

ONLY HUMAN AFTER ALL:
PERSONALITY, RESILIENCE, AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING
ACROSS GENERATIONS - A MODERATION APPROACH

NELA-ALLICE DINU, LAVINIA ȚÂNCULESCU-POPA*
Hyperion University, National University of Political Studies and Public Administration

Abstract

This study examined the role of personality traits and resilience in psychological well-being within a lifespan-oriented framework of adaptation. Using a cross-sectional design, data from 330 Romanian adults were analyzed through correlational, hierarchical regression, and moderation analyses. Psychological well-being was conceptualized as a multidimensional construct encompassing autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations, purpose in life, and self-acceptance. Results showed that emotional stability, extraversion, and conscientiousness were positively associated with resilience, supporting their role in adaptive functioning. Resilience also significantly predicted psychological well-being, explaining variance beyond personality traits. Generational cohort was examined as a moderator of the resilience–well-being relationship, but no significant moderation effect emerged. The findings suggest that resilience contributes consistently to psychological well-being across adulthood. Overall, the results highlight the combined contribution of personality and resilience and support the integration of stable individual differences and adaptive processes in interventions promoting well-being across the adult lifespan.

Keywords: Personality traits; Resilience; Psychological well-being; Emotional stability; Adaptation.

Individual differences in adaptation to life stressors have long been a central topic in psychological research. A consistent finding across decades of study is that people exposed to similar stressors often show markedly different patterns of adjustment, recovery, and well-being. Contemporary perspectives increasingly emphasize that such variability reflects not only situational factors, but also the interaction between relatively stable personality characteristics and more dynamic adaptive resources, such as resilience (Ong *et al.*, 2023).

Within this framework, psychological well-being is conceptualized as a multidimensional construct that both reflects and supports adaptive functioning.

* Hyperion University, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Department of Psychology, Calea Călărașilor 169, 030615, București.

National University of Political Studies and Public Administration, Faculty of Communication and Public Relations, Bulevardul Expoziției 30A, 012244, București, Corresponding author: lavinia.tanculescu@comunicare.ro

Rev. Psih., Vol. 72, Nr. 3, p. 285–299, București, iulie–septembrie 2026, DOI:10.59277/RPSIH.2026.3.04

Recent integrative models suggest that personality traits shape how individuals mobilize adaptive resources, which in turn influences well-being and mental health outcomes (Miller-Graff, 2022; Notebaert *et al.*, 2025). Although associations between personality, resilience, and well-being are well established, fewer theoretical integrations have examined these links at differentiated levels, such as specific personality dimensions and distinct components of psychological well-being. Clarifying these relationships remains important for advancing more precise models of psychological adaptation in contemporary contexts.

Personality refers to enduring patterns of thinking, feeling, and behaving that remain relatively stable across time and situations. The Big Five model provides a widely accepted framework for describing these individual differences, encompassing neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience (Goldberg, 1993; Digman, 1997; McCrae & Costa, 1999). These broad dimensions capture fundamental aspects of personality functioning and show substantial biological grounding and cross-cultural stability (Rothbart & Bates, 2006; John & Srivastava, 1999; McCrae *et al.*, 1999).

Among these traits, neuroticism—conceptualized at its opposite pole as emotional stability—has been consistently associated with vulnerability in the context of stress. Neuroticism reflects a tendency toward negative emotionality, heightened reactivity to stressors, and difficulties in emotional regulation (McCrae & John, 1992; Rothbart & Bates, 2006). High levels of neuroticism are linked to poorer psychological adjustment and lower levels of well-being, whereas emotional stability is associated with calmer responses and more effective self-regulation (Costa & McCrae, 1980; DeNeve & Cooper, 1998). Extraversion, characterized by positive emotionality, sociability, and reward sensitivity, supports active engagement with the environment and sustained adaptive effort under challenge (McCrae & John, 1992). Conscientiousness reflects self-regulation, persistence, and goal orientation, contributing to effective management of demanding situations (McCrae & John, 1992; Derryberry *et al.*, 2003). Agreeableness and openness further support adaptive functioning through social connectedness and cognitive flexibility, respectively (McCrae & John, 1992; Tongg *et al.*, 2004).

Resilience has been conceptualized as a central adaptive capacity that enables individuals to withstand and recover from adversity. Early formulations described resilience as a dispositional quality that allows individuals to overcome hardship and maintain functioning under stress (Bartone *et al.*, 1989; Richardson, 2002; Sinclair & Oliver, 2003). Subsequent theoretical refinements distinguished resilience as recovery to previous levels of functioning from thriving, defined as movement toward higher levels of functioning following adversity (Carver *et al.*, 1989). Other perspectives emphasize resilience as the capacity to restore internal and external balance through cognitive and behavioral processes (Smith & Carlson, 1997) or to achieve positive outcomes despite adversity (Rew & Horner, 2003). More recent accounts conceptualize resilience as a dynamic, process-oriented

construct shaped by interactions among personal and contextual factors (Dyer & McGuinness, 1996; Miller-Graff, 2022).

Empirical research consistently supports the role of resilience as a key link between personality and adaptation. Resilience is negatively associated with neuroticism and positively associated with extraversion and conscientiousness, reflecting the contribution of emotional stability, positive affectivity, and self-regulation to adaptive capacity (Campbell-Sills *et al.*, 2006; Furnham & Cheng, 2000). At the same time, resilience is embedded within broader psychological processes and is partially shaped by perceived stress, coping styles, social support, hope, self-compassion, and depressive symptoms (Chen, 2016; Zhang *et al.*, 2017; Satici, 2016; Yasuhiro *et al.*, 2021; Lu *et al.*, 2017; Notebaert *et al.*, 2025). These findings position resilience as a dynamic adaptive resource that translates stable dispositional tendencies into patterns of psychological functioning.

Psychological well-being represents a central component of overall well-being, encompassing emotional, psychological, and social dimensions (Westerhof & Keyes, 2010). It is widely conceptualized as a multidimensional construct associated with positive functioning, life satisfaction, and human development (Dodge *et al.*, 2012; Huppert, 2017). A key distinction differentiates hedonic well-being, focused on pleasure and subjective happiness, from eudaimonic well-being, which emphasizes meaning, personal growth, and optimal functioning (Diener *et al.*, 1999; Huta & Waterman, 2014).

Integrating these perspectives, Ryff's (1989) theoretical model conceptualizes psychological well-being through six core dimensions: autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, self-acceptance, and purpose in life. Empirical evidence consistently demonstrates robust associations between personality traits and psychological well-being. Extraversion and neuroticism emerge as particularly strong predictors across both hedonic and eudaimonic domains, while conscientiousness, agreeableness, and openness also contribute meaningfully (Steel *et al.*, 2008; Anglim & Grant, 2016). Meta-analytic findings further indicate that positive affect is linked to extraversion, negative affect to neuroticism, environmental mastery to conscientiousness, personal growth to openness, and purpose in life to conscientiousness (Grant *et al.*, 2009; Sun *et al.*, 2018; Anglim *et al.*, 2020).

Although psychological well-being shows relative stability over time, it also varies in response to life circumstances and intentional activities (Headey & Wearing, 1989). From an integrative perspective, personality traits shape adaptive capacities such as resilience, which in turn support both hedonic and eudaimonic aspects of well-being. This framework provides a coherent basis for examining individual differences in adaptation to contemporary stressors.

Building on existing theoretical and empirical work, the present study examines the interrelations among personality traits, resilience, and psychological well-being within an integrated framework of psychological adaptation. Prior

research indicates that stable personality characteristics shape how individuals respond to stress and mobilize adaptive resources (McCrae & John, 1992; DeNeve & Cooper, 1998), while resilience functions as a dynamic capacity that supports recovery and positive functioning across diverse contexts.

The present study focuses on emotional stability, extraversion, and conscientiousness, as these traits have shown the most consistent and theoretically meaningful associations with stress regulation, adaptive functioning, and psychological well-being. Emotional stability—conceptualized as the inverse of neuroticism—reflects emotional regulation, lower reactivity to stress, and greater psychological balance, all of which are central to adaptive functioning. Alongside extraversion and conscientiousness, emotional stability has been consistently linked to resilience and positive psychological outcomes (Costa & McCrae, 1980; Campbell-Sills *et al.*, 2006; Furnham & Cheng, 2000). In contrast, agreeableness and openness, although relevant to interpersonal functioning and cognitive flexibility, show less consistent associations with resilience-related processes and are therefore not central to the present analytical model.

Accordingly, the first objective of the study is to examine the associations between emotional stability, extraversion, and conscientiousness and resilience. The second objective is to investigate the relationship between resilience and multiple dimensions of psychological well-being, including autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance (Ryff, 1989). Finally, drawing on conceptualizations of resilience as a dynamic and context-sensitive process (Dyer & McGuinness, 1996; Ong *et al.*, 2023), the study explores whether generational cohort moderates the association between resilience and psychological well-being.

Previous research indicates that stable personality characteristics play a central role in shaping adaptive responses to stress. Emotional stability, reflecting effective emotional regulation and reduced reactivity to stressors, has been consistently associated with better psychological adjustment, while extraversion and conscientiousness support adaptive functioning through positive affectivity, goal orientation, and behavioral regulation (McCrae & John, 1992; Costa & McCrae, 1980; Campbell-Sills *et al.*, 2006; Furnham & Cheng, 2000). Together, these traits contribute to individuals' capacity to cope effectively with stress and mobilize adaptive resources. Therefore, the present study proposes the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: Emotional stability, extraversion, and conscientiousness will be positively associated with resilience.

Resilience is conceptualized as a key adaptive capacity that supports psychological functioning by facilitating recovery and sustained engagement in the face of stressors (Dyer & McGuinness, 1996; Miller-Graff, 2022). Beyond stable personality traits, resilience reflects a dynamic process through which individuals mobilize internal resources to maintain or restore well-being. Empirical evidence

consistently links higher resilience to more favorable outcomes across multiple dimensions of psychological well-being, including autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations, purpose in life, and self-acceptance (Klainin-Yobas *et al.*, 2014; Aiena *et al.*, 2015; Surzykiewicz *et al.*, 2019; Smith & Yang, 2017). Accordingly, resilience is expected to explain additional variance in psychological well-being beyond that accounted for by personality traits.

Hypothesis 2: Resilience will be positively associated with overall psychological well-being, explaining additional variance beyond that accounted for by personality traits.

Current perspectives further emphasize resilience as a dynamic and context-sensitive process shaped by developmental stage and accumulated life experience (Dyer & McGuinness, 1996; Ong *et al.*, 2023). Consequently, the strength of the association between resilience and psychological well-being may vary across generational cohorts. Therefore, we formulate the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Generational cohort will moderate the relationship between resilience and psychological well-being, such that the strength of this association differs across generations

METHOD

PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE

The study included 330 Romanian adults aged between 18 and 75 years ($M = 44.32$, $SD = 10.82$), of whom 79.1% were women. Regarding educational attainment, 14.2% of participants had completed high school, 40.9% held a university degree, 39.4% had completed postgraduate studies, and 5.5% held a doctoral degree. With respect to residential background, 84.2% of participants lived in urban areas, while 15.8% resided in rural settings. Regarding marital status, 55.8% were married, 16.7% were single, 12.7% were divorced, 9.7% reported being in a consensual union, 2.1% were widowed, and 3% selected other categories.

Participants were classified into generational cohorts based on established frameworks, primarily following Erickson (2009) and informed by Singh and Prakash (2020). Specifically, 9.4% belonged to the Baby Boomer generation (born between 1946 and 1964; $N = 31$), 49.7% to Generation X (born between 1965 and 1980; $N = 164$), 33.6% to Generation Y or Millennials (born between 1981 and 1995; $N = 111$), and 7.3% to Generation Z (born between 1996 and 2012; $N = 24$). Although the distribution across generations was uneven, this reflects the natural composition of the accessible population and is common in non-probabilistic sampling. Generational cohort was therefore treated as a contextual moderator rather than a grouping variable for direct comparisons, allowing the examination of age-related variations without assuming psychological homogeneity within cohorts. Data were collected using a self-administered online questionnaire distributed via

snowball sampling. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and all respondents provided informed consent prior to participation.

METHODS

Personality traits were assessed using the *Ten-Item Personality Inventory* (TIPI) developed by Gosling *et al.* (2003). The instrument measures the Big Five dimensions—Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Openness to Experience—using two items per trait, rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). In the present study, internal consistency coefficients ranged from $\alpha = .43$ to $\alpha = .58$, values comparable to those reported in Romanian samples using the same instrument (Balgiu, 2018). As previously noted in the literature, lower reliability coefficients are expected for ultra-short measures due to the limited number of items per scale, representing a methodological trade-off between measurement precision and assessment efficiency (Furnham, 2008).

Resilience was assessed using the *Brief Resilience Scale* (BRS) developed by Smith *et al.* (2008), designed to measure the ability to recover or “bounce back” from stress. Unlike instruments that assess protective resources or coping strategies, the BRS focuses specifically on adaptive recovery following adversity (Windle *et al.*, 2011). The scale consists of six items (e.g., “I tend to bounce back quickly after hard times”) rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In the present study, the BRS demonstrated good internal consistency, with a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of $\alpha = .86$.

Psychological well-being was assessed using the *Psychological Well-Being Scale* developed by Ryff (1989), adapted by Kállay and Rus (2014). The instrument comprises 42 items organized into six subscales, each consisting of seven items. Items are rated on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). In the present study, internal consistency coefficients were satisfactory across all dimensions: autonomy ($\alpha = .63$; e.g., “I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus.”), personal growth ($\alpha = .69$; e.g., “I have the sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time.”), positive relations with others ($\alpha = .78$; e.g., “Most people see me as loving and affectionate.”), purpose in life ($\alpha = .73$; e.g., “I have a sense of direction and purpose in life”), self-acceptance ($\alpha = .80$; e.g., “I like most aspects of my personality”), and environmental mastery ($\alpha = .74$; e.g., “In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live”).

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The present study employed a non-experimental, cross-sectional design, in which all variables were measured at a single point in time. This approach is appropriate for examining associations among psychological constructs as they naturally occur, without experimental manipulation (Cherry, 2019).

Data analyses focused on testing the study hypotheses using correlational and regression-based approaches. Given that several variables deviated from normal distribution, Spearman's rank-order correlations were used to examine bivariate associations among personality traits, resilience, and psychological well-being dimensions. This non-parametric approach was considered appropriate due to its robustness to non-normality and ordinal measurement characteristics.

To test the study hypotheses, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted. Personality traits (neuroticism, extraversion, and conscientiousness) were entered as predictors of resilience, followed by resilience as a predictor of psychological well-being. To examine whether these associations varied across age groups, generational cohort was included as a moderator using dummy coding. All continuous predictors were standardized prior to analysis to reduce multicollinearity and facilitate interpretation of interaction effects. Results are interpreted in terms of associative rather than causal relationships.

RESULTS

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Descriptive statistics including means, standard deviations, Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients, and Spearman correlations for all study variables are presented in Table 1. Spearman's rho correlations indicated statistically significant associations among personality traits, resilience, and psychological well-being. Emotional stability was positively associated with resilience and with overall psychological well-being, with correlation coefficients ranging from small to moderate in magnitude ($r_s = .464, p < .001$ and $r_s = .447, p < .001$, respectively). Openness to experience, extraversion, and conscientiousness also showed positive associations with resilience and with overall psychological well-being ($r_s = .277, .267, .127, p < .05$ to $p < .001$ and $r_s = .453, .424, .390, p < .001$, respectively), as well as with several dimensions of psychological well-being, including personal growth, environmental mastery, and purpose in life.

Overall, these findings support H1, indicating that all five personality traits were significantly associated with resilience and psychological well-being. In subsequent hierarchical regression analyses, all five personality dimensions were retained as predictors, given that each demonstrated statistically significant bivariate relationships with the outcome variables.

In addition, resilience displayed consistent and meaningful associations with multiple facets of psychological well-being. The strongest relationships were observed for environmental mastery ($r_s = .504, p < .001$) and self-acceptance ($r_s = .437, p < .001$). More moderate, yet still statistically significant, associations emerged for positive relations ($r_s = .358, p < .001$), personal growth ($r_s = .345, p < .001$), autonomy ($r_s = .281, p < .001$), and purpose in life ($r_s = .256, p < .001$).

Table 1
Means, Standard Deviations, Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients, and Spearman Correlations for the Study Variables (N = 330)

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Extraversion	4.467	1.117	(.49)												
2 Agreeableness	4.897	0.858	0.096	(.17)											
3 Conscientiousness	5.589	0.880	0.172**	0.162**	(.51)										
4 Emotional Stability	4.698	1.096	0.210***	0.435***	0.205***	(.58)									
5 Openness to Experience	5.205	0.940	0.428***	0.245***	0.167**	0.286***	(.43)								
6 Resilience	3.303	0.757	0.267***	0.271***	0.127*	0.464***	0.277***	(.86)							
7 Psychological Well-Being	4.569	0.554	0.424***	0.303***	0.390***	0.447***	0.453***	0.477***	(.91)						
8 Autonomy	4.215	0.679	0.270***	0.119*	0.215***	0.305***	0.382***	0.281***	0.631***	(.63)					
9 Personal Growth	4.855	0.668	0.340***	0.262***	0.301***	0.345***	0.473***	0.345***	0.783***	0.497***	(.69)				
10 Positive Relations	4.646	0.764	0.381***	0.385***	0.272***	0.391***	0.374***	0.358***	0.720***	0.243***	0.489***	(.78)			
11 Purpose in Life	4.613	0.758	0.264***	0.183***	0.310***	0.213***	0.311***	0.256***	0.763***	0.334***	0.524***	0.457***	(.73)		
12 Self-Acceptance	4.604	0.757	0.343***	0.171**	0.289***	0.353***	0.292***	0.437***	0.851***	0.463***	0.593***	0.517***	0.578***	(.80)	
13 Environmental Mastery	4.482	0.726	0.341***	0.259***	0.395***	0.443***	0.258***	0.504***	0.826***	0.406***	0.516***	0.547***	0.567***	0.725***	(.74)

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine whether resilience explained additional variance in overall psychological well-being, conceptualized as a global construct, beyond personality traits. Two complementary analytical approaches were employed. In the first approach, the Enter method was used, in which all five personality traits (openness to experience, emotional stability, conscientiousness, extraversion, and agreeableness) were simultaneously entered in Step 1, allowing for the estimation of their collective and unique contributions while controlling for shared variance among predictors. Together, the five personality traits accounted for a significant proportion of variance in overall psychological well-being ($R^2 = .430$, F change = 48.856, $p < .001$). In Step 2, resilience was added to the model and explained a significant additional proportion of variance ($\Delta R^2 = .047$, F change = 28.745, $p < .001$), bringing the total explained variance to $R^2 = .476$. This finding indicates that resilience contributes uniquely to psychological well-being beyond the combined effects of all personality traits. Results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Hierarchical multiple regression predicting overall psychological well-being from personality (as a global construct – Enter Method) and resilience (N = 330)

	Model /Predictor	β	t	p	95% CI	R	R^2	ΔR^2	F_{change}
1	Extraversion	0.225	4.782	< 0.001	[0.066, 0.157]	0.656	0.430	0.430	48.856**
	Agreeableness	0.076	1.611	0.108	[-0.011, 0.109]				
	Conscientiousness	0.250	5.749	< 0.001	[0.103, 0.211]				
	Emotional Stability	0.252	5.219	< 0.001	[0.079, 0.175]				
	Openness to	0.224	4.648	< 0.001	[0.076, 0.188]				
	Experience								
2	Extraversion	0.189	4.149	< 0.001	[0.049, 0.138]	0.690	0.476	0.047	28.745**
	Agreeableness	0.058	1.285	0.200	[-0.020, 0.095]				
	Conscientiousness	0.250	6.000	< 0.001	[0.106, 0.209]				
	Emotional Stability	0.157	3.172	< 0.001	[0.030, 0.129]				
	Openness to	0.201	4.333	< 0.001	[0.065, 0.172]				
	Experience	0.250	5.361	< 0.001	[0.116, 0.250]				
	Resilience								

Notes: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, Dependent Variable: Psychological well-being (overall score)

In the second approach, shown in Table 3, the Stepwise method was employed to identify which personality traits contributed most meaningfully to the prediction of psychological well-being, allowing the algorithm to select predictors based on their statistical contribution. Agreeableness was not retained by the Stepwise procedure, indicating that it did not contribute unique variance beyond the other traits. As shown in Table 3, the Stepwise procedure generated five models. In Model 1, openness to experience emerged as the first selected predictor, accounting for a significant proportion of variance in psychological well-being ($R^2 = .228$, F change = 96.675, $p < .001$). In Model 2, emotional stability was

added, explaining an additional 11.1% of variance ($\Delta R^2 = .111$, F change = 55.098, $p < .001$), bringing the total explained variance to $R^2 = .339$. In Model 3, conscientiousness was added ($\Delta R^2 = .083$, F change = 47.047, $p < .001$), increasing the total explained variance to $R^2 = .422$. In Model 4, extraversion was included ($\Delta R^2 = .028$, F change = 16.447, $p < .001$), with the model accounting for $R^2 = .450$ of the variance in psychological well-being. At the individual level, in Model 4 all four retained traits contributed significantly, with standardized coefficients of $\beta = .235$ for openness to experience, $\beta = .282$ for emotional stability, $\beta = .255$ for conscientiousness, and $\beta = .220$ for extraversion (all $p < .001$). In Model 5, resilience was added and explained a significant additional proportion of variance ($\Delta R^2 = .024$, F change = 14.515, $p < .001$), bringing the total explained variance to $R^2 = .474$. All predictors remained significant in Model 5, with resilience showing a standardized coefficient of $\beta = .255$ (95% CI [0.119, 0.253], $p < .001$), openness to experience $\beta = .210$ (95% CI [0.070, 0.177], $p < .001$), emotional stability $\beta = .178$ (95% CI [0.044, 0.137], $p < .001$), conscientiousness $\beta = .254$ (95% CI [0.108, 0.212], $p < .001$), and extraversion $\beta = .185$ (95% CI [0.047, 0.136], $p < .001$). This finding confirms that resilience contributes uniquely to psychological well-being beyond the effects of the personality traits retained in the model.

Table 3

Hierarchical multiple regression predicting overall psychological well-being from personality traits (as individual factors included in the model – Stepwise Method) and resilience (N = 330)

Model /Predictor	β	t	p	95% CI	R	R^2	ΔR^2	F_{change}
1 Openness to Experience	0.453	9.194	< 0.001	[.210, .324]	0.477	0.228	0.228	96.675**
2 Openness to Experience	0.354	7.408	< 0.001	[.153, .264]				
Emotional Stability	0.346	7.254	< 0.001	[.128, .222]	0.582	0.339	0.111	55.098**
3 Openness to Experience	0.321	7.051	< 0.001	[.136, .242]				
Emotional Stability	0.299	6.518	< 0.001	[.106, .197]				
Conscientiousness	0.275	6.160	< 0.001	[.118, .228]	0.650	0.422	0.083	47.047**
4 Openness to Experience	0.235	4.921	< 0.001	[.083, .194]				
Emotional Stability	0.282	6.304	< 0.001	[.098, .187]				
Conscientiousness	0.255	5.869	< 0.001	[.107, .214]				
Extraversion	0.220	4.681	< 0.001	[.063, .155]	0.671	0.450	0.028	16.447**
5 Openness to Experience	0.210	4.547	< 0.001	[.070, .177]				
Emotional Stability	0.178	3.810	< 0.001	[.044, .137]				
Conscientiousness	0.254	6.105	< 0.001	[.108, .212]				
Extraversion	0.185	4.064	< 0.001	[.047, .136]				
Resilience	0.255	5.464	< 0.001	[.119, .253]	0.688	0.474	0.024	14.515**

Notes: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, Dependent Variable: Psychological well-being (overall score)

Consistent with H2, higher levels of resilience were associated with higher levels of overall psychological well-being, supporting its role as an adaptive resource that complements stable personality characteristics in promoting positive psychological functioning.

Table 4

Moderation Analysis Examining the Interaction Between Resilience and Generational Cohort
Predicting Psychological Well-Being (N = 330)

Independent Variables	Psychological Well-Being (overall score)					
	β	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	LCLI	UCLI
Resilience	-2.431**	0.664	-3.662	0.003	-3.737	-1.125
Generational Cohort	-0.101	0.118	-0.855	0.393	-0.332	0.131
Resilience x Generational cohort	0.168	0.264	0.638	0.524	-0.351	0.688
<i>F</i>	32.820**					
<i>R</i> ²	0.232**					

Notes: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, Dependent Variable: Psychological well-being (overall score)

To test H3, a moderation analysis was conducted using PROCESS (Model 1), examining whether generational cohort moderated the association between resilience and psychological well-being. As shown in Table 4, the interaction between resilience and generational cohort was not statistically significant ($\beta = .168$, $SE = 0.264$, $t = .638$, $p = .524$, 95% CI [-.351, .688]). This indicates that the strength of the relationship between resilience and psychological well-being did not differ across generations. The overall model was significant ($F = 32.820$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .232$), confirming that resilience and generational cohort together predicted psychological well-being, but without a significant interaction effect.

Consistent with this finding, resilience remained a significant positive predictor of psychological well-being across all generational groups, supporting its role as a stable adaptive resource. Thus, H3 was not supported.

DISCUSSION

The present findings support an integrative perspective in which personality traits and resilience jointly contribute to psychological well-being. Consistent with trait-based models of personality (Goldberg, 1993; Digman, 1997; McCrae & Costa, 1999), emotional stability, extraversion, and conscientiousness emerged as meaningful dispositional foundations of adaptive functioning. Individuals characterized by greater emotional stability appear better equipped to regulate stress, while extraversion and conscientiousness support adaptive engagement through positive affectivity, persistence, and self-regulatory capacity (McCrae & John, 1992; Costa & McCrae, 1980; Campbell-Sills *et al.*, 2006; Furnham & Cheng, 2000). These findings reinforce the view that resilience does not operate independently of personality, but rather emerges from stable dispositional tendencies that shape how individuals interpret and respond to life challenges.

Beyond personality traits, resilience accounted for additional variance in psychological well-being, supporting its conceptualization as a dynamic adaptive resource. This result aligns with theoretical models describing resilience as a process that enables individuals to maintain or restore psychological functioning

under conditions of stress (Dyer & McGuinness, 1996; Miller-Graff, 2022). Importantly, resilience was positively associated with all dimensions of psychological well-being, with particularly strong links to environmental mastery. This pattern is theoretically meaningful, as environmental mastery reflects individuals' perceived capacity to manage life demands and exert effective control over their surroundings—capacities that are central to resilient functioning. Although all well-being facets were significantly related to resilience, the stronger association with environmental mastery suggests that resilience may be especially relevant for navigating practical life challenges and maintaining agency in the face of adversity.

From an applied perspective, this finding suggests that interventions aimed at strengthening resilience may also support individuals' ability to manage everyday demands more effectively and maintain a sense of control over their environment. Such interventions may be particularly valuable in educational, occupational, and community settings, where adaptive coping resources can contribute to sustained psychological well-being across adulthood.

Contrary to expectations, generational cohort did not moderate the relationship between resilience and psychological well-being. This finding suggests that the adaptive value of resilience may remain relatively stable across adulthood when well-being is considered as a global construct. While previous research has documented age-related differences in specific well-being dimensions, such as environmental mastery or emotional stability (Ryff & Singer, 1998; Terracciano *et al.*, 2005), the present results indicate that resilience exerts a comparable protective role across generational groups. At the same time, exploratory patterns observed in the data suggest that generational differences may emerge more clearly at the level of specific well-being facets rather than at the global level. In particular, the strong association between resilience and environmental mastery suggests that resilient individuals may be more likely to perceive themselves as capable of managing everyday demands and exerting effective control over their environment. This finding further highlights the importance of environmental mastery as a component of psychological adaptation and points to a potentially fruitful avenue for future research.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The cross-sectional design precludes causal inferences regarding the directionality of associations among personality, resilience, and well-being. Additionally, the reliance on self-report measures may have introduced shared method variance. Unequal group sizes across generations may also have limited statistical power to detect moderation effects. Future studies would benefit from longitudinal designs, more balanced age distributions, and the inclusion of multiple assessment methods to capture dynamic processes of adaptation more comprehensively. Further investigation of how resilience relates to distinct facets of psychological well-being, particularly environmental mastery and self-acceptance, may clarify age-specific pathways of adaptation.

In conclusion, the present findings highlight the joint contribution of personality traits and resilience to psychological well-being across adulthood. Emotional stability, extraversion, and conscientiousness provide a dispositional foundation for adaptive functioning, while resilience acts as a dynamic mechanism that supports well-being across diverse life contexts. Although generational differences did not moderate these relationships at a global level, the results underscore the importance of examining how adaptive resources interact with specific dimensions of well-being. Together, these findings contribute to a more nuanced understanding of psychological adaptation as a dynamic interplay between stable personality characteristics and flexible coping capacities across the lifespan.

REFERENCES

1. Aiena, B. J., Baczwaski, B. J., Schulenberg, S. E., & Buchanan, E. M. (2015). Measuring resilience with the RS-14: A tale of two samples. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 97(3), 291–300.
2. Anglim, J., & Grant, S. (2016). Predicting psychological and subjective well-being from personality: Incremental prediction from 30 facets over the Big 5. *Journal of Happiness studies*, 17(1), 59–80.
3. Anglim, J., Horwood, S., Smillie, L. D., Marrero, R. J., & Wood, J. K. (2020). Predicting psychological and subjective well-being from personality: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 146(4), 279.
4. Balgiu, B. A. (2018). The psychometric properties of the Big Five inventory-10 (BFI-10) including correlations with subjective and psychological well-being. *Global Journal of Psychology Research: New Trends and Issues*, 8, 61–69.
5. Bartone, P. T., Ursano, R. J., Wright, K. M., & Ingraham, L. H. (1989). The impact of a military air disaster on the health of assistance workers: A prospective study. *The Journal of nervous and mental disease*, 177(6), 317–328.
6. Campbell-Sills, L., Cohan, S. L., & Stein, M. B. (2006). Relationship of resilience to personality, coping, and psychiatric symptoms in young adults. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 44(4), 585–599.
7. Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: a theoretically based approach. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 56(2), 267.
8. Chen, C. (2016). The role of resilience and coping styles in subjective well-being among Chinese university students. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 25(3), 377–387.
9. Cherry, K. (2019). How does the cross-sectional research method work. Very Well Mind. Retrived on November 10th, 2025 from <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-a-cross-sectional-study-2794978>
10. Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: happy and unhappy people. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 38(4), 668.
11. DeNeve, K. M., & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: a meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological bulletin*, 124(2), 197.
12. Derryberry, D., Reed, M. A., & Pilkenton-Taylor, C. (2003). Temperament and coping: Advantages of an individual differences perspective. *Development and psychopathology*, 15(4), 1049–1066.
13. Diener, E., Suh, E. M., Lucas, R. E., & Smith, H. L. (1999). Subjective well-being: three decades of progress. *Psychological bulletin*, 125(2), 276.
14. Digman, J. M. (1997). Higher-order factors of the Big Five. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 73(6), 1246.
15. 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.
16. Dyer, J. G., & McGuinness, T. M. (1996). Resilience: Analysis of the concept. *Archives of psychiatric nursing*, 10(5), 276–282.
17. Erickson, T. (2009). Generational differences between India and the US. *Harvard Business Review*, 1.

18. Furnham, A. (2008). Relationship among four Big Five measures of different length. *Psychological Reports*, 102(1), 312–316.
19. Furnham, A., & Cheng, H. (2000). Perceived parental behaviour, self-esteem and happiness. *Social psychiatry and psychiatric epidemiology*, 35(10), 463–470.
20. Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American psychologist*, 48(1), 26.
21. Gosling, S.D., Rentfrow, P. J. & Swann Jr., W.B. (2003). A very brief measure of the Big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(6), 504–528.
22. 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.
23. Headey, B., & Wearing, A. (1989). Personality, life events, and subjective well-being: Toward a dynamic equilibrium model. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology*, 57(4), 731.
24. Huppert, F. A. (2017). Mindfulness and compassion as foundations for well-being. In *Future directions in well-being: Education, organizations and policy* (pp. 225–233). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
25. Huta, V., & Waterman, A. S. (2014). Eudaimonia and its distinction from hedonia: Developing a classification and terminology for understanding conceptual and operational definitions. *Journal of happiness studies*, 15(6), 1425–1456.
26. John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102–138). Guilford Press.
27. Kállay, E., & Rus, C. (2014). Psychometric properties of the 44-item version of Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scale. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 30 (1).
28. Klainin-Yobas, P., Keawkerd, O., Pumpuang, W., Thunyadee, C., Thanoi, W., & He, H. G. (2014). The mediating effects of coping on the stress and health relationships among nursing students: A structural equation modelling approach. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 70(6), 1287–1298.
29. Lu, C., Yuan, L., Lin, W., Zhou, Y., & Pan, S. (2017). Depression and resilience mediates the effect of family function on quality of life of the elderly. *Archives of gerontology and geriatrics*, 71, 34–42.
30. McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., de Lima, M. P., Simões, A., Ostendorf, F., Angleitner, A., ... & Piedmont, R. L. (1999). Age differences in personality across the adult life span: parallels in five cultures. *Developmental psychology*, 35(2), 466.
31. McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications. *Journal of personality*, 60(2), 175–215.
32. McCracken, L. M., Carson, J. W., Eccleston, C., & Keefe, F. J. (2004). Acceptance and change in the context of chronic pain. *Pain*, 109(1), 4–7.
33. Miller-Graff, L. E. (2022). The multidimensional taxonomy of individual resilience. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 23(2), 660–675.
34. Notebaert, L., Crane, M., Carpini, J. A., Timming, A. R., & Eastham, J. (2025). Resilience to Workplace Incivility: How Different Recovery Experiences Influence Resilience Dimensions. *Adversity and Resilience Science*, 1–15.
35. Ong, A. D., Liu, Z., & Cintron, D. W. (2023). Five challenges for hope and resilience research. *Current opinion in psychology*, 49, 101538.
36. Rew, L., & Horner, S. D. (2003). Personal strengths of homeless adolescents living in a high-risk environment. *Advances in nursing science*, 26(2), 90–101.
37. Richardson, G. E. (2002). The metatheory of resilience and resiliency. *Journal of clinical psychology*, 58(3), 307–321.
38. Rothbart, M. K., & Bates, J. E. (2006). Temperament. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology, Vol. 3, Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 99-166). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
39. 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.
40. Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. (1998). *The role of purpose in life and personal growth in positive human health*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

41. Satici, S. A. (2016). Psychological vulnerability, resilience, and subjective well-being: The mediating role of hope. *Personality and individual differences*, 102, 68–73.
42. Sinclair, R. R., & Oliver, C. M. (2003). Development and validation of a short measure of hardiness. *Defense Technical Information Center Report*, Portland, OR: Portland State University.
43. Singh, M. S., & Prakash, N. (2020). Deconstructing the Conceptualization of Generational Cohorts. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, 4(4), 1417–1418.
44. Smith, B. W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., & Bernard, J. (2008). The brief resilience scale: assessing the ability to bounce back. *International journal of behavioral medicine*, 15(3), 194–200.
45. Smith, C., & Carlson, B. E. (1997). Stress, coping, and resilience in children and youth. *Social service review*, 71(2), 231–256.
46. Smith, G. D., & Yang, F. (2017). Stress, resilience and psychological well-being in Chinese undergraduate nursing students. *Nurse education today*, 49, 90–95.
47. Steel, P., Schmidt, J., & Shultz, J. (2008). Refining the relationship between personality and subjective well-being. *Psychological bulletin*, 134(1), 138.
48. Sun, J., Kaufman, S. B., & Smillie, L. D. (2018). Unique associations between Big Five personality aspects and multiple dimensions of well-being. *Journal of personality*, 86(2), 158–172.
49. Surzykiewicz, J., Konaszewski, K., & Wagnild, G. (2019). Polish version of the resilience scale (RS-14): A validity and reliability study in three samples. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 2762.
50. Terracciano, A., McCrae, R. R., Brant, L. J., & Costa Jr, P. T. (2005). Hierarchical linear modeling analyses of the NEO-PI-R scales in the Baltimore Longitudinal Study of Aging. *Psychology and aging*, 20(3), 493.
51. Tong, E. M., Bishop, G. D., Diong, S. M., Enkelmann, H. C., Why, Y. P., Ang, J., & Khader, M. (2004). Social support and personality among male police officers in Singapore. *Personality and individual differences*, 36(1), 109–123.
52. Westerhof, G. J., & Keyes, C. L. (2010). Mental illness and mental health: The two continua model across the lifespan. *Journal of adult development*, 17(2), 110–119.
53. Windle, G., Bennett, K. M., & Noyes, J. (2011). A methodological review of resilience measurement scales. *Health and quality of life outcomes*, 9(1), 8.
54. Yasuhiro, K., Su-Hie, T., & Neary, S. (2021). Mental health of Malaysian university students: UK comparison, and relationship between negative mental health attitudes, self-compassion, and resilience. *Higher Education*, 81(2), 403–419.
55. Zhang, H., Zhao, Q., Cao, P., & Ren, G. (2017). Resilience and quality of life: exploring the mediator role of social support in patients with breast cancer. *Medical science monitor: international medical journal of experimental and clinical research*, 23, 5969.

Data Availability Statement

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article are made available by the authors without undue reservation.

Authors Contributions

Both authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the main objective of the study, the analysis of the data, and the writing of the manuscript.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted without any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

