

## Examining How Mindset Affects University Students' Imagination

Asma Latif<sup>1</sup>, Laraib Fatima<sup>2</sup>, Ayesha Tahir<sup>3</sup>, Attiya Rashid<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> PhD Scholar, Department of Advanced Studies in Education IER, University of the Punjab,

<sup>2</sup> Lahore, Pakistan. <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-4899-7252>.

<sup>3</sup> M. Phil Scholar, Department of English, Lahore Garrison University, Lahore, Pakistan. <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-4587-6292>.

<sup>4</sup> PhD Scholar, Department of Advanced Studies in Education IER, University of the Punjab,

<sup>5</sup> Lahore, Pakistan. <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9471-5778>.

<sup>5</sup> M. Phil, Scholar, Department of Advanced Studies in Education IER, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan. <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-6456-992X>

**Corresponding Author:** Email: [asmalatif700@gmail.com](mailto:asmalatif700@gmail.com)

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.63163/jpehss.v3i3.548>

### Abstract

The goal of this research is to learn about the ways in which the mental processes and creative abilities of university students are influenced by their imaginations and mindsets. Mindset encompassing beliefs about intelligence to influence imaginative thinking. Positivism was the research paradigm in this study. The data was collected using a quantitative research method and utilized a causal-comparative research strategy. The 640 universities students were chosen for the study using a purposive selection method. Two sections of the modified instrument were used: the first with demographics, and the second had 49 items, 29 about mindset and had a reliability of.877; the second half had 20 items dealing with imagination and had a reliability of.876). Three specialists verified the accuracy of the instrument. Analyses of the data were conducted using descriptive and inferential statistics. The results showed that mentality had a moderately beneficial effect on creativity. This research was conducted through survey method and it's beyond the control of researcher. The findings indicated that there was a rather weak positive association between mindset and the imagination of the students. Implication: This will strengthen the learning approaches of students and expose them to various assignments with the aim of doing best and therefore their assessment and personal virtues will mature as a result of which their potential will be developed accordingly and as a result prefer a better career.

**Key words:** Examining, Mindset, Affects, Imagination, Mentality, Students.

### Introduction

In this chapter, we explore the beginning of the study in great depth. Get the attitude and imagination of the variable out of the way first. Second, we go over the connections between these variables. There are definitions of key terminology relevant to the study, as well as the study's aims, a statement of the problem, its significance, a null hypothesis based on demographics and factors, and certain restrictions and delimitations. According to Dweck and Leggett (1988), a person's mentality reveals their perceptions about their abilities, including whether they believe their aptitude in a specific area is permanent or malleable. It appears that self-determination and the growth mindset go hand in hand, since people with the former think that they can improve their skills via effort. A growth mindset, as described by Dweck's research

(Dweck et al., 1999), is characterised by a strong belief in one's ability to learn and improve, and by the idea that one can transform even their most fundamental level of intelligence. Conversely, people who have a fixed mindset may believe that they have little to no influence over the circumstances that are preventing them from progressing. For instance, they are more likely to agree with claims like "you can't really change the amount of intelligence you have established" and to reject challenging learning opportunities (Dweck & Yeager, 2019). A person's mindset consists of their long-standing patterns of thought, behaviour, and attitude that shape their worldview, actions, and reactions to life's challenges. It encompasses fundamental assumptions, biases, and points of view regarding one's own identity, other people, and the world at large. Consequently, these factors significantly affect a person's resilience, adaptability, goal-setting, and evaluation of their own achievement and well-being. The extraordinary power of the mind to conjure up mental representations and concepts that go beyond what is immediately apparent is what we mean when we talk about imagination. It is the source of all creativity, allowing people to imagine new worlds, develop new routes, and perceive new possibilities. Many fields rely on creative thinking, including the hard sciences, the arts, literature, and problem-solving. Authors and artists can utilise their imaginations to create original worlds, characters, and narratives. The creative potential of the group can be unlocked through the dynamic interaction of mindset and imagination. In spite of setbacks, the growth mentality promotes perseverance and intrinsic drive. When people use their imaginations, they are able to perceive more options and challenge conventional wisdom. All of these things work together to make the team more creative and better at finding long-term solutions. A person's creative potential is unlocked through the dynamic interaction of their brain processes, attitude, and imagination. Growth mentality promotes resilience and perseverance when faced with adversity, provides a variety of viewpoints and evaluation criteria, (Shaw & Houtz, 2005).

### **Research Objectives**

1. Determine the mentality of college students by analyzing demographic information such as major, gender, and institution.
2. Use demographic characteristics (university, gender, and department) to determine the degree of creativity among college students.
3. Find the impact of mentality on creative thinking among college students.

### **Hypotheses**

H<sub>01</sub>: The organizational design of the university does not make much of impact on the positive attitude strength of the students within the university.

H<sub>02</sub>: The positive attitude of the university students is also permanent and independent of the gender.

H<sub>03</sub>: The students in the university do not have a significant variance in the level of positive attitude in different departments.

H<sub>04</sub>: The attitude of the university students is negative across institutions.

H<sub>05</sub>: Gender does not bring any significant difference to the magnitude of negative mindset among the students in the university.

H<sub>06</sub>: The variation between the levels of negative mindset among students of the university across departments is also not significant.

H<sub>07</sub>: And as it concerns the university, which the student attended, the university students are not that much different as to the extent of their learning mindset.

- H<sub>08</sub>: Gender is not an influential factor, statistically significant to the level of the learning mindset to the university students.
- H<sub>09</sub>: There is a wide difference between the level of learning mindset among the students of the universities and it is departmentalized based.
- H<sub>10</sub>: Among the students, imagination will not vary much due to the university.
- H<sub>11</sub>: The level of imagination difference among the university students does not show any significant difference when their levels of imagination are being compared on basis of gender.
- H<sub>12</sub>: There is no huge imagination of varying varieties that are produced in a sub division of a department among university students.
- H<sub>13</sub>: The mindset only has little influences on imagination among the university students.

## **Literature Review**

Mindset of the individual which is comprised of his/her belief, attitude and perception towards the world and it is the view of the individual that makes him/her react what way towards various things in the world we live in, (Gollwitzer, 1980). When investigating the mindset, Carol Dweck states that individuals of fixed mindset tend to seek the validation of other people. Student of politics and even a teacher regards that there exists a notion of effortlessness that holds that we are supposed to do such an act to get what we want without thinking of what to leave with, or in other scenes, without leaving, (Dweck, 2016). Positive mentality can be termed as the aspect of the mind that makes the mind appreciate the positive things in life over the evil. It is possible to boost positive feelings of happiness by being positive, which is the means to finding good in the life through the use of gratitude, reappraisal, and savoring the life, (Quoidbach & Gross, 2015). Fixed mindset people take success as the credit that is given to this competence and not effort and input and their natural ability output is known as feedback, (Stacey & Brian, 2019). They are not ready to be at hard situations, easily give up and are purely result-oriented. The students who were less likely to believe that working hard is not the thing to make a person smarter or any better at something he or she is not good at yet (Dweck, 2016). Growth mindset is a concept that states that an individual can learn to be smarter (Bourke et al., 2019). Potential, to them, means hard work, addressing the challenge, getting through bad times, failure and learning and process and not result. Students on a development mindset turned out to be more ambitious in their learning targets compared to the fixed mindset learners since the latter researcher Blackwell conducted this study (Zhu et al., 2019).

## **Theory of Action of Gollwitzer Phase**

None of these factors is termed the individual's mindset, which encompasses his/her beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions of the world; instead, it is the individual's outlook that dictates how he/she reacts to the myriad elements in the world surrounding us, (Gollwitzer, 1980). Our attitude goes a very long way in deciding how we live and in facing our challenges. In her investigation of the mindset, Carol Dweck observes that people with a fixed mindset try to gain validation from others. At the initial stage of adversity, they likewise demonstrate weaker resilience and consequently can retreat more readily. In other words, it is dependent on the stance you assume, as this is grounded in how you view yourself and in the judgments you make about other people. The way you see things outlines how effectively you will confront the challenges you face at work and in life as a whole, owing to the attitude you embrace. In cases where you have to undertake a creative endeavor, it is highly productive for creativity to coexist with a fixed or expanding mindset. Dweck (2016) contends that, in politics, students as well as teachers

maintain a view that effortless execution entitles us to gain what we desire, merely overlooking what we may have to forsake in the bargain. The ability to conjure images/cognitions in the mind and to work out in the brain novel, appealing, or previously inexperienced things was so named by Aristotle (1970). Imagination has been defined as the formation of internally rewarding perceptions, emotions, and conceptions. These meeting may arise with startling new images, or instead be repeat encounters rewritten memories combined with imagined adjustments. Imagination is vital in linking experience with learning, for it transfers knowledge into the process of problem-solving. Formulating hypotheses is termed disciplined imagination. Another method of cultivating imagination is to hear narrative story-telling, for precise word choices conjure entire worlds within the imagination. On one hand, imagination is been regarded as a cognitive process, (Byrne, 2005). Effective imagination entails combining the knowledge and ideas present in the surrounding world into a new concept or thought. This imagination may be ignited or guided by the random recollections and musings bubbling up from your own past, most often the distant past. A reading assignment fires your creative imagination by supplying fresh ideas to mash up (there are still plenty more ideas to mine), which is precisely why you should read as much as humanly possible. Consequently, you ought to read as much as possible to enhance your ability to write even better. Examining already existing concepts is a vital stage in cultivating greater innovativeness (Bartlett, 1928).

### **Kant's Theory of Imagination**

Whilst philosophers construe imagination as a capacity confined to only the most restricted exercises for instance, make-believe or visualization Kant conceives of it as a wider faculty of the mind, whose contributions span the cognitive, artistic, and ethical dimensions of our life. Kant draws a categorical divide among the various kinds of creative movements, ranging from production and generation to, for example, activities of empirical and everlasting intuition (Sellars, 1978). Kant portrays it the imagination as the faculty that can present a representation even when intuition is lacking. After embracing this interpretation, Kant conceives imagination as a representational faculty and, more specifically, as the apparatus that configures both intuitive and conceptual portrayals of whatever lies beyond immediate perception. The phenomenon appears with the greatest frequency when we visualize a tangible object or even a portion of it that has been lost to our present possession. For example, I might conjure the Frank Stella painting I saw two months ago open it and see an unseen house, apprehended only from and through its front facade. Nevertheless, by examining this doctrine more closely, we will realize that, owing to their intellectual nature, concepts and ideas permit imagination to produce entities that have no actual existence. Kant maintains that imagination retains a pivotal role, threading itself through trivial objects the wand. Ultimately, Kant arrives at the postulate that our encounters with the cognitive, the beautiful, and the moral hinge on the interplay between sensibility and the non-sensible or analytical, whereby the imagination mediates the encounter and thereby produces a representation. Within Kantian thought, the productive or reproductive capacity of imagination is the power whereby the imagination functions as a sense even when no object is present. The first function serves to present an object or exhibition as it stands and thereby precedes experience, whereas the second represents the object in mimetic form and follows upon the experience, (Ginsborg, 1997). With respect to the figure above, first detail the impact that mindset has on imagination. Second, depict the categorical impact of mindset and imagination with respect to the demographic variable (E= effect).

### **Material and Methods**

Exploration Plan a causal-comparative design informed the research, with the aim of exploring how university students' mindsets interrelate to generate creativity. In this study, the researchers adopted a quantitative research method, adopted the positivist paradigm. Participants Punjab's

public and private university graduates formed the study's population. The accessible population comprised 644 graduates from Punjab's universities. Of the 88 universities in Punjab, the researcher selected a lone public (PU) and a single private (UMT) institution; 51 of these were public universities and 37 were air universities. The investigation utilized a multistage sampling approach. To differentiate between public and private universities, the investigator applied a purposive sampling approach. In the initial phase of the study, the investigator opted for a single public university PU and for a private institution UMT. Secondly, the participants were chosen among the students enrolled in business studies and social science programs. Third, data obtained comprised representatives of both male and female participants. With regard to measurements, Dosi and Rosati (2018) and Kazi and Khalid (2012) applied modified questionnaires to evaluate their respective sub-constructs. The questionnaire comprised two separate sections. The initial part requested participants to supply certain personal details, including their gender, department, and institution. Altogether, the second round of the survey contained 81 items, 29 concentrated on mind-related concepts and 20 on imagination. To gain an idea of the instrument's validity, we circulated it to three specialists for their feedback. Consequently, three specialists were scheduled to assess the recommended piece of equipment. The questionnaire underwent revision by eliminating redundant items to secure a general opinion from the professionals. Subsequent to the consultation, the tool was employed to gather the data. Depending Reliability (3.6) a group of forty undergraduate students served as pilot testers for the surveys. "To assess the instruments' internal consistency, Cronbach's alpha was applied. Ultimately, the instrument yielded a mercy Cronbach's alpha of .877, while its subscales showed sufficient reliability at .831 for positive mindset, .757 for negative mindset, and .842 for the learning mindset. With regard to the total dependability of the imagination scale, the value attained was .876. The data were collected from one private institution (UMT) and one public university (PU). A formal letter was taken down by the University of the Punjab's Institute of Education and Research. To begin with, authorisation was secured from the pertinent university department heads, and the pack was thereafter distributed to the students. Questionnaires intended for 640 students were mailed out by the social science and business studies departments of the two institutions. The research questions directed the selection of statistical tests among them t-tests, analysis of variance, and frequency analyses as applied to the collected dataset. The computed results stemmed from adopting suitable statistical approaches namely descriptive measures (mean and standard deviation) alongside regression analysis. Moral deliberation Consent was obtained from both the students and the department heads of all universities involved. Consideration of ethical considerations, including obtaining participants' informed consent and ensuring their privacy, remained constant throughout the study.

## Results and Discussion

**Table 1: Using an independent sample t-test, the researcher evaluated the extent of students' mindsets by university.**

	University	N	Mean	SD	Df	t	Sig.
Mindset							
Positive Mindset	PU	320	3.154	.630	638	1.005	.000
	UMT	320	3.124	.659			

Generally, there are 320 students in private schools, but also 320 students in the universities as observed in Table 1. The trend  $t = 1.005$  was significant at the  $p < 0.05$  level of significance with the average score being ( $M = 3.144$ ,  $SD = .659$ ) and ( $M = 3.154$ ,  $SD = .630$ ) in the private and the public university respectively. Student mean of a public university is larger than the one of a private university. In terms of results, it is observed that the optimistic attitudes of students are not uniform across schools and therefore the null hypothesis  $H_01$  could not be accepted.

**Table 2: Independent sample t-test between female and male for mean difference positive mindset of university students**

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	Sig.
Mindset							
Positive Mindset	Male	186	3.269	.554	638	3.95	.001
	Female	454	2.964	.558			

Table 2 reports that 186 male students averaged 3.269, with a standard deviation of .554, whereas 454 female students averaged 2.964, with a standard deviation of .558; the corresponding t-value is 3.95, with significance set at  $p < 0.05$ . The mean score for male students was higher than that observed for female pupils. In light of the presented evidence, hypothesis H02 is thus rejected.

**Table 3: One-way ANOVA to find positive mindset's level of university students on the basis of department**

	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	f	Sig.
Mindset						
Positive Mindset	Between groups	2.214	3	.738	1.782	.149
	Within groups	263.3	637	.414		
	Total	265.5	639			

Table 3 indicates that, at the  $p < 0.05$  significance level, neither between groups nor within groups according to department shows a statistically significant difference, with  $df = 3$  and an  $F(3, 637)$  of 1.782. In the last instance, the findings uphold the null hypothesis (H03).

**Table 4: Independent sample t-test on level of negative mindset of students on university basis**

	University	N	Mean	SD	Df	t	Sig.
Mindset							
N-Mindset	PU	320	3.182	.647	638	1.078	.167
	UMT	320	3.022	.561			

Table 4 indicates that the total population of students comprises 320 individuals from a public university and 320 from a private one". The average of the former was  $M = 3.144$  with  $SD = .647$  whereas the latter was  $M = 3.042$  with  $SD = .567$ . Having come to this conclusion one comes to the conclusion that the level of negative attitude thereof among the students is not significantly different and thus the null hypothesis H04 was rejected.

**Table 5: One-sample t-test between females and male population amongst the students at the university**

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	Sig.
Mindset							
Negative Mindset	M	86	3.252	.593	638	2.52	.356
	F	454	3.119	.611			

Females of 454 as shown on Table 4.5 were contrary to 186 males out of 640 people. The mean score of the male respondents was ( $M = 3.252$ ,  $SD = .593$ ) and the respondents of the female gender attained an average of ( $M = 3.119$ ,  $SD = .611$ ). As far as the gender is concerned, the t-

value obtained was 2.52, which proved not to be significant at the levels of  $p \leq 0.05$ . It is located on the basis of the data that the average score among male students is greater than in case with female students, and due to this fact, the null hypothesis H05 needs to be abandoned.

**Table 6: One-way ANOVA on departments**

	Source of Variance	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Mindset Negative Mindset	Between groups	5.622	3	1.86	5.170	.076
	Within groups	230.6	634	.363		
	Total	236.2	635			

As Table 6 shows, mean square estimates derived to the negative mindset among groups and within groups were ( $M = 5.622, 230.6$ ). The null hypothesis is based on  $df = 3$  and the F-value 5.170 with the degrees of freedom (3, 634) is only slightly significant where  $p = 0.061$ , thus no significant difference is detected. The data thus results into the conclusion that affiliation to departments has no weight to the negative mindset of students and consequently the null hypothesis H06 becomes acceptable.

**Table 7: Independent sample t-test on university comparison**

	University	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	Sig.
Mindset							
Learning Mindset	PU	320	3.312	.745	637	1.844	.038
	UMT	320	3.211	.622			

Table 7 reveals that the total number of students enrolling in the public university, which is at 320 students, is equal to the number of those going to the privately run counterpart. The mean score got a statistically significant difference ( $M = 3.312, 3.211$ ;  $t = 1.844$ ) when using the  $p = 0.05$ . Thus, the average of the public university is higher than the average of the private, which means unequal differences in the attitude towards learning in university students. Hence, hypothesis H07 should be rejected.

**Table 8: Independent sample t- test on genders in the university**

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	Df	T	Sig.
Mindset							
LM	Male	186	3.444	.711	638	3.39	.940
	Female	454	3.214	.677			

Table 8 reveals that the total number of students enrolling in the public university, which is at 320 students, is equal to the number of those going to the privately run counterpart. The mean score got a statistically significant difference ( $M = 3.324, 3.222$ ;  $t = 1.851$ ) when using the  $p = 0.05$ . Thus, the average of the public university is higher than the average of the private, which means unequal differences in the attitude towards learning in university students. Hence, hypothesis H07 should be rejected.

**Table 9: Independent sample t-test of the learning mindset of on genders in the university**

	Source of Variance	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Learning Mindset	Between groups	2.274	3	.758	1.583	.192
	Within groups	304.6	637	.479		
	Total	306.9	639			

Table 9 indicates that at the level of significance  $p < 0.05$ , results indicates that it is not a significant result since the adjusted value of the  $df = 3$  and the corresponding values of the mean squares of the within-group ( $M = 2.274$ ), between-group ( $F = 1.583$ ) support this assertion. It is seen that the level of growth mindset in college students was the same regardless of their major. With this evidence, we therefore accept hypothesis H09.

**Table 10: Conducting an independent sample t - test on imaginations of the students in different universities.**

University	N	M	SD	Df	T	Sig.
University of the Punjab	320	3.244	.656	638	3.304	.000
UMT		3.397	.632			

The information in table 10 reveals that PU and UMT in particular have 320 students per each institution. In case of the public university the mean was ( $M = 3.244$ ,  $SD = .656$ ) and in case of the private university the mean was ( $M = 3.397$ ,  $SD = .632$ ); the latter gave a t-value 3.304 and it was significant at  $p 0.05$ . In turn, it is possible to draw a conclusion regarding the differences between the groups in the level of students imagination. With the empirical evidence, hypothesis H10 is subsequently rejected.

**Table 11: Independent t-test samples between male and females in the sample of students in the university.**

Gender	N	M	SD	Df	T	Sig.
Male	186	3.444	.588	638	3.612	.203
Female	454	3.256	.602			

As shown in Table 11, the list of male participants who participated was 186, as opposed to 454 female participants. The t-value (3.612) calculated with a means of 3.444 ( $SD = .588$ ) of men and 3.256 ( $SD = .602$ ) of women was not significant at 0.05 level. In that way, it is concluded that the level of creativity of the university students varies according to gender. The mean score occupied by the male students surpassed that of the female students at an average. Considering these results hypothesis H11 is thus accepted.

**Table 12: An ANOVA test on price-elasticity amplitudes among the university students in different areas of studies.**

Source of variance	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	1.070	3	.354	.970	.404
Within groups	233.133	633	.366		



Total 234.203 634

According to table 12, the between-groups and within-groups values of the mean square combine to  $M=.35$  and  $M=.366$  respectively. Under the significance level of 0.05 the dispersion between the level of imagination in students of the different departments of the university was considered non-significant ( $df = 3$ ;  $F(3, 633) = 0.970$ ). Being aware of this, we agree with H12.

**Table 13: A regression analysis on mindset of the students influences their degree of imagination.**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.569	.324	.323	.49811

a. Predictors: (Constant), mindset

$F = 305.969$  and  $Sig. = .000$

Regression Coefficient

Model	Non standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Std. Error	B	T	
1 (Constant)	1.212	.119		10.345	.000
Mindset	.654	.033	.555	17.449	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Imagination

Table 13 demonstrates that the mindset is related to the imaginative abilities of university students ( $\beta = .555$ ,  $t(639) = 17.449$ ,  $p = .000$ ). These results indicate that the increase of the mindset by a unit is associated with a somewhat (.569) point escalation of imagination of the university students. Based on this, regression model that gave result of  $F = 305.966$ ,  $p = .000$ , and  $R^2 = .312$  implies that mindset explains 30 percent of the variance of the dependent variable imagination. The positive coefficient of beta value indicates that rise in mindset has substantial influence. Based on this, the hypothesis H13 was proved to be statistically significant.

## Discussions

The evidence reveals that the participants exhibited heightened levels of mindset and imagination, as their mean scores fell above the expected benchmark. These results align with previous research underscoring the pivotal role of these constructs within academic settings. Additionally, the regression analysis demonstrated a significant yet moderate effect of students' mindset on their imaginative capacities. Mindset accounted for 32% of the variance observed in the imagination. As Kant maintained, the present investigation likewise contends that imagination plays a pivotal role in closing the gap between sensory perception and intellectual concepts (Ginsborg, 1997). Students with a growth mindset are more likely to tap into imaginative modes that integrate prior knowledge with new insights to generate innovative representations and solutions. The present analysis indicated that university students displaying a growth mindset exhibit mild enhancement in their imaginative capabilities. The present findings echo those reported by Keller and McGill (2000), in which both a moderate mindset and a correspondingly moderate degree of imagination were observed. Students exhibit an apt tendency to adapt to novel settings and pursue fresh discoveries. When presented with any situation, be it inside or outside the classroom, they remain prepared and view the challenge as a chance for learning. The research proved that the mental orientation of university students is merely associated with their creative levels in a moderate way. The results therefore reaffirmed the previous finding conducted by Petrova and Cialdini (2005) that stated that mental disposition has minimal influence on imagination. In a bid to shed light behind this discovery, it could be contended that a daring learning attitude is achieved when learners impede out of their zones of

comfort, forge destiny by exploiting the potentials of students, fostering curiosity, sharp-eyed attention, coherent expression, collaborative discipline. As regards the sub indicators of the mindset, given variables were found influential co-prognoses of imagination. The attitude not only included the good but also the bad and the ability to have the learning power through the errors which had a great effect on imagination. Combined, the study results emphasize the values of developing an open-minded and non-judgmental attitude combined with the ability to reflect on failures and shortcomings (Blackwell et al., 2007; Dweck, 2016).

### Conclusion

The findings of this practice reiterate the need to instill a mindset that would stimulate imaginative and innovative thinking, which is critical to personal development within the continuously changing social-economic environment and professional direction in the future. The findings implied that the students involved attained reasonably high levels of mindset and imagination with their scores averagely above the theorized baseline. The findings indicated that there was a rather weak positive association between mindset and the imagination of the students. Implication: This will strengthen the learning approaches of students and expose them to various assignments with the aim of doing best and therefore their assessment and personal virtues will mature as a result of which their potential will be developed accordingly and as a result prefer a better career. Also, the statistical analysis demonstrated that there is a weak positive reflection of mindset on the imagination level of students. Concerning the mindset, the positive beta coefficient implies that an increase of the levels of mindset would have serious impacts on the imagination of the students. This study also examined the effect of demographic factors affecting the mindset and level of imagination on students.

### Recommendations

1. Cultivate a growth mindset in students; administer targeted interventions and training sessions that highlight the malleability of intelligence, underscore the importance of effort and practice.
2. Cultivate a collaborative learning atmosphere wherein learners with diverse thinking styles would engage with one another, drawing on the rich gifts of cognitive diversity.
3. Cultivate and explore imagination and creativity; formulate and implement curricula and instructional activities that spark creativity and enliven expression so that students can venture into ideas that lie beyond established boundaries. Motivate students to take part in activities that cultivate mnemonic imagery, visualization, and the shaping of fresh ideas or solutions.
4. Promote students to examine and value their distinctive cognitive styles, while simultaneously cultivating supplementary ones to sharpen cognitive flexibility. Create a team instructional framework that allows learners whose cognitive styles differ to collaborate and value one another across all the range of cognitive styles.

### References

- Aristotle. (1936). *On the soul; Parvanaturalia; On breath* (W. S. Hett, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (*Loeb Classical Library No. 288*).
- Bartlett, F.C. (1928). Types of imagination. *British journal of psychology*, 18(2), 222-228.
- Blackwell, L. S., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Dweck, C. S. (2007). Implicit theories of intelligence predict achievement across an adolescent transition: A longitudinal study and an

- intervention. *Child Development*, 78(1), 246–263. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.00995.x>
- Blackwell, Lisa S.; Rodriguez, Sylvia; Guerra-Carrillo, Belén (2015), Goldstein, Sam; Princiotta, Dana; Naglieri, Jack A. (eds.), "Intelligence as a Malleable Construct".
- Byrne, R. M. J. (2005, p. 45)). The rational imagination: how people create alternatives to reality. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Dweck, C. S. (1999). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development* (pp. 1–9). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press..
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 256–273.
- Dweck, C. S., & Yeager, D. S. (2019). Mindsets: A view from two eras. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691618804166>
- Ginsborg, H. (1997). Kant on the representation of reason and the imagination. In G. Kukla (Ed.), *Imagination and Interpretation in Kant: The Hermeneutical Import of the Critique of judgment* (pp. 63-88).
- Gollwitzer, P. M. (1990). Action phases and mind-sets. In E. T. Higgins & R. M. Sorrentino (Eds.), *The Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: Foundations of Social Behavior* (Vol. 2, pp. 52–92). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Gollwitzer, P. M. (2012). Mindset theory of action phases. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 526–545).
- Gollwitzer, P. M. (1987). *Motivational vs. volitionale Bewußtseinslage (Motivational vs. volitional mindset)* (Habilitationsschrift, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, pp. 1–3).
- Hussein, Hinda (2018). "Examining the Effects of Reflective Journals on Students' Growth Mindset: A Case Study of Tertiary Level EFL Students in the United Arab Emirates". *IAFOR Journal of Education*. 6 (2): 33–50.
- Kant, I. (1781/1787). *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translation of N. K. Smith (2nd edn. 1933). London: Macmillan.
- Keller, P., A., & McGill, A., L. (1994). Differences in the relative influence of product attributes under alternative processing conditions: attribute importance versus attribute ease of imaginability. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 3(1), 29-49.

- Keown, Stacey R.; Bourke, Brian (2019). "A Qualitative Investigation of Fixed Versus Growth Mindsets of Third and Fourth Grade students" *Education*. 140 (2): 51–59.
- Keren, Gideon (2007), "Framing, Intentions, and Trust-Choice Incompatibility," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 103 (2), 238–55.
- Sellars, W. (1978). The role of imagination in Kant's theory of experience. In *Categories: A Colloquium*. Ed. H. W. Johnstone. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Zhu, P., Garcia, I., & Alonzo, E. (2019). An independent evaluation of growth mindset intervention. MDRC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED594493.pdf>.