

<https://doi.org/10.31108/2.2021.4.24.8>

УДК 159.922:316.37

Olena Savchenko
Oleksandra Kaliuk

THE STRUCTURE OF STUDENTS' SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

Savchenko, Olena, Kaliuk, Oleksandra. The structure of students' subjective well-being.

Introduction. Subjective well-being is one of the indicators of success and a basis of person's socio-psychological adjustment to uncertain situations and unstable social relations. The complexity of this phenomenon requires clarifying its structure.

Aim. To determine the structure of students' subjective well-being.

Methods. Cognitive Features of Subjective Well-Being (KOSB-4) (O. Kaliuk, O. Savchenko), Subjective Well-Being Scale (A. Perrudet-Badoux, G. Mendelsohn, J. Chiche, adapted by M. Sokolova), Life Satisfaction Index A, LSIA (B.L. Neugarten, adapted by N. Panina), Arousal and Optimism Scale, AOS (I.S. Schuller, A.L. Comunian, adapted by N. Vodopyanova). The methodological basis is a structural-functional approach. Factor and correlation analyses were done using «STATISTICA 10.0».

Results. Empirical verification of the author's model of subjective well-being revealed the existence of three independent components in its structure (cognitive-behavioral, emotional, and contrasting).

Conclusions. Students' cognitive and behavioral aspects of well-being are not separated, they form a single factor. There is a polarity in well-being in the form of positive and negative factors.

Key words: psychological well-being, subjective well-being, psychological health, structural-functional approach, components of subjective well-being

Савченко Олена, Калюк Олександра. Структура суб'єктивного благополуччя студентів.

Вступ. Одним з індикаторів психологічного здоров'я є показник психологічного благополуччя. Психологічне благополуччя визначається і описується через суб'єктивне благополуччя. Суб'єктивне благополуччя є одним з показників успішності і умовою соціально-психологічної адаптації особистості до невизначених ситуацій, нестабільних соціальних відносин. Складність даного явища потребує чіткості в виокремленні його структурних компонентів.

Мета. Мета дослідження полягає у визначенні структури суб'єктивного благополуччя студентів.

Методи. Застосовані методики, які діагностують різні аспекти суб'єктивного благополуччя: «Когнітивні особливості суб'єктивного благополуччя (КОСБ-4)» (О. Калюк, О. Савченко), «Шкала суб'єктивного благополуччя» (A. Perrudet-Badoux, G. Mendelsohn, J. Chiche) у адаптації М. Соколової, «Індекс життєвої задоволеності, LSIA» (B. Neugarten) у адаптації Н. Паніної, «Шкала оптимізму та активності, AOS» (I.S. Schuller, A.L. Comunian) у адаптації Н. Водоп'янової. Методологічною основою дослідження є структурно-функціональний підхід. Були застосовані процедури факторного та кореляційного аналізів («STATISTICA 10.0»).

Результати. Емпірична перевірка авторської моделі суб'єктивного благополуччя виявила існування 3 незалежних складових у структурі цього феномена, які виконують різні функції. Так виявлено, що когнітивно-поведінковий компонент виконує адаптаційну функцію, емоційний – регуляторну, а контрастуючий – мотивуючу.

Висновки. Було встановлено, що у студентської молоді когнітивні та поведінкові аспекти благополуччя не розведені, вони утворюють єдиний фактор. У дослідженні знайшло підтвердження припущення щодо поєднання у конструкції «Суб'єктивне задоволення» гедоністичних (пошук задоволення, насолоди) та евдемоністичних (пошук задоволеності від життя, наповненого сенсом буття) мотивів. Також знайшов підтвердження феномен полярності стану благополуччя, що існує на тлі протиставлення «позитивного» та «негативного», «успіху» та «невдачі», «задоволення» та «розчарування» та ін.

Ключові слова: психологічне благополуччя, суб'єктивне благополуччя, психологічне здоров'я, структурно-функціональний підхід, складові суб'єктивного благополуччя.

Савченко Елена, Калюк Александра. Структура субъективного благополучия студентов.

Вступление. Субъективное благополучие является одним из показателей успешности и условием социально-психологической адаптации личности к неопределенным ситуациям, нестабильным социальным отношениям. Сложность данного явления требует четкости в определении его структуры.

Цель. Цель исследования - изучить структуру субъективного благополучия студентов.

Методы. Применены методики, которые диагностируют разные аспекты субъективного благополучия: «Когнитивные особенности субъективного благополучия (КОСБ-4)» (А. Калюк, Е. Савченко), «Шкала субъективного благополучия» (A. Perrudet-Badoux, G. Mendelsohn, J. Chiche) в адаптации М. Соколовой, «Индекс жизненной удовлетворенности, LSIA» (B. Neugarten) в адаптации Н. Паниной, «Шкала оптимизма и активности,

AOS» (I.S. Schuller, A.L. Comunian) в адаптации Н. Водопьяновой. Структурно-функциональный подход - методологическая основа исследования. Применены процедуры факторного и корреляционного анализ («STATISTICA 10.0»).

Результаты. Эмпирическая проверка авторской модели субъективного благополучия выявила существование 3 независимых составляющих в структуре этого феномена (когнитивно-поведенческий, эмоциональный и контрастирующий компоненты).

Выводы. Было установлено, что у студенческой молодежи когнитивные и поведенческие аспекты благополучия не разведены, они образуют единый фактор. Также нашел подтверждение феномен полярности состояния благополучия, который существует на фоне противопоставления «положительного» и «негативного».

Ключевые слова: психологическое благополучие, субъективное благополучие, психологическое здоровье, структурно-функциональный подход, составляющие субъективного благополучия

Introduction. There is a spread of depression, anxiety, rapid growth of aggression and conflict situations under the conditions of excessive social change, the crisis of society, reduced social activity, increasing stressful factors. All these factors depress a person and negatively affect their emotional conditions, thus requiring strengthening their mental health. One of the indicators of mental health is the level of psychological well-being. The World Health Organization considers psychological well-being as the main criterion of health, which includes physical, spiritual and social well-being. Psychological well-being is defined and described through subjective well-being, which manifests itself as the ability to overcome difficulties, optimize their emotional background, constructively resolve conflicts, and others. Subjective well-being is one of the indicators of success and a ground of personal socio-psychological adaptation to uncertain situations, unstable social relations.

Currently, there are several areas of research on well-being, namely: philosophical, sociological, medical, psychological, economic and environmental. Among them, the psychological approach to the study of well-being is the most developed and empirically justified. The study of the psychological well-being phenomenon makes it possible to distinguish two main approaches: eudemonistic (C. Ryff (2014), E.L. Deci, R.M. Ryan (2000), etc.) and hedonistic (N.M. Bradburn (1965), E. Diener (2009), A.S. Waterman (2008), etc.). In the eudemonistic paradigm, the subject of research is psychological well-being in the context of the personality's full functioning. The main attention is paid to the process of intra-personal resources actualization by a person. As a consequence of this realizing person experiences the fullness of one's life, achievement of a stable state of satisfaction, which extends to all aspects of life. In the hedonistic paradigm, the subject of study is subjective well-being. The main focus is on the study of subjective experiences of joy and happiness that a person feels in connection with satisfaction with their lives, the results of their activities and themselves.

The approaches to the study of well-being allow us to distinguish two interrelated terms: «psychological well-being» and «subjective well-being». Therefore, there is a need to distinguish between these two concepts. The concepts «personal potential», «positive traits», «psychological resources» are usually used to interpret psychological well-being. At the same time the subjective well-being is considered through the concepts of «happiness», «life satisfaction», «quality of life».

The theoretical basis for understanding the psychological well-being phenomenon was laid by N.M. Bradburn and D. Caplovitz (1965), who actually introduced into scientific using this concept of «psychological well-being» and identified it with the subjective feeling of happiness and general satisfaction with life. The scientist created a model that has reflected the structure of psychological well-being as a balance between positive and negative affects. However, later the interest in the psychological well-being assessment was shifted towards the cognitive and value aspects of life, towards the search for more objective indicators, normative criteria. Thus, C. Ryff was one of the first, who attempted to operationalize the construct of «psychological well-being» by associating it with other personal constructs that reflect various aspects of successful functioning. The researcher squared its content with the «peaks of human potential» (mental health, self-realization, maturity, self-determination) (Zhukovskaya & Troshikhina, 2011). Among the main measures of psychological well-being, C. Ryff identified the following: self-acceptance, personal growth, autonomy, environmental mastery, positive relationships with others, and purpose in life. The researcher has believed that everything should not be reduced to a hedonistic experience of «good life», because such indicator does not have a reliable conceptual basis. There were obtained «the important evidence as to why eudaemonic well-being may be consequential for health and well-being – namely, because it is fundamentally anchored in how individuals negotiate their way through the challenges of life» (Ryff, 2014).

E. Diener (2009), on the contrary, insisted that well-being has have a subjective nature, so the research subject of psychologists should be both positive and negative affects, and satisfaction with life in general, its individual areas (work, family, financial standing, health and etc.). The researcher also raised the question of the

interconnectedness of the various components of subjective well-being, and hence the need to study the structure of this psychological phenomenon. E. Diener proposed a three-component structure of subjective well-being, which includes life satisfaction, positive and negative affects. Thus, we can identify two components of subjective well-being, namely the cognitive assessment of satisfaction with different areas of life and the emotional aspect (balance between negative or positive affects experienced by a person).

Russian researchers M. Lebedeva and G. Verbina have specified the main difference between the approaches that study psychological and subjective well-being in the focus on external (psychological well-being) and internal (subjective well-being) criteria, «in the internal and external interpretations» of life and personal experiences (Lebedeva & Verbina, 2021: 51). Subjective experience refers to the certain aspect of mental reality that reflects the self-perception and self-esteem of personal life, its detached events, which correspond to personality's ideas and standards in regard to curiosity, complexity, richness and abundant life. We agree with the opinion of K. Sheldon (2016) that well-being is a non-specific subjective indicator of the constructive conduct of life processes. It is both the result of human activity and the background for planning and implementing the following forms of behavior. Often the experience of well-being is accompanied by higher emotions (a meaningful existence, value and sense of activity, inspiration in performing activities) (Osin & Leontev, 2020).

Yu. Oleksandrov (2009) has associated psychological well-being with the productive aspects of activity, while subjective well-being has been associated with evaluative one. The experience of psychological well-being arises as a result of achieving significant goals and challenges for the individual. Subjective well-being is manifested in the general life satisfaction, in the predominance of positive affects over negative ones. In addition to these two aspects, the researcher has proposed the resource component (personal maturity, which reflects the level of social competence, emotional intelligence, creative position in life, personal potential, etc.), as well as procedural (the means of self-actualization, «personal expressiveness of their own goals») and structural (harmonious ratio of different life spheres, integration and hierarchy of goals, meanings) aspects. We would like to emphasize that for our study the distinction between productive and emotional aspects of satisfaction is the most important difference between psychological and subjective well-being.

Therefore, «psychological well-being» is thought of as an integrative psychological phenomenon, based on the coherence between the requirements of society and human capabilities, manifested through the experience of fullness and saturation of personal existence. And «subjective well-being» is a complex experience based on a positive perception of the results of their activity and assessment of their current state as successful, sublime. It is reflected in integrative assessments and experiences of «happiness», «life satisfaction», «high quality of life».

Aim. To determine the structure of subjective well-being as a significant basis of personal psychological healthy.

In accordance with the aim, the main tasks of the study included:

- 1) development of a model of subjective well-being of the individual;
- 2) testing the proposed concept model in an empirical study;
- 3) finding the relationship between components of subjective well-being and markers of mental health.

Analyzing the components of subjective well-being, we consider it necessary to add a behavioral component to the cognitive (evaluation function) and emotional (experience regulation function) aspects, which were defined in the concept of E. Diener. R. Shamionov (2008) has pointed to the behavioral manifestations of subjective well-being. The author has considered subjective well-being not only as an indicator of the personal inner world, but also as an important regulator of social behavior, because the relationships between internal changes and externally expressed activity of the subject were established in a large number of studies. Researcher has stated that subjective well-being as an integral socio-psychological formation is determined by a person's ideas about himself, his life, relationships, inner states, etc. Presenting his own structure-functional model of subjective well-being, the author has noted that subjective well-being performs at least four functions: regulatory (or adaptive), developmental, executive (or «behavioral») and managing (control of cognitive processes).

In developing our own model, we assumed that subjective well-being consists of three components:

- 1) emotional component (emotional comfort, the balance between positive and negative affects);
- 2) cognitive component (positive assessment of personal life in general and its different events, life satisfaction);
- 3) behavioral component (means of optimizing personal life and activating the process of achieving vital goals).

The emotional component performs a regulatory function, cognitive - evaluative, and behavioral - adaptive. Due to the presence or absence of a subjective experience of well-being, a person can activate various means of optimizing their behavior in different situations, especially in situations of high uncertainty.

Methods. The methodological basis of the research was a structural study, which involves the analysis of the mental phenomenon composition, the main components that perform different functions, and the establishment of relationships between them. According to the bases of the structural-functional approach, each component of the system must perform its specific function, which ensures the integral functioning of the whole system (Savchenko, 2016). Thus, the analysis of the subjective well-being components allowed us to identify those aspects of this phenomenon that ensure its permanence and specificity of individual manifestations. The standardized psychological techniques were used to diagnose certain aspects of the functioning of subjective well-being, namely: «Cognitive features of subjective well-being (KOSB-4)» (O. Kaliuk, O. Savchenko), «Scale of Subjective Well-Being» (A. Perrudet-Badoux, G. Mendelsohn, J. Chiche) in the adaptation of M. Sokolova, «Life Satisfaction Index A, LSIA» (B.L. Neugarten) in the adaptation of N. Panina, «Arousability and Optimism Scale, AOS» (I.S. Schuller, A.L. Comunian) in the adaptation of N. Vodopyanova.

In order to diagnose the cognitive component of subjective well-being, the method «Cognitive features of subjective well-being (KOSB-4)» (O. Kaliuk, O. Savchenko) was used. This technique focuses on identifying 4 aspects of the personal life fullness: general satisfaction with personal life, satisfaction with the process of self-realization, satisfaction with other people relationships, dissatisfaction with oneself and frustration in life. The researchers suggested that the assessment process occurs through a comparison of the existing level of experience with certain internal standards that are formed in the process of education. These standards reflect basic, implicit, poorly understood ideas about success, completeness of existence, etc.

The method «Scale of Subjective Well-Being» (A. Perrudet-Badoux, G. Mendelsohn, J. Chiche) in the adaptation of M. Sokolova was used to diagnose the emotional component of the well-being experience. The individuals have been assessing their condition by comparing the number of positive and negative emotions, establishing a certain ratio of them. This technique also takes into account the following aspects of mental health: tension and sensitivity; signs accompanying the basic psychosomatics; decrease in mood; health concerns, etc.

The behavioral component of subjective well-being was studied using the «Life Satisfaction Index A (LSIA)» (B.L. Neugarten) adapted by N. Panina. This tool allowed us to diagnose the following behavioral manifestations of well-being: resolution and fortitude; congruence between desired and achieved goals, as well as emotional (zest for life, positive mood tone) and cognitive (positive self-concept) aspects of well-being.

The level of activity and optimism in forecasting future performance were important for our study, because we have considered them as essential markers of well-being in the behavioral sphere. The method «Arousability and Optimism Scale (AOS)» (I.S. Schuller, A.L. Comunian) was used in the adaptation of N. Vodopyanova. According to the methodology, the level of optimism reflects the general positive attitude of the individual for the future, which is manifested in the overestimation of the success chances and underestimation of the probability of failure, in the appreciation of their ability to overcome difficulties and solve problems. The level of activity reflects the tendency of the individual to vigorously achieve goals by increase in the level of emotional arousal.

To verify the proposed concept model, the factor analysis procedure (principal components method with Varimax normalized matrix rotation, «STATISTICA 10.0» program) and correlation data analysis were used.

Sample. The study involved students of different courses of Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman, who study in different specialties. Participation in the study was voluntary. The sample size is 42 people. The average age is 20.6 years. The sex distribution was as follows: women - 31 persons (74%), men - 11 persons (26%).

Results and discussion. Table 1 demonstrates the results of factor analysis, which confirms the existence of several independent aspects of subjective well-being that correspond to the content of its components.

The obtained factor structure reflects 63.7% of the total dispersion, which indicates its relatively high prognostic value. This structure explains more than half of the individual variability of subjects in the manifestations of subjective well-being. The structure is formed by three independent significant factors. The significance of the factors was tested by the Humphrey test. It is established that cognitive and behavioral aspects of the students' well-being are not divorced, they form a single factor, combining those aspects that are associated with a positive generalized assessment of their lives (0.87), their relationships with others (0.81), positive self-concept, which includes praising themselves and their own actions (0.59), and behavioral manifestations that reflect the willingness of the individual to consistently achieve the goals (resolution and

fortitude (0.67) and congruence between desired and achieved goals (0.64)). Individuals who receive high values for this factor are characterized by high satisfaction with the course of their lives, other people relationships and the obtained results. They show optimism in forecasting and explaining the results of their activity, adherence to pre-formed plans, their results meet the goals. Also we would like to note that such people have a positive emotional background, do not tend to lower mood for no reason.

Table 1

Structure of a person's subjective well-being, defined empirically

Indicators of subjective well-being	Cognitive-behavioral component	Emotional component	Contrasting component
General satisfaction with personal life	0,87	0,21	0,01
Dissatisfaction with oneself and frustration in life	0,09	-0,25	0,74
Satisfaction with other people relationships	0,81	0,18	0,08
Emotional discomfort	-0,44	-0,86	0,10
Tension and sensitivity	-0,18	-0,78	0,04
Signs accompanying the basic psychosomatics	-0,30	-0,82	0,14
Decrease in mood	-0,54	-0,56	-0,17
Health concerns	-0,33	-0,63	-0,25
Arousability	-0,17	0,60	-0,003
Optimism	0,79	0,23	0,11
Zest for life	0,09	0,34	0,69
Resolution and fortitude	0,67	-0,002	0,02
Congruence between desired and achieved goals	0,64	0,15	0,13
Positive self-concept	0,59	0,24	0,41
Positive mood tone	0,39	0,65	0,36
Total dispersion rate	27,7	26,1	9,9

The second factor, which reflects the emotional component of well-being, is equally significant. This factor included all indicators of psychological health, which were diagnosed by the level of tension and sensitivity (-0.78), psychosomatic manifestations (-0.82), the tendency to a sharp decrease in mood (-0.56), health concerns (-0.63). All these symptoms form a general dissatisfaction with themselves and their lives, which is experienced as emotional discomfort (-0.86). The subjects who do not show the described symptoms have a higher level of total arousability (0.60) and a more positive mood tone (0.65). According to E. Osin and D. Leontev, the subjective well-being combines «satisfaction» and «enjoyment». The first factor more reflects the level of life contentment, based on cognitive assessments, little related to sensory experiences of exaltation, pleasure and ecstasy. The content of the first factor is more related to the interest, the fullness of inclusion in the life process, the experience of its adequacy, compliance with their own standards. The content of the second factor, on the contrary, is associated with strong emotional experiences of «enjoyment», which «has a strong sensory, emotional, hedonistic component: ecstasy, admiration, orgasm, comfort, pleasure, etc., and is almost unrelated to cognitive processes» (Osin & Leontev, 2020: 120). Since the level of personal arousability fell into this factor, it confirms the hypothesis made in L. Vekker studies (1998), that one of the main functions of emotional and sensory components of subjective experience is the overall energization of the body, bringing it in a state of efforts mobilization. We can also add that such energization is determined by the level of psychological health, because we have high negative correlations between the arousability level and indicators

of health, namely: the level of tension and sensitivity ($r = -0.43$; $p < 0.01$), signs accompanying the basic psychosomatics ($r = -0.30$; $p < 0.05$), health concerns ($r = -0.32$; $p < 0.05$), general emotional discomfort ($r = -0.33$; $p < 0.05$). People who experience emotional discomfort are «dissatisfied with themselves and their situation, deprived of trust in others and hope for the future, they have difficulty in controlling their emotions, feel themselves as unbalanced, inflexible, and constantly worry about real and imagined problems» (Sokolova, 1996). Such a strong focus on health problems blocks the channels of activity expression reduces the effectiveness of self-regulatory processes and, as a result, a person feels apathy and helplessness.

The content of the third factor is related to the opposite experiences, namely: dissatisfaction with yourself, general frustration in life. Thus, we can assume that well-being is an experience that has two distinct poles: positive and negative. Experiencing positive, pleasant emotions occur against the background of comparing this current state with past unpleasant impressions, or with anxious expectations for the future. Similarly, the unpleasant experience occurs with the simultaneous experience of losing the positive emotions, in contrast. Such bipolarity is expressed in Ukrainian proverbs «There is good luck in misfortune», «There is happiness in a dream, but nuisance is in the reality», «A road to happiness lies through grief».

Thus, we can assume that the state of satisfaction is not compared with the neutral level, which is characterized by absence of satisfaction and well-being, but the experience of pleasure is relevant to the negative state: dissatisfaction, unhappiness, emptiness. This polarity of factors will be the subject of our further research, as we need to investigate its causes and nature. Only two variables: the level of dissatisfaction with oneself and frustration in life (0.74) and the level of zest for life (0.69) form the composition of the third factor. It is interesting to note that they have the same sign of factor loading, and therefore dissatisfaction can take on the task of an internal motivator, which enhances intellectual emotions, promotes search activity. E. Osin and D. Leontiev have noted that «for different people the same level of satisfaction can characterize a pleasant but passive and meaningless life, or an active, meaningful life, but full of difficulties» (Osin & Leontiev, 2020: 121). On the analogy, we can say that dissatisfaction can lead to both apathy and activity. The experience of displeasure can stimulate a fuller involvement in life, seek new sources that can bring satisfaction, and thus become the basis of subjective well-being. It was found that the higher the level of zest for life (LSIA), the higher the personality symptoms of psychological health and lower the signs of unhealthiness: the tendency to a rapid decrease in mood ($r = -0.30$; $p < 0.05$), the overall level of emotional discomfort ($r = -0.35$; $p < 0.05$).

Conclusions. The study empirically tested the structural-functional model of subjective well-being. The results of factor analysis identified three independent factors that reflect the cognitive-behavioral and emotional aspects of the subjective well-being functioning. This proves that the subjective well-being is a complex experience, which is based on a positive perception of their activity results and assessment of their current state of soul as successful, sublime. This condition is reflected in the experiences of «happiness», «life satisfaction», «high quality of life». The third factor is related to the experience of self-dissatisfaction, which can motivate a person to actively seek new sources of positive emotions, change your inner state. Thus, the three components of subjective well-being perform three different functions: cognitive-behavioral component performs adaptive function, emotional component – regulatory of activity, and contrasting component (focusing on problems, dissatisfaction with oneself) – motivating. The study confirmed the hypothesis about combination of hedonistic (search for pleasure, enjoyment) and eudemonic (search for life satisfaction, meaningful being) motives in the construct «Subjective well-being». Also, the hypothesis of the well-being state polarity, which exists against the background of the opposition of «positive» and «negative», «success» and «failure», «satisfaction» and «disappointment», etc., was confirmed.

Further research may focus on the in-depth study of the well-being nature as a bipolar experience, an analysis of implicit standards with which a person compares his current state. Also, the problem of combining cognitive and behavioral aspects of well-being into a single factor is of interest for researchers. This can be due to both age and cultural factors. Conducting research on different age samples and comparing the structure of «subjective well-being» of Ukrainians with the structure of people of other nationalities are the tasks of further scientific intelligence.

References

1. Vekker, L. M. (1998). *Psikhika i realnost: Edinaya teoriya psikhicheskikh processov. [Psyche and reality: unified theory of mental processes.]* Smysl. <http://psylib.org.ua/books/vekk101/index.htm> [In Russian]
2. Zhukovskaya, L. V., & Troshikhina, E. G. (2011). Shkala psikhologicheskogo blagopoluchiya K. Riff. [K. Riff's Scale of psychological well-being] *Psikhologicheskij zhurnal*. 32(2), 82-93. [In Russian]
3. Lebedeva, M. V., & Verbina, G. G. (2021). Subektivnoe i psikhologicheskoe blagopoluchie kak kategorii sovremennoj psikhologii. [Subjective and psychological well-being as a category of modern psychology] *Mezhdunarodnyj zhurnal mediciny i psikhologii*, 4(5), 48-51. [In Russian]

4. Oleksandrov, Yu. M. (2009). Samorehuliatyia yak chynnyk psykholohichnoho blahopoluchchia. [Self-regulation as a factor of psychological well-being.] *Visnyk KhNPU im. H.S. Skovorody. Psykholohiia*, 32, 175-179. [In Ukrainian]
5. Osin, E. N., & Leontev, D. A. (2020). Kratkie russkoyazychnye shkaly diagnostiki subektivnogo blahopoluchhiya: psikhometricheskie kharakteristiki i sravnitel'nyj analiz. [Brief Russian-Language Instruments to Measure Subjective Well-Being: Psychometric Properties and Comparative Analysis.] *Monitoring obshchestvennogo mneniya: konomicheskie i socialnye peremeny*, 1, 117-142. <https://doi.org/10.14515/monitoring.2020.1.06>. [In Russian]
6. Savchenko, O. V. (2016). *Refleksyivna kompetentnist osobystosti: Monohrafiia*. [Reflexive personality competence: Monograph.] PP Vyshemyrskyi V. S. [In Ukrainian]
7. Sokolova, M. V. (1996). *Shkala subyektivnogo blahopoluchhiya (SHSB): rukovodstvo*. [Scale of Subjective Well-Being (SSB): A Guide.] Psikhodiagnostika. https://www.isras.ru/index.php?page_id=2384&id=3737&l= [In Russian]
8. Shamionov, R. M. (2008). *Subyektivnoe blahopoluchne lichnosti: psikhologicheskaya kartina i faktory*. [Subjective well-being of personality: psychological picture and factors.] Izd-vo Saratovskogo un-ta. [In Russian]
9. Bradburn, N. M., & Caplovitz, D. (1965). *Reports on Happiness. A Pilot Study of Behavior Related to Mental Health*. Aldine Publishing Company.
10. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000) The «What» and «Why» of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1104_01.
11. Diener, E. (Ed.) (2009). Culture and Well-Being: The collected works of Ed Diener. *Social Indicators Research Series*, 38. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2350-0.2>
12. Ryff, C.D. (2014). Psychological Well-Being Revisited: Advances in the Science and Practice of Eudaimonia. *Psychother Psychosom*, 83, 10-28. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000353263>
13. Sheldon, K. (2016) Putting Eudaimonia in its Place: On the Predictor, Not the Outcome, Side of the Equation. In Vittersø J. (Ed.) *Handbook of Eudaimonic Well-Being* (pp. 531-541). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-42445-3_36
14. Waterman, A. S., Schwartz, S. J., & Conti, R. (2008). The implications of two conceptions of happiness (hedonic enjoyment and eudaimonia) for the understanding of intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9, 41-79. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-006-9020-7>

Information about the authors

Савченко Олена Вячеславівна, доктор психологічних наук, професор, професор кафедри педагогіки та психології, Київський національний економічний університет імені Вадима Гетьмана, Київ, Україна

Savchenko, Olena V., Dr., Prof., Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman, Kyiv, Ukraine

E-mail: savchenko.elena.v@gmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/000-0002-7069-7419>

Калюк Олександра Олександрівна, магістрантка другого року навчання, спеціальність Психологія, Київський національний економічний університет імені Вадима Гетьмана, Київ, Україна

Kaliuk, Oleksandra O., student, Kyiv National Economic University named after Vadym Hetman, Kyiv, Ukraine

E-mail: aleks150599@gmail.com

Отримано 5 жовтня 2021 р.
Рецензовано 14 жовтня 2021 р.
Прийнято 18 жовтня 2021 р.