

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE DECISION-MAKING STYLES OF FILIPINO TEACHERS AND SOUTH EAST ASIAN TEACHERS

*Maglonzo, Marc Louie

**De Luna, Josie Marie

***Caparas, Laurene Anne

****Manuel, Mary Jane

Paper Received: 18.12.2022 / **Paper Accepted:** 12.02.2023 / **Paper Published:** 14.02.2023

Corresponding Author: Maglonzo, Marc Louie; Email: josiemarie.deluna@email.lcup.edu.ph doi:10.46360/globus.mgt.120231003

Abstract

Decisions are generally made under the assumption that the option chosen is the best one available and that there is no intent to eventually change them unless demanded by specific circumstances, such as when the original decision no longer achieves the desired result. This explains the necessity of making the best choice at a particular moment and implies the difficulty of the burden borne by the decision-maker. The study findings report that most teachers in select SEA countries make decisions with caution. This means they clearly define the goals to be attained by the decision, consider a wide range of alternatives, diligently research pertinent information, digest knowledge objectively, and carefully weigh alternatives before making a decision. The study also found that teaching experience significantly impacted the choices made by teachers. According to the data research, teachers who have worked for four to six years tend to become more cautious when making decisions. It has been demonstrated that teachers in select SEA countries similarly make decisions. For example, teachers in the Philippines and Indonesia make wise decisions in almost all cases. This indicates that they are cautious when weighing their options before choosing.

Keywords: Decision Making Styles, Filipino Teachers, South-East Asian Teachers, Comparative Analysis.

Introduction

Decision-making is a fundamental part of human life. Teachers, for one, make daily decisions that often have a significant impact on their lives or those of the people around them. In both professional and personal levels, teachers contend situations that require them to analyze problems, come up with options, select the most appropriate course of action, implement decisions, and face pertinent repercussions.

Spradlin (2003) [48] refers to the term “decision” as an allocation of resources. Teachers are said to perceive decisions as something that may consume resources, time, energy, and may even affect one’s morale. It is also described as an irrevocable process that may only be altered if the new decisions made are designed to reverse the original preference (Ford & Roby, 2012 [20]). Decisions are commonly made with the assumption that a given choice is the best available course of action, and are not made intentionally to be changed or challenged in the future. Such is only done if the circumstances dictate the need to make a new decision, or when the original purpose no longer delivers the intended good. This explicates the need to make the right decision at a particular time and insinuates the challenge that it brings to the decision-maker. To a certain extent, it can be argued that, at all times, the goal is to make the right decisions.

More often than not, teachers strive to make the right decisions to solve problems or change the status quo. At times, this adds weight on their shoulders due to personal and environmental expectations that come with the decision-making process.

As Narangerel and Semerci (2020) [34] pointed out, right decisions often lead to positive emotions, whereas the wrong ones trigger the contrast. Likewise, Austin and Harkins (2008) [5] believe that teachers at times have to make agreement on issues, procedures, and policies that affect them as individuals and as a team. Nevertheless, it has been argued that conflicts arising from this process can potentially block dialogue, threaten people, and set aside cooperative working conditions

(Colakkadioglu, 2011 [13]). Hence, how a teacher decides to reach a positive or avoid a negative outcome and emotion needs to be examined. Doing so can help educational leaders understand how they can be motivated and guided to perform more effectively, both as individual teachers and as team members.

In their work, Shahsavarani and Abadi (2015) [47] define decision-making as a problem-solving process aimed at reaching a satisfying solution. It may be considered as an argumentative or emotional process, rational or irrational, that is based on implicit and/or explicit assumptions. For them, decisions are made based on culture, perceptions, belief systems, values, attitudes, personality, knowledge, and the insight of an individual.

Related to this, Abdollahi (2005) [47] noted that decision-making is generally a rational process except when dealing with personal matters that at times cause people to be less rational. Similar to what was articulated in Shahsavarani and Abadi (2015) [47], he believes that most decisions, preferences, and options are influenced by the information available from unconscious paths that have no direct link to the decision-making process. This goes to say that many factors influence decision-making and the individual tasked to make a decision may or may not be rational when approaching this process. With this, decisions may be described as the output of different sources of information, and the constructs identified above may lead to conflicts or unwarranted pressure in making the right decision.

Given the above, it may be argued that the process of decision-making requires an individual to cope with the conflict or pressure brought upon by a problem. How well a person copes with these emotions may impact the quality of the decision.

Most of the studies conducted on decision-making within the educational parameters are heavily directed toward understanding how school leaders make decisions regarding managerial and instructional concerns. However, a big portion of a teacher's time is also spent in making decisions. As such, their unique position in playing an influential role to their students, fellow teachers, school administrators, and other people around them opens a huge room for discussion. Most of the literature about teachers as decision-makers center on their role as educators with emphasis on the decisions they undertake in instructional planning.

For one, Borko et al., (2008) [9] investigates the different types of decisions teachers perform before and while teaching, as well as the short and long-

term decisions they make in relation to instructional planning. It is worthwhile to point out, however, that teachers are subjected every day to situations that require them to make decisions not just on their professional but also on their personal lives. As educators, they are deemed responsible for making quality decisions related to instruction, classroom management, and other school-related affairs, but as individuals, they decide on matters that impact them as members of families and communities. More often than not, they face stress, discomfort, or conflicts in responding to calls for decision-making. Here, Southeast Asian teachers are not exempt.

Just as many others in the region, teachers from the Philippines and other countries in Southeast Asia work in tight conditions where discouraging teacher-student ratio, insufficient infrastructures and instructional materials, and gross impeding social factors such as students' socioeconomic status and lack of family support prevail. These perpetuate pressure for teachers to make right decisions to withstand these predicaments in the workplace and in their personal lives. Given that decision-making is at the core of teachers' responsibilities, the need to understand how they make decisions is essential to helping them become more effective in the classroom and be more proactive in responding to decision-making situations. Teachers are decision-makers who have a direct impact on the students, and finding out their coping patterns can be proven beneficial to the school community and to their own growth as individuals.

In 2012, Colakkadioglu and Gucray [14] looked at the impact of decision-making skill development on adolescent decision-making styles. Overall, the research showed that teaching decision-making skills to the participating adolescents raised their self-esteem, reduced the use of unhealthy coping mechanisms, and increased the use of adaptive coping mechanisms. Duque et al., (2013) [18], meanwhile, sought to examine factors influencing decision-making using a quasi-experimental group design. This study suggest that negative emotion interferes with people's ability to process information, while positive emotion leads to faster information processing in decision making.

In 2015, Bavolar and Orosovalooked [8] into decision-making styles in the context of Slovak high schools and universities. Using the Adult Decision-making Competence Scale and the Decision-making Styles Questionnaire developed by Scott and Bruce in 1995 [45], it was suggested that certain decision-making styles were significant predictors of the general decision-making competency.

In relation to this, Aung and Ye (2015) [4] sought to determine the differences of teachers' decision-making styles with their job satisfaction in selected schools in Thailand. The first part of the questionnaire used was developed by Dennis (2012) [17], based on the Vroom and Yetton's Model (1973) [50], while the second one was based on Weiss' (1967) [51] Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. The study revealed that, in terms of job satisfaction, respondents had low intrinsic job satisfaction levels but their extrinsic job satisfaction levels were higher.

In 2017, Azees et al. [7] investigated the personality dimensions, management styles, and decision-making styles of select Macedonian principals. The study revealed that directed decision-making was preferred by the majority of the respondents, while there was least preference for behavioral approaches. While a simple descriptive design was employed in the study, the data and analysis that it provided gave more context on the variables that will be considered in the present research. Meanwhile, Coruh and Vural (2019) [15] made use of the descriptive-survey method and reported that decision-making differentiated significantly according to the administrative function of the respondents. Similarly, in the present study, the researchers looked into the relationship of the teachers' years of service and education preparation to their decision-making style.

In their 2020 study, Narangerel and Semerci [34] administered the Demand-Control-Support Questionnaire to gather information on workload and the Melbourne Decision-making Questionnaire to assess decision-making styles and self-efficacy among respondents. It was discovered that work control has a favorable impact on decision-making self-efficacy whereas workload has a negative impact. Additionally, whereas buck-passing, procrastination, and hypervigilance decision-making styles are negatively impacted by decision-making self-efficacy, vigilant decision-making is positively impacted. This analysis is helpful to the current study because it sheds light on how teachers' sense of self-efficacy influences the other study variables and how it becomes a predictor of their decision-making style.

All in all, the above provide a framework on what the researchers must do to be able to compare the coping patterns of Filipino and Southeast Asian teachers.

Theoretical Framework

In 1977, Janis and Mann proposed a theory claiming that the decision-making process often leads to complex situations and personal conflicts.

Whenever a person needs to make a decision, especially when the options are deficient, arousal may come about in the process. Arousal tends to increase until he or she makes the decisions, and decreases afterward. Here, it is suggested that the conflict related to decision making of an individual might be good or bad depending on the amount of stress a person experiences (Mann et al., 1997).

Further, the complexity of decision-making is said to demonstrate a stressful action caused by the objective, personal, material or subjective harm resulting from the decision maker's choice (Janis & Mann, 1977 [24]). In other words, a person may experience psychological unrest and conflict when evaluating and contemplating on the suitability of the alternatives and the consequences of his or her actions. Hence, conflict theory suggests patterns on how decision-makers behave in stressful decision-making situations, alongside the coping mechanisms they employ in response to the arousal they experience.

According to Janis and Mann (1977) [24], individuals may exhibit four different decision behaviors, which are vigilant, buck-passing, procrastination, and hypervigilance decision-making styles. In some literature, this is referred to as coping patterns in decision making (Schutte, 2012 [44]).

The *vigilant decision-making* style, for one, is demonstrated when people act with caution in decision-making and carefully search for information about the situation before making a decision. People who observe this decision-making style decide after careful consideration of the alternatives. They are optimistic about finding a solution and they evaluate all alternatives in detail before committing themselves to a choice. Meanwhile, the *buck-passing decision-making* style is seen in people who show avoidant behavior in deciding. They tend not to decide, and often leave decisions to other people. In this way, they avoid making decisions by transferring the responsibility to other people.

In general, the *procrastination decision-making* style is a behavior displayed by those who constantly try to delay the decision-making process. They try to postpone decisions even if there is no logical reason. They undermine decision-making responsibilities to some extent despite pressure, leading to decisions being postponed, or no decision being made in the end at all. Finally, the *hypervigilance decision-making* style may be observed in people who show panic behavior in decision making. They feel under time pressure and under intense stress when they are at some decision-

making points. As a result, they tend to make decisions without so much thought and bring band-aid solutions to problems. This goes to say that if a person is not optimistic about solving problems under current circumstances and thinks there is not enough time for a detailed investigation, he or she might choose the worst or least effective alternative.

Broadly, the concern is on completing the process and relieving the stress experienced by the decision-maker without thinking about the effects of decision alternatives. The person acting in hypervigilance only aims to end the conflict and the mental agony of having to make a decision. In contrast, however, it is argued that individuals who opt for hypervigilant decision-making strategy performed better than those who preferred a vigilant strategy (Johnston et al., 1997 [25]).

Statement of the Problem

The research aims to analyze the decision-making styles of both Filipino and Southeast Asian teachers.

Specifically, the research endeavors to address the following:

1. What are the dominant decision-making styles of the Filipino and Southeast Asian teachers?
2. How may the teachers' years of service be related to their teachers' decision-making styles?
3. How may the groups' dominant decision-making styles be compared with one another?

Scope and Delimitation

The study was conducted from the Philippines but involved, albeit virtually, teachers from Southeast Asian countries as well. Specifically, Indonesian, Singaporean, and Thai teachers were included in the study. These developing countries are equally faced by the challenges brought about by migration and modernization. In terms of education, they continue to strive in providing access to quality education, as demonstrated by the most recent results of the Programme for International Student Assessment (2018) by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. It may be noted that the Philippines performed unimpressively in the said test that covers the areas of Mathematics, Science and Reading, along with other success indicators.

The case of Indonesia may be used to further illustrate the above. The education system in Indonesia, for example, has two broad purposes, which are to establish a high-quality and self-reliant human being whose values are based on the Pancasila or their state ideology, and to support the Indonesian society, people and State. The National Education System Law of 2003 dictates that the national education system in Indonesia should ensure equal opportunity, improvement of quality

and relevance and efficiency in management to meet various challenges in the wake of changes of local, national and global lives (Latief et al., 2021[27]). The education systems in Thailand and Singapore are also comparable.

Meanwhile, in the Philippines, Article 14 of the Constitution of 1987 stipulates that the school shall inculcate patriotism and nationalism, foster love of humanity, respect for human rights, appreciation of the role of national heroes in the historical development of the country, teach the rights and duties of citizenship, strengthen ethical and spiritual values, develop moral character and personal discipline, encourage critical and creative thinking, broaden scientific and technological knowledge, and promote vocational efficiency (Lazo, 2009 [29]). Moreover, the following aims are central to the Philippine education system: 1) live and work as human persons; 2) develop their potentials; 3) make critical and informed decisions; and 4) function effectively in society within the context of their environment and that of the wider community (local, regional, national and global) in order to improve the quality of their lives and that of the society. The international and national factors gravitate to high expectations for teachers to make decisions in the classroom geared toward students' personal development and nation building.

In this regard, the impetus of the current study is to find out the coping patterns in decision-making of Filipino teachers and teachers from select countries in Southeast Asia, as specified above. The study will also compare the coping patterns dominant in each group to understand how they face decision-making situations from their own context.

Methodology

● Research Design

The study followed a quantitative comparative analysis research design in order to identify and compare the decision-making styles of teachers from the Philippines and select countries in Southeast Asia. The study used a questionnaire in data gathering via Google Form, along with the confidentiality agreement form detailing the chief information concerning the study and the ethical use of the gathered data guided by privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity.

This study adheres to a descriptive survey method that aims to describe the decision-making styles of the participants quantitatively using the Melbourne Decision-Making Questionnaire. According to Creswell (2013) [16], this type of research design describes attitudes, tendencies and opinions numerically or quantitatively by performing studies on a sample group chosen from a population. This

method can be identified as describing a situation in the past or present, which in this case is the process of decision-making.

Comparative research can be traced to a long history that has gained much attention in current research due to globalization, technological advances, etc. on cross-national platforms (Azarian, 2011 [6]). Conventionally, comparative analysis emphasized on the “explanation of differences, and the explanation of similarities”. This helps to establish relationships between two or more phenomena and provide valid reasons.

In addition, the results for the two groups are to be compared by looking into the weighted mean of the dominant decision-making style of Filipino and Southeast Asian teachers. Through this descriptive statistical treatment, the researchers were able to analyze the data gathered and give suitable interpretation for the findings. According to Pickvance (2005) [41], comparative analysis is conducted mainly to explain and gain a better understanding of the causal processes involved in the creation of an event, feature or relationship usually by bringing together variations in the explanatory variable or variables.

To a certain extent, it can be argued that this method effectively allows the researchers to define a phenomenon, individual or object as it is in its conditions and to observe it without changing the current situation (Erkus et al., 2013 [19]). In the research, survey technique has been used as the primary data gathering procedure.

● **Participants/Respondents of the Study**

As mentioned, teachers from the Philippines and other Southeast Asian countries, specifically, Indonesia, Singapore, and Thailand were included in the study. The participants of the study were twenty (20) Filipino teachers, eight (8) Indonesian teachers, seven (7) Singaporean teachers, and five (5) Thai teachers. Convenience sampling, which is defined as a type of nonprobability sampling where respondents are sampled simply because they are “convenient” sources of data (Lavrakas, 2008 [28]), was used in the study.

A number of previous studies have detailed different nuances in determining sample sizes and saturation in research (Funder & Ozer [21], 2019; Hennink et al., 2019 [22]; Mishra et al., 2019 [32]). While appropriate sample size planning is crucial for statistically-powerful studies, the planning process is complex and relevant literature is difficult to navigate. Additionally, it is recognized that, in practice, special consideration is necessary given actual circumstances (Anderson, 2019 [3]).

Recent developments in research literature explain adaptive sample size designs as alternatives to fixed sample sizes (Cui & Zhang, 2019). Noting that with data collection are prohibitive costs, it has been argued that, particularly in the social sciences, the determination of the sufficiency of a data set takes into consideration the research question being answered (Van de Schoot & Miočević, 2020 [49]). As stated in literature, the sample size is chosen based on resource constraints. Further, sample size justification is grounded in the manner by which data is collected and how such can provide vital information given the inferential goals of the study (Lakens, 2022 [26]).

For the current study, the respondents are working either from the primary or secondary level and either in a public or private institution in the countries mentioned. In addition, the teaching experiences of these teachers ranged from three to eighteen years, and many of them were in service for around four to six years. For the purposes of anonymity and confidentiality, their names were not used in any portion of this study.

● **Instrument/s of the Study**

In 2012, Raffaldi et al. [42], investigated decision-making styles using both self-report questionnaires and a contextualized measurement. The researchers confirmed that there was a consistent correlation between the scores obtained from the business case and from the self-reported questionnaire, supporting that the latter’s means of collecting data is reliable and valid. The primary aim of this study was to find out whether or not the results of both methods were consistent with one another, which was ultimately the case. Reading this study supports the researchers’ decision of utilizing a self-report questionnaire as the data gathering instrument for the present study.

The Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire is based on the theory of conflict by Janis and Mann (1977) [24] and decision-making styles used by individuals if faced with difficult life or occupational decisions. It is a questionnaire consisting of 22 articles and four subscales aiming to determine decision-making styles, which may be vigilance, buck-passing, procrastination and hypervigilance. The vigilance subscale represents the most effective and rational coping strategy associated with moderate stress. The defensive subscales (buck-passing, procrastination, and hypervigilance) represent less effective coping strategies, i.e., either avoidance or emotional excitement associated with severe emotional stress. It adheres to a three-point Likert Scale characterized by the responses “True for Me” which is equivalent to two (2) points, “Sometimes True for Me”

equivalent to one (1) point, and “Not True for Me” which is zero (0) or no point. According to Isaksson et al., (2014) [23], the tests of reliability of subscales in different USA, Australia and other countries have shown the following Cronbach’s alpha: vigilance 0.65-0.80; hypervigilance 0.61-0.74; buck-passing 0.77-0.87; and procrastination 0.70-0.81 (4, 8-11).

● Data Collection and Analysis

Effective use of the data gathering tool is aimed to yield valid and reliable findings. This section details the data gathering procedure the researchers implemented.

Ogarca (2015) [37] conducted a study in Romania using the Decision Style Inventory by Rowe and Mason (1987). The current research was very much aligned with Ogarca’s as both employed a questionnaire as the primary data-gathering tool and applied descriptive analysis in interpreting the data collected. However, as previously mentioned, the current study also aimed to establish a comparison between the data yielded from both the Filipino teachers and teachers from select countries in Southeast Asia.

The pre-gathering phase required the researcher to share with the participating teachers the purpose of the study. A letter addressed to the principal requesting permission to conduct the study to their teachers has been issued, along with the Informed Consent Form for the teachers. The teachers, as the participants of the study, were assured that their participation will be treated with utmost confidentiality and anonymity. Prior to completing the Google Form designed based on the Melbourne Decision-making Questionnaire, the teachers were informed as to the purpose and the procedures to be undertaken in the study for the spirit of transparency.

Central to the gathering phase is the actual conduct of the survey. The first part of the questionnaire was devoted to personal information like the number of years of teaching. Then, the participating teachers completed the 22-item questionnaire by selecting their preferred responses among “True for Me”, “Sometimes True for Me”, and “Not True for Me”, which had numerical equivalents for statistical ease. The respondents answered the questionnaire without any time pressure.

The post-gathering phase entails tabulating the gathered data and applying statistical treatment to yield the responses to the research questions formulated by the researchers.

The data collected from the respondents were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Using the weighted mean and the standard deviation, the

researchers were able to find out the dominant decision-making style of the 40 participating teachers. The standard deviation served as a measure to validate the weighted mean. The weighted mean is a calculation that takes into account the varying degrees of importance of the numbers in a data set. In calculating a weighted mean, each number in the data set is multiplied by a predetermined weight before the final calculation is made. Moreover, a weighted mean can be more accurate than a simple average in which all numbers in a data set are assigned an identical weight.

Results and Discussions

This section of the study presents the results or findings in relation to the identified research objectives: 1) determine the dominant decision-making styles of the Filipino and Southeast Asian teachers; 2) relate the teachers’ years of service to their teachers’ decision-making styles; and 3) compare the groups’ dominant decision-making styles with one another.

As seen in both the literature reviewed and the responses of the participating teachers, decision-making is an essential skill and activity teachers perform on a daily basis. Teachers need to make decisions in their personal and professional lives that often lead to stress, discomfort and conflict. Decisions, be it on a simple daily matter or an important concern, always entails subsequent consequences that individuals need to bear.

Teachers as persons in authority in the classroom, as stakeholders of a school community, as family members, and the myriad of roles they play, are under constant pressure to make the right decisions at the right time and place.

Teachers, be them from public or private institutions, are decision makers in their own respect who possess different strategies and styles in coping with the conflict brought upon by the need to make decisions on a regular basis. Filipino and Southeast Asian teachers, being a part of almost similar education systems and under almost similar working conditions, make decisions that best help them cope with or eliminate stress from their already complicated working and living situations.

Research Objective 1: Determine the dominant decision-making styles of Filipino and Southeast Asian teachers

The researchers found out that the dominant decision-making style of the respondents is Vigilance. Paez-Gallego et al., (2020), defined vigilance as making decisions based on the systematic search and careful consideration of all

viable alternatives in an unhurried, non-impulsive way with the aim of satisfying personal objectives.

Results show that vigilance is the dominant decision-making style among the participating Filipino teachers, with a weighted mean of 1.59, and Southeast Asian teachers, with a weighted mean of 1.20. Further, Filipino teachers are shown to be vigilant when they feel under tremendous time pressure in making decisions with 16 or 80% of them answering Sometimes True for Me. The possibility that some small things might go wrong causes them to swing abruptly in their preferences with 80% of them answering True for Me. Southeast Asian teachers, meanwhile, agree that they avoid making decisions and the possibility that some small things might go wrong causes them to swing abruptly in their preferences with 17 or 85% of the respondents answering True for Me.

For Buck Passing, wherein the process of making decisions is delayed, 17 or 80% of Filipino teachers surveyed answered Sometimes True for Me. In contrast, participating Southeast Asian teachers like to consider all of the alternatives and if a decision can be made by them or another person, they would let the other person make it. More than half of the respondents answered Not True for Me.

Based on the responses of Filipino teachers for procrastination, it can be seen that whenever they face a difficult decision, these teachers feel pessimistic about finding the good in the situation. During the survey, 17 or 85% of them answered Not True for Me. Similarly, more than half of the Southeast Asian teachers who responded answered Sometimes True for Me on their preference to leave decisions to others.

On Hypervigilance, majority of the Filipino respondents cannot think straight if they have to make a decision in a hurry. The Southeast Asian teachers surveyed likewise try to find out the disadvantages of all alternatives, with many of them answering Not True for Me.

Research Objective 2: Relate the teachers' years of service to their teachers' decision-making styles

Majority of the respondents fall under the 4-6 years of service bracket for both the Filipino and Southeast Asian teachers. Among the 19 Filipino teachers with Vigilant Decision-Making Style, 42% of them are in between 4 to 6 years of service. This simply implies that teaching experience appears to have an influence on their decision-making styles. On the other hand, the only Filipino teacher with Hypervigilance Decision-Making Style falls under the same age bracket. For the Southeast Asian teachers with Vigilance Decision-Making Style,

38.89% fall under the 7 to 9 years of experience. The only Southeast Asian teacher with Buck-Passing Decision-Making Style is between 4 to 6 years of service. Lastly, the only Southeast Asian teacher with Procrastination Decision-Making Style also falls under the 4 to 6 age bracket.

Research Objective 3: Compare the groups' dominant decision-making styles with one another

Comparing the dominant decision-making style of each group, the majority of both the Filipino and Southeast Asian teachers who responded to the questionnaire are Vigilant Decision-Makers, accounting for 95% of the Filipino teachers and 90% of Southeast Asian teachers. This means that the majority of the sample population tends to act with caution in decision-making and carefully search for information about the decision situation before making a decision. They carefully consider alternatives and are optimistic about finding a solution.

Results show that the dominant decision-making styles for both the Filipino and Southeast Asian teachers is the vigilance decision-making style, with ratings of 95% and 90% respectively. Further, it can be seen that Filipino teachers are Not True for Me for Procrastination decision-making style in terms of the indicator of 'Whenever I face a difficult decision, I feel pessimistic about finding a good situation' with a mean of 7.45, while Southeast Asian teachers observe Vigilance decision-making style when they 'avoid making decision' and 'the possibility that some small things might go wrong causes me to swing abruptly in my preferences' with the mean of 7.45 as well.

The Filipino and Southeast Asian Teachers' Decision-making Process

Southeast Asian teachers, generally from archipelagic and coastal regions countries near the Pacific, are placed in almost similar working situations. Both countries have purposes of education that address their national aspirations for the development of human potential and active social participation. In terms of decision-making styles, there are hardly any studies that illustrate the decision-making styles of Filipino and Southeast Asian teachers. Nevertheless, some studies published in these two countries tackle decision-making in general.

For one, Mursalim (2009) [33] underscored the importance of culture among Indonesians when making decisions. For him, culture influences the preference of people to make collective decisions and the ability to solve problems that differ in terms of time orientation, the importance of rationality, and belief system. Hence, when trying to make a

good decision, a person must consider all the alternatives and weigh the positive and negative effects of the available options. For effective decision making to eventuate, he or she must be able to forecast the outcome of each option as well, and based on all these items, determine which option is the best for that particular situation. He underscored that for Indonesians, culture constitutes a complex determining factor that affects the decision-making process.

On the other hand, Noorderhaven (1996) [35] has suggested that Filipino strategic decision processes are influenced by various sets of context variables. In his paper, he analyzed the influence of national culture in organizations using data from the Philippines. He concluded that national culture does indeed influence decision-making processes in the expected directions. Additionally, the conceptualizations based on Hofstede and the Bradford studies provide a fruitful framework for further research (Seidel et al., 2006). In a nutshell, the result of this survey study corresponds well to the expectations based on known cultural differences between the Pacific and the West.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

The majority of the Filipino and Southeast Asian teachers decide using the vigilant decision-making style. This means that they clarify the objectives to be achieved by the decision, canvasses an array of alternatives, searches painstakingly for relevant information, assimilates information in an unbiased manner, and evaluates alternatives carefully before making a choice.

The study also concluded that the majority of the respondents were between four to six years of service which implies that teaching experience has influenced greatly in the decision making of both Filipino and Southeast Asian teachers. The analysis of the data revealed that teachers from four to six years of service tend to become vigilant in making decisions.

It has shown that Filipino and Southeast Asian teachers possess the same decision-making styles. Ninety-five percent of the Filipino and ninety percent of Southeast Asian teachers are vigilant decision-makers. This means that they are careful in examining alternatives before making a decision.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following are recommended:

Further studies may be done with more number of participants from the Philippines and Southeast Asian countries, or possibly even from other developing countries to arrive at a broader understanding of decision-making style of teachers.

A qualitative study may be done to confirm the findings of the current study. Qualitative studies may reveal the lived experiences of teachers and may describe how other factors like culture and workload can impact their decision-making styles.

Future researchers may also want to understand the association of culture in the decision-making style of teachers.

School leadership training institutions may use the findings of this study to develop materials that will help teachers become more effective in making decisions.

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest by the authors in this manuscript.

References

1. Abdollahi, A. (2005). Psychology of decision-making: The effect of following useless and non-instrumental information on selection and decision-making. *Advances in Cognitive Sciences*, 7(1), 39- 48.
2. Aho, E., Haverinen, H., Juuso, H., Laukka, S. and Sutinen, A. (2011). Teachers' principles of decision-making and classroom management: A case study and a new observation method. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S187704281>
3. Anderson, S. F. (2019). Best (but oft forgotten) practices: sample size planning for powerful studies. *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 110(2), 280-295.
4. Aung, N. & Ye, Y. (2015). A comparative study of teachers' decision making styles. Retrieved from <http://www.assumptionjournal.au.edu/index.php/Scholar/article/download/1509>
5. Austin, M. & Harkins, D. (2008). Shifting spaces and emerging voices: Participation support, and conflict in one school administration team. *Early Education and Development*, 19(6), 907-940.
6. Azarian, R. (2011). Potentials and limitations of comparative method in social science. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(4), 113-125. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Reza-Azarian/publication/281269760_Potentials_and_Limitations_of_Comparative_Method_in_Social_Science/links/55dd953d08ae3a

7. Azeska, A., Starc, J. & Kevereski, L. (2017). Styles of decision making and management. Retrieved from <https://scindeks-clanci.ceon.rs/data/pdf/2334-847X/2017/2334-847X1>
8. Bavolar, J. and Orosova, O. (2015). Decision-making styles and their associations. Retrieved from <https://www.sas.upenn.edu/~baron/journal/14/141103/jdm141103.pdf>
9. Borko, H., Roberts, S. & Shavelson, R. J. (2008). Teachers' Decision Making: from Alan J. Bishop to Today. In P. Clarkson & N. Presmeg (Eds.). *Critical Issues in Mathematics Education: Major Contributions of Alan Bishop*. Springer Science+Business Media. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-09673>
10. Buggy, R. (2016). Leadership style and self-efficacy predict decision-coping mechanisms. Retrieved from https://esource.dbs.ie/bitstream/handle/10788/3129/ba_buggy_r_2016
11. Ceresník, M. (2012). Decision-making and cognitive structuring of students at university. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042812039560>
12. Clark, L. and Watson, D. (1999). Temperament: A new paradigm for trait psychology. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1999-04371-016>
13. Colakkadioglu, O. (2011). The effect of conflict theory based decision-making skill training psycho-educational group experience on decision making styles of adolescents. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ981811>
14. Colakkadioglu, O. & Gucray, S. (2012). The effect of conflict theory based decision-making skill training psycho-educational group experience on decision making styles of adolescents. *Educational sciences: Theory and practice*, 12(2), 669-676.
15. Coruh, Y. & Vural, M. (2019). Study on high school teachers' self-esteem in decision-making. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1223089.pdf>
16. Creswell, J. W. (2013). Steps in conducting a scholarly mixed methods study. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/dberspeakrs/48/>
17. Dennis, M. (2012). A comparative study of instructors perceptions on deans' decision-making styles between private university and public university in Bangkok, Thailand.
18. Duque, M., Turla, C. and Evangelista, L. (2013). Effects of emotional state on decision making time. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S18770428130>
19. Erkus, O., De Jager, V. C., Spus, M., van Alen-Boerrigter, I. J., Van Rijswijck, I. M., Hazelwood, L. and Smid, E. J. (2013). Multifactorial diversity sustains microbial community stability. *The ISME Journal*, 7(11), 2126-2136.
20. Ford, V. & Roby, D. (2012). Teacher-leader decision-making. *Leadership & Organizational Management Journal*, 2012(4). Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/34507>
21. Funder, D. C. and Ozer, D. J. (2019). Evaluating effect size in psychological research: Sense and nonsense. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 2(2), 156-168.
22. Hennink, M. M., Kaiser, B. N. & Weber, M. B. (2019). What influences saturation? Estimating sample sizes in focus group research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 29(10), 1483-1496.
23. Isaksson, U., Hajdarevic, S., Jutterstrom, L. & Hornsten, A. (2014). Validity and reliability testing of the Swedish version of Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, 28(2), 405-412.
24. Janis, I. and Mann, L. (1977). *Decision Making: A Psychological Analysis of Conflict, Choice and Commitment*. New York: The Free Press.
25. Johnston, J. H., Driskell, J. E. & Salas, E. (1997). Vigilant and hypervigilant decision making. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(4), 614-622. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.4.614>
26. Lakens, D. (2022). Sample size justification. *Collabra: Psychology*, 8(1), 33267. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.33267>
27. Latief, S., Sari, Y. Yusuf, M., Armila, A. & Hidayat, R. (2021). The development of Islamic education and strengthening of national education system of Indonesia. *International Journal on Advanced Science, Education, and Religion*, 4(2), 86-99.
28. Lavrakas, P. J. (2008). *Encyclopedia of survey research methods*. Sage publications.
29. Lazo, R. S. (2009). *Philippine governance and the 1987 Constitution*. Rex Bookstore, Inc.
30. Lucas, J. (2015). Decision-making stress and satisfaction: A cognitive-affective model. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316922103_Decision-Making_Stress_and_Satisfaction_A_Cognitive-Affective_Model
31. Mann, L., Burnett, P., Radford, M., & Ford, S. (1997). The Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire: An instrument for measuring patterns for coping with decisional conflict. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 10(1), 1-19.
32. Mishra, P., Pandey, C. M., Singh, U., Gupta, A., Sahu, C. & Keshri, A. (2019). Descriptive statistics and normality tests for statistical data.

- Annals of Cardiac Anaesthesia, 22(1), 67.
33. Mursalim, M. (2009). *Persamaan Struktural: Aktivisme Institusi, Kepemilikan Institusional dan Manajerial, Kebijakan Dividen dan Utang*. Jurnal Akuntansi dan Auditing Indonesia, 13(1). Retrieved from <https://journal.uui.ac.id/JAAI/article/view/223>
 34. Narangerel, E. & Semerci, A. (2020). The effects of workload, work control and self-efficacy in decision making on decision making styles. Retrieved from <https://eurokd.com/BSO/doi/10.32038/JBSO.2020.03.04.pdf>
 35. Noorderhaven, N. (1996). Opportunism and trust in transaction cost economics. In *Transaction cost economics and beyond*. Springer, Dordrecht.
 36. Omotola, O. (2012). An investigation into decision making styles practices. Retrieved from <https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/EJBM/article/viewFile/2454/>
 37. Ogarca, R. (2015). An investigation of decision-making styles in SMEs from Southwest Olteniaregion. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212567115000957>
 38. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2018). Programme for International Student Assessment. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/publications/pisa-2018-result.htm>
 39. Paez-Gallego, J., Gallardo-Lopez, J., Lopez-Noguero, F. & Rodrigo-Moriche, M. (2020). Analysis of the relationship between psychological well-being and decision making in adolescent students. Retrieved from <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.0195/full>
 40. Parmigiani, D. (2011). Teachers and decision-making processes: An Italian exploratory study on individual and collaborative decisions. Retrieved March 27, 2021, from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ968810.pdf>
 41. Pickvance, C. (2005). The four varieties of comparative analysis: the case of environmental regulation. Retrieved from <http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/57/1/chrispickvanc>
 42. Raffaldi, S., Iannello, P., Vittani, L. and Antonietti, A. (2012). Decision-making styles in the workplace: Relationships between self-report questionnaires and a contextualized measure of the analytical-systematic versus global-intuitive approach. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2158244012448082>
 43. Rowe, A. & Mason, R. (1987). *Managing with style: A guide to understanding, assessing, and improving decision making*. Jossey-Bass.
 44. Schutte, L. M. (2012). Stress, time pressure, and decision making. Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.wustl.edu/pacs_capstones/65/
 45. Scott, S. & Bruce, R. (1995). Decision-making style: The development and assessment of a new measure. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 55(5), 818-831. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/00131644950550050>
 46. Seidel, S., Rosemann, M., Ter Hofstede, A. and Bradford, L. (2006). Developing a Business Process Reference Model for the Screen Business-A Design Science Research Case Study. In *Proceedings of the 17th Australasian conference on information systems*. Australasian Association for Information Systems.
 47. Shahsavarani, A. & Abadi, E. (2015). The bases, principles, and methods of decision-making. Retrieved from http://www.ijmedrev.com/article_68259_bec2d0c8319895a8119b8c6027fd75ad.pdf
 48. Spradlin, T. (2003). A lexicon of decision making. Retrieved from <http://faculty.fuqua.Duke.edu/daweb/lexicon.htm>
 49. Van de Schoot, R. & Miočević, M. (2020). *Small sample size solutions: A guide for applied researchers and practitioners*. Taylor & Francis.
 50. Vroom, V. & Yetton, P. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 110.
 51. Weiss, D. Dawis, R. & England, G. (1967). *Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire*. Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1968-08111-00>