

Research on the Subjective Well-being of Junior High School Students

Li Tianwei

Counselling Centre of Psychological Health and Education, Southwest Forestry University, Kunming, China

Email address:

44803861@qq.com

To cite this article:

Li Tianwei. Research on the Subjective Well-being of Junior High School Students. *Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*.

Vol. 8, No. 6, 2019, pp. 166-172. doi: 10.11648/j.pbs.20190806.14

Received: November 11, 2019; **Accepted:** November 27, 2019; **Published:** December 3, 2019

Abstract: Objective: The purpose of this study is to analyze the current situation of subjective well-being of junior high school students and its influencing factors, and to provide some practical data for school workers to develop Happiness Education. Methods: Using the method of literature review and quantitative analysis, a questionnaire survey was conducted among 132 junior high school students in a middle school in a town by subjective well-being scale for adolescents. Results: (1) The subjective well-being of junior middle school students is in the middle level (4.3738 ± 0.6567); (2) On the gender factor, boys and girls were significantly different in school satisfaction (4.4608 ± 1.3273 , 5.1094 ± 1.0687 , $t = -2.903$, $P < 0.05$) and positive emotions (3.3464 ± 1.0852 , 4.1589 ± 1.1383 , $t = -3.882$, $P < 0.05$); (3) In terms of grade factors, there are significant differences in environmental satisfaction only. Through pair wise comparison after the event, it is found that there was a significant difference in environmental satisfaction between Grade7 students (4.9375 ± 1.0398) and Grade9 students (4.1500 ± 0.5871) ($p \leq 0.003$). The difference between other grades was not significant. (4) Through the analysis of different background data, it is shown that different background factors have different effects on the subjective well-being of junior high school students. Conclusion: The subjective well-being of junior high school students is at the middle level. In terms of gender factor, boys and girls were satisfied with school (4.4608 ± 1.3273 , 5.1094 ± 1.0687 , $t = -2.903$, $p < 0.05$) and positive emotion (3.3464 ± 1.0852 , 4.1589 ± 1.1383 , $t = -3.882$, $p < 0.05$) there was significant difference in the difference. Different background factors affect the degree of subjective well-being of junior high school students, family atmosphere, the object of the two factors are the most important dimensions of subjective well-being of junior high school students. The subjective well-being of junior middle school students is basically satisfactory, and different background factors have different effects on their subjective well-being. Educators need to distinguish and guide students.

Keywords: High School Students, Subjective Well-being, Differences

1. Introduction

Happiness has always been the eternal pursuit of human beings. In an era of plenty people pay more and more attention to happiness. The study of subjective well-being originated from the United States from the 1950s to the 1960s, and with the study of quality of life and positive psychology, has gone through four stages since its rise: describing subjective happiness, constructing subjective happiness in theory, measuring subjective happiness and applying subjective happiness [1-4]. With the development of active psychology and the research of subjective happiness, some scholars in China have started to accept the research of

subjective well-being of Western utilitarianism, widely absorbed the excellent theoretical achievements and measuring tools.

From the point of view of the relevant literature, the study of subjective well-being of middle school students is mainly focused on three aspects which are difference, correlation and improvement [5]. The study of differences is to distinguish between different groups of subjective well-being, make swb theory more specific, play a rich role in theory. Zhou Tianmei and Gong Qunying conducted a comparative study on subjective well-being among young people [6]. The study of correlation is very high in the study of the subjective well-being of middle school students. Yang Hairong and Shi Guoxing (2004) pointed out negative emotion, family

satisfaction, self-respect and negative coping style, and the satisfaction of school has a good predictive effect on mental health [7]. Hu Qiaohong and Zhang Liang (2010) found that the subjective well-being level of middle school students was above the medium level, and the positive emotion experienced was more than the negative emotion [8]. Wang Jisheng, Ding Xinhua (2003) pointed out that the subjective well-being of the middle school students is closely related to the personality characteristics [9]. Promotion research refers to the study of cultivating and improving happiness. Liu Yujuan (2011) pointed out that to cultivate the subjective well-being of primary and secondary schools should establish the right view of happiness, cultivate positive mental quality, improve the efficiency of teaching and learning in scientific teaching, etc [10].

The researchers divide happiness into three levels: subjective well-being, psychological happiness, and social happiness. The subjective well-being of primary characteristic is its subjectivity; just in the development stage of junior high school special self evaluation is not mature, thinking pattern is not fixed. At this time the teacher could combine all factors under the condition of different students with different educational methods to correct guidance, to improve the well-being of students and the meaning of life is important, also play a role to promote the psychological health of students.

2. Research Process

2.1. The Purpose and Significance of the Research

Happiness is always the pursuit of human's pet, what is happiness? There is different understanding of different people. Based on subjective well-being literature study, different researchers have come in the same factors on the inconsistent results, such as some studies suggest that the subjective well-being in gender: male SWB higher than women [11]. Some studies on the contrary. Similarly, in the economy on the impact of SWB on the differences also exist. The junior middle school stage is an important period of individual physical, psychological development, students in this special stage, showing the psychological development of students psychological development lags behind, self consciousness, and emotion semi mature, semi naive characteristics [12]. At the same time, in the fast the development of the society, great changes have taken place in rural areas, the state investment in rural education is increasing, also have a certain influence on the students' psychological, then to the countryside junior middle school students Under the dual influence of internal and external factors, how about subjective well-being [13]? What are the factors behind it? This topic is based on this understanding.

2.2. Research Purpose

To understand the overall subjective well-being of junior high school students as well as the characteristics of each dimension. Analysis of subjective well-being of junior

middle school students in gender, grade differences, and universal test results of previous study, enrich the theory and development theory. To analyze the difference of subjective well-being under different background information, and the theoretical basis for school and family education is provided.

2.3. Research Meaning

The subjective well-being of primary characteristic is its subjectivity; just in the development stage of junior high school special self evaluation is not mature, thinking pattern is not fixed. At this time teachers could combine all factors under the condition of different students with different educational methods to correct guidance, to improve the well-being of students and the meaning of life is important, also play a role to promote the psychological health of students.

2.4. Objects and Methods

2.4.1. Objects

A middle school were randomly selected in a Town in Southwest China, taking a class as a unit randomly selected first, second, third grade a class, the questionnaire survey was conducted on 132 subjects, ages 12-16 years old. Issued a total of 132 copies, 120 copies on the spot, the recovery rate of 90.9%. Of 115 valid questionnaires, the effective rate of 87.1%. Among them, boys 51, 64 girls; there are 48 students in the first year of junior high school (Grade1), 47 in the second year of junior high school (Grade2) and 20 in the third year of junior high school (Grade3).

2.4.2. The Questionnaire Consists of Three Parts

- (1) The basic situation of the students, including age, sex, grade, academic achievement, family economic status, family atmosphere, whether it is the only child and other background factors.
- (2) Adolescent subjective well-being scale
- (3) Adolescent subjective well-being scale developed by Zhang Xinggui, the young students life satisfaction scale consists of 36 items, the report in the past few weeks for their own living conditions from the view of "totally disagree" to "totally agree" in the Likert -7 score, the higher the score of life satisfaction is higher, can be summed up. Six specific areas of life dimensions are friendship satisfaction, family satisfaction, school satisfaction, academic satisfaction, freedom satisfaction, environment satisfaction. Life satisfaction scale and general life satisfaction scale is 0.65, has good convergent validity, and Big Five Personality in the depression and anxiety scale (negative the index of happiness) negative correlation were -0.45, -0.39, that means the scale has certain discrimination validity. The scale of the internal consistency reliability between 0.87-0.93, and the total scale each subscale of stability reliability between 0.8-0.85 and Cronbach's alpha of the scale in the survey was 0.793, higher reliability can be accepted.
- (4) Happy scale consists of 14 items, the length of time to

experience emotional reports in the past week, each question using 7 point scoring, "no" 1, "1/6 time" record 2 points, "2/6 time" record 3 points, "3/6 time" record 4 points, "4/6 time" 5 points, "5/6 time" 6, "all the time" 7 points. The scale includes positive emotion (6 items) and negative affect (8 items); each project a minimum score of 1 points, the highest score is 7 points, the higher the score, indicating positive emotion or negative emotions more strongly. Widely used in subjective well-being questionnaire, the scale of the letter suggests that the validity was acceptable.

2.4.3. Test Program

The main trial is conducted by the investigator in the manner of full-shift test. Before the test, the main trial shall direct the students to use the table according to the instruction, to help the students understand the filling rules, and to inform the participants that the survey is not signed, and the results of the survey are not given to the teacher. The results are only used for comprehensive analysis, so that the test can be answered in accordance with the actual ideas of the students. The test time was about 20 minutes and the questionnaire was withdrawn on the spot.

2.4.4. Statistical Analysis

All data is statistically processed and analyzed using the SPSS17.0 Chinese version of the software. Single factor variance analysis (one-way ANOVA), was used to analyze the results.

3. Results and Analysis

3.1. The Subjective Well-being of Junior Middle School Students Overall Description

First of all, the life satisfaction dimensions (friendship satisfaction, family satisfaction, school satisfaction, academic satisfaction, freedom satisfaction, environmental satisfaction) and happiness feeling (positive emotion and negative emotion) of the middle school students are counted, and the average (\bar{x}) and the standard deviation (s) are analyzed through the analysis of the average (\bar{x}) and the standard deviation (s). As a whole, the measurement data of the subjective well-being of the junior high school students is statistically analyzed, so as to have a preliminary understanding of the data.

Table 1. The town of junior high school students' subjective well-being dimensions descriptive statistics (n=115).

Dimension	MIN	MAX	\bar{x}	S
Life satisfaction	2.14	6.36	4.7809	0.7792
Family satisfaction	1.00	7.00	5.2112	1.1755
Friendship satisfaction	2.29	6.86	5.1975	0.9367
School satisfaction	1.17	7.00	4.8217	1.2283
Freedom satisfaction	1.40	7.00	4.6104	1.1470
Environmental satisfaction	1.80	6.80	4.5330	0.9941

Dimension	MIN	MAX	\bar{x}	S
Academic satisfaction	1.17	6.83	4.0841	1.1196
positive emotion	1.17	6.50	3.7986	1.1819
negative emotion	1.13	5.13	2.7141	0.8065
Overall happiness	2.23	5.73	4.3738	0.6567

It can be seen from table 1 that the average score of life satisfaction of junior high school students is between 4 and 5 points, life satisfaction ($\bar{x}=4.7809$), positive emotion ($\bar{x}=3.7986$), negative emotion ($\bar{x}=2.7141$). It indicates that the level of subjective well-being of junior high school students is in the middle, and experience less negative emotion. From the perspective of life satisfaction, junior high school students experienced higher family satisfaction ($\bar{x}=5.2112$) and friendship satisfaction ($\bar{x}=5.1975$), followed by school satisfaction ($\bar{x}=4.8217$), freedom satisfaction ($\bar{x}=4.6104$), environmental satisfaction ($\bar{x}=4.5330$), and academic satisfaction ($\bar{x}=4.0861$). Experiencing higher family satisfaction and friendship satisfaction, we can safely draw that the interpersonal support has certain influence on subjective well-being.

3.2. Gender Differences in Subjective Well-being of Junior Middle School Students

From table 2 we can see that there were significant differences between boys and girls in school satisfaction (4.4608 ± 1.3273 , 5.1094 ± 1.0687 , $t=-2.903$, $p<0.05$) and positive emotion (3.3464 ± 1.0852 , 4.1589 ± 1.1383 , $t=-3.882$, $p<0.05$). Girls experience more school satisfaction and positive feelings than boys. Other dimensions have not reached a significant level of gender difference, but female students have higher life satisfaction ($=4.8659$) than male students ($=4.6743$).

Table 2. Gender differences in subjective well-being of Junior Middle School students.

Dimension	Boys (n=51)	Girls (n=64)	p	T
	$\bar{x}\pm S$	$\bar{x}\pm S$		
Life satisfaction	4.6743 \pm 0.7724	4.8659 \pm 0.7801	0.611	1.314
Family satisfaction	5.2325 \pm 1.0755	5.1942 \pm 0.1572	0.270	0.173
Friendship satisfaction	5.1261 \pm 0.9336	5.2545 \pm 0.1178	0.495	0.729
School satisfaction	4.4608 \pm 1.3273	5.1094 \pm 1.0687	0.113	2.903 *
Freedom satisfaction	4.5765 \pm 1.1002	4.6375 \pm 1.1909	0.750	0.282
Environmental satisfaction	4.4902 \pm 0.9994	4.6031 \pm 0.9949	0.504	0.603
Academic satisfaction	3.9444 \pm 1.1109	4.1955 \pm 1.1228	0.537	1.196
positive emotion	3.3464 \pm 1.0852	4.1589 \pm 1.1383	0.716	3.882 *
negative emotion	2.8162 \pm 0.8487	2.6328 \pm 0.7683	0.532	1.214

Note: *P<0.05

3.3. The Grade Difference of the Subjective Well-being of Middle School Students

Table 3. Grade comparison of subjective well-being of junior middle school students.

Dimension	Grade1 (n=48)	Grade2 (n=47)	Grade2 (n=20)	F	P
	$\bar{x}\pm S$	$\bar{x}\pm S$	$\bar{x}\pm S$		
Life	4.8852 \pm 0.8840	4.7845 \pm 0.7068	4.5225 \pm 0.6343	1.545	0.218
Family	5.4167 \pm 1.3079	5.1550 \pm 1.1571	4.8500 \pm 0.7523	1.754	0.178
Friendship	5.0565 \pm 0.9224	5.3435 \pm 0.9577	5.1929 \pm 0.9147	1.117	0.331
School	5.2500 \pm 1.3128	4.7600 \pm 1.2196	4.5500 \pm 1.3169	2.784	0.066
Freedom	4.3750 \pm 0.2312	4.9362 \pm 1.1870	4.4500 \pm 0.8870	3.025	0.053
Environmental	4.9375 \pm 1.0398	4.4681 \pm 1.0183	4.1500 \pm 0.5871	5.504*	0.005
Academic	4.2021 \pm 1.1571	4.0851 \pm 1.2586	3.8100 \pm 1.2586	0.862	0.425
positive emotion	4.0625 \pm 1.2616	3.8726 \pm 1.1725	3.4000 \pm 1.2312	2.080	0.130
negative emotion	2.7786 \pm 0.7831	2.5824 \pm 0.7068	2.8688 \pm 1.0478	1.151	0.320

Table 3 shows that there are significant differences in the dimension of environmental satisfaction among students of different grades. There is a significant margin in freedom satisfaction and no significant difference between grades in other dimensions. As shown in Table 4, the post-comparison analysis shows that, from the three grades, the degree of life satisfaction ($\bar{x}>4.5$), the positive emotion is higher than the negative emotion, and the subjective well-being condition of each grade is basically satisfied. With the growth of grade, life satisfaction, family satisfaction, school satisfaction, environment satisfaction, academic satisfaction and subjective well-being, positive satisfaction decreased, there is a turning point in the other dimensions in the second year of junior high school.

Referring to tables 4 and 3, we can see through the post-comparison of environmental satisfaction and freedom satisfaction of junior high school students in grades. In terms of environmental satisfaction, there was a significant difference between Grade1 students (4.9375 \pm 1.0398) and Grade3 students (4.1500 \pm 0.5871) ($p\leq 0.003$) in junior high school. That is, junior high school Grade1 students have a higher experience of environmental satisfaction than those in the second year of junior high school and the third grade of junior high school. The difference between Grade2 students and Grade3 students in the environment satisfaction is not significant. In terms of freedom satisfaction, there are more experiences among junior high school Grade2 students than those Grade1 students (the average difference between Grade2 students and Grade1 students is -0.5612, $p\leq 0.0200$).

Table 4. The Post-subsequent Comparison of Environmental Satisfaction and Freedom Satisfaction of the Junior High School Students in the Grade.

Dependent Variable	Grade (I)	Grade (J)	\bar{x}_{I-J}	P
Environmental satisfaction	Grade1	Grade2	0.4694	0.020*
		Grade3	0.7875	0.003*
	Grade2	Grade1	-0.4694	0.020
		Grade3	0.3181	0.221
	Grade3	Grade1	-0.7875	0.003
		Grade2	-0.3181	0.221
Freedom satisfaction	Grade1	Grade2	-0.5612	0.020*
		Grade3	-0.0750	0.809
	Grade2	Grade1	0.5612	0.020
		Grade3	0.4862	0.120
	Grade3	Grade1	0.0750	0.809
		Grade2	-0.4862	0.120

3.4. Analysis of the Subjective Well-being of Junior Middle School Students with Different Background Data

As can be seen from Table 5, there is significant difference in school satisfaction scores among students with different academic performance (4.36 \pm 1.35, 5.07 \pm 1.25, 5.25 \pm 1.28, $F=3.29$, $P<0.05$). There was no significant difference in scores in other dimensions. Through pairwise comparison after the event, it is found that a significant difference in school satisfaction between low academic achievement students (4.36 \pm 1.35) and secondary achievement students (5.07 \pm 1.25) (mean difference = -0.7132, $p\leq 0.016$). It can be seen that the school satisfaction of the middle-grade students is significantly higher than that of the students with low academic performance.

The subjective well-being of the students with different family atmosphere did not differ significantly in the negative affective dimension (2.60 \pm 0.81, 2.82 \pm 0.71, 3.06 \pm 1.29, $F=1.62$, $P>0.05$), and there was significant difference in other dimensions. Through pairwise comparison after the event, it is found that there is a significant difference in friendship satisfaction between students with harmonious family and those in quarrelling environment. The three dimensions of life satisfaction, school satisfaction, environmental satisfaction and positive emotion are consistent with the changing trend in the dimension of friendship satisfaction. The subjective well-being of students with harmonious family atmosphere is significantly higher than that of students who quarrel occasionally and often. In terms of freedom satisfaction and academic satisfaction, students in harmonious family atmosphere scored higher than those in occasional quarrelling family atmosphere.

There are significant differences in life satisfaction and academic satisfaction among students whose parents with different educational levels. Through pairwise comparative analysis after the event, it can be seen that the academic satisfaction of students with parents' education level above primary school was higher than that of students whose parents were educated in primary school, and the difference was significant. However, there is no significant difference in parents' educational level in junior high school and high school.

Table 5. The Comparison of the Subjective Well-being of Junior Middle School Students with Different Background Data (I + S).

Background Data		Num.	Life satisfaction	Family satisfaction	academic satisfaction	Freedom satisfaction
Academic Achievements	Low	25	4.55±0.66	4.88±1.18	3.70±1.14	4.76±1.09
	Medium	82	4.83±0.80	5.29±1.20	4.17±1.11	4.52±1.23
	High	8	4.97±0.88	5.46±0.81	4.41±1.02	5.13±0.83
	F		1.49	1.4	2.1	1.2
Family Atmosphere	Harmony	63	5.12±0.63	5.74±0.87	4.40±1.05	4.89±0.95
	Quarrel Sometimes	45	4.42±0.70	4.75±1.01	3.69±1.04	4.28±1.26
	Quarrel Often	6	4.05±1.07	3.21±1.60	3.85±1.56	4.33±2.07
	F		17.51*	26.86*	5.94*	3.87*
Parents' Educational Level	Primary School	45	4.51±0.69	5.00±1.07	3.66±1.03	4.33±1.04
	Junior School	60	4.91±0.76	5.34±1.16	4.24±1.01	4.75±1.21
	Senior School	9	5.13±0.87	5.15±1.61	4.85±1.23	5.00±1.41
	F		4.93*	1.11	6.87*	2.20
Family Economic Status	Bad	7	3.91±0.83	3.91±0.91	2.94±1.16	3.71±1.11
	General	75	4.71±0.69	5.24±1.01	3.93±0.98	4.57±1.08
	Good	29	5.02±0.77	5.36±1.26	4.50±1.07	4.79±1.31
	Very Good	4	5.76±0.67	5.75±2.50	5.92±0.59	5.75±1.25
The Only Child	F		7.10*	3.51*	9.59*	2.98*
	Yes	18	4.72±0.73	5.35±0.97	3.87±1.04	4.88±1.02
	No	97	4.79±0.79	5.18±1.21	4.12±1.13	4.56±1.20
	T		-0.31	0.57	-0.85	1.0
Pour Out Object	Teacher	4	4.92±1.32	5.39±1.50	4.30±1.77	4.50±1.00
	Father	8	5.45±0.60	6.25±0.65	4.62±1.00	5.12±0.99
	Mother	12	5.46±0.63	6.05±0.66	4.73±1.20	5.25±1.05
	Classmate	52	4.84±0.61	5.30±0.93	4.08±1.07	4.53±0.91
	Others	17	4.25±0.67	4.33±1.40	3.73±1.01	4.76±1.60
	Nobody	22	4.38±0.77	4.78±1.23	3.76±1.06	4.18±1.40
	F		7.52*	6.20*	1.96	1.74

Table 5. Continued.

Background Data		environmental satisfaction	friendship satisfaction	School satisfaction	positive emotion	negative emotion
Academic Achievements	Low	4.40±1.12	5.23±1.01	4.36±1.35	3.44±0.87	2.85±0.78
	Medium	4.68±0.98	5.18±0.93	5.07±1.25	3.98±1.31	2.66±0.77
	High	4.50±0.93	5.32±0.93	5.25±1.28	4.13±1.25	2.88±1.16
	F	0.81	0.10	3.29*	2.0	0.72
Family Atmosphere	Harmony	4.90±0.89	5.41±0.78	5.29±1.20	4.17±1.30	2.60±0.81
	Quarrel Sometimes	4.28±1.00	4.98±0.95	4.50±1.28	3.61±1.04	2.82±0.71
	Quarrel Often	4.00±1.26	4.60±1.61	4.50±1.52	2.67±0.52	3.06±1.29
	F	6.89*	4.37*	5.67*	6.37*	1.62
Parents' Educational Level	Primary School	4.35±1.02	4.96±0.85	4.66±1.26	3.75±1.28	2.68±0.71
	Junior School	4.71±0.94	5.30±0.94	5.06±1.32	3.93±1.20	2.74±0.85
	Senior School	5.11±1.16	5.47±1.03	5.06±1.22	4.11±1.26	2.50±0.97
	F	2.97	2.31	1.71	0.44	0.21
Family Economic Status	Bad	3.71±1.49	4.87±0.84	4.14±2.03	3.14±1.21	4.61±0.65
	General	4.60±0.92	5.11±0.92	4.82±1.23	3.74±1.16	3.21±0.70
	Good	4.75±0.87	5.38±0.97	5.24±1.18	4.27±1.22	2.67±0.96
	Very Good	5.25±1.70	6.03±0.65	6.00±0.81	4.50±1.91	2.65±1.34
The Only Child	F	2.72*	1.99	2.59	2.56	1.33
	Yes	4.44±0.92	5.18±0.74	4.55±1.33	3.61±0.97	2.67±0.58
	No	4.63±1.02	5.20±0.97	5.00±1.28	3.91±1.27	2.72±0.84
	T	-0.75	-0.07	-1.34	-0.96	-0.23
Pour Out Object	Teacher	4.75±1.25	5.07±1.12	5.00±2.00	4.50±1.73	2.53±1.19
	Father	5.25±1.03	5.85±0.56	5.87±0.64	4.75±1.03	3.17±1.00
	Mother	5.25±0.75	5.85±0.55	5.58±1.16	4.50±1.24	2.50±0.62
	Classmate	4.67±0.87	5.20±0.87	5.17±0.98	3.88±1.24	2.58±0.76
	Others	4.11±1.11	4.76±1.09	4.00±1.17	3.41±0.79	3.01±0.90
	Nobody	4.22±1.02	4.92±0.94	4.36±1.59	3.40±1.33	2.77±0.72
	F	3.46*	3.41*	5.24*	2.97*	1.52

When an individual encounter a non-compliance, the object is tilted, as can be seen in Table 6, the selection of the object distribution. Of the respondents, 45.2% chose to talk to their

classmates, 19.1% of the students chose not to talk to them, and only 3.5% of the students chose to talk to their teachers. However, the students with the highest subjective well-being

first choose to talk to their parents, followed by teachers and classmates, and the lowest students are those who do not talk about them. It is worth noting that the proportion of students who do not report is 19.1%, and their subjective well-being is low. From Table 5, it can be seen that students' subjective

happiness has significant differences in academic, freedom and negative emotion, and there are significant differences in other dimensions. The students who choose to have the object generally score higher in each dimension than the students without the object.

Table 6. The proportion of tilting objects and SWB mean of junior high school students.

	Teacher	Father	Mother	Classmate	Others	Nobody
Proportion	3.5%	7.0%	10.4%	45.2%	14.8%	19.1%
SWB (\bar{x})	3.88	4.41	4.12	3.74	3.58	3.46

4. Discussion

4.1. Subjective Well-being of Junior Middle School Students

The scores of life satisfaction of junior high school students are divided equally between 4 and 5 points (total score is 7), life satisfaction ($\bar{x}=4.7809$), positive emotion ($\bar{x}=3.7986$) and negative emotion ($\bar{x}=2.7141$), which indicates that the level of subjective well-being of middle school students is at medium level, Experience more positive and less negative emotions. This is consistent with the relevant research results at home and abroad [14, 15]. From the perspective of various dimensions of life satisfaction, junior high school students experience a higher degree of family satisfaction and friendship satisfaction, which may be due to the fact that although junior high school students have enhanced their self-awareness and want to get rid of their parents' shackles, their psychological and physical development is not perfect enough, coupled with the influence of the outside world, it is often difficult to cope with themselves. At this stage, the recognition of the family and the formation of peer relations are conducive to enhancing their ability to deal with problems. It can be shown that interpersonal support has a great influence on the subjective well-being of junior high school students [16, 17]. Junior high school students have the lowest academic satisfaction, which may be related to our education system and educational concept. Although basic education has begun to emphasize quality education, it still attaches importance to examination scores. There are still many students who want to change their lives and destinies by reading. In this context, the academic pressure of students increases, which proves the existing research.

4.2. The Analysis of the Difference of the Subjective Well-being of the Junior Middle School Students in the Gender

Scholars have not reached a consensus on the relationship between gender and subjective well-being. This study shows that the school satisfaction and positive emotion of female students are significantly higher than those of male students, and the overall life satisfaction, freedom satisfaction and academic satisfaction of female students are also higher than those of male students, while the negative emotion is lower than that of male students. It can be seen that the overall subjective well-being of female students is better than that of male students. This may be related to the great differences in

the level of expectation, their own requirements and emotional experience between boys and girls. Although with the development of society, men and women have equal status, but due to the influence of role identity, the expectations of boys in society, family and school are often higher than those of girls. This may be the reason why boys' subjective well-being is slightly lower in general.

4.3. Analysis of Subjective Well-being of Junior Middle School Students Under Different Background Variables

The school satisfaction of students with good academic performance is significantly higher than that of students with low academic performance. Because academic performance is related to teachers and parents' expectations, better academic performance can be rewarded more, increase self-confidence, reduce students' own pressure, distract their attention, and the recognition of the school will be improved accordingly.

The students with family harmony score higher scores than those in the family in terms of friendship satisfaction, life satisfaction, school satisfaction, environmental satisfaction and positive emotion, which may be related to the differences in the way of communication between parents in different family settings. The students under the harmonious family will learn more and more effective communication skills. The way to deal with the problem is also more active and effective, and the students who live in the occasional quarrels and often quarrel with the family have learned the negative side of the parents.

There has been a constant debate about the relationship between economic income and subjective well-being. A study led by Yan Biaobin found that college students with low family income had lower life satisfaction than those with average or high family income [18]. However, some studies have shown that economic income has nothing to do with subjective happiness. The study is in support of the former, in the environment, family, life, school, freedom satisfaction, and the students with poor family economy score lower than the students with good family economy.

When faced with dissatisfaction, the subjective well-being of the students who choose to talk is better than other choices. It can be seen that the accumulation of negative emotions leads to the decrease of subjective well-being. Reasonable catharsis contributes to the improvement of subjective well-being.

5. Conclusion

This study investigated the subjective well-being of junior high school students deeply and found that the subjective well-being of junior high school students was generally satisfactory, and the specific conclusions were as follows.

- (1) The subjective well-being of junior high school students is at the middle level.
- (2) In terms of gender factor, boys and girls were satisfied with school (4.4608 ± 1.3273 , 5.1094 ± 1.0687 , $t = -2.903$, $p < 0.05$) and positive emotion (3.3464 ± 1.0852 , 4.1589 ± 1.1383 , $t = -3.882$, $p < 0.05$) there was significant difference in the difference.
- (3) Different background factors affect the degree of subjective well-being of junior high school students, family atmosphere, the object of the two factors are the most important dimensions of subjective well-being of junior high school students.

References

- [1] Diener E. 1Subjective well-being. 3rd ed., vol. 95. Psychol Bull, 1984, pp. 542-575.
- [2] Costa P T, McCrac R R. Influence of Extraversion Subjective Well-being: Happy and Unhappy People. 4rd ed., vol. 38. Journal of Personality and Social psychology, 1980, pp. 133-156.
- [3] Diener E, Suh EM. Culture and Subjective Well-Being, Cambridge, MA: M IT press, 2000, pp. 87-112.
- [4] Huebner E S, Drane W, Valois R F. Levels and Demographic Correlates of Adolescent Life Satisfaction Reports. 3rd ed., vol. 21. School Psychology International, 2002, pp. 281-292.
- [5] Tang Lei. A Summary of the Research on subjective well-being [j]. Scientific and technological Information (basic Theory study), 2009, (18): 55-56.
- [6] Zhou Tianmei, Li Qunying. A comparative study on the subjective well-being of chinese and young people. Journal of Neijiang Normal University, 2010, 26 (2): 42.
- [7] Yang Hairong. A study on subjective well-being and Mental Health of Junior Middle School students and their related factors [J]. Chinese Journal of Health Psychology, 2004, 12 (6): 416-418.
- [8] Hu Qihong, Zhang Liang. The relationship between life events and subjective well-being of middle school students [J]. Journal of Yichun College: 2010, 32 (1): 77-79.
- [9] Wang Jisheng, Ding Xinhua. A study on the relationship between subjective well-being and Personality characteristics of Junior Middle School students [J]. Chinese journal of clinical psychology, 2003, (2): 96 / 98.
- [10] Wang Xiaojuan, Xia Chun. Research status and analysis of subjective well-being difference [J]. Social psychology; 2004, (3): 9-12.
- [11] Jiang Yuhan, Li Yian. A study on the relationship between psychological resilience and subjective well-being of senior high school students [J]. Chinese Journal of Health Psychology, 2011, 19 (11): 1357-1360.
- [12] Yang Hairong. The study of the subjective well-being and mental health of middle school students and their related factors. 6rd ed., vol. 12. Chinese Journal of Health Psychology. 2004, pp. 416-418.
- [13] Liu Ying, Zhang Xiaoshan. The subjective well-being of urban junior high school students and its influencing factors. Youth research. vol. 2, 2013, pp. 1-8.
- [14] Zhao Yuzhen. The relationship between parenting style, mental toughness and subjective well-being of high school students. Central China Normal University 2014, pp. 32-38.
- [15] Xie Li, Ge Ming-gui. Study on the relationship between the style of the adolescent attribution, the psychological elasticity and the subjective well-being [J]. Journal of Shandong Agricultural University, 2019, 36 (07): 100-105.
- [16] Sun Yan, Liu Sha, Yang Lizhu. The influence of parental rearing style, peer acceptance and teacher expectation on pupils' personality. Psychological science. vol. 2, 2016, pp. 343-349.
- [17] Zhang Xingxu, Guo Haiying, Lin Danhua. A study on the relationship between parent-child, peer, teacher-student relationship and subjective well-being of adolescents [J]. Psychological development and education. 2019, 35 (04). Pp. 458-466.
- [18] Yan Biaobing, Zheng Xue, Qiu Lin. The influence of Family Economic income on the subjective well-being of College students. 2rd ed., vol. 10. Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology. 2002, pp. 118-119.