

MANAGERS' PERSONALITY TRAITS OVER MANAGEMENT STYLES AND DECISION-MAKING STYLES

Beliz Ülgen , (Assoc. Prof. Dr.)

Istanbul Commerce University, Turkey

Mehmet Sağlam, (PhD Candidate)

Istanbul Commerce University, Turkey

Türker Tuğsal, (PhD Candidate)

Beykent University, Turkey

Abstract:

The paper seeks to offer a contribution to the extant literature on the role of managers' personality characteristics over management styles and decision-making styles. We have prepared a questionnaire which consists of Girgin's (2007) personality scale adaptation from Goldberg (1992), Kurban's (2015) decision-making scale adopted from Scott and Bruce (1995), and Yıldızhan's (2012) management style scale. The questionnaire is conducted among managers and employees in various sectors in Istanbul via the single random sampling method. Frequency analysis is applied to descriptive findings. In order to determine reliability and validity of the scales, reliability and factor analysis are performed. We have focused on investigating the impact of managers' personality traits on management styles and decision-making styles by applying the Multivariate Regression Model and Correlation Analysis. The result of the factor analysis revealed that the three dimensions (extraversion, neuroticism, conscientiousness) of big-five personality traits have a significant effect on some dimensions of managers' decision making and management styles.

Keywords: *Personality Traits, Management Styles, Decision-Making Styles, Multivariate Regression Model*

1. Introduction

Although there are many factors exist that are essential for organizations to alive, the crucial effect of managers should not be omitted. Decision making and management styles are main sources to create this effect. Undoubtedly, excluding the independent variables such as the size of organizations and the sector where they operate, also personality traits of the managers who implement these sources have considerable influence. In this context, the main purpose of the study is to investigate the relationship between personality traits of managers and their management styles, besides their decision making styles.

The first section of the study includes the definition of aforementioned concepts. Afterwards in the second section, the application that managers in various organizations participated is explained. To that end, in order to measure Big Five Personality Traits which has five dimensions - *Extraversion, Neuroticism, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience*. Furthermore, the management classification which contains authoritarian, supporter, protective, unionist and laissez-faire management styles was applied. Finally; the relations among rational, intuitive, avoidant and spontaneous decision making styles were investigated. In the third section of the study, the findings and results were presented.

2. Literature Review

Under this section, the general knowledge is presented related with the big five personality traits, decision making styles and management styles by examining various studies in the literature.

2.1. The Big Five Personality Traits

In many academic studies human personality in organizations is an attractive topic especially to build the relationship between the personality characteristics and job related behaviors (Yakasai and Jan, 2015). There are different models of personality traits in field of psychology. But the five factor model often labeled Big Five (e.g., Digman, 1990; John, 1990; McCrae, 1992; McCrae and Costa, 1984 as cited in Bakker et al., 2006) is widely accepted and popular model for embodying individual differences in personality (Berglund et al., 2015, p.59). Based on the general researches about personality traits, starting from the initial studies by Cattell (1943) and Fishke (1949), to more recent studies by Goldberg (1981), Digman and Takemoto-Chock (1983), Costa and McCrae (1985), McCrae and Costa (1987), have concurred on (Mishra and Vaithianathan, 2015) Big Five is a useful typology or taxonomy for classifying the multitude of personality characteristics (Digman, 1990; Goldberg, 1992, 1993; McCrae and Costa, 1987, 1989; McCrae and John, 1992 as cited in Caligiuri, 2006, p.222).

The Big Five Model consists of five personality traits which are Extraversion, Neuroticism, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to Experience.

Extraversion represents assertiveness, sociability, energy and positive emotions (Band, et al., 2014). Extraverted people are talkative, warm, cheerful, active, and enthusiastic (Paramanandam and Radhamani, 2014), self-confident, dominant and excitement seeking (Bakker et al., 2006) and capable in developing interpersonal relationship with others and externalizing their emotions (Therasa and Vijayabanu, 2015). According to Soldz and Vaillant (1999), extraversion is related to social success, preminence and self-promotion (Syed et al., 2015).

Neuroticism contrasts emotional stability and captures one's tendency to experience a variety of disruptive emotions and thoughts (Camps et al., 2016). Another definition of neuroticism states the degree some negative personality traits such as touchiness, unhappiness, impulsiveness, aggressiveness and anxiousness (Berglund et al., 2015). Neurotic people tend to be unhappy and feel uncertainty about their life circumstances (McCrae and Costa, 2008 as cited in Syed et al., 2015, p.184). Fear, anger, depression, easily inclined to stress, not able to control impulses, irritability, low self-esteem are significant indicators of neuroticism (Therasa and Vijayabanu, 2015). Highly neurotic individuals are insecure, anxious and more susceptible to stress than less neurotics (Costa and McCrae, 1992). Their moods tend to be capricious and their behaviors are impulsive. They are more susceptible to psychological stress, as they "are likely to interpret ordinary situations as threatening, and can experience minor frustrations as hopelessly overwhelming" (Widiger, 2009, p. 129 as cited in Giluk and Postlethwaite, 2015).

Agreeableness includes traits such as altruism, mild-mannered, trust and humble (John and Srivastava, 1999 as cited in Quintelier, 2014). According to Barrick and Mount (1991), people who have high agreeableness traits are adaptable, kind, collaborative, kind, helpful, patient, thoughtful and affectionate (Syed et al., 2015). They extremely like to have close interrelationships, interiorise positive approach and they have high life satisfaction (McCrae and Costa, 1991 as cited in Therasa and Vijayabanu, 2015). In the assessment of Costa and Mc-Crae (1995) agreeable people are more trustworthy than nonagreeable people who are manipulative, pessimistic and self-serving (Yakasai and Jan, 2015, p.16). They have also effort to build and keep harmony and prefer to use compromising strategies in dealing with any conflict (Camps et al., 2016).

Conscientiousness identifies task and goal directed, planful and organized behavior, such as thinking before acting, following norms and rules, delaying gratification, prioritizing tasks (Oliver and Srivastava, 1999, p.30). Highly conscientious people are self-disciplined, reliable, ambitious, thorough and efficient (Berglund et al., 2015). McCrae and Costa (1986); Costa et al. (1991) associated conscientiousness with self-discipline, achievement striving, dutifulness, and competence. Especially their persistency and self-discipline characteristics cause them to accomplish tasks or goal in a successful manner. This was demonstrated by some researches which are leaded by Piedmont (1993), Deary et al. (1996), and Deary et al. (2003).

Openness to experience defines the "openness" to new ideas and flexibility (Costa and McCrae, 1985) as cited in Mishra and Vaithianathan, 2015, p.16). This trait indicates the degree of intellectual curiosity, creativity (gender) and individual's tendency to learn, try new things, consider new ideas and change (Osatuyi, 2015). Individuals who have high traits in openness are imaginative, impulsive, open-minded, unprejudiced, curious and indulgent (Berglund et al.,

2015). They are not insistent on their own ideas or views, nor in their expectations toward others (Mondak, 2010 as cited in Quintelier, 2014, p.344). According to McCrae and John (1992), people who have openness traits tend to have more "need of variety, aesthetic sensitivity, and unconventional values than others (Syed et al., 2015, p.184). Big Five Personality Traits has a significant effect especially on the decision making styles of managers and employees and the management styles of managers likewise the other management processes in organization. In this context decision making styles and the management styles are stated in the following sections.

2.2. Decision Making Styles

Rowe et al. (1984) has defined decision as "*an answer to some question or a choice between two or more alternatives*" (p. 3). Therefore, decision making ability is in relation with choosing an alternative from the pool (Hammond, 1999). As for decision making process Krumboltz and Hamel (1977) expresses that defining, creating, examining and acting upon collected information.

Decision making is a function according to Weiss (1983) that includes one's personal interests, information and ideology. Rowe and Mason (1987) put decision making process in an order as; 1) stimuli; 2) the response; 3) the reflection; 4) the implementation; and 5) the evaluation. Driver et al. (1993) classified decision styles with their model Five Basic Decision Styles of Information Use. Decisive, flexible, integrative, hierarchic and systematic were the five decision styles.

Rowe and Mason (1987) developed the Cognitive to Complexity Model and classified decision styles. These four basic styles are 1) directive, 2) analytical, 3) conceptual and 4) behavioral. Directive decision making style is having low tolerance for ambiguity and low cognitive complexity. The analytical decision making style is having high tolerance for ambiguity. The conceptual decision making style is having high level tolerance for ambiguity and high level cognitive complexity. The behavioral decision making style is having low level tolerance for ambiguity and low level cognitive complexity (Rowe and Mason, 1987; Rowe and Davis, 1996; Boulgarides and Cohen, 2001; Connor and Becker; 2003).

Decision making style was defined by Scott and Bruce (1995) as "*the learned habitual response pattern exhibited by an individual when confronted with a decision situation ... it is not a personality trait ... but a habit-based propensity to react in a certain way*" (Scott and Bruce, 1995, p. 820). They classified decision making styles in five dimensions —rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant and spontaneous. *Rational style* depends on logical evaluation choices. *Intuitive style* prioritize feelings and the others' thoughts in decision making process. The managers who have *avoidant style* are tended to avoid to make decisions. *Spontaneous style* defines instant and prompt behaviors in decision making process (Scott and Bruce, 1995 as cited in Bavoġar and Orosova, 2015, p.115). This decision making style which was developed by Scott and Bruce (1995) and adopted by Kurban (2015) was preferred in this study.

2.3. Management Styles

Management style is simply defined as "*a recurring set of characteristics that are associated with the decisional process of the firm*" (Albaum and Herche, 1999, p. 8). The characteristics may change due to the environment and culture where the organizations operate. Despite the fact that there are differences, an organization might be viewed as having a management style which is the sum of its managers, therefore management style becomes part of organization's culture. Poon et al. (2005) examined management decision making styles and compared national culture and management styles of Australia and China. More recently, Chia et al. (2007) observed Hong Kong, China, Taiwan, South Korea and Singapore. As a conclusion within these countries political and socioeconomic factors affect the values of managers.

According to Lewin et al. (1939; cited in Tomaskova and Kopfova, 2011) autocratic, participative and democratic management styles are the most common cited and used management styles. When a manager dictates orders to organization members and without any consultation makes decisions by him or herself this type of management style is called autocratic management style. Autocratic managers generally ignore their subordinates' advices (Knott, 2001). Disadvantage of autocratic management style is in longer term motivation will tend to decrease and employee turnover will increase. As for participative or often called also consultative management style, before a

manager implements a decision he/she consults partners, staff or employees their opinion. After taking their opinions, he/she modifies them into his/her decision and make a final decision (Tomaskova and Kopfova, 2011). In contrast to autocratic managers, democratic managers seek to consult and take advice from their subordinates and try to arrive at a consensus. Democratic management style is characterized by empowerment. Anyone has the decision making responsibility within a given framework. Therefore, individuals feel a sense of commitment and belonging to their organization and their motivation tends to increase (Kocher et al., 2013; Rotemberg and Saloner, 1993).

Another classification about management styles was made by Likert. Likert's System 4 management style has four types. System 1 is exploitative authoritative and managers of this style tend to motivate individuals by threats and punishment, and decisions are imposed to employees. System 2 is benevolent authoritative. Managers of this style tend to control less than System 1. In System 2 decisions are made by lower-level employees within the given limited framework, however major decisions are made at the top. Top managers feel more responsibility. System 3 is consultative system. This type of management style is related to Human Relations Theory. Managers of this style tend to motivate subordinates through rewards; moreover, lower-level employees are free to make decisions related with their work. Top managers still have control over decisions, however they count their subordinates in action plans before setting goals. The last type is System 4 which is named participative system. System 4 is the most effective style of management. Whereas System 3 is related to Human Relations Theory, System 4 is related to Human Resources Theory. System 4 type of management style includes high level of participation, responsibility, motivation, communication and satisfaction (Likert, 1967, p. 48; cited in Hall and Leidecker, 1981).

The management style classification in this application bases on *authoritarian, protective, supporter, unionist and laissez-faire* management styles. *Authoritarian management style* is similar to McGregor's X Theory (Cem, 1971). This type of managers are close to communication and they tend to distrust to subordinates (Öztekin, 2002). *Protective management style* advocates human relations approach which Barnard, Mayo and Follett pioneered (Cem, 1971). Protective managers believe that in order to reach the targets they should guide subordinates. *Supporter management style's* power source is organizational leadership. Besides, leader's power source is subordinates. *Unionist management style* assures self-control, self-management, self-realization and teamwork (Başaran, 1992). *Laissez-faire management style* is also mentioned liberal management style. Employees do their duty or work as they know, however managers do not control or interfere them (Cem, 1971).

3. Methodology and the Application

We have prepared a survey in order to measure the role of managers' personality characteristics over management styles and decision-making styles. Managers and employees who worked in various companies in Istanbul form the population of this study. The questionnaire is conducted among managers and employees. Participants are from various sectors in Istanbul. As for sampling method, the single random sampling method is chosen.

The questionnaire starts with 4 demographic questions and involves in four separate categories the instruments of managers' personality traits, decision-making styles and management styles in this research. The questionnaire packs took about 15-20 minutes to complete. All of the variables used in the second, third and fourth sections of the questionnaire were measured with a Likert-type scale. Responses were elicited on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from totally disagree (1) to totally agree (5). The questionnaire consists of Girgin's (2007) personality scale adaptation from Goldberg (1992), Kurban's (2015) decision-making scale adopted from Scott and Bruce (1995), and Yıldızhan's (2012) management style scale. Questionnaires were sent to all participants via e-mail. The numbers of returning questionnaires were 282 and 12 of them which were not valid questionnaire, were not included in the analysis. 270 questionnaires were included in the study.

Factor Analysis and Reliability Tests

In order to determine reliability and validity of the scales, Cronbach Alpha reliability values and factor analysis are performed. After Correlation Analysis and Multivariate Regression Model is used to explain the relationships among managers' personality traits, decision-making styles and management styles. SPSS for Windows 21.0 program is used to analyze the data.

The results of the factor analysis were seen that the structure of decision making and management styles factors were formed as expectedly. But in spite of the fact that personality traits' two dimensions (*agreeableness* and *openness to experience*) were excluded from the model due to the results of factor and reliability analysis. The final model of the study includes 3 personality traits, 5 decision making styles and 5 management styles factors. The other dimensions of the Cronbach alpha values were more than 0.70 which indicate that the dimensions used for each variable are accepted as reliable according to these results.

It was decided to be done factor analysis because questions of all factors have Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling adequacy higher than 0,60 and Bartlett's test of sphericity, value of sig.; 0.000. Since value of significance is lower than 0,05, it means there is a strong relationship among the variables. Three items with a factor load under 0.50 were excluded from the management styles scale. These all factors with their names, their factor loadings, explained variance are presented in Table 1, Table 2, Table 3.

Table 1. Results of Factor and Reliability Analysis of Personality Traits

Factor Name	Number of Items	Cronbach alpha	Variance explained	KMO Test and Bartlett p value
Extraversion	6	,742	14,766	
Conscientiousness	6	,702	13,486	
Neurotic	8	,751	12,277	
Total			56,42	0,804 and 0,00

Table 2. Results of Factor and Reliability Analysis of Management Styles

Factor Name	Number of Items	Cronbach alpha	Variance explained	KMO Test and Bartlett p value
Authoritarian	7	,747	30,245	
Protective	9	,827	7,685	
Supporter	9	,924	7,131	
Unionist	8	,817	6,270	
Laissez-faire	6	,730	4,958	
Total			56,288	0,929 and 0,00

Table 3. Results of Factor and Reliability Analysis of Decision Making Styles

Factor Name	Number of Items	Cronbach alpha	Variance explained	KMO Test and Bartlett p value
Rational	5	,703	12,948	
Intuitive	5	,852	11,915	
Dependent	5	,794	11,543	
Avoidant	5	,772	10,024	
Spontaneous	4	,727	9,995	
Total			56,427	0,796

4. Research Findings and Results

4.1. Demographic Characteristics of Samples

Demographic characteristics of samples are displayed in Table 4. There were 46 (17%) female and 224 (83%) male participants. Majority of the participants were between the age of 35 and 44 years (52,6%), followed by 31,1% with 45-54 years. 55,9% of employees are university graduated. The highest percentage of employees (73%) had between 1-5 years in this workplace.

Table 4. Demographic Characteristics of Samples

	Variables	Frequency	Valid Percent
Gender	Female	46	17,0
	Male	224	83,0
Age	18-24	1	,4
	25-34	34	12,6
	35-44	142	52,6
	45-54	84	31,1
	55 and over	9	3,3
Education	High School	21	7,8
	University	158	58,5
	Master	83	30,7
	Doctorate	8	3,0
Total Working Time in This Workplace	1-5	197	73,0
	6-10	52	19,6
	11 years and over	21	7,5

4.2. Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis conducted to examine the relationships among all dimensions of personality traits, decision making and management styles show the $p < .01$ and $p < .05$ level of significance. Table 5 presents the correlation matrix for all dimensions.

Table 5. Correlation Analysis Results

Factors	Rational	Intuitive	Dependent	Avoidant	Spontaneous	Authoritarian	Protective	Supporter	Unionist	Laissez-faire
Extraversion	,005	,012	,153*	,197**	,173**	-,005	-,130*	-,144*	-,058	,113
Conscientiousness	,467**	,079	-,053	-,261**	-,045	,055	,163**	,240**	,085	-,148*
Neurotic	-,323**	,217**	,120*	,414**	,216**	,204**	-,115	-,173**	-,101	,357*

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

It is seen in Table 5 that there is a positive relationship between the extraversion managers and dependent, avoidant, spontaneous decision making styles ($r = ,153$, $r = ,197$, $r = ,173$). There is a negative relationship between the extraversion managers and protective, supporter management styles ($r = -,130$, $r = -,144$). There is a positive relationship between the conscientiousness managers and rational decision making styles ($r = ,467$). In contrast there is a negative relationship between the conscientiousness managers and avoidant decision making styles ($r = -,261$). There is a positive relationship between the conscientiousness managers and protective, supporter management styles ($r = ,163$, $r = ,240$) and there is a negative relationship between the conscientiousness managers and laissez-faire management style ($r = -,148$). There is a positive relationship between the neurotic managers and intuitive, dependent, avoidant, spontaneous decision making styles ($r = ,217$, $r = ,120$, $r = ,414$, $r = ,216$). There is a negative relationship between the neurotic managers and rational decision making style ($r = -,323$). In contrast there is a positive relationship between the neurotic managers and authoritarian, laissez-faire management style ($r = ,204$, $r = ,357$). There is a negative relationship between the neurotic managers and supporter management style ($r = -,173$).

4.3. Regression Analysis

Multiple regression models were applied to examine effect of three dimensions of personality traits on decision making and management styles. Table 6 indicates regression results for three dimensions personality traits' on decision making styles. Table 7 regression results for three dimensions personality traits' on management styles.

Table 6. Regression Results for Three Dimensions Personality Traits' on Decision Making Styles

Decision Making Styles	Rational	Intuitive	Dependent	Avoidant	Spontaneous
Personality Traits	β	β	β	β	β
Extraversion	-	-	0,13*	-	0,12*
Conscientiousness	0,40*	0,16*	-	-0,16*	-
Neurotic	-0,22*	0,28*	-	0,34*	0,19*
F	31,46	6,97	2,78	22,3	5,74

Sig. (p) F Change	0,00	0,00	0,04	0,00	0,01
R2	0,26	0,07	0,03	0,21	0,06
*p<0,05					

*β coefficient is significant at the 0.05 level

The F-statistics indicates the overall significance of the models at the 0.05 level implying that the regression model is reliable for prediction. R² values show that; three dimensions of personality traits' explains 26% of the change of rational decision making style, 7% of the change of intuitive decision making style, 3% of the change of dependent decision making style, 21% of the change of avoidant decision making style, 6% of the change of spontaneous decision making style.

The results suggest that extraversion personality has a positive effect on dependent ($\beta = 0,13$) and spontaneous ($\beta = 0,12$) decision making style. Conscientiousness personality has a positive effect on rational ($\beta = 0,40$) and intuitive ($\beta = 0,16$) decision making style. Also it has a negative effect on avoidant ($\beta = -0,16$) decision making style. Neurotic personality has a negative effect on rational ($\beta = -0,22$) decision making style and it has a positive effect on intuitive, ($\beta = 0,28$) avoidant ($\beta = 0,34$) and spontaneous ($\beta = 0,19$) decision making style.

Table 7. Regression Results for Three Dimensions Personality Traits' on Management Styles

Management Styles	Authoritarian	Protective	Supporter	Unionist	Laissez-faire
Personality Traits	β	β	β	β	β
Extraversion	-	-	-	-	-
Conscientiousness	,129*	,145*	,210*	-	0,34*
Neurotic	,262*	-	-	-	-
F	5,75	3,96	7,75	1,31	13,2
Sig F	0,01	0,00	0,00	0,27	0,01
R2	0,06	0,04	0,08	0,01	0,13
*p<0,05					

*β coefficient is significant at the 0.05 level

Depending on the Table 7 results of regression analysis, unionist management style does not fit with model due to F-test p value. The other F-statistics indicates the overall significance of the models at the 0.05 level implying that the regression model is reliable for prediction. Also extraversion has not any effect on authoritarian, protective, supporter and laissez-faire management styles.

R² values show that; two dimensions of personality traits' explains 6% of the change of authoritarian management style, 4% of the change of protective management style, 8% of the change of supporter management style and 13 % of the change of laissez-faire management styles.

The results suggest that conscientiousness personality has a positive effect on authoritarian ($\beta = ,129$), protective ($\beta = ,145$), supporter ($\beta = ,210$) and laissez-faire management styles ($\beta = 0,34$). Neurotic personality only has a positive effect on authoritarian ($\beta = ,262$) management style.

5. Conclusion

In this study the main purpose is to investigate the effects of managers' personality traits on their decision making and management styles due to the limited studies including these three concepts together. This study is one of the very few that reveals the link among personality traits, decision making and management styles. In this context the literature is reviewed and the research model is developed. The research has some limitations such as the limited number of female participants, time and location constraint.

The results highlight that although conscientiousness has a positive effect on rational and initiative decision making styles, it has a negative effect on avoidant decision making style. Neuroticism has a positive effect on three dimensions of decision making styles including initiative, avoidant and spontaneous styles. On the contrary, it has a negative effect on rational style. Finally extraversion has positive effect on both dependent and spontaneous decision making styles.

With regard to management styles, the results illustrate that conscientiousness has positive effect on authoritarian, protective, supporter and laissez-faire management styles. Besides, only neuroticism has positive effect on authoritarian management style. Depending on the results of regression analysis, unionist management style does not fit with model due to F-test p value. Extraversion has not any effect on authoritarian, protective, supporter and laissez-faire management styles.

Further studies may aim to investigate unionist management style and extraversion personality trait. Additionally, these studies may consider the constraints related with sample size, gender distribution and location.

References

- Albaum, G., & Herche, J. (1999). Management style comparisons among five European nations. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 12, 5–27.
- Bakker, A.B., Van Der Zee, K.I., Lewig, K.A. & Dollard, M.F. (2006) The Relationship Between the Big Five Personality Factors and Burnout: A Study Among Volunteer Counselors, *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146 (1), 31-50.
- Band, G., Sao, R., Dalal, A. (April/June 2014). Study and Impact of Gender On Personality Traits. *International Journal of Organizational Behaviour & Management Perspectives*, 3 (2), 873-879.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel psychology*, 44 (1), 1-26.
- Başaran, İ.E. (1992). *Yönetimde İnsan İlişkileri*, Kadioğlu Matbaası, Ankara.
- Bavol'ar, J., Orosova, O. (January 2015). Decision-making styles and their associations with decision-making competencies and mental health. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 10 (1), 115–122.
- Berglund, V., Seva, I.J., Strandh, M. (2015). Subjective well-being and job satisfaction among self-employed and regular employees: Does personality matter differently? *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 28 (1), 55-73.
- Boulgarides, D. J., & Cohen. W. A. (2001). Leadership style vs. leadership tactics. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 6, 59-73.
- Caligiuri, P. (2006). Developing global leaders. *Human Resource Management Review*, 16 (2006) 219–228.
- Camps, J., Stouten, J., Euwema, M. (February, 2016). The Relation Between Supervisors' Big Five Personality Traits and Employees' Experiences of Abusive Supervision. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7 (112), 1-11.
- Cattell, R.B. (1943), "The description of personality: basic traits resolved into clusters", *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 38 (4), 476-506.

- Cem C. (1971). Yönetim Biçimleri. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 4 (1): 91-103.
- Chia, H. B., Egri, C. P., Ralston, D. A., Fu, P. P., Kuo, M. H. C., Lee, C. H., Li, Y., & Moon, Y. L. (2007). Four tigers and the dragon: Values differences, similarities, and consensus. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 24, 305–320.
- Connor, P. E., & Becker, R. W. (2003). Personal value system and decision-making styles of public managers. *Public personal management*, 32, 155-180.
- Costa, P.T. Jr and McCrae, R.R. (1985). *The NEO Personality Inventory*, Psychology Assessment Resources, Odessa, FL.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PIR) and NEO Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*, Psychological Assessment Resources, Odessa, FL.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1995). Domains and facets: Hierarchical personality assessment using the Revised NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 64, 21–50.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., McCrae, R. R., & Dye, D. A. (1991). Facet scales for agreeableness and conscientiousness: A revision of the NEO Personality Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 887–898.
- Deary, I. J., Blenkin, H., Agius, R. M., Endler, N. S., Zealley, H., & Wood, R. (1996). Models of job-related stress and personal achievement among consultant doctors. *British Journal of Psychology*, 87, 3–29.
- Deary, I. J., Watson, R., & Hogston, R. (2003). A longitudinal cohort study of burnout and attrition in nursing students. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 43, 71–81.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality Structure: Emergence of the Five-Factor Model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417–440.
- Digman, J.M. and Takemoto-Chock, N.K. (1983). Factors in the natural language of personality: re-analysis, comparison and interpretation of six major studies. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 16 (2), 149-170.
- Driver, M. J., Brousseau, K. E., & Hunsaker, P. L. (1993). *The dynamic decision maker*, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.
- Fishke, D.W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 44 (3), 329-344.
- Giluk, T.,L., Postlethwaite, B. E. (2015). Big Five personality and academic dishonesty: A meta-analytic review *Personality and Individual Differences*, 72, 59–67.
- Girgin, B. (2007). Beş Faktör Kişilik Modelinin İşyerinde Duygusal Tacize (Mobbing) Etkileri. *Dumlupınar University Masters Thesis*.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1981). *Language and individual differences: the search for universals in personality lexicons*. In Wheeler, L. (Ed.), *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2, Sage, Beverly Hills, CA, 141-165.
- Goldberg, L. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 26–42.
- Goldberg, L. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26–34.
- Hall, J. L., & Leidecker, J. K. (1981). Is Japanese-style management anything new? A comparison of Japanese-style management with US participative models. *Human Resource Management*, 20 (4), 14.
- Hammond, J. S. (1999). *Smart Choices*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.

- John, O. P. (1990). *The Big Five Factor Taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires*. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research*, Guilford, New York, 66–100.
- John, O.P. and Srivastava, S. (1999), *The big-five trait taxonomy: history, measurement, and theoretical Perspectives*. In Pervin, L. and John, O.P. (Eds), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, Guilford, New York, 102-139.
- Knott, A.M., 2001. The dynamic value of hierarchy. *Management Science* 47 (3), 430–448.
- Kocher, M. G., Pogrebna, G., & Sutter, M. (2013). Other-regarding preferences and management styles. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 88, 109-132.
- Krumboltz, J. D., & Hamel, D. A. (1977). *Guide to Career Decision Making Skills*, College Entrance Examination Board, New York.
- Kurban, C. (2015). Bireysel algılarına göre okul yöneticilerinin karar verme stilleri. *Pamukkale University Masters Thesis*.
- Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology* 10, 271–301.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The Hitman Organization*, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.
- McCrae, R. R. (Ed.). (1992). The Five Factor Model: Issues and Applications [Special issue]. *Journal of Personality*, 60 (2).
- McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1984). *Emerging Lives, Enduring Positions: Personality in Adulthood*, Little, Brown and Company, Boston.
- McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1986). Personality, coping, and coping effectiveness in an adult sample. *Journal of Personality*, 54, 385–405.
- McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52 (1), 81-90.
- McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1989). More reasons to adopt the five-factor model. *American Psychologist*, 44, 451–452.
- McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1991) The NEO Personality Inventory: Using the five-factor model in counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 69 (4), 367-372.
- McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. (2008). *Empirical and theoretical status of the five-factor model of personality traits*. In G.J. Boyle, G. Matthews, & D. H. Saklofske (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Personality Theory and Assessment*, SAGE, London, 273-294.
- McCrae, R. & John, O. (1992). An introduction to the five factor model and its applications. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 175–216.
- Mishra, V. & Vaithianathan, S. (2015). Customer personality and relationship satisfaction Empirical evidence from Indian banking sector. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 33 (2), 122-142.
- Mondak, J.J. (2010). *Personality and the Foundations of Political Behavior*, Cambridge University Pres, Cambridge.
- Oliver, J. & Srivastava, S. (1999), “The Big-Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Theoretical Perspectives”, available at http://moityca.com.br/pdfs/bigfive_John.pdf (accessed 26 March 2016).

- Osatuyi, B. (Summer 2015). Personality Traits And Information Privacy Concern on Social Media Platforms. *The Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 55 (4), 11-19.
- Öztekin A. (2002). *Yönetim Bilimi*, Siyasal Kitabevi, Ankara.
- Paramanandam, P. & Radhamani, R. (June 2014). Big Five Personality and Occupational Stress Among the Managerial Personnel of Automobile Industry. *Pratibimba*, 14 (1), 23 -30.
- Piedmont, R. L. (1993). A longitudinal analysis of burnout in the health care setting: Therole of personal dispositions. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 61, 457-473.
- Poon, P. S., Evangelista, F. U., & Albaum, G. (2005). A comparative study of the management styles of marketing managers in Australia and the People's Republic of China. *International Marketing Review*, 22, 34-47.
- Quintelier, E. (2014). The influence of the Big 5 personality traits on young people's political consumer behavior, *Young Consumers*, 15 (4), 342-352.
- Rotemberg, J. J. & Saloner, G. (1993). Leadership style and incentives. *Management Science*, 39 (11), 1299-1318.
- Rowe, A. J., Boulgarides, J. D., & McGrath, M. R. (1984). *Managerial decision making*, Science research associates, Chicago, IL.
- Rowe, A. J. & Davis, S. A. (1996). *Intelligent information systems: Meeting the challenge of the knowledge era*, Quorum boks, Westport, CT.
- Rowe, A. J. & Mason, O. R. (1987). *Managing with style: A guide to understanding, assessing, and improving decision making*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.
- Scott, S. O. & Bruce, R. A. (1995). Decision-making style: The development and assessment of a new measure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 55, 818-831.
- Soldz, S. & Vaillant, G. (1999). The Big Five Personality Traits and the Life Course: A 45-Year Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 33 (2), 208-232.
- Syed, N., Saeed, A. & Farrukh, M. (2015). Organization Commitment and Five Factor Model Of Personality: Theory Recapitulation. *Journal of Asian Business Strategy*, 5 (8), 183-190.
- Therasa, C. & Vijayabanu, C. (2015). The Impact of Big Five Personality Traits and Positive Psychological Strengths towards Job Satisfaction: a Review. *Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences*, 23 (2), 142-150.
- Tomaskova, E. & Kopfova, A. (2011). Management Style at Market Orientation. *Economics & Management*, 16, 981-986.
- Weiss, C. H. (1983). *Ideology, interests, and information*. In *Ethics, the social sciences, and policy analysis*, Springer, US, 213-245.
- Widiger, T. A. (2009). Neuroticism. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior*, The Guilford Press, New York, 129-146.
- Yakasai, A.M. & Jan, M.T. (January, 2015). The Impact of Big Five Personality Traits on Salespeople's Performance: Exploring the Moderating Role of Culture. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review* 4 (5), 11-26.
- Yıldızhan, Y. Ç. (2012). Spor Genel Müdürlüğü merkez örgütünde uygulanan yönetim biçimlerinin belirlenmesi. *Gazi University Doctoral dissertation*.