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ABSTRACT

Understanding styles in deep, it is fair to say that style possesses affective, psychological, physiological, cognitive and sociological facets. Individual differences exhibit individuals to possess different expression, complex behavior and reactions to the environmental stimulus. Styles being the ability of an individual in the performance of the individual, attracted many educational psychologists and scholars. Thinking styles are the stylistic abilities and can be mutated as they contain the fragmented socialization and ascendancy of environment in which individual lives in. Different individuals react to stimulus in different ways according to their stylistic ability of approaching to a stimulus. This study is an attempt to study different cognitive and behavioral correlates that are metacognition, cognitive styles, cognitive rigidity, leadership behavior and coping strategies.
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INTRODUCTION

Individual differences exhibit individuals to possess different expression, complex behavior and reactions to the environmental stimulus. Every person has a different and divergent way of reacting to a stimulus. Their reaction is according to their ability and styles that they possess. Individual does not possess only one style or another but they vary according to various task and situations in which their preferences play a key role. Every individual posses his own personal characteristics which are uncommon and different with other individuals emotional, physical, intellectual and social characteristics. It depends on the favorable styles of the individual to complete a task such as ways in expressing and writing which termed as different styles termed
as teaching styles, mind styles, learning styles, thinking styles and cognitive styles etc. Theory of MSG (Sternberg, 1994) states styles of thinking works on the basic idea that says that types of government in this world are not fortuitous and there is extraneous speculation of how individuals think. It can be stated as a concept of intelligence which equates and combine the individual preferences into five levels of mental self management that are forms, functions, scope, leanings and levels of mental self-government. These five level of mental self-government are further divided into thirteen thinking styles which are functions comprised of three styles which include executive, legislative and judicial styles of thinking; 2) forms comprised of four styles that are oligarchic, anarchic, monarchic and hierarchic styles; 3) levels comprised of local and global styles of thinking; 4) scope comprised of external and internal styles of thinking; and 5) leanings comprised of conservative and liberal styles of thinking (Sternberg, 2005). Individual govern and organize themselves in different forms according to the styles they possess. This paper is an attempt to study the different cognitive and behavioral dimension such as metacognition, cognitive styles, cognitive rigidity, leadership behavior and coping strategies with mental self-government.

**STATE OF ART**

Theory of MSG holds a view that different individuals possess different styles and abilities of completing a task to reach to the desirable goal. In the same way different government of the world are not fortuitous in nature and a reflection or mirror of different ways in which an individual govern and organize them. The thirteen thinking styles are the stylistic preferences of an individual to complete a goal. Styles of thinking are cleaved into five dimensions (Sternberg, 2001): forms, functions, scopes, levels, and leanings. Functions are divided into judicial, executive and legislative. Functions can be understood as (i) legislative—these individuals deals with their problems in a unique way and they handle every situation in a independent and novel manner; (ii) executive—these individuals pursue with the society norms and rule; (iii) judicial—these individuals have their ours norms, ideas, opinions and regulations for dealing with problems (Sternberg, 1997 & Lin, 1999). These three thinking styles often influence and are related to one another in a divergent way but also coexist depending on the individual situation. Forms of thinking that are classified into further subdivisions i) Monarchic—These individuals deals with the problem single mindedly and moves on to the next one without finishing the first
one; ii) Hierarchic – A hierarchic individual often set priorities for completing things before others; iii) Oligarchic – These individuals have an ability to focus on more than one task at the same time; iv) Anarchic individual – These individuals projects ways in which they often show their novel, original and flexibility in task they perform (Sternberg, 1997). Further styles of thinking are divided into levels i) these individuals thinking styles completes the task by keeping the details in mind example they are more interested in trees rather than forest. ii) Global individuals often complete his task by concentrating on abstruse and vague ideas example they are interested in the painting rather than the colors in it. Another dimension is scopes which are classified as i) Individuals with internal thinking styles complete his task by working independently. ii) Individuals with external styles of thinking often complete his task by participating in group interactions and taking help with others. Another classification is leaning which are subdivided as i) individual with liberal styles of thinking completes the task in a manner which doesn’t involve existing procedure and rules. These individuals are unique in completing the work ii) conservative styles of thinking often completes his task with the existing norms and procedure, and do not likes change in task they perform. (Sternberg, 1997).

Consanguinity between styles of thinking and intellectual styles

Styles of thinking and intellectual styles are kept on same construct by Sternberg. These styles and abilities of the individual vary with the situations. Thirteen thinking styles are reconceptualized into three intellectual styles which show a fraternity in empiric research and are extracted factually. (Zhang & Sternberg, 2006) that are type I intellectual styles, type II intellectual styles and type III intellectual styles. Individuals with Type 1 intellectual styles are creative & they have high of intellectual capacities, type 1 intellectual styles include judicial thinking style, legislative style and hierarchical style of thinking. Individual with Type 2 intellectual styles are defined as a tendency which favors the norms and they perform task using lesser levels of intellective possess which include executive thinking styles, local thinking styles, monarchic thinking styles and conservative thinking styles. Individual with Type 3 intellectual styles include the charactertics of both Type I intellectual styles and Type II intellectual styles group includes external styles, anarchic style internal and oligarchic thinking styles.
Fraternity of different variables with Mental Self Government

Cognitive and behavioral responses monitor one’s behavior by mobilizing, recruiting, coordinating and modulating individual’s responses. These responses also affect emotional and attentional responses as an attempt to cope with the threatening and stressful situations (Skinner & Zimmer 2007). This study is an attempt to study the consanguinity of different cognitive and behavioral dimensions that are metacognition, cognitive styles, cognitive rigidity, leadership behavior and coping strategies on individual’s mental self government by studying the impact on their styles. The study aims to link the variables in three aspects that are

- Internal world of the individuals
- To individual’s external world
- To experience of the individual.

Individual’s metacognition awareness and thinking styles seems an influential factor on thinking and learning which received scholars attention. An empirical study was conducted which explains the relationship predictive between the constructs thinking styles and metacognition indicating that, the legislative and judicial styles of thinking uses metacognitive strategies, thinking styles positively contributes to metacognitive strategies and creativity .(Braojos, 2013). Thinking styles and metacognitive awareness are studied and a significant positive relation between metacognitive awareness and conservative, monarchic and oligarchic styles of thinking. Two Scope (internal and external) level of mental self-government showed positive relation with knowledge component of metacognition. Conservative styles, executive styles and hierarchical styles of thinking significantly predict metacognition (Heidari & Bahrami, 2012). The thinking styles predict the metacognition and results depicts that the three thinking styles that are legislative, hierarchical and liberal styles and executive styles positively correlates with metacognition (Zhang, 2010). Cognitive styles are the manners people think, remember and perceive information and their unique way of processing information. The preferences of cognitive styles and intellectual style among university going students in divergent academic fields. Results depicts that there exist a difference among the students of management and engineering fields in their preferred cognitive styles and they differ in intellectual styles as
engineering students possess Type II styles, management students have Type I styles (Gozef, 2015). A research on cognitive styles and thinking styles is studied and results depict that internal style of thinking correlates with the dualism. Adding to the results, Type II thinking styles significantly correlated with dualism scale and Type I styles of thinking positively correlates with relativism scale. Monarchic and local styles of thinking from Type II styles and external and internal styles of thinking show positive significance with relativism styles (Zhang, 2002). Cognitive rigidity is one element in a challenging suite of traits and behavior. Cognitive rigidity with magical eight comprises of perfectionism, compulsion, perseverance, aggression, obsessions and anxiety, depression and suicidality (Complan, 2016). Rigidity is related to stress and insecurity in general life adjustment (Ainsworth, 1958). Cognitive rigidity can be studied by analyzing three aspects that are depression, anxiety and stress on mental self-government. The reason behind studying the relationship between the dimensions of cognitive rigidity (depression, anxiety and stress) and mental self-government have a conceptual framework and link that is both the constructs intellectual styles and cognitive rigidity contains a strong cognitive component. Perceived stress and thinking styles in combination predicts the belief and perceived stress positively correlates with the rational thinking styles, and stress playing the positive significance lowers the propensity of rational thinking (Lasikiewicz, 2015).

Mental health is an important influencer and Sternberg theory of MSG having thirteen styles of thinking was correlated and shows a positive relation with mental health index. Type I style having hierarchical style predicts that one of the dimension; depression is predicted negatively on general severity index and other styles such as internal, anarchic and judicial have positive correlation (Zhang, 2010). Creativity generating styles (Type I styles) and external style of thinking shows a negative relation with anxiety and conservative styles of thinking shows positive relation with anxiety (Zhang, 2009). The fraternity between intellectual styles and leadership behavior and results indicate that styles positively correlate with the leadership behavior. Dimensions of leadership behavior that are interpersonal relations and performance contribute positively with styles of mental self-government (James, 2016). Thinking styles and leadership behavior on the information technology professionals and reached to the conclusion that relationship between thinking style and leadership behavior is significant (Herbst & Maree, 2015). The leadership behavior style in mid-level managers has an internal thinking which positively predicts the value in the task oriented and people-oriented leadership behavior style.
Coping behavior is a response which can be cognitive and behavioral which is taken by an individual after a threatening and stressful situation. (Henson, 2011). Coping strategies and thinking styles when studied found out that hierarchical, local and legislative styles of thinking shows a positive relation with active coping style strategy while oligarchic styles of thinking was influenced by avoidance coping strategies. Behavioral coping style shows consanguinity with judicial and anarchic thinking styles. (Hassan, 2014). Thinking styles and coping strategies it is stated that monarchic, hierarchic and legislative thinking styles are potent predictors of approach coping strategies (Gezzel, 2012).

**METHODOLOGY**

To carry out the literature review a systematic literature review (SLR) approach is followed to study the different dimensions of cognitive and behavioral correlates on mental self-government. A deep and elaborated investigation of different variables is studied to see its consanguinity with mental self-government.

**Conclusion**

People use mental process named thinking through many mental and knowledge processes, such as attention, memory, reasoning, generalizing and classification. When people are doing a task, they prefer a thinking style and describe how individual uses the capacities that their own such as knowledge. In this study cognitive and behavioral correlates are analyzed in the development of MSG. Metacognition as a dimension of cognitive correlates has consanguinity with mental self-government and different metacognition skills use different thinking styles. Type II intellectual styles are related to knowledge-based metacognition and Type I related to regulation of cognition based (James, 2009). Cognitive styles are the different way of using the abilities and it shows a relation with thinking styles and intellectual styles (Sternberg, 2007). Cognitive rigidity is an umbrella term which covers depression, anxiety and stress. From the review of literature, this would be fair to say that different styles of thinking are prone to the above stated dimensions of the cognitive rigidity. Anxiety and thinking styles found out that creativity-generating styles that are Type I styles are negatively correlated (Zhang, 2009). Leadership behavior dimension of behavior correlates shows that different thinking styles shows significant relation with different dimensions that are emotional stabilizer, performance orientor and socially intelligent of
leadership behavior. Different thinking styles abut different emotions and it reinforces different leadership behavior (Hilly, 2013). Performance reckon on the leadership behavior (Velly, 2008). In this era when an individual is facing troubles with different issues coping strategies are the need of an hour. Legislative thinking styles shows relationship with behavior approach coping strategies (Roon, 2001). To epitomize different cognitive and behavior correlates which have different styles of thinking and individual differences are playing their role in understanding different career personalities in development of mental self government.
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