

A Study of Personal Dispositions in Relation with Motivation, Decision Making, Creativity, Interpersonal Behaviour and Psychological Well-Being of Management Students.

Dr. M. Venkatesan

Associate Professor
Department of Management
Indian Institute of Foreign
Technology
New Delhi, India

Anubha Rohatgi

Junior Project Consultant
Centre for Policy Research in
Higher Educational Planning
and Administration
New Delhi, India

Abstract

The present study is designed to examine the personal dispositions of management students with Motivation, Decision Making, Creativity, Interpersonal Behaviour, and Psychological Well-being. The objectives of study is to find out correlation between personality dispositions, motivation, decision making, creativity, interpersonal behaviour, and psychological well-being, and to compare personality dispositions, motivation, decision making, creativity, interpersonal behaviour, and psychological well-being of management students based on their age, gender and work experience. The sample consist of 101 post graduate students who belong to diverse educational background; ranging from engineering to as varied as art and commerce. Out of 101, 87 were male and 14 were female students. Also students belonged to different states of India. The average age of the total sample was 23 years. The analysis revealed that Psychological well-being is significantly correlated with some of the dimensions of personality, decision making and creativity whereas it has no significant correlation with dimensions of motivation to lead, and Interpersonal Behaviour. However, the difference in gender was found in expressed-control behaviour. Succinctly the Identity based and Social Normative motivation to lead also varied between genders. As far as the work experience is concerned, the students who had work experience significantly varied from fresh graduates students on three dimensions of barriers to creativity. Moreover, it was also found that students differs significantly one dimension of decision making and one dimensions of barrier to creativity. From the findings of the study, it has been understood that the age differences, gender differences and work experience

wise differences have made an impact on the psychological variables such as personality dispositions, motivation, decision making, creativity, interpersonal behaviour and psychological well-being of management students. Thus findings would help management in corporate to utilize their work force strategically in their business endeavour.

Keywords

Personal dispositions, Motivation, Decision Making, Creativity, Interpersonal Behaviour and Psychological Well-being.

1. Introduction

In present scenario, managers are considered to be an integral part of every business organization. Manager are viewed as an asset to organization because of the multiple role that manager play in the organization. R.W. Griffin defines manager as a person who first of all is responsible for realization of management process. In particular manager is the person that makes plans and decisions, organizes, supervises and controls human, finance and information resources (Griffin, 2000). As manager's role keep changing due to the change in the context of enterprises' activity, they need to be aware of one's personality, their decision making style, and interpersonal behaviour and so on; so that they can help employees to deal effectively with the situations with the least number of possible conflicts or issues. The psychometric testing will make them aware about their personality, interpersonal behaviour, creativity, decision making styles, which will further help them to take management related decision creatively and with consent of others in the organization.

One of the prominent management researchers, Dr. Henry Mintzberg, defined the manager as a person in charge of an organisation or one of its units. Being in charge, the manager is invested with formal authority, which "gives rise to three interpersonal roles (figurehead, liaison, and leader), which in turn give rise to three informational roles (monitor or nerve centre, disseminator, and spokesman), and these two sets of roles enable the manager to play four decisional roles (entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator)" (Mintzberg, 1975). It is believed that managers' role is to manage things in such a way that the prevailing quality and quantity of production could be sustained by keeping up good interhuman relationships in the enterprise

(Mosley et al.1985). The manager ensures that the organization perform to expectation, he must also ensure that the firm archive it purpose and goals.

The interpersonal roles of manager seem to be fundamental and prime because manager in an organization whether it is small or large, has to interact with its superior, subordinates, peer, and clients as a part of his or her job. Thus we can say that interpersonal behaviours are inevitable or fundamental to managerial job. Some of these studies (e.g., Liden and Graen, 1980; Rosse and Kraut, 1983; Scandura et al., 1986) found that, compared to a low-quality exchange relationship, a high-quality exchange relationship was significantly related to greater supervisory support and guidance, higher subordinate satisfaction and performance, and lower subordinate turnover. Weick (1969) has argued that human relationships are the principal means through which organisations are controlled. Effective managerial decision making and, especially, implementation of decisions have been found to be influenced by interpersonal relations in organisations (Mintzberg and Quinn, 1991). However, manager need to be careful when dealing with interpersonal relations in the work place, as it is reported by previous studies that poor interpersonal relations are related to stress.

Decision making also plays an important role in management. It helps the management in better utilization of resources (men, money, machines, materials, methods, and markets), helps in facing problems and challenges and solving them, helps in business growth, achieve organization objectives, increasing efficiency, facilitate innovation, and motivating employees.

Nowadays, the majority of organisations are fully aware of the importance of creativity for the prosperity of the organization. There are many management problems that require creative insights in order to find satisfactory solutions. Management have started looking for those employees who have the required skills for a job as well as who is creative enough to solve any problems that comes their way. Creativity is also need by managers because they are required to discover new and better solutions for solving the problem that they face rather than using the same tried and tested approach again and again. Moreover, now-a-days, manager deals with problems that require high creativity, as clients want a better and most suitable solution for their problems, so managers

has to think about all the possible ways of solving a problem rather than just focusing on one of them.

Motivation plays a vital role in the management. In an organization, motivation helps to build willingness in employees to work, improves employees' efficiency, and improves job satisfaction of employees. Hence, the more motivated the employees, the better will be its employee's performance, and in turn better will be the overall productivity of organization. However, all this is possible only when the manager knows exactly what motivates its employees? Is it tangible material or intangible materials?

There is growing recognition of the importance of individual wellbeing inside and outside the workplace. Now-a-days, managers are found to adopt practices to increase the well-being of their employees. It is believed that the improvement of employees' well-being will automatically increase the overall performance of the organization. It is evident in today's scenario that managers are focussing on well-being of employees because it will improve the employees job satisfaction, which in turn will improve employees performance and which will further lead to improvement in organization overall effectiveness and productivity.

Thus, highlights the importance of personal dispositions, motivation, decision making, creativity, interpersonal behaviours, and psychological well-being in the organization. It is imperative to assess these variables among management students. So that when they enter into an organization, they are well aware about their personality, motivational skills, decision making style, creativity, interpersonal needs and psychological well-being and can work accordingly.

2. Review of Literature

Review of Literature act as an anchoring of entire research paper. Review of Literature is said to be the DNA of all research paper. It provides a fresh perspective to look into the previously done researches and help the researcher to add something new to the research area. In similar line, the following literature has been worked out to provide base to this present paper.

Few researches are done taking into account personality and decision making variables such as Ahmed, Hasnain, & Venkatesan, M. (2012) found that the personality type 'thinking' has negative correlation with

behavioural, whereas the personality type, 'feeling' showed positive correlation with behavioural decision style.

Few other researches that focussed on Motivation and well-being such as a study by Summers, Sargent, Levey, & Murray (1982) focussed on non-elite runners when training toward their first marathon, and found that goal achievement and "personal worth" were the most reported reasons for participation. In summary, the participants in this research study reported both psychological and physical well-being as resulting from running, while reporting both psychological and physical withdrawal symptoms when losing training sessions. The positive health outcomes from running may often overshadow the negative consequences, and active runners are motivated because of perceived well-being, being socially challenged, experiencing status and increased fitness/health during the participation.

Decision making and Well-being research study by Yilmaz et al. (2013) studied the association of decision-making styles and mental health. They found medium or low correlations in a university student sample between subjective well-being and all four investigated decision-making styles—positive with vigilance and negative with buck passing, procrastination and hyper vigilance. Salo & Alwood, (2011) studied the association between decision-making styles and stress in Swedish military officers. And 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 is a significant relationship of the decision-making styles with coping with stress and life events.

Interpersonal Behaviour and decision making research study by LU (2011) study on working hours and personal preference among Taiwanese employees found that an interpersonal relationship factors such as fit between preferred and actual hour of work, Misfit between preferred and actual hour of work have relationship with decision making style. Salo & Alwood (2011) study on decision-making style, stress and gender among investigators indicate that avoidant style was associated with lower satisfaction with life scale. And also dependent and avoidant styles are associated with higher influence through other's experience in investigative work. This study shown that outcome measures of the judgmental self-doubt scale are better than the dependent and avoidant decision making style. This result also showed that male's investigators

having higher values on rational decision-making style while female having higher value on dependent decision making style and evidenced higher degree of stress and performance-based-self-esteem.

Interpersonal Behaviour and Well-being study by LU (2011) found that people with a fit between preferred and actual hour of work reported higher overall life satisfaction and lower work family conflict whereas people with a misfit between preferred and actual hour of work reported no effect on job satisfaction and work family conflict.

Motivation and gender research done by Miller, Finley, & McKinley (1990) stated that there is a relationship between gender and learning styles, approaches, and motivation, in which reported that women are more intrinsically motivated strategic and organized in their learning and integration of new information compared to men. And Kissau (2006) found that gender differences in school motivation are related to age or grade, and that the differences can vary depending on what motivational component that is examined. Depending on which subject that is examined, they found that young boys like and are good at mathematics and sport while young girls have greater ability beliefs than boys for music and writing.

Decision making and gender research done by Schubert, Brown, Gysler, and Brachinger (1999) found that women are not really more risk-averse than men while conducting financial decisions. Lizárraga, M.; Baquedano, M.; & Cardelle-Elawar, M. (2007) found that significant differences due both to gender and age in participants' perception of the factors that determine their decision processes.

Well-being and gender research study by Akhter (2015) he focussed on investigating gender difference in psychological well-being.. The total sample of his study consisted of 100 students. 50 of male and 50 of female of 10th standard students selected from the Jamshedpur city. Results showed that there are significant gender differences in the levels on psychological well-being. It means male and female students are differs in psychological well-being. Ludban & Gitimu (2015), found that males and females means for 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 females scoring higher than males in all the four subscales. ANOVA showed no statistical differences in autonomy and emotional mastery subscales.

It is evident from the literature review that there are researches on gender and motivation, decision making, and well-being but there are hardly any research that talks about gender and creativity, or gender and Interpersonal behaviour among management students. It can also be noted that though there are researches on variables such as personal dispositions, motivation, decision making, creativity, interpersonal behaviour, and psychological well-being, yet they hardly take into account the demographic variables such as age and work experience. If we look at the managers' in the current scenario, we could understand that they play multiple roles in an organization. For managers' to play multiple role it is important for them to be aware about their personality traits, motivational skills, interpersonal behaviour, creativity, decision making style, and all these will in turn add to their psychological well-being. So the present study is focussing on studying the correlation among personality dispositions, motivation, decision making, creativity, interpersonal behaviour, and psychological well-being. Moreover, it also tries to study the difference among these variables on the basis of gender, age and work experience.

3. Methodology

3.1. Problem of the Study

The Present study is designed to examine the personal dispositions of management graduates in relation with Motivation, Decision Making, Creativity and Interpersonal Behaviour and Psychological well-being.

3.2. Rationale of the Study

The Contemporary management practices followed in corporate is very challenging and organic in nature too. In order to face the world competition, corporate houses utilize their human resources to its optimum level. At every stage the corporate house expect the manager to be having pleasing personality, motivated to the core, having interpersonal relationship skills, creativity to the top, and a sound decision making. In addition to all, having a sound psychological well-being. This hyper mix of psychological traits in an individual seems to be an ideal situation. The review of literature seen in the study haven't given clear picture about all the afore mentioned variables and its mix in any clear cut terms. Given an

opportunity the following research have been made with the help of review of literature and considering all the variables in this present study.

3.3.Objectives of the Study

- To identify relationship of Psychological Well-being with Personality types, Motivation, Decision Making, Creativity, Interpersonal Behaviour, and Psychological well-being of management students.
- To identify the gender difference between Personality types, Motivation, Decision Making, Creativity, Interpersonal Behaviour, and Psychological Well-being of management students.
- To identify the age difference between Personality types, Motivation, Decision Making, Creativity, Interpersonal Behaviour, and Psychological Well-being of management students.
- To identify the work experience related difference between Personality types, Motivation, Decision Making, Creativity, Interpersonal Behaviour, and Psychological Well-being of management students.

3.4 Hypotheses

1. There will be a significant relationship of Psychological Well-being with Personality types, Motivation, Decision making, Creativity, and Interpersonal Behaviour of management students.
2. There will be a significant difference on Personality types, Motivation to Lead, Decision making, Creativity, Interpersonal behaviour, and Psychological Well-being of management students on basis of gender, work experience and age.

3.5. Sample for the Study

The sample of present study comprises of 101 management students belonging to different cities of India and having varied educational background. Out of 101 students 87 are male students and 14 are female students and 34 are fresher whereas 67 management students have working experience.

3.6 Tools Used for the Study

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).
- Decision Making Style Inventory was developed by Rowe & Mason in 1987. It consists of 20 items and four subscales: Directive, Analytical, Conceptual and Behavioural decision making style.
- FIRO-B (The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation instruments) was developed by Judith Waterman and Jenny Rogers in 1996. It assesses needs in 3 areas, with behaviours in 2 directions: Inclusion: expressed inclusion and wanted inclusion, Control: expressed control and wanted control, Affection: expressed affection and wanted affection.
- Motivation to lead scale was developed by Chan and Drasgow in 2001. This scale consists of 27 items and is subdivided on the basis of three dimensions- Identity based motivation to lead, Non-Calculative motivation to lead and Social- Normative motivation to lead. Each subscale has 9 items. The response options are provided in a five point Likert scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree).
- Creativity Barrier Scale was developed by L.P. Martin in 1990. It consists of 36 items, and the participants are required to respond on a 5-point Likert-type scale (ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree). The items were categorized into six aspects of barriers to creative thought and innovative action; (1) self-concept and risk-taking; (2) need for conformity; (3) use of abstract; (4) use of systematic analysis; (5) task achievement; and (6) physical environmental.
- Psychological Well-being scale was developed by Carol Ryff. The Ryff inventory consists of 42 questions (medium form). It consists of a series of statements reflecting the six areas of psychological well-being: autonomy, environmental mastery,

personal growth, positive relations with others, and purpose in life, and self-acceptance. Respondents rate statements on a scale of 1 to 6, with 1 indicating strong disagreement and 6 indicating strong agreement.

3.7 Statistical Design

In this research, the data is analyzed for obtaining mean, standard deviation, t test and Product moment correlation.

4. Findings of the Study

- Table 1 shows the correlation of total sample on dimensions of Psychological Well-being with Personality Types, Motivation, Decision Making, Interpersonal Behaviour, Creativity variables among Management students. The analysis revealed that Psychological well-being is significantly correlated with some of the dimensions of personality, decision making and creativity whereas it has no significant correlation with dimensions of motivation to lead, and Interpersonal Behaviour. (APPENDIX)
- Table 2 shows the t test and significant value on the basis of which it is evident from the result that men and women graduates vary significantly on Expressed Control (EC) dimension of FIRO-B. Similarly, men and women graduates were also found to differ significantly on Identity based and Social Normative motivation to lead dimensions of motivation to lead. On dimensions of Personality, Decision making, Creativity, and Psychological Well-being among management students showed no gender difference. (APPENDIX)
- Table 3 shows the t test and significance value on the basis of which it can be noted that experienced graduates differ significantly from fresher's on Barriers related to self-confidence and risk-taking (A), Barriers related to use of systematic analysis (D), and Barriers related to physical environment (F) dimensions of Barriers to Creativity. However, management student doesn't differ on dimensions of personality, motivation, decision making, interpersonal behaviour, and psychological well-being on basis of work experience. (APPENDIX)
- Table 4 shows the t test and significance value on the basis of which it can be noted that there is significant age difference on Analytical decision making style and Barriers related to self-confidence and

risk-taking (A). However, it was also found that there were no age difference among management students on dimensions of personality, motivation, interpersonal behaviour, and psychological well-being. (APPENDIX)

- Furthermore, T test on the basis of independent and dependent variables, and Multiple Regression was also worked out but no significant result was obtained.

5. Discussion

The analysis reveals that the first hypothesis i.e. “There will be a significant relationship of Psychological well-being with Personality types, Motivation, Decision making, Creativity, Interpersonal Behaviour and of management students” is partially proven, as evident from the result of table 1. The table 1 shows that Environmental mastery is found to be positively related to directive decision making style, and negatively correlated with Behavioural decision making style. Purpose in life is positively correlated to Introversion, and negatively correlated to Extraversion. Personal Growth was also found to be Introversion, directive decision making style, and negatively correlated to extraversion, and Behavioural decision making style. Self-acceptance also shows a negative correlation with barriers related to self-confidence and risk-taking (one of the dimension of creativity).

Thus all this above listed correlation shows that most of the dimensions of Psychological Well-being are significantly correlated with some of the dimensions of Personality types, Decision Making, and Creativity. It was also found that psychological well-being has no correlation with Motivation, and Interpersonal Behavioural. Hence, the hypothesis is partially proven.

Second hypothesis i.e. “There will be a significant difference on Personality types, Motivation, Decision making, Creativity, Interpersonal behaviour, and Psychological Well-being of management students on basis of gender, work experience and age”, is partially proven, as a result shows that there was significant difference between male and female on expressed control dimension of firo-b. Gender difference was also found on Identity based and Social normative motivation to lead (from table 2). On dimensions of Personality, Decision making, Creativity, and Psychological Well-being among management students showed no gender difference. Our finding is similar to the

findings of Miller, Finley, & McKinley (1990) who stated that there is a relationship between gender and learning styles, approaches, and motivation, in which reported that women are more intrinsically motivated strategic and organized in their learning and integration of new information compared to men.

Similarly, it is evident from table 3 that experienced graduates differ significantly from freshers on Barriers related to self-confidence and risk-taking (A), Barriers related to use of systematic analysis (D), and Barriers related to physical environment (F) dimensions of Barriers to Creativity. However, management student doesn't differ on dimensions of personality, motivation, decision making, interpersonal behaviour, and psychological well-being on basis of work experience.

Succinctly, it can be noted from table 4 that there is age difference on analytical decision making style and barriers related to self-confidence and risk taking. However, it was also found that there were no age difference among management students on dimensions of personality, motivation, interpersonal behaviour, and psychological well-being. Our finding is supported by the study done by Lizárraga, M.; Baquedano, M.; & Cardelle-Elawar, M. (2007), found that significant differences due both to gender and age in participants' perception of the factors that determine their decision processes.

6. Conclusion

From the aforesaid result it was found that Psychological Well-being has strong relationship with Personality types, Decision Making, and Creativity. It was also noted that Motivation and Interpersonal Behaviour are not significantly correlated with Psychological Well-being. Gender differences were found in motivation to lead and one of the dimensions of Interpersonal behaviour. Similarly, work experience difference was also evident on few of the dimensions of barriers to creativity. Succinctly, age difference was also evident on one of the dimension of decision making and one of the dimensions of barriers to creativity. Thus it can be concluded that when it comes to motivation, sound decision making, high creativity, and interpersonal behaviour among managers, the demographic variables such as age, gender and work experience do influence these behaviours.

References

- Ahmed, A., Hasnain, N., & Venkatesan, M. (2012). Decision Making in Relation to Personality Types and Cognitive Styles of Business Students. *The IUP Journal of Management Research*, 11(2), 20-29
- Akhter, S. (2015). Psychological Well-being in students of gender difference. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2(4).
- Briggs, C. K., & Myers, B. I. (1998). Myers Briggs Type Indicator.
- Chan, Kim-Yin, & Fritz D. (2001), "Toward a Theory of Individual Differences and Leadership: Understanding the Motivation to Lead," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86 (3), 481-98.
- 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.
- Griffin R.W. (2000): *Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami*. Wyd. Nauk. PWN, Warszawa
- Kissau, S. (2006). Gender Difference in Motivation to Learn French. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 62(3), 401-422
- Liden, R., & Graen, G.B. (1980). Generalizability of the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23, 451-465.
- Lizárraga, M., Baquedano, M., & Cardelle-Elawar, M. (2007). Factors that affect decision making: gender and age differences. *International Journal of Psychology and Psychological Therapy*, 7(3), 381-391
- Lu, L. (2011). "Working hours and personal preference among Taiwanese employees". *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 4(3), 244 – 256
- Ludban, M. & Gitimu, N.P. (2015). Psychological Well-being of College students. *Undergraduate Research Journal for the Human Sciences*, 14.
- Martin, L.P. (1990). Inventory of barriers to creative thought and innovative action, 87-100
- Miller, C. D., Finley, J., & McKinley, D. L. (1990). Learning approaches and motives: Male and female differences and implications for learning assistance programs. *Journal of College Student Development*, 31, 147–154
- Mintzberg, H. (1975). *The Manager's Job; Folklore and fact*. Harvard Business Review, 53(4), 49-61

- Mintzberg, H., & Quinn, B.J. (1991). *Strategy Process: Concepts, Context, Cases*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mosley, D.C., Megginson L.C., & Petri P.H. (1985): *Supervisory management: the art of working with and through people*. OH: South-Western Publishing Co., Cincinnati: 18-19.
- Myers, L.B. (1962). *Manual: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Services.
- Rosse, J.G., & Kraut, A.I. (1983). Reconsidering the vertical dyad linkage model of leadership. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 56, 63-71.
- Rowe, A. J., & Mason, R. O. (1987). *Managing with style: A guide to understanding, assessing, and improving decision making*. San Francisco, California: Jossey Bass.
- Ryff, C., & Keyes, C. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 719–727
- 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
- Scandura, T.A., Graen, G.B., & Novak, M.A. (1986). When managers decide not to decide autocratically. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 106.
- Schubert, Renate, Martin, B., Matthias, G., & Hans, W. B. (1999). "Financial Decision-Making: Are Women Really More Risk-Averse?" *American Economic Review*, 89(2): 381-385
- Summers, J. J., Sargent, G. I., Levey, A. J., & Murray, K. D. (1982). Middle-aged, non-elite marathon runners: A profile. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 54, 963-969.
- Waterman, J.A., & Rogers, J. (1996). *Introduction to the FIRO-B*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
- Weick, K. (1969). *The Social Psychology of Organizing*. Reading, MA: Addison- Wesley.
- 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.

Table 1: Shows the Correlation of Dimensions of Psychological Well-Being with Dimensions of Personality Type, Decision Making, and Creativity.

Dimensions	Autonomy	Environmental Mastery	Positive relation with others	Purpose in Life	Personal Growth	Self-Acceptance
Extraversion				-.254*	-.209*	
Introversion				.246*	.218*	
Directive Decision making style		0.250*			.254*	
Behavioural Decision making style		-0.237*			-.225*	
Barriers related to self-confidence and risk-taking						-.212*

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

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

Table 2: Shows that Mean, Sd, t Value and Significance Level on Basis of Gender

	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
Expressed Control	Male	4.32	2.887	2.259	.026
	Female	2.50	2.139		
Identity based motivation to lead	Male	3.99	.504	2.172	.032
	Female	3.68	.522		
Social-normative based motivation to lead	Male	4.97	.771	2.039	.044
	Female	4.49	1.078		

Table 3: Shows that Mean, Sd, t Value and Significance Level on Basis of Work Experience

	Work Experience	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
Barriers related to Self-confidence And risk taking	Fresher	15.83	3.443	2.415	0.018
	Experienced	13.92	3.964		
Barriers related to use of systematic Analysis	Fresher	14.36	3.173	1.997	0.049
	Experienced	13.06	3.056		
Barriers related to Physical Environment	Fresher	13.81	3.846	2.082	0.040
	Experienced	12.34	3.051		

Table 4: Shows that Mean, Sd, T Value and Significance Level on Basis of Age

	Age	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.
Analytical Decision Making Style	17-22	98.17	122.306	2.056	0.043
	23-28	67.88	21.446		
Barriers related to self-confidence and risk taking	17-22	16.17	3.644	2.295	0.024
	23-28	14.12	3.839		