The International Journal of Indian Psychology
ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print)
Volume 11, Issue 3, July- September, 2023
DIP: 18.01.055.20231103, DOI: 10.25215/1103.055
https://www.ijip.in

Research Paper

Influence of Intellectual Humility and Guilt on Decision-making Styles among Adults from Kerala

Heba Ahmed[1]*, Dr. Lokesh L.[2]

ABSTRACT

The present study was a correlational research design following a quantitative approach. The aim of the study was to examine the influence of intellectual humility and guilt towards the various decision-making styles and compare the findings between individuals belonging to young adulthood and middle adulthood. The data for the research was collected from 200 adults hailing from Kerala, India (n= 200, where young adulthood= 100 and middle adulthood = 100) using convenient sampling method. The tools used for the study were Comprehensive Intellectual Humility Scale (Krumrei-Mancuso & Rouse, 2016), General Decision-Making Questionnaire (Scott & Bruce, 1995), and Guilt and Shame Proneness scale (GASP) developed by Taya R. Cohen and Scott Wolff (2011). The results obtained were statistically analysed using IBM SPSS. Correlation, independent samples T-test and linear regression were used to interpret the data. The results show that Intellectual Humility has a significant relationship with Guilt among young adults whereas no such relationship exists between the two variables among those belonging to middle adulthood. Among young adults, it was discovered that there is a significant relationship between guilt and decision-making style as well whereas no such relationship exists between guilt and any of the five decision-making styles among those belonging to middle adulthood. It was found that Intellectual Humility has a significant impact on decision-making styles among young adults and middle adults. Guilt was found to be a predictor of decision-making styles among young adults but not among middle adults.

Keywords: *Intellectual Humility, Guilt, Decision-making styles*

Psychologists have always been intrigued by people's propensity for holding unjustifiably rigid opinions. Though the phrase "intellectual humility" has been used in many different contexts throughout history, it is challenging to pinpoint who first coined it. There are several definitions of intellectual humility (IH), but they all share the idea that IH entails accepting the possibility that one's thoughts and judgements may be mistaken (Hopkin, Hoyle, & Toner, 2014; Krumrei-Mascuso & Rouse, 2016; Battaly, Baehr, & Howard-Snyder, 2015; Porter & Schumann, 2017; Samuelson, Church, Jarvinen, & Paulus, 2012; Whitcomb; Leary, Diebels, Davisson, Jongman-Sereno, Isherwood, Raimi, Deffler, & Hoyle, 2017; Church & Barrett, 2017). The potential relationship between decision-making styles based on the influence of intellectual humility and guilt could be a spark for further

[1]Msc. Clinical Psychology Student Kristu Jayanti College, Bengaluru
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Kristu Jayanti College, Bengaluru
*Corresponding Author

Received: May 04, 2023; Revision Received: July 10, 2023; Accepted: July 14, 2023

inquiry into the personality foundations for successful decision-making. Excessive feelings of guilt that create anxiety when it comes to making decisions can be channeled into intellectual humility that can prove to be beneficial for the decision-making process. There is a considerable lack of research conducted on these variables in the Indian setting and this study can help in contributing to filling the research gap.

Intellectual humility

Intellectual humility (IH) is an awareness of one's propensity to misjudge one's own opinions and a readiness to alter them when necessary (Krumrei-Mancuso et al., 2019). It entails accepting the possibility that one's beliefs and opinions could be wrong. The ability to admit that one's thoughts and opinions might be incorrect is known as intellectual humility. IH allegedly has a special ability to foster human flourishing by encouraging cooperation, respect for others' viewpoints, and polite debate. The fields of philosophy and theology have given IH the greatest attention, although psychology has just started to take an interest in it.

According to Cole Wright and colleagues, humility is the natural psychological attitude one has towards oneself, which involves moral and cognitive calibration. Intellectual humility can, on such a basis, also be understood as an element of the afore-mentioned general humility, which interrelates intellectual and moral, cognitive, and non-cognitive aspects (Wright, 2019). Intellectual humility (IH) has been defined in different ways depending on the theoretical framework, Roberts and Wood (2007) view it as the absence of intellectual vices such as arrogance, while others see it as the mean between cognitive grandeur and diffidence. Hazlett characterizes IH as acknowledging one's ignorance and questioning one's knowledge (Hazlett, 2015). Whitcomb et al. (2015) emphasize the importance of emotional dispositions and distinguish IH from other traits such as open-mindedness by defining it as admitting intellectual limits. High IH is associated with open-mindedness, flexibility, and the ability to distinguish strong from weak arguments. Low IH can lead to interpersonal conflict and rigid beliefs (Leary et al., 2017). The cognitive correlates of IH have been investigated, revealing that cognitive flexibility and intelligence predict IH, particularly the traits of respect for opposing viewpoints and willingness to change one's mind. However, high cognitive flexibility does not necessarily equate to high IH, and neither cognitive flexibility nor intelligence is necessary to achieve high levels of IH (Zmigrod et al., 2019). IH has also been linked to behaviour, particularly in how people gather and process information and behave around others (McElroy et al., 2014). Fang et al. (2019) found that perspective-taking and guilt-proneness mediate the association between honesty-humility and prosocial behaviour. Davis et al. (2015) conducted two studies that distinguish between IH and general humility, revealing that IH is a subdomain of humility that involves having an accurate view of one's intellectual strengths and limitations and the ability to negotiate ideas fairly. IH is associated with distinctive variations in religious ethnocentrism, objectivism, and desire for cognition.

Guilt

Melanie Klein, a British psychotherapist originally from Austria, built upon Freud's theory of guilt, which is primarily rooted in fear, by proposing that guilt stems from love. Klein argued that the superego, a critical moralizing component of the human mind, contains shame. She also posited that the superego's development involves two stages (later referred to as paranoid and depressive positions), in which children initially experience hostility towards parental authority, but eventually feel remorseful about it. Klein suggested that children may try to repair the harm they caused as a way of managing their guilt. This perspective suggests that empathy and kindness are the fundamental origins of guilt (Fonagy & Target, 1997).

Guilt is defined as the experience of unfavourable feelings about oneself and distress over one's possible involvement in a negative event. It is a self-conscious emotion that arises from a process of self-evaluation and reflection, which can include concerns about how others perceive us. According to Freud, guilt can be linked to an initial sense of shame related to fear of punishment from parents. However, some psychological theories suggest that guilt results from a sense of personal responsibility for harming something that one values, rather than from a lack of empathy or love for others. Kelly (1955) further defined guilt as the realization that one's actions are not in line with their core beliefs and values.

Cohen et al. (2014) conducted research on identifying predictors of unethical and counterproductive behaviours in situations that require individuals to choose between moral and selfish actions. The findings of the study revealed that guilt proneness is an important character trait, as it can help predict the likelihood of unethical behaviour. The research also discovered a significant association between guilt propensity and Honesty-Humility, which is one of the six primary personality traits. Honesty-Humility includes qualities such as sincerity, fairness, avoidance of greed, and humility (Ashton & Lee, 2007, 2008, 2009). The study found that individuals with low levels of Honesty-Humility are more inclined than those with high levels of Honesty-Humility to engage in unethical behaviours, such as stealing or vandalism. Furthermore, there is a correlation between low levels of guilt proneness and frequent dishonesty and conceit, as well as conscientiousness and agreeableness to a lesser extent (Cohen et al., 2014).

Decision-making styles

Decision-making styles are theorised to be stable, trait-like patterns of approach to situations that call for a decision (Driver, 1979). Like personality traits, these styles do not have perfect predictive power, but instead represent likelihoods of behaviour across situations and domains. Studies revealed that a guilty emotional state has specific effects and can critically affect individuals' focusing, also prevailing over the focusing mechanism. According to this mechanism, individuals are likely to restrict their thoughts to what is explicitly represented in the decisional task, failing to make an exhaustive search for alternatives that are represented only implicitly (Legrenzi et al., 1993; Jones et al., 1998).

Time management influences people's decision-making (Wittmann & Paulus, 2008). The relationship between decision styles and time approach was briefly examined by Carelli et al. (2011) using the Zimbardo Time-Perspective Inventory (Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999) as a conceptual framework. They found that those with a good outlook on the future reported using the rational style more frequently, whereas those who had unfavourable views of the future, or the past reported using the avoidant and dependent styles more frequently. The intuitive and spontaneous approaches were shown to be favourably correlated with a present-oriented mindset. Despite the fascinating nature of these results, different definitions of time approach are equally important for making decisions. It has been proposed that emotional intelligence, or the inclination and capacity to interpret emotion-laden information in oneself and others, is important for comprehending the link between emotions and decision-making (Sevdalis, Petrides, & Harvey, 2007; Telle et al., 2011). Di Fabio and Kenny (2012) discovered that emotionally competent people used the rational style more frequently and the avoidant, dependent, and spontaneous styles less frequently.

METHODOLOGY

Aim

The study aims to examine the influence of intellectual humility and guilt towards the various decision-making styles and compare the findings between individuals belonging to young adulthood and middle adulthood.

Sample

The sample consists of 200 participants. It comprises of individuals who were between the age group of 18-40 years (N=100) and 41-60 years (N=100). The sample was selected from different parts of Kerala using convenient sampling method. The data collection took place through online mode by distributing Google forms which took about 10- 15 minutes to complete.

Objectives

1. To study the relationship between intellectual humility and guilt among individuals belonging to young adulthood and middle adulthood.
2. To study the relationship between intellectual humility and decision-making styles among individuals belonging to young adulthood and middle adulthood.
3. To study the relationship between guilt and decision-making styles among individuals belonging to young adulthood and middle adulthood.
4. To estimate the impact of intellectual humility and guilt on decision making styles (Rational, Avoidant, Dependent, Intuitive and Spontaneous) among individuals belonging to young adulthood and middle adulthood.

Hypotheses

- H_o1: There is no significant relationship between intellectual humility and guilt among individuals belonging to young adulthood and middle adulthood.
- H_o2: There is no significant relationship between intellectual humility and decision-making styles among individuals belonging to young adulthood and middle adulthood.
- H_o3: There is no significant relationship between guilt and decision-making styles among individuals belonging to young adulthood and middle adulthood.
- H_o4: There is no significant impact of intellectual humility and guilt on decision making styles (Rational, Avoidant, Dependent, Intuitive and Spontaneous) among individuals belonging to young adulthood and middle adulthood.

Tools used for the study

1. **Comprehensive Intellectual Humility Scale:** It is a self-report measure of intellectual humility developed by Krumrei-Mancuso & Rouse in 2016. The internal consistency of the full scale was strong (.85) and was acceptable to be strong for each subscale (ranging from .72–.87). It consists of four subscales, Independence of Intellect and Ego (5 items), Openness to Revising One's Viewpoint (5 items), Respect for Others' Viewpoints (6 items) and Lack of Intellectual Overconfidence (6 items). The items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). A high score on the Comprehensive Intellectual Humility Scale indicates that a person is more likely to be open to revising their viewpoint, respect others' viewpoints, and have less intellectual overconfidence. A low score on the scale is associated with less awareness of one's own limitations and a reluctance to learn from others.

2. **General Decision-Making Style Questionnaire:** It is a self-report measure designed by Scott and Bruce in 1995, to assess how individuals approach decision situations. The internal-consistency reliability of the scale ranged from .70 to .84 across the five scales. The five scales are: Rational, Avoidant, Dependent, Intuitive, and Spontaneous. The 25 items are rated using 5-point Likert sale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The General Decision-Making Style Questionnaire has a maximum score of 25 and a minimum score of 5. The questionnaire identifies five decision-making styles: rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous. The scores on the questionnaire indicate the degree to which a person uses each of these styles in their decision-making process.
3. **Guilt and Shame Proneness scale (GASP):** The Guilt and Shame Proneness scale developed by Taya R. Cohen and Scott Wolff in 2011, measures individual differences in the propensity to experience guilt and shame across a range of personal transgressions. Cronbach's α was .82 for the shame scale and .85 for the guilt scale. A maximum score on the GASP indicates a higher propensity to experience guilt and shame across a range of personal transgressions.

Procedure

The study was conducted in an online mode. The tools of the study were administered via Google Forms and data was collected upon receiving informed consent from the participants. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was then used to analyse the data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1: Result of Pearson product moment correlation between intellectual humility and guilt among young adults

	Intellectual Humility (Young adults)	
	r	***p***
Guilt	.529**	.001

Note: ** p-value < 0.01

Table 1 shows the correlation between Intellectual Humility and Guilt among young adults. It can be analysed that there is a positive significant correlation between Intellectual Humility and Guilt, with the correlation coefficient (r value) of .529 (p= .000). The null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between intellectual humility and guilt among young adults, is rejected, thus, accepting the alternative hypothesis.

In research conducted by Davis et al. (2015), it was established that IH is a subdomain of humility. Keeping this finding in mind, the result of the present study supports the previous study, published in 2014, Cohen et al. which focused on finding factors that predict unethical and unproductive activity in circumstances when choosing between moral and selfish behaviour is necessary. According to the research, guilt proneness is a crucial character characteristic since it enables us to forecast a person's chance of engaging in immoral behaviour. Another strong relationship between guilt tendency and Honesty-Humility, one of the six key personality qualities, was discovered by this study. The more specific traits of sincerity, justice, refraining from greed, and humility form the overall attitude of honesty-humility, or "the H-Factor" (Ashton & Lee, 2007, 2008, 2009).

Table 2: Result of Pearson product moment correlation between intellectual humility and guilt among middle adults.

	Intellectual Humility (Middle adults)	
	r	**p**
Guilt	.056	.583

Table 2 shows the correlation between Intellectual Humility and Guilt among middle adults. It can be analysed that there is no significant correlation between Intellectual Humility and Guilt, with the correlation coefficient (r value) of .056 (p= .583). Thus, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between intellectual humility and guilt among middle adults is accepted.

Table 3: Result of Pearson product moment correlation between intellectual humility and decision-making styles among young adults.

Decision-making styles	**IH* (Young adults)**	
	r	**p**
RDMS	.414**	.001
IDMS	.076	.453
DDMS	.180	.072
ADMS	-.081	.424
SDMS	-.276**	.005

Note: * p-value < 0.05; ** p-value < 0.01; *Intellectual Humility

Table 3 shows the Pearson correlation between intellectual humility and decision-making styles which includes the Rational decision-making style (RDMS), Intuitive decision-making style (IDMS), Dependent decision-making style (DDMS), Avoidant decision-making style (ADMS) and Spontaneous decision-making style (SDMS) among young adults. A positive significant correlation exists between Intellectual Humility and Rational decision-making style with the correlation coefficient (r value) of .414** (p= .000) and a negative significant correlation exists between Intellectual Humility and Spontaneous decision-making style with the correlation coefficient (r value) of -.276** (p= .005). Thus, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between intellectual humility and decision-making styles among young adults is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted, in the case of Rational and Spontaneous decision-making styles. For the Intuitive, Dependent and Avoidant decision-making styles the null hypothesis is accepted, as there is no significant relationship established between these decision-making styles and intellectual humility. The present study supports the finding from the previous study conducted by Mansi Verma (2019) on intellectual humility and decision-making which found that there is a relationship between intellectual humility and decision-making ability. Previous studies have revealed a link between decision-making skills and the cognitive capacity to consider an intuitive response (Frederick 2005).

Table 4: Result of Pearson product moment correlation between intellectual humility and decision-making styles among middle adults.

Decision-making styles	**IH (Middle adults)**	
	r	**p**
RDMS	.102	.311
IDMS	-.179	.074
DDMS	.244*	.015
ADMS	-.092	.361
SDMS	-.303**	.002

Note: * p-value < 0.05; ** p-value < 0.01; *Intellectual Humility

Table 4 shows the Pearson correlation between intellectual humility and decision-making styles which includes the Rational decision-making style (RDMS), Intuitive decision-making style (IDMS), Dependent decision-making style (DDMS), Avoidant decision-making style (ADMS) and Spontaneous decision-making style (SDMS) among middle adults. A positive significant correlation exists between Intellectual Humility and Dependent decision-making style with the correlation coefficient (r value) of .244* (p= .015) and a negative significant correlation exists between Intellectual Humility and Spontaneous decision-making style with the correlation coefficient (r value) of -.303** (p= .002). Thus, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between intellectual humility and decision-making styles among middle adults is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted, in the case of Dependent and Spontaneous decision-making styles. For the Rational, Intuitive and Avoidant decision-making styles the null hypothesis is accepted, as there is no significant relationship established between these decision-making styles and intellectual humility.

Table 5: Result of Pearson product moment correlation between guilt and decision-making styles among young adults.

Decision-making styles	**Guilt (Young adults)**	
	r	**p**
RDMS	.335**	.001
IDMS	.033	.747
DDMS	.094	.354
ADMS	-.143	.156
SDMS	-.307**	.002

Note: ** p-value < 0.01

Table 5 shows the Pearson correlation between Guilt and decision-making styles which includes the Rational decision-making style (RDMS), Intuitive decision-making style (IDMS), Dependent decision-making style (DDMS), Avoidant decision-making style (ADMS) and Spontaneous decision-making style (SDMS) among young adults. A positive significant correlation exists between Guilt and Rational decision-making style with the correlation coefficient (r value) of .335** (p= .001) and a negative significant correlation exists between Guilt and Spontaneous decision-making style with the correlation coefficient (r value) of -.307** (p= .002). Thus, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between guilt and decision-making styles among young adults is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted, in the case of Rational and Spontaneous decision-making styles. For the Intuitive, Dependent and Avoidant decision-making styles the null hypothesis is accepted, as there is no significant relationship established between these decision-making styles and guilt.

Table 6: Result of Pearson product moment correlation between guilt and decision-making styles among middle adults.

Decision-making styles	**Guilt (Middle adults)**	
	r	**p**
RDMS	-.002	.985
IDMS	-.002	.983
DDMS	-.101	.319
ADMS	-.173	.085
SDMS	-.110	.276

Table 6 shows the Pearson correlation between Guilt and decision-making styles which includes the Rational decision-making style (RDMS), Intuitive decision-making style (IDMS), Dependent decision-making style (DDMS), Avoidant decision-making style (ADMS) and Spontaneous decision-making style (SDMS) among middle adults. From the table it can be understood that no significant correlation exists between guilt and any of the five decision-making styles. Thus, the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between guilt and decision-making styles among middle adults is accepted. The present study supports evidence from a previous study conducted by Orth et al. (2010) which stated that unpleasant emotions, such as shame and guilt, tend to decrease with age.

Table 7: Result of regression analysis predicting Rational decision-making style by Intellectual Humility among young adults.

Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Beta	F	P
RDMS	.414	.172	.163	.178	20.28	.000
*I.H. (Y.A.) **						

**Intellectual Humility (Young Adults)*

Table 7 represents regression analysis which shows that Intellectual Humility predicts 16.3% variation in Rational decision-making style among young adults, since β= .178, t= 4.504, p= .000 where F= 20.28 and p=.000. The regression analysis shows that Intellectual Humility predicts a significant variation in Rational decision-making style among young adults. Specifically, the results indicate a positive relationship between Intellectual Humility and Rational decision-making style, with Intellectual Humility accounting for approximately 16.3% of the variation in this decision-making style. These findings suggest that Intellectual Humility is an important trait for young adults to possess to make more rational decisions based on objective analysis.

Table 8: Result of regression analysis predicting Spontaneous decision-making style by Intellectual Humility among young adults.

Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Beta	F	P
SDMS	.276	.076	.067	24.05	8.09	.005
*I.H. (Y.A.) **						

**Intellectual Humility (Young Adults)*

Table 8 represents regression analysis which shows that Intellectual Humility predicts 6.7% variation in Spontaneous decision-making style among young adults, since β= 24.05, t= -2.84, p= .005 where F= 8.09 and p= .005. The shows that there is a significant but weak relationship between Intellectual Humility and Spontaneous decision-making style among young adults. The results suggest that as Intellectual Humility increases, there is a tendency towards making spontaneous decisions, but this relationship is negative. The R-squared value of 0.067 indicates that Intellectual Humility accounts for only 6.7% of the variation in Spontaneous decision-making style among young adults. While Intellectual Humility is an important trait to consider, it appears to have a limited role in predicting Spontaneous decision-making style, and there are likely other factors that influence this decision-making style, such as personality traits, situational factors, and cognitive biases. Further research is needed to better understand these complex interplays of factors and to identify other predictors of this outcome variable.

Table 9: Result of regression analysis predicting Dependent decision-making style by Intellectual Humility among middle adults.

Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Beta	F	P
DDMS	.244	.059	.050	.101	6.193	.015
*I.H. (M.A.) **						

**Intellectual Humility (Middle Adults)*

Table 9 represents regression analysis which shows that Intellectual Humility predicts 5% variation in Dependent decision-making style among middle adults, since β= .101, t= 2.48, p= .015 where F= 6.193 and p= .015. The regression analysis shows that Intellectual Humility is a statistically significant predictor of Dependent decision-making style among middle adults, explaining about 5% of the variation in this outcome variable. As Intellectual Humility increases, so does the tendency to make decisions that rely on the opinions and guidance of others. While this relationship is statistically significant, Intellectual Humility explains only a small portion of the variation in Dependent decision-making style.

Table 10: Result of regression analysis predicting Spontaneous decision-making style by Intellectual Humility among middle adults.

Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Beta	F	P
SDMS	.30	.092	.082	-.09	9.902	.002
*I.H. (M.A.) **						

**Intellectual Humility (Middle Adults)*

Table 10 represents regression analysis which shows that Intellectual Humility predicts 8.2% variation in Spontaneous decision-making style among middle adults, since β= -.09, t= -3.14, p= .002 where F= 9.902 and p= .002. The study found a statistically significant but weak negative relationship between Intellectual Humility and Spontaneous decision-making style among middle adults. Intellectual Humility accounts for approximately 8.2% of the variation in Spontaneous decision-making style. Although Intellectual Humility is an important trait to consider, it appears to have a limited role in predicting Spontaneous decision-making style among middle adults. Other factors such as personality traits, situational factors, and cognitive biases likely influence this decision-making style.

Table 11: Result of regression analysis predicting Rational decision-making style by Guilt among young adults.

Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Beta	F	P
RDMS	.33	.11	.10	.13	12.37	.001
*Guilt (Y.A.) **						

**(Young Adults)*

Table 11 represents regression analysis which shows that Guilt predicts 10% variation in Rational decision-making style among young adults, since β=.13, t= 3.51, p= .001 where F= 12.37 and p= .001. The regression analysis suggests that Guilt is a statistically significant predictor of Rational decision-making style among young adults, explaining about 10% of the variation in this outcome variable. The β coefficient of 0.13 indicates a positive relationship between Guilt and Rational decision-making style, and the results are statistically significant. These findings suggest that Guilt may be a useful predictor of Rational decision-making style among young adults, but other factors also contribute to this decision-making style.

Table 12: Result of regression analysis predicting Spontaneous decision-making style by Guilt among young adults.

Variable	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Beta	F	P
SDMS	.30	.09	.085	-.125	10.18	.002
*Guilt (Y.A.) **						

**(Young Adults)*

Table 12 represents regression analysis which shows that Guilt predicts 8.5% variation in Spontaneous decision-making style among young adults, since β= -.125 t= -3.19, p= .002 where F= 10.18 and p= .002. The regression analysis shows that Guilt is a statistically significant predictor of Spontaneous decision-making style among young adults, explaining approximately 8.5% of the variation in this outcome variable. A negative relationship exists between Guilt and Spontaneous decision-making style. Although Guilt can be a useful predictor for interventions aimed at reducing impulsive behaviour in young adults, other factors such as personality traits, environmental factors, and cognitive processes may also play a significant role.

CONCLUSION

The major aim or goal of the study was to examine the influence of intellectual humility and guilt towards the various decision-making styles and compare the findings between individuals belonging to young adulthood and middle adulthood from Kerala. The study found that Intellectual Humility is significantly related to Guilt among young adults, but not among middle-aged adults. In addition, Intellectual Humility is related to Rational and Spontaneous decision-making styles in young adults, while it is related to Dependent and Spontaneous decision-making styles in middle-aged adults. Similarly, Guilt is significantly related to Rational and Spontaneous decision-making styles in young adults, while no significant relationship exists between guilt and any of the five decision-making styles among middle adults. It was found that Intellectual Humility has a significant impact on Rational and Spontaneous decision-making styles among young adults. Similarly, Intellectual Humility has a significant impact on Dependent and Spontaneous decision-making styles among middle adults. Furthermore, Guilt is a significant predictor of Rational and Spontaneous decision-making styles among young adults but not among middle-aged adults.

Implications

The study conducted on the influence of intellectual humility and guilt on decision-making styles among adults from Kerala has several implications for practice and future research. Practitioners can use this information regarding the influence of intellectual humility on decision-making styles, to help individuals develop their intellectual humility through interventions such as mindfulness training or reflective practice. The information discovered regarding the role of guilt and decision-making styles can be useful for practitioners who work with individuals who struggle with decision-making, as they may need to focus on helping individuals manage their guilt to encourage more analytical decision-making. Finally, this study highlights the need for further research on the role of cultural factors in decision-making. Specifically, future studies could examine how cultural values and beliefs influence the relationship between intellectual humility, guilt, and decision-making styles among individuals from different regions of India or other countries. Overall, this study provides valuable insights into the complex interplay between individual differences and decision-making processes. By taking these findings into account, practitioners can develop more effective interventions to help individuals make better decisions and achieve their goals.

Limitations

The present study is not without any limitations. The study was conducted on a relatively small sample size from one state, Kerala, and used convenience sampling, making it difficult to generalize the findings to a larger population. Additionally, the use of self-report questionnaires administered through online platforms may have been influenced by social desirability bias, potentially affecting the accuracy of the results. Therefore, caution should be exercised in interpreting the findings and further research should be conducted to confirm and extend the results.

REFERENCES

Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2008). The prediction of Honesty–Humility-related criteria by the HEXACO and Five-Factor Models of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *42*(5), 1216–1228. doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.03.006

Battaly, H., Baehr, J., & Howard-Snyder, D. (2015). Intellectual Humility: Owning Our Limitations. Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, 94, 509-539. doi.org/10.1111/ phpr.12228.

Carelli, M. G., Wiberg, B., & Wiberg, M. (2011). Development and Construct Validation of the Swedish Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *27*(4), 220–227. doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000076

Church, Ian M. & Barrett, Justin (2016). Intellectual Humility. In Everett L. Worthington Jr, Don E. Davis & Joshua N. Hook (eds.), Routledge Handbook of Humility. Springer.

Cohen, T. R., Panter, A. T., & Turan, N. (2012). Guilt Proneness and Moral Character. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *21*(5), 355–359.

Cohen, T. R., Wolf, S. T., Panter, A. T., & Insko, C. A. (2011). Introducing the GASP scale: A new measure of guilt and shame proneness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *100*(5), 947–966. doi.org/10.1037/a0022641

Davis, D. E., Rice, K., McElroy, S., DeBlaere, C., Choe, E., Van Tongeren, D. R., & Hook, J. N. (2015). Distinguishing intellectual humility and general humility. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *11*(3), 215–224. doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2015.1048818

Fang, Y., Dong, Y., & Fang, L. (2019). Honesty-humility and prosocial behavior: The mediating roles of perspective taking and guilt-proneness. *Scandinavian journal of psychology*, *60*(4), 386–393. doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12551

Fonagy, P., & Target, M. (1997). Attachment and reflective function: Their role in self-organization. *Development and Psychopathology, 9*(4), 679–700. doi.org/10.1017/S095 4579497001399

Hazlett, Allan (2015). The maturation of the Gettier problem. Philosophical Studies 172 (1):1-6.

Hopkin, C. R., Hoyle, R. H., & Toner, K. (2014). Intellectual humility and reactions to opinions about religious beliefs. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 42*(1), 50–61. doi.org/10.1177/009164711404200106

Kelly, G. A. (1955). *The psychology of personal constructs. Vol. 1. A theory of personality. Vol. 2. Clinical diagnosis and psychotherapy.* W. W. Norton.

Krumrei-Mancuso, E. J., & Rouse, S. V. (2016). The Development and Validation of the Comprehensive Intellectual Humility Scale. *Journal of personality assessment, 98*(2), 209–221. doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2015.1068174

Krumrei-Mancuso, E. J., Haggard, M. C., LaBouff, J. P., & Rowatt, W. C. (2019). Links between intellectual humility and acquiring knowledge. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *15*(2), 155–170. doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2019.1579359

Leary, M. R., Diebels, K. J., Davisson, E. K., Jongman-Sereno, K. P., Isherwood, J. C., Raimi, K. T., Deffler, S. A., & Hoyle, R. H. (2017). Cognitive and Interpersonal Features of Intellectual Humility. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 43(6), 793–813. doi.org/10.1177/0146167217697695

Legrenzi, P., Girotto, V., & Johnson-Laird, P. N. (1993). Focussing in reasoning and decision making. Cognition, 49, 37–66

McElroy, S. E., Rice, K. G., Davis, D. E., Hook, J. N., Hill, P. C., Worthington, E. L., & Van Tongeren, D. R. (2014). Intellectual Humility: Scale Development and Theoretical Elaborations in the Context of Religious Leadership. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, *42*(1), 19–30. doi.org/10.1177/009164711404200103

Orth, U., Robins, R. W., & Soto, C. J. (2010). Tracking the trajectory of shame, guilt, and pride across the life span. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *99*(6), 1061–1071. doi.org/10.1037/a0021342

Roberts, R. C., & Wood, W. J. (2007). Intellectual virtues: An essay in regulative epistemology. Oxford, UK: Clarendon

Samuelson, P. L., Church, I. M., Jarvinen, M., & Paulus, T. (2012). The science of intellectual humility white paper. Unpublished manuscript, School of Psychology, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California

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. doi.org/ 10.1177/0013164495055005017

Tenelle Porter & Karina Schumann (2018) Intellectual humility and openness to the opposing view, Self and Identity, 17:2, 139-162, DOI: 10.1080/15298868.2017.1361861

Whitcomb, D., Battaly, H., Baehr, J. and Howard-Snyder, D. (2017), Intellectual Humility: Owning Our Limitations. Philos Phenomenol Res, 94: 509-539. doi.org/10.1111/phpr.12 228

Wittmann, M., & Paulus, M. P. (2008). Decision making, impulsivity and time perception. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, *12*(1), 7–12. doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2007.10.004

Wright, J. C. (2019). Humility as a Foundational Virtue. Humility, 146–174. doi.org/10.1093/O SO/9780190864873.003.0007

Zmigrod, L., Zmigrod, S., Rentfrow, P. J., & Robbins, T. W. (2019). The psychological roots of intellectual humility: The role of intelligence and cognitive flexibility. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *141*, 200–208. doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.01.016

Acknowledgement

Under the guidance of Dr. Lokesh L, I am pleased to present the study titled "Influence of Intellectual Humility and Guilt on Decision-making styles among adults from Kerala". I extend my heartfelt thanks to all participants who spent their valuable time helping me. I would like to thank my parents and friends who have supported me during the process. Above all, I thank Lord Almighty for showering his blessings upon me and for offering me the chance to be directed by such resourceful persons.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Ahmed, H. & Lokesh, L. (2023). Influence of Intellectual Humility and Guilt on Decision-making Styles among Adults from Kerala. *International Journal of Indian Psychology, 11(3),* 579-590. DIP:18.01.055.20231103, DOI:10.25215/1103.055