



# SPIRITUAL PERSONALITY, RESILIENCE AND PSYCHOLOGICAL GENERAL WELL-BEING AMONG YOUNG ADULTS

<sup>1</sup>Ms. Meemansa Chauhan, <sup>2</sup>Ms. Shruthi Rose

<sup>1</sup>Student, <sup>2</sup>Assistant Professor

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychology,

<sup>1</sup>Kristu Jayanti College, Bengaluru, India

**Abstract:** The study was conducted to find the relationship between Spiritual Personality, Resilience and Psychological General Well-Being among Young Adults. In the present study, Pearson Correlation, Independent sample t-test, one way ANOVA and Regression Analysis were performed. A non-experimental correlational design with a quantitative approach was used in this study. The sample consisted of 335 individuals aging between 18-26. The tools used for this study were Spiritual Personality Inventory, Brief Resilience Scale and Psychological General Well-Being Scale. Correlation and Regression Analysis were both employed to evaluate the link and effect of Spiritual Personality and Psychological General Well-Being on Resilience. The findings indicated that there was a positive correlation between Spiritual Personality, Resilience and Psychological General Well-Being. The findings also indicated that there are no significant differences in Spiritual Personality, Resilience and Psychological General Well-Being based on in terms of their socio-economic status, family structure, age, substance use and there is a significant gender difference in Resilience but not in Spiritual Personality and Psychological General Well-Being in young adults.

**Index Terms - Spiritual Personality, Resilience and Psychological General Well-Being**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Spirituality is a sense of interconnectedness with others. It provides meaning and purpose to one's existence. Husain, Luqman, and Jahan (2012) highlighted two major components of spiritual personality: noble behavior toward others and moral rectitude. A noble attitude towards others refers to divine characteristics such as trustworthiness, righteousness, faithfulness, generosity, fear of God, kindness, trustworthiness, and living for the sake of others. Moral rectitude relates to qualities such as self-control, constancy, firmness and patience, purity and cleanliness, and satisfaction. Personality is a dynamic and ordered set of qualities that impact cognition, motives, and behaviors in various contexts. Carducci (2009) discovered three characteristics that are present in the majority of these definitions: distinctiveness, behavioral consistency, and the nature and development of personality. Spiritual personality is one who maintains disciplined, rooted, and concentrated mind, with love, peace, and togetherness as the three defining qualities. A person who loves God will get the spiritual quality's essence, and those who seek for spiritual life with all their faith, intelligence, and heart will succeed.

Resilience refers to both the process and the outcome of successfully adapting to difficult or challenging life experiences, according to the definition from the American Psychological Association (APA). Resilience is the ability to withstand adversity, bounce back, and grow despite life's downturns. A new quick resilience scale was developed to measure the capacity to rebound or bounce back from stress. It was correlated with personal traits, social connections, coping, and health. Resilience theory states that how we respond to adversity is what matters most. It involves a transactional dynamic process of person-environment exchanges, an adaptation process of goodness-of-fit across the life course, and is linked to life stress and people's unique coping capacity. It may be on a continuum, interactive, having multiple levels, and a phenomenon.

Psychological wellbeing (PWB) and other expressions related to good mental states, such as happiness or contentment, are similar at their most fundamental level. Well-being is the experience of having a positive outlook on life, feeling content with it, finding meaning or purpose in it, and being able to handle stress. There are five main categories of wellbeing: emotional health, physical health, public health, occupational well-being, and well-being of society. Happiness is declining in the US, and improving well-being can be challenging.

## II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study used quantitative correlational design to understand the significance between the variables used in the study.

### i) Statement of the problem -

To understand the relationship between spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being among young adults. To see if there is a difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being among young adults based on gender, socio-economic status, family structure, age and frequency of substance use.

ii) **Objectives of the study -**

1. To find the relationship between spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being among young adults.
2. To find impact of spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being on resilience.
3. To find difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being in young adults based on their gender.
4. To find difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being in young adults based on their socio- economic status.
5. To find the difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being in young adults based on their family structure.
6. To find the difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being in young adults based on their age.
7. To find the difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being in young adults based on their frequency of substance use.

iii) **Hypotheses -**

H01 - There is no significant relationship between spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being among young adults.

H02 - There is a significant impact of spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being on resilience.

H03 - There is no significant gender difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being in young adults.

H04- There is no significant difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being among young adults based on their socio-economic status.

H05- There is no significant difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being in young adults based on their family structure.

H06 - There is no significant difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being in young adults based on their age.

H07 - There is no significant difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being in young adults based on their frequency of substance use.

iv) **Tools for the study -**

1. **Spiritual Personality Inventory** - The researchers determined the reliability of the inventory through Cronbach alpha. Item analysis was done to find out the internal consistency of the inventory. 32 statements with alpha 0.86 were selected. Two factors, namely, noble attitude toward others and moral rectitude were extracted after applying the Principle Component Factor Analysis with Varimax rotation factors.
2. **Brief Resilience Scale** - The BRS (Smith, Dalen, Wiggins, Tooley, Christopher, and Bernard, 2008) is a 6-item resilience assessment that focuses on the ability to recover from stress and adversity. Responses are scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). (5). The responder is more resilient if their mean BRS score is greater. The BRS is a one-factor scale. To eliminate social desirability response bias, half of the items are assessed in reverse (Cronbach, 1950). Smith et al. (2008) reported Cronbach's alpha values ranging from.80 to.91 across four samples.
3. **Psychological General Well Being** - The scale is made up of 22 polytomous questions, with a high score indicating high levels of psychological well-being. Anxiety, depressive mood, positive well-being, self-control, overall health, and vitality are the six affective states measured.

v) **Procedure of the study-** The present study is using convenience sampling with sample size of 300. The population chosen for the study is both male and females who are in the age range of 18-26. The inclusion criteria for the study are people participating in the study should be comfortable with English. The exclusion criterion for the study is anyone who is diagnosed with any mental illness. The study used Google form as a method of data collection. The sampling technique used in the study was convenience sampling method. The Google form was circulated to the participants. Google form contained informed consent, demographic details of the participant, scales used in the study. The researcher's details were added for further contact. For final analysis those who answered "yes" for participation were considered for the study.

vi) **Statistical procedure of the study -** The statistical procedure was done with help of SPSS (Statistical Packages for Social Sciences). The statistical procedure that was performed in the study was Correlation, Regression analysis, independent sample t test and one-way Anova.

### III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

*Table 1 Sample Distribution*

Demographic variables	Category	N	Percentage
Age range (18 to 21) (22 to 26)	1. Adolescence	148	44.3%
	2. Young adults	182	55.7%
Gender	1. Male	150	44.8%
	2. Female	182	55.2%
Socio Economic Status	1. High class	33	9.9%
	2. Upper middle class	93	28.7%
	3. Middle class	166	48.5%
	4. Lower middle class	28	8.4%
	5. Lower class	15	4.5%
Family Structure	1. Joint Family	106	63%
	2. Nuclear Family	211	31.6%
	3. Single Parent	18	5.4%
Frequency Substance use	1. Everyday	19	5.7%
	2. Weekends	25	7.5%
	3. Occasionally	90	26.9%
	4. Never	170	50.7%
	5. Social Gathering	31	9.3%

Table 1 shows the sample distributions of the demographic variables is mentioned above. The study had two age groups in which 44.3% of them were in adolescence and 55.7% of them were in their early adulthood. The study included both the genders, 44.8% of them were men and 55.2% of them were females. There were five socio economic groups in which 9.9% of them belonged to high class, 28.7% of them belonged to upper middle class, 48.5% of them belonged to middle class, 8.4% of them belonged to lower middle class and 4.5% of them belonged to lower class.

There were three family structures in which 63% of people belonged to joint family, 31.6% of them belonged to nuclear family and 5.4% of them had a single parent. The study had five groups for frequency of substance use in which 5.7% people used substance every day, 7.5% of them used it on weekends, 26.9% of them used it occasionally, 50.7% of them never used it and 9.3% of them used it on social gatherings.

**Table 2 shows the results for Spearman Correlation test on spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being among young adults**

Variables	Spiritual Personality	GPWB
Spiritual Personality	-----	0.27**(r) 0.00 (p)
Resilience	0.21**(r) 0.00 (p)	0.51**(r) 0.00 (p)

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

Table 2 shows the relationship between spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being. Correlation coefficient and the corresponding p-value of spiritual personality with respect to resilience and psychological general well-being is given. Analysis of the table shows that for psychological general well-being, correlation coefficient ( $r = 0.27$ ) and the corresponding p value ( $<0.01$ ) with relation to spiritual personality which is significant at 0.01 level hence, there is a positive correlation. It is shown that psychological general well-being has a positive relationship with resilience.

For resilience, correlation coefficient ( $r = 0.21$ ) and the corresponding p value ( $<0.01$ ) with relation to spiritual personality which is significant at 0.01 level hence, there is a positive correlation. It is shown that spiritual personalities have a positive relationship with resilience.

For, psychological general well-being correlation coefficient ( $r = 0.51$ ) and the corresponding p value ( $<0.01$ ) with relation to resilience which is significant at 0.01 level hence, there is a positive correlation. It is shown that psychological general well-being has a positive relationship with resilience. There is a statistically significant positive correlation between the three variables therefore; there is a significant relationship between spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being among young adults.

Thus, the null hypothesis "There is no significant relationship between spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being among young adults" is rejected.

**Table 3 using Multiple Regression shows the impact of spiritual personality and psychological general well-being on resilience.**

Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized coefficient	Model summary
	B	Std.error	Beta	
Spiritual Personality	0.05	0.01	0.24	R= 0.67 R <sup>2</sup> =0.36 t=4.38
PGWB	0.10	0.01	0.46	F=97.76 P=0.00

Table 3 shows regression analysis of spiritual personality and psychological general well-being on resilience where spiritual personality and psychological general well-being are independent variables and resilience is the dependent variable. With Beta value of 0.24 and .46, F value 5.09 and 9.72 and t value of 4.38. The table also indicates that the R<sup>2</sup> value is 0.36 and the result was found to be significant as the p values is 0.00. This indicates that there's a considerably significant impact of the variables spiritual personality and psychological general well-being on resilience. The R<sup>2</sup> value indicates that 36 %change in resilience is predicted by spiritual personality and psychological general well-being. Thus, the hypothesis stated "There is a significant impact of spiritual personality and psychological general well-being on resilience" is accepted, which assumed there is impact of spiritual personality and psychological well-being on resilience.

**Table 4 shows the difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being in young adults based on their gender.**

Variables	Category	N	Mean	SD	t	Sig.
Spiritual Personality	Male	150	119.79	13.22	0.17	0.85
	Female	185	119.53	13.03		
Resilience	Male	150	19.27	3.56	3.23	0.01
	Female	185	17.97	3.77		
PGWB	Male	150	67.08	17.56	2.57	0.11
	Female	185	62.04	18.12		

In table 4 Independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being based on gender.

The t value for spiritual personality is 0.17 with corresponding p-value = 0.85 which is more than the significant value of 0.05 indicating there is no significant difference in spiritual personality based on gender. The mean and standard deviation of males and females is 119.79 (13.22) and 119.53 (13.03) for spiritual personality which shows no significance difference between the two groups.

The t value for psychological general well-being is 2.57 with corresponding p-value 0.11 which is more than the significant value of 0.05 indicating there is no significant difference in psychological general well-being based on gender. The mean and standard deviation of males and females is 67.08 (17.56) and 62.04 (18.12) for psychological general well-being which shows no significance difference between the two groups.

Whereas, the t value for resilience is 3.23 with corresponding p-value = 0.01, which is less than the significant value of 0.05 indicating there is a significant gender difference on resilience. The mean and standard deviation of males and females is 19.27 (3.56) and 17.97(3.77) for resilience which shows a significant gender difference.

Hence, the null hypothesis, "there is no significant difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being based on Gender", is accepted for spiritual personality and psychological general well-being and rejected for resilience.

**Table 5 shows the difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being in young adults based on their socio- economic status**

Category	High Class		Upper Class	Middle	Middle Class		Lower Middle Class		Lower Class		F	Sig.
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Spiritual Personality	120.39	10.85	119.61	11.34	120.43	14.27	117.14	120.07	114.13	15.54	1.09	0.35
Resilience	19.79	3.83	18.61	3.67	18.19	3.57	18.96	4.451	18.80	3.98	1.41	0.22
PGWB	70.67	19.59	64.28	15.92	64.07	18.40	57.96	20.04	64.73	16.11	1.92	0.10

In table 5, One-way ANOVA was conducted on the socio- economic status which was divided into five groups to compare the difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being among them. For spiritual personality, as the p value (0.35) is more than 0.05, which means that there is no significant difference in spiritual personality based on socio- economic status. Therefore, an analysis of variance showed the difference of socio - economic status on spiritual personality which was not significant, (F = 1.09) and (p =0.35). The mean and standard deviation of high class, upper middle class, middle class, lower middle class and lower class for spiritual personality is 120.39 (10.85), 119.61 (11.34), 120.43 (14.27), 117.14 (12.07) and 114.13 (15.54) respectively, which shows no significance difference between the groups.

For resilience, the p value is (0.22) which is greater than 0.05, which signifies that there's no significant difference in resilience based on socio- economic status. An analysis of variance showed the difference of socio - economic status on resilience which was not significant,

(F = 1.41) and (p = 0.22). The mean and standard deviation for high class, upper middle class, middle class, lower middle class and lower class of resilience is 19.79 (3.83), 18.61 (3.67), 18.19 (3.57), 18.96 (4.51) and 18.80 (3.98) respectively, which shows no significance difference between the groups.

For psychological general well- being, the p value is (0.10) which is greater than 0.05, which signifies that there's no significant difference in psychological general well- being based on socio - economic status. An analysis of variance showed the difference of socio - economic status on psychological general well- being which was not significant, (F = 1.92) and (p = 0.10). The mean and standard deviation for high class, upper middle class, middle class, lower middle class and lower class of psychological general well-being is 70.67 (19.59), 64.28 (15.92), 64.07 (18.40), 57.96 (20.04) and 64.73 (16.118) respectively, which shows no significance difference between the groups. Thus, the null hypothesis which states "there is no significant difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being based socio- economic status" is accepted.

**Table 6 shows the difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being in young adults based on their Family Structure.**

Category	Joint Family		Nuclear Family		Single Parent		F	Sig.
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Spiritual Personality	18.17	13.69	119.80	2.58	24.27	15.46	1.64	0.19
Resilience	18.71	3.76	18.50	3.80	18.72	2.76	0.12	0.88
PGWB	64.64	18.07	64.34	17.87	66.11	18.42	0.83	0.59

In table 6, One-way ANOVA was conducted on the family structure which was divided into three groups to compare the difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being among them.

For spiritual personality, as the p value (0.19) is more than 0.05, which means that there is no significant difference in spiritual personality based on family structure. Therefore, an analysis of variance showed the difference in frequency in family structure on spiritual personality which was not significant, ( $F = 1.64$ ) and ( $p = 0.19$ ). The mean and standard deviation of joint family, nuclear family and single parent for spiritual personality is 118.36 (13.69), 195.80 (12.58), 124.27 (15.46) respectively, which shows no significance difference between the groups.

For resilience, the p value is (0.88) which is greater than 0.05, which signifies that there's no significant difference in resilience based on family structure. An analysis of variance showed the difference in family structure on resilience which was not significant, ( $F = 0.12$ ) and ( $p = 0.88$ ). The mean and standard deviation of joint family, nuclear family and single parent for resilience is 18.71 (3.76), 18.50 (3.80) and 18.58 (3.73) respectively, which shows no significance difference between the groups.

For psychological general well- being, the p value is (0.92) which is greater than 0.05, which signifies that there's no significant difference in psychological general well- being based on family structure. An analysis of variance showed the difference in family structure on psychological general well- being which was not significant, ( $F = 0.83$ ) and ( $p = 0.592$ ). The mean and standard deviation of joint family, nuclear family and single parent for psychological general well- being is 64.64 (18.07), 64.35 (17.87) and 66.11 (18.42) respectively, which shows no significance difference between the groups. Thus, the null hypothesis which states "there is no significant difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being based family structure" is accepted.

**Table 7 shows the difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being in young adults based on their Age.**

Variables	Category	N	M	SD	t	Sig.
Spiritual Personality	Adolescence	148	118.73	13.39	-1.16	0.24
	Young Adults	182	120.40	12.83	-1.115	0.24
Resilience	Adolescence	148	18.54	3.82	-0.28	0.98
	Young Adults	182	18.56	3.66	-0.28	0.98
PGWB	Adolescence	148	64.32	19.13	0.02	0.97
	Young Adults	182	64.26	17.08	0.02	0.97

In Table 7 Independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being based on age. The t value for spiritual personality is -1.16 with corresponding p-value = 0.24 which is more than the significant value of 0.05 indicating there is no significant difference in spiritual personality based on age. The mean and standard deviation of adolescence and young adults for spiritual personality are 118.73 (13.39) and 120.40 (12.83) which shows no significance difference between both the groups.

The t value for resilience is -0.28 with corresponding p-value 0.97 which is more than the significant value of 0.05 indicating there is no significant difference in resilience based on age. The mean and standard deviation of adolescence and young adults for resilience are 18.54 (3.82) and 18.56 (3.66) which shows no significance difference between both the groups.

And the t value for psychological general well-being is 0.29 with corresponding p-value = 0.97, which is less than the significant value of 0.05 which there is no significant difference in psychological general well-being based on age. The mean and

standard deviation of adolescence and young adults for psychological general well-being are 64.32 (19.13) and 64.26 (17.08) which shows no significance difference between both the groups.

Thus, the null hypothesis which states “there is no significant difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being based on age” is accepted.

**Table 8 shows the difference in Spiritual Personality, Resilience and Psychological General Well- Being based on their frequency of Substance use.**

Category	Everyday		Weekend		Occasionally		Never		Social Gatherings		F	Sig.
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Spiritual Personality	119.89	14.88	115.50	11.05	118.68	12.78	120.47	12.29	119.64	13.09	1.04	0.38
Resilience	19.47	4.18	19.04	3.03	18.41	3.73	18.21	3.77	19.90	3.50	1.81	0.12
PGWB	64.42	17.82	61.68	14.97	61.68	17.43	65.15	18.50	69.35	18.02	1.33	0.25

In table 8, One-way ANOVA was conducted on the frequency of substance use which was divided into five groups to compare the difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being among them.

For spiritual personality, as the p value (0.38) is more than 0.05, which means that there is no significant difference in spiritual personality based on frequency of substance use. Therefore, an analysis of variance showed the difference in frequency of substance use on spiritual personality which was not significant, (F = 1.04) and (p = 0.38). The mean and standard deviation of everyday, weekends, occasionally, never and social gatherings for spiritual personality is 119.89 (14.88), 115.50 (11.05), 118.68 (12.78), 120.47 (12.29) and 119.64 (13.09) respectively, which shows no significance difference between the groups.

For resilience, the p value is (0.12) which is greater than 0.01, which signifies that there's no significant difference in resilience based on frequency of substance use. An analysis of variance showed the difference in frequency of substance use on resilience which was not significant,

(F = 1.81) and (p = 0.12). The mean and standard deviation of everyday, weekends, occasionally, never and social gatherings for resilience is 19.47 (4.18), 19.04 (3.03), 18.41 (3.73), 18.21 (3.77) and 19.90 (3.50) respectively, which shows no significance difference between the groups.

For psychological general well- being, the p value is (0.25) which is greater than 0.01, which signifies that there's no significant difference in psychological general well- being based on frequency of substance use. An analysis of variance showed the difference in frequency of substance use on psychological general well- being which was not significant, (F = 1.33) and (p = 0.25). The mean and standard deviation of everyday, weekends, occasionally, never and social gatherings for psychological general well- being is 64.42 (17.82), 61.48 (14.97), 61.68 (17.43), 65.15 (18.50) and 69.35 (18.02) respectively, which shows no significance difference between the groups. Thus, the null hypothesis which states “there is no significant difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well- being based frequency of substance use” is accepted.

**Table 9 shows the results for Pearson correlation test on sub domains of psychological general well-being.**

Variables	Depression	Positive well-being	Self- control	General health
Anxiety	0.76**	0.70**	0.69**	0.54**
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Depression		0.61**	0.65**	0.49**
		0.00	0.00	0.00

Positive well-being	0.66**	0.49**
	0.00	0.00
Self - Control		0.57**
		0.00

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

In table 9, Pearson correlation test on sub domains of psychological general well-being was done. Correlation coefficient and the corresponding p-value of anxiety, depression, positive well-being, self-control and general health is given. Analysis of the table shows that for anxiety correlation coefficient for depression ( $r = 0.76$ ), for positive well-being ( $r = 0.70$ ), for self-control ( $r = 0.69$ ), for general health ( $r = 0.54$ ) and all the corresponding p values are ( $<0.01$ ) with relation to depression, positive well-being, self-control and good health is significant at 0.01 level. Hence, there is a positive correlation between all the above-mentioned variables.

For depression, correlation coefficient for positive well-being ( $r = 0.61$ ), for self-control ( $r = 0.65$ ), for general health ( $r = 0.49$ ) and all the corresponding p values are ( $<0.01$ ) with relation to positive well-being, self-control and good health is significant at 0.01 level. Hence, there is a positive correlation between all the above-mentioned variables.

For positive well-being, correlation coefficient for self-control ( $r = 0.66$ ), for general health ( $r = 0.49$ ) and all the corresponding p values are ( $<0.01$ ) with relation to self-control and general health is significant at 0.01 level. Hence, there is a positive correlation between all the above-mentioned variables.

For self-control, correlation coefficient for general health ( $r = 0.57$ ) and all the corresponding p values are ( $<0.01$ ) with relation to general health is significant at 0.01 level. Hence, there is a positive correlation between self-control and general health. Therefore, there is a positive correlation between all the sub domains of psychological general well-being.

### 1. Limitations of the study-

1. The current study collected data online, which might have had an impact on the study's findings.
2. The participants may have offered an untruthful response because they were bored answering all the questions or because the researcher wasn't there in person.
3. The study cannot be generalized because of the limited sample size.
4. Because convenience sampling was used to conduct the study, it cannot be applied to a broader population.
5. There are not an equal number of participants in each demographic category in the research.

### 2. Major findings of the study-

1. There is a significant relationship between spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being among young adults.
2. There is a significant impact of spiritual personality and psychological general well-being on Resilience.
3. There is a significant gender difference in resilience but not in spiritual personality and psychological general well-being in young adults.
4. There is no significant difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being among young adults based on their socio-economic status.
5. There is no significant difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being in young adults based on their family structure.
6. There is no significant difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being in young adults based on their age.
7. There is no significant difference in spiritual personality, resilience and psychological general well-being in young adults based on their frequency of Substance use.

### REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. Rinehart & Winston.
- Cattell, R. B. (1950). *Personality: A systematic, theoretical, and factual study*. McGraw-Hill.
- Carducci, B. J. (2009). *The psychology of personality* (2nd ed). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Figueredo, A. J., Sefcek, J. A., Vasquez, G., Brumbach, B. H., King, J. E., & Jacobs. (2005). Evolutionary personality psychology. In D. M. Buss (Ed.), *The handbook of evolutionary psychology* (pp. 851–877). John Wiley.
- Funder. (2001). *The personalities puzzle* (2nd ed). Norton.
- Guilford. (1959). *Personality*. McGraw-Hill.

- Kaliappan. (1996). *Personality development of student youth towards nation building – Report of the work under the major UGC research project from April 1993 to October 1996, Department of Psychology.* University of Madras. Chennai, India.
- McClelland. (1951). *Personality.* Dryden Press.
- Mischel. (1999). *Introduction to personality* (6th ed).Forth Worth. Harcourt Publishers Brace College.
- Pervin, & John. (2001). *Personality: Theory and research* (8th ed). John Wiley.
- Ryckman. (2004). *Theories of personality.* Thomson. Wadsworth Publishing.
- Wayne. (1994). *Psychology: Themes and variations* (2nd ed). Brooks/Cole.
- Greene, R. R. (2002). *Resilience: Theory and research for social work practice.* NASW Press.
- Moore, C. (2020). *Resilience Theory: What Research Articles in Psychology Teach Us.* Positivepsychology.com
- Shean, M. *Current Theories related to resilience and young people. A literature review.*
- Davis, T. S. et al. (2013). Tamir, M., et al. (2007). *Layous, K. and S. Lyubomirsky (2012).*
- Zolopa, C., Burack, J. A., O'Connor, R. M., Corran, C., Lai, J., Bomfim, E., DeGrace, S., Dumont, J., Larney, S., & Wendt, D. C. (2022). Changes in youth mental health, psychological wellbeing, and substance use during the COVID-19 pandemic: A rapid review. *Adolescent Research Review*, 7(2), 161–177. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-022-00185-6>
- Hatala, A. R., Njeze, C., Morton, D., Pearl, T., & Bird-Naytowhow, K. (2020). Land and nature as sources of health and resilience among Indigenous youth in an urban Canadian context: A photovoice exploration. *BMC Public Health*, 20(1), 538. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-08647-z>
- Aliche, J. C., Ifeagwazi, C. M., Onyishi, I. E., & Mefoh, P. C. (2019). Presence of meaning in life mediates the relations between social support, posttraumatic growth, and resilience in Young adult survivors of a terror attack. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, 24(8), 736–749. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15325024.2019.1624416>
- Yen, J. Y., Lin, H. C., Chou, W. P., Liu, T. L., & Ko, C. H. (2019). Associations among resilience, stress, depression, and Internet gaming disorder in Young adults. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(17), 3181. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16173181>
- Agteren, J., Woodyatt, L., Iasiello, M., Rayner, J., & Kyrios, M. (2019). Make it measurable: Assessing psychological distress, wellbeing and resilience at scale in higher education. *Student Success*, 10(3), 1a+. <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A611172192/AONE?u=anon~e48f1984&sid=googleScholar&xid=79593776>, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.5204/ssj.v10i3.1411>
- Le, Y. K., Piedmont, R. L., & Wilkins, T. A. (2019). Spirituality, religiousness, personality as predictors of stress and resilience among middle-aged Vietnamese-Born American Catholics. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture*, 22(7), 754–768. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2019.1646235>
- Kong, F., Ma, X., You, X., & Xiang, Y. (2018). The resilient brain: Psychological resilience mediates the effect of amplitude of low-frequency fluctuations in orbitofrontal cortex on subjective well-being in young healthy adults. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*. doi:10.1093/scan/nsy045, 13(7), 755–763. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15325024.2019.1624416>
- Foster, K. A., Bowland, S. E., & Vosler, A. N. (2015). All the pain along with all the joy: Spiritual resilience in lesbian and Gay Christians. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 55(1–2), 191–201. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-015-9704-4>
- Kub, J., & Solari-Twadell, P. A. (2013, October). Religiosity/spirituality and substance use in adolescence as related to positive development: A literature review. *Journal of Addictions Nursing*, 24(4), 247–262. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JAN.0000000000000006>
- Gnanaprakash, C. (2013). Spirituality and resilience among post-graduate university students. *Journal of Health Management*, 15(3), 383–396. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972063413492046>