Work-Related Quality of Life and its Impact on their Decision Making Styles

*Dr. R. Anand

*Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration,
Annamalai University

Abstract:

Thepurpose of this research study is to identify practical approaches to the workrelated quality of life to the decision-making styles of the participants. This practical study has attempted to suggest and aid decision makers in the information technology industries to ameliorate their workrelated quality of life and to provide better situations to work, which improves their decision making abilities. The participants were 143 software engineers who were selectedthrough convenient sampling method. The workrelated quality of life inventory and decisionmaking styles inventory were adopted to study the practical application of workrelated quality of life and decisional style. It is found that there is relationship between the general well being and buck passing decisional style.

Further, implications of the studyare discussed in this article.

Keywords: *quality of work life, decision making styles and software engineers.*

I. Introduction

In the information technology projects, especially software engineers make decisions in the complex situations. Taking right decisions at the times rocks the business success. The decision making style of the individual differ along with their approach towards decision making.The decision making patterns of the software engineers is vital not only for them but also for the projects they are working. The individual decision making behavior is based on the cognitive and social process where the individuals take decisions. Taking decisions is a ubiquitous part of the software engineers' day today life andpeople often making difficult choices between equallyattractive alternatives. The effective and efficient decisions will ultimately determines the success of the projects they are working on and end results in the company

Workrelated quality of life

The workrelated quality of life is adopted toward the perceptions of the software engineers' who works in dynamic environment and their responses to them. Quality of working life, employee assessment, planning interventions, monitoring employees and gathering the organizational changes were scaled in the WorkRelated Quality of Life inventory (Edwards, et.al.,2008; Van Laar, et. al., 2007).

The psychosocial sub dimensions of the scale are defined as follows:

General Well-Being: indicates the psychological wellbeing and general physical health aspects.
Home Work Interface: indicated the extents to which individuals assume the organizationinterpret and tries to

facilitatethemselves with outside pressures of work.

Job and Career Satisfaction: indicates the degree to which individuals are satisfied with their occupation and prospects at job.

Control at Work: indicates how extremeindividuals believethat they are occupied in decisions that have an effect their work.

Working Conditions: indicates the degree to which individuals are pleased with the environment in which they work.

Stress at Work: indicates the degree to which individuals see job pressures and difficulty as tolerable and not extreme.

In this paper, author attempted to study the impact of the software engineers' workrelated quality of life how it relates to their decision-making behavior.

Need for the study

In this digital era, software engineers who works in Information technology companies in Bangalore, like other Information technology companies globally,encounter many challenges at present: the increased pressure to maintain work life balance and the work need to keep pace withrapid technological developments and sustain the competitive advantage.

In the present research study author has made an effort to study the impact of workrelated quality of life on the decision-making styles. The rationale of this research paper is to enhance the knowledge regarding workrelated quality of life by examining its possible attitudinal with the decision-making styles of the software engineers and demographic (age, income, occupational level, and marital status) antecedents.

Hence, this study will helps the software engineer's how should evaluate their present work-related quality issues and develop more

creative and innovate ways in their decisions. The purpose this research study was to understand the impact of workrelated quality of life with the decision making patterns of software engineers who works in IT companies. Alongsideof various factors such as environmental and organizational factors, participants' opinions to decision-making situations seem to be diversedue to their personal distinctiveness and orientations.

II. METHOD

This study is based on the self-report of the software engineers who works in Bangalore has completed the work-related quality of life and decisionmaking styles inventories. The decision-making styles inventory developed by the Leon Mann, Radford, and Kalucy (1986) and work related quality of life scale developed by Simon. E and Darren.VL(2012) has surveyed among the participants.

A decision-making style consists of six aspects of decisions viz., defensive avoidance,hyper vigilance, vigilance, procrastination, rationalization and buck passing. These statements featured a three-point response range as not true, sometimes trueand true for me. The test-retest reliability values are ranges from 0.48 to 0.73 (Leon Mann et al., 1986).Based on the test-retest in India, Amalor (1992) establish reliability as follows:

Decision making styles	Reliability
Vigilance	0.79
Hyper vigilance	0.47
Defensive avoidance	0.58
Procrastination	0.76
Buck passing	0.46
Rationalization	0.59

This decision making inventory possesses both constructs and content validity. The factorial validity of the decision making inventoryscale ranges from 0.54 to 0.81 for all the six dimensions.

The dimensions of the work related quality of life inventory such as home-work interface, general well being, control at work, job career satisfaction, stress at work and working conditions. These items featured a five -point response from strongly disagree (one point), to strongly agree (five points). Simon Easton and Darren Van Laar (2012)reported reliability scores based on test-retestranges from 0.77 to 0.88 for all the sub-scales along with its total.Thetest-retest reliability as follows:

Workrelated quality of life	Reliability
Homework interface	0.78
general well being	0.77
control at work	0.82
job career satisfaction	0.88
stress at work	0.79
working conditions	0.83
Work related quality of life total	0.87

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are framed to study the relationship between decisionmaking and emotional intelligence of the information technology leaders

1. There is a significant difference in work-related quality of work life and decision making styles of software engineers' based on their age, marital status, length of service and salary.

2. Work related quality of life (each of its six dimensions along with its total viz., homework interface, General well being,control at work,job career satisfaction, stress at work and working conditions) will positively relate to six decision making styles viz., hypervigilance,vigilance, procrastination, rationalization, buck passing,and defensive avoidance of the software engineers.

III.   Results and discussion

In order to test the significance of the age, marital status, length of service and salary 'F' test was conducted. To find out the significant relationship between the workrelated quality of life and decision making styles linear correlation analysis was adopted and the values of correlation were calculated.

From the Table 1, it is found that 'F' values are significant for the entire decision making styles viz. vigilance, hypervigilance, buck passing, procrastination, rationalization, and defensive avoidance. And for the workrelated quality life, it is found that 'F' values are significant with career job satisfaction, general well being, stress at workand control at work along with the total and hence the hypothesis is accepted. It is concluded that the software engineers differ significantly in entire decision-making styles and workrelated quality of life.

Table: 1. WORK RELATED QUALITY OF LIFE AND DECISION-MAKING STYLESWITH REGARD TO THEIR AGE

Work related quality of life	Age				F-Value	Scheffe – Post hoc
	A Mean (S.D)	B Mean (S.D)	C Mean (S.D)	D Mean (S.D)		
General well being	23.21 (2.95)	23.64 (2.42)	21.67 (3.25)	23.90 (2.17)	4.082	4 Vs 2 Vs 1 Vs 3
home-work interface	11.83	11.24	11.55	12.48	2.275	---

	(1.87)	(2.13)	(1.70)	(1.29)		
job career satisfaction	21.62 (3.12)	23.81 (20.62)	23.03 (2.28)	20.62 (3.58)	7.978	2 Vs 3 Vs 1 Vs4
control at work	8.13 (2.08)	10.52 (1.66)	10.82 (1.72)	8.67 (1.77)	20.173	3 Vs 2 Vs 4 Vs 1
working conditions	11.62 (1.51)	10.90 (1.86)	11.42 (1.85)	11.86 (1.59)	1.925	---
Stress at work	4.13 (1.13)	4.86 (1.16)	4.82 (1.28)	5.95 (0.59)	13.069	4 Vs2 Vs 3 Vs 1
Work-related quality of life total	80.53 (6.03)	84.98 (4.83)	83.30 (5.97)	83.48 (5.59)	4.819	2 Vs 4 Vs 3 Vs 1
Decision making styles						
Vigilance	12.83 (2.81)	11.59 (2.35)	13.79 (2.27)	14.76 (2.05)	9.388	4 Vs 3 Vs 1 Vs 2
Hyper vigilance	9.49 (1.86)	9.17 (1.69)	8.79 (1.49)	7.62 (1.16)	6.617	1 Vs 2 Vs 3 Vs 4
Procrastination	9.57 (1.12)	9.31 (1.40)	8.73 (1.28)	7.05 (1.39)	20.418	1 Vs 2 Vs 3 Vs 4
Rationalization	10.81 (1.78)	10.26 (2.01)	8.12 (1.65)	8.38 (2.18)	17.796	1 Vs 2 Vs 4 Vs 3
Buck passing	10.45 (1.92)	10.98 (1.57)	12.70 (1.24)	12.43 (1.50)	16.255	3 Vs 4 Vs 2 Vs 1
Defensive avoidance	9.34 (1.84)	9.19 (2.38)	8.03 (1.47)	7.09 (1.44)	9.092	1 Vs 2 Vs 3 Vs 4

N_1= 47   A. Less than 30 years
N_2= 42   B. 31 to 35 years
N_3 = 33   C. 36 to 40 years
N_4 = 21   D. Above 40 years
* - Significant at 0.05 level   [NS] - Not Significant

Software engineers belong to less than 30 years of age were high in hyper vigilance, procrastination, rationalization and defensive avoidance decisional styles. High in hyper vigilance and procrastination may be due to the inclination to make quick decisions or to delay decisions in the face of challenging situations makes them to feel under pressure. High in rationalization may be due to the behavior of the individuals logically selecting the parameters to do what they decided to do. High in defensive avoidance may be due to the tendency of handling the high risk decision. It is nature to understand the young professionals may find difficulties in handling high pressures.

Software engineers belong to 31 to 35 years was high in job career satisfaction dimension of "workrelated quality of life" along with the total work related quality of life. High in career satisfaction may be due to abilities of the individual to meet the demands of the career advancement and utilized the opportunities in their respective field leads in total work-related quality of life as well.

Software engineers belong to 36 to 40 years of age was high in buck passing decisional style. High in buck passing decisional style may be due hesitation to take any initiatives.

Software engineers who belong to more than 40 years of age were high in vigilance decisional style. As well as general well being and work stress dimensions of workrelated quality of life. High in general well being is the

general feeling and opinion towards it. Further, high in stress at work may due to the pressure from the job demands.High in vigilance may be due to the abilities of the individuals toanalyze possible relevant alternatives and information in an unbiased manner before picking the choice of decision. It is concluded that the software engineers differ significantly in their decision-making styles and workrelated quality of life based on their age.

Table: 2. WORK RELATED QUALITY OF LIFE AND DECISION-MAKING STYLESWITH RESPECT TO THEIR MARITAL STATUS

Workrelated quality of life	Marital status			F-Value	Scheffe – Post hoc
	A Mean (S.D)	B Mean (S.D)	C Mean (S.D)		
General well being	22.86 (2.78)	23.56 (2.60)	22.50 (3.26)	1.876	---
home-work interface	12.08 (2.10)	11.06 (1.85)	12.35 (1.29)	7.733	3 Vs 2 Vs 1
job career satisfaction	21.19 (2.97)	23.64 (2.36)	21.62 (3.38)	11.120	2 Vs 3 Vs 1
control at work	8.65 (2.71)	9.82 (1.83)	9.87 (1.98)	4.300	3 Vs 2 Vs 1
working conditions	11.54 (1.52)	11.20 (1.80)	11.60 (1.79)	0.843	---
Stress at work	4.43 (1.42)	4.74 (1.10)	5.12 (1.26)	3.043	
Work-related quality of life total	80.76 (6.82)	84.01 (4.91)	83.07 (5.89)	3.857	2 Vs 3 Vs 1
Decision making styles					
Vigilance	12.32 (2.43)	12.80 (2.71)	14.02 (2.55)	4.815	3 Vs 2 Vs 1
Hyper vigilance	10.03 (1.88)	8.89 (1.56)	8.07 (1.35)	14.500	1 Vs 2 Vs 3
Procrastination	9.76 (1.23)	9.07 (1.42)	7.92 (1.42)	17.776	1 Vs 2 Vs 3
Rationalization	10.62 (1.60)	9.95 (2.23)	8.32 (1.99)	13.602	1 Vs 2 Vs 3
Buck passing	10.35 (1.75)	11.35 (1.92)	12.50 (1.18)	15.485	3 Vs 2 Vs 1
Defensive avoidance	9.59 (2.35)	8.91 (1.82)	7.40 (1.46)	14.045	1 Vs 2 Vs 3

From the Table 2, it is found that 'F' values are significant for the entire decisional style viz. vigilance, hypervigilance, buck passing, procrastination, rationalization, and defensive avoidance. And for the workrelated quality life, it is found that 'F' values are significant for half of the dimensions along with its total, hence the hypothesis is accepted. It is concluded that the software engineers differ significantly in entire decision-making styles and workrelated quality of life.

N_1= 56   A. Unmarried
N_2= 80   B. Married
N_3 =   7   C. Divorcee
* - Significant at 0.05 level   NS - Not Significant

Software engineers who were divorcee are high in work home interface and workcontrol dimensions of workrelated quality of life. Also prefers vigilance and buck passing decisional styles.High in home work interface is under stable since the dependency of the income source and in need to stabilize the dependent father or mother or child totally depend on them. High in control at work may be due to the ability to meet the greater demands in the day to day life. High in vigilance style of decision making may due to process of evaluating the costs and benefits of a decision rationally.High in buck passing may be resulted due to overload of emotions and stress lead to feelings of being pulled.

Married software engineers were high in job carrier satisfaction and overall work related quality of life.High in job carrier satisfaction and overall quality of life related to work by the married software engineers may due to the intrinsic motivators which enjoys the challenges of balancing family and carrier.

Unmarried software engineers were high on hyper-vigilance, procrastination, rationalization, and defensive avoidance decisional styles.The young and fresh software engineers who entered in to the working environment after completion of the degree may feel tense and anxious and unaware of the decision making pattern makes those to be prefer this decisional styles. It is concluded that the software engineers differ significantly in their decisional styles and work-related quality of life based on their marital status.

Table: 3. WORKRELATED QUALITY OF LIFE AND DECISION-MAKING STYLESWITH RESPECT TO THEIR LENGTH OF SERVICE

Work-related quality of life	Length of service			F-Value	Scheffe – Post hoc
	A Mean (S.D)	B Mean (S.D)	C Mean (S.D)		
Work-related quality of life	22.84 (2.92)	23.21 (2.88)	23.57 (2.07)	0.383	---
General well being	11.91 (2.14)	11.49 (1.61)	12.14 (2.19)	1.069	---
home-work interface	22.05 (2.94)	22.55 (2.96)	24.28 (4.15)	1.826	---
job career satisfaction	8.82 (2.30)	9.96 (1.94)	10.28 (2.56)	5.260	3 Vs 2 Vs 1
control at work	11.48 (1.76)	11.37 (1.69)	11.00 (2.08)	0.256	---
working conditions	4.27 (1.20)	5.07 (1.22)	5.28 (0.75)	8.200	3 Vs 2 Vs 1
Work-related quality of life total	81.37 (6.45)	83.66 (5.04)	86.57 (6.83)	4.144	3 Vs 2 Vs 1

Decision making styles					
Vigilance	12.27 (2.60)	13.45 (2.72)	13.14 (1.07)	3.367	2 Vs 3 Vs 1
Hyper vigilance	9.21 (1.70)	8.82 (1.79)	8.43 (1.27)	1.168	---
Procrastination	9.50 (1.36)	8.55 (1.52)	8.71 (1.70)	6.988	1 Vs 3 Vs 2
Rationalization	10.43 (1.98)	9.29 (2.21)	8.00 (1.73)	7.163	1 Vs 2 Vs 3
Buck passing	10.70 (1.74)	11.81 (1.83)	12.57 (1.27)	8.068	3 Vs 2 Vs 1
Defensive avoidance	9.09 (2.09)	8.47 (2.01)	7.43 (1.62)	2.886	----

$N_1 = 37$ A. Less than 6 years
$N_2 = 66$ B. 6 to 12 years
$N_3 = 40$ C. Greater than 12 years
* - Significant at 0.05 level   NS - Not Significant

Form the table-3, it is observed that the F-values are significant only for the career job satisfaction, working environment and work-related quality of life total. Hence the hypothesis is rejected.And for the decision-making styles the F-values are significant for the vigilance, procrastination, rationalization and busk passing. Hence the formulated hypothesis is accepted.

More than 12 years of experience were high in career job satisfaction, working situation and work-related quality of life total as well as prefers buck passing decisional style.High in quality of life related to work and its dimension may be due to job experience makes them feel as a positive and enjoy the same. High in buck passing decisional style may due to substancein the information (quality and quantity) what they receive and the time they receive.

Less than 6 years experienced software engineers were prefers procrastination and rationalization decisional styles. High in these dimensions of decisional style may due to the inexperience new entry to the information technology industry makes them to delay the decisions and after gaining the enough experience on the same makes them to prefer rationalizing the decisions.

Software engineers who belongs to 6 to 12 years of experience are vigilant in their decisions. High in vigilance decision making style may due to the ability and knowledge towards the technicality of the projects handled by them. Further it is evident from the study conducted by Anand. R (2014) the experience and exposure of various situations handled by them makes to prefer vigilance decisional style.It is concluded that the software engineers differ significantly in their decision-making styles and not in their work-related quality of life based on their experience.

Table: 4. WORKRELATED QUALITY OF LIFE AND DECISION-MAKING STYLESWITH RESPECT TO THEIRSALARY

Work related quality of life	Salary					F-Value	Scheffe – Post hoc
	A Mean (S.D)	B Mean (S.D)	C Mean (S.D)	D Mean (S.D)	E Mean (S.D)		
Work-related quality of life	22.91 (3.15)	23.00 (3.44)	23.00 (2.89)	23.23 (2.59)	23.35 (2.28)	0.107	---
General well being	12.15 (1.95)	11.32 (2.59)	11.50 (1.56)	11.62 (1.70)	11.75 (1.52)	0.824	---
home-work interface	21.42 (2.85)	22.86 (2.83)	22.26 (3.44)	22.94 (2.46)	23.10 (3.48)	1.555	---
job career satisfaction	8.09 (2.48)	9.64 (2.08)	9.70 (1.93)	10.59 (1.86)	9.70 (1.45)	6.609	4 Vs 3,5 Vs 2 Vs 1
control at work	11.61 (1.66)	11.09 (1.57)	11.20 (1.66)	11.62 (2.15)	11.35 (1.35)	0.532	---
working conditions	4.36 (1.34)	4.45 (1.40)	4.68 (1.15)	5.00 (1.13)	5.55 (0.94)	3.750	5 Vs 4 Vs 3 Vs 2 Vs 1
Work-related quality of life total	80.54 (6.49)	82.36 (6.25)	82.35 (4.62)	85.00 (5.50)	84.80 (5.39)	3.284	---
Decision making styles							
Vigilance	12.48 (2.51)	12.59 (2.63)	13.23 (2.59)	12.97 (2.99)	13.75 (2.49)	0.895	---
Hyper vigilance	9.58 (1.66)	9.50 (2.04)	8.56 (1.97)	8.65 (1.43)	8.55 (1.19)	2.691	---
Procrastination	9.67 (1.24)	9.27 (1.39)	8.82 (1.58)	8.73 (1.26)	7.85 (1.78)	5.492	1 Vs 2 Vs 3 Vs 4 Vs 5
Rationalization	10.57 (1.64)	11.32 (1.86)	10.26 (1.91)	8.38 (1.79)	7.55 (1.67)	19.289	2 Vs 1 Vs 3 Vs 4 Vs 5
Buck passing	10.79 (1.88)	10.36 (1.56)	11.26 (2.22)	12.41 (1.30)	12.15 (1.18)	6.954	4 Vs 5 Vs 3 Vs 1 Vs 2
Defensive avoidance	9.12 (2.42)	9.50 (1.90)	8.85 (1.88)	8.23 (1.69)	7.40 (1.82)	3.969	2 Vs 1 Vs 3 Vs 4 Vs 5

N_1 = 33   A. Less than 25000
N_2 = 22   B. 25001 to 50000
N_3 = 34   C. 50001 to 75000
N_4 = 34   D. 75001 to 100000
N_5 = 20   E. More than 100000
* - Significant at 0.05 level   NS - Not Significant

From the Table 4, it is found that 'F' values are significant for four decision-making styles where as for the work-related quality life, it is found that 'F' values are significant for two dimensions, hence the hypothesis is accepted for decision-making styles and rejected for quality of life related to work. It is concluded that the software engineers differ significantly in their decision-making styles and do not differ significantly in the quality of life related to work based on their salary.

Software engineers who fall in the 75001 to 100000 salary group were high in career job satisfaction dimensions of quality of life related to work and prefer buck passing decisional style. It is quite nature to understand that the salary is the prime factor of job satisfaction and the same here leads to the high in job career satisfaction as a dimension of quality of life related to work. High in buck passing dimensions of decision making may be due to theattitude to leave the decisions to the group members or the person who leads that project makes them to prefer the same.

Software engineers who belong to more than one lakh were high in working conditions. It may be due to the obtainment of the personal development in the industry by bench marking their goals in the professional life make them feel good support from the organization.

Software engineers who belong to less than 25000 salary group preferredprocrastination decisional style. It may be due to the new and fresher to the sector makes them to take own time to handle the situation makes them to prefer the same.

Software engineers who belong to 25001 to 50000 salary group were preferred rationalization and defensive avoidance decisional style. High in rationalization may be due the process in which the individuals are trying to value and select the alternatives decisions. High in defensive avoidance may be due to the delay in selecting the alternatives available in front them.It is concluded that the software engineers differ significantly in their decision-making styles and do not differ significantly in the quality of life related to work based on their salary.

Table: 5 –QUALITY OF LIFE RELATED TO WORK AND DECISIONMAKING STYLES: CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS

Work-related quality of life	Vigilance	Hyper vigilance	Procrast-ination	Rational-ization	Buck passing	Defensive avoidance
General well being	-0.049	-0.035	-0.081	0.029	-0.194[*]	-0.049
home-work interface	0.036	0.046	-0.028	0.007	-0.058	0.036
job career satisfaction	-0.039	0.029	0.075	-0.036	-0.047	-0.039
control at work	0.142	-0.080	-0.056	-0.043	0.064	0.142
working conditions	0.001	-0.203[*]	-0.011	-0.145	0.084	0.001
stress at work	0.234[*]	-0.066	-0.163	-0.186[*]	0.162	0.234[*]
Quality of life related to work total	0.071	-0.091	-0.069	-0.101	-0.055	0.071

[*] Significant at 0.05 level   [NS] – not significant

There is significant negative relationship between the general well being and buck passing decisional style. It may due to individuals those who were in depressed mood may take less productive decisions. There is significant negative relationship between the

working conditions and hyper vigilance decisional style. It may be due to the nature of the environment and the information available and degree to which the individual's basic requirements are accepted. There is significant negative relationship with rationalization and

positive relationship with defensive avoidance and vigilance decisional style and stress at work dimension of quality of life related to work. The negative relationship is due to the process in which the individual abilities to cope up to justify the logical evaluation of alternatives.And the positive relationship occurs due to the counter process of dealing with the dissatisfaction at work.

IV.   Findings and Conclusion

Based on the current research study that the quality of life related to work and its impact on the decisional stylesof the software engineers, Itestablishes that there is significant negative relationship between the general well being and buck passing decisional style. Further, there is significant negative relationship between the working conditions and hyper vigilance decisional style. And there is significant negative relationship with rationalization and positive relationship with defensive avoidance and vigilance decisional style and work stress dimension of quality of life related to work.

There is a significant influence of salaries received by the software engineers and "career job satisfaction"and "working conditions" dimensions of quality of life related to work as well as buck passing, procrastination, defensive avoidance and rationalization decisional style.

There is a significant influence of experience of the software engineers and "career job satisfaction" and "working environment" dimensions of quality of life along with the quality of life related to work total as well as buck passing, procrastination, and rationalization decisional style.

There is a significant influence of marital status of the software engineers on "career job satisfaction", home-work interface, and "work control" dimensions of quality of life related to work along with the quality of life related to work total as well as hyper vigilance, vigilance, buck passing, defensive avoidance, procrastination, and rationalization decisional style.

There is a significant influence of age of the software engineers on "career job satisfaction", work-home interface, "general well being" and "work control" dimensions of quality of life related to work along with the quality of life related to work total as well as vigilance, buck passing, hyper vigilance, defensive avoidance, rationalization and procrastination decisional style.

This present study examines the work-related quality of life of software engineers how it impacts their decision making styles.Quality of life concomitant to work is an important construct which plays a vital part in the decision making behaviour of the individuals in the organization.

Software engineers withinthis framework are able to enhance their decisional quality through the quality of lifeconcomitant to work. This article provides a number of contributions to the theoretical debate about quality of life concomitant to work and their decisional styles, that is, "Workrelated quality of life and its impact on their decision making styles."

The first contribution is thatthis study explored the relationship between software engineer's workrelated quality of life and its impact on decisional styles. Moreover, this research has constructed based on the valid models of work-related quality of life and decision making style. Thesecond contribution establishes that quality of work life does guidethe software engineers to wide rangeof managerial decision making and to conclude the this study employers of the software engineers should pay much more attentions in the employee engagement programs and flexi work life.

Reference

[1] Amalor, D (1992). A study of decision-making styles in relation to some personality characteristics ofuniversity students. Unpublished M.Phil., thesis, Dept of Psychology, Annamalai University, India.

[2] Anand, R (2014). Decision Making and Leadership Practices: A Study on IT companyLeaders in Bangalore. Asian Journal of Managerial Science, 3 (2), 1-7.

[3] Edwards, J.A., Webster, S., Van Laar, D.L., Easton, S. (2008). PsychometricAnalysis of the Health & Safety Executive Management Standards Work-Related Stress Indicator Tool. Work & Stress 22(2), 96-107.

[4] Leon Mann., Radford, M.H.B., &Kalucy, R.S (1986).Psychiatric disturbance and decision-making.Australia and Newzeland Journal of Psychiatry, 20, 210-217.

[5] Simon Easton and Darren Van Laar (2012). User Manual for work-related quality of life: A measure of quality of life (1st Edition). University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, UK.

[6] Van Laar, D.L., Edwards, J., & Easton, S. (2007). The Work-Related Quality of Life(WRQoL) Scale for Healthcare Workers. Journal of Advanced Nursing 60(3), 325-333.