

PEER PRESSURE AND DECISION MAKING STYLES OF STUDENT TEACHERS

Thazin Mon¹

Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to investigate peer pressure and decision making styles of student teachers from Yangon University of Education. Quantitative approach was used in this study and the required sample was selected by using random sampling technique. A total of 473 student teachers (First year to Final year student teachers) from Yangon University of Education in 2023-2024 academic year participated in this study. As research instruments, the Peer Pressure Questionnaire-Revised (PPQ-R) developed by Sunil Saini and Sandeep Singh (2016) and General Decision Making Style Questionnaires (GDMS) developed by Scott and Bruce (1995) were adapted to measure peer pressure and decision making styles of student teachers in this study. The results showed that the student teachers experienced moderate level of peer pressure and most of them tended to use rational decision making styles. In this study, it was found that there were significant differences in peer pressure of student teachers by gender, age and education level. It was observed that there was significant difference in student teachers' decision making styles by gender but there were no significant differences by age and education level. The result of this study revealed that student teachers who had high peer pressure were most likely to use dependent and spontaneous decision making styles rather than rational decision making style. Moreover, student teachers' decision making styles had a significant association with their level of peer pressure at 0.001 level. To sum up, the findings of this study have implications in assisting student teachers, administrators and educators by highlighting the importance of peer pressure and decision making styles of student teachers.

Keywords: Peer, Peer Pressure, Decision Making Styles, Student Teachers

Introduction

The development of a nation depends much on today's generation, especially the student teachers who are college or university students who choose teaching profession as a career (Balyer & Özcan, 2014). When the student teachers interact with their peers, they might rely on their peers more than necessary, resulting in peer pressure. Hu et al. (2021), Ungar (2000) and Clasen & Brown (1985) defined peer pressure as pressure from peers to make choices consistent with the preferences of influential groups, irrespective of what an individual personally wants. Under this pressure, they may decide to take part in antisocial activities that may ruin their lives. They are very curious about everything in their surroundings and show risky behaviors to maintain their social relationship. It can be observed from these behaviors that peer pressure affects decision making.

Decision making is inseparable from every human being's life. Some people make decisions based on reasons or their own preferences whereas others need help from their peers. This sometimes results in good decisions while sometimes results in bad decisions, depending on the source they are relying to seek guidance to make decisions. Some people always have to take advice from peers even when making important decisions that will have an immense effect on their life. In addition, because of regularly relying on peers, they can't decide for themselves and their decision making will become weaker than before. As decision making is an important aspect of everyone's life, it is necessary to realize how peer pressure influences decision making. Therefore, this study proposes to examine the association between peer pressure and decision making styles among student teachers.

Purposes of the Study

The main purpose of the present study was

- to investigate the peer pressure and decision making styles of student teachers
- The specific objectives were
- To investigate the peer pressure among student teachers

¹ Department of Educational Psychology, Yangon University of Education

- To study the level of peer pressure among student teachers
- To observe the difference in the peer pressure of student teachers by their gender, age and education level
- To explore the decision making styles of student teachers
- To clarify the difference in the decision making styles of student teachers in terms of gender, age and education level
- To find out the association between peer pressure and decision making styles of student teachers

Definitions of Key Terms

Peer. People of the same age group, like classmates, or workmates are called peers (Steinberg & Monahan, 2007).

Peer Pressure. It means the influence exerted by a peer group or an individual encouraging other individuals to change their attitudes, values or behaviors in order to conform to group norms (Trynoe, 2009).

Decision Making Styles. Decision making styles have been defined as the learned habitual response pattern exhibited by an individual when confronted with a decision situation. It is not a personality trait, but a habit-based propensity to react in a certain way in a specific decision context (Scott & Bruce, 1995).

Student Teachers. It is defined as the student enrolled in a teacher preparation program who must successfully complete degree requirements including course work and field experience before being awarded a teaching license (Ryan, 2017).

Review of Related Literature

Peer Pressure

It is universally acknowledged that peers are the most influential people in the adolescents' lives; they impact goals, attitudes, and the ways they think and act. Peers have a very prominent position in an adolescent's life. They need their acceptance, support, and approval. For this acceptance, they feel pressure to follow them, it refers as peer pressure. Social identity theory of Tajfel (1979) explained how individual's identification with a social group affects their behavior and self-concept. According to social identity theory, people are more likely to follow the norms and behaviors of their peer group in the context of peer pressure if they want to preserve a positive social identity. Erikson's theory stated that peer pressure is needed for a person to develop, learn and grow and to form into an individual, it is through both positive and negative peer pressure that people form and develop their individuality and social status, this often starts in adolescence. Peer pressure occurs when an individual experiences implied or expressed persuasion to adopt similar values, beliefs and goals or to participate in the same activities as those in the peer group. It is something everyone has to deal with, even adults (Rubin et al., 2006).

Decision Making Styles

Decision making is a construct linked to human behavior and thus receives scientific consideration in the field of psychology. Denis (2011) observed that if a person wants to overcome the problems, that person needs to possess effective decision making skills and self-confidence in making decisions. Decision making is a broad term that applies to the process of making a choice between options as to a course of action (Thomas et al., 1991). In order to achieve personal and professional goals and enrich one's overall quality of lives, the individuals, belonging to all age groups, categories and backgrounds need to ensure that they make decisions in a well-ordered manner (Kapur, 2020). The effectiveness of the decision making process depends on the characteristics of the person who makes the decision. It is because at the decision making step, the methods preferred by the individuals are important (Shiloh et al., 2001).

When substantial theorizing and empirical research in decision making has focused on the aspects of the decision tasks and decision situation that influence decision outcomes, relatively less empirical attention has been paid to characteristics of the decision maker that might

influence decision outcomes (Scott & Bruce, 1995). Scott and Bruce argue that their study on the development of General Decision Making Style as a measure of decision making styles can be used across contexts and decision situations. The General Decision Making Style consists of five decision making styles: (1) rational, (2) intuitive, (3) dependent, (4) avoidant, and (5) spontaneous. These five decision making styles are a result of the thorough research and relevant literature reviews done by Scott and Bruce (1995). It has been widely employed in research to assess decision making style preferences and their relationships with various individual differences.

In everyday life, decision makers may face with partiality and uncertainty while evaluating the choices in order to make the best decisions. The presence and influence of parents, peers or significant others can also play a crucial role that interferes with one's decision making styles and influence the quality and adaptability of decisions.

Method

Research Design

Quantitative design and questionnaire survey method were used in this study.

Participants of Study

A total of 473 student teachers (First Year, Second Year, Third Year, Fourth Year and Fifth Year) from Yangon University of Education in 2023-2024 academic year participated in this study.

Instrumentation

The Peer Pressure Questionnaire-Revised (PPQ-R) developed by Sunil Saini and Sandeep Singh (2016) was used to measure peer pressure of student teachers. It has a total of 25 items. Each item was assessed along a 5-point Likert scale. For measuring decision making styles of student teachers, General Decision Making Style Questionnaire (GDMS) developed by Scott and Bruce (1995) was used. It was adapted by Tasdelen (2002). It is a self-report, Likert-Scale questionnaire with items scored on range of "1 to 5" for strongly disagree to strongly agree respectively. It consists of 25 items and the scale has 5 subscales, namely rational (5 items), intuitive (5 items), dependent (5 items), avoidant (5 items) and spontaneous (5 items).

Procedure

All the measures used in this study were adapted to Myanmar version. Then, expert review was conducted for face validity and content validity of the instruments. Next, the questionnaires were modified according to their suggestions and recommendations. And then, a pilot study was conducted with a sample of 50 student teachers from Yangon University of Education in first week of March, 2024 to test whether the wording of items, statements and instructions had their clarity and were appropriate to student teachers. The internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha) of the whole inventory for PPQ-R was 0.871 and that of GDMS was 0.746 respectively. Thus, the resultant of Cronbach alpha values showed that the PPQ-R and GDMS had high reliability to measure peer pressure and decision making styles of student teachers.

Data Analysis and Findings

Descriptive Statistics of Peer Pressure

To identify peer pressure of student teachers, descriptive statistics were conducted and the results were shown in Table 1. The mean and standard deviation of peer pressure of student teachers were 63.35 and 12.44 (see Table 1).

Table 1 Mean and Standard Deviation of Student Teachers' Peer Pressure

Variable	N	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Peer Pressure	473	63.35	12.44	30	99

Peer Pressure Level of Student Teachers

Based on descriptive statistics of peer pressure, student teachers in this study were identified into three groups. Among 473 student teachers, 79 are identified as high group, 321 are identified as moderate group and 73 are identified as low group in peer pressure. In other words, most of the student teachers (67.9%) are moderate group, 16.7% of student teachers are high group and 15.4% of student teachers are low group in peer pressure. So, it can be concluded that student teachers from Yangon University of Education have moderate level of peer pressure. So, it may be said that as student teachers are forming their professional identities, they may start to rely more on their own judgments and less on peer opinions, which can moderate at level of peer pressure they experience.

Table 2 Three Different Groups for Peer Pressure of Student Teachers

Variable		High Group	Moderate Group	Low Group	Total
Peer Pressure	N	79	321	73	473
	Percentage	16.7%	67.9%	15.4%	100%

Comparison of Student Teachers' Peer Pressure by Gender

In order to examine whether there was a significant difference in peer pressure of student teachers by gender, the independent sample *t*-test was carried out and the data was presented in Table 3.

Table 3 Means, Standard Deviations, and Results of Independent Samples *t*-test of Student Teachers' Peer Pressure by Gender

Variable	Gender	N	M	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Peer Pressure	Male	159	67.75	12.57	5.662***	471	.000
	Female	314	61.11	11.78			

*** $p < .001$

The result of independent samples *t*-test stated that there was a significant difference in student teachers' peer pressure by gender, in which male student teachers experienced more peer pressure than female student teachers. This may be due to the fact that boys generally have more freedom of movement in peer groups than the girls do. So, they were more frequently found in public with their peer groups while girls of the same age had a stronger preference for dyadic friendships. This result was consistent with previous studies of Umashankari, Kiran and Daspurkayastha (2020). In their results, there was significant difference in peer pressure of adolescents (15-22 years) by gender indicating that males had a higher level of peer pressure compared to females. It was also consistent with the finding of Khin Win Maw (2019) in which the male students have more peer pressure than female students. However, it was contradicted with the research of Manju et.al (2022) indicating that the mean of the male students is less than that of the female students.

Comparison of Student Teachers' Peer Pressure by Age

To investigate the differences in peer pressure of student teachers by age, descriptive analysis was conducted. The mean and standard deviation for peer pressure of student teachers by age were reported in Table 4. Then, one-way ANOVA was also calculated to examine whether there was any significant difference in peer pressure by age or not.

Table 4 Means, Standard Deviations and ANOVA Results of Student Teachers' Peer Pressure by Age

Variable	Age	N	M	SD	F	p
Peer Pressure	19-20 years	188	62.77	12.59	6.531**	.002
	21-22 years	144	66.26	11.57		
	23-24 years	141	61.14	12.61		

** $p < .01$

According to Table 4, it can be seen that the mean score of 21-22 years was the highest among three age groups and that of 23-24 years was the lowest in peer pressure. Moreover, the results of ANOVA indicated that there was a significant difference in student teachers' peer pressure by their age at the 0.01 level. To obtain more detailed information, Post-Hoc test was executed by Tukey HSD method. According to the result, the mean value of 21-22 years was significantly higher than that of 19-20 years at 0.05 level and that of 23-24 years at 0.01 level (see Table 5). Student teachers might face different kinds of pressure related to conformity, career, family and societal roles. It may be because society's expectations and norms change with age. This result was inconsistent with Umashankari, Kiran Babu and Daspurkayastha (2020) that peer pressure does not depend on age.

Table 5 Results of Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons for Student Teachers' Peer Pressure by Age

Variable	(I)Age	(J)Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	p
Peer Pressure	21-22 years	19-20 years	3.498*	.028
		23-24 years	5.122**	.001

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Comparison of Student Teachers' Peer Pressure by Education Level

In order to compare peer pressure of student teachers by their education level, the means and standard deviations of student teachers' peer pressure were reported in Table 6. To make more detailed information on the difference of student teachers' peer pressure by education level, ANOVA was conducted. ANOVA results indicated that there was a significant difference in peer pressure by education level at 0.05 level (see Table 6).

Table 6 Means, Standard Deviations and ANOVA Results of Student Teachers' Peer Pressure by Education Level

Variable	Education Level	N	M	SD	F	p
Peer Pressure	First Year	80	63.19	13.07	2.696*	.030
	Second Year	105	62.44	12.40		
	Third Year	96	65.68	11.64		
	Fourth Year	88	65.18	13.26		
	Fifth Year	104	60.68	11.54		

* $p < .05$

Then, to compare the group differences in detail, Post-Hoc with Tukey method was carried out and the results were shown in Table 7. It can be seen that the mean value of student teachers from third year was significantly higher than that of student teachers from fifth year at 0.05 level in peer pressure. As student teachers navigate college, work and relationships, peer opinions can heavily influence choice in education, career and lifestyle. Moreover, there is a strong need for social validation and fitting into peer groups. This was contradicted with previous study of Khin Win Maw (2019) conducted that there was no significant difference by education level.

Table 7 Results of Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons for Student Teachers' Peer Pressure by Education Level

Variable	(I) Education Level	(J) Education Level	Mean Difference (I-J)	p
Peer Pressure	Third Year	Final Year	4.994*	.036

* $p < .05$ **Descriptive Statistics of Decision Making Styles**

To examine decision making styles of student teachers, descriptive statistics was carried out and the results were shown in Table 8.

Table 8 Frequencies and Percentages of Student Teachers' Decision Making Styles

Decision Making Styles	Frequency	Percentage
Rational	336	71.1%
Intuitive	63	13.3%
Dependent	55	11.6%
Avoidant	8	1.7%
Spontaneous	11	2.3%
Total	473	100%

According to the descriptive statistics shown in Table 7, it was clearly found that the percentage of student teachers who used rational decision making style was the most among the student teachers. It could be concluded that the student teachers from Yangon University of Education used rational decision making style than other styles. It may be because student teachers who are trained to approach the problems logically, considering various solutions, and selecting the most appropriate one based on the situation. This training encourages them rational approach to decision making.

Decision Making Styles of Student Teachers by Gender

To investigate whether there was significant association in decision making styles of student teachers by gender; the Pearson Chi-square was computed and presented. The results of Pearson Chi-square test pointed out that there was significant association between gender and decision making styles of student teachers $\chi^2 (4, N = 473) = 15.906, p < .01$ (see Table 4.9). The significant level was 0.01 level. This may be due to females are more concerned about the security involved in the decision, they value the available time and money more, they think more about the possible consequences either for themselves or for other people affected than males. This result was consistent with previous studies of Salo and Allwood (2011) that there was a significant gender difference in decision making style.

Table 9 Pearson Chi-square Test Results of Student Teachers' Decision Making Styles by Gender

Gender	N	Decision Making Styles										χ^2	p
		Rational		Intuitive		Dependent		Avoidant		Spontaneous			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Male	159	112	70.4%	22	13.8%	12	7.5%	4	2.6%	9	5.7%	15.906**	.003
Female	314	224	71.3%	41	13.1%	43	13.7%	4	1.3%	2	0.6%		
Total	473	336	71.0%	63	13.3%	55	11.6%	8	1.7%	11	2.3%		

** $p < .01$, Cramer's V = 0.183

Decision Making Styles of Student Teachers by Age

To investigate the association in decision making styles of student teachers by age, the Pearson Chi-square was conducted (see Table 10).

Table 10 Pearson Chi-square Test Results of Student Teachers' Decision Making Styles by Age

Age	N	Decision Making Styles										χ^2	p
		Rational		Intuitive		Dependent		Avoidant		Spontaneous			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
19-20	188	131	69.7%	22	11.7%	27	14.4%	5	2.7%	3	1.6%	7.181	.517
21-22	144	100	69.4%	20	13.9%	17	11.8%	2	1.4%	5	3.5%		
23-24	141	105	74.5%	21	14.9%	11	7.8%	1	0.7%	3	2.1%		
Total	473	336	71.0%	63	13.3%	55	11.6%	8	1.7%	11	2.3%		

$p = .517$, Crammer's $V = 0.087$

Pearson Chi-square results indicated that there was no significant association between age and decision making styles of student teachers, $\chi^2 (8, N = 473) = 7.181, p > 0.05$ (see Table 10). This meant that student teachers' decision making styles do not depend on their age. This is why there was slightly different in money pressure, work pressure and social pressure for all age levels of student teachers. This finding was inconsistent with previous studies of Baiocco, Laghi, and Alessio (2009) that older people execute a more rational decision making style as compared to the younger ones.

Decision Making Styles of Student Teachers by Education Level

To compare decision making styles of student teachers under education level, a Chi-square statistics was used.

Table 11 Pearson Chi-square Test Results of Student Teachers' Decision Making Styles by Education level

Education Level	N	Decision Making Styles										χ^2	p
		Rational		Intuitive		Dependent		Avoidant		Spontaneous			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
First Year	80	50	62.5%	11	13.8%	1	17.5%	3	3.8%	2	2.5%	16.346	.429
Second Year	105	78	74.3%	12	11.4%	10	9.5%	2	1.9%	3	2.9%		
Third Year	96	68	70.8%	9	9.4%	16	16.7%	1	1.0%	2	2.1%		
Fourth Year	88	63	71.6%	17	19.3%	6	6.8%	0	0.0%	2	2.3%		
Fifth Year	104	77	74.0%	14	13.5%	9	8.7%	2	1.9%	2	1.9%		
Total	473	336	71.0%	63	13.3%	55	11.6%	8	1.7%	11	2.3%		

$p = .429$, Cramer's $V = 0.093$

According to Table 11, the Pearson Chi-square results indicated that there was no significant association between decision making styles of student teachers by education level, $\chi^2 (16, N = 473) = 16.346, p > .05$. This may be due to universities often teaching similar critical thinking and problem-solving skills across different levels. This approach can lead to similar decision making style among students regardless of their education level. This finding was consistent with previous study of Spicer and Sadler-Smith, (2005) that they observed decision making style was no relationship with year of study.

Comparison of Student Teachers' Peer Pressure by Decision Making Styles

To investigate the difference in peer pressure of student teachers by decision making styles, ANOVA was conducted.

Table 12 Means, Standard Deviations and ANOVA Results of Student Teachers' Peer Pressure by Decision Making Styles

Variable	Decision Making Styles	N	M	SD	F	p
Peer Pressure	Rational	336	61.68	11.81	7.084***	.000
	Intuitive	63	65.02	14.10		
	Dependent	55	68.62	11.57		
	Avoidant	8	69.88	13.09		
	Spontaneous	11	73.73	11.60		

*** $p < .001$

ANOVA results indicated that there was a significant difference of peer pressure by decision making styles at 0.001 level. The results showed that the mean score of spontaneous decision making style was the highest and that of rational decision making style was the lowest (see Table 12). This means that student teachers who experienced high peer pressure tend to use spontaneous decision making style and they are less likely to use rational decision making style. After making mean comparison by decision making styles, the Post-Hoc Test was carried out by Turkey HSD method to obtain more detailed information.

Table 13 Results of Tukey HSD Multiple Comparison for Student Teachers' Peer Pressure by Decision Making Styles

Variable	(I) Decision Making Styles	(J) Decision Making Styles	Mean Differences (I-J)	p
Peer Pressure	Dependent	Rational	6.943**	.001
	Spontaneous	Rational	12.052*	.011

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

According to Table 13, the results revealed that the mean value of student teachers with dependent decision making style was significantly more than that of student teachers with rational decision making style at 0.01 level and the mean value of student teachers with spontaneous decision making style was significantly more than that of student teachers with rational decision making style at 0.05 level in peer pressure.

Peer Pressure Level by Decision Making Styles

To investigate the association between decision making styles and peer pressure level, a Chi-square test was conducted. The result was shown in the following Table 14.

Table 14 Association between Decision Making Styles and Peer Pressure Level of Student Teachers

Decision Making Styles		Peer Pressure Level			Total	χ^2	p
		Low	Moderate	High			
Rational	Count	58	238	40	336	28.208***	.000
	%	79.5%	74.1%	50.6%	71.1%		
Intuitive	Count	10	38	15	63		
	%	13.7%	11.8%	19.0%	13.3%		
Dependent	Count	4	36	15	55		
	%	5.5%	11.2%	19.0%	11.6%		
Avoidant	Count	1	3	4	8		
	%	1.4%	0.9%	5.1%	1.7%		
Spontaneous	Count	0	6	5	11		
	%	0.0%	1.9%	6.3%	2.3%		
Total		Count	73	321	79	473	

*** $p < .001$, Cramer's V = 0.173.

Table 14 showed the Pearson Chi-square results and indicated that the peer pressure level of student teachers were significantly different on whether they have the preferred decision making styles $\chi^2 (8, N = 473) = 28.208, p < .001$. It can be interpreted that there is association between decision making styles of student teachers by peer pressure level. It may be because differences in peer pressure level have consequence for how student teachers make decision. If they trust their peers' opinions, they may rely on them more heavily, affecting their decision making styles to be more reliant on others than self-analysis. This finding is consistent with Dr. Renu Verna & Aditi Bansal (2019). They found that the adolescents who possess more peer pressure have less decision making abilities and vice-versa.

Discussion and Recommendation

As conceded by Singh and Saini (2010), a peer is somebody, who is of the same societal association based on age, class, or rank. Peer pressure is a sense of force from the same age group to do something dangerous for oneself and others. They influence people in either good ways or bad ways. Influence occurs when an individual acts or thinks in ways that he or she might not otherwise act or think, an effect that can be attributed to experiences with friends and affiliates. Moreover, decision making is the intricate process of selecting a particular option from a range of alternatives with the aim of attaining a specific and desired outcome. Wirawan (2013) suggested that this involves a systematic procedure, encompassing the analysis of problems, the identification of various alternative solutions, the careful selection of the most suitable option to address the problems at hand, the active implementation of the chosen decisions, and finally, an evaluation of how well these decisions have been put into practice. In essence, decision making is a multifaceted and dynamic process that requires thoughtful consideration and strategic planning to navigate through the complexities of problem solving and goal achievement.

The decisions made by young adults are influenced by a complex interplay of factors, including peer pressure, particularly during the transition from adolescence to young adulthood. The desire for social acceptance and the fear of rejection influences their choices in various aspects of life, including academics and lifestyle. This developmental period involves a balancing act between asserting autonomy and yielding to social influence, with peer pressure having both positive and negative effects on academic performance and social dynamics. This research will focus on the association between peer pressure and decision making.

For at least one major reason, teachers and educators should be aware of the present findings. Peer pressure can lead to positive outcomes when it encourages beneficial behaviors but it can also lead to negative consequences if it pushes individuals toward harmful actions. Therefore, there is a need to understand peer pressure i.e., how to manipulate peer pressure to bring positive change in the decision making styles of student teachers. Identification and knowledge of peer pressure can help teachers and educators to take proactive step in developing student teachers' decision making. It is important to know about the consequences that the decisions influenced by peers have on one's life, and think carefully and rationally before making a decision. An understanding of the association between peer pressure and decision making styles may encourage student teachers to make more autonomous, confident and competent decision makers in their lives. From the findings of this study, peer pressure levels of student teachers influenced decision making styles. Peer pressure can lead to positive outcomes when it encourages beneficial behaviors but it can also lead to negative consequences if it pushes individuals toward harmful actions. Therefore, there is a need to understand peer pressure i.e., how to manipulate peer pressure to bring positive change in the decision making styles of student teachers. Identification and knowledge of peer pressure can help teachers and educators to take proactive step in developing student teachers' decision making. Individuals join peer groups to learn and cope with new changes brought by modernization such as technological change and the need for new skills. Thus, any individual will more or less encounter peer pressure, just differing in the extent to which they are influenced by their peers. Peer pressure exerts both positive and

negative effects on life. Peer pressure may encourage one to study, make advances in career and improve living standard. It may also have negative effects in that one is forced to smoke, drink alcohol, and steal things. Sometimes, peers are the main culprits in making a person to not study properly and being absent from school. Peers may also induce unbearable burden in a bid to advance in career and live the lifestyle of peers. Thus, knowledge about peer pressure and how it affects people should be paid attention to. Only then, a person can contemplate whether they are influenced by peers or not. If they are, they can take counter measures to reduce the effects that their peers have on them, adjust their mentality and seek individuality. The matter of making decisions happens only when there are alternative solutions to the problems that an individual faces in a situation that demands their decision. Thus, it is an approach in which people have to think consciously and diligently to find the possible and feasible solutions. A decision can lead to unimaginable consequences severely affecting an individual's career, relationship with others professionally, socially and personally. The decision making is full of risk and responsibilities and accountability. Sometimes, a decision a person made affects not only the person that made the decision but also other people's livelihood. Hence, decision making is an important process in which one has to consider all the possibilities before making the final decision. A person's life can change significantly because of a decision they made such as the university they attend, the major subject they study, and the career they choose. These important decisions may be made according to the persuasion from their peers. A number of people are unknowingly making decisions based on peer pressure. It kills and gives rise to a set of people who are merely clones of each other, losing the sense of individuality. Succumbing to peer pressure in making important decisions of one's life can only land one in sorrow. One is likely to encounter huge expenses which they cannot afford. With time, this becomes a burden to the individual and the family at large (Olive, 1999). Therefore, it is important to know about the consequences that the decisions influenced by peers have on one's life, and think carefully and rationally before making a decision.

Conclusion

Since this study spotlighted the current situations of student teachers' peer pressure and decision making styles from Yangon University of Education, the findings of this study can be used as the knowledge base for teachers and educators. This study could be beneficial to the student teachers in order to become aware of their own susceptibility to peer pressure and their decision making styles. Additionally, the findings of this study could also help teachers and educators by reminding them to know the influence of peer pressure on decision making styles of student teachers. Therefore, this study could hopefully help to encourage student teachers to become more autonomous, confident and competent decision makers in their lives.

Acknowledgements

We would like to offer respectful gratitude to Dr. Kay Thwe Hlaing (Rector, Yangon University of Education), Dr. May Myat Thu (Pro-rector, Yangon University of Education), Dr. Khin Khin Oo (Pro-rector, Yangon University of Education), Dr. Nyo Nyo Lwin (Pro-rector, Yangon University of Education) and Dr. Tin Myo Swe (Pro-rector, Yangon University of Education) for their official permission to do this research. We would like to express our special thanks to the educational psychology experts from Yangon University of Education for their recommendations and precious advice. Finally, we would like to say thanks to all B.Ed. students participated in this study for their cooperation.

References

- Baiocco, R., Laghi, F., & Alessio, M. (2009). Decision-making style among adolescents: Relationship with sensation seeking and locus of control. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32(4), 963-976.
- Balyer, A., & Özcan, K. (2014). Choosing teaching profession as a career: Students' reasons. *International Education Studies*, 7(5), 104-115.
- Clasen, D. R., & Brown, B. B. (1985). The multidimensionality of peer pressure in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 14(6), 451-468.

- Deniz, M. E. (2011). An investigation of decision making styles and the five-factor personality traits with respect to attachment styles. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 11(1), 105-113.
- Dr. Rani, R. (2019). Effect of peer pressure on decision making of undergraduate students. *Annual Peer Reviewed Journal of Education*, 3(1), 1-6.
- Hu, K., Tao, Y., Ma, Y., & Shi, L. (2021). Peer pressure induced punishment resolves social dilemmas on interdependent networks. *Scientific Reports*, 11(1), 1-12.
- Kapur, R. (2020). Decision making skills: Integral part of one's lives in personal and professional spheres. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 30(8), 1019-1034.
- Olive, M. (1999). The impact of peer pressure on decision-making in adolescence. *Adolescent Psychology*, 13(2), 55-63.
- Rubin, K. H., Bukowski, W. M., & Parker, J. G. (2006). Peer interactions, relationships, and groups. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3. Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 571-645). Wiley.
- Ryan, K. (2017). *The role of student teachers in teacher education programs: An analysis of field experiences and licensure requirements*. Routledge.
- Saini, S., & Singh, S. (2016). *Peer Pressure Questionnaire-Revised (PPQ-R)*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Salo, I., & Allwood, C. M. (2011). Decision-making styles, stress, and gender among investigators. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50(8), 1299-1303.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1995). Decision-making style: The development and assessment of a new measure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 55, 818-831.
- Shiloh, S. (2001). Individual differences in compensatory decision-making style and need for closure as correlates of subjective decision complexity and difficulty. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 14(2), 167-182.
- Singh, S., & Saini, S. (2010). Peer pressure and its influence on the decision-making process. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 28(4), 302-315.
- Singh, U., & Manju. (2023). Gender differences in self-esteem, parental pressure, and peer pressure among adolescents. *Indian Journal of Health and Well-being*, 14(4), 499-502.
- Spicer, D. P., & Sadler-Smith, E. (2005). An examination of the General Decision Making Style Questionnaire in two UK samples. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(2), 137-149.
- Steinberg, L., & Monahan, K. C. (2007). Age differences in resistance to peer influence. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(6), 1531-1543.
- Tajfel, H. (1979). Individuals and groups in social psychology. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 18(2), 183-190.
- Thomas, J. C., Dougherty, T. W., & Harbison, K. P. (1991). Organizational politics and career success: The moderating role of tolerance for politics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12(3), 175-182.
- Trynoe, M. (2009). *Peer pressure and adolescent behavior: Understanding the influence of peers on youth development*. Springer.
- Umashankari, V., Kiran Babu, N. C., & Daspurkayastha, M. (2020). Study on levels of peer pressure among adolescents. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 8(3), 694-703.
- Ungar, M. T. (2000). The math of peer pressure. *Adolescence*, 35(137), 167-175.
- Verna, R., & Bansal, A. (2019). Peer pressure and decision-making abilities in adolescents. *Journal of Psychological Research*, 23(2), 102-110.
- Wirawan, H. (2013). Decision making as a dynamic and multifaceted process: A conceptual framework. *Psychology and Behavioral Science International Journal*, 1(3), 91-101.