





www.ijpes.com



The Effect of School Managers' Five-Factor Personality Traits on Decision-Making Processes

Esra TÖRE¹, Gülsu NAİBOĞLU²

¹ Faculty of Education, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, İstanbul, Turkey  0000-0001-9133-6578

² Faculty of Education, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, İstanbul, Turkey  0000-0002-9249-9173

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received 16.12.2021

Received in revised form
26.04.2022

Accepted 07.06.2022

Article Type Research
Article

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the effects of the five-factor personality traits (FFPTs) of school administrators on decision-making processes. The research was conducted using one of the quantitative research approaches, the relational survey model. The research sample comprised 363 managers working in İstanbul during the academic year of 2020-2021, of which 133 were female, and 230 were male. Five-Factor Personality Traits Scale and Melbourne Decision-making Scale were used as data collection tools. Neuroticism, one of the subdimensions of the Big Five Inventory, was found to negatively influence self-esteem in decision-making, whereas extroversion, conscientiousness, openness, and agreeableness positively influenced self-esteem in giving. Neuroticism, one of the sub-dimensions of the Big Five Inventory, positively influenced attentive, avoidant, delaying, and frightened decision-making styles. In contrast, extroversion, conscientiousness, openness, and agreeableness negatively influenced these decision-making styles.

© 2022 IJPES. All rights reserved

Keywords:

Five-factor personality traits, decision-making processes, school manager.

1. Introduction

Management emerges as an ongoing concept among people living in communities. The necessity of living together gave birth to management (Balyer, 2019). On the other hand, organizations form the basis of the existence of managers. An organization is a conscious community formed by people coming together for a purpose. There are employees at certain levels in the organization, which distinguishes managers from employees; to guide, organize and supervise them (Robbins, Decenzo & Coulter, 2016). "What does the manager do?" When asked, in its most up-to-date form, it provides the necessary resources for achieving the goals through other individuals, provides direction and guidance to the goals, manages the necessary organizations, and takes decisions to achieve these goals (Robbins & Judge, 2019). No matter how much management has emerged in business, management is essential and inevitable in an organization created by people in any organization. These organizations include organizations such as hospitals, government agencies, and schools. Educational organizations, which are the field of research, are the central vein of educational management. The managers working here consist of educational employees who come together to achieve the educational needs of society and the educational goals set (Bakioğlu, 2016). Like every organization, educational organizations need managers in their schools. These managers have been in management with their "leadership" characteristics rather than "management" in recent years.

In this way, the success of the organization in every field and the fruitful academic results that will emerge can only be realized with a positive and constructive management approach (Beeman & Perez, 2013). There

¹Corresponding author's address: İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Department of Educational Sciences, Halkalı, 34303 Küçükçekmece/İstanbul /Turkey

e-mail: esra.tore@izu.edu.tr

Citation: Töre, E. & Naiboğlu, G. (2022). The effect of school managers' five-factor personality traits on decision-making processes. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 9(3), 730-740. <https://dx.doi.org/10.52380/ijpes.2022.9.3.767>

are competencies as well as management styles that the manager should have. Among these competencies, the one that will affect the organization the most is "decision making". In the new period, rapidly changing situations and extraordinary events have created the need for leaders to think quickly and make decisions. This situation brings with it unilateral decision-making. Healthy organizations are distinct (Aydn, 2013) on the basis of the appropriate assignments and permissions to be granted inside the organization. Therefore, there is a need for managers who can deal with the problems to be experienced in all areas of the organization as a whole, carry out teamwork, use their technical knowledge and skills, overcome them with harmonious and robust relationships, and take strategic and practical decisions (Ercan & Altunay, 2015).

1.1. Decision-making Process

The decision-making process is one of the essential roles of managers, the cornerstones of management. As a result of Mintzberg's studies in the 1960s, he revealed "the managerial roles of managers at work." He gathered these roles under three main titles among themselves, and one of these main titles is "Decision Roles" (Robbins, Decenzo & Coulter, 2016). Also, Daniel E. Griffiths developed the theory "Management is decision making" in 1959. Individuals make decisions in all areas of their lives, affecting their environment and themselves. When making decisions, one should know both oneself and others well; knowing a person is to know his personality well. Personality is a state that privatizes the individual. It also includes personality behaviors and lifestyles (Üngüren, 2011). The situation is the same in organizations, and since the decisions to be taken by the manager concern the entire organization, he should make the right decisions. There are also personal factors besides the environmental factors he is influenced by while making the decisions (Tekin, 2018). According to studies, individuals are affected by many factors in their decision-making processes, and one of the most important among them is personality (Oğuz, 2009). The distinguishing aspect of this research from other studies is to examine the effect of school managers' "five-factor personality traits on decision-making processes".

Among service organizations, schools are based on education and training. School service is about student learning (Hoy & Miskel, 2015). In this context, educational management is the discipline of managing the overall operation of these institutions. Numerous fields, including psychology, sociology, politics, and economics, have influenced educational administration. Educational management should set education as its target and not deviate from this path. If management in understanding business is taken as a basis, effectiveness and goals may be in trouble. Although a complete model cannot be drawn for educational management due to the confusion of educational organizations, the most up-to-date is "school-based management." School-based management is a decentralized structure that sees autonomous and individual schools as the key to development and progress and where decision-making authority and responsibility are left to the school. School-based management has four primary forms: Management under the control of the school principal, management under the control of experts (teachers), management under the control of the community (parents and community members), and balanced management (Bakioğlu, 2016).

Decision-making skills are essential for a manager and fundamentally affect the organization and its success (Lunenberg & Ornstein, 2013). A decision is defined as "the dynamic series of factors and activities that begins with identifying the necessary elements for action and ends with the formation of a specific judgment for action", as Mintzberg puts it. The decision is the basis of action. The manager's choice on any given topic is the decision. It is the solution strategy selected by managers at all levels after considering a problem (Kaya, 2008). Decision-making is considered the management's brain, and the more accurate the decision is made, the more successful the organization will achieve in every step (Taşçı, 2011). Decision-making consists of two processes: managerial and functional. While making decisions, the manager cannot remove himself from his staff and environment (Yldz & Donmez, 2017). (Oztürk, 2009) The manager is also affected by the situations resulting from his own decision-making. The decision requires a process since it reflects the past and the future (Sar, 2006). The decision is about the result and the processes it goes through until the last moment (Koçel, 2018). Every decision is a risk and affects the entire organization; It is necessary to analyze the past, present, and future (Bakioğlu & Demirel, 2013). Managers must consider their decision-making processes (Sezer, 2016). In the first periods of the management, the issue of the decision process was not given importance – Fayol, Luther, Gullick, and Urwick did not participate in the decision-making process.

In contrast, decision-making constitutes the center of management and has become a part of the steps of today's management (Çelikten, Gılıç, Çelikten & Yıldırım, 2019). Decision-making refers to a process with a

beginning and an end; When the decision comes out, it is necessary to predict by analyzing the returns before and after it (Tekin & Ehtiyar, 2010). The decision is the product of a certain process and its output and reports the "result." The decision mechanism has passed through a process until the conclusion, and the decisions must be evaluated by looking at this process (Koçel, 2018; Torunlar, 2018). The decision-making process is similar to the "butterfly effect" and can affect the decision area, environment, and even their environment. Decision-making can be based on the decision maker's values, preferences, and explicit or implied knowledge (Shaked & Schechter, 2019). Therefore, managers should be very careful in their decision-making and consult (Torunlar, 2018).

Education, like other sectors, is affected by national and international changes, and they have to keep up with the changes quickly. On the other hand, this situation has strategic importance as the managers' decisions against every possible problem and change will affect the teacher, student, parent, and the environment. School managers make decisions inside complicated institutions known as schools (Shaked & Schechter, 2019). Principals and other decision-makers deal with alterations, escalating expectations, and rising demands (Ahmad & Ghavifekr, 2014). Decision-making is one of the most dangerous and challenging responsibilities of a school manager. There may be such circumstances that have detrimental effects on the school and even on a person's career (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2011). While overcoming these difficulties, the determinant of the success or failure of schools is "decision making," which is of great importance for schools (Shaked & Schechter, 2019). Decision-making mechanisms involve much more than the 'mechanical application of existing rules, regulations, and various levels of school and school-related policy'. School managers are often local policymakers who tailor the authorities' guidelines to their particular situation (Frick, 2009; Spillane & Kenney, 2012). While making decisions, it is impossible for managers not to be influenced by internal and external stakeholders or not be pressured in the decision process. In today's world of high expectations, stringent demands, and rapid changes, the decision-making processes of principals are becoming more complex (Shaked & Schechter, 2019). The decision-making process can be affected by various factors (Summak & Kalman, 2020), and Sezer (2016) revealed that school managers are affected by some internal and external factors in the decision-making process. In addition, the leadership style of the manager influences decision-making, as do external factors such as the national policy backdrop (e.g., accountability), the size and location of the institution, and the quality of trusting relationships among colleagues (Polka, Litchka, Mete & Ayaga, 2016). Another component is the personality features of the manager, which is one of the characteristics resulting from the manager's education.

1.2. Five-Factor Personality Traits

Personality makes individuals their own and has distinctiveness; it is the whole of the features that carry the individual to a different field from the others, and differences make the reactions of individuals to events and situations differently. Especially within an organization, the behaviors or thoughts of the individual develop depending on their personality traits. "What personality traits and basic dimensions of personality differentiate individuals in terms of emotional, interpersonal relationships, experiential, attitudinal, and motivational styles?" Personality theorists gathered the data from the question under various factors and produced different models (Durak-Batıgün & Şahin, 2006; Tozkoparan, 2013). In the early 1980s, Robert McCrae and Paul Costa utilized factor analysis to examine the continuity and structure of personality, focusing on the dimensions of "extraversion" and "emotional inconsistency (neuroticism)". Later, they added the "openness to experience" factor. McCrae and Costa, who supported the three-factor personality model for a long time, concluded from their research that personality should be investigated in five dimensions; they added "agreeableness" and "conscientiousness" to the model and named it "Five-Factor Personality Traits"—"Big Five" (McCrae & Costa, 1999). **Neuroticism:** "Depression (propensity to experience dysphoric effects – sadness, hopelessness, guilt): low self-esteem, irrational perfectionist beliefs, pessimistic attitudes" (McCrae & Costa, 1999). If the consistency of the individual experiences in their emotions, they are balanced, calm, flexible, and comfortable in their relations with other individuals. If the situation is the opposite, individuals are more excited and anxious about their relationships with other individuals, and their moods can change quickly (Yıldızoğlu, 2013). On the other hand, if the individual has high neuroticism, impulse control and coping with stress become more complicated; The individual can be defined as anxious, tense, resentful, depressed, self-important, touchy, and challenging to adapt (Zhao & Seibert, 2006). **Extraversion:** Assertiveness (preference for friendship and social stimulation): Social skills, multiple friendships,

entrepreneurial professional interests, participation in sports, and club memberships (McCrae & Costa, 1999); extraversion consists of positive emotions, and the individual is self-confident, optimistic, active, ambitious, enthusiastic and open to development. The social aspects of these individuals dominate; they are talkative and have leadership characteristics (Tozkoparan, 2013). **Openness to Experience:** Actions (need for diversity, innovation, and change): Interest in travel, many different hobbies, foreign culinary knowledge, different professional interests, friends sharing tastes; openness to other people's ideas, criticism, and changes; it includes imagination, creativity, high intellectual angle, and non-resistance to experiences (Park & Antonioni, 2007). **Agreeableness:** (desire to defer to others during interpersonal conflict): Forgiving attitudes, belief in cooperation, offensive language, reputation as repulsive; the individual who shows compatibility can show empathy in their agreements with the other person and does not ignore the wishes and desires of the other person and is easy to live with, and thus, he is successful in teamwork (Ercan & Altunay, 2015). **Conscientiousness:** Strive for achievement (a strong sense of purpose and high levels of ambition): Leadership skills, long-term plans, organized support network, and technical expertise; the individual is determined, determined, patient, reliable, and is controlled and planned in performing the given task (Zhao & Seibert, 2006).

As with all managers, the most critical responsibility of school managers is "decision making." "Decision-making" in educational organizations has a never-ending cycle and a structure based on fundamental decision-making (Hoy & Miskel, 2015). School managers are faced with situations requiring daily quick and urgent action. As a result of quality decision-making, positive benefits are provided to the organization by signing the good works (Hoy & Tarter, 2010; Arslan & Demirli, 2018). Studies show that the manager is affected by many factors in the decision process, and this subject has been studied with different variables and different results have been obtained: decision-making and information management (Igwe, 2014; Stephen, 2015; Tunç & Çelikkaleli, 2005; Arslan & Demirli, 2018); personality traits (Bruin, Parker & Fischhoff, 2007; Tozkoparan, 2013); morality, communication (Tekin, 2018); change and uncertainty (Frick, 2009; Mayasari, 2018; Polka, Litchka, Mete & Ayaga, 2016); engagement (Taşçı, 2011); leadership characteristics (Kaya, 2008; Deniz, Arı, Akdeniz & Özteke, 2015); school managers (Hoy & Tarter, 2010; Bakioğlu & Demirel, 2013; Shaked & Schechter, 2019; Yıldız & Dönmez, 2017; Oğuz, 2009); self-esteem (Sezer, 2016); career (Bacanlı, 2012); organization management (Çelikten, Gılıç, Çelikten & Yıldırım, 2019); individual perception (Kurban & Yaşar, 2017; Leggett, Campbell-Evans & Gray, 2014); influencing factors (Sağır, 2006; Harris, 2012; (Cremona, 2012).

Since personality traits are a more specific and subjective situation, the manager will likely be affected by his decisions in line with his personality traits. In this direction, this research aims to determine to what extent managers' personality traits affect the decision-making processes. It is thought that the FFPT has sub-dimensions that will affect the decision-making processes, and in this direction, it is essential for the managers to know themselves. A manager who knows himself will be more careful in the decision-making process. The open or strong side of a leader consists of "agreeableness," which expresses confidence, "conscientiousness," which expresses commitment to the task, "neuroticism," which expresses emotional instability, and "openness to experience," which expresses innovation. Knowing the orientation of education managers on this issue and knowing the percentage of their influence on the decisions they will make as leaders can be a guide for conducting different researches in the field.

2. Method

2.1. Research Model

The research aims to examine the effect of school managers' Five-Factor Personality Traits (FFPTs) on their decision-making processes. A relational screening model was used in the research. A relational survey model evaluates the relationship between two or more variables (Gürbüz & Şahin, 2017).

The main and sub-hypotheses of the research are given below:

H₁. School managers' Five-Factor Personality Traits (FFPTs) significantly affect their level of self-confidence in decision-making.

1a. Neuroticism, one of the sub-dimensions of FFPTs, significantly affects the decision-making processes of school managers.

- 1b. Extraversion, one of the sub-dimensions of FFPTs, significantly affects the decision-making processes of school managers.
- 1c. Openness to experiences, one of the sub-dimensions of FFPTs, significantly affects the decision-making processes of school managers.
- 1d. Agreeableness, one of the sub-dimensions of FFPTs, significantly affects the decision-making processes of school managers.
- 1e. conscientiousness, one of the sub-dimensions of FFPTs, significantly affects the decision-making processes of school managers.
- H2. School managers' Five-Factor Personality Traits (FFPTs) significantly affect their decision-making styles.
- 2a. Neuroticism, one of the sub-dimensions of FFPTs, significantly affects the decision-making styles of school managers.
- 2b. Extraversion, one of the sub-dimensions of FFPTs, significantly affects the decision-making styles of school managers.
- 2c. Openness to experiences, one of the sub-dimensions of FFPTs, significantly affects the decision-making styles of school managers.
- 2d. Agreeableness, one of the sub-dimensions of FFPTs, significantly affects the decision-making styles of school managers.
- 2e. Conscientiousness, one of the sub-dimensions of FFPTs, significantly affects the decision-making styles of school managers.

2.2. Population and Sample

Three thousand three hundred forty-two school managers working in public schools in the Anatolian districts of Istanbul constitute the research universe. A random method was used to determine the sample, and 363 participants constituted the study sample. The sample was determined using the convenience sampling method, and the data from 363 volunteer managers were obtained by collecting the scales prepared via "Google forms" on the digital platform. While determining the quotas, the types of schools defined by the Ministry of National Education (state schools) and school levels (kindergarten, primary, secondary and high school) were considered. 63% of the research sample is male, and 36.6% are female managers (including the manager, deputy chief manager, and assistant manager).

2.3. Data Collection Tools

In his study, the "Melbourne Decision-Making Scale" and "Five Factor Personality Scale" (FFPS) were used as data collection tools. At the same time, the "personal information form" was applied to obtain the participants' demographic information. The personal information form prepared by the researcher consists of 6 questions in total, including information about the gender, marital status, tenure, type of school, task type, and education status of the participants in the study group.

The Five-Factor Personality Scale was developed by John, Donahue, and Kentle (John, Donahue & Kentle, 1991) and adapted into Turkish by Alkan (2007); validity and reliability studies were conducted. The scale consists of 5 sub-dimensions and 44 items. It is a 5-point Likert-type scale (1. I strongly disagree, 5. I agree very much). The reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.87 by Alkan (2007). In this study, the reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.80.

Mann, Burnett, Radford, and Ford developed the Melbourne Decision-Making Scale (Mann, Burnett, Radford & Ford, 1997), and its Turkish adaptation and validity and reliability study were performed by Deniz (Deniz, 2004). The scale consists of two parts; it consists of 28 items in total, one sub-dimension in the first part and four sub-dimensions in the second part. It is a 3-point Likert type scale (1st true, 2nd sometimes true, and 3rd not true). In the Turkish version, Deniz applied (2004) at three-week intervals and found that the reliability coefficients varied between 0.68 and 0.87. Mann et al. (1997) found the reliability coefficient to be 0.74. In this study, the reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.64. The data were applied online to school

managers working on the Anatolian side in the 2020-2021 academic year, after the permission of the Istanbul Provincial Directorate of National Education.

2.4. Data Analysis

The data collected for the research study were analyzed by using SPSS 23 program. The normality of the data was examined with the Kolmogorov Smirnov Test, and it was determined that the data have a normal distribution ($p > .05$; $p = .300$). The study data were tested using correlation analysis and simple linear regression analysis.

2.5. Ethical

Ethical Committee Approval is required by applying to İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University Social Sciences Ethical Committee in the present study. Ethical Committee Approval's information is presented below:

- Date of decision: 26.03.2021
- The number of the approval document: 2021/3

3. Findings

The results of correlation analysis examining the relationship between managers' FFPTs and decision-making styles and their sub-dimensions, self-confidence in decision-making, are given in Table 1. According to Table 1, there was a moderately negative correlation ($r = -0.37$, $p.001$) between decision-making styles and extraversion, one of the five-factor personality traits sub-dimensions; a negatively low level among liability ($r = -0.21$, $p.001$); negative and moderate between aperture size ($r = -0.30$, $p.001$); it was discovered that there was a negative and low level ($r = -0.18$, $p.001$)

Table 1. Results of Correlation Analysis between FFPS and Decision Making Styles

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Decision making styles (total)	—						
2. Self-esteem in decision making	-0.56*	—					
3. Extraversion	-0.37*	0.35*	—				
4. Conscientiousness	-0.21*	0.31*	0.31*	—			
5. Openness to experiences	-0.30*	0.31*	0.60*	0.41*	—		
6. Agreeableness	-0.18*	0.18*	0.24*	0.50*	0.35*	—	
7. Neuroticism	0.38*	-0.41*	-0.42*	-0.37*	-0.28*	-0.37*	—

Note. * $p < .001$

The results of the regression analysis examining the effect of the five-factor personality traits of the managers and the subdimensions of the FFPS on self-confidence in decision making are shown in Table 2. It is seen that FFPT significantly affects self-esteem in decision-making ($\beta = .27$; $p < 0.01$). FFPS explains 8% of self-esteem in decision-making. Neuroticism, which is one of the sub-dimensions of FFPS, negatively affects self-esteem in decision-making and has a rate of 17% ($\beta = -.41$; $p < 0.01$); extraversion positively affects self-esteem in decision-making and it was 12% ($\beta = .35$; $p < 0.01$); openness to experiences positively affects self-esteem in decision-making and 10% ($\beta = .31$; $p < 0.01$); agreeableness positively affects self-esteem in decision-making and 3% ($\beta = .18$; $p < 0.01$); conscientiousness positively affects self-esteem in decision-making and explains it by 10% ($\beta = .31$; $p < 0.01$). The first hypothesis and sub-hypotheses of the study were confirmed.

The results of the regression analysis examining in which the effect of the five-factor personality traits of the managers' personality traits on their decision-making style are shown in Table 3. It is seen that FFPT significantly affects decision-making styles. FFPT explains decision-making styles at a rate of 7%. Neuroticism, one of the sub-dimensions of FFPS, affects decision-making styles positively and has a rate of 14% ($\beta = .37$; $p < 0.01$); extraversion negatively affects decision-making styles by 14% ($\beta = -.36$; $p < 0.01$); openness to experiences negatively affects decision-making styles and it was 9% ($\beta = -.30$; $p < 0.01$); agreeableness affects decision-making styles negatively and it was 3% ($\beta = -.17$; $p < 0.01$); conscientiousness negatively affects

decision-making styles and explains it by 4% ($\beta = -.20$; $p < 0.01$). The second hypothesis and sub-hypotheses of the study were confirmed.

Table 2. Results of Regression Analysis Regarding the Effect of FFPS on Self-Esteem in Decision Making

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	B	Standard Error	β	T	p	F	R	R ²
Self-esteem in decision making	Constant	9.51	1.23	-	7.70	.00	30.48	.27	.07
	FFPS	.04	.00	.27	5.52	.00			
	Constant	19.50	.38	-	51.03	.00	73.65	.41	.16
	Neuroticism	-.14	.01	-.41	-8.58	.00			
	Constant	12.40	.55	-	22.32	.00	50.55	.35	.12
	Extraversion	.12	.01	.35	7.11	.00			
	Constant	12.37	.64	-	19.35	.00	38.56	.31	.09
	Openness to experiences	.10	.01	.31	6.21	.00			
	Constant	12.93	.09	-	13.60	.00	12.71	.18	.03
	Agreeableness	.08	.02	.18	3.56	.00			
Constant	11.38	.79	-	14.32	.00	38.77	.31	.09	
Conscientiousness	.13	.21	.31	6.22	.00				

Dependent Variable: Self-esteem in decision making/ ** $p < 0.01$

Table 3. Regression Analysis Results for the Effect of FFPS on Decision-making Styles

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable	B	Standard Error	β	T	p	F	R	R ²
Decision-making styles	Constant	60.26	3.76	-	16.02	.00	25.91	.25	.06
	FFPS	-.11	.23	-.25	-5.09	.00			
	Constant	32.31	1.17	-	27.46	.00	59.66	.37	.14
	Neuroticism	.41	.05	.37	7.72	.00			
	Constant	53.61	1.67	-	32.09	.00	56.97	.36	.13
	Extraversion	-.40	.05	-.36	-7.54	.00			
	Constant	52.77	1.94	-	27.17	.00	36.44	.30	.09
	Openness to experiences	-.29	.04	-.30	-6.03	.00			
	Constant	50.91	2.88	-	17.65	.00	11.54	.17	.03
	Agreeableness	-.25	.07	-.17	-3.39	.00			
Constant	51.04	2.48	-	20.58	.00	16.07	.20	.04	
Conscientiousness	-.26	.06	-.20	-4.00	.00				

Dependent Variable: Decision-making styles/ ** $p < 0.01$

4. Conclusion and Discussion

In this study, it was determined that FFPT significantly affects self-esteem in decision-making. "Neuroticism," one of the sub-dimensions of FFPS, negatively affects self-esteem in decision making. It should be underlined that on the Melbourne decision-making scale, the goal of "self-esteem" is self-respect in decision-making, not personality self-esteem. Heidari and Arani (2017) concluded in their research that the neuroticism variable has a significant relationship with all decision-making styles except self-esteem. Uçkun, Üzümlü, Uçkun (2017) did not find a significant relationship between personality and decision-making in their research. In this study, "Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Openness, and Agreeableness," the subdimensions of FFPS, were found to negatively affect the subdimensions of "Attentive, Avoidant, Procrastinating, and Panic" in decision making; "Neuroticism," one of the subdimensions of FFPS, was found to have a positive effect on decision making. Neurotic people tend to experience negative emotions such as "fear, sadness, confusion, anger, guilt and hatred" (Heidari & Arani, 2017). Studies in the field have yielded different results between neuroticism and decision making. In their research, Denburg et al. (2009) discovered a negative association between neuroticism and decision-making; as neuroticism increases in an individual, so does the rate of difficulty in making decisions (Denburg, Weller, Yamada, Shivapour, Kaup, LaLoggia, Cole, Tranel & Bechara, 2009). Gambetti and Giusberti (2019) discovered a positive relationship between neuroticism and procrastination in decision-making and avoidant styles. In Baltac's (2017) study, he discovered a positive correlation between

neuroticism, a sub-dimension of the BFLI, and decision-making procrastination. In contrast, a negative relationship was found with other personality sub-dimensions. The findings of this study also support this conclusion: It can be concluded that individuals with neurotic personality traits are anxious, anxious, and insecure, which positively affects their decision-making styles. In their studies, Bayram and Aydemir (2017) discovered that personality traits are associated with decision-making, and other research supports this conclusion (Riaz, Riaz, & Batool, 2012; Ülgen, Salam, & Tusal, 2016; Iennaco, Messina, Moretto, Dell'Orco, Costa, Sperandeo, Cioffi, Esperandeo, Maldonato, Dolce, & Bu This study reveals that the sub-dimensions of the most recent and widely accepted personality theories influence decision-making styles in both good and negative ways. In this direction, how creative the educational leader is and their level of curiosity; levels of an organization and work ethic; sociability; relationship and courtesy levels; emotional consistency explain their decision-making styles in a meaningful way. Knowing the leader's personality traits, who plays a leading role in making the final correct decisions of an organization, will also provide a foresight against the mistakes to be made in the process.

5. Recommendations

Decision-making refers to a process within the management, and every decision managers take has critical importance in organizational terms. Research shows that personality traits are among the various factors that affect the decision processes of individuals. Individuals have different personality traits, and accordingly, they have to make different decisions according to different situations. Making the right decision is an important action in educational organizations, as it is in every organization. Decisions to be taken by school managers will also affect the organization in terms of academic, social, and interpersonal communication. Since individuals' "extrovert," "conscientious," "openness," "agreeableness," and "neurotic" behaviors have a significant impact on their decision-making, managers with a high level of self-awareness are open to consultations and criticism regarding the decisions they will make with a solid understanding of themselves. Leadership style choices would be appropriate. Doing practices for school managers to get to know themselves, providing the necessary guidance and psychological support, and ensuring that they receive executive coaching; would be appropriate to carry out studies to improve their self-awareness. Since this research includes school managers working on the Anatolian side of Istanbul, mixed studies can be done by collecting qualitative data from teachers in different provinces.

6. References

- Ahmad, R. H., & Ghavifekr, S. (2014). School leadership for the 21st Century: A conceptual overview. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management*, 2(1), 48–61.
- Alkan, N. (2007). *Beş Faktör Kişilik Ölçeği'nin geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması*. Ankara: Yayınlanmamış Araştırma.
- Arslan, A., & Demirli, C. (2018). Bilgi yönetimi ve karar verme ilişkisinin incelenmesi. *Istanbul Commerce University Journal of Science*, 17(33), 1-26.
- Aydın, M. (2013). *Eğitimde örgütsel davranış*. Gazi.
- Bacanlı, F. (2012). Kariyer karar verme güçlükleri ve meslek seçimine ilişkin akılcı olmayan inançların ilişkisi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 4(37), 86-95.
- Bakioğlu, A. (2016). *Türk eğitim sistemi ve okul yönetimi*. Nobel.
- Bakioğlu, A. & Demirel, A. (2013). Okul yöneticilerinin belirsizlik durumlarını algılama ve karar verme tarzları. *Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 38, 9-35.
- Baltacı, A. (2017). Erteleme davranışı eğilimi ve beş faktör kişilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişkiler: okul yöneticileri üzerine bir araştırma, *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies*, 3(1), 56-80.
- Balyer, A. (2019). *Eğitim yönetiminde yeni yaklaşımlar* (2. bs.). Anı.
- Bayram, N. & Aydemir, M. (2017). Decision-making styles and personality traits, *MAD 17 Vietnam Conference*, Hai Phong- Hanoi, Vietnam, 18-18.
- Beeman, N., & Perez, L. (2013). Dancing with data: Purposeful decision-making for charter leaders. *Identifying Leaders for Urban Charter, Autonomous and Independent Schools: Above and Beyond the Standards*, 17.

- Bruin, W. B., Parker, A. M., & Fischhoff, B., (2007). Individual differences in adult decision-making competence. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 92(5), 938-956.
- Çelikten, M., Gılıç, F., Çelikten, Y. & Yıldırım, A. (2019). Örgüt yönetiminde karar verme süreci: Bitemeyen bir tartışma. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(2), 581-592.
- Cremona, K., (2012). A framework for understanding organisational dynamics. Erişim: 20 Kasım 2020, Australian Businesswomen's Network: <https://herbusiness.com/blog/organisational-dynamics/>
- Denburg, N. L., Weller, J. A., Yamada, T. H., Shivapour, D. M., Kaup, A. R., LaLoggia, A., Cole, C. A., Tranel, D. & Bechara, A. (2009). Poor Decision-making among older adults is related to elevated levels of neuroticism, *The Society of Behavioral Medicine*, 37, 164-172.
- Deniz, M. E. (2004). Üniversite öğrencilerinin karar vermede öz saygı, karar verme stilleri ve problem çözme becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi üzerine bir araştırma. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 15, 23-35.
- Deniz, M.E., Arı, A., Akdeniz, S. ve Özteke, H. İ. (2015). The prediction of decision self-esteem and decision-making styles by mindfulness. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 7(1), 45-50.
- Durak-Batıgün, A. & Şahin, N. H. (2006). İş stresi ve sağlık psikolojisi araştırmaları için iki ölçek: A tipi kişilik ve iş doyumu. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 17(1), 32-45.
- Ercan, G. & Altunay, E. (2015). İlkokul ve ortaokul yöneticilerinin kişilik özellikleri ile karar verme becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (İzmir İli Örneği). *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 34(2), 120-143.
- Frick, W. C. (2009). Principals' value-informed decision making, intrapersonal moral discord, and pathways to resolution. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 47(1), 50-74.
- Gambetti, E. & Giusberti, F. (2019). Personality, decision-making styles and investments, *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 80, 14-24.
- Gürbüz, S. ve Şahin, F. (2017). *Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma yöntemleri* (4. b.s.). Seçkin.
- Harris, I., (2012). Determinant factors of decision-making process in higher education institution (A Case of State University of Gorontalo, Indonesia). *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 12(18), 32-40.
- Heidari, M. & Arani, M. R. (2017). Relationship between five personality factors with decision-making styles of coaches, *Sport Science*, 10(1), 70-76.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2015). *Eğitim yönetimi* (S. Turan, Çev.). Nobel.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2010). Swift and smart decision making: heuristics that work. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 24(4), 351-358.
- Iennaco, D., Messina, M., Moretto, E., Dell'Orco, S., Costa, V., Sperandeo, R., Cioffi, V., Esposito, a., Maldonato, N. M., Dolce, P. & Buonocore, G. (2018). Decision-making styles and personality traits, *9th IEEE International Conference on Cognitive Infocommunications*, Budapest, Hungary.
- Igwe, N.R. (2014). *Information management and decision-making in organisations: A case study of NBTE* [Unpublished Thesis]. University of Ibadan, Kaduna.
- John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). *The Big Five Inventory (Versions 4a and 54)*. University of California, Berkeley, Institute of Personality and Social Research.
- Kaya, G. (2008). *Ortaöğretim kurumlarında görev yapan öğretmenlere göre okul müdürlerinin öğretim liderliği davranışları ile karar verme becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Keysan, Ş. (2018). *Kişilik özelliklerinin karar verme sürecine etkileri: Denizli'de finans sektörü çalışanları üzerinde uygulama* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Pamukkale Üniversitesi, Denizli.
- Koçel, T. (2018). *İşletme yöneticiliği* (17. bs.). Beta.

- Kurban, C. ve Yaşar, M. (2017). Bireysel algılarına göre okul yöneticilerinin karar verme stilleri. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Science*, 10(1), 170-190.
- Leggett, B. M., Campbell-Evans, G. & Gray, J. (2014). Opportunities taken, lost or avoided: The use of difference opinion in school decision making, *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(4), 115-125.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (2013). *Eğitim yönetimi* (G. Arastaman, Çev.). Nobel.
- Mann, L., Burnett, P., Radford, M. & Ford, S. (1997). The Melbourne Decision-making Questionnaire: An instrument for measuring patterns for coping with decisional conflict, *Journal of Behavioral Decision making*, 10, 1-19.
- Mayasari, L. I. (2018). The influence of communication and creativity on decision-making of school principals. *STKIP Kusumanegara Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia*.
- McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. (1999). A five-factor theory of personality in L. A. Pervin & O.P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd. Ed.). Guilford.
- Oğuz, E. (2009). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin karar verme stilleri. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 17(2), 415-426.
- Othman, R., Othman, R., Hallit, R. Obeid, S. & Hallit, S. (2020). Personality traits, emotional intelligence and decision-making styles in lebanese universities medical students, *BMC Pscyholgy*, 8(46),2-14.
- Özbağ, G. (2016). The role of personality in leadership: Five factor personality traits and ethical leadership. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 235-242.
- Öztürk, S. (2009). *Eğitim yöneticisinin karar verme sürecini etkileyen faktörler ve eğitim kurumlarında bir uygulama* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Beykent Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Park, H., & Antonioni D. (2007). Personality, reciprocity, and strength of conflict resolution strategy, *Journal of Research in Personality*, 41, 110-125.
- Polka, W., Litchka, P., Mete, R., & Ayaga, A. (2016). Catholic school principals' decision-making and problem-solving practices during times of change and uncertainty: A North American analysis. *Journal of Catholic Education*, 20(1), 220-243.
- Riaz, M. N., Riaz, M. A. & Batool, N. (2012). Personality types as predictors of decision-making styles. *Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 22(2), 99-114.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Örgütsel Davranış* (İ. Erdem, Çev.). Nobel.
- Robbins, S.P., DeCenzo, D.A., & Coulter, M. (2016). *Yönetimin esasları* (A. Öğüt, Çev.). Pegem.
- Sağır, C. (2006). *Karar verme sürecini etkileyen faktörler ve karar verme sürecinde etiğin önemi: uygulamalı bir araştırma* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Trakya Üniversitesi, Edirne.
- Sezer, Ş. (2016). School manager's opinions on task priorities and the factors affecting their decision-making process, *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(3), 121-137.
- Shaked, H., & Schechter, C. (2019). Exploring systems thinking in school principals' decision-making. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 22(5), 573-596.
- Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2011). *Ethical leadership and decision-making in Education*. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Spillane, J. P., & Kenney, A. W. (2012). School administration in a changing education sector: The US experience. *Journal of Educational Administration*. 50(5), 541-561.
- Stephen, P. O. (2015). Impact Evaluation of the information management on the decision-making effectiveness of administrators in the Nigerian Universities. *Public Policy and Administration Review*, 3(1), 71-79.
- Summak, S. M., & Kalman, M. (2020). A Q-methodological analysis of school principals' decision-making strategies during the change process at schools. *CEPS Journal*, 10(2), 123-144.
- Taşçı, Ö. (2011). *İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin okul yöneticilerinin karar verme sürecindeki etkilerine ilişkin alguları ile örgütsel adanmışlıkları arasındaki ilişki* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

- Tekin, Ö. A., & Ehtiyar, V. R. (2010). Yönetimde karar verme: Batı Antalya bölgesindeki beş yıldızlı otellerde çalışan farklı departman yöneticilerinin karar verme stilleri üzerine bir araştırma. *Journal of Yaşar University*, 5(20), 3394-3414.
- Tekin, Y. F. (2018). *Okul müdürlerinin karar verme stilleri ile iletişim becerileri arasındaki ilişki: karma bir uygulama (Aydın ili örneği)* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Aydın Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Aydın.
- Torunlar, M. (2018). Yönetim eyleminin bir parçası olarak karar verme süreçlerinde belge/bilgi yönetiminin önemi ve katkıları. *Bilgi Yönetimi Dergisi*, 1(1).
- Tozkoparan, G. (2013). Beş faktör kişilik özelliklerinin çatışma yönetim tarzlarına etkisi: Yöneticiler üzerinde bir araştırma. *Ekonomik ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 9(2), 189-231.
- Tunç, B., & Çelikkaleli, Ö. (2005). Üniversitede bilgi kültürü: Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi örneği. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(2).
- Uçkun, C. G., Üzüm, B. & Uçkun, S. (2017). Kişilik ve karar verme ilişkisi: Kocaeli MYO Örneği, *TURAN-SAM Uluslararası Bilimsel Hakemli Dergisi*, 35(9), 231-237.
- Ülgen, B., Sağlam, M. & Tuğsal, T. (2016). Managers' personality traits over management styles and decision-making styles, *International Journal of Commerce and Finance*, 2(1), 125-136.
- Üngüren, E. (2011). *Psikobiyolojik kişilik kuramı ekseninde yöneticilerin kişilik özellikleri, karar verme stilleri ve örgütsel sonuçlara yansımaları* [Doktora tezi]. Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Antalya.
- Yıldız, C., & Dönmez, B. (2017). Ekolojik sistemler kuramı çerçevesinde yöneticilerin karar verme davranışını etkileyen faktörlerin incelenmesi. *Turkish Studies*, 12(28).
- Yıldızoğlu, H. (2013). *Okul yöneticilerinin beş faktör kişilik özellikleriyle çatışma yönetimi stili tercihleri arasındaki ilişki* [Yüksek lisans tezi]. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Zhao, H., & Seibert, S. E. (2006). The big five personality dimensions and entrepreneurial Status: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(2), 259-271.