



Yoga practice and well-being, life satisfaction, and happiness: A descriptive study

Catarina Silva¹, António Rosado², Alexandre Ramos³

¹⁻³ Faculty of Human Kinetics, Lisbon University, Department Education Social and Humanity Sciences Estrada da Costa, , Cruz Quebrada, Dafundo, Portugal

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to verify if the practice of Yoga influences well-being, life satisfaction and happiness according to the following variables: practitioner or non-practitioner of Yoga, gender, age, volume and years of practice, as well as status (teacher or student). Participants were 281 adults (214 practitioners of Yoga and 67 non-practitioners) between the ages of 18 and 90, 81% women and 19% men. The Psychological Well-being (EMMBEP), Life Satisfaction Scale (SWLS), and Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS) were applied.

To analyze the data, the Statistic Package for Social Sciences, versão 25.00, was used, evaluating variance. The results in the studied population showed that the time of Yoga practice influences the overall well-being and, in particular, one of its dimensions: joy of life. It is also evidenced that being a yoga teacher can increase life satisfaction. Gender influences the sense of balance and personal happiness, the female gender with higher values.

Keywords: questionnaires, well-being, life satisfaction, happiness, yoga

1. Introduction

Internationally, there is growing recognition that complete mental health requires more than the absence of mental distress and disorders (World Health Organization, 2004). There must also be signs of positive functioning and a positive evaluation of one's life, which constitutes mental well-being (World Health Organization, 2004 World Health Organization (WHO).

Well-being, happiness and life satisfaction are some of the main focuses on positive psychology, according to Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) ^[1]. The connections between these constructs have yet to be explored in much depth and the study of their relation can prove beneficial in driving further work that strengthens this field. Well-being may present two interrelated components, an affective one and cognitive one ^[2].

Luhnam, Hofmann, Eid, and Lucas ^[3] indicate that well-being is influenced by two types of factors: intrinsic (psychological aspects, values, beliefs, religion, coping strategies and diseases) and extrinsic (sociodemographic, cultural and life events). Well-being results from the dynamic balance between psychological, physical and social resources and psychological, physical and social changes, according to Dodge, Daly, Thuyton, and Sanders ^[4].

Well-being is also characterized by two components ^[5]: hedonic and eudemonic, whereas the hedonic component consists in the sensation of pleasure, such the experience of pleasant feelings or a balance between pleasant and unpleasant feelings; in the eudemonist component, it is a question of seeking personal fulfillment, regardless of the pleasure involved.

Life satisfaction represents a global evaluative attitude towards various domains of life ^[6] and is, according to Practor, Linley and Maltby ^[7], a central construct of positive psychology, constituting the cognitive component of subjective well-being ² or an indicator ^[8].

Life satisfaction, according to Shin and Johnson ^[9], is

considered a process of cognitive judgment, in which individuals evaluate the quality of their lives based on their own criteria. Life satisfaction is evaluated as the degree of positive emotions experienced by the individual ^[10]. Also Veenhoven and Ouwenell ^[11] refer life satisfaction as the realization of a positive qualitative evaluation of the object the life as a whole.

Life satisfaction, according to Diener ^[132], reflects a long-term perspective, depending on the circumstances of life, which reflect conscious values and personal goals. Changes in life satisfaction occur at all times, but this involves a relatively consistent long-term component ^[7]. The same authors indicate that the quality of involvement, family relationships and favorable social conditions, like a healthy lifestyle, a good physical health and the participation in sports activities, can further support life satisfaction.

Happiness is understood as a synonymous of joy, satisfaction or positive well-being, combined with the sense of a meaningful and worthwhile life ^[13]. Happiness is considered by Veenhoveen ^[14] as the degree to which the person evaluates the overall quality of life in a positive way, that is, how much one likes his or her life. Happiness, according to Diener ^[12], can be considered as a trait or a state. When understood as a state, the happy person is one who has moments of happiness, with a deep involvement in life ^[15].

In order to identify the causes of happiness, Lyubomirsky and Lepper ^[13] attribute more influence to intuition and daily experiences, than circumstances, demographic variables and life events, whit great importance to person's subjectivity.

Happiness can be achieved by fulfilling important goals, desires, and needs ^[16], or it can happen as a result of the balance between positive and negative affects ^[17].

Similarly to well-being here are two perspectives of happiness involved ^[18]: hedonic and eudemonic. The first involves a good life, oriented to material goods, with a search for maximum pleasure and minimization of pain. In

eudemonism, instead, people seek to live according to their true selves, seeking a life with meaning, of personal growth from within. Traditionally, the approaches to happiness have adopted only one of these two conceptualizations, although some theories have covered the two concepts^[19,20].

The study of contemplative practices, such as yoga, offers much of positive psychology (Kielty, Gilligan, & Staton, 2017). Yoga consists of ethical guidelines, including truthfulness, non-violence, and non-attachment. This foundation of ethical and moral guidelines, coupled with the postures, breathing, and relaxation exercises, can cultivate physical and mental balance (Gard, Noggle, Park, Vago, & Wilson, 2014). The practice of Yoga has been related to the increase of well-being, satisfaction with life and happiness in populations of diverse ages, as indicated by Silva and Rosado^[21], and can positively influence the quality of life of healthy people^[22]. Nevertheless, there is limited literature on the effects that can be considered to ensure that yoga practices are in alignment with stakeholders' needs (Forman, Olin, Hoagwood, Crow, & Saka, 2009).

1.2 Objectives

This study used an exploratory approach to document the benefits of yoga practice, specifically, studying if there are significant differences in well-being, life satisfaction and happiness, between practitioners and non-practitioners of Yoga, and according to gender, age, years of practice, weekly practice of Yoga and the fact of teaching or not Yoga.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Participants and Sample

Participants in the study were 281 adult individuals, 227 of the female gender (80.5%) and 54 of the male gender (19.1%), between the ages of 18 and 90 (Mean age= 46.08, *SD* = 13.83). The sample was divided into two groups: 214 yoga practitioners, 176 female and 38 male (Mean age = 46.46, *SD* = 13.65) and 67 non-practitioners, 51 female and 16 male (Mean age = 44.86, *SD* = 14.46). Yoga practitioners with a mean of 7.16 years of practice (*SD* = 8.26), an average number of sessions per week of 2.69 (*SD* = 2.01), and a mean duration of sessions of 66.00 (*SD* = 20.75). All participants signed a written informed consent form. The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Human Motricity Faculty of the University of Lisbon.

2.2 Measurement tools

The demographic questions of the questionnaire focused on age, gender, practice and teaching of Yoga. In the case of Yoga practitioners, specific information was requested regarding the time of practice of Yoga (years / months), the number of sessions per week and its approximate duration (in minutes).

Psychological Wellbeing Scale (EMMBEP)^[23] consists of 25 items on a Likert scale of five points, ranging from: never (1) to almost always (5). It analysis six factors: joy of life (8 items: 5, 12, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25); aspects of sociability (4 items: 13, 14, 15 and 16); sense of control of self and events (3 items: 17, 18 and 19); aspects of social involvement and motivation (3 items: 9, 10 and 11); self-esteem (4 items: 1, 2, 3 and 4) and sense of balance (3 items: 6, 7 and 8). The original version has an internal consistency of $\alpha = 0.93$, with values between 0.71 (social involvement) and 0.85 (joy of life).

The Portuguese adaptation of Monteiro, Tavares and Pereira^[24] was applied, which in a confirmatory factor analysis certified the six dimensions, with good psychometric qualities similar to the original scale.

Life Satisfaction Scale (SWLS)^[12] evaluate the individual's global cognitive assessment of their own lives, understanding satisfaction globally with a single factor. It consists of five positively worded statements on a Likert 7-point scale, which varies between strongly disagree (1) and strongly agree (7). In the original version, it presents good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.87$).

Validation was used for the Portuguese population of Neto^[25], who found good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.78$) and very good convergent validity. Later, Figueiras, Santana, Corte-Real, Brustad and Fonseca^[26], in a confirmatory factorial analysis, confirmed the single factor of the initial version ($\alpha = 0.82$).

Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS) Lyubomirsky and Lepper^[27] aims to evaluate in a global way the happiness experienced. It consists of four statements on a Likert scale of 7 points, ranging from: a very unhappy person (1) to a very happy person (7), presenting the following dimensions: characterization of self with absolute classification and relationship with the personal happiness and the description of the characterization of happy and unhappy people (happiness in others). Statement number 4 has reversed score. The personal happiness is being averaged for all scores. The internal consistency in the original version varied between $\alpha = 0.79$ and $\alpha = 0.94$ with different samples.

The version used was Pais-Ribeiro version^[28], which in a confirmatory factorial analysis confirmed the only factor of the previous version ($\alpha = 0.76$), with good adjustment (*CFI* = 0.97 and *SRMR* = 0.03).

In the scale that evaluates happiness, we considered two factors: personal happiness and perception of the happiness of others. The values of internal consistency were considered satisfactory.

2.3 Purposed Statistical Procedure

The data were analyzed with. Statistic Package for Social Sciences, versão 25.00, to determine the internal consistency of the scales, Cronbach's alpha was used. In order to verify if the collected data followed the assumptions of normality, the asymmetry and kurtosis values were verified. Additionally a supplement, the quartile-quartile (QQ) diagrams were analyzed, where there is a linear distribution, meaning that both sets of quartiles derive from the same distribution and the Shapiro-Wilk Test. In this test, it was found that normality did not occur in all distributions. However, ANOVA is quite robust in relation to non-compliance with this requirement^[29]

Descriptive statistics of central tendency were used to describe the demographic variables: mean and standard deviation. The intergroup differences were studied with analysis of variance (ANOVA), verified the requirements of normality and homogeneity of variances, and were verified post-hoc comparisons using the DMS test for the independent variables, with more than two groups: age grouped into five age levels (less than 30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60, and over 60 years), weekly practice volume (multiplication of number of sessions per week by session duration), and volume of practice (multiplying the number of sessions per week by the duration of each session and by

years of practice). The size of the effect was calculated by the square partial eta. It was also analyzed the association between well-being, life satisfaction and happiness with analysis of Pearson's correlations. All statistical analyses considered $p < 0.05$ as significance level.

3. Results & Discussion

3.1 Results

In what concerns normality, it was verified that the distribution of variables did not present any accentuated

deviation to normality. The value of the partial square eta ranged from 0.00 to 0.17, with most values considered small and medium, according to Cohen ³⁰ (small: 0.01, medium: 0.06; and high: 0.14).

Overall characterization of participants among all participants in the study, when gender was considered, there were significant differences in the perception of happiness of others ($F = 6.24, p = 0.03$) and in sensation of balance ($F = 4.76, p = 0.03$), that two are dimensions of well-being, with higher averages for the female gender (see table 1).

Table 1: Mean variance, internal consistency and effect size on the joy of life, Life Satisfaction and Happiness Scales of all participants by gender.

	Female	Male	F	p	ηp^2
	M ± SD	M ± SD			
Well-being	97.44±11.60	97.00±14.92	0.55	0.82	0.00
	30.85±4.57	31.11±5.86	0.13	0.72	0.00
Sociability	16.48±2.32	16.00±3.03	1.61	0.21	0.01
Control	11.14±1.89	11.17±2.66	0.01	0.92	0.00
Involvement	11.64±1.95	11.85±2.17	0.50	0.48	0.00
Self esteem	15.49±2.39	15.67±2.01	0.26	0.61	0.00
Balance	11.85±1.84	11.20±2.33	4.85	0.03	0.02
Life satisfaction	25.99±5.54	25.87±4.99	0.02	0.89	0.00
Personal happiness	5.44±0.75	5.27±0.82	2.17	0.14	0.01
Others happiness	5.59±1.05	5.24±1.16	4.76	0.03	0.17

Considering age, there were significant differences in sensation of balance ($F = 2.46, p = 0.050$) and in self-esteem ($F = 2.40, p = 0.046$), life satisfaction ($F = 6.13, p = 0.00$) and personal happiness ($F = 5.05, p = 0.00$). In the post-hoc tests, differences in self-esteem were found in the age groups between 31-40 and 41-50 ($p = 0.02$), between 31-40 and 51-60 ($p = 0.02$) and 31-40 to over 60 ($p = 0.02$). The self-esteem had a maximum value in the interval between 31-40 years and then decreased reaching the minimum value at more than 60 years. The opposite was found in sense of balance, with averages increasing with age, being higher in the 60s, with significant differences between the less 30s and 31s-40s ($p = 0.04$), among the 30s and 51-60 ($p = 0.01$) and between the ages of less 30s and more 60s ($p = 0.01$). In life satisfaction, the younger participants less 30 years

had averages higher than those between 41-50 years ($p = 0.00$), between less 30 years and 51-60 ($p = 0.047$), between 31-40 and more 60s ($p = 0.04$), and between 41 and 51-60 ($p = 0.047$), between 31-40 and more than 60 ($p = 0.04$). It was verified that satisfaction life satisfaction was higher at 31-40, then decreasing with age, but not reaching initial values.

In personal happiness, there were differences between participants less than 30 years of age and those between 41-50 ($p = 0.04$), between 30 and 51-60 ($p = 0.01$), between 31-40 and 41-50 ($p = 0.00$), between 31-40 and 51-60 ($p = 0.00$), and between 31-40 and more than 60 ($p = 0.00$). Values were higher at 31-40 and then lower until they reach a lower value at 51-60 and go up slightly again.

Table 2: Mean variance, internal consistency and effect size on the Well-being, Life Satisfaction and Happiness Scales of all participants by age group.

Age Group	<30	31-40	41-50	51-60	+60	F	P	ηp^2
Group	M ± SD	M ± SD	M ± SD	M ± SD	M ± SD			
Well-being	96.73±11.06	100.22±12.20	96.30±12.58	96.29±13.87	96.73±11.26	1.18	0.32	0.02
Joy life	30.84±4.75	31.82±4.82	30.75±4.60	30.41±5.16	30.56±4.81	0.83	0.51	0.01
Sociability	16.61±2.13	16.97±2.70	16.24±2.68	15.94±2.26	16.18±2.37	1.67	0.16	0.02
Control	10.54±1.83	11.43±2.11	11.32±2.09	11.08±2.23	11.11±1.81	1.35	0.25	0.02
Involvement	11.93±1.97	12.03±1.88	11.21±2.01	11.65±2.06	11.62±2.01	1.57	0.18	0.02
Self esteem	15.85±2.28	16.18±2.08	15.22±2.54	15.23±2.42	15.52±2.32	2.46	0.05	0.04
Balance	11.00±1.79	11.78±1.98	11.57±1.90	11.98±2.01	12.16±1.94	2.40	0.05	0.03
Life satisfaction	27.63±4.84	27.78±4.61	23.68±6.17	25.53±5.36	25.62±4.90	6.13	0.00	0.08
Personal happiness	5.59±0.67	5.70±0.79	5.21±0.87	5.22±0.61	5.28±0.71	5.05	0.00	0.07
Others happiness	5.48±1.14	5.59±1.02	5.67±1.07	5.50±1.12	5.31±1.07	0.83	0.50	0.01

Note: age groups = <30 (under 30 years), 31-40 (between 31 and 40 years), 41-50 (between 41 and 50 years), 51-60 (between 50 and 60 years), and + 60 (over 60 years).

To verify if there were associations between well-being, satisfaction with life and happiness, in its various

dimensions, an analysis of Pearson's correlations was made. All variables correlate positively with each other.

Table 3: Correlations between variables and their dimensions: Well-being, Life Satisfaction and Happiness

Dimen.	I	I.1	I.2	I.3	I.4	I.5	I.6	II	III.1	III.2
I.WB	-									
I.1.JL	.92**	-								
I.2.Soc.	.76**	.66**	-							
I.3.Con	.82**	.74**	.55**	-						
I.4.Inv.	.60**	.41**	.31**	.39**	-					
I.5.SE.	.78**	.66**	.52**	.60**	.46**	-				
I.6.BL.	.64**	.49**	.40**	.46**	.36**	.35**	-			
II.LS.	.47**	.47**	.31**	.33**	.23**	.49**	.21**	-		
III.PH.	.45**	.42**	.42**	.30**	.19**	.46**	.18**	.57**	-	
III.2-OH.	.09	.12	.04	.05	.05	.13*	-.00	.12*	.13*	-

Note: ** the correlation is significant at level 0.001, * the correlation is significant at level 0.05
 Dimen. = Dimension, I. Well-being, I.1. Joy of life, I.2. Sociability, I.3 Control, I.4. Involvement, I.5 Self-esteem, I.6 Balance, II. Life satisfaction, III.1 Personal happiness, III.2 others happiness.

Comparing Groups Considering Yoga Practice

Regarding the overall comparison between practitioners and non-practitioners of Yoga in the variables of well-being, life satisfaction and happiness, there were no significant differences. But there is a non-significant trend of higher scores in Yoga practitioners on overall well-being, sociability, sense of balance, joy of life, sense of control, social involvement and motivation, self-esteem, satisfaction

with life, personal happiness and happiness of others. (Table 4).
 In general well-being, considering intense practice groups, on one hand, practitioners with more than 12 years of practice and non-practitioners revealed little difference. (F= -1.90, p = 0.06). Concerning joy of life, considering the same groups, there were significant differences (F = -2.19, p = 0.03).

Table 4: Mean, standard deviation, asymmetry values, kurtosis, analysis of variance, internal consistency and effect size on the Wheel-being, Life Satisfaction and Happiness Scales, and Yoga practice

	Practing	Not practicing	Asym	Kurto	F	p	ηp ²
	M ± SD	M ± SD	Metry	Sis			
Well-being	97.49±12.11	96.91±12.88	-0.32	0.31	0.14	0.74	0.00
Joy of life	31.01±4.71	30.54±5.23	-0.41	0.73	0.49	0.49	0.00
Sociability	16.36±2.52	16.45±2.36	-0.74	1.64	0.06	0.81	0.00
Control	11.15±2.04	11.10±2.12	-0.37	0.61	0.03	0.42	0.00
Involvement	11.73±1.97	11.51±2.07	-0.16	-0.40	0.66	0.86	0.00
Self esteem	15.60±2.89	15.28±2.43	-0.09	-0.25	0.94	0.33	0.00
Balance	11.63±1.94	12.03±1.98	-0.44	0.42	2.14	0.15	0.01
Life satisfaction	26.06±5.44	25.65±5.44	-0.74	0.14	0.28	0.60	0.00
Personal happiness	5.43±0.77	5.34±0.75	-0.18	0.89	0.59	0.44	0.00
Others happiness	5.59±1.08	5.33±1.05	-0.60	0.42	2.99	0.08	0.01

In terms of the number practice years, we found significant differences in overall well-being (F = 2.63, p = 0.03) and in their joy of life dimension (F = 2.87, p = 0.02). In post-hoc tests, practitioners with more than 12 years of practice had the highest means: the difference was significant

considering the groups 1.1-2 years (p = 0.02) and 6-12 years (p = 0.049). In the joy of life, participants with more than 12 years of practice presented a higher average than those with 1.1-2 years (p = 0.01).

Table 5: Mean, standard deviation, analysis of variance, internal consistency and effect size on Welfare Scales, Life Satisfaction, Happiness, and the number of years of Yoga practice

Years pract.	0.1-1	1.1-2	3-6	7-11	+12	F	p	ηp ²
	M ± SD	M ± SD	M ± SD	M ± SD	M ± SD			
Wheel-being	98.29±11.92	94.97±13.82	99.02±11.51	96.31±9.53	101.82±10.59	2.63	0.03	0.06
Joy of life	31.38±3.99	29.97±6.14	31.47±4.38	30.72±4.10	32.81±4.04	2.87	0.02	0.07
Sociability	16.52±2.06	16.60±2.21	16.28±2.36	16.79±2.38	16.75±2.51	0.88	0.50	0.02
Control	11.17±2.16	10.72±2.08	11.27±1.74	11.03±1.71	11.94±2.00	1.96	0.09	0.05
Involvem.	11.98±2.16	11.63±2.03	12.05±1.80	11.33±1.63	12.06±1.98	1.64	0.15	0.04
Self esteem	5.74±2.76	5.53±2.17	5.81±2.24	5.44±2.28	5.82±1.53	0.75	0.59	0.02
Balance	11.50±1.88	12.25±2.34	11.81±2.08	11.51±1.47	12.39±1.82	1.83	0.11	0.04
Life satisfaction	5.48±0.72	5.54±0.84	5.54±0.65	5.47±0.76	5.60±0.61	0.39	0.86	0.00
Personal happiness	5.55±0.90	5.63±1.32	5.72±1.07	5.53±1.24	5.58±1.05	0.19	0.97	0.00
Others happiness	25.88±5.52	25.78±6.25	26.05±5.14	25.72±4.74	28.42±4.04	2.17	0.06	0.05

Regarding the number of weekly sessions, duration of sessions, weekly practice volume and total volume, there were no significant differences among practitioners.

When comparing Yoga students with Yoga teachers, there were significant differences in life satisfaction (F = 4.15; p = 0.04), with a higher average in Yoga teachers.

Table 6: Mean, standard deviation, values, analysis of variance, internal consistency and effect size on the Welfare Scales, Life satisfaction and Happiness, and students and Yoga teachers.

	Student	Teacher	F	P	ηp^2
	M ± SD	M ± SD			
Weel-being	97.33±11.85	98.59±13.97	0.26	0.61	0.00
Joy of life	30.92±4.57	31.63±5.61	0.54	0.47	0.00
Sociability	16.35±2.44	16.44±3.05	0.03	0.86	0.00
Control	11.16±2.01	11.15±2.25	0.00	0.99	0.00
Involvement	11.76±1.99	11.52±1.87	0.37	0.55	0.00
Self esteem	15.52±2.34	16.11±1.83	1.56	0.21	0.01
Balance	11.62±1.90	11.74±2.26	0.10	0.75	0.01
Life satisfaction	25.78±5.61	28.04±3.51	4.15	0.04	0.01
Personal happiness	5.39±0.77	5.65±0.76	2.63	0.11	0.01
Others happiness	5.63±1.03	5.33±1.37	1.73	0.19	0.01

3.2 Discussion

The present study aimed to verify if the practice of Yoga influences well-being, life satisfaction and happiness. Participants were initially compared to gender, with significant differences in sense of balance and in the perception of happiness of the others, with the female gender always showing higher levels. The reflection on happiness seems to include an evaluation of the perception of the happiness of others, and this perception influences the evaluation of their own happiness. In fact, Lyubomirsky, King, and Diener [27] indicate that happy people feel more positive and judge others favorably, a condition that may justify the results found in the perception of happiness. The evidence is that this pattern is more prominent in the female gender.

When comparing age, there were variations in the sense of balance, self-esteem, life satisfaction and in the perception of happiness in others. The differences in the various dimensions were differentiated according to age. Aged practionners had higher values?

Regarding the sensation of balance, it increased with age, which confirms the results of Simões [3], who says that as people age, they achieve a better balance. Considering the practice of Yoga, the results show that there are no significant differences between practitioners and non-practitioners of Yoga on well-being, satisfaction with life and the perception of happiness.

Thus, in general, the practice of Yoga does not seem to significantly differentiate the perceptions between practitioners and non-practitioners. Obviously, life satisfaction, the perception of happiness and well-being having a multifactorial origin, are explained by other determinants with a more significant impact on these variables. Much current knowledge about its effects is based on short-term practitioners who have participated in yoga-based treatments or programs. When we consider long term effects the results can be very different.

The number of weekly sessions, duration of sessions, weekly volume and total volume did not show significant differences, showing that the quality of the involvement as crucial importance in the explanation of the positive outcomes. Moreover, the potential importance of the degree to which participants find such engagement personally meaningful toward these relations has been overlooked and must be included in other studies. Analyzing only the practitioners of Yoga, considering the years of practice, we found that the group with twelve or more years presented higher means of global well-being and joy of life, a dimension of well-being, in accordance with Büssing,

Hedstuck, Khalsa, Osterman, and Heusser [36], who refer that the impact of Yoga practice depends on the degree of involvement in the practice itself, where the years of practice may influence the increase in the values of the referred constructs.

When comparing to Yoga teachers with Yoga students, the former have higher levels of satisfaction with life. Moliver, Mika, Chartrand, Housseman, and Khalsa [37] consider that the practice of Yoga seems to be essential for life satisfaction, suggesting that perhaps they are the teachers with the highest values of life satisfaction.

It was also verified that the studied variables all correlate significantly with each other, although with not very high values. In the literature consulted, there was evidence of the relationship between well-being, life satisfaction and happiness. In fact, Veenhoven and Oueneel [11] report that the concept of life satisfaction has been used in an undifferentiated, indistinct and interchangeable way compared to well-being and happiness. Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi [1] affirm, in this context, that life satisfaction operationalizes happiness. Also, for Veenhoven and Ouwebeel [11], happiness is understood as the decisive component of a good life, confused with subjective well-being. The study of the relationship between these constructs is still necessary, considering the study of divergent and convergent validities to support the assumption that these are separate, yet interrelated constructs.

Researchers have primarily used quantitative methodologies to examine the effects yoga training has on targeted outcomes, instead of examining the process of program implementation (Maynard, B. R., Solis, M. R., Miller, V. L., & Brendel, K. E., 2017). Yoga-based interventions for improving cognition, academic achievement, behavior, and socioemotional functioning of must also be conceived and researched.

As future work, it would be pertinent to carry out studies with more significant sample sizes and longitudinal studies, allowing to verify the evolution over time and the analysis of the persistence of the effects, in the medium and long terms. Other variables that may influence the psychosocial effects of yoga as the type of Yoga, the effectiveness of intervention programs in different

4. Conclusions

The study showed that there are no significant differences between practitioners and non-practitioners, except for the differences found between non-practitioners and practitioners with more than 12 years of practice, with

significant differences in well-being and joy of life. The practice of Yoga on continuum basis as a tool to enhance people's quality of life can thus be considered as an activity that can improve overall well-being, life satisfaction and happiness, which revealed to be interrelated constructs.

5. References

1. Seligman M, Csikszentmihalyi M. Positive psychology: an introduction. *Am Psychol*, 2000.
2. Pavot W, Diener E. Review of the Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Psychol Assess*. 1993; 5(2):164-172.
3. Luhmann M, Hofmann W, Eid M, Lucas R. Subjective well-being and adaptation to life events: a meta-analysis. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 2011; 3:592-616.
4. Dodge R, Daly A, Huyton J, Sanders L. The challenge of defining wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*. 2012; 2(3):222-235.
5. Lent R. toward a unifying theoretical and practical perspective on well-being and psychosocial adjustment. *J Couns Psychol*. 2004; 5(4):482-509.
6. Brief A, Butcher A, George J, Link K. Integrating Bottom-Up and Top-Down Theories of Subjective Well-Being: The Case of Health. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1993; 64:646-653.
7. Proctor C, Lindley P, Maltby J. Youth life satisfaction: a review of the literature. *Journal of Happiness Studies*. 2009; 10:583-630.
8. Erdogan B, Bauer T, Truxillo D, Mansfield L. Whistle While You Work: A review of the life satisfaction literature. *Journal of Management*. 2012; 38(4):1038-1083.
9. Shin D, Johnson D. Avowed happiness as an overall assessment of the quality of life. *Soc Indic Res*. 1978; 5:475-492.
10. Frisch M. Quality of Life Therapy: applying a life satisfaction approach to positive psychology and cognitive therapy. New York, NY, US: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 2006.
11. Veenhoven R, Ouweneel P. Appreciation-of-life and length-of-life in nations varying in state-welfare-effort. *Soc Indic Res*. 1995; 36:1-49.
12. Diener E, Emmons R, Larsen R, Griffin S. The satisfaction with life scale. *J Pers Assess*. 1985; 49(1):71-75.
13. Lyubomirsky S, Lepper H. A measure of subjective happiness: preliminary reability and construct validation. *Soc Indic Res*. 1999; 46(2):137-155.
14. Veenhoven R. Happiness: also known as 'life-satisfaction' and 'subjective well-being'. In: Land K, Michalos A, Sirgy, J. editores. *Handbook of Social Indicators and Quality of Life research* Springer. Netherlands, 2012, p. 63-77.
15. Nakamura J, Csikszentmihalyi M. The concept of flow. In: Snyder C, Lopez S, editors. *Handbook of positive psychology*. New York: University Press, 2002, p. 89-105.
16. Emmons R, McCullough M. Counting blessings versus burdens: an experimental investigation of gratitude and subjective well-being in daily life. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 2003; 84:377-389
17. Keyes C, Shmokin D, Ryff C. Optimizing well-being: the empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2002; 82(6):1007-1022.
18. Fave D, Brdar I, Freir T, Vella-Brodrick D, Wissing M. The eudaimonic and hedonic components of happiness: qualitative and quantitative findings. *Soc Indic Res*. 2011; 100(2):185-207.
19. Keyes C. Mental Illness and/or Mental Health? Investigating Axioms of the Complete State Model of Health. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2005; 73(3):539-548.
20. Seligman M, Steen T, Park N, Peterson C. Positive psychology progress: empirical validation of interventions. *Am Psychol*. 2005; 60(5):410-421.
21. Silva C, Rosado A. Efeitos psicossociais da prática de yoga: uma revisão sistemática. *Revista Iberoamericana de Psicología del Ejercicio y el Deporte*. 2017; 12(2):203-216.
22. Coelho C, Lessa T, Carvalho R, Coelho L, Scari R, Fernandes N, Júnior J. Qualidade de vida em mulheres praticantes de Hatha Yoga. *Motriz*. 2011; 17(1):33-38.
23. Massé R, Poulin C, Dassa C, Lambert J, Bélair S, Battaglini A. Élaboration et validation d'un outil de mesure du bien-être psychologique. *Can J de Public Health*. 1998; 89(5):352-357. DOI: 10.17269/ciph.89.1014
24. Monteiro S, Tavares J, Pereira A. Adaptação portuguesa da Escala de Medida de Manifestação de Bem-estar Psicológico com estudantes universitários—EMMBEP. *Psicologia, Saúde & Doenças*. 2012; 13(1):66-77.
25. Neto F. Satisfaction with life scale: psychometric properties in an adolescent sample. *J Youth Adolesc*. 1993; 22(2):125-134.
26. Figueiras T, Santana P, Corte-Real N, Dias C, Brustad R, Fonseca. A. Análise da estrutura factorial e da invariância da versão portuguesa da Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLSp) quando aplicada a adultos de ambos os sexos. *Revista Portuguesa de Ciências do Desporto*. 2010; 10(3):11-30.
27. Lyubomirsky S, King L, Diener E. The benefits of frequent positive affect: does happiness lead to success? *Psychol Bull*. 2005; 131(6):803-855.
28. Pais-Ribeiro J. Validação transcultural da Escala de Felicidade Subjectiva de Lyubomirsky e Lepper. *Psicologia, Saúde & Doenças*. 2012; 13(2):157-168.
29. Blanca J, Alarcon J, Bono R, Bendayan R. Non-normal data: is ANOVA a valid option. *Psicothema*. 2017; 29(4):552-557.
30. Cohen J. Statistical power analyses for the behavioral Sciences. Secons edition. Lawrence Erlbaun Associates Publishers, 1988.
31. Simões A. Factos e factores do desenvolvimento intelectual do adulto. *Psychologica*. 2006; 42:25-43.
32. Diener E, Inglehart R, Tay L. Theory and validity of Life Satisfaction Scales. *Soc Indic Res*, 2012, 112(3).
33. Khan A, Husain A. Social support as a moderator of positive psychological strengths and subjective well-being. *Psychological Reports*, 106(2), 534-542.
34. Kutek S, Turnbull D, Fairweather-Schmidt A. rural men's subjective well-being and the role of social support. *Aust J Rural Health*. 2011; 19(1):20-26.
35. Charles S, Carstensen L. Social and emotional aging. *Annu Rev Psychol*. 2010; 61:383-409. DOI: 10.1146/annurev. Psych.093008.100448
36. Bussing A, Hedtstuck A, Khalsa S, Osterman T, Heusser P. Development of specific aspects of

- spirituality during a 6-month intensive Yoga practice. Evid Based Complement Alternat Med, 2012, 981523.
37. Moliver N, Mika E, Chartrand M, Hausman R, Khalsa S. Yoga experience as a predictor of psychological wellness in women over 45 years. Int J Yoga. 2013; 6(1):11-19. Available from: <http://www.ijoy.org.in/text.asp?2013/6/1/11/105937>.