

# Decision Making Styles among Teacher Trainees

Tajuddin Shaik,  
Research Scholar,  
Department of Education,  
Acharya Nagarjuna University.

Dr. M. Esther Suneela,  
Principal, A. L. College of Education,  
Chair Person, BOS in Education,  
Acharya Nagarjuna University.

## Abstract:

*The present research work was aimed at studying the impact of gender, nature of course and locality of residence on Decision making styles of teacher trainees. A sample of 600 teacher trainees studying in colleges of education of Krishna district in Andhra Pradesh was taken for collection of data. The stratified random sampling technique was employed. The Decision making styles of the teacher trainees were assessed by using Decision Making Styles Scale (DMSS) constructed by Dr. Noorjehan N. Ganihar. The obtained data were subjected to descriptive statistics such as Mean, S.D and inferential statistics such as ANOVA to test the hypotheses. The investigator of this study concluded that there is significant impact of gender, nature of course and locality of residence on Decision making styles of teacher trainees. Women and arts teacher trainees are found to use Routine, Compromise Decision making styles more frequently whereas men and science teacher trainees use Heuristic decision making styles more often. Urban teacher trainees use Routine Decision making styles more often when compare to rural teacher trainees and rural teacher trainees use Compromise and Heuristic Decision making styles more frequently than urban teacher trainees.*

**Key words:** *Decision making styles, Routine, Compromise, Heuristic, Stratified random sampling, Teacher trainees.*

## Introduction:

On a daily basis, we face complex decisions that depend on varieties of knowledge and judgement. The list of everyday decisions is endless for any human being because new ones keep on arising. Decision making means to select a course of action from among the identified alternatives in order to reach at a solution for a specific problem. The process of decision making is one of the most critical processes; in this process we may use different kinds of tools, techniques and perceptions. Decision making plays an important role in the individual's life and it is fundamental activity for human being. There are individual differences regarding to Decision making styles. Decision making styles of individuals differ from one individual to another. Decision making reflects the thinking and problem solving mode of decision makers. In the process of making an important decision, using the wrong style can lead to disaster, effective and successful decisions give peace and pleasure to the individuals.

## Objectives:

1. To study the Decision making styles of teacher trainees.
2. To study the impact of gender, nature of course and locality of residence on Decision making styles of teacher trainees.

**Hypotheses:**

**Hypothesis-1:** There would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Decision making styles.

**Hypothesis-1A:** There would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Routine Decision making styles.

**Hypothesis-1B:** There would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Compromise Decision making styles.

**Hypothesis-1C:** There would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Heuristic Decision making styles.

**Hypothesis-2:** There would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Decision making styles.

**Hypothesis-2A:** There would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Routine Decision making styles.

**Hypothesis-2B:** There would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Compromise Decision making styles.

**Hypothesis-2C:** There would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Heuristic Decision making styles.

**Hypothesis-3:** There would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Decision making styles.

**Hypothesis-3A:** There would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Routine Decision making styles.

**Hypothesis-3B:** There would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Compromise Decision making styles.

**Hypothesis-3C:** There would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Heuristic Decision making styles.

**Hypothesis-4:** There would be no significant interaction among gender, nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Decision making styles.

**Sample:**

The sample consisted of 600 teacher trainees selected from Krishna district of Andhra Pradesh on the basis of stratified random sampling technique.

**Tool used:**

The Decision making styles of the sample were estimated by using Decision making style scale (DMSS) constructed by Dr. Noorjehan N. Ganihar (2005). It consists of 48 items, each item has three responses. The reliability of the Decision making styles scale was computed using split-half method of reliability and it was found to be 0.86 and the validity was 0.92

**Statistical techniques used:**

The obtained data were subjected to descriptive statistics such as Mean, S.D and inferential statistics such as ANOVA to test the hypotheses and interpret the data.

## Results and Discussion:

The data obtained from the sample of 600 teacher trainees are subjected to quantitative analysis to test the hypotheses formulated regarding independent variables in the investigation and the results are presented in the following pages. Table-1 presents the means and SD's of scores on Routine decision making styles.

**Table-1: Mean and S.D's of scores on Routine Decision making styles.**

	Men		Women	
	Arts	Science	Arts	Science
Rural	Mean = 29.00 SD = 3.25	Mean = 15.46 SD = 1.68	Mean = 22.28 SD = 2.23	Mean = 17.81 SD = 4.85
Urban	Mean = 25.53 SD = 4.78	Mean = 15.32 SD = 1.97	Mean = 21.96 SD = 2.32	Mean = 28.42 SD = 3.57

Grand Means					
Men	21.32	Arts	24.69	Rural	21.13
Women	22.61	Science	19.25	Urban	22.80

An observation of Table-1 clearly indicates that rural-men-arts teacher trainees have obtained the highest mean of 29.00 with an S.D of 3.25 suggesting that they use Routine-Decision making style more often than other groups of teacher trainees whereas urban-men-science teacher trainees have obtained the lowest mean of 15.32 with an S.D of 1.97 indicating that they use less frequently Routine-Decision making style. There are mean differences among the 8 groups of teacher trainees with regard to Routine-Decision making style. The data are further subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA), to test whether there are any significant differences among the 8 groups of teacher trainees in their Routine Decision making styles, and the obtained results are presented in Table-2.

**Table- 2: Summary of ANOVA of scores on Routine Decision making styles.**

Source of variation	Sum of scores	df	Mean sum of scores	F-value
Gender	249.62	1	249.62	22.94**
Nature of course	4433.60	1	4433.60	407.50**
Locality of residence	418.34	1	418.34	38.45**
Gender *  Nature of course	6214.60	1	6214.60	571.19**
Gender * Locality of residence	1813.08	1	1813.08	166.64**
Nature of course * Locality of residence	1904.60	1	1904.60	175.05**

Gender *				
Nature of course *	543.39	1	543.39	49.94**
Locality of residence				
Wss	6441.40	592	10.88	-----
Total	22018.63	599	-----	-----

Note: \* Significant at 0.05 level, \*\* Significant at 0.01 level, @ Not Significant.

The F-value of 22.94 for the variable Gender, the F-value of 407.50 for the variable Nature of course, the F-value of 38.45 for the variable Locality of residence are all significant beyond 0.01 level, indicating that all the three independent variables such as Gender, Nature of course, Locality of residence have significant influence on their Routine decision making styles.

Men and Women teacher trainees differ significantly in their Routine Decision making styles. However, when we consider the means, Women teacher trainees have obtained a higher mean of 22.61, indicating that they use higher level of Routine Decision making styles, when compare to Men(M=21.32) who use Routine Decision making styles less frequently i.e. Women teacher trainees use higher level of Routine Decision making styles than Men teacher trainees.

There is significant difference between Arts and Science teacher trainees in their Routine Decision making styles. However, when we consider the means, Arts teacher trainees have obtained a higher mean of 24.69 suggesting that they use higher level of Routine Decision making styles, when compare to Science teacher trainees (M=19.25) who use Routine Decision making styles less frequently i.e. Teacher trainees with Arts group use higher level of Routine Decision making styles than the teacher trainees with Science group.

There is significant difference between Rural and Urban teacher trainees in their Routine Decision making styles. However, when we consider the means, Urban teacher trainees have obtained a higher mean of 22.80, indicating that they use higher level of Routine Decision making styles, when compare to Rural teacher trainees(M=21.13) who use Routine Decision making styles less frequently i.e. Urban teacher trainees use higher level of Routine Decision making styles compare to Rural teacher trainees.

The F-value of 571.19 for the first order interaction between Gender and Nature of course, the other F- value of 166.64 for the interaction between Gender and Locality of residence, the F-value of 175.05 for the interaction between Nature of course and Locality of residence are all significant beyond 0.01 level, suggesting that there is significant interaction between Gender and Nature of course, Gender and Locality of residence and Nature of course and Locality of residence with regard to Routine Decision making styles.

The F-value of 49.94 for the second order interaction among the three independent variables are significant beyond 0.01 level, suggesting that there is significant interaction among the Gender, Nature of course and Locality of residence with regard to Routine Decision making styles.

**Table-3: Mean and S.D's of scores on Compromise Decision making styles.**

	Men		Women	
	Arts	Science	Arts	Science
Rural	Mean = 9.09 SD = 2.45	Mean = 11.64 SD = 2.78	Mean = 15.36 SD = 1.97	Mean = 13.62 SD = 2.93
Urban	Mean = 10.33 SD = 2.10	Mean = 12.14 SD = 2.93	Mean = 14.92 SD = 2.36	Mean = 9.52 SD = 1.15

Grand Means					
Men	10.80	Arts	12.42	Rural	12.42
Women	13.35	Science	11.73	Urban	11.72

An observation of Table-3 clearly indicates that rural-women-arts teacher trainees have obtained the highest mean of 15.36 with an S.D of 1.97 suggesting that they use Compromise-Decision making style more often than other groups of teacher trainees whereas rural-men-arts teacher trainees have obtained the lowest mean of 9.09 with an S.D of 2.45 indicating that they use less frequently Compromise-Decision making style. There are mean differences among the 8 groups of teacher trainees with regard to Compromise-Decision making style. The data are further subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA), to test whether there are any significant differences among the 8 groups of teacher trainees in their Compromise-Decision making styles, and the obtained results are presented in Table-4.

**Table-4: Summary of ANOVA of scores on Compromise Decision making styles.**

Source of variation	Sum of scores	df	Mean sum of scores	F-value
Gender	977.92	1	977.92	169.48**
Nature of course	72.10	1	72.10	12.49**
Locality of residence	73.50	1	73.50	12.73**
Gender *  Nature of course	1238.40	1	1238.40	214.62**
Gender * Locality of residence	371.30	1	371.30	64.35**
Nature of course * Locality of residence	181.50	1	181.50	31.45**
Gender * Nature of course * Locality of residence	80.68	1	80.68	13.98**

Wss	3418.76	592	5.77	-----
Total	6414.16	599	-----	-----

Note: \* Significant at 0.05 level, \*\* Significant at 0.01 level, @ Not Significant.

The F-value of 169.48 for the variable Gender, the F-value of 12.49 for the variable Nature of course, the F-value of 12.73 for the variable Locality of residence are all significant beyond 0.01 level, indicating that all the three independent variables such as Gender, Nature of course, Locality of residence have significant influence on their Compromise Decision making styles.

Men and Women teacher trainees differ significantly in their Compromise Decision making styles. However, when we consider the means, Women teacher trainees have obtained a higher mean of 13.35, indicating that they use higher level of Compromise Decision making styles, when compare to Men(M=10.80) who use Compromise Decision making styles less frequently i.e. Women teacher trainees use higher level of Compromise Decision making styles than Men teacher trainees.

There is significant difference between Arts and Science teacher trainees in their Compromise Decision making styles. However, when we consider the means, Arts teacher trainees have obtained a higher mean of 12.42 suggesting that they use higher level of Compromise Decision making styles, when compare to Science teacher trainees (M=11.73) who use Compromise Decision making styles less frequently i.e. Teacher trainees with Arts group use higher level of Compromise Decision making styles than the teacher trainees with Science group.

There is significant difference between Rural and Urban teacher trainees in their Compromise Decision making styles. However, when we consider the means, Rural teacher trainees have obtained a higher mean of 12.42, indicating that they use higher level of Compromise Decision making styles, when compare to Urban teacher trainees(M=21.13) who use Compromise Decision making styles less frequently i.e. Rural teacher trainees use higher level of Compromise Decision making styles compare to Urban teacher trainees.

The F-value of 214.62 for the first order interaction between Gender and Nature of course, the other F- value of 64.35 for the interaction between Gender and Locality of residence, the F-value of 31.45 for the interaction between Nature of course and Locality of residence are all significant beyond 0.01 level, suggesting that there is significant interaction between Gender and Nature of course, Gender and Locality of residence and Nature of course and Locality of residence with regard to Compromise Decision making styles.

The F-value of 13.98 for the second order interaction among the three independent variables are significant beyond 0.01 level, suggesting that there is significant interaction among the Gender, Nature of course and Locality of residence with regard to Compromise Decision making styles.



**Table-5: Mean and S.D's of scores on Heuristic Decision making styles.**

	Men		Women	
	Arts	Science	Arts	Science
Rural	Mean = 9.84 SD = 1.87	Mean = 20.78 SD = 2.63	Mean = 10.36 SD = 1.16	Mean = 16.56 SD = 5.15
Urban	Mean = 12.12 SD = 3.71	Mean = 20.53 SD = 3.11	Mean = 11.12 SD = 1.73	Mean = 10.06 SD = 2.98

Source of variation	Sum of scores	Df	Mean sum of scores	F-value
Gender	2158.41	1	2158.41	151.14**

Grand Means					
Men	15.81	Arts	10.86	Rural	14.38
Women	12.02	Science	16.98	Urban	13.45

An observation of Table-5 clearly indicates that rural-men-science teacher trainees have obtained the highest mean of 20.78 with an S.D of 2.63 suggesting that they use Heuristic-Decision making styles more often than other groups of teacher trainees whereas rural-men-arts teacher trainees have obtained the lowest mean of 9.84 with an S.D of 1.87 indicating that they use less frequently Heuristic-Decision making styles. There are mean differences among the 8 groups of teacher trainees with regard to Heuristic-Decision making styles. The data are further subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA), to test whether there are any significant differences among the 8 groups of teacher trainees in their Heuristic-Decision making styles, and the obtained results are presented in Table-6.

Nature of course	5630.41	1	5630.41	394.28**
Locality of residence	128.81	1	128.81	9.02**
Gender *  Nature of course	1893.93	1	1893.93	132.62**
Gender * Locality of residence	564.54	1	564.54	39.53**
Nature of course * Locality of residence	897.93	1	897.93	62.88**
Gender * Nature of course * Locality of residence	208.84	1	208.84	14.62**
Wss	8457.61	592	14.28	-----
Total	19940.48	599	-----	-----

**Table-6: Summary of ANOVA of Scores on Heuristic Decision making styles.**

Note: \* Significant at 0.05 level, \*\* Significant at 0.01 level, @ Not Significant.

The F-value of 151.14 for the variable Gender, the F-value of 394.28 for the variable Nature of course, the F-value of 9.02 for the variable Locality of residence are all significant beyond 0.01 level, indicating that all the three independent variables such as Gender, Nature of course, Locality of residence have significant influence on the Heuristic Decision making styles.

Men and Women teacher trainees differ significantly in their Heuristic Decision making styles. However, when we consider the means, Men teacher trainees have obtained a higher mean of 15.81, indicating that they use higher level of Heuristic Decision making styles, when compare to Women(M=15.81) who use Heuristic Decision making styles less frequently i.e. Men teacher trainees use higher level of Heuristic Decision making styles than Women teacher trainees.

There is significant difference between Arts and Science teacher trainees in their Heuristic Decision making styles. However, when we consider the means, Science teacher trainees have obtained a higher mean of 16.98 suggesting that they use higher level of Heuristic Decision making styles, when compare to Arts teacher trainees (M=10.86) who use Heuristic Decision making styles less frequently i.e. Teacher trainees with Science group use higher level of Heuristic Decision making styles than the teacher trainees with Arts group.

There is significant difference between Rural and Urban teacher trainees in their Heuristic Decision making styles. However, when we consider the means, Rural teacher trainees have obtained a higher mean of 14.38, indicating that they use higher level of Heuristic Decision making styles, when compare to Urban teacher trainees(M=13.45) who use Heuristic Decision making styles less frequently i.e. Rural teacher trainees use higher level of Heuristic Decision making styles compare to Urban teacher trainees.

The F-value of 132.62 for the first order interaction between Gender and Nature of course, the other F- value of 39.53 for the interaction between Gender and Locality of residence, the F-value of 62.88 for the interaction between Nature of course and Locality of residence are all significant beyond 0.01 level, suggesting that there is significant interaction between Gender and Nature of course, Gender and Locality of residence and Nature of course and Locality of residence with regard to Heuristic Decision making styles.



The F-value of 14.62 for the second order interaction among the three independent variables are significant beyond 0.01 level, suggesting that there is significant interaction among the Gender, Nature of course and Locality of residence with regard to Heuristic Decision making styles.

## DISCUSSION:

The hypothesis-1 stated that there would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their decision making styles. The F-values of 22.94, 169.48, and 151.14 for the variable gender on Routine, Compromise, and Heuristic Decision making styles respectively are all significant beyond 0.01 level, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-1 is not accepted and it is concluded that there is significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Decision making styles.

The Hypothesis-1A predicted that there would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Routine decision making styles, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-1A is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Routine Decision making styles. Women teacher trainees are found to use Routine Decision making styles more frequently compare to men teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-1A is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that women teacher trainees use Routine Decision making styles more frequently than men teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-1B predicted that there would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Compromise decision making styles, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-1B is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Compromise Decision making styles. Women teacher trainees are found to use Compromise Decision making styles more frequently compare to men teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-1B is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that women teacher trainees use Compromise Decision making styles more frequently than men teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-1C predicted that there would be no significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Heuristic decision making styles, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-1C is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Heuristic Decision making styles. Men teacher trainees are found to use Heuristic Decision making styles more frequently compare to women teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-1C is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that men teacher trainees use Heuristic Decision making styles more frequently than women teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-2 stated that there would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their decision making styles. The F-values of 407.50, 12.49, and 394.28 for the variable nature of course on Routine, Compromise, and Heuristic Decision making styles respectively are all significant beyond 0.01 level, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-2 is not accepted and it is concluded that there is significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Decision making styles.

The hypothesis-2A predicted that there would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Routine decision making styles, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-2A is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Routine Decision making styles. Arts teacher trainees are found to use Routine Decision making styles more frequently compare to science teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-2A is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that arts teacher trainees use Routine Decision making styles more frequently than science teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-2B predicted that there would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Compromise decision making styles, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-2B is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Compromise Decision making styles. Arts teacher trainees are found to use Compromise Decision making styles more frequently compare to science teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-2B is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that arts teacher trainees use Compromise Decision making styles more frequently than science teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-2C predicted that there would be no significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Heuristic Decision making styles, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-2C is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Heuristic Decision making styles. Science teacher trainees are found to use Heuristic Decision making styles more frequently compare to arts teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-2C is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that science teacher trainees use Heuristic Decision making styles more frequently than arts teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-3 stated that there would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Decision making styles. The F-values of 38.45, 12.73, and 9.02 for the variable locality of residence on Routine, Compromise, and Heuristic Decision making styles respectively are all significant beyond 0.01 level, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-3 is not accepted and it is concluded that there is significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Decision making styles.

The hypothesis-3A predicted that there would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Routine decision making styles, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-3A is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Routine Decision making styles. Urban teacher trainees are found to use Routine Decision making styles more frequently compare to rural teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-3A is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that urban teacher trainees use Routine Decision making styles more frequently than rural teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-3B predicted that there would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Compromise decision making styles, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-3B is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Compromise Decision making styles. Rural teacher trainees are found to use Compromise Decision making styles more frequently compare to urban teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-3B is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that rural teacher trainees use Compromise Decision making styles more frequently than urban teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-3C predicted that there would be no significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Heuristic decision making styles, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-3C is not accepted and it can be stated that there is significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Heuristic Decision making styles. Rural teacher trainees are found to use Heuristic Decision making styles more frequently compare to urban teacher trainees. As the hypothesis-3C is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that rural teacher trainees use Heuristic Decision making styles more frequently than urban teacher trainees.

The hypothesis-4 stated that there would be no significant interaction among gender, nature of course and locality of residence with regard to decision making styles. The F-values of 571.19, 214.62, and 132.62 for the first order interaction between gender and nature of course, the F-values of 166.64, 64.35, and 39.53 for the interaction between gender and locality of residence, the F-values of 175.05, 31.45, and 62.88 for the interaction between nature of course and locality of residence, the F-values of 49.94, 13.98, and 14.62 for the second order interaction among gender, nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Routine, Compromise, and Heuristic Decision making styles respectively are all significant beyond 0.01 level, based on the results obtained the hypothesis-4 is not accepted and it can be said that

there is significant interaction effect between gender and nature of course, gender and locality of residence, nature of course and locality of residence, and second order interaction among gender, nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Routine, Compromise, and Heuristic Decision making styles. As hypothesis-4 is not accepted as warranted by the results, it is concluded that there is significant interaction effect among gender, nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Decision making styles.

### Conclusions:

1. There is significant difference between men and women teacher trainees in their Routine, Compromise, and Heuristic Decision making styles.
  - 1A. Women teacher trainees use Routine Decision making styles more frequently than men teacher trainees.
  - 1B. Women teacher trainees use Compromise Decision making styles more frequently than men teacher trainees.
  - 1C. Men teacher trainees use Heuristic Decision making styles more frequently than women teacher trainees.
2. There is significant difference between arts and science teacher trainees in their Routine, Compromise, and Heuristic Decision making styles.
  - 2A. Arts teacher trainees use Routine Decision making styles more frequently than science teacher trainees.
  - 2B. Arts teacher trainees use Compromise Decision making styles more frequently than science teacher trainees.
  - 2C. Science teacher trainees use Heuristic Decision making styles more frequently than arts teacher trainees.
3. There is significant difference between rural and urban teacher trainees in their Routine, Compromise, and Heuristic Decision making styles.
  - 3A. Urban teacher trainees use Routine Decision making styles more frequently than rural teacher trainees.
  - 3B. Rural teacher trainees use Compromise Decision making styles more frequently than urban teacher trainees.
  - 3C. Rural teacher trainees use Heuristic Decision making styles more frequently than urban teacher trainees.
4. There is significant interaction effect between gender and nature of course, gender and locality of residence, nature of course and locality of residence, and second order interaction among gender, nature of course and locality of residence with regard to Routine, Compromise, and Heuristic Decision making styles.

### Implications:

1. In the present investigation it is found that among the three Decision making styles, Routine is found to be primary Decision making styles, teacher trainees irrespective of their gender, nature of course and locality of residence may be encourage to use Routine Decision making styles while make important decisions in their lives.
2. Women teacher trainees are found to use Routine and Compromise Decision making styles and men teacher trainees use Heuristic Decision making styles. It is suggested that women teacher trainees may encourage to use Routine and Compromise Decision making styles and men teacher trainees may encourage to use Heuristic Decision making styles while making important decisions in their lives.
3. Arts teacher trainees are found to use Routine and Compromise Decision making styles and science teacher trainees use Heuristic Decision making styles. It is suggested that arts teacher trainees may encourage to use Routine and Compromise Decision making styles and science teacher trainees may encourage to use Heuristic Decision making styles while make important decisions in their lives.
4. Urban teacher trainees are found to use Routine Decision making styles and rural teacher trainees use Compromise and Heuristic Decision making styles. It is suggested that urban teacher trainees may encourage to using Routine Decision making styles and rural teacher trainees may encourage to using Compromise and Heuristic Decision making styles while making important decisions in their lives.
5. Managements may be advised to appoint counselors in educational institutions to assess the Decision making styles of teacher trainees. Counselors may help the teacher trainees to make right decision(select the right Decision making style)

6. Managements are advised to conduct programs for the students so as to enhance their Decision making styles which in turn contribute to the excellence in their lives.

### References:

1. Best, J.W and J.V. Kalin, (1992). Research in Education. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Ltd.
2. Bhatia, H.R. (1995). A text Book of educational Psychology, New Delhi: Mc Millan India Ltd.
3. Chouhan, S.S. (1978). Advanced Educational Psychology. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
4. Clark Briggs and Patrick Little (2008). Impact of Organizational Culture and Personality traits on decision making in technical Organizations, Journal of Business Management. 11(1)15-16.
5. Kothari, C.R. (1985). Research Methodology. New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd.
6. Koul, L. (1984). Methodology of Educational Research. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
7. Mangal, S.K. (1993). Advanced Educational Psychology. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Ltd.
8. Satid Elbanna (2006). Strategic decision making process perspectives, International Journal of Management reviews. Vol. 8(1), pp.1-20.

