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The issues concerning old age are increasing in developing countries. To have broader understanding of the current scenario in Pakistani society, the study investigated the relationship between resilience, wisdom, and life satisfaction among elderly adults living with their families and living in old-age homes. The sample consisted of 212 elderly adults with age ranging from 50 to 90 years \((M = 61.93, SD = 9.85)\). Employing the technique of snowball and purposive sampling, data was collected from individuals living with their families \((n = 124)\) and in old-age homes \((n = 88)\). Urdu versions of Ego Resiliency Scale-89 (Aslam, 2007), Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale (Arzeen & Haq, 2013) and Satisfaction with Life Scale (Siddiq, 2001) were used to assess study variables. The findings showed that resilience and wisdom were positively related with life satisfaction among elderly adults. Wisdom and life satisfaction were found to be higher in the elderly individuals living with their families as compared to their counterparts. The results revealed that resilience mediated the relationship between wisdom and life satisfaction in elderly adults living with families. Implications and suggestions were given based upon the research conducted for similar researches in the field of gerontology.
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The last century has noticed some drastic changes in the rapid increase of population of elderly individuals throughout the world as a result of modernization, globalization, and urbanization. These changes have attributed to number of factors such as increased longevity, age, and decreased death rates due to the enhancement of technology and medical research (Chatfield, 2015). Hence, it requires more facilitation and research in the field of gerontology and issues concerning ageism.
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Ideally a good and successful life is considered accomplished when an individual looks back towards life experiences to endeavor good memories in his/her old age. The physical, psychological, and socio multi-dimensional processes that occur during the course of life define ageing (Sawin, Corbett, & Carbine, 2015). Maintenance of good health parallel to the respected place in a society and life full of accomplished goals is referred to as successful ageing (Jean, Shin, & Lee, 2012). The successful ageing process as described by Rowe and Kahn (2015) is the maintenance of good mental health along with good interpersonal and intrapersonal, relationships as well as intact physiological health. On the contrary, an older person who is dependent on others for his most basic needs and also does not have love or companionship, would not wish to survive a long life (Quadagno, 2005). Successful ageing has been documented to be related positively with one’s coping abilities, relationships with others, religious viewpoints, self-efficacy, socio-economic status, and health status (Bulow & Soderqvist, 2013). Most of the researches conducted in the field of gerontology and geriatrics, aimed towards finding out processes that leads towards successful ageing (Quadagno, 2005). The researches proved that psychological well-being and positive contextual factors developed in a healthy environment are also primary factors apart from the prevention and treatment of any disease and disability in order to attain successful ageing (Hoogland, 2014).

Theorists have researched the process of ageing in respect to different domains of psychological, sociological, and biological changes in order to build systematic understanding towards successful ageing. Psychological theories are more concerned with the extrinsic and intrinsic contextual factors that directly or indirectly effect on the mental health of an individual during the course of life. The most relevant psychological theory that explains the ageing process and changes during the life course leading towards old age is known as psycho-social developmental stages of Erick Erikson. Erikson (1964) studied the psycho-social developmental stages in which he stated that, “generativity (the final accomplished stage) stems from both inner needs or drives and external societal forces. It involves fertility, productivity, and creativity, affording new lives, new products, and new ideas throughout the life course of an individual” (p. 64). As the acceptance and positivity towards life develops, it not only affects the current stage of life but also the prospect stages accordingly, making the total output of life worth living and recalling in an old age (Schoklitsch & Baumann, 2011). Likewise, sociological perspective breaks down the mechanism of contextual factors that affect the ageing process, such as pointing out the global effect of modernization
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(Cowgill as cited by Ting, 2012) which makes it difficult for older generation to cope up with the challenges of today. According to research, the reason older people experience loneliness and disparity is because the familial system has declined and modernization has undermined the position of older people (Quadagno, 2005). When it comes to old-age, satisfaction with life is more dependent upon others and is more sensitively related with the mental well-being of old individuals (Khan, 2014). Gueldner et al. (2001) investigated life satisfaction in 138 elderly individuals living in old-age homes and individuals living with their families and the results revealed that individuals living with families had more life satisfaction compared to their counterparts. The factors affecting life satisfaction of elderly included social support, material circumstances, and socio-economic status (Borg, Hallbergir, & Blomqvist, 2006; Khan, 2014).

Likewise, the supplementary factor that comes along with old age is wisdom. It is the psychological attainment of openness and body of knowledge that plays integral role as coping mechanism and increases life satisfaction in old-age (Webster, Westerhof, & Bohlmeijer, 2012) and it has been deliberated as the zenith of cognitive development process (Baltes & Staudinger, 2000). According to Erick Erikson's (1964) psycho-social developmental stages, the last stage of life called generativity and wisdom together are intertwined (Schoklitsch & Baumann, 2011). Meeks and Jeste (2009) described wisdom as prosocial behavior, practical and tacit body of knowledge, emotional homeostasis, contemplation of self-understanding, and confronting uncertainty with insight and openness (Meeks & Jeste, 2009). The consistency of positivity in life leading towards wisdom is also supported with ‘Berlin and Yale models of wisdom’ (Baltes & Staudinger, 2000; Sternberg, 1998).

Wisdom has been found to be positively associated with life satisfaction (Ardelt, 2000; Baltes, Staudinger, Maercker, & Smith, 1995; Jason et al., 2001; Mickler & Staudinger, 2008; Perry et al., 2002; Takahashi & Overton, 2002). It has been found that wisdom effects life satisfaction more than socioeconomic position, physical environment, physical health, and social relations (Ardelt, 2000; Ferrari, Kahn, Benayon, & Nero, 2011; Jason et al., 2001; Perry et al., 2002). On the other hand, evidence also suggests that wisdom is more persistent among the financially and interpersonally underprivileged respondents and individuals with low perceived social support such as minorities, elders, women, and individuals with illiterate background (Brugman, 2000). Brugman (2000) also stated that those with fewer resources to find fulfillment, satisfaction, and happiness in the
external environment are more indulged towards self-understanding which is the requirement for the manifestation of wisdom.

Resiliency refers to personal dispositions that works as a shield against adversity and distress (Langer, 2004; Lee & Chan, 2009). Ego in particular refers to controlling desires of individual to adapt to external restrictions and compulsions (Block & Kremen, 1996). Ego resiliency refers to the internal personality structure or fairly stable personality trait that functions to modulate these impulses adaptively and helps an individual to adapt to changing environments (Block & Kremen, 1996).

Resiliency in old age plays a role of motivator and encourages the positive side of well-being that leads towards a good life. Empirical evidence suggests that resilience is a significant predictor of well-being and life satisfaction, especially in socially deprived individuals (Bauer & Park, 2010; Gillham et al., 2011; Proctor, Maltby, & Linley, 2011). On the other hand, literature also states that socially intact individuals or non-institutionalized elderly individuals have higher resilience as compared to individuals in institutionalized shelter homes (Azeem & Naz, 2015; Buer & Park, 2010; Cheung & Kam, 2012). Aged individuals who suffer from trauma, depression, or loneliness, resilience is the major coping mechanism to protect them from chronic disorders such as depression, PTSD (Post Traumatic Stress Disorder) and maladaptive and coping stress response (Wu et al., 2013). The most common stressors known that come along ageing are loneliness, isolation, loss of purpose, independence, and changes in health and physical abilities where the ability to be resilient in various patterns strengthen them internally to face the hardship of life (Nakashima & Canda, 2004; Staudinger et al., 1995).

Becker (2013) highlighted resiliency as the ability to assess one’s inner wisdom. He further stated that wisdom not only effects satisfaction with life but also build resiliency towards the adversities. Wisdom is one of such factors that enhances the ability to be resilient towards major and minor adversities (Greiten, 2015). Positive emotions build resilience hence affecting life satisfaction in elderly adults (Cohn, Fredrickson, Brown, Mikels, & Conway, 2009). The aim of achieving successful life is associated with the ability of resilience towards adversities and active engagement in life (Tornstam, 1996). Broaden and built theory is based on the similar concept stating positive emotional wisdom supporting and enhancing the ability of being resilient in old-age (Fredrickson, 1998; Fredrickson & Cohn, 2008).
Ageing is becoming a major issue of developing countries like that of Pakistan, where currently 9 million population is 60 years of age and above and it would increase to 42 million by the year 2050 (United Nations, 2002). Gulzar, Zafar, Ahmad, and Ali (2008) stated that values concerning the respect and honor of the old people have been changing and the status of old parents has been affected and traditional family structure is also getting weaker due to breakdown of joint family system to nuclear family and thereby creating more and more problems for the elder members of the family.

Ahmed (2011) emphasized that comparatively, in joint family, loving atmosphere of house and friendly relationships among the members give security and recognition to the older members of the family whereas in nuclear family structure, elderly parents have little or no authority and their care and support is neglected. Sabzwari and Azhar (2011) highlighted when the attempts of elderly to join and live with their children fail, it results in the loneliness and loss of social support of elderly people. This situation of no work and no fellow leaves them being helpless and feeling alienated (Ahmed, Muzzafar, Javaid, & Fatima, 2015). Empirical evidence suggests that elderly individuals in the families are not supported by their own kin even for basic necessities and in result elderly individuals end up facing hardships (Ali & Kiani, 2003). It has also been noted that this change has resulted in no respect, no care, isolation, poor health, and physical abuse for elderly individuals (Afzal, 1999; Ahmed et al., 2015; Clark, Zaman, & Chaudhry, 2002).

Gull and Dawood (2013) stated that in spite of a socially cohesive society in Pakistan, in some segments, norms have been changing and recently, one can notice a clear turn down of the extended family system. Children leave their parents and there is no one who could look after their needs. Consequently, the abandoned parents land up in old homes (Gull & Dawood, 2013). Old homes do deliver services and amenities which help the elderly people to live in a better condition. They added that old homes do not provide a solution to all of their concerned problems because they can only contribute on a large span for the basic and most important needs.

In Islamabad city, the trend has recently risen for old-age shelter homes and many non-profit organization (NGOs) are working in this regard to take care of the abandoned elderly population (Khan, 2014). Studies conducted on old-age homes and individuals living with their family showed positive relation between social support with quality of life (Khan, 2014) and positive relation between religiosity/spirituality with well-being (Gull & Dawood, 2013; Hafeez & Rafique, 2014) for both samples. However, research also suggests that socially intact
individuals or non-institutionalized elderly individuals have higher levels of resilience as compared to individuals in institutionalized shelter homes (Azeem & Naz, 2015; Buer & Park, 2010; Cheung & Kam, 2012). Considering that wisdom, resilience, and life satisfaction are the main constructs of old age (Quadagno, 2005), the present research aimed to investigate the relation between these variables in both groups of elderly individuals. Also the main target was to test the contradicting literature evidence for wisdom and resilience. Research conducted by Brugman (2000) states that wisdom persist more in socially deprived elderly individuals. The research also aimed to test the concrete evidence of resilience as playing the role of mediator between positive emotional wisdom and life satisfaction in elderly adults as suggested by Cohn et al. (2009). The inclusion criteria for participants at least over 50 years of age was selected as Pakistan has been undergoing an increase in the magnitude of the disabled elderly population, particularly after the age of 50 years (Rukanuddin, 2003). Keeping in view previous literature and theories, following hypotheses were formulated.

1. There will be positive relationship between resilience, wisdom, and life satisfaction of elderly adults.
2. Resilience will mediate the relationship between wisdom and life satisfaction in elderly adults living in old-age shelter homes and living in families.
3. Elderly adults living with families will score higher on resilience and life satisfaction as compared to elderly adults living in old-age homes.
4. Elderly adults living in old-age homes will score higher on wisdom as compared to the elderly adults living with families.

Method

Sample

A sample of 212 elderly adults (119 men and 93 women) including individuals living with their families (n = 124), and individuals living in old-age homes (n = 88) within the age range of 50-90 years, \((M = 61.93, SD = 9.85)\) was selected from Rawalpindi and Islamabad. Purposive and snowball sampling technique was used to gather data. Both private and government Old-age/shelter homes were approached for the sample. Inclusion criteria was 1) participants must be of 50 years of age; and 2) they must be able to read,
understand and write Urdu. For detail along other demographic variables see Table 1 below.

Table 1

*Frequency and Percentage along Demographics Variable (N=212)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Living with their Families</th>
<th>Demographics of Individuals living in Old-homes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 124</td>
<td>n = 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>68(54.83)</td>
<td>Men 51(57.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>56(45.16)</td>
<td>Women 37(42.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>74(59.67)</td>
<td>50-60 21(23.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>44(35.48)</td>
<td>61-70 35(39.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>6(4.83)</td>
<td>71-80 22(25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>81-90 10(11.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>119(95.96)</td>
<td>Married 39(44.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>1(0.8)</td>
<td>Unmarried 17(19.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>5(4.03)</td>
<td>Widow 18(20.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widower</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>Widower 14(15.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>54(43.54)</td>
<td>Employed 10(11.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>Unemployed 68(77.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>28(22.58)</td>
<td>Retired 11(12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Business</td>
<td>8(6.45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>35(28.23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Set up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Family</td>
<td>84(67.74)</td>
<td>Apka Apna Ghar 19(21.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Family</td>
<td>40(32.25)</td>
<td>Najjat Trust 25(28.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio economic Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>73(58.87)</td>
<td>Bint-e-Fatima 4(4.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>42(33.87)</td>
<td>Afiyat Trust 21(23.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-Middle</td>
<td>9(7.25)</td>
<td>MGQ Trust 2(2.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows that elderly adults living with family comprise of 54.83% of men and 45.16% of women whereas elderly adults living in old-age homes consist of 57.95% of men and 42.04% of women participants. Majority of the participants in both groups is aged from 50 to 70 years. Table shows that majority of the participants living with their families are mostly married whereas, participants living in old-age homes are equally dispersed. Majority of the elderly individuals living with families are employed while majority of participants from old-age homes is unemployed.
**Instruments**

**Ego Resiliency Scale-89 (ER 89).** This scale was developed by Block and Kremen (1996) to assess psychological resilience. This was translated and adapted in Urdu language by Aslam (2007). The present research used the Urdu version. It is a 14 item self-report scale based on a 4-point Likert scale with response categories ranging from 1 = *strong disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *agree* and 4 = *strongly agree*. The alpha reliability of original scale is .81 and the test-retest reliability is .67. The maximum score of ego resiliency scale can be up to 56 and minimum score is 14. Its Alpha reliability is .64. There is no negative item in the scale. The higher score represent more resiliency in an individual and low score represents vice versa.

**Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale (SAWS).** Wisdom was measured with the Self-Assessed Wisdom Scale Urdu Version developed by Webster (2003). For the present research its Urdu version translated by Arzeen and Haq (2013) was used. This is a 40-item scale reflecting the following five dimensions of wisdom: Critical Life Experiences, Reminiscence/Reflectiveness, Openness to Experience, Emotional Regulation, and Humor. Participants respond to each question using a Likert type scale that range from 1 (Strongly disagree) - 6 (Strongly agree). Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for the total SAWS is .84 and test-retest reliability = .84. The Possible score range is 64 to 236 and there is no negative item in the scale.

**Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS).** Life Satisfaction in elderly adults was measured by SWLS originally developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin (1985) and translated in Urdu by Siddiq (2001). It is used to measure the contentment with the overall course of life of an individual. It is a self-report scale constituted with 5 items to measure life satisfaction. The items are measured through 5-point Likert scale. The ratings shows 1 = *totally disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *don’t know*, 4 = *agree* and 5= *totally agree*. There is no negative item in the scale. The alpha reliability of the scale is .87. High scores represent higher level of satisfaction with life and low scores represents low satisfaction with life.

**Procedure**

Data was collected from Rawalpindi/Islamabad city. Informed consent was also taken from each participant before the instrument was administered. For participants from old-age homes, consent was taken also from the managing authorities to approach the potential
sample for this research. Scales were administered in individual setting. Participants were given the instructions properly, both verbally and in written text above the instruments. In case of any ambiguity, further guidance was also provided. The participants were reassured that their responses will be kept confidential and that there is no right or wrong options within the scale. The participants were instructed to fill the scales and guidance was given independently on each participant keeping the age sensitivity of population for the study. The researcher read out the questionnaire aloud for the elderly convenience in old-age homes. Those elderly individuals were excluded who were distressed or were not interested in taking part in the research. Difficulty was faced to access sample from old-home as the limited existence of old-age homes in Islamabad and Rawalpindi.

**Results**

To test the hypotheses of the present study quantitative analyses were carried out by using SPSS version 21. Pearson Product Moment correlation, linear regression, *t*-test, and hierarchal regression analysis for mediating role of variable were used to compare the results of variables tested in elderly adults living with families and living in Old-age homes.

Table 2

**Alpha Coefficient and Descriptive Statistics of Self Assessed Wisdom Scale, Satisfaction with Life Scale, and Ego Resiliency Scale-89**

(N = 212)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Kur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAWS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>176.08</td>
<td>31.34</td>
<td>86-240</td>
<td>6-240</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWLS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER 89</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>41.12</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>26-56</td>
<td>4-56</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Skew = Skewness; Kur = Kurtosis; SAWS = Self Assessed Wisdom Scale; SWLS = Satisfaction with Life Scale; ER 89 = Ego resiliency.

Table 2 shows satisfactory alpha coefficients for all measures. Values of skewness and Kurtosis for all scales are less than 1 indicating that data is normally distributed.
Table 3

**Mean Differences between Elderly Adults Living with Families and in Old-age Homes on Study Variables (N = 212)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Living with Families (n = 124)</th>
<th>Living in Old Home (n = 88)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Cohn’s d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>(212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWS</td>
<td>178.33</td>
<td>33.13</td>
<td>173.53</td>
<td>28.58</td>
<td>9.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWLS</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>6.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER89</td>
<td>42.46</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>40.30</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SAWS = Self Assessed Wisdom Scale; SWLS = Satisfaction with Life Scale; ER89 = Ego Resiliency Scale.

* **p < .01.

Table 4

**Relationship among Wisdom, Resilience, and Life Satisfaction (N = 212)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elderly living with Families (n = 124)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 SWLS</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ER89</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 SAWS</td>
<td>-.80**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elderly living in Old Homes (n = 88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 SWLS</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ER89</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 SAWS</td>
<td>-.68**</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.74**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SWLS = Satisfaction with Life Scale; ER89 = Ego Resiliency Scale-89; SAWS = Self Assessed Wisdom Scale.

* *p < .05, **p < .01.

The results in Table 4 indicate significant positive relationship between life satisfaction and wisdom for individuals living with their families as well as for people living in old-age homes. Resilience is also positively related with wisdom for participants from both groups. However, resilience has nonsignificant relationship with life satisfaction for elderly living in families whereas it is significantly and positively related to life satisfaction for participants from old-age homes.
Mediating effect Resilience between Wisdom and Life Satisfaction among Elderly Adults Living in Old-age Homes (N = 88)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>-4.77</td>
<td>-13.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>.15***</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>4.93***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>25.67***</td>
<td>18.35***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta F$</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LL = Lower limit; UL = Upper limit; CI = Confidence interval.

*** $p < .001$.

Mediation Effect of Resilience between Wisdom and Life satisfaction

The mediation results of Model 1 shows that the wisdom significantly predict relationship with resilience, $b = .15$, $t = 5.06$, $p < .000$. The $R^2$ value shows that wisdom explains 22% of the variance in relationship resilience and $b$ is positive shows that relationship is also positive. As the wisdom increases resilience will also increase. However, wisdom’s direct effect ($c’$) on life satisfaction was nonsignificant. The results of direct effect were $b = .17$, $t = .71$, $p = .47$. 

Figure 6. Mediating effect of Resilience between Wisdom and Life Satisfaction
The Model 2 is the relationship of life satisfaction with both resilience and wisdom. The results of Model 2 showed that the resilience significantly predicts relationship with life satisfaction $b = .35$, $t = 4.93$, $p = .00$. The $R^2$ value shows that Model 2 explains 30% of the variance in relationship with life satisfaction and since resilience $b$ is positive shows that relationship is positive also. As resilience increases life satisfaction also increases. Similarly, positively significant interaction of resilience with wisdom shows that relationship is positive as wisdom increases resilience also increases.

Since Sobel test showed indirect effect ($b = 0.05$), the standard error, associated $z$-score ($z = 3.50$) and $p$-value (0.00). The $p$-value is under the .05 threshold, results computed show there is significant indirect effect, giving compelling evidence that there is meaningful complete mediation process.

**Discussion**

The present study was aimed to find out the relationship between resilience, wisdom, and life satisfaction in elderly adults living with their families and elderly adults living in old-age homes. The expansion of modernization and the increased aging population throughout the world (United Nations, 2002) has made it important to investigate in the field of gerontology. Though, Pakistan is considered a socially cohesive society, the decline of extended family systems is evident (Itrat, Taqai, Qazi, & Qidwai, 2007) and this has not only affected the prior status of elderly in families but also the patriarchal and matriarchal system that allowed elders to maintain positions of decision making role has also declined (Sabzwari & Azhar, 2011). It is evident that such drastic changes in life effect have negative psychological effect. One study revealed that feeling of loneliness and constrained relationship with the children is the primary reason to seek voluntary or involuntary admission in old-age shelter homes (Hedge et al., 2012).

It was hypothesized that wisdom, resilience, and life satisfaction will be positively related. The current findings confirmed the positive relation of wisdom with life satisfaction which is in line with previous researches (Ardelt, 2000; Ferrari et al., 2011; Jason et al., 2001; Mickler & Staudinger, 2008; Perry et al., 2002). The consistency of positivity in life and the achievement of goals manifest wisdom which in turn increase satisfaction with life (Jonson & Magnusson, 2001). The positive relationship of wisdom with life satisfaction is also supported and explained with ‘Berlin and Yale models of wisdom’
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(Baltes & Staudinger, 2000; Sternberg, 1998). The insightfulness and openness that is obtained from the wisdom factor helps the older age individual to look beyond the stresses and feel happy (Ardelt, 2000).

The current findings show that resilience and wisdom also appeared to be positively related which is in accordance with the previous research (see, e.g., Becker, 2013; Greiten, 2015) that highlight the positive link between these two variable. However, resilience was significantly and positively related to the life satisfaction for the sample living in old-age homes. It is evident that due to hard life experiences and conditions, participants were psychologically disturbed. Resilience was found to positively predict life satisfaction in them mainly because it works as a shield against adversities (Langer, 2004; Lee & Chan, 2009). Resilience must be an optimal construct in order to serve through trivial life circumstances, and elderly individuals who suffered from such drastic changes in life that brought them to old-age homes had to retain resilience in order to achieve satisfaction with life otherwise survival is not possible.

Though social support is considered one the main factor to enhance resiliency (Azeem & Naz, 2015; Buer & Park, 2010; Cheung & Kam, 2012), however, the contradicting evidence emphasize that resilience factor comes in place where there is persistence of harsh life experiences whereas, broaden and build theory explains the effect of positive and reflective thinking of life on the attainment of resiliency. Fredrickson’s broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions offers an overarching theoretical explanation, by linking the cumulative experience of momentary positive emotions to the development of resources for long-term success and well-being (Fredrickson & Cohn, 2008). Cohn et al. (2009) highlighted the role of resilience being the mediation between wisdom and life satisfaction. It was hypothesized that resilience would mediate the relation between wisdom and life satisfaction in the individuals living in old-age homes. Findings confirmed the mediating role of resilience in enhancing the wisdom on life satisfaction in elderly population living in old age homes. The main goal of the study was to test whether wisdom can directly or indirectly effect the satisfaction with life having resiliency factor effecting it. 30% of variance is explained with resilience being the mediator between wisdom and life satisfaction.

One of the objectives of the present research was to compare both samples on levels of resilience, wisdom, and life satisfaction in both samples. Based on the previous literature, it was hypothesized that compared to individuals living in old-age homes, individuals living with their families will score higher on resilience and life satisfaction while on wisdom, individuals living in old-age homes will score
higher than their counterparts. The hypothesis was proposed based upon the contradictory research evidence suggested by Brugman (2000) that tested wisdom in old-age which claims that a person must go through trails and errors of life until the manifestation of wisdom occurs (Ardelt, 2000; Erikson, 1964; Pascual-Leone, 2000). According to Brugman (2000) wisdom is related to life satisfaction in socially and economically disadvantage population but the results in the present study supported the existing literature explaining wisdom as a positive emotion. The results did not support the hypothesis proving more significance of wisdom in the population living with families. The psychosocial developmental stages of Erik Erikson states that wisdom is an enduring process that positively relates to one stage of life with another (Schoklitsch & Baumann, 2011). The Berlin Model of wisdom (Baltes & Staudinger, 2000) stated that wisdom is developed over time in an intense motivated process which is effected by positive contextual factors. The balance theory of wisdom (Sternberg, 1998) also claims that attainment of wisdom is achieved through intelligent and tacit knowledge to maintain balance between the individual and the environment.

Limitations, Suggestions, and Implications

The sample obtained from population living in old-age homes was restricted to only old-age homes that existed in the city of Islamabad/Rawalpindi, hence, the findings cannot be generalizable to general population of Pakistan because contextual factors may vary. Self-report measures were implied which increase the concern about accuracy of results and possibility of social desirability bias. Although age of the participants was part of the demographic sheet but no analysis was carried out because of the unequal distribution of the data collected from both population. Further researches should focus on this variable to check the effect of age, on wisdom, resilience, psychological distress and life satisfaction. Future research should also investigate the role of socioeconomic class on the development of resilience, wisdom, and life satisfaction.

Despite the above mentioned limitations, the study provides better understanding of the living experiences of old population living in shelter homes. It is important to highlight neglected population and point out their life experiences in order to create awareness to understand and address such issues. There must be increased number of old-age shelter homes throughout Pakistan and non-profit organizations working in this regard for the safety and care of frail and elderly individuals. The need for old-age shelter homes is increasing
due to the fact that modernization is globalizing. It is negatively effecting the life of older generation which is consequentially endangering the interpersonal relationships of future generations. Population living in shelter homes need to be highlighted in order to hear what they want to say and convey. This implication is also one of the way for social support which can contribute to enhance their life.

**Conclusion**

From the present study, we found that in the old age individuals in the selected old age homes, the wisdom factor works as a coping mechanism in order to enhance the resiliency towards distress which effects satisfaction with life and in turn give them hope to live further. The study suggested that resilience mediated the relationship between wisdom and life satisfaction. This study has revealed that people who live with their families are more resilient, have more wisdom, and life satisfaction as compared to the individuals who are living in old-age homes. Social support is important but the need to persist social support requires wisdom that develop through tacit and intelligent body of practical knowledge towards the life. The researcher concluded the findings as such that generational gap, new technology and overarching changes in the world has made huge impact in the living style of common people. It is the role of today’s educated generation to create awareness and understand the elderly individuals who are unable to cope with unending transformation of the world and help them thrive their last years of life with patience and harmony.
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