Research Article

A Study on Thinking Styles of Prospective Teachers

Rev. Dr. S. Amaladoss Xavier SJ
Assistant Professor,
St. Xavier's College of Education
(Autonomous), Palayamkottai 627 002.

S. Sherlin
Research Scholar,
Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,
Tirunelveli 627 012.

Abstract

Through this study, the investigator made an attempt to find out the thinking styles of prospective teachers in Kanyakumari revenue district. The objectives of the study were, i) To find out the level of thinking styles and its dimensions of prospective teachers. ii) To find out whether there is any significant difference in the thinking styles and its dimensions of prospective teachers with respect to their gender and qualification. Survey method was adopted by the investigator. The population for the present study consists of prospective teachers of Kanyakumari revenue district. Using stratified random sampling technique the investigator selected a representative sample of900 prospective teachers from various Colleges of Education in Kanyakumari revenue district. To interpret the raw data, analyses were done using percentage, mean, standard deviation and t-test. The findings of the study revealed that, most of the prospective teachers seem to have moderate level of thinking styles in total and its dimensions. There is no significant difference in the thinking styles and its dimensions idiosyncratic thinking style, flexible thinking style, scientific thinking style, consequent thinking style and confused thinking style of male and female prospective teachers. But, there is significant difference in the dimension creative thinking style of male and female prospective teachers. There is no significant difference in the thinking styles and its dimensions flexible thinking style, consequent thinking style and creative thinking style of U.G and P.G qualified prospective teachers. But, there is significant difference in the dimensions idiosyncratic thinking style, scientific thinking style and confused thinking style of U.G and P.G qualified prospective teachers.

Keywords: Thinking Styles, Prospective Teachers, Gender Differences, Qualification Differences, Idiosyncratic Thinking, Flexible Thinking, Scientific Thinking, Creative Thinking, Consequent Thinking, Confused Thinking

INTRODUCTION

Education plays an important role in enabling a person to face the real life situation with adequate knowledge. Thinking is an important and vital topic in modern education. Whatever we do begins with a thought. Thinking is a mental attitude that sees the bright side of life, which admits into the mind, thoughts, words and images that are conductive to growth, expansion and success. Thinking style is the characteristic way of processing information. It's the way of acquiring knowledge, organize thoughts, form views and opinions, apply values, solve problems, make decisions, plan and express oneself to others. Thinking style is very important because it leads to clearer thinking, problem-solving, decision-making, more effective communication, improved work and relationships. It helps to achieve goals and attaining success, to improve the greater inner powers and strengths, to face the difficulties encountered along the way of life and to be happier in life. Such an important factor thinking styles should be inculcated among the students to make their life more comfortable. Then the question arises, who will inculcate this among the students. There is no doubt that, the answer will unanimously come as teachers. As teachers will help to promote the thinking styles of students, they should possess it in a great degree. Thinking styles is not a matter that can be developed over night, it should be developed progressively. By keeping this in mind, the investigator tried to find out the thinking styles of prospective teachers, since they are the future teachers.

OBJECTIVES

- To find out the level of thinking styles and its dimensions of prospective teachers.
- To find out whether there is any significant difference in the thinking styles and its dimensions of prospective teachers with respect to their gender and qualification.

HYPOTHESES

- The level of thinking styles and its dimensions of prospective teachers is moderate.

- There is no significant difference in the thinking styles and its dimensions of prospective teachers with respect to their a) gender and b) qualification.

METHODOLOGY

The investigator used survey method for the present study.

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The population for the present study consists of all the prospective teachers of Kanyakumari revenue district. Using the stratified random sampling technique, the investigator selected a representative sample of 900 prospective teachers from various Colleges of Education in Kanyakumari district.

TOOLS USED

For the present study the investigator used the followings tools,

- Thinking Styles Scale prepared and validated by the investigator.
- Personal Data Sheet prepared by the investigator.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

To interpret the raw data, analyses were done using percentage, mean, standard deviation, and t-test. The results of the analyses are presented in the following tables.

- The level of thinking styles and its dimensions of prospective teachers is moderate.

Table 1

Level of Thinking Styles and its Dimensions

Dimensions	Low		Average		High	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Idiosyncratic Thinking Style	124	13.8	611	67.9	165	18.3
Flexible Thinking Style	103	11.4	617	68.6	180	20.0

Scientific Thinking Style	119	13.2	596	66.2	185	20.6
Consequent Thinking Style	122	13.6	644	71.6	134	14.9
Creative Thinking Style	194	21.6	522	58.0	184	20.4
Confused Thinking Style	155	17.2	571	63.4	174	19.3
Thinking Styles in Total	99	11.0	676	75.1	125	13.9

It is inferred from the above table that13.9%, 18.3%, 20.0%, 20.6%, 14.9%, 20.4% and 19.3% prospective teachers have high level thinking styles and its dimensions idiosyncratic thinking style, flexible thinking style, scientific thinking style, consequent thinking style, creative thinking style and confused thinking style.

2. There is no significant difference in the thinking styles and its dimensions of prospective teachers with respect to their a) gender and b) qualification.

It is inferred from the above table that13.9%, 18.3%, 20.0%, 20.6%, 14.9%, 20.4% and 19.3% prospective teachers have high level thinking styles and its dimensions idiosyncratic thinking style, flexible thinking style, scientific thinking style, consequent thinking style, creative thinking style and confused thinking style.

2. There is no significant difference in the thinking styles and its dimensions of prospective teachers with respect to their a) gender and b) qualification.

Table 2.a

Difference in Thinking Styles and its Dimensions of Prospective Teachers with Respect to their Gender

Dimensions	Gender	N	Mean	S.D	Calculated tValue	p Value	Remarks

Idiosyncratic Thinking Style	Male	172	54.16	**8.39**	1.48	0.14	**N.S**
	Female	728	53.10	8.37			
Flexible Thinking Style	Male	172	49.69	9.09	0.03	0.97	**N.S**
	Female	728	49.67	8.93			
Scientific Thinking Style	**Male**	172	43.87	7.89	0.39	0.69	**N.S**
	Female	728	43.62	7.68			
Consequent Thinking Style	Male	172	43.29	7.44	0.32	0.75	**N.S**
	Female	728	43.50	7.58			
Creative Thinking Style	Male	172	48.79	8.53	2.83	0.00	**S**
	Female	728	46.64	9.03			
Confused Thinking Style	Male	172	31.66	6.95	1.39	0.17	**N.S**
	Female	728	30.89	6.52			
Thinking Styles in Total	Male	172	271.48	35.47	1.31	0.19	**N.S**
	Female	728	267.42	36.72			

It is inferred from the above table that, there is no significant difference in the thinking styles and its dimensions idiosyncratic thinking style, flexible thinking style, scientific thinking style, consequent thinking style and confused thinking style of male and female prospective teachers. But, there is significant difference in the dimension creative thinking style of male and female prospective teachers. While comparing the mean scores, male prospective teachers (48.79) are better than the female prospective teachers (46.64) in their creative thinking style.

Table 2.b

Difference in Thinking Styles and its Dimensions of Prospective Teachers with Respect to their Qualification

Dimensions	Qualification	N	Mean	S.D	Calculated t Value	p Value	Remarks
Idiosyncratic Thinking Style	U.G	730	52.96	8.36	2.56	0.01	S
	P.G	170	54.78	8.32			

Flexible Thinking Style	U.G	730	49.59	8.92	0.54	0.59	N.S
	P.G	170	50.01	9.11			
Scientific Thinking Style	U.G	730	43.41	7.77	2.04	0.04	S
	P.G	170	44.75	7.42			
Consequent Thinking Style	U.G	730	43.42	7.58	0.37	0.72	N.S
	P.G	170	43.65	7.46			
Creative Thinking Style	U.G	730	46.89	9.02	1.11	0.27	N.S
	P.G	170	47.74	8.76			
Confused Thinking Style	U.G	730	31.30	6.44	2.52	0.01	S
	P.G	170	29.89	7.19			
Thinking Styles in Total	U.G	730	267.59	36.83	1.04	0.29	N.S
	P.G	170	270.82	35.016			

It is inferred from the above table that, there is no significant difference in the thinking styles and its dimensions flexible thinking style, consequent thinking style and creative thinking style of U.G and P.G qualified prospective teachers. But, there is significant difference in the dimensions idiosyncratic thinking style, scientific thinking style and confused thinking style of U.G and P.G qualified prospective teachers.

While comparing the mean scores, P.G qualified prospective teachers (54.78 & 44.75) are better than the U.G qualified prospective teachers (52.96 & 43.41) in their idiosyncratic thinking style and scientific thinking style. But, the mean scores reveals that, U.G qualified prospective teachers (31.30) are better than the P.G qualified prospective teachers (29.89) in their confused thinking style.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Most of the prospective teachers seem to have moderate level of thinking styles in total and its dimensions idiosyncratic thinking style, flexible thinking style, scientific thinking style, consequent thinking style, creative thinking style and confused thinking style.

The findings clearly indicate that, there is significant difference between male and female prospective teachers in the dimensions creative thinking style. The mean scores reveal that, male prospective teachers are better than the female prospective teachers in their creative thinking style. It may be due to the reason that, males are having the capacity to think a

particular issue divergently than females. It authorises the general fact that, most of the innovative works and discoveries are the result of male's creative thinking.

Further analyses reveal that, the dimensions idiosyncratic thinking style, scientific thinking style and confused thinking style of U.G and P.G qualified prospective teachers differs significantly. The mean scores reveal that, P.G qualified prospective teachers are better than the U.G qualified prospective teachers in their idiosyncratic thinking style and scientific thinking style. In the case of confused thinking style, the reverse is happen. This may be due to the reason that, P.G qualified prospective teachers possess more knowledge and experience than U.G qualified prospective teachers as idiosyncratic thinking and scientific thinking are the thinking styles, which are developed through the development of age and experience. Also, the knowledge and experience reduce the confusion arise. So, confused thinking style is more for U.G qualified prospective teachers than the P.G qualified prospective teachers. Thus, it is the need of the hour that everyone, especially the prospective teachers, concentrate on understanding the importance of thinking styles and try to cultivate the desired thinking styles.

REFERENCES

- Mehta, D.D (2005). Education in Emerging Indian Society. Luthiana: Tandon Publications Books market.
- Mangal, S.K (2007). Advanced Educational Psychology.(2nded.), New Delhi: Prentice Hall of lndia Pvt. Ltd.,
- http://www.successconsciousness.com/positive attitude.htm
- http://www.successconsciousness.com/positive attitude thinking.htm
- http://www.positivethinking.co.in
- http://www.searchfeed.com/rd/feed!TextFeed.jsptrackID=&pID=&cat=positive+thinking