

Relative dominance of Sattva and Tamas Gunas (qualities) makes a difference in self-compassion and human flourishing

Yogendra Verma^[1]

Gyanesh Kumar Tiwari^[2]

Abstract:

The present study aimed to assess the nature and extent of the impacts exerted by sattvic and tamasic personality as enunciated by Indian theory of personality on the self-compassion and human flourishing of the student participants. A total of four hundred sixty-eight participants comprising two hundred sixty-five sattvics (Mean Age = 20.05, SD = 2.07) and two hundred three tamasics (Mean Age = 19.90, SD = 1.93) participated in the present study. The results of the study indicated that the sattva and tamas gunas shaped the self-compassion and human flourishing of the participants. The participants having relative dominance of sattva guna as compared to tamas guna exhibited higher mean scores on the self-compassion, human flourishing and their components. In addition, the scores on the self-compassion and human flourishing demonstrated positive correlations whereas self-judgement, isolation, and over-identification demonstrated either non-significant positive correlations or significant negative correlations with the scores of these measures. The scores on the self-kindness, common humanity, mindfulness and overall self-compassion components of self-compassion significantly accounted for variance in the scores of hedonic human flourishing, social well-being, psychological well-being, eudaimonic human flourishing, and overall human flourishing of the both sattvics and tamasics whereas the self-judgment aspect of self-compassion caused significant variance in the scores of hedonic human flourishing, social well-being, psychological well-being, eudaimonic human flourishing and overall human flourishing and isolation only to psychological well-being of the tamasics. The results of the study have significant implications of for researchers, academicians, laymen, counselors and educational psychologists. The findings of the study have been discussed in the light of recent findings and theories of personality, self-compassion, and human flourishing. The limitations and future directions for research have also been discussed.

Keywords: Personality, Sattva, Tamas, Self-compassion, Human Flourishing, Hedonic Well-being, Eudaimonic Well-being.

I. INTRODUCTION

The recent years have witnessed an upsurge in the scientific study of human potentialities and goodness with an unprecedented momentum achieved after the formal establishment of Positive Psychology as a branch of inquiry in 2000. In the recent past, self-fulfillment, happiness, life satisfaction, well-being, contentment, and gratitude have become the important psychological constructs to decipher the basic nature of human flourishing. The flourishing research has impacted the interventions of social institutions and educational institutions to achieve the most positive and fulfilling functioning. In the psychological sense, the meaningfulness is most closely related with human flourishing. The researchers have argued that human flourishing occurs when the life activities of the individuals are in consonance with the important values ensuing alive and authentic feeling. It has been found that happiness and meaning were included in the ratings of the good life of people whereas in another view diverse set of mental health indicators reflecting happiness and the other meaningfulness denote human flourishing. Researchers have argued that to live within an optimal range of human functioning, one that connotes goodness, generativity, growth, and resilience constitute human flourishing.

The human flourishing entails a new and promising area of research having significant applications in the interventions of social and educational institutions to achieve the most positive and fulfilling functioning. The researchers have demonstrated that the positive emotional feelings and sentiments convey more personal and psychological benefits than just a personal subjective experience. It has been reported to widen attention, broaden behavioural repertoires leading to expanding skills, performance, intuition, and creativity of the individuals. It also carries physiological benefits comprising significant and positive cardiovascular effects and predicts mental health, outcomes, and longevity (Fredrickson & Losada, 2005). It significantly impacts the academic achievement and other performance in other areas of the individuals. For example, it was reported that the individuals having high levels of flourishing were more likely to complete their university education, get better jobs, succeed in their jobs and exhibit lower work absenteeism (Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005). This study also documented that flourishers are able to receive greater support and assistance from their co-workers and supervisors in their workplace as well as show wider social impact,

^[1] Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, School of Humanities & Social Sciences, Doctor Harisingh Gour Central University, Sagar, 470003, Madhya Pradesh, India, Email: vermayogendra51@gmail.com

^[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, School of Humanities & Social Sciences, Doctor Harisingh Gour Central University, Sagar, 470003, Madhya Pradesh, India, Email: gyaneshpsychology@gmail.com

community involvement, social relationships, overall social support, and perceived companionship than non-flourishers across culture.

II. PERSONALITY AND HUMAN FLOURISHING

Personality has been defined as a coherent patterning of affect, behavior, cognition, and desires which represent integration over time and space (Ortony, Norman & Revelle, 2005). Various personality attributes have been shown to be associated with individual differences in affective level and environmental responsivity (Corr, 2008; Revelle, 1995). The most influencing theory of personality which has shown a high degree of heuristic value is the Big Five Factor Model proposed by McCrae and Costa (1987). The theory conceives personality as the combination of five main dimensions which comprises of extraversion, agreeableness, neuroticism, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. Extraversion refers to the degree to which an individual is sociable, cheerful, and active and an individual high on extraversion exhibits talkativeness, dominance, and gregariousness whereas agreeableness denotes friendliness and compliance in an individual. An individual high on this trait good-natured, soft-hearted, and trusting whereas individual low in this variable would be more irritable, ruthless, and suspicious. Neuroticism indicates the dominance of experience of negative emotions and leads the individual with neuroticism to become more emotional, vulnerable, and anxious whereas those low on this trait shows calm, self-controlled and a greater sense of well-being. Conscientiousness refers to the extent to which an individual works hard, shows order and high self-discipline. The individuals high on this trait are driven, ambitious, and responsible whereas those low in this variable are negligent, lazy and irresponsible. The openness refers to the extent to which one is artistic, imaginative, and has intellectual interests. Those high in openness are creative, imaginative, and prefer variety whereas those low in this variable are uncreative, down to earth, and prefer routine.

The Vedic theory asserts that while the classification scheme of the three gunas comprises all aspects of material, social and psychological reality, the gunas themselves are related to each other (Das, 1999). The Sattva guna comprises the qualities of cleanliness, truthfulness, gravity, dutifulness, detachment, discipline, mental equilibrium, respect for superiors, contentment, sharp intelligence, sense control, and staunch determination (Dasgupta, 1961; Prabhupada, 1986). Dasgupta (1961) describes the sattvic quality as being free from attachment and vanity and absolutely unruffled in success and failure. A person with a sattvic quality is characterized by satisfaction, simplicity, gravity, self-control and purification (Dasgupta, 1961). The rajas guna includes intense activity, desire for sense gratification, little interest in spiritual elevation, dissatisfaction with one's position, envy of others, and a materialistic mentality (Das, 1999). According to Bhagavad-gita, rajasic guna entails an action performed with great effort by one seeking to gratify his desires and enact from a sense of false ego. A person predominated by rajas guna is described as greedy, envious, impure and moved by joy and sorrow (Das, 1999). The basic

qualities associated with tamas guna include mental imbalance, anger, ignorance, arrogance, depression, laziness, procrastination and a feeling of helplessness. The quality of tamas overcomes the illumination of knowledge and leads to many errors and it leads to ignorance, carelessness, idleness, and sleep (Dasgupta, 1961).

In the modern psychological literature, well-being refers to the process of pain avoidance and pleasure attainment (hedonism) as well as it also includes eudaimonia aspect of the meaning and pursuit of fulfillment of the true individual nature (Kahneman, 1999; Waterman, 1993). Khanna et al. (2013) conducted a study to explicate the relationship of trigunas and well-being indicators such as psychological capital, personality, life satisfaction, and subjective happiness. The study was conducted on two samples of 80 Indian professionals and 110 students. The study reported that Sattva was positively correlated with well-being whereas Rajas and Tamas were negatively correlated with well-being. The older age group participants with higher levels of Sattva were reported to exhibit higher level of well-being with no gender difference.

Singh et al. (2016) conducted a study to understand the relationship between the triadic gunas and well-being dimensions across three nations on 493, 302 and 353 from India, the USA and the Czech Republic, respectively. Regression analysis revealed that Trigunas accounted significantly for well-being dimensions. Sattva accounted for 48% variance in Czechs, 56% in Indians and 55% in Americans, Rajas accounted for 21% variance in Czechs, 08% in Indians and 54% in Americans and Tamas accounted for 50% variance in Czechs, 20% in Indians and 64% in Americans. The study approved the effectiveness of the trigunas personality constructs in predicting the well-being of the participants.

III. THE PRESENT STUDY

The current status of the research demonstrates that very little research has been done to uncover the individual strengths and positive community and social institutions to help the individuals or their social life well and an over emphasis was on the psychological problems and their remedies. According to Seligman (2002), the human flourishing and mental constructs were understood only by those factors which acted as restraining forces as opposed to the human strengths. It has been argued that psychology could not produce knowledge of what makes life worth living (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). These arguments led to think the researchers of new branch of psychology which emphasises on the conditions and processes that contribute to the flourishing or optimal functioning of people, groups, and institutions (Gable & Haidt, 2005) and pay more attention to build the best qualities in life instead of repairing the worst things in life (Seligman, 2002).

The arguments led the psychologists to undertake scientific inquiries on human potentialities and human strengths of human flourishing, an important construct that is attracting the researchers of recent years (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Human flourishing refers to living within an optimal range of human functioning, associated with wellness, generativity, performance, growth, and

resilience (Fredrickson & Losada, 2005; Larsen & Prizmic, 2008). Human flourishing instigates experiencing major aspects of social and psychological functioning such as relatedness, optimism, self-acceptance, feeling competent, having supportive and rewarding relationships, contributing to the happiness of others, being respected by others and it involves both psychological, social well-being and social-psychological prosperity (Diener, et al., 2010). Further, human flourishing may also be conceived as a condition which facilitates an optimal psychological functioning of the individuals (Keyes & Haidt, 2002).

In India, the Vedic literature is a depository of knowledge relating to all fields of human endeavor, from physics and psychology to medicine, art, and aeronautics (Goswami, 1977). The Vedas literature says that all material elements are infused with the modes of nature, or gunas-sattva, rajas and tamas. According to Dasgupta (1961), gunas are the universal characteristics of all kinds of mental tendencies. The Vedic theory assumes that our psycho-physical disposition consists of mixtures of the gunas (Prabhupada, 1976). According to the Vaisnava or personalist approach of Vedic philosophy, the material personality is expressed through the gunas which are covering of the original spiritual personality of the living entity. This theory conceives personality as a continuum of past, present and future. Developing an understanding about gunas is relevant for the social and mental health sciences to have a full and true nature of people of India (Das, 1999).

The above discussions on the role of personality in shaping the nature and extent of happiness clearly demonstrate that culture and cultural conceptions of personality may play the mediating and moderating role in determining the nature of the interactions between these two psychological constructs. In India, there has a long debate over the usefulness and applicability of the American and Western conceptions of personality and other psychological constructs to explicate and understand the behaviours of people having a different religious, social philosophical, cultural and spiritual upbringing (Gergen, Gulerce, Lock & Mishra, 1996). It has been argued that the reductionistic ontology of personhood of the Western cannot be applied to understand the psychology of the people having their roots of socialization in the society having a spiritual ontology (Das, 1999). In this backdrop, the present study attempts to understand the nature and extent of the impacts of sattvic and tamasic personality attributes on the self-compassion and human flourishing of the students.

IV. HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses were framed to be tested through the data of this study:

1. The participants with sattvic personality attributes will emit higher mean scores on hedonic (emotional well-being), eudaimonic (social and psychological well-being) and overall human flourishing as compared to the participants with tamasic attribute.
2. The scores on self-compassion will show a positive correlation with the scores on hedonic (emotional well-being), eudaimonic (social and psychological well-being) and overall human flourishing of the participants.
3. The sattvic personality will account for significant variance in the scores of hedonic (emotional well-being), eudaimonic (social and psychological well-being) and overall human flourishing of the participants.
4. The self-compassion will account for significant variance in the scores of hedonic (emotional well-being), eudaimonic (social and psychological well-being) and overall human flourishing of the participants.

V. METHODS AND PROCEDURE

The study employed a correlational research design. The convenient sampling method was employed to select the participants.

A. Sample

Five hundred undergraduate and postgraduate students with an equal number of male and female served as the participants in the study. The biographic details of the participants were obtained through a questionnaire. The participants with age ranging from 18 to 25 years were allowed to take part in the study. A total of four hundred sixty-eight participants comprising two hundred sixty-five sattvics (Mean Age = 20.05, SD = 2.07) and two hundred three tamasics (Mean Age = 19.90, SD = 1.93) participated in the present study.

B. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The participants with apparent normal physical and mental health were included in the study. The participants who were below 18 years and above the 25 years of age were not included in the study.

C. Psychometric Tools

The following tools were employed to collect the data in this study:

a. The Vedic Personality Inventory

The Vedic Personality Inventory (VPI) standardized by Wolf (1998) was employed to measure personality in terms of Indian conceptions of Trigunas. The scale was translated by three researchers from English to Hindi followed by retranslation from Hindi to English. The researchers have used this questionnaire extensively across the globe. The questionnaire has been well researched and validated psychological assessment tool based on the three Gunas (Wolf, 1998). It consists of 56 items with seven point scale (1-Very Strongly Disagree, 2-Strongly Disagree, 3-Somewhat Disagree, 4-Neutral, 5-Somewhat Agree, 6-Strongly Agree, 7-Very Strongly Agree) which includes 15 items for Sattva guna, 19 items for Rajas guna and 22 items for Tamas guna. Wolf (1998) reported that VPI has good internal consistency ranging from $\alpha = 0.70$ to 0.92 for the three Gunas (Wolf, 1998). Reliability coefficients of the questionnaire reported by the researchers range from 0.74 to 0.79 (Das, 1999).

b. Mental Health Continuum-Short Form (MHC-SF)

Human flourishing was assessed with the help of Mental Health Continuum-Short Form (MHC-SF; Keyes, 2005). The scale was translated by three researchers from English to Hindi followed by retranslation from Hindi to English. The scale is based on the model of flourishing having theoretical origin from three sources: studies on

emotional well-being (Diener, Suh, Lucas, & Smith, 1999), studies on hedonic (subjective or emotional) well-being and eudaimonic (psychological) well-being (Ryff, 1989) and studies on social well-being (Keyes, 1998). The scale consists of 14-item. Each item is scored according to respondents' experiences over the last month on a 6-point Likert scale ('never', 'once or twice', 'about once a week', '2 or 3 times a week', 'almost every day', or 'every day'). Three items represent emotional wellbeing, six items represent psychological well-being and five items represent social well-being. It has been reported that internal consistency reliability for each of the three sets of measures-emotional, psychological, and social well-being in the MHC short and long forms have all been $> .80$ (Keyes, 2005a).

c. Self-compassion scale

To assess the self-compassion of the participants, Self-Compassion Scale (Neff, 2003a) consisting 26 items was used. The scale was translated by three researchers from English to Hindi followed by retranslation from Hindi to English. The scale explicitly represents the thoughts, emotions and behaviors associated with the various components of self-compassion. It includes items that measure how often people respond to feelings of inadequacy or suffering with self-kindness, self-judgment, common humanity, isolation, mindfulness and over-identification. It consists of 26 items comprising self-kindness (items-5, 12, 19, 23, 26), self-judgment (items-1, 8, 11, 16, 21), common humanity (items-3, 7, 10, 15), isolation (items-4, 13, 18, 25), mindfulness (items-9, 14, 17, 22) and over-identified (items-2, 6, 20, 24) with five point scale from almost never to almost always. There is ample evidence for the reliability and validity of the SCS. The internal reliability of the SCS has been found to be consistently high in studies across a wide variety of populations suggesting that all SCS items are inter-correlated in a satisfactory manner (Neff & Pommier 2013; Werner et al. 2012). The large majority of translations have replicated the six-factor structure of the scale across the cultures (Arimitsu, 2014; Castilho et al., 2015).

D. Procedure

The data collection for the study was started after the procurement of the questionnaires and selection of the sample. For the sake of convenience and accuracy, the whole sample was divided into 20-25 groups. The scales were administered and the scoring was carried out as per the guidelines depicted in their manuals. The raw scores so obtained were arranged as per the design of the study. When the task of data collection was completed, the same were treated with mean, standard deviation (SD), coefficient of correlation and hierarchical regression analysis through SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences), a software programme to analyze the data.

VI. RESULTS

The mean and SDs were computed to describe the personality differences in self-compassion and human flourishing. The results showed that there were significant differences in

human flourishing of the participants having sattvic and tamasic personality attributes. The participants having sattvic personality achieved significantly higher mean scores on hedonic human flourishing (Sattvic-M = 12.97, SD = 1.98; Tamasic-M 10.51, SD = 3.65, $t = 9.32$, $df = 466$, $p = .000$), social well-being (Sattvic-M = 15.73, SD = 5.50; Tamasic-M 12.86, SD = 5.77, $t = 5.48$, $df = 466$, $p = .000$), psychological well-being (Sattvic-M = 23.85, SD = 4.51; Tamasic-M 19.84, SD = 5.78, $t = 8.42$, $df = 466$, $p = .000$), eudaimonic human flourishing (Sattvic-M = 39.58, SD = 8.48; Tamasic-M 32.70, SD = 9.17, $t = 8.15$, $df = 466$, $p = .000$) and overall human flourishing (Sattvic-M = 52.55, SD = 9.17; Tamasic-M 43.21, SD = 11.69, $t = 9.68$, $df = 466$, $p = .000$) as compared to those who possessed tamasic personality.

Likewise, the sattvic personality participants scored significantly higher mean scores on self-kindness (Sattvic-M = 18.34, SD = 3.03; Tamasic-M 17.35, SD = 3.79, $t = 3.15$, $df = 466$, $p = .002$), self-judgement (Sattvic-M = 15.04, SD = 3.60; Tamasic-M 13.94, SD = 3.87, $t = 3.18$, $df = 466$, $p = .002$), isolation (Sattvic-M = 12.81, SD = 3.32; Tamasic-M 10.45, SD = 3.45, $t = 7.48$, $df = 466$, $p = .000$), mindfulness (Sattvic-M = 15.81, SD = 2.48; Tamasic-M 14.61, SD = 3.11, $t = 5.31$, $df = 466$, $p = .000$), over-identification (Sattvic-M = 13.17, SD = 3.32; Tamasic-M 10.47, SD = 3.38, $t = 8.68$, $df = 466$, $p = .000$) and overall self-compassion (Sattvic-M = 90.03, SD = 9.60; Tamasic-M 81.20, SD = 10.01, $t = 9.69$, $df = 466$, $p = .000$) with their tamasic counterparts.

The coefficients of correlations were computed among the scores of self-compassion, human flourishing and their components of the participants having sattvic and tamasic personality. The results indicated that there were positive significant correlations among the scores of self-kindness and the components of human flourishing namely social well-being ($r = .223$, $p = .000$), psychological well-being ($r = .223$, $p = .000$) and eudaimonic human flourishing ($r = .268$, $p = .000$). Mindfulness exhibited positive significant correlations with scores of psychological well-being ($r = .196$, $p = .001$) and human flourishing ($r = .257$, $p = .000$).

The coefficients of correlation among the scores of various components of self-compassion and human flourishing were also computed for tamasics. The results indicated that there were positive and significant correlations among the scores of self-kindness and hedonic human flourishing ($r = .218$, $p = .000$), common humanity and hedonic human flourishing ($r = .254$, $p = .000$), mindfulness and hedonic human flourishing ($r = .247$, $p = .000$), self-kindness and social well-being ($r = .230$, $p = .001$), common humanity and social well-being ($r = .205$, $p = .003$), mindfulness and social well-being ($r = .268$, $p = .000$), self-kindness and psychological well-being ($r = .325$, $p = .000$), common humanity and psychological well-being ($r = .255$, $p = .000$), mindfulness and psychological well-being ($r = .334$, $p = .000$), self-kindness and eudaimonic human flourishing ($r = .329$, $p = .000$), common humanity and eudaimonic human flourishing ($r = .273$, $p = .000$), mindfulness and eudaimonic human flourishing ($r = .356$, $p = .000$), self-kindness and human flourishing ($r = .342$, $p = .000$), common humanity and human flourishing ($r = .307$, $p = .000$), and mindfulness and human flourishing ($r = .374$, $p = .000$). Conversely, the negative correlations existed among the scores of self-judgement and psychological well-being ($r = -.245$, $p = .000$),

self-judgement and eudaimonic human flourishing ($r = -.229$, $p = .001$), and self-judgement and hedonic human flourishing ($r = -.207$, $p = .003$) of the tamasic personality.

The regression analyses were carried out assuming self-compassion and its components as the predictors and human flourishing and its components as the criterion. The results showed that the scores of self-kindness accounted 5.0%, 7.20%, 6.60% and 3.10% variance in the scores of social well-being ($R^2 = 5.0\%$, $F(1, 263) = 13.73$, $p = .000$), psychological well-being ($R^2 = 7.20\%$, $F(1, 263) = 20.40$, $p = .000$), eudaimonic human flourishing ($R^2 = 6.60\%$, $F(1, 263) = 18.64$, $p = .000$), and overall human flourishing ($R^2 = 3.10\%$, $F(1, 263) = 8.30$, $p = .004$) of the participants with sattvic personality, respectively. The common humanity contributed 2.30% to the psychological well-being ($R^2 = 2.30\%$, $F(1, 263) = 6.21$, $p = .013$) of the sattvic personality participants. The mindfulness contributed 5.10% and 1.50% to the hedonic human flourishing ($R^2 = 5.10\%$, $F(1, 263) = 14.11$, $p = .000$) and psychological well-being ($R^2 = 1.50\%$, $F(1, 263) = 03.95$, $p = .048$) of the sattvic personality participants, respectively. The overall self-compassion contributed 3.70% and 1.40% to the psychological well-being ($R^2 = 3.70\%$, $F(1, 263) = 10.22$, $p = .002$) and overall human flourishing ($R^2 = 1.40\%$, $F(1, 263) = 3.86$, $p = .050$) of the sattvic personality participants, respectively (Table 1).

The regression analyses were also carried out assuming self-compassion and its components as the predictors and human flourishing and its components as the criterion of the participants with tamasic personality. The results demonstrated that the scores of self-kindness accounted for 4.80%, 5.30%, 10.60%, 10.80% and 11.70% variance in the scores of hedonic human flourishing ($R^2 = 4.80\%$, $F(1, 201) = 10.07$, $p = .002$), social well-being ($R^2 = 5.30\%$, $F(1, 201) = 101.24$, $p = .001$), psychological well-being ($R^2 = 10.60\%$, $F(1, 201) = 23.80$, $p = .000$), eudaimonic human flourishing ($R^2 = 10.80\%$, $F(1, 201) = 24.39$, $p = .000$) and overall human flourishing ($R^2 = 11.70\%$, $F(1, 201) = 26.71$, $p = .000$) of the tamasic personality participants, respectively. The self-judgment contributed 6.50%, 15.90%, 5.80%, 6.50% and 15.90% to the hedonic human flourishing ($R^2 = 6.50\%$, $F(1, 201) = 13.92$, $p = .000$), social well-being ($R^2 = 15.90\%$, $F(1, 201) = 37.95$, $p = .000$), psychological well-being ($R^2 = 5.80\%$, $F(1, 201) = 12.45$, $p = .001$), eudaimonic human flourishing ($R^2 = 6.50\%$, $F(1, 201) = 13.92$, $p = .000$) and overall human flourishing ($R^2 = 15.90\%$, $F(1, 201) = 37.95$, $p = .000$) of the tamasic personality participants, respectively (Table 1).

Table 1: Coefficients of Regression of the Scores of self-compassion and its components as the Predictors and human flourishing (HF) as the Criterion of the sattvics and tamasic

Predictors	Criterion	Personality									
		Sattvic					Tamasic				
		R	R ²	R ² Δ	F	p	R	R ²	R ² Δ	F	p
Self-kindness	Hedonic HF	.043	.002	.002	00.48	.488	.218	.048	.048	10.07	.002
	Social Well-being	.223	.050	.050	13.73	.000	.230	.053	.053	11.24	.001
	Psychological Well-being	.268	.072	.072	20.40	.000	.325	.106	.106	23.80	.000
	Eudaimonic HF	.257	.066	.066	18.64	.000	.329	.108	.108	24.39	.000
	Overall HF	.175	.031	.031	08.30	.004	.342	.117	.117	26.71	.000

Self-judgement	Hedonic HF	.078	.006	.006	01.62	.204	.254	.065	.065	13.92	.000
	Social Well-being	.063	.004	.004	01.06	.304	.399	.159	.159	37.95	.000
	Psychological Well-being	.081	.007	.007	01.74	.188	.241	.058	.058	12.45	.001
	Eudaimonic HF	.084	.007	.007	01.88	.171	.254	.065	.065	13.92	.000
	Overall HF	.061	.004	.004	00.98	.323	.399	.159	.159	37.95	.000
Common Humanity	Hedonic HF	.041	.002	.002	00.44	.509	.254	.065	.065	13.87	.000
	Social Well-being	.013	.000	.000	00.04	.835	.205	.042	.042	08.83	.003
	Psychological Well-being	.152	.023	.023	06.21	.013	.255	.065	.065	14.04	.000
	Eudaimonic HF	.089	.008	.008	02.11	.148	.273	.074	.074	16.16	.000
	Overall HF	.074	.005	.005	01.43	.232	.307	.094	.094	20.88	.000
Isolation	Hedonic HF	.078	.006	.006	01.61	.206	.022	.000	.000	00.10	.756
	Social Well-being	.093	.009	.009	02.28	.133	.038	.001	.001	00.30	.586
	Psychological Well-being	.104	.011	.011	02.89	.091	.188	.035	.035	07.34	.007
	Eudaimonic HF	.005	.000	.000	00.01	.941	.134	.018	.018	03.67	.057
	Overall HF	.013	.000	.000	00.04	.838	.105	.011	.011	02.23	.137
Mindfulness	Hedonic HF	.226	.051	.051	14.11	.000	.247	.061	.061	13.01	.000
	Social Well-being	.052	.003	.003	00.71	.399	.268	.072	.072	15.57	.000
	Psychological Well-being	.122	.015	.015	03.95	.048	.334	.111	.111	25.20	.000
	Eudaimonic HF	.031	.001	.001	00.25	.619	.356	.127	.127	29.25	.000
	Overall HF	.031	.001	.001	00.25	.619	.374	.140	.140	32.72	.000
Over-identification	Hedonic HF	.039	.002	.002	00.40	.529	.036	.001	.001	00.26	.611
	Social Well-being	.037	.001	.001	00.35	.552	.006	.000	.000	00.01	.932
	Psychological Well-being	.054	.003	.003	00.77	.382	.010	.000	.000	00.02	.886
	Eudaimonic HF	.005	.000	.000	00.01	.937	.010	.000	.000	00.02	.892
	Overall HF	.013	.000	.000	00.04	.834	.019	.000	.000	00.07	.786
Self-compassion (Overall)	Hedonic HF	.079	.006	.006	01.66	.199	.237	.056	.056	11.97	.001
	Social Well-being	.013	.000	.000	00.05	.827	.168	.028	.028	05.82	.017
	Psychological Well-being	.193	.037	.037	10.22	.002	.149	.022	.022	04.58	.034
	Eudaimonic HF	.112	.012	.012	03.32	.070	.188	.035	.035	07.34	.007
	Human Flourishing (Overall)	.120	.014	.014	03.86	.050	.231	.053	.053	11.28	.001

The common humanity contributed 6.50%, 4.20%, 6.50%, 7.40% and 9.40% to the hedonic human flourishing ($R^2 = 6.50\%$, $F(1, 201) = 13.87$, $p = .000$), social well-being ($R^2 = 4.20\%$, $F(1, 201) = 08.83$, $p = .003$), psychological well-being ($R^2 = 6.50\%$, $F(1, 201) = 14.04$, $p = .000$), eudaimonic human flourishing ($R^2 = 7.40\%$, $F(1, 201) = 16.16$, $p = .000$) and overall human flourishing ($R^2 = 9.40\%$, $F(1, 201) = 20.88$, $p = .000$) of the tamasic personality participants, respectively. The isolation contributed 3.50% to the psychological well-being ($R^2 = 3.50\%$, $F(1, 201) = 07.34$, $p = .007$) of the tamasic personality participants. The mindfulness contributed 6.10%, 7.20%, 11.10%, 12.70% and 14.0% to the hedonic human flourishing ($R^2 = 6.10\%$, $F(1, 201) = 13.01$, $p = .000$), social well-being ($R^2 = 7.20\%$, $F(1, 201) = 15.57$, $p = .000$), psychological well-being ($R^2 = 11.10\%$, $F(1, 201) = 25.20$, $p = .000$), eudaimonic human flourishing ($R^2 = 12.70\%$, $F(1, 201) = 29.25$, $p = .000$) and overall human flourishing ($R^2 = 14.0\%$, $F(1, 201) = 32.72$, $p = .000$) of the tamasic personality participants, respectively. The overall self-compassion contributed 5.60%, 3.50% and 5.30% to the hedonic human flourishing ($R^2 = 5.60\%$, $F(1, 201) = 11.97$, $p = .001$), eudaimonic human flourishing ($R^2 = 3.50\%$, $F(1, 201) = 07.34$, $p = .007$) and overall human flourishing ($R^2 = 5.30\%$,

$F(1, 201) = 11.28, p = .001$) of the tamasic personality participants, respectively (Table 1).

VII. DISCUSSION

The results of the study unequivocally evinced that the self-compassion and human flourishing of the participants were patterned after the personality attributes of sattva and tamas. The results demonstrated significant differences in the mean scores of human flourishing of the participants having sattvic and tamasic personality attributes. In the other words, the participants having sattvic personality evoked significantly higher mean scores on hedonic human flourishing, social well-being, psychological well-being, eudaimonic human flourishing and overall human flourishing as compared to those who possessed tamasic personality. Similarly, the sattvic personality participants scored significantly higher mean scores on self-kindness, self-judgement, isolation, mindfulness, over-identification and overall self-compassion with their tamasic counterparts. In short, the participants with sattva gunas were on upper hand as compared to tamas gunas in achieving self-compassion and flourishing scores. These results approved our hypothesis 1.

The coefficients of correlations indicated that there were positive significant correlations among the scores of self-kindness and the components of human flourishing namely social well-being psychological well-being and eudaimonic human flourishing. Mindfulness exhibited positive significant correlations with scores of psychological well-being and human flourishing of the sattvics. The positive and significant correlations among the scores of self-kindness and hedonic human flourishing, common humanity and hedonic human flourishing, mindfulness and hedonic human flourishing, self-kindness and social well-being, common humanity and social well-being, mindfulness and social well-being, self-kindness and psychological well-being, common humanity and psychological well-being, mindfulness and psychological well-being, self-kindness and eudaimonic human flourishing, common humanity and eudaimonic human flourishing, mindfulness and eudaimonic human flourishing, self-kindness and human flourishing, common humanity and human flourishing, and mindfulness and human flourishing were also observed for tamasics. Conversely, the negative correlations existed among the scores of self-judgement and psychological well-being, self-judgement and eudaimonic human flourishing, and self-judgement and hedonic human flourishing of the tamasic personality. With these results, our hypothesis 2 got partially approved.

The results of regression analyses showed that the scores of self-kindness, common humanity, mindfulness and overall self-compassion accounted for statistically significant variance in the scores of hedonic human flourishing, social well-being, psychological well-being, eudaimonic human flourishing, and overall human flourishing of the sattvics. For the tamasics, the scores of self-kindness, self-judgement, common humanity, isolation, mindfulness and overall self-compassion accounted for significant variance in the scores of hedonic human flourishing, social well-being, psychological well-being, eudaimonic human flourishing and overall human flourishing. One remarkable difference in

the regression analyses was that self-judgment and isolation, negative aspects of self-compassion, also accounted for variance in the scores of various components of flourishing of the tamasics which is absent in the case sattvics.

In essence, it can be argued that sattvic guna plays more facilitative roles in the acquisition and maintenance of self-compassion and flourishing as compared to tamas guna. The causes of these differences lie in the differences in the nature and basic dynamics of sattvics and tamasics. According to The Bhagavad Geeta (Chapter-XIV, Shloka-6), the attribute of sattva entails being the giver of joy and light and purity itself, binds the mortal being with attachment to knowledge and attachment to happiness. Sattvic types cultivate awareness of others, of their surrounding and environment. They have mild desires and strong will. They are noble, forgiving, generous, free from anger, passion, conceit, ego, greed or jealousy (Rastogi & Kewalramani, 2010). They are self-controlled and righteous (Kapadia, 2004). They are truthful, content and firm. On the other hand, tamasics have disturbances in the process of perception and activities of the mind. Their emotions and energy tend to be stagnant and repressed; they do not know what their problems really are. They are lazy types who prefer easy and relaxed life. Fear is the driving force for them. They have no motivation to initiate a physical or mental action. There is no clear focus. They are stubborn and refuse to shake off dullness, fear, grief, low spirits or vanity (Kajriwal & Krishnan, 2004). The sattvics involve themselves in activities that cater to the development and expression of the intellect, mind and spirit. They have also an inclination towards humanity and interest of people (Kapadia, 2004). These differences in the attributes of sattvics and tamasics may be assumed to be the major causes in their acquisition of dissimilar patterns of the scores on self-compassion and flourishing measures. These results partially endorsed our hypotheses 3 and 4.

VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It can be concluded that the sattva and tamas gunas have major roles in shaping the self-compassion and human flourishing of the participants. The participants having relative dominance of sattva guna as compared to tamas guna exhibited higher mean scores on the self-compassion, human flourishing and their components. In addition, the scores on the self-compassion and human flourishing demonstrated positive correlations except few. The scores on the self-kindness, common humanity, mindfulness and overall self-compassion components of self-compassion significantly accounted for variance in the scores of hedonic human flourishing, social well-being, psychological well-being, eudaimonic human flourishing, and overall human flourishing of the both sattvics and tamasics whereas the self-judgment aspect of self-compassion caused significant variance in the scores of hedonic human flourishing, social well-being, psychological well-being, eudaimonic human flourishing and overall human flourishing and isolation only to psychological well-being of the tamasics.

IX. DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The findings of the study make it clear that Indian concepts of

sattva, rajas and tamas gunas have very important implications for the scientific study of human behaviours. There is a big scope for the scientific study involving Indian constructs of personality. It has the remarkable potential to help understand many positive and negative aspects of human behaviours. The future researchers having good training in the scientific psychology may go for an in-depth study of the original texts written in Sanskrit and other Indian languages, and come up with the detailed descriptions of the basic dynamics, conceptual foundations and put them before the scientist community where the empirical validation and investigation can be planned and materialized. For the future study, the self-compassion and human flourishing could be studied involving self-forgiveness (Mudgal & Tiwari, 2015), body image (Jain, & Tiwari, 2016a; Jain, & Tiwari, 2016b; Tiwari, & Kumar, 2015; Tiwari, 2014), gender and goal orientations (Verma & Tiwari, 2017), emotional intelligence (Tiwari, 2016a), emotion regulation (Tiwari, 2015), yogic practices (Tiwari, 2016b), sustainable behaviors (Tiwari, 2016c) and, academic and non-academic self-concepts (Gujare, & Tiwari, 2016a; Gujare, & Tiwari, 2016b). Use of qualitative methods, mixed methods, the inclusion of other variables having greater relevance to Indian socio-cultural settings, the inclusion of larger sample distributed across different geographical areas and inclusion of non-student samples will make the findings of future research more valuable, insightful and generalizable.

X. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors have no conflict of interest with anyone.

XI. REFERENCES

- Arimitsu, K. (2014). Development and validation of the Japanese version of the Self-Compassion Scale. *Japanese Journal of Psychology*; 85:50-59.
- Castilho, P., Pinto-Gouveia, J., & Duarte, J. (2015). Evaluating the multifactor structure of the long and short versions of the Self-Compassion Scale in a clinical sample. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 1-15.
- Corr, P. J. (2008). The reinforcement sensitivity theory. In P. J. Corr (Ed.), *The reinforcement sensitivity theory of personality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dasa, D. G. (1999). *The Vedic Personality Inventory*. Bhaktivedanta College
- Dasgupta, S. (1961). *A History of Indian Philosophy*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press
- Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(2), 276-302. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.125.2.276>
- Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D. W., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2010). New well-being measures: short scales to assess flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, 97(2), 143-156. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9493-y>
- Fredrickson, B. L., & Branigan, C. A. (2005). Positive emotions broaden the scope of attention and thought-action repertoires. *Cognition and Emotion*, 19, 313-332
- Gable, S. L., & Haidt, J. (2005). What (and Why) Is Positive Psychology? *Review of General Psychology*, 9, 103-110.
- Gergen, K.J., Gulerce, A., Lock, A., & Misra, G. (1996). Psychological science in cultural context. *American Psychologist*, 51 (5), 496-503.
- Goswami, S. D. (1977). *Readings in Vedic literature: The tradition speaks for itself*. Los Angeles: Bhaktivedanta Book Trust.
- Gujare, S. K. & Tiwari, G. K. (2016a). Mental health symptoms predict academic achievement of the female students. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 4, Issue 1, No.76, 93-111. DIP: 18.01.006/20160476.
- Gujare, S. K. & Tiwari, G. K. (2016b). Academic self-concept and academic outcome of the graduate students: The mediating role of socioeconomic status and gender. *International Journal of Education and Psychological Research*, Volume 4, Issue 5, 1-7.
- Jain, P., & Tiwari, G. K. (2016a). Body image satisfaction and Life Satisfaction in HIV/AIDS patients. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 3, Issue 2, No.1, 81-90. DIP: 18.01.011/20160302.
- Jain, P., & Tiwari, G. K. (2016b). Positive body image and general health: A Mixed Methods Study. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 4, Issue 1, No. 76, 33-51. DIP: 18.01.003/20160476.
- Kahneman D. (1999). Objective happiness. In: Kahneman D, Diener E, Schwarz N, editors. *Well-being: Foundations of Hedonic Psychology*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation Press; p. 3-25.
- Kapadis, M. (2004). *Emotional Intelligence-A Workbook for Beginners*, BPI (India) Pvt. Ltd.
- Kejriwal, A. & Krishnan, V. R. (2004), Impact of Vedic Worldview and Gunas on Transformational Leadership, *Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers*, Volume 29, No. 1, 29-40.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). *Social well-being*. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61(2), 121-140
- Keyes, C. L. M. (2005). Mental illness and/or mental health? Investigating axioms of the complete state model of health [Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't]. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73(3), 539-548.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (2005a). Mental illness and/or mental health? Investigating axioms of the complete state model of health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 539-548.
- Keyes, C. L. M., & Haidt, J. (2002). *Flourishing: Positive psychology and the life well lived*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Khanna, P., Singh, K., Singla, S., & Verma, V. (2013). Relationship between Triguna theory and well-being indicators. *International Journal of Yoga-Philosophy, Psychology and Parapsychology*, 1(2), 69.

- Larsen, R.J., & Prizmic, Z. (2008). The regulation of emotional well-being: Overcoming the hedonic treadmill. In M. Eid and R.J. Larsen (Eds.), *The science of subjective wellbeing* (pp. 258-289). New York: Guilford.
- Lyubomirsky, S., King, L. A., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(6), 803-855.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa Jr., P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal Of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81-90.
- Mudgal, S., & Tiwari, G. K. (2015). Self-Forgiveness and Life Satisfaction in People Living with HIV/AIDS. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 3, Issue 1, No. 10, 101-108. DIP: C03175V3I12015.
- Neff, K. (2003a). The development and validation of a scale to measure self-compassion. *Self and Identity*, 2, 223-250.
- Neff, K. D. & Pommier, E. (2013). The relationship between self-compassion and other-focused concern among college undergraduates, community adults, and practicing mediators. *Self and Identity*, 12(2), 160-176.
- Ortony, A., Norman, D. A., & Revelle, W. (2005). Effective functioning: A three-level model of affect, motivation, cognition, and behavior. In J. Fellous & M. Arbib (Eds.), *Who needs emotions? The brain meets the machine*. (p.173-202). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Prabhupada, A. C. B. S. (1976). *Srimad-Bhagavatam*. Hong Kong: Bhaktivedanta Book Trust.
- Prabhupada, A. C. B. S. (1986). *Bhagavad-gita as it is*. Los Angeles: Bhaktivedanta Book Trust.
- Rastogi, M. R., & Kewalramani (2010). Emotional intelligence and Triguna. In Sandhya Ojha & Sambhu Upadhyaya (Eds.), *Psychosocial aspect of health and illness* (pp. 261-268). New Delhi: Global Vision Publishing House.
- Revelle, W. (1995). Personality processes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 46, 295-328.
- Seligman M, Csikszentmihalyi M. 2000. Positive psychology: an introduction. *Am. Psychol.* 55:5-14
- Seligman, M.E.P. (2002). *Authentic happiness*. New York: Free Press.
- Singh, K., Jain, A., Kaur, J., Junnarkar, M., & Slezackova, A. (2016). Cross-cultural differences on Gunas and other well-being dimensions. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, 24, 139-146.
- Tiwari, G. K. (2014). Body image satisfaction enhances self-esteem. *VAICHARIKI*, IV(4), 7-11.
- Tiwari, G. K. (2015). Chronic Physical Illness Affects Emotion Regulation Process: A Case of HIV/AIDS. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 3, Issue 1, No. 8, 158-166. DIP: C03143V3I12015.
- Tiwari, G. K. (2016a). Mediating role of emotional intelligence in academic achievement of the graduate students. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 4, Issue 1, No. 74, 49-59. DIP: 18.01.026/20160401.
- Tiwari, G. K. (2016b). Yoga and mental health: An Underexplored relationship. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 4, Issue 1, No. 76, 19-31. DIP: 18.01.002/20160476.
- Tiwari, G. K. (2016c). Sustainable Behaviors and happiness: An Optimistic Link. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Volume 4, Issue 1, No. 75, 127-136. DIP: 18.01.051/20160401.
- Tiwari, G. K., & Kumar, S. (2015). Psychology and body image: A review. *Shodh Prerak*, 5 (1), 1-9.
- Verma, Y., & Tiwari, G. K. (2017). Self-compassion as the predictor of flourishing of the students. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*. DOI: 10.25215/0403.122
- Waterman, A. S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (Eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 678-691.
- Werner, K. H., Jazaieri, H., Goldin, P. R., Ziv, M., Heimberg, R. G., & Gross, J. J. (2012). Self-compassion and social anxiety disorder. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, 25, 543-558.
- Wolf, D. B. (1998). The Vedic Personality Inventory: A Study of Gunas. *Journal of Indian Psychology*, 16 (1), 26-43.