

Personality Dispositions, Resilience, and Decision Making and Their Impact on Psychological Well-Being of Management Graduates

* Venkatesan M.
** Anubha Rohatgi

Abstract

Business organizations are constantly facing a lot of challenges from political, environmental, social, technological, economic, and legal environments and these organizational level challenges and their changes as well are increasing many folds in the recent times. This present state is placing undue pressure on managers, especially young managers. As a result, managers are experiencing changes in their physical, psychological, cognitive, emotional, and social environments, which has a significant impact on their psychological well-being. In order to see the impact of personality dispositions, resilience, and decision making on psychological well-being of management graduates, this study was undertaken ; 120 management students participated in the study, out of which 78 students completed the tests. The tools used were MBTI by Briggs and Myers (1998), FIRO-B by Waterman and Rogers (2004), Resilience scale by Wagnild and Young (1993), Decision Making Style Inventory by Rowe and Mason (1987), and Psychological Well-being scale by Ryff (1989). The analysis of data revealed that most of the dimensions of personality disposition, resilience, and decision making were found to be significantly correlated with psychological well-being. The study results showed that personality dispositions, resilience, and decision making were significant predictors of psychological well-being. The gender of management graduates showed significant variation in thinking and feeling dimensions of personality dispositions, and autonomy dimension of psychological well-being. The work experience of management graduates varied significantly on some dimensions of personality dispositions. Similarly, the age of management graduates was also found to differ significantly on some dimensions of personality dispositions and psychological well-being.

Keywords : personality dispositions, resilience, decision making, psychological well-being

JEL Classification : I20, I23, J0

Paper Submission Date : September 8, 2017 ; **Paper sent back for Revision :** December 26, 2017 ; **Paper Acceptance Date :** December 30, 2017

Organizations are constantly changing, and business environments are also becoming unpredictable in the recent scenario. Organization success in such a competitive world depends a lot more on the people who are a part of the organization such as managers. Managers play a very vital role in the success of an organization. Managers' personality plays an important role in creating a good market condition within and outside the organization. Also, as a part of managers' role, they should pose good decision making ability and should have clarity about their decisions because at times, they have to deal with problems that require quick decision making, and in such scenarios, managers' decision making ability will decide the faith of the organization. Managers face a lot of challenges as a part of the organization. Irrespective of ups and downs,

* Associate Professor in OB and HRM, Indian Institute of Foreign Trade, B-21, IIFT Bhawan, Qutab Industrial Area, New Delhi. E-mail: venkatesan@iift.edu

** Junior Project Consultant, National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, 17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, Opp. Adchini, New Delhi - 110 016. Email: anubha28rohatgi@gmail.com

managers pose the tendency to bounce back and face the challenges, that is, they show resilience. Resilience is a fundamental ability of individuals, groups, organizations, and systems as a whole to respond productively to disruptive events. Managers' resilience tendency is very important in today's uncertain and changing business environment. The ever-changing marketing situations and conditions put undue pressure on the managers. In such a situation, managers should show high resilience tendency in order to cope with stress and disruptive events, and find a solution for the same.

Multinational companies are targeting India for outsourcing. In this critical scenario, we presume that more multinational companies would enter into India and propagate more market competition, looking for more stable, competitive managers with better resilient and decision - making qualities. All this requires a considerable personality and resilient attitude and having sound psychological well-being. These are the prerequisites to become an able manager working in any multinational or Indian organization. Similarly, the decision-making ability of a manager is considered as an essential attribute in order to face the competition and sustain in the market.

In managerial profession, combination of these three, that is, personality, decision making, and resilience will either boost up one's psychological well-being or hinder one's psychological well-being. Contemporary research indicates that resilience in individuals results in outcomes such as lower levels of psychological distress (Min et al., 2013), higher levels of optimistic thinking (Cooper, Flint -Taylor, & Pearn, 2013), and more positive work attitudes (Youssef & Luthans, 2007).

On a whole, managers as individuals are supposed to have a stable personality with unshakeable attitude and having clarity in decision making, along with a bouncing back attribute that makes them a reckoning force in any business organization. The aforesaid traits are either acquired or forced on them through training. This could be the reason for which organizations are taking a proactive role in guiding, mentoring, and training their respective managers for pivotal roles in organizations.

Moreover, having four different generations - baby boomers, Gen X, Gen Y, and millennials itself is challenging for any organization. In order to connect with all these aforesaid generations, what is required is understanding of human nature, deliberating, and reciprocating issues related to an organization in an amicable manner, without provoking any other stakeholder. Besides that, during the time of crisis, coping up with the situation and sailing through has become a salient quality of an individual or a manager.

However, the existing body of knowledge hasn't come across any good literature in the aforesaid areas. Having said all, it is imperative to empirically test the aforesaid attributes of an individual or a manager of a modern organization.

Review of Literature

In order to study the above mentioned variables and their impact on psychological well-being, the following literature review was carried out :

(1) Personality Dispositions and Psychological Well - Being : Ullah (2017) found that personality dimensions accounted for 29.4% of the total variance in psychological well-being and were also found to influence or effect total well-being of university students. The author also found that two personality factors such as neuroticism and conscientiousness emerged as a common predictor of well-being in both males and females.

Sharma (2015) studied the personality traits and personal effectiveness of the subjects in the age group of 22 - 50 years. The author revealed that a significant relationship got established between personal traits and personal effectiveness. This study showed that across age groups, the relationship between personality traits and personal effectiveness was linear and consistent.

Saricaoglu and Arslan (2013) found that there was significant positive correlation between all subscales of psychological well-being and self-compassion. There was a negative correlation between psychological well-being and neuroticism, and a positive correlation between psychological well-being and other personality traits ; whereas no significant correlation was found between autonomy and agreeableness. Personal traits and self-compassion significantly predicted all subscales of psychological well-being. It was found that the most significant predictor of positive relations with others as a subscale of psychological well-being was extroversion; the most prominent predictor of autonomy, environmental mastery, and purpose in life and self-acceptance subscales was self-compassion ; and the variable which predicted the subscale of personal growth best was openness to experience as personal traits.

Gutiérrez, Jiménez, Hernández, and Puente (2005) found that the personality factors of extraversion and neuroticism were the most predictive of subjective well-being among nursing professionals. Schmutte and Ryff (1997) found significant relations between personality traits and PWB: that is, neuroticism, extraversion, and conscientiousness were predictors of self-acceptance, environmental mastery, and purpose in life ; openness to experience was a predictor of personal growth ; agreeableness predicted positive relations with others ; and finally, autonomy was strongly predicted by neuroticism.

McCrae and Costa (1991) stated that certain personality traits, such as extraversion and neuroticism, represented enduring cognitive dispositions directly affected well-being. Other personality traits, such as agreeableness and conscientiousness, were found to have an indirect or instrumental role, which led people to encounter specific situations, that in turn affected well-being.

(2) Resilience and Psychological Well - Being : Sagone and Indiana (2017) studied the relationships between a positive affect with dimensions of resilience and perceived self-efficacy in life skills on 147 Italian healthy adolescents. They used the positive and negative affect schedule, the resiliency attitudes and skills profile, and the perceived self - efficacy scales in life skills. The study results showed that adolescents with high positive affect reached higher levels of resilience than those with low positive affect.

Some cross cultural researchers systematically reviewed various empirical studies on mental toughness and individual differences in learning, educational and work performance, psychological well-being, personality, and other psychological attributes. Their review of studies found that the emotionally and mentally tough individuals were able to maintain greater levels of control and confidence under stressful situations, which might lead to better psychological well-being (Lin, Mutz, Clough, & Papageorgiou, 2017).

Faircloth (2017) designed and conducted a study to determine if resilience mediated the relationship between negative life events and psychological well-being among emerging adults, and 325 college students participated in this study. The results revealed significant positive relationships between resilience and all six indices of well-being.

Sagone and De Caroli (2014) found that there were positive relationships between PWB (environmental mastery, personal growth, and self-acceptance) and resilience: the more the adolescents were able to choose contexts suitable to personal needs, to see themselves as growing and expanding, and to perceive themselves as self-satisfied, the more resilient they were. They also showed gender and age differences - that boys expressed a greater well - being (environmental mastery and self-acceptance) than girls, and late adolescents showed a greater well-being (personal growth and purpose in life) than middle aged participants.

Srivastava and Sinha (2005) found that resilience and happiness were positively related to well-being. Ryff and Singer (2003) argued that resilient individuals were generally capable of maintaining their physical and psychological health and had the ability to recover more quickly from stressful events.

(3) Decision Making and Psychological Well - Being : Yilmaz, Arslan, Saricaoglu, and Yilmaz (2013) examined the association of decision-making styles and mental health. Their findings showed medium or low correlations in

a university student sample between subjective well-being and all four investigated decision-making styles.

Salo and Allwood (2011) focused on studying the association between decision-making styles and stress in Swedish military officers. The study found that the avoidant style was related to distress not only after, but even before a decision, suggesting a generally higher level of cortisol secretion. Deniz (2006) found that there was a significant relationship between decision-making styles with coping with stress and life events.

(4) Psychological Well - Being and Gender : Ludban and Gitimu (2015) found that the mean values for males and females for psychological well being as measured by the Ryff scale significantly differed for four of the subscales (personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance) with females scoring higher than males in all the four subscales. ANOVA showed no statistical differences in autonomy and emotional mastery subscales.

Jnaneswar (2016) argued that there was a strong correlation between work - life balance, turnover intention, and organizational support among IT employees in Kerala. The study also revealed that there was a significant difference between men and women respondents with respect to work - life balance and organizational support for work-life balance.

(5) Psychological Well - Being and Age : Keyes, Shmotkin, and Ryff (2002) stated that the younger adults with less education reported lower levels of subjective and psychological well-being. Various other research showed that the levels of PWB (psychological well-being) tend to change over the lifespan. They found that autonomy and environmental mastery tended to increase with older age ; whereas, purpose in life and personal growth tended to be lower among older adults (Ryff, 1989, 1991; Ryff & Keyes, 1995; Ryff & Singer, 1998).

Objectives of the Study

✧ To identify the relationship of psychological well-being with personality dispositions, resilience, and decision making among management graduates.

✧ To see whether personality dispositions, resilience, and decision making predict psychological well-being or not.

✧ To identify the gender difference between personality dispositions, resilience, decision making, and psychological well-being of management graduates.

✧ To identify the work experience related difference between personality dispositions, resilience, decision making, and psychological well-being of management graduates.

✧ To identify the age related difference between personality dispositions, resilience, decision making, and psychological well-being of management graduates.

Methodology

(1) Problem : To study the impact of personality dispositions, resilience, and decision making on psychological well-being of management graduates.

(2) Rationale : From the literature review, it is observed that resilience has a very strong relationship with psychological well-being. The review also gives evidence for the relationship between decision making and well-being. It is expected that personal traits and psychological health have to be intact in case of executives engaged in managerial level jobs. It is also evident from the literature review that there are very few research studies that have

discussed about all these above mentioned variables in case of management graduates. Therefore, the objective of the current study is to study the impact of personality dispositions, resilience, and decision making on psychological well-being of management graduates.

(3) Hypotheses

- ✚ **H1 :** There is a significant relationship of psychological well-being with personality dispositions, resilience, and decision making among management graduates.
- ✚ **H2 :** Personality dispositions, resilience, and decision making significantly predict psychological well-being.
- ✚ **H3 :** There is a significant difference between gender, work experience, and age with respect to personality dispositions, resilience, decision making, and psychological well-being among management graduates.

(4) Sampling : The sample of the present study comprised of 120 management graduates belonging to different cities of India and having varied educational background. Out of 120, only 78 students completed the test. The sample consists of 65 men and 13 women graduates. Out of these, 25 were freshers ; whereas 53 management graduates had work experience. This study was conducted between July - August 2016.

(5) Tools : The variables were assessed using the following scales :-

- ✚ **MBTI :** Myers Briggs Type Indicators was developed by Katharine Cook Briggs and Isabel Briggs Myers in 1998. The four areas of personality are perception (sensing vs. intuiting), judgment (thinking vs. feeling), extraversion (extraversion vs. introversion), and orientation towards the outer world (perceiving vs. judging).
- ✚ **FIRO-B (The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation instrument)** was developed by Judith Waterman and Jenny Rogers in 1996. It assesses needs in three areas, with behaviors in two directions: Inclusion: expressed inclusion and wanted inclusion ; Control: expressed control and wanted control ; Affection: expressed affection and wanted affection.
- ✚ **Resilience scale** was developed by Wagnild and Young (1993). It is a 14- item scale that measures the ability of individuals to deal with stress. The respondent is required to answer these items on a 7 - point scale.
- ✚ **Decision Making Style Inventory** was developed by Rowe and Mason in 1987. It consists of 20 items and four subscales: directive, analytical and conceptual & behavioural decision making styles.
- ✚ **Psychological well-being scale** was developed by Carol Ryff. The Ryff inventory consists of 42 questions (medium form). It consists of a number of statements reflecting the six areas of psychological well-being: autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance. Respondents were asked to rate these statements on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 to 6, with 1 indicating *strong disagreement* and 6 indicating *strong agreement*.

(6) Statistical Design : In this research, Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data using *t* - test, product moment correlation, and multiple regression.

Table 1. Correlations of Dimensions of Psychological Well - Being with Dimensions of Personality Disposition, Resilience, and Decision Making Among Management Graduates

Dimensions	Autonomy	Environmental Mastery	Personal Growth	Positive Relations with Others	Purpose in Life	Self-Acceptance
Extraversion	.291**	.323**	.305**	.365**		.311**
Introversion	-.289*	-.325**	-.307**	-.369**		-.312**
Sensing			-.299**			
Intuition			.307**			
Thinking	.294**				.332**	
Feeling	-.296**				-.334**	
Judging					.510**	
Perceiving					-.504**	
Expressed Inclusion	.313**	.454**		.301**		
Expressed Affection		.223*	.301**	.350**	.373**	.256*
Expressed Control	.253*			-.296**		
Wanted Affection			.313**	.286*	.319**	
Wanted Control			-.350**		-.294**	-.236*
Total Firo-B	.279*	.290*				
Resilience	.512**	.459**	.392**		.440**	.473**
Analytical Decision Making			.258*			

Note : **correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 2. Summary of ANOVA of Personality Disposition, Resilience, & Decision Making as Predictors of the Autonomy Dimension of Psychological Well Being

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	Multiple R	R Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1221.292	20	61.065	.737	.543	3.387	.000
Residual	1027.695	57	18.030				

Dependent Variable: Autonomy

Predictors: Personality dispositions such as extroversion, introversion, sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving; fundamentals of interpersonal relations orientation- behaviour (FIRO-B) such as expressed inclusion, expressed affection, expressed control, wanted inclusion, wanted affection, wanted control, and total FIRO-B ; resilience ; decision making dimensions such as directive decision making, analytical decision making, conceptual decision making, and behavioural decision making.

Analysis and Results

The Table 1 reveals that autonomy is positively related to extraversion, thinking, expressed inclusion, expressed control, total FIRO-B, and resilience ; whereas, it is negatively related to introversion and feeling.

Environmental mastery is positively related to extraversion, expressed inclusion, expressed affection, total FIRO-B, and resilience ; whereas, it is negatively related to introversion. Personal growth is positively correlated with extraversion, intuition, analytical decision making, expressed affection, wanted affection, and resilience ; whereas, it is negatively correlated with introversion, sensing, and wanted control. Positive in relation with others is positively correlated with extraversion, expressed inclusion, expressed affection, wanted affection ; whereas, it

Table 3. ANOVA of Personality Disposition, Resilience, and Decision Making as Predictors of the Autonomy Dimension of Psychological Well - Being

Independent Variables	Beta	t	Sig.
Extroversion	9.812	2.029	.047
Introversion	9.824	2.027	.047
Sensing	.968	.497	.621
Intuition	1.201	.620	.538
Thinking	-1.565	-.948	.347
Feeling	-1.848	-1.118	.268
Judging	-3.133	-1.644	.106
Perceiving	-3.142	-1.645	.105
Expressed Inclusion	-.179	-.054	.957
Expressed Affection	-.517	-.156	.877
Expressed Control	-.458	-.137	.892
Wanted Inclusion	-.609	-.184	.854
Wanted Affection	-.672	-.199	.843
Wanted Control	-.333	-.100	.921
Total FIRO-B	.651	.196	.846
Resilience	.166	3.580	.001
Directive Decision Making	-.063	-1.084	.283
Analytical Decision Making	-.167	-2.569	.013
Conceptual Decision Making	.016	.272	.787
Behavioral Decision Making	-.109	-1.808	.076

Table 4. Summary of ANOVA of Personality Disposition, Resilience, & Decision Making as Predictors of the Environmental Mastery Dimension of Psychological Well - Being

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	Multiple R	R Square	F	Sig.
Regression	592.001	20	29.600	.705	.497	2.816	.001
Residual	599.179	57	10.512				

Dependent Variable : Environmental Mastery

Predictors: Personality dispositions such as extroversion, introversion, sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving ; fundamentals of interpersonal relations orientation- behaviour (FIRO-B) such as expressed inclusion, expressed affection, expressed control, wanted inclusion, wanted affection, wanted control, and total FIRO-B; resilience ; decision making dimensions such as directive decision making, analytical decision making, conceptual decision making, and behavioural decision making .

is negatively correlated with introversion and expressed control. Purpose in life is positively correlated with thinking, judging, expressed affection, wanted affection, resilience ; whereas, it is negatively correlated with feeling, perceiving, and wanted control. Self - acceptance is positively correlated with extraversion, expressed affection, resilience ; whereas, it is negatively correlated with introversion and wanted control. Thus, psychological well-being is found to be correlated with personality dispositions, resilience, and decision making.

The Table 2 and Table 3 show the multiple regression analysis of dimensions of personality disposition, resilience, and decision making with autonomy dimension of psychological well-being. Overall, the variance

Table 5. ANOVA of Personality Disposition, Resilience, and Decision Making as Predictors of the Environmental Mastery Dimension of Psychological Well-Being

Independent Variables	Beta	t	Sig.
Extroversion	-4.804	-1.301	.199
Introversion	-4.921	-1.330	.189
Sensing	3.416	2.299	.025
Intuition	3.493	2.363	.022
Thinking	.451	.358	.722
Feeling	.366	.290	.773
Judging	-1.237	-.850	.399
Perceiving	-1.265	-.867	.389
Expressed Inclusion	5.103	1.997	.051
Expressed Affection	4.351	1.715	.092
Expressed Control	4.582	1.796	.078
Wanted Inclusion	3.991	1.582	.119
Wanted Affection	4.528	1.754	0.85
Wanted Control	4.536	1.785	.080
Total FIRO-B	-4.349	-1.711	.093
Resilience	.079	2.231	.030
Directive Decision Making	-.025	-.556	.580
Analytical Decision Making	-.007	-.145	.885
Conceptual Decision Making	.015	.322	.749
Behavioral Decision Making	.004	.082	.935

Table 6. Summary of ANOVA of Personality Disposition, Resilience, & Decision Making as Predictors of the Personal Growth Dimension of Psychological Well - Being

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	Multiple R	R Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1222.642	20	61.132	.727	.529	3.200	.000
Residual	1088.807	57	19.102				

Dependent Variable: Personal Growth

Predictors: Personality dispositions such as extroversion, introversion, sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving; fundamentals of interpersonal relations orientation - behaviour (FIRO-B) such as expressed inclusion, expressed affection, expressed control, wanted inclusion, wanted affection, wanted control, and total FIRO-B; resilience; decision making dimensions such as directive decision making, analytical decision making, conceptual decision making, and behavioural decision making.

explained by the dimensions of personality disposition, resilience, and decision making on autonomy dimension of psychological well-being is 54% ($F = 3.387, p < .01$). It can be noted that extraversion, introversion, and resilience ($B = 9.812, p = .047$; $B = 9.824, p = .047$; $B = .166, p = .001$, respectively) positively influence the autonomy dimension of psychological well-being. On the other hand, it can also be noted that analytical decision making ($B = -.167, p = .013$) is negatively contributing to the autonomy dimension of psychological well-being.

The Table 4 and Table 5 show the multiple regression analysis of dimensions of personality disposition, resilience, and decision making with the environmental mastery dimension of psychological well-being. Overall variance explained by the dimensions of personality disposition, resilience, and decision making on

Table 7. ANOVA of Personality Disposition, Resilience, & Decision Making as Predictors of the Personal Growth Dimension of Psychological Well-Being

Independent Variables	Beta	t	Sig.
Extroversion	-3.270	-.657	.514
Introversion	-3.486	-.699	.488
Sensing	3.201	1.598	.116
Intuition	3.537	1.775	.081
Thinking	-1.618	-.953	.345
Feeling	-1.827	-1.073	.288
Judging	3.201	1.631	.108
Perceiving	3.087	1.570	.122
Expressed Inclusion	-1.634	-.474	.637
Expressed Affection	-.816	-.239	.812
Expressed Control	-1.170	-.340	.735
Wanted Inclusion	-1.419	-.417	.678
Wanted Affection	-1.190	-.342	.734
Wanted Control	-1.669	-.487	.628
Total FIRO-B	1.274	.372	.711
Resilience	.055	1.140	.259
Directive Decision Making	.057	.957	.343
Analytical Decision Making	.114	1.703	.094
Conceptual Decision Making	.095	1.528	.132
Behavioral Decision Making	.078	1.256	.214

Table 8. Summary of ANOVA of Personality Disposition, Resilience, & Decision Making as Predictors of Positive Relations with Others Dimension of Psychological Well-Being

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	Multiple R	R Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1193.002	20	59.650	.737	.543	3.393	.000
Residual	1002.177	57	17.582				

Dependent Variable: Positive relations with others

Predictors: Personality dispositions such as extroversion, introversion, sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving; fundamentals of interpersonal relations orientation- behaviour (FIRO-B) such as expressed inclusion, expressed affection, expressed control, wanted inclusion, wanted affection, wanted control, and total FIRO-B; resilience; decision making dimensions such as directive decision making, analytical decision making, conceptual decision making, and behavioural decision making.

environmental mastery dimension of psychological well-being is 50% ($F = 2.816, p < .01$). It can be noted that sensing, intuition, and resilience ($B = 3.416, p = .025$; $B = 3.493, p = .022$; $B = .079, p = .030$, respectively) positively influence the environmental mastery dimension of psychological well-being.

The Table 6 and Table 7 show the multiple regression analysis of dimensions of personality disposition, resilience, and decision making with the personal growth dimension of psychological well-being. The overall variance explained by the dimensions of personality disposition, resilience, and decision making on personal growth dimension of psychological well-being is 53% ($F = 3.200, p < .01$).

The Table 8 and Table 9 show the multiple regression analysis of dimensions of personality disposition,

Table 9. ANOVA of Personality Disposition, Resilience, & Decision Making as Predictors of Positive Relations with Others Dimension of Psychological Well - Being

Independent Variables	Beta	t	Sig.
Extroversion	-10.004	-2.095	.041
Introversion	-10.288	-2.149	.036
Sensing	4.575	2.380	.021
Intuition	4.613	2.413	.019
Thinking	-2.888	-1.772	.082
Feeling	-2.775	-1.699	.095
Judging	3.195	1.697	.095
Perceiving	3.093	1.640	.106
Expressed Inclusion	4.836	1.463	.149
Expressed Affection	4.397	1.340	.186
Expressed Control	3.631	1.100	.276
Wanted Inclusion	3.567	1.093	.276
Wanted Affection	4.662	1.397	.168
Wanted Control	4.177	1.271	.209
Total FIRO-B	-4.080	-1.241	.220
Resilience	-.033	-.719	.475
Directive Decision Making	.007	.125	.901
Analytical Decision Making	-.019	-.304	.763
Conceptual Decision Making	-.015	-.249	.804
Behavioral Decision Making	-.032	-.535	.595

Table 10. Summary of ANOVA of Personality Disposition, Resilience, & Decision Making as Predictors of Purpose in Life Dimension of Psychological Well -Being

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	Multiple R	R Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1349.414	20	67.471	.762	.581	3.949	.000
Residual	973.919	57	17.086				

Dependent Variable: Purpose in Life

Predictors: Personality dispositions such as extroversion, introversion, sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving; fundamentals of interpersonal relations orientation- behaviour (FIRO-B) such as expressed inclusion, expressed affection, expressed control, wanted inclusion, wanted affection, wanted control, and total FIRO-B; resilience; decision making dimensions such as directive decision making, analytical decision making, conceptual decision making, and behavioural decision making.

resilience, and decision making with positive relations with others dimension of psychological well-being. Overall variance explained by the dimensions of personality disposition, resilience, and decision making on positive relations with other dimensions of psychological well-being is 54% ($F = 3.393, p < .01$). It can be noted that sensing and intuition ($B = 4.575, p = .021$; $B = 4.613, p = .019$, respectively) positively influence positive relations with others dimension of psychological well-being. On the other hand, it can also be noted that extraversion and introversion ($B = -10.004, p = .041$; $B = -10.288, p = .036$, respectively) negatively contribute to the positive relations with other dimensions of psychological well-being.

The Table 10 and Table 11 show the multiple regression analysis of dimensions of personality disposition,

Table 11. ANOVA of Personality Disposition, Resilience, & Decision Making as Predictors of Purpose in Life Dimension of Psychological Well-Being

Independent Variables	Beta	t	Sig.
Extroversion	2.627	.558	.579
Introversion	2.595	.550	.585
Sensing	2.706	1.428	.159
Intuition	2.789	1.480	.144
Thinking	-2.136	-1.329	.189
Feeling	-2.330	-1.447	.153
Judging	2.151	1.159	.251
Perceiving	1.800	.968	.337
Expressed Inclusion	3.217	.987	.328
Expressed Affection	3.546	1.096	.278
Expressed Control	3.022	.929	.357
Wanted Inclusion	3.238	1.007	.318
Wanted Affection	3.534	1.074	.287
Wanted Control	2.868	.885	.380
Total Firo-b	-3.273	-1.010	.317
Resilience	.078	1.715	.092
Directive Decision Making	.017	.298	.766
Analytical Decision Making	.070	1.104	.274
Conceptual Decision Making	.057	.971	.335
Behavioral Decision Making	.053	.896	.374

Table 12. Summary of ANOVA of Personality Disposition, Resilience, & Decision Making as Predictors of the Self-Acceptance Dimension of Psychological Well-Being

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	Multiple R	R Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1286.029	20	64.301	.655	.429	2.137	.013
Residual	1714.855	57	30.085				

Dependent Variable: Self-acceptance

Predictors: Personality dispositions such as extroversion, introversion, sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling, judging, and perceiving; fundamentals of interpersonal relations orientation- behaviour (FIRO-B) such as expressed inclusion, expressed affection, expressed control, wanted inclusion, wanted affection, wanted control, and total FIRO-B; resilience; decision making dimensions such as directive decision making, analytical decision making, conceptual decision making, and behavioural decision making.

resilience, and decision making with purpose in life dimension of psychological well-being. The overall variance explained by the dimensions of personality disposition, resilience, and decision making on purpose in life dimension of psychological well-being is 58% ($F = 3.949, p < .01$).

The Table 12 and Table 13 show the multiple regression analysis of dimensions of personality disposition, resilience, and decision making with the self- acceptance dimension of psychological well-being. The overall variance explained by the dimensions of personality disposition, resilience, and decision making on the self-acceptance dimension of psychological well-being is 43% ($F = 2.137, p < .01$). It can be noted that resilience ($B = .144, p = .020$) positively influences the self-acceptance dimension of psychological well-being.

Table 13. ANOVA of Personality Disposition, Resilience, & Decision Making as Predictors of the Self-Acceptance Dimension of Psychological Well-Being

Independent Variables	Beta	t	Sig.
Extroversion	-.281	-.045	.964
Introversion	-.506	-.081	.936
Sensing	2.819	1.121	.267
Intuition	2.967	1.186	.240
Thinking	-.423	-.198	.844
Feeling	-.405	-.190	.850
Judging	-.089	-.036	.971
Perceiving	-.332	-.135	.893
Expressed Inclusion	3.397	.786	.435
Expressed Affection	3.554	.828	.411
Expressed Control	3.274	.758	.451
Wanted Inclusion	2.812	.659	.513
Wanted Affection	3.379	.774	.442
Wanted Control	3.225	.750	.456
Total FIRO-B	-3.211	-.747	.458
Resilience	.144	2.390	.020
Directive Decision Making	-.099	-1.311	.195
Analytical Decision Making	-.154	-1.831	.072
Conceptual Decision Making	-.015	-.196	.845
Behavioral Decision Making	-.137	-1.754	.085

Table 14. Mean, SDs, and t - values of Significant Dimensions of Personality Disposition, FIRO-B, and Psychological Well - Being on the Basis of Gender

	GENDER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
Thinking	male	65	15.97	5.277	2.345	.022
	female	13	12.15	5.757		
Feeling	male	65	7.88	5.269	-2.338	.022
	female	13	11.69	5.879		
Autonomy	male	65	30.75	5.087	2.828	.006
	female	13	26.31	5.618		

Thus, Tables 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 show the multiple regression results of personality disposition, resilience, and decision making dimensions on varied dimensions of psychological well-being of management graduates. The results from Tables 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13 show that all the above mentioned variables are predictors of dimensions of psychological well-being, as it is evident from the *F* value and significance.

The Table 14 shows the *t* - test values and significant values. It is evident from the results that men and women graduates vary significantly on thinking and feeling dimensions of personality types. Similarly, men and women graduates are also found to differ significantly on the autonomy dimension of the psychological well-being scale. Men graduates have higher means as compared to their counterparts on thinking and autonomy aspects ; whereas,

Table 15. Mean, SDs, and *t* - values of Significant Dimensions of Personality Disposition, FIRO-B, and Psychological Well - Being on the Basis of Work Experience

	WORK EXPERIENCE	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Wanted Control	Fresher	25	1.76	1.615	-2.294	.025
	Experienced	53	2.96	2.369		
Thinking	Fresher	25	13.56	5.635	-1.989	.05
	Experienced	53	16.17	5.298		
Judging	Fresher	25	11.84	7.972	-2.059	.043
	Experienced	53	15.23	6.151		
Perceiving	Fresher	25	10.08	7.994	2.065	.042
	Experienced	53	6.68	6.151		

Table 16. Mean, SDs, and *t* - values of Significant Dimensions of Personality Disposition, FIRO-B, and Psychological Well - Being on the Basis of Age Group

	AGE GROUP (in years)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Intuition	(20-23)	31	16.00	4.872	2.000	.049
	(24-27)	47	13.26	6.529		
Thinking	(20-23)	31	13.71	5.539	-2.164	.034
	(24-27)	47	16.40	5.278		
Feeling	(20-23)	31	10.13	5.620	2.147	.035
	(24-27)	47	7.45	5.249		
Autonomy	(20-23)	31	28.29	5.509	-.2352	.021
	(24-27)	47	31.15	5.078		

women graduates are found to have a higher mean than men graduates with respect to the feeling dimension.

The Table 15 shows the *t* - test and significance values on the basis of which it can be noted that experienced graduates differ significantly from freshers on thinking, judging, and perceiving dimensions of personality types. Similarly, experienced graduates are found to vary significantly on the wanted control dimension of interpersonal behavior. Experienced graduates are found to have high mean scores as compared to freshers on thinking, feeling, and wanted control aspects ; whereas, freshers have a higher mean score for the perceiving dimension.

The Table 16 shows the *t* - test and significance values on the basis of which it can be noted that the respondents in the age group of 20 - 23 years differ significantly from the respondents in the 24 - 27 years age group with respect to the intuition, thinking, and feeling dimensions of personality types. Similarly, they are also found to vary significantly on the autonomy dimension of psychological well-being. Graduates belonging to the 20-23 years age group have higher mean values for intuition and feeling dimensions ; whereas, the respondents in the 24 - 27 years age group are found to have higher mean values for thinking and autonomy dimensions.

Discussion

The aim of the study is to examine the relationship between personality dispositions, resilience, and decision making and their impact on psychological well - being of management graduates.

The analysis of data reveals that the first hypothesis (H1) is partially proven, as is evident from the results of Table 1. The Table 1 shows that dimensions of psychological well-being are correlated with most of the

dimensions of personality types, decision making, interpersonal behaviour, and resilience. Our finding is somewhat similar to the findings of Sagone and De Caroli (2014), who found that there is a positive relationship between PWB (environmental mastery, personal growth, and self-acceptance) and resilience, and to the findings of Yilmaz et al. (2013), who found that there was a medium or low correlation in a university student sample between subjective well-being and decision-making styles. It can be said that personality dispositions, resilience, and decision making share a strong relationship with psychological well-being of management graduates. Thus, our results are in line with the previously conducted studies, and it adds to the literature as there are hardly any research studies that have been conducted on management graduates using all the above-mentioned variables.

Hypothesis H2 is proven, as can be inferred from the Table 2. The results from Table 3 - Table 8 show that all the above-mentioned variables are predictors of all the dimensions of psychological well-being, as is evident from the F - value and significance. Our findings are somewhat similar to the result of Sourì and Hasanirad (2011) who discovered that resilience was a predictor of PWB, and optimism played a mediating role in the relationship between resilience and PWB.

Hypothesis H3 is partially proven, as the results show that men and women graduates vary significantly on thinking and feeling dimensions of personality types. Similarly, men and women graduates are also found to differ significantly on the autonomy dimension of the psychological well-being scale. Men graduates are found to have a higher mean as compared to their women counterparts on thinking and autonomy dimensions ; whereas, women graduates are found to have a higher mean than their men counterparts on the feeling dimension (Table 3). Our findings are contrary to the results obtained by Ludban and Gitimu (2015), who found that mean values for men and women with respect to psychological wellbeing as measured by the Ryff scale significantly differed for four of the subscales (personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance) with women scoring higher than men in all the four subscales. ANOVA showed no statistical differences in autonomy and emotional mastery subscales.

Similarly, work experience related differences are also evident on all the variables in management graduates. Experienced graduates differ significantly from freshers on thinking, judging, and perceiving dimensions of personality types. Similarly, experienced graduates are found to vary significantly on the wanted control dimension of interpersonal behaviour. Experienced graduates are found to have a high mean score as compared to freshers on thinking, feeling, and wanted control dimensions ; whereas, freshers have a higher mean score for the perceiving dimension (Table 4).

Moreover, a significant difference is also found on the basis of age group. It is found that the respondents in the 20-23 years age group differ significantly from the respondents in the 24 - 27 years age group on intuition, thinking, and feeling dimensions of personality types. Similarly, they are also found to vary significantly on the autonomy dimension of psychological well - being. Graduates belonging to the 20 - 23 years age group have higher mean scores for intuition and feeling dimensions ; whereas, respondents in the 24 -27 years age group are found to have higher mean scores on thinking and autonomy dimensions (Table 5).

Our findings are somewhat similar to the results of various previously conducted research studies that showed that the levels of PWB tend to change over the life span. Studies found that autonomy and environmental mastery tended to increase with older age ; whereas, purpose in life and personal growth tended to be lower among older adults (Ryff, 1989, 1991; Ryff & Keyes, 1995; Ryff & Singer, 1998).

Conclusion

From the aforesaid results, it is observed that most of the dimensions of personality dispositions, resilience, and decision making were found to be significantly correlated with psychological well-being. The results also show that personality dispositions, resilience, and decision making are predictors of psychological well-being. At the

micro level, gender of the management graduates also shows significant variation in thinking and feeling dimensions of personality dispositions and autonomy dimension of psychological well-being. In addition to that, the work experience of management graduates also varies significantly on some dimensions of personality dispositions. Similarly, on the basis of age group, the management graduates are also found to differ significantly on some dimensions of personality dispositions and psychological well-being.

Managerial Implications

From this study, it can be ascertained that the management students who came from different states of India exhibited that their personal traits and decision making styles had an influence on their psychological well-being. It implies that the management students' personality, resilience traits, and decision making styles need to be regulated in order to have a well-adjusted psychological well-being. Managerial profession demands sound psychological health in order to take challenging assignments. Indeed, personal and psychological traits, besides background variables such as gender, educational qualifications, and discipline play an equal role in managerial profession. In order to bring in work life- balance among management professionals, it is essential to get to know their personal traits and other background measures and groom them accordingly.

Limitations of the Study and Scope for Future Research

This study could have been more useful, if respondents were from both management and non-management backgrounds. Succinctly introducing some of the moderating variables such as work commitment and job satisfaction would have added some more light to this study.

In order to meet the existing competition between business organizations, most of the organizations are concentrating on the behavioural issues of their employees. Soft skills of management students need to be harnessed in order to get identified by the companies and further get placed in those companies. Thus, a longitudinal study may add value to this existing research. A similar kind of study may be tried in work settings, so as to get to know the progress and trend among employees, which would further enable the organizations to get better productivity.

References

- Cooper, C.L., Flint-Taylor, J., & Pearn, M. (2013). *Building resilience for success: A resource for managers and organizations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Deniz, M. E. (2006). The relationships among coping with stress, life satisfaction, decision making styles and decision self-esteem: An investigation with Turkish university students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 34(9), 1161 - 1170.
- Faircloth, A. L. (2017). *Resilience as a mediator of the relationship between negative life events and psychological well-being* (Electronic Theses & Dissertations 1373). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/1373>

- Gutiérrez, J. L. G., Jiménez, B. M., Hernández, E. G., & Puente, C. P. (2005). Personality and subjective well-being: Big five correlates and demographic variables. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38(7), 1561-1569.
- Jnaneswar, K. (2016). Relationship between work life balance, turnover intention and organizational support for work life balance: A study in the IT Industry in Kerala. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 9 (5), 33 - 44. doi:10.17010/pijom/2016/v9i5/92569
- Keyes, C. L. M., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C. D. (2002). Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82 (6), 1007-1029.
- Lin, Y., Mutz, J., Clough, P. J., & Papageorgiou, K. A. (2017). Mental toughness and individual differences in learning, educational and work performance, psychological well-being, and personality : A systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01345>
- Ludban, M., & Gitimu, N.P. (2015). Psychological well-being of college students. *Undergraduate Research Journal for the Human Sciences*, 14. Retrieved from <http://www.kon.org/urc/v14/ludban.html>
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1991). Adding liebe und arbeit: The full five factor model of well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17 (2), 227-232.
- Min, J. A., Yoon, S., Lee, C.U., Chae, J.H., Lee, C., Song, K.Y., & Kim, T. S. (2013). Psychological resilience contributes to low emotional distress in cancer patients. *Support Care Cancer*, 21 (9), 2469 - 2476.
- Myers, I. B., & Briggs, K. C. (1998). *Introduction to type : A guide to understanding your results on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* (6th ed.). USA : Oxford Psychologists Press.
- Rowe, A. J., & Mason, R. O. (1987). *Managing with style : A guide to understanding and improving decision making*. San Francisco : Jossey- Bass.
- Ryff, C.D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it ? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57 (6), 1069 - 1081.
- Ryff, C.D. (1991). Possible selves in adulthood and old age: A tale of shifting horizons. *Psychology and Aging*, 6 (2), 286-295.
- Ryff, C.D., & Keyes, C.L.M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69 (4), 719 - 727.
- Ryff, C.D., & Singer, B. (1998). Middle age and well-being. In H.S. Friedman (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of mental health* (pp. 707-719). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Ryff, C.D., & Singer, B. (2003). Flourishing under fire: Resilience as a prototype of challenged thriving. In C. L. M. Keyes & J. Haidt (Eds.), *Positive psychology and the life well-lived* (pp. 15 - 36). Washington, DC: APA.
- Sagone, E., & De Caroli, M. E. (2014). Relationship between psychological well-being and resilience in middle and late adolescents. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 881-887.
- Sagone, E., & Indiana, M. L. (2017) The relationship of positive affect with resilience and self-efficacy in life skills in Italian adolescents. *Psychology*, 8, 2226 - 2239.
- Salo, I., & Allwood, C. M. (2011). Decision-making styles, stress and gender among investigators. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 34 (1), 97 - 119.

- Saricaoglu, H., & Arslan, C. (2013). An investigation into psychological well-being levels of higher education students with respect to personality traits and self-compassion. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 13 (4), 2097-2104.
- Schmutte, P. S., & Ryff, C. D. (1997). Personality and well-being: Re-examining methods and meanings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73 (3), 549 -559.
- Sharma, E. (2015). Mapping personality to enhance personal effectiveness. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, 8 (12), 44 - 55. doi:10.17010/pijom/2015/v8i12/84377
- Souri, H., & Hasanirad, T. (2011). Relationship between resilience, optimism and psychological well-being in students of medicine. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30 (1), 1541 - 1544.
- Srivastava, S., & Sinha, A.K. (2005). Resilience for well-being: The role of experiential learning. *Psychological Studies*, 50 (1), 40 - 49.
- Ullah, F. (2017). Personality factors as determinants of psychological well-being among university students. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 4 (2), 5-16.
- Wagnild, G. M., & Young, H. M. (1993). Development and psychometric evaluation of the resilience scale. *Journal of Nursing Measurement*, 1 (2), 165 - 178.
- Waterman, J., & Rogers, J. (2004). *Introduction to the FIRO-B instrument*. Mountain View, CA : Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Yilmaz, H., Arslan, C., Saricaoglu, H., & Yilmaz, S. (2013). An investigation of subjective well-being in terms of coping with stress and decision-making in university students. *Middle East Journal of Scientific Research*, 14 (9), 1143 - 1148.
- Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). Positive organizational behavior in the workplace : The impact of hope, optimism, and resilience. *Journal of Management*, 33 (5), 774 - 800.

About the Authors

Dr. Venkatesan M. is an Associate Professor with Indian Institute of Foreign Trade, New Delhi since 2008. He is presently sharing the responsibility of Heading the Assessment and Development Centre at IIFT, New Delhi. His areas of interest in research are Organizational Behavior, Behavioral Economics, Organizational Change and Development, Leadership Development, and Career Counseling & Guidance.

Ms. Anubha Rohatgi is a Junior Project Consultant at National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi.