**TÍTULO:** Estudio de los estilos de creación de decisiones de los gerentes de acuerdo con su locus de control y estilos de aprendizaje.

**AUTORES:**

1. Assist.Prof. Dr. Salim Akyürek.

2. Assist.Prof. Dr. Mert Baştaş.

**RESUMEN:** El objetivo de esta investigación es especificar de qué manera los estilos de toma de decisiones de los gerentes cambian de acuerdo con sus estilos de aprendizaje y enfoque de control. Tres escalas fueron utilizadas en esta investigación: "Decision-Making Styles Scale (DMSS)", "Locus of Control Scale (LOCS)", y "Learning Styles İnventory (LSI)". En este estudio participaron gerentes, asistentes principales y gerentes adjuntos de las escuelas secundarias estatales del Ministerio de Educación Nacional, Esmirna. El resultado de la investigación reveló que los gerentes preferían los estilos de toma de decisiones en su mayoría, su punto focal era la auditoría interna y la adaptación abstracta que conceptualizaba los estilos de aprendizaje. Se observó que sus estilos de toma de decisiones diferían proporcionalmente en comparación con los estilos de aprendizaje y enfoque de control.

**PALABRAS CLAVES:** Gerente, estilo de toma de decisiones, estilo de aprendizaje, locus de control.

**TITLE:** Study of decision-making styles of managers according to their locus of control and learning styles.

**AUTHORS**:

1. Assist. Prof. Dr. Salim Akyürek.

2. Assist. Prof. Dr. Mert Baştaş.

**ABSTRACT:** The objective of this research is to specify how the decision-making styles of managers change according to their learning styles and control approach. Three scales were used in this research: "Decision-Making Styles Scale (DMSS)", "Locus of Control Scale (LOCS)", and "Learning Styles İnventory (LSI)". This study involved managers, assistant principals and deputy managers of state secondary schools of the Ministry of National Education, Izmir. The result of the investigation revealed that managers preferred the decision-making styles in their majority, their focal point was the internal audit and the abstract adaptation that conceptualized the learning styles. It was observed that their decision-making styles differed proportionally in comparison with the learning styles and control approach.

**KEY WORDS:** Manager, Decision-making style, Learning style, Locus of control.

**INTRODUCTION.**

The fact that humans are social beings, their causal multi-dimensional behaviors, the way they perceive the social world, and how they organize their reactions to it are among the most interesting research topics of behavioral science. In this regard, there is a strong demand for more studies to facilitate understanding of the connection of cognitive processes and indiviual characteristics with behavior. The findings obtained from this research are significant in providing tangible data about

the managers', with whatever locus of control or learning styles, common preferences of decision-making styles or the way they put them into practice.

**Locus of control.**

The concept "Locus of Contol" was first pronounced by Phares in 1957[1]. Later, "psychology and social sciences", the keystones of "Social Learning Theory", brought up by Rotter (1996)[2], were introduced. "Locus of Control", brought up as the result of perception of expectations within Social Learning Theory[3], forms an important dimension of personality[4] and functions among the basic elements shaping human behavior[5].

People usually believe that the situations they experience as a result of their own behaviors or a coincidence, fate, chance, relationships with others, and others' strong influences, which are not self-oriented[6]. Either "internal" or "external", this issue is called "Locus of Control"[7]. In brief, "Locus of Control" is one's efforts put into taking own beliefs, skills and abilities under control. In other words, it is a way of specifying the reasons, interior or exterior, affecting one positively or negatively. If an individual considers the positive or negative events resulting from self-behavior, he acquires "Internal Locus of Control", but if the events are related to external reasons, he acquires "External Locus of Control"[8]. In other words, "Locus of Control" is an indication of an individual's

---

[1] **İ. Dağ, Kontrol Odağı, Stresle Başa Çıkma Stratejileri ve Psikolojik Belirti Gösterme İlişkileri, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, 1990, pp.4.**

[2] **J. B. Rotter, Generalized Expectancies for İnternal vs. External Control of Reinforcement, Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80 (1), pp.1-28.**

[3] **İ. Dağ, Kontrol Odağı Ölçeği (KOÖ): Ölçek Geliştirme, Güvenirlik ve Geçerlik Çalışması. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 2002, 17 (49), pp.77-78.**

[4] **J. B. Rotter, a.g.e. 1966, pp.1.**

[5] **A. Dönmez, Denetim Odağı (Locus Of Control) ve Çevre Büyüklüğü. Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi, 1983, 16 (1), pp.38-39.**

[6] **O. Yaşar, Karar Verme Stili Öncülleri: Savunma Sanayinde Bir Araştırma. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Kara Harp Okulu, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2011, p.55.**

[7] **J. B. Rotter, a.g.e. 1966, pp.1.**

[8] **C. A. Smith, & R. J. Mihans,RaisingIssues of StudentLocus of Control: Beginning A LongitudinalStudy. Research in Education, 2009, 8, 63-65; P.E. Spector & et all.,Locus Of Control and Well-Being At Work: How GeneralızableAre Western Fındıngs? Academy of Management Journal, 2002, 45, pp. 453-454.**

perception of the events developing around[9], his belief in his ability to control the events faced in his life and the origin of thiscontrol he looksfor[10].

"Locus of Contrtol" is one of the dimensions of personality, emotion, behavior, thought, and attitude, which differentiate one both subjectively and objectively from others. It is also defined as an individual's level of acceptance of the results of his behaviors in the case of events faced[11].Within the concept of "Locus of Control", it is emphsized that an individaul's behaviors are either self-directed or directed by other factors and his responsibilities for thoughts and feelings are also stressed[12]. Although it is explained in two styles, interior and exterior, a big majority of people find themselves somewhere moving between these two ends.

**Learnıng style.**

Learning is not a new concept. It has been a matter of discussion and a topic for researches for long years. "How does learning come about?", "What is the role of the teacher and learner in the process?", "What does learning mean?", and "What strategies and methods are practiced while learning?" are the questions that kept minds busy for years and several researches have been done and Works have been published.

The "learning" topic is still one of the most important issues of Behavioral Sciences today. It is hoped that, if the secret codes of learning are worked out in the researches, human behavior will be better understood and foreseen in advance, because learning is the most crucial source of the

---

[9]A.D. Burçak, İç Denetim Programının Ergenlerin Denetim Odağı, Öğrenilmiş Güçlük ve Savunma Mekanizmalarını Kullanma Biçimi Üzerindeki Etkisi", Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir, 2012, p.14.

[10]T.A. Judge, A. Erez & J.E. Bono, ThePower of Being Positive: The Relation Between Positive Self-Conceptand Job Performance. Human Performance, 1998, 11 (2/3), p.70.

[11]G.Ş. Tekeli, Lise Son Sınıf Öğrencileri İle Üniversite Öğrenciler Arasında Bir Karşılaştırma: Akademik Benlik Yeterliliği, Denetim Odağı, Stresle Başa Çıkma ve Problem Çözme Becerisi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi,, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2010, p.36; D.C. Gardner, & S.A. Warren, *Careers and disabilities: A career education approach.* Connecticut: Greylock Publishers, 1978.

[12] A. Ünvar, Gerçeklik Kuramına Dayalı Psiko-Eğitim Programının Lise Öğrencilerinin Denetim Odağı ve Yılmazlık Düzeyi Üzerindeki Etkisinin İncelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir, 2012, p.3.

function of the mechanizm shaping human behavior. Therefore, "learning" is still an issue concerning every part of the community without discrimination[13]. In a broad sense, "learning" is defined as the lasting changes in human behavior as a result ofrepetitionsandexperiences[14].

People differ from other living beings in several characteristics, the most important of which is that a human can think and learn. Every individual perceives the environment differently because of the differences in thinking and learning. In other words, every individual has a different style of thinking and learning. The "Lerning Styles Concept", first pronounced by Rita Dunn (1960), explains the differences between individuals' personal characteristics and the reflection of their preferences, acquiring knowledge and the process[15]. The concept explains the differences between the learner and others when trying to understand the experience,through using more than one sense organs, regulating and putting it in memory, keepingit in mind and using it later[16].

The "Learning Style" develops in parallel to individual development, consisting of one's habits of acquiring knowledge, practicing it, percepting, keeping in mind, recalling, solving problems and making decisions[17]. "Learning Style" is the route one follows to acquire knowledge and the method to put it into practice[18], it is the general tendency one prefers in practicing knowledge[19]. "Learning Styles", in general, satarting from the acquisition level, explain fixed individual differences in organizing, practicing and ending by remembering knowledge."Learning Style" is related to an

---

**13** S. Güney, Örgütsel Davranış, Ankara: .Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 2. Baskı, 2012, p.121.

**14** T.J. Shuell, The Role of The Student in Learning fromİnstruction. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 1988, 13, pp.276-278.

**15**J. M. Reid, The Learning Style Preferences of ESL Students.TESOL Quarterly, 1987, 21 (1), pp.87-111; G. Bengiç, İlköğretim 6. ve 7. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Öğrenme Stilleri ile Sosyal Bilgiler Dersinde Başarıları Arasındaki İlişki. Yayınlaşmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Denizli, 2008, p.19; A. H. Boydak, Öğrenme Stilleri, İstanbul: Beyaz Yayıncılık, 21.Basım, 2015, p.3.

**16** J. M. Reid, a.g.e. 2015, p.89.

**17** D.H. Schunk, Öğrenme Teorileri: Eğitimsel Bir Bakışla, Mahmut Yasin Demir vd. (çev.), Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi, 2014, p.304.

**18** A.Y. Kolb, & D.A.Kolb, Experiential Learning Theory: A Dynamic, HolisticApproachto Management Learning, Educationand Development. The Sage Handbook Of Management Learnıng, EducatıonAnd Development, 2008, p.47.

**19** D.H. Jonassen, &B.L. Grabowski, Handbook Of IndividuaDifferences, Learning, andInstruction. Newyork: Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group, 2011, p.22.

individual's choices and preferences during learning process and in the learning environment. Simply, it can also be explained as an individual's different way of learning or approaches compared to others[20].

At this point, it is emphasized that the differences among individuals should not be ignored.In this respect, it can be assumed that learning styles are totally peculiar to individuals, emerged as a result of the interaction with learning environments and other learners and include three different dimensions: cognitive, affective and physiological.

"Learning Styles" are biological and developmental features peculiar to individuals and they can differ from individual to individual[21]. Despite the similarities in learning styles, all individuals do not exactly have the same style. One may not have the superior style due to one's needs, wishes, and preferences. In other words, every individual has a unique style of learning.

**Decısıon-makıng style.**

Decision and decision-making is crucial in human life. People have to make decisions in every phase of life in order to exist because it can be said that life is a chain of making decisions. Therefore, individuals, groups, organizations, and States have to make decisions almost in every issue to solve problems and sustain their lives.

"Decision" is a process of thinking about an issue for the best solution, have a choice and make a definite judgement[22]. "Decision-making" is the process of understanding and interpreting problems together with the other(s), collecting information and data, developing alternatives for solutions,

[20] F. Deveci, Ergenlerde Karar Verme Stilleri ile Algılanan Sosyal Destek Düzeyi Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana, 2011, p.43.

[21]Makhlouf, A. M. E.,Witte, M. M. &Dahaway, B. M. (2012). A Comparison of Preferred Learning StylesBetweenVocationalandAcademicSecondary SchoolStudents in Egypt. Instutefor Learning Styles Research Journal, Spring, 1, pp:3-4.

[22] T. Koçel, İşletme Yöneticiliği, İstanbul: Genişletilmiş Beta Yayınları, 12. Baskı, 2010, p.109.; D. Gürüz, & E. Gürel, Yönetim ve Organizasyon. Ankara. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 2. Baskı, 2009, p.322.

comparing them and deciding on the best choice[23]. In short, it is the process of determining the most suitable choice for a situation. It is a crucial factor that helps carry out organizational activities in the best way. It is a process between the management and the organization. That is to say, it has an organizational and managerail nature. Decision-making is one of the key elements and key functions for a manager. A manager is always in a decision-making position[24].

If management is a play, decision is the basic element. The manager is the main actor. He is responsible for decision-making and practising it, which indicates success and quality as well as efficiency. The most important determiner of the process is the decision-making style[25]. The style is the way one prefers in making decisions[26].

Phillips et al., made a broader definition and included in it an individual's reactions and actions, as well as the way of approaching problems[27]. In other words, the style is expressed as the approach one follows indecision-making[28].

The factors creating differences among styles are the information gathered and the number of choices in reaching decisions[29]. One of the differences in decision-making is one's style[30]. Individual differences, on the other hand, emerge from the haste in making decisions and the amount of information evaluated[31]. In addition, individual, domestic, cultural, and environmental

---

[23] T. Koçel, 2010, a.g.e. p.136.

[24] A.H. Aydın, Yönetim Fonksiyonları. Yönetim ve Organizasyon, Salih Güney (ed.), Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 2007, p.89.

[25] H. Izgar, & E. Yılmaz, PİO ve YİBO'nda Görev Yapan Okul Yöneticilerinin Karar Vermede Özsaygı ve Karar Verme Stilleri Arasındaki İlişki. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 2007,1 (17), p.341.

[26] S.G. Scott, & R.A. Bruce, Decision Making Style: The Development and of A New Measure. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1995, 55 (5), p.818.

[27] K. Tatlıoğlu, Farklı Öz-Anlayış Düzeylerine Sahip Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Karar Vermede Özsaygı, Karar Verme Stilleri ve Kişilik Özelliklerinin Değerlendirilmesi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya, 2010, p.11.

[28] I.L. Janis, & L. Mann, Decision Making: A Psychological Analysis of Conflict, Choice and Commitment, New York: FreePress, 1977,p.46.

[29] O.Yaşar, 2011, a.g.e. p.34.

[30] A.M. Parker, & B. Fischhoff, Decision-Making Competence: External Validation Through An İndividual-DifferencesApproach. Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 2005, 18 (1), 1-27.

[31] A. Gacar, Türkiye'deki Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretim Elemanlarının Karar Verme ve Atılganlık Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. Yayınlamamış Doktora Tezi, Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elâzığ, 2011, p.14.

factors influence decision-making process. All these factors are affective impacts and guide an individual's habits. Besides individual differences, all habits learned and taught as a result of experiences throughout life form the decision-making style. "Decision-making Style" is the way previously learned and based on experiences an individual practices in the process of making decisions.

When the "Locus of Control" and " Learning Styles" are overviewed, a connection between the variables in question can be claearly observed. It is hoped that studies are done to examine the variables in question in detail and new information is obtained.

**Aım of the research.**

The aim of this research is to examine managers's Locus of control and learning and decision-making styles, and specify any differentiations in terms of their styles in question.

**Populatıon and samples.**

The participants in this research are 1134 managers ( managers, head assistants, and assistant managers) in 227 State High Schools of the Ministry of Education in İzmir, Turkey. The sampling was carried out through %95 reliability level and %5 sampling error. The scales were administered to 368 managers in the selected schools and 365 scales filled in correctly were evaluated.

**Data collectıon, methodology and data collectıon tools.**

Three scales "Decision-Making Styles Scale" (DMSS), "Locus of Control Scale" (LOCS), and "Learning Style Inventory" (LSI) were used in the research. A "Personal Information Form", develloped by the researcher, was used to gather information about the managers' demographic characteristics. The DMSS was developed by Scott & Bruce (1995)[32] and adapted into Turkish and

---

[32]S. G. Scott, & R. A. Bruce, Decision Making Style: The Development And of A New Measure. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1995, 55 (5), 818-831.

implemented by Taşdelen (2002)[33]. The FCS was developed by Dağ (2002)[34]. Rotter's İnternal–External Locus of Control Scale was referredtowhiledeveloping FCS. The high scores indicated to İnternal Locus of Control and the low scores indicated to External Locus of Control. In order to specify "Lerrning Styles", the Kolb Learning Styles Inventory-III[35] was used. This inventory was translated into Turkish and adapted by Aşkar & Akkoyunlu (1993)[36].

**Data analysıs and research questıons**.

In the context of the research, firstly tests were conducted for the validity and reliability of the scales and average and standard deviation values of the sub-dimensions of the scales were specified. The SPSS 21.0 program was referred to for the analysis of the data, followed by analyses to specify the managers' decision-making styles, Locus of control and learning styles. In order to determine the differences in decision-making styles in terms of the managers' Locus of control and learning styles, a one-way ANOVA and for any differences in decision-making styles in terms of Locus of control an independent sampling t-test was conducted. Prior to the analysis process, the Levene test was conducted to specify the equality of the variances of the groups. This was followed by a homogeneity test of the variances to determine the significant differences in decision-making styles among the groups. The research questions are as follows;

1. What are the managers' perceptions of "Locus of Control?"

2. What are the managers' "Learning Styles?"

3. What are the managers' "Decision-making Styles?"

4. Do the managers' "Decision-Making Styles" differ from their "Learning Styles?"

5. Do the managers' "Decision-Making Styles" differ from thier "Locus of Contol?"

---

[33]A. Taşdelen, Öğretmen Adaylarının Farklı Psikososyal Değişkenlere Göre Karar Verme Stilleri. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir, 2002.

[34]İ. Dağ, Kontrol Odağı Ölçeği (KOÖ): Ölçek Geliştirme, Güvenirlik ve Geçerlik Çalışması. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 2002, 17 (49), 77-90.

[35]D. A. Kolb, TheKolb Learning Style İnventory. Hay Resources Direct, 1999.

[36]P. Aşkar, & B. Akkoyunlu, Kolb Öğrenme Stili Envanteri. Eğitim ve Bilim, 1993, 17 (87), ss:37-47.

**Fındıngs.**

*Findings related to "Decision-making Styles" (DMS).*

The Cronbachs Alfa values in DMS scale was calculated as 0.73. The reliability values on the basis of dimensions were 0.85 for rational decision-makingstyle (RDMS), 0.81 for intuitive decision-making (İDMS), 0.72 for dependent decision-makingstyle (DDMS), 0.80 for avoidant decision-makingstyle (ADMS), and 0.78 for spontaneous decision-makingstyle (SDMS). These calculations are the indications of the reliability of the scales. The dimensions of the scales, item numbers, averages and standard deviation values are as in Table 1.

**Table 1. The sub-dimensions of DMS scale and the items measuring the dimensions.**

| Dimensions | | Scaleitemnumber | Ave. | S.d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | RDMS | 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 | 4,09 | 0,59 |
| 2 | IDMS | 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 | 3,50 | 0,76 |
| 3 | DDMS | 27, 28, 29, 30 | 3,46 | 0,73 |
| 4 | ADMS | 31, 32, 33, 34, 35 | 2,28 | 0,75 |
| 5 | SDMS | 36, 37, 39, 40 | 2,41 | 0,76 |

As it can be noted in Table1, the general average score in rational decision-making style is 4.09 (s.s.=0.59), the average score in intuitive decision-makingscale is 3.50 (s.s.=0.76), the average score in dependent decision-making scale is 3.46 (s.s.=0.73), the average score in spontaneous decision-makingscale is 2.41 (s.s.=0.76) and the average score in avoidant decision-making scale is 2.28 (s.s.=0.75). The distribution of the managers' decision-making styles is as in Table 2.

**Table2. Thedistribution of the managers in terms of their DMS.**

| Decision-MakingStyles | f | % |
|---|---|---|
| RDMS | 200 | 54,79 |
| İDMS | 76 | 20,82 |
| DDMS | 70 | 19,18 |
| ADMS | 11 | 3,02 |
| SDMS | 8 | 2,19 |
| Total | 365 | 100,0 |

As Table 2 shows, 200 managers (%54.76) have rational, 76 (%20.82) haveintuitive, 70 (%19.18) havedependent, 11 (%3.02) havespontaneous, and 8 (%2.19) have avoidant decision-making styles.

### *The findings in Locus of Control Scale (LOCS).*

The reliability values of İnternal Locusof Control (İLC) were calculated as 0.72 and 0.66 for External Locusof Control (ELC). The sub-dimensions of the scale are as in Table3.

**Table 3: The FCS dimensions and the items measuring the dimensions.**

| | **Dimensions** | Scaleitemnumber | Ave. | S.d. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | İnternalLocus of Control (İLC) | 7,8,9,10,11,13,14,15,16 | 3,77 | 0,54 |
| 2 | ExternalLocus of Control (ELC) | 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 12 | 2,83 | 0,73 |

WhenTable 3 is overviewed, it is observed that the general average score in internal Locus of Control is higher than (ave.=3.77, s.s.=0.54) external Locus of Control (ave.=2.83, s.s.=0.73), with a lower standard deviation. This indicates that the managers adapt internal Locus of Control more. Table 4 presents the distribution of the managers in terms of their LOC (Locus of Control).

**Table 4: The distribution of the managers in terms of their Locus of Control.**

| Locus of Control | f | % |
|---|---|---|
| İLC | 314 | 86,0 |
| ELC | 51 | 14,0 |
| Total | 365 | 100,0 |

As it is observed in Table 5, 314 (%86), a great majority of the managers have internal and 51 (%14) have external Locus of Control.

*Findings in Kolb Learning Style Inventories (LSI).*

Through the behavioral questions directed to the managers, the dimensions and the sources for their learning styles were specified. When the statistical values are examined, it is observed that the values for the dimensions differed between 12 and 48. The managers' average score throughout their active living is at the highest point (ave.=35.12; s.s.=6.17) and the average score throughout their abstract living is at the lowest point (ave.=24.32; s.s.=5.72). The descriptive statistics are as in Table 5.

**Table 5: Descriptivestatistics of the dimensions of learning styles.**

| Dimensions of learning styles | Min. | Max. | Average | Standart Deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Abstract Conceptualization | 14 | 42 | 24,32 | 5,72 |
| Reflective Observation | 17 | 41 | 29,54 | 4,70 |
| Concrete Experience | 12 | 48 | 31,08 | 5,64 |
| Active Experience | 15 | 48 | 35,12 | 6,17 |

The questions in the questionnaire were formulated to clearly explain learning styles. The distribution is as in Table 6.

**Table 6: The distribution of the managers in terms of their learning styles.**

| Learning styles | f | % |
|---|---|---|
| Diverging | 135 | 36,9 |
| Assimilating | 106 | 29,0 |
| Converting | 63 | 17,3 |
| Accomodating | 61 | 16,8 |
| Total | **365** | 100,0 |

As in Table 6, 135 (%36.9) of the managers havea dapted diverging, 106 (%29.0) have adapted assimilating, 63 (%17.3) have adapted converting, and 61 (%16.8) have adapted accomodating learning styles.

*Findings revealing the differences in respect of managers' decision-making  and learning styles.*

In order to specify the differences in the subjet question, a one-way ANOVA was conducted and the results are shown in Table 7.

**Table 7: The one-way ANOVA results in respect of the managers' learning styles.**

| Decision-Making Style | | Sum of squares | S.D. | Squares average | F. | p. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **RDMS** | **İn-group** | **3,027** | **3** | **1,009** | **2,900** | **,035** |
| | Betweengroups | 125,629 | 361 | ,348 | | |
| | Total | 128,656 | 364 | | | |
| **İDMS** | **İn-group** | **9,611** | **3** | **3,204** | **5,745** | **,001** |
| | Betweengroups | 201,317 | 361 | ,558 | | |
| | Total | 210,928 | 364 | | | |
| DDMS | İn-group | ,375 | 3 | ,125 | ,228 | ,877 |
| | Betweengroups | 198,049 | 361 | ,549 | | |
| | Total | 198,424 | 364 | | | |
| **ADMS** | **İn-group** | **22,155** | **3** | **7,385** | **14,377** | **,000** |
| | Betweengroups | 185,437 | 361 | ,514 | | |
| | Total | 207,592 | 364 | | | |
| **SDMS** | **İn-group** | **18,012** | **3** | **6,004** | **11,019** | **,000** |
| | Betweengroups | 196,701 | 361 | ,545 | | |
| | Total | 214,713 | 364 | | | |

* $p < 0.05$

As it is revealed in Table 8, rational, intuitive, avoidant, and spontaneous decision-making differenciate significantly in respect to learning styles (F=1.009, F=3.204, F=7.384, F=6.004, p<.05). On the other hand, dependent decision-making style differs in respect to learning style.

In order to specify the differences in decision-making styles in terms of groups, a homogenic test in the variances was conducted. The results are as in Table 8.

**Table 8: Descriptive statistics in te variables and the results of the variance homogenic test.**

| Decision-Making Style | Learning Styles | N | Ave. | S.d. | Levene test statistica lvalue | p | Differences |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RDMS | Accomodating | 61 | 4,0951 | ,47273 | 1,398 | ,243 | --- |
| | Converting | 63 | 3,9079 | ,70283 | | | Diverging |
| | Assimilating | 106 | 4,0906 | ,55968 | | | --- |
| | Diverging | 135 | 4,1733 | ,60288 | | | Converting |
| | Total | 365 | 4,0904 | ,59452 | | | --- |
| IDMS | Accomodating | 61 | 3,8295 | ,69170 | 1,372 | ,251 | Assimilating Diverging |
| | Converting | 63 | 3,5841 | ,72138 | | | --- |
| | Assimilating | 106 | 3,4151 | ,71645 | | | Accomodating |
| | Diverging | 135 | 3,3852 | ,80321 | | | Accomodating |
| | Total | 365 | 3,5025 | ,76123 | | | |
| ADMS | Accomodating | 61 | 3,4590 | ,60066 | 4,310 | ,005 | Diverging |
| | Converting | 63 | 3,5278 | ,70727 | | | Diverging Assimilating |
| | Assimilating | 106 | 3,4340 | ,76166 | | | Converting |
| | Diverging | 135 | 3,4500 | ,79398 | | | Accomodating Converting |
| | Total | 365 | 3,4603 | ,73832 | | | |
| SDMS | Accomodating | 61 | 2,4066 | ,76678 | 1,394 | ,244 | Assimilating Diverging |
| | Converting | 63 | 2,7302 | ,81451 | | | Assimilating Diverging |
| | Assimilating | 106 | 2,2585 | ,74012 | | | Accomodating Converting |
| | Diverging | 135 | 2,0311 | ,62000 | | | Accomodating Converting |
| | Total | 365 | 2,2805 | ,75519 | | | |

* p<0.05

In respect to rational decision-making, diverging and converting styles a difference was noted. Managers with diverging learning styles have a higher average (ave.= 4.1773: s.s.=0, 602) compared to those with converting learning styles with an average of (ave.=3.9079: s.s=0.702). In respect to intuitive decision-making, a difference was observed between accomodating and assimilating and diverging learning styles. It was observed that, managers with accomodating learning styles (ave.=3.8295:s.s.=0,691) had higher scores compared to those with assimilating learning styles (ave.=3.4151:s.s=0,716) and those with diverging learningstyles (ave.=3.3852:s.s=0.803). In respect to avoidant decision-making styles, a difference asobserved between accomodating learning styles and diverging learning styles and converting learning styles and diverging and assimilating learning styles.

The managers adapting establising learning styles had higher scores (ave. 3.4590:s.s=0.600) compared to those with Diverging learning styles (ave. 3,4500:s.s.=0,793), those with converting learning styles (ave.3,5278:s.s=0.707), those with diverging learning styles (3,4500:s.s=0,793), and those with assimilating learning styles (ave.3.4340:s.s.=0,761).

In respect to "Spontaneous decision-making", a difference was observed between accomodating and converting learning styles and assimilation and divergin gstyles. The managers adapting accomodating learning style have a higher average (ave.=2,4066: s.s.=0.766) compared to the ones adapting assimilation learning style (ave.=2,2585.s.s.=0.740) and diverging learning style (ave.=2.0311:s.s.=0.620). Similarly, managers adapting converting learning style (ave.=2,7302: s.s.= 0.814) have higher scores compared to the ones adapting assimilation learning style (ave.=2,2585: s.s.=0.740) and adapting diverging learning style (ave.=2.0311: s.s.=0.620).

**Findings related to managers' decision-making styles in respect to Locus of control.**

InrespecttoLocus of Control, an independent t-test was conducted to specify any differences in decision-making styles. The results are as in Table 9.

**Table 9: t-Test results in decision-making styles in repect to Locus of Control.**

| Decision-Making Styles | | Levenetest statistical value | | t-test value | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | p | t | S.d. | p |
| RDMS | **Variances are equal** | **17,032** | **,000** | **3,831** | **363** | **,000** |
| | Variances are not equal | | | 2,744 | 56,399 | ,008 |
| İDMS | Variances are equal | 1,078 | ,300 | -1,625 | 363 | ,105 |
| | **Variances are not equal** | | | **-1,478** | **63,103** | **,144** |
| DDMS | Variances are equal | 1,116 | ,291 | ,608 | 363 | ,544 |
| | **Variances are not equal** | | | **,637** | **69,826** | **,526** |
| ADMS | **Variances are equal** | **10,511** | **,001** | **-3,763** | **363** | **,000** |
| | Variances are not equal | | | -3,113 | 59,925 | ,003 |
| SDMS | **Variances are equal** | **10,389** | **,001** | **-3,961** | **363** | **,000** |
| | Variances are not equal | | | -3,259 | 59,763 | ,002 |

* p<.05

As shown in Table 9, a difference was noted in rational, aviodant, and spontaneous decision-making styles in respect to Locus of control (t=3.831, t=1,478, t=,637, t=3,763, t=3,961, p<.05).The averages of decision-making and standard deviation values in respect to Locus of Control are revealed in Table 10.

**Table 10: Descriptive statistics related to managers' decision-making styles  in terms of Locus of Control.**

| Decision-MakingStyles | Locus Of Control | N | Ave. | S.d. | S.d.Ave. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **RDMS** | İLC | 314 | 4,1376 | ,52823 | ,02981 |
| | ELC | 51 | 3,8000 | ,85229 | ,11934 |
| IDMS | İLC | 314 | 3,4764 | ,74423 | ,04200 |
| | ELC | 51 | 3,6627 | ,84899 | ,11888 |
| DDMS | İLC | 314 | 3,4697 | ,74525 | ,04206 |
| | ELC | 51 | 3,4020 | ,69835 | ,09779 |
| **ADMS** | İLC | 314 | 2,2217 | ,70853 | ,03998 |
| | ELC | 51 | 2,6431 | ,92374 | ,12935 |
| **SDMS** | İLC | 314 | 2,3487 | ,71790 | ,04051 |
| | ELC | 51 | 2,7990 | ,94342 | ,13211 |

* p<.05

According to the t-test statistics to do with any differences in decision-making styles in terms of rational decision-making styles, managers with interior control styles had a higher score (ave.=4,1376; s.s.=0.528) compared to the ones with exterior control styles (ave.=3,8000; s.s.= 0.852), in terms of avoidant decision-making styles, managers with exterior Locusof control had a higher score (ave.=2.6432; s.s.=0.923) compared to the ones with interior Locus of control (ave.=2.2217; s.s.= 0,708), and the ones with spontaneous decision-making styles had a higher score (ave.=2,7990; s.s.=0,943) compared to the ones with interior Locus of control (ave.=2,3487; s.s.=0,717).

**Dıscussıon.**

*Descriptive statistics.*

The managers' responses indicate that, in terms of decision-making styles, the majority have rational decision-making styles (n=200, %54, 79), in terms of Locus of Control they have internal Locus of Control style (n=314, %86), they have a more active experience in terms of learning styles (ave.=35,12; s.s.=6,17), and abstract conceptualization (ave.=31,08; s.s.=5,64) diverging in terms of learning styles (n=135 %36.9) and assimilating styles (n=106 %29.0).

*Decision-MakingStyles.*

Themajority of the managers' inclination to adapt rational decision-making styles indicate that before making a decision, they examine all probabilities, are careful in making their decisions, and take differentalternatives into account. On the other hand, they do not delay important decisions till the last minute. The fact that they are rational, they are eager to reach information, act wisely, follow systematic and rational strategies, and are sufficient in porblem solving and self-control. Every individual has a way of decision-making style into which they look from different perspectives. While some need more information to do analyses, some rely on their intuition. Some need quidance from others, but some make decisions independently.While some make spontaneous

decisions, some need time. There are some who avoid making decisions. Galotti, et al.[37] argue and relate the differencies to perceptual skills, acting independently from intelligence and individual differences. The distribution of managers' decision-making styles supports this explanation.

*Locus of Control.*

Similar supportive findings related to managers' Locus of control have been obtained in several other studies, which indicate that a big majority of managers adapted internal Locus of control[38]. Compared to external Locus of control, internal Locus of control is adapted more and is associated with reliable mood and communication, fighting stress, reaction to pressure, efficacy, creativity, struggle, questioning, socialization, success oriented and ambition, which are indications of a dimension of mature personality[39].

In the light of speculative framework and research findings, the reason for adapting internal Locus of control may due to the managers' position and their power in control, their right to interfere results, and their skills in converting prevailing situations[40]. Similarly, in astudy by Dilekmen,

---

[37]K.M. Galotti, E. Ciner, H.E. Altenbaumer, H. J. Geerts, A. Rupp& J. Woulfe, Decision-MakingStyles in a Real-Life Decision: Choosing a CollegeMajor. PersonalityandIndividualDifferences, 2006, 41 (4), 629-639.

[38]T.R.,Mitchell, C.M. Smyser& S.E. Weed. Locus of control: Supervisionand Work Satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 1975, 18 (3), 623-631;M. Gamble, C. Hollan, & F. Dangella. RelatingLocus Of Control toMachiavellianismandManagerialAchievement. Pscyhological Report, 1990, 67, 339-343; O.K. Bağlum, Eğitim Yöneticilerinin Sorun Çözme ve Denetim Odağı İlişkisi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2000;E. Türkoğlu, Türk ve Alman Okul Yöneticilerinden Denetim Odağı Boyutunda Farklı Değişkenler Açısından Karşılaştırılması. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Tokat, 2007; B. Tokat, H. Kara, & N. Ülkgün, Yöneticilerin Sorun Çözme Yetenekleri ve Kontrol Odağının Belirlenmesi: DPU Örneği, Akademik Bakış, 2007, 11, 1-11.

[39] B. Yeşilyaprak, Lise Öğrencilerinin İçsel ya da Dışsal Denetimli Oluşlarını Etkileyen Etmenler. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara, 1988, pp.77-81; İ. Dağ, a.g.e. 1990, pp.76-80; H. Küçükkaragöz, İlkokulöğretmenlerinde Kontrol Odağı ve Öğrencilerinin Kontrol Odağının Oluşumuna Etkileri. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi,Dokuz Eylüll Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir, 1998, pp.5.

[40]D.M.A. Fazey& J. A. Fazey, ThePotentialforAutonomy in Learning: Perceptions of Competence, MotivationandLocus of Control in First-yeaUndergraduateStudents. Studies in HigherEducation, 2001, 26 (3), 345-361; M. Loosemore& A.S.Y. Lam, TheLocus of Control: A Determinant of OpportunisticBehaviour in Construction HealthandSafety. Construction Management andEconomics, 2004, 22 (4), 385-394; W.H. Ng Thomas. & D.C. Feldman, Locus Of Control And Organizational Embeddedness. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 2011, 84 (1), 173-190.

Alver, Ada and Akçay[41], it was stated that school managers adapted internal Locus of control and they used their skills in influencing occurences[42].

In the research investigating the connection between managers' perception of perfectionism and the level of Locus of control, it was noted that they dapated internal Locus of control, thus running activities under their control, struggling to achieve perfectionism[43]. These findings show consistence with the managers' belief that success is only possible with hard work. In this respect, it can be assumed that managers are eager to change their environment because they see themselves responsible for the results.

*Learning Styles.*

It is observed that, firstly, managers are the ones who practice abstract conceptualisation and active living and they filter the information they obtain in their brains and take action.

According to the average scores in the scale items, directos primarily feel responsibilities in the process of learning, they adapt learning through practice and application, they interact their intuition and are not unwilling and quiet. Managers with abstract conceptualisation, active living learning style and eager to dissociate, adapt deductive approach, are strict with details and proceed step by step[44].

It is argued that they can learnn without difficulties on condition that opportunities are created to solve problems, make decisions, to plan information systematically, and order logically. The have the ability to learn through prcticising and thinking. However, they always expect to receive feedback from superiors. Secondly, managers produce a perceptional modelling from the

---

[41] **M. Dilekmen, B. Alver, Ş. Ada, & K. Akçay, İlk ve Ortaöğretim Okul Yöneticilerinin İç-Dış Kontrol Odakları, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Dergisi, 2009, 9 (1), 128-136.**
[42] **A. Ünvar, Gerçeklik Kuramına Dayalı Psiko-Eğitim Programının Lise Öğrencilerinin Denetim Odağı ve Yılmazlık Düzeyi Üzerindeki Etkisinin İncelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir, 2012, pp.76.**
[43] **E. Kıral, İlköğretim Okulu Yöneticilerinin Mükemmeliyetçilik Algısı ve Kontrol Odağı ile İlişkisi, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2012.**
[44] **P. Aşkar & B. Akkoyunlu, Kolb Öğrenme Stili Envanteri, Eğitim ve Bilim, 1993, 17 (87), pp:38-39; D.A. KolbTheKolb Learning Style İnventory. Hay Resources Direct, 1999, pp.7.**

combination of abstract conceptualisation and reflective observation dimensions. They belong to the ones who learn through assimilation (n=106, %29.0).The ones who learn through assimilation adapt abstract perception and thought disposition tendency[45]. While thinking, they Locus on abstract concepts (values), thoughts and meanings[46].

In terms of learning through assimilation, managers are very good at unifying broad and comprehensive information in a logical unity, their skills in planning and identifying problems are well developed, but are not successful in following a systematic way in the process of application. They learn best through observation and thinking, because they adapt learning through assimilation, their awareness level is quite high. If they believe in the expertism of learning resources, thy need feedback and proper guidance.

During the process of decision-making and gathering information, and while they assimilate this information they base it on their cognitive styles, they, the decision-makers, systematically rationalize and try to solve the problem or they reach solutions through trial and error. Theoretical findings support the findings in this research because it was observed that managers overview the information from their experiences, apply it to situations and rationalize it. In the light of all the findings, it can be assumed that managers are mostly inclined to learn by doing only after rationalizing the situation. These two findings support each other because a big majority of managers adapt rational decision-making style and diverging and assimilating learning style.

---

[45]D. A. Kolb, Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development. EnglewoodCliffs, PrenticeHallInc, NJ. 1984, pp.77-78; E. Kılıç, Web Temelli Öğrenmede Baskın Öğrenme Stilinin Öğrenme Etkinlikleri Tercihi Ve Akademik Başarıya Etkisi. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara. 2002, p.22; İ.E. Gencel, Öğrenme Stilleri, Deneyimsel Öğrenme Kuramına Dayalı Eğitim, Tutum ve Sosyal Bilgiler Program Hedeflerine Erişi Düzeyi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir, 2006, pp.46-48; H. Özgür, BÖTE Bölümü Öğretmen Adaylarının Öğrenme Stillerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi, Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 2013, 34, pp.103-105.
[46]McKenney, James L.,& P.G.W.Keen. How managers' mindswork. Harvard Business Review, 1974, 52 (3), pp. 79-90; S. Avşaroğlu& Ö. Üre, Üniversite öğrencilerinin karar vermede özsaygı, kara verme ve stresle başa çıkma stillerinin benlik saygısı ve bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 2007, 18, p.97; A. Taşdelen, Öğretmen Adaylarının Farklı Psikososyal Değişkenlere Göre Karar Verme Stilleri. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2001, 10, 40-52.

*Managers' decision-making styles differ from their learning styles.*

According to the analyses done to determine the differences in decision-making styles in regard to learning styles, except dependent decision-making styles, decision-making styles differ in respect of learning styles (F=1.009, F=3.204, F=7.384, F=6.004, p<.05).

The investigation to determine the source of the difference showed that managers adapting Abstract Conceptualization (AC), Active Experience (AE) and Diverging Learning Style (DLS) are more rational compared to the ones with Concrete Experience (CE), Reflective Observation (RO), and Converting Learning Style (CLS); the ones adapting Concrete Experience (CE) and Active Experience (AE) are more intuitional and instant compared to the ones with Diverging Learning Styles (DLS), are more intuitional, avoidant, and instant in making decisions compared to AC and AE diverging learning style, are more avoidant and spontaneous decision-maker compared to the ones with AC, AE, diverging, CC, and RO styles. As a result, managers' decision-making styles are affected by their learning styles. Managers with different learning styles have a different decision-making style.

*Managers' decision-making styles differ in respect of their Locus of control.*

The analyses carried out in the subject question revealed that rational, avoidant, and instant decision-making styles differ in terms of Locus of control, but intuitive and dependent decision-making styles do not differ. In the investigation in terms of the dimensions of Locus of control, a difference was noted in favour of the ones with internal Locus of control and a difference in favour of the ones with external Locus of control in respect to avoidant and instant decision-makers; that is to say, managers' decision-making styles are affected by their Locus of control. Managers with different Locus of control have different decision-making styles.

**CONCLUSIONS.**

In this research, it has been determined that managers' decision-making styles differ in respect of their learnin styles. This difference increased more among the ones with diverging, converting, and accomodating learning styles. It was also found out that rational, avoidant, and instant decision-making style differed in respect of Locus of Control, but therewas no difference in dependent decision-making styles.

In short, the managers were not born with these characteristics, but they gained these through experience. Their decision-making styles are affected by several factors. At this point, it is important to remember that the results may be positive or negative, there may not be specifc evidence to show the good or the bad one and may differ from individual to individual. The individual should be aware of this and arrange his behavior and living accordingly.

As a result, it can be said that decision-making is not an ability, but a process that can be learned.

**BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.**

1. Aşkar, P. & Akkoyunlu, B. (1993). Kolb Öğrenme Stili Envanteri. Eğitim ve Bilim, 17 (87), ss:37-47.

2. Avşaroğlu, S. & Üre, Ö. Üniversite öğrencilerinin karar vermede özsaygı, kara verme ve stresle başa çıkma stillerinin benlik saygısı ve bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 2007, 18, p.97.

3. Aydın, A. H. (2007). Yönetim Fonksiyonları. Yönetim ve Organizasyon, Salih Güney (ed.), Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

4. Bağlum, O. K. (2000). Eğitim Yöneticilerinin Sorun Çözme ve Denetim Odağı İlişkisi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

5. Bengiç, G. (2008). İlköğretim 6. ve 7. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Öğrenme Stilleri ile Sosyal Bilgiler Dersinde Başarıları Arasındaki İlişki. Yayınlaşmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Denizli.

6. Boydak, A. H. (2015). Öğrenme Stilleri, İstanbul: Beyaz Yayıncılık, 21.Basım.

7. Burçak, A.D. (2012). İç Denetim Programının Ergenlerin Denetim Odağı, Öğrenilmiş Güçlük ve Savunma Mekanizmalarını Kullanma Biçimi Üzerindeki Etkisi", Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.

8. Dağ, İ. (1990). "Kontrol Odağı, Stresle Başa Çıkma Stratejileri ve Psikolojik Belirti Gösterme İlişkileri", Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

9. Dağ, İ. (2002). Kontrol Odağı Ölçeği (KOÖ): Ölçek Geliştirme, Güvenirlik ve Geçerlik Çalışması. Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 17 (49), 77-90.

10. Deveci, F. (2011). Ergenlerde Karar Verme Stilleri ile Algılanan Sosyal Destek Düzeyi Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

11. Dilekmen, M., Alver, B., Ada, Ş.& Akçay, K. (2009). İlk ve Ortaöğretim Okul Yöneticilerinin İç-Dış Kontrol Odakları, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Dergisi, 9 (1), 128-136.

12. Dönmez, A. (1983). Denetim Odağı (Locus Of Control) ve Çevre Büyüklüğü. Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi, 16 (1), 37-47.

13. Fazey, D. M.A. &Fazey, J. A. (2001). ThePotentialforAutonomy in Learning: Perceptions of Competence, Motivationand Locus of Control in First-year Undergraduate Students. Studies in HigherEducation, 26 (3), 345-361.

14. Gacar, A. (2011). Türkiye'deki Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretim Elemanlarının Karar Verme ve Atılganlık Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. Yayınlamamış Doktora Tezi, Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elâzığ.

15. Galotti, K. M., Ciner, E., Altenbaumer, H. E., Geerts, H. J., Rupp, A. & Woulfe, J. (2006). Decision-MakingStyles in a Real-Life Decision: Choosing a College Major. Personality and Individual Differences, 41 (4), 629-639.

16. Gamble, M., Hollan, C. &Dangella, F. (1990). RelatingLocus Of Control to Machiavellianism and Managerial Achievement. Pscyhological Report, 67, 339-343.

17. Gardner, D.C.&Warren, S.A. (1978). Carreers and disabilities: A career education approach. Connecticut: Greylock Publishers.

18. Gencel, İ. E. (2006). Öğrenme Stilleri, Deneyimsel Öğrenme Kuramına Dayalı Eğitim, Tutum ve Sosyal Bilgiler Program Hedeflerine Erişi Düzeyi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.

19. Güney, S. (2012). Örgütsel Davranış, Ankara: .Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 2. Baskı,

20. Gürüz, D. & Gürel, E. (2009). Yönetim ve Organizasyon. Ankara. Nobel Yayın Dağıtım, 2. Baskı.

21. Izgar, H. & Yılmaz, E. (2007). PİO ve YİBO'nda Görev Yapan Okul Yöneticilerinin Karar Vermede Özsaygı ve Karar Verme Stilleri Arasındaki İlişki. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,1 (17), 341-351.

22. J.L. McKenney, & Keen. P.G.W. How managers' mindswork. Harvard Business Review, 1974, 52 (3), pp. 79-90.

23. Janis, I. L. &Mann, L. (1977). DecisionMaking: A Psychological Analysis of Conflict, Choiceand Commitment, New York: FreePress.

24. Jonassen, D. H. &Grabowski, B. L. (2011). Handbook Of IndividualDifferences, Learning, and Instruction. Newyork: Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group,

25. Judge, T.A., Erez, A. & Bono, J.E. (1998). ThePower of BeingPositive: The Relation Between Positive Self-ConceptandJobPerformance. Human Performance,11 (2/3), 167–187.

26. Kılıç, E. (2002b). Web Temelli Öğrenmede Baskın Öğrenme Stilinin Öğrenme Etkinlikleri Tercihi Ve Akademik Başarıya Etkisi. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi,Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

27. Kıral, E. (2012). İlköğretim Okulu Yöneticilerinin Mükemmeliyetçilik Algısı ve Kontrol Odağı ile İlişkisi, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

28. Koçel, T. (2010). İşletme Yöneticiliği, İstanbul: Genişletilmiş Beta Yayınları, 12. Baskı.

29. Kolb, D. A.(1999). TheKolb Learning Style İnventory. Hay Resources Direct.

30. Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development. EnglewoodCliffs, PrenticeHallInc, NJ.

31. Kolb, A. Y. &Kolb, D. A. (2008). Experiential Learning Theory: A Dynamic, HolisticApproachto Management Learning, Educationand Development. The Sage Handbook Of Management Learnıng, EducatıonAnd Development, 42-68.

32. Küçükkaragöz, H. (1998). İlkokulöğretmenlerinde Kontrol Odağı ve Öğrencilerinin Kontrol Odağının Oluşumuna Etkileri. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylüll Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.

33. Loosemore, M. & Lam, A.S.Y. (2004). TheLocus of Control: A Determinant of OpportunisticBehaviour in Construction HealthandSafety.Construction Management and Economics, 22 (4), 385-394.

34. Makhlouf, A. M. E.,Witte, M. M. &Dahaway, B. M. (2012). A Comparison of Preferred Learning Styles Between Vocational and Academic Secondary School Students in Egypt. Instutefor Learning Styles Research Journal, Spring, 1, pp:1-9.

35. Mitchell, T. R., Smyser, C. M. & Weed, S. E. (1975). Locus of control: Supervision and Work Satisfaction. Academy of Management Journal, 18 (3), 623-631.

36. Ng Thomas. W. H. &Feldman, D. C. (2011). Locus Of Control And Organizational Embeddedness. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 84 (1), 173-190.

37. Özgür, H. (2013). BÖTE Bölümü Öğretmen Adaylarının Öğrenme Stillerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi, Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 34, 103-118.

38. Parker, A. M.&Fischhoff, B. (2005). Decision-Making Competence: ExternalValidation Through An İndividual- Differences Approach. Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 18 (1), 1-27.

39. Reid, J. M. (1987). The Learning Style Preferences of ESL Students. TESOL Quarterly, 21 (1), 87-111.

40. Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized Expectancies for İnternal vs. External Control of Reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 80 (1), 1-28.

41. Schunk, D. H. (2014). Öğrenme Teorileri: Eğitimsel Bir Bakışla, Mahmut Yasin Demir vd. (çev.), Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi,

42. 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.

43. 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.

44. Shuell, T. J. (1988). The Role of TheStudent in Learning from İnstruction. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 13, 276-295.

45. Smith, C.A. &Mihans R.J. (2009). Raising Issues of Student Locus of Control: Beginning A Longitudinal Study. Research in Education, 8, 63-65.

46. Spector, P.E., Cooper, C.L., Sanchez, J.I., O'Driscoll, M., Sparks, K., Bernin, P., Büssing, A., Dewe, P., Hart, P., Lu, L., Miller, K., De Moraes, F. L. R., Ostrognay, M.G., Pagon, M., Pitariu, H., Poelmans, S., Radhakrishnan, P., Russinova, V., Salamatov, V., Salgado, J., Shima, S., Siu, O. L., Stora, J.B., Teichmann, M., Theorel, T., Vlerick, P., Westman, M., Mariawiderszal-Bazyl, P.W. veShanfa, Y.(2002). "Locus Of Control andWell-Beıng At Work: How GeneralızableAre Western Fındıngs?", Academy of Management Journal, 45, 453-466.

47. Taşdelen, A. (2001). Öğretmen Adaylarının Farklı Psikososyal Değişkenlere Göre Karar Verme Stilleri. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,10, 40-52.

48. Taşdelen, A. (2002). Öğretmen Adaylarının Farklı Psikososyal Değişkenlere Göre Karar Verme Stilleri. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.

49. Tatlıoğlu, K. (2010). Farklı Öz-Anlayış Düzeylerine Sahip Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Karar Vermede Özsaygı, Karar Verme Stilleri ve Kişilik Özelliklerinin Değerlendirilmesi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.

50. Tekeli, G. Ş. (2010). Lise Son Sınıf Öğrencileri İle Üniversite Öğrenciler Arasında Bir Karşılaştırma: Akademik Benlik Yeterliliği, Denetim Odağı, Stresle Başa Çıkma ve Problem Çözme Becerisi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi,, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

51. Tokat, B.,Kara, H.&Ülkgün, N. (2007). Yöneticilerin Sorun Çözme Yetenekleri ve Kontrol Odağının Belirlenmesi: DPU Örneği, Akademik Bakış, 11, 1-11.

52. Türkoğlu, E. (2007). Türk ve Alman Okul Yöneticilerinden Denetim Odağı Boyutunda Farklı Değişkenler Açısından Karşılaştırılması. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Tokat

53. Ünvar, A. (2012). Gerçeklik Kuramına Dayalı Psiko-Eğitim Programının Lise Öğrencilerinin Denetim Odağı ve Yılmazlık Düzeyi Üzerindeki Etkisinin İncelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.

54. Yaşar, O. (2011). Karar Verme Stili Öncülleri: Savunma Sanayinde Bir Araştırma. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Kara Harp Okulu, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

55. Yeşilyaprak, B. (1988). Lise Öğrencilerinin İçsel ya da Dışsal Denetimli Oluşlarını Etkileyen Etmenler. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

## DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

1. **Assist. Prof. Dr. Salim Akyürek.** School of Tourism and Hotel Management, Near East University, Mersin 10, Turkey. Email: salim.akyurek@neu.edu.tr

2. **Assist. Prof. Dr. Mert Baştaş.** Atatürk Education Faculty, Near East University, Mersin 10, Turkey. Email: mert.bastas@neu.edu.tr