

The Effect of Decision-Making Skill Training Programs on Self-Esteem and Decision-Making Styles

Oguzhan COLAKKADIOGLU*
D. Billur CELIK**

Suggested Citation:

Colakkadioglu, O., & Celik, B. (2016). The effect of decision-making skill training programs on self-esteem and decision-making styles. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 65, 259-276
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2016.65.15>

Abstract

Problem Statement: Decision making is a critical cognitive process in every area of human life. In this process, the individuals play an active role and obtain outputs with their functional use of decision-making skills. Therefore, the decision-making process can affect the course of life, life satisfaction, and the social relations of an individual. This study evaluates the effectiveness of the psycho-educational group-based program which aims to develop the highly-significant decision-making skills of university students during the transition to adulthood

Purpose of the Study: This paper aimed to examine the effect of decision-making skill training group practices based on decision-making styles of university students and to evaluate the permanence of this effect

Method: A pre-test-post-test control group true experimental model was used in the study. The personal information form, interview form, and Melbourne Decision-Making Questionnaire (MDMQ) were applied before experimental procedures as pre-test measures. The study was conducted on 44 students studying at Mustafa Kemal University, Faculty of Education within a period of six weeks from February through March 2013. Twenty-two participants (twelve female and ten male) were included in the treatment group (mean age 22.1) and 22 participants (thirteen female and nine male) were included in the control group (mean age 21.9 years).

* Corresponding author: Dr. Mustafa Kemal University, Faculty of Education, Psychological Counseling and Guidance Dept, Hatay, e-mail: colakkadioglu@gmail.com

** Uzm. Mustafa Kemal University, Faculty of Education, Psychological Counseling and Guidance Dept, Hatay, e-mail: billur_celik@yahoo.com

Findings: The analysis results showed that there was a significant difference at each sub-scale between the adjusted post-test average scores; there existed a significant difference at each subscale between the adjusted post-test average scores; following the observations made by the leader, the total scores achieved by the participants at each session from the Group-Related Measures Survey Form were 17 and higher.

Conclusion and Recommendations: In conclusion, it was observed that decision-making training group practices increased self-esteem and positive coping style scores of the students and decreased the negative coping style scores. This increase and decrease in relevant scores are also supported by the qualitative data. Decision making is one of the major abilities that affects individuals' lives in direct and indirect ways. It would be beneficial if young individuals gain positive decision-making skills in the early stages of their lives. As a consequence, we recommend that decision-making training groups, workshops and courses should be a part of the curriculum program in the entire education process.

Keywords: University students, decision making, decision-making styles, skill training

Introduction

Decision making is a critical cognitive process that is required in every area of human life. In this process, the individuals play an active role and obtain outputs parallel with their functional use of decision-making skills. Therefore, the decision-making process and the skills regarding the effective management of this process can affect the course of life, life satisfaction, and the social relations of an individual.

Commonly, the researchers have defined decision making as a process of choosing one potential possibility among others (Miller & Byrnes, 2001; Rehman & Khan, 2015). Decision-making skills had been previously considered to be unteachable. It was thought that this skill was acquired over the course of time, and dependent on age. However, several studies have shown that decision-making skills can be taught (Taal & De Carvalho, 1997; Klaczynski et al., 2001). Janis and Mann (1977) postulated seven procedural criteria they considered to be necessary for teaching decision-making skills. These criteria include (1) thoroughly canvassing a wide range of alternative courses of action, (2) surveying the full range of objectives to be fulfilled and the values implicated by the choice, (3) carefully weighing whatever he or she knows about the costs and risks of negative consequences, as well as the positive consequences, that could flow from each alternative, (4) intensively searching for new information relevant to the further evaluation of the alternatives, (5) correctly assimilating and taking account of any new information or expert judgment to which he or she is exposed, even when the information or judgment does not support the course of action he or she initially prefers, (6) reexamining the

positive and negative consequences of all of the known alternatives, including those originally regarded as unacceptable, before making a final choice, and (7) making detailed provisions for implementing or executing the chosen course of action, with special attention to contingency plans that might be required if various known risks were to materialize. Janis and Mann (1977) characterize the decision-making process of a person who meets all of the above criteria as vigilant decision making. In the studies conducted on the subject, it was concluded that the individuals whose decision-making skills were developed vigilantly had a higher level of self-esteem and life satisfaction (Cenkseven-Onder, 2012) and they could effectively perform their cognitive functions by being less affected by stressful life events (Janis & Mann, 1977).

In recent years, one of the concepts that have been widely accepted in the literature is the concept of "emerging adulthood," proposed by Arnett (2004) in his studies on developmental periods. The concept of emerging adulthood refers to the transitional period between the end of adolescence and young adulthood. This period generally coincides with university life. The individuals between 18 and 29 years of age neither bear certain responsibilities like adults nor are they dependent on their families like a teenager (Atak & Çok, 2010). Awareness of alternatives in many different areas such as the search for identity, social relations, romantic relationships, work, and world vision, as well as experiences and decisions, have a significant place in the individual's life. During this period, individuals make choices that can change the navigation of the course of their life (Arnett, 2004). This process that begins during adolescence emerges as a period of producing life decisions that are shaped and clarified during the emerging adulthood period. There are also various studies that demonstrate that the conscious and effective decision making in this spiral of choices is directly related to factors such as problem solving (Deniz, 2004; Singh & Chaudhary, 2015), self-esteem (Josephs et al., 1992; Colakkadioglu & Gucray, 2012; Temel et al., 2015), self-sufficiency (Oneren and Ciftci, 2013), and life satisfaction (Cenkseven-Onder, 2012).

It is of great importance for high school and university aged individuals to acquire decision making skills, as these are the periods when decisions that affect and determine an individual's life course are made which have an effect on the perception of one's own being and one's life. A review of the literature reveals that many educational programs have been developed in order to promote more logical and rational decision making in high school and university, attempting to improve students' decision-making skills (Taal & De Carvalho, 1997; Singh & Chaudhary, 2015). Regarding the studies in Turkey, there are three studies that have been conducted on the development of decision-making skills for university (Ersever, 1996), high school (Colakkadioglu & Gucray, 2012), and primary-elementary school (Seyhun, 2000) students. In his study, Ersever (1996) examined the effects of university students' participation in the interaction group-based decision-making skill training program on decision-making styles. A review of the studies in the literature showed that there are no studies that test the effect of group practices that are based on conflict theory and conducted on the basis of psycho-educational

groups on the decision-making styles of university students. However, such studies are important for university students with regard to achieving basic cognitive skills in the development of their decision-making skills. Considering that effective decision making will also engender advanced problem solving skills (Mann et al., 1989), psychological well-being (Hamarta, 2009), and psychological endurance in coping with stressful life events (Frisch 2000), it can be understood how much it actually has common importance in the life courses of individuals. In this regard, it is possible to state that a higher inclusion of effective decision making in psycho-educational programs as a teachable skill will produce significant benefits both on an individual and social basis. This paper aimed to examine the effect of decision-making skill training group practices developed on the basis of the conflict theory on the decision-making styles of university students and to evaluate the permanence of this effect.

Method

Research Design

A pre-test-post-test control group true experimental model was used in the study. The personal information form, interview form, and Melbourne Decision-Making Questionnaire (MDMQ) were applied before experimental procedures as pre-test measures. The MDMQ, Evaluation at the End of the Group by Members (EEGM) and Group-Related Measures Survey Form (GRMSF) were used after the procedures as post-tests. Finally, in the follow-up process, MDMQ was applied in both groups.

Participants

The study was conducted on 44 students studying at Mustafa Kemal University, Faculty of Education within a period of six weeks from February through March 2013. Twenty-two participants (twelve female and ten male) were included in the treatment group (mean age 22.1) and 22 participants (thirteen female and nine male) were included in the control group (mean age 21.9 years). There was no significant difference between the groups in terms of gender, pre-test average scores for the socio-economic status and MDMQ sub-scales. Three group members left the group at the end of the second session. Therefore, the study was performed with a total of thirty-nine participants.

Data Collection

Personal information form. The form was composed to determine the potential factors that were considered to have an effect on the study. The participants who had undergone or were undergoing psychiatric treatment or had recently been exposed to severe traumatic incidents were excluded.

Interview form. The interview form was created on the basis of the forms prepared by DeLucia-Waack (2006). The interview form included information about the psycho-educational groups and the content, objectives, duration, average group size, and rules

Melbourne decision-making questionnaire (MDMQ). The Melbourne Decision-Making Questionnaire was prepared by Mann et al. (1997), based on the Flinders Decision-Making Questionnaire. The first part of the questionnaire aims to identify self-esteem in the decision-making process. Cronbach's alpha value was found to be .74 (Mann et al., 1997). The second part is composed of vigilance, buck-passing, procrastination, and hyper-vigilance sub-scales. In the sample collected from six countries, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were found to be 0.80, 0.87, 0.81, and 0.74 (Mann et al. 1997). The adaptation of the MDMQ was conducted by Deniz (2004).

Group-Related measures survey form (GRMSF). The form was developed by DeLucia-Waack (2006) and adapted by Colakkadioglu and Gucray (2012). The form was completed by the group leader in the measurement of members' behaviors in sessions. It consists of nine behavior items, (1) willingness to participate, (2) willingness for change, (3) willingness to discuss the problems, (4) responsibility for change, (5) identification of objectives, (6) potential to create contact, (7) characteristics of being a role model, (8) contact with the leader, (9) expectations of effectiveness from the group.

Evaluation at the end of the group by members (EEGM). The form was developed by DeLucia-Waack (2006) and adapted to Turkish by Colakkadioglu and Gucray (2012). The form is used to evaluate the acquisitions of members from psycho-educational groups and their feedback related to the group process.

Data Analysis

The pre-test, post-test, and permanence data collected from the treatment and control groups through the MDMQ were evaluated for the study hypotheses with the Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) using the SPSS 17.0 program. The findings of the ANCOVA analysis were discussed and interpreted within the context of the related literature. Furthermore, the Group-Related Measures Survey Form (GRMSF) completed by the leader in the qualitative dimension of the study and the Evaluation at the End of Group by Members (EEGM) presented to the members in the treatment group were analyzed in terms of documents and the analysis procedure was completed.

Results

Findings of the Melbourne Decision-Making Questionnaire

The statistics regarding the pre-test and post-test scores of the Melbourne Decision-Making Questionnaire subscales are given in Table 1.

Table 1.*Descriptives Regarding the Pre-Test and Post-Test Total Scores of MDMQ Sub-Scales*

Groups	N	MDMQ sub-scales	Total scores		Corrected post-test Means	
			\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}_d	
Treatment	22	S	Pre-Test	7.09	2.11	10.01
			Post-Test	10.05	1.54	
		V	Pre-Test	7.59	1.86	9.94
			Post-Test	10.10	1.48	
		B	Pre-Test	6.54	2.66	2.95
			Post-Test	3.26	2.02	
		P	Pre-Test	6.18	2.55	2.13
			Post-Test	2.52	1.71	
		H	Pre-Test	5.95	2.27	3.08
			Post-Test	3.05	1.61	
		S	Pre-Test	6.95	1.70	7.07
			Post-Test	7.04	1.29	
V	Pre-Test	7.27	1.77	7.59		
	Post-Test	7.45	1.65			
Control	22	B	Pre-Test	5.86	2.27	5.85
			Post-Test	6.00	2.28	
		P	Pre-Test	5.27	2.65	5.47
			Post-Test	5.13	2.53	
		H	Pre-Test	5.86	2.62	5.65
			Post-Test	5.68	2.33	

According to the data in Table 1, when the adjusted post-test arithmetic means of the scores the groups achieved from the Melbourne Decision-Making Questionnaire sub-scales were analyzed, it was observed that the means of the treatment group for self-esteem (10.01) and vigilance (9.94) subscales were higher than the means of the control group for self-esteem (7.07) and vigilance (7.59) subscales. It was also found that the means of the treatment group for buck-passing (2.95), procrastination (2.13), and hyper-vigilance (3.08) sub-scales were lower than the means of the control group for buck-passing (5.85), procrastination (5.47), and hyper-vigilance (5.65) sub-scales.

An analysis of covariance was performed in order to test whether this difference was significant. The analysis results showed that when the pre-test scores of the groups for self-esteem, vigilance, buck-passing, procrastination, and hyper-vigilance sub-scales were controlled, respectively, there was a significant difference at each sub-scale between the adjusted post-test average scores [respectively, $[F_{(1-38)}=25.27, p<0.001]$, $[F_{(1-38)}=106.54, p<0.001]$, $[F_{(1-38)}=128.98, p<0.001]$, $[F_{(1-38)}=78.52, p>0.001]$, $[F_{(1-38)}=138.09, p<0.001]$]. In the current study, follow-up test scores were evaluated as a second variable. The statistics regarding the post-test and follow-up test scores of the Melbourne Decision-Making Questionnaire subscales are given in Table 2.

Table 2.*Descriptives regarding the Post-Test and Follow-Up Test Total Scores of MDMQ Sub-Scales*

Groups	N	MDMQ sub-scales	Total scores		Corrected follow-up test means	
			\bar{X}	SD	\bar{X}_d	
Treatment	22	S	Post-Test	10.05	1.54	8.97
			Follow-up	10.31	1.24	
		V	Post-Test	10.10	1.48	9.50
			Follow-up	10.63	1.21	
		B	Post-Test	3.26	2.02	3.90
			Follow-up	2.94	1.58	
		P	Post-Test	2.52	1.71	3.39
			Follow-up	2.10	1.48	
		H	Post-Test	3.05	1.61	3.76
			Follow-up	2.63	1.25	
		S	Post-Test	7.04	2.29	8.02
			Follow-up	6.86	1.32	
V	Post-Test	7.45	1.65	8.65		
	Follow-up	7.68	1.52			
Control	22	B	Post-Test	5.59	2.28	5.30
			Follow-up	6.13	2.00	
		P	Post-Test	5.13	2.53	3.93
			Follow-up	5.04	2.51	
		H	Post-Test	5.68	2.33	4.93
			Follow-up	5.90	2.22	

According to the data in Table 2, when the adjusted follow-up test arithmetic means of the scores the groups achieved from the Melbourne Decision-Making Questionnaire sub-scales were analyzed, it was observed that the means of the treatment group for self-esteem (8.97) and vigilance (9.50) sub-scales were higher than the means of the control group for self-esteem (8.02) and vigilance (8.65) sub-scales. It was also found that the means of the treatment group for buck-passing (3.90), procrastination (3.39), and hyper-vigilance (3.76) sub-scales were lower than the means of the control group for buck-passing (5.30), procrastination (3.93), and hyper-vigilance (4.93) sub-scales.

An analysis of covariance was performed in order to test whether this difference was significant. The analysis results demonstrate that when the follow-up test scores of the groups for self-esteem, vigilance, buck-passing, procrastination, and hyper-vigilance subscales were controlled, respectively, there existed a significant difference at each subscale between the adjusted post-test average scores [respectively, $[F_{(1-38)}=190.47, p<0.001]$, $[F_{(1-38)}=161.09, p<0.001]$, $[F_{(1-38)}=189.01, p<0.001]$, $[F_{(1-38)}=394.87, p>0.001]$, $[F_{(1-38)}=140.39, p<0.001]$].

Findings of Group-Related Measures Survey Form

Table 3 illustrates the scores achieved by the participants from the Group-Related Measures Survey Form (GRMSF) at each session, total scores of six sessions, and total scores of each session, following the observations made by the leader. In the analysis of the survey form and while processing the related data, the behaviors of the participants were limited to the statements given on the survey form. In the study, S stands for session, M for mean, and Par 1, Par 2, etc. refer to the sequence numbers designated for the participants.

Table 3.

The Observations Made by the Leader, Total Scores Achieved by the Participants at Each Session from the Group-Related Measures Survey Form

<i>Participant</i>	<i>S.1</i>	<i>S. 2</i>	<i>S. 3</i>	<i>S. 4</i>	<i>S. 5</i>	<i>S. 6</i>	<i>Total</i>
Par. 1	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.0	20.1
Par. 2	3.1	3.3	3.0	2.8	3.4	3.6	19.2
Par. 3	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.0	2.8	3.2	19.1
Par. 4	3.8	4.0	3.6	4.0	3.4	3.8	22,6
Par. 5	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.2	17,6
Par. 6	4.0	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.4	3.2	22.2
Par. 7	3.2	3.0	2.8	3.6	3.4	3.8	19.8
Par. 8	2.7	2.9	2.8	3.0	2.6	3.2	17.2
Par. 9	3.1	3.6	4.0	3.8	3.6	3.0	21.1
Par. 10	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.4	3.6	3.8	22.0
Par. 11	3.9	3.7	3.4	3.0	2.8	3.6	20.4
Par. 12	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.0	3.4	3.6	20.5
Par. 13	3.7	3.7	4.0	3.6	3.0	3.8	21.8
Par. 14	2.9	3.7	2.4	2.6	3.2	3.6	19.4
Par. 15	3.4	3.9	3.6	3.4	4.0	2.8	21.1
Par. 16	3.0	3.3	3.2	3.8	3.6	3.8	20.7
Par. 17	3.6	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.6	22.7
Par. 18	2.9	3.1	3.0	2.8	3.2	3.2	18.2
Par. 19	3.6	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.8	22.7

Table 3 shows that following the observations made by the leader, the total scores achieved by the participants at each session from the Group-Related Measures Survey Form were 17 and higher. This reveals that the participants took advantage of the group process. Moreover, it can also be argued with this finding that the sessions achieved their objective.

Findings of the Evaluation at the End of the Group by Members

Table 4 shows the responses given by the participants to close-ended questions in the Evaluation at the End of the Group by Members Form, as well as the frequencies of the responses.

Table 4.

Responses Given by the Participants to Close- Ended Questions in the Evaluation at the End of the Group by Members Form and the Frequencies of the Responses

<i>Item</i>	<i>Statement</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>I don't know</i>
1	The decision making skill training group helped students to feel better.	19	-	-
2	The decision making skill training group helped students to reveal their emotions.	15	-	4
3	The decision making skill training group practice helped students to learn some new things on the subjects related to family, friends, and teachers.	17	1	1
4	The decision making skill training group practice helped me to acquire decision making skills.	18	-	1
5	The leader managed the decision making skill training group in a good way	15	2	2
		Yes	No	Maybe
7	I will suggest that my friends participate in the decision making skill training group.	18	-	1

As seen in Table 4, the participants in the treatment group responded to all of the questions. According to these findings, it can be argued that the participants generally had a positive opinion about the decision-making skill training group practices. Two open-ended questions in the Evaluation at the End of the Group by Members Form (Questions 6 and 8) and the related answers by the participants were rearranged in written form in the electronic format and the responses of participants were analyzed with the document examination method. The responses given by the participants and the frequencies of responses are given in Table 5.

Table 5.

Responses Given by the Participants to Open-Ended Questions in the Evaluation at the End of the Group by Members Form and the frequencies of the Responses

<i>Statement</i>	<i>Responses</i>	<i>Frequency (f)</i>
<i>1. What did you learn at the end of the decision making skill training group experience?</i>	I learned how to identify the actual problem.	14
	I learned how to formulate an objective.	15
	I learned how to identify the options.	18
	I learned how to use the sources of information.	16
	I learned how to identify the areas of uncertainty.	12
	I learned how to identify the effects of options.	14
	I learned how to choose the best alternative.	15
	I learned how to plan.	17
	I learned how to review and apply my decision.	15
<i>2. What are your suggestions for a better operation of the decision making skill training group?</i>	I learned how to have a self-confidence regarding decision making.	15
	It was quite successful, I don't have any suggestions.	18
	There should be less homework.	1
	There should be no break between the group sessions.	3
	Members should be more active.	2
	Members should be given more opportunities to speak.	4
	There should be more practice.	2
There should be more activities.	1	

When the responses given by the participants were analyzed, it was observed that they learned the decision-making steps and that they had overall satisfaction regarding the operation of the group. However, they also had remarkable suggestions regarding a lighter load of homework and forms, more activities, and more participation in the process.

Discussion and Conclusion

In the decision-making skill training group practices that were developed on the basis of conflict theory, decision making was addressed in five steps and the participants were informed about what to do at each step. Sample decision problems were given as homework and the members could successfully perform these duties. According to Harter (1999), the experience of success of an individual affects self-esteem positively. Similarly, Josephs et al. (1992) state that the knowledge about the possible steps to take in a decision-making situation could increase self-esteem. Furthermore, the group sessions included activities where the group members communicated with each other, shared their experiences, and provided feedback to each other, which enabled the members to support each other. According to Harter (1999), peer acceptance and cooperation affected one's self-esteem level positively. Similar studies report that when faced with a problem, young people were willing to obtain support from peers at first, as they think they have gone through the same processes in life (Turner 1999). According to the literature, there is a positive significant correlation between self-esteem in decision making and overall self-esteem (Josephs et al., 1992; Colakkadioglu & Gucray, 2012; Temel et al., 2015). In this regard, an increase in overall self-esteem would affect self-esteem in the decision-making process in a positive way (Colakkadioglu & Gucray, 2012; Temel et al., 2015). It can be argued that the decision-making skill training group practices had a positive impact on self-esteem in the decision making levels of the participants.

In the decision-making skill training group practices developed on the basis of conflict theory, the participants had the opportunity to learn the steps of decision making and gained experience through practice. A review of the programs that aim to develop the decision-making skills showed that the participants improved their decision-making skills (Mann & Harmoni, et al., 1989; Taal & De Carvalho, 1997; Byrnes, 1998; Byrnes et al., 1999; Klaczynski et al., 2001; Colakkadioglu & Gucray, 2012; Singh & Chaudhary, 2015). Decision-making skill training group practice had an effect on increasing positive coping style scores in this study, as well. The participants had decreasing scores of procrastination, hyper-vigilance, and buck-passing subscales of the Melbourne Decision-Making Questionnaire, also. Similarly, Mann and Beswick et al. (1989), and Seyhun (2000) concluded in their studies that the participants had a decrease in the scores of negative coping styles at the end of the applied decision-making skill training programs.

The effect of the decision-making skill training group practices developed on the basis of the conflict theory on the self-esteem levels of the students in decision making, the increase in positive coping style scores, and the decrease in negative coping style scores continued during the follow-up test, as well. This situation was thought to originate from the content of the applied decision-making skill training group practices. Mann and Beswick et al. (1989) and Colakkadioglu and Guçray (2012) also reported similar findings.

In conclusion, it was observed that decision-making skill training group practices developed on the basis of the conflict theory increased self-esteem and positive coping style scores of the students in decision making and decreased the negative coping style scores. This finding continued through the follow-up test, as well.

The increase in self-esteem in decision-making scores and positive coping style scores and the decrease in negative coping style scores are also supported by the qualitative data of the study. In the study, using the Group-Related Measures Survey Form, the evaluations made by the leader indicated that the participants had scores over the average. In this regard, it was concluded that the group practices were useful for the participants regarding their decision-making skills. Likewise, most of the students responded to the statements in the Evaluation at the End of the Group by Members Form in a positive way. These findings, which are also supported with qualitative data, could be interpreted as the achievement of group objectives.

Decision making is one of the major abilities that affects individuals' lives in direct and indirect ways. As in our paper, the literature reveals that decision making is relevant to other important cognitive and psychological mechanisms such as coping and problem-solving skills, self-esteem and self-sufficiency. As a teachable ability, it would be beneficial if young individuals gain positive decision-making skills in the early stages of their lives. As a consequence, we recommend that decision-making training groups, workshops and courses should be a part of the curriculum program in the entire education process. It's obviously vital to guide individuals on a key skill that develops coping and problem solving and also promotes self-esteem, self-sufficiency and, ultimately, life satisfaction. We believe that acquiring positive decision-making skills in school would help prevent future psychological difficulties. This is because systematic guidance in school-aged children can help develop determined adults with cognitive and psychological capabilities.

References

- Arnett, J. J. (2004). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties* (2nd Edition). New York, Oxford University Press.
- Atak, H., & Cok, F. (2010). A new period in human life: Emerging adulthood. *Turkish Journal of Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 17(1), 39-50.
- Baron, J., Laskey, K. & Brown, R. V (1989). *Going through the goop: An introduction to decision making*. Retrieved on 21 March 2008, from <http://www.sas.upenn.edu/~baron/papers.htm/dmtext.html>
- Byrnes, J. P. (1998). *The Nature and development of decision-making: A self-regulation model* (1st Edition). USA, NJ: Earlbaum Manwah.
- Byrnes, J. P., Miller, D. C., & Reynolds, M. (1999). Learning to make good decisions: A self-regulation perspective. *Child Development*, 70, 1121-1140.
- Cenkseven-Onder, F. (2012). Decision-making styles and life satisfaction. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 40(9), 1523-1536.
- Colakkadioglu, O., & Guçray, S. S. (2012). Catisma kuramina dayali olarak gelistirilen karar verme beceri egitimi psiko-egitim grup yasantisinin ergenlerin karar verme stillerine etkisi [The effect of conflict theory based decision-making skill training psycho-educational group experience on decision making styles of adolescents]. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Egitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 12(2), 655-676.
- DeLucia-Waack, J. L. (2006). *Leading psycho-educational groups for children and adolescents*. United Kingdom, Sage.
- Deniz, M. E. (2004). Universite ogrencilerinin karar vermede oz saygi, karar verme stilleri ve problem cozme becerileri arasindaki iliskinin incelenmesi uzerine bir arastirma [Investigation of the relation between decision making Self-esteem, decision making style and problem solving Skills of university students]. *Egitim Arastirmalari Dergisi*, 4(15), 23-35.
- Ersever, O. H. (1996). *The effects of an encounter group experience and a short term educational program on the decision making styles of the university students*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Ankara, Turkiye.
- Frisch, M. B. (2000). Improving mental and physical health care through quality of life therapy and assessment. In Diener, E., & Rahtz, D. R. (Eds), *Advances in quality of life theory and research* (pp. 207-241). London: Kluwer Academic Press.

- Gucray, S. S., Colakkadioglu, O., & Cekici, F. (2009). Grup uygulamalarinda aktiviteler/egzersizler; amaçları, cesitleri ve uygulama ornekleri [Activities/Exercises in group work process; their purposes, kinds and some examples]. *Cukurova Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu Dergisi*, 18(2), 194-208.
- Hamarta, E. (2009). A prediction of self-esteem and life satisfaction by social problem-solving. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 37, 73-82.
- Harter, S. (1999). *The construction of the self*. New York, The Guilford Press.
- Janis, I. L., & Mann, L. (1977). *Decision making: A psychological analysis of conflict, choice and commitment*. New York, Free Press.
- Josephs, R. A., Larrick, R., Steele, C. M., & Nisbett, R. M. (1992). Self-esteem and risk aversion in decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(1), 26-37.
- Klaczynski, P. A., Byrnes, J. B., & Jacobs, J. E. (2001). Introduction: Special issue on decision making. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 22, 225-236.
- 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.
- Mann, L., Beswick, G., Allouache, P., & Ivey, M. (1989) Decision workshops for the improvement of decision-making skills and confidence. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 67, 478-481.
- Mann, L., Harmoni, R., & Power, C. (1989). Adolescent decision making: The development of competence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 12, 265-278.
- Mann, L., Harmoni, R., Power, C., Beswick, G., & Ormond, C. (1988). Effectiveness of the GOFER Course in decision making for high school students. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 1, 159-168.
- Miller, D. C., & Byrnes, J. P. (2001). Adolescents' decision making in social situations: A self-regulation perspective. *Applied Developmental Psychology*, 22, 237-256.
- Oneren, M., & Ciftci, G. E. (2013). Yoneticilerin oz yeterlilik ve karar verme tarzlarına iliskin ozel bankalarda bir arastirma [A study concerning self-sufficiency and decision making styles of managers of private banks]. *Atatürk Universitesi Iktisadi ve Idari Bilimler Dergisi*, 27(3), 305-321.
- Rehman, R. R., & Khan, A. W. (2015). Realtng individual demographics, work-family conflict and decision making styles of faculty members in higher

education sector of Pakistan. *VFAST Transactions on Education and Social Sciences*, 5, 51-63.

Singh, A., & Chaudhary, A. K. (2015). SETP: A new powerful tool for improving problem solving, decision making and creativity in teenagers. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 2, 10-15.

Seyhun, H. (2000). *Karar verme becerileri eğitim programının ilköğretim son sınıf öğrencilerinin karar verme becerilerine etkisi* [The effect of decision-making skill training programs on the decision-making skills of 8th grade students]. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi.

Taal, M., & De Carvalho, F. S. (1997). Stimulating adolescents decision making. *Journal of Adolescence*, 20: 223-226.

Temel, V., Birol, S. S., Nas, K., Akpınar, S., & Tekin, M. (2015). Self-esteem in decision making and decision-making styles of teachers. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 10, 744-750

Turner, G. (1999). Peer support and young people's health. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22, 567-572.

Karar Verme Beceri Eğitimi Programının Karar Vermede Özsaygı ve Karar Verme Stilllerine Etkisi

Atıf:

Colakkadioglu, O., & Celik, B. (2016). The effect of decision-making skill training programs on self-esteem and decision-making styles. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 65, 259-276
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2016.65.15>

Özet

Problem Durumu: Karar verme, yaşamın her alanında ihtiyaç duyulan, önemli bir bilişsel süreçtir. Bu süreçte bireyler aktif rol alır ve karar verme becerilerini ne kadar işlevsel kullandıkları ile doğru orantılı çıktılar elde ederler. Dolayısıyla karar verme süreci ve bu süreci etkili yönetebilme becerisi bireyin hayatının akışını, yaşam doyumunu ve sosyal ilişkilerini etkileyebilmektedir.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bireyin yaşamını etkileyen ve yaşamına yön veren kararların alındığı dönem olması, bu kararların da kişinin kendisini ve yaşamını algılayışı üzerinde etkili olması nedeniyle lise ve üniversite çağındaki kişilere karar verme becerilerinin kazandırılması önemlidir. Yurtdışı alanyazını incelediğimizde lise ve

üniversite öğrencilerinin daha mantıklı ve akılcı kararlar verebilmelerini desteklemek amacıyla, karar verme becerilerini geliştirmeye yönelik çok sayıda eğitim programı geliştirildiği görülmektedir. Türkiye’de yapılan çalışmalarda ise üniversite, lise ve ilköğretim öğrencilerinin karar verme becerilerinin geliştirilmesine yönelik üç çalışma ile karşılaşmaktadır. Yapılan çalışmalar incelendiğinde üniversite öğrencilerine yönelik çatışma kuramına dayanan, psiko-eğitim grubu temelinde yürütülen grup uygulamalarının, öğrencilerin karar verme stillerine etkisini sınanan bir çalışmaya ise rastlanmamıştır. Oysa üniversite öğrencileri için bu tür çalışmalar karar verme becerilerini geliştirmede temel bilişsel becerileri kazandırması açısından önemlidir. Etkili karar vermenin, öğretilen bir beceri olarak psiko-eğitim programlarda sıklıkla yer almasının hem bireysel hem de toplumsal bazda önemli fayda sağlayacağını söylemek mümkündür. Bu çalışmada çatışma kuramına dayalı olarak geliştirilen karar verme beceri eğitimi grup uygulamalarının, üniversite öğrencilerinin karar verme stillerine etkisi ve bu etkinin kalıcılığının incelenmesi amaçlanmıştır.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Araştırma deneysel desende olup, araştırmada deneysel desenin türlerinden biri olan “öntest-sontest kontrol gruplu gerçek deneysel model” kullanılmıştır. Deneysel işlemler başlamadan önce kişisel bilgi formu, görüşme formu, Melbourne Karar Verme Ölçeği (MKVÖ), deneysel işlemlerin bitiminde, MKVÖ, Grup Sürecinin Genel Değerlendirilmesi Formu (GSGDF) ve Gruba İlişkin Ölçümler Gözlem Formu (GİÖGF), izleme sürecinde MKVÖ veri toplama araçları olarak kullanılmış, her iki gruba da uygulanmıştır. Araştırma, 2012-2013 öğretim yılı bahar yarıyılında Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesinde öğrenimine devam eden toplam 44 öğrenci ile sekiz haftalık sürede gerçekleştirilmiştir. Deney grubunda çalışmalar lider tarafından yürütülürken, kontrol grubuna herhangi bir işlem yapılmamıştır. Deney grubunda 12 kız, 10 erkek olmak üzere toplam 22 katılımcı yer almıştır. Kontrol grubunda 13 kız ve 9 erkek olmak üzere toplam 22 katılımcı yer almıştır. Grupların cinsiyet açısından eşit olup olmadıklarını belirlemek için yapılan kay kare testi sonucuna göre, gruplar arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunmamıştır ($\chi^2(1) = 0.82, p > .05$). Benzer şekilde grupların, Sosyo-Ekonomik Düzey (SED) ölçeği, Melbourne Karar Verme Ölçeği’nin Öz-Saygı (MKVÖS), Dikkatli (MKVD), Kaçınan (MKVK), Erteleyici (MKVE) ve Panik (MKVP) alt ölçekleri öntest ortalama puanları açısından eşit olup olmadıklarını belirlemek için yapılan t testi sonucuna göre, grupların sırasıyla, SED, MKVÖS, MKVD, MKVK, MKVE ve MKVP ortalama puanları arasında da anlamlı bir fark bulunmamıştır ($t(42) = 1.36, p > .05$; $t(42) = .24, p > .05$; $t(42) = .58, p > .05$; $t(42) = .91, p > .05$; $t(42) = 1.16, p > .05$; $t(42) = .12, p > .05$).

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Grupların Melbourne Karar Verme Ölçeği alt ölçeklerinden aldıkları puanların düzeltilmiş sontest aritmetik ortalamalarını dikkate aldığımızda; deney grubunun Özsaygı (10.01) ve dikkatli (9.94) alt ölçeklerinin ortalamalarının, kontrol grubunun özsaygı (7.07) ve dikkatli (7.59) alt ölçeklerinin ortalamalarından yüksek olduğu, deney grubunun kaçınan (2.95), erteleyici (2.13) ve panik (3.08) alt ölçeklerinin ortalamalarının, kontrol grubunun kaçınan (5.85), erteleyici (5.47) ve panik (5.65) alt ölçeklerinin ortalamalarından düşük olduğu görülmektedir. Gözlenen bu farkın anlamlı olup olmadığını test etmek için kovaryans analizi uygulanmıştır. Analiz sonuçları grupların sırasıyla özsaygı, dikkatli, kaçınan,

erteleyici ve panik öntest puanları kontrol altına alındığında, düzeltilmiş sontest ortalama puanları arasında tüm alt ölçeklerde anlamlı bir fark olduğunu göstermiştir [sırasıyla $F_{(1-38)}=25.27$, $p<.001$], [$F_{(1-38)}=106.54$, $p<.001$], [$F_{(1-38)}=128.98$, $p<.001$], [$F_{(1-38)}=78.52$, $p>.001$], [$F_{(1-38)}=138.09$, $p<.001$].

Grupların Melbourne Karar Verme Ölçeği alt ölçeklerinden aldıkları puanların düzeltilmiş izleme testi aritmetik ortalamalarını dikkate aldığımızda; deney grubunun özsaygı (8.97) ve dikkatli (9.50) alt ölçeklerinin aritmetik ortalamalarının, kontrol grubunun özsaygı (8.02) ve dikkatli (8.65) alt ölçeklerinin aritmetik ortalamalarından yüksek olduğu, deney grubunun kaçınan (3.90), erteleyici (3.39) ve panik (3.76) alt ölçeklerinin ortalamalarının, kontrol grubunun kaçınan (5.30), erteleyici (3.93) ve panik (4.93) alt ölçeklerinin ortalamalarından düşük olduğu görülmektedir.

Gözlenen bu farkın anlamlı olup olmadığını test etmek için kovaryans analizi uygulanmıştır. Analiz sonuçları grupların sırasıyla özsaygı, dikkatli, kaçınan, erteleyici ve panik sontest puanları kontrol altına alındığında, düzeltilmiş izleme testi ortalama puanları arasında tüm alt ölçeklerde anlamlı bir fark olduğunu göstermiştir [sırasıyla $F_{(1-38)}=190.47$, $p<.001$], [$F_{(1-38)}=161.09$, $p<.001$], [$F_{(1-38)}=189.01$, $p<.001$], [$F_{(1-38)}=394.87$, $p>.001$], [$F_{(1-38)}=140.39$, $p<.001$]. Benzer şekilde liderin gözlemleri sonucunda katılımcıların her bir oturumda Gruba İlişkin Ölçümler Gözlem Formu'ndan aldıkları toplam puanlarının 17 ve üzerinde olduğu görülmektedir.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri: Çatışma kuramına dayalı olarak geliştirilen karar verme beceri eğitimi grup uygulamalarında da katılımcılara karar verme basamakları ve bu konuda uygulamalı çalışmalar yapılmıştır. Bununla birlikte katılımcılara örnek karar sorunları ev ödevleri olarak verilmiş ve katılımcıların örnek karar sorunlarını başarıyla gerçekleştirdikleri görülmüştür. Karar verme beceri eğitimi grup uygulamaları, bu çalışmada da olumlu başa çıkma stili puanlarının yükselmesine etki etmiştir. Bu durumda da katılımcıların Melbourne karar verme ölçeği umursamazlık, panik ve sorumluluktan kaçma alt ölçek puanlarında düşme görülmüştür. Alt ölçeklerde görülen puan düşmelerinin uygulanan karar verme beceri eğitimi grup uygulamalarının içeriğinden kaynaklandığı düşünülmektedir.

Katılımcıların karar vermede öz-saygı puanlarının ve olumlu başa çıkma stili puanlarının yükselmesini, olumsuz başa çıkma stilleri puanlarının azalmasını araştırmanın nitel verileri de desteklemektedir. Araştırmada grup lideri "Gruba İlişkin Ölçümler Gözlem Formu" ile öğrencilerin "gruba katılım konusundaki istekliliği, değişim için istekliliği, problemleri açıkça tartışmak için istekliliği, değişim için sorumluluğu, amaçlarını belirleyebilmesi, diğer grup üyeleri ile bağlantı kurma potansiyeli, diğer grup üyeleri için rol model olma özelliği, grup lideri ile bağlantısı ve grubun yararlı olacağı beklentisi" ile ilgili davranışlarını gözlemlemiştir. Liderin değerlendirmesi sonucu katılımcıların ortalamasının üzerinde bir puan aldığı görülmüştür. Bu durumda da katılımcıların grup uygulamasından karar verme becerileri açısından yararlandıkları sonucuna varılmıştır. Sonuç olarak çatışma kuramı temelli olarak hazırlanan karar verme beceri eğitimi grup uygulamalarının öğrencilerin karar vermede öz-saygı ve olumlu başa çıkma stili puanlarını artırdığı;

olumsuz başa çıkma stili puanlarını ise azalttığı ve bu durumun izleme testinde de devam ettiği görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Üniversite öğrencileri, karar verme, karar verme stilleri, karar verme beceri eğitimi.