

Study of Relations between Personality Traits and Psychological Well-Being

Dur Khan*

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to understand association between Personality Traits and Psychological Well-being domains in a sample of management students. It is both primary and secondary research involving 706 full- time MBA students. The survey makes use of Goldberg's Scale (Goldberg, 1993) to measure big five personality traits. Ryff's Well-Being Scale (Ryff, 1989) is used to measure Psychological well-being. There is an association between personality traits and psychological well-being as per the study. Personality traits namely extraversion, conscientiousness, openness and agreeableness moderately predicted psychological well-being. 'Openness to experience' is moderately associated with 'Personal growth' and 'Purposefulness' among the MBA students. The study gives insight on how personality associates with well-being domains.

Keywords: *Personality Traits, Psychological Well-Being, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Openness, Agreeableness*

INTRODUCTION

Studies on Personality and personality traits, psychological well-being state and mental health are of significant importance as these dynamic concepts play an important role in determining the behaviour of individuals. Personality can be defined as “the set of habitual behaviors, cognitions and emotional patterns evolving from biological and environmental factors” (Corr & Matthews, 2009). On the other hand, Psychological well-being is accomplished by achieving a state of balance between challenging and satisfying life events (Dodge et al., 2012). This paper attempts to

* Assistant Professor, Jammalal Bajaj Institute of Management Studies, University of Mumbai, Maharashtra, India. Email: durkhan@jbims.edu

understand association of Personality Traits and Psychological Well-being domains in a sample of management students.

PERSONALITY AND PERSONALITY TRAITS

Personality captures what people are like and ability captures what people can do (Colquitt, 2009). Personality has to do with individual differences among people in behavior patterns, cognition and emotion (Mischel, 2004). Personality dimensions are beyond one's control, they strongly influence one's attitudes, expectations and assumptions and behaviour (Kinicki, 2008).

Personality can be conceptualized using personality traits. Personality traits are recurring regularities and trends in a person (Colquitt, 2009). One popular and widely used personality trait model is *Five Factor Model (FFM)* (Goldberg, 1993; Costa & McCrae 1992). The five factors are *extraversion*, *agreeableness*, *conscientiousness*, *neuroticism* (or its opposite pole, emotional stability), and *intellect or openness to experience*. (John et al., 2008). Many personality psychologists (Digman, 1989; Costa & McCrae 1992; Goldberg, 1993; Saucier & Goldberg, 1996) agree that said five domains capture the most basic individual differences in personality traits and different alternative trait models can be conceptualized in terms of the Big Five structure. There are researchers (Block, 1995) who argue that there are many more personality differences than can be represented other than the five factors with two poles.

Extraversion (Extrovert vs. Introvert Individuals): Extraversion includes traits like being sociable, talkative, gregarious, assertive, active, ambitious and expressive (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Extroverts have a strong desire for social recognition, status, praise and power. Extraversion is associated with adjective traits such as being talkative, passionate, sociable, bold, and dominant (Colquitt, 2009). Extraversion is manifested by noticeable engagement with the external social world. Extraverts enjoy being around with people. They are full of energy and experience positive emotions more frequently than others. When in a group, these individuals like to talk a lot, assert themselves, and draw attention to themselves (Friedman & Schustack, 2016).

Agreeableness (Agreeable vs. Disagreeable Individuals): Agreeableness include personality traits such as being courteous, trusting, flexible, cooperative, soft-hearted, forgiving, good-natured, and tolerant (Barrick

& Mount, 1991). Agreeableness reflects individual differences in concern with cooperation, collaboration and social harmony. Agreeable individual value getting along with others. Agreeable individuals are considerate, friendly, generous and helpful. They are willing to compromise their happiness for others benefit. (Colquitt, 2009). Disagreeable individuals may prefer self-interest. They give less importance to getting along with others. These individuals are generally not concerned with others comfort and well-being. Often they might be unfriendly, unhelpful and uncooperative. Whereas situations that require tough and outright objective decisions, agreeableness is not useful. It might rather prove out to be harmful (Friedman & Schustack, 2016).

Conscientiousness (Conscientious vs. Unconscientious Individuals): Conscientiousness includes traits such as being hardworking, thorough, organized, responsible, careful, and persevering (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Conscientiousness is associated with trait like being dependable, organized, reliable, ambitious, and hardworking (Colquitt, 2009). Conscientiousness concerns the way in which people control, regulate, and direct their impulses (Friedman & Schustack, 2016).

An individual who is high on the Conscientiousness is perceived as intelligent. A hallmark of intelligence is the ability to think about future consequences before acting impulsively. Intelligence and acting on impulses is seen contrary, Intelligence involves examination of long-range goals, organizing and planning ways to achieve these goals, and persevering toward one's goals in presence of short-lived impulses. There are obvious benefits of being high in conscientiousness, Individuals high on Conscientiousness achieve high levels of success through purposeful planning, persistence and perseverance (Colquitt, 2009).

Emotional stability (Emotionally Stable vs. Neurotic Individuals): Neuroticism (polar opposite of emotional stability) includes traits like being anxious, depressed, emotional, angry, embarrassed, worried, and insecure (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Neurotic individuals are limited in social skills and avoids situations that demand for taking control (Colquitt, 2009).

Neuroticism (polar opposite of emotional stability) means the tendency to experience negative feelings. Individual with high on Neuroticism are less emotionally stable. These individuals may experience some negative feeling such as anxiety, anger, or depression, and they are likely to experience several of these emotions. People low on emotional stability are high in neuroticism. These individuals are emotionally reactive in

nature. There can be events that might not affect most of people around, but neurotic individuals may respond to those events. Their reactions tend to be more emotional and more intense than normal. These issues become a hurdle in the ability to think clearly, to cope efficiently with stress and to make effective decisions (Friedman & Schustack, 2016).

At the other end of the scale, individuals who score high in emotional stability are people low in neuroticism. They get upset less easily and they are less emotionally reactive. They are calm and emotionally stable. Highly emotionally stable individuals do not experiences tubborn negative feelings. Interestingly, this does not mean that they experience a lot of positive feelings. Frequency of positive emotions is rather a factor of the Extraversion domain (Colquitt, 2009).

Openness to Experience (Open vs. Closed Individuals): Openness to experience include traits like being imaginative, curious, original, intelligent, broad minded and artistically sensitive (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Openness has to do with curious, imaginative, creative, complex, refined, sophisticated (Colquitt, 2009). Openness to Experience describes a personality trait that differentiates imaginative, creative people from down-to-earth, conventional people. Open individuals are intellectually curious, sensitive to beauty, and appreciative of art. They tend to be more aware of their feelings, compared to closed people. Open individuals tend to think and act in non-conventional distinctive ways (Friedman & Schustack, 2016).

Intellectuals typically score high on Openness to Experience; that is why this factor has also been called Intellect. However, Intellect is probably best regarded as one aspect of openness to experience. Openness don't seem to be powerfully associated with years of education and scores on standard intelligent tests. People scoring low on openness to experience have slender interests. They tend to prefer the straightforward, and obvious ways over the complex, ambiguous, and subtle. Closed people prefer familiarity over novelty; they are conservative in nature and show resistance to change (Colquitt, 2009).

The Big Five is very popular framework of personality assessment. One of the reason is the fact that personality traits are quite stable and not likely to experience major changes particularly after adulthood. Personality is stable over a period of four-year (Cobb-Clark & Schurer, 2012). Like other non-cognitive traits, personality can be exhibited as a stable input into many decisions (Caspi, 2005).

Changes over time in entire levels are extreme over childhood, some changes are also likely to occur during adulthood. However, they seem to be very steady and determined by biological progress rather than life experience. Big Five is a robust measure both across cultures and samples. Also, Big Five personality traits are generally not associated with cognitive skills which is defined as the ability to solve abstract problems (John et al., 2008). Hence, the Big Five personality traits comprises of truly distinct factors in the analysis of personality.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING (PWB) AND ITS DOMAINS

Psychological well-being relates differently to different people. It is very subjective. In general, the ability to cope up with the frequent stresses of everyday life in an acceptable way can be regarded as psychological health. Ryff Carol (1989) explains psychological well-being by lying down its different facets. A person with following attributes can be regarded as a psychologically healthy person. The degree and proportion of each facet may vary but an overall positive presence of these can be regarded as presence of psychological well-being.

Ryff (1989) in her seminal paper “Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being” promoted Psychological well-being theory. She differentiated Psychological well-being (PWB) from subjective well-being (hedonic well-being). Ryff (1989) explored the meaning of Psychological Well-Being by studying the extensive literature on well-being. She theorised six aspects of well-being as autonomy, positive relations with others, self-acceptance, environmental mastery, purpose in life and personal growth. A sample of Three hundred and twenty-one individuals consisting of men and women as well as young, middle-aged, and older adults, rated themselves on these six measures along with some other measures of well-being (affect balance, self-esteem, life satisfaction, locus of control, morale and depression). Results discovered that aspects like positive relations with others, purpose in life, autonomy, and personal growth were not strongly present in prior assessment indexes, hereby supporting the assertion that key aspects of positive functioning have not been symbolised in the empirical research arena (Ryff, 1989).

Ryff’s study (1989) was based on the fact that there has been negligence in the task of defining the essential features of psychological well-being.

She argued that much of the prior literature is founded on conceptions of well-being that have little theoretical rationale as a consequence of which, theory on psychological well-being has neglected important aspects of positive functioning. An alternative framework of psychological well-being, based on the integration of several theoretical domains is presented and operationalized in this research. The research also brings attention to the fact that the literature on psychological well-being was not, in its inception, strongly theory guided. Instruments, earlier developed for other purposes, became the standard bearers for defining positive functioning. The six aspects of psychological well-being conceptualized by Ryff (1989) autonomy, personal growth, self-acceptance, life purpose, mastery, and positive relations are described below in detail.

Autonomy: Autonomy consist of qualities like self-determination, independence, and the regulation of behavior from within have got considerable emphasis in the prior literature. Individuals with high autonomy are Self-actualizers. These people show autonomous functioning. People high in autonomy have an internal locus of control, they do not look for others' approval, and they evaluate themselves by personal standards. Autonomy involves the process of turning inward. Life span developmentalists suggest that autonomy gives an individual a sense of freedom from the standards governing everyday life (Ryff, 1989).

Self-Acceptance: The most repeated standard of well-being evident in the previous perspectives is the individual's sense of self-acceptance. This is regarded as a central feature of mental health as well as a characteristic of self-actualization, optimal functioning, and maturity. Acceptance of self and of one's past life is also emphasized by Life span theories. Holding positive attitudes toward oneself thus emerges as an essential characteristic of positive and healthy psychological functioning (Ryff, 1989).

Positive Relations with Others: Positive relations with others includes having trusting and warm interpersonal relationships. The ability to love and care is regarded as a significant component of mental health. Positive relations comes with strong feelings of empathy and affection for all human beings, being capable of greater love, deeper friendship, and more complete identification with others. Warmth relating to others is seen as a criteria of maturity. Thus, the importance of positive relations with others is frequently stressed in these conceptions of psychological well-being (Ryff, 1989).

Environmental Mastery: An individual's ability to manage environments suitable to his/her mental conditions is seen as a dominant characteristic of

positive functioning. Maturity and life span development also contribute to this. These theories emphasize one's ability to progress in the world and change it creatively through physical and mental activities. Environmental mastery is an important ingredient of positive psychological functioning (Ryff, 1989).

Purpose in Life: Mental health is said to include beliefs that give one the feeling there is purpose in and meaning to life. Maturity also give emphasis to a clear comprehension of life's purpose, a sense of direction in life and intentionality. Thus, one who has positive psychological functioning has goals, intentions, and a sense of direction, and the feeling that life is meaningful (Ryff, 1989).

Personal Growth: Optimal positive functioning requires individuals to continue developing their potential to grow and expand as a person. Self-actualization and realizing one's true potentials are central for personal growth. Openness to experience is a key characteristic of the positive functioning person. Those who are ready to experience and learn eventually continually develop themselves. Continued growth is also given evident emphasis in Life span theories (Ryff, 1989).

The basic aim of Ryff's research (1989) was to encourage interest in the research question of what factors constitutes to positive psychological functioning of an individual. The combination of mental health and life span developmental theories points to multiple aspects of positive psychological functioning. The above six dimensions of well-being constitute to an individual's mental health and positive functioning. It is argued by Ryff, 1989 that early conceptions of well-being neglect of important aspects of psychological health. In an effort to introduce the concept of psychological well-being to the empirical literature, six theory-guided dimensions of well-being were operationalized. The key aspects of positive psychological functioning emphasized in Ryff's theory have not been represented in the empirical arena (Ryff, 1989).

LITERATURE REVIEW ON PERSONALITY AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING

A study by Chaturvedula and Joseph (2007) aimed to identify the general level of PWB in fifty (50) military aircrew and to find the association between PWB and personality. The results indicate that the aviators perceive themselves to have average quality of life and Psychological

well-being. They manifested high levels of neuroticism and very high levels of extraversion. This study emphasizes that health care providers must have a clear understanding about the level of psychological well-being and personality make-up of the aircrew (Chaturvedula & Joseph 2007).

Grant along with his fellow researchers studied association of personality traits with psychological well-being domains. According to the authors, there is considerable research on association of personality with “hedonic” or subjective well-being, however, research on association of personality with “eudaimonic” or psychological well-being is limited. The study investigated the association between the Big Five traits and subjective as well as psychological well-being in a sample of 211 men and women. Results indicated that the relationship between personality and psychological well-being is stronger than the relationship between personality and subjective well-being. It was found that Extraversion, neuroticism and conscientiousness correlated similarly with both psychological and subjective well-being. Thus, these traits represent personality tendencies for a decent level of well-being. However, the association of personality dimensions within each domain of well-being is diverse. This signifies the need to study the relationship between personality and well-being in terms of specific trait-well-being dimension associations (Grant et al., 2009).

The relationships were analysed among personality traits, psychological well-being and emotional intelligence (EI) in undergraduate students in a study by Augusto and his fellow researchers in 2010. It was found that low scores in neuroticism and high scores in extraversion are the dimensions of personality highly correlated with all the psychological well-being domains, they are also the best predictors of psychological well-being (Augusto et al., 2010). Results of a research determining the relationship between personality domains and well-being indicated that all personality domains correlated significantly with well-being. Openness to experience and conscientiousness were found to contribute significantly to well-being followed by extraversion (Marzuki, 2013).

Certain personality traits such as Extraversion, Conscientiousness and Openness relate differently to psychological well-being in Iranian and Swedish cultures. Neuroticism relate similarly across said cultures (Kjell et al., 2013). Associations of personality traits with psychological well-being (PWB) were analysed across ages 33-50 as part of a study done by a group of researchers in 2013. In another research, it was found

that Low neuroticism and high extraversion correlated strongly with high PWB. Conscientiousness, openness, and agreeableness were also linked to PWB. Personality traits were more strongly linked to PWB than emotional well-being (Kokko et al., 2013).

Gale and his fellow researchers in 2013 highlighted that Neuroticism and Extraversion are linked with well-being. The research applied structural equation modelling to data from 4583 people from the MRC National Survey of Health and Development. The impact of Neuroticism and Extraversion on mental well-being at ages 16 and 26 years and on life satisfaction at age 60-64 was studied, the mediating roles of psychological and physical health was also explored. It was reported that *Extraversion has direct and positive impact on both measures of well-being*. The impact of Neuroticism on both well-being and life satisfaction was largely indirect through tendency to psychological distress and physical health problems. Personality characters in youth have enduring influence on well-being measured forty years later (Gale et al., 2013).

Psychologists have given considerable attention to how well-being relates to personality traits. An early investigation used the big five model of traits and found that openness to experience was linked with personal growth, agreeableness was linked with positive relations with others, and extraversion, conscientiousness and neuroticism were all linked with environmental mastery, purpose in life and self-acceptance (Schmutte & Ryff, 1997). Another study by Pandya and Korat (2015) reported high correlation between the youths Personality Traits and Psychological well-being. The study was done on a sample of 120 individuals with both males and females in equal numbers selected through random sampling. Personality Traits Inventory and Psychological well-being Inventory having sufficient reliability and validity were used. For the purpose of analysis, The Karl-Pearson technique was used. Study reveals that there is significant positive correlation between the youths Personality Traits and Psychological well-being (Pandya & Korat, 2015).

The study by Mobarakeh and fellow researchers (2015) studied the relationships between personality traits and psychological well-being among Iranian adolescent migrants in Kuala-Lumpur, Malaysia. The results from this study showed that there was negative relationship between neuroticism trait and psychological well-being whereas extroversion and agreeableness have positive correlation with psychological well-being. The results also indicated that openness to experience and conscientiousness do not have significance relationships with psychological well-being (Mobarakeh et al., 2015).

A recent study by Reese et al. (2017) explored links between narrative identity, personality traits, and well-being for 263 adolescents (age 12-21) from three New Zealand cultures: Māori, Chinese, and European. Across cultures, older adolescents with higher causal coherence reported better well-being. Personality was positively linked to well-being for New Zealand European adolescents only. Neuroticism, conscientiousness, and openness were the personality traits linked to well-being (Reese et al., 2017).

GAP ANALYSIS AND IDENTIFICATION OF VARIABLES

From the literature review it can be concluded that there is *ambiguity in determining relationship between personality traits and psychological well-being*, different authors have different opinions regarding the same five factors of personality. More importantly, there is paucity of research in area of linking personality traits *with individual domain of psychological well-being*. Hence, keeping literature review as base, following variables are identified for study. The Independents variables are *Personality Traits*. The Big Five personality traits are *Emotional stability* (the degree to which a person can be depressed, anxious, angry and emotionally insecure), *Extroversion* (the degree to which a person can be talkative, active, sociable, and assertive), *Openness to experience* (the degree to which an individual can be open to new experiences and intellectually curious), *Agreeableness* (the extent to which a person can be flexible, good natured, trusting, and liked by others) and *Conscientiousness* (the degree to which a person can be a planner, a dependable, responsible and organized person).

Psychological Well-Being Domains are identified as dependent variables. The psychological well-being domains are *Autonomy* (the degree of independence and self-determination), *Environmental mastery* (the ability to manage one's life properly and responsibly), *Personal growth* (the extent of being open to new experiences), *Positive relations with others* (the ability to have satisfying and high quality relationships with others), *Purpose in life* (the degree of goal-orientation, believing that one's life is meaningful and purposeful) and lastly *Self-acceptance* (the degree of a positive attitude towards oneself and one's past life).

Some findings from empirical research are listed here. Extraversion, neuroticism and conscientiousness correlate with psychological well-being, suggesting that these traits represent personality predispositions for a general level of well-being (Grant et al., 2009). Low scores in neuroticism and high scores in extraversion are the dimensions of personality most related

to all the psychological well-being scales, and also the best predictors of psychological well-being (Augusto et al., 2010). Personality traits such as Extraversion, Openness, and Conscientiousness relate differently to well-being measures across Iranian and Swedish cultures. Neuroticism relate similarly across these cultures (Kjell et al., 2013).

Low neuroticism and high extraversion correlated strongly with high psychological well-being. Conscientiousness, openness, and agreeableness were also linked to psychological well-being (Kokko et al., 2013). Neuroticism and Extraversion are linked with well-being. Extraversion had direct, positive effects on both measures of well-being. The impact of Neuroticism on both wellbeing and life satisfaction was largely indirect through tendency to psychological distress and physical health problems (Gale et al., 2013). There is negative relationship between neuroticism trait and psychological well-being, while extroversion and agreeableness traits have positive correlation with psychological well-being (Mobarakeh et al., 2015).

All personality domains (neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness) correlated significantly with well-being. Openness to experience, conscientiousness and extraversion contributed significantly to well-being (Marzuki, 2013). Neuroticism, conscientiousness, and openness are linked to well-being (Reese et al., 2017). Thus, literature review also supports association of all big five traits with psychological well-being.

What is lacking in empirical research is the association of personality traits with individual domain of psychological well-being. There is paucity of research in this area, only one early research associates big five traits with individual domain of psychological well-being. The research by Schmutte and Ryff in 1997 found that openness to experience and extra version are linked with personal growth, agreeableness and extraversion are linked with positive relations with others; extraversion, conscientiousness and neuroticism are all linked with environmental mastery, purpose in life and self-acceptance and lastly Neuroticism is linked with autonomy (Schmutte & Ryff, 1997).

When the personality trait model and psychological well being model is combined, *there is a possibility of considerable association between each personality traits and psychological well-being domains.* For example Openness to experience and Personal growth can be associated as the later means degree to which an individual can be open to new experiences and intellectually curious and the former means the extent of

being open to new experiences. On similar lines, Agreeableness can be associated with Positive relations as agreeableness means being friendly and positive relations include having quality relationship with others. This gap will be addressed in our study.

OBJECTIVES

Based on the literature review and gap analysis, following the objectives are identified for study. The first objective is *to analyze the personality traits and psychological well-being of business management students*. Profiling of students in terms of their personality trait composition and psychological well-being state is the leading objective of this research. Once the mapping of traits is done, the following objective is *to understand the association between personality traits and psychological well-being domains*. When personality traits and psychological well-being factors are considered together, there is a strong need to map them together. The final objective of this research is to understand how ‘each’ of the personality traits overlap with ‘each’ psychological well-being domains and whether there is association between these traits. Based on literature review and objectives, following hypothesis are formulated.

HYPOTHESES

To fulfill the objective to understand the association between personality traits and psychological well-being domains, following hypotheses are formulated.

H_0 : *Personality traits are not associated with psychological well-being domains.*

H_A : *Personality traits are associated with psychological well-being domains.*

This hypothesis is developed keeping literature review as base. Since in the empirical research, there evidence of all personality traits being associated with psychological well-being (Augusto et al., 2010; Marzuki, 2013; Kjell et al., 2013, Kokko et al., 2013; Pandya & Korat, 2015; Mobarakeh et al., 2015; Reese et al., 2017), for the purpose of our study, the association of all personality traits with psychological well-being is hypothesized. It is also highlighted in the gap analysis that is paucity in research attempting to link individual personality traits with individual psychological well-being domains. Our research attempts to fill this gap

in the empirical literature by understanding the significance of association of all personality traits individually with all well-being domains as well as with overall psychological well-being. Further, the strength of these associations will be studied.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Secondary research in form of literature review is done; primary research is also undertaken through a survey questionnaire. It is descriptive and exploratory research. Sample consist of 478 men and 228 women within the age group of 24-30 year olds. Total sample size drawn is 706 respondents selected through random sampling.

QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The survey makes use of big five (Goldberg, 1993) to measure personality traits (Emotional stability, Extroversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness). It includes sentences and the respondents have to indicate their degree of agreement on a scale of 1 to 5 (1=Very Inaccurate, 5=Very Accurate) as a description of their personalities. Sample test sentences are; 'I am quiet around strangers, I make people feel at ease, I follow a schedule. I am full of ideas.'

The survey also draws questions from Ryff's Well-Being Scale of 1989 to measure Psychological well-being (Personal growth, Positive relations, Environmental mastery, Autonomy, Self-acceptance and Purposefulness). It includes sentences and the respondents have to indicate their degree of agreement on a scale of 1 to 6 (1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree). Sample test sentences are; 'I tend to worry about what other people think of me. I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live. I feel confident and positive about myself.' The following analysis discusses the reliability of the questionnaire.

Table 1: Reliability Test

Item Set	No. of items	N (No. of Respondents)	No. of Valid Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Personality Traits	50	706	601*	0.929
Psychological Well-Being	42	706	562*	0.945

*Responses with missing data was excluded for reliability calculation

	Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Emotional Stability	Openness To Experiences	Personal Growth	Personal Relations	Purposefulness	Self-Acceptance	Autonomy	Environmental Mastery
Skewness	-.376	-.825	-.566	-.228	-.566	-.376	-.625	-.602	-.645	-.512	-.559
Std. Error of Skewness	.092	.092	.092	.092	.092	.092	.092	.092	.092	.092	.092
Kurtosis	.298	1.107	.535	-.097	.827	.298	.130	.773	.829	.331	.739
Std. Error of Kurtosis	.184	.184	.184	.184	.184	.184	.184	.184	.184	.184	.184

One of the objective of the study is to understand the personality traits and level of psychological well-being of management students. Descriptive analysis of Table 2 shows that majority of students have high Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Openness but low Emotional Stability. Considering psychological well-being, majority of students demonstrate high level of Personal Growth, Personal Relations, Purposefulness, Self-Acceptance, Autonomy and Environmental Mastery. Further, the relationship between Personality traits and Psychological well-being domains is tested through Chi-square test. The strength of these associations is tested through Cramer's V test.

H_0 : Personality traits are not associated with Psychological well-being domains.

H_A : Personality traits are associated with Psychological well-being domains.

Table 3 gives the Chi-Square and Cramer's V test analysis for testing association between Personality Traits and Psychological Well-Being.

Inference: Considering the results of Table 3, Null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted at 5% level of significance.

Table 3: Association between Personality Traits and Psychological Well-Being Domains

PWB	118.43	.000	.410	77.29	.000	.331	67.33	.000	.309	31.02	.000	.210	36.22	.000	.227
EM	103.19	.000	.382	52.92	.000	0.274	74.54	.000	0.325	52.17	.000	.272	48.04	.000	0.261
A	139.18	.000	.444	80.62	.000	0.380	92.63	.000	.362	30.09	.000	.206	47.42	.000	0.259
SA	85.68	.000	.348	121.13	.000	.414	56.05	.000	.282	29.88	.000	.206	40.05	.000	0.238
P	175.44	.000	.498	80.98	.000	.339	91.37	.000	.360	39.40	.000	.236	95.723	.000	0.368
PR	65.91	.000	.306	30.48	.000	.207	49.84	.000	.266	32.03	.000	.213	38.38	.000	0.233
PG	706.00	.000	1.00	64.72	.000	.303	54.386	.000	0.278	47.71	.000	.260	78.08	.000	0.333
	Chi-square	p-value	Cramer's V	Chi-square	p-value	Cramer's V	Chi-square	p-value	Cramer's V	Chi-square	p-value	Cramer's V	Chi-square	p-value	Cramer's V
	Extraversion			Agreeableness			Conscientiousness			Emotional Stability			Openness To Experiences		

PG=Personal Growth, PR=Positive Relations with Others, P=Purposefulness, SA= Self-Acceptance, A=Autonomy, EM=Environmental Mastery, PWB= Overall Psychological Well-being

Personality traits are significantly associated with psychological well-being domains. P value is less than 0.05 for all traits and domains. Table 3 demonstrates the association of personality traits and psychological well-being domains. Hence it can be interpreted that personality traits are significantly associated with psychological well-being. Looking at strength of these associations, the relationship is different for each trait. Cramer's V value up to 0.3 denotes weak association between the traits, 0.3 to 0.6 is considered as moderate association and 0.6 and above is considered high association.

DISCUSSION

Extraversion best predicted personal growth. Extraversion is significantly associated with all well-being domains ($p < 0.05$ for all). There is a very strong association between extraversion and personal growth (Cramer's $V = 1.00$). Extraversion trait is also moderately associated with all other well-being domains like Purpose in life (Cramer's $V = .498$) and Autonomy (Cramer's $V = .444$), environmental mastery (Cramer's $V = .382$), Self-acceptance (Cramer's $V = .348$), Positive Relations (Cramer's $V = .306$). Extraversion is moderately associated with overall psychological well-being (Cramer's $V = .410$). This indicates that an individual with high extraversion will also have high personal growth. And he may possibly also have high psychological well-being.

Agreeableness has a significant association with psychological well-being domains ($p < 0.05$ for all). These associations are moderate in nature for Self-acceptance (Cramer's $V = .414$), Autonomy (Cramer's $V = .380$), Purpose in life (Cramer's $V = .339$), Personal Growth (Cramer's $V = .303$) and weak for the rest. Overall agreeableness is moderately associated with psychological well-being (Cramer's $V = .331$). *This indicated that having high level of agreeableness increases one's chances of having high psychological well-being.*

Conscientiousness has significant association with all psychological well-being domains ($p < 0.05$ for all). However, this association is moderate in nature for Purpose in life (Cramer's $V = .360$), Autonomy (Cramer's $V = .362$) and Environmental mastery (Cramer's $V = .325$). For rest of the traits it's a weak association. Overall, conscientiousness is moderately associated with Psychological well-being (Cramer's $V = .309$) *signifying that having high level of Conscientiousness increases probabilities of having high psychological well-being.*

Emotional stability weakly predict psychological well-being. Emotional stability has significant association with each well-being domain. However, this association is weak for all (Cramer's $V < 0.300$ for all) *indicating that having high level of emotional stability may not necessarily indicate high psychological well-being.*

Openness is also significantly associated with all psychological well-being domains ($p < 0.05$ for all). However, this association is moderate for Personal Growth (Cramer's $V = 0.333$) and Purpose in life (Cramer's $V = 0.368$) and weak for rest of the well-being domains. It is also weakly associated with overall psychological well-being. *This indicates that openness though moderately predicts personal growth and purposefulness, it may not very strongly predict overall psychological well-being.*

MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Based on data analysis, the association of personality traits and psychological well-being domains is established. All big five traits are significantly associated with all well-being domains as well as with overall psychological well-being. However, the strength of association differs for each relationship. Personality traits namely extraversion, conscientiousness, openness and agreeableness moderately predicted psychological well-being with a crammers value of more than 0.3. Emotional stability weakly predicted well-being and all its domain. Extraversion majorly predicted overall Psychological well-being ($V = 0.410$). 'Extraversion' is strongly associated with 'Personal Growth' ($V = 1$) and moderately associated 'autonomy' ($V = 0.444$), 'Purpose in life' ($V = 0.498$) and all other well-being domains ($V > 0.3$). 'Conscientiousness' is associated with 'Environmental mastery', 'autonomy' and 'Purposefulness' as well as with overall psychological well-being ($V > 0.3$). 'Agreeableness is moderately associated with self-acceptance ($V = 0.414$), 'Purpose in life', 'personal growth', 'autonomy' and with overall psychological well-being ($V > 0.3$). Lastly 'Openness to experience' is moderately associated with 'Personal growth' and 'Purposefulness'.

The study of literature as well suggest that personality traits predict psychological well-being (E.g. Augusto et al., 2010). The strength of these association differ for each relationship. Extraversion is significantly associated with all well-being domains. A very strong association is observed between extraversion and personal growth. Extroverts are high in Personal Growth and Introverts are low on it. This could be because extroverts are have strong desire for praise, social recognition, status and

power. They are ambitious and hence demonstrate high personal growth. Extraversion trait is also moderately associated with all other well-being domains like Purpose in life, Autonomy, environmental mastery, Self-acceptance and Positive Relations. Extraversion is moderately associated with overall psychological well-being. Literature also suggest Extraversion to have direct and positive effect on psychological well-being (Gale et al., 2013). Extraversion is linked with environmental mastery, purpose in life and self-acceptance (Schmutte & Ryff, 1997).

Agreeableness also has a significant association with psychological well-being domains. These associations are moderate in nature for Self-acceptance, Autonomy, and Purpose in life, Personal Growth and weak for the rest. Overall agreeableness is moderately associated with psychological well-being. Review of literature also shows that agreeableness has positive correlation with psychological well-being (Mobarakeh et al., 2015). Conscientiousness has significant association with all psychological well-being domains. However, this association is moderate in nature for Purpose in life, Autonomy and Environmental mastery. For rest of the traits it's a weak association. Overall, conscientiousness is moderately associated with Psychological well-being. Empirical Research also suggest that Conscientiousness is linked with environmental mastery, purpose in life (Schmutte & Ryff, 1997). High Conscientiousness Individuals are organized and systematic, so they also manage their lives properly by demonstrating high environmental mastery and they also show high purposefulness.

Considering emotional stability, it has significant association with each well-being domain. However, this association is weak for all well-being domains. Literature review shows neuroticism (opposite of emotional stability) to be linked with environmental mastery, purpose in life and self-acceptance. Also, the impact of Neuroticism on well-being is largely indirect through tendency to psychological distress and physical health problems (Gale et al., 2013). There is negative relationship between neuroticism trait and psychological well-being (Mobarakeh et al., 2015).

Openness is significantly associated with all psychological well-being domains and this association is moderate for Personal Growth and Purpose in life and weak for rest of the well-being domains. Openness is also weakly associated with overall psychological well-being. An early research also suggest that Openness to experience is linked with personal growth (Schmutte & Ryff, 1997). This is because individuals high on openness are ready to take up new opportunities and challenges, they are open to new experiences and learnings and hence this may lead to the

self-evaluation that the individual is growing and developing in personal and professional life.

CONCLUSION

The study revealed significant association of all personality traits with all psychological well-being domains. (Augusto et al., 2010; Marzuki, 2013; Kjell et al., 2013, Kokko et al., 2013; Pandya & Korat, 2015; Mobarakeh et al., 2015; Reese et al., 2017). It also validates the age old study by Schmutte and Ryff in 1997 suggesting that Openness to experience is linked with personal growth, conscientiousness is linked with environmental mastery and purpose in life. However, strangely, agreeableness is not linked with positive relations with others. It is worthy to note that agreeableness is rather moderately linked self-acceptance. Extraversion is strongly linked to personal growth. The research was initiated in order to understand and comprehend the link between personality traits and psychological well-being domains. The findings on how personality associates with well-being gives a fair idea about the traits which are significantly linked with high level of psychological well-being. Individuals will also benefit from this research. One can become conscious and start working on the improvement of mental health as well as personality development.

LIMITATIONS AND SCOPE OF STUDY

The study lays down its foundation on the two age old model; The Five Factor Model (Goldberg, 1993; Costa & McCrae, 1992) and Psychological well-being model (Ryff, Carol D, 1989). Hence the research limits itself to the personality traits and psychological well-being domains provided by these models. Also, the primary research involves respondents from Mumbai, India only.

REFERENCES

- Augusto, J. M., Landa, M. P. M., & Esther, L.-Z. (2010). Emotional intelligence and personality traits as predictors of psychological well-being in Spanish undergraduates. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 38(6), 783-794.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1),

1-26.

- Block, J. (1995). Going beyond the five factors given: Rejoinder to Costa and McCrae and Goldberg and Saucier. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*(2), 226-229. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.117.2.226
- Caspi, A., Brent, W. R., & Rebecca, L. S. (2005). Personality development: Stability and change. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *56*(1), 453-484.
- Chaturvedula, S., & Joseph, C. (2007). Dimensions of psychological well-being and personality in military aircrew: A preliminary study. *Indian Journal of Aerospace Medicine*, *51*(2), 17-27.
- Cobb-Clark D., & Schurer S. (2012). The stability of big-five personality traits. *Economics Letters*, *115*(1), 11-15.
- Colquitt, J., Le-Pine, J., & Wesson, M. (2009). *Organizational behavior: Improving performance and commitment in the workplace*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Irwin.
- Corr, P. J., & Matthews, G. (2009). *The Cambridge handbook of personality psychology*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-86218-9
- Costa, P. T. Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO five-factor inventory (NEO-FFI) manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Digman, J. M. (1989). Five robust trait dimensions: Development, stability, and utility. *Journal of Personality*, *57*(2), 195-214. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1989.tb00480.x
- Dodge, R., Daly, A., Huyton, J., & Sanders, L. (2012). The challenge of defining wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, *2*(3), 222-235. doi:10.5502/ijw.v2i3.4
- Friedman, H. S., & Schustack, M. W. (2016). *Personality: Classic theories and modern research* (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Gale, C. R., Booth, T., Möttus, R., Kuh, D., & Deary, I. J. (2013). Neuroticism and extraversion in youth predict mental wellbeing and life satisfaction 40 years later. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *47*(6), 687-697. Retrieved from <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.06.005>
- Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, *48*(1), 26-34. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.48.1.26. PMID 8427480
- Grant, S., Langan-Fox, J., & Anglim, J. (2009). The big five traits as predictors of subjective and psychological well-being. *Psychological Reports*, *105*(1), 205-231.

- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 114-158). New York: Guilford.
- Kinicki, A. (2008). *Organizational behavior: Core concepts*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Irwin.
- Kjell, O. N. E., Ali, A. N., Sverker, S., Trevor, A., & Danilo, G. (2013). Iranian and Swedish adolescents: Differences in personality traits and well-being. *PeerJ*, 1(1), 197. doi: 10.7717/peerj.197
- Kokko, K., Tolvanen, A., & Pulkkinen, L. (2013). Associations between personality traits and psychological well-being across time in middle adulthood. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 47(6), 748-756. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2013.07.002>
- Marzuki, N. A. (2013). The impact of personality on employee well-being. *European Scientific Journal*, 9(20), 43-52.
- Mischel, W. (2004). Toward an integrative model for CBT: Encompassing behavior, cognition, affect, and process. *Behavior Therapy*, 35(1), 185-203.
- Mobarakeh, M., Juhari, R., Yaacob, S., Redzuan, M., & Mobarakeh, S. (2015). The effects of personality traits and psychological well-being among Iranian adolescent migrants in Kuala-Lumpur, Malaysia. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 20(7), 25-28. doi:10.9790/0837-20712528
- Pandya, M., & Korat, N. (2015). Personality traits and psychological well-being among youths of Rajkot district. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2(2), 19-23.
- Reese, E., Myftari, E., McAnally, H. M., Chen, Y., Neha, T., Wang, Q., Jack, F., & Robertson, S.-J. (2017). Telling the tale and living well: Adolescent narrative identity, personality traits, and well-being across cultures. *Child Development*, 88(2), 612-628. doi:10.1111/cdev.12618
- 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.
- 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. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.3.549>