APJETPSS Volume 1 Issue 1 | E-ISSN: 3082-4052 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.70847/592758

Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Technologies, Psychology, and Social Sciences

Journal Homepage: https://ijmshe.com/index.php/apjetps

Research Article

Exploring the Influence of Personality Traits and Decision-Making Styles of Undergraduate Students: A Correlational Analysis

Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez [1] | Mieryc Kert D. Tullao [2] | Charles Ghaverilel L. Arado [3] | Carlo John Sumande [4] | Ms. Joannie V. Intong [5] | Al-Sheree Ann Cantal Eupena [6] | Bartolome A. Cabahug Jr. [7] | Mark Joel C. Ortiz [8]

[1-7] University of Mindanao, Davao City, 8000, Philippines

[8] University of Southeastern Philippines, Davao City, 8000, Philippines

Article Info

Article history:

Received: 21 December 2024
Revised: 17 January 2025
Accepted: 28 January 2025

Keywords:

Personality traits, General decision-making, Undergraduate students, College students, Quantitative analysis

Abstract

Decision-making styles represent consistent patterns of behavior individuals exhibit when making decisions, encompassing cognitive and behavioral processes. These styles are influenced by various factors, including personality traits, which are theorized to shape individual approaches to decision-making. Grounded in this premise, the study examined the relationship between the Big Five Personality Traits—openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism—and General Decision-Making Styles (GDMS) among undergraduate students. Utilizing a quantitative-correlational research design, data were collected from a sample of 301 students through two validated instruments: the Big Five Inventory (BFI) and the General Decision-Making Styles Questionnaires. The findings reveal significant insights into personality-decision-making dynamics. Openness and agreeableness emerged as the most prevalent personality traits among the participants, while rational decision-making was identified as the dominant style. Furthermore, neuroticism demonstrated a significant correlation with intuitive, dependent, and avoidant decision-making styles, highlighting the emotional and cognitive vulnerabilities associated with these traits. These results suggest that personality traits substantially influence decision-making preferences, underscoring the interplay between dispositional factors and cognitive strategies. This study contributes to the growing body of literature on personality and decision-making, providing empirical evidence of their interconnectedness. It emphasizes the importance of understanding personality as a determinant of decision-making styles, particularly in academic and developmental contexts. Future research is recommended to expand these findings by exploring additional variables, longitudinal impacts, and cross-cultural comparisons to enhance the generalizability and theoretical robustness of the conclusions.

Cite as: Navasquez, B. A., Tullao, M. K., Arado, C. G., Sumande, C. J., Intong, J., Eupena, A. S., Cabahug, B. Ortiz, M. J. (2025). Exploring the Influence of Personality Traits and Decision-Making Styles of Undergraduate Students: A Quantitative Analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Technologies, Psychology, and Social Sciences*, 1(1), 25–45. https://doi.org/10.70847/592758

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

Introduction

Decision-making is an essential cognitive and behavioral process that influences individual and organizational outcomes. General decision-making styles, as conceptualized by Scott and Bruce (1995), represent consistent patterns individuals exhibit when making decisions. These styles are classified into five distinct categories: rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous. Rational decision-makers rely on logic and systematic analysis, intuitive decision-makers emphasize gut feelings and emotions, dependent decision-makers prioritize external advice, avoidant decision-makers tend to delay decisions, and spontaneous decision-makers act impulsively (Bavolar & Orosova, 2015; Geisler & Allwood, 2017; Ramey, 2023).

The General Decision-Making Styles (GDMS) framework has demonstrated strong psychometric validity and reliability across diverse contexts, establishing its utility in examining decision-making processes (Spicer & Sadler-Smith, 2005; Verma & Rangnekar, 2015). Furthermore, research suggests a significant relationship between personality traits, as defined by the Big Five Model—openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism—and decision-making styles. Studies indicate that conscientious individuals are more likely to adopt rational decision-making styles, while extraverted and open individuals may favor intuitive decision-making (Egbaria & Zaid, 2023). Similarly, agreeable individuals often engage in dependent decision-making due to their collaborative tendencies (Egbaria & Zaid, 2023).

Despite the substantial body of research linking personality traits to decision-making styles, critical gaps remain in the literature. First, much of the existing research treats personality traits as static constructs, neglecting their developmental trajectories during adolescence and early adulthood—a period of significant cognitive, emotional, and social growth (Bleidorn et al., 2021). This omission is particularly relevant in the context of college students, whose decision-making styles may evolve alongside personality changes during these formative years.

Second, methodological limitations persist, including an overreliance on self-report measures for assessing decision-making styles. Such measures are susceptible to biases and often fail to capture the situational and contextual nuances of real-world decision-making (Robins et al., 2001). Additionally, external factors such as cultural norms, social environments, and academic pressures are frequently overlooked despite their potential influence on both personality traits and decision-making behaviors (Obenza et al., 2024a).

Finally, the long-term implications of personality development on decision-making styles remain underexplored. While existing studies provide valuable insights, they often offer fragmented perspectives, lacking a comprehensive understanding of how personality traits and decision-making styles interact and adapt over time in response to academic and personal challenges.

In response to these gaps, this study aims to investigate the relationship between Big Five personality traits and general decision-making styles among undergraduate students, focusing on how personality traits influence decision-making during late adolescence and early adulthood. By adopting a quantitative approach, this research seeks to trace the development of personality traits throughout the college years, providing a developmental perspective on decision-making styles.

Through this lens, the study endeavors to bridge existing gaps by integrating established

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

personality theories with a nuanced understanding of developmental processes. This approach not only contributes to the theoretical understanding of personality and decision-making but also has practical implications for creating personalized educational interventions. By tailoring support systems to align with students' unique personality profiles and decision-making preferences, educators can foster more adaptive decision-making behaviors, ultimately enhancing academic and personal outcomes.

Theoretical Framework

Big Five Model Theory

Personality traits are dynamic qualities that affect our behavior, motivation, thought processes (Yunus et al., 2018), financial well-being (Obenza et al., 2024b), and financial management behavior (Obenza et al., 2024d). Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientious, Neuroticism, and Openness to experience, are the five dimensions widely known as the Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality, commonly referred to as the BIG FIVE (Soto et al., 2013; McCrae & John, 1992). This model is known widely because of its acceptance among personality psychologists due to its applicability across cultures, comprehensiveness, occupational, psychological, and health outcomes, and ability to predict various social (McCrae & John, 1992; Soto et al., 2013). The Five-Factor Model (FFM) shows that everyone has this basic personality, it is not measured by their gender, age, or culture. However, people change in how strong these traits are shown (Novikova 2013). The research shows that the Big Five traits change and develop overtime, formed by both genetics and life experiences (Soto et. al. 2013). The model can be also used for understanding personality disorders and can be used as another way to diagnose them instead of the current system (Costa & McCrae, 1992). The main idea of five main personality traits was first recommended by Fiske in 1949. Eventually, other researchers like Norman (1967), and Goldberg (1981) enhanced and improved this research. In this study, this theory backs the notion that personality has a dynamic impact on people's lives cross-culturally, hence, making it probable to affect decision-making.

Decision-Making Style

Decision-making is a cognitive process that includes choosing and selecting options based on values and preferences (Fülöp, 2005). It includes different methods, like brainstorming, making decisions as a team, and grouping ideas (Akdere, 2011). Decision-making styles are also distinct approaches individuals use to gain, process, and utilize information to make decisions easily. Research has shown several key styles, including rational, avoidant, intuitive, dependent, and spontaneous (Scott & Bruce 1995). Some classifications include directive, analytical, conceptual, and behavioral styles (Rowe & Mason, 1987) and decisive, flexible, hierarchic, integrative, and systematic approaches (Driver et. al., 1990). Knowing your decision-making styles can help you do better at work, improve your daily performance, and develop your career (Driver et. al., 1990).

Scott and Bruce (1995) created an instrument called the General Decision Making Style (GDMS) resource to determine five decision-making styles: rational, avoidant, intuitive, dependent, and spontaneous. This instrument has been widely used in research to

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

learn and study decision-making styles in different situations. Thunholm (2008) found that people with an avoidant decision-making style had high levels of cortisol, a stress hormone. At the same time, Allwood and Salo (2012) found that avoidant and dependent decision-making styles were connected to higher stress levels and poorer sleep quality among Swedish public authority employees.

Research has shown that the General Decision Making Styles shows good internal consistency, temporal stability, and a robust fi-factor structure (Spicer & Sadler-Smith, 2005; Alacreu-Crespo et al., 2019). The scale has been found to correlate with personality traits, coping styles, and mental health outcomes (Alacreu-Crespo et al., 2019; Bavoľár & Orosová, 2015). Rational and intuitive decision-making styles are associated with better coping skills and emotional stability. However dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous styles are associated with poor coping habits and emotional instability (Alacreu-Crespo et. al., 2019). This theory is connected to the study by laying out the structure of decision-making style in an organized manner that can be easily measured and correlated with another psychological variable.

Methodology

This study employed a quantitative, correlational research design to examine the relationship between the Big Five personality traits—openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism—and General Decision-Making Styles (GDMS) among undergraduate students. A correlational design was chosen as it allows the analysis of naturally occurring relationships between variables without manipulating them. This approach is well-suited for exploring complex psychological constructs and their interdependencies, providing insights into patterns and associations (Voxco, 2021).

The target population for this research included undergraduate students enrolled in universities in Davao City. A stratified random sampling technique was employed to ensure the representativeness of the sample. Stratified sampling divides the population into subgroups or strata based on shared characteristics, such as academic program, year level, or university affiliation, to ensure proportional representation (Hayes, 2024). A total of 301 students participated in the study, a sample size determined using power analysis to ensure sufficient statistical power for detecting significant relationships among variables.

Data collection utilized two validated instruments. The first instrument, the Big Five Inventory (BFI), was developed by John and Srivastava (1999) and measures five major dimensions of personality: openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. The BFI consists of 44 items, each rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). This inventory is widely recognized for its cross-cultural validity and reliability. The second instrument was the General Decision-Making Styles (GDMS) Questionnaire, designed by Scott and Bruce (1995). This 25-item tool assesses five decision-making styles: rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous. Similar to the BFI, responses were measured on a 5-point Likert scale. The GDMS is extensively utilized in research due to its robust psychometric properties (Spicer & Sadler-Smith, 2005).

Participants were invited to join the study through purposive outreach in collaboration with university administrators. They were provided with an informed consent form outlining the study's objectives, data privacy measures, and the voluntary nature of their participation. Data

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

collection was conducted both online and in person, ensuring accessibility for all participants while maintaining confidentiality. The survey instrument was divided into two sections. The first section collected demographic information, including age, gender, year level, and field of study. The second section contained items from the BFI and GDMS. A pilot test was conducted with 30 students to refine the questionnaire, resulting in minor adjustments to item wording to enhance clarity and comprehension.

The validity of the instruments was established through content validation from prior studies. Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega, with both metrics exceeding the recommended threshold of 0.70, indicating strong internal consistency (Zinbarg et al., 2005). Specifically, the BFI and GDMS yielded Cronbach's alpha values of 0.798 and 0.841, respectively, while McDonald's omega values were 0.826 and 0.843.

Data were analyzed using Jamovi software, which provided a comprehensive platform for performing descriptive and inferential statistical analyses. Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were calculated to summarize the levels of personality traits and decision-making styles. Pearson's correlation coefficients were computed to identify the strength and direction of relationships between personality traits and GDMS. Additionally, multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the predictive power of personality traits on decision-making styles. The R^2 value was computed to assess the proportion of variance in decision-making styles explained by the independent variables.

This study adhered to ethical guidelines as outlined in the National Ethical Guidelines for Research Involving Human Participants (2022). Ethical clearance was obtained from the University of Mindanao's ethics review board. Participants were informed about their rights, including anonymity and the ability to withdraw from the study at any stage. Data were securely stored, with access restricted to the research team, ensuring participants' confidentiality.
The rigorous methodological approach adopted in this study ensures the reliability, validity, and applicability of the findings, contributing meaningful insights into the relationship between personality traits and decision-making styles among undergraduate students.

Results and Discussion

The study employed reliability analysis to ensure the internal consistency of the instruments used. Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega were calculated for both the Big Five Inventory (BFI) and the General Decision-Making Styles (GDMS) questionnaire. Cronbach's alpha values of 0.798 and 0.841 for the BFI and GDMS, respectively, demonstrated acceptable to good reliability, aligning with recommendations by Diamantopoulos and Winklhofer (2001) and Drolet and Morrison (2001), which consider values between 0.70 and 0.90 tolerable to good. McDonald's omega values of 0.826 for BFI and 0.843 for GDMS further confirmed the instruments' internal consistency, meeting the threshold of 0.70 for reliability (Zinbarg et al., 2005). These results underscore the robustness of the scales for assessing personality traits and decision-making styles.

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

Table 1 presents the reliability analysis results, providing evidence of the validity and reliability of the measures employed in the study.

Table 1. Reliability Analysis - Scale Reliability Statistics

	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
Personality Traits scale	0.798	0.826
General Decision-Making Style scale	0.841	0.843

Table 2 presented below shows that overall GDMS scores a mean of 3.40 and a standard deviation (SD) of 0.474. The mean indicates a moderate level of presence of multiple decision-making styles among the samples. On the other hand, the SD of such numbers suggests a narrower decision-making style or tendency. The dominating style among the five identified is the Rational Decision-Making Style (M = 4.10, SD = 0.636). This indicates that the sample prefers to decide in a logical, structured, and evidence-based way. In the academe, this is witnessed when a student is consistently present and even achieves more (Baiocco et al., 2009). Following this is the Dependent Decision-Making Style (M = 3.51, SD = 0.706), which indicates the reliance of the sample on other people when deciding. This result contradicts the study of Ain and Ch (2022), indicating that such a style is the least prevalent among students. Next, the Intuitive Decision-Making Style (M = 3.42, SD = 0.760) places third on the list, which implies that students rely on their gut feelings in decision-making. This supports the results of a study indicating that intuition correlates with decision-making among students (Sree & Sinha, 2024). Subsequently, the fourth among the five styles is the Spontaneous Decision-Making Style (M = 3.14, SD = 0.901), which shows that students are not that impulsive when deciding. Avoidant Decision-Making Style (M = 2.81, SD = 1.003), placing last, means that the sample can create decisions and not stay away from them.

Moreover, personality dimensions reveal various information regarding the students. Openness (M = 3.85, SD = 0.633) and Agreeableness (M = 3.84, SD = 0.638) are the highest-rated traits, indicating that students value flexibility, curiosity, and cooperation. This result aligns with Jones (2022), indicating that these variables are commonly present among college students. This also aligns with Obenza et. al. (2024c) stating that agreeableness is the dominant personality trait among univeristy students. Subsequently, Neuroticism gathers a mean of 3.33 and SD of 0.819, revealing that students have diverse ways of coping with stress and emotional stability. Students who score high on this test are more likely to depict stressful situations, view events negatively, and may have more ineffective ways of coping (Gunthert et al., 1999). Lastly, Extraversion (M = 3.30, SD = 0.647) and Conscientiousness (M = 3.72, SD = 0.694) are present in moderate levels, exhibiting students' ability to socialize and consistency dependent on the context.

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

Table 2.1. Descriptive Level of Students General Decision-Making Style and Personality Traits

	N	Mean	SD	Description
General Decision-Making Style	301	3.40	0.474	Moderate Level
Rational Decision-Making Style	301	4.10	0.636	Very High Level
Intuitive Decision-Making Style	301	3.42	0.760	Moderate Level
Dependent Decision-Making Style	301	3.51	0.706	High Level
Avoidant Decision-Making Style	301	2.81	1.033	Very Low Level
Spontaneous Decision-Making Style	301	3.14	0.901	Moderate Level
Extraversion	301	3.30	0.647	Moderate Level
Agreeableness	301	3.84	0.638	High Level
Conscientiousness	301	3.72	0.694	High Level
Neuroticism	301	3.33	0.819	Moderate Level
Openness	301	3.85	0.633	Very High Level

Table 2.2.1. Interpretation table for Descriptive Level of Students General Decision-Making Style

Range of Means	Descriptive Level	Interpretation
4.50 - 5.00	Very High	This means that the presence of a General Decision-Making Style is very high.
3.50 - 4.49	High	This means that the presence of General Decision-Making Style is high.
2.50 - 3.49	Moderate	This means that the presence of General Decision-Making Style is moderate.
1.50 - 2.49	Low	This means that the presence of General Decision-Making Style is low.
1.00 - 1.49	Very Low	This means that the presence of General Decision-Making Style is very low.

Table 2.2.1. Interpretation table for Descriptive Level of Personality Traits

Range of Means	Descriptive Level	Interpretation
4.50 - 5.00	Very High	This means that the presence of Personality Traits is very high.

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

3.50 - 4.49	High	This means that the presence of Personality Traits is high.
2.50 - 3.49	Moderate	This means that the presence of Personality Traits is moderate.
1.50 - 2.49	Low	This means that the presence of Personality Traits is low.
1.00 - 1.49	Very Low	This means that the presence of Personality Traits is very low.

Table 3 shows the correlation between GDMS and personality traits based on its five indicators. Predominantly, neuroticism correlates with three decision-making styles: intuitive decision-making style, dependent decision-making style, and avoidant decision-making style, as well as GDMS in general. On the other hand, extraversion is found to be highly correlated with two decision-making styles: rational decision-making style and spontaneous decision-making style, as well as GDMS in general. Conscientiousness also shows a significant relationship with two decision-making styles: rational decision-making style and avoidant decision-making style. Meanwhile, agreeableness and openness are both found to correlate with rational decision-making style only.

Moreover, findings about neuroticism agree with the conclusion that demonstrates neurotic individuals' tendency toward a dependent decision-making style, seeking advice and guidance from others (Servaas et al., 2013). On a different note, the findings also agree with Senler and Sungur-Vural (2013), concluding that neuroticism is not correlated with rational decision-making style. In the same way, it agrees with Othman et al. (2020), stating that a less spontaneous decision-making style is present in this specific personality trait. Also, the findings agree that a significant relationship exists between neuroticism and avoidant decision-making style (Narooi & Karazee, 2015).

This finding also agrees and differs with Urieta et al. (2021), who find that extroverted students are more likely to adopt a rational-intuitive decision-making style, which involves both logical reasoning and intuition. Results agree that individuals who score high in extraversion adapt to a rational decision-making style; however, it contradicts the presence of an intuitive decision-making style. On the other hand, the study opposes the notion that high extraversion scores lead to a lower rational decision-making style (Othman et al., 2020).

Additionally, the findings agree with Senler and Sungur-Vural (2013), as they indicate that agreeableness and conscientiousness correlate with rational decision-making style. On the other hand, the findings agree and also disagree with Othman et al. (2020), as their results suggest that a less spontaneous decision-making style is associated with agreeableness and conscientiousness, but they also suggest the presence of a dependent decision-making style, which is not present in this study.

Furthermore, findings also suggest that individuals who score high in openness are more prone to decide more rationally. According to Gimenez‑Fernandez et al. (2023), individuals with high levels of openness are more likely to adopt a flexible decision-making style, adapting their approach to different situations. The

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

findings of this study somehow disagree with Gimenez‐Fernandez et al. (2023), as it favors one decision-making style over the other. Also, the conclusion agrees with the notion that openness is less correlated with GDMS (Othman et al., 2020).

Table 3. Correlation Analysis

		General Decision-Making Style	Rational Decision-Making Style	Intuitive Decision-Making Style	Dependent Decision-Making Style	Avoidant Decision-Making Style	Spontaneous Decision-Making Style
Extraversion	Pearson's r	0.215***	0.208***	0.042	0.155**	0.057	0.198***
	df	299	299	299	299	299	299
	p-value	<.001	<.001	0.468	0.007	0.327	<.001
Agreeableness	Pearson's r	0.090	0.222***	-0.010	0.092	-0.080	0.106
	df	299	299	299	299	299	299
	p-value	0.121	<.001	0.870	0.111	0.166	0.066
Conscientiousness	Pearson's r	-0.091	0.569***	-0.112	-0.052	-0.333***	-0.122*
	df	299	299	299	299	299	299
	p-value	0.117	<.001	0.051	0.368	<.001	0.034
Neuroticism	Pearson's r	0.239***	-0.129*	0.215***	0.234***	0.266***	0.050
	df	299	299	299	299	299	299
	p-value	<.001	0.025	<.001	<.001	<.001	0.390
Openness	Pearson's r	0.105	0.476***	0.066	0.010	-0.166**	0.067
	df	299	299	299	299	299	299
	p-value	0.070	<.001	0.254	0.862	0.004	0.249

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

In this study, regression analysis was used to explore the impact of the five personality traits on decision-making styles, as it facilitates the identification of significant predictors and

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

provides insights into the extent to which individual personality traits shape decision-making behaviors. The regression analysis, with an F-value (5, 295) = 11.5, $p < .001$, demonstrates the significant relationship between personality traits and decision-making styles among college students. The R^2 value of 0.163 indicates that personality traits help explain differences in decision-making styles, accounting for 16.3% of the variation. These findings suggest that personality traits such as Extraversion, Neuroticism, and Openness are correlated with DMS, supported by earlier studies conducted by Heidari and Arani (2017), Ülgen et al. (2016), and Urieta et al. (2021). On the other hand, the trait of Conscientiousness shows a negative impact on the DMS, which aligns with the study conducted by Wasarhelyi et al. (2019), indicating the complex relationship between conscientiousness and decision-making.

It is also emphasized in the study by Hakim et al. (2021) that highly conscientious individuals may overanalyze situations, resulting in difficulty acting decisively and struggles to adapt flexibly. The findings in this regression analysis highlight the significant role of personality traits in shaping the general decision-making styles, where each trait has unique contributions supported by the previous study conducted by Egbaria and Zaid (2023).

Table 4.1 Model Fit Measures

				Overall Model Test			
Model	**R**	**R^2**	**Adjusted R^2**	**F**	**df1**	**df2**	**p**
1	0.404	0.163	0.149	11.5	5	295	<.001

Note. Models estimated using a sample size of N=301

Table 4.2 Omnibus ANOVA Test

	Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**p**
Extraversion	3.572	1	3.572	18.720	<.001
Agreeableness	0.143	1	0.143	0.752	0.387
Conscientiousness	3.116	1	3.116	16.331	<.001
Neuroticism	4.436	1	4.436	23.249	<.001
Openness	1.345	1	1.345	7.050	0.008
Residuals	56.286	295	0.191		

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

Note. Type 3 sum of squares

Theoretical Implications

The key findings from the regression analysis have important theoretical implications that contribute to our understanding of the relationships between personality traits and their role in decision-making, which also provides support to the Big Five Factor Model Theory by (Soto et al., 2013; McCrae & John, 1992). The results propose personality can be understood in terms of five broad dimensions: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience which demonstrates that these traits are related to decision-making style, which is consistent with the previous studies conducted by (Heidari & Arani, 2017). There is a positive relationship between extraversion and decision-making style, which is consistent with the Big Five Factor Model's characterization of extraversion as a trait that involves sociability and assertiveness as further explained by Heidari and Arani (2017). The negative relationship between conscientiousness and decision-making style challenges traditional views that associate conscientiousness with positive outcomes in various domains, including decision-making. This finding suggests that the relationship between personality traits and decision-making is not straightforward and may depend on contextual factors. Future research could explore the conditions under which conscientiousness becomes a hindrance rather than a help in decision-making. Also, the findings imply that the impact of personality traits on decision-making may vary across different contexts (e.g., social vs. individual decision-making). This calls for further research to explore how situational factors interact with personality traits to influence decision-making styles. Lastly, understanding the relationship between personality traits and decision-making can inform training and development programs aimed at improving decision-making skills. For instance, interventions could be designed to help individuals with high neuroticism develop coping strategies to manage stress and enhance their decision-making capabilities. Overall, these theoretical implications suggest a need for a more integrated and detailed understanding of how personality traits influence decision-making, highlighting the complexity of these relationships and the potential for practical applications in various fields.

Conclusion

This study revealed significant insights into the relationship between personality traits and general decision-making styles among undergraduate students. The findings highlighted three key outcomes. First, agreeableness and openness were significantly associated with rational decision-making. This suggests that individuals who exhibit high levels of amicability and open-mindedness are more likely to engage in logical and systematic approaches when making decisions. These traits reflect their ability to remain objective and adaptable in situations that require careful deliberation.

Second, the study identified that the avoidant decision-making style was the least prevalent among college students. This indicates that students are generally proactive in addressing challenges and responsibilities, demonstrating a readiness to confront decisions rather than evade them. Such tendencies may reflect the demands of academic and social contexts, which often require active participation and problem-solving.

Third, neuroticism was associated with multiple decision-making styles, including intuitive, dependent, and avoidant. These findings align with the theoretical understanding of

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

neuroticism as a trait characterized by heightened emotional reactivity and susceptibility to stress. Individuals high in neuroticism may struggle with logical decision-making, as their negative affectivity can lead to impulsive or stress-driven choices. The variation in their decision-making styles underscores their diverse coping mechanisms in managing stressful situations

Recommendations

To build upon the findings of this study, future research should consider diversifying the sample population to include participants from a wider range of cultural, institutional, and geographical backgrounds. A more representative sample would enhance the generalizability of the findings and allow researchers to identify patterns influenced by societal norms and values. Exploring these variations across diverse contexts could uncover unique relationships between personality traits and decision-making styles that remain unexplored in the current study. Furthermore, longitudinal research designs are recommended to track changes in personality traits and decision-making styles over time. Such an approach would provide a deeper understanding of their developmental trajectories and the contextual factors influencing these variables at different stages of life.

In addition to quantitative methods, integrating qualitative research approaches, such as interviews and focus group discussions, would be valuable for uncovering the underlying cultural, social, and normative factors shaping decision-making behaviors. This would allow researchers to move beyond numerical data and gain richer insights into the lived experiences of individuals, providing a more holistic understanding of the interplay between personality and decision-making. Employing advanced analytical tools, such as structural equation modeling (SEM) or machine learning algorithms, could also offer a more precise and robust exploration of these relationships. These methods would facilitate the identification of complex moderating or mediating variables, strengthening the theoretical framework and practical implications of the research.

By addressing these recommendations, future studies can expand the scope and depth of knowledge on the relationship between personality traits and decision-making styles, contributing to more effective interventions in educational, organizational, and psychological contexts.

Limitations of the Study

This study has several limitations that should be considered. First, it relied on self-reported data, which are prone to biases such as social desirability and subjective interpretation, potentially affecting the accuracy of the findings. Additionally, the sample was limited to undergraduate students from a specific geographical area, restricting the generalizability of the results to broader populations and cultural contexts. The cross-sectional design further limits the ability to establish causal relationships between personality traits and decision-making styles, as it captures data at a single point in time. Lastly, while the study employed validated instruments, external factors such as stress levels, academic pressures, and social influences that could impact decision-making behaviors were not accounted for, leaving room for further exploration in future research.

Acknowledgement

The researchers would like to thank the Almighty God for guiding them in this whole research journey. They would also like to express gratitude to the participants who

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

willingly shared their time and were part of the subjects. Lastly, many thanks to the friends, family, classmates, and teachers who were ever supportive and kind.

References

Ahmed, M. A., Khattak, M. S., & Anwar, M.

(2020b). Personality traits and entrepreneurial intention: The mediating role of risk aversion. Journal of Public Affairs, 22(1). https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2275

Ahmed, M. A., Khattak, M. S., & Anwar, M.

(2020c). Personality traits and entrepreneurial intention: The mediating role of risk aversion. Journal of Public Affairs, 22(1). https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2275

Ain, N., & Ch, A. H. (2022). Students'

perception of Decision-Making styles at university level in Punjab. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Students'-Perception-of-Decision-Making-Styles-at-Ain-Ch./1f3f6cb71a4934bf9a7fe6683a98ad704d4f62b1?utm_source=direct_link

Akdere, M. (2011). An analysis of

decision-making process in organizations: Implications for quality management and systematic practice. Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 22(12), 1317–1330. https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2011.625180

Alacreu-Crespo, A., Fuentes, M. C.,

Abad-Tortosa, D., Cano-Lopez, I., González, E., & Serrano, M. Á. (2019). Spanish validation of General Decision-Making Style scale: Sex invariance, sex differences and relationships with personality and coping styles. Judgment and Decision Making, 14(6), 739–751. https://doi.org/10.1017/s1930297500005453

Allwood, C. M., & Salo, I. (2012).

Decision-making styles and stress. International Journal of Stress Management, 19(1), 34–47. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027420

Aryal, S. (2023, August 3). Questionnaire

method of data collection. Microbe Notes. https://microbenotes.com/questionnaire-method-of-data-collection/

Azeska, A., Starc, J., & Kevereski, L. (2017).

Styles of decision making and management and dimensions of personality of school principals. International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science Engineering and Education, 5(2), 47–56. https://doi.org/10.5937/ijcrsee1702047a

Baiocco, R., Laghi, F., & D'Alessio, M. (2008).

Decision‐making style among adolescents: Relationship with sensation seeking and locus of control. Journal of Adolescence, 32(4), 963–976. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.08.003

Bavoľár, J., & Orosová, O. (2015).

Decision-making styles and their associations with decision-making competencies and mental health. Judgment and Decision Making, 10(1),

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

115–122. https://doi.org/10.1017/s1930297500003223

Bleidorn, W., Hopwood, C. J., Back, M. D., Denissen, J. J. A., Hennecke, M., Hill, P. L., Jokela, M., Kandler, C., Lucas, R. E., Luhmann, M., Orth, U., Roberts, B. W., Wagner, J., Wrzus, C., & Zimmermann, J. (2021). Personality trait stability and change. Personality Science, 2. https://doi.org/10.5964/ps.6009

Bruce, R. A. & Scott, S. G. (1995). Decision-Making style: the development and assessment of a new measure. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55(5), 818–831. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164495055005017

Costa Jr, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1987). Neuroticism, somatic complaints, and disease: Is the bark worse than the bite? Journal of Personality, 55(2), 299–316. Retrieved from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1987.tb00438.x

Dewberry, C., Juanchich, M., & Narendran, S. (2013). Decision-making competence in everyday life: The roles of general cognitive styles, decision-making styles and personality. Personality and Individual Differences, 55(7), 783–788. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.06.012

DeVellis, R. F. (2017). Scale development: Theory and applications (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Diamantopoulos, A. and Winklhofer, H. M. (2001). Index Construction with Formative Indicators: An Alternative to Scale Development. Journal of Marketing Research 38 (2), 269-277. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1558630

Driver, M., Brousseau, K. R., & Hunsaker, P. (1990). The Dynamic Decision maker: Five decision styles for executive and Business success. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Dynamic-Decision-Maker%3A-Five-Decision-Styles-Driver-Brousseau/3e2c6977eda63113ebdcf6b36c3053ad1f839eab?utm_source=direct_link

Drolet, A., & Morrison, D. G. (2001). Do we really need Multiple-Item measures in service research? Journal of Service Research, 3 (3), 196–204. https://doi.org/10.1177/109467050133001

Egbaria, H., & Zaid, J. (2023). The Association of Personality Traits and Decision-Making Styles among Arab Undergraduate Students in Israeli Universities. International Journal of Social Science Humanity & Management Research, 2(04). https://doi.org/10.58806/ijsshmr.2023.v2i4n06

Fiske, D. W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 44(3), 329–344. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0057198

Fülöp, J. (2005). Introduction to decision making metGunthert, K. C., Cohen, L., & Armeli, S. (1999). The role of neuroticism in daily stress and coping. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-role-of-neuroticism-in-daily-stress-

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

and-coping.-Gunthert-Cohen/2fb49f3b508610286afc037e1447bd361d7a6d14

Geisler, M., & Allwood, C. M. (2017). Relating Decision-Making styles to social orientation and time approach. Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 31(3), 415–429. https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.2066

Gimenez‐Fernandez, E. M., Stefan, I., Beukel, K., & Sandulli, F. (2023). Exploring the dynamics of openness and formal appropriability and its impact on innovation performance in start‐ups. R and D Management, 53(3), 434–458. https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12583

Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. Review of personality and social psychology, 2(1), 141-165. Retrieved from: https://projects.ori.org/lrg/PDFs_papers/universals.lexicon.81.pdf

Gopal, C., & Hemalatha, N. (2020). Relationship between personality and decision making styles among college students. Deleted Journal, 23(15). https://doi.org/10.36295/asro.2020.231501

Gunthert, K. C., Cohen, L. H., & Armeli, S. (1999). The role of neuroticism in daily stress and coping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77(5), 1087–1100. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.5.1087

Hakim, L. N., Santoso, G. A., Takwin, B., Sunitiyoso, Y., & Abraham, J. (2021). Group decision quality, conscientiousness and competition. Cogent Psychology, 8(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2021.1872907

Hayes, A. (2024, August 19). How stratified random sampling works, with examples. Investopedia. https://www.investopedia.com/terms/stratified_random_sampling.asp

Heidari, M., & Arani, M. R. (2017). RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FIVE PERSONALITY FACTORS WITH DECISION MAKING STYLES OF COACHES. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/RELATIONSHIP-BETWEEN-FIVE-PERSONALITY-FACTORS-WITH-Heidari-Arani/ff0747138f8945b46873977f670d3de3a96116b1?utm_source=direct_link

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 (Vol. 2, pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press

Jones, C. A. (2022). Five Factor Model: Insights into a College Population. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Five-Factor-Model%3A-Insights-into-a-College-Jones/930c77465cdfb7b836ce342efe6b5ed4d2edb456

KS, V. M., Rajkumar, E., Lakshmi, R., John, R., Sunny, S. M., George, A. J., Pawar, S., & Abraham, J. (2023). Influence of decision-making styles and affective styles on academic procrastination among students. Cogent Education, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2023.2203598

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

Lee, J. H., Park, H., & Cheung, S. D. (1985). A study on neuroticism in college students. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/A-Study-on-Neuroticism-in-College-Students-Lee-Park/2ac579115fae27cb983fe67a03ffb006a5206b4d

Mashingaidze, M., Phiri, M., & Bomani, M. (2021). The influence of strategy formulation practices on the perceived financial performance of small and medium enterprises: The Zimbabwean experience. The Southern African Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management, 13(1). https://doi.org/10.4102/sajesbm.v13i1.343

McCrae, R. R., & John, O. P. (1992). An introduction to the Five‐Factor model and its applications. Journal of Personality, 60(2), 175–215. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1992.tb00970.x

Mendes, F. F., Mendes, E., & Salleh, N. (2019b). The relationship between personality and decision-making: A Systematic literature review. Information and Software Technology, 111, 50–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2019.03.010

Narooi, Z. S., & Karazee, F. (2015). Investigating the Relationship among Personality Traits, Decision-making Styles, and Attitude to Life (Zahedan Branch of Islamic Azad University as Case Study in Iran). Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n6s6p311

Norman, W. T. (1967). Personality Trait Descriptors--Normative Operating Characteristics For A University Population. Retrieved from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ed014738

Novikova, I. A. (2013). Big five (The Five‐Factor Model and the Five‐Factor Theory). The Encyclopedia of Cross‐Cultural Psychology, 136–138. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118339893.wbeccp054

Obenza, B., Tabac, C. E., Estorba, D. R., Baring, A., Rizardo, J. P., Badayos, C. J., Zaragoza, A. P., & Dela Cruz, P. S. (2024b). Personality Traits and Financial Well-Being of College Students in Davao City. International Journal of Applied Research and Sustainable Sciences, 2(1), 41–56. https://doi.org/10.59890/ijarss.v2i1.1160

Obenza, B. N., Torralba, A. J., Eupena, A.-S. A. C., Sumayo, G. S., & Abelito, J. T. (2024c). Personality Traits and Happiness of University Students in Region XI and Region XII: the Philippine Context. American Journal of Human Psychology, 2(1), 33–40. https://doi.org/10.54536/ajhp.v2i1.2551

Obenza, B., Torrefranca, J. P., Amarilla, J. D. ., Pandamon, J. ., Encarnacion, S. ., Getalado, G. ., & Azis, A. H. . (2024d). Personality Traits and Financial Management Behavior of University Students. International Journal of Business and Applied Economics, 3(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.55927/ijbae.v3i1.7309

Orçan, F. (2023). Comparison of cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega for ordinal data: Are they different? International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education, 10(4), 709–722. https://doi.org/10.21449/ijate.1271693

Othman, R. E., Othman, R. E., Hallit, R., Obeid,

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

S., & Hallit, S. (2020). Personality traits, emotional intelligence and decision-making styles in Lebanese universities medical students. BMC Psychology, 8(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-020-00406-4

Ramey, W. (2023, July 31). Exploring decision-making styles | Dr. Will Ramey. OnTheStacks. https://onthestacks.com/leverage-your-decision-making-style/

Ravinder, E. B., & Saraswathi, A. B. (2020). Literature Review Of Cronbachalphacoefficient (A) And Mcdonald ' s Omega Coefficient (Ω). https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Literature-Review-Of-Cronbachalphacoefficient-(-%CE%91-)-Ravinder-Saraswathi/863c581cd8edd7b9702fbf4f84cdbb068e7dff24

Riaz, M. N., Riaz, M. A., & Batool, N. (2012). Personality types as predictors of decision making styles. Journal of Behavioural Sciences, 22(2), 99. http://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/doap/PDF-FILES/Abstract%20no.%208_Vol_22_No_2_2012.pdf

Rowe, A., & Mason, R. (1987). Managing with Style: A Guide to Understanding, Assessing, and Improving Decision Making. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Managing-with-Style%3A-A-Guide-to-Understanding%2C-and-Rowe-Mason/915e9ef1d0720aa2eefab940322b07e923dcf41f?utm_source=direct_link

Robins, R. W., Tracy, J. L., Trzesniewski, K., Potter, J., & Gosling, S. D. (2001). Personality correlates of Self-Esteem. Journal of Research in Personality, 35(4), 463–482. https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.2001.2324

Sarstedt, M., & Mooi, E. (2014). Regression analysis. In Springer texts in business and economics (pp. 193–233). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-53965-7_7

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1995). Decision-Making style: the development and assessment of a new measure. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55(5), 818–831. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164495055005017

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1995b). Decision-Making style: the development and assessment of a new measure. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55(5), 818–831. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164495055005017

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1995c). Decision-Making style: the development and assessment of a new measure. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55(5), 818–831. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164495055005017

Senler, B., & Sungur-Vural, S. (2013). Pre-Service science teachers' teaching Self-Efficacy in relation to personality traits and academic Self-Regulation. The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 16. https://doi.org/10.1017/sjp.2013.22

Servaas, M. N., Van Der Velde, J., Costafreda, S.

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

G., Horton, P., Ormel, J., Riese, H., & Aleman, A. (2013). Neuroticism and the brain: A quantitative meta-analysis of neuroimaging studies investigating emotion processing. Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 37(8), 1518–1529. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2013.05.005

Smith, G. M. (1967). The usefulness of peer ratings of personality in educational research. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 27(4), 967–984. Retrieved from: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/001316446702700445

Soto, C. J., Kronauer, A., & Liang, J. K. (2015). Five‐Factor Model of Personality. The Encyclopedia of Adulthood and Aging, 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118521373.wbeaa014

Spicer, D., & Sadler‐Smith, E. (2005). An examination of the general decision making style questionnaire in two UK samples. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/An-examination-of-the-general-decision-making-style-Spicer-Sadler%E2%80%90Smith/234c955a40faa555c6ac7e7d9a0a9fca3fd10d09

Spicer, D. P., & Sadler‐Smith, E. (2005). An examination of the general decision making style questionnaire in two UK samples. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 20(2), 137–149. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940510579777

Sree, D. U., & Sinha, A. (2024). Intuition and rational thinking on decision making among college students. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Intuition-and-rational-thinking-on-decision-making-sree-Sinha/c04b1e6d71e3d41d5aea438c6945d9e35d99f3b6

Thunholm, P. (2008). Decision‐making styles and physiological correlates of negative stress: Is there a relation? Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 49(3), 213–219. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2008.00640.x

Thunholm, P. (2009). Military leaders and followers – do they have different decision styles? Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 50(4), 317–324. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2009.00714.x

Ülgen, B., Saglam, M., & Tugsal, T. (2016). Managers' personality traits over management styles and Decision-Making styles. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Managers%E2%80%99-Personality-Traits-Over-Management-Styles-%C3%9Clgen-Saglam/12e600bf24d2f7d2bf8d8f7bab0e2aedd3fec5d2?utm_source=direct_link

Urieta, P., Aluja, A., Garcia, L. F., Balada, F., & Lacomba, E. (2021). Decision-Making and the alternative five factor Personality Model: exploring the role of personality traits, age, sex and social position. Frontiers in Psychology, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.717705

Verma, N., & Rangnekar, S. (2015). General decision making style: evidence from India.

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/General-decision-making-style%3A-evidence-from-India-Verma-Rangnekar/c3ec49da050f54ea719c69a72f2b36e36792b37b

Yunus, M. R. B. M., Wahab, N. B. A., Ismail, M. S., & Othman, M. S. (2018). The importance role of personality trait. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 8(7). https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v8-i7/4530

Voxco. (2021, March 22). Correlational research. Voxco. https://www.voxco.com/blog/correlational-research/

Wasarhelyi, J. N., John, B., Long, B., & Lovas, G. S. (2019). The Effects of Parent attachment and Parenting Styles on Decision-Making in College Students [Susquehanna University]. Journal of Student Research. https://doi.org/10.47611/jsr.vi.639

Widiger, T. A., & Oltmanns, J. R. (2017). Neuroticism is a fundamental domain of personality with enormous public health implications. World Psychiatry, 16(2), 144–145. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20411

Zhang, L. (2006). Thinking styles and the big five personality traits revisited. Personality and Individual Differences, 40(6), 1177–1187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.10.011

Zinbarg, R. E., Revelle, W., Yovel, I., & Li, W. (2005). Cronbach's α, Revelle's β, and Mcdonald's ωH: their relations with each other and two alternative conceptualizations of reliability. Psychometrika, 70(1), 123–133. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-003-0974-7

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph

Creative Commons Licensing Terms

[1]Corresponding Author: Babie Alyanna C. Navasquez
[*]Corresponding Email: b.navasquez.548601@umindanao.edu.ph