Abstract

Education is an important from various points of view. Its field of activity is so wide that all activities and experiences are embraced in its sphere of work. Essentially it is a process of development, a development of the latent inherent capacities of a person to the fullest extent. It sublimes the animal basic instincts in a person to socially useful activities, habits of thinking and behaving. It inculcates in a person higher moral and social ideas together with spiritual values. So that he is able to form a strong character useful to his own self and the society of which he is an integral part. Further, education meets the immediate needs of a person and also prepares him for his future life. It culturists, the person promoting social and refined patterns of behaviour. Not only this, it develops all his intellectual and emotional powers, so that he is able to meet the problems of life squarely and solve them successfully. This study reveals the level of decision making of B.Ed. Students in Kanyakumari district. It also draws attention to the level of sociability of B.Ed. Students in Kanyakumari district. Data were collected by using decision making scale and Sociability scale. The investigator has selected 300 students studying in six B.Ed., colleges of Kanyakumari district. For selecting the students the investigator used random sampling method. The results demonstrate that 42.7% of B.Ed. students have moderate level of Sociability and 32.7% of the B.Ed. students have moderate level of decision making.
1. **Introduction**

Education plays an important role in enabling a person to face a real life situation with adequate knowledge. Without sound values, good habits and strict self-discipline, even the most gifted person cannot blossom into a good achiever. Without getting themselves inculcated with proper values, mere academic achievements would amount to accumulation of degrees/diplomas which will be a cold comfort on a wintry night (Shastry, 2003). Only the educated are free in mind and body. People who do not recognize a palpable absurdity are very much in the way of civilization. Natural abilities are like plants that need pruning by study. Knowledge, awareness, skills, attitude, wisdom will stand anyone in good stead (Ramesh, 2010). Through education, one gains knowledge and broadens his horizon. According to Tagore, “The widest road leading to the solution of all our problems is education”. This research paper is divided into further five sections. Section I shows the significance of study along with some important operational definitions used in present study. Section II combines some important objectives along with null hypothesis to be proved. Section III comes with important research procedures opted for the data collection. Section IV demonstrates the important results, analysis & their interpretations. Finally, the last part of this paper highlights important findings & future recommendations. This paper ends with appropriate references used for the present research.

2. **Significance Of The Study**

Decision making is the need of the hour for the students as well as teachers. Students of this age too impulsive and to make decision. They are easily carried away by their own decisions. Besides many people believe that decision making is one of the most important factors for preventing social problems. The level of good decisions of the students is proportionate to achievement level of the students. Teachers need to be able to get along with students who understand later to their needs a prospective teachers should be able to reach up to them, and no their capacity, standard, background and understanding of the society essential too, students learning outcome is ultimately to fulfil the needs of the society. To bring up a correlation in the learning and the expectation and need of the society, the teachers need to extract the essence of the needs from the social member either directly or indirectly. All these can achieved only if the prospective teachers is sociable.

The ability to comprehend the good and bad, and to sick on to truth and justice, can be attributed to good decision making skills. Higher education plays a vital role in developing the personality of the students. In order to do any work and complete it in successful way it is the duty of the students to develop their decision making add sociability for setting their goals and achievements. A prospective teachers has to be good as decision making and sociability these qualities are helpful in taking a correct decisions, understanding the mind of the study and impact the require knowledge. Taking into consideration this situation, the investigator felt a need to conduct a study to know about the decision making and sociability of B.Ed., students in Kanyakumari district in relation to their name, gender, religion, educational qualification of parents, computer knowledge, habit of newspaper reading ,major subject in UG and locality of residence.

3. **Operational Definitions**

- **Decision making:** Decision making is defined as the selection of one course of action from two or more alternative courses of action. Moreover it is the cognitive process of reaching a decision.
• **Sociability**: Sociability is the relative tendency or disposition to be sociable or associate with one’s fellows. Sociability is the ability to be fond of the company of others; people who are sociable are inclined to conversation with others. A prominent example is ethnic sociability, which is measure of the degree to which certain ethnic groups are able to interact with people from other ethnic groups. Sociability is the quality of being sociable; socialness.

• **B.Ed. students**: B.Ed. Student is a student teacher who is undergoing a bachelor degree in education from College of Education.

### 4. Objectives Of The Study

Following are the general objectives of the present study:

I. To find out the level of decision making of B.Ed., students in Kanyakumari district.

II. To find out the level of sociability of B.Ed., students in Kanyakumari district.

III. To find out the relationship between decision making and sociability of B.Ed., students in Kanyakumari district.

### 5. Null Hypotheses

The following are the hypotheses formulated for the present study:

I. There is no significant difference between male and female B.Ed., students in their decision making and its dimensions.

II. There is no significant difference between rural and urban B.Ed., students in their decision making and its dimensions.

III. There is no significant difference between male and female B.Ed., students in their sociability.

IV. There is no significant difference between rural and urban B.Ed., students in their sociability.

### 6. Research Procedure

I. **Method Adopted In The Present Study**

In this study the investigator adopted survey method.

II. **Population**

The populations of the present study are the students studying in B.Ed., colleges in Kanyakumari district.

III. **Sample**

The investigator has selected 300 students studying in six B.Ed., colleges of Kanyakumari district. For selecting the students the investigator used random sampling method.

IV. **Tools Used In The Present Study**

In the present study investigator used the following tools:

1. Decision making scale which is standardized by the investigator
2. Sociability scale was developed by Anbalagan, (2005).
7. Data Analysis & Interpretations

Table 1: Level Of Decision Making Of The B.Ed. Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Making</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, it is evident that 32.7% of the B.Ed., students have moderate level of decision making and 32.3% and 35.0% of the B.Ed., students have high and average levels of decision making respectively.

Table 2: Difference Between Male And Female B.Ed. Students In Their Decision Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Male N =81</th>
<th>Female N = 219</th>
<th>Calculated Value of ‘t’</th>
<th>Remarks at 5% level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selecting method of teaching</td>
<td>9.802</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>2.065</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting audio-visual aids</td>
<td>9.604</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>3.327</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing a test</td>
<td>9.913</td>
<td>10.032</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating co-curricular activities</td>
<td>9.963</td>
<td>10.01</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39.77</td>
<td>40.58</td>
<td>1.373</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(At 5% level of significance, the table value of ‘t’ is 1.96)

It is inferred from the table that there is no significant difference between male and female B.Ed., students in their decision making and its dimensions of selecting audio-visual aids and participating co-curricular activities. But there is significant difference between male and female B.Ed., students in their dimensions of selecting method of teaching and preparing a test. While comparing the mean scores of male (9.802) and female (10.16) B.Ed., students selecting method of teaching female students is better than male students. While comparing the mean scores of male (9.604) and female (10.18) B.Ed., students in their selecting audio-visual aids female students is better than male students.

Table 3: Difference Between Rural And Urban B.Ed., Students In Their Decision Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Rural N = 140</th>
<th>Urban N = 160</th>
<th>Calculated Value of ‘t’</th>
<th>Remarks at 5% level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selecting method of teaching</td>
<td>9.985</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting audio-visual aids</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>1.636</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing a test</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>9.956</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating co-curricular activities</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40.22</td>
<td>40.49</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(At 5% level of significance, the table value of ‘t’ is 1.96)
It is inferred from the table that there is no significant difference between rural and urban B.Ed., students in their decision making and its dimensions of selecting method of teaching, selecting audio-visual aids, preparing a test and participating co-curricular activities.

Table 4: Level Of Sociability Of The B.Ed., Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociability</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, it is evident that 42.7% of B.Ed., students have moderate level of sociability and 28.0% and 29.3% of B.Ed., students have high and average levels of sociability respectively.

Table 5: Difference between male and female B.Ed. Students in their sociability

(At 5% level of significance, the table value of ‘t’ is 1.96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociability</th>
<th>Male N = 81</th>
<th>Female N = 219</th>
<th>Calculated Value of ‘t’</th>
<th>Remarks at 5% level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
<td>53.3 12.89</td>
<td>56.88 12.25</td>
<td>2.194</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is inferred from the table that the calculated value of ‘t’ (2.194) is greater than the table value which is 1.96 at 5% level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. There is significant difference between male and female B.Ed., students in their sociability. While comparing mean scores of male and female students, male students have more sociability than female students.

Table- 6: Difference Between Rural And Urban B.Ed. Students In Their Sociability

(At 5% level of significance, the table value of ‘t’ is 1.96)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sociability</th>
<th>Rural N = 140</th>
<th>Urban N = 160</th>
<th>Calculated Value of ‘t’</th>
<th>Remarks at 5% level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean S. D.</td>
<td>56.78 12.06</td>
<td>55.16 12.89</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is inferred from the table that the calculated value of ‘t’ (0.503) is lesser than the table value at 5% level of significance. The null hypothesis is accepted. That is, there is no significant difference between rural and urban B.Ed., students in their sociability.

Table- 7: Relationship Between Decision Making And Sociability Of The B.Ed. Students

(At 5% level of significance, for 298 df, the table value is 0.139)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>(\Sigma X)</th>
<th>(\Sigma Y)</th>
<th>(\Sigma XY)</th>
<th>(\Sigma X^2)</th>
<th>(\Sigma Y^2)</th>
<th>Correlation Co-efficient ((\gamma))</th>
<th>Remarks at 5% level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>12111</td>
<td>16777</td>
<td>495103</td>
<td>985033</td>
<td>676486</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is inferred from table that the calculated \(\gamma\)-value (0.047) is lesser than the table value (0.139) at 5% level of significance for 298 df. Hence the null hypothesis is accepted. That is, there is no significant relationship decision making and sociability of the B.Ed., students.
8. Findings

The major findings of the present study are as follows

i.) 35.0% B.Ed., students have moderate level of decision making.
ii.) There is no significant difference between male and female B.Ed., students in their dimension of preparing a test, participating co-curricular activities and decision making. But there is significant difference between selecting method of teaching and selecting audio visual aids.
iii.) There is no significant difference between rural and urban B.Ed., students in their decision making and its dimensions of selecting method of teaching, selecting audio-visual aids, preparing a test and participating co-curricular activities.
iv.) 7% B.Ed., students have moderate level of sociability.
v.) There is significant difference between male and female B.Ed., students in their sociability. That is male students have more sociability than female students.
vi.) There is no significant difference between rural and urban B.Ed. students in their sociability.
vii.) There is no significant relationship decision making and sociability of B.Ed., students.

9. Recommendations

- The sociability of the girls lower than the male students. This state can be changed when the girls get equal chances that of boys to mingle to the society and conduct cultural programs. In addition to these girls should be given more social recognition to improve their sociability. There will be considered improvement girls leadership quality, when they are given leadership chances in their working places, situation atmosphere.
- The selection procedure of student teachers and teacher trainees, higher level of decision making level and sociability may be placed as a requirement and the same assessed before admission.
- Level of decision making of prospective teacher needs to be enhanced through suitable curriculum modification so that they can instil the same to the future generation.
- Greater level of social awareness can be emphasized through education for the affective domain and psychomotor domain. For these prospective teachers can be indulged in activities like planting of saplings, maintaining a nursery, neighbourhood and college clean.
- The teaching-learning of sociability can be acquired by heuristic method which means encouraging the students to discover for themselves by visits, excursions, nature walks, eco-tourism, trekking, field trips, studies and library consultation.
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