Research Article

Personality Factors For Promoting Psychological Well-Being Among Adolescents in Urban and Rural Areas of Bihar

Dr. Aparna Pathak

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, D.A.V.P.G.College, Siwan. JP University, Chapra.

Abstract

The present study aimed to investigate personality factors and psychological well-being among rural and urban adolescents. The study focused on five major personality dimensions: neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. It also examined differences in personality factors and psychological well-being between rural and urban adolescents and explored the relationships between personality dimensions and psychological well-being. The sample consisted of 100 adolescents, including 50 rural and 50 urban participants. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, independent-samples t-tests, and Pearson's product–moment correlation coefficient. The findings revealed significant rural–urban differences in personality factors. Rural adolescents obtained higher mean scores in extraversion and openness to experience, whereas urban adolescents obtained higher mean scores in neuroticism, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. The differences in neuroticism, extraversion, openness, and agreeableness were significant at the .01 level, while the difference in conscientiousness was significant at the .05 level. The results also indicated a significant difference in psychological well-being between rural and urban adolescents. Urban adolescents obtained a higher mean score (88.24) than rural adolescents (79.20), with the difference being significant at the .05 level. Correlation analysis revealed a strong positive relationship between extraversion and psychological well-being (r = .865) and a positive relationship with openness to experience (r = .644). Conscientiousness showed a weak positive correlation (r = .204), whereas neuroticism (r = −.688) and agreeableness (r = −.732) showed negative correlations with psychological well-being. The negative relationship involving agreeableness requires further verification and investigation. The study highlights the relevance of personality characteristics to understanding psychological well-being during adolescence. The findings may help educators, parents, and school counsellors develop appropriate strategies to support adolescents' emotional and psychological development. However, the results should be interpreted within the limitations of the sample and correlational research design. Further studies using larger samples and longitudinal approaches are recommended.

Keywords: Personality Factors, Psychological Well-Being, Rural Adolescents, Urban Adolescents, Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness.

Introduction:

Adolescence is an important developmental period characterized by substantial physical, emotional, cognitive, and social changes. During this stage, individuals gradually develop a more stable sense of identity, establish interpersonal relationships, develop personal goals, and become increasingly independent in their decision-making. These developmental changes can influence both personality development and psychological well-being. Understanding the factors associated with psychological well-being during adolescence is therefore important for promoting healthy psychological development. Personality is one of the important individual-difference variables that may influence psychological well-being. Personality refers to relatively stable patterns of thoughts, feelings, attitudes, and behaviours that distinguish one individual from another. The Five-Factor Model generally conceptualizes personality in terms of neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness (McCrae & Costa, 2008). These personality characteristics influence how adolescents perceive their circumstances, respond to stressful experiences, interact with others, and pursue personal goals. Consequently, personality may play an important role in determining the extent to which adolescents experience positive psychological functioning.

PERSONALITY:

Personality refers to individual differences in characteristic patterns of thinking, feeling and behaving. The study of personality focuses on two broad areas : one is understanding individual differences in particular personality

characteristics, such as sociability or irritability. The other is understanding how the various parts of a person come together as a whole.

Personality Definition:

Personality is the total quality of an individual's behavior as it shown on his habits of thinking, in his attitude, interests, his manner of acting and his personal philosophy of life. Personality is more than the sum total of an individual's traits and characteristics.

When psychologists define personality, they tend to refer to qualities within a person, characteristics of a person's behavior, or both. In a now famous definition, psychologist Gorden Allport (1937) mentioned both inner qualities.

"Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment."

In a more recent definition, psychologist Walter Mischel (1977) mentioned both inner processes and behavior but emphasized behavior. Personality, he wrote, consists of;

"The distinctive patterns of behavior that characterize each individual's adaptation to the situations of his or life."

According to Allport "Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychological system that determine his unique adjustments to his environment."

It is reasonably assumed that personality functions as a basis for all types of behavior. The person may or not be co-operative, may have more or less competitiveness, possesses positive or negative leadership qualities or may be emotionally stable or anxious. It all depends upon his personal make-up, Singer et al. (1972) had also opined similarly, since personality determined by genetic factors but modified by environmental experience, a strong possibility exists that personality influences activity preferences as well as gets modified by activity experiences. The personality mould is formed early in life but can be changed by later experiences partly, if not completely.

As personality is reflective of the entire behavioral dimensions of individual, it has strong bearing on some variables also. Man's personality is the total picture of behavior, which is made up of many components, some of which are objective and therefore, easily studied and measured. And some are subjective and cannot be measured easily. These objective components are physique, speed, strength and movement. The subjective components include motives, feeling, ideas, attitudes, character, will power etc. Personality according to Eysenck (1968). "It's a stable and enduring organization of person's character, temperaments, intellect and physique, which explains about the physiological differences between introverts and extroverts in the light of concept of weak and strong nervous system."

According to Funder, D. C. (1997) "Personality refers to individual's characteristic patterns of thought, emotion and behaviour, together with the psychological mechanisms hidden or not-behind those patterns. This definition means that among their colleagues in other subfields of psychology, those psychologists who study personality have a unique mandate : to explain whole persons."

According to Salvatore Maddi (2006) "Personality is a stable set of characteristics and tendencies that determine those commonatities and differences in psychological behavior (thoughts, feelings, and actions) of people that have continuity in time and that may not be easily understood as the sole result of the social and biological pressures of the moment."

By examining the various approaches to the study and assessment of personality, the researcher came to the conclusion that the Big Five Model is one of the most comprehensive, empirical models. During the course of three or four decades of research, hundreds of personality measures and various phrases used to define personality were factor analysed in order to identify the essential, underlying components of personality. The findings showed five characteristics.The "Five Factor Model" is another name for these Big Five features (Costa and Mc Crae, 1992). Openness, Consciousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism are the Big Five Factors (OCEAN). As a result, operational parametersinvestigated to evaluate personality were in line with NEO-FFI.

1. **Openness:** is a general appreciation for art, adventure, unusual ideas, and imagination. People who are open to experience are intellectually curious, appreciative of art, witty and sensitive to beauty. People with low scores on openness tend to have more conventional, traditional interests.
2. **Conscientiousness**: is a tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully and aim for achievement. It includes the factor known as Need for Achievement. People high on this trait are generally achievement oriented, organised, responsible and dependable. On the negative side, they can be perfectionistsor workaholic.
3. **Extraversion**: is characterized by positive emotions and the tendency to seek the company of others.

Extroverts enjoy being with people and are energetic, dominant, assertive, outgoing, talking, fun-loving. Introverts, on the other hand, are quiet, less involved in external world and prefer to be alone.

4. **Agreeableness**: is a tendency to be compassionate and cooperative. Individuals high on this trait are considerate, friendly, generous, helpful, trustworthy, caring, warm and willing to compromise their interests with others. They hold an optimistic view of human nature. People who score low are suspicious, unfriendly, and uncooperative and place self interest above getting along with others.
5. **Neuroticism:** is the tendency to experience negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, fear etc. Those who score high on neuroticism are vulnerable to stress, more likely to interpret ordinary situations as threatening, emotionally unstable, anxious, worried, distressed, irritable and hypertensive. On the other hand, individuals who score low are emotionally stable, calm and free from persistent negative feelings.

This model represents a significant advancement in personality. In comprehending the profile across cultures, it has been shown to be helpful. The usefulness of the five dimensions in populations of the old and young, educated and illiterate, is further supported by cross-cultural researches. (Mc Crae and John, 1992).

PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL BEING:

Psychological well being attempts to understand people's evaluation of their lives. These evaluations may be primarily cognitive (e.g. life satisfaction or martial satisfaction) or may consist of the frequency with which people experience pleasant emotion (e.g. depression). Researchers in this field strive to understand not just undesirable clinical states, but also differences between people in positive levels of long terms well-being. Psychological well-being refers to how people evaluate their lives and includes variables such as life satisfaction and martial satisfaction lack of depression and anxiety and positive moods and emotions.

Some researchers explain psychological well-being in terms of self acceptance, personal growth in life and positive relations with others, environmental mastery and autonomy. A person's evaluation of his or her life may be in form of cognitions e.g.: when person gives conscious evaluative judgments about his or her satisfaction with life as a whole, or evaluative judgments about specific aspects of his or life such as recreation. However, an evaluation of one's life may also be in the form of affect such as people experiencing unpleasant or pleasant moods and emotions in reaction to the life. Thus a person is said to have high psychological well-being if she or he experiences life satisfaction and frequent joy, and only infrequently experience unpleasant emotions such as sadness and anger. On the contrary a person is said to have low psychological well-being if he or she is dissatisfied with life, experiences little joy and affection, and frequently feels negative and affective such as anger or anxiety. The cognitive and affective components of psychological well-being highly interrelated.

Psychological well-being means a general sense of emotional health as evidenced by high self-esteem and positive relationships with others and a lack of anxiety, depression and deviant behavior. As summarized, Psychological well-being is about lives going well. It is the combination of feeling good and functioning effectively (Huppert, 2009).

Personality Factors and Psychological Well-Being:

Personality is an important psychological construct that helps explain why individuals differ in their thoughts, emotions, patterns of behaviour, coping strategies, interpersonal relationships, and responses to life circumstances. It consists of relatively stable patterns of characteristics that influence how individuals perceive themselves and their environment and how they respond to different situations. Psychological well-being, on the other hand, refers to positive psychological functioning and includes the individual's ability to accept oneself, establish meaningful relationships, manage everyday environmental demands, maintain autonomy, develop a sense of purpose, and continue to grow as a person. Consequently, personality factors are expected to play an important role in determining the level and quality of psychological well-being.

The relationship between personality and well-being has been extensively investigated in personality and positive psychology. Research indicates that personality is not merely associated with temporary emotional states but is systematically related to broader indicators of well-being, including life satisfaction, positive and negative affect, self-acceptance, environmental mastery, positive relationships, purpose in life, autonomy, and personal growth. A major meta-analysis by Anglim et al. (2020), based on 462 studies and approximately 334,567 participants, examined relationships between Big Five and HEXACO personality characteristics and both subjective and

psychological well-being. The authors found substantial relationships between personality and several dimensions of well-being, demonstrating that personality is an important predictor of individual differences in psychological functioning.

Concept of Psychological Well-Being

Psychological well-being is broader than the simple experience of happiness. Ryff's multidimensional model conceptualizes psychological well-being through six major dimensions: self-acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth. Self-acceptance involves having a positive attitude toward oneself and accepting both one's strengths and weaknesses. Positive relations refer to the ability to establish warm, trusting, and meaningful relationships. Autonomy reflects independence and the ability to regulate one's behaviour according to personally held values. Environmental mastery refers to the capacity to manage everyday responsibilities and effectively utilize opportunities. Purpose in life involves having meaningful goals and a sense of direction, while personal growth refers to the continuing development of one's potential.

Personality characteristics can influence each of these dimensions. For example, an emotionally stable person may find it easier to accept oneself and manage stressful circumstances, whereas an individual high in conscientiousness may demonstrate greater environmental mastery through effective planning and self-regulation. Similarly, extraversion and agreeableness may facilitate positive interpersonal relationships, while openness to experience may contribute to personal growth. Research by Schmutte and Ryff (1997) demonstrated that personality traits were associated differently with the six dimensions of psychological well-being, indicating that well-being is multidimensional and that different personality traits may contribute to different aspects of positive psychological functioning.

Personality and the Big Five Model

The Five-Factor Model, commonly known as the Big Five personality model, provides one of the most widely used frameworks for understanding personality. The five major dimensions are neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Each dimension represents a broad pattern of individual differences and can have different implications for psychological well-being.

Neuroticism and Psychological Well-Being:

Neuroticism refers to a tendency to experience negative emotional states such as anxiety, worry, sadness, insecurity, irritability, and emotional vulnerability. Individuals high in neuroticism may be more sensitive to stressful experiences and may be more likely to interpret ordinary difficulties as threatening or overwhelming. They may also engage in rumination, excessive worry, and negative self-evaluation.

Consequently, neuroticism generally has a negative relationship with psychological well-being. High neuroticism may interfere with self-acceptance, environmental mastery, and emotional stability. Individuals who frequently experience anxiety and negative emotions may have greater difficulty maintaining positive relationships, pursuing meaningful goals, and coping effectively with stressful circumstances.

The empirical evidence for this relationship is particularly strong. In a study of 5,440 adolescents, Heilmann et al. (2021) found that adolescents with higher neuroticism had a significantly greater risk of low life satisfaction. The odds of low life satisfaction were higher among adolescents with pronounced neuroticism (OR = 1.46). The findings demonstrate the importance of neuroticism in understanding adolescent well-being.

Similarly, research on early adolescents has identified neuroticism as the strongest personality predictor of global life satisfaction. The findings showed that neuroticism was negatively related to global satisfaction as well as satisfaction in several specific life domains.

Thus, it can be stated that higher neuroticism is generally associated with lower psychological well-being**,** whereas emotional stability may facilitate better adjustment, effective coping, and positive psychological functioning.

Extraversion and Psychological Well-Being:

Extraversion is characterized by sociability, assertiveness, activity, enthusiasm, energy, and a tendency to experience positive emotions. Extraverted individuals are generally more likely to seek social interaction, participate in group activities, communicate with others, and experience positive emotional states.

These characteristics can contribute to psychological well-being through several mechanisms. First, social interaction provides opportunities for emotional support and belongingness. Second, active participation in social and recreational activities can generate positive experiences. Third, extraverted individuals may develop broader interpersonal networks that provide assistance during stressful circumstances.

Research supports a positive association between extraversion and well-being. Anglim et al. (2020) found that extraversion was meaningfully related to several dimensions of subjective and psychological well-being. Their large meta-analysis demonstrated that personality traits were associated with both general well-being and specific dimensions of psychological functioning.

Among adolescents, Heilmann et al. (2021) reported that higher extraversion was associated with a lower risk of low life satisfaction.

Therefore, higher extraversion may promote psychological well-being by facilitating social interaction, positive affect, interpersonal support, and active engagement with the environment.

Agreeableness and Psychological Well-Being:

Agreeableness refers to characteristics such as kindness, cooperation, trust, empathy, sympathy, and concern for others. Highly agreeable individuals are generally more inclined to cooperate with others and maintain harmonious interpersonal relationships.

Positive relationships are a central component of Ryff's psychological well-being model. Consequently, agreeableness may contribute to well-being through interpersonal mechanisms. Individuals who are cooperative, empathetic, and supportive may experience more positive social relationships and receive greater interpersonal support.

Research among adolescents supports this association. Heilmann et al. (2021) found that higher agreeableness was associated with higher life satisfaction among adolescents. Similarly, research involving Chinese adolescents found that agreeableness was significantly associated with life satisfaction.

However, agreeableness may not influence all dimensions of psychological well-being equally. Schmutte and Ryff (1997) found that positive relations with others were particularly associated with agreeableness and extraversion. This suggests that agreeableness may be especially important for the interpersonal component of psychological well-being.

Conscientiousness and Psychological Well-Being:

Conscientiousness involves responsibility, organization, self-discipline, persistence, achievement orientation, and goal-directed behaviour. Individuals high in conscientiousness are generally more likely to plan their activities, regulate their behaviour, fulfil responsibilities, and persist in achieving their goals.

These characteristics have direct relevance to psychological well-being. Conscientious individuals may experience greater environmental mastery because they are able to organize their daily activities and manage responsibilities effectively. They may also experience a stronger sense of purpose because they tend to establish goals and work systematically toward achieving them.

Empirical research supports this interpretation. Heilmann et al. (2021) found that adolescents with higher conscientiousness had a significantly reduced risk of low life satisfaction. In their study, higher conscientiousness was associated with lower odds of low life satisfaction (OR = 0.59).

Schmutte and Ryff (1997) also found associations between conscientiousness and dimensions such as self-acceptance, environmental mastery, and purpose in life.

Therefore, conscientiousness may enhance psychological well-being by promoting self-control, achievement, effective time management, environmental mastery, and goal attainment**.**

Openness to Experience and Psychological Well-Being:

Openness to experience is associated with imagination, creativity, curiosity, intellectual flexibility, appreciation of new ideas, and willingness to explore unfamiliar experiences. Individuals high in openness may be more receptive to different perspectives and may actively seek opportunities for learning and personal development.

The relationship between openness and psychological well-being is somewhat more complex than the relationships involving neuroticism, extraversion, and conscientiousness. Openness may be particularly relevant to

personal growth because individuals who are curious and receptive to new experiences may be more willing to learn, reconsider existing beliefs, and explore new possibilities.

Schmutte and Ryff (1997) reported that personal growth was associated with openness to experience and extraversion. However, openness does not necessarily predict global life satisfaction consistently across populations. For example, Heilmann et al. (2021) found no significant association between openness and either self-rated health or life satisfaction among adolescents.

This suggests that openness may have a stronger relationship with particular dimensions of psychological well-being, such as personal growth, than with overall life satisfaction.

Personality as a Predictor of Psychological Well-Being:

The evidence indicates that personality is an important predictor of individual differences in psychological well-being. Anglim et al. (2020) conducted one of the most comprehensive meta-analyses of the relationship between personality and well-being. Their analysis included both subjective well-being—life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect—and psychological well-being—positive relations, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, self-acceptance, and personal growth.

Importantly, research has demonstrated that personality may be more strongly associated with psychological well-being than with subjective well-being. A study examining the Big Five found that personality factors had stronger relationships with psychological well-being than with subjective well-being. Extraversion, neuroticism, and conscientiousness showed broadly similar associations with both forms of well-being, while different personality traits were associated with particular dimensions of well-being.

This finding is important because it demonstrates that personality does not simply influence whether a person feels happy. Rather, personality may influence how individuals function psychologically, including how they establish relationships, manage their environment, develop personally, maintain goals, and understand themselves.

Personality, Coping, and Psychological Well-Being

One important mechanism through which personality may affect well-being is coping behaviour. Individuals with different personality characteristics may respond differently to stressful situations. For example, emotionally stable individuals may be more likely to use adaptive coping strategies, whereas highly neurotic individuals may be more vulnerable to avoidance, rumination, or emotional coping.

Evidence from Chinese adolescents supports the role of coping style in the relationship between personality and life satisfaction. Zhang et al. (2017) examined 2,357 Chinese adolescents and found significant associations between extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and life satisfaction. Importantly, coping style partially mediated the relationships between these personality traits and life satisfaction, while it fully mediated the relationship between openness to experience and life satisfaction.

This finding suggests that personality may influence well-being partly because it affects the way individuals respond to problems. Thus, personality should not necessarily be regarded as a direct and unchangeable determinant of well-being. Psychological interventions that improve coping skills, emotional regulation, problem-solving, and social competence may help individuals achieve better psychological functioning regardless of their underlying personality characteristics.

Personality and Psychological Well-Being During Adolescence

The relationship between personality and psychological well-being is particularly important during adolescence. Adolescence is a developmental period involving major biological, cognitive, emotional, social, and educational changes. During this period, young people develop greater independence, establish more complex peer relationships, develop their identities, and begin making important educational and occupational decisions.

Because adolescents encounter multiple developmental challenges, personality characteristics may influence how successfully they adjust to these demands. For example, high neuroticism may make academic or interpersonal difficulties more emotionally challenging, whereas conscientiousness may help adolescents organize their academic responsibilities. Extraversion and agreeableness may facilitate peer relationships, while openness may encourage exploration and personal development.

Heilmann et al. (2021), using data from 5,440 seventh-grade adolescents, found that neuroticism was associated with a higher risk of poor self-rated health and low life satisfaction, whereas conscientiousness was associated with a reduced risk of these outcomes. Extraversion and agreeableness were also associated with greater life satisfaction.

Similarly, a study of 344 early adolescents found that the Big Five personality traits were significantly related to global life satisfaction as well as satisfaction in specific domains such as family, friends, school, self, and living environment. Neuroticism emerged as the strongest predictor of global life satisfaction.

Research on 500 Serbian adolescents also demonstrated that personality characteristics and negative life events contributed to life satisfaction. Extraversion and agreeableness made unique contributions to adolescent life satisfaction, although personality did not moderate the relationship between negative life events and life satisfaction in that study. The researchers suggested that the relative contribution of personality may vary according to cultural context.

Overall Relationship Between Personality and Psychological Well-Being

Taken together, the available evidence indicates that personality factors are important correlates of psychological well-being. Neuroticism generally has a negative relationship with well-being, whereas extraversion and conscientiousness generally show positive relationships**.** Agreeableness is particularly relevant to positive interpersonal functioning, while openness may be associated more strongly with personal growth and exploration than with global life satisfaction.

The relationship can therefore be summarized as follows:

Personality factor	General relationship with psychological well-being	Possible explanation
Neuroticism	Negative	Greater anxiety, emotional instability, worry and vulnerability to stress
Extraversion	Positive	Social engagement, positive affect and interpersonal support
Agreeableness	Positive	Empathy, cooperation and harmonious relationships
Conscientiousness	Positive	Self-regulation, goal achievement and environmental mastery
Openness	Mixed/Dimension-specific	Curiosity, creativity, personal growth and openness to new experiences

It is important, however, not to interpret these relationships as evidence that personality traits alone determine psychological well-being. Psychological well-being is influenced by multiple factors, including family relationships, social support, socioeconomic circumstances, educational experiences, stressful life events, coping strategies, and cultural environment. Personality represents one important component within this broader network of influences.

Rational of the study:

Personality factors play a significant role in understanding psychological well-being. The evidence from theoretical and empirical research suggests that individuals with different personality characteristics experience and respond to life circumstances in different ways. Neuroticism is generally associated with reduced well-being because it increases vulnerability to negative emotional experiences, whereas extraversion may promote well-being through positive emotions and social relationships. Conscientiousness may enhance well-being by supporting self-regulation, achievement, and environmental mastery, while agreeableness may strengthen interpersonal relationships. Openness to experience may contribute particularly to personal growth, although its association with global life satisfaction appears less consistent.

The relationship becomes especially significant during adolescence because personality is associated with how young people respond to developmental challenges, academic demands, peer relationships, and stressful experiences. Evidence from large adolescent samples demonstrates that neuroticism, conscientiousness,

extraversion, and agreeableness are meaningfully associated with life satisfaction and related indicators of well-being.

Thus, the study of personality factors and psychological well-being can provide important insights into individual differences in positive psychological functioning. Understanding these relationships may help psychologists, teachers, counsellors, and educational institutions identify adolescents who may be vulnerable to poor well-being and develop interventions emphasizing adaptive coping, emotional regulation, interpersonal competence, self-awareness, goal-setting, and personal growth. Importantly, the evidence suggests that personality should be considered not as an isolated determinant but as one of several interacting factors that contribute to psychological well-being.

Research Gap:

Although previous studies have established an association between personality and psychological well-being, several areas require further investigation. First, much of the existing research has been conducted outside India, and cultural differences may influence the relationship between personality and well-being. Second, studies have used different personality models and different conceptualizations of well-being, making direct comparisons difficult. Third, adolescents experience rapidly changing social, academic, and emotional circumstances, making it important to examine personality and psychological well-being specifically during this developmental period.

Therefore, a study of personality factors and psychological well-being among adolescents can contribute to understanding how individual personality characteristics are associated with positive psychological functioning during adolescence. Such findings may also have implications for school counseling, psychological interventions, and programmes designed to promote healthy adolescent development.

The following objectives were formulated for the proposed study:

1. To see the difference between personality factors of rural and urban adolescents

2. To study the difference between psychological well-being of rural and urban adolescents

3. To examine the relationship between personality factors and psychological well-being of adolescents

Hypotheses:

The following hypotheses were formulated to empirically validate the above objectives:

1. There would be significant difference between personality factors of rural and urban adolescents
2. There would be significant difference between psychological well-being of rural and urban adolescents.
3. There would be significant relationship between personality factors and psychological well-being of adolescents

Sample:

Purposive sampling was used in this research. Purposive sampling is a method adopted by researchers where data is collected from particular units of the universe for constituting a sample that represents the universe. It is most commonly used for sampling hours, as it is uncomplicated and economical in many cases. A total of 100 samples of senior secondary school students were randomly selected from Bihar's School. The sample consisted of 50 rural and 50 urban from school students.

RESEARCH DESIGN:

In the present study a between groups design (rural and urban) and correlational design were used. Present study was to examine the difference between personality factors and psychological well-being of rural and urban adolescents and also to find out the relationship between personality factors and psychological well-being of adolescents separately. A correlational research design was used because it gives the measure of a relationship among variables and there is no control over them. So, Therefore, two group design and correlational research design was used in this research.

TOOLS:

There were two tools used for data collection.

1. **Personality Inventory (NEO – FFI) by Paul T. Costa and Robert Mc Crae (1992)** was used to assess personality factors. The NEO – FFI is a short form of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory. This personality inventory assesses five dimensions of personality namely Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. This inventory is based on the five factor model of personality. The Inventory consists of 60 items with 12 items assessing each personality factor. The items are rated on a five point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Responses are added on each dimension to get the total score on each personality factor. Costa and Mc Crae (1992) report that the NEO FFI scales are highly reliable and strongly correlated with the corresponding domain scales of the full NEO PI – R (convergent reliability ranged from 0.77 to 0.94 across various samples).
2. **Psychological Well-being - Carol Ryff (1989a)**'s scale is used to assess the experience of well-being. She has conceptualized multidimensional model of psychological wellbeing with mainly six dimensions that are named as-autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life and self- acceptance (Ryff, 1989a; Ryff, 1989b). The scale has 42 items with 7 items in each dimension. The response categories for each item are on a six point scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. All the responses are added to get the score on psychological well-being. Responses to negatively scored items are reversed in the scoringprocedure. High scores indicate high self-ratings on psychological well- being and the dimension assessed.

Results and Discussion:

Table 1: Difference in means of rural and urban in the experience offive personality factors.

	Groups	N	Mean	SD	SED	t	Sig. Level
Neuroticism	Rural	50	24.64	6.694	1.639	10.870	< .01
	Urban	50	42.46	9.464			
Extraversion	Rural	50	50.56	9.243	1.765	12.023	< .01
	Urban	50	29.34	8.385			
Openness	Rural	50	46.74	10.059	1.719	8.320	< .01
	Urban	50	32.44	6.822			
Agreeableness	Rural	50	35.28	10.396	1.843	10.560	< .01
	Urban	50	54.74	7.855			
	Rural	50	50.48	12.219	2.140	2.477	< .01

Conscientiousness	Urban	50	55.78	8.924			

Table- 5.2 shows that score Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness scores of rural adolescents were 24.64, 50.56, 46.74, 35.28 , and 50.48 respectively and mean scores of urban were 42.46, 29.34, 32.44, 54.74 and 55.78 respectively and their respective SDs of rural adolescents were 6.694, 9.243, 10.059, 10.396 and 12.219 respectively and SDs of urban adolescents were 9.464, 8.385, 6.822, 7.855 and 8.924 respectively. Their respective SED were1.639, 1.765, 1.719, 1.843 and 2.140. The t- ratios between means Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness scores of the two groups were found as 10.870, 12.023, 8.320, 10.560 and 2.477, which was significant at level of 0.01. It means that there is statistical difference on the scores of Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness between rural and urban adolescents. The findings of the present study did confirm the hypothesis -1 which states that "there would be significant difference between personality factors of rural and urban adolescents" was proved true by the finding of the study.

The present study was conducted to investigate the differences in five personality factors, namely neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, between rural and urban adolescents. The sample consisted of 100 adolescents, including 50 rural and 50 urban adolescents. The differences between the mean scores of the two groups were examined using the independent-samples t-test. The findings revealed differences in the five personality dimensions between rural and urban adolescents, although the statistical significance of the conscientiousness result requires verification.

Neuroticism. The results indicated that the mean neuroticism score of rural adolescents was 24.64 (SD = 6.694), whereas that of urban adolescents was 42.46 (SD = 9.464). The calculated t-value was 10.870, indicating a statistically significant difference at the .01 level. Urban adolescents therefore obtained higher neuroticism scores than their rural counterparts. Neuroticism is generally associated with a tendency to experience negative emotions, including anxiety, emotional instability, worry, and vulnerability to stress. One possible explanation is that adolescents living in urban environments may experience different forms of academic competition, social comparison, and performance-related pressure. However, the present study did not directly measure these factors, and therefore, they should be regarded as possible explanations rather than established causes of the observed difference.

This finding can be discussed in relation to the research conducted by Atherton et al. (2024), who examined rural–urban differences in personality traits and well-being among American adults using data from two longitudinal studies. Their findings indicated that individuals living in rural areas tended to report higher neuroticism than those living in urban areas. However, the differences in personality traits were not consistent across both samples. The direction of their neuroticism finding differs from the present study, in which urban adolescents obtained higher scores. This inconsistency suggests that geographical differences in personality may depend on the characteristics of the population, the social environment, and the cultural context. Moreover, because Atherton et al. studied adults in the United States, their findings cannot be directly generalized to adolescents in India.

Extraversion. The mean extraversion score of rural adolescents was 50.56 (SD = 9.243), compared with 29.34 (SD = 8.385) among urban adolescents. The calculated t-value was 12.023, which was statistically significant at the .01 level. These findings indicate that rural adolescents in the present sample scored higher on extraversion than urban adolescents. Extraversion is commonly associated with sociability, assertiveness, interpersonal engagement, and positive emotional expression. The observed difference may reflect variations in peer interactions, opportunities for social participation, family environments, and community relationships. Nevertheless, the study does not establish which, if any, of these factors contributed to the difference.

The findings can also be considered alongside the study by Nimbalkar and Rani (2023), which investigated personality characteristics among rural and urban secondary school students. Their results indicated that urban students scored higher on extraversion and openness to experience, whereas rural students scored higher on agreeableness and conscientiousness. The extraversion result differs from the present findings, where rural adolescents obtained higher mean scores. Such differences emphasize that personality patterns should not be assumed to be uniform across geographical settings. Variations in sampling, age groups, educational environments, and the instruments used to assess personality may contribute to differences between studies.

Openness to Experience. The mean openness score of rural adolescents was 46.74 (SD = 10.059), while urban adolescents obtained a mean score of 32.44 (SD = 6.822). The calculated t-value was 8.320, indicating a statistically significant difference at the .01 level. Rural adolescents therefore obtained higher openness scores than urban adolescents in the present sample.

Openness to experience generally reflects curiosity, imagination, intellectual exploration, receptiveness to new ideas, and an interest in varied experiences. The higher scores among rural adolescents may indicate greater openness within this particular sample. However, it would be inappropriate to conclude that rural adolescents are universally more open to experience than urban adolescents. Differences in educational opportunities, family expectations, extracurricular participation, and exposure to diverse experiences may be relevant factors for further investigation, but their actual contribution remains uncertain.

The present finding differs from the results reported by Nimbalkar and Rani (2023), who found higher openness among urban secondary school students. It also contrasts with Atherton et al. (2024), whose adult samples showed that individuals living in rural areas tended to have lower openness, although the results varied across samples and statistical adjustments. These differences indicate that the relationship between residential location and openness to experience is complex and may be influenced by age, culture, socioeconomic circumstances, and the specific characteristics of the population being studied.

Agreeableness. The findings revealed that rural adolescents had a mean agreeableness score of 35.28 (SD = 10.396), whereas urban adolescents had a mean score of 54.74 (SD = 7.855). The calculated t-value was 10.560, which was statistically significant at the .01 level. Thus, urban adolescents obtained higher agreeableness scores than rural adolescents in the present sample.

Agreeableness generally refers to individual differences in cooperation, empathy, consideration for others, trust, and interpersonal harmony. The higher scores among urban adolescents may indicate greater expression of these characteristics within the studied group. However, agreeableness should not be interpreted as a direct measure of moral character or social adjustment. The observed difference may be associated with several individual and contextual factors that were not examined in the present study.

The results can be compared with those of Nimbalkar and Rani (2023), who reported higher agreeableness among rural secondary school students than among urban students. Their finding is opposite to the pattern observed in the present research. This discrepancy suggests that the development and expression of agreeableness cannot be explained solely by whether adolescents live in rural or urban areas. Family socialization, peer relationships, school climate, cultural expectations, and individual experiences may also be relevant. Further research is required to identify the factors associated with agreeableness among adolescents in different residential settings.

Conscientiousness. The mean conscientiousness score of rural adolescents was 50.48 (SD = 12.219), compared with 55.78 (SD = 8.924) among urban adolescents. The calculated t-value was 2.477. The urban group therefore obtained a higher mean score than the rural group. However, assuming 50 independent observations in each group and a conventional two-tailed independent-samples t-test with equal variances, this result is statistically significant at the .05 level but not at the .01 level. Consequently, the finding should not be reported as significant at the .01 level without further statistical evidence.

Conscientiousness generally refers to characteristics such as organization, responsibility, persistence, self-discipline, and goal-directed behaviour. The higher mean score among urban adolescents may reflect differences in the expression of these characteristics within the sample. However, the result does not establish that urban living produces greater conscientiousness. Educational expectations, family responsibilities, school practices, and individual circumstances could be explored in future research to better understand the observed difference.

The present result is consistent with the direction of the findings reported by Atherton et al. (2024), who observed lower conscientiousness among rural adults in one of their longitudinal samples. However, their findings were not consistent across both studies, and the research focused on adults rather than adolescents. In contrast, Nimbalkar and Rani (2023) reported higher conscientiousness among rural secondary school students. The differing results reinforce the importance of examining personality in specific developmental and cultural contexts rather than assuming that the same residential patterns apply to all populations.

Table 2: Difference in means of rural and urban in the experience ofpsychological well-being.

Variables	Group	N	Mean	SD	SED	t	P
Psychological Wellbeing	Rural	50	79.20	12.418	3.674	2.460	<.05
	Urban	50	88.24	22.822			

The findings presented in Table 2 revealed that the mean psychological well-being score of rural adolescents was 79.20 (SD = 12.418), whereas the mean score of urban adolescents was 88.24 (SD = 22.822). The standard error of the difference was 3.674, and the calculated t-value was 2.460, which was statistically significant at the .05 level. These findings indicate that urban adolescents obtained significantly higher psychological well-being scores than rural adolescents in the present sample. Therefore, the hypothesis proposing a significant difference in psychological well-being between rural and urban adolescents was supported at the .05 significance level. The findings of the present study did confirm the hypothesis -2 which states that 'there would be significant difference between psychological wellbeing of rural and urban adolescents" was accepted.

Psychological well-being is an important aspect of positive mental health. It encompasses several dimensions of positive psychological functioning, including self-acceptance, positive relationships with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, and purpose in life. Ryff (1989) developed a multidimensional framework of psychological well-being that emphasizes positive functioning rather than merely the absence of psychological distress. From this perspective, the higher mean score obtained by urban adolescents may indicate comparatively higher levels of positive psychological functioning among the participants in the urban group. However, the precise interpretation depends on the characteristics and scoring procedures of the psychological well-being scale used in the present study.

The higher psychological well-being scores among urban adolescents may be associated with differences in educational opportunities, access to health and counselling services, recreational facilities, social networks, and exposure to diverse experiences. Urban adolescents may have greater access to certain institutional and educational resources that support personal development and psychological adjustment. Nevertheless, these explanations are tentative because the present study did not directly examine the availability of these resources or their relationship with psychological well-being. Urban environments may also expose adolescents to academic competition, social comparison, and other stressors. Consequently, residential location alone cannot explain the psychological well-being of adolescents.

The findings can be compared with the study conducted by Kumar (2025), entitled A Comparative Study of Psychological Well-Being between Rural and Urban Higher Secondary School Students. The study examined psychological well-being among higher secondary school students from rural and urban areas using a sample of 100 students aged 14–18 years. This research is particularly relevant because it focused on the same broad population and geographical comparison as the present study. However, the direction and magnitude of its results should be compared with the present findings only after examining the full statistical results reported in the original article.

The present findings may also be discussed in relation to research on the psychological experiences of rural and urban adolescents in India. Dhoundiyal and Venkatesh (2009) examined the psychological characteristics of 240 rural and urban adolescent girls aged 12–18 years. Their study investigated psychological difficulties and health-related quality of life and highlighted the importance of psychological support for adolescent development. Although their research did not measure precisely the same outcome as the present study, it provides relevant evidence that adolescents' psychological experiences warrant attention across different residential settings. Their findings also support the importance of considering the broader social and educational context when studying adolescent mental health.

More recent research by Kumar (2023) on psychological well-being among youth reported no statistically significant difference between rural and urban participants. This finding differs from the significant residential difference observed in the present study. The discrepancy suggests that the relationship between residential

setting and psychological well-being may vary according to the characteristics of the participants, their developmental stage, socioeconomic circumstances, measurement instruments, and study design. Therefore, the present finding should be understood as a result specific to the adolescents included in this sample rather than a universal pattern applicable to all rural and urban populations.

The theoretical perspective proposed by Ryff and Keyes (1995) is also useful for interpreting the results. Their multidimensional model of psychological well-being emphasizes that positive psychological functioning involves several related but distinguishable dimensions. These include autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relationships, purpose in life, and self-acceptance. From this perspective, the observed difference between rural and urban adolescents could reflect differences in one or more dimensions of well-being rather than a uniform difference across all aspects of psychological functioning. Since the present table reports only the overall psychological well-being score, further analysis of individual dimensions would be required to determine the specific areas contributing to the observed difference.

The findings have potential implications for educational institutions, school counsellors, parents, and professionals concerned with adolescent development. The comparatively lower mean score among rural adolescents suggests that their psychological well-being deserves attention when planning school-based mental health promotion programmes. Schools may consider providing accessible counselling, opportunities for positive peer interaction, activities that develop emotional competence, and support for academic and personal challenges. At the same time, interventions should be based on students' actual needs rather than assumptions that all rural adolescents experience lower well-being or that all urban adolescents experience better psychological health.

It is also important to recognize that the present study identifies a statistical association between residential group membership and psychological well-being scores; it does not establish that living in an urban area causes higher psychological well-being. Variables such as gender, family income, parental education, family relationships, school environment, personality traits, and access to psychological support may influence the relationship. Future research incorporating these variables, larger samples, and longitudinal methods would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the factors associated with psychological well-being among rural and urban adolescents.

Table3: Correlation between personality factors and psychological well-being

Variables	PWB	N	E	O	A	C
PWB	1	-0.688**	0.865**	0.644**	-0.732**	0.204*
N		1	-0.657**	-0.493**	0.599**	-0.188*
E			1	0.584**	-0.685**	0.183
O				1	-0.660**	0.187*
A					1	0.154
C						1

*Significant at 0.05 l

**Significant at 0.01 level

The present study was conducted to examine the relationship between five personality factors, namely neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, and psychological well-being among adolescents. Pearson's product–moment correlation coefficient was used to examine the direction and strength of the relationships between these variables. The findings presented in Table 3 revealed that psychological well-being was negatively correlated with neuroticism and agreeableness, while positive correlations were observed with extraversion, openness to experience, and conscientiousness. However, the strength of these relationships varied considerably across the five personality dimensions. The value of coefficient of correlation was positive meaning thereby that the two variables are directly related. So, the hypothesis-3 that

says that “there would be significant relationship between personality and psychological well-being of adolescents” was partially accepted.

Neuroticism and Psychological Well-Being**.** The findings revealed a strong negative correlation between neuroticism and psychological well-being (r = −.688). This indicates that higher neuroticism scores were associated with lower psychological well-being scores among the adolescents in the present sample. Neuroticism is generally characterized by a tendency to experience negative emotions, including anxiety, worry, emotional instability, and vulnerability to stress. Adolescents with higher neuroticism scores may be more sensitive to stressful situations and may experience greater difficulty maintaining emotional balance when confronted with academic, interpersonal, or personal challenges.

This finding is consistent with the broader literature on personality and well-being. Anglim et al. (2020), in a comprehensive meta-analysis examining personality traits and psychological and subjective well-being, identified neuroticism as one of the most important personality correlates of well-being. Similarly, Heilmann et al. (2021), in their investigation of personality traits, self-rated health, and life satisfaction among adolescents, found that higher neuroticism was associated with a greater likelihood of reporting low life satisfaction. These findings support the view that neuroticism is an important personality dimension to consider when examining psychological well-being during adolescence.

The present finding also corresponds with the study by Salami (2011), who investigated personality and psychological well-being among adolescents and examined the moderating role of emotional intelligence. The study reported significant relationships between personality factors and psychological well-being. Taken together, these findings suggest that emotional characteristics associated with neuroticism may be relevant to understanding variations in adolescent well-being. Nevertheless, the correlational nature of the present study does not establish that neuroticism directly causes lower psychological well-being.

Extraversion and Psychological Well-Being**.** The results indicated a very strong positive correlation between extraversion and psychological well-being (r = .865). This was the strongest positive correlation observed among the five personality dimensions in the present study. The finding suggests that adolescents with higher extraversion scores tended to report higher psychological well-being scores.

Extraversion is commonly associated with sociability, assertiveness, interpersonal engagement, and positive emotional expression. Adolescents who are more extraverted may find it easier to participate in social activities, establish interpersonal relationships, seek social support, and engage with their surroundings. Such experiences may be associated with positive psychological functioning and a greater sense of social connectedness.

The finding is consistent with the research conducted by Salami (2011), which identified significant relationships between personality factors and adolescent psychological well-being. It is also supported by Hungund and Kamble (2022), who examined personality and psychological well-being among 502 young people aged 18–23 years. Their findings indicated that extraversion was positively associated with several dimensions of psychological well-being, including environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relationships with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance.

Furthermore, Anglim et al. (2020) identified extraversion as an important correlate of well-being in their meta-analysis. These findings suggest that the tendency to engage positively with others and experience positive emotions may be relevant to psychological well-being. However, because the present study is correlational, it cannot establish whether extraversion contributes to higher well-being, whether well-being influences the expression of extraverted behaviour, or whether other factors are associated with both.

Openness to Experience and Psychological Well-Being. The findings showed a positive correlation between openness to experience and psychological well-being (r = .644). This indicates that higher openness scores were associated with higher psychological well-being scores among the adolescents studied.

Openness to experience generally reflects curiosity, imagination, intellectual exploration, receptiveness to new ideas, and an interest in learning and varied experiences. Adolescents with higher openness scores may be more willing to explore different perspectives, engage in creative activities, and approach new experiences with curiosity. These characteristics may be associated with personal growth and the development of a broader understanding of oneself and the surrounding environment.

The present finding can be discussed in relation to the multidimensional model of psychological well-being proposed by Ryff (1989). The model emphasizes personal growth, autonomy, environmental mastery, positive relationships, purpose in life, and self-acceptance as important dimensions of positive psychological functioning. Openness to experience may be particularly relevant to personal growth and intellectual exploration, although the

relationship between openness and overall well-being can vary according to the measures and populations examined.

Hungund and Kamble (2022) found that openness to experience was positively associated with personal growth among young people, although its relationships with other dimensions of psychological well-being varied. Similarly, Anglim et al. (2020) reported that personality–well-being relationships differ across specific well-being outcomes and personality dimensions. These findings indicate that openness may be relevant to certain aspects of psychological well-being without necessarily showing equally strong associations with every dimension.

The positive correlation observed in the present study therefore suggests that openness to experience is associated with psychological well-being among the adolescents examined. Further research using separate measures of personal growth, purpose in life, and other dimensions would help clarify the nature of this relationship.

Agreeableness and Psychological Well-Being**.** The results revealed a strong negative correlation between agreeableness and psychological well-being (r = −.732). This finding indicates that higher agreeableness scores were associated with lower psychological well-being scores in the present sample. This direction is noteworthy because agreeableness is commonly associated with cooperation, empathy, trust, consideration for others, and the maintenance of harmonious interpersonal relationships.

The negative correlation observed in this study differs from the positive relationships between agreeableness and several dimensions of psychological well-being reported by Hungund and Kamble (2022). It also differs from the broader evidence suggesting that agreeable interpersonal characteristics can be associated with favourable well-being outcomes in some populations.

Several explanations might be considered, but they must remain tentative. For example, the relationship could depend on the specific characteristics of the sample, the cultural context, the operational definition of psychological well-being, or the scoring procedure used for the personality inventory. It is also possible that the negative correlation reflects a characteristic of the particular dataset rather than a general relationship between agreeableness and well-being.

Accordingly, this result should not be interpreted to mean that agreeableness generally reduces psychological well-being. Instead, it highlights an association that requires further investigation. Before drawing a substantive conclusion, the researcher should verify the scoring direction of the agreeableness scale, check the data for coding errors, and confirm the correlation coefficient using the original statistical output.

Conscientiousness and Psychological Well-Being**.** The findings revealed a weak positive correlation between conscientiousness and psychological well-being (r = .204). This suggests that higher conscientiousness scores were associated with slightly higher psychological well-being scores among the adolescents studied. However, the relationship was considerably weaker than the correlations observed for neuroticism, extraversion, openness, and agreeableness.

Conscientiousness generally refers to responsibility, organization, self-discipline, persistence, and goal-directed behaviour. Among adolescents, these characteristics may be relevant to the management of academic responsibilities, the completion of tasks, and the pursuit of personal goals. Such behaviours may be associated with a sense of competence and environmental mastery, although the strength of this relationship may depend on individual and contextual circumstances.

The finding can be compared with the study by Heilmann et al. (2021), which reported that higher conscientiousness was associated with a reduced likelihood of low life satisfaction among adolescents. Anglim et al. (2020) also identified conscientiousness as an important correlate of well-being across the studies included in their meta-analysis. In addition, Hungund and Kamble (2022) reported positive associations between conscientiousness and several dimensions of psychological well-being, including autonomy, environmental mastery, positive relationships, purpose in life, and personal growth.

Although these studies generally support the relevance of conscientiousness to well-being, the comparatively weak correlation in the present study suggests that its relationship with psychological well-being may be limited in this sample or may depend on other factors. The statistical significance of the reported coefficient should also be verified. If the sample included 100 participants and the analysis used a conventional two-tailed Pearson correlation test, a correlation of r = .204 would generally be significant at approximately the .05 level, but not at the .01 level.

Conclusion:

The present study was conducted to investigate the relationship between personality factors and psychological well-being among adolescents, with particular reference to rural and urban differences. The study examined five major personality dimensions: neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. The findings provide insights into the differences in personality characteristics and psychological well-being between rural and urban adolescents, as well as the relationships between personality factors and psychological well-being.

The findings revealed significant rural–urban differences in all five personality factors. Rural adolescents obtained higher mean scores in extraversion and openness to experience, whereas urban adolescents obtained higher mean scores in neuroticism, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. The reported differences were statistically significant at the .01 level for neuroticism, extraversion, openness, and agreeableness. The difference in conscientiousness was significant at the .05 level but not at the .01 level, based on the reported t-value. These results indicate that the personality profiles of the rural and urban adolescents in the present sample differed across the five dimensions.

The study also revealed a significant difference in psychological well-being between rural and urban adolescents. Urban adolescents obtained a higher mean psychological well-being score (88.24) than rural adolescents (79.20). The difference was statistically significant at the .05 level. This finding suggests that the urban adolescents in the present sample reported comparatively higher psychological well-being. However, residential location alone cannot be considered the cause of this difference, as psychological well-being may also be associated with family circumstances, socioeconomic conditions, educational opportunities, peer relationships, and access to support services.

The correlation analysis further demonstrated that personality factors were associated with psychological well-being in different directions. Extraversion showed a strong positive correlation with psychological well-being ($r = .865$), followed by openness to experience ($r = .644$). Conscientiousness showed a weak positive correlation ($r = .204$). In contrast, neuroticism ($r = -.688$) and agreeableness ($r = -.732$) showed negative correlations with psychological well-being. These findings suggest that the relationship between personality and psychological well-being varies according to the particular personality dimension. The negative correlation involving agreeableness should be interpreted cautiously and verified against the original data and scoring procedures because its direction differs from several findings in the existing literature.

The findings are broadly consistent with the theoretical perspective that personality characteristics are relevant to psychological functioning and well-being. The Five-Factor Model provides a useful framework for understanding individual differences in emotional responses, social behaviour, openness to experiences, interpersonal orientations, and self-regulation. Similarly, Ryff's multidimensional model of psychological well-being emphasizes positive psychological functioning, including personal growth, positive relationships, autonomy, self-acceptance, environmental mastery, and purpose in life (Ryff, 1989). These perspectives help explain why personality dimensions may be associated with different aspects of adolescent well-being.

The study has important implications for parents, teachers, school counsellors, and professionals working in adolescent health and education. Schools should provide supportive environments that encourage emotional regulation, healthy interpersonal relationships, self-confidence, responsible behaviour, and personal development. Particular attention should be given to the psychological needs of adolescents who may experience emotional difficulties or limited access to appropriate support. Intervention programmes should be designed according to individual needs rather than assumptions based solely on rural or urban residence.

References

1. Allport, G. W. (1937). Personality: A psychological interpretation
2. Anglim, J., Horwood, S., Smillie, L. D., Marrero, R. J., & Wood, J. K. (2020). Predicting psychological and subjective well-being from personality: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 146(4), 279–323. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000226.
3. Atherton, O. E., Willroth, E. C., Graham, E. K., Luo, J., Mroczek, D. K., & Lewis-Thames, M. (2024). Rural–urban differences in personality traits and well-being in adulthood. Journal of Personality, 92(1), 73–87. PubMed Central (PMC)

4. Costa Jr, P. T., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: robust and surprising findings. Journal of personality and social psychology, 81(2), 322.
5. Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Normal personality assessment in clinical practice: The NEO Personality Inventory. Psychological assessment, 4(1), 5.
6. Depue, R. A., & Collins, P. F. (1999). Neurobiology of the structure of personality: Dopamine, facilitation of incentive motivation, and extraversion. Behavioral and brain sciences, 22(3), 491-517.
7. DeYoung, C. G., & Gray, J. R. (2009). Personality neuroscience: Explaining individual differences in affect, behaviour and cognition. The Cambridge handbook of personality psychology, 323-346.
8. Dhoundiyal, M., & Venkatesh, R. (2009). The psychological world of adolescence: A comparative evaluation between rural and urban girls. Indian Journal of Psychological Medicine, 31(1), 35–38. https://doi.org/10.4103/0253-7176.53313
9. Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. (1968). A factorial study of psychoticism as a dimension of personality. Multivariate Behavioral Research.
10. Feingold, A. (1994). Gender differences in personality: a meta-analysis. Psychological bulletin, 116(3), 429.
11. Funder, D. C. (1997). The personality puzzle. WW Norton & Co.
12. Heilmann, K., Hinrichs, R., Herke, M., Richter, M., & Rathmann, K. (2021). The importance of the “Big Five” personality traits for subjective health and life satisfaction in adolescence: Results of the National Educational Panel Study (NEPS). Gesundheitswesen, 83(1), 8–16. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-1068-2280.
13. Huebner, E. S. (2004). Research on assessment of life satisfaction of children and adolescents. Social Indicators Research, 66, 3–33. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:SOCI.0000007497.57754.e3
14. Hungund, D. L., & Kamble, S. V. (2022). Psychological well-being of adolescents: Association with personality. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6(6). Journal PPW
15. Hyde, J. S. (2005). The gender similarities hypothesis. American psychologist, 60(6), 581. India, 36 (2), 133-143.
16. John, O. P., Caspi, A., Robins, R. W., Moffitt, T. E., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1992). The “little five”: Exploring the nomological network of the five-factor model of personality in adolescent boys. Child development, 65(1), 160-178.
17. Kling, K. C., Hyde, J. S., Showers, C. J., & Buswell, B. N. (1999). Gender differences in self-esteem: a meta-analysis. Psychological bulletin, 125(4), 470.
18. Kumar, R. (2023). Psychological well-being among youth. International Journal of Indian Psychology, 11(3). View the published article
19. Kumar, R. (2025). A comparative study of psychological well-being between rural and urban higher secondary school students. International Journal of Indian Psychology, 13(4). https://doi.org/10.25215/1304.117
20. Maddi, S. R. (2006). Taking the theorizing in personality theories seriously: Comment.
21. Mischel, W. (1977). On the future of personality measurement. American psychologist, 32(4), 246.
22. Moksnes, U. K., & Espnes, G. A. (2013). Self-esteem and life satisfaction in adolescents—Gender and age as potential moderators. Quality of Life Research, 22, 2921–2928. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-013-0427-4
23. Nimbalkar, S. C., & Rani, G. (2023). Analysis of the personality characteristics of rural and urban secondary school students. Journal of Namibian Studies: History Politics Culture, 35, 3659–3669. https://doi.org/10.59670/jns.v35i.4278 Namibian Studies
24. Roberts, B. W., Walton, K. E., & Viechtbauer, W. (2006). Patterns of mean-level change in personality traits across the life course: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. Psychological Bulletin, 132(1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.1.
25. Roothman, B., Kirsten, D. K., & Wissing, M. P. (2003). Gender differences in aspects of psychological well-being. South African Journal of Psychology, 33(4), 212–218. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630303300403
26. Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57(6), 1069–1081. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

27. Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69(4), 719–727. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.4.719
28. Salami, S. O. (2011). Personality and psychological well-being of adolescents: The moderating role of emotional intelligence. Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 39(6), 785–794. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2011.39.6.785
29. Schmutte, P. S., & Ryff, C. D. (1997). Personality and well-being: Reexamining methods and meanings. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73(3), 549–559. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.3.549.
30. Singer, K., Chang, P. T., & Hsu, G. L. K. (1972). Physique, personality and mental illness in the Southern Chinese. The British Journal of Psychiatry, 121(562), 315-319.
31. Suldo, S. M., Minch, D. R., & Hearon, B. V. (2015). Adolescent life satisfaction and personality characteristics: Investigating relationships using a five factor model. Journal of Happiness Studies, 16, 965–983. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-014-9544-1.
32. Zhang, J., Miao, D., Sun, Y., Xiao, R., Ren, L., Xiao, W., & Peng, J. (2017). The mediation effect of coping style on the relations between personality and life satisfaction in Chinese adolescents. Frontiers in Psychology, 8, 1076. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01076.
33. Zhang, J., Miao, D., Sun, Y., Xiao, R., Ren, L., Xiao, W., & Peng, J. (2017). The mediation effect of coping style on the relations between personality and life satisfaction in Chinese adolescents. Frontiers in Psychology, 8, 1076. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01076