International Journal of **Recreation** & Sports Science

The Impact of Leadership Orientations on Decision-Making Styles: A Research on Youth Camp Organizations

Arif Özsarı[1] Tolga Tek[2]

[1]Mersin University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Mersin-Turkey, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4753-8049, arifozsari@mersin.edu.tr
[2]Selçuk University, Konya-Turkey, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8350-1307, tolgatek5@gmail.com
✉Corresponding Author:arifozsari@mersin.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

Youth organizations are very important for the development of young people. It is thought that the leadership orientations of youth leaders and the decision-making mechanisms which they use are important in terms of being role models for young people who will play an important role in the construction of the future. This study aims to investigate the relationship between leadership orientations and decision-making styles of individuals working as leaders in youth camps affiliated to the Ministry of Youth and Sports, a non-profit public organization. A total of 197 youth camp leaders, consisting of 45 females and 152 males, voluntarily participated in the research. The Multifactor Leadership Orientations Scale and the Decision-Making Styles Scale were used to collect research data. According to the correlation analysis results, a positive and moderate level of relationship was found between rational decision-making and structural leadership *(r=.553)*, human resource leadership *(r=.531),* political leadership *(r=.429),* and charismatic leadership *(r=.475)* dimensions. There was a weak level of relationship between intuitive decision-making style and structural leadership *(r=.165)*, human resource leadership *(r=.232)*, there was a moderate level of relationship political leadership *(r=.355)*, and charismatic leadership *(r=.381)* dimensions. A positive and weak level of relationship was found between dependent decision-making style and human resource leadership *(r=.207)* and political leadership *(r=.187)* dimensions. A negative and weak level of relationship was observed between avoidant decision-making style and structural leadership *(r=-.171)*. According to the regression analysis results, structural leadership (β=.295), human resource leadership (β=.248) and charismatic leadership (β=.198) dimensions have a significant positive influence on the rational decision-making sub-dimension of the decision-making styles scale. Charismatic leadership (β=.315) dimensions have a significant positive influence on the Intuitive decision making sub-dimension of the decision-making styles scale. Human resource leadership (β=.225) dimensions has a significant positive influence on the dependent decision-making subdimension of the decision-making styles scale. In conclusion, leaders who exhibit structural, human-oriented, and charismatic leadership styles are likely to effectively employ a rational decision-making approach. Additionally, leaders with a charismatic leadership orientation may be proficient in utilizing an intuitive decision-making style, while those with a human-oriented leadership approach might excel in dependent decision-making.

Keywords: Leadership orientations, decision-making styles, youth camp

INTRODUCTION

Youth organizations have a serious role in the comprehensive development of individuals (Cheng et al., 2022) and camping experiences can facilitate the satisfaction of psychological needs (Ellis et al., 2021). According to Cranfield (1990), youth service is seen as part of the educational structure of the country and includes organizations in both the statutory and voluntary sectors. Although many leadership researches have been conducted in the corporate and public sectors (Posner, 2015), it is possible to say that these researches are limited in non-profit organizations. Youth camps under the Ministry of Youth and Sports, which is a non-profit public organization, include activities carried out to evaluate their time outside of school in order to

support the social and cultural development of individuals. These activities are carried out at certain periods throughout the year. Youth development leaders play vital roles in the lives of young people (Garst et al., 2019). Youth camp leaders are individuals who have successfully completed the training programs offered by the Ministry of Youth and Sports and are appointed as group leaders, activity leaders, and program coordinators in summer and winter camps in natural and seaside settings (Özsarı & Yıldız, 2020). Each of the leaders working in youth camps is a person who strives to achieve the determined missions by receiving certain training in order to carry out the leadership process (Özsarı, 2021). These leaders are responsible for organizing and conducting activities (sporting, social and cultural) and events that benefit young participants throughout the camp, and they hold qualifications and certifications in these areas (Atabey, 2022).

Unquestionably, leadership is the most deliberate field within the social sciences (Maqbool et al., 2023). The changing perception towards leadership reveals that different leadership types are felt to be needed to deal with different problems that modern organizations face (Ulucan &Yavuz Aksakal, 2022). The literature examines the attributes of leaders, models of leadership behavior, sources of power, and various leadership approaches utilized by leaders, as well as leadership theories (Dursun et al., 2019). The behavioral leadership theory is one of them.

These theories, which focus on the different styles and behaviors of leaders, try to explain the work of leaders by their nature (Goff, 2003). There are some important studies explaining the development and content of behavioral theories (Yesil, 2016).

These are listed as follows: Ohio State University Leadership Model (Schriesheim & Bird, 1979), University of Michigan Leadership Research (Evans, 1996; Boje, 2000), Harvard University Studies (Hare, 1973; Stein, 1979), Blake and Mouton's Management Style Matrix Model (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Blake & Mouton, 1982), X and Y Approaches (Bobic et al., 2003; Carson, 2003; Kopelman et al., 2008), Yukl's leadership behavior models (Yukl, 1981, 1989), and Rensis Likert's System 4 Model (Reilly, 1978; Mathew et al., 2011). Different studies make serious contributions to the development of behavioral theories. These studies have led to the identification of various leadership styles, and their effectiveness has been examined. Taking on the role of a leader is an impressive and challenging task (Gomes, 2014). Recently, the concept of leadership is perceived as a more flexible, collaborative and democratic process in a community (Shera & Murray, 2016). Leadership is a personal relationship in which one person guides, coordinates, and supervises others. Leadership is the power to influence individuals or communities to achieve common goals (Khan et al., 2015). Leaders provide guidance to their followers, create a climate of trust, and motivate them to rise above their personal interests, thus inspiring them to go beyond expectations (Bin Jomah, 2017; Erol & Savas, 2023). Leaders enhance the level of sensitivity within an organization, provide guidance on how to reach a goal, and facilitate the development that benefits not only themselves but also others (Bender, 2006). Leadership and orientation styles have significant impacts on both small and large organizations (Abood & Thabet, 2017). A leader can facilitate or hinder team members from exchanging, processing, and integrating information (Schippers &Rus, 2021). A leader can guide people towards a particular direction, especially forward, by managing their performance, activities, and processes (Bender, 2006). It can be stated that the extent to which leaders fulfill their responsibilities effectively is directly proportional to their leadership qualities (Aykurt, 2022).

Recently, researchers have focused more attention on understanding which environmental and personal features influence decision-making processes, and how (Marques da Rocha et al., 2023). Individuals often need to make decisions in their daily lives (Ayal et al., 2015). The decision-making process is primarily driven by individual cognition (Lean Keng & AlQudah, 2017). Ayal et al. (2015) argued that decision-making should incorporate not only analytical tasks but also intuitive processes. Nunnally states that the initial theoretical explanations of decision-making styles primarily emphasize behaviors rather than characteristics. However, some researchers studying decision-making styles concentrate on the information collected by individuals and how they process it (Tasdelen, 2001). Dual-process theorists argue that there are two different types of processing modes for a cognitive task. One process is characterized as fast, automatic, and unconscious, while the other is characterized as slow, controlled, and conscious. Type 1 processes are also variously described as associative, heuristic, or intuitive, while type 2 processes are variously described as rule-based, analytic, or reflective (Frankish, 2010; Dijkstra et al., 2013; Viswanathan & Jain, 2013).

The decision-making mechanisms of individuals is a key factor (Riddell, 2017). Scott and Bruce (1995) classified five fundamental decision-making styles in the decision-making process as follows: rational, dependent, intuitive, avoidant, and spontaneous decision-making styles. Rational decision-making style requires systematically selecting among possible options based on reason and facts, involving

a series of processes. These processes can be listed as follows: problem identification, generating alternative solution scenarios, analyzing the outcomes by selecting the best possible options, implementing the solution decisions, and evaluating the final result to make a decision (Uzonwanne, 2016). Intuitive decision-making style represents the belief that emotions lead to the right decision-making process (Dikerel, 2008). Dependent decision-making style is characterized by being guided and advised by others (Cook & Gonzales, 2016). The recommendations and guidance of other individuals are taken into consideration (Aygun, 2020). Avoidant decision-making style is a style characterized by attempts to avoid making decisions (Loo, 2000). Individuals are hesitant to take responsibility during the decision-making stage (Ghareeb & Kaya, 2022). Spontaneous decision-making style is a model in which time constraints are present. Immediate and prompt decision-making is required, aiming to reach the most logical decisions as quickly as possible (Bahrami, 2017). Effective decision-making is an important life and business skill (Loo, 2000). Decision-making not only shapes the culture of an organization but also affects its performance. The decision-making process is the final outcome when there are alternative choices, selecting among several potential variables (Sulich et al., 2021). The most crucial aspect of leadership is decision-making (Aygun, 2020; Yunita et. al., 2023). Individuals who have strong decision-making mechanisms and can appropriately utilize their leadership orientations also have a high potential for success (Bahrami, 2017). It is expected that a leader's decision-making style is contingent on specific contextual variables (Hariri et al., 2014). Leadership is the process of influencing followers to achieve a goal (Noori,2021). Leaders are individuals who possess strong values that guide their decisions and actions (Baloglu et al., 2009).

There is a need for youth leaders in youth organizations who can contribute to increasing the effectiveness and productivity of young people (Cheng et al., 2022). It is also important to understand the experiences of youth leaders (Garstet al., 2023). Some researchers have found that youth organizations support student development (Amirianzadeh et al., 2011; Borges et al., 2011; Alajmi &Kalitay, 2019; Lopukhova et al., 2022). Therefore, in this study, a study was conducted from the perspective of youth camp leaders in order to contribute to the literature on determining the relationship between leadership orientations and decision-making styles. Leadership is a widely recognized phenomenon in social organizations that helps to facilitate coordination among individuals (Perret & Powers, 2022).

Leadership skills facilitate the ability to pose the right questions and then make suitable decisions (Bhugra et al., 2013). Awareness of individuals' decision-making styles as well as their leadership styles can help to focus on achieving organizational goals and develop the necessary skills (Al-Omari, 2013). Leadership styles have often been proven to support employees in performing their duties better and more efficiently, while also allowing them to extend their organizational tenure (Pattali vd., 2024). Leadership styles significantly impact organizational dynamics and it is crucial to optimize leadership strategies to improve performance (Rao vd., 2024).

The fundamental element of leadership, perhaps the most important element, is the decision-making function. Because individuals, groups, or masses are directly or indirectly affected by the decisions made. Young people, who are an important building block of society, spend a significant portion of their time with youth leaders during the youth camps they participate in. During this process, it can be observed that youth leaders and young people integrate through various activities. Therefore, it is believed that youth leaders have an impact on the individuals who participate in youth camps during this process, where their leadership orientations are effective in decision-making mechanisms. Recent research confirms connections between leadership and adolescent development (Engelbert & Wallgren,2016). Hence, it is considered important to know the leadership styles that are believed to have an impact on the decision-making skills of youth leaders working in nature and sea camps. The starting point of the research is based on this idea. It is believed that the research findings will contribute to individuals participating in various nature and sea camps, their families, as well as to those working in the public and private sectors and managing camp activity providers. No research has been found that evaluates the leadership orientations and decision-making styles of youth camp leaders together. For this reason, the research findings are thought to be important due to their contribution to the literature.

METHOD

Ethical Considerations

The Research Ethics Committee of Osmaniye Korkut Ata University's Faculty of Science has granted ethical approval for the research under decision number 2022/5/23 dated 03/06/2022. Additionally, research permission has been obtained from the Ministry of Youth and Sports, General Directorate of Education, Research and Coordination. The study adhered to the research principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.

Research Model

This study employed a relational screening model, a research methodology designed to evaluate the presence and magnitude of change between two or more variables (Karasar, 2019).

Participants

The sample group consists of individuals selected by convenience sampling method among those who have been successful in participating in youth camp leadership training and actively serve in youth camps. A total of 197 individuals participated in the research, including 45 females (22.8 %) and 152 males (77.2 %). In terms of educational level, 23 individuals (11.7 %) had an associate degree, 150 individuals (76.1 %) had a bachelor's degree, and 24 individuals (12.2 %) had a postgraduate degree. Regarding leadership experience, it was determined that 118 individuals (59.9 %) had 1-3 years of experience, 38 individuals (19.3 %) had 4-6 years of experience, and 41 individuals (20.8 %) had 7 years or more of experience.

Data Collection Tools

Decision-making styles scale*:* The scale was developed by Scott and Bruce (1995) and translated into Turkish by Tasdelen (2002). The scale consists of 5 subscales and 25 items. The rational decision-making style includes items 1-5, intuitive decision-making style includes items 6-10, dependent decision-making style includes items 11-15, avoidance decision-making style includes items 16-20, and spontaneous decision-making style includes items 21-25.

Multidimensional Leadership Orientations Scale: The scale, developed by Dursun et al. (2019), consists of 4 subscales and 19 items. The structural leadership dimension includes items 1-4, human resource leadership dimension includes items 5-9, political leadership dimension includes items 10-14, and charismatic leadership dimension includes items 15-19.

Statistical Analysis

Two components of normality are skewness and kurtosis (Tabachnick vd., 2013). One of the basic assumptions of parametric tests is normal distribution (Uysal et al., 2022). The skewness and kurtosis values in the study were distributed in the range of -1/+1 (Cokluk et al., 2018), the assumption of normality was met. Confirmatory factor analysis, descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation analysis and Multiple regression methods were used in the analysis of research data used.

RESULTS

Table 1. Confirmatory Factor Analysis for The Data Collection Tools

	CMIN/DF (x^2/df)	CFI	TLI	IFI	RMSEA
Multidimensional Leadership Orientations Scale	1.754	.949	.937	.950	.062
Decision-making styles scale	1.733	.936	.922	.938	.055

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) results for the Multidimensional Leadership Orientations Scale were as follows: CMIN/DF (x2/df): 1.754, CFI: .949, TLI: .937, IFI: .950, RMSEA: .062. Additionally, for the subscales of the scale in this study.The Cronbach's Alpha (α) values were found as follows: structural leadership dimension: .86, human resource leadership dimension: .85, political leadership dimension: .87, charismatic leadership dimension: .77, and the overall Cronbach's Alpha value for the scale was found to be .93.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) results for the Decision-Making Styles Scale were as follows: CMIN/DF (x2/df): 1.733, TLI: .922, CFI: .936, IFI: .938, RMSEA: .055.Additionally, for the subscales of the scale in this study, the Cronbach's Alpha (α) values were found as follows: rational decision-making style: .78, intuitive decision-making style: .82, dependent decision-making style: .74, avoidance decision-making style: .84, spontaneous decision-making style: .82,and the overall Cronbach's Alpha value for the scale was found to be .84. Inter-item covariance was plotted to provide fit indices.The results obtained for both scales can be considered within acceptable limits (Doll et al. 1994; Erdogan et al., 2007; Kurgun & Akdag, 2013; Kline, 2019).

Table 2. Correlation Analysis

N: 197	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1-Rational decision-making style	-							
2-Intuitive decision-making style	.311**	-						
3-Dependent decision-making style	.185**	.154*	-					
4-Avoidant decision-making style	-.105	.209**	.289**	-				
5-Spontaneous decision-making style	-.055	.302**	.181*	.678**	-			
6-Structural leadership	.553**	.165*	.096	-.171*	-.047	-		
7-Human resource leadership	.531**	.232**	.207**	-.092	-.014	.711**	-	
8-Political leadership	.429**	.355**	.187**	-.021	.057	.605**	.681**	-
9-Charismatic leadership	.475**	.381**	.088	-.103	.016	.603**	.582**	.725**

**p<0.01; *p<0.05

According to the correlation analysis results, a positive and moderate level of relationship was found between rational decision-making and structural leadership (r=.553), human resource leadership (r=.531), political leadership (r=.429), and charismatic leadership (r=.475) dimensions. There was a weak level of relationship between intuitive decision-making style and structural leadership (r=.165), human resource leadership (r=.232), there was a moderate level of relationship political

leadership (r=.355), and charismatic leadership (r=.381) dimensions.

A positive and weak level of relationship was found between dependent decision-making style and human resource leadership (r=.207) and political leadership (r=.187) dimensions. A negative and weak level of relationship was observed between avoidant decision-making style and structural leadership (r=-.171)

Table 3: Multiple Regression Analysis

1- First Part

Model	B	±	(β)	t	p	VIF		
Constant	1.324	.301	-	4.404	.000	-		
Structural leadership	.287	.085	.295	3.387	.001	2.282	p=.000	R=.602
Human resource leadership	.268	.099	.248	2.706	.007	2.534	$F_{(4,192)}$= 27.274	R^2=.362
Charismatic leadership	.192	.085	.198	2.259	.025	2.320	D-W=2.187	Adj.R^2=.349
Political leadership	-.052	.078	-.062	-.660	.510	2.695		

Dependent variables: Rational decision making

2- Second Part

Model	B	±	(β)	t	p	VIF		
Constant	1.898	.476	-	3.990	.000	-		
Structural leadership	-.233	.134	-.172	-1.732	.085	2.282	p=.000	R=.416
Human resource leadership	.040	.156	.026	.254	.800	2.534	$F_{(4-192)}$= 10.051	R^2=.173
Charismatic leadership	.424	.135	.315	3.151	.002	2.320	D-W=2.096	Adj.R^2=.156
Political leadership	.244	.124	.212	1.972	.050	2.695		

Dependent variables: Intuitive decision making

3- Third Part

Model	B	±	(β)	t	p	VIF		
Constant	2.506	.512	-	4.898	.000	-		
Structural leadership	-.144	.144	-.105	-.996	.320	2.282	p=.018	R=.245
Human resource leadership	.340	.168	.225	2.022	.045	2.534	$F_{(4-192)}$= 3.065	R^2=.060
Charismatic leadership	-.146	.145	-.107	-1.005	.316	2.320	D-W=1.997	Adj.R^2= .040
Political leadership	.203	.133	.175	1.526	.129	2.695		

Dependent variables: Dependent decision making

VIF (variance inflation factor) values were lower than 10 (Mertler & Vannatta Reinhart, 2017), it was determined that there was no multicollinearity problem among the research variables. At the same time, the Durbin-Watson value indicates whether there is autocorrelation in the model. Usually D-W around 1.5-2.5. value is proof that there is no autocorrelation (Kalaycı, 2018). Table 3 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis conducted to examine the relationship between the multidimensional leadership orientation, modeled as the independent variable, and the decision-making styles, presented as the dependent variables. However, the avoidance decision-making style ($F_{(df=4,192)}$=2.274; $p>0.05$) and the spontaneous decision-making style ($F_{(df=4-192)}$=0.694; $p>0.05$) were not included in the multiple regression model due to their lack of statistical significance.

The model presented in the first part of Table 3 is statistically significant ($F_{(df=4,192)}$=27.274 $p<0.001$). The R^2 value of the model is .362, and the adjusted R^2 value is .349, indicating that approximately 35% of the variance in rational decision-making can be explained by multidimensional leadership orientation. When examining the beta values, significant and positive effects are observed for the dimensions of structural leadership (β =.295), human resource leadership (β=.248) and charismatic leadership (β=.198) within the multidimensional leadership orientation scale. It is determined that structural leadership, human resource leadership, and charismatic leadership dimensions have a significant positive influence on the "rational decision-making" sub-dimension of the decision-making styles scale. The model presented in the second part of Table 3 is found to be statistically significant ($F_{(df=4,192)}$=10.051 $p<0.001$). The R^2 value of the model is .173, and the adjusted R^2 value is .156, indicating that approximately 16% of the variance in intuitive decision-making can be explained by multidimensional leadership orientation. When considering the beta values, significant and positive effects were observed for the dimensions of charismatic leadership (β =.315)within the multidimensional leadership orientation scale. It is determined that charismatic leadership dimensions have a significant positive influence on the "intuitive decision-making" sub-dimension of the decision-making styles scale. The model presented in the third part of Table 3 is found to be statistically significant ($F_{(df=4,192)}$= 3.065 $p<0.05$). The R^2 value of the model is .060, and the adjusted R^2 value is .040, indicating that 4% of the variance in dependent decision-making can be explained by the independent variable of multidimensional leadership orientation. When considering the beta values, a significant and positive effect is observed for the dimension of human resource leadership (β=.225) within the multidimensional leadership orientation scale. It is determined that the dimension of human resource leadership has a significant positive influence on the dependent decision-making sub-dimension of the decision-making styles scale.

CONCLUSION

In this study conducted with the participation of nature and sea youth camp leaders, structural leadership, human resource leadership and charismatic leadership dimensions have a significant positive influence on the rational decision-making sub-dimension of the decision-making styles scale. Charismatic leadership dimension has a significant positive influence on the intuitive decision-making sub-dimension of the decision-making styles scale. Human resource leadership dimension has a significant positive influence on the dependent decision-making sub-dimension of the decision-making styles scale. In conclusion, leaders who exhibit structural, human-oriented, and charismatic leadership styles are likely to effectively employ a rational decision-making approach. Additionally, leaders with a charismatic leadership orientation may be proficient in utilizing an intuitive decision-making style, while those with a human-oriented leadership approach might excel in dependent decision-making. Being in a leadership position involves both dealing with demands and developing an identity as a leader (Larsson & Björklund, 2021). Searle &Hanrahan (2011) stated that leaders can consciously develop opportunities to inspire others through interaction and effort.It can be said that the results of this research have implications for both youth leaders and individuals participating in youth camp organizations. The implication for youth leaders is to identify the impact of the leadership orientations they use or have on their decision-making mechanisms. Thus, they will be able to gain knowledge about leadership orientations and decision-making mechanisms and develop themselves accordingly. There may be differences in young people's perceptions of issues such as what a good leader is and even the value of leadership within an organization (Riddell, 2017). Since the leadership styles and decision-making styles of youth leaders can have a direct impact on young people, the perspectives of young people can improve thanks to these differences. This idea is what it means for young people. It can be said that today young people need strong leaders who understand their dynamics and can set an example for them during periods of development and change. For this reason, various studies on leadership from the perspective of young people can be conducted in the future.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest that may compromise the content presented in this paper.

Author Contributions

Study Design, AÖ.; Data Collection, AÖ; Statistical Analysis, AÖ, TT; Data Interpretation, AÖ, TT; Manuscript Preparation, AÖ, TT; Literature Search, AÖ, TT. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This research received no funding. No grant or funding organisation was thus involved in this research project.

Limitations

The major limitation is the small size of the sample. This indicates difficulties with the generalizability of the research. However, taking into account both variables in the context of youth camps diminishes the significance of these limitations.

REFERENCES

Abood, S. A., & Thabet, M. (2017). Impact of leadership styles on decision making styles among nurses' managerial levels. *Journal of Nursing and Health Science*, *6*(5), 71-78.

Alajmi, N., & Kalitay, M. (2019). Leadership development in international student organization: Case study on Erasmus student organization (Sweden). Retrieved from https://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:lnu:diva-84919</div

Al-Omari, A.A. (2013). The relationship between decision making styles and leadership styles among public schools principals. *International Education Studies*, *6*(7), 100-110. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n7p100

Amirianzadeh, M., Jaafari, P., Ghourchian, N., & Jowkar, B. (2011). Role of student associations in leadership development of engineering students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *30*, 382-385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.075

Atabey, C. (2022). A study on the career experiences of female youth leaders affiliated to the Ministry of Youth and Sports. Unpublished master's thesis. Denizli, Turkey: Pamukkale University.

Ayal, S., Rusou, Z., Zakay, D., & Hochman, G. (2015). Determinants of judgment and decision making quality: The interplay between information processing style and situational factors. *Frontiers in psychology*, *6*, 1088 doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01088

Aygun, G. (2020). Determining the relationship between leadership and decision-making styles of managers in the Turkish construction industry. Unpublished master's thesis. Gaziantep, Turkey: Hasan Kalyoncu University.

Aykurt, E. (2022). The effect of leadership characteristics of soccer referees on their decision making. Unpublished master's thesis. Istanbul, Turkey: Istanbul University.

Bahrami, S. (2017). The relationship between managers' decision making skills and leadership styles and a research. Unpublished master's thesis. Istanbul, Turkey: Bahçeşehir University.

Baloglu, N., Karadag, E., & Gavuz, S. (2009). The effect of school principals' multifactorial leadership styles on delegation of authority: A linear and structural equation modeling study. *Journal of Uludag University Faculty of Education, 22*(2), 457-479.

Bender, P.U. (2006). *Leadership from within.* Turkey: Hayat Publishing.

Bin Jomah, N. (2017). Perceptions of employees in the effects of decision-making and leadership styles on relationships and perceived effectiveness in king Saud University development context. *International Education Studies*, *10*(1), 197-210.

Bhugra, D., Till, A., & Ruiz, P. (2013). Leadership, decision-making and errors: Cultural factors. *International Psychiatry*, *7*(2), 27-29.https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118569948.ch8

Blake, R., & Mouton, J. (1964). The managerial grid: The key to leadership excellence. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1982). *Theory and research for developing a science of leadership. The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 18(3), 275–291.* https://doi.org/10.1177/00218863820180030

Bobic, M. P., & Davis, W. E. (2003). A kind word for Theory X: Or why so many new fangled management techniques quickly fail. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *13*(3), 239-264.https://doi.org/10.1093/jpart/mug022

Boje, D. (2000). The isles leadership: The voyage of the behaviorists. *The Leadership Box*. https://davidboje.com/388/behaviors.htm

Borges, J. C., Ferreira, T. C., de Oliveira, M. S. B., Macini, N., & Caldana, A. C. F. (2017). Hidden curriculum in student organizations: Learning,

practice, socialization and responsible management in a business school. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 153-161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2017.03.003

Carson, C. M. (2005). *A historical view of Douglas McGregor's Theory Y. Management Decision, 43(3),* 450– 460. https://doi.org/10.1108/0025174051058 9814

Cranfield, I. (1990). The youth service curriculum: A ten-point plan. *Education + Training*, 32(3). https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM000000000 0274

Cheng, X., Liu, W., & Li, Y. (2022). Is online collaboration process suitable for digital youth organization? A design approach", *Journal of Electronic Business & Digital Economics*, 1(2), 66-89. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEBDE-04-2022-0005

Cokluk, O., Sekercioglu, G., Buyukozturk, S. (2018). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik SPSS ve Lisrel uygulamları.* Pegem Akademi. pp. 16.

Cook, C., & Gonzales, H. (2016). Australian individual decision styles, intuitive and rational decision making in business. *International Proceeding of Economics Development and Research*, 86, 93-100.

Dijkstra, K. A., van der Pligt, J., & van Kleef, G. A. (2013). Deliberation versus intuition: Decomposing the role of expertise in judgment and decision making. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*,26(3), 285-294.https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.1759

Dikerel, M. (2008). Examining the relationship between leadership behaviors and decision-making strategies of public elementary school administrators. Unpublished master's thesis. Istanbul, Turkey: Yeditepe University.

Doll, W.J., Weidong, X., Torkzadeh, G.A. (1994). confirmatory factor analysis of the end-user computing satisfaction instrument. *MIS Quarterly* 18: 453-461.

Dursun, M., Gunay, M., & Yenel, F. (2019). Multidimensional leadership orientations scale (MLOS): Validity and reliability study. *International Academy of Management Journal*,2(2), 333-347.

Ellis, G., Jiang, J., Locke, D., & Snider, C. (2021). Youth program activity impacts: A model of camp activities, psychological needs, and immersion. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 121, 105842.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2 020.105842

Engelbert, B., & Wallgren, L. G. (2016). The origins of task- and people-oriented leadership styles: remains from early attachment security and influences during childhood and adolescence. *SAGE Open,*6(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016649012

Erdogan, Y., Bayram, S., & Deniz, L. (2007). Web-based teaching attitude scale: An exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis study. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 4(2),1-14.

Erol, Y.,&Savaş, E.B.(2023). The effects of leadership types on spirituality in the Workplace. Ozsungur, F.&Bekar, F.(Ed.)*Spirituality Management in the Workplace*, Emerald Publishing Limited, Leeds, pp. 197-219. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-83753-450-020231009

Evans, M. G. (1996). RJ house's a path-goal theory of leader effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*,7(3), 305-309.

Frankish, K. (2010). Dual-process and dual-system theories of reasoning. *Philosophy Compass*,5(10), 914-926.

Garst, B. A., Weston, K. L., Bowers, E. P., & Quinn, W. H. (2019). Fostering youth leader credibility: Professional, organizational, and community impacts associated with completion of an online master's degree in youth development leadership. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 96, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.11.0 19

Garst, B. A., Stephens, L., Parry, B., Bowers, E. P., & Quinn, W. (2023). Influence of a youth development leadership graduate degree program on the professional pathways of youth leaders.*Children and Youth Services Review*,149, 106928. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2023.106 928

Ghareeb, M., & Kaya, M. (2022). Investigation of decision-making styles of soccer players according to some demographic variables. *Mediterranean Journal of Sport Sciences*, 5(1), 119-131.https://doi.org/10.38021/asbid.1086910

Goff, D.G. (2003). What do we know about good community college leaders: A study in leadership trait theory and behavioral leadership theory. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED476456

Gomes, A.R. (2014). Leadership and positive human functioning: A triphasic proposal. In A.R. Gomes, R. Resende, & A. Albuquerque (eds.), Positive human functioning from a

multidimensional perspective: Promoting high performance (Vol. 3, pp. 157-169). New York: Nova Science

Gurbuz, S., & Sahin, F. (2017). Research methods in social sciences. Turkey: Seckin, pp.259.

Hare, A. P. (1973). Theories of group development and categories for interaction analysis. *Small Group Behavior, 4*(3), 259-304. http://doi:10.1177/104649647300400301

Hariri, H. Monypenny, R., & Prideaux, M. (2014). Leadership styles and decision-making styles in an Indonesian school context. *School Leadership & Management,34*(3),284-298. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2013.849678

Ilmez, M. (2010). Determination of the relationship between leadership styles and decision-making styles of managers and employees in a public institution.Unpublished master's thesis. Ankara, Turkey: Ufuk University.

Kalaycı, S. (2018). *SPSS applied multivariate statistical techniques.* Ankara: Dynamic.

Karasar, N. (2019). *Scientific research method. 34th Edition.* Nobel, Turkey, pp. 111.

Khan, M.S., Khan, I., Qureshi, Q.A., Ismail, H.M., Rauf, H., Latif, A., & Tahir, M. (2015). The styles of leadership: A critical review. *Public Policy and Administration Research*, 5(3), 87-92.

Kline, R.B. (2019). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. Fourth Ed. London: The Guilford Press.

Kopelman, R.E, Prottas, D.J. & Davis, A.L. (2008). Douglas Mcgregor' Theory X & Y: Toward A Construct-Valid Measure. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 20(2), 255-271.

Kurgun, O., & Akdag, G. (2013). The relationship between intellectual capital and organizational performance: A research in hotel businesses in the Mediterranean region. *Nevsehir Hacı Bektas Veli University SBE Journal*, 2(2), 155-176.

Larsson, G., & Björklund, C.(2021). Age and leadership: Comparisons of age groups in different kinds of work environment. *Management Research Review,44*(5),661-676.https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-01-2020-0040

Lean Keng, S., & AlQudah, H.N.I. (2017). Assessment of cognitive bias in decision-making and leadership styles among critical care nurses: a mixed methods study. *Journal of Advanced Nursing,73*(2), 465-481. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13142

Loo, R. (2000). A psychometric evaluation of the general decision-making style inventory. *Personality and individual differences,29*(5),895-905. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00241-X

Lopukhova, J., Makeeva, E., Gorlova, E., & Rudneva, T. (2022, September). Student associations as a way of improving professional competencies and soft skills. In *International Conference on Interactive Collaborative Learning*(pp. 455-464). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Marques da Rocha, M.C., Malloy-Diniz, L.F., Romano-Silva, M.A., Joaquim, R.M., Serpa, ALdO., Paim Diaz, A., de Paula, J.J., Costa, D.S., Silva, AGd., Pinto, ALdCB., & de Miranda, D.M. (2023). Decision-making styles during stressful scenarios: The role of anxiety in COVID-19 pandemic. *Front Psychiatry,5*(14),1-8. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2023.1105662.

Maqbool, S., Zafeer, H.M.I., Zeng, P., Mohammad, T., Khassawneh, O., & Wu, L. (2023). The role of diverse leadership styles in teaching to sustain academic excellence at secondary level. *Frontiers in Psychology,13*, 1096151. 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1096151

Mathew, C. D., Renganathan, R., & Joseph, K. (2011). The likert organisational profile: Methodological analysis and test of system 4t in tourist destinations. *European Journal of Business and Management,3*, 7-78.

Megheirkouni, M. (2018). Leadership and decision-making styles in large-scale sporting events. *Event management,22*(5), 785-801.https://doi.org/10.3727/152599518X15299559876162

Mertler, C.A., & Vannatta Reinhart, R. (2017). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical application and interpretation* (Sixth edition). New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis.

Noori, A.Q. (2021). Students' experiences of their leadership development through the leadership subject taught in universiti teknologi Malaysia. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices,3*(8), 01-09.

Reilly, A. J. (1978). Interview. *Group & Organization Studies, 3*(1), 11-23.https://doi.org/10.1177/105960117800300103

Schriesheim, C.A., & Bird, B.J. (1979). Contributions of the Ohio state studies to the field of leadership. *Journal of Management,5*(2), 135-145.

Stein, R. T., & Heller, T. (1979). An empirical analysis of the correlations between leadership status and participation rates reported in the

literature. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*(11), 1993-2002.https://doi:10.1037/0022-3514.37.11.1993

Özsarı, A., & Yıldız, K. (2020). Investigation of youth camp leaders' predispositions to teamwork. *Gazi Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, 25*(3), 187-197.

Özsarı, A. (2021). Investigation of the mental intelligence traits and teamwork tendencies of recreational youth camp leaders. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies,7*(1), 241-254.

Pattali, S., Sankar, J. P., Al Qahtani, H., Menon, N., & Faizal, S. (2024). Effect of leadership styles on turnover intention among staff nurses in private hospitals: the moderating effect of perceived organizational support.*BMC Health Services Research,24*(1), 199. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-024-10674-0

Perret, C., & Powers, S. T. (2022). An investigation of the role of leadership in consensus decision-making. *Journal of Theoretical Biology,543*, 111094. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2022.111094

Posner, B.Z.(2015). An investigation into the leadership practices of volunteer leaders. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 3(7), 885-898.https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-03 2014-0061

Rao, K. K., & Ganesh, K. V. B. (2024). A new optimised whale optimisation technique for analysing the impact of leadership styles on logistic. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems and Applications in Engineering,12*(1s), 633-646.

Rehman, R.R., & Waheed, A. (2012). Individual's leadership and decision making styles: A study of banking sector of Pakistan. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, *22*(3), 70-89.

Riaz, M.N., & Haque, A.U. (2016). Leadership styles as predictors of decision making styles among top, middle and lower managers. *Pakistan Business Review*,*17*(4), 227-244.

Riddell, P.M.(2017). Reward and threat in the adolescent brain: Implications for leadership development. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *38*(4), 530-548.https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-03-2015-0062

Searle,G.D.,& Hanrahan, S.J.(2011). Leading to inspire others: charismatic influence or hard work? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *32*(7), 736-754.https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731111170021

Schippers, M.C., & Rus, D.C. (2021). Majority decision-making works best under conditions of leadership ambiguity and shared task representations. *Frontiers in Psychology*,*12*, 519295.https://doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.519295

Scott, S.G., & Bruce, R.A. (1995). Decision-making style: The development and assessment of a new measure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*,*55*(5), 818-831.

Shera, W., & Murray, J. M. (2016). CITY Leaders: Building Youth Leadership in Toronto. *SAGE Open*, 6(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244016659118

Shujaat, J.M., Riaz, M.N., & Yasmin, H. (2021). Impact of decision-making styles on leadership styles in business managers. *International Review of Management and Business Research,10*(1), 208-215.

Short, C.C. (2021). Nurse *executives' intuitive decision making and leadership personality styles during organizational change*. *Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies*. 11170. https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/11170

Sulich, A., Soloducho-Pelc, L., & Ferasso, M. (2021). Management styles and decision-making: Pro-ecological strategy approach. *Sustainability*,*13*(4), 1604. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13041604

Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S., & Ullman, J. B. (2013).*Using multivariate statistics*. Boston, MA: pearson.

Tasdelen, A (2001). Decision-making styles of teacher candidates according to some psycho social variables. *Pamukkale University Faculty of Education Journal*,*10*(10), 40-52.

Tasdelen, A (2002). Preservice teachers' decision making styles according to different psycho social variables. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Izmir, Turkey: Dokuz Eylul University.

Tambe, A., & Krishnan, V.R. (2000). Leadership in decision making. *Indian Management, 39*(5), 69-79.

Ulucan, E., & Yavuz Aksakal, N. (2022). Leadership selection with the fuzzy topsis method in the hospitality sector in Sultanahmet region. *Mathematics*,*10*, 2195. https://doi.org/10.3390/math10132195

Uysal, İ., & Kılıç, A. F. (2022). Normal distribution dilemma. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International,12*(1), 220-248. https://doi.org/10.18039/ajesi.962653

Uzonwanne, F. (2015). Leadership styles and decision-making models among corporate leaders in non-profit organizations in North America.*Journal of Public Affairs*,*15*(3), 287-299.

Uzonwanne, F. (2016). Rational model of decision making. In A. Farazmand (Ed.), Global encyclopedia of public administration, public policy, and governance. Springer International Publishing, AG. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_2474-1

Viswanathan, V., &Jain, V. (2013). A dual-system approach to understanding "generation Y" decision making. Journal, *30*(69), 484-492.https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-07-2013-0649

Yeşil, A. (2016). A theoretical research on leadership and motivation theories. *International Academic Journal of Management Sciences, 2*(3), 158-180.

Yılmaz, M., & Yenel, F. (2020). Examining the leadership orientations of camp leaders working in youth camps. *Eurasia Journal of Sport Sciences and Education,2*(2), 118-134. https://doi.org/10.47778/ejsse.823434

Yukl, G. (1981). Leadership in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G. (1989). Leadership in organizations, 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Yunita, I., Syam, H., Ulmadevi, U., Jannah, N. Z., & Asri, R. W. (2023). The role of leadership in decision making and team building. *GIC Proceeding*,*1*, 256-263. https://doi.org/10.30983/gic.v1i1.128