



E-ISSN: 2278-4136
P-ISSN: 2349-8234
JPP 2019; 8(6): 247-251
Received: 10-09-2019
Accepted: 14-10-2019

Pratibha H Devaramane
MHS. Student, Department of
Human Development and
Family Studies, College of
Community Science, University
of Agricultural Sciences,
Dharwad, Karnataka, India

Ganga V Yenagi
Professor of Psychology,
Department of Extension
Education, College of
Agriculture, University of
Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad,
Karnataka, India

Corresponding Author:
Ganga V Yenagi
Professor of Psychology,
Department of Extension
Education, College of
Agriculture, University of
Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad,
Karnataka, India

Psychological well-being of urban and rural adults

Pratibha H Devaramane and Ganga V Yenagi

Abstract

The present study was conducted to examine the psychological well-being of urban and rural adults. A sample of 360 adults of which 180 each from Dharwad and Gadag districts were randomly selected. Adults were administered with Ryff's psychological well-being scale which consists of 42 items and six dimensions. The data were subjected to t and F analysis to compare psychological well-being of urban and rural adults. The results revealed that more than 50 per cent of the urban adults had medium level of psychological well-being and more than 50 per cent of rural adults had high level of psychological well-being. Emerging adults, young adults and middle adults of urban area differ significantly on autonomy whereas rural emerging, young and middle adults differ significantly on overall psychological well-being. All the three groups of adults in urban area exhibited similar level of psychological well-being.

Keywords: Psychological well-being, emerging adults, young adults and middle adults

Introduction

In today's modern and competitive world, it has been observed that everyone around the globe is facing stress, anxiety and symptoms of depression. Achieving an adequate level of psychological well-being is a challenge for everybody. Wellbeing is a term that always appears to be difficult to explain by a single definition. It is a dynamic concept that includes subjective, social and psychological dimensions as well as health-related behaviours. Psychological wellbeing is the dynamic and active process that gives a sense of knowledge to the people about how their lives are enduring the interaction between their circumstances, activities and psychological resources or 'mental capital'. Feelings of wellbeing are vital to the overall health of individuals, enable them to successfully overcome difficulties and achieve what they want out of life. An individual with a high psychological well-being is happy, capable, well-supported, satisfied with professional and personal life. Psychological well-being is also considered as a major factor for optimal human functioning (Ryff & Keyes, 1995; Ryff & Singer, 1998) ^[8, 9], occasionally investigated as a predictor variable or an antecedent of individual positive development, but also as the outcome of high levels of subjective well-being (Ryff, 2013) ^[10]. Psychological well-being may be influenced by factor like age, gender, family, locality etc. The age of a person may be an important phenomenological variable that determines whether people take into account their aging attitudes when evaluating their own lives. People who feel relatively old should be more likely to take into account their aging attitudes when evaluating their lives than people who feel relatively young because the former feel closer to the age group to which those attitudes are relevant. Hence, present study was conducted with the objectives to analyse psychological well-being among urban and rural adults and to compare psychological well-being among emerging, young and middle adults of urban and rural areas.

Materials and Methods

The study was conducted among 360 adults of which 180 were from Dharwad and 180 were from Gadag districts. A randomly selected sample of 180 adults each from urban and rural areas were so selected that 60 were emerging adults, 60 were young adults and 60 were middle adults. The Ryff Psychological Well-Being Scale (1995) ^[8] was used to measure Psychological well-being of adults. The scale consists of 42 items and the scores ranges from 1 to 6 (i.e., 1= very strongly disagree and 6=very strongly agree). Among 42 items 22 items are positively scored and 20 items are negatively scored (i.e., if the score is 6 then it is adjusted to 1 and vice versa). The scale has 6 dimensions like Autonomy, Environmental mastery, Personal growth, Positive relations, Purpose in life and Self-acceptance. The maximum score for overall psychological well-being is 252 and for each dimension 42 is the maximum score. The data collected were subjected to t test to compare psychological well-being of urban and rural adult groups. F test was used to compare psychological well-being between emerging, young and

middle adults of urban and rural areas. Karl Pearson's correlation was used to know the Relationship of age, income, education, occupation, size of family and socio-economic status with psychological well-being.

Results and Discussion

Distribution of respondents on demographic characteristics is

presented in table 1. About 53 percent of the urban adults and 76 per cent of rural adults were graduates. About 13 per cent of urban and 15 per cent of rural adults were educated between 10th and graduation. Fifty per cent of the urban adults and 56.11 per cent of the rural adults were working in private sectors.

Table 1: Distribution of respondents on demographic characteristics N=360

Variables	Category	Urban (n=180)	Rural (n=180)
Age	Emerging adults (18-24 years)	60 (33.33)	60 (33.33)
	Young adults (25-40 years)	60 (33.33)	60 (33.33)
	Middle adults (40-60 years)	60 (33.34)	60 (33.34)
Gender	Male	90 (50.00)	90 (50.00)
	Female	90 (50.00)	90 (50.00)
Education	Professional qualification with technical degrees or diplomas	21 (11.77)	14 (7.88)
	Post-graduation	34 (18.99)	-
	Graduation	96 (53.33)	137 (76.11)
	10 th class pass but < graduation	23 (12.88)	27 (15.00)
	Primary pass but <10 th class	6 (3.03)	2 (1.01)
	< Primary but attended school at least one year	-	-
	Just literate but no schooling	-	-
Occupation	Illiterate	-	-
	Service in Central/State/Public undertakings	54 (30.00)	37 (20.66)
	Service in Private sector/business	90 (50.00)	101 (56.11)
	Service at shops, transport, own cultivation of land	36 (20.00)	42 (23.23)
	Self-employment with income >5000	-	-
	Self-employment with income <5000	-	-
	Unemployment	-	-

Figures in the parenthesis indicates percentages

Table 2 shows the distribution of adults' familial characteristics. Nearly 83 per cent of urban adults and 76 per cent of rural adults were from nuclear families where as 17 per cent of urban adults and 24 per cent of rural adults were from joint families. About 52 per cent of the urban adults and 62 per cent of rural adults had small families while 31 per cent of urban and 27 per cent of rural adults had medium families. Nearly 17 per cent of the urban adults and 11.11 per cent of the rural adults were from large families. Majority of the urban adults (68.99%) and rural adults (71.77%) had

average income of Rs. 10,000-49,999. About 56 per cent of the urban adults belonged to lower middle class while 25 per cent from upper high socio economic status group, 16.11 per cent belonged to low socio economic status group and only 3.99 per cent were from high socio-economic status group. In case of rural adults about 48 per cent were from poor class, 30 per cent from lower middle class, 19.44 per cent from upper high and 2.88 per cent from high socio-economic group. None of the rural respondents were from upper high or very poor categories.

Table 2: Distribution of respondents on familial characteristics N=360

Variables	Category	Urban (n=180)	Rural (n=180)
Type of family	Nuclear	150 (83.33)	136 (75.66)
	Joint	30 (16.67)	44 (24.34)
Size of family	Small	93 (51.77)	112 (62.22)
	Medium	56 (31.11)	48 (26.77)
	Large	31 (17.12)	20 (11.01)
Income	>50000	49 (27.22)	36 (20.00)
	10000-49999	124 (68.89)	129 (71.77)
	<1000 -9999	7 (3.89)	15 (8.23)
Socio-economic status	Upper high	-	-
	High	7 (3.99)	5 (2.88)
	Upper high	45 (25.00)	35 (19.44)
	Lower middle	99 (55.55)	54 (30.00)
	Poor	29 (16.40)	86 (47.68)
	Very poor or below poverty line	-	-

Figures in the parenthesis indicates percentages

Table 3 shows the distribution of urban and rural adults on dimensions of psychological well-being and overall psychological well-being. Majority of the urban (82.22%) and rural adults (77.22) exhibited medium level of autonomy, about 62 per cent of the urban adults and 52 per cent of rural adults had medium level of environmental mastery. With

regard to personal growth, about 54 per cent of the urban adults and 71 per cent of rural adults had high level of personal growth, about 61 per cent of urban adults and 68 per cent of rural adults had high level of positive relations, about 58 per cent of urban adults and 71.77 per cent of rural adults had high level of positive relations, almost equal percentage

of the urban adults (50.66% and 48.99%) exhibited medium and high level of self-acceptance and about 63 per cent of rural adults had high self-acceptance. With regard to overall psychological well-being, it was found that about 53 per cent of urban adults had medium level of psychological well-being

and 54 per cent of the rural adults had high levels of psychological well-being, nearly 47 per cent of the urban adults had high level of psychological well-being and 46.11 per cent of the rural adults had medium level of psychological well-being.

Table 3: Distribution of adults on psychological well-being. N=360

Variables	Urban (n=180)			Rural (n=180)		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Autonomy	2 (1.11)	148 (82.22)	30 (16.67)	5 (2.78)	139 (77.22)	36 (20.00)
Environmental mastery	-	112 (62.22)	68 (37.78)	-	93 (51.77)	87 (48.23)
Personal growth	-	83 (46.11)	97 (53.89)	-	53 (29.44)	127 (70.56)
Positive relations	-	71 (39.44)	109 (60.56)	-	58 (32.22)	122 (67.78)
Purpose in life	-	76 (42.22)	104 (57.78)	-	51 (28.33)	129 (71.67)
Self-acceptance	1 (0.66)	91 (50.66)	88 (48.88)	-	66 (36.77)	114 (63.23)
Overall psychological well-being	-	96 (53.33)	84 (46.67)	-	83 (46.11)	97 (53.89)

Figures in the parenthesis indicates percentages

Table 4 shows comparison of mean scores of three groups-emerging, young and middle adults in urban and rural areas on psychological well-being. Table revealed that urban emerging, young and middle adults differed significantly on autonomy ($f=3.42^*$). Emerging adults had significantly higher autonomy (28.03) than young and middle adults. The reason could be that autonomy is the independence and regulation of behaviour through internal locus of control and emerging adults generally would like to be more independent. The results are in line with the results of Ryff (1989)^[7] who found that middle adults scored higher on autonomy, environmental mastery and purpose in life. Young and middle adults scored

better on personal growth than older adults. In rural area, a significant difference was found for overall psychological well-being ($f=9.77^*$). Rural young adults exhibited significantly better psychological well-being (191.10) than rural emerging and middle adults. The results are on par with Nepomuceno *et al.* (2015)^[5] who revealed that urban and rural adults differed significantly on well-being. Urban emerging, young and middle adults did not differ significantly on any of the dimensions of psychological well-being except autonomy while rural adults also did not differ on any of the dimensions of psychological well-being.

Table 4: Comparison of three adult groups of urban and rural areas on psychological well-being N=360

Components	Urban (n=180)				Rural (n=180)			
	Emerging adults	Young adults	Middle adults	F-value	Emerging adults	Young adults	Middle adults	F-value
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)		Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	
Psychological well-being								
Autonomy	28.03 (4.37)	26.52 (3.51)	26.47 (3.20)	3.42*	26.97 (4.780)	26.95 (4.87)	27.33 (4.28)	0.13 ^{NS}
Environmental mastery	29.05 (3.69)	29.85 (3.37)	29.65 (3.80)	0.79 ^{NS}	30.45 (4.24)	31.25 (3.15)	29.87 (4.29)	1.87 ^{NS}
Personal growth	30.25 (4.41)	31.27 (4.58)	30.98 (4.33)	0.84 ^{NS}	31.78 (5.33)	33.47 (3.80)	32.05 (4.28)	2.41 ^{NS}
Positive relations	31.62 (4.40)	32.12 (3.81)	31.30 (4.51)	0.56 ^{NS}	31.68 (4.59)	33.52 (4.35)	32.17 (4.86)	2.55 ^{NS}
Purpose in life	30.53 (5.67)	31.88 (5.01)	31.20 (4.65)	1.04 ^{NS}	32.65 (5.04)	33.68 (3.85)	32.90 (4.98)	0.80 ^{NS}
Self-acceptance	29.87 (4.87)	30.63 (3.34)	30.08 (4.68)	0.49 ^{NS}	31.62 (4.71)	32.90 (4.58)	31.85 (4.42)	1.34 ^{NS}
Overall psychological well-being	179.35 (20.47)	182.27 (15.54)	179.77 (17.46)	0.46 ^{NS}	176.72 (17.84)	191.10 (17.19)	185.53 (18.85)	9.77*

* $p \leq 0.05$ level of significance, NS- Non Significant

Comparison of mean scores of urban and rural adults on psychological well-being is presented in table 5. The table revealed that urban and rural emerging adults differed significantly on dimension of psychological well-being like purpose in life ($t=2.16^*$) and self-acceptance ($t=2.00^*$). Rural emerging adults exhibited better purpose in life and better self-acceptance than urban emerging adults. Urban adults will have more exposure which leads to different aspirations and purpose which rural adults lack. This in turn make the urban adults confused. Since rural adults will have less exposure and hence set definite goal. Urban and rural young adults differed

significantly on environmental mastery ($t=2.35^*$), personal growth ($t=2.87^{**}$), purpose in life ($t=2.21^*$), self-acceptance ($t=3.09^{**}$) and overall psychological well-being ($t=2.95^{**}$). In all dimensions of psychological well-being and overall psychological well-being rural young adults scored better than urban young adults. Urban and rural young adults did not differ on positive relations and autonomy. A significant difference between urban and rural middle adults was found for self-acceptance ($t=2.21^*$). Rural middle adults exhibited better self-acceptance (31.85) than urban middle adults.

Table 5: Comparison of urban and rural adults on psychological well-being. N=360

Variables	Emerging (n=120)			Young (n=120)			Middle (n=120)		
	Urban	Rural	t-value	Urban	Rural	t-value	Urban	Rural	t-value
Autonomy	28.03 (4.37)	26.97 (4.78)	1.28 ^{NS}	26.52 (3.51)	26.95 (4.87)	0.56 ^{NS}	26.47 (3.20)	27.33 (4.28)	1.26 ^{NS}
Environmental mastery	29.05 (3.69)	30.45 (4.24)	1.93 ^{NS}	29.85 (3.37)	31.25 (3.15)	2.35*	29.65 (3.80)	29.87 (4.29)	0.29 ^{NS}
Personal growth	30.25 (4.41)	31.78 (5.33)	1.72 ^{NS}	31.27 (4.58)	33.47 (3.80)	2.87 ^{**}	30.98 (4.33)	32.05 (4.28)	1.36 ^{NS}
Positive relations	31.62 (4.40)	31.68 (4.59)	0.08 ^{NS}	32.12 (3.81)	33.52 (4.35)	1.87 ^{NS}	31.30 (4.51)	32.17 (4.86)	1.01 ^{NS}
Purpose in life	30.53 (5.67)	32.65 (5.04)	2.16*	31.88 (5.01)	33.68 (3.85)	2.21*	31.20 (4.65)	32.90 (4.98)	1.93 ^{NS}

Self-acceptance	29.87 (4.87)	31.62 (4.71)	2.00*	30.63 (3.34)	32.90 (4.57)	3.09**	30.08 (4.68)	31.85 (4.41)	2.12*
Overall psychological well-being	179.35 (20.47)	176.72 (17.84)	0.75 ^{NS}	182.27 (15.53)	191.10 (17.18)	2.95**	179.77 (17.46)	185.53 (18.85)	1.74 ^{NS}

* $p \leq 0.05$ level of significance, ** $p \leq 0.01$ level of significance NS- Non Significant

Table 6 presents relationship of demographic variables with psychological well-being of urban emerging, young and middle adults in urban area. With regard to emerging adults, it was observed that education was significantly and positively related to positive relations ($r = 0.27^*$) and purpose in life ($r = 0.27^*$). These results are in line with the results of Moe (2012)^[4] and Ibitoye and Sanuade (2014)^[2] who reported that education and psychological well-being are positively related. Socio-economic status was significantly and positively related to autonomy (0.27^*) and self-acceptance (0.27^*). These

results are supported by Vera-villarroel *et al.* (2015)^[12] who reported that socio-economic status and autonomy are positively related. Reshma and Manjula (2016)^[6] found that adults belonging to high socio-economic status groups have significantly higher levels of self-acceptance. Other independent variables like age, occupation, composition and income were not related to any of the dimensions of psychological well-being and also with overall psychological well-being.

Table 6: Relationship of independent variables with psychological well-being of urban emerging, young and middle adults N=180

Emerging adults (n=60)							
Components	Autonomy	Environmental mastery	Personal growth	Positive relations	purpose in life	Self-acceptance	Overall psychological well-being
Age	0.03	-0.05	0.09	-0.03	-0.15	-0.01	-0.03
Income	0.01	-0.03	-0.09	-0.18	-0.17	0.15	-0.07
Education	0.16	-0.12	-0.16	0.27*	0.27*	-0.18	-0.19
Occupation	0.25	-0.13	-0.04	-0.04	-0.15	0.12	-0.00
Size of family	0.11	0.08	-0.02	-0.04	-0.06	0.07	0.02
Socio-economic status	0.27*	0.12	0.09	-0.00	0.09	0.27*	0.19
Young adults (n=60)							
Age	-0.29*	-0.03	-0.12	-0.01	0.17	-0.35**	-0.13
Income	0.38**	-0.07	-0.02	0.18	0.03	0.15	0.15
Education	0.14	-0.23	-0.16	-0.08	0.32*	-0.00	-0.19
Occupation	0.28*	-0.08	0.01	0.19	0.01	0.17	0.14
Size of family	-0.11	-0.20	-0.19	-0.27*	-0.15	-0.24	-0.29*
Socio-economic status	0.01	-0.02	0.34**	-0.10	-0.15	-0.03	-0.19
Middle adults (n=60)							
Age	0.00	-0.11	-0.19	-0.23	-0.15	-0.13	-0.20
Income	0.15	0.08	0.11	0.13	-0.02	0.24	0.16
Education	-0.07	-0.18	-0.02	-0.15	0.24	-0.18	-0.08
Occupation	0.17	0.26*	0.18	0.07	0.13	0.22	0.24
Size of family	-0.19	0.04	0.16	0.05	0.09	-0.02	0.05
Socio-economic status	-0.05	-0.06	-0.05	0.09	-0.06	0.17	0.02

** $p \leq 0.01$ level of significance

* $p \leq 0.05$ level of significance

With respect to urban middle adults, it was found that there was a significant positive relation between occupation and environmental mastery (0.26^*). These results are on par with the results of Vera-Villarroel *et al.* (2015)^[12] who found that higher the level of occupation better the level of psychological well-being. Age, income, education, size of family and socio-economic status were not related to any of dimensions of psychological well-being and overall psychological well-being.

Table 7 shows the relationship of demographic variables and psychological well-being of rural emerging, young and middle adults. The table revealed that a significant but negative correlation between age and purpose in life ($r = -0.29^*$) while negative but non-significant relation was found between age and other dimensions of psychological well-being like autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations, self-acceptance and also with overall psychological well-being. The results are supported by Springer *et al.* (2011)^[11] who reported that purpose in life and age are negatively related.

With regard to rural young adults, it was revealed that age was negatively and significantly related to self-acceptance ($r = -0.29^*$). Education was positively and significantly related to purpose in life ($r = 0.27^*$) and self-acceptance ($r = 0.30^*$). It was also found that size of family and purpose in life are significantly but inversely related ($r = -0.32^*$) indicating that increase in size of family improves the purpose in life. The results are supported by results of Springer *et al.* (2011)^[11] who found that age was negatively related to self-acceptance, education had positive and significant relationship with purpose in life and self-acceptance. The results are on par with Moe (2012)^[4] and Ibitoye and Sanuade (2014)^[2] who reported that education had positive relationship with psychological well-being.

Among urban middle adults income was positively and significantly related to positive relations (0.30^{**}) and purpose in life (0.39^{**}). Socio-economic status was positively and significantly related to purpose in life (0.34^{**}) of the rural middle adults. Kaplan *et al.* (2008)^[3] revealed that higher level of income and socio-economic status promotes positive relations and personal growth.

Table 7: Relationship of independent variables with psychological well-being of rural emerging, young and middle adults N=180

Emerging adults (n=60)							
Variables	Autonomy	Environmental mastery	Personal growth	Positive relations	Purpose in life	Self-acceptance	Overall psychological well-being
Age	-0.04	-0.16	-0.09	-0.01	-0.29*	-0.14	-0.09
Income	-0.18	-0.06	-0.15	-0.04	-0.12	0.07	-0.15
Education	0.04	0.21	0.14	0.06	0.12	0.13	0.17
Occupation	-0.18	-0.11	-0.20	-0.13	-0.25	-0.04	-0.16
Size of family	0.07	-0.11	-0.06	0.01	-0.15	-0.03	0.04
Socio-economic status	0.08	-0.09	-0.13	-0.02	-0.09	-0.09	-0.01
Young adults (n=60)							
Age	-0.08	-0.12	0.15	0.11	0.05	-0.29*	-0.06
Income	0.06	0.16	0.08	0.17	0.16	0.07	0.08
Education	0.08	0.18	0.03	0.06	0.27*	0.30*	0.21
Occupation	0.10	-0.11	-0.08	-0.00	-0.16	-0.12	-0.08
Size of family	0.10	0.07	-0.20	-0.14	-0.32*	-0.09	-0.13
Socio-economic status	0.21	0.22	0.09	0.08	0.16	0.14	0.22
Middle adults (n=60)							
Age	-0.12	0.03	-0.06	0.10	0.06	0.03	0.01
Income	0.06	-0.20	-0.16	0.30*	0.39**	-0.02	-0.24
Education	-0.25	0.23	-0.03	0.15	0.17	0.12	0.09
Occupation	0.15	-0.03	0.05	0.09	0.04	0.14	0.12
Size of family	-0.07	0.11	0.04	-0.04	-0.13	-0.08	-0.04
Socio-economic status	0.16	-0.08	-0.10	-0.21	0.34**	-0.08	-0.16

** $p \leq 0.01$ level of significance

* $p \leq 0.05$ level of significance

Conclusion

The present study ascertained the psychological well-being among urban and rural emerging, young and middle adults. The results revealed that half of the urban adults had medium level of psychological well-being, while majority of rural adults had high level of psychological well-being. The results also revealed that urban emerging adults, young adults and middle adults differ significantly on dimension of psychological well-being like autonomy, whereas rural emerging, young and middle adults differ significantly on overall psychological well-being.

References

- Clarke PJ, Marshall VW, Ryff CD, Rosenthal CJ. Well-being in Canadian seniors: Findings from the Canadian study of health and aging. *Canadian Journal of Aging*. 2000; 19:139-159.
- Ibitoye OG, Sanuade OA. Psychological well-being and the elderly in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Sociol. Anthropol.* 2014; 12:74-85.
- Kaplan GA, Shema SJ, Leite MCA. Socioeconomic determinants of psychological well-being: The role of income, income change, and income sources over 29 years. *Annual Epidemiology*. 2008; 18(7):531-537.
- Moe K. Factors influencing women's psychological well-being within a positive functioning framework. Ph. D. Dissertation, College of Education, Univ. Kentucky. Lexington, Kentucky, 2012.
- Nepomuceno BB, Cardoso AAV, Ximenes VM, Joao Paulo Pereira Barros JPP, Jader Ferreira Leite JF, Mental health, well-being, and poverty: A study in urban and rural communities in Northeastern Brazil. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention Communication*. 2015; 44(1):63-75.
- Reshma NS, Manjula MY. Psychological well-being across gender and socio-economic status among middle adults. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*. 2016; 3(3):64-70.
- Ryff CD. Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1989; 57:1069-1081.
- Ryff CD, Keyes C. The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1995; 69:719-727.
- Ryff CD, Singer B. The contours of positive human health. *Psychological Inquiry*. 1998; 9:1-28.
- Ryff CD. Psychological well-being revisited: advances in the science and practice of Eudaimonia. *Psychotherapy Psychosomatics*. 2013; 83:10-28.
- Springer KW, Pudrovskaya T, Hauser RM. Do psychological well-being change with age? Longitudinal tests of age variations and further exploration of the multidimensionality of Ryff's model of psychological well-being. *Social Science Research*. 2011; 40(1):392-398.
- Vera-Villarreal P, Celis-Atenas K, Lillo S, Contreras D, Diaz-Pardo N, Torres J *et al.* Towards a model of psychological well-being. The role of socioeconomic status and satisfaction with income in Chile. *University Psychology*. 2015; 14(3):1055-1066.
- [http://www.pcy.org.au/PDF/Clubs/Beenleigh/Ryff-s-Psychological-Well-Being-Scales-\(PWB\)-1.aspx](http://www.pcy.org.au/PDF/Clubs/Beenleigh/Ryff-s-Psychological-Well-Being-Scales-(PWB)-1.aspx)