respondents were approached for data collection after informed consent from them and the administrative heads of the selected organizations. The study was undertaken with approval from competent committee of research advisory of Assam Agricultural University, Jorhat, Assam.

Multiple regression with categorical variables and reference variables was used to find out the impact of demographic variables contributing towards subjective wellbeing.

Results and Discussion:

Objective (1): The results of demographic information of the sample are categorized further into the following sub-heads: 1.1. Personal characteristics, 1.2. Familial characteristics and 1.3. Work-related information and shown in the following tables:

Table: 1.1. Distribution of the respondents according to their personal characteristics

Variables	Categories	F	%
1. Gender	Male	166	43.22
	Female	218	56.77
2. Age	a. 18-24 years	106	27.60
	b. 25-35 years	141	36.71
	c. 36-45 years	96.00	25.00
	d. 46-55 years	30	7.81
	e. 55 and more years	10	2.60
3. Marital status	a. Married	208	54.16
	b. Unmarried	102	26.56
	c. Single now	74	19.27
4. Ordinal position	a. First born	198	51.56
	b. Middle born	107	27.86
	c. Last born	79	20.57
5. Educational qualification	a. Did not complete high school	9	2.34
	b. High school	57	14.84

	c. Higher secondary school	128	33.33
	d. Bachelor’s degree	96	25.00
	e. Diploma course	25	6.51
	f. Post graduation	78	20.31
6.Suffering from any chronic diseases	a. Yes	37	9.63
	b. No	328	85.41
	c. May be	19	4.94
7.Individual monthly income	a. Below Rs. 10,000	38	9.89
	b. Rs. 10,000 – Rs. 30,000	167	43.48
	c. Rs. 30,000 – Rs. 50,000	51	13.28
	d. Rs. 50,000 – Rs. 1 lakh	83	21.61
	e. Rs. 1 lakh – 2 lakh	45	11.71
	f. Rs. 2 lakh above	0	0

Table 1.2. Distribution of respondents according to their familial characteristics

Variables	Categories	F	%
1.Type of current family	a. Nuclear	267	69.53
	b. Joint	84	21.87
	c. Extended	24	6.25
	d. Blended (step family)	9	2.34
2.Size of the current family	a. 2-4	272	70.83
	b. 5 and more	109	28.38
	c. Single	3	0.78
3.Member who needs consistent care	a. No	192	50.00
	b. A baby/small child	56	14.58
	c. Parent(s)	95	24.73
	d. Others	41	10.67
4.Highest level of education completed by respondents’ parents	a. Did not complete high school	62	16.14
	b. High school	38	9.89
	c. Higher secondary school	49	12.76
	d. Bachelor’s degree	140	36.45
	e. Diploma course	0	0
	f. Post graduation	92	23.95
	g. Don’t know	3	0.78

1.3. Work-related information of the respondents

Table 1.3. Distribution of respondents according to their work-related information

Variables	Categories	F	%
1.Work related to education background	a. Yes	266	69.27
	b. No	118	30.72
2.Employment status	a. Full-time/ Permanent	353	91.92
	b. Not regular/ Part-time	31	8.07
3. Work hours daily	a. 1-2 hours	0	0
	b. 3-4 hours	0	0
	c. 5-6 hours	191	49.73
	d. More than 6 hours	193	50.26
4.Types of duties performed in the office	a. Duties inside the office only	312	81.25
	b. Also outdoor/field duties	152	39.58
	c. Also administrative duties including paperwork and other clerical duties etc	93	24.21
	d. Others	32	8.33
5.Duration of work experience	a. This is my first year	43	11.19
	b. 1-2 years	18	4.68
	c. 3-5 years	73	19.01
	d. 6-10 years	76	19.79
	e. 11 and more years	174	45.31

6. Expecting to work in the same place in near future	a. Yes	190	49.47
	b. No	51	13.28
	c. May be	143	37.23
7. Participation in professional development activities during the last 12 months	a. Conferences or seminars or workshops	157	40.88
	b. Trainings or development programmes	164	42.70
	c. Any more degree/diploma qualified	22	5.72
	d. Office tours/ visits	93	24.21
	e. Participation in office association activities	130	33.85
	f. Research work	31	8.07
	g. No participation	42	10.93
8. Supported people around work	a. Not yet	30	7.81
	b. Yes, with financial support	49	12.76
	c. Yes, with individual counselling (discussing how one can identify his problem and find ways to solve it)	234	60.93
	d. Personally being available when needed	110	28.64

Objective (2): The results of subjective well being of the sample are shown in the following table:

Table 2.1: Distribution of respondents according to their status of Subjective well being

Variable	Levels	F	%
Subjective well being	High	66	17.18
	Average	251	65.36
	Low	67	17.44

Objective (3): The relationship of demographic variables with subjective wellbeing (SWB) was analyzed using multiple regression with categorical variables. The demographic variables in different categories were taken as potential predictors of SWB. The use of categorical variables as independent variables in the regression model involves the application of coding methods. Coding methods in the present study refer to ways in which membership in a given group can be represented in mutually exclusive and exhaustive manner. Dummy variables are used for coding that divide the entire sample into various groups based on qualities and implicitly allowed to run the individual regressions for each sub group. It represents a group membership with dummy variables that take on values 0 and 1 (or more). This means membership in a particular group is coded as one, where as non-membership in a group is coded as zero.

Gujrati and Porter in their book ‘Basic econometrics’ (2017) states that “Once you go beyond one qualitative variable, you have to pay close attention to the category that is treated as the base category, since all comparisons are made in relation to that category. This is especially important when you have several qualitative regressors, each with several categories.” Therefore, the variables which were given highest value in the dummy table were considered as the omitted reference category in the regression models and the results for each variable is interpreted holding all other variables as constant. The categories of variables that were not responded by any respondents were automatically excluded from the regression model. Regression analysis has been run on all the independent variables considered under the study. The independent variables with their categories and reference categories are listed in the table given below.

Table 3.1.: Distribution of demographic variables with their categories and reference categories used as potential predictors in the categorical regression models

Demographic variables	Categories	Reference variable for regression
1. Type of organization	a. Government b. Private	Private
2. Gender	a. Male b. Female	Female
3. Age	a. 18-24 years b. 25-35 years c. 36-45 years d. 46-55 years e. 55 and more years	55 and more years
4. Marital status	a. Married b. Unmarried c. Single now	Single now

5. Ordinal position	a. First born b. Middle born c. Last born	Last born
6. Educational qualification	a. Respondent did not complete high school b. Respondent completed high school c. Respondent completed higher secondary school d. Respondent completed bachelors degree e. Respondent completed diploma course f. Respondent completed post graduation	Respondent completed post graduation
7. Suffering from any chronic diseases	a. No chronic illness b. May have chronic illness c. Suffering from chronic illness	Suffering from chronic illness
8. Individual monthly income	a. Income less than Rs10,000 b. Income Rs10,000 to Rs30,000 c. Income Rs30,000 to Rs 50,000 d. Income Rs50,000 to Rs 1lakh e. Income more than Rs.1 lakh	Income more than Rs.1 lakh
9. Type of current family	a. Nuclear b. Joint c. Extended d. Blended (step family)	Blended (step family)
10.Total number of members in the current family	a. 2-4 b. 5 and more c. Single	Single
11.Member who needs consistent care currently	a. No dependent member b. A baby/small child c. Dependent parent d. Other dependent member	Other dependent member
12.Highest level of education completed by respondents' parents	a. Parents did not complete high school b. Parents completed high school c. Parents completed higher secondary school d. Parents completed bachelors degree e. Parents completed post graduation f. Respondent not sure	Respondent not sure
13. Work related to education background	a. Work do not relate to education background b. Work related to educational background	Work related to educational background
14. Employment status	a. Not regularly employed b. Regularly employed	Regularly employed
15. Work hours daily	a. 5to6 work hours b. More than 6 work hours	More than 6 work hours
16.Types of duties performed in the office	a. Duties inside the office only b. Also outdoor/field duties	Other duties

	c. Also administrative duties including paperwork and other clerical duties etc d. Other duties	
17. Duration of work experience	a. First year of work experience b. Work experience of 1to2yrs c. Work experience of 3to5yrs d. Work experience of 6to10yrs e. Work experience of 11 and more years	Work experience of 11 and more years
18. Expecting to work in the same place for next few years	a. Do not expect to work in same place in future b. May work in same place c. Expect to work in same place in future	Expect to work in same place in future
19. During the last 12 months, did you participate in any of the following kinds of professional development activities	a. Conferences or seminars or workshops b. Trainings or development programmes c. Any more degree/diploma qualified d. Office tours/ visits e. Participation in office association activities f. Research work g. No participation	No participation
20. Supported people around work	a. Did not support people around work yet b. Supported with financial support c. Supported with individual counseling d. Personally being available when needed	Personally being available when needed

Regression analysis has been run on all the independent variables considered under the Table 3.1. But the table 3.2 showing the results of regression analysis depicts only the statistically significantly contributing independent variables. However, the R-value and R square value predicts the correlation and percentage of variation of all the independent variables considered under the study together. The variables in bold and parenthesis are the omitted reference variables used as base for categorical multiple regression. Interpretations of each variable is done holding all the other variables constant.

Table 3.2.: Multiple regression analysis of demographic characteristics (potential predictors) and SWB (dependent variable)

Predictor variables	Unstandardized coefficient Beta	Std. error	t	Sig.	R	R sq
18-24 yrs	-17.768	3.953	-4.495	.000***	.827	.685
25-35 yrs	-10.679	4.050	-2.636	.009**		
36-45 yrs	-8.150	3.578	-2.278	.023*		
46-55 yrs	1.654	4.054	.408	.684		
(55 years and above)						
Married	-15.041	3.306	-4.549	.000***		
Unmarried	-12.269	3.954	-3.103	.002**		
(Single now)						
Nuclear family	-18.722	4.256	-4.399	.000***		
Joint family	-19.928	3.875	-5.143	.000***		
Extended family	-15.277	4.259	-3.587	.000***		
(Blended/step family)						
2to4 family members	-23.974	5.725	-4.188	.000***		

5andmore familymember (Single)	-19.886	5.913	-3.363	.001**
No dependent member	10.312	2.966	3.477	.001**
A baby/small child	8.468	3.005	2.818	.005**
Dependent parent (Other dependent member)	2.011	3.024	.665	.506
Parents did not complete high school	25.140	6.499	3.868	.000***
Parents completed high school	26.620	6.375	4.175	.000***
Parents completed higher secondary school	29.010	6.399	4.533	.000***
Parents completed bachelors degree	24.581	6.142	4.002	.000***
Parents completed post graduation (Respondent not sure)	18.993	6.306	3.012	.003**
Respondent did not complete high school	-24.197	6.509	-3.718	.000***
Respondent completed high school	5.188	3.238	1.602	.110
Respondent completed higher secondary school	5.229	3.279	1.595	.112
Respondent completed bachelors degree	10.258	3.199	3.206	.001**
Respondent completed diploma course (Respondent completed post graduation)	7.726	3.747	2.062	.040*
5to6 work hours (More than 6 work hours)	5.485	2.209	2.483	.014*
Duties inside office only	-7.721	2.720	-2.839	.005**
Also outdoor or field activities	.708	2.140	.331	.741
Also administrative duties (Other duties)	-8.651	2.147	-4.030	.000***
Do not expect to work in same place in future	2.329	2.562	.909	.364
May work in same place (Expect to work in same place in future)	-8.669	2.384	-3.636	.000***
Attended conference/ seminar or workshops	-3.982	2.094	-1.901	.058
Training/development programmes	1.722	1.890	.911	.363
More degree or diploma qualified	8.191	4.919	1.665	.097
Office tours or visits	11.244	1.838	6.118	.000***
Participation in office association activities	-2.989	2.158	-1.385	.167
Researchwork (No participation)	-5.506	3.198	-1.158	.874
Did not support people around work yet	-10.094	3.994	-2.527	.012*
Supported with financial support	-3.324	1.674	-.193	.847
Supported with individual counseling (Personally being available when needed)	5.102	1.935	2.637	.009**
No chronic illness	5.731	1.956	2.930	.004**
May have chronic illnesses (Suffering from chronic illness)	9.871	3.799	2.598	.010*

The Table no. 3.2. presents the results of multiple regression analysis investigating demographic variables as potential predictors of subjective well-being in the respondents (N=384).

The major inferences drawn from the table are discussed below:

- With R value = 0.827, the model indicates a strong level of prediction. The demographic variables explain 68.50% of the variability of Subjective well-being of the respondents (since R square = 0.685). And the rest 31.50% of the variation is caused by factors other than the predictors included in this model.

- Respondents of 18-24 years; 25-35 years and 36-45 years of age had 17.7%, 10.67% and 8.150% lower SWB respectively, compared to those of age group of 55 or more years. But respondents of 46 to 55 years of age had 1.65% higher SWB than the ones of 55 or more years.

This means that respondents from age groups of 18-45 years had lower SWB than those from age group of 55 or more years. It can be due to the fact that younger respondents usually keep higher expectations in life which are difficult to achieve as per expectations. Older individuals with longer life experiences learn to set more realistic aspirations achievement of which contributes to their happiness. Many studies have identified a U-shaped relation between age and reported life satisfaction. These studies suggest that life satisfaction reaches its minimum between the age of mid-30s and early 50s (Blanchflower and Oswald, 1998). These reasons can contribute towards lower well-being in younger years. The present study also found that respondents of 46 to 55 years of age had higher SWB than the ones of 55 or more years. It can be supported by a study of Easterlin (2006) where he explains that the slight rise in happiness during midlife is due to growing satisfaction with one's family, life and work. But after that happiness may deteriorate as there is continuing decline of satisfaction with health and finance.

- It was found that married and unmarried (never married before) respondents had 15.04% and 12.26% lower SWB respectively than the 'single now' (divorced/widowed/separated) respondents. This finding contradicts with many researches that confirmed that married individuals have the highest level of well-being, followed by cohabiting, dating, single, and finally widowed and divorced individuals (Verbakel, 2012; Hughes & Waite, 2009; Simon, 2002). From the interviews under the present study, many participants reported that they regarded their jobs as something to look forward to, it helped them stay occupied and busy and it contributed towards life satisfaction. Though one was widowed or separated, there is a possibility that they are occupied with their jobs, and thus have good SWB count. Individuals who were divorced or separated may have better life satisfaction and lowered experience of negative affect after leaving a possible dysfunctional marriage. Single people who strive to prevent relationship conflict and disagreements were found just as happy as people involved in a relationship (Girme et al., 2015).

- Respondents from nuclear, joint and extended families were found to have lower SWB, than the those from blended or step families. This result can be explained by research studies of Ganong and Coleman (2018) & Polak and McCullough (2006), where they found 'gratitude' to be the source of happiness and life satisfaction in step families. They were happy to have another chance of a family, and the value of relationships and co-parenting were taken seriously and with patience. The respondents of the present study also revealed in the interviews that they preferred practicing positive outlook and being thankful, as it helped them to stay stable and satisfied. This can be a reason behind higher SWB among the respondents from step families.

- Respondents having 2 to 4 as well as 5 and more numbers of family members had 23.97% and 19.88% lower SWB than those living single. Most of the respondents who reported to be living single were the ones who stayed away from home in their job locations. In such cases, living alone for work might give them a sense of purpose and have lowered experience of stress to be physically present for family responsibilities. This may result in higher SWB count. Now a day's living solo is also a popular way of living with much freedom, focusing more on one's dreams, nurturing social networks, creating innovative communities and effectively dealing with discrimination (Kislev, E., 2019).

- Respondents who had no dependent members in the family, those who had a baby/small child and those with dependent parents at home needing consistent care had higher SWB than those who had other dependent members needing care. People generally regard taking care of one's offspring and ageing parents as family duties and out of most genuine concern. But taking care of other dependent members like relatives or friends may pose as an extra toll on the respondent, in addition to daily family responsibilities. In such cases, one's SWB may be lowered.

- Respondents who did not complete high school had lower SWB than those completing post graduation. But those completing high school, higher secondary school, bachelor degree and diploma course had higher SWB, than the post graduates. Many studies posit that education is a positive predictor of SWB, such as the study by Cunado & Gracia (2012). Educated people are more mature cognitively and likely to have a better life, as they have improved skills and make better choices (Kingston, et al, 2003). In addition to that, being highly educated can make one "overqualified" for many jobs, which may again lower SWB. These may be the reasons behind higher level of SWB in the respondents attaining middle level of education in the current study.

- Respondents who were working for 5-6 hours a day had 5.48% higher SWB, than those working for more than 6 hours. Longer working hours were found to be associated with lower wellbeing in many previous studies (Wong, K., 2019; Oakman, J., 2020). During the interviews, Work-life balance was reported as an important element of life by the

respondents under the present study. They asserted that they prefer balancing their busy work life with family time and recreations. Therefore, longer working hours may result in higher experience of negative emotions such as frustration and distress, and thus lower their SWB.

- Those who were working only inside the office had 7.72% lower SWB; those having additional outdoor/ field activities had 0.70% higher SWB and those having additional administrative duties had 8.65% lower SWB, compared to the ones having other duties like emergency duties, event management and business development activities.

This means that respondents with indoor work roles and additional administrative duties had lower SWB, than the respondents with other types of duties such as emergency duties, event management etc. A number of studies provide evidences that outdoor activities significantly predict subjective well-being of an individual (Zhang, Z., 2019; Jackson, S. B. et al., 2021; White, M.P. et al., 2019).

The respondents who reported being involved in other duties such as emergency duties in government organisations and event management and business development activities in private organisations, had higher SWB, than the ones having additional administrative duties. Due to pandemic situations, almost all the organisations had to involve in formulation of new administrative procedures regarding frequently changing standard operating procedures given by the government. The way of traditional working had been changing since then. These additional administrative duties may have charged extra toll on the employees, thus lowering their SWB.

- Respondents who reported that they were not expecting to work in the same place in the future had 2.32% higher SWB, compared to those who were positively expecting to work in the same office in future. But those who were not sure about working in the same place in future had 8.66% lower SWB, compared to those who were expecting to work in the same office in future. Hope and SWB has been found to be associated in some studies (Bailey, et al., 2007; Long, 2020). Employees who expect to opt for other jobs are hopeful that the next job would be better or beneficial in some ways. Therefore, it is possible that they may experience good score of SWB, compared to those who were certain about doing the same job in the future. A study by Longhi, et. al (2019) reveals that mental health declines before a job change, rises after the job change, but again falls back to the baseline level. Therefore, the respondents who were not sure about the job change in the study, may have experienced higher negative affect due to the confusion, and thus reporting lowered SWB.

- Regarding participation in professional development activities within 12 months prior to data collection, respondents who were involved in any conference/seminar/ workshop, office association activities and research work had 3.98%, 2.98% and 0.50% lower SWB respectively, compared to the ones who had no participation in any of the listed professional development activities in the questionnaire during that period.

The COVID-19 crisis had popularized a substantial increase in online learning and online working among people. Virtual participation in seminars and conferences have become so common that, anyone can join those from anywhere at any time. Without physical learning experiences, the impact of such events may not be as sustaining as the impact of practical offline interactions with experts. At the time of data collection, already blended type of working had started. People had started attending offices personally. But most of the professional development programs were still online. So, attending office physically and adjusting such online participation to the blended schedule of work can be challenging and lowly satisfying. This can lead to lowered SWB among those respondents. Regarding research activities, people involved in survey work and lab work faced tremendous challenges due to lockdown, social distancing, unavailability of lab materials and lack of staff attending. This may be a reason behind lowered SWB among these people.

However, those involved in training/ development programmes had 1.72% higher SWB, those who qualified anymore degree/diploma during that period had 8.19% higher SWB and those participating in any office tours/visits had 11.24% higher SWB, than the ones who had no participation in any of the listed professional development activities.

Some people used the period of lockdown for skill development. Unlike attending any available webinars, some people opted for longer and more engaging training programs to develop new skills and some people focused on personal growth by qualifying another degree program or new diplomas. In addition to that office tours and visits might have helped people be reconnected and refreshed. Therefore, the respondents who were involved in training programs, acquired any other degree/diploma and participated in office tours may show higher SWB, than the ones who did not participate in any development programs during the previous 12 months of data collection.

- Regarding the act of supporting people around work, respondents who reported to have not been supporting anyone around work yet, had 10.09% lower SWB, than the ones who supported people by personally being available when needed. Also, those respondents who supported people with only financial help had 0.32% lower SWB, than the reference group. But those who supported people by individually counselling them about their problems had 5.10% higher SWB, than the ones who supported people by personally being available when needed.

Morrison et al. (2012) found that both life satisfaction and positive feelings predicted reports of prosocial activities. Oishi et al. (2007) found that happier people volunteer more. Therefore, the respondents who had not supported any people yet, had lower SWB. Also, those who supported people around work with only financial help, had lower SWB, compared to those who invested more of their time and personal effort for people by personally being available when needed. On the other hand, the respondents who supported people through individually counselling them about their problems and discussing solution had higher SWB among all the other groups. This may be because discussing with someone about

their problems and deciding on possible solutions to certain problems would be a learning experience for both the parties. In such cases, one may have higher SWB.

- Respondents who were not suffering from any chronic diseases and also those who were not sure about the presence of any chronic diseases in them had 5.73% and 9.87% higher SWB, than the ones confirming to have suffered from chronic diseases. This finding can be supported by the fact that presence of any chronic disease causes varying degrees of disruption to an individual's life. This disruption may impact on one's quality of life or well-being (Devins et al., 1983).

Conclusion

The demographic variables explain 68.50% of the variability of Subjective well-being of the total respondents. The demographic variables found to be highly significant ($p < 0.001$) to the prediction of SWB were 'age groups', 'marital status', 'family type', 'number of family members'; 'parent's education qualification', 'respondent's education qualification', 'types of duties at work', 'expectation of working at the same place in future' and 'participation in professional development activities'. 'Presence of dependent family members', 'supporting people around work', 'suffering from any chronic diseases by the respondent' were found to be significantly contributing to the prediction of SWB at $p < 0.01$ level. 'Working hours' was significant to the prediction of SWB at $p < 0.05$ level of significance.

The results have supported many popular prior findings in the area, though a few interesting contradictory findings were also observed. Large-scale research on subjecting well-being and demographic characteristics can be undertaken in terms of other confounding variables also, so as to discover ways to sustain a healthy ratio of the phenomena for a longer quality living.

References:

1. Argyle, M.; Martin, M. and Crossland, J. (1989). Happiness as a Function of Personality and Social Encounters. In: Recent Advances in Social Psychology: An International Perspective. Forgas, J.P. and Innes, J.M. (eds.). Elsevier Science Publishers B.V., North-Holland, pp. 189-247.
2. Bailey, T. C. and Snyder, C.R. (2007). Satisfaction with life and hope: A look at age and marital status. *The Psychological Record*, 57(2), 233-240.
3. Blanchflower DG, Oswald AJ. (2004). Well-being over time in Britain and the USA. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 88(7-8), 1359-1386.
4. Blanchflower DG, Oswald AJ. (1998). What makes an entrepreneur? *Journal of Labor Economics*, 16(1), 26-60.
5. Bos, E.H.; Snippe, E.; de Jonge, P. and Jeronimus, B.F. (2016). Preserving Subjective Wellbeing in the Face of Psychopathology: Buffering Effects of Personal Strengths and Resources. *PloS One*, 11(3), e0150867.
6. Cochran, W.G. (1977). Sampling techniques (3rd edn.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
7. Costa, P.T. and McCrae, R.R. (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: Happy and unhappy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(4), 668-678.
8. Cunado, J. and De Gracia, F.P. (2012). Does Education Affect Happiness? Evidence for Spain. *Social Indicators Research*, 108(1), 1-12.
9. Devins, G.M.; Blinik, Y.M.; Hutchinson, T.A.; Hollomby, D.J.; Barre, P.E. and Guttmann, R.D. (1983). The emotional impact of end-stage renal disease: Importance of patients' perceptions of intrusiveness and control. *International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine*, 13(4), 327-343.
10. Diener Ed, Eunkook S, Shigehiro O. (1997). Recent findings on subjective well-being Indian. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 24, 25-41.
11. Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 34-43.
12. Easterlin, R.A. (2005). Feeding the Illusion of Growth and Happiness: A Reply to Hagerty and Veenhoven. *Soc. Indic. Res.*, 74, 429-443.
13. Easterlin, R.A. (2006). Life cycle happiness and its sources - Intersections of psychology, economics, and demography. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 27(4), 463-482.
14. Ganong, L.; Coleman, M.; Chapman, A. and Jamison, T. (2018). Stepchildren Claiming Stepparents. *Journal of Family Issues*, 39(6), 1712-1736.
15. Girme, Y.U.; Nickola, F. and Sivailele, S.C. (2015). Happily Single: The Link Between Relationship Status and Well-Being Depends on Avoidance and Approach Social Goals. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, DOI: 10.1177/1948550615599828.
16. Gujarati, D.; Porter, D. and Gunasekar, S. (2017). Basic Econometrics Paperback. 5th Edn. McGraw Hill Education, ISBN-10: 9780071333450.
17. Hughes, M.E. and Waite, L.J. (2009). Marital biography and health at mid-life. *J. Health Soc. Behav.*, 50(3), 344-358.

18. Jackson, S.B.; Stevenson, K.T.; Larson, L.R.; Peterson, M.N. and Seekamp, E. (2021). Outdoor Activity Participation Improves Adolescents' Mental Health and Well-Being during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(5), 2506.
19. Jones, E. (1953). The life and work of Sigmund Freud. *Basic Books*.
20. Kingston, P.W.; Hubbard, R.; Lapp, B. and Wilson, J. (2003). Why Education Matters. *Sociology of Education*, 76(1), 53.
21. Kislev, E. (2019). 1st Edn. Publisher University of California Press, USA, ISBN-10 : 0520299140 .
22. Long, L.J.; Bistricky, S.L.; Phillips, C.A.; D'Souza, J.M.; Richardson, A.L.; Lai, B.S.; Short, M. and Gallagher, M.W. (2020). The potential unique impacts of hope and resilience on mental health and well-being in the wake of hurricane Harvey. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 33, 962-972.
23. Longhi, S.; Nandi, A.; Bryan, M.; Connolly, S. and Gedikli, C. (2019). Do all job changes increase wellbeing? Technical Report, What works well being.
24. Lucas, R.E.; Diener, E. and Suh, E. (1996). Discriminant validity of well-being measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(3), 616-628.
25. Morrison, M.; Tay, L. and Diener, E. (2012). Subjective well-being across the lifespan worldwide. Paper submitted for publication, University of Western Ontario.
26. Oakman, J.; Kinsman, N.; Stuckey, R. et al. (2020). A rapid review of mental and physical health effects of working at home: how do we optimise health?. *BMC Public Health*, 20, 18-25.
27. Oishi, S.; Diener, E. and Lucas, R. (2007). The optimum level of well-being: Can people be too happy? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2, 346-360.
28. Polak, E.L. and McCullough, M.E. (2006). Is gratitude an alternative to materialism? *Journal of Happiness Studies: An Interdisciplinary Forum on Subjective Well-Being*, 7(3), 343-360.
29. Schult, M. (2014). Parenthood and life satisfaction: Why don't children make people happy? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76, 319-336.
30. Simon, R.W. (2002). Revisiting the Relationships among Gender, Marital Status, and Mental Health. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 107, 1065-1096.
31. Steel, P.; Schmidt, J. and Shultz, J. (2008). Refining the relationship between personality and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134, 138-161
32. Stiglitz, J.E.; Sen, A. and Fitoussi, J.P. (2009). Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress. *The Commission Paris*.
33. Suh, E.M. and Koo, J. (2008). Comparing subjective well-being across cultures and nations: The "what" and "why" questions. In : The science of subjective well-being. Eid, M. and Larsen, R.J. (eds.). *Guilford Press*, pp. 414-427.
34. Verbakel, E. (2012). Subjective Well-Being by Partnership Status and Its Dependence on the Normative Climate. *Eur. J. Population*, 28, 205-232.
35. White, M.P.; Alcock, I.; Grellier, J.; Grellier, J.; Wheeler, B.W.; Hartig, T.; Warber, S.L.; Bone, A.; Depledge, M.H. and Fleming, L.E. (2019). Spending at least 120 minutes a week in nature is associated with good health and wellbeing. *Sci. Rep.*, 9, 7730.
36. Wilson, R.M.; Runciman, W.B.; Gibberd R.W.; Harrison, B.T.; Newby, L.; Hamilton, J.D. (1995). The Quality in Australian Health Care Study. *Med J Aust*. 163(9), 458-71. doi: 10.5694/j.1326-5377.1995.tb124691.x. PMID: 7476634.
37. Wong, K.; Chan, A. and Ngan, S.C. (2019). The Effect of Long Working Hours and Overtime on Occupational Health: A Meta-Analysis of Evidence from 1998 to 2018. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(12), 2102.
38. World Happiness Report (2017). Sustainable Development Solutions Network. New York. ISBN 978-0-9968513-5-0.
39. Zhang, Z. (2019). Outdoor group activity, depression, and subjective well-being among retirees of China: The mediating role of meaning in life. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 24(9), 1245-1256.