

EXAMINING THE ROLE OF DOGMATISM AS A PREDICTOR OF HAPPINESS AND HARMONY AMONG YOUNG ADULTS: A CORRELATIONAL STUDY

^aJUNXI GENG, ^bQURATUL-AIN, ^cZAIN ABBAS, ^dJIAN ZHANG

^a*Sichuan International Studies University*

^b*University of Sargodha Pakistan.*

^c*Center for Studies of Education and Psychology of Ethnic Minorities in Southwest China, Southwest University, Chongqing, China.*

^d*Center for Studies of Education and Psychology of Ethnic Minorities in Southwest China, Southwest University, Chongqing, China**

email: ^a463509665@qq.com, ^bquratali883@gmail.com, ^czainabbas7587@gmail.com, ^dzhangjian@swu.edu.cn

This work is supported by Project "Theoretical Construction and Practical Exploration of Chinese Education Modernization" (Grant No. VAA230006) and "The Historical Logic and Contemporary Value of the Spread of Chinese Sericulture as "Belt and Road" (Grant No. SWU2403008).

Abstract: The current study was intended to explore whether dogmatism is a predictor of happiness and harmony in life among young adults 18-25 years of age. In addition, this research also intended to identify mean differences in study variables across demographic variables including gender, age, etc. The study was based on a correlational research design. Participants comprised young adults ($N = 300$) from the University of Sargodha Pakistan. Data was collected using a purposive sampling technique. Linear regression analysis was applied to test of hypothesis. The findings revealed that dogmatism negatively predicted happiness and remained non-significant for harmony in life. Happiness positively predicted harmony in life among young adults. The findings revealed that if the level of dogmatism is managed to be lowered in young adult levels of happiness can be raised in them which will have a high impact on their flourishing.

Keywords: Dogmatism, happiness, harmony in life, young adults

1 Introduction and Literature Review

Rokeach (1960) proposed the concept of dogmatism to discuss the notion of rigid-mindedness. According to him, individuals high in dogmatism do not welcome those ideas that do not belong to their intellectual boundaries. He discussed dogmatism as an individual difference variable in cognitive style. Rokeach conceives dogmatism as an ordinary style of handling information and forming ideas. From Rokeach's point of view, a person is dogmatic or has a closed mind to the degree that s/he opposes the sway of ideas that plunge outside her/his predestined intellectual limitations. He/she pays attention to the course of action of how individuals systematize and develop their viewpoints concerning others' viewpoints within their "belief system". The level of one's dogmatism is determined by the extent to which an individual lets his/her beliefs communicate with each other when these beliefs are interrelated and constitute a belief system. An open-minded person demonstrates "intercommunication" of viewpoints whereas one with a closed mind exhibits "segregation" of viewpoints.

1.1 Dogmatism

The background of dogmatism is related to monumental California research authoritarian personality (Mele, 2015). In the research of the California group, we explained that authoritarian personality includes fascist tendencies. According to Rokeach, the research conducted on the California group was related to a specific personality type ethnocentrism, and narrowness. The view of Rokeach was that authoritarianism was not bounded by fascistic properties it can be related to a situation on the continuum fluctuating from extreme left (socialism) to extreme right (Fascism). He added that it is not bounded to political or economic consideration, but includes people with academic preferences in the civilization, the social and physiological sciences, and other religions. According to Rokeach prejudice on its own is not a predictor of authoritarianism.

He wanted to evaluate the tendencies found common in all the aspects of authoritarianism, irrespective of definite ideology

philosophical or scientific subject. The results of all these investigations were the basis of the concept of dogmatism. Rigidity refers to the idea or belief that refers to the extent to which a person is open to others' beliefs, ideas, and thoughts one person who accepts others' opinions, viewpoints, and ideas is considered to be less rigid than the person who does not accept others opinions, norms and beliefs.

A dogmatic person constructs his boundaries of beliefs and is not open-minded he/she sets his intellectual limitations and doesn't let others cross these limits or boundaries even dogmatic people who are high on rigidity don't even let others communicate their beliefs to them. Here two important phenomena intercommunication and segregation are there. Here intercommunication is higher in less rigid individuals and segregation is higher in more rigid and close-minded people. A personality attribute that is more closely related to adaptability and creativity is openness to experience. People with low levels of openness to experience tend to favor simplistic, non-intellectually challenging, black-and-white worldviews. In contrast, those with high levels of openness choose more nuanced perspectives and are at ease with complex concepts.

One of these qualities, openness to values, is prepared to "re-examine social, political, and religious beliefs" and is even thought to be "the antithesis of dogmatism" (Smith, Johnson, & Hathaway, 2009). The links between openness, dogmatism, and sympathy were studied in this study of master 's-level counselors-in-training enrolled in CACREP-accredited schools. The findings revealed that dogmatism and openness have a negative relationship and that openness and sympathy scores are entirely correlated. A survey of master 's-level students enrolled in the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (Duenyas, 2023). certified program was conducted after receiving institutional review board approval. Dogmatism and rigidity are interrelated and interconnected phenomena that fluctuate directly and also affect mental health in the same way as it is proposed that nothing remains the same or static De-Sardan, J. P. O. (2008).

As there is a confounding concept of distress that fluctuates accordingly. When people are rigid to beliefs and ideas they don't allow others to interfere or disturb their belief system if we see the Buddhist point of view they believe that everything in the world is changing there is a constant state of change in individuals and life can never remain same for individuals here if people are rigid and don't allow changes in their life they will eventually have to face higher levels of distress in their life (Lama & Cutlers, 1998). While if we consider a flexible mindset they will be more open to new experiences or new changes in life and therefore will have lower levels of distress in their lives.

If we sum up the research poor mental health is associated with those who are rigid and inflexible to the point of view while good mental health serves flexible and open-minded people. *Happiness* is an enterprise and a positive force of life. A person textures well-being underneath different effective influences. Religious dogmatism that influences the whole world is one of the critical factors of happiness or well-being. The present study decided to examine the relationship between dogmatism and well-being. This research is a correlation research. The population of research comprises all individuals with 30-50 years old who lived in Tehran, Iran, in 2015. From all of the subjects, 180 subjects were selected as samples. The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire and Rokeach dogmatism scale were used in the research. Data were examined by the Pearson correlation test. Results show a significant negative correlation between dogmatism and happiness ($a=0.05$).

Dogmatism ads a negative effect on well-being. Religious dogmatism is the most hazardous issue in contradiction to well-being. Dogmatic persons have a stubborn cognitive system that

arises as an unchanging personality trait and declines their modification with the atmosphere. (Denier et al., 2014). If we consider dogmatism in the light of authoritarianism we will see that dogmatic people are those individuals who tend to appreciate authority figures in every and then a situation of life they are more likely to follow or obey the rules that are put forward by authority figures consider marketing psychology when they have to sell different products they market them through advertisement, therefore, they make their advertisements attractive by adding authority figures in it consider an advertisement of medicine if those medicines are endorsed by a doctor in the media they are more likely to get purchased by the people who are high on dogmatism as the doctor is the authority figure for medicines, this is so because highly dogmatic people have believed in the words of authority figures than non-authority figures (Harvey & Hays, 1972).

Harmony refers to the concept that serves the purpose of balance in stabilizing different aspects of life (Li, 2008a) When it comes to balancing different domains of life the most important and crucial part is mutual support and dependence without which things cannot go further nor flourish (Li, 2008b). Considering a psychological well-being point of view to maintain a balance in life you don't need only personal well-being but social and environmental factors are also involved which takes things a step further when an individual focuses on their spirituality his own mental and physical well-being he has to take many things into account like maintaining and syncing oneself with its environmental factors. (Kjell, 2011). In 2011 Damburn and Ricard proposed that individual perception about oneself is as important as his understanding and a positive perception of the environment around him so that he can take and balance things side by side.

Balance and harmony are often used interchangeably but if we see things, in general, what it means to be a person in harmony (Coursey, et al 2019), it is not a separate complete phenomenon but a portion of a broader notion if seen more commonly balance is used to illustrate the relationship between two related phenomena but it does not necessarily mean that just analyzing both phenomena will result in a balance for the aspects and situations it further involves many subconcepts and is a complex phenomenon in simple terms harmony can involve three major phenomena (a) analytical phenomena (b) motivational phenomena (c) axiological phenomena here analytical principles refer to the deeper understanding of different factors, situations and people in addition to which you should also have the ability to analyze and evaluate those phenomena on just grounds by having a positive perception. Motivational phenomena refer to the ideas of your choices and methods to act on a plan while axiological concepts illustrate the importance of valuing life outcomes.

All of these major concepts work together to serve the balance in life and its domains Ideals of harmony were explained in classical Chinese and Greek philosophy they explained and stressed the importance of harmonizing and balancing features and subdomains of life (Li, 2008a). Here harmony can be conceptualized as the quality of relationships among multiple balancing acts around the world. Harmony and Affective Balance category have a wide range of literature support as when it comes to harmony emotions are the most important factor for balance in life it doesn't only include balance and equilibrium but also complexity and granularity now if we consider emotional balance there are two important domains to consider positive affect (PA) and negative affect (NA) (Bradburn, 1969).

Although positive and negative effects are considered as a continuum if we go further to have a deeper look they are even more complex than one could imagine. Mostly when it comes to harmony one might think that a person could have harmony in life if he could higher rate or score on positive affect and a lower score on negative affect but this is not the case on actual grounds. Here idea of harmony can be a balance in both PA and NA in such a way that if a person is in a state of highly charged emotions he could be in harmony by having high PA and NA

simultaneously similarly he could experience harmony by having low PA and NA when experiencing a low arousal state (Lomas, 2017c), balance is not only important when it comes to positive emotions pain is also a very important factor of life when it comes to endurance. (Nelson et al., 2014).

Cognitive balance is a very broad category that has a diverse range of concepts. Here a quite useful and worthy concept for cognitive balance was provided by Wallace and Shapiro (2006) in the Buddhist philosophy they divided the concept of cognitive balance into four forms Conative, cognitive, attentional, and affective. The next category to be included is balance between oneself and others which is of utter importance because a stable life needs balanced relationships whether it is family, friends, or intimate relationships (Levpušček, 2006). Here if we take an example of partnership whether it is professional or romantic both need harmony i.e. if one partner is doing something for the other partner he is also having some expectation from him which if not fulfilled leads to conflicts, toxicity in relationships, breakups and divorces. Ideal relationships are the ones that have practical implications of the rule of give and take (Salazar, 2015).

If we have to compare the two cultures then Western culture mostly focuses on individualism and in Eastern culture individuals have major concerns about the collectivist approach if we consider self-other balance eastern culture could be considered more in harmony than Western culture due to collectivist approach although western culture is not considered more indulgent in harmony domain but still western individuals also interact productively in a more healthy manner.

1.2 Happiness

Happiness is a broad term that is frequently used with well-being due to its similarity. Happiness represents a person's subjective gratitude for life. According to Mahipalan, & Sheena, (2019), it is an individual's positive psychological state. Happiness is an individual's positive potential and high productive level, to build and maintain social relationships, and the ability to gain more success. According to Deb, (2020), happiness is an individual's satisfaction with life. It is based on a person's affects and thoughts. According to Haybron (2008), happiness has two essential approaches; prudential pleasure and psychological pleasure.

Hence, it represents two conceptually different things, a powerful condition of mind and a lifestyle that is excellent for someone. Happiness is a positive, optimistic, and constructive feeling. When an individual has positive views about oneself and other individual's lifestyles and thinks that all things are good then the individual's psychological well-being level is high (Kang, et al. 2021). According to (Pfund 2023) six distinct extents of wellness are present i.e., personal growth, self-acceptance, autonomy, purposeful life, positive social relations, and environmental mastery. The most reliable components of happiness are self-progress, independence, self-confidence, and well-being. Stress tolerance, interpersonal relationships, problem-solving, and reality testing.

1.3 Theoretical perspective of happiness

Hedonism Theory. Happiness is the feeling of positive consistency of satisfaction over discomfort. It is a subjective sentiment. A pleased or satisfied lifestyle increases feelings of pleasure, reduces pain, and positive thinking about life, and has a high level of excitement (Fletcher, 2009). According to hedonic theory, an individual's psychological situation influences a person's satisfaction level. A satisfied person will be more confident, helpful, responsible, and enjoy life more (Layard, 2005). Happy individuals perform new tasks or activities in an energetic mood (Haybron, 2008). So, according to this theory, happiness is not only a condition of someone's awareness but a condition of well-being (Fletcher, 2009)

2 Research Design

The present study was conducted using a co-relational research design. In the presented study the data was collected by survey research method. The purpose of this study is to see the relationship between dogmatism, happiness, and harmony in life among young adults.

2.1 Sample

The sample of the present study consisted of $N = 300$ young adults including both men ($n = 51$) and women ($n = 249$). A purposive sampling technique was used to select the sample of the study. The age range of the sample was 18-25 years ($M = 20.5$, $S.D = 5.43$). Demographic variables such as gender, age, education, residence, and family system were also measured. The data was collected from students of the University of Sargodha (UOS) Pakistan.

Table 1: Frequency and Percentage of Participants

Characteristics	N	%
Gender		
Boys	51	17
Girls	249	83
Education		
BS	256	85.3
MSc	44	14.7
Age		
18-20	88	29.3
21-25	212	70.7
Residence		
Urban	168	56
Rural	132	44
Family System		
Nuclear	202	67.3
Joint	98	32.7

Table 1 reveals that a greater number of female young adults ($n = 249$, 83%) participated in the study compared to male young adults ($n = 51$, 17%). A higher number of participants from urban areas ($n = 168$, 56%) participated in the study as compared to rural areas ($n = 132$, 44%). The higher number of participants did BS ($n = 256$, 85.3%) as compared to Msc ($n = 44$, 14.7%). The high number of participants belong to the 21-25 age range ($n = 212$, 70.7%) as compared to the 18-20 age range ($n = 88$, 29.3%). The majority of participants belong to a nuclear family system ($n = 202$, 67.3%) as compared to a joint family system ($n = 98$, 32.7%).

Procedure

In the present study, the impact of dogmatism was investigated on happiness and harmony in life. The sample for the study was young adults and all of the young adults were university students. After getting permission from the Head of Department to conduct this study. All participants were assured that their information would be kept confidential and would only be used for research purposes. Informed consent was signed by the participant to keep their information confidential. Three scales were administered to participants in a relaxed environment. Complete guidance was provided to participants to avoid response bias.

After the completion of the questionnaires, they were thanked for their cooperation. Analysis for descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation, and linear Regression was used through IBM-SPSS. For the reliability coefficient reliability analysis was run which provided Cronbach's alpha and item-related correlation. To measure the demographic mean difference, an independent

sample t-test was also used. After that the results were analyzed through spss.26. Finally, the limitations of the studied variables were put forward.

Results

The goal of the present study is to investigate whether dogmatism is a predictor of happiness and harmony in life among young adults 18-25 years of age. SPSS-25 was used to carry out data analysis. Primarily, the demographic characteristics were identified through frequencies and percentages. Descriptive statistics and alpha reliability coefficient were calculated. Pearson correlation was calculated to find out the relationships between variables. Linear regression analysis was applied to calculate the effect of predictors on the outcome variables. Independent sample t-tests were applied to calculate mean differences across demographic factors.

Table 2: Psychometric Properties for Scales

Scale	M	SD	Range	Cronbach's α
Dogmatism Scale	27.75	4.17	19-43	.37
Oxford Happiness Scale	119.37	15.35	69-161	.80
Harmony in Life Scale	26.35	4.70	5-35	.75

The following table shows the psychometric properties of the scales which was used for the present study. Here Cronbach's α value for the dogmatism Scale was .37 indication of satisfactory internal consistency. The Cronbach's α Scale of Oxford happiness scale was .80 which represents high internal consistency. The Cronbach's α Scale value of harmony in life scale was .75 which shows good internal consistency.

Table 3: Pearson Correlations for Present Study Variables

Variables	1	2	3
1. Dogmatism	-		
2. Oxford Happiness	-.28**	-	
3. Harmony in Life	-.076	.56**	-

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

The following table revealed that dogmatism has a significant negative correlation with construct happiness ($r = -.28$, $p < .001$) and happiness shows a significant positive correlation with harmony in life scale ($r = .56$, $p < .001$) while Dogmatism has a non-significant correlation with harmony in life ($r = -.076$, $p > .05$).

Table 4: Regression Coefficients of dogmatism on happiness

Variable	B	β	SE
Constant	148.6		5.72
Dogmatism	-1.05	-.29	0.204
R²	0.08		

Note. $N = 300$

** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

This table shows the impact of dogmatism on happiness in young adults. The R^2 value of .08 revealed that the predictor variable explained a .08% variance in the outcome variable with $F(1, 298) = 26.71$, $p < .001$. The findings show that dogmatism has negatively predicted happiness ($\beta = -.29$, $p < .001$).

Table 5: Regression Coefficients of dogmatism on harmony in life

Variable	B	β	SE
Constant	28.73		1.82
Dogmatism	-0.08	-.08	0.06
R²	0.006		

Note. $N = 300$

*** $p < .001$

The following table shows the impact of dogmatism on harmony in life among young adults. The R^2 value of .006 represents that the predictor variable explained .006% variance for the outcome variable with $F(1, 298) = 1.73, p < .001$ so therefore The findings prove that dogmatism does not predict harmony in life ($\beta = -.08, p > .05$).

Table 6: Regression Coefficients of happiness on harmony in life

Variable	B	β	SE
Constant	5.83		1.76
Happiness	0.172	.56	0.02
R²	0.31		

Note. $N = 300$

*** $p < .001$

The following table shows the impact of dogmatism on harmony in life among young adults. The R^2 value of .31 represents that the predictor variable explained a .31% variance for the outcome variable with $F(1, 298) = 137.12, p < .001$. Therefore, the findings revealed that happiness positively predicted harmony in life ($\beta = .56, p < .001$).

Table 7: Mean Comparison for Bs and MSc students graduate on happiness.

Variables	BS (M, SD)	MSc (M, SD)	t(298)	p	Cohen's d
Dogmatism	27.72, 4.24	27.90, 3.75	-2.73	.78	0.04
Happiness	118.5, 15.5	124.2, 13.41	-2.27	.02	1.16
Harmony in Life	26.1, 4.65	27.3, 4.91	-1.47	.14	1.09

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

The following table indicated non-significant mean differences with dogmatism $t(298) = -.273, p > .05$. Result showed that Ms.c students have higher scores on dogmatism ($M = 27.90, SD = 3.75$) compared to Bs students ($M = 27.72, SD = 4.24$). Cohen's d was 0.04 (< 0.20) which indicates no effect size. These results showed significant mean differences in happiness with $t(298) = -2.27, p > .05$. Findings revealed Ms. C students displayed high scores in happiness ($M = 124.2, SD = 13.41$) compared to Bs students ($M = 118.5, SD = 15.5$). Cohen's d was 1.16 (> 0.20) which indicates a high effect size. Findings showed non-significant mean differences in harmony in life with $t(298) = -1.47, p > .05$. Results displayed that Bs students display lower scores in harmony in life ($M = 26.1, SD = 4.65$) compared to Ms.c students ($M = 27.3, SD = 4.91$). Cohen's d was 1.09 (< 0.20) which indicates a satisfactory effect size.

3 Discussion

The current study was interested in exploring the relationship between dogmatism, happiness, and harmony in life among young adults 18-25 years of age. Moreover, dogmatism has been studied as a predictor of happiness and harmony in life. In addition, this research also intended to identify mean differences in study variables across demographic variables including gender, age, etc. All three variables were important in their unique way as well as collectively. Initially, psychometric analysis was run on the SPSS to ensure that the instruments used

in the present research were reliable. The instruments were used on the sample of 300 young adults. For the measurement of dogmatism, the 11-item short scale of dogmatism was used. Its items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1-strongly disagree to 5-strongly agree.

The alpha reliability of the dogmatism scale originally found is .37 which shows satisfactory internal consistency and proves the scale as a reliable instrument. To measure construct happiness, an Oxford happiness scale was used. It is comprised of 29 items. Its items are rated on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1-strongly disagree to 6-strongly agree. The alpha reliability of the status consumption scale originally found is .80 which shows high internal consistency and proves the scale is a reliable instrument. For the measurement of harmony, the harmony in life scale was used. It is comprised of 5 items. Its items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1- strongly disagree to 7-strongly agree.

The alpha reliability of the consumer independence scale originally found is .75 which shows internal consistency and proves the scale is a reliable instrument. Furthermore mean, range, the standard deviation were also computed for the present research under the heading of psychometric properties (See Table 2) The data of 300 young adults which were all university students of UOS Pakistan, were further evaluated with the help of advanced statistics for the testing of the hypothesis. The first finding of the present research is that there is a significant negative correlation between dogmatism and happiness. The previous research supported similar results (Denier ED et al., 2014). also found that dogmatism negatively predicts Happiness.

People who are rigid regarding their beliefs and thoughts end up having a very low level of happiness in their life .when dogmatic people stick to an idea they don't allow any flexibility in it they are also not open to others' views and opinions and want others to confirm their beliefs and ideas this result in problems among their close relationships i.e their family and friends which lead to interrelationships conflict. These conflicts can also lead to social disapproval and loneliness. Taking it further when somebody is high on dogmatism they don't consider plans B and just stick to the same routine and motives although there are chances for their success for the benefit of consistency in their goals sometimes they become victims of burnout and are unable to continue further still they don't mold their ways and do not consider other options which increase their level of frustration which eventually decrease their level of happiness.

The second finding of the present study was that there is a significant negative correlation between dogmatism and harmony in life. Previously we assumed that harmony in life scale, happiness scale, and satisfaction with life scale have similar constructs where Dogmatism negatively predicted happiness which ultimately suggested lower levels of satisfaction with life with increased levels of dogmatism. Now here as satisfaction with life scale complements harmony in life scale it was hypothesized that dogmatism will negatively predict harmony in life scale people having rigid beliefs and thoughts are not open to others' opinions and ideas so are unable to keep balance in their life, individuals who are willing to achieve balance in their life are open to compromise in specific situations to maintain healthy relationships and to avoid stress in their life in contrary to that dogmatic people are not open to compromises as it is against their perfectionist mentality, they don't want to bow down their heads in front of others because of these egoistic approaches in their life, therefore, they ultimately lose that harmony and balance in their life.

The third finding of the present research was that there is a positive correlation between happiness and harmony in life, and happiness positively predicts harmony in life among young adults. As harmony in life refers to balance in different domains of life when an individual has a higher level of happiness his mind and body are relaxed without any stress and strain and therefore can work more efficiently to maintain and balance different domains of life i.e there is a person who awakes by

feeling happy so he will automatically indulge himself in healthy and productive activities in life i.e going for a walk doing a healthy breakfast and will happily complete his all to-do list which will eventually take him a step further to a more balanced life as his important duties will be completed in time and will lead a healthy life too but in contrary to that when the persons don't feel happy so whenever he will try to finish some unfinished work he will soon be annoyed by them and will feel lazy and depressive to complete his to-do list due to which he will end up having a more disturbed and unbalanced life.

The fourth finding of present study is that there is a low level of happiness among BS undergraduate students than Master's students ,now taking it into account when BS students get admission in university they have just completed their intermediates so when they join universities they all of sudden face a whole different environment in which they have to study and work independently they are not mature enough to do so and therefore for them it takes time to experience ,analyze and then expertise things and their environment while in contrary to that Master's students are comparatively more mature when they join universities as many of them have spent 2 years of their graduation in affiliated colleges and sub-campuses in which they didn't have to face as many issues as are to be faced by BS students in universities and by the time they are in universities they are mature enough experienced enough to understand things so are less involved interpersonal and inter-role conflict and can also better adopt to their environment. Therefore their (Master's students) level of happiness is higher than that of BS undergraduate students. The last finding of the present study is that there are no significant differences in the dogmatic level of boys and girls which was also supported by research findings as dogmatism is a personality trait so it doesn't matter if the individual is a male or female he can or cannot be dogmatic depending upon his other personality traits i.e authoritarianism and rigidity are both traits of highly dogmatic individuals. Similarly, openness and extroverted individuals are more open to opinions and suggestions and thus are less dogmatic in comparison.

4 Conclusion

The present study aimed to study the impact of dogmatism on happiness and harmony in life which was considered to be the main goal of the research while the additional goal was to study the impact of happiness on harmony in life among young adults. The findings revealed satisfactory and high reliability of instruments used in the research. Results indicated a significant negative correlation between dogmatism and happiness. Dogmatism also shows a non-significant correlation with harmony in life.

Happiness also showed a significant positive correlation with harmony in life. The results are supported by the literature review. Linear regression analysis was used to prove the positive and negative correlations between study variables. Differences were also found based on demographic variables. In addition, independent sample T-tests were applied to analyze relationships between demographic variables.

5 Suggestions for the Future Research

The researcher should collect data from several cities or try to collect data from every province in Pakistan to generalize research on the whole population of Pakistan. The future researcher should use more than one research design to reduce social desirability and response biases, resulting in a high level of internal validity in the study. Future researchers should also pay attention to the qualitative parts of the study.

For the validation of scales in the collectivist culture of Pakistan, Confirmatory factor analysis should be carried out for all scales. Similarly, all the scales were in the English language. Although the participants belonged to academia still it would be more appropriate in future research to carry out Urdu translation, adaptation, and cross-language validation of these scales. To

analyze cause and effect relationships, the future researcher should aim to eliminate all possible confounding factors. To have a deeper understanding of these variables, future studies should broaden this network of concepts.

Literature:

1. Bradburn, N. (1969). *The Structure of Psychological Wellbeing*. New York: Aldine. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t10756-000>
2. Coursey, K., Pirzchalski, S., McMullen, M., Lindroth, G., & Furuushi, Y. (2019). Living with harmony: a personal companion system by Realbotix™. *AI love you: Developments in human-robot intimate relationships*, 77-95.
3. Damburn, M., & Ricard, M. (2011). Self-centeredness and selflessness: A theory of self-based psychological functioning and its consequences for happiness. *Review of General Psychology*, 15(2), 138-157.
4. Deb, S., Thomas, S., Bose, A., & Aswathi, T. (2020). Happiness, meaning, and satisfaction in life as perceived by Indian university students and their association with spirituality. *Journal of religion and health*, 59, 2469-2485.
5. De-Sardan, J. P. O. (2008). *Anthropology and development: Understanding contemporary social change*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
6. Diener, ED. (2014). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542– 575.[doi:10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542](https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542)
7. Duenyas, D. L., Sumiel, A., & Krahwinkel, J. (2023). Experience of Underrepresented Students in Master's-Level Counselor Education Programs. *Journal of Counselor Preparation and Supervision*, 17(2), 8.
8. Fletcher, G. (2009). Rejecting well-being invariabilism. *Philosophical Papers*, 38(1), 21-34.
9. Harvey, J., & Hays, D. G. Effects of dogmatism and authority on the source of communication upon persuasion. *Psychological Reports*, 30, 119-122
10. Haybron, D. M. (2008). Philosophy and the science of subjective well-being. *The science of subjective well-being*, 17-43.
11. Haybron, D. M. (2008). Philosophy and the science of subjective well-being. *The science of subjective well-being*, 17-43.
12. Hills, P., & Argyle, M. (2002). The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire: a compact scale for the measurement of psychological well-being. *Personality and individual differences*, 33(7), 1073-1082.
13. Kang, J., Martinez, C. M. J., & Johnson, C. (2021). Minimalism as a sustainable
14. Kjell, O. N. E. (2011). Sustainable well-being: A potential synergy between sustainability and well-being research. *Review of General Psychology*, 15(3), 255–266. [doi:10.1037/a0024603](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024603).
15. Lamba, D. & Cutler, H. C. (1998). *The art of happiness: A handbook for living*.
16. Layard, R. (2005). *Mental health: Britain's biggest social problem?*
17. Levpušček, M. P. (2006). Adolescent individuation concerning parents and friends: Age and gender differences. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 3(3), 238-264.
18. Li, C. (2008a). The ideal of harmony in ancient Chinese and Greek philosophy. *Dao*, 7(1), 81–98.
19. Li, C. (2008b). The philosophy of harmony in classical Confucianism. *Philosophy Compass*, 3(3), 13.*lifestyle: Its behavioral representations and contributions to emotional well-being. Sustainable Production and Consumption*, 27, 802-813.
20. Lomas, T. (2017c). The value of ambivalent emotions: a cross-cultural lexical analysis. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 125.<https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2017.1400143>
21. Mahipalan, M., & Sheena, S. (2019). Workplace spirituality and subjective happiness among high school teachers: Gratitude as a moderator. *Explore*, 15(2), 107-114.
22. Mele, V. (2015). 'At the crossroad of Magic and Positivism'. *Roots of an Evidential Paradigm through Benjamin and Adorno. Journal of Classical Sociology*, 15(2), 139-153.
23. Pfund, G. N., Willroth, E. C., Mroczek, D. K., & Hill, P. L. (2023). Valuing Versus Having: The Contrary Roles of Valuing and Having Money and Prestige on Well-Being. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 19485506231166048.

24. Rokeach, M. & Restle, F. (1960). A Fundamental distinction between open and closed systems. In Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic books
25. Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
26. Salazar, F., Baird, G., Chandler, S., Tseng, E., O'Sullivan, T., Howlin, P., ... & Simonoff, E. (2015). Co-occurring psychiatric disorders in preschool and elementary school-aged children with autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, 45, 2283-2294.
27. Shearman, S. M., & Levine, T. R. (2006). Dogmatism Updated: A Scale Revision and Validation. *Communication Quarterly*, 54, 275-291
28. Smith, C. L., Johnson, J. L., & Hathaway, W. (2009). Personality Contributions to Belief in Paranormal Phenomena. *Individual Differences Research*, 7(2), 85-96.
29. Wallace, B. A., & Shapiro, S. L. (2006). Mental balance and well-being: building bridges between Buddhism and Western psychology. *American Psychologist*, 61(7), 690.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AN, AO