P-ISSN 2708-6453	Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review	Oct-Dec 2022, Vol. 6, No. 4
O-ISSN 2708-6461	http://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2022(6-IV)04	[35-43]

Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review
www.plhr.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Relationship between Students' Self-Construal and Decision Making Styles at University Level

Dr. Fasiha Altaf * [1]Sadia Jabeen[2] Sobia Younas[3]

1. Assistant Professor, Department of Education, GC Women University Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Lecturer, Department of Education, University of Lahore, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Lecturer, Department of Education, GC Women University Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan

Corresponding Author Fasiha.altaf@gcwus.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Present study aimed to investigate relationship between students' self-construal and decision making styles at university level. Correlational research design was used to investigate the relationship between the variables. Population of the study was consisted on all university students in Lahore. Simple random sampling technique was used to select the sample. Sample of the study was 200 male and female students from public and private universities in Lahore. Self-construal scale and decision-making scale were used for data collection. Reliability of the instruments were .869 and .756 respectively. Findings of the study revealed that there was significant positive moderate correlation existed between students' self-construal and decision-making styles at university level. Findings further concluded that there was significant mean difference existed between university students' perceptions about self-construal and decision-making based on their gender, university type, qualification and age. There is an emerging group of students hold an interdependent self-construal. Therefore, findings of this study suggested that different decision-making styles should be used according to the students having different behavior to improve their performance and interpersonal relationships at university level.

KEYWORDS Decision-Making Styles, Self-Construal, University Students

Introduction

Construal refers to an individual's observation, cognition, and interpretation of the world around them, particularly the behaviors or acts of those people or things directly in their immediate environment. While the former refers to an individual's conception of themselves, the latter refers to how an individual evaluates their environment. Construal is needed whenever people are asked to move beyond the information provided by the direct observation or second-hand report of an impulse event. This is the case whenever people are required to proceed beyond the information offered by an impulse event. This is especially the case when individuals are forced to draw further conclusions about the substance, context, or meaning of the activities and results that are occurring around them. To put it another way, a person is more likely to participate in construal when they do not have the knowledge necessary to effectively deal with a certain issue. The process of self-construal involves analysing the foundations of self-definition and determining the degree to which one describes oneself. At its origin, the phrase resulted from identifying cultural differences in the individual. There is a distinction to be made between constructing oneself and doing so in the context of a social setting. It has long been thought that the opinion of the self is one of the essential constructions in the process of understanding cultural

differences in a range of domains, including thinking, feeling, and action (Kitayama, Duffy, & Uchida, 2007)

Humans' conduct while making decisions will always be subjective to some degree. The decision makers' perceptions drive their actions and reactions rather than the objective realities of the situation. The decision-wants, the maker's desires, personality characteristics, values, experiences, and subjective evaluations all contribute to their unique perception of reality. Reality is a unique phenomenon. As a result of the fact that people act and make choices by what they consider to be the truth, it is essential to consider the subjectivity of individuals as an integral aspect of the decision-making process (George & Dane, 2016).

The adolescent stage is significant for the study of decision-making ability because it is a vital stage in which the teenager is asked to make decisions on their own and to experience the repercussions of their decisions in new environments that are unsupervised and dangerous. As a result of this, the adolescent stage is particularly important for the research on the capability of making decisions (Alessio, Baiocco, & Laghi, 2006; Baillie, Lovato, Johnson, & Kalaw, 2005). It is possible that certain decisions an individual takes while they are still a teenager will have substantial ramifications for the remainder of their lives (Baiocco, Laghi, & Alessio, 2009). There have not been many studies done to determine how crucial it is for children to be able to make judgments at this point in their lives, but it's becoming increasingly clear that this ability is critical (Crone, Vendel, & Molen, 2003).

Literature Review

Making a decision requires following a series of logical procedures, including identifying the issue at hand, thinking about several potential solutions, and selecting the one that is most suitable given the circumstances (Garman, Corrigan, & Morris, 2002). The process of making a decision is to eliminate as much uncertainty and doubt as possible regarding the available options to the point where one can make a sensible selection from those available. Others believe that most decisions are subconsciously (Kaur, Bala, & Singh, 2015). Making decisions is essential for people and impacts virtually every element of life. Research has started looking into the differences between people regarding their ability to make effective and successful decisions. This includes achieving better choice outcomes, such as positive societal objectives (Geisler & Allwood, 2018).

Active research is being conducted on human performance about decisions from various psychological, cognitive, and normative viewpoints. These perspectives include: The psychological view examines individual decisions concerning the individual's sought-after requirements, preferences, and ideals. Creating decisions is an ongoing, consistent process incorporated into interacting with the surrounding environment, following the cognitive point of view. The normative perspective is concerned with the logic of decision-making and rationality and the invariant choice it leads to. This is determined by examining individual decisions (Bajwa, Batool, Asma, Ali, & Ajmal, 2016).

This method presents itself in a clearly obvious manner in self-construal literature, which is variously categorised as both collectivist and individualistic and is seen as possessing both of these self-images (Tuli&Chaudhary, 2010). Studies on self-construal have shown something that has been referred to as a "unique mix." This combination consists of strong individualistic impulses that coexist with pronounced collectivist orientations that are centered on the family. These are the kinds of orientations that are considered to be family-centered in their focus.

The act of making a decision requires the engagement of a wide range of cognitive processes, such as the collection and processing of information, the solving of problems, judgments, learning, and remembering. There is evidence to suggest that many adolescents are capable of making acceptable judgments by the age of 15; furthermore, they have the capability of creative problem solving and can understand the stages involved in the process of systematic decision-making (Othman, Othman, Hallit, Obeid, & Hallit, 2020).

A more recent study (Cheng & Lam, 2013) with Chinese students in Hong Kong provides some support for the notion that self-construal and performance objectives are connected. This study was conducted with Chinese students. According to the findings of this study, independent self-construal had a favourable relationship with the target orientation of the performance approach, whereas interdependent self-construal had no connection with this aspect of the approach. The fact that there is a positive correlation between independent self-construal and performance goals may be interpreted as evidence that self-directed pupils have a predisposition to work for their own personal development. In exceptional cases, accomplishing performance goals by exhibiting high performance or limiting the exhibition of low competence when compared to others could be a strategy for maintaining or improving one's good self-regard. Because interdependent self-construal and performance goals are not related to one another, there may be a need for interdependent students to choose between various forms of social motivation in order to achieve academic success. Interdependent students may have the need to obtain social acceptability by demonstrating their competency to their professors and peers because of the high importance that is put on academic achievement in Asian environments. The finding lends further credence to the concept that the aspiration of Asian students to win the acceptance of their peers is favourably correlated with the ambition of obtaining both mastery and success (Chang & Wong, 2008; Liem et al., 2012).

Despite the fact that self-construal has significant implications for students' motivation to achieve their goals, very few studies have been done that directly explore the relationship between the objectives of self-construal and the achievement of students. This is despite the fact that many studies have not been done that directly explore the relationship between the objectives of self-construal and the achievement of students. One type of research used secondary school students from Singapore to investigate the hypothesised link between students' self-construction and their accomplishment goals in English language acquisition (Luo, Hogan, & Paris, 2011). They found that interdependent self-construal was the only one that correctly predicted positive outcomes for mastery avoidance goals, but independent self-construal correctly predicted positive outcomes for mastery strategy objectives. Only autonomous self-construal was found to be a major predictor of targets for success plans and avoidance, which is another topic that needs to be mentioned. Students who have a self-conception that is interdependent on others are more likely to have a mastery orientation. This may explain why these students tend to put in a lot of effort to develop themselves in areas where they believe they are lacking mastery. The main objective of the study was to investigate relationship between students' self-construal and decision making styles at university level.

Method and Material

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not there is a correlation between how college students perceive themselves and the types of decisions they make at the university level. In order to study the nature of the connection that exists between the variables, a correlational research design was utilized. The population of the study comprised of all of the students enrolled in universities in Lahore. The survey included male and female students from public and private universities in the city of Lahore, totaling

200 participants. Self-construal scale and decision-making scale were used for data collection. Reliability of the instruments were .869 and .756 respectively. Data were collected personally by the researchers from university students. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data.

Results and Discussion

Table 1
Correlation between Self-Construal and Decision-Making Styles at University Level

Measures	*M*	*SD*	*r- value*	*Sig.*
Self-Construal	94.59	14.66	.319**	.000
Decision-Making Styles	74.75	74.75		

Correlation between self-construal and decision-making styles of university students was calculated by using Pearson r. Findings of the study revealed that there was significant moderate correlation between self-construal and decision-making styles of university students at p≤.05 level of significance.

Table 2
Impact of Self-Construal on Decision-Making Styles of University Students

	Unstandardized Co-efficient	Standardized Co-efficient						
Model	*B*	Std. Error *B*	*B*	*T*	*P*	*Df*	*F*	R^2
Constant	59.439	3.270						
Self-Construal	.162	.034	.319	4.739	.000	198	22.462	.102

Dependent Variable: Decision-Making Styles

A linear regression analysis was conducted in order to find the significance effect of self-construal on students' decision-making styles at university level. "Findings of the study shows that self-construal was found to be significant with (R^2 = .102) at p≤.05 level of significance". "The findings of the effect of self-construal on decision-making styles was significantly predict the dependent variable with" (β =.319, F=22.462, p=0.000).

Table 3
Difference of Perceptions between Male and Female Students regarding Self-Construal and Decision-Making Styles at University Level

Measures	Gender	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*Df*	*t-value*	*Sig.*
Self-Construal	Male	100	96.69	15.42	194.981	2.042	.037
	Female	100	92.49	13.61			
Decision-Making Styles	Male	100	78.37	4.50	155.823	7.852	.000
	Female	100	71.14	8.02			

Gender wise difference of perceptions between male and female students regarding self-construal and decision-making styles at university level was found by using independent samples t-test. Findings of the study revealed that there was significant difference between self-construal and decision-making styles of university students at p≤.05 level of significance.

Table 4

University wise Difference of Perceptions of Students regarding Self-Construal and Decision-Making Styles at University Level

Measures	University Type	*N*	*M*	*SD*	*Df*	*t-value*	*Sig.*
Self-Construal	Public	125	96.03	15.69	182.80	1.911	.058
	Private	75	92.18	12.48			
Decision-Making Styles	Public	125	77.28	5.39	110.85	6.193	.000
	Private	75	70.54	8.43			

University wise difference of perceptions of public and private students regarding self-construal and decision-making styles at university level was found by using independent samples t-test. Findings of the study revealed that there was significant difference between public and private students' perceptions about self-construal and decision-making styles at p≤.05 level of significance.

Table 5
Qualification wise Difference of Students' Perceptions regarding Self-Construal at University Level

Measures	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*Sig.*
Self-Construal	1075.810	2	537.905	2.541	.081
	41696.570	197	211.658		
	42772.380	199			

Qualification wise difference of perceptions of students regarding self-construal at university level was found by using one-way ANOVA. Findings of the study revealed that there was no significant difference among university students' perceptions about self-construal at p≤.05 level of significance.

Table 7
Qualification wise Difference of University Students' Perceptions about Decision-Making Styles

Measures	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*Sig.*
Decision-Making Styles	2757.609	2	1378.804	32.927	.000
	8249.386	197	41.875		
	11006.995	199			

Qualification wise difference of perceptions of students regarding decision-making styles at university level was found by using one-way ANOVA. Findings of the study revealed that there was significant difference among university students' perceptions about decision-making styles at p≤.05 level of significance.

Table 8
Post-hoc Analysis to find out Differences of Students' Perceptions about Decision-Making Styles

(I) Academic Qualification	(J) Academic Qualification	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
BS	MPhil	6.58514*	1.02243	.000
	PhD	9.00842*	1.38982	.000
MPhil	BS	-6.58514*	1.02243	.000
	PhD	2.42328	1.48849	.236

PhD	BS	-9.00842*	1.38982	.000
	MPhil	-2.42328	1.48849	.236

A post-hoc was applied to find out the qualification wise difference of perceptions of students regarding decision-making styles at university level was. Findings of the study revealed that there was significant difference among university students' perceptions about decision-making styles at p≤.05 level of significance.

Table 9
Age wise Difference of Perceptions of Students' Perceptions regarding Self-Construal at University Level

Measures	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*Sig.*
Self-Construal	1397.680	2	698.840	3.327	.038
	41374.700	197	210.024		
	42772.380	199			

Age wise difference of perceptions of students regarding self-construal at university level was found by using one-way ANOVA. Findings of the study revealed that there was significant difference of university students' perceptions about self-construal at p≤.05 level of significance.

Table 10
Post-hoc Analysis to find out Differences of Students' Perceptions about Self-Construal at University Level

(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
21-31 Years	32-42 Years	1.68455	2.29742	.744
	Above 42 Years	7.24037*	2.81258	.029
32-42 Years	21-31 Years	-1.68455	2.29742	.744
	Above 42 Years	5.55582	2.95299	.147
Above 42 Years	21-31 Years	-7.24037*	2.81258	.029
	32-42 Years	-5.55582	2.95299	.147

Post-hoc analysis of self-construal at university level was conducted to find out the differences of perceptions among university students within groups. Findings revealed that students having age group between 21-31 years was significantly different with the students having age group above 42 years. Moreover students having age group of 32-42 years was found to be significant with the students having age group of 21-31 years at p≤.05 level of significance.

Table 11
Age wise Difference of Perceptions of Students' Perceptions regarding Decision-Making Styles at University Level

Measures	Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*Sig.*
Decision-Making Styles	3086.685	2	1543.342	38.387	.000
	7920.310	197	40.205		
	11006.995	199			

Age wise difference of perceptions of students regarding decision-making styles at university level was found by using one-way ANOVA. Findings of the study revealed that there was significant difference among university students about decision-making styles at p≤.05 level of significance.

Table 12
Age wise Difference of Perceptions of Students' Perceptions regarding Decision-Making Styles at University Level

(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
21-31 Years	32-42 Years	5.36571*	1.00518	.000
	Above 42 Years	10.29442*	1.23058	.000
32-42 Years	21-31 Years	-5.36571*	1.00518	.000
	Above 42 Years	4.92871*	1.29201	.001
Above 42 Years	21-31 Years	-10.29442*	1.23058	.000
	32-42 Years	-4.92871*	1.29201	.001

Post-hoc analysis was conducted to find out the differences of perceptions of students regarding decision-making styles at university level. Findings of the study revealed that there was significant difference among university students about decision-making styles at $p \leq .05$ level of significance within different groups.

Discussion

A summary of significant discoveries is offered below, along with the results that support those conclusions when interpreted in light of the relevant literature. The primary objective of the study was to evaluate the connection between how university students perceive themselves and how satisfied they are with their academic performance. In this study, the link between the different variables was investigated through the use of a correlational research methodology. The results of the study showed that there was a significant moderate positive link between students' self-construal and their level of decision making skills. The findings of the study also showed that there was a substantial difference between the perspectives of male and female students at the university level regarding their self-construal and their level of self-confidence. According to the findings of Delaney's (2014) research, there were substantial differences between age groups and between genders. According to the findings of Bajwa, Batool, Ali, and Ajmal (2016), the mean values of both decision making styles were greater among females as compared to males, and the results were also statistically significant. Another study, which supported the findings of the current study, was carried out by Ding, Xu, Yang, Li, and Heughten (2020) on the subject of students' business experience. They discovered that both female and male students who lacked business experience exhibited a high propensity to avoid conflicts or tasks that required immediate attention. In addition, the findings of the study came to the conclusion that there was a significant mean difference that existed between university students based on their qualification and age. On the other hand, there were significant differences of opinion between public and private students' opinions regarding their self-construal and confidence of taking decision.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not there is a correlation between how university students perceive themselves and how satisfied they are with their studies. The results of the study showed that there was a significant moderate positive link between students' self-construal and their level of academic satisfaction. The findings of the study also showed that there was a substantial difference between the perspectives of male and female students at the university level regarding their self-construal and their level of decision making skill. In addition, the findings of the study came to the conclusion that there was a significant mean difference that existed between university students based on their qualification and age. On the other hand, there were significant differences of

opinion between public and private students' opinions regarding their self-construal and decision making style.

Recommendations

1. University faculties, administration, and professional advisors can help students learn new decision-making skills or make improvements to the decision-making skills they already possess. This can assist students in overcoming any limitations in their current decision-making style and guide them in the process of decision-making.

2. Educational institutions and departments can invite professionals from both the public and private sectors to lead a focus group discussion in order to investigate how students from various regions feel about the decision-making process involved in selecting a course or area of concentration.

3. The university, departments, and faculty can seek assistance from professional advisors who can provide students with self-help workshops to assist students in coping with the challenges they face during the decision-making process for students from a variety of cultural backgrounds.

4. Educational institutions and their faculties have the option of soliciting the assistance of expert advisors from the public and private sectors who are able to provide programmes and organise seminars and workshops. The pupils will have the opportunity to investigate their strengths, which will improve their ability to make decisions.

5. It is possible that the curriculum needs to be redesigned to reflect the changing needs of society, and that existing information needs to be brought up to date for students who come from a variety of backgrounds.

References

Alessio, M., Baiocco, R., & Laghi, F. (2006). The problem of binge drinking among Italian university students: A preliminary investigation. *Addictive Behaviours, 31*(6), 2328-2333.

Bajwa, R. S., Batool, I., Asma, M., Ali, H., & Ajmal, A. (2016). Personality traits and decision making styles among university students (Pakistan). *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences, 14*(1), 38-41.

Baiocco, R., Laghi, F., & D'Alessio, M. (2009). Decision-making style among adolescents: Relationship with sensation seeking and locus of control. *Journal of Adolescence*, *32*(4), 963-976.

Bajwa, R. S., Batool, I., Asma, M., Ali, H., & Ajmal, A. (2016). Personality traits and decision making styles among university students (Pakistan). *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences, 14*(1), 38-41.

Crone, E. A., Vendel, I., & Van-Der-Molen, M. W. (2003). Decision-making in adolescents and adults: insensitivity to future consequences or driven by immediate rewards? *Personality and Individual Differences, 35*(5), 1625-1641.

Cheng, R. W. Y., & Lam, S. F. (2013). The interaction between social goals and self-construal on achievement motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *38*(2), 136-148.

Delaney, R. K. (2014). Age and Gender Differences in Decision-Making Style Profiles (Master Thesis). West Virginia University. Morgantown, West Virginia.

Ding, N., Xu, X., Yang, H., Li, Y., & Heughten, P. V. (2020). Decision-making styles of Chinese business students. *Journal of Education for Business, 95*(6), 351-358.

Garman, A. N., Corrigan, P. W., & Morris, S. (2002). Staff burnout and patient satisfaction: evidence of relationships at the care unit level. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *7*(3), 235- 256.

George, J. M., & Dane, E. (2016). Affect, emotion, and decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 136*(2), 47-55.

Kaur, J., Bala, I., & Singh, S. (2015). Development of decision making style scale for senior secondary school students. *Review of Research, 4*(4), 1-10.

Kitayama, S., Duffy, S., & Uchida, Y. (2007). Self as cultural mode of being.In S. Kitayama& D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 136-174). New York: Guilford.

Making, 31, Geisler, M., & Allwood, C. M. (2018). Relating Decision-Making Styles to Social Orientation and Time Approach. *Journal of Behavioral Decision* 415–429. Othman, R., Othman, R., Hallit, R., Obeid, S., &Hallit, S. (2020). Personality traits, emotional intelligence and decision-making styles in Lebanese universities medical students. *BMC Psychology, 8*(46), 1-14.

Tuli, M., Chaudhary, N., (2022). Socio-cultural images of motherhood: Individual variations of a collective construct. *Human Arenas*, *45*(2), 1-10