LUBELSKI ROCZNIK PEDAGOGICZNY
T. XLIV, z. 1 – 2025

DOI: 10.17951/lrp.2025.44.1.65-85

Ewelina Sitko
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
ORCID – 0000-0003-1887-5676

Martyna Płudowska
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
ORCID – 0000-0001-6246-9152

Barbara Cichy-Jasiocha
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
ORCID – 0000-0001-5363-4240

Rafał Bartczuk
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
ORCID – 0000-0002-0433-7327

Andrzej Edward Sękowski
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
ORCID – 0000-0003-1042-0941

HOW TO MAKE DECISIONS IN STYLE? PSYCHOLOGICAL CORRELATES OF DECISION-MAKING STYLES*

Introduction: Decision-making styles are a research area of individual differences psychology. The construct of decision-making style refers to an individual's relatively stable tendency to respond to decision-making tasks. It helps explain differences between individuals who make distinct choices in seemingly identical decision-making tasks and contexts.
Research Aim: The aim of the study was to determine correlations between decision-making styles and temperament, affect, thinking styles and coping with stress in early adults.
Research Method: A questionnaire study was conducted using standardized psychological tests: the General Decision Making Style Questionnaire (KSPD), the Sensation Seeking Scale ImpSS-8, the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule PANAS, the Thinking Style Inventory TSI,

* Suggested citation: Sitko, E., Płudowska, M., Cichy-Jasiocha, B., Bartczuk, R., Sękowski, A.E. (2025). How to Make Decisions in Style? Psychological Correlates of Decision-Making Styles. *Lubelski Rocznik Pedagogiczny*, *44*(1), 65–85. http://dx.doi.org/10.17951/lrp.2025.44.1.65-85

and the Inventory for Measuring Coping with Stress Mini-COPE. A total of 280 individuals in the developmental stage of early adulthood (20–40 years old) were surveyed.
Results: Decision-making styles were found to statistically significantly correlate with temperament traits, trait affect, thinking styles and coping strategies.
Conclusion: The findings of the study expand the knowledge of the impact of the decision maker's individual characteristics on the entire decision-making process. By examining the strength and nature of the relationships between young adults' decision-making styles and selected personal variables, we were able to identify some of the characteristics that play a role in shaping those individuals' adaptive and non-adaptive decision-making styles.

Keywords: decision-making, decision-making styles, temperament, affect, thinking styles, coping with stress

INTRODUCTION

Decision-making, one of the fundamental activities of every individual, represents an important area of research in social sciences, including psychology, pedagogy, and cognitive sciences. Daily, humans make numerous decisions, ranging from trivial to highly consequential ones. Each decision, however serious it may be, serves the purposes of survival and adaptation to the environment, simultaneously influencing the quality of one's social relationships and the overall satisfaction with life. Whether one makes seemingly minor choices concerning one's everyday functioning or decides between options that significantly impact one's future career or personal life, satisfactory decision-making requires the integration of various stimuli and the analysis of available information. The decision-making process is also influenced by individual characteristics, such as personality traits and motivational factors, including the ability to anticipate the consequences of one's actions. Additionally, researchers emphasize that decision-making plays a crucial role in adaptive capabilities. Relatively stable decision-making dispositions not only affect one's scope of social competencies but also influence one's self-esteem, which in turn impacts one's mental health and overall well-being (Deniz, 2006; Leykin et al., 2011; Thunholm, 2004).

The integration of knowledge derived from classical decision theories with some concepts and findings of individual differences psychology has facilitated the development of a construct that captures individual differences in responding to decision-making situations. This construct, referred to as *decision-making style*, denotes the typical manner in which an individual interprets a decision-making situation, along with their characteristic behavioral pattern. The decision-making style, as a relatively stable tendency toward specific behavior, provides a framework for understanding individual differences in decision-making observed within a population (Baiocco et al., 2009). To date, several models of decision-making styles have been proposed (see Harren, 1979; Phillips et al., 1984), and the top-

ic of relatively stable tendencies in responding to decision-making situations has become a subject of intensive exploration in psychology and other disciplines of social science (Mann et al., 1989; Rowe & Mason, 1987).

One of the most recent approaches to decision-making styles has been developed by Scott and Bruce (1995). The authors define decision-making style as a learned behavioral pattern that manifests in decision-making situations. They understand it as an individual's characteristic way of interpreting such situations and responding to them (Scott & Bruce, 1995). This concept helps explain why different individuals, when faced with seemingly identical decision-making tasks, behave in different ways (Baiocco et al., 2009). The authors describe decision-making styles as habit-based tendencies to react in specific ways to decision-making situations; however, they argue that these tendencies should not be equated with personality traits (Scott & Bruce, 1995). They have identified five decision-making styles: the rational style, associated with analyzing all alternatives and logical thinking; the intuitive style, focused on relying on personal hunches and feelings; the dependent style, characterized by seeking guidance and advice from others; the avoidant style, linked to procrastination, deferral, and attempts to evade decision-making situations; and the spontaneous style, connected to impulsiveness and making decisions on the spur of the moment (Scott & Bruce, 1995). According to those authors, decision-making styles are independent of one another, and in any given decision-making situation, different combinations of these styles may be activated in individuals. The rational and intuitive styles are classified as adaptive decision-making styles, whereas the avoidant, dependent, and spontaneous styles are considered maladaptive, as they do not facilitate effective adjustment to the environment (Scott & Bruce, 1995).

Due to the developmental nature of early adulthood, the study of decision-making styles in this specific age group appears to be particularly compelling. Early adulthood is defined as the period between the ages of 20/22 and 35/40 (Gurba, 2011). During this phase, young adults gain a range of privileges while simultaneously facing new challenges. Achieving full autonomy entails taking responsibility for their own behaviors and choices. An established personality enables individuals to independently set life goals and make informed decisions (Gurba, 2011). Decisions made by young adults often have a significant impact on their future, both personally and professionally. Consequently, understanding the correlates of both adaptive and maladaptive decision-making styles, beyond having a scientific value, can also hold substantial implications for educational and psychological practice.

The Emotion Imbued Choice (EIC) model (Lerner et al., 2015) may serve as an inspiration in the search for variables co-occurring with different decision-making styles. In their model, Lerner et al. (2015) have synthesized research and theoretical frameworks addressing the relationships between selected situational and

individual variables, emotions, and decision-making processes. Various studies confirm that emotions constitute a powerful and pervasive driving force in evaluation and decision-making processes (Carpenter et al., 2016; Crane et al., 2017; Garfinkel et al., 2016; Keltner & Lerner, 2010; Kusev et al., 2017). The EIC model suggests that rational choice theories do not encompass all factors influencing the decision-making process, which is also shaped by the relatively stable predispositions of the individuals who are faced with choosing among alternatives. Although the EIC model focuses on the role of emotions in decision-making, it also emphasizes the importance of factors such as temperament, personality, and cognitive mechanisms (Lerner et al., 2015). Considering the assumptions of this model, we concluded that it is both worthwhile and justifiable to examine the relationships between these variables and the construct reflecting individual differences in people's responses to decision-making situations. Ultimately, our research model incorporated the following variables: a temperamental variable – sensation seeking; a variable reflecting relatively stable tendencies in emotional functioning – trait-emotions; and two constructs encompassing personality components: thinking styles and coping strategies for stress. Empirical evidence suggests that, similarly to emotions, temperament (Ciberti et al., 2020; Hegedűs et al., 2021), thinking styles (Phillips et al., 2016), and stress coping strategies (Kertzman et al., 2024) are significantly associated with decision-making across various situational contexts.

Temperament is a genetically conditioned variable within the domain of personality (Strelau, 2004). Zuckerman's (1994) conceptualization focuses on one specific dimension of temperament – sensation seeking, which is "a trait defined by the seeking of varied, novel, complex, and intense sensations and experiences, and the willingness to take physical, social, legal, and financial risks for the sake of such experience" (Zuckerman, 1994, p. 27). As such, it represents a tendency to seek out or avoid stimuli.

Negative and positive affect should be understood as an individual's relatively stable emotional characteristics (Brzozowski, 2010). Affect, conceptualized as a trait, is characterized by a degree of temporal constancy and cross-situational stability (Watson & Tellegen, 1985). It is assumed that for each individual, a dominant, specific mood can be identified. Affect thus represents a tendency rooted in fundamental emotions, feelings, and nonspecific emotional states (Watson, 2000). Various positive mood states are expressed through positive affect (e.g. joy, enthusiasm), reflecting the extent to which an individual experiences joy in life. Negative affect, on the other hand, pertains to the experience of various negative mood states (e.g. sadness, fear) and indicates the level of sadness or negative emotional arousal a person experiences.

Thinking styles reside on the borderline between personality and cognitive functions (Nosal, 2000). They are defined as "preferred ways of thinking that de-

termine how an individual utilizes their cognitive resources" (Matczak, 2000, p. 776). Thinking styles are considered metacognitive processes, which means they are responsible for controlling and guiding lower-order cognitive processes as well as decision-making (Sternberg, 1994). Based on five criteria of cognitive self-regulation, Sternberg (1994) has identified thirteen thinking styles. The thinking styles within the "functions" dimension are the legislative, executive, and judicial styles. Regarding the form of self-regulation, styles can be divided into monarchic, oligarchic, hierarchic, and anarchic ones. The level of generality at which problems are considered differentiates thinking styles into global and local. Thinking styles identified by scope reflect a dominant orientation toward performing actions independently (internal style) or through interaction with others (external style). The final criterion relates to openness to change, setting apart liberal from conservative styles (Strzałecki & Wiśniewska, 2010).

Stress-coping strategies pertain to one's functioning in circumstances perceived as challenging or going beyond one's mental assets (Heszen-Niejodek, 2005). Coping with stress is defined as "constantly changing cognitive and behavioral efforts to manage specific external and/or internal demands that are appraised as taxing or exceeding the resources of the person" (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984, p. 141). As such, they should be understood as a sequence of (deliberate and purposeful) behaviors that an individual employs while interpreting a situation as a threat (a stressful situation). Carver (1997) has identified 13 stress-coping strategies: active coping, planning, positive reframing, acceptance, humor, religion, using emotional support, using instrumental support, self-distraction, denial, venting, substance use, behavioral disengagement, and self-blame.

RESEARCH AIM AND QUESTION

The aim of the present study is to describe decision-making styles and their subjective correlates. Considering the theoretical assumptions of the EIC model (Lerner et al., 2015), the concept of decision-making styles by Scott and Bruce (1995), as well as the findings of studies on variables that play a part in decision-making, the following research question has been formulated: What are the relationships between decision-making styles and temperament traits, trait emotions, thinking styles, and stress-coping strategies in early adults?

Based on the theoretical framework regarding decision-making styles and the findings of previous studies, the following hypotheses were formulated:

H 1.1. There is a positive relationship between impulsivity and intuitive and spontaneous decision-making styles.

H 1.2. There is a positive relationship between sensation seeking and intuitive, spontaneous, and dependent decision-making styles.

H 1.3. There is a negative relationship between impulsivity and sensation seeking and the rational decision-making style.

H 2.1. There is a positive relationship between positive affect and intuitive and spontaneous decision-making styles.

H 2.2. The higher the level of negative affect and the lower the level of positive affect, the higher the level of dependent and avoidant decision-making styles.

H 3.1. The higher the levels of executive, judicial, hierarchic, and local thinking styles, and the lower the level of the oligarchic thinking style, the higher the level of the rational decision-making style.

H 3.2. There is a positive relationship between the intuitive decision-making style and legislative, oligarchic, anarchic, and external thinking styles.

H 3.3. The higher the levels of executive, external, and conservative thinking styles, and the lower the levels of legislative and internal thinking styles, the higher the level of the dependent decision-making style.

H 3.4. The higher the levels of monarchic, oligarchic, and conservative thinking styles, and the lower the levels of legislative, hierarchic, and liberal thinking styles, the higher the level of the avoidant decision-making style.

H 3.5. The higher the levels of legislative, oligarchic, anarchic, global, external, and liberal thinking styles, and the lower the levels of executive and hierarchic thinking styles, the higher the level of the spontaneous decision-making style.

H 4.1. The higher the levels of active coping and planning, and the lower the level of behavioral disengagement, the higher the level of the rational decision-making style.

H 4.2. There is a positive relationship between the intuitive decision-making style and positive reframing, using emotional support, and using instrumental support.

H 4.3. There is a positive relationship between the dependent decision-making style and using emotional support, using instrumental support, self-distraction, denial, and self-blame.

H 4.4. The higher the levels of self-distraction, denial, substance use, behavioral disengagement, venting, and self-blame, and the lower the levels of active coping and planning, the higher the level of the avoidant decision-making style.

H 4.5. The higher the levels of humor, denial, and venting, and the lower the level of planning, the higher the level of the spontaneous decision-making style.

RESEARCH METHOD AND SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

The primary criterion for inclusion in the study group was age. The sample (N = 280) consisted of 156 women (55.7%) and 124 men (44.3%) in the stage of early adulthood, which many researchers define as ranging between 20 and 40 years

of age (Gurba, 2011; Bee, 2004); $M = 27.00$ $SD = 5.27$. The respondents varied in terms of place of residence, level of education, as well as employment and marital status. More detailed data are presented in Table 1.

Table 1.
The participants' social characteristics

Social characteristics		*N*	%
Education	Basic vocational	9	3.2
	Secondary	103	36.8
	Higher	168	60.0
Marital status	Single	193	68.9
	Married	79	28.2
	Widowed	1	0.4
	Divorced	5	1.8
	Separated	2	0.7
Employment status	Student	117	41.8
	Unemployed	14	5.0
	Employed	179	63.9
	Disability pensioner	1	0.4

Source: Authors' own study.

The study employed four psychological instruments. The explained variable – decision-making styles – was measured using the General Decision Making Style Inventory (KSPD) (Scott & Bruce, 1995, Polish adaptation by Sitko, 2023). This tool identifies dominant ways of making choices, referred to as decision-making styles. The questionnaire consists of 25 items which measure five decision-making styles: rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous. The main KSPD scales demonstrate satisfactory reliability, with Cronbach's alpha values as follows: rational style – 0.79, intuitive style – 0.80, dependent style – 0.80, avoidant style – 0.93, and spontaneous style – 0.80.

The ImpSS-8 Impulsivity and Sensation-Seeking Scale (Webster & Crysel, 2012, Polish translation by Palacz-Chrisidis, 2019) is a shortened version of the 19-item method developed by Zuckerman et al. (1991). It measures the sensation-seeking trait through two factors: sensation seeking and impulsivity. The scale consists of eight items (Palacz-Chrisidis, 2019). Cronbach's alpha was 0.54 for impulsivity and 0.70 for sensation seeking.

The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule SUPIN C-20 (Watson & Clark, 1992, Polish adaptation by Brzozowski, 2010) was used to measure the intensity of positive and negative affect understood as a trait. Each subscale includes 10

adjectives (Brzozowski, 2010). The tool demonstrates satisfactory reliability, with Cronbach's alpha of 0.90 for positive affect and 0.90 for negative affect.

The Thinking Styles Inventory (KSM) (Sternberg & Wagner, 1991, Polish translation by Strzałecki & Wiśniewska, 2010) was applied to measure thinking styles. This instrument consists of 104 items (Strzałecki & Wiśniewska, 2010) on 13 different thinking style scales based on five criteria of cognitive self-management: functions, forms, levels, scope, and leanings. KSM demonstrates satisfactory reliability coefficients, with Cronbach's alpha values as follows: legislative – 0.73, executive – 0.74, judicial – 0.72, monarchic – 0.50, oligarchic – 0.62, hierarchic – 0.75, anarchic – 0.61, global – 0.57, local – 0.60, external – 0.82, internal – 0.73, liberal – 0.87, and conservative – 0.82.

The Inventory for Measuring Coping with Stress – Mini-COPE (Carver, 1997, Polish adaptation by Juczyński & Ogińska-Bulik, 2009) was used to measure coping. The inventory consists of 28 items grouped into 14 coping strategies (Juczyński & Ogińska-Bulik, 2009). The split-half reliability of the scale is 0.86 (Guttman coefficient 0.87).

A custom demographic questionnaire had also been developed for the present study to determine basic sociodemographic variables (age, gender, education, marital status, and employment status).

The study was conducted between February and December 2020 using the LimeSurvey online platform across the entire country. The sample consisted of young adults aged 20 to 40 years. Recruitment primarily relied on snowball sampling. Prior to the study, participants were provided with instructions containing a brief description of the study's objective; they were also informed that participation was voluntary and anonymous.

STATISTICAL DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Relationships between the variables were analyzed using the Pearson correlation coefficient (r). The following interpretation of the correlation coefficient was adopted: 0–0.30, a weak (low) correlation; 0.31–0.50, a moderate correlation; 0.51–0.70, a strong (high) correlation; and 0.71–1, a very strong (very high) correlation (Cohen, 1988; Rosenthal, 1996). The reliability of the scales was assessed by Cronbach's alpha coefficient. Statistical calculations were carried out using IBM SPSS Statistics v. 29.0.0.0.

RESULTS

The correlation analysis revealed a number of significant interrelationships between decision-making styles and temperament traits (Table 2).

Table 2.
Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) between Decision-Making Styles (KSPD) and Temperament Traits (ImpSS) (N = 280)

ImpSS	KSPD						
	Rational	Intuitive	Dependent	Avoidant	Spontaneous	Adaptive	Maladaptive
Impulsivity	**-0.435****	**0.165****	-0.087	**0.146***	**0.456****	**-0.187****	**0.256****
Sensation Seeking	**-0.137***	**0.143***	-0.030	-0.007	**0.239****	-0.001	0.094

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Source: Authors' own study.

Impulsivity was observed to positively correlate with the maladaptive decision-making style and negatively with the adaptive decision-making style. This indicates that the higher the level of impulsivity, the higher the level of the maladaptive style and the lower the level of the adaptive style. A positive relationship was also demonstrated between impulsivity and the intuitive, avoidant, and spontaneous decision-making styles, as well as a negative relationship between impulsivity and the rational style. This suggests that individuals with higher levels of impulsivity are more likely to rely on spontaneous, intuitive, and avoidant ways of making decisions and less likely to use rational approaches. Similarly, the higher the level of sensation seeking, the greater the reliance on intuitive and spontaneous styles, and the lower the use of the rational style. In other words, higher sensation seeking is associated with higher scores on spontaneous and intuitive styles, but lower scores on the rational style. The correlations observed were weak to moderate.

Table 3.
Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) between Decision-Making Styles (KSPD) and Trait Emotions (SUPIN) (N = 280)

SUPIN	KSPD						
	Rational	Intuitive	Dependent	Avoidant	Spontaneous	Adaptive	Maladaptive
Positive affect	**-0.118***	**0.124***	**-0.223****	**-0.349****	**0.315****	0.000	**-0.179****
Negative affect	0.061	-0.028	**0.290****	**0.357****	-0.080	0.023	**0.326****

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Source: Authors' own study.

Weak to moderate correlations were also found between the decision-making scales and trait emotions (Table 3). Maladaptive style was positively correlated with negative affect and negatively correlated with positive affect. This suggests that higher levels of negative affect and lower levels of positive affect are associated with a greater intensity of maladaptive behaviors. A positive association was observed between positive affect and the intuitive and spontaneous styles, while an inverse relationship existed between positive affect and the rational, dependent, and avoidant styles. Positive correlations were also observed between negative affect and the dependent and avoidant styles. The results of the correlation analysis indicate that higher positive emotionality is associated with higher levels of intuitive and spontaneous styles, and a lower intensity of the rational, dependent, and avoidant styles. Conversely, higher levels of negative emotionality co-occur with greater intensity in the dependent and avoidant styles.

Table 4.
Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) between Decision-Making Styles (KSPD) and Thinking Styles (KSM) (N = 280)

KSM	KSPD						
	Rational	Intuitive	Dependent	Avoidant	Spontaneous	Adaptive	Maladaptive
Legislative	0.083	**0.133***	**-0.229****	**-0.176****	**0.236****	**0.139***	-0.110
Executive	**0.218****	0.070	**0.192****	0.066	**-0.136***	**0.190****	0.069
Judicial	**0.174****	0.112	-0.002	-0.100	0.060	**0.187****	-0.036
Monarchic	0.025	0.082	0.117	**0.162****	0.055	0.069	**0.184****
Hierarchic	**0.219****	0.063	0.079	**-0.150***	**-0.122***	**0.186****	-0.115
Oligarchic	-0.182**	0.126*	0.081	**0.170****	**0.226****	-0.041	**0.253****
Anarchic	0.083	**0.134***	-0.017	-0.114	**0.171****	0.140*	0.000
Global	-0.080	0.080	0.036	**0.147***	**0.157****	-0.003	**0.184****
Local	**0.158****	0.071	0.108	0.018	0.005	**0.150***	0.065
Internal	0.089	0.066	**-0.185****	-0.051	0.040	0.101	-0.101
External	-0.005	**0.136***	**0.219****	-0.009	**0.130***	0.083	0.159**
Liberal	0.093	0.071	-0.063	**-0.177****	**0.199****	0.107	-0.049
Conservative	0.076	0.035	**0.212****	**0.209****	-0.097	0.073	**0.187****

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Source: Authors' own study.

It was observed that all thinking styles significantly correlated with decision-making styles (Table 4), although the correlations were weak. Adaptive style was positively associated with the legislative, executive, judicial, hierarchic, and local thinking styles, while the maladaptive style showed positive relationships with the monarchic, oligarchic, global, external, and conservative thinking styles. The rational style exhibited significant positive relationships with the executive, judicial,

hierarchic, and local thinking styles, as well as an inverse relationship with the oligarchic style. In contrast, the intuitive style demonstrated positive correlations with the legislative, oligarchic, anarchic, and external thinking styles. A positive relationship was also observed between the dependent style and the executive, external, and conservative thinking styles, along with a negative correlation with the legislative and internal styles. For the avoidant decision-making style, higher levels were associated with higher scores on the monarchic, oligarchic, global, and conservative thinking styles, and lower scores on the legislative, hierarchic, and liberal styles. Finally, the spontaneous decision-making style demonstrated positive correlations with the legislative, oligarchic, anarchic, global, external, and liberal thinking styles, as well as a negative correlation with the executive and hierarchic styles.

Table 5.
Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) between Decision-Making Styles (KSPD) and Coping Strategies (Mini-COPE) (N = 280)

Mini-COPE	KSPD						
	Rational	Intuitive	Dependent	Avoidant	Spontaneous	Adaptive	Maladaptive
Active coping	**0.179****	0.092	-0.015	**-0.301****	-0.014	**0.178****	**-0.204****
Planning	**0.275****	0.054	-0.029	**-0.302****	**-0.138***	**0.218****	**-0.270****
Positive reframing	0.071	**0.153***	-0.009	-0.117	0.094	0.114*	-0.034
Acceptance	0.108	0.017	-0.099	**-0.162****	0.037	0.083	**-0.132***
Humor	-0.078	-0.108	-0.112	0.099	**0.193****	**-0.121***	0.100
Religion	0.085	-0.019	0.042	0.057	-0.115	0.044	0.002
Using emotional support	-0.034	**0.224****	**0.360****	0.034	0.031	**0.119***	**0.207***
Using instrumental support	-0.034	**0.180****	**0.442****	0.112	0.012	0.091	**0.227****
Self-distraction	-0.011	**0.232****	**0.243****	**0.190****	0.098	**0.140***	**0.282****
Denial	-0.112	**0.141***	**0.166****	**0.310****	**0.147***	0.014	**0.344****
Venting	-0.113	**0.178****	**0.146***	**0.233****	**0.135***	0.037	**0.280****
Substance use	-0.086	-0.048	0.078	**0.231****	0.041	-0.087	**0.203****
Behavioral disengagement	**-0.178****	-0.064	0.084	**0.449****	0.039	**-0.159****	**0.343****
Self-blame	0.072	0.002	**0.214****	**0.342****	-0.113	0.049	**0.265****

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Source: Authors' own study.

Statistically significant correlations were observed between decision-making styles and coping strategies. The correlation analyses are presented in Table 5. A positive correlation was identified between adaptive decision-making styles and active coping, planning, using emotional support, and self-distraction. This decision-making dimension was negatively correlated with humor and behavioral disengagement. In contrast, higher levels of the maladaptive decision-making style were associated with higher scores on the scales of using emotional support, using instrumental support, self-distraction, denial, venting, substance use, behavioral disengagement, and self-blame. Maladaptive styles were also negatively associated with active coping, planning, and acceptance. The rational decision-making style was positively correlated with active coping and planning, and negatively with behavioral disengagement.

Higher levels of positive reframing, using emotional support, using instrumental support, self-distraction, denial, and venting were associated with more frequent use of the intuitive decision-making style. The study confirmed that there were positive relationships between the dependent decision-making style and using emotional support, using instrumental support, self-distraction, denial, venting, and self-blame. The avoidant decision-making style was positively correlated with self-distraction, denial, venting, substance use, behavioral disengagement, and self-blame. An inverse relationship was found between this style and active coping, planning, and acceptance. Humor, denial, and venting were positively associated with the spontaneous decision-making style, whereas the dimension of planning was negatively associated with it.

DISCUSSION

The primary aim of the present study was to determine the relationships of temperament, affect, thinking styles, and coping strategies with decision-making styles.

Impulsivity, as a temperament trait, is characterized by quick reactions and can lead to errors (Matczak, 2000). There are two types of impulsivity: functional impulsivity, which enables making quick decisions in appropriate situations, and dysfunctional impulsivity, which can result in irreversible decisions with risky consequences (Dickman, 1990).

The results of our study confirm the hypothesis that a high level of impulsivity is associated with the intuitive and spontaneous decision-making styles (Hypothesis 1.1). However, due to the relatively low reliability of the Impulsivity scale, these findings should be interpreted with caution. It is likely that the intuitive style is linked to functional impulsivity, while the spontaneous style, which can be considered a faster version of the intuitive style, is associated with dysfunctional impulsivity. Moreover, research by Thunholm (2004) corroborates strong connections

between the intuitive and spontaneous styles in the context of decision-making. Impulsivity involves acting without considering future consequences, while sensation seeking is associated with a need for novel, stimulating, and risky experiences (Zuckerman, 1994). The findings of the present study confirm that employing a rational decision-making style requires low levels of sensation seeking and impulsivity (Hypothesis 1.3). Rational decision-making involves careful deliberation, focusing attention on available options, and predicting potential consequences (Baiocco et al., 2009; Harren, 1979). Scientific studies suggest that decision-making styles, except for the rational and avoidant styles, are closely associated with sensation seeking and a certain degree of emotional disinhibition (Baiocco et al., 2009; Bechara et al., 2000; Crone & Horner, 2003; Franken & Muris, 2005). The findings of this study partially support this assumption (Hypothesis 1.2). The intuitive and spontaneous decision-making styles are indeed significantly related to sensation seeking, whereas the dependent style does not exhibit such associations. The intuitive and spontaneous decision-making styles are largely based on the emotions one experiences, as contact with one's emotions and sensation seeking promote the experience of positive emotionality. The dependent style, albeit also connected with emotionality, is more closely associated with anxiety and a sense of pressure. The decision made does not result in a pleasurable emotional release but rather in a feeling of relief from completing the decision-making process, without personal satisfaction (Harren, 1979).

Affect has also proven to play a part in decision-making situations. The present research confirms that higher levels of positive emotions are associated with a greater tendency to use the intuitive and spontaneous decision-making styles (Hypothesis 2.1). These styles are closely related, and the experience of positive emotions underlies both. Experiencing strong, positive emotions enables individuals to make decisions quickly and resolutely, promoting determination and persistence (Brzozowski, 2010; Lerner et al., 2015; Valdesolo & Graham, 2014). Fredrickson (2001) suggests that positive emotions enhance creativity and cognitive flexibility by broadening cognitive contexts, which leads to the generation of more ideas in problem-solving situations. Positive emotions foster the development of new patterns of thinking that are more flexible (Isen & Daubman, 1984), open to information (Estrada et al., 1997), creative (Isen et al., 1987), integrative (Isen et al., 1991), and efficient (Isen & Means, 1983; Isen et al., 1991). These patterns are highly beneficial in the decision-making process. Tugade and Fredrickson (2002) emphasize the significant adaptive role of positive emotions. Emotional intelligence may also play a significant role in this context, as it enables the regulation of emotions and the effective use of emotions to manage and understand one's behavior, including decision-making. Conversely, experiencing low levels of positive emotions and high levels of negative emotions hinders the decision-making process and promotes the use of avoidant or dependent decision-making

styles (Hypothesis 2.2). Prolonged experiences of negative emotions can lead to anxiety, loneliness, low directiveness, and a lack of desire for social interaction (Brzozowski, 2010). Decision-making situations present a significant emotional challenge, where avoiding such situations or relying on the advice of others provides temporary relief (Baiocco et al., 2009). A review of existing studies confirms that experiencing negative emotions makes adaptive decision-making more difficult (Harlé & Sanfey, 2007; Small & Lerner, 2008). Experiencing depressive symptoms – such as reduced or no positive affect and heightened negative affect – is also associated with less adaptive decision-making (Leykin & DeRubeis, 2010), decision avoidance (Schwartz et al., 2002), or reliance on others (Pilowsky, 1979).

Thinking styles are predominant ways of thinking that govern the allocation and organization of cognitive resources, including the decision-making process (Matczak, 2000). A decision-maker with a rational decision-making mindset carefully analyzes available information and predicts the consequences of their decisions, focusing on efficient task execution. Such individuals excel at time and resource management, avoiding excessive focus on a single task and basing their thinking on concrete details. A rational decision-maker employs various thinking styles, such as judicial, executive, hierarchic, and local, while avoiding the oligarchic style, thus corroborating Hypothesis 3.1 (Hunt, 1994). Someone who makes decisions based on the intuitive style, values their independence and autonomy, actively tackles problems, follows their instincts, and seeks innovative solutions. Their thinking aligns with styles such as legislative, oligarchic, anarchic, and external (Harren, 1979; Scott & Bruce, 1995; Sternberg, 1994), which supports Hypothesis 3.2. Analytical and sequential processing abilities characterize the rational style, whereas the intuitive style is marked by holistic and intuitive thinking (Gambetti et al., 2008). According to Zhang and Sternberg (2009), thinking styles such as legislative, judicial, global, and liberal are more adaptive than others and allow individuals to function effectively in various situations. Research by Fan (2016) demonstrates that students utilizing these thinking styles are more successful in gathering information and making career-related decisions than their peers. In alignment with other scientific findings, the present results also confirm Hypotheses 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5. A dependent decision-maker prefers executing imposed plans and adhering to established rules. They feel comfortable working in a team where they are not required to make independent decisions. Their thinking is characterized by a clear dominance of the executive, external, and conservative thinking styles, accompanied by a low level of internal and legislative styles (Sternberg, 1994; Strzałecki & Wiśniewska, 2010). An individual with an avoidant decision-making style may postpone decisions due to an aversion to ambiguous situations, difficulty making decisions independently, poor time and resource management, distraction by other tasks, or focusing on too many decisions simultaneously. This type of decision-maker relies on the monarchic, oligarchic, and conservative thinking

styles, with low levels of the legislative, hierarchic, and liberal styles (Strzałecki & Wiśniewska, 2010). A person exhibiting a spontaneous decision-making style acts without prior planning, relying mainly on intuition and impulses and paying little attention to detail. They feel highly independent and self-confident, often seeking new experiences and not fearing risks. However, they struggle with effective time and resource management and frequently fail to follow through on their plans. Such individuals commonly utilize legislative, oligarchic, anarchic, global, external, and liberal thinking styles while avoiding the executive and hierarchic styles (Matczak, 2010; Sternberg, 1994).

Decision-making styles are closely linked to strategies for coping with stressful situations (Allwood & Salo, 2012; Salo & Allwood, 2011; Thunholm, 2008). The rational decision-making style correlates positively with active coping and planning, and a lack of a tendency to withdraw from challenges allows rational decision-making (Alacreu-Crespo et al., 2019; Harren, 1979), an observation that supports Hypothesis 4.1. Individuals with an intuitive decision-making style are capable of perceiving positive outcomes of difficult events and utilizing the support of others and external resources (Alacreu-Crespo et al., 2019; Harren, 1979), which confirms Hypothesis 4.2. Both rational and intuitive styles show positive associations with active and more adaptive coping strategies (Allwood & Salo, 2012). Responding to stress through seeking support from others and resources, escaping into other activities, self-blame, and denial is positively associated with the dependent style (Alacreu-Crespo et al., 2019; Harren, 1979). Decision-makers with an avoidant style are more likely to cope with difficult situations by using psychoactive substances, escaping into other activities, denying reality, withdrawing from actions, venting, and self-blame. They are less likely to use planning, active engagement, or positive reframing of difficulties (Alacreu-Crespo et al., 2019; Deniz, 2006; Juczyński & Ogińska-Bulik, 2009; Pellerone, 2013; Salo & Allwood, 2011; Thunholm, 2004). Spontaneous decision-makers often struggle with planning, but are more likely to cope through humor, denial, and venting (Alacreu-Crespo et al., 2019; Harren, 1979). The dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous styles are significantly more strongly associated with avoidant or maladaptive behaviors, such as substance use, denial, or self-blame (supporting Hypotheses 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5).

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the present study provide a deeper understanding of how individual characteristics of a decision-maker influence their decision-making. They also offer some clues about why two individuals facing the same decision-making problem and seemingly identical decision-making circumstances may behave differently and make different choices (Baiocco et al., 2009). The insights we gained into

decision-making styles enhance the understanding of how decision-makers may behave based on the styles they adopt.

We can expect that individuals characterized by low impulsivity, a positive mood, effective cognitive analysis methods, and strong stress-coping skills will prefer the rational and intuitive decision-making styles, and so will be more balanced in decision-making situations. Rational decision-makers will analyze consequences and alternatives in a logical manner, while intuitive individuals will rely on emotions and seek solutions that are the most emotionally satisfying for them. Decision-makers with avoidant and dependent decision-making styles are more sensitive to their current emotions. For fear of the consequences, they may avoid independently analyzing the decision-making situation and making decisions. They may rely on the opinions of others or postpone decision-making for as long as possible. In contrast, individuals with a spontaneous style make choices impulsively, without analyzing all possible options. Guided by their immediate emotional state, they tend to make the first decision they see as appropriate.

The present study provides valuable insights into the correlates of decision-making styles, enabling a wide range of applications in areas such as recruitment and training, career counseling, and psychological or psychotherapeutic support. The present conclusions about decision-making styles can help specialists better support their clients/patients and identify new opportunities for their personal and professional development.

STUDY LIMITATIONS

The present study, despite its epistemic merit, has certain limitations. The first limitation is the correlational design of the study, which does not allow one to draw causal inferences. An experimental or a longitudinal study would have to be conducted to determine the influence of the analyzed variables on the level of specific decision-making styles.

Another limitation of the study is the age of the participants – the results of the analyses should be applied to age groups other than early adulthood with great caution.

REFERENCES

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.

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

Bee, H. (2004). *Psychologia rozwoju człowieka*. Zysk i S-ka.

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.08.003

Bechara, A., Damasio, H., & Damasio, A.R. (2000). Emotion, decision making and the orbitofrontal cortex. *Cerebral Cortex*, *10*, 295–307.

Brzozowski, P. (2010). *Skala Uczuć Pozytywnych i Negatywnych SUPIN. Polska adaptacja skali PANAS Davida Watsona i Lee Anny Clark. Podręcznik.* Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych Polskiego Towarzystwa Psychologicznego.

Carpenter, S.M., Yates, J.F., Preston, S.D., & Chen, L. (2016). Regulating emotions during difficult multiattribute decision making: The role of pre-decisional coherence shifting. *PLoS ONE*, *11*(3), Article e0150873. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0150873

Carver, C.S. (1997). You want to measure coping but your protocol's too long: Consider the Brief COPE. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *4*(1), 92–100. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327558ijbm0401_6

Ciberti, A., Cavalletti, M., Palagini, L., Giorgi Mariani, M., Dell'Osso, L., Mauri, M., Maglio, A., Mucci, F., Marazziti, D., & Miniati, M. (2020). Decision-making, impulsiveness and temperamental traits in eating disorders. *Clinical Neuropsychiatry*, *17*(4), 199–208. https://doi.org/10.36131/cnfioritieditore20200401

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Crane, M.F., Brouwers, S., Forrest, K., Tan, S., Loveday, T., Wiggins, M.W., Munday, C., & David, L. (2017). Positive affect is associated with reduced fixation in a realistic medical simulation. *Hum Factors*, *59*(5), 821–832.

Crone, D.A., & Horner, R.H. (2003). *Building Positive Behavior Support Systems in Schools. Functional Behavioral Assessment.* Guilford Press.

Deniz, M.E. (2006). The relationships among coping with stress, life satisfaction, decision making styles and decision self-esteem: An investigation on Turkish university students. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *34*, 1161–1170. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2006.34.9.1161

Dickman, S.J. (1990). Functional and dysfunctional impulsivity: Personality and cognitive correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *58*(1), 95–102. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.1.95

Estrada, C.A., Isen, A.M., & Young, M.J. (1997). Positive affect facilitates integration of information and decreases anchoring in reasoning among physicians. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *72*, 117–135. http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1997.2734

Fan, J. (2016). The role of thinking styles in career decision-making self-efficacy among university students. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *20*, 63–73. https://doi:10.1016/j.tsc.2016.03.001

Franken, I.H.A., & Muris, P. (2005). Individual differences in decision-making. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *39*(5), 991–998. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.04.004

Fredrickson, B.L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, *56*(3), 218–226. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.218

Gambetti, E., Fabbri, M., Bensi, L., & Tonetti, L. (2008). A contribution to the Italian validation of the General Decision-making Style Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *44*(4), 842–852. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2007.10.017

Garfinkel, S.N., Zorab, E., Navaratnam, N., Engels, M., Mallorquí-Bagué, N., Minati, L., Dowell, N.G., Brosschot, J.F., Thayer, J.F., & Critchley, H.D. (2016). Anger in brain and body: The neural and physiological perturbation of decision-making by emotion. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *11*(1), 150–158. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsv099

Gurba, E. (2011). Wczesna dorosłość. In J. Trempała (Ed.), *Psychologia rozwoju człowieka* (pp. 287–311). PWN.

Harlé, K.M., & Sanfey, A.G. (2007). Incidental sadness biases social economic decisions in the Ultimatum Game. *Emotion*, *7*(4), 876–881. https://doi.org/10.1037/1528-3542.7.4.876

Harren, V.A. (1979). A model of career decision making for college students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *14*(2), 119–133. https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90065-4

Hegedűs, K.M., Gál, B.I., Szkaliczki, A., Andó, B., Janka, Z., & Álmos, P.Z. (2021). Temperament, character and decision-making characteristics of patients with major depressive disorder following a suicide attempt. *PLoS ONE*, *16*(5), e0251935. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251935

Heszen-Niejodek, I. (2005). Teoria stresu psychologicznego i radzenia sobie. In J. Strelau (Ed.), *Psychologia. Podręcznik Akademicki* (vol. 3, pp. 465–492). GWP.

Hunt, E.B. (1994). Theoretical models for the study of intelligence. In D.K. Detterman (Ed.), *Current Topics in Human Intelligence* (pp. 233–256). Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Isen, A.M., & Daubman, K.A. (1984). The influence of affect on categorization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *47*, 1206–1217.

Isen, A.M., Daubman, K.A., & Nowicki, G.P. (1987). Positive affect facilitates creative problem solving. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*(6), 1122–1131. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.6.1122

Isen, A.M., & Means, B. (1983). The influence of positive affect on decision-making strategy. *Social Cognition*, *2*(1), 18–31. https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.1983.2.1.18

Isen, A.M., Rosenzweig, A.S., & Young, M.J. (1991). The influence of positive affect on clinical problem solving. *Medical Decision Making*, *11*, 221–227.

Juczyński, Z., & Ogińska-Bulik, N. (2009). *Narzędzia pomiaru stresu i radzenia sobie ze stresem*. PTP.

Keltner, D., & Lerner, J.S. (2010). Emotion. In D.T. Gilbert, S.T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 317–352). Wiley.

Kertzman, S., Rauchverger, B., Waseem, S.Z., Weizman, A., Portuguese, S., & Grinshpoon, A. (2024). Relationship between coping styles and affective decision-making process among schizophrenia patients and healthy controls. *Annals of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience*, *7*(1), 1048.

Kusev, P., Purser, H., Heilman, R., Cooke, A.J., Van Schaik, P., Baranova, V., Martin, R., & Ayton, P. (2017). Understanding risky behavior: The influence of cognitive, emotional and hormonal factors on decision-making under risk. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*(102). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00102

Lazarus, R.S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal and Coping*. Springer.

Lerner, J.S., Li, Y., Valdesolo, P., & Kassam, K.S. (2015). Emotion and decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *66*(1), 799–823. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115043

Leykin, Y., & DeRubeis, R.J. (2010). Decision-making styles and depressive symptomatology: Development of the Decision Styles Questionnaire. *Judgment and Decision Making*, *5*(7), 506–515.

Leykin, Y., Roberts, C.S., & DeRubeis, R.J. (2011). Decision-making and depressive symptomatology. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *35*(4), 333–341.

Mann, L., Harmoni, R., & Power, C. (1989). Adolescent decision-making: The development of competence. *Journal of Adolescence*, *12*(3), 265–278. https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-1971(89)90077-8

Matczak, A. (2000). Style poznawcze. In J. Strelau (Ed.), *Psychologia. Podręcznik Akademicki* (vol. 2, pp. 761–782). GWP.

Nosal, C.S. (2000). Różnice w stylach myślenia i uczenia się. *Przegląd Psychologiczny*, *43*(4), 469–480.

Palacz-Chrisidis, A. (2019). *Podmiotowe mediatory związku między temperamentem a problemowymi zachowaniami hazardowymi młodzieży.* [Unpublished PhD dissertation]. Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II.

Pellerone, M. (2013). Identity status, coping strategy and decision making process among Italian University Students. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *106*, 1399–1408. https://doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.156

Phillips, S.D., Pazienza, N.J., & Ferrin, H.H. (1984). Decision-Making Styles and Problem-Solving Appraisal. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *31*(4), 497–502. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.31.4.497

Phillips, W.J., Fletcher, J.M., Marks, A.D.G., & Hine, D.W. (2016). Thinking styles and decision making: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *142*(3), 260–290. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000027

Pilowsky, I. (1979). Further validation of a questionnaire method for classifying depressive illness. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *1*, 179–185.

Rosenthal, J.A. (1996). Qualitative descriptors of strength of association and effect size. *Journal of Social Service Research*, *21*(4), 37–59. https://doi.org/10.1300/J079v21n04_02

Rowe, A.J., & Mason, R.O. (1987). *Managing with Style: A Guide to Understanding, Assessing, and Improving Decision Making.* Jossey-Bass.

Salo, I., & Allwood, M. (2011). Decision-making styles, stress and gender among investigators. *Policing*, *34*(1), 97–119.

Schwartz, B., Ward, A., Monterosso, J., Lyubomirsky, S., White, K., & Lehman, D.R. (2002). Maximizing versus satisficing: Happiness is a matter of choice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*(5), 1178–1197. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.5.1178

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

Sitko, E. (2023). *Wybrane psychologiczne uwarunkowania stylów podejmowania decyzji u osób we wczesnej dorosłości*. [Unpublished PhD dissertation]. Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski Jana Pawła II.

Small D.A., & Lerner J.S. (2008). Emotional policy: Personal sadness and anger shape judgments about a welfare case. *Political Psychology*, *29*, 149–168. https://doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00621.x

Sternberg, R.J. (1994). Thinking styles: Theory and assessment at the interface between intelligence and personality. In R. J. Sternberg, P. Ruzgis (Eds.), *Personality and Intelligence* (pp. 169–187). Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R.J., & Wagner, R.W. (1991). *Thinking Style Inventory*. Star Mountain Projects.

Strelau, J. (2004). Temperament. In J. Strelau (Ed.), *Psychologia. Podręcznik akademicki* (vol. 2, pp. 683–719). GWP.

Strzałecki, A., & Wiśniewska, E. (2010). Style myślenia według. R. J. Sternberga, Uwarunkowania psychologiczne. *Przegląd Psychologiczny*, *53*(1), 33–59.

Thunholm, P. (2004). Decision-making style: Habit, style or both? *Personality and Individual Differences*, *36*(4), 931–944. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00162-4

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

Tugade, M.M., & Fredrickson, B.L. (2002). Positive emotions and emotional intelligence. In L.F. Barrett, P. Salovey (Eds.), *The Wisdom in Feeling: Psychological Processes in Emotional Intelligence* (pp. 319–340). Guilford Press.

Valdesolo, P., & Graham, J. (2014). Awe, uncertainty, and agency detection. *Psychological Science*, *25*(1), 170–178. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613501884

Watson, D. (2000). *Mood and Temperament.* Guilford Press.

Watson, D., & Clark, L.A. (1992). Affects separable and inseparable: On the hierarchical arrangement of the negative affects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *62*(3), 489–505. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.62.3.489

Watson, D., & Tellegen, A. (1985). Toward a consensual structure of mood. *Psychological Bulletin*, *98*(2), 219–235. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.98.2.219

Webster, G.D., & Crysel, L.C. (2012). 'Hit Me, Maybe, One More Time': Brief measures of impulsivity and sensation seeking and their prediction of blackjack bets and sexual promiscuity. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *46*(5), 591–598.

Zhang, L.F., & Sternberg, R.J. (2009). Revisiting the value issue in intellectual styles. In L.F. Zhang & R. Sternberg (Eds.), *Perspectives on the Nature of Intellectual Styles* (pp. 63–85). Springer Publishing Company.

Zuckerman, M. (1994). *Behavior Expression Biosocial Bases of Sensation Seeking*. Cambridge University Press.

Zuckerman, M., Kuhlman, D.M., Thornquist, M., & Kiers, H. (1991). Five (or three) robust questionnaire scale factors of personality without culture. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *12*(9), 929–941. https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(91)90182-B

JAK PODEJMOWAĆ DECYZJE W DOBRYM STYLU? PSYCHOLOGICZNE KORELATY STYLÓW PODEJMOWANIA DECYZJI

Wprowadzenie: Style podejmowania decyzji stanowią obszar badawczy psychologii różnic indywidualnych. Konstrukt ten odnosi się do względnie stałych tendencji w zakresie reagowania jednostki w sytuacji decyzyjnej. Pozwala on wyjaśnić różnice między osobami dokonującymi różnych wyborów, mimo pozornie identycznych zadań i kontekstów decyzyjnych.
Cel badań: Za główny cel analiz obrano określenie związków między stylami podejmowania decyzji i wybranymi zmiennymi temperamentalnymi, osobowościowymi i afektywnymi w szczególnej grupie rozwojowej jaką stanowią osoby we wczesnej dorosłości.
Metoda badań: W celu zweryfikowania postulowanych zależności przeprowadzono badanie kwestionariuszowe z wykorzystaniem standaryzowanych testów psychologicznych: Kwestionariusza Stylów Podejmowania Decyzji (KSPD), Skali Poszukiwania Doznań ImpSS-8, Skali Uczuć Pozytywnych i Negatywnych SUPIN, Kwestionariusza Stylów Myślenia, Inwentarza do Pomiaru Radzenia Sobie ze Stresem Mini-COPE. Przebadano łącznie 280 osób w okresie rozwojowym wczesnej dorosłości (20–40 lat).
Wyniki: Wyniki przeprowadzonych badań wskazują na istotne statystycznie zależności pomiędzy stylami podejmowania decyzji i cechami temperamentu, afektem rozumianym jako cecha, stylami myślenia i strategiami radzenia sobie ze stresem
Wnioski: Rezultaty przeprowadzonych badań poszerzają wiedzę dotyczącą znaczenia indywidualnych cech decydenta dla całego procesu decyzyjnego. Siła i charakter zależności między stylami podejmowania decyzji i wybranymi zmiennymi podmiotowymi pozwalają określić cechy istotne z perspektywy kształtowania adaptacyjnych i nieadaptacyjnych stylów decyzyjnych młodych dorosłych.

Słowa kluczowe: podejmowanie decyzji, style podejmowania decyzji, temperament, afekt, style myślenia, radzenie sobie ze stresem