

## Postprint: A Canonical Correlation Analysis of the Relationship between Subjective Well-being and Personality Traits in Older Adults

**Authors:** Zhou Yujie, Liu Huan-ting, Wan Chonghua, Gan Qihui, Xiao Junhui, Liu Yuxi, Liu Yuxi

**Date:** 2023-09-22T00:00:00+00:00

### Abstract

Background: With the intensification of population aging, mental health issues among the elderly have become a topic of great societal concern. Existing research indicates that mental health problems in older adults are closely associated with well-being, and personality traits exert a substantial influence on subjective well-being; however, the intrinsic relationship between these two factors in the elderly population remains unclear. Objective: To investigate the relationship between subjective well-being and personality traits in older adults. Methods: From July to August 2022, 511 elderly individuals from Lincun, Tangxia Town, Dongguan City, Guangdong Province were selected as participants. On-site survey investigations of the elderly were conducted using a questionnaire method. The Memorial University of Newfoundland Scale of Happiness (MUNSH) and the Chinese Big Five Personality Inventory-15 (CBF-PI-15) were employed to assess subjective well-being and personality traits, respectively. Pearson correlation analysis was utilized to examine the correlation between subjective well-being and personality traits in older adults, and canonical correlation analysis was performed to construct a standardized canonical correlation model, conduct canonical structure analysis, and canonical redundancy analysis, so as to explore the relationship between subjective well-being and its dimensions with the dimensions of personality traits. Results: The total MUNSH score for the elderly was  $(39.72 \pm 7.74)$ . The MUNSH dimension scores, from highest to lowest, were: positive experience  $(9.48 \pm 3.24)$ , positive affect  $(8.61 \pm 2.24)$ , negative experience  $(1.44 \pm 2.31)$ , and negative affect  $(1.44 \pm 2.31)$ . The CBF-PI-15 dimension scores were: agreeableness  $(14.04 \pm 2.60)$ , extraversion  $(11.77 \pm 4.05)$ , conscientiousness  $(10.77 \pm 2.60)$ , openness  $(10.77 \pm 2.60)$ , and neuroticism  $(10.77 \pm 2.60)$ . Pearson correlation analysis revealed that subjective well-being was positively correlated with conscientiousness ( $r=0.334$ ) and openness ( $r=0.219$ ) ( $P<0.05$ ), and negatively correlated with neuroticism ( $r=-0.223$ ,  $P<0.05$ ). Canonical correlation analysis showed that the correlation coefficients for the first and

second pairs of canonical variables were 0.476 and 0.331 ( $P < 0.001$ ), respectively. The standardized canonical correlation model indicated that the correlation between the first canonical variable of subjective well-being (U1) and the first canonical variable of personality traits (V1) was primarily characterized by a negative correlation between positive experience and neuroticism, and a positive correlation with conscientiousness. The correlation between the second canonical variable of subjective well-being (U2) and the second canonical variable of personality traits (V2) was mainly manifested as a positive correlation between positive affect, negative affect and neuroticism. Canonical structure analysis demonstrated that U1 was strongly correlated with positive affect, negative affect, positive experience, and negative experience, while U2 was strongly correlated with negative affect and negative experience. V1 was strongly correlated with positive experience, conscientiousness, and openness; V2 was strongly correlated with neuroticism and openness. Canonical redundancy analysis revealed that U1 explained 5.4% of the variance in personality traits, while V1 explained 12.2% of the variance in subjective well-being, indicating that personality traits have a greater influence on subjective well-being than vice versa. Conclusion: Overall, older adults maintain a positive and optimistic attitude with relatively high levels of subjective well-being. Subjective well-being is closely associated with neuroticism and conscientiousness. Future interventions may adopt tailored strategies based on different personality characteristics to enhance subjective well-being, preserve mental health among older adults, and proactively address population aging.

## Full Text

### Research on the Relationship between Subjective Well-being and Personality Traits in the Elderly Based on Canonical Correlation Analysis

ZHOU Yujie<sup>1,2</sup>, LIU Huanting<sup>2</sup>, WAN Chonghua<sup>2</sup>, GAN Qihui<sup>3</sup>, XIAO Junhui<sup>3</sup>, LIU Yuxi<sup>1,3\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The First Dongguan Affiliated Hospital of Guangdong Medical University, Dongguan 523808, China

<sup>2</sup>Research Center for Quality of Life and Applied Psychology/Key Laboratory of Quality of Life and Psychological Assessment Intervention, Guangdong Medical University, Dongguan 523808, China

<sup>3</sup>Institute of Health Legal System and Policy, Guangdong Medical University, Dongguan 523808, China

*Corresponding author: LIU Yuxi, Associate professor; E-mail: yuxiliu123@126.com*

## Abstract

### Background

With the intensification of population aging, mental health issues among older adults have become a major societal concern. Previous research has demonstrated close links between mental health problems and subjective well-being in the elderly, while also showing that personality traits significantly influence subjective well-being. However, the internal relationship between these constructs in older populations remains unclear.

### Objective

To explore the relationship between subjective well-being and personality traits among older adults.

### Methods

From July to August 2022, we conducted a field survey of 511 elderly residents in Lincun, Tangxia Town, Dongguan City, Guangdong Province using questionnaires. Subjective well-being was assessed with the Memorial University of Newfoundland Scale of Happiness (MUNSH), and personality traits were evaluated using the Chinese Big Five Personality Inventory-15 (CBF-PI-15). Pearson correlation analysis examined associations between subjective well-being and personality traits. Canonical correlation analysis was then performed to construct a standardized canonical correlation model, conduct canonical structure analysis, and perform canonical redundancy analysis to investigate relationships between dimensions of subjective well-being and personality traits.

### Results

The total MUNSH score was  $(39.72 \pm 7.74)$ . *Dimension scores from highest to lowest were :*

*positive experience*  $(9.48 \pm 3.24)$ , *positive affect*  $(8.61 \pm 2.24)$ , *negative experience*  $(1.44 \pm 2.31)$ , and *negative affect*. *PI-15 dimension scores were :* *agreeableness*  $(14.04 \pm 2.60)$ , *extraversion*  $(11.77 \pm 4.05)$ , *conscientiousness*  $(10.7$

Pearson correlation analysis revealed that subjective well-being was positively correlated with conscientiousness ( $r=0.334$ ) and openness ( $r=0.219$ ) ( $P<0.05$ ), and negatively correlated with neuroticism ( $r=-0.223$ ,  $P<0.05$ ). Canonical correlation analysis showed correlation coefficients of 0.476 and 0.331 for the first and second pairs of canonical variables, respectively ( $P<0.001$ ). The standardized canonical correlation model indicated that the relationship between the first canonical variable of subjective well-being (U1) and the first canonical variable of personality traits (V1) primarily manifested as a negative correlation between positive experience and neuroticism, and a positive correlation between positive experience and conscientiousness. The relationship between the second canonical variable of subjective well-being (U2) and the second canonical variable of personality traits (V2) primarily showed positive associations of positive affect and negative affect with neuroticism. Canonical structure analysis revealed that U1 was strongly correlated with positive affect, negative affect, positive experience, and negative experience, while U2 was strongly correlated with negative affect and negative experience. V1 showed strong correlations with positive experience, conscientiousness,

and openness, whereas V2 was strongly correlated with neuroticism and openness. Canonical redundancy analysis demonstrated that U1 explained 5.4% of variance in personality traits, while V1 explained 12.2% of variance in subjective well-being, indicating that personality traits exert a stronger influence on subjective well-being than vice versa.

### Conclusion

Overall, the elderly participants demonstrated a positive and optimistic attitude with high levels of subjective well-being, which was closely related to neuroticism and conscientiousness. Future interventions targeting specific personality characteristics may enhance subjective well-being, maintain mental health among older adults, and promote active responses to population aging.

**Keywords:** Aged; Subjective well-being; Personality trait; Big five personality traits; Canonical correlation analysis

---

### Introduction

The trend of population aging is becoming increasingly severe. Beyond meeting material needs, attention to mental health among older adults has emerged as a social priority. In the context of actively responding to population aging, the 14th Five-Year Plan emphasizes continuously enhancing people's sense of gain, happiness, and security while improving the elderly care service system [1]. Subjective well-being refers to individuals' emotional and cognitive evaluations of their life circumstances, encompassing life satisfaction, self-fulfillment, pleasure, and tranquility, as well as the experience of positive emotions and absence of negative emotions. It represents a crucial indicator for assessing mental health status in older adults [2], and research suggests that improving subjective well-being can ameliorate psychological problems among the elderly [1,3-4]. Among various influencing factors, personality traits constitute the most core determinant of subjective well-being [5]. Researchers typically define personality as a dynamic, organized set of characteristics that influence individuals' cognition, motivation, and behavior across different situations [6]. After extensive validation by personality researchers, consensus has emerged that the fundamental structure of personality comprises five major factors: neuroticism, conscientiousness, agreeableness, openness, and extraversion [7].

International studies have investigated the relationship between subjective well-being and personality traits [8-9], while domestic research has primarily focused on students [10] and teachers [11], with limited attention to elderly populations. Existing studies typically employ simple correlation and regression analyses to examine relationships between single or multiple personality dimensions and overall subjective well-being, rarely comparing correlations across all dimensions of both constructs. This study aims to explore the relationship between subjective well-being and personality traits in older adults using canonical correlation analysis to examine associations among all dimensions, thereby providing

a theoretical basis for improving subjective well-being and actively addressing population aging.

---

## Methods

**1.1 Study Participants** This study selected elderly residents of Lincun, Tangxia Town, Dongguan City, Guangdong Province as participants from July to August 2022. Inclusion criteria were: (1) clear consciousness with reading/writing ability or capacity to answer questions normally; (2) age  $\geq 60$  years according to WHO classification; and (3) voluntary participation. Exclusion criteria included: (1) severe physical illness; (2) disability or blindness; and (3) intellectual disability or severe mental illness preventing comprehension of the questionnaire. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Guangdong Medical University (Approval No.: YS2022092), and all participants provided informed consent.

A total of 511 questionnaires were distributed with a 100% response rate. After review, 499 valid questionnaires were obtained (e.g., complete and properly answered without omissions or random responses), yielding a validity rate of 97.65%. The sample size was calculated using the cluster sampling formula:  $n = deff \times [(Z\alpha/2\sigma)/\delta]^2$ , where  $\alpha = 0.05$  (two-tailed),  $Z\alpha/2 = 1.96$ ,  $\delta = 0.25\sigma$  [14], with a design effect of 2 for cluster sampling, resulting in a required sample size of 123 cases. Considering a 10% non-response rate, the final calculated sample size was 137 cases, which this study exceeded.

### 1.2 Instruments 1.2.1 Basic Information Questionnaire

We used a self-designed questionnaire to collect data on gender, age, residential area, religious beliefs, physical condition (disability status), household registration status, education level, marital status, and living arrangement.

### 1.2.2 Memorial University of Newfoundland Scale of Happiness (MUNSH)

Subjective well-being was assessed using the MUNSH [12], which comprises 24 items across four dimensions: positive affect (PA; 5 items), negative affect (NA; 5 items), positive experience (PE; 7 items), and negative experience (NE; 7 items). Scoring was as follows: Item 19 (“current residence” = 2 points, “other residence” = 0 points); Item 23 (“satisfied” = 2 points, “dissatisfied” = 0 points); all other items (“yes” = 2 points, “unclear” = 1 point, “no” = 0 points). Each item scored 0-2 points, with total MUNSH score = PA - NA + PE - NE, ranging from -24 to +24. For convenience, a constant of 24 was added, resulting in a final range of 0-48, where higher scores indicate greater well-being. The Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  was 0.853 and validity was 0.700, indicating good reliability and validity.

### 1.2.3 Chinese Big Five Personality Inventory-15 (CBF-PI-15)

Personality traits were evaluated using the CBF-PI-15 developed by ZHANG et

al. [13] based on the Chinese Big Five Personality Inventory-Brief (CBF-PI-B). This 15-item scale includes five dimensions: neuroticism (N), conscientiousness (C), agreeableness (A), openness (O), and extraversion (E), with three items per dimension. A 6-point Likert scale was used, ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 6 (completely agree), with items 2 and 5 reverse-scored. Cronbach's  $\alpha$  values for N, C, A, O, and E dimensions were 0.747, 0.611, 0.740, 0.803, and 0.738, respectively, indicating good reliability.

**1.3 Data Collection** We employed a questionnaire survey method using cluster sampling to survey 511 elderly residents in Lincun, Tangxia Town, Dongguan City. Prior to implementation, survey team members received standardized training to ensure uniform procedures and instructions. During data collection, researchers fully informed participants about the study purpose, strictly maintained confidentiality, coded all participant information to protect privacy, and obtained informed consent after briefly introducing themselves and the survey content.

**1.4 Statistical Analysis** Data were double-entered into Excel to ensure accuracy and analyzed using SPSS 26.0. Normality of continuous variables was assessed using skewness and kurtosis tests; data were considered normally distributed when absolute skewness  $< 3$  and absolute kurtosis  $< 10$  [15]. Normally distributed continuous data are presented as  $(\bar{x} \pm s)$ , and categorical data as frequencies and percentages. Pearson correlation analysis examined relationships between subjective well-being and personality traits. Canonical correlation analysis was performed to construct a standardized canonical correlation model, conduct canonical structure analysis, and perform canonical redundancy analysis to explore relationships between dimensions of subjective well-being and personality traits. In canonical structure analysis,  $r > 0.7$  indicated strong correlation, 0.5-0.7 good correlation, 0.3-0.5 moderate correlation, and  $< 0.3$  weak correlation [16]; this study used  $|r| > 0.4$  as the threshold for strong correlation. Statistical significance was set at  $P < 0.05$ .

---

## Results

**2.1 General Characteristics of Participants** A total of 499 valid questionnaires were collected. The sample included 206 males and 293 females, with 219 aged 60-70 years, 244 aged 70-80 years, and 36 aged over 80 years. Regarding residence, 11.02% (55/499) lived in urban areas and 88.98% (444/499) in rural areas. Most participants (96.39%, 481/499) had no religious beliefs, while 3.61% (4/499) had disabilities. For household registration, 13.83% (69/499) were non-local residents and 86.17% (430/499) were local residents. In terms of education, 14.23% (71/499) had no formal education, 46.09% (230/499) had primary school education, 27.86% (139/499) had junior high school education, 11.22% (56/499) had high school/technical secondary education, 0.40% (2/499) had col-

lege/vocational education, and 0.20% (1/499) had bachelor' s degree or higher. Regarding marital status, 78.76% (393/499) were married, 1.00% (5/499) unmarried, 0.20% (1/499) divorced, and 20.04% (100/499) widowed. For living arrangements, 6.81% (34/499) lived alone and 93.19% (465/499) lived with others.

**2.2 Normality Tests** The total MUNSH score showed skewness of -1.688 and kurtosis of 2.926. Dimension scores were: PA (skewness -2.044, kurtosis 4.265), NA (skewness 2.381, kurtosis 6.044), PE (skewness -1.054, kurtosis 0.153), and NE (skewness 2.202, kurtosis 6.079). For CBF-PI-15 dimensions: A (skewness -1.433, kurtosis 3.734), E (skewness -0.254, kurtosis -0.807), C (skewness -0.572, kurtosis -0.237), O (skewness 0.742, kurtosis -0.231), and N (skewness 0.695, kurtosis -0.409). All variables were considered normally distributed.

**2.3 MUNSH and CBF-PI-15 Scores** The total MUNSH score was  $(39.72 \pm 7.74)$ , significantly higher than the national norm of  $(28.70 \pm 10.72)$  ( $t = 31.791$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ) [17]. Dimension scores from highest to lowest were :  $PE(9.48 \pm 3.24)$ ,  $PA(8.61 \pm 2.24)$ ,  $NE(1.44 \pm 2.31)$ , and  $NA(0.93 \pm 1.80)$ . CBF - PI-15 dimension scores from highest to lowest were :  $A(14.04 \pm 2.60)$ ,  $E(11.77 \pm 4.05)$ ,  $C(10.75 \pm 3.57)$ ,  $O(7.20 \pm 3.57)$ , and  $N(5.44 \pm 2.60)$ .

**2.4 Pearson Correlation Analysis** Pearson correlation analysis revealed that PA was positively correlated with C, O, and E ( $P < 0.05$ ). NA was negatively correlated with C ( $P < 0.05$ ) and positively correlated with N ( $P < 0.05$ ). PE was negatively correlated with N ( $P < 0.05$ ) and positively correlated with C and O ( $P < 0.05$ ). NE was positively correlated with N ( $P < 0.05$ ) and negatively correlated with C and A ( $P < 0.05$ ). Total subjective well-being scores were positively correlated with C and O ( $P < 0.05$ ) and negatively correlated with N ( $P < 0.05$ ).

**Table 1** Correlation analysis of subjective well-being and its dimensions with each dimension of personality traits in the elderly (r values)

[Table content would be inserted here with PA, NA, PE, NE correlations with N, C, A, O, E]

## 2.5 Canonical Correlation Analysis 2.5.1 Canonical Correlation Results

Using subjective well-being as the X variable set ( $X1=PA$ ;  $X2=NA$ ;  $X3=PE$ ;  $X4=NE$ ) and personality traits as the Y variable set ( $Y1=N$ ;  $Y2=C$ ;  $Y3=A$ ;  $Y4=O$ ;  $Y5=E$ ), canonical correlation analysis yielded four pairs of canonical variables. The first two pairs showed statistically significant canonical correlation coefficients ( $P < 0.001$ ): the first pair had a correlation coefficient of 0.476 with an eigenvalue contribution rate of 67.3%; the second pair had a correlation coefficient of 0.331 with a contribution rate of 28.3%. The cumulative contribution rate of the first two pairs was 95.6%, indicating that the correlation between

subjective well-being and personality traits was primarily explained by the first pair .

**Table 2** Canonical correlation analysis between subjective well-being and personality traits of the elderly

[Table content showing first pair: 0.476, Wilks' lambda 20.000,  $P < 0.001$ ; second pair: 0.331, Wilks' lambda 12.000,  $P < 0.001$ ]

### 2.5.2 Standardized Canonical Correlation Model

In the first pair, the large absolute coefficient for X3 indicated that U1 was primarily determined by PE. The coefficients for Y1 and Y2 were 0.518 and -0.763, respectively, indicating that N and C were the main determinants of V1. In the second pair, coefficients for X1 and X2 were -0.759 and -0.806, respectively, showing that U2 was jointly determined by PA and NA. The coefficient for Y1 was -0.765, indicating that N was the primary determinant of V2 .

**Table 3** Standardized canonical correlation model between subjective well-being and personality traits of the elderly

[Table content showing the equations for U1, V1, U2, V2]

### 2.5.3 Canonical Structure Analysis

U1 was negatively correlated with X1, X3, Y2, Y3, Y4, and Y5, and positively correlated with X2, X4, and Y1, showing strong correlations with X1, X2, X3, and X4. U2 was positively correlated with Y3 and negatively correlated with all other variables, with strong correlations with X2 and X4. V1 was negatively correlated with X1, X3, Y2, Y3, Y4, and Y5, and positively correlated with X2, X4, and Y1, showing strong correlations with X3, Y2, and Y4. V2 was positively correlated with Y3 and negatively correlated with all other variables, with strong correlations with Y1 and Y4 .

**Table 4** Typical structure analysis of subjective well-being and personality traits of the elderly (r values)

[Table content showing correlation matrix]

### 2.5.4 Canonical Redundancy Analysis

U1 explained 53.9% of within-group variance in the X variable set and 5.4% of variance in the Y variable set. V1 explained 24.1% of within-group variance in the Y variable set and 12.2% of variance in the X variable set, confirming that personality traits have a greater influence on subjective well-being than the reverse .

**Table 5** Canonical redundancy analysis of subjective well-being and personality traits of the elderly (%)

[Table content showing explained variance percentages]

## Discussion

### 3.1 Current Status of Subjective Well-being and Personality Traits

Based on previous scoring classifications where MUNSH total score  $\geq 36$  indicates high well-being,  $\leq 12$  indicates low well-being, and intermediate scores indicate moderate well-being [18], the elderly participants in this study achieved a total score of  $(39.72 \pm 7.74)$ , indicating high well-being that significantly exceeded the national norm [17]. This aligns with findings from Liu et al. [19], suggesting that older adults in Dongguan City, Guangdong Province generally experience high levels of well-being, possibly due to low rates of solitary living. The high scores on PE and PA dimensions indicate abundant positive emotions and experiences among these older adults.

In contrast, Long et al. [3] reported that rural empty-nest elderly had a subjective well-being score of  $(21.33 \pm 1.36)$ , substantially lower than our findings. Li et al. [20] found that solitary older adults showed significantly higher negative factors than non-solitary elders, as long-term solitary living leads to monotonous lifestyles, lack of family and companionship, unmet emotional needs, and consequent feelings of loss and loneliness. In our study, while 88.98% (444/499) of participants lived in rural areas, only 7.43% (33/444) of rural-dwelling elderly lived alone, suggesting that solitary living may reduce well-being levels.

Regarding personality traits, CBF-PI-15 scores were highest for agreeableness  $(14.04 \pm 2.60)$ , followed by extraversion  $(11.77 \pm 4.05)$ , conscientiousness  $(10.75 \pm 3.57)$ , openness  $(7.20 \pm 3.90)$ , and neuroticism  $(7.20 \pm 3.90)$ . Overall, participants exhibited positive personality profiles, consistent with Tang et al. [21]. The high agreeableness scores likely reflect older adults' characteristics of warmth, kindness, amiability, and helpfulness, aligning with the compassionate and cooperative nature of this trait [8]. The lowest neuroticism scores may reflect emotional stability in later life, with personality features tending toward modesty and calm self-confidence [22], as neuroticism primarily manifests as emotional instability, distress, and anxiety. Liu [23] reported higher agreeableness but lower conscientiousness among older adults, differing from our findings—possibly due to variations in regional economic levels and urban-rural differences [24].

### 3.2 Relationship between Subjective Well-being and Big Five Personality Traits

This study found close connections between subjective well-being and Big Five personality traits. Pearson correlation analysis showed positive correlations between subjective well-being and conscientiousness, agreeableness, openness, and extraversion, and negative correlations with neuroticism, consistent with research by Liu [10], Li et al. [11], and Li et al. [25]. These findings suggest that individuals scoring higher on conscientiousness, agreeableness, openness, and extraversion tend to have higher well-being than those scoring high on neuroticism. Three potential explanations emerge: (1) Environmental influences on personality formation [26]—currently, China's stable and harmonious social environment fosters positive personality tendencies across age groups, thereby enhancing subjective well-being; (2) Optimization of elderly

care services ensuring support and security, coupled with diverse recreational activities, meets both material and spiritual needs and strengthens subjective well-being; and (3) Personality traits influence behavioral patterns and emotions [8]—conscientiousness, agreeableness, openness, and extraversion manifest as positive behaviors and attitudes, whereas neuroticism predisposes individuals to negative emotions, reducing life satisfaction and subjective well-being.

While previous research examined correlations between single or multiple personality dimensions and overall subjective well-being using simple correlation and regression analyses, our study employed canonical correlation analysis to investigate relationships across all dimensions comprehensively. Results showed that subjective well-being was primarily influenced by positive experiences, with close ties to neuroticism and conscientiousness. Positive affect and positive experience were negatively correlated with neuroticism—individuals with pronounced neuroticism tendencies experience more negative emotions and fewer positive experiences, resulting in lower well-being. Positive experience was positively correlated with conscientiousness, reflecting self-discipline, caution, and self-regulation abilities, consistent with Abdullahi et al. [8]. This suggests that highly conscientious individuals experience more frequent positive affect, higher life satisfaction, and fewer negative emotions, as they are more likely to regulate negative emotions effectively, thereby enhancing subjective well-being [27].

This study has several limitations. First, while Lincun was selected for its large, concentrated elderly population facilitating data collection, the single-region sample limits generalizability. Future research should examine different types of older adults across various economic regions to enhance robustness and representativeness. Second, this cross-sectional design establishes correlation rather than causation. Third, reliance on questionnaires and scales introduces subjectivity; future studies should integrate objective health examination data for more comprehensive and convincing results.

In conclusion, this study provides an in-depth exploration of the relationship between subjective well-being and personality traits in older adults. The findings indicate that positive personality traits enhance subjective well-being, with relationships primarily manifesting as positive correlations between positive experience and conscientiousness, and negative correlations with neuroticism. Personality traits exert a stronger influence on subjective well-being than the reverse. Future interventions should address the specific needs of older adults with different personality characteristics through psychological interventions, emotion regulation strategies, music therapy, narrative therapy, and physical exercise [28] to improve subjective well-being, address psychological problems, and inform more scientific and precise elderly care strategies for maintaining physical and mental health while actively responding to population aging.

## References

- [1] ZHENG Bingwen. Prospects for the “14th Five-Year Plan” : achieving new levels of people’ s livelihood and well-being [J]. *China Human Resources and Social Security*, 2021(4): 38-40. DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1674-9111.2021.04.020.
- [2] WANG Zhao, YANG Hong, YAO Qiuli, et al. Investigation on subjective well-being and its influencing factors among the elderly [J]. *Chinese Journal of Social Medicine*, 2022, 39(3): 319-323. DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1673-5625.2022.03.020.
- [3] LONG Sulan, LIU Xia, MA Ling, et al. Correlation between subjective well-being, coping style, and social support among rural empty-nest elderly [J]. *China Rural Health*, 2022, 14(8): 66-69. DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1674-361X.2022.08.028.
- [4] JIANG Zhaoquan, ZHOU Shixue, SUN Rui. Study on the relationship between personality characteristics, social support, and subjective well-being among empty-nest elderly [J]. *Modern Preventive Medicine*, 2020, 47(13): 593-601.
- [5] DA Huiming. A decade of research on subjective well-being of Chinese elderly: review and prospect [J]. *Chinese Journal of Gerontology*, 2019, 39(9): 2288-2294. DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1005-9202.2019.09.075.
- [6] TONG Fupei. The influence of personality traits on quality of life in the elderly: a multiple mediation effect analysis [D]. Nanjing: Nanjing Normal University, 2021.
- [7] QIU Peiwen. Review and prospect of “Big Five” personality research [J]. *CO-Operative Economy & Science*, 2022(15): 124-126. DOI:10.13665/j.cnki.hzjjykj.2022.15.023.
- [8] ABDULLAHI AM, ORJI R, RABIU AM, et al. Personality and subjective well-being: towards personalized persuasive interventions for health and well-being [J]. *Online J Public Health Inform*, 2020, 12(1): e1. DOI:10.5210/ojphi.v12i1.10335.
- [9] CHENG H, FURNHAM A. Personality, peer relations, and self-confidence as predictors of happiness and loneliness [J]. *J Adolesc*, 2002, 25(3): 327-339. DOI:10.1006/jado.2002.0475.
- [10] LIU Yuanxin. Study on the relationship between subjective well-being and Big Five personality among middle school students [J]. *Education Observation*, 2019, 8(41): 61-63. DOI:10.16070/j.cnki.cn45-1388/g4s.2019.41.028.
- [11] LI Xiaona, LIU Chang, DUAN Chaohui. The influence of personality traits and teacher-student relationship distress on subjective well-being of middle school teachers [J]. *Journal of Henan Institute of Science and Technology*, 2020, 40(4): 23-29.
- [12] KOZMA A, STONES MJ. The measurement of happiness: development of the Memorial University of Newfoundland Scale of Happiness (MUNSH) [J]. *J Gerontol*, 1980, 35(6): 906-912. DOI:10.1093/geronj/35.6.906.

- [13] ZHANG XT, WANG MC, HE LN, et al. The development and psychometric evaluation of the Chinese Big Five Personality Inventory-15 [J]. *PLoS One*, 2019, 14(8): e0221621. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0221621.
- [14] NI Yanyan, ZHANG Jinxin. Reasonable selection of allowable error  $\delta$  in sample size estimation for hypothesis testing [J]. *Journal of Evidence-Based Medicine*, 2011, 11(6): 370-372. DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1671-5144.2011.06.011.
- [15] ZHU Keke, XUE Huiyuan, ZHANG Fen, et al. The mediating role of second victim experience and support between patient safety culture and burnout among nurses [J]. *Chinese Nursing Management*, 2022, 22(12): 1877-1882. DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1672-1756.2022.12.023.
- [16] HAZRA A, GOGTAY N. Biostatistics series module 6: correlation and linear regression [J]. *Indian J Dermatol*, 2016, 61(6): 593-601. DOI:10.4103/0019-5154.193662.
- [17] FENG Yanan, WANG Yuhuan, HOU Weiwei. Investigation and analysis of subjective well-being and influencing factors among elderly in nursing institutions [J]. *Chinese Journal of Gerontology*, 2013, 33(2): 371-374. DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1005-9202.2013.02.056.
- [18] LIN Rong, SONG Jihong, YANG Guifang, et al. Correlation between subjective well-being and social support among elderly in Fuzhou nursing institutions [J]. *Chinese Journal of Gerontology*, 2014, 34(12): 3426-3429. DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1005-9202.2014.12.100.
- [19] LIU Yuxi, FENG Xiaoqing, WAN Chonghua, et al. Analysis of subjective well-being of migrant elderly in Dongguan City, Guangdong Province [J]. *Chinese Journal of Health Education*, 2020, 36(3): 230-233. DOI:10.16168/j.cnki.issn.1002-9982.2020.03.008.
- [20] LI Wenfang, CHEN Bang, LI Feifei, et al. Comparative study on subjective well-being between solitary and non-solitary elderly [J]. *Journal of Huangshan University*, 2021, 23(6): 59-64.
- [21] TANG Li, MILAYI, HU Ying, et al. Relationship between optimistic personality and depression, subjective well-being among the elderly [J]. *Chinese Journal of Gerontology*, 2022, 42(5): 1195-1197. DOI:10.3969/j.issn.1005-9202.2022.05.049.
- [22] MAO Maohua, QU Chengyi, REN Yanfeng. Personality characteristics and cognitive function in the elderly [J]. *Chinese Mental Health Journal*, 2005, 19(6): 387-388. DOI:10.3321/j.issn:1000-6729.2005.06.012.
- [23] LIU Jiabin. Study on the correlation between personality, social support, and e-health literacy among elderly in Yanji City [D]. Yanji: Yanbian University, 2022.
- [24] ZHANG Haizhong. A decade review of urban-rural cross-cultural empirical

research on personality psychology [J]. Social Sciences Review, 2006, 21(3): 125-127. DOI:10.16745/j.cnki.cn62-1110/c.2006.03.063.

[25] LI Sijin, YE Weifeng, LI Xu. Neuroticism, extraversion personality and subjective well-being: the mediating role of goal internality and realization possibility [J]. Psychology and Communication, 2021, 4(4): 238-246.

[26] FAN Shiyu. Personality formation—the influence of genetic and environmental factors on psychological changes [J]. Education Modernization, 2017, 4(38): 333-334. DOI:10.16541/j.cnki.2095-8420.2017.38.162.

[27] HU YQ, WANG ZH, FAN Q. The relationship between conscientiousness and well-being among Chinese undergraduate students: a cross-lagged study [J]. Int J Environ Res Public Health, 2022, 19(20): 13565. DOI:10.3390/ijerph192013565.

[28] SUN Chengdong, QIAN Jianfeng, SHAO Jiali, et al. Research progress on subjective well-being of the elderly [J]. Psychology Monthly, 2022, 17(24): 238-240. DOI:10.19738/j.cnki.psy.2022.24.075.

---

**Author Contributions:** ZHOU Yujie, LIU Huanting, and WAN Chonghua conceptualized the study and designed the overall framework. ZHOU Yujie, LIU Huanting, and GAN Qihui collected, organized, and entered data. ZHOU Yujie, LIU Huanting, WAN Chonghua, and XIAO Junhui analyzed and interpreted results. WAN Chonghua, GAN Qihui, XIAO Junhui, and LIU Yuxi revised the English version and manuscript. LIU Yuxi controlled quality, reviewed the paper, and supervised the project.

**Conflict of Interest Statement:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

**Received:** March 6, 2023; **Revised:** July 20, 2023

**Edited by:** WANG Shiyue

*Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.*

*Source: ChinaXiv –Machine translation. Verify with original.*