

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGIOSITY AND
HAPPINESS: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF SELF-
CONTROL, SELF-REGULATION, AND LIFE
SATISFACTION**

ABDUL AZIZ RUSMAN

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA

2019

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGIOSITY AND
HAPPINESS: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF SELF-
CONTROL, SELF-REGULATION, AND LIFE
SATISFACTION**

by

ABDUL AZIZ RUSMAN

**Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

August 2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praise is due to Allah, the Beneficent the Merciful. I am very grateful to everyone who has made this study of reverie crystallized. It would not have been possible without the incredible support that I received. First, I would like to express my special appreciation and thanks to my main supervisor Dr. Intan Hashimah Mohd. Hashim and my co-supervisor Dr. Norzarina Mohd. Zaharim for their guidance, knowledge, and encouragement, who helped me to find my voice through the thesis process.

I would like to recognize my family for all of their love and assistance. I am grateful for my family's strength, guidance, and support to follow my reverie. I am thankful that my parents, Rusman Hasibuan and Naslah Daulay, blessed me with the appreciation for reverie that led to this dissertation. Thank you also to my mother-in-law, Berliana Nasution, that encouraged my enjoyment in reverie. I owe a special thanks to my wife, Fauziah Nasution, and my two 'menjeng', Shafi and Shifa, for tough-love, sympathy, and comedic.

Special thanks also reserved for Universiti Sains Malaysia which facilitated the completion of this thesis, and for Islamic State University of North Sumatera which permitted the study. Last and not least, my warmest thanks to administrative staff at Postgraduate Office of the School of Social Science.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	x
ABSTRAK	xi
ABSTRACT	xiii

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Problem Statement.....	3
1.3 Research Objectives	6
1.4 Research Questions.....	7
1.5 Significance of Study.....	7
1.6 Scope of the Study	9
1.7 Organization of the Chapter	9
1.8 Summary.....	11

CHAPTER 2 - LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction	12
2.2 Happiness.....	12
2.2.1 Historical Development of Happiness	12
2.2.2 Conceptualizing of Happiness	14
2.2.2(a) Hedonic Tradition	14
2.2.2(b) Eudaimonic Tradition.....	15
2.2.2(c) Islamic Tradition	16

2.2.3	Theories of Happiness	17
2.2.4	Happiness in this study	20
2.2.5	Measurements of Happiness	21
2.2.6	Determinants of Happiness	26
2.2.6(a)	The Person's Genetic Set Point.....	27
2.2.6(b)	The Person's Current Circumstances	30
2.2.6(c)	The Person's Current Intentional Activities.....	32
2.2.7	Consequences of Happiness.....	36
2.2.7(a)	Creativity and Productivity	37
2.2.7(b)	Longevity	40
2.2.7(c)	Social Relationships and Pro-social Behavior	41
2.3	Life Satisfaction.....	41
2.3.1	Definition of Life Satisfaction	41
2.3.2	Components of Life Satisfaction	42
2.3.3	Measurement of Life Satisfaction.....	44
2.3.4	Happiness and Life Satisfaction	47
2.4	Religiosity.....	49
2.4.1	Definition of Religiosity	49
2.4.2	Religiosity in Islamic Context.	49
2.4.3	Aspects of Religiosity.....	51
2.4.4	Measurement of Religiosity.....	53
2.4.5	Religiosity, Life Satisfaction, and Happiness.....	55
2.5	Self-regulation	59
2.5.1	Definition of Self-regulation.....	59
2.5.2	Aspects of Self-regulation	60
2.5.3	Measurement of Self-regulation	63
2.5.4	The Role of Self-regulation on the Relationships between Religiosity, Life Satisfaction, and Happiness.....	64

2.6	Self-control	67
2.6.1	Definition of Self-control.....	67
2.6.2	Aspects of Self-control	68
2.6.3	Measurement of Self-control	70
2.6.4	The Role of Self-control on the Relationships between Religiosity, Life Satisfaction, and Happiness	73
2.7	Conceptual Framework.....	75
2.8	Hypotheses.....	78

CHAPTER 3 - METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction	79
3.2	Research Design	79
3.3	Location	80
3.4	Population and Sampling.....	83
3.5	Procedure	86
3.6	Measurement	87
3.6.1	Questionnaire Design.....	87
3.6.2	Translation	89
3.7	Ethical Consideration	90
3.8	Data analysis.....	91
3.9	Pilot Study	92
3.10	Analysis of the Pilot Study	93

CHAPTER 4 - RESULTS

4.1	Preparation of the analysis.....	100
4.2	Descriptive Statistics	102
4.2.1	Demographic Characteristic of Sample	103
4.2.2	Demographic Characteristic of Variable Scale.....	105

4.3	Assessment of Measurement Model.....	110
4.3.1	Multivariate Normality Test	110
4.3.2	Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Religiosity.....	111
4.3.3	Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Self-control	117
4.3.4	Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Self-regulation	123
4.3.5	Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Life Satisfaction.....	129
4.3.6	Confirmatory Factor Analysis of Happiness	133
4.4	Structural Model	137
4.5	Model Modification.....	142
4.6	Hypotheses Testing.....	144
4.6.1	Hypothesis One.....	145
4.6.2	Hypothesis Two	145
4.6.3	Hypothesis Three	146
4.6.4	Hypothesis Four	147

CHAPTER 5 - DISCUSSION

5.1	Introduction	148
5.2	Summary of Findings	148
5.3	Discussion.....	150
5.3.1	The Relationship between Religiosity and Self-control	151
5.3.2	The relationship between religiosity and self-regulation.....	153
5.3.3	The Mediating Effect of Self-control and Self-regulation on the Relationship between Religiosity and Life Satisfaction	154
5.3.4	The Mediating Effect of Self-control, Self-regulation and Life Satisfaction on the Relationship between Religiosity and Happiness	156
5.4	Implication.....	159
5.4.1	Theoretical Implication.....	159
5.4.2	Practical Implication.	161

5.5	Limitations and Future Direction	162
5.6	Conclusion	163

REFERENCES	164
-------------------------	-----

APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 3.1 Area of District in Medan City	82
Table 3.2 Number Of Village (Kelurahan) and Administrative Unit (Lingkungan) by District in Medan City	82
Table 3.3 Population of Medan City by Districts and Gender	83
Table 3.4 Population of Medan City by Age Group and Gender	84
Table 3.5 Participants of Pilot Study by Districts and Gender	93
Table 3.6 Validity and Reliability of The Subjective Happiness Scale.....	95
Table 3.7 Validity and Reliability of The Satisfaction With Life Scale.....	96
Table 3.8 Validity and Reliability of The Centrality of Religiosity Scale	97
Table 3.9 Validity and Reliability of The Brief Self-Control Scale	98
Table 3.10 Validity and Reliability of The Self-Regulation Scale.....	99
Table 4.1 Descriptions and thresholds of goodness-of-fit indices used in the assessment of both measurement and structural models	102
Table 4.2 Distribution of Subject by District and Gender	103
Table 4.3 Distribution of Subject by Age Group and Gender	104
Table 4.4 Means and Standard Deviations for Variables Scores of Each Gender	105
Table 4.5 Mean, Standard Deviation, and Frequency Distribution of Happiness	105
Table 4.6 Mean, Standard Deviation, and Frequency Distribution of Life Satisfaction	106
Table 4.7 Mean, Standard Deviation, and Frequency Distribution of Self- regulation	107
Table 4.8 Mean, Standard Deviation, and Frequency Distribution of Self-control	108
Table 4.9 Mean, Standard Deviation, and Frequency Distribution of Religiosity.....	109
Table 4.10 Summary result of fit indices for the five-factor CRS constructs	113

Table 4.11	Summary Result of Parameter Estimates for the five-factor CRS structure	116
Table 4.12	Correlation Matrix of ETA and KSI.....	117
Table 4.13	Summary result of fit indices for the two-factor BSCS constructs ..	119
Table 4.14	Summary Result of Parameter Estimates for the two-factor BSCS structure	122
Table 4.15	Correlation Matrix of ETA and KSI.....	123
Table 4.16	Summary result of fit indices for the two-factor SRS constructs	125
Table 4.17	Summary Result of Parameter Estimates for the two-factor SRS structure	128
Table 4.18	Correlation Matrix of ETA and KSI.....	129
Table 4.19	Summary result of fit indices for the SWLS constructs	130
Table 4.20	Summary Result of Parameter Estimates for the SWLS structure ...	133
Table 4.21	Summary result of fit indices for the SHS constructs	134
Table 4.22	Summary Result of Parameter Estimates for the SHS structure	137
Table 4.23	Summary result of fit indices for the proposed model structure	139
Table 4.24	Structural model assessment – proposed model	140
Table 4.25	Decomposition of Structural Effects – Proposed Model	141
Table 4.26	Summary result of fit indices for the modified model structure	142
Table 4.27	Structural model assessment – Modified model.....	143
Table 4.28	Decomposition of Structural Effects – Modified Model.....	144

LIST OF FIGURE

	Page
Figure 2.1	Hypothesized Structural model 77
Figure 4.1	Second-Order SEM Model of CRS..... 112
Figure 4.2a	Standardized Solution of item and five-factor CRS structure..... 114
Figure 4.2b	t-Value of item and five-factor CRS structure 115
Figure 4.3	Second-Order SEM Model of BSCS..... 118
Figure 4.4a	Standardized Solution of item and two-factor BSCS structure..... 120
Figure 4.4b	t-Value of item and two-factor BSCS structure 121
Figure 4.5	Second-Order SEM Model of SRS 124
Figure 4.6a	Standardized Solution of item and two-factor SRS structure 126
Figure 4.6b	t-Value of item and two-factor SRS structure..... 127
Figure 4.7	First-Order SEM Model of SWLS 129
Figure 4.8a	Standardized Solution of item SWLS structure 131
Figure 4.8b	t-Value of item for SWLS structure 132
Figure 4.9	First Order SEM of SHS 134
Figure 4.10a	Standardized Solution of item SHS structure..... 135
Figure 4.10b	t-Value of item for SHS structure 136
Figure 4.11	Path diagram for structural equation model with one latent predictor variable ξ_1 , three mediator variables η_1, η_2, η_3 and one criterion variable η_4 138
Figure 4.12	Completely Standardized Path Coefficient for the Proposed Structure Model..... 140
Figure 4. 13	Completely Standardized Path Coefficient for the Modified Structure Model..... 143

HUBUNGAN ANTARA KEAGAMAAN DAN KEGEMBIRAAN: PERANAN PENGANTARA KAWALAN KENDIRI, PERATURAN KENDIRI, DAN KEPUASAN HIDUP

ABSTRAK

Keagamaan telah dikaitkan dengan kegembiraan tetapi laluan sebenar yang menggariskan hubungan tersebut masih kabur. Satu mekanisme yang mungkin dapat menerangkan hubungan antara keagamaan dan kegembiraan adalah peranan keagamaan dalam mempromosikan kawalan dan peraturan sendiri. Kawalan dan peraturan sendiri kemudiannya mempengaruhi kepuasan hidup dan seterusnya kegembiraan. Tujuan kajian ini adalah untuk mengkaji hubungan antara keagamaan, kawalan sendiri, peraturan sendiri, kepuasan hidup dan kegembiraan. Lebih khusus lagi, kajian ini mengkaji (1) hubungan antara keagamaan dan kawalan sendiri; (2) hubungan antara keagamaan dan peraturan sendiri; (3) kesan pengantaraan kawalan sendiri dan peraturan sendiri terhadap hubungan antara keagamaan dan kepuasan hidup; dan (4) kesan pengantaraan kawalan sendiri, peraturan sendiri, dan kepuasan hidup terhadap hubungan di antara keagamaan dan kegembiraan. Peserta kajian terdiri daripada enam ratus dua puluh lapan orang dewasa pertengahan di Medan, Indonesia. Mereka direkrut melalui persampelan bertujuan dan berstrata. Kajian ini menggunakan reka bentuk rentas dan pendekatan kuantitatif. Data dikumpul menggunakan lima soal selidik laporan sendiri, iaitu Skala Kegembiraan Subjektif / *Subjective Happiness Scale* (Lyubomirsky et al., 1999); Skala Kepuasan dengan Kehidupan / *Satisfaction with Life Scale* (Diener, et al, 1985); Skala Keutamaan Keagamaan / *Centrality of Religiosity Scale* (Huber, 2003); Skala Ringkas Kawalan Kendiri / *The Brief Self-Control Scale* (Tangney, et al., 2004); dan Skala Peraturan

Kendiri / *Self-Regulation Scale* (Schwarzer, et al, 1999). Data dianalisis dengan menggunakan Model Persamaan Struktur / *Structural Equation Model* (menggunakan perisian LISREL 8.80) yang penelitian varians antara pembolehubah dalaman (*endogenous*) dan luaran (*exogenous*) dilakukan serentak. Keputusan menunjukkan bahawa (a) keagamaan berkait secara positif dengan kawalan sendiri (.287, $p < .01$), dengan magnitud hubungan saiz kesan adalah .083; (b) keagamaan mempunyai kaitan positif dengan peraturan (.283, $p < .01$), dengan magnitud hubungan saiz kesan adalah .174; (c) kawalan sendiri dan peraturan sendiri menunjukkan kesan pengantara secara positif untuk hubungan di antara keagamaan dan kepuasan hidup (.131, $p < .05$ untuk keagamaan; .283, $p < .01$ untuk kawalan sendiri; dan .299, $p < .01$ untuk peraturan sendiri), magnitud hubungan menunjukkan saiz kesan 0.333; dan (d) kawalan sendiri, peraturan sendiri, dan kepuasan hidup menunjukkan kesan pengantara secara positif untuk hubungan di antara keagamaan dan kegembiraan (.188, $p < .01$ untuk keagamaan; .275, $p < .01$ untuk kawalan sendiri; .439, $p < .01$ untuk peraturan sendiri; dan .240, $p < .01$ untuk kepuasan hidup) dengan magnitud hubungan yang diperkali menunjukkan saiz kesan .794. Penemuan ini memberikan bukti tentang peranan penting kawalan diri dan peraturan sendiri dalam menjelaskan hubungan di antara keagamaan dan kegembiraan dan menyumbang kepada pemahaman yang lebih baik mengenai mekanisme yang menggariskan hubungan di antara pembolehubah - pembolehubah ini.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGIOSITY AND HAPPINESS: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF SELF-CONTROL, SELF-REGULATION, AND LIFE SATISFACTION

ABSTRACT

Religiosity has been associated with happiness but the exact pathway outlining the relationship remains unclear. One possible mechanism explaining the relationship between religiosity and happiness is the role of religiosity in promoting self-control and self-regulation. Self-control and self-regulation subsequently influence life satisfaction and consequently happiness. The aim of this study is to examine further the relationships between religiosity, self-control, self-regulation, life satisfaction and happiness. More specifically, this study examines (1) the relationship between religiosity and self-control; (2) the relationship between religiosity and self-regulation; (3) the mediating effect of self-control and self-regulation on the relationship between religiosity and life satisfaction; and (4) the mediating effect of self-control, self-regulation, and life satisfaction on the relationship between religiosity and happiness. Participants were six hundred and twenty-eight of middle adults in Medan, Indonesia. They were recruited through purposive stratified sampling. This explanatory research employed a cross-sectional design and a quantitative approach. Data were collected using five self-report questionnaires, namely the Subjective Happiness Scale (Lyubomirsky et al., 1999); the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, et al., 1985); the Centrality of Religiosity Scale (Huber, 2003); the brief Self-control Scale (Tangney, et al., 2004); and the Self-regulation Scale (Schwarzer, et al., 1999). Data were analyzed by applying Structural Equation Model (using the LISREL software 8.80) which provides

simultaneous examination of variance between endogenous and exogenous variables. The results revealed that (a) religiosity was positively related to self-control (.287, $p < .01$), the magnitude of the relationship had an effect size of .083; (b) religiosity was positively related to self-regulation (.283, $p < .01$), the magnitude of the relationship had an effect size of .174; (c) self-control and self-regulation positively mediated the relationship between religiosity and life satisfaction (.131, $p < .05$ for religiosity; .283, $p < .01$ for self-control; and .299, $p < .01$ for self-regulation), the magnitude of the relationship had an effect size of 0.333; and (d) self-control, self-regulation, and life satisfaction were positively mediated the relationship between religiosity and happiness (.188, $p < .01$ for religiosity; .275, $p < .01$ for self-control; .439, $p < .01$ for self-regulation; and .240, $p < .01$ for life satisfaction) the magnitude of the relationship by squaring the coefficient had an effect size of .794. The finding provides evidence for the important role of self-control and self-regulation in explaining the relationship between religiosity and happiness and contributes to better understanding about the mechanisms outlining the relationship between these

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The quest to live a happy life is the fundamental drive of human natural instinct. Whatever the behaviors people may conduct, they are all motivated to move toward ever-greater personal happiness (Lyubomirsky, 2008). Indeed, many substantial evidences have elucidated that happiness is associated with and precedes desirable life outcomes. For example, happiness has led to greater longevity (Danner, et al., 2001; Ostir, et al., 2000), better social life and more cooperation with others (Diener & Seligman, 2004; Schimmack, et al., 2004), stronger relationships (Feeney & Collins, 2015), less depression (Smith, et al., 2003), and even less chances to engage in criminal activity (Baier & Wright, 2001).

Recently, the concept of happiness is almost indistinguishable from life satisfaction that leads for them to be used interchangeably (Lucas, et al., 2003; Staw & Barsade, 1993). Despite these terms are interconnected concepts, however, both terms comprised different meanings that are often mixed up. Life satisfaction requires cognitive processing of the conditions of life as a whole (Diener, et al., 2004), whereas happiness concerns the sum of emotional experiences as time passes (Lyubomirsky, et al., 2005). Thus, it is possible for a person to be satisfied with life even if he or she experiences little pleasant affect, and vice versa (Diener, et al., 2004). The present study proposes this conceptual differences between happiness and life satisfaction, in which life satisfaction may lead to the happiness (Heller et al., 2004; Pearson, 2008).

There is a long history of scientific studies from a multitude of disciplines pointing out that religiosity has a positive link to happiness (Inglehart, 2010). A huge amount of published researches have generated almost similar conclusions that religiosity is positively and consistently related to life satisfaction and happiness (Sillick, et al., 2013; Diener, et al., 2011; Inglehart, 2010). Although it seems fairly established and well documented, but the mechanism of how religiosity shapes life satisfaction and affects happiness remains not fully understood. This leads to the need to investigate this link and examine whether there are any mediating variables explaining the relationships between these three constructs. This study proposes a model outlining the relationship between religiosity, life satisfaction and happiness.

One possible mechanism is that the link from religiosity to happiness stems partly from religion's capability to enhance self-control and self-regulation. Carver & Scheier (1998) have denoted that self-control is a part of the wider phenomenon of self-regulation, associated with the process by which one adjusted behavior to conform to the expected norms. They further explained that while self-regulating, one is leading and modifying one's behavior in pursuit of some preferred results or goals. In addition, self-regulation often arises outside of awareness or without requiring any meaningful effort (Fitzsimmons & Bargh, 2004). Perhaps through this self-regulatory process, religious constructs can be triggered in an automatic fashion or effortlessly (Shariff & Norenzayan, 2007) and thus foster one's satisfaction with life and happiness.

However, the proposed interrelations of the constructs need further empirical inquiry. Additionally, almost all existing studies conducted in western culture such as documented by Ano & Vasconcelles (2005), Layard (2005), and Stutzer & Frey (2002). In relation to this issue, not many studies have been done in the Indonesian

context, especially in North Sumatera. Thus, the present study is interested in investigating happiness and life satisfaction among people of North Sumatera based on how religiosity influences both self-control and self-regulation and -in turn- affects life satisfaction and happiness. Data analysis used in this research is Structural Equation Model (SEM). The research phenomenon further describes and explains through this model.

1.2 Problem Statement

Indonesia with a total population of considerably more than 240 million people, of which over 200 million identifying themselves as Muslim (BPS, 2016), contains the world's largest Muslim population. Although there is only less pressure from some groups in Indonesia to incorporate Islamic law into the judicial code than in many other Muslim majority countries (Davis & Robinson, 2006), however, excitement over Islamic religious rituals is a widespread social and cultural phenomenon in this country. Every year an increasing number of Indonesian Muslims perform *Umrah* and hope to be shortlisted in Indonesia's annual Hajj quota with waiting list getting longer by the year (Agung, 2015). Religion is a huge part of everyday's lives in Indonesia in which television programs are interrupted for the call to daily prayers (*adzan*). People also fast the month of *Ramadan*, and engage in various forms of religious rituals, such as assembly of *dhikr* (Hafiz, 2015). Even non-practicing Muslims are likely to be influenced by Islamic values as these become intertwined with cultural norms and values (French, 2008). For example, non-Muslims in Indonesia might refrain from drinking alcohol because it is not customary to serve it at meals and social events because of religious prohibitions.

However, this widespread excitement over religious ritual is still not accompanied by an increase in people's happiness. Based on the world happiness report 2018 (Helliwell, et al., 2018), published by UN SDSN (United Nation Sustainable Development Solutions Network), Indonesia's people happiness has decreased from 2012 to 2017. The report provides that happiness index of Indonesia fell gradually from 5.35 index 2012 to 5.09 index in 2017. Furthermore, the report also reveals a decline of Indonesia's happiness ranks, of the 156 countries surveyed over the year 2015-2017, Indonesia was ranked 74th in 2015, declined to 79th in 2016, and dropped further to rank 96th in 2017 with a score 5.09 on the 0 to 10 scale. Even when compared to the average score for Southeast Asia (mean = 5.280), Indonesia has a happiness level below average. It is further reported that Indonesia's happiness index from 2008-2010 to 2015-2017 has decreased by -0.160. This low level of people's happiness in Indonesia also reflected in various phenomena. To note a few, the growth of various violence and intolerance behaviors -whether it relates to religion, ethnicity, state or community, have been reported in Indonesia (Umi, 2010; Yenni, 2016; Christophe, 2017). According to Setara Institute, there were 117 cases of violence conducted by community social organization in 2010, and increased to 244 cases in 2011 (Sutowo & Wibisono, 2013). However, despite the high level of excitement or enthusiasm in performing religious rituals in Indonesia, but issues of unhappiness and violence remain intrinsic parts of Indonesian lives.

Nevertheless, researches conducted to look at the link between religiosity and happiness are firmly well known within the scientific literature. Several excellent studies have found a positive relationship between the two (Krause, et al., 2018; Sillick, et al., 2013; Diener, et al., 2011; Inglehart, 2010). Despite the apparent consistency of these findings, however, this relationship still presents a curious

dilemma, especially when looking at real live community samples such as Indonesia. Thus, it is important to unpack the mechanism of how religiosity can be linked to life satisfaction and happiness, especially in the context of Indonesia where religious euphoria is high and yet happiness is low.

As mentioned previously, many researches have been using the concept of happiness and life satisfaction interchangeably. Although these two are interrelated, however, they have different meanings. Lumpkin & Hunt (1989) describe life satisfaction as the way in which a person perceives how one's life has been up to now and how one feels one's life is going to be in the future. Meanwhile, happiness may be as the result of a person's perception of experiencing positive emotions including life satisfaction. If happiness and life satisfaction are of the same latent variable, accordingly the same independent variables should validate them identically. Unfortunately, a study conducted by Gundelach & Kreiner (2004) provided evidence that the two variables actually are different and that their relationships to macro-social variables differ radically. Thus, even though there is a strong correlation between the two, they should not be considered as the same latent variable. Hence, additional empirical evidence for these conceptual differences between happiness and life satisfaction is highly indispensable, in which life satisfaction is conceptualized as influencing the feeling of happiness.

A broad empirical study supports the notion that religiosity effectively fosters self-regulation and self-control (McCullough & Willoughby, 2013). It is worth noting that the association may be one route in which religiosity is able to foster self-regulation and self-control and thereby influence happiness. The present study tries to extend this line of thinking by suggesting that religiosity is robustly associated with self-regulation and self-control during the course of life, then these

associations could explain further the religiosity's relationship with life satisfaction and happiness. Hence, further empirical scrutiny of the interconnections among these concepts is required to address this issue.

In addition, most researches that looked at the inter-relatedness of different variables have focused on Western populations. Thus, scientific psychological investigation on Eastern populations with different social and cultural considerations, particularly in Indonesia, is required. This is a part of the attempt to capture a broader understanding of psychological knowledge that applicable across a wider range of populations.

1.3 Research Objectives

This study intends to explore how religiosity influences people's life satisfaction and happiness in Medan, North Sumatera, Indonesia. As such, mediator variables are the main consideration of this study. To address this purpose, research objectives are formulated to test serial mediation of the relationship between religiosity and happiness through self-control, self-regulation, and life satisfaction; and to provide an overview whether or not this indirect serial mediation effect accounts for the relationship between religiosity and happiness. Specifically, this study aims to investigate:

1. The relationship between religiosity and self-control.
2. The relationship between religiosity and self-regulation.
3. The mediating effect of self-control and self-regulation on the relationship between religiosity and life satisfaction.
4. The mediating effect of self-control, self-regulation, and life satisfaction on the relationship between religiosity and happiness.

1.4 Research Questions

As initially reflected on research objectives mentioned above, this study is part of the attempt to investigate religiosity and its possible influence on happiness through mediating role of self-control, self-regulation, and life satisfaction. That is, it sought to answer the questions formulated as follow:

1. Does religiosity positively relate to self-control?
2. Does religiosity positively relate to self-regulation?
3. Do self-control and self-regulation mediate the relationship between religiosity and life satisfaction?
4. Do self-control, self-regulation, and life satisfaction mediate the relationship between religiosity and happiness?

1.5 Significance of Study

This study is significant in a number of ways. First, it can contribute a comprehensive look into why -for some people- a high level of enthusiasm or excitement in performing religious rituals does not always lead them to a happier life and it does so by providing better understanding about how religiosity to be more useful for adherents. However, the whole of religious rituals is based around self-control. Whatever the acts of worship and rituals commanded is to build in a person the kind of restraint, discipline, and *sabr* (patience). One of the reasons for praying five times a day is to gain discipline; fasting in the month of Ramadan in order to “learn self-restraint” (Qur’an, 2:183); partaking in Hajj, partly, is to practice fortitude; and “lowering gaze” (Qur’an, 24:31) is to resist temptation. As well as the pursuit of happiness offered by religion. Religiosity is stringent about examining the

how and why of whatever to earn and spend (17:26); regulating what to consume; regulating speech; and constantly exerting control over thoughts and feelings. Thus, the secret behind performing religious rituals is the practice of self-control and self-regulation. When religious rituals are done so, then happiness in this life and in the life to come is warranted.

Second, it can unpack the specific mechanism of the way religiosity affects life satisfaction and happiness. Evidences that religiosity is linked to self-control (Baumeister, et. al., 2007) is well established. Results from some personality researches have provided evidence that dimensions of personality that linked to the capability to regulate one's behavior in a way in line with one's purpose or out of concern for the wishes and feelings of others (e.g., high Agreeableness, high Conscientiousness, and low Psychoticism) related to religiosity (Saroglou, 2002; Lodi-Smith & Roberts, 2007; Francis & Katz, 1992). These outcomes deliver tentative endorsement for the suggestion that religiosity is related to self-control. Furthermore, religion potentially has an effect on the chosen goals that people decide on (Roberts & Robins, 2000; Saroglou, et al., 2004), effect the importance relevant to those goals, minimize conflict between all those goals (Emmons, 1999), and as well, persuade the process by which religious teachings are transformed into personally substantial values (Ryan, et al., 1993). This religious relationship with goals endorses some essential paths by which religion has the potential impact on self-regulation. In brief, the study may help to elucidate well-established relationships between religiosity and happiness. Better elucidating of the way that religiosity shape people's conduct in their pursuit of happiness would fill an important gap in understanding of this correlation.

Third, this research has significant potential to advance understanding for the unclear concept of the similarities and differences between happiness and life satisfaction, and to improve consideration of how they are interconnected. Therefore, the present research findings could provide the evidence of how to better distinguish between life satisfaction and happiness.

Finally, this line of researches so far has almost entirely used Western and Christian samples. More attention to Indonesian and Muslim samples will truly widen the spectrum of this line of researches and make the findings in this field of study more generalizable to a wider range of sample.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The center of interest in this inquiry is limited to studying happiness and religiosity, and the mediating role of self-control, self-regulation, and life satisfaction. The included participants were citizens of Medan, North Sumatera, Indonesia, who aged 40 years or older (middle adults and above). Lastly, although the Indonesian government has recognized six official religions (namely Islam, Protestantism, Catholicism, Hinduism, Buddhism and Confucianism), only Muslim (as the predominant religion) were included in this study.

1.7 Organization of the Chapter

This study includes five chapters. Chapter one provides an introduction of the study, which consists of background, problem statement, objectives, questions, and significance of study. In the last part, the scope of study is presented as well.

Chapter two outlines the key concepts that are examined in this study. It, therefore, reviews the literature on happiness, life satisfaction, self-control, self-

regulation, and religiosity. The chapter discusses past theoretical and empirical studies related to those concepts, and then presents a model that serves as the conceptual framework for this study. Subsequently the chapter ends by building several hypotheses to be tested.

Next is chapter three. It includes explanations of research design, sampling method, sample and location, as well as preferred measurements and procedure used in this study. Data gathering method and statistical technique used also elaborated herein. This chapter ends by presentation of the results of the pilot study, especially related to research instruments.

Chapter four is data analysis. This chapter begins with a review of several preparations made before the analyzed data. Descriptive statistics then presented to provide a complete picture and to allow proper interpretation of relevant results. Furthermore, an investigation of the measurement model performed using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was also presented. This was followed by the structural model tests with Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) that served as a confirmatory assessment. Then, the chapter ends by examining the study's hypotheses, in which the mediation analyses conducted under the principles of Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to assess the relationship between religiosity, self-control, self-regulation, life satisfaction and happiness.

Finally, chapter five presents the summary of findings that drawn out from the present research. These findings then discussed according to research questions, followed by discussion on theoretical and practical implications. Chapter five also discusses limitations of the current study and recommendations for further research, and subsequently ends with conclusions.

1.8 Summary

As an introduction to the study, this chapter serves an insight into the whole research by providing brief description about the role of self-control, self-regulation, and life satisfaction on the relationship between religiosity and happiness. Specifically, it explicated in the background of study and problem statement. Research objectives, research questions, and significance of the study have presented based on the problem statement. Scope of the study and organization of the chapter have set and then concluded by summary. The following chapter discusses literature review as related to each variable, and then followed by the presentation of conceptual framework of the study.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the literatures related to the variables in this study. Initially, the chapter discusses happiness and its role as the goal of human life and satisfaction with life as the basis for achieving happiness. This is followed by a discussion of religiosity as a variable that has an important role in guiding human behavior toward life satisfaction and happiness. Further, literature and studies concerning self-control and self-regulation as the mediating variables in explaining how religiosity related to happiness becomes the next focus. This is followed by a discussion of the theoretical framework that supports the link among these variables. This is the model adopted in the study. Lastly, the proposed hypotheses of this study are presented at the end of this chapter.

2.2 Happiness

2.2.1 Historical Development of Happiness

Throughout history, the idea of happiness has always been an intricate one. Democritus (460 BC - 370 BC) was considered as the first philosopher to discuss happiness. According to him, being happy is not a product of external circumstances, but rather of a human's expression of thoughts. Nevertheless, this subjectivist view proposed by Democritus was not endorsed by Socrates and Plato who conceptualized happiness in more absolute and objective terms. On the other hand, Aristotle has emphasized that happiness was not beyond one's reach, but is attainable for any person desiring to live in harmony with the most valued virtues

(Tatarkiewicz, 1976). McMohan (2006) further explained that the ancient Greeks, as well as the Romans, have viewed that pleasure and virtue was interdependent. As such, living pleasantly was not possible without living honorably, prudently, and/or justly. However, a man possessed a life of virtue, even being tortured, could still be happy.

In the medieval times, Christian philosophers have also considered that the good life is consisting life of virtue. On the other hand, virtue was deemed insufficient for happiness, but has shifted to spiritual matter; can only achieved through dedicated faith and God' grace. In other words, happiness lay in God's hand (Tatarkiewicz, 1976).

In the Enlightenment, as it called "the Age of Reason", the notion of happiness has shifted to place more emphasis on earthly explanation and less on the other-worldly. There was an increase emphasis on pleasure as a pathway to attain happiness. In the early 19th century, Jeremy Bentham as a utilitarian philosophy has illustrated these changes that happiness amount to utility while utility considered come from the maximum pleasure. According to Jeremy Bentham, the prime aim of human is to fight for the surplus pleasure over pain. He further encouraged that morals and legislation should be based on the maximum happiness of the highest amount of people (Tatarkiewicz, 1976).

In recent centuries, the notions that human have the ability to attain and pursue happiness has received widespread appreciation. Conception of happiness shifted to feeling good than being good (McMohan, 2006). Thus, the concept of happiness adopted in the Classical and Medieval as perfection or virtue has been largely ignored and considered unused. In this era, as Haybron (2007) noted, both social and behavioral sciences have initiated to offer significant attention to the topic,

so as conception of happiness based on philosophical treatments are fewer than in centuries past.

2.2.2 Conceptualizing of Happiness

Contemporary conceptualization of happiness can be divided into three different approaches. The first is hedonic tradition whereas the second has its roots in Aristotle's concept of eudaimonia, and the last is related to Islamic perspective. Below is the discussion of these approaches.

2.2.2(a) Hedonic Tradition

Hedonism point of view defines happiness as searching for pleasure and anticipating of pain. The term of happiness is assumed to be related to the presence of positive emotions and the degree of satisfaction with life (Diener, 2000). Throughout the history of psychology and philosophy, this approach which is rooted to Greek philosophers has had many adherents (Kahneman, et al., 1999). This happiness model is come of Bentham's theory of hedonistic that everyone's behavior is based on utility's principle, by means of calculating the estimated pleasure and pain of behaviors (Bentham, 1907). In other words, pain or pleasure human gained is the outcomes of what has been done before.

For Bentham (1907), this human nature is impossible to be changed. This nature drives every individual to make calculation in order to maximize his or her utility. In addition to the individual, however this is also true for society since it is formed by individuals. Therefore, lawmaker as well as policy-maker should also refer this human's nature principle to maximize people utilities. For both legal and illegal, good and bad, right and wrong should be determined by pleasure and pain.

Whatever people conducted is to please these masters. According to Bentham, reaching for pleasure and avoiding pain are the essence of human nature.

Similarly, Fordyce (1988) has defined happiness as the whole evaluation of pleasure and pain that the individual has experienced in his recent past. In a parallel vein, Kahneman (1999) has also defined happiness as the average of pleasant and unpleasant experiences. Another analogous view is offered by Lyubomirsky et al. (2005) who defined happiness as experiencing positive emotions most frequently over time. However, all these definitions involve the notion of affect balance, so that is very close to definition of happiness proposed by Jeremy Bentham as the summation of pleasures and pains.

2.2.2(b) Eudaimonic Tradition

Eudaimonic tradition is another approach to happiness. It has risen out of the philosophical solution. The principle point of this tradition on happiness is realizing one's full potential. As mentioned earlier by Aristotle, happiness is the full potential actualization, or eudaimonia (Waterman, 1990). Thus, gaining the true happiness does not come from fulfilling appetites, but rather originates from performing what is morally appropriate to do, that is, manifestation of virtue and kindness. Although in some instances, fulfillment of appetites and needs seems to lead happiness, but on the contrary, this pleasure seeking may also prevent happiness (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

According to Ryan & Deci (2008), happiness involves three basic psychological needs, namely autonomy or to choose what to do, competency or to do confidently what should be done, and relatedness or to have good quality of human relationship. Ryan and Deci further asserted that fulfilling these needs would enhance happiness. Subsequently, this tradition has gained support from many

religious movements, and spiritual as well, because of its similarity with some religious values.

Another eudaimonic approach is authentic happiness model proposed by Seligman (2011). Seligman introduced five fundamental elements to describe happiness, namely pleasure, engagement, relationships, meaning, and accomplishment. However, distinguishing between the pleasant life and meaningful life makes this model seem as an attempt to reconcile both hedonic and eudaimonic traditions, because pleasant life can be paralleled with hedonic tradition whereas meaningful life equaled eudaimonic.

Nevertheless, most scholars describe happiness as comprising of three components: more positive affect, less negative affect, and more satisfaction with life (Diener et al., 1995). Positive affect involves good feelings (e.g., pleased, delighted, and enthusiastic), whereas negative affect is related to bad feelings (e.g., tense, stressed, irritable, and miserable). Conversely, life satisfaction is broader, relating to a cognitive evaluation of how contented a person is with his or her state of life. People with greater satisfaction with life would agree that his/her life conditions are wonderful (Diener, et al., 1985).

2.2.2(c) Islamic Tradition

Islam is one of the celestial religions that provide a perfect way of life. Every single word of God's commandments taught in religion, aimed to provide true happiness of its adherents in every aspect of human life, for both worldly-life and the hereafter. As al-Qarni (2003) stated, be at peace, remain positive, rejoice, and be happy. These Islamic values conveyed through the Prophet Muhammad has highlighted that people who is true believer and work righteousness, whether male or

female, will accept a good life and reward the best of what they have done (Quran, 16:97).

Mufti (2016) has described that happiness in Islam is peacefulness arises from faith in God. The possible way to achieve happiness is being upon the truth by submitting and worshiping Him, and accelerating in virtuous deeds. Even the smallest charity or any little acts of kindness have the potential for a person to become happier. Islamic values asserted that earthly life is nothing but a means to achieve eternal life in the Hereafter. Thus, being happy is only possible by following this guideline. This is due to following Islamic teaching and remaining submissive to God's worship could be the best reminder to raise awareness that this life is a stopover to eternal life after. Thus, the true happiness is only be found by worshiping God because it was manifestations of God's love and mercy.

There are numerous ways that religiosity may possibly have an effect on happiness including promises of spiritual and material compensation (Abdel-Khalek, 2011). As taught in Islam, remembering Allah, reciting Qur'an, asking God's forgiveness, fasting at Ramadan, taking ablutions, and prayer, have a stimulating unconscious effect on Muslims, and as well supporting them to possess better self-regulatory capability. However, all these Islamic teachings and submissive to God's worship have an effect on how Muslims regulate thoughts and behavior to stay in accordance with religious values and, in turn, can certainly help clarify life satisfaction and happiness that religious individuals often enjoy.

2.2.3 Theories of Happiness

There are three well-known theories of happiness: Set-Point Theory, Comparison Theory, and Affect Theory.

The Set-Point Theory views happiness as a stable attitude towards life that is biologically encoded in humans (Lykken, 1999). This happiness “base-line” is largely independent of circumstances. According to Lykken (1999), Set-Point Theory asserts that any major life event will only alter the acute level of happiness experienced by an individual and that over time, the individual will return to their base-line level of happiness. Set-Point Theory suggests that no matter what a person does, he or she ends up staying within a certain, stable level of happiness (Cummins, et al., 2002).

Comparison Theory expresses happiness as a continuous judgment process involving the comparison of life as it relates to a perceived “ideal life” (McDowell & Newell, 1996). In this sense, happiness is mainly the product of mental evaluation rather than the circumstances. An individual compares life as it is, with his or her perceived standard of how it should be. Comparison Theory goes beyond Set-Point Theory in how it defines happiness. According to McDowell and Newell (1996), happiness depends on both the adequacy of material circumstances and people’s feelings about these circumstances. In this regard, a personal assessment of one’s condition compared to an external reference standard or to one’s aspirations may be called life satisfaction.

Affect Theory defines happiness as an emotion determined by the subjective assessment of how a person feels after taking everything into consideration (Kahneman & Tversky, 2000). This theory seems quite similar to Bentham’s definition of happiness and its modern version of “objective happiness” as the sum of experienced pleasures and pains. Affect Theory suggests that a person computes the balance of pleasant and unpleasant experiences based on an estimate of frequency and duration. It proposes that this accounting occurs automatically and is reflected in

an individuals' active state of "mood" (Veenhoven, 2006). In other words, mood is like an inner happiness calculator computing one's level of happiness. Affect Theory argues that gratification of needs and wants are the determinant factors behind happiness. Veenhoven (2006) attempts combining the Comparison and Affect Theories by defining overall happiness as the total of its components. Overall happiness is defined as "the degree to which an individual judges the overall quality of his life-as-a-whole favorably".

Each of the three theories outlined above captures some part of reality about happiness. However, they do not tell a complete story. Even if all the three integrated, would still not see the whole picture because each individually, and all the three collectively, leave out some important aspect of happiness.

Set-Point Theory underestimates the impact of external factors on happiness. It implies that there is virtually no value in striving for happiness mainly because a person is hard-wired to stay within a certain level of happiness no matter what he or she does. Set-Point Theory does not really offer any explanation as to why a person is happy. It simply points to a biological "Black Box" that determines a human being's level of happiness. Set-Point Theory predicts that over time, a person is equally happy regardless of life circumstances. There is ample evidence showing that an individual's level of happiness in life does indeed change depending on internal or external factors (Diener, et al., 1997; Frey & Stutzer, 2000).

Comparison Theory implies that if a person simply lowers the standards, he or she will be happy. It does not set any minimum standards for "a good life". In this sense, if one could lower the standards enough he or she would not need to strive for happiness. Conversely, if one continuously raises the comparison yardstick, he or she would never reach happiness. Like Set-Point Theory, Comparison Theory

underestimates the impact of external factors. The theory implies that happiness is determined by an intellectual yardstick as opposed to life events or circumstance.

Affect Theory views happiness as a positive emotion that reflects an appraisal of how an individual feels. However, this theory does not really capture the qualitative aspect of life experiences. For instance, if a human rates his/her life as good, and if an animal does the same thing, there is no way to say which good is better. Comparison and Affect Theories are ambiguous about establishing what constitutes a “good” life (Mill & Crisp, 1998).

2.2.4 Happiness in this study

Regardless of the considered happiness models discussed above, the three ‘hallmarks’ serves to delineate the general concept. First, happiness is subjective in nature; it is an expression of individual experience. External objective factors or conditions are not included in the definition of happiness. Second, happiness is a frequency of positive experiences, not only a lack of negative influences. Third, happiness is a global assessment, not only a single life domain.

Therefore, the construct of happiness is broadly subjected to the individual’s perceptual interpretation of events and experiences. As such, it cannot be inferred directly from objective circumstances, but rather should be understood from the individual’s perspective. Furthermore, happiness is subject to be moderately stable over time and to show sensitivity to ongoing experience and changing circumstances.

Following Islamic teaching, happiness can be viewed as an inner state of the heart, characterized by peace in mind, tranquility, and a relaxed disposition. Incorporating Lyubomirsky’s subjective happiness theory (2008), happiness is also part of the joyful experience, positive well-being, or contentment, integrated with a

meaningful sense, that life is good and worthwhile. Thus, this research refers to happiness as an inner state of heart resulted from sense that life is good, meaningful, and worthwhile.

2.2.5 Measurements of Happiness

Based on the literature review, happiness has been measured with several different instruments. In choosing the best instrument, it depends on the intended population, the quantity of items, the accessibility of the scale, and the psychometric property of the measure. The following is the brief summary of the measures that have used to quantify happiness.

The Affect Balance Scale (ABS) defines happiness as the magnitude of the gap between positive affective states and negative affective state. These conditions occur in a relatively short duration and they usually generated from events that occur around the environment (Bradburn & Caplovitz, 1965). The relationship between the two components of affect (positive and negative) is orthogonal or perceived as not related to each other (independent to one another). Thus, although the increase in happiness may have a relationship with a decrease in negative affect but it is not necessary lead to an increase in positive affect (Kozma, et al., 1991). This scale consists of ten items, five items for each of the two components of affect (positive and negative).

Several studies on young and middle-aged samples have been carried out to validate this scale. For example, Kozma, et al., (1991) have found that the main weakness of the Affect Balance Scale as a measure of happiness is indicated by alpha of the total scale as below .65, which means quite low reliability for internal consistency of the scale. However, by separating subscales that have positive and

negative affect, Stock and Okun (1982) have found internal consistency ranged from .53 to .61 for positive affect and ranged from .64 to .65 for negative affect. Bearing in mind that each subscale possesses the small number of items, this result may be acceptable. Further, study employed elderly persons with a varied sample made up of rural, urban, and institutional residents as conducted by Kozma and Stone (1980) has reported an alpha of .59, and test-retest reliability for a 12 month interval was only $r = .27$. In addition, a subgroup study conducted by Himmel and Murrell (1983) has provided an alpha coefficient of .65 for community samples and of .75 for clinical samples.

Other measure of happiness developed by Kozma and Stones in 1980 is *MUNSH*. This scale combined the best features of other scales and intended to measure happiness in older people. As noted above, the low reliability of internal consistency and temporal stability of the Affect Balance Scale is due to measures affective state in a short-term. Therefore, the *MUNSH* is intended to assess aspects of happiness in short- and long-term. This scale contains ten affects (consist of five items for each of positive and negative affects) and fourteen experiences (consist of seven positive experiences and seven negative experiences). Internal consistency reliability of this measure is indicated by an alpha of .86 (Kozma & Stones, 1980). One clear bipolar factor has generated using a principal components analysis with positive and negative dimensions, accounting for 50% of the variance. Moreover, although affect items of the scale was the lower loading than experience items, but the distinction between short and long-term states is not clear. In addition, as a bipolar factor with positive and negative items, happiness score is unreliable with Bradburn's conceptualization of affect, morale, and satisfaction. Thus, whether or

not the MUNSH in fact assesses the short-term affective states or the long-term one remains unclear and requires for a longitudinal study to determine it.

The other measurement of happiness is The Oxford Happiness Inventory (OHI). Designed in the late 1980s, this cross-culturally scale consist of 29 items to measures personal happiness. The design and format of the scale was based on the Beck Depression Inventory. Each item has four alternatives that differ for each item in four incremental levels, numbered from 0 to 3. Hills and Argyle (2002) from Department of Experimental Psychology of the University of Oxford originally developed this scale. Later, Francis, et al., (1998) have employed this inventory to compare college students in the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia. In Israel, Francis and Katz (2000) employed this scale in a Hebrew translation. Based on this inventory, Lu and Shih (1997) formed the Chinese Happiness Inventory (CHI) to use in Taiwan.

Next is The Chinese Happiness Inventory (CHI). As aforementioned, this measurement was designed based on the Oxford Happiness Inventory. In total, the scale involves thirteen subscales. Of all subscales, seven (namely: positive affect, optimism, fitness, social commitment, contentment, self-satisfaction, and mental alertness) were from the Oxford Happiness Scale which formed 28 items. Another six subscales of the Chinese Happiness Inventory were originated from a study in Taiwan (namely: peace of mind, praise and respect from others, downward social comparisons, satisfaction of material needs, achievement at work, and harmony of interpersonal relationships) and consisted of 20 items. The total number of items of the scale consists of 48 items (Lu & Shih, 1997). In addition, each item of the Chinese Happiness Inventory represents different levels of experienced subjective happiness from four alternative responses to choose. These choices are coded as 0,

1, 2, and 3. Based on study conducted by Lu, et al., (2001), result has provided alpha coefficients of .93 for British students, and of .94 for Taiwanese students.

Furthermore, Hills and Argyle (2002) have developed The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire at Oxford University. They found that respondents endorse the two central items. The answers to these items were not normally distributed and this is evidenced from the mean scores of less than corresponding standard deviation. They point out that these items might not fully contribute to the measured happiness. Hence, the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire was designed to use only single statement on a six-point Likert scale, so it becomes easier to administer. Construct validity of this scale is strongest, indicated by its relationship with the Depression–Happiness scale, the life regard index, and the self-esteem (.90; .77; and .81 respectively). However, this scale is less susceptible to the bias of respondent than other scales and is more comprehensive (Hills & Argyle, 2002).

In 1993, McGreal and Joseph also established The Depression–Happiness Scale. They argued that literatures of the measurement involve two kinds of scales: literatures related to life satisfaction and happiness; and literatures assessed depression and loneliness. In addition, they stated that aspects of depression do not included in the most used assessment of happiness. However, employed depression scales, such as the Beck Depression Inventory, have tendency toward a floor effect for the normal population. That is, the potential range of scores is from 0 to 63 and is from 0 to 9 for non-depressed individuals. Although one has a score of zero, it is not automatically indicates the sign of happiness, but it may be only an indication of no depression.

In 1999, Lyubomirsky and Lepper have established The Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS). This short scale involved only four items and intended not