

Study of the Relationship of Hardiness and Hope with Life Satisfaction in Managers

Najmeh Hamid, PhD*

Department of Clinical Psychology
Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Ahvaz, Iran
n.hamid@scu.ac.ir

Received: 1/ 1/ 2020 Revised: 25/4/ 2020 Accepted: 19/ 7/ 2020
Doi: 10.22034/IJPB.2020.214143.1143

The purpose of the present research was to study the relationship between hardiness and hope and life satisfaction in organizational managers working in the Education Ministry of Ahvaz, Iran. The research method of this study was multiple correlation in nature in which hardiness and hope are considered as predictor variables and life satisfaction is the predictable variable. A sum of 164 organizational managers in Ahvaz Education Ministry was selected through random cluster sampling. Participants completed the personal view survey (PVS), the D inner's life satisfaction scale (SWLS) and the trait hope scale (THS). The data were analyzed using Pearson's correlation coefficient and stepwise multiple regression. The results of this research showed that there was a significant positive relationship between hardy personality traits, including its subscales of commitment, control and challenge with hopefulness (including its subscales agency and pathways $p < .001$). Furthermore, there was a significant positive relationship between psychological hardiness and its subscales with life satisfaction and hopefulness and its subscales with life satisfaction ($p < .001$). The results of regression analysis showed that hope agency, commitment, control and pathway orderly offered the most significant contribution in predicting life satisfaction.

Keywords: hardiness, hope, life satisfaction, managers

If character is considered a combination of individual actions, thoughts, emotions' and motivation, the components which make up a character could be different in various individuals. In addition, it is probable that these components are composed in different ways and consequently lead to various exclusive personalities. There are different views on this subject. Another individual difference variable that has been found to buffer the effects of stress is psychological hardiness. Psychological hardiness is defined as a personality style or tendency; fairly stable over time, that is composed of the following inter-related components: (1) commitment (vs. alienation), referring to the ability to feel deeply involved in activities of life; (2) control (vs. powerlessness), the belief one can control or influence events when experienced; and (3) challenge (vs. threat), the sense of anticipation of change as an exciting challenge to further development. Since 1979, an extensive body of research has shown that hardiness buffers ill effects of work-related stress on health among a wide variety of occupations. For example, hardiness has been found to relate to work-related stress among middle managers. Some researchers believe that these different individuality and personality traits distinguish people with respect to their reaction to stressful situations. (Nie, Teng, Bear, Guo, Liu & Zhang, 2019). Various studies have pointed out that stressful events are effective in the manifestation of mental and physical disorders. With regards to this fact Kobasa (1982) suggested that the concept of hardiness is an element which clarifies the relation between mental pressure and disorders in some people. They supposed that hardiness can prevent the harmful effects of mental pressures. Psychological hardiness is a set of personality traits which have the potential to act as a protective shield against stressful life events (Park, Lee, Kong &

Jang, 2017). Among various internal resources that humans possess, hardiness has been suggested as one solution to overcome stressful situations. Hardiness refers to a positive attitude through which an individual actively intervenes in controlling and resolving situations in reality without avoidance and accepts change as being merely another hurdle to cross. Kobasa (1982) mentioned hardiness as one of the mediators that influences stress responses, suggesting that it is an effective coping strategy against stress.

From Kobasa's (1979) point of view a hardy individual has 3 characteristics:

- a) Confidence; having the ability to control or influence events and regards the stressful factors as changeable (control).
- b) A profound feeling of commitment with respect to individual activities.
- c) Able to accept the fact that changeability is an exciting challenge allowing for further growth and regards it as an ordinary aspect of life.

Individuals with high commitment believe in their own worth, importance and meaningful entity and because of this belief can find a purpose for their actions by their curiosity being stimulated. Such people are completely in unity with many aspects of their life such as their job, family and social interactions. Individuals who have the ability of control consider life events as predictable and controllable. They believe they can control what happens around them. These people take responsibility for their actions rather than blaming others for their mistakes. The factor of challenge is the belief that change is a natural aspect of life. Challenging individuals consider the

positive and negative situations as an opportunity to learn and grow rather than as a threat to their own safety and calmness. This belief leads to cognitive flexibility and tolerance against vague and embarrassing life situations. Hardy individuals show high compatibility in the event of stressful mental situations. This trait protects them against various stressful events like a shield (Aragiannopoulou, & Kamtsios, 2018). Among various internal resources that humans possess, hardiness has been suggested as one solution to overcoming stressful situations. Hardiness refers to a positive attitude through which an individual actively intervenes in controlling and resolving situations in reality without avoidance and accepts change as being merely as another hurdle to cross. Kobasa (1982) mentioned hardiness as one of the mediators that influences stress responses, suggesting that it is an effective coping strategy when faced with stress. Understanding nurses' stress-related temperament and nurses' personal hardiness facilitates better coping in stressful situations and decreases vulnerability to burnout. Furthermore, it has been suggested that implementing measures to reinforce a person's hardiness is critical in reducing burnout. Hardiness has also been reported as having a mediating role between perceived job stress and burnout in nurses in intensive care units uses. It is presumed that strengthening hardiness in nurses, who experience high stress levels due to frequent exposure to violent episodes, reduces burnout and might lead to enhanced job satisfaction and, eventually, to a higher quality of patient care. Therefore, verifying the mediating role of hardiness in the relationship between violence-induced stress and the impact level of a violent event could provide theoretical grounds to establish intervention strategies that could help nurses cope more effectively in stressful situations. Some

researchers refer to psychological hardiness as general criteria for mental health and life satisfaction (Pandey, & Shrivastava, 2017). They believe that hardy traits act as a cognitive problem solving style which attains purposeful growth. They also believe that university students high in hardiness can cope effectively with any educational difficulties and it helps them to develop positive growth processes and consequently, learning. It leads to an increase in variables such as creativity and rationality. Life satisfaction is an abstract concept that is exclusive and forms subjective well-being. This concept refers to a general cognitive evaluation of an individual about their own life and is based on individual judgment. In this process, a comparison between individual supposed criteria and actual life is carried out. Two major predictors that are assumed to be relevant for both aspects of satisfaction are personality traits and context-specific factors, such as satisfaction regarding basic psychological needs (i.e., perceived autonomy, competence, and relatedness; e.g., Deci & Ryan, 2000; DeNeve & Cooper, 1998; Ryan & Deci, 2017). Research on personality traits and basic psychological needs is rooted in different traditions emphasizing different aspects of individual behavior. Personality research mainly deals with individual factors that are assumed to be relatively stable and that form the basis of behavioral patterns that are generalizable across situations (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

The self-determination theory (SDT; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci & Ryan, 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2017) suggests that individuals have three innate basic psychological needs. These are the need for competence, which concerns succeeding in challenging tasks; the need for autonomy, which concerns experiencing choice and feeling like the initiator of one's own actions; and the need for relatedness, which concerns

establishing a sense of mutual respect with and reliance on others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). In the SDT, the fulfillment of basic psychological needs is seen as essential for optimal psychological functioning, growth, success, and overall well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci & Ryan, 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2017). Thereby, the degree of need satisfaction is supposed to predict various positive work-and life-related outcomes (Shirazi, Chari, Kahkha & Marashi, 2018; Deci & Ryan, 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2017). Individuals who are satisfied with basic psychological needs are intrinsically motivated and engage more often in activities which they find interesting and enjoyable (Deci & Ryan, 2008; Vansteenkiste, Lens & Deci, 2006). In previous studies in the literature, being satisfied with basic psychological needs has also been related to different aspects of well-being. For example, several studies in organizational contexts found that being satisfied with basic psychological needs at work predicted positive outcomes, such as job attitude, job commitment, job satisfaction, general health, and life satisfaction in general (e.g., Baard, Deci & Ryan, 2004; Ilardi, Leone, Kasser & Ryan, 1993; Meyer, Enstrom, Harstveit, Bowles & Beevers, 2007; Hoseini, Nasrolahi & Aghili, 2017).

It should be noted that the satisfaction of basic psychological needs is highly context-dependent ((Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci & Ryan, 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2017). Thus, contexts that are likely to support need satisfaction (e.g., autonomy supportive leadership) are expected to yield positive outcomes (e.g., satisfaction, high performance), whereas contexts that are likely to impede need satisfaction (e.g., an autocratic leadership style) are expected to yield negative outcomes (e.g., stress, low performance, dropout) (Ryan & Deci, 2017). Usually, several contexts are present in a person's life. For example, relevant

contexts for apprentices may be a vocational school, a company, a part-time job, clubs and societies, friends, and family-related contexts. However, such different contexts that support or diminish the satisfaction of basic psychological needs, as well as the context-dependent effects of basic psychological need satisfaction on outcome variables, have been seldom considered in previous research. One notable exception is the study of Milyavskaya and Koestner (2011) in which basic psychological need satisfaction in various contexts such as that of family, friends, school, and work was investigated. They found basic psychological need satisfaction in different contexts to be strongly related to wellbeing in the corresponding contexts. However, Milyavskaya and Koestner (2011) used a composite measure of basic psychological need satisfaction and of wellbeing in their analyses (i.e., all items related to the need for autonomy, competence, and relatedness were averaged to form one measure of overall need satisfaction in the corresponding context). Civitci & Civitci (2015) also used an overall score of need satisfaction in their study, without taking the theoretical description of different needs into account. More research is needed to investigate how the satisfaction of basic psychological needs in different contexts affects relevant outcomes such as satisfaction.

How close these criteria are with one's actual life results in the individual being more satisfied in life (Karaman & Watson, 2017). Hardiness as a personality trait can affect the amount of life satisfaction (Ng, Huebner & Hills, 2015). Some researches show the relation of hardiness with compatibility strategies and life satisfaction (Karaman & Watson, 2017; Martin, Byrd, Watts & Dent, 2015). Another variable is hope and its

relationship with life satisfaction is confirmed. Hopefulness can enhance satisfaction and subjective well-being. According to Snyder conceptualization, hope is a cognitive/motivational structure which is formed because of interaction between subscales of agency (aimed decision) and pathway (the ability to plan different ways to get to the intention (Snyder, Sympson, Ybasco, Borders, Babyak & Higgins, 1996; Aggarwal, Kataria, & Prasad, 2017). The first subscale is of the belief that an individual can start and tolerate situations and conditions to reach their aims. The pathway is a thought in relation to individual ability to overcome obstacles that arise and find new ways to reach ones aims. In other words, the individual knows effective and acceptable paths to reach their goals. Hopeful people have more pathways to follow to attain their goals. They can preserve their motivation when faced with an obstacle and use substituted strived pathways but hopeless people lose motivation easily because of the lack of enough pathways and suffer from negative emotions. Snyder (Méndez-Giménez, 2017) in a research by Bailey, whinnying, Frisch and Snyder (Meurk, Morphett, Carter, Weier, Lucke & Hall, 2016) the subscale of agency had the most ability in predicting the life satisfaction variable. Other studies by Davis, Snyder & Tuskasa (Mohammadi, Fard & Heidari, 2014). Ong, Edwards & Bergman (Marco, Guillén & Botella, 2017) indicate the positive relationship between hope and the amount of well-being, some research findings indicate positive relations and in Snyder's (Moyer, Murrell, Connally & Steinberg, 2016). Research that was carried out on adults pointed out there was a meaningful and

positive relationship between hope, psychological hardiness and self-satisfaction (Eilenberg, Hoffmann, Jensen & Frostholm, 2017; Shirinzadeh, Mirjafary, 2006; Suyanti, Keliat & Daulima, 2018).

They also believed that the role of commitment as a psychological hardiness subscale is more than two other hardiness subscales namely challenge and control. With regards to these results by recognizing and enhancing these psychological factors it can have significant effects on the subjective well-being, hope and life satisfaction among managers. Managers with high hardiness are more hopeful and less affected by depression and negative thoughts. Moreover, they have better functions in comparison with control group. Considering the role of personality traits of hardiness and hope in life satisfaction, the present study aimed to survey the relationship between hardiness and its subscales (commitment, challenge, control) with hope and its subscales (agency, pathway) in relation to life satisfaction among organizational managers in the education ministry in Ahvaz.

Hypothesis Framework:

- 1- There is a positive relationship between hardiness and its subscales with hope
- 2- There is a positive relationship between hardiness and its subscales with life satisfaction
- 3- There is a positive relationship between hope and its subscales with life satisfaction.
- 4- A combination of hardiness and hope can clarify the life satisfaction.

Method

The current research is a multiple correlation study which analyzed psychological hardiness and its subscales as predictor variables with life satisfaction being a predictable variable.

The sample was made up of 164 organizational managers of Ahvaz education ministry that were selected through random cluster sampling and were chosen with respect to criteria of age, educational status, not suffering from any acute psychological and physical disorders and other criteria considered in this research.

Instruments

This research used 3 scales: Personal View Survey (PVS), Trait Hope Scale and Life satisfaction scale (SWLS).

Personal View Survey (PVS)

The PVS scale (Kobasa, 1982) consists of 50 items with three subscales; challenge, commitment, and control with 17, 16, 17 items respectively. Scores of 39 items are reversed. Ratings of each item are 0 (not at all true) to 3 (completely true) in 4 escalations. Each score indicates the positive value of hardiness. Kobasa summarized scores of all components and divided them by 3 for a hardiness score as a single trait; scores were considered inverted, and a total score resulted from the 3 subscales of commitment, challenge and control separately. The study pointed out hardiness (commitment, control and challenge) had the validity coefficient .70, .52 and .52 in sequence. This coefficient was .75 for total hardiness moreover validity coefficients were .79, .78 and .64 for other scales in sequence. Some researchers reported .86, .83, .72 and .71 validity coefficient using Cranach's Alpha for hardiness scales

and commitment, control and challenge subscales in sequence (Civitci & Civitci, 2015; Wersebe, Lieb, Meyer, Hoyer, Wittchen & Gloster, 2016). Validity and reliability scale was confirmed by Shirinzadeh and Mirjafary (2006) for 100 managers. The results indicated that this questionnaire had internal consistency ($\alpha=.68$), moreover significant correlation between this questionnaire and positive sentiment ($p=.034$, $r=.46$) and optimism ($p=.001$, $r=.64$) indicated simultaneous validity. In this research the reliability of this scale by alpha coefficient was .76.

Life satisfaction scale (SWLS)

In this research the used life satisfaction scale was designed by Diener, Emmons & Larson & Griffin (1985). Trompetter, Lamers, Westerhof, Fledderus & Bohlmeije, (2017) and revised by Port and Diener (Mohammadi, Fard & Heidaric, 2014) for all age groups. This scale was organized by 48 questions which indicated the degree of life satisfaction and subjective well-being. This scale was composed of 5 subjects and each subject had 7 items which evaluated total life satisfaction. Gungor & Avci (2017) in their studies, reached number .82 coefficients for retest correlation during 2 months. In addition, life satisfaction reliability was .83 by Cronbach's Alpha method and .69 by retest method. Bayati et al. (Taehri, Ahadi, Kashan & Kermani, 2015) reported a validity score by retest method psychological hardiness scale. Hope scale and life satisfaction scale were distributed among organizational managers in the education ministry then the necessary explanations were given to them about scale responding procedures and research importance. The respondents were asked to answer the questionnaire carefully

and completely. In this research the reliability of this scale by alpha coefficient was .68.

The Trait Hope Scale (Snyder et al., 1991)

This scale is a 12-item measure of the two dimensions of hope ranging from 1 (definitely false) to 4 (definitely true). It consists of four agency items (i.e. items that tap the belief in one's ability to initiate and maintain movement towards goals); four pathway items (i.e. items that tap the ability to conceptualize routes to a goal and four filler items). A total score is used as a measurement of the global concept of hope and is calculated as the sum of the eight agency and pathways items (range=8 to 32). Test retest reliabilities for the Hope Scale suggest temporal stability (.83 over a three-week interval, .73 over an eight-week period) (Snyder et al., 1991). Alpha coefficients for the two subscales are acceptable (agency=.71 to .77; pathway=.63 to .80) (Snyder et al., 1991). The alpha coefficients in this study were .79 for agency and .80 for pathways. This instrument demonstrates both internal and temporal reliability, with two separate and yet related factors, as well as an overarching hope factor (Babyak, Snyder & Yoshinobu, 1993). Several studies have confirmed its convergent and discriminant validity (Snyder, 2002). In this study, the alpha coefficient was .71 for agency subscale and .67 for pathway subscale.

Results

In this section the relationship between hardiness, hope and life satisfaction in managers is distinguished. Descriptive findings about hardiness, hope and life satisfaction are indicated in Table 1.

Table 1
Mean and Standard Deviation of Psychological Hardiness, Hope and Life Satisfaction in Managers

Indicator	M	SD
Psychological hardiness	71.75	2.96
Challenge	49	7.06
Commitment	87.50	6.31
Control	78.60	9.29
Hope	7	3.25
Agency	3	2.5
Pathway	3	2.5
Life satisfaction	41	8.73

For examining the first proposed hypothesis indicating the relationship between hardiness and its subscales the Pearson's correlation coefficient was employed. Table 2 shows the correlation coefficient between hardiness and its subscales in relation to hope in managers.

Table 2
Correlation Coefficient between Hardiness, and its Subscales in Relation to Hope in Managers

Variable	Pathway	Agency	Hope
Hardiness	** .483	** .502	** .641
Challenge	** .457	** .497	** .512
Commitment	** .493	** .478	** .593
Control	** .46	** .453	** .547

* P<.05 **P<.001

As can be seen in Table 2, there is a significant positive relationship between hardiness and all its subscales (challenge,

commitment, control) and hope and its subscales agent and pathway. This correlation is significant for each of the hardiness subscales and hope coefficients in the level ($p < .001$). Among the high coefficients, the correlation coefficient of commitment component with hope was the highest level ($r = .593$). To study the second and third theory, Pearson's correlation coefficient is used and the results are shown in Table 3 which shows correlation coefficient between hardiness, hope and life satisfaction in managers.

Table 3
Correlation Coefficient between Hardiness, Hope and Life Satisfaction in Managers

Variable	Life satisfaction	
	r	P
Hardness	.496	.000
Commitment	.593	.000
Challenge	.412	.000
Control	.423	.000
Hope	.512	.000
Agency	.44	.000
Pathway	.393	.000

As is observed in table 3, there is a significant positive relationship between hardiness and all its subscales (challenge, commitment, control) with hope and its subscales agent and pathway. This correlation is significant for each of the hardiness subscales and hope coefficient in the level ($p < .001$). Among the high coefficients, the correlation coefficient of commitment component with hope was the highest level ($r = .593$) and the

hopefulness struggle was at the lowest level ($r = .512$). To study the second and third theory, Pearson's correlation coefficient is used and results are shown in table 3, indicating that the commitment subscale has the highest correlation coefficient ($r=.513$) in comparison to hope and life satisfaction ($r=.547$). Table 4 shows the results of regression analysis of predictive variables with life satisfaction.

Based on the results of Table 4, it is clear that the total sum of variable $R^2(.377)$ predicts the variable variance of life satisfaction. It can be concluded that in explaining the amount of life satisfaction from hardiness and hope, the sum of variables predicted by $R^2 = .377$ are explained and predicted by variance of criteria variables, that is, from predicate variables. The significance of the model can explain up to 37% of the variance in life satisfaction score. The component of the agency alone accounts for 31% of the variance in terms of satisfaction with life. The addition of the control variable increases the predictive power to .019, which is statistically significant, and subsequently, the commitment variables of .022 actually increase the predictive power and the passage to the extent .024 predict criteria variables and predictive values by these variables were statistically significant.

Table 4
Results of Regression Analysis of Predictive Variables with Life Satisfaction

Pre- variable	Statistical indicator	R	R2	F P	Regression coefficient			
					1	2	3	4
Life satisfaction	Agency	.559	.312	181.49 P<.001				
	Agency control	.576	.331	98.99 P<.001	$\beta = .49$ $t = 10.03$ $P < .001$	$\beta = .41$ $t = 5.8$ $P < .001$		
	Control and commitment	.595	.353	68.22 P<.001	$\beta = .39$ $t = 6.15$ $P < .001$	$\beta = .21$ $t = 3.38$ $P < .001$	$\beta = .16$ $t = 2.51$ $P < .001$	
	Agency Control Commitment Pathway	.614	.377	52.43 P<.001	$\beta = .29$ $t = 5.13$ $P < .001$	$\beta = .19$ $t = 3.11$ $P < .001$	$\beta = .18$ $t = 3.2$ $P < .001$	$\beta = .18$ $t = 3.2$ $P < .001$

Discussion

The aim of this survey was to study the relationship between psychological hardiness due to its subscales and hope due to its subscales with life satisfaction in organizational managers in the Education Ministry. The results of this research indicated that there was a positive, meaningful relationship between psychological hardiness and each of its subscales i.e. commitment, challenge and control with hope although the role of commitment is higher than 2 other subscales. (i.e., control and challenge) Other studies (Park et al., 2017; Aragiannopoulou & Kamtsios, 2018) pointed out psychological hardy trait can increase hopefulness among individuals by devising resistance training and appropriate ways of dealing with stressful events. The commitment subscale is a belief in one's importance and worth and in turn makes life activities more meaningful. This study also indicated that there was a positive relationship between psychological hardy control and the total amount of hope following its subscales. In other words, controlling one's feelings helps an individual to believe in the fact that life events are the results of one's own deeds rather than other external and unwanted factors. This belief leads to the creation of more responsibility in an individual with respect to one's life which causes stronger motivation to follow one's intentions. Control feelings in a hardy individual enables them to apply the appropriate strategies. This is also true with respect to hope pathway which refers to the power of thought and strategies to achieve one's goals. Previous studies indicated that managers who are extremely serious and conscientious are inquisitive, perseverant and more aspiring (Civitci & Civitci, 2015; Pandey & Srivastava, 2017). Hardy traits are also one of the main effective ways of accomplishing educational success

(Aragiannopoulou & Kamtsios, 2018). It is noticeable that hardiness has a positive relation with being diligent in work management (Aragiannopoulou & Kamtsios, 2018; Park et al., 2017). The results of the current study indicated that there is a positive and meaningful relationship between hope due to its subscales (agent & pathway) and life satisfaction. These results are also similar to Bailey et.al. (Park et al., 2017), in this research the agent subscale was a more predictive factor for life satisfaction. Personality traits and the satisfaction of basic psychological needs have previously been investigated as relevant determinants of satisfaction. However, both constructs have seldom been investigated simultaneously. Moreover, the context-specificity of basic psychological need satisfaction has often been proposed theoretically but not been accounted for in empirical research. Our results corroborate the assumption that personality traits are more relevant for general life satisfaction, which is highly related to general well-being. Looking at these results, one might argue that life satisfaction is somehow predetermined by rather stable dispositions and is less susceptible to change. However, we also found that life satisfaction can be positively affected by basic psychological need satisfaction—particularly, and context-independent, by social relatedness, Snyder & Tsukasa (Ryan & Deci, 2017) in their study, indicated the same positive relationship between hope and subjective well-being. People with high levels of hopefulness are more powerful and motivated to follow their intentions. This ability enables them to take part in problem-solving activities and leads to their growth. Previous findings pointed out that hope is an important source for compatibility and flexibility in managers and medical students (Ryan & Deci, 2017). Hope is conceptualized as an individual's perceived

confidence to produce plausible routes to desired goals (pathway, the cognitive component), and perceived motivation to use those pathways to begin and maintain the effort of pursuing desired goals (agency, the motivational component) (Snyder, 2002). Individuals with higher levels of hope are more affirmative with their goals and maintain higher motivation in pursuing them (Snyder, 2002), and tend to be satisfied with what they have achieved in life (Kwok, Cheng & Wong, 2015). The majority of cross-sectional studies suggest that hope is strongly correlated with greater life satisfaction (Bailey, Eng, Frisch & Snyder, 2007; Wong & Lim, 2009). Besides, longitudinal research indicates that hope is an important predictor of later life satisfaction after controlling the initial life satisfaction (Marques, Lopez & Mitchell, 2013; Marques, Lopez & Pais-Ribeiro, 2011).

The current study has shown that there was a positive relationship between psychological hardiness and its subscales (commitment, control & challenge) and life satisfaction. Crowley & et.al found that hardy people had high subjective well-being because of using active and effective ways to confront their problems. Hardiness decreases threatened evaluation about exams and events and in return increases their successful compatibility (Kobasa, Maddi, Kahn, 1982; Park et al., 2017). The ability to confront stress and further interpretation of harmful experiences is a characteristic of hardy people in decreasing or modifying negative effects of this feeling. Consequently, these people preserve their physical and mental health and this in turn leads to ore life satisfaction (Garrosa, Rainho, Moreno-Jiménez, Monteiro, 2010; Civitci & Civitci, 2015). The present research showed that there was a positive relationship between psychological hardiness and its

subscales (commitment, control & challenge) and life satisfaction. Crowley & et.al found that hardy people had high subjective well-being because of using active and effective ways to confront their problems. Hardiness decreases threatened evaluation about exams and events and in return increases their successful compatibility (Kobasa et al., 1982; Park et al., 2017). In another recent research, it was found that hope was the most powerful predictive variable of life satisfaction and after that the hardiness variable, which has already been surveyed in relation to life satisfaction. To clarify the level of life satisfaction due to hope and hardy subscales the results indicated that agency is the most powerful variable and in sequence commitment and pathway in predicting and clarifying the level of life satisfaction. These results were also pointed out in the studies of Bailey et al. (2007). These researchers referred to agency subscale as the most effective variable in predicting the level of life satisfaction. Based on theoretical foundations about hope subscale, agency subscale indicates the motivation aspect of hope concept (Mohammadi et al., 2014) and shows the degree of motivation in an individual to follow their intentions. It can be concluded that people with high thought agency may have more motivation and mental energy to persevere in achieving their goals. Previous discussion indicated that there is a relationship between subjective well-being, hope and education activities (Civitci & Civitci, 2015; Bluth & Blanton, 2015). Following the agency subscale, commitment and hardiness contribute more in distinguishing the level of life satisfaction. It seems that the belief in life meaningfulness and importance leads to more life satisfaction as the consequences of having more control and utilizing confronting strategies against life problems (Gilman, Dooley & Florell, 2006; Kong, Wang & Zhao, 2014). In the

current study people with high subjective well-being gained higher scores under the conditions of controlling age, intelligence and previous scores. This research indicated that there is a close corresponding relationship between subjective well-being and hardiness with life satisfaction. It also indicates that there is an individual self-evaluation about different aspects of life. People with more life satisfaction are more successful in their jobs, education, family and social relations (Kwok et al., 2015); Marques et al., 2013; Marques et al., 2011) these people have a positive life perspective and more self-respect. With regards to the results of the present study it can be concluded that there is a positive relationship between hardiness traits and its subscales, that is commitment, control and challenge and the level of hope and life satisfaction; in addition to these variables it is important that managers carry out their duties more effectively. It is recommended that further research be carried out to further extend the results of the present study. The findings of the research at hand indicated that hardiness and hope traits play an important role in life satisfaction.

Acknowledgements

This article is taken from a research project approved by the General Directorate of Education of Khuzestan Province on managers. I would like to express my appreciation to the Research Center of the General Directorate of Education of Khuzestan Province, high school principals and other colleagues who helped me in this research.

References

- Taheri, A., Ahadi, H., Kashan, F. L., & Kermani, R. A. (2015). *Mental Hardiness and Social Support in Life Satisfaction of Breast Cancer Patients*, 159, 406-409.
- Aggarwal, S. D., Kataria & Prasad, S. (2017). A comparative study of quality of life and marital satisfaction in patients with depression and their spouses. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, 30, 65-70.
- Aragiannopoulou, E., & Kamtsios, S. (2018). Multidimensionality vs. unitary of academic hardiness: An under explored issue. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 51, 149-156.
- Atkinson, F., & Martin, J. (2020). Gritty, hardy, resilient, and socially supported: A replication study. *Disability and Health Journal*, 13(1), 100839.
- Alipour Hamze Kandi, N., & Zeinali, A. (2017). Relationship between Personality Characteristics, Internal Locus of Control, Psychological Hardiness and Nurses' Quality of Life. *Journal of Research Development in Nursing & Midwifery*, 14(1), 8-15.
- Baumeister, R., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497–529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497>.
- Baard, P. P., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2004). Intrinsic need satisfaction: A motivational basis of performance and well-being in two work samples. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34, 2045–2068. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2004.tb02690.x>.
- Babyak, M. A., Snyder, C. R., & Yoshinobu, L. (1993). Psychometric properties of the Hope Scale: A confirmatory

- factor analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 27(2), 154-169.
- Bailey, T. C., Eng, W., Frisch, M. B., & Snyder, C. R. (2007). Hope and optimism as related to life satisfaction. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 2(3), 168–175.
- Bluth, K., & Blanton, P. W. (2015). The influence of self-compassion on emotional well-being among early and older adolescent males and females. *The journal of positive psychology*, 10(3), 219-230.
- Cho, H. N., & Kim, S. J. (2014). Relationship of job stress, hardiness, and burnout among emergency room nurses. *Korean Journal of Occupational Health Nursing*. 23(1), 11-19.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO five factor inventory (NEO-FFI)*. Professional manual. Odessa, Florida: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Civitci, N., & Civitci, A. (2015). Social Comparison Orientation, Hardiness and Life Satisfaction in Undergraduate Students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 205, 516-523.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227–268.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life domains. *Canadian Psychology*, 49, 14–23. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0708-5591.49.1.14>.
- DeNeve, K. M., & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: A meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124, 197–229.

- Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71–75.
- Eilenberg, T. D., Hoffmann, J. S., Jensen & Frostholm, L. (2017). Intervening variables in group-based acceptance & commitment therapy for severe health anxiety. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 92, 24-31.
- Finlay-Jones, A. L., Rees, C. S., & Kane, R. T. (2015). Self-compassion, emotion regulation and stress among Australian Psychologists: *Testing an emotion regulation model of self-compassion using structural equation modeling*. PloS One, 10(7), e0133481.
- Garrosa, E., Rainho, C., Moreno-Jiménez, B., & Monteiro, M. J. (2010). The relationship between job stressors, hardy personality, coping resources and burnout in a sample of nurses: a co relational study at two time points. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*. 47(2), 205-217.
- Gilman, R., Dooley, J., & Florell, D. (2006). Relative levels of hope and their relationship with academic and psychological indicators among adolescents. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 25(2), 166–178.
- Gungor, A., & Avci, M. (2017). Examining the relationship between hope and life satisfaction among middle school students. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 1(1), 54-63.
- Ilardi, B. C., Leone, D., Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1993). Employee and supervisor ratings of motivation: Main effects and discrepancies associated with job satisfaction and adjustment in a factory setting. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23, 1789–1805. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1993.tb01066.x>.

- Hardy, J. L. (2018). *Hope and Suicide: An Empirical Investigation of the Relationship Between Hope Theory and The Interpersonal Theory of Suicide* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Akron).
- Hall, C. W., Row, K. A., Wuensch, K. L., & Godley, K. R. (2013). The role of self-compassion in physical and psychological well-being. *The Journal of Psychology, 147*(4), 311–323.
- Hoseini, S., Nasrolahi, B., & Aghili, M. (2017). Prediction of hope of life based on spiritual well-being and psychological hardiness in women with breast cancer. *Archives of Breast Cancer, 136*-140.
- Jamal, Y., Zahra, S. T., Yaseen, F., & Nasreen, M. (2017). Coping Strategies and Hardiness as Predictors of Stress among Rescue Workers. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, 32*(1).
- Joeng, J. R., & Turner, S. L. (2015). Mediators between self-criticism and depression: Fear of compassion, self-compassion, and importance to others. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 62*(3), 453–463.
- Karaman, M. A., & Watson, J. C. (2017). Examining associations among achievement motivation, locus of control, Academic stress and life satisfaction: A comparison of U.S. and international undergraduate students. *Personality and Individual Differences, 111*, 106–110.
- Kwok, S. Y., Cheng, L., & Wong, D. F. (2015). Family emotional support, positive psychological capital and job satisfaction among Chinese white-collar workers. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 16*(3), 561–582.

- Kobasa, S. C. (1979). Hardiness and health: a prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42(1), 168-177.
- Kobasa, S. C. (1982). Commitment and coping in stress resistance among lawyers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42(4), 707-717. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.42.4.707.
- Kobasa, S. C., Maddi, S. R., & Kahn, S. (1982). Hardiness and health: a prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42(1), 168.
- Kong, F., Wang, X., & Zhao, J. (2014). Dispositional mindfulness and life satisfaction: the role of core self-evaluations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 56, 165-169.
- Kwok, S. Y., Cheng, L., & Wong, D. F. (2015). Family emotional support, positive psychological capital and job satisfaction among Chinese white-collar workers. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16(3), 561-582.
- Marco, J. H. V., Guillén & Botella, C. (2017). The buffer role of meaning in life in hopelessness in women with borderline personality disorders. *Psychiatry Research*, 247, 120-124.
- Martin, J. J., Byrd, B., Watts, M. L., & Dent, M. (2015). Gritty, hardy, and resilient: Predictors of sport engagement and life satisfaction in wheelchair basketball players. *Journal of Clinical Sport Psychology*, 9(4), 345-359.
- Marques, S. C., Lopez, S. J., & Mitchell, J. (2013). The role of hope, spirituality and religious practice in adolescents' life satisfaction: Longitudinal findings. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 14(1), 251-261.

- Marques, S. C., Lopez, S. J., & Pais-Ribeiro, J. L. (2011). Building hope for the future: A program to foster strengths in middle-school students. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 12(1), 139–152.
- Méndez-Giménez, A. J. A., Cecchini-Estrada, J., & Fernández-Río, D. (2017). Mendez-Alonso & Prieto-Saborit J A. 32 Achievement Goals, Self-Determined Motivation and Life Satisfaction in Secondary Education. *Revista de Psicodidáctica*, 22(2), 150–156.
- Meyer, B., Enstrom, M. K., Harstveit, M., Bowles, D. P., & Beevers, C. G. (2007). Happiness and despair on the catwalk: Need satisfaction, well-being, and personality adjustment among fashion models. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 2, 2–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760601076635>.
- Meurk, C. K., Morphett, A., Carter, M., Weier, J., Lucke, & Hall, W. (2016). Skepticism and hope in a complex predicament: People with addictions deliberate about neuroscience. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 32, 34-43.
- Mohammadi, F., Fard, F. D., & Heidari, H. (2014). Effectiveness of logo therapy in hope of life in the women depression. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 159, 643-646.
- Moyer, D. N. A. R., Murrell, M. L., Connally & Steinberg, D. S. (2016). Showing up for class: Training graduate students in acceptance and commitment therapy. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science in Press*, Corrected Proof, Available online 15 December.
- Milyavskaya, M., & Koestner, R. (2011). Psychological needs, motivation, and well-being: A test of self-determination theory across multiple domains. *Personality and Individual*

Differences, 50, 387–391. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.10.029>

- Ng, Z. J., Huebner, S. E., & Hills, K. J. (2015). Life satisfaction and academic performance in early adolescents: Evidence for reciprocal association. *Journal of School Psychology*, 53(6), 479-491.
- Nie, Q., Teng, Z., Bear, G. G., Guo, C., Liu, Y., & Zhang, D. (2019). Hope as Mediator Between Teacher–Student Relationships and Life Satisfaction Among Chinese Adolescents: A Between-and Within-Person Effects Analysis. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 20(7), 2367-2383.
- Nordmo, M., Olsen, O. K., Hetland, J., Espevik, R., Bakker, A. B., & Pallesen, S. (2020). It's been a hard day's night: A diary study on hardiness and reduced sleep quality among naval sailors. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 153, 109635.
- Pandey, D., & Shrivastava, P. (2017). Mediation effect of social support on the association between hardiness and immune response. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, 26, 52-55.
- Park, J. H. E. N., Lee, K. R., Kong & Jang, M. J. (2017). Hardiness Mediates Stress and Impact Level in Nurses Who Experienced a Violent Event. *Journal of Emergency Nursing*, 43(6), 539-544.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. New York: Guilford Publications
- Sanei, M., Khosropour, F., & Bahrampour, A. (2019). The Structural Model of the Role of Cognitive Coping Strategies in Relation to Psychological Hardiness with Hope in Women with Breast Cancer. *Medical Ethics Journal*, 13(44), 1-16.

- Shirinzadeh, S., & Mirjafary, S. A. (2006). *The Relationship between Hope and Stress Coping Strategies among Shiraz University Students*. Third Students' Mental Health Seminar, Tehran, Iran
- Suyanti, T. S. B. A., Keliat, & Daulima, N. H. (2018). Effect of logotherapy, acceptance, commitment therapy, family psychoeducation on self-stigma, and depression on housewives living with HIV/AIDS. *Enfermería Clínica*, 28(1), 98-101.
- Snyder, C. R. (2002). Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13(4), 249–275.
- Snyder, C. R., Simpson, S. C., Ybasco, F. C., Borders, T. F., Babyak, M. A., & Higgins, R. L. (1996). Development and validation of the State Hope Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(2), 321–335.
- Shirazi, M., Chari, M., Kahkha, S. J., & Marashi, F. (2018). The Role of Hope for the Future and Psychological Hardiness in Quality of Life Among Dialysis Patients. *Jentashapir Journal of Health Research*, 9(1).
- Thomassen, Å. G., Hystad, S. W., Johnsen, B. H., Johnsen, G. E., & Bartone, P. T. (2018). The effect of hardiness on PTSD symptoms: A prospective mediational approach. *Military Psychology*, 30(2), 142-151.
- Trompetter, H. R. S., Lamers, G. J., Westerhof, M., Feeders, & Bohlmeijer, E. T. (2017). Both positive mental health and psychopathology should be monitored in psychotherapy: Confirmation for the dual-factor model in acceptance and commitment therapy. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 91, 58-63.
- Vansteenkiste, M., Lens, W., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Intrinsic versus extrinsic goal contents in self-determination theory:

Another look at the quality of academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, *41*, 19–31. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4101_4.

Wersebe, H. R., Lieb, A. H., Meyer, J., & Hoyer, H. U. (2016). Changes of valued behaviors and functioning during an Acceptance and Commitment Therapy Intervention. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science in Press*. *Corrected Proof, Available online 16 November*.

Wong, S. S., & Lim, T. (2009). Hope versus optimism in Singaporean adolescents: Contributions to depression and life satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *46*(5), 648–652.