The Spanish Journal of Psychology (2016), **19**, e84, 1–9.
© Universidad Complutense de Madrid and Colegio Oficial de Psicólogos de Madrid
doi:10.1017/sjp.2016.95

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Can Big Five Facets Distinguish between Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being? A Dominance Analysis

Rosario J. Marrero, Mar Rey and Juan Andrés Hernández-Cabrera

Universidad de la Laguna (Spain)

Abstract. In this study, the aim was to analyze the relative importance of Five-Factor Model (FFM) personality facets for eudaimonic or psychological well-being (PWB) and hedonic or subjective well-being (SWB) through dominance analyses. The participants were 1,403 adult residents of Spain (mean age 37.2 years, *SD* = 13.9). As expected, facets captured a substantial proportion of the variance in PWB and SWB, with PWB being better predicted than SWB (explaining around 36–55% of the variance of PWB vs. 25% of the variance of SWB). Some facets were common to both types of well-being such as depression (explaining between 5–33% of the variance), vulnerability (explaining between 4–21% of the variance), positive emotions (explaining between 2-9% of the variance) and achievement striving (explaining between 2–10% of the variance), whereas others made a unique contribution according to type of well-being. Certain facets had a greater relative importance for women's well-being -e.g., positive emotions explained 9% of the variance of self-acceptance for women vs. 3% for men- and others for men's well-being -e.g., achievement striving explained 9% of the variance of personal growth for men vs. 2% for women-. The present results contribute to the literature by identifying which Big Five facets showed greater relative importance in explaining and distinguishing between PWB and SWB for women and men.

Received 1 March 2016; Revised 2 November 2016; Accepted 3 November 2016

Keywords: big five, dominance analyses, psychological well-being, subjective well-being.

In recent years the number of studies related to well-being has grown exponentially. There is consensus among researchers that well-being is not necessarily the absence of ill-being, and the two constructs have been shown to be independent and compatible (Keyes, Shmotkin, & Ryff, 2002). Happiness is considered to be a life goal for most if not all individuals and is a key component of well-being. Two types of well-being have been described: hedonic or subjective well-being (SWB) based on maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985), and eudaimonic or psychological well-being (PWB) based on the concept of a meaningful life and full realization of human potential (Ryff, 1989). SWB has been defined in terms of a cognitive and an affective component: Life satisfaction is the global cognitive appraisal of one's life as a whole (Diener et al., 1985), and the balance between positive and negative affect reflects individual happiness (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). PWB is based on Aristotelian philosophical assumptions about "a meaningful life" or a life worth living. PWB reflects the full development of capabilities and self-actualization. Ryff's (1989) conceptualization of PWB, comprising six dimensions which were used in the present study: self-acceptance involves a positive attitude towards oneself and acceptance of one's limitations; positive relations with others refers to the ability of individuals to love and trust each other; autonomy refers to independence and self-regulation of behavior, ceasing to be influenced by external pressure; environmental mastery consists of the ability to choose or create environments most suitable for one's conditions; purpose in life is the need to set goals or objectives that give meaning to life; and personal growth is based on striving to develop one's potential, to grow and expand as a person, only possible by optimizing the above-mentioned dimensions.

Although related, both types of well-being have been shown to be different (Keyes et al., 2002). Adults who reported higher levels of PWB also showed greater life satisfaction, more positive affect and less negative affect (Keyes et al., 2002) but the correlation between the summed measure of PWB and the summed measure of SWB was only .59. Chen, Jing, Hayes, and Lee (2013) have found that components of both PWB and SWB have unique explanatory power, over and beyond overall well-being. Besides, these authors note that each component of well-being can be differentially related to other well-being measures, personality, goals, locus of control or quality of social relations.

In this article, we examine empirical links between personality and both types of well-being. Personality traits are central to the understanding of the individual.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rosario J. Marrero Quevedo. Dept. of Clinical Psychology, Psychobiology and Methodology. Faculty of Psychology. Universidad de La Laguna. Campus de Guajara, s/n. 38205. Tenerife (Spain).

E-mail: rmarrero@ull.edu.es

https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2016.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The Five-Factor Model (FFM), often referred to as the "Big Five", is the most widely used integrative model of characteristics of personality (McCrae & Costa, 1997; McCrae & Terracciano, 2005). Extraversion, conceived as activity and sensation seeking, comprises warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, excitement-seeking and positive emotions; Neuroticism, focusing on emotional stability and adjustment, is composed by the facets: anxiety, hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness and vulnerability; Agreeableness, referring to interest in interpersonal interactions, comprising the facets trust, straight forwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty and tender-mindedness; Conscientiousness, including goal-directed behaviours and impulse control, whose facets are competence, order, dutifulness, achievement striving, self-discipline and deliberation; and to Openness to Experience, involving intelligence, creativity or interests and cultural level, comprising openness to fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, ideas and values. Previous research has found substantial associations between Big Five broad dimensions and SWB but few empirical works have jointly analyzed the relationships between constitutive Big Five facets, SWB and PWB (Anglim & Grant, 2014; Chen et al., 2013; Keyes et al., 2002). Facets within these broad domains could provide further information about the connection with the two types of well-being. Costa and McCrae (1999) suggested that each facet captures unique personality information.

Most previous research has demonstrated that Neuroticism is one of the most prominent predictors of PWB and SWB (Marrero & Carballeira, 2011; Schmutte & Ryff, 1997; Steel, Schmidt, & Shultz, 2008). Neurotic individuals generally report more negative affect than emotionally stable individuals (Watson et al., 1988). Also, Extraversion shows a close association with high levels of positive affect (Watson et al., 1988). In addition, Conscientiousness has also been linked to SWB and PWB (Marrero & Carballeira, 2011; Marrero & Carballeira, 2012; Schmutte & Ryff, 1997). However, Agreeableness and Openness to experience do not seem to be related with SWB but have an association with certain dimensions of PWB. Agreeableness is linked to positive relations with others and Openness to experience is associated with personal growth (Marrero & Carballeira, 2012; Schmutte & Ryff, 1997). Empirical evidence suggests a greater relationship between Big Five broad dimensions and PWB than between these traits and SWB, explaining 40–62% of the variance of PWB (Anglim & Grant, 2014; Hounkpatin, Wood, Boyce, & Dunn, 2015). However, we have not found studies analyzing the relationship between the Big Five facets and the two types of well-being in the same work.

Some scholars have analyzed the associations between Big Five facets and SWB. In this regard, positive emotions and assertiveness, both facets of Extraversion, have been identified as determinants of happiness and life satisfaction (Marrero & Carballeira, 2011; Schimmack, Oishi, Furr, & Funder, 2004). On the other hand, facets of Neuroticism, such as depression, appear to be among the most powerful predictors of happiness and life satisfaction, while vulnerability is related to positive and negative affect (Marrero & Carballeira, 2011). Thus, there is some support for the claim that Big Five facets show substantially greater predictive utility than the Big Five broad dimensions. Although, Schmutte and Ryff (1997) suggested that the facets would provide additional information to the understanding of PWB, only one study has examined Big Five facets in relation to PWB (Siegler & Brummett, 2000). These authors used four measures equivalent to Ryff's dimensions (self-acceptance, environmental mastery, positive relations with others and purpose in life) and examined the associations between facets and PWB at the bivariate level. The results showed that not all Big Five facets were equally associated to PWB. Although these findings suggest the relevance of Big Five facets for PWB, bivariate statistics are not able to capture the complexity of relationships between personality facets and well-being. Thus, further research is needed to clarify the relative power of lower-order Big Five levels for predicting PWB and SWB.

Certain sociodemographic characteristics have showed be associated with some dimensions of PWB, but consistent relationships between SWB and sociodemographic factors were not found. Some authors have found gender differences in PWB with women having more positive relations with others (Ryff, 2014) and greater personal growth (Marrero & Carballeira, 2012) than men. Purpose in life and personal growth decrease with age, whereas environmental mastery and autonomy increase with age (Ryff, 2014).

Therefore, the current study addresses whether Big Five facets provide a sufficiently detailed description of both types of well-being. We sought to identify those Big Five facets that are common to both types of well-being and which make a unique contribution to each of them. Some Big Five facets, mainly from Neuroticism, Extraversion and Conscientiousness, were expected to be closely related with SWB and PWB, although not all would have equal weight for the prediction of each type of well-being (Schmutte & Ryff, 1997; Siegler & Brummett, 2000; Soto, 2015). Gender differences are also expected in the facets that explain PWB but no are expected for SWB (Marrero & Carballeira, 2012). This study explores a new direction in understanding and measuring the relative contribution of each facet to the explanation of well-being by

https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2016.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

means of dominance analysis. The merit of dominance analysis is that it allows statistically decomposing the total predicted variance of the regression model according to the importance of each predictor.

Method

Participants

The study sample consisted of 1,403 Spanish adults ranging in age from 17 to 78 years (M = 37.2, SD = 13.9) and 47.11% were women. Regarding educational level, 55% had a secondary school education, 21% university and 18% primary school.

Participants were contacted through psychology students. The researchers requested them to locate people of different ages and professions who were willing to participate in the study. All participants were informed about the aim of the study, anonymity and confidentiality regarding the information gathered. The questionnaires were administered individually at home. Completion of these involved consent for them to be used exclusively for the purposes of research.

Instruments

Ryff's Psychological Well-being Scales were used (PWBS; Ryff, 1989). The original version consists of six dimensions of 14 items per scale. In this study, the Spanish version of 39 items proposed by Díaz et al. (2006) was used. The six dimensions were assessed on a six-point answering scale, ranging from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 6 (*totally agree*). Well-being measures were constructed by summing the scores on the individual items. The individuals with higher scores on each scale were considered to have higher well-being. In this study, Cronbach's alpha was acceptable: autonomy (α = .74), environmental mastery (α = .64), personal growth (α = .66), positive relations (α = .79), purpose in life (α = .76) and self-acceptance (α = .77).

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener et al., 1985) was used as a cognitive measure of whole life satisfaction. A total of 5 items were answered using a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (*not satisfied at all*) to 7 (*totally satisfied*). The final score in the scale was obtained by summing the scores on the individual items. The Spanish version has showed adequate psychometric properties (Vázquez, Duque, & Hervás, 2013). Cronbach´s alpha in this study was .85.

The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS, Watson et al., 1988) assessed positive and negative affect referring to the present, using 10 descriptors each. PANAS uses a 5-point scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) *to* 5 (*strongly agree*). Also, the score for each scale was obtained by summing the scores for the constituent items. In this study, Cronbach´s alpha for positive affect was .87, and for negative affect it was .86.

The Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R, Costa & McCrae, 1999) was employed to measure the five broad traits of personality and 30 facets. The questionnaire uses a 5-point Likert scale; from strongly disagree to strongly agree, for 240 items. Big Five facets were constructed by summing the scores on the individual items. In this study Cronbach's alpha for each dimension was adequate: Extraversion (α = .84), Neuroticism (α = .89), Agreeableness (α = .82), Conscientiousness (α = .87) and Openness to Experience (α = .85). For all 30 facets, Cronbach's alpha ranged between .37 for tender-mindedness and .80 for depression.

A check-list in the form of a questionnaire was designed to record socio-demographic characteristics of participants, such as age, gender and educational level.

Data analysis

To analyze the relative contribution of Big Five facets to PWB and SWB, dominance analysis (Azen & Budescu, 2003) was used through *R* statistical package. This technique has been developed to order individual predictors' contributions to an overall regression effect or R^2. Traditional multiple regression analyses consider variables in isolation from one another by calculating the squared zero-order correlations or in the presence of one another by calculating the beta weights, i.e., the expected change in criterion variable for a one-unit change in predictor variable when the other covariates are held constant (Nathans, Oswald, & Nimon, 2012). When variables are correlated, then β values can result in different rank orders of the variables. Any explanatory variance depends on the variable that was entered first in the regression model, potentially leading to misunderstanding of a variable's true contribution. It is recommended that after obtaining beta weights, researchers should use additional measures to more accurately capture the relative contribution of independent variables to the regression equation (Nathans et al., 2012). A dominance analysis examines R^2 changes resulting from adding a predictor to all possible subsets of regression models. So, dominance analysis is used to identify both the unique contribution of each variable and the contribution in the presence of the other predictors to the regression effect.

Results

Dominance analyses

To determine the relative importance of Big Five facets for PWB and SWB, a series of dominance analyses were conducted. Because the inclusion of each additional

https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2016.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

variable exponentially increases the number of calculations, it was important to select a set of predictor variables from among 30 NEO-PI-R facets. To further reduce the number of predictor variables, generalized linear models (GLM) were constructed first (McLeod & Xu, 2010). This technique yields the best subset of inputs using a variety of information criteria as well as cross-validation. A best GLM analysis was used to select the 30 Big Five facets, gender, age, and educational level as predictor variables and each measure of SWB and PWB as criterion variables. The results showed a set of different predictors for each measure of well-being. Educational level was not a significant predictor for any of the regression models. Age was a significant predictor of personal growth and purpose in life. Gender was a significant predictor for the majority of measures of well-being. So the dominance analyses were repeated for men and women separately for all the measures of PWB and positive affect of SWB. We included only those facets that had proved to be significant predictors in GLM analyses for each dimension of well-being, and age was included for the analyses of personal growth and purpose in life. To test for multicollinearity between the predictors, the tolerance criterion and variance inflate factor (VIF) were applied in all the analyses. The results revealed no multicollinearity between the predictor variables. Table 1 summarizes the results of the dominance analysis for each of the well-being measures for men and women separately. The beta weight of all the independent variables included in the analysis appears in column 1 of the table. The second column shows the proportional marginal variance decomposition (*pmvd*), reflecting the relative importance of each regressor (Grömping, 2006). This value multiplied by 100 indicates the average proportion of the predictor's explained variance with respect to each dependent variable. The third column shows the confidence interval obtained by bootstrapping procedure. This procedure provides a measure of confidence and reproducibility that indicates the chance of reproducing the sample result over 1000 bootstrap samples (Azen & Budescu, 2003). The fourth column presents the full model's R^2 for each of the well-being measures, obtained by averaging each predictor's contribution across all possible models. The full model's R^2 can be decomposed into components that reflect the relative importance of each predictor (*pmvd*).

In predicting the autonomy of men, 21% of the predicted variance can be attributed to vulnerability. The average contributions of openness to values (4.9%), self-consciousness (4%), depression (1.9%), compliance (1.7%), excitement seeking (1%), straight forwardness (1%) and openness to feelings (1%) only explained an additional 15.5% of variance $F(8, 469) = 34.28$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .36. In the case of women, the contribution of the predictors was mainly shared between self-consciousness (18%), vulnerability (8.8%) and depression (5.9%), while the remaining predictors only contributed around 6% $F(8, 501) = 41.12$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .39.

For environmental mastery in men, vulnerability (15.2%) and self-discipline (13.3%) jointly explained over half the variance $F(9, 454) = 49.72$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .49. Other variables that contributed to explain environmental mastery were depression (8.5%) and dutifulness (6.4%). For environmental mastery in women, vulnerability (13.3%), self-discipline (8.1%), depression (7.6%), positive emotions (6.4%) and hostility (5.4%) contributed similarly $F(9, 495) = 48.88$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .45.

Personal growth in men was mainly explained by openness to values and achievement striving, explaining a variance of 9–11% each $F(8, 505) = 39.48$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .37. Personal growth in women was explained by openness to actions (8.1%), feelings (6.4%), values (6.3%) and ideas (5%) $F(8, 543) = 39.20$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .36. Age was a predictor of personal growth in both men and women, with greater relative importance for women (3.7% of explained variance).

The results for positive relations with others showed that warmth alone explained 24.1% of the variance for men, depression explained 16.4% and positive emotions explained 2.7% $F(5, 508) = 78.58$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .43. Similar results were observed for women, although depression had greater weight in the equation than warmth (17.6% and 8.8%, respectively). Altruism and age were significant for women but not for men. The average contribution of all the predictors that entered in the equation was 39% $F(5, 571) = 75.66$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .39.

Purpose in life for men was mainly explained by achievement striving (20.3% of explained variance) and depression (12% of explained variance), although self-discipline (11.7% of explained variance) made important relative contribution $F(7, 487) = 85.96$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .55. For women, depression was the most important predictor (15.2% of explained variance) followed by self-discipline (9.7% of explained variance), achievement striving (9.5% of explained variance) and competence (7.3% of explained variance). The facets that entered the equation explained 46% of the variance of purpose in life $F(7, 521) = 65.35$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .46.

Self-acceptance was explained mainly by depression for both men and women (31.1% and 33.9%, respectively). The remaining predictors - vulnerability, positive emotions, competence, self-discipline and hostility - explained an additional 20% of variance

https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2016.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. *Dominance analysis of personality facets as predictors of PWB and SWB*

	Men				Women			
	β	*pmvd*	Confidence Interval	R^2	β	*pmvd*	Confidence Interval	R^2
Autonomy				.36				.39
Depression	–.10	.019	.000 .121		–.15**	.059	.002 .017	
Self-consciousness	–.16**	.040	.004 .099		–.29***	.180	.077 .276	
Vulnerability	–.30***	.213	.102 .301		–.21***	.088	.016 .179	
Excitement-seeking	–.12**	.010	.000 .027		–.02	.001	.000 .011	
Feelings	.11**	.010	.000 .030		.09*	.011	.000 .045	
Values	.19***	.049	.014 .096		.13***	.028	.005 .062	
Straight forwardness	.12**	.010	.000 .032		.14***	.013	.002 .033	
Compliance	–.18***	.017	.004 .047		–.17***	.017	.004 .038	
Environmental mastery				.49				.45
Hostility	–.10**	.020	.001 .065		–.20***	.054	.018 .107	
Depression	–.20***	.085	.015 .194		–.15**	.076	.002 .221	
Vulnerability	–.22***	.152	.038 .273		–.18***	.133	.017 .239	
Assertiveness	–.10*	.006	.000 .016		–.03	.000	.000 .009	
Positive emotions	.09*	.016	.000 .053		.17***	.064	.015 .125	
Feelings	.09*	.010	.000 .035		.08*	.008	.000 .037	
Dutifulness	.18***	.064	.016 .133		.11**	.023	.000 .078	
Achievement striving	.07	.009	.000 .069		.10*	.019	.000 .076	
Self-discipline	.21***	.133	.038 .236		.14**	.081	.005 .156	
Personal growth				.37				.36
Age	–.13***	.022	.003 .052		–.16***	.037	.010 .082	
Depression	–.21***	.048	.017 .100		–.20***	.050	.018 .092	
Feelings	.13**	.034	.004 .085		.17***	.064	.017 .126	
Actions	.10*	.026	.001 .082		.19***	.081	.025 .145	
Ideas	.17***	.039	.009 .084		.15***	.050	.006 .117	
Values	.22***	.106	.051 .165		.14***	.063	.012 .130	
Modesty	.16***	.017	.005 .038		.08*	.005	.000 .017	
Achievement striving	.28***	.093	.047 .144		.11**	.016	.002 .050	
Positive relations				.43				.39
Age	–.03	.000	.000 .010		–.15***	.022	.006 .046	
Depression	–.34***	.164	.010 .243		–.34***	.176	.107 .251	
Warmth	.35***	.241	.149 .322		.17***	.088	.017 .167	
Positive emotions	.12**	.027	.001 .111		.16***	.066	.010 .151	
Altruism	.05	.002	.000 .030		.26***	.046	.010 .098	
Purpose in life				.55				.46
Depression	–.25***	.120	.055 .188		–.27***	.152	.067 .244	
Warmth	.13***	.033	.002 .089		.01	.000	.000 .012	
Assertiveness	–.13***	.009	.003 .019		–.08*	.005	.000 .014	
Positive emotions	.11**	.017	.000 .057		.17***	.045	.012 .097	
Competence	.14***	.054	.006 .171		.16***	.073	.009 .180	
Achievement striving	.31***	.203	.089 .314		.22***	.095	.030 .171	
Self-discipline	.19***	.117	.022 .247		.18***	.097	.014 .201	
Self-acceptance				.53				.52
Hostility	–.04	.002	.000 .020		–.07*	.006	.000 .029	
Depression	–.35***	.311	.189 .400		–.34***	.339	.219 .430	
Vulnerability	–.16***	.074	.007 .203		–.15***	.058	.007 .154	
Positive emotions	.15***	.032	.007 .084		.25***	.085	.041 .147	
Competence	.13**	.057	.002 .147		.12**	.035	.002 .093	
Self-discipline	.16***	.056	.008 .136		.05	.004	.000 .030	

https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2016.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 1. *(Continued)*

	Men				Women			
	β	*pmvd*	Confidence Interval	R^2	β	*pmvd*	Confidence Interval	R^2
Positive Affect				.24				.20
Impulsiveness	.03	.000	.000 .009		.05	.002	.000 .014	
Vulnerability	–.17**	.064	.005 .149		–.25***	.113	.048 .169	
Warmth	.20***	.066	.021 .116		.12**	.024	.001 .068	
Ideas	.09*	.011	.000 .040		.09*	.011	.000 .041	
Competence	.12*	.047	.000 .137		.08	.014	.000 .096	
Achievement striving	.18***	.064	.012 .130		.16***	.048	.012 .092	
Men and Women								
Negative Affect				.22				
Depression	.31*	.140	.091 .191					
Vulnerability	.19*	.043	.013 .087					
Activity	.15*	.016	.006 .028					
Straight forwardness	–.16*	–.026	.011 .048					
Life Satisfaction				.29				
Depression	–.39***	–.226	.175 .275					
Positive emotions	.15***	.036	.012 .069					
Trust	.08**	.009	.000 .028					
Achievement striving	.11***	.016	.004 .037					

Note: pmvd = proportional marginal variance decomposition.
*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

$F(6, 469) = 113.58$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .59 for men; $F(6, 522) = 126.59$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .59 for women. Self-discipline was better predictor of self-acceptance for men than women (5.6% and .4%, respectively).

The results of dominance analyses for the different SWB measures are presented in Table 1. Because gender was a significant predictor in the previous best GLM regression model for positive affect along, the dominance analyses were conducted separately for women and men. In women, vulnerability was far more important in the equation than for men (11.3% vs 6.4%, respectively). In men, warmth explained almost three times the variance compared to women (6.6% vs 2.4%, respectively). Achievement striving was a significant predictor for positive affect with similar importance for both genders. However, all the facets that entered the equation explained no more than 25% of the variance in positive affect $F(6, 500) = 28.22$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .24 for men; $F(6, 540) = 24.10$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .20 for women.

Of the 30 facets, only four explained negative affect and life satisfaction in both men and women. Negative affect was explained by depression, vulnerability, straight forwardness and activity $F(4, 1146) = 83.71$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .22. In addition, life satisfaction was explained by depression (23%) and the remaining predictors – positive emotions, achievement striving and trust – only accounted for an increase in variance of 6% $F(4, 1152) = 116.54$, $p < .001$, R^2adjusted = .29.

Discussion

This study analyzes the relative importance of Big Five facets on PWB and SWB through the dominance analyses. Most previous research assumes that Neuroticism, Extraversion and Conscientiousness broad dimensions are the best predictors of SWB and PWB (Ryff, 2014; Schmutte & Ryff, 1997; Steel et al., 2008). However, there is little research on which Big Five facets have greatest explanatory power for well-being (Marrero & Carballeira, 2011; Siegler & Brummett, 2000). Big Five facets allow operationalizing the broad traits and identifying individual differences in these traits (Costa & McCrae, 1999), so they can provide more useful information that explains and promotes well-being.

The four main findings of the current work were: First, Big Five facets captured a substantial proportion of the variance in PWB and SWB. Second, facets were better predictors of PWB than SWB, explaining twice as much variance in the different measures of well-being. Third, each facet had a relative importance for each measure of well-being, although some facets proved to be common to both types of well-being. Depression, vulnerability, positive emotions and achievement striving were more closely related to most measures of

https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2016.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

well-being for women and men. Fourth, Big Five facets that predicted both types of well-being had a different relative importance for men and women.

Environmental mastery was predicted by self-discipline and vulnerability for men and women. However, self-discipline which implies motivation and constancy to complete tasks despite difficulties (Costa & McCrae, 1999) was more relevant for men than women. Positive emotions and achievement striving contributed to explain the variance of environmental mastery for women but they were not particularly important for men. Achievement striving presupposes high levels of aspiration, and positive emotions implies greater enthusiasm (Costa & McCrae, 1999).

Positive relations with others was linked mainly to warmth and depression for men and women. However, much of the variance of positive relations with others was explained by warmth for men but not so much for women. Altruism had more weight for women than men. A possible explanation is that men require greater warmth to counteract the effect of differential socialization which they are subjected to greater emotional control (Wood & Eagly, 2002). Age was a significant predictor of positive relations in women, but not in men. Women reported less positive relationships with age. The protective effects of positive relationships seem have greater importance for women than men (Eisenlohr-Moul & Segerstrom, 2013; Ryff, 1989).

Purpose in life was related to depression and the majority of the facets of Conscientiousness for women and men. Achievement striving was the most important predictor of purpose in life for men, whereas depression was for women. Somehow these results reflect the gender stereotype where women are perceived as more emotional than men, and men are perceived as more capable of managing the environment than women (Ebert, Steffens, & Kroth, 2014).

Self-acceptance was explained mainly by depression for both, men and women. Some studies have found that people with slightly impaired levels of self-acceptance, autonomy, purpose in life and positive relationships were at a higher risk of depression (Wood & Joseph, 2010). However, positive emotions made a greater contribution to self-acceptance in women and self-discipline were more important predictors of self-acceptance for men. Gender role stereotypes also had an impact on self-acceptance.

Personal growth was predicted by most of the facets of Openness to experience, such as openness to values, actions, feelings and ideas for both genders. Openness to action was more important for personal growth of women, whereas achievement striving had greater weight for men. Personal growth in men seems be related with gender stereotype, so that men who fulfill the stereotype of facing stressors in a more proactive manner (McLean & Anderson, 2009) showed greater personal growth. However, women's personal growth was linked to new ideas beyond fit into the gender stereotype.

Our results suggest that *autonomy* of men depends on the management of situational demands –low vulnerability-; whereas for women social interaction –low self-consciousness was more important to gain autonomy. The more individualistic and independent role of men against the tendency to relatedness, interdependence and connectedness of women have been documented (Wood & Eagly, 2002).

Negative affect and *life satisfaction* were explained mainly by depression for men and women. The link between depression and negative affect has been extensively demonstrated. Depressed people show greater reactivity to negative emotions, attenuation of positive emotions as well as emotional insensitivity (Bylsma, Morris, & Rottenberg, 2008) and have a negative attributional style (Korn, Sharot, Walter, Heekeren, & Dolan, 2014).

Vulnerability was the most important predictor of *positive affect* for women while this facet together with warmth had similar weight in explaining the variance of positive affect for men. These results could be explained in two ways: inability to handle stress decreases positive affect or the presence of positive affect may offset distress (Garland et al., 2010). On the other hand, the results of our study indicated that a more caring attitude seem to be needed to promote positive affect in men.

The results of the current study provide further support for FFM as an integrative model of the relationships between lower-order Big Five levels, PWB and SWB, although further research to identify what other factors cause well-being is required (Keyes, Kendler, Myers, & Martin, 2015). Big Five facets contributed to explain 36–55% of the variance of PWB and around 25% of the variance of SWB. The use of dominance analyses allowed us to identify which facets were common and which differed between SWB and PWB. Consistent with previous research, the results indicated a certain overlapping between the two types of well-being since both require a certain emotional stability. However, hedonic pursuits were more related with carefreeness, positive emotions and absence of depression, while eudaimonic pursuits were related to meaning, i.e., competence, achievement striving or self-discipline (Huta & Ryan, 2010). In addition, the analysis revealed facets that were common to both genders and which facets explained the well-being of men and women separately.

Despite the relevance of the results found in the current study, there are several limitations that need be resolved in the future. First, this study was cross-sectional, so causal inferences about the determinants

https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2016.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of PWB and SWB cannot be drawn on the basis of personal traits. There may be a bidirectional linkage between personality and well-being (Soto, 2015). Presumably, the congruence between personality and environment favors well-being. Second, the sample comprised mainly young adults, although the age range was large, so this limits the generalizability of the results. It would be useful to examine the relationships between personality and well-being in different developmental periods. In addition, longitudinal research would allow us to identify which facets remain stable and which could change according to individual development. Cross-sectional and longitudinal studies have demonstrated changes in personality traits and well-being with age (Soto, John, Gosling, & Potter, 2011), but the majority of reliable variance in personality traits have been attributable to stable influences and changing factors have had a greater influence on SWB (Anusic & Schimmack, 2015). Third, individual differences by gender for some measures of PWB were found. Some of these differences can be attributed to different personality profiles between men and women. Lehmann, Denissen, Allemand, and Penke (2013) have found that women have higher levels of Neuroticism, Extraversion, and Agreeableness, while men have greater Openness to experience, albeit with small effect size (Hyde, 2014). Finally, some Big Five facets showed low internal consistency which could have influenced the effect size estimates.

Despite the limitations, the current study reveals that Big Five facets should be employed to explain commonalities and differences between PWB and SWB. Of the sociodemographic variables analyzed, only gender distinguished between the two types of well-being. The differences between men and women highlight the existence of certain gender stereotypes which affect well-being in positive and negative ways. Future interventions focused on promoting the personal traits identified may contribute to the happiness of individuals.

References

Anglim J., & Grant S. L. (2014). Incremental criterion prediction of personality facets over factors: Obtaining unbiased estimates and confidence intervals. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *53*, 148–157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2014.10.005

Anusic I., & Schimmack U. (2015). Stability and change of personality traits, self-esteem, and well-being: Introducing the meta-analytic stability and change model of retest correlations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *110*, 766–781. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000066

Azen R., & Budescu D. V. (2003). The dominance analysis approach for comparing predictors in multiple regression. *Psychological Methods*, *8*, 129–148. https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.8.2.129

Bylsma L. M., Morris B. H., & Rottenberg J. (2008). A meta-analysis of emotional reactivity in major depressive disorder. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *28*, 676–691. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2007.10.001

Chen F. F., Jing Y., Hayes A., & Lee J. M. (2013). Two concepts or two approaches? A bifactor analysis of psychological and subjective well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *14*, 1033–1068. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-012-9367-x

Costa P. T., & McCrae R. R. (1999). *Inventario de Personalidad Neo Revisado (NEO PI-R) e Inventario Neo Reducido de Cinco Factores (NEO-FFI). Manual Profesional* [Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual]. Madrid, Spain: Tea Ediciones, S.A.

Díaz D., Rodríguez-Carvajal R., Blanco A., Moreno-Jiménez B., Gallardo I., Valle C., & van Dierendonck D. (2006). Validación española de las escalas de bienestar psicológico de Ryff. *Psicothema*, *18*, 572–577. http://www.psicothema.com/psicothema.asp?id=3255

Diener E., Emmons R. A., Larsen R. J., & Griffin S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *49*, 71–75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13

Ebert I. D., Steffens M. C., & Kroth A. (2014). Warm, but maybe not so competent?-Contemporary implicit stereotypes of women and men in Germany. *Sex Roles*, *70*, 359–375. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-014-0369-5

Eisenlohr-Moul T., & Segerstrom S. (2013). Autonomy, positive relationships, and IL-6: Evidence for gender-specific effects. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, *18*, 420–438. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8287.2012.02085.x

Garland E. L., Fredrickson B., Kring A. M., Johnson D. P., Meyer P. S., & Penn D. L. (2010). Upward spirals of positive emotions counter downward spirals of negativity: Insights from the broaden-and-build theory and affective neuroscience on the treatment of emotion dysfunctions and deficits in psychopathology. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *30*, 849–864. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2010.03.002

Grömping U. (2006). Relative importance for linear regression in R: The package relaimpo. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *17*, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v017.i01

Hounkpatin H. O., Wood A. M., Boyce C. J., & Dunn G. (2015). An existential-humanistic view of personality change: Co-occurring changes with psychological well-being in a 10 year cohort study. *Social Indicators Research*, *121*, 455–470. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-014-0648-0

Huta V., & Ryan R. M. (2010). Pursuing pleasure or virtue: The differential and overlapping well-being benefits of hedonic and eudaimonic motives. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *11*, 735–762. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-009-9171-4

Hyde J. S. (2014). Gender similarities and differences. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *65*, 373–398. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115057

Keyes C. L. M., Kendler K. S., Myers J. M., & Martin C. C. (2015). The genetic overlap and distinctiveness of flourishing and the Big Five personality traits. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *16*, 655–668. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-014-9527-2

https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2016.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Keyes C. L. M., Shmotkin D., & Ryff C. D. (2002). Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*, 1007–1022. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.1007

Korn C. W., Sharot T., Walter H., Heekeren H. R., & Dolan R. J. (2014). Depression is related to an absence of optimistically biased belief updating about future life events. *Psychological Medicine*, *44*, 579–592. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291713001074

Lehmann R., Denissen J. J. A., Allemand M., & Penke L. (2013). Age and gender differences in motivational manifestations of the Big Five from age 16 to 60. *Developmental Psychology*, *49*, 365–383. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028277

Marrero R. J., & Carballeira M. (2011). Well-being and personality: Facet-level analyses. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *5*, 206–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.09.030

Marrero R. J., & Carballeira M. (2012). The contribution of personality to PWB: An exploratory study. In B. S. Nguyem (Ed.), *Psychology of satisfaction* (pp. 41–65). New York, NY: NOVA.

McCrae R. R., & Costa Jr, P. T. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist*, *52*, 509–516. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.5.509

McCrae R. R., & Terracciano A. (2005). Universal features of personality traits from the observer's perspective: Data from 50 cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*, 547–561. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.3.547

McLean C. P., & Anderson E. R. (2009). Brave men and timid women? A review of the gender differences in fear and anxiety. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *29*, 496–505. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.05.003

McLeod A. I., & Xu C. (2010). *Bestglm: Best subset GLM. R package, version 0.34*. Ontario: Canada. Retrieved from University of Western. http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=bestglm

Nathans L. L., Oswald F. L., & Nimon K. (2012). Interpreting multiple linear regression: A guidebook of variable importance. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, *17*, 2–19. http://hdl.handle.net/1911/71096

Ryff C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of PWB. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *57*, 1069–1081. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

Ryff C. D. (2014). Psychological well-being revisited: Advances in the science and practice of eudaimonia. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, *83*, 10–28. https://doi.org/10.1159/000353263

Schimmack U., Oishi S., Furr R. M., & Funder D. C. (2004). Personality and life satisfaction: A facet-level analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*, 1062–1075. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204264292

Schmutte P. S., & Ryff C. D. (1997). Personality and well-being: Reexamining methods and meanings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *73*, 549–559. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.3.549

Siegler I. C., & Brummett B. H. (2000). Associations among NEO personality assessments and well-being at midlife: Facet-level analyses. *Psychology and Aging*, *15*, 710–714. https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.15.4.710

Soto C. J. (2015). Is happiness good for your personality? Concurrent and prospective relations of the Big Five with subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality*, *83*, 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12081

Soto C. J., John O. P., Gosling S. D., & Potter J. (2011). Age differences in personality traits from 10 to 65: Big Five domains and facets in a large cross-sectional sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100*, 330–348. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021717

Steel P., Schmidt J., & Shultz J. (2008). Refining the relationship between personality and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, *134*, 138–161. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.1.138

Vázquez C., Duque A., & Hervás G. (2013). Satisfaction with life scale in a representative sample of Spanish adults: Validation and normative data. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, *16*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2013.82

Watson D., Clark L. A., & Tellegen A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 1063–1070. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063

Wood A. M., & Joseph S. (2010). The absence of positive psychological (eudemonic) well-being as a risk factor for depression: A ten year cohort study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *122*, 213–217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2009.06.032

Wood W., & Eagly A. H. (2002). A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: Implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*, 699–727. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.128.5.699

https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2016.95 Published online by Cambridge University Press