

58

Presentation date: December, 2019

Date of acceptance: January, 2020

Publication date: March, 2020

ANALYSIS

OF DECISION-MAKING STYLES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS ACCORDING TO VARIOUS VARIABLES

ANÁLISIS DE ESTILOS DE TOMA DE DECISIONES DE ADMINISTRADORES ESCOLARES SEGÚN DIFERENTES VARIABLES

Salim Akyürek¹

E-mail: salim.akyurek@neu.edu.tr

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9763-9633>

¹Near East University, Turkey.

Suggested citation (APA, seventh edition)

Akyürek, S. (2020). Analysis of decision-making styles of school administrators according to various variables. *Universidad y Sociedad, 12*(2), 405-416.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to reveal how the decision-making styles of administrators change according to demographic characteristics. In the study, Decision Making Styles Scale was used. The sample of the study consists of 365 administrators working in state high schools. The data were analyzed by the SPSS statistical program. The independent sample t-test was used to determine whether the decision-making styles of the administrators differed from demographic factors according to gender and education level. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether or not they differ according to age, location, working time and total working time. Levene test was used to determine the variance of the groups before the analysis and variance homogeneity tests were applied in case of differences. As a result of the research, it has been found that decision making styles differ partially according to age, gender, working time in the position and total working time, but not according to education level and position.

Keywords: Administrator, school administrator, decision making style.

RESUMEN

Este estudio tiene como objetivo revelar cómo los estilos de toma de decisiones de los administradores cambian de acuerdo con las características demográficas. En el estudio, se utilizó la Escala de estilos de toma de decisiones. La muestra del estudio consta de 365 administradores que trabajan en escuelas secundarias estatales. Los datos fueron analizados por el programa estadístico SPSS. La prueba t de muestra independiente se utilizó para determinar si los estilos de toma de decisiones de los administradores diferían de los factores demográficos según el género y el nivel educativo; El análisis de varianza unidireccional (ANOVA) se utilizó para determinar si difieren o no según la edad, la ubicación, el tiempo de trabajo y el tiempo de trabajo total. Se usó la prueba de Levene para determinar la varianza de los grupos antes del análisis y se aplicaron las pruebas de homogeneidad de varianza en caso de diferencias. Como resultado de la investigación, se ha encontrado que los estilos de toma de decisiones difieren parcialmente según la edad, el género, el tiempo de trabajo en el puesto y el tiempo de trabajo total, pero no según el nivel de educación y el puesto.

Palabras clave: Administrador, administrador de la escuela, estilo de toma de decisiones.

INTRODUCTION

Management is defined as a process of effort, cooperation, and effective decision-making to achieve the specified objectives of the employees or the organization. However, in our age when the change is dizzying fast, developing economic and social conditions increase the responsibilities of the executives and restrict the planned and programmed action in many ways and even make it impossible. Administrators now have difficulty in predicting the future, they are uncertain about what to do. For this reason, the idea that administrators can plan and control the future events in advance and manage the situation, to maintain the status of traditional management has started to change completely.

Thus, in classical management systems, administrators move away from the existing hierarchical structure, to differentiate between departments, levels and interpersonal relations, to change the rules of the game, to stretch and soften, team and group spirit to the front, to recognize the employees better to discover, develop, develop their thoughts, energy and creativity by creating a structure that will help them. In this structure, individual features and decision-making activities affected by these features appear as an important process.

Decision and decision making are two phenomena that occupy an important place in human life. As a result of the increasing complexity of institutional and social life, the lives of individuals and groups have become increasingly complex. The importance of getting rid of this chaos and finding solutions to the problems that have emerged have become increasingly important, and decision-making has become even more important as a necessary and correct activity for individuals, groups, organizations, and societies.

In this context, it is stated that decision making is critical for the safe and efficient operation of basic, complex socio-technical systems in all activities of people (Jenkins, et al., 2010). In organizations and societies such as individuals and groups, they have to make decisions and even make the right decisions to reach their goals and survive. Otherwise, they cannot survive for a long time. The key to survival is to identify problems and priorities at the right time, to use opportunities appropriately and effectively, to find and choose the best solution and to apply the choice. The result of the selection shows the quality of the decision.

In organizations and societies such as individuals and groups, they have to make decisions and even make the right decisions to reach their goals and survive. Otherwise, they cannot survive for a long time. The key to survival is

to identify problems and priorities at the right time, to use opportunities appropriately and effectively, to find and choose the best solution and to apply the choice.

The result of the selection shows the quality of the decision. Decision-making behavior involves a process that extends from one direction to management and from one organization to another. Organizations and management need to have a healthy decision-making mechanism to perform their functions effectively and efficiently. Decision making is a vital factor for organizations.

In this respect, it can be said that decision making has administrative and organizational quality and is one of the basic functions of management and management. Regardless of their level, every administrator is a decision-maker and important decisions are made by administrators (Robins et.al., 2013: 11). The decision-making mechanism that applies to all administrators in a school is the most important tool and the most important function of the administrators. School administrators are obliged to use the human and material resources under their orders effectively and efficiently to realize the aim of the enterprise.

The work of the school head starts at this point. Since the decision is the beginning of each activity, the school administrator has to find the answers to the questions such as which work will be done, how to be done, by whom, which resources will be used and to make the best choice among the available options. In short, decision-making is an indispensable process for both the individual and the organization. For this reason, decision-making is the most basic and most serious job of the school administrators.

Decision-making style is one of the most important determinants of the decision-making process. Decision-making style refers to the way an individual chooses a solution when faced with a problem. Decision-making style is expressed as an individual's reaction to any situation, approach to the problem and the style of action it has shown. In other words, it is explained as the approach that the individual follows at the time of decision. Decision-making style is a coherent, perceptual and mental activity and is the product of individual characteristics. Therefore, people may exhibit different approaches to similar problems. Research on decision-making is often focused on what individuals rely on when making decisions and how they make decisions. However, the decision-making styles of individuals differ from each other and the reason for this difference is the amount of information obtained and evaluated, the number of options determined in reaching the decision and the speed in the decision-making process.

The factors that make a difference between styles are the information gathered in the decision process and the number of choices determined in reaching the decision. Another source of the difference in decision-making styles is the individual's habits that can be learned and taught as a result of his / her experiences throughout his life. In this context, the decision-making style can be defined as the style that the individual has learned and used in the decision-making process based on his / her differences and experiences. It can be said that experience and learning are one of the most important factors affecting the decision-making process.

They have many habits that people bring from the past and are influenced by internal and external factors. These habits emerge as a result of the decision-makers personal choices and experiences being mixed in the learning environments and affect his decision-making styles. Research has shown that an individual's decision-making style is a situation that can be learned, acquired and taught as well.

It is thought that understanding the decision-making style will enable the individual to understand himself / herself better in individual, managerial and organizational sense, and facilitate the correct communication with his / her environment and other employees, as well as contribute to the establishment of an organization that can better understand the organization and managerial needs and combat the external factors better.

It is important that administrators, especially school administrators, become aware of the individual characteristics and styles they use when making decisions. For this reason, researches about decision-making and decision-making styles of administrators are important.

Determining and understanding the decision-making style of administrators is considered important in many ways. The most important of these is that the individual can make it easier for the administrators to get to know him/herself better and to communicate with his / her environment and other employees. It is also considered that knowledge of decision-making style can also provide information about the suitability of administrators in their positions and expected jobs. Thus, knowing the decision-making style may contribute to a better understanding of the organization and its administrative needs in the managerial and organizational sense and to the formation of an organization that can better fight against external factors.

This study aims to determine how the school administrators' decision-making styles differ according to demographic factors (age, gender, educational background, position, working time in the position and total working time).

METHODOLOGY

Survey technique was used in the research. Information on demographic characteristics were collected by the Information Form formed by the researcher. In order to collect data, the Decision Making Styles Scale developed by Scott & Bruce (1995), were used. Decision Making Styles Scale was translated and adapted into Turkish by Ta delen (2002). The original form of the DMSS consists of 25 items and five dimensions. The dimensions of the scale explain five decision-making styles: rational, intuitive, dependent, instant (spontaneous) and avoidant.

The scale items are scored according to the 5-point rating as "strongly disagree" (1), "disagree" (2), "undecided" (3), "agree" (4), "strongly agree" (5). Scott & Bruce (1995), found that the internal consistency coefficient of the scale ranged from 0.79 to 0.94 for each subscale. Ta delen (2002), obtained internal consistency coefficients ranging from 0.76 to 0.79. The results showed that high consistency data can be obtained on the area of behavior measured by the scale. As a result of these analyzes, the scale was made available on 24 items. Sub-dimensions and items of the scale are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Decision making style scale item numbers by dimensions.

Dimensions	Scale item
Rational Decision-Making Style (RDMS)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Intuitive Decision Making Style (IDMS)	6, 7, 8, 9, 10
Dependent Decision Making Style (DDMS)	11, 12, 13, 14
Avoidant Decision Making Style (ADMS)	15, 16, 17, 18, 19
Spontaneous Decision Making Style (SDMS)	20, 21, 22, 23, 24

Population and Sample

The research was conducted in İzmir province and districts. The research population consists of 227 state high schools and 1143 administrators working in these high schools. Stratified sampling method was used in the selection of samples and sub-layers were formed by considering the number of schools in İzmir districts. The scales were distributed to 368 administrators working in schools and 365 scales filled in correctly were evaluated. The confidence level of the sample is 95% and the sampling error is 5%.

Data Analysis and Questions

Within the scope of the research, difference tests were conducted to analyze whether the decision-making styles

of administrators differ according to demographic factors. As a demographic characteristic of the participants; age, gender, education, position, working time in position and total working time were used. The independent sample t-test was used to determine whether the decision-making styles of the administrators differed from demographic factors according to gender and education level. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether or not they differ according to age, location, working time and total working time. The Levene test was performed for the equality of the variance of the groups before the analysis began. The SPSS package program was used in the analysis of the data. Within the scope of the study, answers to the following questions were sought.

- a) Do administrators' decision-making styles differ according to age?
- b) Do administrators' decision-making styles differ according to gender?
- c) Do administrators' decision-making styles differ according to their level of education?
- d) Do administrators' decision-making styles differ according to the position?
- e) Do administrators' decision-making styles differ according to the working time in the position?
- f) Do administrators' decision-making styles differ according to total working time?

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic characteristics of the administrators participating in the research are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Results on demographic characteristics.

Demographic characteristics		N	%
Age	25-34	25	6,8
	35-44	162	44,4
	45-54	130	35,6
	55-64	48	13,2
Gender	Female	95	26,0
	Male	270	74,0
Education Level	High School	5	1,4
	License	300	82,2
	Master's Degree	58	15,9
	Doctorate	2	0,5
Position	Administrator	128	35,1
	Head assistant administrator	26	7,1
	Assistant administrator	211	57,8

Working Time In The Position	1-2 years	127	34,8
	3-4 years	83	22,7
	5-6 years	59	16,2
	7-8 years	30	8,2
	9 years +	66	18,1
Total Working Time	1-5 years	5	1,4
	6-10 years	36	9,9
	11-15 years	63	17,3
	16-20 years	111	30,4
	21-25 years	68	18,6
	26-30 years	43	11,8
	31-35 years	22	6,0
	36-40 years	12	3,3
	40 years +	5	1,3

According to Table 2, the majorities of the administrators were male (74.0%), aged 35-54 years (80%) and graduate (82.2%), predominantly assistant administrator (57.8%), working between 1-4 years (57.5%) and have an experience of 11-25 years (66.3%)

Findings regarding the differences in the decision-making styles of the administrators according to demographic variables

Age:

One-way ANOVA was performed in order to determine the differentiation according to age from demographic factors and the results are given in Table 3.

Table 3. One-way ANOVA results of administrators by age.

Decision-Making Styles		Sum of squares	s.d.	Average of squares	F	p
RDMS	In-groups	,431	3	,144	,405	,750
	Between Groups	128,225	361	,355		
	Total	128,656	364			
IDMS	In-groups	5,283	3	1,761	3,091	,027
	Between Groups	205,645	361	,570		
	Total	210,928	364			
DDMS	In-groups	,264	3	,088	,160	,923
	Between Groups	198,160	361	,549		
	Total	198,424	364			

ADMS	In-groups	,403	3	,134	,234	,873
	Between Groups	207,189	361	,574		
	Total	207,592	364			
SDMS	In-groups	1,503	3	,501	,848	,468
	Between Groups	213,210	361	,591		
	Total	214,713	364			

According to Table 3; it was observed that the intuitive decision-making style differed significantly by age ($F = 3.091, p < .05$). On the other hand, other decision-making styles do not differ according to age. In order to determine the differences between the groups in the intuitive decision-making style, a homogeneity test of the variances were performed and the results were shown in Table 3.

* $p < .05$

Table 4. Descriptive statistics of variables and variance homogeneity test results.

Decision-Making Styles	Age	N	Ave.	s.d.	Levene Statistical Value	p	Differences
IDMS	25-34	25	3,5760	,7923	,404	,750	---
	35-44	162	3,6198	,7500			45-54
	45-54	130	3,4169	,7353			35-44
	55-64	48	3,3000	,8021			---
	Total	365	3,5025	,7612			

* $p < .05$

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that the intuitive decision-making style differs according to age groups, 45-54 age group administrators' intuitive decision-making styles (ave. = 3,6198; sd = 0.750), 35-44 age group administrators' intuitive decision-making styles higher than the average (ave. = 3,4169; sd = 0, 7353).

Gender:

Table 5 shows the independent samples t-test for the purpose of testing whether there is a difference in decision-making styles by gender.

Table 5. Decision-making styles by gender t-test results.

Decision-Making Styles F		Levene Statistical Value		t-test Value		
		p	t	S.D.	p	
RDMS	Variances are equal	1,372	,242	-,016	361	,987
	Variances are not equal			-,017	193,720	,986
IDMS	Variances are equal	,000	,992	,111	361	,912
	Variances are not equal			,111	166,462	,911
DDMS	Variances are equal	,178	,673	-2,110	361	,036
	Variances are not equal			-2,180	175,720	,031
ADMS	Variances are equal	,317	,574	-,088	361	,930
	Variances are not equal			-,087	162,249	,931
SDMS	Variances are equal	10,913	,001	-,702	361	,483
	Variances are not equal			-,789	209,696	,431

* $p < .05$

When Table 5 is examined, it is found that only dependent decision-making style differs according to gender (t

= -2.180, $p < .05$). The averages and standard deviation values of variables by gender are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Descriptive statistics by decision-making styles by gender.

Decision-Making Styles	Gender	N	Ave.	s.d.	Standard Error Mean
RDMS	Female	95	4,0884	,52407	,05377
	Male	268	4,0896	,62029	,03789
IDMS	Female	95	3,5116	,75665	,07763
	Male	268	3,5015	,76349	,04664
DDMS	Female	95	3,3211	,69922	,07174
	Male	268	3,5065	,74872	,04574
ADMS	Female	95	2,2779	,76759	,07875
	Male	268	2,2858	,75209	,04594
SDMS	Female	95	2,3684	,63355	,06500
	Male	268	2,4328	,80997	,04948

* p<.05

According to Table 6; only in the dependent decision-making style men (ave. = 3,5065, s.d. = ,748) have more average points than women (ave. = 3,3211, s.d. = ,699).

Education level:

One-way ANOVA was performed to determine the differentiation according to education level. However, it was observed that there was a small number of administrators in the groups that could negatively affect the analysis. The groups were rearranged in order to evaluate the results of the analysis and the distribution of the administrators according to their educational level was regained. The distribution of administrators by the level of education is given in Table 7.

Table 7. Redistribution of administrators by level of education.

Education level	f	%
High School/License	305	83,6
Master's Degree/Doctorate	60	16,4
Total	365	100,0

The independent sample t-test was used to test whether there were differences in decision-making styles as a result of the regrouping of administrators according to training level and the test results are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Decision-making styles by administrators' level of education t-test statistics.

Decision-Making Styles F		Levene Statistical Value		t-test Value		
		p.	t.	s.d.	p.	
RDMS	Variances are equal	,156	,693	-1,179	361	,239
	Variances are not equal			-1,199	83,431	,234
IDMS	Variances are equal	,245	,621	-1,246	361	,214
	Variances are not equal			-1,209	79,931	,230
DDMS	Variances are equal	,318	,573	-,476	361	,634
	Variances are not equal			-,457	79,243	,649
ADMS	Variances are equal	,371	,543	1,347	361	,179
	Variances are not equal			1,388	84,500	,169
SDMS	Variances are equal	,791	,374	-,687	361	,493
	Variances are not equal			-,637	77,021	,526

* p<.05

When Table 8 is examined, it is seen that decision making styles do not differ according to education level (t = -1.119, t = -1.209, t = -.476, t = 1.388, t = -.637, p> .05).

Position:

In order to determine the differentiation according to the position, a one-way ANOVA was made and the results are given in Table 9.

Table 9. One-way ANOVA results by position of administrators.

Decision-making styles		Sum of squares	s.d.	Average of squares	F	p
RDMS	In-groups	1,303	2	,651	1,853	,158
	Between Groups	126,512	360	,351		
	Total	127,814	362			
IDMS	In-groups	,031	2	,015	,026	,974
	Between Groups	210,796	360	,586		
	Total	210,827	362			

DDMS	In-groups	,791	2	,395	,724	,486
	Between Groups	196,548	360	,546		
	Total	197,338	362			
ADMS	In-groups	2,169	2	1,084	1,905	,150
	Between Groups	204,879	360	,569		
	Total	207,047	362			
SDMS	In-groups	2,195	2	1,098	1,871	,155
	Between Groups	211,158	360	,587		
	Total	213,353	362			

* p<.05

When Table 9 is examined; decision-making styles did not differ significantly according to position (p> .05).

Working time in the position:

One-way ANOVA was made to determine the differentiation according to the working time of the position and the results are given in Table 10.

Table 10. One-Way ANOVA results based on working time of administrators in the position.

Decision-making styles	Sum of squares	s.d.	Average of squares	F	p
------------------------	----------------	------	--------------------	---	---

RDMS	In-groups	1,191	4	,298	,842	,499
	Between Groups	126,623	358	,354		
	Total	127,814	362			
iDMS	In-groups	1,814	4	,454	,777	,541
	Between Groups	209,012	358	,584		
	Total	210,827	362			
DDMS	In-groups	,157	4	,039	,071	,991
	Between Groups	197,181	358	,551		
	Total	197,338	362			
ADMS	In-groups	2,579	4	,645	1,129	,343
	Between Groups	204,469	358	,571		
	Total	207,047	362			
SDMS	In-groups	7,347	4	1,837	3,192	,014
	Between Groups	206,006	358	,575		
	Total	213,353	362			

* p<.05

According to Table 10, the instantaneous decision-making style differs significantly according to the working time in its position (F=3.191, p<.05). On the other hand, other decision-making styles do not differ according to working time in the position. The homogeneity tests of the variances were performed to determine which groups differed in the instantaneous decision-making style. The results are given in Table 11.

Table 11. Differentiated work times and test statistics.

Decision-making styles	Working time in the position	N	Ave.	s.d.	Levene Statistical Value	p	Differences
SDMS	1-2 years	127	2,2382	,73723	1,328	,259	3-4 years
	3-4 years	83	2,6054	,78488			1-2 years
	5-6 years	59	2,4322	,73083			---
	7-8 years	28	2,4464	,89587			---
	9 year +	66	2,4848	,72706			---
	Total	363	2,4146	,76771			---

* p<.05

In Table 11, there is a difference between administrators who work for 1-2 years and those who work for 3-4 years in terms of instant decision-making style. It was determined that the administrators who worked for 3-4 years in their positions had higher average decision making styles (ave. = 2,605; s.d. = 0.784) than the administrators who worked for 1-2 years (ave.= 2,238; s.d. = 0.737).

Total working time:

One-way ANOVA was performed to determine the differentiation according to the total working time and the results are given in Table 12.

Table 12. One-way ANOVA results according to total working time of administrators.

Decision-making styles		Sum of squares	s.d.	Average of squares	F	p
RDMS	In-groups	3,306	8	,413	1,175	,313
	Between Groups	124,508	354	,352		
	Total	127,814	362			
IDMS	In-groups	9,483	8	1,185	2,084	,037
	Between Groups	201,344	354	,569		
	Total	210,827	362			
DDMS	In-groups	4,799	8	,600	1,103	,360
	Between Groups	192,540	354	,544		
	Total	197,338	362			
ADMS	In-groups	10,559	8	1,320	2,378	,017
	Between Groups	196,488	354	,555		
	Total	207,047	362			
SDMS	In-groups	3,053	8	,382	,642	,742
	Between Groups	210,299	354	,594		
	Total	213,353	362			

* p<.05

According to Table 12 it is observed that intuitive and avoidant decision-making styles differ significantly according to the total working time ($p<.05$). On the other hand, other decision-making styles do not differ according to total working time. The homogeneity test of the variances was

performed in order to determine which groups differ in the intuitive and avoidant decision-making styles where significant differences were found and the results are shown in Table 13.

Table 13. Descriptive statistics of variables and variance homogeneity test results.

Decision-making styles	Total working time	N	Ave.	s.d.	Levene Statistical Value	p	Differences
IDMS	1-5 years	5	4,3200	,46043	1,145	,332	21-25 years
	6-10 years	36	3,4778	,91374			---
	11-15 years	63	3,6063	,68341			---
	16-20 years	110	3,6055	,74708			---
	21-25 years	67	3,2925	,76382			1-5 years
	26-30 years	43	3,3535	,75446			---
	31-35 years	22	3,4909	,80883			---
	36-40 years	12	3,4000	,62668			---
	40 years +	5	3,7200	,50200			---
	Total	363	3,5030	,76315			

ADMS	1-5 years	5	2,9200	,76942	2,202	,027	---
	6-10 years	36	2,1222	,73644			40 years +
	11-15 years	63	2,4825	,78915			---
	16-20 years	110	2,1618	,75443			40 years +
	21-25 years	67	2,2358	,68484			40 years +
	26-30 years	43	2,2930	,73205			---
	31-35 years	22	2,2273	,63334			---
	36-40 years	12	2,7500	1,06558			---
	40 years +	5	2,6400	,16733			6-10 years 16-20 years 21-25 years
	Total	363	2,2832	,75628			

* p<.05

When Table 13 is examined, it is seen that there is a difference between the administrators whose total working time is between 1-5 years and the employees whose total working time is between 21-25 years in terms of intuitive decision-making style. The intuitive decision-making styles of administrators with a total working time of 1-5 years (ave.=4,320; s.d.= 0.460) to the intuitive decision-making styles of administrators whose total working time is between 21-25 years (ave.=3,292; s.d.=0.763) were determined to be higher than. In terms of avoidant decision-making style, it was found that there is a difference between the administrators whose total working time is more than 40 years and the employees whose total working time is between 6-10 years, 16-20 years and 21-25 years.

Avoidant decision-making styles of administrators whose total working time is between 6-10 years (ave.=2,122; s.d.= 0.736) to avoidant decision-making styles of administrators with a total working time of more than 40 years (ave.=2,640; s.d.=0,167) were found to be lower than. It was found that the avoidant decision-making styles (ave.= 2,161; s.d.=0,754) of the administrators whose total working time was between 16-20 years were lower than the avoidant decision-making styles (ave.=2,640; s.d.=0,167) of the administrators whose total working time was more than 40 years.

Avoidant decision-making styles of administrators whose total working time is between 21-25 years (ave.=2,235; s.d.=0.684) to avoidant decision-making styles of administrators with a total working time of more than 40 years (ave. =2,640; s.d.= 0,167) were found to be lower compared to. It was found that the avoidant decision-making styles (ave.=2,235; s.d. = 0.684) of the administrators whose total working time was between 21-25 years were lower than the avoidant decision-making styles (ave.=2,640;

s.d.=0.167) of the administrators whose total working time was more than 40 years.

Decision-making styles of administrators differ according to demographic factors:

As a result of the evaluations on whether the decision-making styles differ according to age, it is seen that only intuitive decision-making styles differ significantly according to age and there is no difference compared to other age groups. It was found that only administrators aged 45 to 54 had more intuitive decision-making style compared to administrators aged 35 to 44, in other words, administrators in the 45-54 age group were more intuitive in decision-making than those in the 35 to 44 age group. This is partly intuitive decision-making style observed an increase in as the age progresses, administrators, and the experiences of occupation from the years of experiences and they are more tend to use their experience and of their experience in their professional life and experience the increased joint decision-making by reflecting the styles tend to prefer to make a decision it can be said that more intuitive.

Moreover, considering the time spent collecting information and excess analysis, it can be stated that older administrators tend to make more intuitive decisions. Research has shown that the quality of decision-making behavior as a learned behavior increases with age. Alver (2003), found that decision-making styles do not differ according to age. Research by Scott & Bruce (1995); Loo (1999); Yaşar (2011), also found that rational decision-making increases with age and moves away from intuitive decision-making. As a result, it can be said that the intuitive decision-making style is partially differentiated by age groups.

By gender

It was found that decision-making styles differ by gender only in dependent decision-making style, and that men are more dependent on decision-making than women. It can be stated here that male administrators make more dependent decisions than female administrators, and female administrators have more flexible decision making structure. The findings of the research are consistent with the findings by Gürçay (1998), Kesici (2002), Deniz (2002), Candangil & Aydoğlan (2006). However, in the study conducted by Kesici (2002); and Deniz (2002), it was found that girls had a more rational decision-making style than boys. In the study conducted by Gürçay (1998), it was found that males mostly used avoidant decision-making style.

Contrary to these studies, Loo (1999), Alver (2003), Baiocco, Laghi & D'Alessio (2009); and Yaşar (2011), found that decision making styles did not differ according to gender. In our society, it is thought that because of their upbringing, men will have a more independent decision-making style. More men than women obedient, submissive, to be satisfied with existing behave in a more controlled way in the desired position and the expectation that cause to be more dependent on them, Kuzgun (1993), in contrast to the idea of male administrators than female administrators more dependent decision-making style has been found to have.

The reason why men use the dependent decision-making style is that they feel the pressure and control of the environment more strongly in decision-making today than women, have higher managerial expectations, and are more dependent on their environment and top management at the time of taking responsibility. It can be said that the difference between the results of the other researches and this research may be due to the characteristics of the participants in the sectoral and sample groups. It can also be seen that the reason for the lack of differentiation in other decision-making styles in educational and cultural exchange.

By level of education

It was found that the decision making styles of the administrators did not differ according to the level of education. In other words, it can be said that the decision-making styles of the administrators are not affected by the education level, and the decision-making styles of the administrators with different education levels do not differ. It is stated that one's level of education is related to his or her values and cognitive priorities. It is known that increasing the level of education reduces decision-making based on

personal judgments, increases the amount of information collected and the ability to use it through analysis.

However, no such finding was found. Contrary to the findings of the research, it is found that the level of education differs according to the decision-making styles. In this context, Yaşar (2011), reported that graduates differ in terms of decision-making style compared to both undergraduate and doctoral graduates, and graduates prefer a more rational decision-making style. It is considered that the reason why the decision-making styles do not differ according to the educational level may be related to the training that the administrators have received.

The reason for this is that administrators receive similar training both before and during their careers. Also, it is not thought that all teachers may perhaps one day take up positions in the administration, lack of courses that include decision-making trials in all levels of education to face situations that will consciously make decision-making trials, the fact that the theoretical knowledge in the courses is not reflected in the application can also be considered among the reasons why there are no differences.

By position

It was found that the decision-making styles of the administrations did not differ according to the position. Based on this finding, it can be stated that the decision-making styles of the administration do not change according to their positions and the position does not affect the decision-making style. The reasons such as the fact that the executives constantly represent each other in the management process, stand side by side during the day, and have to produce similar solutions to similar situations can be counted as the reasons for the absence of this differentiation.

According to working time in the position

It is observed that there is a difference between administrations who work between 1-2 years and those who work between 3-4 years in terms of instant decision-making style according to the duration of work in their position and that administrations who work between 3-4 years prefer a more instant decision-making style than administrators who work between 1-2 years.

Based on this finding, in the light of the knowledge, experience, and experiences gained in the first years of the positions of the administrators, it is seen that they turned towards instant decision-making style in the third and fourth years. As a result of the increasing resemblance of the decision situation to the experience of administrations, it is stated that less options for the solution are derived

and the decision is made quickly with the available information. Moreover, it is stated that the length of the term of duty has a negative effect on the quality of the decision. In line with other findings, it can be said that with the increase in working time in the current position, administrations move away from instant decision-making style and shift towards rationality. As a result, according to the findings of the research, it can be stated that instant decision-making styles differ partially according to working time.

According to total working time

It was found that there was a difference between the administrators with a total working period of 1-5 years and the administrators with a total working period of 21-25 years in terms of intuitive decision-making style. In addition, there is a difference in the style of decision-making between the administrators whose total working time is more than 40 years and the employees whose total working time is between 6-10 years, 16-20 years and 21-25 years. In the literature, it is observed that there is an expectation that administrators will increase their ability to predict the results of their actions with the experience they have and that their intuition will become more prominent in their decisions.

However, according to the findings obtained within the scope of the research, it was found that the administrators who were in the first years of the profession (1-5 years) used the intuitive decision-making style more than the administrators who worked in the profession for 21-25 years. A similar finding was found in the study by Goll & Rasheed (2005), and it was found that heuristics in decision making were negatively correlated with study time. This finding is in line with the research findings. Based on this finding, it is considered that administrators' intuitive decision-making tendencies increase due to the lack of knowledge and experience of the administrators at the beginning of the profession.

Contrary to the research findings, it was reported by Oğuz (2009), that the decision-making styles of school administrators do not differ according to the working year. In another finding, it is seen that the administrators who have been in the profession for 21-25 years prefer to avoid making decisions and the scores of avoiding decision-making style decrease in parallel with the decrease in the working year. Together with the advancing experiences, it is determined that people behave routinely, show hesitation in interfering with the rules and hesitate at the time of decision.

Contrary to the findings of the research, Yaşar (2011), states that the tendency to rational decision making

increases with increasing working years. It is considered that this difference originates from the education sector and may be related to age and burnout. In summary, it is seen that intuitive and avoidant decision-making styles differ partially according to the total working time.

CONCLUSION

It has been found that decision making styles differ partially according to age, gender, working time and total working time in the current position, but not differing according to education level and current position. Differences in the decision-making styles of school administrators regarding age variables should be taken into consideration, and environments in which administrators of different ages can make joint decisions should be created to balance the intuitive of older administrators and rational decision-making tendencies of younger administrators.

Thus, it is thought that an equilibrium environment will be created at the point of rational and intuitive decision making and will increase the efficiency of organizational decisions. The arithmetic means values are close to each other with the finding that it is found that men are significantly more dependent on gender variable and decision-making styles of school administrators than women. In this context, motivating women and men by creating environments where they can make independent decisions in the decision-making process, regardless of the gender variable, can be useful in increasing the efficiency of organizational decisions.

As the educational level of school administrators increase, decision-making processes are expected to be positively differentiated; however, the lack of this differentiation has led to the necessity of enriching the educational content of the master's and doctorate programs (even if it is optional). The fact that school administrators' decision-making styles do not differ according to the position can be considered as a finding that they are modeled from each other.

Considering that this situation may prevent diversity and richness in the organizational environment, the creation of an environment for the creation of the self, based on the courage to think independently, can be considered as a factor increasing the effectiveness of decisions. The fact that there is a differentiation between the administrators between 1-2 years and 3-4 years in terms of decision-making styles according to the position of the administrators and the high tendency of instant decision-making of 3-4 years administrators are considered as a finding that the sensitivity shown in the first years of management is lost in the process. At this point, continuous audit and evaluation activities for administrators will contribute to keeping the

sensitivity of administrators ' early years in the profession dynamic.

The need for administrators to behave more intuitively than the first years of the profession and 21-25 years, and to turn to the avoidant decision making style after 40 years, especially in the formation of organizational decisions, new administrators, administrators with middle seniority and administrators in the last years of the profession need to create environments where they can interact and decide together.

For this reason, it is thought to be useful to organize activities that will programmatically bring together young and older executives within and outside the organization. Also, administrators want to spend the decision-making process as healthy but avoid the responsibilities of their decisions. For this reason, it is thought to be useful to organize activities that will programmatically bring together young and older executives within and outside the organization.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Alver, B. (2003). Çeşitli kamu kurum ve kuruluşlarında çalışanların empatik becerileri, karar stratejileri ve psikolojik belirtileri arasındaki ilişkiler. (Doktora Tezi). Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Baiocco, R., Laghi, F., & D'Alessio, M. (2009). Decision-making style among adolescents: Relationship with sensation seeking and locus of control. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32, 963-976.
- Candangil, Ö. S., & Aydoğan, C. A. (2006). Denetim odakları farklı lise öğrencilerinin bazı kişisel özelliklerine göre karar vermede öz-saygı ve stres düzeyleri. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2, 71- 88.
- Deniz M.E. (2002). Üniversite öğrencilerinin karar verme stratejileri ve sosyal beceri düzeylerinin ta-baskın ben durumları ve bazı özlük niteliklerine göre karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi. (Doktora Tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Goll, I., & Rasheed, A. A. (2005). "The Relationships Between Top Management Demographic Characteristics, Rational Decision Making, Enviromental Munifence and Firm Performance", *Organization Studies*, 26(7), 999-1023.
- Gürçay, S. S. (1998). Bazı kisisel degişkenler, algılanan sosyal destek ve atılganlığın karar verme stilleri ile ilişkisi. *Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 2(9), 7-16.
- Jenkins, D. P., Stanton, N. A., Salmon, P. M., Walker, G. H., & Rafferty, L. (2010). Using the decision-ladder to add a formative element to naturalistic decision-making research. *Intl. Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 26 (2-3), 132-146.
- Kesici, Ş. (2002). Üniversite öğrencilerinin karar verme stratejilerinin psikolojik ihtiyaç örüntüleri ve özlük niteliklerine göre karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi. (Doktora Tezi). Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Kuzgun, Y. (1993). Karar stratejileri ölçeği geliştirilmesi ve standardizasyonu, VII. Ulusal Psikoloji Kongresi Bilimsel Çalışmaları. Ankara, Türk.
- Loo, R. (1999). A psychometric evaluation of the general decision-making style inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29, 895-905.
- Oğuz, E. (2009). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin karar verme stilleri. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 17(2), 415-426.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1995). Decision making style: The development and of a new measure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 55 (5), 818-831.
- Taşdelen, A. (2002). Öğretmen adaylarının farklı psikososyal değişkenlere göre karar verme stilleri. (Doktora Tezi). Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Yaşar, O. (2011). Karar verme stili öncülleri: savunma sanayinde bir araştırma. (Doktora Tezi). Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.