

Decision Making Styles In Relation To Their Academic Achievement Among B.Ed.Students

S. RAJA¹ , Dr. K. VELLAICHAMY²

¹Research Scholar Department of Education Madurai Kamaraj University Madurai-625 021.

²Assistant Professor Department of Education Madurai Kamaraj University Madurai-625 021.

ABSTRACT

Teaching is a series of decisions we make to help students learn. Some decisions are made by the syllabus or school, but the majority are made by us, the teachers. We make a huge number of decisions every day, with some researchers reporting that teachers make 0.7 decisions per minute during interactive teaching (Borko et al, 1990). Another study showed that elementary school teachers had 200–300 exchanges with students every hour, most of them unplanned and requiring decision-making (Jackson,1990). Making good choices is not easy: psychological research has revealed that a number of biases often distort how we make decisions and place an emphasis on faster, more automatic aspects of our thinking rather than slower, more analytic approaches. These biases can be addressed, but first decision making itself needs to be viewed as a skill, one that can be learned through a sequence of guided steps much as driving a car or speaking a new language can be learned. Schools are supposed to teach children how to become thoughtful, engaged, and productive citizens, but the important skill of making good decisions is rarely part of classroom activities. A group of researchers and teachers is seeking to change that.

Keywords: Decision making and Academic Achievement

NEED FOR THE STUDY

It is sunlight clear that Scientific and Technological explosions are so rapid, failing even the individuals, who have been working in advanced research centers, however capable they are, in coping with the nascent discoveries, inventions, and innovations. It is a sad truism that even our reputed institutions and Universities find it difficult to secure a position within the best 200 higher education institutions across the Globe. The term “Style” basically the manner of writing or speaking or performing. In the context of decision making, Style refers to performing. Thus, ‘style of decision making’ refers to the manner of making decisions. For the purpose of the present study, Style of decision making has been classified under two heads, viz: Unofficial Decision Making Styles, Official Decision Making Styles. The styles of unofficial decision making are as follows: Certainty Decision Making, Uncertainty Decision Making and Risk Taking Decision Making. One of the

reasons for the provision of poor quality of education that which makes the student products either unemployable or incapable of self-employment, is that the University teachers need not necessarily possess the skills involved in need-based course designing, evolving innovative and zero-cost instructional techniques and tactics, developing appropriate instruments for the measurement of desirable behavioural changes on the part of the learners, and designing and transacting supplementary and enrichment programmes for the exceptional learners, counseling the students with problems and guiding them in their career development. To be precise, however excellent an academic programme designed is, the successful realization of the outputs with the desirable behaviours is highly dependent upon the academic achievement of the students. But a thorough review of the related literature as available in print as well as electronic media vividly indicated that not even a single scientific attempt has been made in this direction by anybody till date. Hence the present study.

TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

DECISION MAKING STYLES - refers to the three kinds of decision making, viz. Certainty, Uncertainty and Risk Taking under the unofficial category as well as another three kinds of decision making, viz. Bureaucratic, Democratic and Laissez-Faire under the official category.

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT – refers to the first year marks obtained by the B.Ed.students.

VARIABLES OF THE STUDY

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

1. Certainty Decision Making Style
2. Uncertainty Decision Making Style
3. Risk Taking Decision Making Style
4. Bureaucratic Decision Making Style
5. Democratic Decision Making Style
6. Laissez-Faire Decision Making Style

INDEPENDENT-POPULATION-VARIABLES

1. Gender
2. Educational Generation

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

The hypotheses formulated for verification in this investigation are as follows:

HYPOTHESIS I: Each of the six Decision Making Styles of the B.Ed. students is dependent upon each of the population variables of the study.

HYPOTHESIS II: Each of the Academic Achievement of the B.Ed. students is dependent upon each of the population variables of the study.

HYPOTHESIS III: Each of the B.Ed.students' Academic Achievement is significantly related to each of the six Decision Making Styles.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The specific objectives of the present investigation are as follows:

1. To measure the Decision Making Styles as well as Academic Achievement of the B.Ed.students involved in this study.
2. To identity the relationships between each of the six Decision Making Styles and Academic Achievement among the B.Ed.students.

METHOD

Tools used for data collection :

1. Multi-dimensional Decision Making Styles Inventory developed by the Investigator

Sample : A stratified representative sample of 475 B.Ed.students constituted from colleges in Madurai District with due representation given to the five variables, viz. Gender and Education generation.

Statistical Treatments :

1. Two tailed test of significant difference between the mean scores of large independent samples.
2. Test of significance of Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r).

GENDER AND EXPERIMENTAL VARIABLES

TABLE 1: THE MEAN SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL VARIABLES AMONG TEACHERS: GENDER-WISE

| Sl. No. | Experimental Variable | Gender | | | | 't' value | Significance at 0.05 level |
|---------|-----------------------|---------------|------|-----------------|------|-----------|----------------------------|
| | | Male (N= 304) | | Female (N= 171) | | | |
| | | Mean | S.D | Mean | S.D | | |
| 1. | Certain Decision | 22.66 | 4.32 | 22.60 | 4.50 | 0.14 | * |
| 2. | Uncertain Decision | 20.74 | 4.15 | 20.63 | 4.38 | 0.27 | * |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|---|
| 3. | Risk Taking Decision | 14.79 | 4.74 | 15.37 | 4.52 | -1.32 | * |
| 4. | Bureaucratic Decision | 22.83 | 4.83 | 22.77 | 5.11 | 0.11 | * |
| 5. | Democratic Decision | 21.36 | 4.25 | 21.61 | 4.28 | -0.61 | * |
| 6. | Laissez-Faire Decision | 13.35 | 5.03 | 13.19 | 5.10 | 0.32 | * |

* denotes not significant at 0.05 level.

It is evident from table 1 that there is no significant difference in any of the experimental variables among the B.Ed.students in terms of the population variable, Gender at 0.05 level. It means that there is no significant difference in each of the experimental variables between male and female teachers.

In other words, the male as well as female B.Ed.students do not differ in their unofficial decision making styles and official decision making styles.

EDUCATIONAL GENERATION AND EXPERIMENTAL VARIABLES

TABLE 2: THE MEAN SCORES OF EXPERIMENTAL VARIABLES AMONG TEACHERS: EDUCATIONAL GENERATION-WISE

| Sl. No. | Experimental Variable | Educational Generation | | | | 't' value | Significance at 0.05 level |
|---------|-----------------------|------------------------|------|----------------|------|-----------|----------------------------|
| | | First (N=305) | | Others (N=170) | | | |
| | | Mean | S.D | Mean | S.D | | |
| 1. | Certain Decision | 22.13 | 4.29 | 23.55 | 4.42 | -3.37 | -S |
| 2. | Uncertain Decision | 20.45 | 3.94 | 21.15 | 4.68 | -1.65 | * |
| 3. | Risk Taking Decision | 15.68 | 4.58 | 13.78 | 4.59 | 4.33 | S |
| 4. | Bureaucratic Decision | 21.98 | 4.59 | 24.29 | 5.19 | -4.8 | -S |
| 5. | Democratic Decision | 20.69 | 3.86 | 22.82 | 4.59 | -5.13 | -S |

S denotes significance at 0.05 level. * denotes not significant at 0.05 level.

It is evident from table 2 that there is no significant difference in two experimental variables, viz. Uncertainty Decision Making Style in unofficial situations, and possession of Consultancy-Extension Services Excellence between the B.Ed.students , who are first generation learners and those teachers who are not first generation learners.

TABLE 3: RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN EACH UNOFFICIAL DECISION MAKING STYLE AND EACH ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

| UNOFFICIAL DECISION MAKING STYLES | ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Certain Decision | 0.18 ^S |
| Uncertain Decision | 0.043 * |
| Risk Taking Decision | -0.160 ^S |

S denotes significance at 0.05 level.

* denotes not significant at 0.05 level.

It is evident from table 3 that the product moment correlation coefficients computed between Certainty decision making style and each of the four dimensions of academic achievement of B.Ed.students are significant at 0.05 level as well as positive.

HYPOTHESES VERIFICATION

HYPOTHESIS I: Each of the six Decision Making Styles of the B.Ed. students is dependent upon each of the population variables of the study. Accepted.

HYPOTHESIS II: Each of the Academic Achievement of the B.Ed. students is dependent upon each of the population variables of the study. Accepted.

HYPOTHESIS III: Each of the B.Ed.students' Academic Achievement is significantly related to each of the six Decision Making Styles. Accepted.

CONCLUSIONS

The specific conclusions emerged out of the present investigation are as follows:

1. The B.Ed.students' of four decision making styles, viz. Certainty, Uncertainty, Bureaucratic and Democratic is found a little above the theoretical average 18, since their mean scores are 23, 21, 23 and 21 respectively, while that of the two decision making styles, viz. Risk Taking and Laissez-Faire is a little below the theoretical average 18, since their mean scores are 15 and 13 only.

2. The University teachers' practice of Certainty decision making style is higher among the teachers,
 - Who are male than female.
 - Who belong to other generations than those who are first generation learners.

EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

It is sunlight clear from this study that University teachers' each decision making styles in unofficial situations as well as official contexts, besides each of the four dimensions of academic excellences is independent of Gender. This is a typical reflection of the contemporary society wherein women are on a par with men, if not excelling. The finding that bureaucratic as well as democratic decision making styles are positively related to three dimensions except the dimension, Consultancy-Extension services, while Laissez-Faire decision making style is found negatively related to the three dimensions, but not related to the dimension, Consultancy-Extension Services sharply indicates two factors, viz. Laissez-Faire is not conducive to academic excellence and the academic excellence, Consultancy-Extension Services is not at all dependent upon the decision making styles have nothing to do with the Consultancy-Extension services excellence, which is in tune with the social reality.

REFERENCES

1. Aswathappa, (1999). K. **Human Resource and Personnel Management**. New Delhi: TMH
2. Babble, Earl (2004). **The Practice of Social Research (10th ed.)**. Australlia: Thomson& Wadsworth.
3. Basotia, G.R. & Sharma, K.K.(2002).**Research Methodology**. Jaipur:Mangal Deep Publications.
4. Best, Jhon W. and Khan, James V.(2006). **Research in Education (10th ed.)**. New Delhi: Prantice Hall of India Pvt.Ltd.
5. Bhattacharya, S. (1972). **Psychometrics and Behavioural Research**. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt.Ltd.
6. Bondur, Albert(1986).**Social Foundations of Thought and Acton**. River, N.I: Prantice Hall.
7. Bose, P.K.(1977). **Higher Educational at Cross Roads**. Calcutta: World Press.
8. Buch, M.B.(ed.)(1974). **A Survey of Research in Education**. Baroda: Centre for Advanced Study in Education, M.S.Universiy.
9. Buch, M.B.(ed.)(1979). **Second Survey of Research in Education**. Baroda: Society for Educational Research and Development.
10. Buch, M.B.(ed.)(1987). **Third Survey of Research in Education**. New Delhi: National Council of Educational Research and Training(NCERT).
11. Buch, M.B.(ed.)(1991). **Fourth Survey of Research in Education**. (Vol. I & II). New Delhi: NCERT.
12. Chaster, Haries W.(ed.)(1960). **Encyclopedia of Educational Research (3rd ed.)**. New York: The Macmillan co.
13. Cherunilam, Francis(2003). **Business Environment (14th ed.)**. Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.
14. Chunawalla,S.A.(2005). **Product Management(4th ed.)**. Mumbai: Himalaya Publishing House.
15. Cohen Louis, Manion Lawrence and Morrison Keith (2008). **Research Methods in Education**. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
16. Delighton, Leec (1971). **The Encyclopedia of Education**. New Year: Macmillan co. & The Free Press.