ABSTRACT

Subjective well-being was originally considered to be an individual benchmark in achieving satisfaction in a stable life. However, there are several factors that affect the decrease and increase in subjective well-being, such as social support and personality. This study aims to determine the effect of openness personality as a mediator of the relationship between social support and subjective well-being. This type of research is ex-post facto. The research location was at SMAN 1 Pacitan Regency with a total sample of 237 students. The sample collection technique uses simple random sampling. The data collection technique uses a scale consisting of an openness personality scale, a social support scale, and a subjective well-being scale. The instrument validation technique uses the previous measuring instrument validity and reliability based on the Cronbach Alpha coefficient. Data analysis used multiple regression with a significance level of 0.05. The results showed that there was a significant positive influence on openness personality as a mediator of the relationship between social support and subjective well-being. The mediation model in this study is known as perfect mediation because the value on path c', namely the variable social support with subjective well-being and then included the openness personality variable, found insignificant results. The percentage of the contribution of the social support variable to the subjective well-being variable which was initially 22.7% became 49.2% after including openness personality as a mediator.
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INTRODUCTION

Every individual goes through pleasant and unpleasant events in life. In responding to unpleasant events, in general there are two forms of attitude that arise, namely some can control it, while others are not able to control it. If a person is unable to control these unpleasant events, dissatisfaction will occur so that he is less happy in living life.

The above is closely related to individual well-being. The concept which in English is called well-being generally means happiness and a peaceful situation. In addition, well-being can also be known using the hedonic approach. This approach focuses on subjective well-being which can be interpreted as a more dominant experience that has a positive impact and increases life satisfaction (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

Subjective well-being can determine a person's happiness because happiness is part of the subjective well-being that a person feels about his life (Khanam & Bukhari, 2015). Although well-being is subjective, its existence can be proven objectively through behavioral traits and everything that has been achieved in life. There are several factors that are taken into consideration by researchers to find out if someone has achieved happiness and satisfaction in life, such as changes in social roles including getting married and getting a job, wealth, even physical health to well-being (Hill et al., 2014).

In fact, happiness and important aspects of life are dynamically intertwined. This is found in studies that examine the effect of social support on subjective well-being. (Gülaçti, 2010) found that 43% of social support predicts subjective well-being. Social support also has a significant effect on the subjective well-being of adolescents, namely 23.9% (Laurita & Rusli, 2021). In addition, the level of social support can affect a person's well-being (Tefbana et al., 2021).

Subjective well-being is determined by an individual's cognitive and affective assessment of his or her life. The two are interrelated (Diener et al., 2017). Indicators of subjective well-being are how high satisfaction, joy, and emotions are felt. That is, individuals are said to have high subjective well-being when they feel satisfied, happy, and do not experience more positive emotions. Conversely, a person is said to have low well-being if he is not satisfied with his life, he does not have more joy because he often feels negative feelings. This relates to the definition of happiness which means a situation where individuals feel happy which is marked by satisfaction with their lives.

Someone who is happy has no difficulty in building social relationships, helping others, and being productive in the work environment and successfully adapting to all changes (Armenta et al., 2015). Initially, subjective well-being was thought to be a consistent trait, but there are things that affect the rise and fall of subjective well-being, such as marital status, occupation, and personality (Diener et al., 2012).

Personality is a trait model that tends to be fixed so that it can become a characteristic that can describe the stability of one's behavior (Feist, 2019). There are various explanations about the personality of the characters. One of them is as stated by McCrae and Costa which states that each individual can be understood in
the form of the Big Five Personality Theory (Pervin et al., 2012). The findings regarding the Big Five reveal that there is a relationship between personality and subjective well-being regardless of age. (Lampropoulou, 2018).

The five traits are neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Neuroticism associated with bad traits. For example, prone to anxiety, stiffness, emotional, sentimental, feeling insecure, and not feeling good enough. Extraversion shows the trait of liking to be sociable, not passive, happy to talk, people-oriented, not pessimistic, likes attention and high affiliation. Openness to experience describes the trait of imaginative, creative, original, interested in many things, and high curiosity. Agreeableness describes the trait of being soft-hearted, trusting, helpful, forgiving and innocent. Then conscientiousness shows the trait of being assertive, persistent, ambitious, hardworking, organized and reliable (Cummings & Sanders, 2019).

In general, neuroticism appears to have a significant correlation with negative aspects of subjective well-being. On the other hand, extraversion is closely related to positive aspects of subjective well-being. Meanwhile, the other three personalities have a low but significant correlation with subjective well-being (Karademas, 2006).

Openness personality are characterized by having a higher curiosity, providing opinions and values that are rarely thought of by others (Farmer & Tierney, 2017). In addition, someone who is open has characteristics that display a strong curiosity for knowledge, creative, and flexible thinking (LePine, 2003). Therefore, people with the opennes personality type will be eager to learn new things and have a high interest in participating in experiencing various things that have a positive impact on them (Ashton, 2018). In addition, individuals who are open will find it easier to share their insights because they have experienced various events through their curiosity to gain knowledge from those around them (Williamson, 2018).

Individuals who have high subjective well-being can control their emotions and are good at dealing with various events in life (Longo et al., 2016). Therefore, high subjective well-being is important for adolescents, especially in Indonesia, so that they can overcome negative emotions and complete their developmental stages properly. Subjective well-being can be described as a person's feeling of joy over a long period of time, not feeling much sadness, and being satisfied with his life (Das et al., 2020). This concept has high consistency so that everyone can use it to deal with various kinds of situations, including teenagers. Subjective well-being related to cognitive evaluations and emotional feelings can affect the general quality of life. Among adolescents, subjective well-being has been shown to be closely related to their health and well-being over a lifetime (Hoeur, 2018).

Adolescence is a process that a child takes before entering adulthood. This age is very vulnerable to a problem (Jackson & Goosens, 2019). Adolescence can be identified by the occurrence of behavioral transitions, such as starting to protest parental interference that is too excessive for him, not appreciating parental advice, prioritizing appearance, trying to get new friends, being selective and competitive in choosing friends, and not seldom feel sadness. In addition, a teenager tends to feel dissatisfied quickly, always wants to be different, and faces many problems.
These changes in behavior further emphasize that adolescents need high subjective well-being. However, there are challenges in itself because teenagers tend to be dissatisfied and emotionally unstable because of the pressure they receive when facing situations that are different from before (McMahon et al., 2020).

Based on the stages of development, adolescence is a time when well-being becomes uncertain, especially since adolescence is known as a period of emotional development (Santrock, 2020). Subjective well-being is related to adolescent mental health, for example, adolescents with high subjective well-being can become more creative individuals and are able to manage stress well. This shows the importance of subjective well-being for adolescents (Karaca et al., 2016). However, as the adolescent development process progresses, there are changes that occur in a teenager, which include biological, cognitive, and social-emotional changes. In dealing with these changes, a teenager will often find psychological problems or negative affect which then creates anxiety, fear, anger, and sadness (Santrock, 2020).

Adolescents' subjective well-being decreases with age, this is due to their reduced emotional well-being, such as experiencing anxiety and depression (Shek & Liu, 2014). In addition, physical change factors are also a cause of low subjective well-being in adolescents (Wood et al., 2018). This lack of subjective well-being in adolescents can lead to unhealthy behavior, such as delinquency which is in the spotlight of many today, drug abuse, problems related to school, depression and even suicide.

Low life satisfaction, lack of help, appreciation, and attention from the closest people or society, as well as more dominant negative affect such as depression, confusion, and symptoms of other mental health disorders are characteristics that adolescents tend to have low subjective well-being (Pechmann et al., 2020). This condition has implications for teenagers to commit deviant acts. According to the results of the Basic Health Research conducted in 2018 regarding mental health, it was found that in general, mental disorders in the form of pressure that degrade youth performance and worry at the age of 15 and over amounted to 6.1%. This mental disorder encourages self-harm and even the worst impact is suicide. In fact, depression and anxiety are the main culprits for 80% of suicides in Indonesia (Risksedas, 2018).

Other actions that can occur due to a lack of social support and low subjective well-being in adolescents are deviant behavior or known as adolescents delinquency. Adolescents delinquency is rife in Indonesia, especially in Pacitan District. The graph of adolescents delinquency in Pacitan has increased in terms of quantity and quality of its modus operandi. According to data from the police, teenagers were involved in as many as 30 cases in 2017 and 40 incidents in 2019. The majority of these cases were immoral acts. In addition, the Pacitan Health Office noted that a total of 381 young women became pregnant at the age of 18 (Tondowisudo et al., 2019). The above phenomenon shows that there are still many teenagers who do not feel social support from those closest to them and have not achieved adequate subjective well-being. There are many theories that affect subjective well-being, namely self-esteem, character, never give up, social support, contribution to the environment and demographic elements, such as gender, age,
marital status, and salary. Some research explains that personality is able to consistently predict subjective well-being (Diener et al., 2012).

Open individuals have the possibility of living longer than their counterparts, but this depends on the point of view studied (Turiano et al., 2012). *Openness to experience* is less consistent in influencing changes in individual well-being because it creates greater fluctuation and variability. Yet one can predict this *trait* to be "opposite" with *conscientiousness*. Similar to *conscientiousness*, these unstable influences may be difficult to identify on moderation tests. Therefore, future research needs to examine personality *traits* as predictors or mediators not only of changing patterns, but also of the stability of well-being over time (Hill et al., 2014).

*Personality* traits refer to individual influences on the environment, experiences, and motivations that reflect values, attitudes, and coping strategies developed through social interaction (McAdams & Olson, 2010). Individuals with a high *openness* personality can improve their ability to focus on work and sleep quality, so that it has an impact on high *well-being* (Mullola et al., 2019). Besides that, it can also show the level of pleasure in social relations, new things, and need support in carrying out activities (Soto, 2015). This is in line with research conducted (Yu et al., 2021) showing that personality *openness* influences subjective well-being.

Apart from being influenced by personality, one's well-being can also be observed from how much social support one receives (Ratelle et al., 2013; Savelkoul et al., 2000; Tarigan, 2018; RJ Taylor et al., 2001). Research by Uchida et al., (2008) explains that no correlation was found between social support and *well-being* in European and American cultures. This is different from the research that researchers do. The phenomena that occur in adolescents and the results of this literature review have encouraged researchers to find out how much effect social support has on *well-being* in Indonesian culture, especially high school (SMA) students.

The study conducted by Adejuwon et al., (2018) revealed that social support plays a very important role in relation to a person's subjective well-being. This research is reinforced by the research of Brajša-Ţganec et al., (2018) which revealed that social support, especially receiving social support from peers, is closely related to a person's subjective well-being.

Based on these scientific reasons and problems, research was carried out related to *openness* personality as a mediator of the influence of social support on subjective well-being.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

This type of research is ex-post facto research with a quantitative approach because it is presented with numbers starting from data collection, interpretation of the data and the appearance of the results. The research was conducted at SMA Negeri 1 Pacitan Regency. This research activity was carried out in May 2022. The population for this research was all students of SMAN 1 Pacitan, totaling 615
people. The sampling technique used is simple random sampling, by taking 237 students from a total population of 615 students.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Hypothesis Test Results/Research Question Answers

Testing the hypothesis in this study using regression model analysis with the help of SPSS 20 for windows. The mediator variable is the variable that mediates the relationship and influences the strength and weakness of the relationship dependent variable and independent variable. The effect of the mediator variable can be analyzed if in each regression model (paths a, b, and c) it shows significant results (p <0.05). The results of the regression analysis in this study are as follows:

a. There is an influence between social support on personality openness

The results of the regression test on the influence of social support on personality openness are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Multiple Path Regression Coefficient $a$</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>64.730 std. Error 4.791</td>
<td>32.293 Betas .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>.334 std. Error 0.038</td>
<td>.180 1.294 1.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 1 shows the results the first hypothesis regression line equation obtained a constant value $B_0 = 64.730$ and $B_1 = 0.334$, the regression line equation obtained can be written $Y = 64.730 + 0.334 X$. In addition, the value of the path $a$ on the social support variable to personality openness with a significance value of 0.002 <0.05, then it can be concluded that $H_a$ is accepted and it is stated that there is an intermediate effect social support variable on openness personality.

Table 2

Coefficient of Determination $(R^2)$ Path $a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Square</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$ Square</th>
<th>std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>15,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on table 2, it is known that the $R^2$ value is 0.271, meaning that there is an influence of social support on personality openness which contributes.
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27.1% in predicting variations in subjective well-being. The remaining 72.9% is influenced by other factors not examined in this study.

b. There is an influence between personality openness on subjective well-being

The results of the regression test on the influence of openness personality on subjective well-being are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficient of Multiple Path Regression b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unstandardized Coefficients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>41,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>openness</td>
<td>.587</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 3 shows the results the second hypothesis regression line equation obtained a constant value $B_0 = 41.318$ and $B_1 = 0.587$, the regression line equation obtained can be written $Y = 41,318 + 0.587 X$. In addition, the value of line $b$ on the personality variable openness to subjective well-being has a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$, then it can be concluded that $H_a$ is accepted and it is stated that there is an intermediate effect openness personality variable on subjective well-being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>std. Error of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.686 a</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>9.754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on table 4, it is known that the R Square value is 0.482, meaning that there is an influence of personality openness which contributes 48.2% in predicting variations in subjective well-being. The remaining 51.8% is influenced by other factors not examined in this study.

c. There is an influence between social support on subjective well-being

Regression test results of influence between social support on subjective well-being is shown in the following table:
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Table 5
Multiple Path Regression Coefficient c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>std. Error</td>
<td>Betas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>54,597</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>18,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>5,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 5 shows the results the third hypothesis regression line equation obtained a constant value $B_0 = 54,597$ and $B_1 = 0.373$, the regression line equation obtained can be written $Y = 54,597 + 0.373 \times X$. In addition, the value of path $c$ on the social support variable on subjective well-being has a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$, then it can be concluded that $H_a$ is accepted and it is stated that there is an intermediate effect social support variable on subjective well-being.

Table 6
Coefficient of Determination ($R^2$) Path c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>9,512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on table 6, it is known that the $R$ Square value is 0.227, meaning that there is an influence of social support that contributes 22.7% in predicting variations in subjective well-being. The remaining 77.3% is influenced by other factors that are not examined in detail this research.

d. There is an influence of personality openness as a mediator between social support and subjective well-being

The results of the regression test on the influence of openness personality as a mediator between social support with subjective well-being shown in the following table:

Table 7
Regression Model for Path $c'$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MeanSquare</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4683.125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2341562</td>
<td>27,871</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residual</td>
<td>19659.592</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>84015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24342.717</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on table 7 shows there is the influence of openness personality variables as a mediator between social support on subjective well-being. Meanwhile, based on table 8 known based on the results of the regression line equation from the constant values obtained $B_0 = 68.503$, $B_1 = 0.457$, and $B_2 = 0.250$, the line equation The regression obtained can be written $Y = 68.503 + 0.457X + 0.250M$. Test multiple regression analysis by controlling for subjective well-being variables, showing the results of the direct effect regression coefficient (line $c$) increase. The coefficient equation for the Beta value on the path $\alpha = 0.271$, meanwhile Beta value at distance $b = 0.482$, then $\alpha + b = 0.271 + 0.482 = 0.753$. Mark beta has increased from 0.327 (see table 26) to 0.753 Besides that is, the significant value obtained in path $c'$ after controlling subjective welfare variable is 0.132 and greater than 0.05. Referring to the concept put forward by Baron & Kenny (1986), then This research took full mediation. Thus it can be concluded that there is an influence of openness personality variable as an intermediate mediator social support for subjective well-being, meaning openness personality can predict the occurrence of mediated subjective well-being through social support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>68.503</td>
<td>6.616</td>
<td>4.308</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>openness</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>4.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>5.667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on table 7 shows there is the influence of openness personality variables as a mediator between social support on subjective well-being. Meanwhile, based on table 8 known based on the results of the regression line equation from the constant values obtained $B_0 = 68.503$, $B_1 = 0.457$, and $B_2 = 0.250$, the line equation The regression obtained can be written $Y = 68.503 + 0.457X + 0.250M$. Test multiple regression analysis by controlling for subjective well-being variables, showing the results of the direct effect regression coefficient (line $c$) increase. The coefficient equation for the Beta value on the path $\alpha = 0.271$, meanwhile Beta value at distance $b = 0.482$, then $\alpha + b = 0.271 + 0.482 = 0.753$. Mark beta has increased from 0.327 (see table 26) to 0.753 Besides that is, the significant value obtained in path $c'$ after controlling subjective welfare variable is 0.132 and greater than 0.05. Referring to the concept put forward by Baron & Kenny (1986), then This research took full mediation. Thus it can be concluded that there is an influence of openness personality variable as an intermediate mediator social support for subjective well-being, meaning openness personality can predict the occurrence of mediated subjective well-being through social support.

Based on table 9, it is known that the R Square value is 0.492, meaning that there is an influence of personality openness and social support on subjective well-being which contributes 49.2% in predicting variations in subjective well-being. The remaining 50.8% is influenced by other factors not examined in this study. Meanwhile, the result of path $c$ is 0.227 with an effective contribution of 22.7%.
but when the openness personality mediator variable is included between social support and subjective well-being variables the R Square increases by 0.492 with an effective contribution of 49.2%, this indicates that there is a mediating effect of openness personality on social support and subjective well-being.

Based on the results of research that has been done, it can be seen that personality openness mediates social support on subjective well-being in adolescents. This proves that personality openness and social support can predict the level of subjective well-being of these adolescents. High subjective well-being can be achieved when adolescents have an open personality and get the right social support.

In this study, it is known that there is a significant positive effect between social support on subjective well-being with a significance value on the path $c = 0.00$ (p <0.05). This is in line with previous research which showed that social support significantly affects subjective well-being in adolescents (Habibah, 2017; Tarigan, 2018). In this stage of human development, an individual will want a good and enjoyable life. To achieve this condition, the individual must have positive emotions towards himself. This emotional experience is called subjective well-being, a concept that evaluates an individual's life or in this study a teenager.

Subjective well-being is a very broad concept because it includes emotions, pleasurable experiences, reduced levels of negative moods, and high levels of satisfaction with life (Snyder & Lopez, 2002). A teenager who has high subjective well-being can lead a healthy life and is able to adapt to certain transformations in life. Subjective well-being in adolescents depends on the needs encountered in order to fulfill life satisfaction and goals (Eryilmaz, 2012).

There are several factors that influence a person's subjective well-being, such as social relationships, social support, social acceptance, self-acceptance, personality type, life situation, and self-fulfillment. Social relations and social acceptance significantly affect subjective well-being in high school adolescents in Turkey (Arslan, 2016). In adolescent life, social support that comes from peers is more strongly related to their subjective well-being than that from parents (CYS Lee & Goldstein, 2016). Meanwhile, other research shows that subjective well-being is significantly influenced by support from family and peers (Brannan et al., 2013).

It is known that there is a significant positive influence between personality openness on social support with a coefficient of 0.482 with a significance value on path $b = 0.002$ (p <0.05). This reinforces the previous study conducted by Udayar et al., (2020) which showed that good social support can predict emotional stability and personality openness. Besides that, Swickert et al., (2010) also conducted a study whose results showed that openness personality predicts social support. Individuals with high openness personality are characterized by openness to emotions, appreciating art and beauty, and possessing intelligence. These characteristics are significantly related to social support (Barańczuk, 2019).

Personality is believed to provide an important influence on social support on the grounds that personality can cause reactions or responses from the people around us consistently. In the context of social support, individuals who are experiencing hostility and anger will be more difficult to interact so they will...
receive less social support (Dehle & Landers, 2005; Scarr & McCartney, 1983). Social support can provide a feeling of comfort, valued, loved, and assisted for someone who gets it so that it creates calm, confidence, and competence.

Another factor that influences subjective well-being is personality openness. Personality openness, extraversion, and agreeableness significantly influence life satisfaction and positive affect which are part of Han's subjective well-being (2020). In addition, in research conducted by Furqoni Z. A (2019) also explained that openness personality has a significant influence on subjective well-being.

Understanding the relationship between personality and subjective well-being is important because personality can explain the stability of subjective well-being. In addition, it can also help understand the role of personality in designing interventions to improve subjective well-being. Personality is something that is inherent in the individual so as to enable the individual to behave in consistent patterns (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Personality can predict how a person reacts to other people, how a person gives his opinion and solves a problem, and can be influenced by the stress conditions around him (Shirazi, Khan, & Ansari, 2012).

Openness personality with high curiosity tend to expand their knowledge structure regarding some of their concepts and stimuli (schemes) then seek change. Therefore, the potential to increase subjective well-being is also quite high. In line with research conducted by Wen (2019) which explains that personality openness has a positive effect on subjective well-being.

There are three components of subjective well-being, namely life satisfaction, happiness, and filled with positive emotions (Deci & Ryan, 2008). Life satisfaction is a cognitive evaluation carried out by individuals to measure how satisfied the individual is with life. This life satisfaction is considered a stable indicator of subjective well-being (Diener et al., 1985). Well-being measures appear to be stable over time. This is based on a study conducted by Anglim et al., (2015) on a large scale and over a period of 8 years.

This life satisfaction has been investigated with many other constructs, for example life satisfaction is a key indicator of mental health and is positively associated with a wider spectrum of positive personal, psychological, behavioral, social, interpersonal, and intrapersonal outcome factors (Proctor et al., 2009). Life satisfaction has also shown clear validity of the concepts of positive affect, negative affect, optimism, self-esteem and social support (Gómez et al., 2020). In addition, life satisfaction is also influenced by self-esteem, social support, cultural homogeneity, individualism versus collectivism, and others (Diener et al., 1985). At the individual level, subjective well-being has been widely studied to be influenced by factors such as gender, age, salary, role in the profession, school level, marital status, personality, health, and behavior.

Social relationships and activities have been shown to be key elements that contribute to individual health and well-being throughout life (Wagner et al., 2014). In the context of social relations, one of the important predictors of subjective well-being is social support. Social support defined as “having someone to rely on when going through difficult times”, along with income and healthy life expectancy, are important factors contributing to differences in levels of subjective well-being (Helliwell et al., 2017).
The construction of social support and subjective well-being is very complex, so the research findings related to these two variables also vary, partly due to the conceptualization and operationalization of the researchers. Another part is because it uses different aspects of the social support variable so that it can have a relationship with different aspects of the subjective welfare variable. For example, several aspects of social support and social relationships such as wider social networks, positive family relationships, interactions with friends, and received and perceived support are associated with lower rates of depression, higher life satisfaction and happiness, as well as well-being. in general (Pinquart & Sörensen, 2000; Siedlecki et al., 2014; Thomas, 2010). The importance of social support for an individual's well-being also depends on the source of social support and the age of the individual. From childhood onwards (first family, then friends and partners) provides physical protection, social guidance, self-definition, and so on which lead to affective and cognitive acceptance throughout life (Segrin, 2003).

The strongest and most consistent predictor of subjective well-being besides social support is individual personality differences (Lucas & Diener, 2015). The results showed that subjective well-being scores were quite stable over time even in the face of changing life circumstances. This stability is caused by partly genetic factors and partly because there is a strong relationship between personality traits and subjective well-being (Lucas, 2018). Behavior resulting from individual differences in personality traits can refer to gains related to well-being. There is a possibility that the relationship between personality and well-being flows through differences in behavior shown by individuals with different personalities or environments (Anusic et al., 2014).

According to instrumental theory, personality traits have a direct influence on actions or circumstances which then affect subjective well-being (Heller, Ilies, & Watson, 2004). In addition, according to temperament theory, personality traits affect subjective well-being as a result of emotional reactions and cognitive processing effects on information (Diener et al., 2012). In a study of workers in five Chinese cities, (Zhai, Willis, O'Shea, Zhai, & Yang, 2013) explained that extraversion and conscientiousness have a positive effect on subjective well-being, while neuroticism has a negative effect. Meléndez et al., (2019) suggested that extraversion, openness, and conscientiousness have a positive effect on subjective well-being, while extraversion and conscientiousness have a positive effect on life satisfaction. Meanwhile, Han, (2020) in his research explained that individuals who have a high openness personality also feel a high level of subjective well-being.

The relationship between life satisfaction (which is an aspect of subjective well-being) and personality has received considerable attention in the last two decades (Anglim, Horwood, Smillie, Marrero, & Wood, 2020; Jovanović, 2019; Lachmann et al., 2018; Nishimura & Suzuki, 2016; Smith & Konik, 2021). To prove the relationship between subjective well-being and personality, there is research conducted by Suldo et al., (2015), the results of which are personality factors account for 47% of the variance of subjective well-being. Personality openness, conscientiousness, and extraversion significantly influence subjective well-being.
At each phase of development, a teenager is required to be able to pass and complete his developmental tasks properly. This will have implications for the creation of life satisfaction and happiness which can ultimately increase the level of subjective well-being of these adolescents. In the process of carrying out these developmental tasks, a teenager as a social being will certainly need social support from the closest people and the environment.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that there is an influence of personality openness as a mediator between social support and subjective well-being in adolescents. The relationship between social support and subjective well-being becomes more significant by adding openness personality as a moderator with a contribution value of 49.2%.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research and discussion, it can be concluded that there is a significant influence of personality openness as a mediator between social support on subjective well-being. The mediation model in this study is known as full mediation because the value in path c’ is found to be insignificant. The percentage contribution of the independent variable (social support) to the dependent variable (subjective well-being) which was initially 22.7% became 75.3% after being included as a mediator variable of openness personality.
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