

Full Length Research Paper

Self-esteem in decision making and decision-making styles of teachers

Veysel TEMEL*, Sefa Şahan BİROL, Kazım NAS, Selahattin AKPINAR, Murat TEKİN

Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University, Physical Education and Sports High School, Karaman, Turkey.

Received 13 January, 2015; Accepted 9 March, 2015

The aim of the study was to examine the self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles of the teachers in various branches of Çat town of Erzurum Province, Turkey in terms of some variables in 2014-2015 year. A total of 153 teachers (84 females and 69 males) (age ($X = 1.6536 \pm 0.72837$)) from different departments participated in the study. The data collection tool was the Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire I-II. For detecting the differences, Analysis of variance (ANOVA) test, tukey test and t-test were used. According to the findings, buck-passing, procrastination and hyper vigilance in decisionmaking scores of male were higher than that of female. Significant difference was obtained in teachers' service year, lesson hours of the teachers and the father's occupation. On the other hand, no significant difference was obtained in the other variables.

Key words: Teacher, self-esteem in decision making, decision-making styles.

INTRODUCTION

Teacher is important (Boreham et al., 2006; Ngimbudzi, 2009; Seco, 2002; Skaalvik and Skaalvik, 2010). When teachers enjoy their work they do not want to leave their schools, they are committed to their job and their profession – they are stimulated to perform their job very well to achieve school goals. Teachers with high job satisfaction could outperform those without high job satisfaction (Sargent and Hannum, 2005; Klassen and Chiu, 2010). 'Satisfied teachers are likely to be more enthusiastic and to spend more time and energy on educating students' (Nguni et al., 2006, in Cerit, 2009). Accordingly, satisfied and productive teachers are a key factor in the success of education (Firman and Tola, 2008) and can contribute to students' achievement as a key indicator for school performance; see for exam-

ple, 'Gender and experience in job satisfaction' (Menon and Athanasoula-Reppa, 2011); and 'the relevance of "personal mastery" to leadership' (Retna, 2011). A teacher usually has to complete the following activities in teaching process: (1) explain the core knowledge of a problem; (2) show how to solve the problems with specific knowledge; (3) provide solutions and worked examples of a problem; (4) give targeted feedback to students in the process of their trying to solve the problem; (5) recommend related activities based on students' cognitive state. Student model is the core element of ITS, based on which ITS is able to select the most suitable teaching strategies, provide related examples according to the needs of students, and replace human teachers to some extent (Shi et al., 2002).

*Corresponding author. E-mail: veyselltemel@gmail.com

Decisions made prior to teaching might relate to organizing the content material or designing activities to maximize students' interest and engagement. Decisions during teaching might focus on whether students are learning or the types of adjustments that are needed, and judgments made after teaching could determine the types of feedback or grades that students should receive or the need for follow-up activities. All of these decisions are influenced by the ongoing classroom context, as well as a teacher's experiences, values, and knowledge of content, pedagogy, and individual students (Bernstein-Colton and Sparks-Langer, 1993). The act of making instructional decisions during and after the act of teaching requires several skills. First, teachers must assess students' ongoing performance and learning by observing their responses, examining their writing, communicating, or interacting with students, and providing multiple choice, true/false, or similar forms of selected response assessments. These methods of formative assessment, which can be planned ahead of time or employed spontaneously, enable teachers to identify difficulties with students' participation and/or learning (Bell and Cowie, 2001; Shepard, 2005). Second, teachers must interpret and react to information about student learning by providing richer explanations or demonstrations, altering students' assignments, or adjusting their learning goals to add or subtract complexity from the lesson. Wilson et al. (1987) describe this process as "mediation" because the continuous adjustment of instruction enables the teacher to mediate students' current understandings and the goals of a lesson.

Decision-making is important in organisations including schools because the success of an organisation depends on the quality of the decisions taken (Robbins et al., 2009). Different decision-making contexts can encourage the use of a different decision-making style to achieve the most desirable alternative outcome (Scott and Bruce, 1995).

How decisions are effectively made in a school are usually reliant on principals because they are the ones who are usually in charge of setting up the decision-making process (Nutt, 2008). This decision-making process can help accommodate inputs from teachers and achieve effective decision-making. Effective decision-making, according to Rausch (2005), involves the following steps: defining issues to be addressed, identifying alternatives, finding relevant information, evaluating the alternatives, selecting the most desirable alternative, implementing the alternative and monitoring the progress of the implementation towards the desired outcome. Effective decision-making will help teachers fulfil their job satisfaction.

Literature suggests a positive correlation between participative decision-making and staff's productivity (Dickson, 1982; Driscoll, 1978). Extensively, many theories of job satisfaction have been proposed, but one of the most common and widely utilised in educational settings

has been that of Hersberg et al. (Saad and Isralowits, 1992; Derlin and Schneider, 1994; Dinham and Scott, 1996; 1998; 2000; Lester, 1987; Mercer, 1997; Scott et al., 1999). In terms of Research Question 2 (Can the model of the teacher-perceived principal decision-making styles significantly predict teacher job satisfaction?), we found that rational, intuitive, dependent and avoidant decision-making styles are significant predictors of teacher job satisfaction. In terms of Research Question 3 (Can the model of the teacher-perceived principal decision-making styles still significantly predict teacher job satisfaction after the possible effects of gender, marital status, teacher certification and school location are controlled?), we found that teacher-perceived principal decision-making styles (except spontaneous decision-making style) are still significant predictors of teacher job satisfaction even after the possible effects of gender, marital status, teacher certification and school location are controlled.

METHODS

Study universe and sample

This study investigates the self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles of the teachers in various branches, like math, physical education and sports, history, music and English, in terms of some of variables. The study is a descriptive study. The result obtained was restricted to 153 teachers. The study group of 168 teachers from 310 working in the central schools depending on Ministry of Education in Cat town of Erzurum province in 2014-2015 academic year was reached; but 15 was excluded from evaluation. It consisted of a total of 84 females and 69 males (Age (1.6536 ± 0.72837)) in 153 different branches (Physical education and sports teachers, math teachers, history teachers, music teachers and English teachers).

Data collection tool

In the study, 153 teachers working in Çat town of Erzurum City in Turkey were given questionnaires. In this research, a Personal Information Form and the Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire I-II, developed by Mann et al. (1998) and translated to Turkish by Deniz (2004) were used as a scale. A personal information form was developed in the study to determine participants' gender, age, marital status, education status, the number of years worked in a school, the place of the teachers' living, lesson hours of the teachers, the teachers' working schools, the father and mother's occupation, father and mother's education status, doing sports of the teachers and also the teachers doing individual or team sports

Decision making questionnaire

The Melbourne Decision-Making Questionnaire consisted of two parts. The Decision-Making Questionnaire I (DMQ1) measured self-esteem as a decision maker. It consisted of six items (sample item: "I think I am a good decision maker") to which the respondent checked "True for me" (score 2); "Sometimes true" (score 1); "Not true for me" (score 0). The maximum score was 12. Decision-Making Questionnaire II consisted of 22 items and used the same

response format as DMQI. One scale measured vigilance (sample item: "When making decisions I like to collect lots of information"). Each of the six vigilance items related to a step in sound decision making, such as defining goals, collecting information, considering alternatives, and checking alternatives. The buck-passing scale consisted of six items (sample item: "I prefer to leave decisions to others"). The procrastination scale consisted of five items (sample item: "I put off making decisions"). The hyper vigilance scale consisted of five items (sample item "I feel as if I'm under tremendous pressure when making decisions") (Mann et al., 1998). In data analysis, descriptive statistical methods, including frequency (n), percentage (%), mean (\bar{X}) and standard deviation (SD) were used for personal information. Normal distribution was used to highlight the differences using analysis of variance (ANOVA) test, tukey test, t-test, which are non-parametric tests, used because of effectuation of homogeneity conditions.

Data analysis and interpretation

To evaluate the statistics, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Windows version 21,00 package programme was used. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) test, Tukey test, T-test, mean frequency distribution and standard deviation were done.

On the first phrase of the research, demographic characteristics were analyzed. This study was done with the aim of presenting teachers' making decision styles who were working in Cat town of Erzurum City in Turkey. The information obtained was interpreted as follows: in the first phase of the study, the demographic features of the participating teachers were determined. According to this, 84(54.9%) participants were females and 69(45.1%) were males. The age distribution of the teachers was as such: 76(49.7%) of them were between 20 and 25; 54(35.3%) of them were between 26 and 30, 23(15.0%) of them were between 31-35 and over (Age 1.6536 ± 0.72837). The marital status dispersion of the teachers was such: 108(70.6%) were single, 35(70.6%) were married and 10(6.5%) were engaged. The education status dispersion of the participants was as such: 133(86.9%) of them had a master degree and 20(13.1%) of them graduated from university. The number of years worked in a school was as such: 130(85.0%) of them worked between 1 and 5 years, 23(15.0%) of them worked between 6 and 10 years. When the residence of the teachers was analyzed, rate of the teachers living in a metropole was 53(34.6%), in a city was 47(30.7%), in a town was 38(24.8%) and in a village and small town was 15(9.8%). Lesson hours of the teachers were; 17(11.1%) for below 15 h, 9(5.9%) for 15 and 18 h, 21(13.7%) for 19 and 22 h, 35(22.9%) for 23 and 26 h and last one was 71(46.4%) for 27 h and over. The rate of the teachers' working schools was; 40(26.1%) of them work in a primary school and 88(57.5%) of them work in a secondary school and 25 (16.3%) of them work in a high school. The father's occupation dispersion of the participants was: 26(17.0%) of them as an official, 29(19.0%) of them as a worker, 17(11.1%) of them as a tradesman, 18(11.8%) of them as a farmer and 63(41.2%) of them as a retired. The mother's occupation dispersion of the participants was: 15(9.8%) of them were farmers, 22(14.4%) of them were retired and great majority of them were housewives with the rate of 11.1% (116). The father's education status dispersion of the participants was: 22(14.4%) of them were literate, 46(30.1%) of them were primary school graduate, 23(15.0%) of them were secondary school graduate, 42(27.5%) of them were high school graduate and 20(13.1%) of them had four – year degree or two-year degree. The mother's education status dispersion of the participants was: 18(11.8%) of them were illiterate, 15(9.8%) of them were literate, 75(49.0%) of them graduated from primary school, 23(15.0%) of them graduated from secondary school and 22(14.4%) of them graduated from high school. Doing

sports rate of the teachers was: 60(39.2%) as Yes and 93 (60.8%) as No. The rate of the teachers' doing individual sports was 32(20.9%) and team sports rate among the teachers was 28(18.3). On the second phase of the research, teachers' problem solving levels were determined.

FINDINGS

In the second part of the study, making decision styles of teachers were tried to be determined.

In Table 1, making decision self-esteem, making decision sub-dimensions and total points of teachers participating in the search were analyzed. At the end of this search, self –esteem dimensions of the teachers was found to be $\bar{X} = 9,1046$ (min 0 – max 18). So self-esteem of the teachers' rate is mid-level. When sub-dimensions of the making decision were looked, vigilance making decision rate was $\bar{X} = 8,8301$ (min 0 – max 31). So it can be said that their points are low-level. Buck passing making decision rate was $\bar{X} = 10,6536$ (min 0 – max 15). So their points are high level. Procrastination making decision rate was $\bar{X} = 10,8627$ (min 0 – max 15). So it can be said that their points are high level. Hyper vigilance making decision rate was $\bar{X} = 13,8562$ (min 0 – max 18). From this result, their points were high level. The last one for the making decision of total points was $\bar{X} = 53,3072$ (min 0 – max 79). So, it could be said that their points were over medium level. Finally, making decision total point was $\bar{X} = 53,3072$. Making decision total point was regarding the minimum score of 0 and maximum score of 79 total point of the scale. When teachers' total point was $\bar{X} = 53,3072$ in the making decision inventory examined, it could be said that teachers participating in the research had over mid-level making decision styles.

Evaluation of decision making styles, according to gender, are presented in Table 2. According to "gender variable", the teachers' points of Buck-Passing in making decision styles were $\bar{X} = 11,1159$ for female and $\bar{X} = 11,1159$ for male, and there was a statistically meaningful difference in Buck-passing (t:-2,052 p<0,05).

The teachers' points in procrastination making decision style were $\bar{X} = 10,2381$ for female and $\bar{X} = 11,6232$ for male, and there was a statistically meaningful difference in procrastination (t:-3,368 p<0,05).

The teachers' points in hyper vigilance making decision style were $\bar{X} = 13,3810$ for female and $\bar{X} = 14,4348$ for male, and there was statistically meaningful difference in hyper vigilance (t:-2,019 p<0,05).

Table 1. Results of teachers related to \bar{X} and Ss values of making decision styles self-esteem, sub-dimensions and total point.

Sub-dimensions of making decision Inventory	n	\bar{X}	Ss	Min.	Max.
Self-esteem	153	9,1046	3,00036	,00	18,00
Vigilance	153	8,8301	3,33599	,00	31,00
Buck-passing	153	10,6536	2,55291	,00	15,00
Procrastination	153	10,8627	2,61589	,00	15,00
Hyper vigilance	153	13,8562	3,24528	,00	18,00
Total Point	153	53,3072	8,84462	,00	79,00

Table 2. Evaluation of decision-making styles of teachers, according to gender.

Decision making styles		n	\bar{X}	Ss	Sd	t	p-Value
Buck-passing	Female	84	10,2738	2,77402			
	Male	69	11,1159	2,18643	151	-2,052	,042*
Procrastination	Female	84	10,2381	2,81827			
	Male	69	11,6232	2,12894	151	-3,368	,001*
Hyper vigilance	Female	84	13,3810	3,59352			
	Male	69	14,4348	2,67603	151	-2,019	,045*

*p<.05.

Table 3. Evaluation of decision-making styles of teachers, according to teachers' service year.

Decision making styles	Service yr	n	\bar{X}	Ss	Sd	t	p-value
Buck-passing	1-5 y	130	10,8462	2,45095			
	6-10	23	9,5652	2,88926	151	2,247	,026*
Hyper vigilance	1-5	130	14,0846	3,06021			
	6-10	23	12,5652	3,97522	151	,038*	2,093

*p<.05.

Evaluation of decision making styles, according to teachers' service year, are presented in Table 3. According to "teachers' service year", the teachers' points of Buck-Passing in making decision styles were \bar{X} =10,8462 for between 1-5 years and \bar{X} =9,5652 for between 6-10 years, and there was a statistically meaningful difference in buck-passing (t:2,247 p<0,05).

The teachers' points of hyper vigilance in making decision styles were \bar{X} =14,0846 for between 1-5 years and \bar{X} =12,5652 for between 6-10 years, and there was a statistically meaningful difference in hyper vigi-

lance (t: 2,093 p<0,05).

Evaluation of self-esteem in decision making and decision-making styles of teachers, according to Lesson hours the teachers having are presented in Table 4. According to "Lesson hours the teachers have", the teachers' points of self esteem in making decision styles were \bar{X} = 10,4118 for less than 15 h, \bar{X} = 12,0000 for between 15-18 h, \bar{X} = 9,6667 for between 19-22 h, \bar{X} = 9,2286 for between 23-26 h and \bar{X} = 8,1972 for 27 h, and there was a statistically meaningful difference in self-esteem in decision making (F:5,254 p<0,05).

Table 4. Evaluation of self-esteem in decision making and decision-making styles of teachers, according to lesson hours the teachers have.

Self-esteem and decision making styles	Lesson h	n	\bar{X}	Ss	Sd	F	p-value	Meaningful differences Tukey test
Self-esteem	15 ten az	17	10,4118	3,12368				
	15-18	9	12,0000	3,35410				
	19-22	21	9,6667	2,90402				
	23-26	35	9,2286	2,57917	148	5,254	,001*	2-5
	27 ve üzeri	71	8,1972	2,82145				
Hyper vigilance	15 ten az	17	12,1765	3,28320				
	15-18	9	12,2222	2,77389				
	19-22	21	14,5238	2,04007				
	23-26	35	14,8857	2,38588	148	2,974	,021*	1-4
	27 ve üzeri	71	13,7606	3,72430				

*p<.05.

Table 5. Evaluation of decision-making styles of Teachers, according to the father's occupation.

Decision making styles	Father's occupation	n	\bar{X}	Ss	Sd	F	p-value	
Vigilance	Officer	2 6	8,5769	2,59497				
	Worker	2 9	9,2069	2,84579				
	Tradesman	1 7	8,7059	2,77859	148	3,221	,014*	4-5
	Farmer	1 8	11,1667	5,57568				
	Retired	6 3	8,1270	2,86521				

*p<.05.

The teachers' points of hyper vigilance in decision making styles were $\bar{X} = 12,1765$ for less than 15 h, $\bar{X} = 12,2222$ for between 15-18 h, $\bar{X} = 14,5238$ for between 19-22 h, $\bar{X} = 14,8857$ for between 23-26 h and $\bar{X} = 13,7606$ for 27 h and over, and there was a statistically meaningful difference in hyper vigilance in decision making (F:2,974 p<0,05).

Evaluation of decision-making styles of teachers, according to the father's occupation are presented in Table 5. According to the father's occupation, the teachers' points of vigilance in decision making styles were $\bar{X} = 8,5769$ for officers, $\bar{X} = 9,2069$ for workers, $\bar{X} = 8,7059$ for tradesmans, $\bar{X} = 11,1667$ for farmers and $\bar{X} = 8,1270$ for retired and there was a statistically

meaningful difference in vigilance in decision making styles (F:3,221 p<0,05).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This study was carried out to find out whether or not the self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles of the teachers differ according to the variables of gender, age, marital status, educational status, professional service year, the place where he/she lives the most, secondary education institutions they work, father's occupation, mother's occupation, parental education status, active sportive level of them, lesson hours they have entered in a the week and sports they have done.

As a result of study, the results obtained in this study in order to identify making decision self-esteem, making decision sub-dimensions and total points of the teachers

were as follows; self esteem dimensions of the teachers was found as $\bar{X} = 9,1046$ (min 0 – max 18). So self-esteem of the teachers' rate is mid-level. When Sub-dimensions of the making decision were looked, vigilance making decision rate was $\bar{X} = 8,8301$ (min 0 – max 31). So it could be said that their points were low-level. Buck passing making decision rate was $\bar{X} = 10,6536$ (min 0 – max 15). So their points were high level. Procrastination making decision rate was $\bar{X} = 10,8627$ (min 0 – max 15). So it could be said that their points were high level. Hyper vigilance making decision rate was $\bar{X} = 13,8562$ (min 0 – max 18). From this result, their points were high level. The last one for the making decision of total points was $\bar{X} = 53,3072$ (min 0 – max 79). So it could be said that their points are over medium level. Finally, making decision total point was $\bar{X} = 53,3072$. Making decision total point was regarding the minimum score of 0 and maximum score of 79 total point of the scale. When teachers' total point of $\bar{X} = 53,3072$ in the making decision inventory was examined, it could be said that teachers participating in the research had over mid-level making decision styles.

On the other hand, A meaningful relationship was not found according to the teachers' age, marital status, educational status, the place where he/she lives the most, secondary education institutions they work, mother's occupation, father and mother's education status and doing sports of the teachers. But, a meaningful relationship was found according to gender, teachers' service year, lesson hours of the teachers' having and the father's occupation. According to the evaluation of self-esteem in decision making and decision-making styles of teachers, we could say that self-esteem levels of teachers who entered lesson between 15-18 h were higher than teachers who entered lesson 27 h and over. Hyper vigilance levels of teachers who entered lesson between 23-26 h were higher than teachers who entered lesson less than 15 h. According to the evaluation of decision-making styles of teachers, levels of the vigilance approach of the teachers whose fathers were farmers were higher than the ones whose fathers were retired.

In the study of Mau (2000) on female students, it was reported that there was a difference on behalf of girl students. When other studies that were conducted with university students were analysed, for example: Sinangil (1993), Taşdelen (2002), Köse (2002), Kesici (2002), Deniz (2002), Avşaroğlu (2007) and Çetin (2009) they found no difference between students' self-esteem in decision making and decision-making styles in terms of sex/gender variable. We are of the opinion that the reason why our findings and findings of other studies

were different may be due to the fact that our study was carried out with taekwondo athletes.

Campos (1993), Ripoll et al. (1995), McPherson (1999), Fontana (2007) all conducted studies with fresh and experienced athletes from different sportive branches and found positive results on behalf of experienced athletes. The study of Kioumourtzoglou et al. (1998), which was made with a national water polo team, and amateur basketball team and the study of Egesoy et al. (1999), which was made with professional and amateur football athletes, indicated that no difference was found among the experienced athletes in terms of correct and quick decision-making. As for the study of Çetin (2009), made with elite and non-elite athletes; it was discovered that no difference existed in terms of self-esteem in decision making and using decision-making styles; which is in agreement with our findings. It may be concluded that self-esteem in decision making and decision-making styles of the taekwondo athletes were similar, whether they performed training with authoritarian, democratic, stressful and innovative or easy-going trainer types.

Conflict of Interests

The author has not declared any conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Abu Saad I, Isralowitz RE (1992). Teachers' Job Satisfaction in Transitional Society within the Bedouin Arab Schools of the Negev. *J. Social Psychol.* 132(6):771-781.
- Avsaroglu S (2007). Analyzing of decisional self-esteem, decision-making, self-esteem and coping with stress styles of college students in terms of some variables. Unpublished doctoral Thesis, Selçuk University, Konya, Turkey.
- Bell B, Cowie B (2001). Formative assessment and science education. Norwell, MA: Kluwer.
- Bernstein-Colton A, Sparks-Langer GM (1993). A conceptual framework to guide the development of teacher reflection and decision-making. *J. Teacher Educ.* 44(1):45-54.
- Boreham N, Gray P, Blake A (2006). Job satisfaction among newly qualified teachers in Scotland . Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association, September, at the University of Warwick ,
- Campos W (1993). The effects of age and skill level on motor and cognitive components of soccer performance. Doctoral Thesis, University Of Pittsburgh, USA.
- Cerit Y (2009). The effects of servant leadership behaviours of school principals on teachers' job satisfaction . *Educ. Manage. Admini. Leadership* 37(5):600-23.
- Cetin MÇ (2009). The study in a comparative manner of physical education and sports high school students' decision-making styles, social skills levels and coping with stress styles in terms of some variables. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Deniz ME (2002). The study in a comparative manner of university students' decision-making strategies and TA-dominant status of me of the social skills levels and in terms of certain personal qualities. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Selcuk University, Konya, Turkey.
- Derlin R, Schneider G (1994). Understanding job satisfaction: principals and teachers, urban and suburban. *Urban Educ.* 29(1):63-88.
- Dickson JW (1982). Top managers' beliefs and rationales for employee

- participation. *Hum. Relations*. 35(3):203-217.
- Dinham S, Scott C (1996). *The Teacher 2000 Project: A Study of Teacher Satisfaction, Motivation and Health*. Kingswood: University of Western Sydney, Nepean – Faculty of Education.
- Dinham S, Scott C (1999). "The relationship between context, type of school and position held in school and occupational satisfaction, and mental stress", paper presented at the Australian College of Education/Australian Council for Educational Administration, National Conference, Darwin.
- Driscoll (1980). Trust and participation, *educational Administration Quarterly*. 16 (1), 93-106.
- Egesoy H, Eniseler N, Çamlıyer H, Çamlıyer H (1999). Comparison of the speed of decision-making performance, decision-making and the accuracy of the given decision of elite and non-elite soccer players. *J. Physical Educ. Sports Sci*. 2(3):22-33.
- Firman H, Tola B (2008). The future of schooling in Indonesia. *J. Int. Cooperation Educ*. 11(1):71-84.
- Fontana FE (2007). The effects of exercise intensity on decision making performance of experienced and inexperienced soccer athletes. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Pittsburg, USA.
- Kesici S (2002). The study in a comparative manner of the university students' psychological needs of decision-making strategies and according to personal nature. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Selçuk University, Konya, Turkey.
- Kioumourtzoglou E, Kourtessis T, Michalopoulou M, Derri V (1998). Differences in several perceptual abilities between experts and novices in basketball, volleyball and water-polo. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 86(1):899-912.
- Klassen RM, Chiu MM (2010). Effects on teachers' self-efficacy and job satisfaction: Teacher gender, years of experience, and job stress. *J. Educ. Psychol*. 102(3):741 – 56 .
- Köse A (2002). Investigation of the psychological needs and decision-making strategies of the first-year students studying in psychological counseling and guidance in terms of gender and perceived socio-economic level. Unpublished master thesis. Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Lester PE (1982). Development and Factor Analysis of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ). *Educ Psychol. Measure*. 47 (1), 223-233.
- Mau WC (2000). Cultural differences in career in career decision-making styles and self-efficacy. *J. Vocational Behavior*. 57:365-378.
- McPherson SL (1999). Expert-novice differences in performance skills and problem representations of youth and adults during tennis competitions. *Res. Q. Exercise Sport*. 70(3):233-251.
- Menon ME, Athanasoula-Reppa A (2011). Job satisfaction among secondary school teachers: The role of gender and experience. *School Leadership Manage*. 31(5):435-50 .
- Mercer D (1997). Job satisfaction and the secondary school teacher: *the creation of a model of job satisfaction*.
- Ngimbudzi FW (2009). Job satisfaction among secondary school teachers in Tanzania: The case of Njombe District. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Jyvaskyla.
- Nguni S, Slegers P, Denessen E (2006). Transformational and transactional leadership effects on teachers' job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior in primary schools: The Tanzanian case. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 17(2):145-77 .
- Nutt PC (2008). Investigating the success of decision making processes. *J. Manage. Stud*. 45(2):425-55 .
- Rausch E (2005). A practical focus on leadership in management – For research, education and management development. *Management Decision* 43(7/8):988 – 1000 .
- Retna KS (2011). The relevance of 'personal mastery' to leadership: The case of school principals in Singapore. *School Leadership Manage*. 31(5):451-70
- Ripoll H, Kerlizin Y, Stein J, Reine B (1995). Analysis of information processing, decision making, and visual strategies in complex problem solving sport situations. *Human Movement Sci*. 14(3):325-349.
- Robbins S, Bergman R, Stagg I, Coulter M (2009). *Management*, 5th ed, Frenchs Forest, NSW, , Australia: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Sargent T, Hannum E (2005). Keeping teachers happy: Job satisfaction among primary school teachers in rural Northwest China. *Comparative Educ. Rev*. 49(2):173-204.
- Scott SG, Bruce RA (1995). Decision-making style: The development and assessment of a new measure. *Educ. Psychological Measure*. 55(5):818-31 .
- Seco GMDS (2002). Teacher satisfaction: Some practical implications for teacher professional development models. Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, 11-14 September, at the University of Lisbon.
- Shepard LA (2005). Linking formative assessment to scaffolding. *Educ. Leadership*. 63(3):66-70.
- Shi H, Rodriguez O, Chen S, Shang Y (2002). Integrating adaptive and intelligent techniques into a web-based environment for active learning. *Intelligent Systems: Technology and Applications*. 4:229-260.
- Sinangil HK (1993). Concerns relations with decision-making in the executive candidates. VII. National Congress of Psychology, Scientific Studies. *Turkish Psychological Association Publication*. 171-177, Ankara.
- Skaalvik EM, Skaalvik S (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teach. Teacher Educ*. 26(4):1059-69 .
- Tasdelen A (2002). Teacher candidates' decision-making styles with different psycho-social variables. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir, Turkey.
- Wilson SM, Shulman LS, Richert AE (1987). "150 different ways" of knowing: Representations of knowledge in teachers. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Exploring teachers' thinking* (pp. 104-124). London: Cassell.