

Effects of Decision-Making Styles of School Administrators on General Procrastination Behaviors

Celal Teyyar UĞURLU*

Suggested Citation:

Ugurlu, C.T. (2013). Effects of decision making styles of school administrators on general procrastination behaviors. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 51, 253-272.

Abstract

Problem Statement: Lack of habits such as effective time management, determination of priorities, and effective and productive use of time is one of several reasons for procrastination behaviors. Personality traits along with incorrect cognitive loads about the self and the environment are other reasons for procrastination behaviors. At this point, reasons behind procrastination behaviors are mainly explained with self-managing skills, personality traits, and cognitive processes. This situation creates a result that reflects decision-making styles of an individual which set the relation between decision-making styles and procrastination behavior.

Purpose of Study: This study aims to identify the correlation between decision-making styles of principals (administrators) and their procrastination tendencies and the relationship of decision-making styles with age. Relational survey model is utilized to examine decision styles and procrastination behaviors of school administrators.

Methods:

Sample of the study comprises principals and vice-principals serving in elementary and high schools of the central Sivas province and its counties. A total of 397 principals and vice-principals were serving in schools of the region in 2011-2012 academic year and questionnaires were sent to all of them. A total of 285 (71.79 %) questionnaires were returned to the researcher and further analyses were performed with this data.

Findings:

Findings show that means for rational decision-making are $M=3.24$, intuitive decision-making $M=3.24$, and dependent decision-making subdimensions of the decision-making styles are high; and avoidant

*Dr. Cumhuriyet University, Department of Educational Sciences, Sivas, Turkey, celalteyyar@yahoo.com

decision-making $M=1.84$, and spontaneous decision-making $M=2.17$ are low. According to the results, rational decision making, which is one of the decision-making styles and procrastination tendencies do not significantly differ with respect to the age variable. Correlation between rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant and spontaneous decision-making styles jointly results in a minor but significant correlation with procrastination behaviors of school administrators ($R=0.536$, $R^2= 0.287$, $p< .01$). Five mentioned variables jointly account for 29% of the variance in the procrastination.

Conclusion and Recommendations:

The results favored more experienced school administrators in terms of decision-making styles and this enabled us to conclude that choosing school principals from experienced ones could result in better performance against procrastination. Positive school climate and a healthy surrounding, along with rational decisions are necessary for an effective management process in schools.

Keywords: Decision making, decisionmaking styles, procrastination, general procrastination

Introduction

The decision-making process is the basis of management systems. As a source of managing human behaviors in an orderly manner, the *decision-making process* should always be referenced. Permanence of organizations is related with successful management of organizational variables like mission, association, and coordination.

Just as in medical science, which is built on the biological structure of living organisms, ailments of organizations can also be treated only by an in-depth understanding of the anatomy and physiology of the organization. While the anatomy of an organization makes up the distributions of the decisions, powers and duties, the organization procreates its own decision-making conditions and consequently, affects the decisions of its members. The decision-making process in an organization is functioning as an innovative and problem-solving procedure and is applied in the assignment of duties to the staff. The life span of an organization is related to the quality of the decisions being made (Bursalıoğlu, 1998). Effective decision making is a major concern for the administrators and makes up a significant proportion of their professional life. Technological developments, globalization, requirements brought about by the need for localization, and social concerns can all affect decisions of an administrator. Attitudes and behaviors towards decision making can play a vital role in determining the characteristics of the tasks to be completed such as when, where and with whom the tasks will be completed. While administrators' approaches towards the decision-making process and different decision-making styles can produce different administrative conditions, their own

decision-making styles in turn create their own behavioral patterns. One such pattern is procrastination behavior.

Lack of habits like effective time management, determination of priorities, and effective and productive use of time is one of the reasons for procrastination behaviors. Personality traits along with incorrect cognitive loads about the self and the environment are other reasons. At this point, reasons behind procrastination behaviors are mainly explained with self-managing skills, personality traits, and cognitive processes (Balkis, 2007). This situation creates a result that reflects decision-making styles of an individual, which set the relation between decision-making styles and procrastination behavior.

Decision Making and Decision-Making Styles

Decisionmaking is a matter of making a selection from different options (Erdoğan, 1996; Akdağ, 2002; Uğurlu, 2007; Oğuz, 2009; Altunok, Özpeynirci, Kazançoğlu & Yılmaz, 2010; Dönmez, Uğurlu & Cömert, 2011). An administrator is expected to choose the most appropriate solution when a problem is encountered. According to Oğuz (2009), the decision process in school administration is based on problem solving. School administrators are in charge of making the right choice to solve a problem that concerns the teachers in the school as well as any other school-related issue. A healthy organization is dependent on the true operation of the decision-making process. This decision-making process involves perceiving, defining, and gathering information on the problem, identifying possible solutions, selecting the best solution, implementing and then evaluating. Management of the decision-making process is influenced by the proficiencies of the administrators who are expected to be well-trained as sources of true-selections.

The interrogative approach reveals the significance of decision-making approaches by asking can the importance of decisionmaking and how alternatives are chosen be influenced by the decision-making styles of the administrators (Bursalıoğlu, 1998). Qualifications of the members of the organization influence the attitudes of administrators on the decision-making process and thus shape the way they make selections. For example, an administrator's influence on staff will differentiate when he/she ensures participation of the personnel, consults them, hesitates to make decisions or makes immediate decisions without a brief consideration.

When discussing decision-making styles, it is unlikely that there is only one single decision-making style, with the complexity of the situation itself making some decisions more difficult than others. Indeed, the administrator, who is the head of the decision-making process can possess different decision-making styles. Possession of different decision-making styles determines the qualification of the decision-making behaviors. According to Oğuz (2009), decisionmaking is one of the substantial processes that an administration has to perform. In the completion of the organizational tasks, the way the decision-making process is pursued plays a

prominent role. Decision-making is influenced by the personal traits of the administrator and the staff.

Different personality traits possessed by individuals may generate different decision-making styles with diverse social and psychological constructs. Distinct classifications are observed on decision-making styles and according to Scott and Bruce (1995), there are; rational, intuitive, dependent, spontaneous, and avoidant decision-making styles. Responses of those individuals in the position of decisionmaking determine their decision-making style.

Decision genres according to decision-making styles indicated by Deniz (2004) are as follows: Individuals implementing cautious decision-making style make their decisions carefully. Avoidant decision-makers tend to relinquish decision-making to others. Individuals with procrastinating decision-making style are likely to postpone the decision. Without an acceptable reason, they continuously try to postpone the decision. While individuals with spontaneous decision-making style are quick decisionmakers under the stress of time limitation.

There are various studies examining relations between decision-making styles and some other variables; Dilmaç and Bozgeyikli (2009) examined the relation between subjective well-being and decision making of prospective teachers, Bacanlı and Sürücü (2006) examined the relation between decision-making styles and test anxiety, and Pennino (2002) examined the relation between decision styles and ethical conditions. A brief research of the literature on decision styles and decision making (Podrug, 2011; Henderson and Nutt, 1980; Haniffa and Ahmed, 2008;) reveals that decision style of an individual is determinative in making alternative selections. Decision styles of people in a position to make decisions impact the quality of the decision, what the decision will be and how it will be carried out.

In terms of school administration, decision manners of school administrators are a means for effective administration of the school. Schools can become more effective institutions when the staff is well-coordinated and effective ways of communication are utilized. School administrators are continuously in charge of making effective decisions about teachers in their school. According to Podrug (2011), diverse cultural formations require distinct administrative manners. In order to be successful in their objectives, organizations must upgrade their ability of coherence to different customs. Schools as organizations of a combination of pupils from diverse cultural backgrounds are well-affected by decisions of administrators. The origin of different decision styles of both teachers and administrators at school is distinct personal attributions of their lives. These attributions may vary from administrator to administrator. And consequently, everyone working in the school is somehow affected by the decision styles of the administrator. Just as decision style of administrators affects the staff, so do their administrative manners. Procrastination is one such administrative manner.

Procrastination

Many people immediately categorize everything as black or white, good or bad, true or false. A truly effective leader needs to be able to see the shades of gray in

situations in order to make wise decisions (Murtagh, 2003). However, when the situation becomes leaving today's work for tomorrow the decision process can become impaired. And in organizations, some decisions have to be prompt.

Although viewed as a common phenomenon and an unfavorable feature, there is no consensus on the exact definition of the concept procrastination. Commonly, it is defined as including attitudes and behaviors which affect productivity of an individual in a negative way (Balkis, 2007). Beyond a characteristic of inefficient management of time, procrastination is defined as a personality trait. Procrastination as a personality trait includes cognitive and affective elements and results from various reasons. Risk-taking, fear of failure and laziness may be counted as a few such reasons (Uzun Özer and Ferrari, 2011; Uzun and Saçkes, 2010; Fee and Tangney, 2000; Lay, 1986). According to another definition, procrastination is avoiding self-regulatory behaviors. It is defined as a motivational problem beyond laziness or lack of time-management (Lee, 2005). Or can be defined as despite being aware of consequences, delaying work that has to be finished (Klassen, Krawchuk and Rajani, 2008; Chu & Choi, 2005; Eerde, 2003). Various studies related procrastination with different personal traits. Defined as a hazardous and weighty event, procrastination is affected by individual performances. And at the same time, can be defined to be a motivational condition. Such a negative correlation was found between intrinsic motivation and procrastination (Fatimah, et al., 2011). McCrown and Johnson (1991) stated that procrastination is being oblivious to and negligent while performing a task. Thence procrastination is recognized as an illness (Fatimah, 2011). Examining procrastination according to different variables, Uzun Özer, Demir and Ferrari (2009) found that female university students exhibited procrastination behaviors because of the fear of failure. Whereas another research finding performed by Ferrari, Uzun Özer and Demir (2009) revealed that procrastination behavior does not differentiate with the gender variable.

Relation of Decision Styles and Procrastination

Decision styles and procrastination have been investigated in relation with various organizational variables. In his research performed to put forth the relation between decision styles of prospective teachers and procrastination behaviors, Balkis (2006) found that prospective teachers' procrastination tendencies are related with their thinking and decision styles. Decision styles are determinative in procrastination and an underlying reason of it. Competence in time management, working in an orderly and regular manner will reduce procrastination and enhance the quality of the organizational functioning which is correlated with decision styles.

It is seen in the literature that the relation between decision styles and procrastination concepts has been studied according to many different concepts within many different organizations. Some such studies are as follows: Relation between procrastination tendencies of teachers and their levels of apprehension (Güner, 2008), comparing the procrastination tendencies of teachers in terms of their professional efficacy perceptions (Gülebağlan, 2003), relationships between the levels of self-actualization, general procrastination, and hopelessness among university

students (Dünyaogulları, 2011), self-esteem of university students on decisionmaking (Avşaroğlu, 2007), adolescent self-esteem and decision-making style of the decision with the perceived level of social support, social competence and level of expectation in terms of some variables (Kaşık, 2009), irrational beliefs and decision-making styles (Can, 2009), relationship between leadership styles and making a decision styles (İlmez, 2010), relationships between career development and decisionmaking styles (Yayla and Bacanlı, 2011), procrastination and motivation (Lee, 2005), and academic procrastination and perfectionism (Seo, 2008). Examination of the literature reveals that studies investigating the relation between procrastination and decision styles are performed on students, teachers, and adults. However, there is no study encountered in the literature examining decision styles of school administrators and their procrastination behaviors. Thence, investigation of the relation between decision styles of school administrators and their procrastination behaviors is considered necessary.

Overlooking these studies as a whole, it can be seen that decision styles influence human behaviors in many ways. Describing the effects of school administrators' decision styles on procrastination behaviors and examining that relation is the aim of this study. By performing this study, we seek answers to the following questions:

1. What are the views of school administrators on decision styles and procrastination?
2. Is there any significant relation between decision styles and procrastination behaviors of school administrators in terms of age variable?
3. Is there a predictive relationship between decision styles and its subdimensions of school administrators and procrastination?

Method

This study was designed as a descriptive and associative survey model. Survey models aim to represent a current or past situation as it is. The incident, person or object subject to the research is described within its own circumstances without any effort to modify (Karasar, 1999).

Population and Sample

The population of the study is comprised of 397 principals and vice-principals working in primary and secondary schools in the academic year 2011-2012 within the boundaries of the central district of Sivas. The study tried to reach the entire population and for this reason, the selection of the sample wasn't done.

It is aimed to collect data from every principal and vice-principal in the region and questionnaires were sent to all of these 397 school administrators. A total of 285 (71.79 %) questionnaires were returned to the researcher and further analyses performed with this data.

Data collection tools

Procrastination Scale (PS) was developed by Lay (1986) and adopted into Turkish by Balkis (2006), reliability of the scale is established by internal consistency calculations. As a result of analyses performed, internal consistency coefficient of the scale is found to be $\alpha = .82$. Test-re-test reliability is found to be $r = .80$ by application of the scale after a month. In order to establish the construct validity of the scale, researchers performed factor analyses and found that findings account for the 32.09% of the total variance. According to the results, eigenvalue is 4.80 with single factor (Balkis, 2006).

Decision-Making Styles Inventory, (DMSI), was developed by Scott and Bruce (1995) to measure individual differences in decision-making styles. A 24-item original form of the decision making styles inventory is utilized with five subdimensions: rational, intuitive, dependent, spontaneous, and avoidant decision-making styles. Internal consistency coefficients were found to be between $\alpha = .79$ and $.94$ for subdimensions of the inventory. The inventory was adopted into Turkish by Taşdelen (2002). Data received from applications were analyzed for the correlation between English and Turkish forms of the inventory, Pearson's correlation coefficient for items ($n=38$) calculated to be $r = .727$ where $p < .001$.

Internal consistency analyses (Cronbach's alpha) for each of the five subdimensions of the scale are performed. Results are: Internal consistency of Rational Decision-Making sub-scale is alpha: $.76$. Internal consistency of Intuitive DecisionMaking sub-scale is alpha: $.78$. Internal consistency of Dependent DecisionMaking sub-scale is alpha: $.76$. Internal consistency of Avoidant DecisionMaking sub-scale is alpha: $.79$. Internal consistency of Spontaneous DecisionMaking sub-scale is alpha: $.76$. And for the whole inventory, internal consistency is found to be alpha: $.74$. Examining test-re-test reliabilities, Pearson's Correlation coefficient between the two applications was found to be $r = .257$ with $p < .05$ for rational decision-making sub-scale; $r = .293$ with $p < .01$ for intuitive decision-making sub-scale; $r = .524$ with $p < .01$ for dependent decision-making sub-scale; $r = .347$ with $p < .01$ for avoidant decision-making sub-scale; $r = .257$ with $p < .05$ for spontaneous decision-making sub-scale; and $r = .439$ with $p < .01$ for the whole scale (Taşdelen, 2002).

Data Analyses

Means of the scores received from the inventory were calculated to establish the views of the school administrators on decision-making styles and procrastination and subscales of procrastination. Possible attainable scores from the decision-making styles inventory are between 25 and 100. Possible attainable scores from the procrastination scales are between 15 and 75.

In order to identify the variation of views of administrators according to personal traits, provision of normality assumption is checked. To do this, skewness and kurtosis coefficients are examined and the distribution is found to be normal. Also, since the sample consisted of over 50 participants ($N=190$), Kolmogorov Smirnov test is performed (decision- making styles Skewness value $-.350$ and Kurtosis value $.560$;

procrastination Skewness value -.040 and Kurtosis value .091) and since the normality assumption is verified, parametric tests t-test and ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) were performed. Since the analysis of variance (ANOVA) resulted with a significant p value, in order to find the source of variances between groups, equality of variances is examined. As a result of Levene's test for equality of variances, the Benferroni test, which is one of the post hoc tests, is applied for the dimensions with equal variances. The value of significance is adopted as .05.

In the study, correlation analyses are performed for variables of each of the inventories and the correlations set forth between the variables. The + or - signs of the correlation coefficients are used to set the direction of the correlation. In order to test to what extent the variables in the research model are predictive of each other, multiple regression analysis is performed (Büyüköztürk, 2007).

Results

The aim of performing this survey was to identify the correlation between decision-making styles of principals and their procrastination tendencies. Findings of this research will provide a source for international literature. Means and correlations between decision styles and procrastination, relations between decision styles with their subdimensions and procrastination, differences in opinions of principals according to the age variable and prediction levels of decision styles on procrastination were investigated under this heading.

Decision-making styles and procrastination, means, standard deviations and correlations.

Correlation values, means and standard deviations are displayed in Table 1 to present the correlation between inventories and their sub-dimensions utilized in this study.

Table 1.

Findings for correlation values, means, and standard deviations of decisionmaking styles and procrastination.

	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
Decision Making	3.24	.51						
Rational	4.48	.62	.633**					
Intuitive	3.38	.81	.621**	.522**				
Dependent	4.04	.74	.598**	.387**	.228**			
Avoidant	1.84	.84	.682**	.097	.058	.321**		
Spontaneous	2.17	.85	.762**	.247**	.252**	.227**	.645**	
Procrastination	1.62	.43	-.020	-.175**	.189**	.255**	.128*	-.061

** P < .01 * P < .05

Examination of Table 1 reveals that mean of the decisionmaking styles is M=3.24 and mean of the procrastination is M=1.62. Findings show that means for rational decisionmaking are M=3.24; intuitive decision-making M=3.24; and dependent decisionmaking subdimensions of the decision-making styles are high and avoidant decisionmaking M=1.84 and spontaneous decision-making M=2.17 are low. Administrators expressed that they are more cautious when making their decisions rationally, intuitively or dependently. It can be concluded that they avoid spontaneous and avoidant decision styles. In general, administrators are attentive to make more qualified decisions. Low mean value of procrastination scores (M=1.64) indicates that they exhibit less procrastination behavior.

Correlations found to be low or negative between inventories utilized in this study are decision-making styles and procrastination $r = -0.20$; rational decisionmaking and avoidant decisionmaking $r = 0.97$; avoidant decisionmaking and intuitive decisionmaking $r = 0.58$ and spontaneous decisionmaking $r = -0.61$.

Findings related with age about decision styles and procrastination behaviors of school administrators.

Opinions of administrators on general decision styles and rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant and spontaneous decision styles subdimensions along with procrastination are given under this heading.

Table 2.

Results on decision styles of principals and their procrastination tendencies with respect to the age variable.

Sub-scale	Age	n	M	SD	F	p	Post hoc (Benforonni)	
Decision making	Below years	35	105	2.92	.93	41.904	0.00	1 < 2 1 < 3
	36-50 years	89	3.41	.56				
	50 years +	91	3.45	.56				
	Total	285	3.24	.58				
Rational	Below years	35	105	4.46	.36	2.541	0.08	
	36-50 years	89	4.39	.38				
	50 years +	91	4.59	.42				
	Total	285	4.48	.48				
Intuitive	Below years	35	105	3.36	.66	4.783	0.00	1 < 2
	36-50 years	89	4.02	.70				
	50 years +	91	3.85	.74				
	Total	285	3.83	.74				
Dependent	Below years	35	105	3.98	.98	7.61	0.00	1 < 2 3 < 2
	36-50 years	89	4.28	.70				
	50 years +	91	3.87	.87				
	Total	285	4.04	.72				
Avoidant	Below years	35	105	1.25	.85	63.290	0.00	1 < 2 2 < 3 1 < 3
	36-50 years	89	2.04	.84				
	50 years +	91	2.34	.74				
	Total	285	1.84	.84				
Spontaneous	Below years	35	105	1.45	.95	101.093	0.00	1 < 2 1 < 3
	36-50 years	89	2.50	.70				
	50 years +	91	2.67	.67				
	Total	285	2.17	.77				
Procrastination	Below years	35	105	1.55	.55	2.302	0.10	
	36-50 years	89	1.68	.78				
	50 years +	91	1.65	.65				
	Total	285	1.62	.72				

In order to test whether or not decision styles and procrastination behaviors of administrators differ with respect to the age variable, one-way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) along with post hoc tests are performed. According to the results, rational decision making, which is one of the decision-making styles and procrastination tendencies do not significantly differ with respect to the age variable. According to the total scores of decisionmaking on the other hand, administrators younger than 35 years of age received lower scores on decisionmaking and their scores are significantly lower than those over 35 years of age. For intuitive decisionmaking, results significantly favored principals younger than 35 years of age compared with the administrators between 36 and 50, for dependent decisionmaking, results significantly favored administrators younger than 35 years of age and older than 50 years of age compared with the administrators aged between 36 and 50. Avoidant decisionmaking results favored younger age groups significantly and for the spontaneous decisionmaking, results favored administrators that were 35 years of age and younger compared with those between 36 and 50 and those over 50 (Table 2).

Predictive relationships between decision-making styles and procrastination

Multiple regression analysis performed to obtain predictive relationship between decisionmaking styles and procrastination behaviors of administrators.

Table 3.

Results of multiple regression analysis on decision-making styles and procrastination

Model	Predicted variable: Procrastination							
	Predictive variable	B	ShB	β	t	p	Binary r	Partial r
Constant		2.203	0.175		12.583	.000		
Rational		-.172	0.044	-0.244	-3.394	.000	-.175	-.195
Intuitive		.240	0.032	0.447	7.408	.000	.189	.374
Dependent		-.195	0.034	-0.330	-5.709	.000	-.225	-.289
Avoidant		.228	0.036	0.439	6.286	.000	.128	.318
Spontaneous		-.165	0.036	-0.321	-4.614	.000	-.061	-.233
R= 0.536		R ² =0.287						
F(5. 279)=22.476		p=.000						

Results of the analyses on predictive relations of rational, dependent, intuitive, avoidant, and spontaneous decision-making styles and procrastination behavior are given in Table 3. Examination of partial correlations between predictive variables and dependent (predicted) variables revealed that there is a minor negative relation

between rational decisionmaking and procrastination ($r = -.17$), however the correlation is calculated to be $r = -.19$ when other variables are taken into consideration. There is a minor positive correlation between intuitive decisionmaking and procrastination ($r = .189$). Yet the correlation is calculated to be moderately positive ($r = .37$) when the other two variables are taken into account. The minor negative correlation ($r = -.225$) between dependent decision-making style and procrastination is yet a minor negative correlation ($r = -.289$) including the other four variables in the calculation. The minor positive correlation ($r = .128$) between avoidant decision-making style and procrastination is calculated to be $r = .318$ when other variables are included in the calculation. The minor negative correlation ($r = -.061$) between spontaneous decision-making style and procrastination is calculated to be minor negative with $r = -.233$ when other variables are included in the calculation.

Correlation between rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous decision-making styles jointly results in a minor but significant correlation with procrastination behaviors of school administrators ($R = 0.536$, $R^2 = 0.287$, $p < .01$). Five mentioned variables jointly account for 29% of the variance in procrastination.

According to the standardized regression coefficient (β), significance of predictive variables on procrastination behavior is intuitive ($\beta = 0.447$), avoidant ($\beta = 0.439$), dependent ($\beta = -0.330$), spontaneous ($\beta = -0.321$) and rational ($\beta = -0.244$), decisionmaking respectively. Investigation of the significance of regression coefficients with t-test reveals that each variable is a significant predictor of procrastination.

Discussion

The purpose of this study is to identify the correlation between decision-making styles of administrators and their procrastination tendencies and the relation of decision-making styles with age. According to Steel (2007), procrastination is conceptually linked to the conscientiousness trait, reflecting responsibility (i.e., the diligent fulfillment of objectives). This makes procrastination especially important, because it can provide insight into the relationship of traits to performance and motivation (p. 81). The relationship between decision-making styles of school administrators and procrastination will likewise explain the fact that the characteristics of decision-making will predict the procrastination.

Findings of this study reveal that decision-making styles and its subdimensions are related to procrastination. Decision-making styles are in minor and negative correlation with procrastination. As expected, school administrators who are assiduous in decisionmaking are less likely to procrastinate. Likewise the results of the study performed by Balkis (2007) revealed that there is a negative relation between rational decision-making styles and procrastination behaviors of prospective teachers. There is a positive relation between avoidant decisionmaking style and procrastination. From analysis of the subdimensions of decision-making styles, it is expected that avoidant decision-makers will be more likely to exhibit procrastination behaviors. Findings of both this study and others with similar

agendas reveal parallel results. Ferrari and Pychyl (2012) in their study on academic procrastination and perceived social loafing found that there is a positive relation between the two. Results of this study agree that administrators with avoidant decision-making styles are more likely to procrastinate. Again the result of the negative relationship between the rational decisionmaking and procrastination shows similarity with results of similar studies, which indicate a negative relation between being responsible and procrastination (Dilmaç and Bozgeyikli, 2009; Balkis, 2007; Watson, 2001).

It is found that rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous decision-making styles are related with different variables. According to the results of this study, rational and spontaneous decision-making styles are in negative relation with procrastination, whereas dependent, avoidant and intuitive decision-making styles are in positive relation with procrastination. It can be concluded that school administrators with rational or spontaneous decision-making styles tend not to procrastinate. These results correspond with the findings of previous studies in the literature. For example, people with higher motivation and self-esteem are less likely to procrastinate (Klassen and Kuzucu, 2009; Klassen, et al., 2009; Ferrari, 2001), procrastination is negatively related with academic achievement (Balkis, 2011; Balkis and Duru, 2009; Wesley, 1994), procrastination is in minor correlation with stress and stress-related illnesses (Sirois, 2009). Rational, dependent and spontaneous decisionmaking styles of school administrators reduce their procrastination behaviors. School administrators with avoidant and intuitive decisionmaking styles on the other hand, exhibit more procrastination.

Examining decision-making styles of school administrators and their procrastination behaviors with respect to age, it is found that rational decision-making style and procrastination variables do not differ significantly. School administrators between 36 and 50 years of age are found to exhibit more intuitive decision-making styles compared to school administrators aged 35 and younger. This finding can be explained by assuming that school administrators' intuitions get better as they grow older and more experienced. Similarly, school administrators between 36 and 50 years of age are found to be more dependent in decision making. As they get older, school administrators tend to be more avoidant and spontaneous decision-makers. We can conclude from these results that school administrators are more attentive and selective in their decision-making styles as they possess more experience with age. Thence, procrastination decreases with age. According to Steel, 2007; Gröpel and Steel (2008), age is effective in procrastination. There is a negative correlation between age and procrastination. Eerde (2003) states that age creates a resistance against procrastination and even prevails it.

Examining the results of multiple regression analyses performed to reveal if there is a predictive relationship between subdimensions of decision-making styles of school administrators and procrastination, it can be concluded that rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous decision-making styles and procrastination are correlated significantly. Rational, dependent and spontaneous decision-making styles are negative predictors and intuitive and avoidant decision-making styles are positive predictors of procrastination. Examining the styles as a whole, they explain

29% of the variance in procrastination. This shows that procrastination behaviors of school administrators are affected by their decision styles. More attentive management of the decision-making process lowers the procrastination of school administrators. Gröpel and Steel (2008) concluded that there is a negative relation between goal setting, interest enhancement, and procrastination. It can be concluded that there will be less procrastination when school administrators focus on the objectives of the school and reserve their energy for school. For this reason, high motivation of school administrators can be viewed as preclusive for procrastination. Spada, Hiou and Nikcevic (2006) and Owens and Newbegin (1997) also found that procrastination is positively correlated with increasing depression and anxiety.

Conclusion

The result favoring older school administrators in decision-making styles enables us to conclude that the best scenario would be if school principals were chosen from experienced ones, if there could be a positive school climate, and a healthy surrounding. Also rational decisions are necessary for an effective management process in schools. Since decision-making styles of school administrators are related with their procrastination behaviors, they require a school atmosphere where they can make more qualified decisions. The result of this study can be considered important since school administrators self-evaluated themselves and the result showed a relation between decisionmaking styles of school administrators and procrastination. Policy makers in education can be expected to be attentive on qualifications of school administrators while selecting them. As the results of the study affirmed, there are less procrastination behaviors with increasing age proving that school administrators achieve more maturity with time. Thence, a criterion can be set for selecting school administrators who have worked in educational institutions for a while. Just like Eerde (2003) stated, procrastination is lowered with age. An increase in the quality of cognitive skills and consciousness helps to reduce procrastination with age. For this reason, encouraging school administrators to attend administrative training can be considered a fair requirement.

References

- Akdağ, B. (2002). Eğitim örgütlerinde yönetim süreçlerine katılma [Participating administrative processes in educational organizations]. *Journal of Teachers World*, 267, 21-25.
- Altunok, T., Özpeynirci, Ö., Kazançoğlu, Y. & Yılmaz, R. (2010). Comparative analysis of multicriteria decision making methods for postgraduate student selection. *Eğitim Araştırmaları- Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 40, 1-15.
- Avşaroğlu, S. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinin karar vermede özsaygı, karar verme ve stresle başa çıkma stillerinin benlik saygısı ve bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [The study of styles of coping with stress, decision-making and self-esteem of university students on decision-making in terms of self-esteem and some variables]. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Selçuk University, Konya.

- Bacanlı, F. & Sürücü, M. (2006). İlköğretim 8.sınıf öğrencilerinin sınav aygıları ve karar verme stilleri arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi [Investigation of the relationship between Test Anxieties and Decision-Making Styles of 8th graders]. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 45, 7-35.
- Balkıs, M. (2011). Academic efficacy as a mediator and moderator variable in the relationship between academic procrastination and academic efficacy. *Eğitim Araştırmaları- Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 45, 1-16.
- Balkıs, M. (2007). Öğretmen adaylarının davranışlarındaki erteleme eğiliminin, karar verme stilleri ile ilişkisi [The Relationships between student teachers' procrastination behaviors and decision making styles]. *Pamukkale University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 1 (21), 67-83.
- Balkıs, M.& Duru, E. (2009).Prevalence of academic procrastination behavior among pre-service teachers, and its relationship with demographic and individual preferences. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 5 (1), 18-32.
- Bursalıoğlu, Z. (1998). *Okul yönetiminde yeni yapı ve davranış [New trends and perspectives in school administration]*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Can, Ö.(2009).Üniversite öğrencilerinin akılcı olmayan inançları ve karar verme stillerinin incelenmesi [Analysing the irrational beliefs and decision making styles of university students].Unpublished Master's Thesis, Selçuk University, Konya.
- Chu, A.S.C.& Choi, J.N. (2005). Rethinking procrastination: Positive effects of "active" procrastination behavior on attitudes and performance. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 145 (3), 245-264.
- 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 [A Study of comparison of university students decision making strategies and social skill levels with respect to T-dominant ego states and some self-qualities]. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Selçuk University, Institute of Social Sciences, Konya.
- Dilmaç, B, Bozgeyikli, H. (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının öznel iyi olma ve karar verme stillerinin incelenmesi [A research on subjective well-being and decisionmaking of teacher candidates]. *Erzincan Journal of Educational Faculty*, 11 (1), 171-187.
- Dönmez, B., Uğurlu, C.T. & Cömert, M. (2011). Gevşek yapıli sistemler olarak ilköğretim okullarında karar verme, liderlik ve çatışma: Nitel bir araştırma [Decision making, leadership and conflict in primary schools as loosely coupled system: A qualitative research]. *Uludağ University Journal of Educational Faculty*, 24 (1), 1 -29.
- Dünyaogulları, Ö. (2011).Üniversite son sınıf öğrencilerinin kendilerini gerçekleştirme engelleriyle genel erteleme eğilimi ve umutsuzluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi [Investigation of the relationships between the levels of self-actualization, general procrastination and hopelessness among the last year university students]. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir.

- Eerde, W. (2003). A meta-analytically nomological network of procrastination. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35, 1401-1418.
- Erdoğan İ (1996). *İşletmelerde davranış [Business behavior]*. İstanbul: Dönence.
- Fatimah, O. Likman, Z.M. Khairudin, R. Wan Shahrazad, W.S.& Halim, F.W. (2011). Procrastination's relation with fear of failure, competence expectancy and intrinsic motivation. *Pertanika J. Soc. Sei. & Hum.* 19, 123 - 127.
- Fee, R.L.& Tangney, J.P. (2000). Procrastination: A means of avoiding shame or guilt. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 15, 167-184.
- Ferrari, J.R. (2001). Procrastination as self-regulation failure of performers: Effects of cognitive load, self-awareness, and time limits on 'working best under pressure'. *European Journal of Personality*, 15, 391-406.
- Ferrari, J.R., Uzun Özer, B. & Demir, A. (2009). Chronic procrastination among Turkish adults: Exploring decisional, avoidant, and arousal styles. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 149 (3), 302-307.
- Ferrari, J.R. & Pychyl, T.A. (2012). "If I wait, my partner will do it:" The role of conscientiousness as a mediator in the relation of academic procrastination and perceived social loafing. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 14 (1), 13-24.
- Gröpel, P. & Steel, P. (2008). A mega-trial investigation of goal setting, interest enhancement, and energy on procrastination. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45, 406-411.
- Gülebağlan, C. (2003). Öğretmenlerin işleri son ana erteleme eğilimlerinin, mesleki yeterlik algıları, mesleki deneyimleri ve branşları bakımından karşılaştırılmasına yönelik bir araştırma [The Research comparing the procrastination tendencies of teachers in terms of their professional efficacy perceptions, experiences and branch of study]. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ankara University, Ankara.
- Güner, D. (2008). İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan sınıf ve branş öğretmenlerinin erteleme eğilimleri ve kaygı düzeyleri. [The lecturers who works in primary school general tendency of postponement and their level of apprehension]. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Yeditepe University, Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Haniffa, M.B.M. & Ahmed, E.M. (2008). Gender differences in decision-making styles of Malaysian managers. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 19 (3), 405-415.
- Henderson, J.C. & Nutt, P.C. (1980). The influence of decision style on decision making behavior. *Management Science*, 26 (4), 371-386.
- İlmez, M. (2010). Bir kamu kurumundaki görevli yöneticilerin çalışanların liderlik stilleri ile karar verme stilleri arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi [Determine the relationship between leadership styles and making a decision styles of manager and employee in the public organization]. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ufuk University, Ankara.

- Kaşık, D.Z. (2009). Ergenlerde karar verme stilleri ve algılanan sosyal destek düzeylerinin sosyal yetkinlik beklentisi ve bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [Adolescent self-esteem and decision-making style of the decision with the perceived level of social support, social competence and level of expectation in terms of some variable treated as a comparative analysis]. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Selçuk University, Konya.
- Klassen, R.M., Krawchuk, L.L. & Rajani, S. (2008). Academic procrastination of undergraduates: Low self-efficacy to self-regulate predicts higher levels of procrastination. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33, 915-931.
- Klassen, R.M., Ang, R.P., Chong, W.H., Krawchuk, L., Huan, V.S., Wong, Y.F. & Yeo, L.S. (2009). A cross-cultural study of adolescent procrastination. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 19 (4), 799-811.
- Kuzgun, Y. (2000) *Meslek danışmanlığı [Career counseling]*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Lay, C.H. (1986). At least my research article on procrastination. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 20, 474-495.
- Lee, E. (2005). The relationship of motivation and flow experience to academic procrastination in university students. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 166 (1), 5-14.
- Murtagh, J. (2003). Procrastination can be an asset in business and leadership. *Hudson Valley Business Journal*, 24, 7.
- Oğuz, E. (2009). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin karar verme stilleri [Decision-making styles of elementary school administrators]. *Kastamonu Journal of Education*, 17 (2), 415-426.
- Owens, A.M. & Newbegin, I. (1997). Procrastination in high school achievement: A causal structural model. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 12 (4), 869-887.
- Pennino, C.M. (2002). Is decision style related to moral development among managers in the U.S.?. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 41, 337-347.
- Podrug, N. (2011). Influence of national culture on decision making style. *SEE Journal*. 37-44. DOI:10.2478/v10033-011-0004-0
- 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.
- Seo, E.H. (2008). Self-efficacy as a mediator in the relationship between self-oriented perfectionism and academic procrastination. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 36 (6), 753-764.
- Sirois, F.M. (2004). Procrastination and intentions to perform health behaviors: The role of self-efficacy and the consideration of future consequences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 37, 115-128.
- Spada, M.M. Hiou, K. & Nikcevic, A.V. (2006). Metacognitions, emotions, and procrastination. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy: An International Quarterly*, 20 (3), 319-326.

- Steel, P. (2007.) The nature of procrastination: A meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133 (1), 65-94.
- Taşdelen, A. (2002). Öğretmen adaylarının farklı psiko sosyal degiskenlere göre karar verme stilleri [Decision making styles of student teachers in relation to different psychosocial characteristics]. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Dokuz Eylul University: İzmir.
- Uğurlu, C.T. (2007). Gevşek yapıli sistemler olarak okulların üç kavramı: Kara verme, liderlik ve çatışma [Decision making, leadership and conflict in primary schools as loosely coupled system]. *Bayburt University Journal of Educational Faculty*, 2 (3), 15-30.
- Uzun Özer, B.& Ferrar,i J.R. (2011). Gender orientation and academic procrastination: Exploring Turkish high school students. *Individual Differences Research*, 9 (1), 33-40. www.idr-journal.com.
- Uzun Özer, B. Demir, A.& Ferrari, J.R. (2011). Exploring academic procrastination among Turkish student: Possible gender differences in prevalence and reasons. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 149 (2), 241-257.
- Uzun Özer, B. ve Saçkes, M. (2010).Effects of academic procrastination on college students' life satisfaction. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 12, 512-519.
- Yayla, A.&Bacanlı ,F. (2011)). İlköğretim 8.sınıföğrencilerinin kariyer gelişimleri ile karar verme stilleri arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi [An examination of the relationships between career development and decision making styles of 8th grade students]. *Elementary Education Online*, 10 (3), 1148-1159. [Online]: <http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr>
- Watson, D.C. (2001). Procrastination and the five-factor model: A facet level analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30, 149-158.
- Wesley, J.C. (1994). Effects of ability, high school achievement, and procrastinatory behavior on college performance. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 54 (2), 404-408.

Okul Yöneticilerinin Karar Verme Stillерinin Genel Erteleme Eğilimi Davranışlarına Etkisi

Atıf:

- Uğurlu, C.T. (2013). Effects of decision making styles of school administrators on general procrastination behaviors. *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 51, 253-272.

(Özet)

Problem Durumu

Yönetim sistemlerinin temelinde karar süreci vardır. İnsan davranışlarının sistemli bir yapı içerisinde yönetilmesinin kaynağı olarak *karar verme* her zaman başvurulması

gereken bir süreçtir. Örgütlerin varlıklarının sürekliliği amaç, işbirliği, eşgüdüm gibi örgüt değişkenlerinin iyi yönetilmesine bağlıdır.

Kararın etkili bir şekilde alınması yöneticiler için önemlidir ve onların iş yaşamlarının önemli bir kısmını doldurmaktadır. Teknolojik yenilikler, küreselleşme, yerelleşme gereksiniminin getirdikleri, sosyal sorunlar yöneticilerin karar verme davranışlarını etkileyebilmektedir. Karar verme davranışlarına ilişkin tutum ve davranışlar, işlerin nasıl, ne kadar sürede, nerede, kiminle yapılabileceğinin belirleyicisi olabilmektedir. Karar verme sürecine ilişkin yöneticilerin yaklaşımları, karar verirken gösterdikleri karar stilleri, sonuç olarak farklı yönetsel durumların oluşmasına neden olabilirken, kendi karar stilleri yine kendi davranış biçimlerinin oluşmasına da neden olmaktadır. Bunlardan bir tanesi de erteleme eğilimi olabilir.

Erteleme davranışının bazı nedenlerinin, bireyin zamanı etkili bir şekilde yönetebilme, önceliklerini belirleyebilme, verimli ve etkili çalışabilme alışkanlıklarının olmaması olduğu görülmektedir. Diğer nedenleri ise, bireyin kişilik özellikleri yanında kendine ve çevresine yönelik olarak yaptığı hatalı bilişsel yüklemelerdir. Bu noktada erteleme davranışını tetikleyen nedenlerin daha çok bireyin kendini yönetme becerileri, kişiliği ve bilişsel süreçlerle açıklanmasıdır. Bu durum kişinin karar verme stilini yansıtan bir sonuç yaratır ki, karar verme stili ve erteleme davranışları ilişkisi kaçınılmaz olur.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bu çalışmada okul yöneticilerinin karar verme stillerinin ve erteleme eğilimlerinin yaş değişkenine göre düzeyleri, karar verme stilleri ile erteleme davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin betimlenmesi amaçlanmaktadır.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi

Araştırmanın çalışma grubunu Sivas Merkez İlçe ile bağlı belde ve köylerinde bulunan ilköğretim okulları ve liselerde görev yapan okul müdürleri ve müdür yardımcılarıdır. İlköğretim okulları ve liselerde 2011-2012 eğitim öğretim yılında görev yapan toplam okul müdürü ve müdür yardımcısı sayısı 397'dir. Araştırmada Genel Erteleme Ölçeği, (GEÖ) ve Karar Verme Stilleri Ölçeği, (KVSÖ) kullanılmıştır. Araştırma bulgularının analizinde SPSS istatistik paket programından yararlanılmıştır. Araştırmada yöneticilerin karar verme stillerinin ile erteleme eğilimleri ve alt boyutlarına ilişkin görüşlerini saptamak için aritmetik ortalamaya bakılmıştır. Karar verme stilleri ölçeğinden alınabilecek puanlar 25-100 puan aralığındadır. Genel erteleme eğilimi ölçeğinden alınabilecek puanlar ise 15-75 puan aralığındadır.

Araştırmanın Bulgular

Araştırma bulgularına göre, karar verme stilleri ile erteleme eğilimi ilişkisinin $r = -0,20$; rasyonel karar ile kaçınan karar ilişkisinin $r = 0,97$; kaçınan karar ile sezgisel karar ilişkisinin $r = 0,58$ ve anlık karar ile erteleme ilişkisinin $r = -0,61$ düşük ya da negatif yönlü olduğu bulgusuna ulaşılmıştır.

Yaş değişkenine göre, karar verme stillerinden rasyonel boyut ile erteleme eğilimi yaş değişkenine göre anlamlı bir farklılık göstermemektedir. Karar verme stilleri ile okul yöneticilerinin erteleme eğilimleri arasındaki yordayıcılık ilişkisinde; Karar

verme stillerinden rasyonel, sezgisel, bağımlı, kaçınan ve anlık karar verme stilleri birlikte, okul yöneticilerinin erteleme eğilimleri ile düşük düzeyde ve anlamlı bir ilişki vermektedir. Regrasyon katsayılarının anlamlılığına ilişkin t-testi sonuçları incelendiğinde ise, bütün değişkenlerin erteleme eğilimi üzerinde anlamlı bir yordayıcı olduğu görülmektedir.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri:

Araştırmanın sonuçları karar verme stilleri ve alt boyutlarının erteleme eğilimi arasında bir ilişki olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Karar verme stilleri genel olarak erteleme eğilimi ile düşük ve negatif bir ilişki içerisindedir.

Araştırma sonuçlarına göre, rasyonel karar ve anlık karar ile erteleme ilişkisinin negatif olduğu; bağımlı, kaçınan ve sezgisel karar ile pozitif ilişkili olduğu sonuçlarına ulaşılmıştır. Rasyonel ve anlık karar veren okul yöneticilerinin daha az erteledikleri ya da erteleme davranışlarında bulunmadıkları söylenilebilir.

Okul yöneticilerinin karar verme stilleri alt boyutları ile erteleme eğilimlerinin yaş değişkenine göre anlamlı bir şekilde farklılaşma göstermediği görülmüştür. Okul yöneticilerinin karar verme stilleri alt boyutlarının erteleme eğilimlerini yordayıp yordamadığına ilişkin analizi sonuçları incelendiğinde, rasyonel, sezgisel, bağımlı, kaçınan ve anlık karar verme stilleri ile erteleme eğilimleri arasında anlamlı bir ilişkinin olduğu görülmektedir. Rasyonel, bağımlı ve anlık karar verme stillerinin erteleme eğilimi ile negatif yönlü bir yordama ilişkisinin olduğu, sezgisel ve kaçınan karar verme stillerinin erteleme eğilimi ile pozitif ilişkili olduğu görülmüştür. Bütün olarak incelendiğinde ise, karar verme stilleri alt boyutları, erteleme eğilimlerinin % 29'unu açıklamaktadır.

Okul yöneticilerinin karar verme stillerinin daha yaşlı okul yöneticileri lehine anlamlı farklılaşması, okulların yönetiminde belli bir süre çalışmış kişilerin yönetici olarak görev almasının önemini ortaya koymaktadır. Okullar için olumlu iklim, sağlıklı bir okul çevresi, rasyonel karar verme biçimleri okulların yönetim sürecinin etkili ve verimli işlemesi için gereklidir. Okul yöneticilerinin karar verme stilleri erteleme eğilimleri ile ilişkili olduğundan, okul yöneticilerinin nitelikli karar verme tercihlerini kullanacakları ortamlara gereksinim duymaktadırlar. Karar verme stilleri ile erteleme eğilimleri arasındaki ilişkiyi test eden bu çalışmada, karar verme stillerinin farklı boyutlarının erteleme eğilimi ile olan ilişkisi, okul yöneticilerinin kendilerini değerlendirmeleri açısından önemli bir sonuç olarak kabul edilebilir. Okulların yönetiminden sorunlu üst sistemlerin ise okullarda görev yapacak olan yöneticilerin seçiminde niteliğe önem vermeleri beklenebilir.

Anahtar sözcükler: Karar verme, karar verme stilleri, erteleme, genel erteleme eğilimi