University of Richmond

UR Scholarship Repository

2015

Friendship quality and personality as predictors of psychological well-being in emerging adults

Emma Gleckel
University of Richmond

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses

Part of the Psychology Commons

"Friendship Quality and Personality as Predictors of Psychological Well-Being in Emerging Adults"

By

Emma Gleckel

Honors Thesis

Submitted to

Department of Psychology
University of Richmond
Richmond, VA

May 1, 2015

Advisor: Dr. Karen Kochel

Abstract

The present study investigated the relationship between personality, friendship quality, and well-being, among 394 emerging adults. The aim of the study was to examine whether friendship quality contributed to aspects of well-being (e.g. happiness, belongingness, and anxiety), when controlling for personality. Results showed that personality dimensions accounted for a significant amount of variance in each aspect of well-being. Moreover, friendship quality predicted happiness, belongingness, and anxiety, above and beyond the influence of personality. Results also revealed that only positive friendship features predicted variance in happiness and belongingness, whereas only negative friendship features predicted variance in anxiety. Findings indicate the importance of having high quality friendships.

Friendship Quality and Personality as Predictors of Psychological Well-Being in Emerging

Adults

Subjective well-being refers to the relative presence of positive affect, absence of

negative affect, happiness, and one's overall satisfaction with life (Myers & Diener, 1995).

Although this study will review literature on multiple aspects of subjective well-being (e.g.

happiness, satisfaction with life, positive affect), all of which are closely related, this study

focuses specifically on the component of life satisfaction.

Lyubomirsky, Sheldon, and Schkade (2005) proposed a framework of three main factors

that influence happiness: set point, circumstances, and intentional activities. Set point factors are

heritable, fixed, and stable factors, such as personality traits. Set point factors account for

approximately 50% of the variability in happiness. The category of circumstances refers to

relatively stable factors such as demographic variables and culture; these account for about 10%

of variance. Intentional activities, the voluntary things that people do in their everyday lives,

account for the remaining 40% of variance (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005). The interaction of these

three categories impact overall subjective well-being.

This framework has not been applied in the same way to other forms of psychological

well-being. However, based on research examining predictors of variance in well-being, it is

likely that the categories of stable factors, life circumstances, and voluntary activities are also

applicable to other areas of well-being. As such, this study examines both set point factors (e.g.

personality traits) and intentional activities (e.g. friendship quality) as predictors of happiness as

well as other aspects of well-being, specifically belongingness and anxiety.

Personality and Well-Being

The Big Five Personality Traits is often used as a framework for examining five personality dimensions of extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness. These five factors can be observed through both self- and peer- reports, in both children and adults, and across cultures (Kotov, Gamez, Schmidt, & Watson, 2010), suggesting that personality traits are heritable and stable throughout the lifetime.

Research has shown that personality predicts various dimensions of subjective well-being, including life satisfaction, happiness and positive affect (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998). For example, extraversion and neuroticism have been found to be the strongest predictors of happiness, and neuroticism and conscientiousness, the strongest predictors of life satisfaction (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998; Quevedo & Abella, 2011). Similarly, Hayes and Joseph (2003) found that extraversion and neuroticism best predicted scores on the Oxford Happiness Inventory, and neuroticism and conscientiousness best predicted scores on the Satisfaction with Life Scale. Brebner, Donaldson, Kirby and Ward (1995) found that scores on extraversion and neuroticism together accounted for 42% of the variance in predicting happiness. Cheng and Furnham (2003) also found a strong positive correlation between happiness and extraversion, with extraversion as a direct predictor of happiness.

Taken together, findings suggest that personality traits, including extraversion, neuroticism, and conscientiousness, account for a significant amount of variance in subjective well-being (Hayes & Joseph, 2003). However, recent research has suggested that neuroticism is the biggest predictor of all subjective well-being indicators (Quevedo & Abella, 2011). Importantly, extraversion and neuroticism as predictors of happiness have also generalized in

cross-cultural studies (Cheng & Furnham, 2001), supporting the perspective that personality traits are heritable, stable factors and can be generalized as significant predictors of happiness.

Personality also accounts for some of the variance in negative forms of adjustment, such as depression, loneliness and anxiety (Cheng & Furnham, 2001). However, the absence of happiness is not the same as the presence of unhappiness, and vice versa (Bradburn, 1969). As such, evidence that specific traits predict happiness does not imply that these same traits will predict, or correlate oppositely with, negative adjustment. For example, although extraversion is a direct predictor of happiness, it is not a direct predictor of depression (Cheng & Furnham, 2003). It is necessary, therefore, to examine the effect of personality on different forms of adjustment, as factors that contribute to one's happiness are not necessarily indicative of other aspects of adjustment.

Studies have found that personality directly influences various forms of psychological *mal*adjustment. In a meta-analyses, Kotov et al. (2010) found that common mental disorders of depression, anxiety and substance use disorders, are strongly linked to personality. Kotov et al. (2010) found that neuroticism was most strongly correlated with all disorders, although other personality traits also showed significant effects. Conscientiousness in particular was strongly linked with internalizing disorders, although results showed a relatively weak link between extraversion and major depressive disorder. Koorevaar et al. (2013) also found links between the Big Five personality traits and late-life depression. Results showed that the presence of a depression diagnosis and the severity of depression were significantly associated with higher neuroticism, and lower extraversion and conscientiousness (Koorevaar et al., 2013). Overall, the current research shows the importance of personality dimensions in predicting aspects of psychological maladjustment.

Personality and Social Relationships

Personality also influences social relationships and friendship experiences (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998). For example, personality traits of extraversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness influenced the number and quality of participants' social relationships (Asendorpf & Wilpers, 1998). In addition, friends of participants who were high in agreeableness reported less irritation than other friends (Berry, Willingham & Thayer, 2000). Extraversion and agreeableness have also been associated with both peer acceptance and friendship (Jensen-Campbell et al., 2002). Similarly, Berry et al. (2000) found that extraversion scores predicted the extent to which participants felt close to their friends, and friends' neuroticism scores predicted the number of conflicts in which dyads engaged.

Friendship Quality and Well-Being

Research suggests that personality only accounts for partial variance in subjective well-being. Although it is important to know what are the stable, heritable traits that contribute to well-being, it is also beneficial to look at what other factors account for this variance, such as those that fall into the intentional category. Factors in the intentional category account for approximately 40% of the variance in happiness (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005), and should therefore also have a significant impact on well-being. As such, it is important to continue to look at what other factors contribute to well-being over and above personality.

Researchers are interested in the possibility that non-stable traits, specifically aspects of interpersonal relationships, affect well-being. Friendship is an example of an intentional, voluntary action (Demir & Weitekamp, 2007). Examining types of voluntary factors, such as friendship quality, can be particularly beneficial because these are factors over which people have more choice and control. Factors that focus on enhancing personal relationships appear to

be important to subjective well-being (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998). High levels of friendship quality, in particular, have been linked to positive outcomes. Friendship quality predicts well-being in children and adolescence, particularly in periods of transition (Bagwell et al., 2005). As such, it is important to examine links between friendship quality and well-being in later developmental stages, such as emerging adulthood.

Higher levels of friendship quality, characterized by feelings of peer support and closeness of friends, affect well-being in different aspects of life. For example, Ashwin (2003) found that peer support was linked with improving students' academic performance, and Dennis, Phinney and Chuateco (2005) found that lack of peer support was a negative predictor of college adjustment and lower academic achievement. Friendship quality and a sense of school belonging have also been strongly associated (Pittman & Richmond, 2007).

In addition, having close friends is thought to enhance adolescents' social skills, perceived social competence and self-worth (Pittman & Richmond, 2008). Bagwell et al. (2005) found that positive friendship quality predicted higher levels of self-esteem. Furthermore, social relationships can also mitigate stressful life events and contribute to well-being; perceived friendship support may have direct protective factors and enhance feelings of well-being (Rodriguez, Mire, Myers, Morris & Cardoza, 2003).

Overall, higher levels of friendship quality have been linked with psychological well-being. However, research has also shown that friendship quality predicts maladjustment. Studies have examined the direct linkages between quality of social networks and social support, with maladjustment. For example, students who had less social support from friends were more likely to engage in risky behaviors, which may result in poorer academic and social adjustment (Rodriguez et al., 2003).

Additionally, Jackson, Soderlind and Weiss (2000) found that individuals who felt unsupported in their network of close relationships experienced increases in loneliness, and unsatisfactory social relationships increased vulnerability to loneliness. However, people felt less lonely when they were satisfied with their social networks, when their relationships were ones characterized by intimacy and closeness, and when they perceived these relationships to be supportive (Jackson et al., 2000). Likewise, Bagwell et al. (2005) found that social support from friends protected against loneliness and helped to reduce stress by allowing emotional expression.

Friendship quality is also an important influence on psychological outcomes. For example, Pittman and Richmond (2007) showed that the quality of students' relationships with friends predicted more internalizing behaviors such as anxiety, depression and withdrawal. Additionally, Rodriguez et al. (2003) found that high levels of friendship quality predicted lower levels of perceived distress. Findings highlight the impact of high quality friendships on well-being and psychological adjustment.

Thus far, research has examined links between friendship quality and subjective well-being, as well as friendship quality and maladjustment. Recently, Demir and Weitekamp (2007) emphasized the importance of friendship quality by examining links between friendship quality and happiness, when controlling for personality. As previously indicated, personality is an important factor to control for as it accounts for a significant amount of variance in positive and negative forms of adjustment and well-being. As such, controlling for personality establishes more secure links about the specific impact and contribution of friendship quality on well-being.

Demir and Weitekamp (2007) found that all personality variables except openness were significantly correlated with happiness, and neuroticism had the strongest relationship.

Importantly, findings suggested significant correlations between positive friendship quality features and happiness over and above personality, where friendship quality positively correlated with happiness. By controlling for personality, a significant predictor of happiness, results emphasize the importance of friendship quality on subjective well-being. However, research has not yet addressed links between friendship quality and negative adjustment, when controlling for personality.

There is also limited research assessing different dimensions of friendship and their links with happiness (Demir & Weitekamp, 2007). It is important to consider both positive and negative aspects of friendship, because both features are associated with different aspects of adjustment and well-being. Additionally, relationships vary in their relative amount of positive features (e.g. companionship, security, support) and negative features (e.g. conflict, dominance, rivalry). Bagwell et al. (2005) found that friendships with high levels of positive features and low levels of negative features were associated with better psychosocial adjustment. However, negative features of friendship were stronger predictors of adjustment than positive friendship features. Despite these findings, many studies only focus on positive friendship features when assessing overall friendship quality (Bagwell et al., 2005). As such, it is important that future studies examine both positive and negative friendship features.

The purpose of the current study was to examine personality and friendship quality as predictors of psychological well-being. First, this study aims to investigate linkages between friendship quality and happiness in emerging adulthood, when controlling for personality. Second, it aims to extend prior research by examining if friendship quality predicts other forms of adjustment (e.g. belongingness and anxiety), when controlling for personality.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from two small liberal arts universities on the east coast of the United States. There were 394 participants (197 dyads). Of the 197 dyads, 92 dyads were male (46.4%) and 105 dyads (53.3%) were female. Participants ranged from first-year to fourth-year students. Not all participants came with a friend from the same year. There were 101 (25.6%) first-year students, 129 (32.7%) second-year students, 50 (12.7%) third-year students, and 112 (28.4%) fourth-year students. To be included in the study, participants needed to be the same sex, attend the same university and have been friends for at least four months. Participants ranged in age from 18-23 years (M = 19.76, SD = 1.28). Participants were Asian/Pacific Islander (12.2%), Black/African American (6.1%), Hispanic/Latino (4.1%), White/Caucasian (72.8%), and other/Multi-ethnic (4.6%).

Procedure

Participants were recruited for the study via flyers hung in the psychology department, email, and announcements made to students enrolled in Introduction to Psychology courses. Students who were interested contacted the researchers by email to set up a time to participate. Participants were instructed to bring a close, same-sex friend with them to the lab. Each member of the friend dyad was directed to a different room in the lab where he/she completed the online survey independently. Consent was obtained from all participants prior to their beginning the study and participants were aware that they could withdraw from the study at any time. It took participants approximately 30-45 minutes to complete the survey. After completing the study, participants were debriefed by the researchers and handed a list of both on-campus and off-campus resources in case the survey caused any distress. Participants either received $10 each or

Introduction to Psychology class credit as compensation for their time. The study was approved by the IRB at both universities.

Measures

Friendship Quality. The Network of Relationships Inventory (NRI; Furman and Buhrmester, 1985) was used as a measure of friendship quality. Participants rate the quality of their same-sex friendship by responding to 30 items on a 5 point scale, (1 = little or none, 5 = the most). The NRI assesses both positive friendship features (e.g. companionship) and negative friendship features (e.g. conflict). Sample items include: "how much do you talk to this person about everything" and "how often do you and this person argue with each other"?

Personality. The Big Five Inventory (BFI; John and Srivastava, 1999) questionnaire was used to measure personality. The BFI is used to measure 5 personality dimensions: extraversion, neuroticism, conscientiousness, openness and agreeableness. This scale consists of 48 items, and participants rate, on a 5 point scale, the extent to which they agree or disagree with each item (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Sample questions include: To what extent are you someone who "has a forgiving nature" and to what extent are you someone who "is outgoing, sociable"?

Happiness. The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener et al., 1985) was used to assess happiness. This scale is used to assess global cognitive evaluations of one's life. It consists of 5 items, and participants rate their agreement with each item on a 7 point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree), where higher scores represent greater satisfaction with life. Sample questions include: "I am satisfied with my life" and "the conditions of my life are excellent".

Belongingness. The Belongingness in College Students Questionnaire (Asher & Weeks, 2012) was used to assess participants' feelings of belongingness. This scale consists of 6 items, and participants rate how strongly they agree or disagree with each item on a 5 point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Sample items include: "It's hard for me to fit in here" and "I'm glad I came to this school".

Anxiety. The Generalized Anxiety Disorder Inventory (GAD-7; Spitzer et al., 2006) was used to measure anxiety. This scale consists of 7 items, and participants rate how often they experience each item on a 4 point scale (0 = not at all, 3 = nearly every day). Sample items include: "trouble relaxing" and "becoming easily annoyed or irritable".

<div align="center">Results</div>

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were first conducted. See Table 1 for means, standard deviations and correlations. On average, participants scored moderately on the following measures: belongingness, personality traits (extraversion, conscientiousness, neuroticism, agreeableness, openness) and positive friendship quality. However, participants earned low scores on anxiety and negative friendship quality.

Regression Analysis

Friendship Quality and Happiness. To test the hypothesis that friendship quality contributes to happiness, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed. In Step 1, Gender was entered. The model was statistically significant $F (1, 389) = 6.27$, $p < .05$ and explained 1.6% of variance in happiness. In Step 2, the Big 5 Personality Traits (i.e. extraversion, neuroticism, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness) were entered. The model was statistically significant $F (6, 384) = 54.09$, $p < .05$. The total variance predicted was

45.8%, with personality factors accounting for 44.2% of variance beyond Step 1. In Step 3, two dimensions of friendship quality, positive friendship quality and negative friendship quality, were entered. The model was statistically significant $F (8, 382) = 42.44$, $p < .05$. The total variance predicted was 47.1%, with friendship quality accounting for 1.3% of variance beyond Steps 1 and 2. In the final model, five predictor variables were significant: gender, extraversion, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and positive friendship quality features. See Table 2 for Beta values and R^2 Change.

Friendship Quality and Belongingness. To test the hypothesis that friendship quality contributes to feelings of belongingness, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed. In Step 1, Gender was entered. The model was statistically significant $F (1, 389) = 4.50$, $p < .05$ and explained 1.1% of variance in happiness. In Step 2, the Big 5 Personality Traits (i.e. extraversion, neuroticism, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness) were entered. The model was statistically significant $F (6, 384) = 12.51$, $p < .05$. The total variance predicted was 16.3%, with personality factors accounting for 15.2% of variance beyond Step 1. In Step 3, two dimensions of friendship quality, positive friendship quality and negative friendship quality, were entered. The model was statistically significant $F (8, 382) = 12.14$, $p < .05$. The total variance predicted was 20.3%, with friendship quality accounting for 3.9% of variance beyond Steps 1 and 2. In the final model five predictor variables were significant: gender, extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, and positive friendship quality features. See Table 3 for Beta values and R^2 Change.

Friendship Quality and Anxiety. To test the hypothesis that friendship quality contributes to anxiety, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed. In Step 1, Gender was entered. The model was not statistically significant $F (1, 389) = 3.14$, $p > .05$. In Step 2, the Big 5

Personality Traits (i.e. extraversion, neuroticism, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness) were entered. The model was statistically significant $F_{(6, 384)} = 36.13$, $p < .05$. The total variance predicted was 36.1%, with personality factors accounting for 35.3% of variance beyond Step 1. In Step 3, two dimensions of friendship quality, positive friendship quality and negative friendship quality, were entered. The model was statistically significant $F_{(8, 382)} = 28.38$, $p < .05$. The total variance predicted was 37.3%, with friendship quality accounting for 1.2% of variance beyond Steps 1 and 2. In the final model, two predictor variables were significant: neuroticism and negative friendship quality features. See Table 4 for Beta values and R^2 Change.

Discussion

The present study investigated links between personality, friendship quality, and well-being. Results suggest that personality accounts for a significant amount of variance in happiness, belongingness, and anxiety. Furthermore, findings show that friendship quality accounts for a significant amount of variance in these three aspects of well-being, over and above variance predicted by personality.

Extraversion, conscientiousness and neuroticism accounted for a significant amount of variance in happiness. There was a positive correlation between extraversion and happiness and between conscientiousness and happiness; there was a negative correlation between neuroticism and happiness. Results support prior research that personality is a significant predictor of subjective well-being (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998; Hayes & Joseph, 2003). They are also consistent with research suggesting that extraversion, conscientiousness, and neuroticism, are the most significant predictors of happiness (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998; Quevedo & Abella, 2011). In addition, these results support findings from Hayes and Joseph (2003) that conscientiousness and neuroticism were the most significant predictors of life satisfaction. The Satisfaction with Life

Scale, which was used in the current study, emphasizes cognitive aspects of subjective well-being; it follows that conscientiousness might be a predictor of the more cognitive aspects of happiness (Hayes & Joseph, 2003).

Personality traits of extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism accounted for a significant amount of variance in belongingness. There was a positive correlation between extraversion and belongingness, and between agreeableness and belongingness; there was a negative correlation between neuroticism and belongingness. Agreeableness, characterized by traits such as altruism and kindness, is associated with maintaining positive interpersonal relations (Jensen-Campbell et al., 2002). Additionally, Selfhout et al. (2010) found that individuals high on agreeableness and extraversion tended to be selected more as friends, and Berry et al. (2000) showed that neuroticism predicted the number of conflicts in which dyads engaged. It follows that individuals with more positive interpersonal interactions and less conflict with friends are more likely to feel a sense of belongingness.

Furthermore, neuroticism accounted for a significant amount of variance in anxiety, where there was a positive correlation between neuroticism and anxiety. Neuroticism may predispose people to experience negative affect (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998). Individuals who are high on neuroticism also tend to be easily upset, moody, and anxious (Steel, Schmidt, & Shultz, 2008), indicating that this personality dimension is likely to predict forms of maladjustment, such as anxiety. In addition, supporting prior findings, neuroticism was predictive of adjustment across the board, supporting that it is the most significant predictor of well-being indicators (Quevedo & Abella, 2011).

Findings also show that friendship quality is a significant predictor of well-being in emerging adulthood, specifically when controlling for personality. Consistent with findings from

Demir and Weitekamp (2007), friendship quality accounted for a significant amount of variance in happiness, when controlling for personality. Moreover, results from the current study showed that friendship quality accounted for a significant amount of variance in belongingness and anxiety, over and above what was accounted for by personality.

Results indicate that friendship quality contributes significantly to overall well-being. By showing that friendship quality is predictive above and beyond the influence of personality, this suggests that friendship has the potential to modify the set point for happiness (Demir & Weitekamp, 2007). Furthermore, this supports the framework proposed by Lyubomirsky et al. (2005) in that the intentional activities category offers the best opportunities for increasing happiness. If friendship quality has the potential to modify happiness, it should follow that friendship quality also has the potential to modify feelings of belongingness, anxiety, and perhaps additional forms of adjustment.

Importantly, positive and negative friendship features predicted different aspects of well-being. Only positive friendship features predicted variance in happiness and belongingness, where positive friendship features correlated positively with happiness and belongingness. However, only negative friendship features predicted variance in anxiety, where negative friendship features correlated positively with anxiety.

These findings are consistent with the domain-specific model (Ingersoll-Dayton et al., 1997), which indicates that positive social exchanges predict positive outcomes, and negative social exchanges predict negative outcomes. Results from the present study suggest that positive features predicted positive outcomes of happiness and belongingness, and negative features predicted negative outcomes of anxiety. In addition, the present study, which suggests links between negative friendship features and anxiety, supports research from Bagwell et al. (2005)

that suggested strong associations between negative friendship features and clinical symptoms. Although many studies only focus on positive friendship features, findings from the present study suggest the need to examine both dimensions of friendship, because they are associated with different aspects of adjustment and well-being.

Overall, results show that when accounting for stable, heritable traits such as personality, friendship quality is still a significant predictor of well-being. Findings therefore suggest the importance of high quality friendships.

Limitations and Future Directions

One limitation of this study is that dyadic data analysis was not performed because of the complexity and time constraints of the analysis. By using the individual instead of the dyad as the unit of analysis, effects may seem larger than they actually are due to an increased sample size. Additionally, analyses did not account for the interdependence that is likely to occur due to friendship. For example, there is likely to be correspondence in how friends report on certain constructs, such as friendship quality. Similarly, it is also possible that friends are alike in certain areas of psychological well-being. In the future, dyadic data analysis will be performed to account for such limitations.

Another limitation is the sample population used in this study. Participants were recruited from a small, liberal arts environment, indicating limitations for generalizability. In the future, additional sample populations should be studied to see if effects generalize across populations. Future research may also target minority groups to examine how friendship quality may impact happiness, belongingness, and anxiety in such groups, particularly in a college environment.

A third limitation is that this study is not longitudinal. As such, it does not allow for looking at patterns of relationships over time. A longitudinal design would allow for seeing how friendship quality predicts adjustment, both currently and in the long term.

Additional research should build off the current study to further examine links between friendship quality and well-being. One future direction is to look at sex differences in how friendship quality predicts adjustment. The current study controlled for sex; however, research suggests that there are differences in how boys and girls experience peer relationships. For example, girls are more likely to engage in prosocial interactions characterized by self-disclosure, and are more sensitive to distress and to the status of their peer relationships. These sex differences may lead to disparate emotional and behavioral development in boys and girls, where girls may develop intimate relationships but experience heightened vulnerability to emotional difficulties (Rose & Rudolph, 2006). As such, it would be beneficial to examine whether sex differences emerge, and what these differences are, when investigating links between friendship quality and well-being.

Future research could also measure additional aspects of subjective well-being. Subjective well-being is characterized by happiness, satisfaction with life, and positive and negative affect. In this study, the Satisfaction with Life Scale was used to measure subjective well-being. However, which personality dimension is the strongest correlate of subjective well-being may depend on the operational definition of subjective well-being (Hayes & Joseph, 2003). As such, additional measurement scales could be used to look at different aspects of this construct.

Moreover, research could examine how friends' perceptions of the quality of their friendship affect aspects of well-being. Research suggests that discordant perceptions of a

relationship predict lower social support and satisfaction in the relationship (Bagwell et al., 2005). Further studies could therefore investigate how friends' perceptions of their friendship quality predict subsequent adjustment.

The current study found that personality and friendship quality are predictors of well-being. However, there are many other contributing factors, and it is therefore important that research continue to examine what these additional factors are, particularly when controlling for personality.

References

Asendorpf, J. B., & Wilpers, S. (1998). Personality effects on social relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(6), 1531-1544.

Asher, S. R., & Weeks, M. S. (2012). Social relationships, academic engagement, and well-being in college: Findings from the Duke social relationships project.

Ashwin, P. (2003). Peer support: Relations between the context, process and outcomes for the students who are supported. *Instructional science*, *31*(3), 159-173.

Bagwell, C. L., Bender, S. E., Andreassi, C. L., Kinoshita, T. L., Montarello, S. A., & Muller, J. G. (2005). Friendship quality and perceived relationship changes predict psychosocial adjustment in early adulthood. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *22*(2), 235 254.

Berry, D. S., Willingham, J. K., & Thayer, C. A. (2000). Affect and personality as predictors of conflict and closeness in young adults' friendships. *Journal of Research in Personality, 34*(1), 84-107.

Bradburn, N. M., & Noll, C. E. (1969). The structure of psychological well-being. Chicago: Aldine Pub.

Brebner, J., Donaldson, J., Kirby, N., & Ward, L. (1995). Relationships between happiness and personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 19*(2), 251-258.

Cheng, H., & Furnham, A. (2001). Attributional style and personality as predictors of happiness and mental health. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *2*(3), 307-327.

Cheng, H., & Furnham, A. (2003). Personality, self-esteem, and demographic predictions of happiness and depression. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*(6), 921-942.

Demir, M., & Weitekamp, L. A. (2007). I am so happy 'cause today I found my friend: Friendship and personality as predictors of happiness. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 8*(2), 181-211.

DeNeve, K. M., & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: a meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological bulletin*, *124*(2), 197.

Dennis, J. M., Phinney, J. S., & Chuateco, L. I. (2005). The role of motivation, parental support, and peer support in the academic success of ethnic minority first-generation college students. *Journal of College Student Development*,*46*(3), 223-236.

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49,* 71-75.

Furman, W. & Buhrmester, D. (1985). Children's perception of the personal relationships in their social networks. *Developmental Psychology, 21*(6), 1016-1024.

Hayes, N., & Joseph, S. (2003). Big 5 correlates of three measures of subjective well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*(4), 723-727.

Ingersoll-Dayton, B., Morgan, D., & Antonucci, T. (1997). The effects of positive and negative social exchanges on aging adults. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, *52*(4), S190-S199.

Jackson, T., Soderlind, A., & Weiss, K. E. (2000). Personality traits and quality of relationships as predictors of future loneliness among American college students. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 28*(5), 463-470.

Jensen-Campbell, L. A., Adams, R., Perry, D. G., Workman, K. A., Furdella, J. Q., & Egan, S. K. (2002). Agreeableness, extraversion, and peer relations in early adolescence: Winning friends and deflecting aggression. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*(3), 224-251.

John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, *2*, 102-138.

Koorevaar, A., Comijs, H., Dhondt, A., Marwijk, H. V., Mast, R. V., Naarding, P., . . . Stek, M. (2013). Big Five personality and depression diagnosis, severity and age of onset in older adults. *Journal of Affective Disorders, 151*(1), 178-185.

Kotov, R., Gamez, W., Schmidt, F., & Watson, D. (2010). Linking "big" personality traits to anxiety, depressive, and substance use disorders: a meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, *136*(5), 768.

Lyubomirsky, S., Sheldon, K. M., & Schkade, D. (2005). Pursuing happiness: The architecture of sustainable change. *Review of General Psychology, 9*(2), 111-131.

Myers, D. G., & Diener, E. (1995). Who is happy?. *Psychological science*, *6*(1), 10-19.

Pittman, L. D., & Richmond, A. (2007). Academic and psychological functioning in late adolescence: The importance of school belonging. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *75*(4), 270-290.

Pittman, L. D., & Richmond, A. (2008). University belonging, friendship quality, and psychological adjustment during the transition to college. *The Journal of Experimental Education, 76*(4), 343-362.

Quevedo, R. J., & Abella, M. C. (2011). Well-being and personality: Facet-level analyses. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*(2), 206-211.

Rodriguez, N., Mira, C. B., Myers, H. F., Morris, J. K., & Cardoza, D. (2003). Family or friends: Who plays a greater supportive role for Latino college students?. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *9*(3), 236.

Rose, A. J., & Rudolph, K. D. (2006). A review of sex differences in peer relationship processes: potential trade-offs for the emotional and behavioral development of girls and boys. *Psychological bulletin*, *132*(1), 98.

Selfhout, M., Burk, W., Branje, S., Denissen, J., Van Aken, M., & Meeus, W. (2010). Emerging late adolescent friendship networks and Big Five personality traits: A social network approach. *Journal of personality*, *78*(2), 509-538.

Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B., & Löwe, B. (2006). A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. *Archives of internal medicine*, *166*(10), 1092 1097.

Steel, P., Schmidt, J., & Shultz, J. (2008). Refining the relationship between personality and subjective well-being. *Psychological bulletin*, *134*(1), 1

Table 1

Correlations, Means and Standard Deviations

Measure	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	Mean	SD
1. Happiness	-	.40**	-.32**	.24**	.19**	.34**	-.38**	-.06	.23**	.00	-.00	2.17
2. Belongingness		-	-.19**	.27**	.23**	.18**	-.27**	.01	.25**	.02	3.84	0.78
3. Anxiety			-	-.11*	-.19**	-.22**	.59**	-.01	.01	.10*	0.75	0.67
4. Extraversion				-	-.02	.17**	-.27**	.06	.17**	.10*	3.35	0.76
5. Agreeableness					-	.27**	-.23**	.04	.15**	-.19**	3.74	0.59
6. Conscientiousness						-	-.27**	-.01	.17**	-.11*	3.48	0.61
7. Neuroticism							-	-.08	-.05	-.04	2.78	0.73
8. Openness								-	.02	.02	3.45	0.57
9. Positive Friendship Quality									-	.14**	3.33	0.77
10. Negative Friendship Quality										-	1.51	0.70

n = 394

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 2

Regression Analysis with Gender, Personality Traits and Friendship Quality as Predictors of Happiness

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Gender	-.55	.22	-.13*
Step 2			
Gender	-.23	.18	-.05
Extraversion	.38	.11	.13*
Agreeableness	.13	.15	.04
Conscientiousness	1.14	.15	.32*
Neuroticism	-1.30	.13	-.44*
Openness	.08	.15	.02
Step 3			
Gender	-.37	.19	-.08*
Extraversion	.33	.11	.12*
Agreeableness	.07	.15	.02
Conscientiousness	1.09	.15	.31*
Neuroticism	-1.29	.13	-.44*
Openness	.06	.15	.02
Positive Friendship Quality	.34	.11	.12*
Negative Friendship Quality	-.08	.13	-.03

*p < .05

ΔR^2 = .02 for Step 1, .44 for Step 2, .01 for Step 3

Table 3

Regression Analysis with Gender, Personality Traits and Friendship Quality as Predictors of Belongingness

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Gender	-.17	.08	-.11*
Step 2			
Gender	-.18	.08	-.12*
Extraversion	.24	.05	.23*
Agreeableness	.27	.07	.20*
Conscientiousness	.10	.07	.08
Neuroticism	-.12	.06	-.12*
Openness	-.05	.07	-.04
Step 3			
Gender	-.26	.08	-.17*
Extraversion	.21	.05	.20*
Agreeableness	.23	.07	.17*
Conscientiousness	.07	.07	.06
Neuroticism	-.12	.06	-.11*
Openness	-.07	.06	-.05
Positive Friendship Quality	.22	.05	.21*
Negative Friendship Quality	-.04	.06	-.66

*p < .05

ΔR^2 = .01 for Step 1, .15 for Step 2, .04 for Step 3

Table 4

Regression Analysis with Gender, Personality Traits and Friendship Quality as Predictors of Anxiety

Variable	B	SE B	β
Step 1			
Gender	.12	.07	.09
Step 2			
Gender	-.07	.06	-.05
Extraversion	.05	.04	.06
Agreeableness	-.03	.05	-.03
Conscientiousness	-.06	.05	-.05
Neuroticism	.55	.04	.60*
Openness	.04	.05	.03
Step 3			
Gender	-.05	.06	-.04
Extraversion	.04	.04	.04
Agreeableness	-.02	.05	-.02
Conscientiousness	-.05	.05	-.05
Neuroticism	.55	.04	.60*
Openness	.04	.05	.03
Positive Friendship Quality	.03	.04	.03
Negative Friendship Quality	.10	.04	.10*

*$p < .05$

$\Delta R^2 = .01$ for Step 1, .35 for Step 2, .01 for Step 3