

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF DECISION-MAKING IN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS (ON THE EXAMPLE OF UZBEK AND RUSSIAN STUDENTS)

T.R. Khabiev

Teacher at National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7990847>

Abstract. *The article presents a cross-cultural comparative analysis of decision-making strategies between Uzbek and Russian students. It was shown that decision-making is a phenomenon described in psychology as human behavior in problematic situations. Cultural peculiarities between students were found - Russian students are more prone to avoidance and procrastination when making decisions.*

Keywords: *decision-making, cross-cultural analysis, problem situation, avoidance, procrastination, vigilance, hypervigilance.*

Problem Statement.

As numerous works show, the person, making decisions in situations of uncertainty, due to limited individual experience, takes into account only part of the factors that affect the result. Analyzing the works devoted to the study of the problem of decision-making, T.V. Kornilova notes that in Russian and foreign science theories of decision-making are based mainly on two main models: probabilistic forecasting (normative theories describing by mathematical methods the behavior of decision-makers) and supersituative personality activity (psychological theories that emerged from descriptive theories, the subject of which are personal, cognitive and metacognitive factors of decision-making) [3].

Interest in psychology in the study of decision-making arose after the works of W. Edwards. Due to which in the studies the real human behavior in decision-making situations, deviating from normative strategies (described in the theories of probabilistic forecasting) became the subject of study. However, the desire of researchers to describe by mathematical props subjective probabilities of decision-making continued, for example, the model of subjectively expected utility (Subjective Expected Utility - SEU) L. Savage was quite popular. Modern psychological theories of decision-making refer to descriptive models based on the principle of multiple system determination and processivity in particular, they include the theory of "bounded rationality" by G. Simon and perspective theory by D. Kahneman and A. Tversky [4].

The school of M.M. Kashapov studied the supersituational activity of the individual when making decisions in problematic situations. The decision which the person makes at detection of a supersituational level of problematics, is the decision of higher order, than at detection of a situational level of problematics, M.M.Kashapov notes, that making of this kind of decisions activates a condition of reflexivity due to what the person predicts the result, considers all possible alternatives, shows initiative in process of search of the optimum decision. The concept of "supersituational thinking" is seen as a mental cognitive process aimed at finding the problem (discrepancy) that sometimes lies beyond the boundaries of a cognized and transformed situation. The ability to supra-situational thinking allows solving both professional tasks and situations, and

everyday and personally significant problems, increasing the efficiency of the performed activity [2].

When making a decision, the subject is faced with a number of tasks: to gather information carefully, analyze it deeply, and choose a solution that is adequate to the goal. Such tasks require the subject to build a relationship between his or her own cognitive abilities, the peculiarities of the task to be solved, and the ways of solving the task available to him or her within the problem situation. In the presence of the ability to clearly orient in the task a person, most likely, will demonstrate an ability to allocate the most important information for the solution of the task, contained in a situation of uncertainty [5].

Analyzing I. Jenis and L. Mann's model, T.V. Kornilova comes to a conclusion that such components of decision-making process as vigilance, back-passing, procrastination and hypervigilance describe human behavior in problematic situations quite well. Procrastination manifests itself as a defensive reaction in which a person seeks to shift responsibility when making a decision. In turn, avoidance is characterized by ignoring possible difficult and risky situations. In case of hypervigilance a person tends to make a decision impulsively, and in some cases such behavior can take the form of panic decision-making. In the case of vigilance, according to the author, a person can accurately and rationally assess the possible consequences of the chosen strategy [3].

Thus, the ability to make fast and high-quality decisions in situations of uncertainty is largely determined by the level of personal self-organization and the development of metacognitive competencies. In this connection the study of metacognitive peculiarities of decision-making in students at the stage of primary professionalization deserves special attention.

Presentation of the results of the study.

The study involved university students (age: $\bar{x}=21,46$; $\sigma=2,89$) in a total of 116. Among them 36 males (31%) and 90 females (69%). As the Russian sample were used the results of the study on the Russian sample of V.V. Barabanshikova, "Professional Deformations in Innovative Professions" for a total of 32 students. The study included the Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire (MDCQ) as adapted by T.V. Kornilova.

Table 1.
Comparative analysis of the results of the decision-making study between the Uzbek and Russian samples

Scales	Mean and standard deviation	
	Results on an Uzbek sample of students (N=116)	Results on a Russian sample of students (N=32)
Vigilance	$\bar{x}=13,91$; $\sigma=3,15$	$\bar{x}=14,94$; $\sigma=3,20$
Avoidance	$\bar{x}=8,80$; $\sigma=3,88$	$\bar{x}=10,31$; $\sigma=3,81$
Procrastination	$\bar{x}=7,53$; $\sigma=3,36$	$\bar{x}=9,03$; $\sigma=3,45$
Supervigilance	$\bar{x}=8,33$; $\sigma=3,34$	$\bar{x}=9,00$; $\sigma=2,82$

The results of the study showed that Russian students have higher scores on the mean values of the avoidance ($\bar{x}=10,31$) and procrastination scales ($\bar{x}=9,03$) in comparison with Uzbek students ($\bar{x}=8,80$ & $\bar{x}=7,53$). No clear differences were found on the vigilance and hypervigilance scales.

Decision-making is a process in which a person chooses a certain decision in a situation of uncertainty. All people, regardless of profession or age, are subject to this process. The most

critical step in the decision-making process is choosing certain criteria by which to make a choice. The strategies used to make decisions involve many factors, such as personality traits, abilities, and preferences. This paper examines Russian students' high scores on two decision-making strategies: avoidance and procrastination. In this context, avoidance means that students prefer not to make a decision if they are not sure about the right choice, while procrastination is putting off a decision until the last moment.

This paper analyzed the results of a survey of students on decision-making strategies. In doing so, it was found that the majority of Russian students who received high scores on avoidance and procrastination. This suggests that these two strategies can often be used in tandem with each other. Russian university students who use the avoidance strategy tend not to make a decision if they cannot be sure of its correctness. They habitually avoid risk, preferring not to resolve conflicts rather than face possible trouble. As a consequence, they often do not identify their capabilities and do not take the right steps to achieve their goals.

In addition, students who use the procrastination strategy often postpone making a decision until the last moment. They tend to postpone making a decision because of a lack of confidence in their abilities, and they are also almost always afraid of the consequences of the final choice. They try to avoid making a decision until they can fully explore all of their options.

Conclusion and Recommendations.

In summary, we can say that avoidance and procrastination strategies are common types of decision-making strategies that can affect students' quality of life and career success. In fact, the right strategy depends on the context and situation, so it is important to use certain resources to improve decision-making strategies in order to get the most out of the chosen direction. As valuable skills, decision-making strategies can be developed and improved to help students achieve their goals and ultimate goal in life.

It is worthwhile to give some recommendations on how to develop effective decision-making skills:

- Exercise your decision-making skills in everyday life. You don't have to face big problems to start practicing decision-making. Try making decisions on small matters such as: where to go for lunch, what book to read, etc.
- Explore new areas of knowledge. If you don't know what you are going to encounter, it will be difficult to make decisions. The more knowledge you have on a certain topic, the easier it will be for you to make decisions in that area.
- Evaluate all of your options. Don't make a decision too quickly without thinking about what other options are possible. Develop several options to evaluate them all, and choose the most appropriate one for your situation.
- Take responsibility for your actions. If your decision does not produce the expected result, take responsibility for your actions, rather than trying to pass it on to others. Every time you make a decision, watch the consequences and learn from your mistakes.
- Don't be afraid to take risks. Sometimes known risks can be better choices than seemingly safe options. No matter what decision you make, executing it will always involve a degree of uncertainty. Be willing to take risks to achieve your goals.

REFERENCES

1. Barabanshchikova V.V. *Professional deformations in innovative professions* (In Russ) // diss. dokt. psy. nauk. Moskva, 2016. 359 s.
2. Kashapov M.M. *Theory and practice of conflict resolution* (In Russ). YArosavl': Remder, 2003. 183 s.
3. Kornilova T.V. *Human intellectual and personal potential under uncertainty and risk* (In Russ). SPb.: Nestor-Istoriya, 2016.
4. Rahaev H.M., Toguzayev T.H., Gyatov A.V. *The Paradoxes and Contradictions of Decision Theory* (In Russ) // *Upravlencheskoe konsul'tirovanie*, 2019. №8. – S. 47-59. DOI 10.22394/1726-1139-2019-8-47-59.
5. Tverski A., Kaneman D. *Availability: frequency and probability estimation heuristics* (In Russ) // *Prinyatie reshenij v neopredelennosti: pravila i predubezhdeniya*. - Har'kov: Izd-vo Institut prikladnoj psihologii «Gumanitarnyj centr», 2005, S. 191-207.