
DECISION-MAKING OF HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Dr. D. Ponmozhi*1, B. Achya*2

*1Principal & Professor In Education, O.P.R. Memorial College Of Education, Vadalur, Tamilnadu, India.

*2M. Ed Student, O.P.R. Memorial College Of Education, Vadalur, Tamilnadu, India.

DOI : <https://www.doi.org/10.56726/IRJMETS64098>

ABSTRACT

The goal of the current study is to investigate how pupils in higher secondary schools make decisions. 120 samples were selected from one government institution, one self-financing institution, and one aided school using the random sampling technique. In this study, the normative survey method was applied. This study employed the **Decision styles questionnaire (Leykin & DeRubeis, 2010)**. was used in this study. These 36 items in 7 dimensions like **Spontaneous, Dependent, Vigilant, Avoidant, Brooding, Intuitive and Anxious Decision styles** with 5-point scale with reliability score of 0.8 and a validity score of 0.9. Descriptive, deferential, correlational, and regression analyses were carried out using SPSSIBM23. The higher secondary school students are making decision some times. (73-108). There is a significant relationship between **School type, Gender, Age, Medium, Mothers Qualification, Fathers Qualification, Parental Occupation, Parental Income, No Of Family Members, Family Type, Group of study and decision making**. The prediction model contained five of the eleven predictors and was reached in five steps with 6 variables removed. The model was statistically significant, $F(5, 114) = 15.657$, $p < .001$, and accounted for approximately 63 % of the variance of Decision making ($R^2 = .638$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.407$). Inspection of the structure coefficient suggests that, the Group and Gender were relatively strong indicators of Decision making of Higher secondary school children.

Keywords: Decision Making, Higher Secondary Schools, Students.

I. INTRODUCTION

Decision-making is essential to determining one's destiny. Adolescence is a crucial period of development marked by notable shifts in social, emotional, and cognitive aspects. Among the numerous significant events of this time, making decisions is essential to determining one's destiny. Students in higher secondary school, usually between the ages of 16 and 18, are faced with a growing number of decisions that have an immediate effect on their academic trajectory, employment opportunities, interpersonal connections, and overall life route. Their future performance and well-being can be greatly impacted by their capacity to make wise, well-informed judgments during this phase. But not all students use the same approach to making decisions; some may be more swayed by emotion or peer pressure, while others may rely more on reasoning and analysis.

NEED OF THE STUDY

Research on **decision-making styles** of higher secondary school students is essential for understanding how young individuals approach critical decisions in their academic, personal, and future life contexts. Students face pivotal decisions regarding their career paths, educational choices, and personal relationships. These decisions, in turn, have long-lasting effects on their futures. The need for research on **decision-making styles of higher secondary school students** is undeniable. Adolescence is a critical period for developing skills that will influence decisions throughout adulthood. By studying how students make decisions—whether rationally, intuitively, impulsively, or avoidantly—we can provide better educational support, career counseling, and emotional guidance. Such research will enable educators, counselors, and parents to help students develop **effective decision-making skills**, navigate the challenges of adolescence more effectively, and make choices that will positively influence their academic, personal, and professional lives.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Research on **decision-making styles** among **higher secondary school students** holds significant value in shaping both the personal development and academic success of adolescents. The **significance of researching decision-making styles** in higher secondary school students cannot be overstated. Understanding how students make decisions can help educators, counselors, and parents provide better support, guidance, and interventions tailored to individual needs. This research has practical implications for improving **academic**

performance, career planning, emotional intelligence, social competence, and behavioral outcomes. Moreover, it plays a crucial role in empowering students to make informed, responsible choices that shape their future academic, professional, and personal lives. Ultimately, such research helps cultivate a generation of **independent, self-aware, and resilient individuals** capable of navigating life's challenges with confidence.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of the study is stated as **A Study on Decision Making Styles of Higher Secondary School Students.**

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION:

- **Higher Secondary School Students:** Those who all are doing classes for 11 and 12 std as students in Government, Self-financing and Aided schools.
- **Decision Making Styles:** The score obtained by the Higher Secondary School Students in the scale **Decision styles questionnaire (Leykin & DeRubeis, 2010).**

OBJECTIVES:

1. To evaluate the comprehensive Decision making styles on higher secondary school students.
2. To measure the impact of Decision making styles on the higher secondary school students and their relationship with subsamples.
3. To quantify the relationship between Decision making styles on their Personal variables of Higher secondary school students.
4. To identify the dominant impact of Decision making styles of higher secondary school students.

HYPOTHESIS:

1. The comprehensive Decision making styles of the higher secondary school students are very high.
2. There is no significant relation between Decision making styles and higher secondary school student's personal variables
3. There is no dominant influence of personal variables on Decision making styles of higher secondary school students.
4. There are no preferred Decision-making styles of higher secondary school students.

II. METHODOLOGY

Normative survey method is used in the present study. In brief it is an attempt to analyze, interpret and report the present level of Decision-making styles of higher Secondary school students. These 36 items in 7 dimensions like **Spontaneous, Dependent, Vigilant, Avoidant, Brooding, Intuitive and Anxious Decision styles** with 5-point scale with reliability score of 0.8 and a validity score of 0.9. Descriptive, deferential, correlational, and regression analyses were carried out using SPSSIBM23. The pupils enrolled in the higher secondary in Cuddalore district make up the study's population. In the Cuddalore district, there are approximately 20,000 students enrolled in 34 higher secondary schools. 120 samples were selected from one government institution, one self-financing institution, and one aided school using the random sampling technique. There are 33 male and 87 female students participating in this study across these 120 samples. Descriptive analysis, Differential analysis, Multiple correlation and Regression analysis were cried out with the help of IBMSPSS23.

ANALYSIS OF THE DECISION-MAKING OF HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Table 1: Percentage Analysis Of Decision Making Score Of The Total Sample				
S.No	DECISION MAKING	Score	N	Percentage
1	Never	0-36	0	0
2	Rarely	37-72	5	4
3	Sometimes	73-108	61	51
4	Often	109-144	53	44
5	Always	145-180	1	1

	Total		120	100
--	-------	--	-----	-----

The above table 1 shows that 4 % of Higher Secondary School Students **Rarely** Making Decision (37-72), 51% of Higher Secondary School Students **Sometimes** Making Decision (73-108), 44% of Higher Secondary School Students **Often** Making Decision (109-144) and 01% of Higher Secondary School Students **Often** Making Decision (145-180). **Thus, Higher Secondary School Students Sometimes Making Decision.**

ANALYSIS OF DECISION-MAKING SCORE OF ENTIRE AND SUBSAMPLES

Evaluating the degree of Higher Secondary School Students **Decision Making Styles** for both the full sample and selected sub-samples is one of the study's key goals. For both full and sub samples, the mean Standard deviation values have been computed. which comprise the students enrolled in Higher Secondary School Students were considered as the population and sample. Sub-samples were considered for **School type, Gender, Age, Medium, Mothers Qualification, Fathers Qualification, Parental Occupation, Parental Income, No Of Family Members, Family Type and Group of study.**

Variable	N	Mean	STD
DECISION MAKING	120	105.82	18.12

The above table 2 shows the mean score and standard deviation of Higher Secondary School Students **Decision Making** are found to be **105.82 and 18.12** respectively. **It is concluded that the Higher Secondary School Students are Making Decision some times. (73-108).**

Personal Variable		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t/f	Result
School Type	Government	40	116.38	13.54	13.96	S
	Aided	40	103.78	16.06		
	Private	40	97.30	19.17		
Gender	Male	33	92.45	17.44	-5.567	S
	Female	87	110.89	15.70		
Age	16	77	102.00	19.46	-3.21	S
	17	43	112.65	13.05		
Medium of Instruction	Tamil	80	110.08	16.07	3.846	S
	English	40	97.30	19.17		
Mothers Qualification	Illiterate	14	113.71	10.89	13.84	S
	School Level	83	108.89	16.90		
	College Level	23	89.91	17.35		
Fathers Qualification	Illiterate	18	107.83	14.18	9.714	S
	School Level	77	109.64	17.10		
	College Level	25	92.60	18.09		
Parental Occupation	Daily Wages	62	109.94	14.59	4.709	S
	Self-Employment	23	108.74	19.61		
	Business	25	96.12	18.19		
	Government Job	10	97.80	24.60		
Parental	10-20K	70	109.80	15.23	3.570	S

Income	20-30K	12	110.25	20.50		
	30-40K	13	95.31	18.10		
	40-50K	10	97.40	22.93		
	50-60K	15	98.40	19.77		
Family Members	3-5	83	103.65	17.96	-1.985	S
	6-8	37	110.68	17.77		
Family Type	Nuclear	72	101.81	18.02	4.690	S
	Joint	44	111.75	16.55		
	Single Parent	4	112.75	21.01		
Group Of Study	Bio-Maths	27	98.85	16.37	4.690	S
	Comp-Maths	12	95.50	24.95		
	Commerce	81	109.67	16.38		

School type: According to the computed f-value, there appears to be appreciable difference in total Decision-Making Styles between Government, private and self-financing Higher Secondary School students. Considering that the calculated f-value of 13.96 is significant at the 5% level. Consequently, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected. **Therefore, it may be concluded that Government, private and self-financing Higher Secondary School students significantly differ in the Total Decision-Making.**

Gender: According to the computed t-value, there appears to be appreciable difference in total Decision-Making Styles between male and female Higher Secondary School students. Considering that the calculated t-value of -5.567 is significant at the 5% level. Consequently, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected. **Therefore, it may be concluded that Male and female Higher Secondary School students significantly differ in the Total Decision-Making Styles.**

Age: According to the computed t-value, there appears to be appreciable difference in total Decision-Making Styles between 16 and 17 years Higher Secondary School students. Considering that the calculated t-value of -3.21 is significant at the 5% level. the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected. **Therefore, it may be concluded that 16 and 17 years Higher Secondary School students significantly differ in the Total Decision-Making Styles.**

Medium: According to the computed t-value, there appears to be appreciable difference in total Decision-Making Styles between English and Tamil medium Higher Secondary School students. Considering that the calculated t-value of -3.846 is significant at the 5% level. Consequently, the alternative hypothesis is rejected and the null hypothesis is accepted. **Therefore, it may be concluded that English and Tamil medium Higher Secondary School students significantly differ in the Total Decision-Making Styles.**

Mothers qualification: According to the computed f-value, there appears to be appreciable difference in total Decision-Making Styles between Higher Secondary School students with different Mothers qualification. Considering that the calculated f-value of 13.84 is significant at the 5% level. Consequently, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected. **Therefore, it may be concluded that Higher Secondary School students with different Mothers qualification significantly differ in the Total Decision-Making.**

Fathers qualification According to the computed f-value, there appears to be appreciable difference in total Decision-Making Styles between Higher Secondary School students with different Fathers qualification. Considering that the calculated f-value of 9.714 is significant at the 5% level. Consequently, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected. **Therefore, it may be concluded that Higher Secondary School students with different Fathers qualification significantly differ in the Total Decision-Making.**

Parental Occupation: According to the computed f-value, there appears to be appreciable difference in total Decision-Making Styles between Higher Secondary School students with different Parental Occupation. Considering that the calculated f-value of 4.709 is significant at the 5% level. Consequently, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected. **Therefore, it may be concluded that Higher Secondary School students with different Parental Occupation significantly differ in the Total Decision-Making.**

Parental income: According to the computed f-value, there appears to be appreciable difference in total Decision-Making Styles between Higher Secondary School students with different Parental income. Considering that the calculated f-value of 3.570 is significant at the 5% level. Consequently, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected. **Therefore, it may be concluded that Higher Secondary School students with different Parental income significantly differ in the Total Decision-Making.**

Family Type: to the computed f-value, there appears to be appreciable difference in total Decision-Making Styles between Higher Secondary School students from Nuclear, Joint and single parent family. Considering that the calculated f-value of 4.690 is significant at the 5% level. Consequently, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected. **Therefore, it may be concluded that Higher Secondary School students from Nuclear, Joint and single parent family significantly differ in the Total Decision-Making.**

Family Members: According to the computed t-value, there appears to be appreciable difference in total Decision-Making Styles between Higher Secondary School students with 3-5 and 6-8 family members. Considering that the calculated t-value of -1.984 is significant at the 5% level. Consequently, the alternative hypothesis is rejected and the null hypothesis is accepted. **Therefore, it may be concluded that Higher Secondary School students with 3-5 and 6-8 family members significantly differ in the Total Decision-Making Styles.**

Group: According to the computed f-value, there appears to be appreciable difference in total Decision-Making Styles between Bio-Maths, Computer-Maths and Commerce group Higher Secondary School students. Considering that the calculated f-value of 6.280 is significant at the 5% level. Consequently, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis is rejected. **Therefore, it may be concluded that Bio-Maths, Computer-Maths and Commerce group Higher Secondary School students significantly differ in the Total Decision-Making.**

	Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	Pearson r	Sr ²	Structure Coefficient
	(Constant)	127.834	15.557				
1	Gender	28.723	6.024	.711	.456	0.166	0.260
2	Group	-18.422	3.597	-.853	.276	0.186	0.292
3	Type of school	-9.370	2.772	-.424	-.432	0.091	0.143
4	Mother Qualification	-7.488	3.086	-.228	-.400	0.049	0.076
5	Family Type	5.476	2.380	.170	.262	0.045	0.071

Note. The dependent variable- **Decision making**, R²= .638 , Adjusted R²= 0.407 , Sr² is squared semi-partial correlation, F(5, 114)= 15.657.

Table 4. shows that Type of school, Age, Gender, Medium, Mother Qualification, Father Qualification, Parental occupation, Parental income, Family members, Family Type, Group and Decision making were used in a stepwise multiple regression analysis to predict Decision making of the higher secondary school students. The correlation of variables is shown in table.4.15. As can be seen correlations with gender, group, School type, Mothers Qualification, Family type and Decision making were statistically significant.

The prediction model contained five of the eleven predictors and was reached in five steps with 6 variables removed. The model was statistically significant, F(5, 114)= 15.657 , p < .001, and accounted for approximately

63 % of the variance of Decision making ($R^2 = .638$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.407$). Decision making is primarily predicted by gender and followed by group, School type, Mothers Qualification, Family type. The raw and standardized regression coefficient of predictors together with their correlation with Decision making, their squared semi-partial correlations, and their structure coefficients are shown in table-4.16. The gender, group, received the strongest weightage and School type, Mothers Qualification, Family type received least weightage in model. With the sizeable correlations between the predictors, the unique variance explained by each of the variables indexed by the squared semi-partial correlation was relatively high: with gender, group, School type, Mothers Qualification, Family type uniquely accounted for approximately 26%, 29%, 14%, 8% and 7% of the decision making. Inspection of the structure coefficient suggests that, **the Group and Gender were relatively strong indicators of Decision making of Higher secondary school children.**

Table 5: Stepwise Regression Of Total Decision Making And Its Subscales

	Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	Pearson r	Sr ²	Structure Coefficient
	(Constant)	8.882E-15	.000				
1	Intuitive	1.000	.000	.247	.804	1.000	0.646
2	Anxious	1.000	.000	.202	.687	1.000	0.471
3	Brooding	1.000	.000	.186	.615	1.000	0.378
4	Dependent	1.000	.000	.230	.556	1.000	0.309
5	Spontaneous	1.000	.000	.179	.507	1.000	0.257
6	Vigilant	1.000	.000	.256	.708	1.000	0.501
7	Avoidant	1.000	.000	.221	.671	1.000	0.450

Note. The dependent variable- **Decision making**, $R^2 = 1.000$, Adjusted $R^2 = 1.000$, Sr^2 is squared semi-partial correlation, $F(7, 112) = 5581.138$.

Table 5 shows Spontaneous, Dependent, Vigilant, Avoidant, Brooding, Intuitive and Anxious Decision styles and Decision making were used in a stepwise multiple regression analysis to predict Decision making of the higher secondary school students. The correlation with **Intuitive, Anxious, Brooding, Dependent, Spontaneous, Vigilant, Avoidant and Decision making** were statistically significant.

The prediction model contained seven of the seven predictors and was reached in seven steps with no variables removed. The model was statistically significant, $F(7, 112) = 5581.138$, $p < .001$, and accounted for approximately 100 % of the variance of Decision making ($R^2 = 1.000$, Adjusted $R^2 = 1.000$). Decision making is primarily predicted by **Intuitive**, and followed by **Anxious, Brooding, Dependent, Spontaneous, Vigilant, Avoidant**. The raw and standardized regression coefficient of predictors together with their correlation with Decision making, their squared semi-partial correlations, and their structure coefficients are shown in table-5. The **Intuitive style and Vigilant style**, received the strongest weightage and **Anxious, Brooding, Dependent, Spontaneous and Avoidant** least weightage in model. With the sizeable correlations between the predictors, the unique variance explained by each of the variables indexed by the squared semi-partial correlation was relatively high: with **Intuitive, Anxious, Brooding, Dependent, Spontaneous, Vigilant, and Avoidant** uniquely accounted for approximately 65%, 47%, 38%, 31%, 26%, 50% and 45% of the decision making.

Inspection of the structure coefficient suggests that, **the Intuitive and Vigilant were relatively strong dominant style of Decision making of Higher secondary school children.**

III. CONCLUSION

The 17-year-old Tamil-medium female students in higher secondary school who stay in government schools, are the children of an illiterate mother and a father with a high school education, have parental incomes of between Rs 20,000 and Rs 30,000, live in a family of six to eight people with a single parent, and are enrolled in a commerce group exhibit high decision-making skills. Higher secondary school students' gender, group, school type, mother's qualifications, and family type all influence their decision-making. Children in higher secondary

school tended to make decisions in a more intuitive and vigilant manner, but they struggled with spontaneity. Students in higher secondary schools should receive decision-making training so they can endure in challenging situations.

IV. REFERENCES

- [1] **AlAmer N. A. (2023).** Decision-Making Styles and Managerial Creativity of Nursing Managers in Saudi Arabia: A Multi-Center Cross-Sectional Study. *Healthcare (Basel, Switzerland)*, 11(12), 1719. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare11121719>.
- [2] **Bakken, B. T., Hansson, M., & Hærem, T. (2024).** Challenging the doctrine of “non-discerning” decision-making: Investigating the interaction effects of cognitive styles. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 97(1), 209-232.
- [3] **Bavolar, J., Kacmar, P., Lovas, L., & Durbisova, S. (2024).** Decision-making styles and goal striving. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 37(1), e2349.
- [4] **Bozyiğit, E., & Biçer, T. (2024).** Do Decision-Making Styles Affect Career Stress?. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi-Pamukkale University Journal of Education*.
- [5] **Efremov, L., Karaman, M., & Aslan, M. (2023).** Decision-Making Styles as Human Factors in Occupational Context. In *Occupational and Environmental Safety and Health V* (pp. 577-587). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- [6] **K.S., V. M., Rajkumar, E., Lakshmi, R., John, R., Sunny, S. M., Joshua George, A., ... Abraham, J. (2023).** Influence of decision-making styles and affective styles on academic procrastination among students. *Cogent Education*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2203598>.
- [7] **Mantry, Asit & Kour, Tarandeep & Sahu, Pradeep. (2022).** Decision-making styles of the Headmistresses of High schools: A Cross-Sectional Study. 11. 29-31.
- [8] **Marques da Rocha, M. C., Malloy-Diniz, L. F., Romano-Silva, M. A., Joaquim, R. M., Serpa, A. L. O., Paim Diaz, A., de Paula, J. J., Costa, D. S., da Silva, A. G., Pinto, A. L. C. B., & de Miranda, D. M. (2023).** Decision-making styles during stressful scenarios: The role of anxiety in COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in psychiatry*, 14, 1105662. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2023.1105662>.
- [9] **Marquez-Ramos, F., Alarcon, D., Amian, J. G., Fernandez-Portero, C., Arenilla-Villalba, M. J., & Sanchez-Medina, J. (2023).** Risk Decision Making and Executive Function among Adolescents and Young Adults. *Behavioral sciences (Basel, Switzerland)*, 13(2), 142. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13020142>
- [10] **Raoust, G., Kajonius, P., & Hansson, S. (2023).** Personality traits and decision-making styles among obstetricians and gynecologists managing childbirth emergencies. *Scientific reports*, 13(1), 5607. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-32658-6>.
- [11] **Rouco, C., Marques-Quinteiro, P., Reis, V., & Duarte, I. (2024).** Relationship between Decision-Making Styles and Leadership Styles of Portuguese Fire Officers. *Fire*, 7(6), 196.
- [12] **Sedlár, M., & Gurňáková, J. (2024).** Decision-Making Styles in Medical Students and Healthcare Professionals: The Roles of Personality Traits and Socio-Emotional Intelligence Factors. *The Journal of psychology*, 1-21. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2024.2369618>.
- [13] **Soltwisch, B. W., Dimitrov, D., & Hojnik, J. (2023).** How decision-styles and cultural orientation influence entrepreneurial and social entrepreneurial intentions: A cross-cultural comparison. *Frontiers in psychology*, 13, 988815. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.988815>.
- [14] **Watson, D., Mhlaba, M., Molelekeng, G., Chauke, T. A., Simao, S. C., Jenner, S., Ware, L. J., & Barker, M. (2023).** How do we best engage young people in decision-making about their health? A scoping review of deliberative priority setting methods. *International journal for equity in health*, 22(1), 17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-022-01794-2>.