Jordan Journal of Applied Science - Humanities Series
Applied Science Private University
2023, Vol 34(1)
e-ISSN: 2708-9126
Research Article

Interpersonal goals and their relationships to relational interdependent self-construal and communal orientation among volunteer community service students

Mariam Al-Ziadat [1*], Ahmad Al-Shraifin [2].

[1]The University of Jordan, Amman.
[2]Yarmouk University, Irbid. Jordan.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 10 May 2021
Accepted 11 July 2021
Published 01 Jan 2023

*Corresponding author:
The University of Jordan, Amman Jordan.
Email: mariamalziadat_76@yahoo.com.

Abstract

This study aims at investigating the relationship between interpersonal goals, relational interdependent self- construal and communal orientation among volunteer community service students at the University of Jordan. Participants are 320 volunteer community service students; 83.1%females and 16.9% males. The age ranged between (18-24) years. Participants are asked to fill out online self-report measures of interpersonal goals, relational interdependent self-construal and communal orientation. The results show that there is a statistically significant difference in communal orientation attributed to the interaction among compassionate goals, gender and college sections in favor of males in scientific colleges. The results also show that there is no statistically significant difference in relational interdependent self-construal attributed to the interaction among compassionate goals, gender and college sections. Finally, the results revealed high level of interpersonal goals, communal orientation and moderate level of relational interdependent self-construal.

Keywords: Interpersonal goals, relational interdependent self- construal, communal orientation, volunteer community service students.

1. Introduction

University students are in a developmental stage called “emerging adulthood” that ranges in the ages between (18-25) years (Arnett, 2000). This stage is crucial to search and discover meaning in life also to develop coping models. Therefore, university students are in need to find meaning to their existence in the new environment- campus- by establishing suitable social links and participating in initiations and activities which may enable them to achieve their identity (Shin, Steger & Henry, 2016).

Self-determination Theory (STD), a theory of human psychological needs and motivation, suggests that humans are initiative and active in nature. Also, also he/she is prone to growth and has control on internal and external forces. Nevertheless, that active growth doesn’t work automatically; it needs secure and supportive conditions from social environment (Demir & Ozdemir, 2010).

STD proposes three global psychological innate needs that must be satisfied in order to achieve safe healthy growth and psychological well-being; the first is competence which involves controlling the environment. The second is dependency which involves personal control over his/her actions. Finally, relatedness need that involves sense of belonging, communicating, enhancing close relationships and developing secure attachment relationships (Demir & Ozdemir, 2010; Downie, Mageau & Koestner, 2008). When those needs are fulfilled social behavior, happiness and ethical commitment may be achieved (Damon, Menon & Bronk, 2003).

STD further proposes that people have a tendency to integrate the self into a coherent, unified entity to the extent, i.e. the university campus (Hadden, Overup & Knee, 2014). This notion has been assured by positive psychology which considers humans as self- oriented systems to development and integration. They are not merely a result of social learning but they are directed towards healthy growth and involvement in internal and external environment (Deci & Vansteenkiste, 2004).

Hellman, Hoppes & Ellison (2006) conducted a study to examine the volunteering community service factors among university students (N = 403). The results showed that sense of community connectedness and helping people in need are the factors influencing community volunteering.

Interpersonal goals reflect various motivational points of view regarding the relationship between the self and others. And this well documented in SDT; when individual try to achieve his goal, he tries to fulfill one of his basic needs. There are two common types of these goals: Compassionate goals which reflect ecosystem and self- image goals that reflect egosystem. Whereas self- image goals' individuals insist on being adequate, in control and satisfying their needs even at the expense of others (Kuncewicz and Crocker, 2015) Compassionate goals' individuals regard themselves as part of the whole interpersonal system and they consider their well- being as a result of others well- being so that they focus on supporting others and doing favor without waiting anything to themselves in return (Kuncewicz and Crocker, 2015; Jiang., Canevello., Gore., Hahn & Crocker, 2017; Niiya and Crocker, 2019).

Interpersonal goals, particularly compassionate ones, are associated with responsiveness (understanding and giving care to others) (Jiang et al., 2017) and relatedness as a psychological need which can be satisfied by compassionate goals (Hadden and Knee, 2015). Feeling safe in relationship and realizing that others will give support to the needy are considered as a core factor in good relationships that promote prosocial behavior. This leads to acting in a satisfying way to feel more secure in the relationship (Canevello and Crocker, 2011).

Furthermore, three studies on three cultures (U.S, (n=130) Japan (n = 230), Poland (n = 246)) conducted on university students revealed that compassionate goals predict an increase in social support as well as motivation to develop and decrease anxiety and depression. Yet, self-image goals weaken the quality of relationships and mental health. Also, they predict loneness and conflict; similarly, they decrease social support and increase anxiety and depression (Kuncewicz and Crocker, 2015). In other words, the two types of interpersonal goals are experienced differently and have various and distinct consequences on the relationships and community (Park, et al., 2010).

On the other hand, compassionate goals are associated with relational interdependent self-construal (RISC) in which persons define themselves in relation to their community memberships and to the extent of their social roles (Jiang, et al., 2017).

Relational interdependent self-construal (RISC); Self- construal (SC) was first used by Markus and Kitayama (1991) to illustrate how Americans and Japanese have a sense of themselves. SC is defined as "how individual sees the self in relation to others" (P143). SC has many types; one of them is (RISC) (Cross, Hardin & Gercek-Swing, 2011, p. 143).

Personality theories (e.g. Alport) suggested that self-construal and consistency has the greatest role in maintaining the integrity of self. At the same line, Festinger views consistency as a basic motive that has the power to trigger behavior. Moreover, we can say that consistency is regarded as fundamental motive and that differs across culture e.g. collective cultures such as Jordan may view the person as embedded in their social community and at the same time those persons define their role in accordance to their position. His aspect of the self which called small self that should be elaborated to greater self (cross, Gore & Morris, 2003).

Cross, et al. (2011) suggested that RISC affects how people behave, feel, and think. In other words, the ones who have RISC define themselves in terms of their roles in social relationships and social memberships. They tend to act in ways that enhance intimacy and harmony in their relationships which in return increase satisfaction (Chen and Welland, 2002; Jiang, et al., 2017; Terzino and Cross, 2009).

RISC is positively associated with responsiveness. Hence, RISC individuals insist on the needs, feelings and thoughts of others. Similarly, RISC is associated with communal orientation (Bresnahan., Chiu and Levine, 2004; change, 2015).

Communal orientation is associated with interpersonal goals, particularly compassionate ones, as both are concerned with reciprocal responsiveness (Park, et al., 2010). Communal orientation and interpersonal goals further create safety environment for them as well as for others who can rely on them and trust them (Crocker & Canevello, 2008).

In attachment theory it's proposed that people in their early age try to attach with their parents to fulfill their basic safety needs and this will affect their goals and personality latter. In another word, there's a relationship between secure attachment and compassionate goals (Park, et al., 2010).

Clark and Mills defined communal orientation as "an outlook de-emphasizing self and focusing on the needs of others while exchange orientation is based on the expectation that there will be repayment for favors given" (Bresnahan, Chiu & Levine, 2004).

Receiving care is important to self, and giving care to others can be a reward for the person who gives care (Le, et al., 2012). People with communal orientation like to give and receive benefits not in a reciprocal way but in responsiveness to other's needs. They don't expect or wait benefits in return and they are more likely to keep track of others' needs (Truchot and Deregard, 2001).

It was suggested that there are many reasons underlining engaging in communal activities such as Altruism; being responsive to others needs without concerning about the self-benefits. The other reason which is less obvious is the ego system in that persons intend to response to others needs in order to meet their needs in society relationships (Park, Troisi & Maner, 2010).

1.1 Interpersonal goals, RISC and Communal orientation

Research regarding the relationship between interpersonal goals, RISC and communal orientation find that compassionate goals are associated with RISC (Niiya and Crocker, 2019)

because both of them embed responsiveness (Cross, et al., 2003). For their parts, Jiang et al. (2017) conducted four studies to examine the relationship between interpersonal goals and RISC on different samples. These studies highlighted the positive relationship between compassionate goals and RISC. Also, Canevello and Crocker (2015) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between interpersonal goals and RISC. The results emphasized the positive relationship between them. Concerning this point, Kuncewicz, Niiya & Crocker (2015) test this relationship in Japan, Poland and America. The results showed that RISC correlates with two types of interpersonal goals only in Japan. Also, it is suggested that the two types of interpersonal goals have the same function across cultures.

Moreover, Park., Troisi and Maner (2010) conducted two studies to examine the relationship between communal orientation and compassionate goals among 300 undergraduate students. These studies confirm that compassionate goals predict communal orientation and that whereby altruistic concerns predict more relatedness, empathy and less hostility, anger egoistic concerns predict more self-oriented goals. Also, Crocker & Canevello (2012) examined this relationship among university students. They find that when people contribute to others well-being, they get benefit to themselves in return; also, this can last for long time in contrast to self-image goals. Moreover, Crocker and Canevello (2008) conducted two studies to find whether interpersonal goals predict social support over time. Participants included 199 freshman students and 65 roommate pairs. The results showed that while compassionate goals predict increased social support and closeness self- image goals predict conflict and less social support.

Furthermore, Bresnahan, Chiu and Levine, (2004) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between RISC and communal orientation among 357 participants (178 Taiwanese and 179 Americans). The results indicated that American participants scored higher on different scales except RISC. In addition, woman had higher degrees on relational interdependent self- construal and communal orientation. The results further show that there is a relationship between relational interdependent self- construal and communal orientation.

Similarly, O'Connor & Keil (2017) conducted a study on (133) university students. The results showed that participants who reported high degrees on environmental concern were more committed to organization's initiations and this relation is moderated by higher level of construal as well as the use of small wins' strategy.

The current study in comparison with previous ones is characterized by its sample type and size; 320 volunteer community service students at the University of Jordan from different schools. Also, it differs in investigation all study's variable together among volunteer community service students at the University of Jordan which is rarely found and investigated together particularly with Arabian and Jordanian context. Furthermore, it modified three scaled among Jordanian context.

2. Statement problem

University students are in a developmental stage called "emerging adulthood" (Arnett, 2000). This stage is crucial for them to satisfying their psychological needs (e.g. relatedness, etc.) (Demir & Ozdemir, 2010) and to find life meaning in the new environment- campus- by establishing suitable social links and participating in initiations and activities which may enable them to achieve their identity (Shin, Steger & Henry, 2016).

Literature review revealed that people have a tendency to integrate the self into a coherent, unified entity (Relational interdependent self- construal), i.e. the university campus (Hadden, Overup & Knee, 2014). And this can be achieved through engaging in voluntary work (communal orientation). Hellman, Hoppes & Ellison (2006) conducted a study to examine the volunteering community service factors among university students (N = 403). The results showed that sense of community connectedness and helping people in need are the factors influencing community volunteering. Similarly, RISC is associated with communal orientation (Bresnahan., Chiu and Levine, 2004; change, 2015).

Previous studies showed that communal orientation is associated with interpersonal goals, particularly compassionate ones, as both are concerned with reciprocal responsiveness (Park, et al., 2010). Communal orientation and interpersonal goals further create safety environment for them as well as for others who can rely on them and trust them (Crocker & Canevello, 2008).

Research regarding the relationship between interpersonal goals, RISC and communal orientation find that compassionate goals are associated with RISC (Niiya and Crocker, 2019) because both of them embed responsiveness (Cross, et al., 2003).

Thus, the main question of this research is: what are the relationships between interpersonal goals and relational interdependent self- construal and communal orientation among volunteer community service students?

3. Aims and Questions of the study

The current study aims at examining the relationship between interpersonal goals and RISC and communal orientation among volunteer community service students at the University of Jordan. The study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are the levels of Interpersonal goals (Compassionate goals, Self-image goals), relational interdependent self- construal and communal orientation among volunteer community service students?
2. Is there a difference in relational interdependent self- construal and communal orientation attributed to the types of interpersonal goals (Compassionate goals, Self-image goals) among volunteer community service students?
3. Is there a difference in relational interdependent self- construal and communal orientation attributed to interpersonal goals and gender(male/female), college types (humanistic, scientific, and medical) among volunteer community service students and the interaction among them?

4. The importance of the current study

The importance of the current study stems from two dimensions: theoretical and practical. It aims at examining the relationship between interpersonal goals and RISC and communal orientation among volunteer community service students at the University of Jordan. The importance of this study comes in view of the scarcity of research that dealt with interpersonal goals and RISC and communal orientation among volunteer community service students. Which in turn contributes to understanding human behavior in a precise scientific framework, and examining the most important factors that contribute to Voluntary work among a sample of volunteer community service students, and thus providing a scientific material that contains psychological and scientific information that can enrich the Jordanian and Arabic library in this

area. As for the practical dimension; the application of this study will provide a scientific addition about the relationship between the variables of the study, as the results of this study will help us to provide data about the relationships between interpersonal goals and RISC and communal orientation in campus life. Furthermore, this study added three new adaptive scales within Jordanian context.

5. Research terms

Self- image goals' individuals insist on being adequate, in control and satisfying their needs even at the expense of others (Kuncewicz and Crocker, 2015).

Compassionate goals' individuals regard themselves as part of the whole interpersonal system and they consider their well- being as a result of others well- being (Niiya and Crocker, 2019).

Relational Self-Construal is defined as "how individual sees the self in relation to others" (P143). (Cross, Hardin & Gercek-Swing, 2011).

Clark and Mills defined communal orientation as "an outlook de-emphasizing self and focusing on the needs of others while exchange orientation is based on the expectation that there will be repayment for favors given" (Bresnahan, Chiu & Levine, 2004).

6. Limitations:

6.1 The limits of the study

1. Spatial boundaries: determine the spatial framework of research in The University of Jordan University.

2. Time limits: The time limits were related to the research period from from February 2020 until October/ 20203.

Human limits: This study and its results are determined by the sample of the study on which the tools of the study were applied, and they are a sample chosen by random cluster method from volunteer community service students at the University of Jordan.

7. Methods

This study followed the correlational study approach.

7.1 Participants

Participants were randomly chosen during the course of this study over the period from February /2020 until October/ 2020. The sample comprised of 320 volunteer community service students at the University of Jordan; 83.1% of them were female and 16.9% were males. Their ages ranged between (18-24) years, 70% were from humanistic colleges, 20% from scientific colleges and 9.4% were from medical college Table (1). Participants were chosen in the procedure of available sample. The study tools were distributed through an electronic link that was designed by Google format, to the students' e-mail, after obtaining a moral approval from The University of Jordan. All participants participated voluntarily and completed the three online measures.

Table (1): Demographic characteristics.

Categories		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Female	266	83.1
	Male	54	16.9
	Total	320	100.0
Major	humanistic	224	70.0
	Medical	30	9.4
	Scientific	66	20.6
	Total	320	100.0

7.2 Tools

Participants were asked to complete the three self-report measures. All measures were translated and customized to Jordanian environment and their psychometric characteristics were investigated for Jordanian versions.

- **Interpersonal goals**

Interpersonal goals were measured using the compassionate and self-image goals scale. It is widely used and has adequate psychometric characteristic in its original version; it consists of 13 items and involves two sub-measures encompass: compassionate goals and self-image goals. Each item is rated on the 5-point Likert scale ranging from not at all to extremely (Crocker & Canevello, 2008).

For the purpose of this study; compassionate and self-image goals scale was translated into Arabic; then it was back –translated into its original language to ensure compatibility. Then, the scale was adjusted to suit the Jordanian environment. Psychometric characteristics of the Jordanian version were investigated as follows: 10 reviewers specialized in counseling, psychometric and psychiatry provided their notes and recommendations on the Jordanian version in terms of items suitability. This version consisted of 13 items assessing interpersonal goals on two sub-measures: compassionate goals and self-image goals. Items were rated using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from ‘always’ ”5” to ‘never’ ”1”. Items discrimination validity for the Jordanian version of interpersonal goals sub-measures were calculated; items’ values range between (.438-.556) for compassionate goals sub- measures and (.337-.608) for self-image goals sub-measures. This indicates adequate items discrimination validity. In addition, Cronbach’s alpha coefficient was (∝=709). For compassionate goals sub- measures (∝=.637) and for self-image goals sub-measure (∝=567). These values are statistically significant indicating that interpersonal goals scale has adequate psychometric characteristics.

- **Relational-interdependent self-construal**

Relational-interdependent self-construal (RISC) was measured using personal attitude scale. It consisted of a number of statements considering various attitudes and feelings that had adequate psychometric characteristics; (α=.86). The original version of the scale concluded 11 statements (2 negative and 9 positive) (e.g., If a person hurts someone close to me, I feel hurt as well). The responses were rated on a 7- point Likert scale (Cross, Bacon &Morris, 2000).

For the purpose of the current study; (RISC) was translated into Arabic language after receiving permission from the scale’s correspondent developer. Then, it was back–translated into its original language to ensure consistency. The scale was then modified to be more appropriate to the Jordanian environment and psychometric characteristics were derived for the scale. 10

reviewers specialized in counseling, psychometric and psychiatry provided their notes and recommendations on the Jordanian version considering items suitability. The Jordanian version consisted of 11 items (2 negative and 9 positive). The respondent had to rate how likely he/she would agree or disagree with each statement on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1"Never" to 5 "Almost Always". Items Distinction semantics validity for the Jordanian version of the scale were calculated; items values range between (0.222- 0.732) which indicated an adequate items discrimination validity and Cronbach's coefficient alpha was (∝=768). These values are statistically significant. Hence, (RISC) has adequate psychometric characteristics.

❖ **Communal orientation**

Communal orientation was measured using communal orientation scale (COS). It has adequate psychometric characteristics; (α=.68). The original version of the scale involved 14 statements (7 negative and 7 positive) (e.g., I often go out of my way to help another person). The responses were rated on a 7- point Likert scale (Clarck, Ouellette, Powell &Milberg, 1987).

For the purpose of the current study; COS was translated into Arabic and then it was back–translated into its original language to ensure consistency. The scale was then modified to be more appropriate to the Jordanian environment and psychometric characteristics were derived for the scale. 10 reviewers specialized in counseling, psychometric and psychiatry provided their notes and recommendations on the Jordanian version considering items suitability. Finally, the Jordanian version consisted of 14 items (7 negative and 7 positive). The respondent has to rate how likely he/she would agree or disagree with each statement on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1"Never" to 5 "Almost Always". Items Distinction semantics validity for the Jordanian version of the scale were calculated; items values range between (295. - .607) which indicated an adequate items discrimination validity. In addition, Cronbach's coefficient alpha was (∝=698). These values are statistically significant. Hence, COS have adequate psychometric characteristics.

❖ **Statistical analysis**

Descriptive statistic measures: means and standard deviations were calculated to determine the types of interpersonal goals, also the levels of Relational-interdependent self-construal and communal orientation. Then t test was calculated to examine the difference in relational interdependent self- construal and communal orientation related to the types of interpersonal goals. Finally, the analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to examine the difference in relational interdependent self- construal and communal orientation related to the interaction between interpersonal goals and gender (male/female) and college types (humanistic, scientific and medical). Significant level was set to (α = 0.05).

8. Results

❖ **Results of the first question**

What are the levels of Interpersonal goals (Compassionate goals, Self-image goals) relational interdependent self- construal and communal orientation among volunteer community service students?

To answer this question, the means and standard deviation were used. The results show that there are a high level of compassionate goals and self-image goals in favor of compassionate goals, moderate level of relational interdependent self-construal and high level of communal orientation. Means and standard deviations are calculated to determine the levels of the study

variables as follows: (M = 4.23, SD= .480) for compassionate goals, (M = 3.82, SD= .562) for self-image goals, (M = 3.65, SD= .572) for relational interdependent self-construal, and (M= 3.92, SD=.448) for communal orientation.

❖ **Results of the second question**

Is there a difference in relational interdependent self- construal and communal orientation attributed to the types of interpersonal goals (Compassionate goals, Self-image goals) among volunteer community service students?

To answer this question, the means and standard deviation and T test were used. the results indicated that there are statistically significant differences in communal orientation attributed to interpersonal goals in favor of compassionate goals and the results are equal to (3.054) as shown in Table (2) below.

Table (2): The results of t test for independent samples for relational interdependent self-construal and communal orientation attributed to interpersonal goals

variables		Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Relational interdependent self-construal	Compassionate goals	3.6441	.57239	.100	306	.921
	Self-image goals	3.6364	.58280			
Communal orientation	Compassionate goals	3.9652	.43343	3.054	306	.002
	Self-image goals	3.7837	.46662			

❖ **Results of the third question**

Is there a difference in relational interdependent self- construal and communal orientation attributed to interpersonal goals and gender (male/female), college types (humanistic, scientific, and medical) among volunteer community service students and the interaction among them?

To answer this question, MANOVA was used to reveal the differences among the study variables. The results indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in relational interdependent self-construal attributed to the interactions between types of interpersonal goals, gender and college types. Yet there is a statistically significant difference in communal orientation attributed to the interaction between compassionate goals, gender and college types in favor of males in scientific colleges as can be noted in Table (3) below.

Table (3): The results of MANOVA test

Variable		Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
College	Relational interdependent self-construal	.151	2	.075	.230	.795
	Communal orientation	.402	2	.201	1.042	.354
Gender	Relational interdependent self-construal	.314	1	.314	.960	.328
	Communal orientation	.013	1	.013	.067	.797

Interpersonal goals	Relational interdependent self-construal	.320	1	.320	.977	.324
	Communal orientation	1.235	1	1.235	6.401	.012
College* gender	Relational interdependent self-construal	1.764	2	.882	2.695	.069
	Communal orientation	1.439	2	.720	3.731	.025
Gender* Interpersonal goals	Relational interdependent self-construal	.025	1	.025	.077	.782
	Communal orientation	.073	1	.073	.381	.538
*college Interpersonal goals	Relational interdependent self-construal	1.057	2	.529	1.615	.201
	Communal orientation	.327	2	.164	.848	.429
College* gender* Interpersonal goals	Relational interdependent self-construal	.025	2	.013	.039	.962
	Communal orientation	.116	2	.058	.302	.740
Error	Relational interdependent self-construal	96.878	296	.327		
	Communal orientation	57.098	296	.193		
Corrected Total	Relational interdependent self-construal	101.113	307			
	Communal orientation	61.423	307			

8.1 Discussion

The results indicated the existence of high levels of interpersonal goals (compassionate and self-image goals) in favor of compassionate goals among the volunteer community service students at the University of Jordan. The results are considered logical because people have the two types of interpersonal goals (Canevello and Crocker, 2015; Ferrari, et al., 2008). Interpersonal goals are the main mechanism through which students influence and are influenced in their social environments. Compassionate goals are manifested clearly within the community service students (Hellman, Hoppes & Ellison, 2006).

Particularly, participants of the current study are volunteer service students from various memberships and goals on campus, which reflect a genuine concern for others well-being. Focusing on compassionate goals involves supporting others, not to gain something for oneself, but to boost others well-being or prevent them from being harmed (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2010; Brown, Brown, & Penner, 2011).

Individuals with compassionate goals try to do things like supporting others, trying to be constructive in their comments, not harmful to anyone, and not ignorant to their relations with them (Canevello & Crocker, 2010; Crocker & Canevello, 2008). This indicates that people can simultaneously support others and control how others view them. Thus, the goals that people have

in their relations influence relationship processes and the quality of others' relations (Canevello & Crocker, 2010, 2011b).

It can also be explained that when individuals have compassionate goals, they are confident that their needs can be met in cooperation with others. They also explain their relationships in non-zero terms, so that what is good for one person can also be good for the other (Crocker et al., 2015). Individuals increasingly believe that relationship difficulties can bring people closer to each other and strengthen their relations (a belief in relationship growth) (Canevello & Crocker, 2011a). They also have confidence that others will be around in times of need, and become less anxious about their relationships. Moreover, when individuals have compassionate goals to support others, their feelings of self-esteem increase (Canevello & Crocker, 2011b), and they become less anxious and depressed (Canevello & Crocker, 2010).

Another way of discussing this finding is through Crocker (2011) two longitudinal studies which showed that compassionate goals focus on others well- being and positively affects self-esteem and relationship quality, and this is very obvious in the current study. Previous studies have reported that some people focus on how others perceive them and wonder whether or not they will be accepted. Moreover, they may pursue relationships in self-image goals to develop and identify their preferred image whereas others seek developing mutual caring relationships (Canevello and Crocker, 2015).

The results of the present study also showed that participants have high levels of communal orientation. This result is in line with the previous findings which find that community service students have personalities that reinforce social bonds, such as: expressing themselves emotionally, and behaving in cooperative ways (Le, et al., 2012, Chang, 2015; Hellman, Hoppes & Ellison 2006). They insist on meeting others needs and may try to please them (Bresnahan, Chiu &Levine, 2004).

The students' communal orientation is based on modifying the positive relationship between the climate of voluntary work and positive feelings, so that the communal orientation, as a kind of communal value, causes students to realize the appropriate value in the climate of voluntary work, and thus produce a positive impact. Communal orientation refers to individual orientation, i.e. a sense of responsibility towards society, so that students with communal orientation are tailored to assist the needy people and pay more attention to increasing social welfare, since feelings of worth to others are more valuable resources (Truchot, Keirsebilk, & Meyer, 2000).

This result can also be explained in that people with communal orientation show a kind of flexibility that protects them from potential negative consequences of providing sustainable care for others. Similarly, such people have the desire to help others can enhance interpersonal well-being. For example, caregiving for others has been shown to be associated with increased self-efficacy and self-esteem (Crocker, 2008; Piferi & Lawler, 2006).

Another way to explain this result is that people are viewed as social creatures interacting together in ways that ranged between superficiality to dependency and they use different strategies to fulfill their specific needs (Canevello and Crocker, 2015). Hence, social unity helps individuals to satisfy their psychological, social and physical needs. It is also composed of distinct processes; acceptance and establishing supportive reciprocal caring relationships (Niiya & Crocker, 2009).

Furthermore, our results showed that participants have moderate level of (RISC). Previous literature has revealed that people in a group culture – *Jordanian context is one of them*- define themselves by their roles in community. They are also defined by their community as people within the community context. Hence, uniqueness is less important and their self is transferred from the small self to the larger one (Cross, Gore, Morris, 2003; Jiang, et al., 2016).

According to Cross et al. (2000), individuals with highly RISC depend on mutual relationships. They tend to think and act in ways that strengthen these existing relations. Therefore, they tend to define themselves in terms of close relationships, since they will be more likely to help others.

Moreover, Markus and Kitayama (1991) suggested that people in a collective community define themselves as related to others. Cross, et al., (2011) insisted that people have both types of self- construal and then the culture determines which one is prominent in the person. Hence, Jordanian collective community insists on social relationships, supporting and helping others in need.

Cross et al. (2000) also indicated that individuals who had self-construal that depended on highly reciprocal relationships were more sympathetic, took the desires and needs of others into account, and were more likely to describe their important relationships as being closer than those with less self-construal.

The results of the current study are in line with le, et al. (2012) and Park et al., (2010) in that there are statistically significant differences in communal orientation attributed to interpersonal goals in favor of compassionate goals. This finding can be explained in light of compassionate goals and communal orientation in the sense that both of them are concerns for mutual response (Park et al., 2010).

People with highly compassionate goals create a safe environment for themselves and others, and thus others can rely on and trust them (Crocker & Canevello, 2008). Research on communal orientation has focused largely on the care that communal-oriented people provide to others, highlighting their selfless nature, and neglecting how they might test positive results on their own (Clark, 2011).

Moreover, these results indicate that in some respects the needs of people with communal orientations are met simply through providing care and compassion for others. More specifically, providing community care and positive interpersonal relationships to others help in maintaining community relationships, regardless of self-oriented communal motives for receiving care from others (Clark & Finkel, 2005).

This result can also be explained in that people with communal orientations feel responsible for the well-being of others. Similarly, such people have the desire to help others whenever they are in need for help (Clark et al., 1987). People with communal orientations endorse the rule that people should be cooperative, and they should respond to voluntarily without remuneration (Clark & Aragon 2013).

These results are consistent with (Park et al., 2010) in that there are statistically significant differences in communal orientation attributed to the interaction between gender and college in favor of males in scientific colleges.

This result can be explained in that females are more likely to involve in social volunteer service and responsed effectively to others in needs. This does not mean that males are less in doing so (Burton, Gore and Sturgeon, 2012). Males and females have the combination of both types (Chen & Welland, 2002).

The results of the current study also showed that there are no statistically significant differences in the RISC attributed to interactions between compassionate goals, gender, or college types. This result is at variance with with Armas, Gomez, Hernandez, Galindo & Asensio (2014).

Gender is assumed to be responsible for individual differences in RISC and compassionate goals. Besides, the level of sympathetic goals between genders is different; consequently, feeling close to others in the community may not explain the relationship between interpersonal goals and RISC.

This finding supports the hypothesis that people with compassionate goals tend to define themselves in terms of their close relationships.

This result can be interpreted in light of the students' RISC, which is positively related to the response by which they sympathize with the needs and feelings of others (Change, 2015).

9. Recommendations

Our study recommends conducting more studies regarding its variable among different samples. Also developing counseling or training programs s based on compassionate goals and RISC

Conflicts of interest statements

All authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

References

Armas, E, G., Gomez, J, D., Hernandez, H., Galindo, M, G & Asensio, A, B. (2014). **Relations between the Relational Self-Construal, the Choice of Goals and Psychological Need Satisfaction of University Students, Univ**. *Psychol.* 13 (4).

Arnett, J. J. (2000). **Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties**. *APA PsycArticles.*

Bresnahan, M. J., Chiu, H. C and Levine, T. R. (2004). **Self-construal as a predictor of communal and exchange orientation in Taiwan and the USA**. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 7, 187–203.

Burton, K. A., Gore, J. S. & Sturgeon, J. (2012). **The Role of Relational Self-construal in Reactions to Charity Advertisements**. *Self and Identity*, 11, 343–359.

Canevello, A and Crocker, J. (2011). **Interpersonal goals, others' regard for the self, and self-esteem: The paradoxical consequences of self-image and compassionate goals, European Journal of Social Psychology**. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 41, 422–434.

Canevello, Amy and Crocker, Jennifer. (2015). **How Self-Image and Compassionate Goals Shape Intrapsychic Experiences**. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 620–629.

Chang, C. (2015). **Self-construal and Facebook activities: Exploring differences in social interaction orientation**. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 53, 91–101

Chen, S & W, J. (2002). **Examining the Effects of Power as a Function of Self-Construals and Gender**. *Self and Identity*, 1, 251-269.

Clark, M., Ouellette, R., P, M., & Milberg, S. (1987). **Recipient' s mood, relationship type, and helping**. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 94–103.

Crocker, J. (2011). **The Paradoxical Consequences of Interpersonal Goals: Relationships, Distress, and the Self**. *Psychological Studies*, 56 (1),142-150.

Crocker, J., & Canevello, A. (2012**). Consequences of self-image and compassionate goals**. *In Advances in experimental social psychology,* 45229-277.

Crocker, J and Canevello, A. (2008). **Creating and Undermining Social Support in Communal Relationships: The Role of Compassionate and Self-Image Goals**. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(3), 555–575.

Cross, S. E. (2000). **The relational-interdependent self-construal and relationships**. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78(4), 791-80.

Cross, S. E, Gore, J. S., & Morris, M. L. (2003). **The Relational-Interdependent Self-Construal, Self-Concept Consistency, and Well-Being**. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 85 (5), 933–944.

Cross, S. E., Hardin, E. E., and Gercek- Swing, B. (2011). **The What, How, why, and Where of Self-Construal**. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 15(2) 142–179

Damon, W., Menon, J., & Bronk, K. C. (2003). **The Development of Purpose During Adolescence**. *Applied Developmental Science*, 7, 3, 119–128.

Deci, E & Vansteenkiste, M. (2004**). Self-Determination Theory and Basic Need Satisfaction: Understanding Human Development in Positive** Psychology. *Riccerche di Psicologia*, 1,27, 23 – 40.

Demir, M & Ozdemir, M (2010). **Friendship, Need Satisfaction and Happiness**. *Journal Happiness Stud,11*, 243–259.

Downie, M. Mageau, G, A., & Koestner, R. (2008). **What makes for a pleasant social interaction? Motivational Dynamics of Interpersonal Relations**. *The Journal of Social Psychology,* 148(5), 523-534.

Ferrari, J. R., Dobis, K., Eva I., Michna, D. M., Wagner, J, M., Sierawsk, S & Boyer, P. (2008). **Community Volunteerism Among College Students and Professional Psychologists**. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 18:1-2, 35-51, DOI: 10.1300/J005v18n01_04

Gore, J & Cross, S. (2011). **Conflicts of Interest: Relational Self-construal and Decision Making in Interpersonal Contexts**. *Self and Identity*, 10: 185–202.

Gore, J., Cross, S & Kanagawa, C. (2009). **Acting in our interests: Relational self-construal and goal motivation across cultures**. *Motiv Emot*, 33, 75–87.

Hadden, B, W. & Knee, C. R. (2015). **Who am I in it for? Interpersonal Goals and Secure Base Support**. *Self and Identity*, 14(6), 675–691.

Hadden, B, W., Overup, C, S., & Knee, C. R. (2014**). Removing the Ego: Need Fulfillment, Self-Image Goals, and Self-Presentation**. *Self and Identity*,13 (3), 274–293, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2013.815398.

Hellman, C, M., Hoppes, S & Ellison, G, C. (2006). **Factors Associated with College Student Intent to Engage in Community Service**. *The Journal of Psychology*, 140(1), 29–39.

Jiang, Tao., Canevello, Amy., Gore, Jonathan., Hahn, Jennifer & Crocker, Jennifer. (2017). **The association between compassionate goals and relational-interdependent self-construal**. *Self and Identity*, 16 (2), 143–170.

Kuncewicz, D., Niiya, Y and Crocker, J. (2015**). Are Compassionate and Self-Image Goals Comparable across Cultures?**. *Polish Psychological Bulletin* 46(4) 513–522.

Le, B, M., Impett, E, A., Kogan, A, W., Gregory, D and Cheng, Ce. (2012). **The personal and interpersonal rewards of communal orientation**. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 30(6) 694–710

Niiya, Y & Crocker, J. (2019**). Interdependent = Compassionate? Compassionate and Self-Image Goals and Their Relationships with Interdependence in the United States and Japan**. *Frontiers in Psychology*.

O'Connor, J & Keil, M. (2017). **The effects of construal level and small wins framing on an individual's commitment to an environmental initiative**. *Journal of Environmental Psychology,* 52, 1-10

Park, L. E., Troisi, J. D & Maner, J. K. (2010). **Egoistic versus altruistic concerns in communal relationships**. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 28(3), 315–335

Peker, M., Booth, R and Eke, A. (2018**). Relationships among self-construal, gender, social dominance orientation, and interpersonal distance**. *J Appl Soc Psychol*, 48,494–505.

Shin, J. Y., Steger, M, F and Henry, K, L. (2016). **Self-Concept Clarity's Role in Meaning in Life among American College Students: A latent Growth Approach**. *Self and Identity*, 1-18.

Terzino, K& Cross, S. (2009). **Predicting Commitment in New Relationships: Interactive Effects of Relational Self-construal and Power**. *Self and Identity*, 8, 321–341.

Truchot, D and Deregard, M. (2001**). Perceived inequity, communal orientation and burnout: The role of helping models**. *work & stress*, 15 (4), 347- 356.