Disparities of Self-compassion and Job Satisfaction across Decision-Making Styles among Filipino Workers
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Abstract

Self-compassion and job satisfaction of Filipino workers across their decision-making styles are constructs of the present study being presented in the field of work. This paper aimed to identify the decision-making style; describe and measure the degree of self-compassion and job satisfaction; and determine the difference in self-compassion and job satisfaction across decision-making styles among respondents. The General Decision-making Styles Questionnaire (GDSQ), Self-compassion Scale, and Job Satisfaction Survey were administered to 359 respondents who aged from 28-60 years old, regardless of gender, across different companies in Calabarzon. The respondents were employees from entry level positions, supervisors, as well as executive level positions. Results have shown that rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, spontaneous, and dependent were the decision-making styles among respondents. The degree of self-compassion was at a high level (M=142.78, SD=21.16), while the degree of job satisfaction showed respondents’ ambivalence towards their job (M=3.51, SD=0.46). The Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) confirmed a significant difference (F= 5.054**, p of 0.0001) in the self-compassion and job satisfaction across decision-making styles among Filipino workers and was validated by Fisher’s LSD as a post hoc test. Outcomes of the study is recommended as a basis in proposing intervention programs in human resource management and industrial psychology. Mixed-method research is recommended to strengthen the concepts of self-compassion and related variables in this study.
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INTRODUCTION

Work is especially vital for Filipinos for a reason - it “shapes well-being and the quality of life” (Hechanova et al., 2019). It was posted on the website of the Philippine Statistics Authority (2021) that the employment rate was at 91.2 percent in February 2021. Equivalently, there were 43.2 million Filipinos who had jobs or business out of the 47.3 million Filipinos who were in the labor force, prompting the researchers to believe that work is essential for Filipinos although they have different meanings and reasons for it. Moreover, Hechanova et al. (2019) stated that Filipinos view their work as “one of life’s most important activities,” that they “live to work” and they value it more than leisure. In relation to that, problems arise in the workplace, and employees’ decision-making is assessed through their work experience. Workers decide every day, even with a simple situation, whether they are going to work or not, thus, workers’ decision is vital; and making decisions is significant at the workplace (Hechanova et al., 2019). As many workers experience difficulties and challenges in their respective jobs, this study aimed to determine the degree of self-compassion of workers to themselves. Through these tough times, satisfaction of workers matters, Iwata et al. (2017, as cited in World Bank, 2017) concluded that when employees are satisfied, they are more loyal and willing to take on additional work even during challenging times. Thus, this study is claimed to be significant in the changing work landscapes which affect workers.
self-compassion, job satisfaction, and decision-making.

Ty and Morga (2020) claimed that the stronger predictors of happiness among Filipino workers are their occupational well-being as well as their self-compassion. Moreover, having high level of occupational well-being which includes the job satisfaction will result to more self-compassion. (p.15). They concluded that a more direct path which results to a higher happiness is self-compassion and occupational well-being (Ty & Morga, 2020). Additionally, Neff (2012) supported that self-compassion enhances motivation rather than self-indulgence. Thus, self-compassion is associated with proficiency goals and intrinsic motivation to learn and grow in a certain field that people pursue.

In a 2017 survey conducted by Staffing Industry Analysts, the global advisor on staffing and workforce solutions in the Philippines, the job satisfaction of employees in the Philippines dropped from a 5.25 rating in 2016 to a rating of 4.97 on a 10-point scale. Based on the results, it has been indicated that employees in Region IV-A are less satisfied and less happy in their job compared to other regions which scored higher than the median score of 5. Given a 10-point scale, it has been found that the overall score of satisfaction among employees fall under the rating of 5.10. The factors that make the Filipino workers in Region IV-A happy and satisfied are the location, quality of work, and relationships with officemates. Conversely, the lowest rated factors are the lack of career and development opportunities and basic salary.

Aziri (2011) believed that people's sentiments and views regarding their current jobs are referred to as job satisfaction. Furthermore, work satisfaction among employees fluctuates a lot, ranging from intense happiness to extreme frustration. They also have their own stand points on the overall quality of their work. Therefore, employees can also experience different feelings and emotions about their respective jobs, the nature of their work as well as with their relationship to their co-employees, supervisors and with all the staff in their organization (George et al. in Mohsen & Sharif, 2020). Additionally, Spector (1997) mentioned that job satisfaction is the overall feeling of employees towards their job. In this study, job satisfaction is operationally defined as a way to assess the nine dimensions of job satisfaction among Filipino workers, as cited in Spector (1997).

“Decision-making style has been described as the way learned habitual response patterns manifest when individuals are faced with a decision situation” (Scott & Bruce, 1995, p.820). The authors have mentioned decision-making styles which can be described as the method that people use to make decisions. They described decision-making styles as a person's unique approach to perceiving and reacting to decision-making tasks. Despite the fact that an individual could use more than one decision-making style, it has been concluded by Thunholm Bavol'ár and Orosova (2015), that every individual has the dominant style which they use in their everyday decision-making. Additionally, decision-making have five styles; rational-making decisions in a logical and structured manner; intuitive-trusting one's intuition and making choices that feel right; dependent-describes people who consult others before deciding and relying on others for support; avoidance-describes people postponing decisions or making them at the last minute; and spontaneous-involves creating swift and impulsive decisions. These aspects in the decision-making process can influence the decision-maker and the organization. Indeed, decision-making has been found essential especially in the workplace (Ceshi et al., 2017, as cited in Bavolár & Orosóvá, 2015). In this study, “decision-making style” is operationally defined as a tool that can further assess if there is a difference between “self-compassion and job satisfaction” among Filipino workers.

This study could be significant to the following entities: Filipino workers - they will be able to understand the importance of the variables among themselves. They may also change their own views as they venture on the topic with a more in-depth
discussion involving I/O practitioners, psychologist, and HR Professionals. This research can also serve as a guide for them so that they may be able to see and reflect on the awareness of the study to the general public, particularly the Filipino workers; and Future researchers - From this current study, they could gain an idea about the significance of the variables and they could also fill the gap in the study that the researchers were not able to focus on.

Nicklin et al. (2019) reported that self-compassion helps foster healthy relationships, intimacy, and conflict-resolution techniques. In addition to that, authors reported that when workers feel lonely about their work, it is more likely for them not to be able to function fully in their job and less likely to go neither above nor beyond their jobs (Nicklin et al., 2019).

In relation to job satisfaction literature, Amiri et al. (2010) concluded that it is necessary and important that all workers are happy with their supervisors. Indeed, human resource is one of the most crucial resources among organizations. They tend to ensure the satisfaction of the employees in terms of enhancing professional accomplishments, increased productivity, and organizational efficiency. Having an evaluation about employee satisfaction helps them to increase the collaboration and employee engagement. The way their supervisors, heads, and leaders manage and guide them are also factors that contribute to their satisfaction as reported by Spector (1997).

Sharif and Nazir (2016) found that employee job satisfaction is strongly influenced by working atmosphere, job security, the level of fairness, proximity, compensation and promotion, and relationships of the co-workers and supervisors. This means that when workers work in a pleasant atmosphere, have more job security, and are treated equally, their job satisfaction rises. As a result of this, they would be able to contribute positively to organizational efficiency and to the company. It also rises with the quality of their relationships with their co-workers and supervisors which enable them to contribute and collaborate effectively with one another. On the other hand, Abaci and Arda (2013) assessed the relationship of “self-compassion and work satisfaction” in white collar jobs. They stressed that those employees who have “high levels of self-compassion tend to … feel more satisfied with their life and are more prone to positive affect.” This kind of individual tends to have a more balanced and optimistic point of view and a high level of job satisfaction. They concluded that self-compassion is moderately positively correlated to job satisfaction among white collar workers and does not vary by gender (Abaci & Arda, 2013).

The results of the studies have suggested that self-compassion has been connected consistently with positivity towards the work of every employee and is also connected with the psychological wellbeing of the workers. Literatures also highlighted the significance of the two variables in the workplace. Previous authors concluded that self-compassion is correlated to job satisfaction. However, in the present study, researchers aimed to describe and measure the degree of self-compassion and job satisfaction. More so, researchers used the results of association of the two variables to examine the disparity of self-compassion and job satisfaction across the decision-making styles among the Filipino workers.

In every organization, decision-making is critical (Zohori in Mohsen & Sharif, 2020). It was concluded in their study that in the Agricultural Bank of Khuzestan, the significance of decision-making was highlighted in order to achieve job satisfaction among employees. Mohsen and Sharif (2020) indicated “that there is a positive relationship between employee engagement in organizational decision-making and work satisfaction” (p.7). Decision-making in the organization has contributed to the employee’s job satisfaction for it promotes leadership actions and collaboration.

Scott and Bruce in Michailidis & Banks, 2016) stated that the systematic assessment of alternatives is referred to as the rational style. When an individual relies more on feelings, it is characterized as an intuitive style. The avoidant style is characterized by
an individual’s tendency to avoid making decisions whenever possible; whereas the spontaneous is defined as a proclivity to make a swift decision (Michailidis & Banks, 2016). Workplace tension is one of the most common issues among employees. Individual performance can be harmed by job stress, which can influence how people act at work (Saeidi et al., in Michailidis & Banks, 2016). They strongly suggested in the supporting literature from Allwood and Salo (Michailidis & Banks, 2016) that avoidant and dependent decision-making styles can lead to high levels of stress in the workplace.

In terms of Filipino culture and research, self-compassion is associated with positive functioning and emotional well-being (Domingo, 2014, in Umandap & Teh, 2019). It has been linked as well to occupational well-being and happiness (Morga, 2015, as cited in Umandap & Teh, 2019). In the Filipino context, self-compassion has also been linked with job satisfaction. Abaci and Arda (2013) demonstrated that in white collar jobs, the results have shown that there is an average positive relationship between the two variables: self-compassion and job satisfaction in Istanbul. In this present study, the researchers also used the self-compassion and job satisfaction; however, the researchers determined the degree and disparities of the two variables among Filipino workers. Hayes and Allison (Bávorár & Orosová, 2015) stressed that “decision-making style plays an important role in the workplace” (p.7), while Hechanova et al. (2019) argued that an individual is required to create or decide in all types of work.

In the Philippine context, Filipinos are used to the scenario that an individual “of highest status” has the final decision in a group (Cultural Atlas, 2021). However, in this modern age, many organizations in the Philippines due to the demands of the labor market seek not just “cognitive skills” but also “behavioural skills, particularly decision-making skills” (World Bank, 2017, para.1); thus, present researchers aimed to identify the decision-making style among Filipino workers and determine difference among the three variables. Indeed, decision-making has been seen to be significant in a worker and can shape an individual’s self-compassion and job satisfaction especially today where companies give emphasis on collaboration in different organization structures such as in decision-making style. Clarke (2020) mentioned that self-compassion in the workplaces enables a worker to have the “ability to identify problems, accept negative feedback from others, and change habits that are no longer aligned with their best interests” (para.8); thus, self-compassion enables us to be more mindful of ourselves and our decision making, resulting in more balanced and positive interactions with others (Clarke, 2020). In the study conducted by Ty and Morga (2020), they stressed that the self-compassion and occupational wellbeing in employees in the Philippines have been found statistically significant.

However, there are no studies and articles regarding the self-compassion of Filipino workers in Region IV-A (EBSCO, 2021). In relation to this, a survey conducted by Job Street (2020) for the happiness of employees found out that Region IV-A has a 5.1 score, an above meridian score of 5, which concluded that Region IV-A workers are less satisfied in their jobs. It is for this reason that the researchers aimed to explore the workers situation particularly in Region IV-A. Many researchers have conducted studies using either self-compassion, job satisfaction and decision-making style but there is no researcher who conducted studies using the three variables simultaneously; most of the time, a single variable is used or a combination of two variables only. There are no correlational or comparative studies found on the EBSCO Website regarding the use of three variables—self-compassion, job satisfaction and decision-making style (EBSCO, 2021), although there were correlational studies on self-compassion and job satisfaction. It is thus, the researchers aim to explore the disparity on self-compassion and job satisfaction across decision-making styles among Filipino workers.

The researchers identified the decision-making style among Filipino workers in Region IV-A;
described and measured the degree of self-compassion and job satisfaction among Filipino workers; and determined the difference in self-compassion and job satisfaction across decision-making styles among Filipino workers. The researchers hypothesized that there is no discernible difference in Filipino workers’ “self-compassion” and “job satisfaction” across their decision-making styles. The alternative hypothesis is that self-compassion and job satisfaction have a significant difference across the decision-making styles among Filipino workers.

The theoretical framework of this present paper is multimodal; it is a combination of two theories: Self-compassion Theory by Neff (2008) and Job Satisfaction Theory by Spector (1997). There are three elements of self-compassion: a “combination of self-kindness, common humanity, and mindfulness” (Neff, 2008, p.22). The self-compassion theory states that self-compassion occurs when an individual receives self-kindness, common humanity, and mindfulness. Accordingly, high scores in terms of the three elements: self-kindness, common humanity, and mindfulness lead to high self-compassion. In contrast, low self-compassion occurs when they receive the counterparts of the three elements: self-judgment, isolation, and over-identification. Moreover, self-compassion is experienced differently and is conceptually distinct; but they also tend to engender one another (Neff, 2012).

Spector (2022) used the JSS or “Job Satisfaction Survey” was created to quantify individual work satisfaction, which was believed to reflect a lustre of workers’ feelings about the job. It was created to include an overall attitude score based on a number of different factors. “The nine facets are Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Fringe Benefits, Contingent Rewards Operating Procedures, Co-workers, Nature of Work, and Communication”. Job satisfaction theory states that job satisfaction occurs when an employee receives the nine facets of job satisfaction. When an employee scores high in terms of the nine facets, it can lead to job satisfaction. Meanwhile, when employees score low in terms of the nine facets, it means that they feel less satisfied. However, if the employee’s scores are average in the nine facets, this means that the employee is ambivalent.

It was also added that when the nine facets are combined it yields a “good measure of satisfaction” (para.3). “Multitrait-multimethod analysis” to provide support and evidence for the theory was used. Spector (2022) concluded that “employees’ ability to hold varying attitudes about different aspects of the job was strong evidence for the multidimensionality of job satisfaction” (p.705). Thus, it is useful in explaining the interaction of employees and organizations regarding “job satisfaction” in the workplace. As well as on measuring the difference between self-compassion and job satisfaction across the decision-making styles among the respondents.

The researchers tend to identify the decision-making style among Filipino workers. Then, the researchers tend to describe or measure the degree of self-compassion and job satisfaction among Filipino workers. Also, to determine the difference in self-compassion and job satisfaction across decision-making styles among Filipino workers. Hence, the researchers hypothesize that these are not valid states wherein there is no discernible difference on Filipino workers’ “self-compassion” and “job satisfaction” through decision-making styles. The alternative hypothesis is that self-compassion and work satisfaction have a significant difference across the decision-making styles among Filipino workers.

METHODS

This study involved the participation of Filipino workers, age 18-60, particularly in Region IV-A composed of the following provinces: Cavite, Laguna, Batangas, Rizal, Quezon, as a response to where the previous studies fall short, regardless of gender, religion, ethnicity, and socio-economic status.

A total of 359 Filipino workers responded, with specific representatives from each province in Cavite (n₁=71), Laguna (n₂=71), Batangas (n₃=73), Rizal (n₄=73), etc.
eral studies had revealed that “Self-compassion Scale” and “Job Satisfaction Survey” have good internal consistency which range from 0.60 to 0.91 for the total scale” (Spector, 1997, para. 1). Spector also added that “an average of 0.70 was obtained for internal consistency” out of 3,067 people; the internal consistency of which was measured in a smaller sample of “43 employees over an 18-month span which resulted in a score of 0.37-0.74” (para.1). Validity was demonstrated in studies that used multiple work satisfaction scales on a single employee. Spector (1997) reported that a “ratio of 0.61 for colleagues to 0.80 for supervision” was found in the subscales of “job satisfaction” and some were also found on the “Job Description Index” (para. 3). The levels for dissatisfaction, satisfaction, and ambivalence for the “36-item” sum wherein the potential scores vary from 36 to 216, are: 36 to 108 in terms of dissatisfaction, 144 to 216 in terms of satisfaction, and between 108 and 144 for the ambivalence.

The last standardized test used was the “General Decision-Making Style Questionnaire” by Scott and Bruce (1995); it was developed for the measurement of decision-making style among adolescents and adults. This questionnaire measures “five decision-making styles” - the Rational, Intuitive, Dependent, Avoidant and Spontaneous - through the five-Likert scale which varies from strongly disagree to strongly agree. This is a 25-item questionnaire, and each dimension is measured by five items for the purpose.

The researchers used a non-quota probability sampling with a random sampling technique, wherein they had equal chances to be selected. An initial screening were sent to the partipants through Microsoft forms. This form contains the basic informations about the respondents like their age, work position, the region where they belong, as well as their email since this will be used for sending the two remaining questionnaires. Potential respondents were chosen randomly per decision-making style and eventually take the two remaining standardized tests: “Self-compassion Scale” and “Job Satisfaction Survey.”

The researchers used those standardized tests in English. First, the “Self-Compassion Scale” by Neff (2003) was used. Several studies had revealed that “Self-compassion Scale” seems to have “psychometrically sound and theoretically valid measure of self-compassion” (Neff, 2015, p.244). Furthermore, the findings demonstrated that “when an individual has a high level of self-compassion, it is usually associated with psychological well-being rather than narcissistic characteristics” (Neff, 2015, p.244). The Self-Compassion Scale has good construct validity and acquired convergent validity. Participant responses to the Self-Compassion Scale had a good test–retest reliability - Self-Compassion Scale (overall score): .93; Kindness subscale: .88; Self-Judgment subscale: .88; Common Humanity subscale: .80; Isolation subscale: .85; Mindfulness Subscale: .85; and Over-Identification subscale: .88 (Neff, 2012).

The second standardized test used was the “Job Satisfaction Survey” composed of a 36-item questionnaire by Paul Spector; it has nine facets and four items in each facet. It was stated by Spector (1997) that the survey is “applicable to all organizations” (para.1); hence, this test can be utilized in organizations and among workers. The validity and reliability of this well-known instrument have been assessed. Internal consistency was moderate among the nine subscales which had “a score of 0.60 for co-workers to 0.91 for the total scale” (Spector, 1997, para. 1). Spector also added that “an average of 0.70 was obtained for internal consistency” out of 3,067 people; the internal consistency of which was measured in a smaller sample of “43 employees over an 18-month span which resulted in a score of 0.37-0.74” (para.1). Validity was demonstrated in studies that used multiple work satisfaction scales on a single employee. Spector (1997) reported that a “ratio of 0.61 for colleagues to 0.80 for supervision” was found in the subscales of “job satisfaction” and some were also found on the “Job Description Index” (para. 3). The levels for dissatisfaction, satisfaction, and ambivalence for the “36-item” sum wherein the potential scores vary from 36 to 216, are: 36 to 108 in terms of dissatisfaction, 144 to 216 in terms of satisfaction, and between 108 and 144 for the ambivalence.

The researchers used a non-quota probability sampling with a random sampling technique, wherein they had equal chances to be selected. An initial screening were sent to the partipants through Microsoft forms. This form contains the basic informations about the respondents like their age, work position, the region where they belong, as well as their email since this will be used for sending the two remaining questionnaires. Potential respondents were chosen randomly per decision-making style and eventually take the two remaining standardized tests: “Self-compassion Scale” and “Job Satisfaction Survey.” The researchers used standardized tests – Self-Compassion Scale, Job Satisfaction Survey, and General Decision-Making Style Questionnaire.

The researchers used those standardized tests in English. First, the “Self-Compassion Scale” by Neff (2003). Several studies had revealed that “Self-compassion Scale” seems to have “psychometrically sound and theoretically valid measure of self-compassion” (Neff, 2015, p.244). Furthermore, the findings demonstrated that “when an individual has a high level of self-compassion, it is usually associated with psychological well-being rather than narcissistic characteristics” (Neff, 2015, p.244). The Self-Compassion Scale has good construct validity and acquired convergent validity. Participant responses to the Self-Compassion Scale had a good test–retest reliability - Self-Compassion Scale (overall score): .93; Kindness subscale: .88; Self-Judgment subscale: .88; Common Humanity subscale: .80; Isolation subscale: .85; Mindfulness Subscale: .85; and Over-Identification subscale: .88 (Neff, 2012).

The second standardized test used was the “Job Satisfaction Survey” composed of a 36-item questionnaire by Paul Spector; it has nine facets and four items in each facet. It was stated by Spector (1997) that the survey is “applicable to all organizations” (para.1); hence, this test can be utilized in organizations and among workers. The validity and reliability of this well-known instrument have been assessed. Internal consistency was moderate among the nine subscales which had “a score of 0.60 for co-workers to 0.91 for the total scale” (Spector, 1997, para. 1). Spector also added that “an average of 0.70 was obtained for internal consistency” out of 3,067 people; the internal consistency of which was measured in a smaller sample of “43 employees over an 18-month span which resulted in a score of 0.37-0.74” (para.1). Validity was demonstrated in studies that used multiple work satisfaction scales on a single employee. Spector (1997) reported that a “ratio of 0.61 for colleagues to 0.80 for supervision” was found in the subscales of “job satisfaction” and some were also found on the “Job Description Index” (para. 3). The levels for dissatisfaction, satisfaction, and ambivalence for the “36-item” sum wherein the potential scores vary from 36 to 216, are: 36 to 108 in terms of dissatisfaction, 144 to 216 in terms of satisfaction, and between 108 and 144 for the ambivalence.

The last standardized test used was the “General Decision-Making Style Questionnaire” by Scott and Bruce (1995); it was developed for the measurement of decision-making style among adolescents and adults. This questionnaire measures “five decision-making styles” - the Rational, Intuitive, Dependent, Avoidant and Spontaneous - through the five-Likert scale which varies from strongly disagree to strongly agree. This is a 25-item questionnaire, and each dimension is measured by five items for the purpose. On confirmatory factor analysis, this offers a best fit across styles of decision-making. Moreover, the Scott and Bruce (1995) “previous explanatory analysis, confirmatory and exploratory analysis”, and the other confirmatory and exploratory analysis given here all point to a five-factor structure being the most applicable. A higher score in a specific subscale specifies that the respondent uses the specific style most of the time. Face validity and logical content validity have therefore been determined for the measure. Furthermore, it has been determined to have good internal consistency which range from 0.667 to 0.87 (Scott & Bruce, 1995).
Researchers employed a quantitative approach with a comparative research design to determine the similarities or differences in the variables through quantitative data gathering (Esser & Vliegenthart, 2016). In this study, it was used to determine the differences in the self-compassion and job satisfaction of Filipino workers across the decision-making styles.

The data analysis used was the Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA). Stockburger (2018) mentioned that “it is used to see if the independent grouping variable can explain a statistically significant amount of variance in the dependent variable at the same time” (p.2). It is an “extension of ANOVA and there are two or more dependent variables” (Stockburger, 2018, p.1). MANOVA is required as it aimed to determine the disparity in the mean scores of two dependent variables, across the independent variable.

To ensure the validity of this paper, procedures were followed: The researchers sought to understand and did thorough research on the variables. Approval from the proponents of the research instruments for three consecutive days was done to protect the paper from copyright infringement. The researchers were granted approval from the DLSU-D Ethics Review Committee.

The researchers used HIPAA compliant platforms to maintain the “privacy, security, and integrity of protected information” of the respondents. Given the situation during the pandemic, the researchers enjoined respondents through different social media platforms by posting a poster with a QR code of the Microsoft Form or indicating the link.

Researchers had the initial screening through Microsoft Forms for the decision-making style by answering the “General Decision-making Style Questionnaire.” It was sent to the respondents through a personal message using their email account. After the completion of the “General Decision-making Style Questionnaire,” they were randomly selected to know who among the respondents would take the two remaining standardized tests. After answering the questionnaires, non-monetary beneficence (e.g., token and certificate of participation).

Responses were gathered and encoded. Researchers conducted MANOVA and other descriptive statistics. Software applications like XLSTAT and JASP were used to analyze the data.

RESULTS

To prove the reliability of the instruments, particularly self-compassion scale and job satisfaction survey, the researchers ran a reliability test of the respondents’ answers to the standardized tools. Based on the result, it was found that the general decision-making styles were used to categorize the respondents on the five decision-making styles. Self-compassion Scale (α=0.847) and the Job Satisfaction Survey (α=0.897) have good Cronbach’s alpha or internal consistency.

Table 1 shows the decision-making style was categorized into: rational (n=75; 20.89%), intuitive (n=73; 20.33%), dependent (n=70; 19.50%), avoidant (n=70; 19.50%), and spontaneous (n=71, 19.78%). Among the respondents, the most type of decision-making style is rational, followed by intuitive, spontaneous, and the dependent and avoidant decision-making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>19.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (N)</strong></td>
<td><strong>359</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 2, there is a total of 359 (100%) observations to determine the degree of self-compassion. Only a few of the respondents indicated low self-compassion (n=3; 0.8%). Nearly half of the sample shows moderate self-compassion (46%), while more than half of the sample fall under high level of self-compassion (n=191; 53.2%). Results indicated that the mean value of self-compassion (M=3.51; SD=0.46) gave an overall impression of high level. While for the job satisfaction scale, out of 359, two (0.56%) of the respondents indicated feeling dissatisfied with their jobs. More than half of the sample have felt ambivalent (209 out of 359, 58.22%) towards their jobs, while 148 (41.23%) have felt satisfied with their jobs. Results have shown that the overall degree of job satisfaction among respondents fall under the ambivalent level of job satisfaction (M=142.78, SD=21.16).

### Table 2. Degree of Self-Compensation and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-compassion</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>44.85</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>54.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>54.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>359</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researchers used MANOVA for testing two dependent variables (i.e., self-compassion and job satisfaction), and one independent variable (i.e., decision-making style consisting of five styles: rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous). Hence, the above-mentioned results clearly suggest that the null hypothesis should be rejected, and the alternative hypothesis be accepted.

### Table 3. Summary Difference of Self-compassion and Job Satisfaction across Decision-Making Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>F_{obt}</th>
<th>P_{value}</th>
<th>n^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai’s Trace</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>5.003**</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilk’s Lambda</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>5.054**</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling-Lawley’s Trace</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>5.106**</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy’s Largest Root</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>8.648**</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N=359. *p<0.05. **p<0.01.

Since the data was significant, post-hoc test using Fisher LSD was delivered (see Table 4). The Fisher LSD explains the five contrasting decision-making styles, particularly the rational decision-making style, intuitive decision-making style, dependent decision-making style, avoidant decision-making style, and the spontaneous decision-making style. The results of Fisher LSD have shown that the self-compassion across decision-making style has an LSD-value of 0.146. This also indicates that the avoidant and dependent decision-making styles are statistically different in the self-compassion among respondents with a p-value less than 0.01.
Table 4. Fisher LSD Post-hoc of Self-Compassion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Standardized difference</th>
<th>Critical Value</th>
<th>Pr&gt;Dif</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant vs Dependent</td>
<td>-0.199</td>
<td>-2.592</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.010**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant vs Intuitive</td>
<td>-0.147</td>
<td>-1.935</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant vs Rational</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>-1.788</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant vs Spontaneous</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
<td>-1.608</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous vs Dependent</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>-0.993</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous vs Intuitive</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.317</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous vs Rational</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.874</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational vs Dependent</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.848</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational vs Intuitive</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.161</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive vs Dependent</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.684</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LSD Value = 0.146

Note. N=359. *p<0.05. **p<0.01

Table 5 highlighted the Fisher (LSD) of the decision-making style and job satisfaction; the results have shown that avoidant vs rational was found to be significant since (Pr>Dif= <0.0001) is less than alpha 0.05 (p>0.05) and alpha 0.01 (p>0.01). In addition to that, avoidant vs spontaneous, intuitive vs rational, dependent vs rational were considered significant with an alpha less than 0.05 (p>0.05) and alpha 0.01 (p>0.01) However, spontaneous vs rational has been found to be significant (Pr>Dif=0.046) with an alpha smaller than alpha 0.05 (p>0.05) but greater than alpha 0.01 (p>0.01). The LSD-value for job satisfaction across decision-making style is 6.526. This explains that there were decision-making styles that has statistical difference in terms of the job satisfaction among the respondents.

Table 5. Fisher LSD Post-hoc of Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Standardized difference</th>
<th>Critical Value</th>
<th>Pr&gt;Dif</th>
<th>Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant vs Rational</td>
<td>-18.202</td>
<td>-5.390</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant vs Spontaneous</td>
<td>-11.471</td>
<td>-3.351</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.001**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant vs Dependent</td>
<td>-5.900</td>
<td>-1.718</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant vs Intuitive</td>
<td>-4.840</td>
<td>-1.424</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive vs Rational</td>
<td>-13.362</td>
<td>-3.999</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive vs Spontaneous</td>
<td>-6.631</td>
<td>-1.958</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuitive vs Dependent</td>
<td>-1.060</td>
<td>-0.312</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent vs Rational</td>
<td>-12.302</td>
<td>-3.643</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent vs Spontaneous</td>
<td>-5.571</td>
<td>-1.628</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous vs Rational</td>
<td>-6.731</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>1.967</td>
<td>0.046*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LSD Value = 6.526

Note. N=359. *p<0.05. **p<0.01.

DISCUSSION

The researchers identified the decision-making styles of the respondents and categorized them based on the result of the standardized test: rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous. It was supported by the study of Galotti, et al. (2006) that various approaches of decision-making are believed to exist among people. Some place emphasis on acting in an objective, detached manner while obtaining a lot of data and doing clear analyses. Others think of themselves as being more intuitive and holistic.
While some manage the process independently, others depend on advice from others. In contrast to individuals who are considerably more deliberate and intentional, some people approach decision-making activities in a more spontaneous manner. Some situations are avoided by other people. Degree of self-compassion and job satisfaction has also been determined by the researchers. The mean score on the findings shows that the degree of self-compassion among respondents falls under the high level of self-compassion. It suggests that respondents perceive themselves to have greater mindfulness than over-identification with thoughts, isolation versus recognition of common humanity, and more self-kindness than self-judgment. Jay Miller et al. (2019) stressed that when an employee is kind to themselves, they tend to be more present, empathically engaged, and compassionate with the people around them. On the other hand, in terms of the degree of job satisfaction, the findings show that most of the respondents fall under the ambivalent level of job satisfaction. It explains that respondents perceive to have mixed feelings about their work per se.

The current study sought to know if there is a significant difference between self-compassion and job satisfaction across decision making styles. The respondents in this study were Filipino workers who work in Region IV-A and were randomly selected. The researchers used instruments such as General Decision-Making Style Questionnaire (1995), Self-compassion Scale (2012), and Job Satisfaction Survey (1997). Through the aforesaid instruments, the researchers were able to draw a conclusion that there is a significant difference between self-compassion and job satisfaction across the decision-making styles among workers.

The researchers also determined the disparity in the self-compassion and job satisfaction across the decision-making styles among Filipino workers. In relation to this, a post hoc test has been conducted. In this study, it was concluded that in the self-compassion across the respondents' decision-making styles, only the avoidant decision-making style and dependent decision-making style has been found to be significantly different. It is supported by Bavol’ár and Orosová’s (2015) study, which found a negative association between avoidant and dependent decision-making styles; they found that relying on others to make decisions can lead to a decreased desire to avoid making them. When comparing spontaneous decision-making to dependent, intuitive, and rational decision-making, there was no significant different. (Baiocco et al., 2009, p. 973, Bavol’ár & Orosová, 2015). The “no significance” result between intuitive and spontaneous was considered since Bavol’ar and Orosova (2015) stated that the latter is “a high-speed” form of the intuitive style. According to Omotola (2012), spontaneous when compared to dependent and intuitive, are positively connected in her study, indicating a link between the compared decision-making styles.

Moreover, the avoidant decision-making style and spontaneous decision-making style proved to be not significant. In this research the outcome between rational versus intuitive and dependent are not significant. Omotola (2012) in his study found that the rational compared to dependent and intuitive have weak but positive relationship with each other. The intuitive and dependent yielded a not-significant result. In terms of the decision-making styles in the context of self-compassion, it is supported by the study of Bavol’ar and Orosova (2015) which concluded that the four decision-making styles particularly rational, spontaneous, intuitive, and dependent lead to a positive subjective wellbeing.

We also found that there is no significance between intuitive and avoidant decision-making style, as well as the rational and avoidant style. The rational and avoidant has been reported to have a negative relationship with each other; to conclude that those individuals who tend to avoid decision-making are also those people who are rational decision-makers (Bavol’ar & Orosova, 2015). This only proves that individuals have a “dominant decision-making style;” however, there are circumstances when they use more
than one style in making decisions (Thunholm, 2004, as cited in Bavol’ar & Orosova, 2015).

Most of the decision-making styles under self-compassion appear to have a not significant result. Neff (2012) argued that the self must be recognized, “as a member of humankind and deserves to be treated with the same patience and respect as others” as an important feature of self-compassion. Therefore, whichever decision-making style every person has, self-compassion has a positive impact on their mindfulness as well as their interactions with others.

In the context of job satisfaction across the five decision-making styles findings show that rational decision-making style is significantly different to avoidant, intuitive, dependent, and spontaneous. It explains that each decision-making style is different; this is in connection to Scott and Bruce (1995, as cited in Douma et al., 2020) which concluded that decision-making styles are “independent but not mutually exclusive;” they have their unique characteristics. Avoidant and spontaneous decision-making styles have been found to be significant as well. The post hoc test showed that intuitive and spontaneous is not significant as supported by Bavol’ar and Orosova (2015) that the spontaneous is “a high-speed” form of the intuitive. The avoidant and dependent led to a not significant result which explains that both style have been associated with lower decision-making competence. Moreover, dependent and avoidant decision-making styles both “deny responsibility” in making decision; dependent decision-makers deny responsibility by projecting it to others while avoidant decision-makers deny responsibility by avoiding making decision (Harren, 1979, as cited in Omotola, 2012). Furthermore, avoidant, and intuitive style have been found to be not significant. Intuitive and spontaneous are also not significant. This supports the study of Scott and Bruce (1995) which emphasized that intuitive and spontaneous use the “sense of feeling”.

Findings also showed intuitive and dependent to be not significant. While dependent and spontaneous yielded a not significant result. It can be supported by the study of Geisler and Allwood (2017) that the dependent, and spontaneous are both associative to “more maladaptive behavior and negative outcomes,” which could allow researchers to accept the not significant result. Through the results of the study, the researchers have accepted the multimodal theory. Hence, Spector (1997) reported that workers hold varying attitudes in terms of their job satisfaction, while Neff (2012) mentioned that self-compassion is experienced differently by individuals and are conceptually distinct but also tend to engender one another. Therefore, it can be stressed that there is a significant difference in the self-compassion and job satisfaction across the decision-making style among the Filipino workers.

The present study was limited to the use of quantitative design which focused on disparities in self-compassion and job satisfaction across the decision-making styles among Filipino workers. Future researchers may use this study as a basis in proposing intervention program in the human resource management and industrial psychology. They may look upon the similarities on the variables such as self-compassion and job satisfaction across decision-making style. Also, they may consider in-depth study through mixed method type of research to support the results of this study: having high level of self-compassion and feeling ambivalent towards the job. Interviews and other research instruments may also be used to replicate the study as well as acquisition of further data to deepen the results of the study.

CONCLUSION

The respondents’ decision-making style has been identified as variation of rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous. Equally, majority of the respondents fall under high level of self-compassion; most of the respondents marked the ambivalent category of job satisfaction. Indeed, there is a significant difference on the extent of self-compassion and job satisfaction across decision-making styles among Filipino Workers. With that,
the multimodal theory comprises of self-compassion theory and job satisfaction theory should be considered in managing the Filipino workers.
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