



# European Journal of Psychology and Educational Research

Volume 1, Issue 1, 1 - 10.

ISSN: 2589-949X

<http://www.ejper.com/>

## Gender Differences of Experiencing of Subjective Social Well-Being

Tatyana Viktorivna Danilchenko \*  
National University, UKRAINE

*Received: April 02, 2018 ▪ Revised: April 30, 2018 ▪ Accepted: May 20, 2018*

**Abstract:** The article deals with the gender differences in experiencing subjective social well-being. Subjective social well-being (SSWB) is defined as an integral social and psychological phenomenon, which reflects awareness and evaluation of social functioning based on the correlation between the level of demand and degree of satisfaction of individual's social needs, as a result of which he/she defines his/her social being as optimal and experiences the feeling of satisfaction. It has been demonstrated that while divorce decreases the SSWB of men, it equally increases and decreases the SSWB of women. The leading agents of social relation for women are friends, parents and a partner, for men—parents, neighbours and acquaintances. The presence of children decreases the SSWB of women. At the same time, for men the effect depends on the perception of parenthood. For women dominant psychological factors of experiencing SSWB are competence, autonomy, intuitiveness, desire for power, activeness, whereas for men they are courage, expression of aggression, universalism, kindness and conformism.

**Keywords:** *Subjective social well-being, social approval, positive relations, social visibility, positive social judgments.*

**To cite this article:** Danilchenko, T.V. (2018). Gender differences of experiencing of subjective social well-being. *European Journal of Psychology and Educational Research*, 1(1), 1-10. doi: 10.12973/ejper.1.1.1

### Introduction

The need of a person to belong to a community is fundamental, which can be reflected in thoughts, opinions and interpersonal relationships during interaction. According to R. Nisbet, "life is the search for belonging" (Nisbet, 1953: p.2). The essence of this belonging or interpersonal relationships with other people is represented in the state of their well-being or sociality (Fratiglioni et al., 2004). Social connections are the central element of well-being experience as individual and social parameters are interconnected.

Well-being was first studied as integral category with its own structure (Bradburn, 1969). However, the scientific discussion revealed that this universal notion is unable to describe complex subjective perception and assessment of reality from the point of view of an individual. This is because subjective well-being consists of partial assessments of different aspects of person's life. Thus, new works started to appear which suggested differentiating the given notion. Firstly, psychological (eudemonistic) and subjective (hedonistic) well-beings were differentiated. Later on, certain aspects of subjective well-being were defined (Diener and Seligman, 2002). According to C.L.M. Keyes, the progress in studying well-being should be "not only in the transition from negative to positive dimension, but also from psychological to social one" (Keyes, 1998: p.135).

Due to certain ambiguity of the notion, the term "subjective social well-being" is still not wide spread among the scientists. Thus, the terms "social well-being" (J. S. Larson, R.W. England, L. Callaghan, C. L. M. Keyes, M. L. Muller), "psycho-social well-being" (T. O'Hare, M.V. Sherrer, H.S. Connery, J. Thornton, K. Emrick) are used in the studies of the level and degree of people's satisfaction with their social contacts, status, security and prospects in the society. Following the theory of F. Huppert, the term "flourishing" is used to indicate optimal state of life (F. Huppert, M. Seligman), particularly "interpersonal flourishing" (Ryff, Singer and Wing, 2001). We believe that the term "subjective social well-being" is the most precise. The specification "subjective" is important as in social sciences there is a tradition to define happiness/ well-being as individual "inner" phenomenon, which is affected by social factors. For instance, E. Diener considers positive relationships to be leading factor of its experiencing (Diener, 2013).

---

#### \* Correspondence:

Tatyana Viktorivna Danilchenko, Psychological Sciences, National University, Chernihiv, Ukraine.

✉ [dan20151975@gmail.com](mailto:dan20151975@gmail.com)

In psychology social well-being is seen as:

- 1) individual experience of positive social functioning: “social well-being is an optimal functioning in the society” (Nieboer et al., 2005: p. 2); “the appearance of a positive or negative mental state not only as a result of other people’s actions, but as a result of possession of public goods, relationships with other people” (Skilton, 2009: p.2);
- 2) aspect of general subjective well-being, concerning social interaction and engagement (Evans and Valleley, 2007);
- 3) part of eudemonistic aspect of well-being, focusing on social life (Joshnloo and Ghaedi, 2009).

SSWB is considered to be a component of person’s general subjective well-being (life satisfaction) (Callaghan, 2008; Evans and Valleley, 2007), sometimes in an obvious way, but more often indirectly, as a system of social factors, affecting the general concept of subjective well-being (Diener and Seligman, 2004; Helliwell and Putnam, 2004; Cohen, 2004). Social well-being is also thought an indicator of subjective quality of life (Rapley, 2003; Bowling, Gabriel, Dykes et al., 2003). Besides, recently new theses were published in which psychological, social and emotional well-being are studied as separate components of more general factor-subjective well-being (Muller, 2012; Gallagher, Lopez and Preacher, 2009).

Subjective social well-being is seen as an integral social and psychological phenomenon, which reflects the awareness and evaluation of social functioning. It is based on the correlation between the level of demand and degree of satisfaction of individual’s social needs, as a result of which he/she defines his/her social being as optimal and experiences the feeling of satisfaction.

Psychology studies the gender factor in the context of general subjective well-being. It was established that both officially registered marriage, and, to a smaller degree, consensual union affect subjective well-being. This regularity is equally true for men and women. Extended family increases subjective well-being more than the standard one (Helliwell and Putnam, 2004). It was demonstrated that negative life events, for example, the death of the partner, have a greater effect on the psychological and social well-being of men, than women (Carmel and Bernstein, 2003). Other gender differences were discovered. According to E. Van Lente and colleagues, the low level of flourishing is detected for women who are unemployed, live in the city and have low level of education. The highest level of flourishing is detected for young men with high level of education and paid occupation (Van Lente et al., 2012).

Evidently, men and women experience social comfort under different conditions. Firstly, women are more socially oriented (Nolen-Hoeksema and Rusting, 2000). Social connections for them are more relevant and realized, and, probably, become the most significant factor in the well-being experience. Men are more socially distant (Zhuravlev and Kupreichenko, 2012). Secondly, women are more emotional (Wood et al., 1989).

## **Methodology**

### *Research Goal*

The aim of this paper is to define the specifics of experiencing subjective social well-being by different genders.

### *Sample and Data Collection*

The study involved the citizens of Chernihiv City (75,6%) and Chernihiv Region (24,4%), of whom 250 were women and 186 were men. The respondents of the survey were: a) distribution by education: people with higher education-49,4%, with secondary education-32%; b) distribution by marital status: married-52,11%, single-33,5%, divorced-10,8%, widowers-3,4%; c) distribution by age: 20-23 years old-22,2%, 24-29 years old-25,2%, 30-44 years old-22,9%, 45 and older-19,7%. Respondents were people with different professions: psychologists, theater employees, medical workers, educators, drivers, engineers, accountants, civil servants and unemployed. The participation in the survey was voluntary and anonymous.

Target variable in the study was general level of SSWB. The only available methodology of studying social well-being from the individual’s point of view (Author-C. L. M. Keyes) proved to be ineligible for Ukrainian society as social integration and social contribution merged into a single factor of SSWB (Danilchenko, 2015). Keyes’s model of social well-being is based on the eudemonistic approach and appeals to the social aspects of human functioning. According to the author, there are 5 dimensions, which serve as the criteria of optimal functioning in the social environment: social acceptance (positive perception of human nature and a sense of comfort among other people), social actualization (belief in the development of society); social contribution (assessment of own value for the society), social coherence (perception of the quality, organization and functioning of the social environment), social integration (the extent to which people feel certain belonging to community) (Keyes, 1998). However, according to the Ukrainians’ belief, socially adapted person will definitely perform certain actions to the benefit of the group and society, as it is a sign of integration to the social processes.

The questionnaire, designed by the author, was used to diagnose the level of SSWB (Danilchenko, 2015). The questionnaire measured the following parameters:

*Social visibility* reflects the self-assessment of social importance of an individual. In particular, it includes the following statements: "People consider me an influential person", "My work is important for the society", "I can say that I am an important part of the groups I belong to". For 10 scale points "Social visibility" Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficient equals 0,83 (split-half reliability-0,8).

*Social distance* shows the feeling of alienation in social relationships of different levels. The examples of the statements are: "I feel distant from people", "I often feel lonely", "I feel that I am losing the sense of being connected to the society". For 7 scale points "Social distance" Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficient equals 0,83 (split-half reliability-0,8).

*Emotional acceptance* reveals the satisfaction with the relationships and the presence of support and recognition by close people. It includes the following statements: "I am satisfied with the status I have in the family and friendly group", "I can totally trust my family and friends", "I feel accepted by close people". For 7 scale points "Emotional acceptance" Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficient equals 0,81 (split-half reliability-0,8).

*Social approval* depicts the results of social comparison, when the successes of others and reaction to personal achievements serve as a certain standard, used to compare the effectiveness of social functioning. For example, "Other people value me as an individual", "I feel that people around me treat me with respect", "Most people approve of my actions". For 7 scale points "Social approval" Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficient equals 0,8 (split-half reliability-0,78).

*Positive social judgments* testify to faith in people, in their kindness and honesty, trust to them. For example, "Most people can be trusted", "I consider people kind", "Most people always behave honestly". For 5 scale points "*Positive social judgments*" Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficient equals 0,79 (0,73), which is acceptable for 5 points. All 36 points of the questionnaire, combined into a single general scale, showed an acceptable reliability coefficient-0,79 (split-half reliability-0,8).

In the study the following tools were also used: Psychological well-being scale (C. Riff, L. V. Zhukovska, Ye. H. Troshyhina), Life satisfaction scale (V. A. Khashchenko, A. V. Baranova), questionnaire "Adaptive strategies of behaviour" (N. M. Melnykova), Schwartz value survey (V. M. Karandashev), Self-confidence test (V. H. Romek), Time perspective questionnaire (F. Zimbardo, A. Syrtsova, O. Mitina). The statistical analysis of the data was carried out with the help of SPSS 18 (frequency regression analysis) package and SPSS Modeller 22 (Neuron networks, Bayesian Belief Network).

For the statistical analysis of the results neuron networks were used. It is a non-linear statistical method, modeling ways of processing information by the brain based on the probability theory (Haykin, 2009). This instrument of Data mining (intellectual analysis of the data in order to search for the hidden regularities) allows to create hypotheses about correlations independently. The main advantages of the method for this study are:

- 1) in contrast to the linear regression, for which proportional ratios are typical (more-more, less-less, more-less), non-linear correlations are used in this method. Non-linearity is seen as a specific dynamics of the system, characterized by ambiguity, vagueness. It is obvious that not all social situations, connected with interaction with other people and groups, will affect SSWB experience. Some of them have neutral effect or are ignored, while certain contacts and social situations can have great subjective significance and seriously affect the experience of social well-being. As neuron networks are designed to solve non-parametric, loosely formalized tasks, they give a possibility to consider the violation of asymmetry and non-additivity;
- 2) when designing neuron network, independence of input variables is not obligatory, as system multidimensionality is expected. We suppose that the factors of SSWB experience form intricate interconnected complexes. In contrast to the regression analysis, which provides for a separate effect of each variable, the neuron network makes it possible to simulate the synergetic and antagonistic effects of factors.

Multilayer perceptron, which is neuron network of direct signal propagation, was used. The activation function was hyperbolic tangent. Weight coefficients (w-weight) demonstrate the effect of each predictor on the response of each neuron. The sum of all weight coefficients equals 1. The contribution of predictors illustrates the importance of a particular variable for the precise functioning of the neuron network (in our case-the forecasting of SSWB general level).  $s$  (strength) is the significance of lateral bonds between variables (multidimensional scope analogue of  $\beta$ -coefficient in regression analysis). It can have either positive (accelerating bonds), or negative (decelerating bonds) values. During the calculations, signals ( $s$ ) are multiplied with weight coefficients ( $w$ ) so that the network would reproduce the input values as close as possible to the known control values.

Neuron networks as statistical method have a number of limitations. Firstly, they are quite sensitive to the quality and volume of statistical data. Secondly, their effectiveness depends on the choice of network structure and activation function (sigmoid, hyperbolic tangent, exponential or linear function), which requires certain training in mathematics (Haykin, 2009).

## Results

The gender-age regularities of SSWB experience were established. For women, the lowest level of SSWB can be observed within the age groups of up to 23 and older than 45, while for men the situation is reversed: the highest level of SSWB was stated for the same age groups.

Desire for social visibility, desire to be a social actor is equally characteristic for men and women (table 1). The experience of social exclusion is predictably lower for women. However, women consider their relations with close people more favourable and have a stronger need of social approval.

For women, the evaluation of relation quality determines the SSWB experience to a greater extent (30,3%) than for men (17,1%). It should also be pointed out that the impact of wider social systems, particularly the state, on the SSWB experience is comparatively small (predictor value 0,055...0,096). One more gender difference is that women have a more integrated system of social relations perception compared to men. Thus, the system of relations satisfaction of women was realized by 6 neurons, the leading roles of which were: in the first neuron ( $w=0,134$ )-relations with neighbours ( $s=0,447$ ), relatives ( $s=0,372$ ) and parents ( $s=0,266$ ); in the second neuron ( $w=0,414$ )-the evaluation of the situation in the state ( $s=-0,321$ ) and relationships with friends.

Table 1. Gender differences in experiencing subjective social well-being

SSWB parameters	Men	Women	p
Social visibility	44,87±9,598	42,91±9,226	0,05
Social distance	21,34±7,562	21,07±6,539	-
Emotional acceptance	37,97±6,998	39,59±6,032	0,01
Social approval	34,51±5,951	35,31±5,422	-
Social judgements	20,64±4,061	21,00±4,118	-
Total index of SSWB	116,65±25,139	117,73±22,904	-

The third neuron ( $w=0,021$ ) is formed by negative evaluation. It means that the relations are enumerated, whose problems influence the SSWB experience most. These are the relations with parents ( $s=-0,551$ ), with the partner ( $s=-0,446$ ). This neuron also includes the negative evaluation of the situation in the country ( $s=-0,465$ ) and the positive evaluation of the relations with neighbours ( $s=0,502$ ). The fourth and the sixth neurons reflect the general evaluation of the social situation, although according to different criteria. Thus, but for the general perception of the social situation ( $s=0,412$ ), the fourth neuron ( $w=0,265$ ) is formed by the following relations: with neighbours ( $s=0,453$ ), parents ( $s=0,338$ ), acquaintance ( $s=0,336$ ), so it is oriented to living on the common territory. The sixth neuron ( $w=0,127$ , social situation  $s=-0,440$ ) also includes colleagues ( $s=-0,372$ ), acquaintances ( $s=0,357$ ), relatives ( $s=-0,293$ ). It means that colleagues and relatives contribute to experiencing SSWB unless they provoke negative interaction. It is important to emphasize that satisfaction from the relations with a partner affect SSWB experience comparatively less and in a negative way (3rd neuron:  $-0,446$ , 5th:  $-0,449$ ). The fifth neuron ( $w=-0,370$ ) enumerates those social actors, dissatisfying relations with whom provoke lowering of SSWB most: partner ( $s=-0,449$ ), acquaintances ( $s=-0,284$ ), colleagues ( $s=-0,280$ ) and parents ( $s=-0,279$ ). The evaluation of the relations with friends for women form a comparatively autonomous dimension, whereas the relations with all the others form an interdependent recurrent system: the relations with parents are included in 1<sup>st</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> neurons, with neighbours – in 1<sup>st</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>, acquaintance – in 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> neurons. The evaluation of the situation in the country is included in 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> neurons with all negative indices, which indicates the decelerating effect of this parameter on the SSWB experience. The leading agents of social relations for women are friends ( $w=0,177$ ), parents ( $w=0,153$ ) and partner ( $w=0,144$ ), that is the circle of care. Their effect on SSWB is comparatively high.

As for men, satisfaction with relations defines the SSWB experience less (17,1% forecast accuracy) and the systems of relations are internally simpler and more differentiated, which means that the evaluation of one type of relations is not transferred to the other. Thus, the 1<sup>st</sup> neuron ( $w=-0,079$ ) reflects the decelerating effect of problematic relations with colleagues ( $s=-0,435$ ), parents ( $s=-0,363$ ), acquaintance ( $s=-0,354$ ), and relevant relations with relatives generally ( $s=0,36$ ) on the SSWB experience. The second neuron ( $w=0,268$ ) is created by the criteria of the evaluation of personal social situation ( $s=0,325$ ), such as the quality of relations with colleagues ( $s=-0,396$ ) and the situation in the country ( $s=0,35$ ). Therefore, men consider social situation to reflect the characteristics of a wider social system (the country) on the individual level. The third neuron with the biggest importance ( $w=0,492$ ) for the SSWB experience includes the evaluation of the quality of relations with parents ( $s=0,483$ ) and partner ( $s=0,291$ ). The leading agents of social relations for men are parents ( $w=0,259$ ), neighbours ( $w=0,200$ ) and acquaintances ( $w=0,149$ ), i.e. those observers, who you have to keep your public face for. So it can be concluded that for men the impact of the system of relations evaluation on the SSWB experience has strict internal structure: the peculiarities of family relations, characteristics of social situation in the country, problematic relations.

Single men fall into the group with higher than average level of SSWB most often (forecast probability – 0,469<sup>†</sup>). On the other hand, the lack of a partner decreases the level of SSWB for women (probability of falling into the group with the low level of SSWB – 0,358, average level of SSWB – 0,395). The first marriage ensures either the increase of SSWB (for the men – 0,453, for the women – 0,387), or its decrease (0,227 and 0,320 correspondingly). And if the first marriage for men contributes to a greater extent to acquiring social well-being (probability of falling into the group with the highest level of SSWB – 0,453, average – 0,427), for women the probability of SSWB increase or decrease is equal (from 0,320 to 0,387). This data is also relevant for women in the second marriage. It should be mentioned that the second marriage has a negative effect on the SSWB experience of men (the probability of the group with the lowest level of SSWB – 0,227). It can be concluded that most often the first marriage has a positive effect on the SSWB experience for men, and for women the effect depends on specific circumstances of family life and their subjective evaluation. By itself the first marriage (as a social criteria) cannot serve as a prognostic factor of SSWB experience for women.

Divorce, as a rule, reduces the social well-being of men (the probability for the group with lower than average SSWB-0,100), while for women there is a two group polarization. For most women the SSWB after the divorce increases (probability for group with higher than average SSWB-0,186), and for some it falls rapidly (probability for group with the lowest SSWB-0,170). No definite regularity “divorce → decrease in social well-being” has been identified either for men, or for women, which testifies to the significance of the subjective perception of marital experience.

Despite the conventional viewpoint on widowers as the least socially successful group, our research has proven that widower hood can equally increase and decrease the SSWB of men (0,001 ... 0,002). However, the loss of a partner worsens the SSWB experience of women (probability for group with the SSWB lower than average-0, 102).

For men the absence of children can either decrease SSWB (probability for group with the low SSWB-0,633), or increase it (probability for group with the SSWB higher than average-0,645). Interestingly, the similar tendency can be observed for men with one child: probability for the group with the highest SSWB-0,363, group with the lower than average SSWB-0,399. No clear tendency was identified for women. Most of the childless belong to the group with SSWB higher than average (probability-0,580). All the rest were equally divided between all the other SSWB level groups (probability from 0,428 to 0,490). The highest probability for women with one child is to be in the group with average (0,396) and high (0,367) SSWB levels, while all the others are divided between the other groups comparatively evenly (from 0,225 to 0,279).

Different situation is observed for families with two children: for men it becomes the factor of SSWB increase (probability for the group with the highest SSWB-0,242), and for women – the factor of SSWB decrease (probability for the group with SSWB lower than average-0,245). Overall, it can be concluded that in Ukrainian realities children become the factor of decrease of social well-being for women. This fact is consistent with the research of Russian sociologists, according to which having many children has a detrimental effect on the subjective well-being of Russian women (mostly, due to the economic, not psychological reasons) (Hahulina, 2006). According to our data, for men the situation varies, and having many children can serve as a factor of SSWB increase or decrease depending on the specific situation of parenthood and its perception.

During statistical procedures, aimed at defining gender specifics, the non-linear model of neuron networks composition (0,756) proved to be more suitable than the linear regressive analysis model (0,678). Apparently, the psychological characteristics of an individual create a consistent integral system, which has the heterarchical character. That is why, further we will refer to the data on the SSWB psychological factors for men and women taking into account their synergistic, not partial effect.

During women data analysis, 4 neurons were identified (one negative and three positive), which explain 55,7% of the data (table 2).

---

<sup>†</sup> Here and thereafter the results of Bayesian Belief Network modeling are presented, where the subjective authenticity of any event varies from 0 to 1.

Table 2. The basic psychological factors of experience of subjective social well-being of men and women

	Sex	Rank	Weight of Neuron, w	Neuron 1	Neuron 2	Neuron 3	Neuron 4
Autonomy	M	28	0,016	-0,149	0,218	0,476	-0,025
	W	6	0,041	<b>0,677</b>	0,265	-0,203	<b>0,693</b>
Competence	M	31	0,013	0,142	-0,116	0,009	0,442
	W	5	0,042	-0,236	<b>0,797</b>	0,159	0,128
Self-acceptance	M	11	0,03	0,054	0,393	0,342	0,428
	W	14	0,03	-0,195	-0,310	<b>0,591</b>	-0,053
Positive past	M	5	0,043	-0,466	<b>0,571</b>	0,141	<b>-0,500</b>
	W	1	0,052	<b>0,546</b>	-0,401	0,333	-0,201
Negative past	M	22	0,022	0,472	0,101	-0,413	0,072
	W	2	0,049	-0,370	<b>0,693</b>	0,066	0,045
Hedonistic present	M	14	0,027	-0,174	<b>0,526</b>	0,282	-0,455
	W	-	-	-	-	-	-
Self-confidence	M	13	0,029	0,327	0,454	<b>0,538</b>	0,412
	W	4	0,047	0,218	-0,407	0,296	0,421
Social courage	M	8	0,038	0,455	<b>0,83</b>	0,472	0,207
	W	29	0,017	0,447	0,286	0,186	-0,346
Social initiative	M	3	0,053	0,025	<b>1,099</b>	0,35	-0,002
	W	7	0,039	-0,062	-0,277	0,356	0,407
Assertive behavior	M	9	0,034	-0,289	<b>-0,586</b>	-0,222	-0,488
	W	-	-	-	-	-	-
Planning of the future actions	M	2	0,077	<b>-1,015</b>	0,352	-0,038	0,288
	W	-	-	-	-	-	-
Power	M	4	0,046	<b>0,549</b>	-0,437	-0,350	-0,067
	W	8	0,035	<b>0,619</b>	0,232	<b>0,531</b>	0,181
Self-transcendence	M	1	0,081	-0,407	<b>1,073</b>	-0,164	0,016
	W	23	0,023	-0,028	<b>0,546</b>	0,352	0,005
Self-development	M	-	-	-	-	-	-
	W	24	0,023	<b>0,531</b>	0,268	0,112	<b>-0,553</b>
Egoism	M	36	0,008	-0,241	-0,012	-0,086	-0,273
	W	10	0,034	-0,067	<b>0,625</b>	-0,135	-0,092
Social trust	M	21	0,023	-0,396	-0,024	0,453	0,415
	W	15	0,027	-0,182	<b>-0,502</b>	-0,303	0,205
Process orientation	M	12	0,03	-0,364	<b>-0,531</b>	0,201	-0,411
	W	25	0,022	0,234	0,158	-0,445	-0,077
Result orientation	M	18	0,024	<b>-0,625</b>	-0,281	0,009	-0,331
Passive strategies	W	27	0,021	0,055	0,246	-0,430	<b>0,572</b>
Strategies aimed at the environment	M	6	0,042	<b>0,582</b>	-0,086	-0,326	-0,415
	W	35	0,01	-0,051	0,03	0,177	0,198
Contact strategies	M	20	0,023	-0,466	-0,325	-0,091	-0,302
	W	17	0,027	<b>-0,505</b>	0,067	<b>0,629</b>	0,275
Change in oneself	M	10	0,031	0,169	-0,356	0,296	-0,317
	W	20	0,025	<b>-0,643</b>	0,116	0,141	0,15

The most significant parameters (in descending order): positive and negative past, life goals, self-confidence, competence, autonomy, initiativeness, power, conformism, egoism, change of environment, personal growth. The negative neuron ( $w=-0,441$ ) reflects those psychological characteristics, which lead to the SSWB decrease. It includes such most significant parameters as competence ( $s=0,797$ ), negative past ( $s=0,693$ ), egoism ( $s=0,625$ ), values of self-transcendence ( $s=0,546$ ), low social trust ( $s=-0,502$ ). While negative past experience, low level of interpersonal trust and high level of egoism obviously lead to dissatisfaction of social needs, competence and self-transcendence values turned out to be unexpected negative factors. The latest include the universalism (understanding, tolerance, protection of well-being of all people and nature) and kindness (protection and improvement of loved ones' well-being). In our opinion, the first probable explanation of this can be the popularization of "European values" in modern Ukraine, which emphasize the individual success. Secondly, egoism is typical for crisis periods of individual development, thus, when solving a difficult life problem, an individual may ignore group well-being and concentrate on individual ambitions.

High competence (ability to perform various activities, choose context for the realization of individual needs and values) mostly belongs to the instrumental characteristics of the individual, which is typical characteristic for men.

According to existing stereotypes, woman has to choose between typical gender role, in which competence is not typical, and professionalism, which can be seen by society (especially by men) as a threat to their self-identification. That is why competence can reduce the positive evaluation of social functioning of the individual.

Psychological parameters, which contribute to the SSWB increase for women, form three system complexes. The first neuron ( $w=0,353$ ) includes such characteristics as autonomy ( $s=0,677$ ), power as a value ( $s=0,619$ ), positive past ( $s=0,546$ ), self-development (achievements, power) ( $s=0,531$ ), avoiding contact strategies ( $s=-0,505$ ) and changes in oneself ( $s=-0,505$ ), personal growth ( $s=0,451$ ), courage ( $s=0,447$ ), life goals ( $s=0,401$ ). Therefore, the first symptom-complex reflects the achievement of authentic subjectivity – the realization of the desired way of existence, which is based on its past experience and maximally corresponds to the essence of the person. The third neuron, which has the biggest subjective weight ( $w=0,473$ ), combined the parameters, connected to the compliance to the external effects: contact strategies ( $s=0,629$ ), self-acceptance ( $s=0,591$ ), passive strategies ( $s=0,572$ ), power as a value ( $s=0,531$ ), activeness ( $s=0,471$ ), ability to support others ( $s=0,494$ ).

As society is an open system, the important mechanism of social functioning of an individual is the ability to “process” social effects, discovering certain balance between self-identity and conventional norms of small groups and society in general. It should be noted that the value “Power” was included to both neurons with positive values. Thus, both power over own life (self-governance) and power over the external world (ability to affect individuals and public institutions) are important. The last neuron ( $w=0,263$ ) combined the characteristics which testify to social apathy: autonomy ( $s=0,693$ ), passive strategies ( $s=0,572$ ), self-development ( $s=-0,553$ ). Hence, it can be concluded that for women there are three types of psychological resources for the achievement of SSWB: self-identity («I want»), adaptability to the social environment («I need») and humbleness («I can»).

During the data analysis for men 4 neurons were identified (two positive and two negative ones) which explain 53,8% of the data. The most significant parameters (in descending order): transcendence values (kindness, universalism), planning of the future actions, initiative in social contacts, power, positive part, strategies of the behaviour aimed at the change of the environment, social courage, assertive aggression behaviour, change in oneself, self-acceptance, process orientation.

The first negative neuron ( $w=-0,557$ ) has two pole: negative – planning of future actions ( $s=-1,015$ ), result orientation ( $s=-0,625$ ) and positive – behaviour strategies aimed at the environment ( $s=0,582$ ) and power as value ( $s=0,549$ ). To our mind, this complex reflects men’s desire to control social reality combined with the understanding of the limitedness of such control. Correspondingly, the SSWB experience is obstructed by the desire to consider all the aspects and plan the precise scenario of the future events development. On the other hand, it is enhanced by the ability to use any social situations to achieve personal goals, adaptability to specific changeable circumstances. The second positive neuron ( $w=0,735$ ) combined various characteristics, which, on one hand, are similar to the traditional stereotypes of masculinity – social initiativeness ( $s=1,099$ ), courage ( $s=0,830$ ), expression of aggression ( $s=0,586$ ), and on the other hand – femininity (transcendent values –  $s=1,073$ ). Such combination has an internal contradiction: it includes such positive parameter as hedonistic present ( $s=0,526$ ), but simultaneously denies the process orientation ( $s=-0,531$ ). All in all, it can be concluded that the SSWB experience of men is facilitated by instrumental characteristics, which are conventional for a certain culture. However, it should not be accompanied by the rejection of the orientation towards the welfare of other people.

The third negative neuron ( $w=-0,058$ ) concerns self-identity and included the following parameters: self-confidence ( $s=0,538$ ), autonomy ( $s=0,476$ ), social courage ( $s=0,472$ ) and trust ( $s=0,453$ ). What is more, this complex includes such parameter as avoiding strategies ( $s=-0,474$ ). This allows us to conclude that in the mind of surveyed men the autonomy is not connected with the social distancing (reduction of the number of contacts with other people, concentration on inner feelings), but is particularly concerned with the social impact on decision making. The fourth neuron ( $w=0,238$ ), the same as for women, combines characteristics, connected with the perception of social situation for ensuring SSWB. Still, unlike the passive strategies of women, it is more typical for men to retreat temporarily from the plan, but not to give it up. This neuron includes the following parameters: positive past ( $s=-0,500$ ), assertive behaviour ( $s=-0,488$ ), hedonistic present ( $s=-0,455$ ), competence ( $s=0,442$ ), self-acceptance ( $s=0,428$ ).

### Discussion and Conclusion

The data on the effect of the marriage on the subjective well-being experience, that we received, coincides with the results of the German longitudinal study. According to German research, the following rating was built: married (subjective well-being equals 7,2 points on a 10-point scale), single (6,6...7,0 points), divorced (6,2...6,9), widowed (6,0) (Lucas, Clark, 2006). According to our research, similarly, the highest level of SSWB can be observed in married group (first marriage  $M=124,5$ , second marriage-119,1), lower SSWB level in single (117,4), divorced (117,1) and widowed (107,9) groups. It is worth mentioning that in the USA single people had higher level of social well-being compared to married people (Muller, 2012).

In conclusion, while comparing the men and the women, certain regularities can be established. Firstly, as a rule, the divorce reduces the SSWB for men. Divorce can either increase or reduce SSWB experience of women, as marital status

affects social well-being not directly, but through a subjective assessment of marital relationships. Successful marriage increases subjective well-being significantly, while unsuccessful can reduce it immensely (even compared to single and divorced groups) (Helliwell and Putnam, 2004).

Secondly, the leading agents of social relations for women are friends, parents and partner, and for men – parents, neighbours and acquaintance. These data are consistent with the results of the Dutch scientists: the main contribution to the subjective well-being belongs to relationships with an intimate partner and friends (13%) (Nieboer et al., 2005).

Thirdly, the existence of children, especially more than two, for Ukrainian women is the factor of social well-being decrease, whereas for men it can be the factor of SSWB increase or decrease depending on the specific situation of parenthood and its perception.

It should be noted that the connections between personality traits and the experience of subjective (Diener, Harter and Arora, 2010; Schimmack, 2003) and psychological well-being (Joshanloo and Ghaedi, 2009; Ozer and Benet-Martinez, 2006; Schmutte and Ryff, 1997) are studied. The research by J. Wilt et al. can serve as an example of how the connections between personal traits and SSWB construct are studied (according to C. L. M. Keyes). In this research a positive correlation of social well-being scales with extraversion, conscientiousness, emotional stability, openness, ability to cause liking in others was established (Wilt, Cox and McAdams, 2010). In our research, the main factor of SSWB experience for both genders is the peculiarities of self-evaluation (self-confidence) and affective focus of personal life perception (positive past), which is consistent with the results of I. C. Siegler and B. H. Brummett research. This research studied the connection between the positive evaluation of relationships and personality traits, and established certain correlation between the sociability and self-esteem (Siegler and Brummett, 2000). However, the acquiring of SSWB is enhanced by the traits, which are typically attributed to the opposite gender. Thus, for men the factors of well-being are both masculine (social initiative, courage, expression of aggression, absence of reflexive contact) and feminine (universalism, kindness, conformism). Autonomy is much less important than for women. At the same time, for women, the psychological factors of SSWB are masculine characteristics: competence, autonomy, initiativeness, desire for power, activeness etc. However, the self-acceptance is connected to the social evaluation more, than for men.

The SSWB experience correlates with the compliance with the gender norms of society. That is why we consider the comparison of SSWB in different countries promising.

### References

- Bowling, A., Gabriel, Z., Dykes, J., Dowding, L. M., Evans, O., Fleissig, A., Bannister, D., & Sutton, S. (2003). Let's ask them: a national survey of definitions of quality of life and its enhancement among people aged 65 and over. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 56(4), 269-306.
- Bradburn, N. M. (1969). *The structure of psychological wellbeing*. Chicago, Aldine.
- Callaghan, L. (2008). Social Well-Being in Extra Care Housing: An Overview of the Literature. PSSRU Discussion Paper 2528. March, 2008. Accessed on 12.03.2014. [www.ukc.ac.uk/PSSRU/dp2528.pdf](http://www.ukc.ac.uk/PSSRU/dp2528.pdf)
- Carmel, S. & Bernstein, J. (2003). Gender differences in physical health and psychosocial well being among four age-groups of elderly people in Israel. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development*, 56(2), 113-131.
- Cohen, S. (2004). Social Relationships and Health. *American Psychologist*, November, 676-684.
- Danilchenko, T. V. (2015). Metodichni problemy vyvchennia subiektyvnoho sotsialnoho blahopoluchchia. *Visnyk Chernihivskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni T. H. Shevchenka. Seriya «Psykhologichni nauky»*, 126, 57-62.
- Danilchenko, T. V. (2015). Questionnaire subjective social well-being: A methodological substantiation and working out procedure. *East European Scientific Journal*, 3(4), 20-29.
- Diener, E., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). Very happy people. *Psychological Science*, 13, 81-84.
- Diener, E., Ng, W., Harter, J. & Arora, R. (2010). Wealth and happiness across the world: Material prosperity predicts life evaluation, whereas psychosocial prosperity predicts positive feeling. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99, 52-61.
- Diener, E. (2013). The Remarkable Changes in the Science of Subjective Well-Being. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 8(6), 663-666.
- England, R. W. (1998). Measurement of social well-being: alternatives to gross domestic product. *Ecological Economics*, 25(1), 89-103.
- Evans, S., & Vallyly, S. (2007). *Best Practice in Promoting Social Well-Being in Extra Care Housing: A Literature Review*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.



- Eyles, J. (1986). Quality of life and social well-being, in R. J. Johnston ed., *The dictionary of human geography*. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Fratiglioni, L., Wang, H. X., Ericsson, K., Maytan, M., & Winblad, B. (2000). Influence of social network on occurrence of dementia: a community-based longitudinal study. *Lancet*, *355*, 1315-1319.
- Gallagher, M. W., Lopez, S. J., & Preacher, K. J. (2009). The Hierarchical Structure of Well-Being. *Journal of Personality*, *77*(4), 1025-1049.
- Hahulina, L. (2006). Chelovek v sisteme social'nyh svyazey. *Vestnik obshhestvennogo mneniya. Dannye. Analiz. Diskussii*, *1*(81), 39-49.
- Haykin, S. (1999). *Neural networks and learning machines*. Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Helliwell, J. & Putnam, R. (2004). The social context of well-being. *Philosophical transactions royal society of London, series B biological sciences*, *359*, 1435-1446.
- Huppert, F. A. (2009). A new approach to reducing disorder and improving well-being. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *4*, 108-111.
- Huppert, A. F., So, T. C. (2013). Flourishing across Europe: application of a new conceptual framework for defining well-being. *Social Indicator Research*, *110*, 837-861.
- Joshanloo, M., & Ghaedi, G. (2009). Value priorities as predictor of hedonic and eudaimonic aspects of well-being. *Personality and individual differences*, *47*, 294-298.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *61*, 121-140.
- Larson, J. S. (1993). The measurement of social well-being. *Social Indicators Research*, *28*(3), 285-296.
- Lucas, R. E., & Clark, A. E. (2006). Do people really adapt to marriage? *Journal of happiness studies*, *7*(4), 405-426.
- Muller, M. L. (2012). Social well-being: Investigating the relation of social aspects to optimal functioning in society: Bachelor thesis. Universiteit Twente, Enschede, April 2012, 39 p. Accessed on 12.03.2014. [http://essay.utwente.nl/61867/1/M%20C3%BCller,\\_M.\\_-\\_s0163465\\_\(verslag\).pdf](http://essay.utwente.nl/61867/1/M%20C3%BCller,_M._-_s0163465_(verslag).pdf)
- Nieboer, A., Lindenberg, S., Boomsma, A., & Van Bruggen, A. C. (2005). Dimensions of well-being and their measurement: The SPF-IL Scale. *Social Indicators Research*, *73*, 313-353.
- Nisbet, R. (1953). *The Quest for Community*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nolen-Hoeksema, S. & Rusting, C. (1999). Gender differences in well-being. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, N. Schwartz (Eds.) *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology*, N.Y. (pp. 330-352).
- O'Hare, T., Sherrer, M. V., Connery, H. S., Thornton, J., & Emrick K. (2003). Further Validation of the Psycho-Social Well-Being Scale (PSWS) with Community Clients. *Community Mental Health Journal*, *39*(2), 115-129.
- Ozer, D. J., Benet-Martinez, V. (2006). Personality and the prediction of consequential outcomes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *57*, 401-421.
- Rapley, M. (2003). *Quality of Life Research*. London, Sage.
- Reig-Martinez, E. (2013). Social and economic wellbeing in Europe and the Mediterranean Basin: Building an enlarged human development indicator. *Social Indicators Research*, *111*(2), 527-547.
- Ryff, C. D., Singer, B., Wing, E. H., & Love, G. D. (2001). Elective affinities and uninvited agonics: Mapping emotion with significant others onto health in C. D. Ryff, B. Singer (Eds.). *Emotion, social relationships, and health*. New York: Oxford University Press (pp. 133-175).
- Schimmack, U. (2003). Affect measurement in experience sampling research. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *4*(1), 79-106.
- Schmutte, P. S., Ryff, C. D. (1997). Personality and well-being: What is the connection? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *73*, 549-559.
- Siegler, I. C., & Brummett, B. H. (2000). Associations between neo personality inventory assessment and well-being at mid-life: Facet level analysis. *Psychology and Aging*, *15*, 710-714.
- Skilton, L. (2009). *Measuring societal wellbeing in the UK*. Working paper: London: Office for National Statistics (ONS).
- Van Lente, E., Barry, M. M., Molcho, M., Morgan, K., Watson, D., Harrington, J., & McGee, H. (2012). Measuring population mental health and social well-being. *International Journal of Public Health*, *57*(2), 421-430.
- Wilt, J., Cox, K. S., & McAdams, D. P. (2010). The Eriksonian life story: Developmental scripts and psychosocial adaptation. *Journal of Adult Development*, *17*, 156-161.

Wood, W., Rhodes, N. & Whelan, M. (1989). Sex differences in positive well-being: A consideration of emotional style and marital status. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106, 249-264.

Zhuravlev, A. & Kupreichenko, A. (2012). *Social'no-psihologicheskoe prostranstvo lichnosti*. M., Institut psihologii RAN.