International Journal of Arts & Sciences,
CD-ROM. ISSN: 1944-6934 :: 5(1):163–177 (2012)
Copyright © 2012 by InternationalJournal.org

EXAMINATION OF SELF-ESTEEM, DECISION MAKING STYLES AND PROBLEM SOLVING SKILLS OF PROFESSIONAL TOURIST GUIDES IN THE PROCESS OF DECISION MAKING IN TERMS OF SOME DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Sevcan Yildiz, Yusuf Yilmaz and Pınar Çelik

Akdeniz University, Turkey

In this study, it is examined whether some of demographic characteristics of tourist guides have any effect on their self-esteem, decision making styles and problem solving skills in the process of decision making. The working group of the study consists of 648 participants who are working actively as tourist guides in the provinces of Antalya, Ankara, Muğla and Antalya. However, only 442 surveys that possess the necessary qualifications for the analysis have been included into the study. As a result of the T-test, it was found out that the variables of gender and marital status did not create a significant difference on self-esteem, decision making styles and problem solving skills. Furthermore, the variable of age did not create any difference on self-esteem, decision making styles and problem solving skills. While the variable of age did not create any difference on "Cautious Decision Making Style", "Abstaining Decision Making Style" and "Panic Decision Making Style" which are sub-dimensions of decision making styles, it created a significant difference on "Dilatory Decision Making Style". The variable of education did not create any difference on self-esteem, decision making styles and problem solving skills. While the variable of education did not create any difference on "Abstaining Decision Making Style", "Dilatory Decision Making Style" and "Panic Decision Making Style" which are sub-dimensions of decision making styles, it created a significant difference on "Cautious Decision Making Style".

Keywords: Professional tourist guide, Self-esteem in the process of decision Making, Decision making Styles, Problem solving skills, Decision making.

Introduction

Millions of people travel for touristic purposes in the world each year. Countries gain currency profit as a result of these travels and these profits contribute to the development of the countries. Tourism revenues play a crucial role in compensating foreign trade deficit as well. Moreover, tourism is a significant sector in the development of countries. Tourists' expenditures which are made for buying goods and services provide source of income for the suppliers of goods and services. As the number of people attending to tourism event increases, the expenditures made for goods and services shall increase as well and the production of these goods and services shall increase as a consequence.

Tourist guide is the person who communicates with tourists during their travels, makes them enjoy their time, introduces the places of sightseeing in all aspects, assists tourists in extraordinary situations, preserves their rights, eases the travel organizations and who possesses the necessary training to behave in accordance with ethical rules and standards (Tangüler, 2002, p. 3). Tourist guide carries out the process of operation with his/her performance during the sightseeing and interest shown to the tourists and he/she plays a crucial role in satisfying tourists by dealing with the problems occurring during these operations in person (Yarcan and Peköz, 1998, p. 95). Generally, it is impossible to estimate why tourists go to a certain place and what they will do there (Brown, 2006, p. 365). Therefore, a tourist guide should be careful while communicating with tourists and provide a good tour management by carrying out travel planning in detail (Doswell, 1979, p. 66; Snell and Carpenter, 1992, p. 27; Crick, 1992, p. 142).

Tour guiding constitutes a strategic factor in the representation of a destination area and in influencing the quality of the tourist experience, the length of stay, and the resulting economic benefits for a local community (Dahles, 2002, p. 783).

The tourist guides should possess some kind of individual characteristics in order to carry out their occupation suitably and to be successful. These are (Batman *et al*., 2000, p. 24-35):

- Communication,
- Possessing educational and technical characteristics regarding the occupation,
- Leadership,
- Behavior flexibility,
- Patience and tolerance,
- Ability of humor,
- Good appearance,
- Occupational ethics and determination.

Most of the characteristics specified above such as communication, leadership, behavior flexibility, patience and tolerance, determination are effective in individuals' solving the problems and decision making. Each tourists guide should possess certain types of leadership characteristics; because tourist guides make leadership for tourist groups and direct them during the tour (Cohen *et al*. 2002, p. 919).

Tour guiding is a strong emphasis on the mediation activities of guides: Mediation among hosts and guests, mediation between the tour operator/travel agency and the tourists, mediation among the tour leader and the local tourist scene, mediation between the hotel sector and the tourist (Dahles, 2002, p. 784).

Both problem solving and decision making are defined as the set of complex processes that a person determines and evaluates lots of action alternatives and chooses one of these alternatives so as to apply (Phillips *et al*., 1984; Deniz, 2004, p. 24). Kuzgun (Kuzgun, 1992) defines making decision as an orientation resolving the problem when there is more than one way regarding an object which is thought to meet a certain problem. Decision making is a cognitive process as well (Von Winterfeld and Edwards, 1986) and this process starts with the rise of problem and ends with the application of decisions and evaluation of results (Adair, 2000).

The efficiency of decision making process depends on the decision maker. Because, the method and characteristics of the individual in decision making process is important (Shiloh *et al*., 2001). One of these characteristics is self-esteem. Self-esteem is the sum of judgments that an individual makes about himself/herself as a result of this person's dealing with his/her own entity as an object and evaluating this entity (Yılmaz and Altınok, 2010, p. 688). Again, self-esteem is an individual's regarding and accepting himself/herself important (Kuzgun and Bacanlı, 2005). According to Coopersmith (Coopersmith, 1967; see Rizvançe, 2005), self-esteem is the degree to which he/she perceives himself/herself as important, successful and valuable as well as self evaluation of the mentioned individual and his/her protecting this evaluation and the statement of approval or disapproval attitude. According to Çolakkadıoğlu (Çolakkadıoğlu, 2003), self-esteem is the degree of trust to an individual's decision making abilities. Individual's high levels of self-esteem may provide more healthy decision making ability (Brown and Mann, 1991). Generally, self-esteem is defined as a personal worthiness attitude and the sum of emotional

thoughts reached as a result of an individual's self attitudes (Coopersmith, 1967; Rosenberg, 1965), characteristics (Bagley *et al*., 1983; Budak, 2000; Yörükoğlu, 1998; Wells and Marwel, 1976) and the evaluation of behaviors and attitudes of the surrounding people towards an individual (Mead, 1934; Rogers, 1951; Yalom, 2002) (See Rizvançe, 2005, p. 32). Self-esteem and trust of an individual in the decision making process is the dominant variable of this process (Mann *et al*., 1998).

Another variable affecting decision making processes of individuals is decision making styles. Decision making style is defined as the situation in which an individual shows an attitude, reaction and activities in a decision giving style (Phillips *et al*., 1984). Furthermore, decision making style states the individual difference in evaluating the information while making decision or solving problem (Thunholm, 2004).

According to Deniz (Deniz, 2004), individuals use the styles of careful, avoidant, dilatory and panic in the decision making process. The individuals who apply the careful decision making style elaborately look for the related information before taking decision and make the choice after evaluating the alternatives carefully. The individuals who apply avoidant decision making style avoid making decisions and tend to leave the decisions to other people. Thus, they try to get rid of making decision by turning the responsibility over somebody else. The individuals who apply dilatory decision making style constantly try to delay or postpone the decision. The individuals who apply panic decision making style feel themselves under pressure of time when they encounter with a situation of decision making. As a result of this, they show careless behaviors and tend to reach rapid solutions.

The studies regarding decision making styles show that people use very different methods when making decisions (KaÇık, 2009, p. 11). Characteristics of individuals enable them to make decisions in different way as these characteristics combine with their abilities. As a result, this means the usage of decision making styles (Tümer, 1999). Lots of different decision making styles which are very similar to each other in terms of content while very different in terms of detail have been acquired in the literature review carried out in relation to decision making styles (Tekin and Ehtiyar, 2010, p. 3399). Some of these definitions are as follows: Decision making style is a response which is learned, become a pattern and shown when an individual encounter with a situation of making decision (Scott and Bruce, 1995, p. 820). Decision making style is a characteristic behavior of the individual affected in the process of decision making (Hulderman, 2003, p. 4).

Alternatives should be evaluated well before making decision. Therefore, decision making rises as a problem. In one respect, we have to make decision in order to solve a problem (Deniz, 2004, p. 24).

There are lots of definitions concerning problem solving. While Kruger (Kruger, 1997) defines problems solving as the systematic process of intervention to undesired situations, Morgan (Morgan, 1999) defines it as finding the best way to deal with the encountered problem. Again in another definition, problem solving is defined as purposive, behavioral, cognitive and emotional reactions by meeting the needs caused from inner and outer changes in daily lives of individuals (Heppner and Krauskopf, 1987; Shewchuk *et al*., 2000).

An individual must acquire a problem solving skill in order to maintain his/her life healthily and protect his/her mental health. Effective problem solving skill requires being flexible, being attuned to an environment easily and solving problems in order to reach the desired purpose (Arın, 2006, p. 43). According to Heppner and Anderson (1985), the individuals who do not solve the problems effectively are more anxious and distrustful and they remain incapable in understanding anticipations of other people when compared to the individuals who have effective problem solving skills (See. Izgar *et al*., 2004, p. 2).

According to Bingham (Bingham, 2004, p. 26-36), there is only one way to solve all the problems effectively. Problem solving behavior varies according to situation and time. It is possible for a problem solver to his/her attitude and steps from problem to problem. In spite of these changes, there are some basic aspects of problem solving process which is conclusive and seeming as highly similar. These are:

1. Identifying the problem and feeling the need for dealing with this problem,
2. Trying to explain the problem, to recognize and the quality and area of this problem and to comprehend the secondary problems concerning the aforementioned problem,
3. Collecting data and information concerning the problem,

4. Choosing and regulating the most suitable data for the problem,
5. Determining various possible solution ways in the light of information concerning collected data and problems,
6. Evaluating solution aspects and choosing the best one which is suitable for the situation,
7. Implementing the agreed solution way (trying),
8. Evaluating the used problem solving method.

The purpose of this study is to determine whether there are differences in terms of some demographic features on professional tourist guides concerning their self-esteem, decision making styles and problem solving skills.

Purpose and Importance of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the effect of some demographic features on professional tourist guides concerning their self-esteem, decision making styles and problem solving skills. The importance of this study stems from the fact that there are very few studies in national and international literature regarding self-esteem, decision making styles and problem solving skills of the employees working in tourism sector. In this respect, this study shall greatly contribute to the literature.

Professional tourist guides serve for various tourist groups every day. They generally also serve for those people who are very different from each other in terms of culture and ethnical identity. It is very important for a tourist guide to use his/her self-esteem and decision making styles in order to solve the problems stemming from both group members and other reasons such as tour routes, programs and plans. There is nobody to help the guide during the tour. Thus, he/she has to solve lots of problems immediately there and ensure the satisfaction of tourist group. Otherwise, tourist satisfaction will be affected negatively, there will be complaints and even this will affect negatively the tourist's coming back to that country.

Methodology of the Study

Working Group

Working group of the study is composed of 648 participants who are actively working as tourist guides in the provinces ofAntalya, Ankara, Muğla, Antalya. First of all, the acquired data was transmitted to computer and 126 scales which were left empty with a rate of 2/3 were removed from the matrix. Then, statistic analyses were carried out from 442 participants after multivariate and univariate outliers had been cleaned from data set.

Data Collection Tool

The data collection tool which was prepared to collect the data in this study being performed in accordance with relational screening model of screening models is composed of four parts. In the first part, personal information of the participants along with the purpose of the scale, total statement number, form of response and average response time were included. In the second part, there are six statements which aim at determining self-esteem (self-trust) in decision making. In the third part, there are 22 statements measuring decision making styles. And finally in the fourth part, there are 35 statements measuring problem solving skills.

Self-esteem scale in decision making is composed of six items developed as likert type trial ranking and three items are graded in an opposite way. Grading is carried out as "True (2 points)", "Sometimes True (1)" and "Not True (0)" in order to determine accrual level of each item. The highest point that can be acquired from the scale is 12. High points mean high levels of self-esteem in the decision making

process. Reliability co-efficient of the scale was found as .74 for six countries (USA, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan) (Mann *et al*., 1998). Reliability and validity works of this scale was carried out by Deniz (Deniz, 2004) in Turkey and he found the reliability co-efficient of the scale as. 72.

Decision Making Style scale is composed of 22 titles developed as likert type trial ranking scale. Grading is as "True (2 points)", "Sometimes True (1)" and "Not True (0)" in order to determine accrual level of each item. Decision Making Style scale is composed of four sub-scales which are careful, avoidant, dilatory and panic. High levels of the points indicate that the concerned decision making styles are used. Mann and his friends (Mann *et al*., 1998) suggest that features of sub-scales are explained below according to the results acquired from six countries (See: Deniz, 2004);

- Careful Decision Making Style: It is composed of six items and its reliability co-efficient has been found as .80. The individuals taking place in this group looks for information before giving decision and make the choice by evaluating the alternatives. Deniz also (Deniz, 2004) has found the reliability co-efficient as .80.
- Avoidant Decision Making Style: It is composed of six items and its reliability co-efficient has been found as .87. Deniz (Deniz, 2004) found the reliability co-efficient as .78. The individuals taking place in this group avoid from making decisions and want other people to give the decisions on behalf of them. Therefore, they take their responsibilities to other people and try to get rid of these responsibilities.
- Dilatory Decision Making Style: It is composed of five items and its reliability co-efficient has been found as .81. Deniz (Deniz, 2004) found the reliability co-efficient as .64 which is a bit low. The individuals taking place in this group permanently delay and postpone their decisions. They always delay their decisions without connecting this act to any reason.
- Panic Decision Making Style: It is composed of five items and its reliability co-efficient has been found as .74. Deniz (Deniz, 2004) found the reliability co-efficient as .71. The individuals taking place in this group feel themselves under pressure of time when they encounter with a situation of decision making and they show thoughtless behaviors and give rapid decisions.

Problem Solving Inventory: Problem solving inventory (PSI) was developed by Heppner and Petersen and adapted to Turkish by ġahin, ġahin and Heppner (1993). Problem Solving Inventory is a scale self-evaluating scale which measures the perception of problem solving skills of an individual. Likert type six ranking scale was used in order to determine realization level of each item taking place in the scale which includes "I always behave like that (1)", "I mostly behave like that (2)", "I frequently behave like that (3)", I sometimes behave like that (4)" "I scarcely behave like that (5)", I never behave like that (6)". Problem solving inventory is composed of six sub-scales which are Hasty Approach, Considering Approach, Avoidant Approach, Evaluative Approach, Self-Confident Approach and Planned Approach. When the scale is graded, total point was found by reversing the negative statements. The lowest point is 32 and the highest point is 192 in the scale. The high levels of points acquired from the scale mean that the individual feels himself/herself insufficient regarding problem solving skills and low levels of points mean that the individual feels himself/herself sufficient. Crohnbach Alfa reliability co-efficient was found as .88 by dividing the odd numbers and even numbers and the acquired reliability co-efficient was found as 0.81 by using the dividing technique within the scope of the studies carried out for adapting test into Turkish (SavaĢır and ġahin, 1997).

Analysis of Data

Within the scope of this study, t test and one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used in order to compare group averages with each other. LSD was used for the situations in which variance homogeneity was provided and Tamhane test was used for the situations in which variance homogeneity was not provided in bilateral comparisons. SPSS 17.00 program was used in the analysis of data and importance level was found as .05.

Findings and Comments

Demographic findings regarding the individuals participated in the study are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Features of the Participants.

Variable		N	%
Gender	Female	309	69,9
	Male	133	30,1
	Total	442	100
Marital Status	Married	251	56,8
	Single	191	43,2
	Total	442	100,0
Education	High school	54	12,2
	College	108	24,4
	University	250	56,6
	Postgraduate	30	6,8
	Total	442	100,0
Age	30 and below	120	27,1
	31-35	81	18,3
	36-40	107	24,2
	41-45	52	11,8
	46-50	42	9,5
	51-55	19	4,3
	56 and above	21	4,8
	Total	442	100,0

As it is seen in Table 1, 69.9% of the guides are male and 30.1% of them are female. 56.8% of the guides are married while 43.2% of them are single. When the education levels of the guides are observed, it is seen that 12.2% of them are graduates of high school, 24.4% of them are associate degree, 56.6% of them are bachelor's degree and 6.8% of them are post graduate. When the ages of guides are examined, it is seen that 27.1% of them are 30 years old and below, 18.3% of them are between 31 and 35 years old, 24.2% of them are between 36 and 40 years old, 11.8% of them are between 41 and 45 years old, 9.5% of them are between 46 and 50, 4.3% of them are between 51 and 55, 4.8% of them are 56 years old and above. Moreover, average age of the guides was found to be 37.3.

T test was carried out in order to compare self-esteem, decision making style sup-scales and problem solving skill points in decision making in terms of gender and the results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. T test results of the participants regarding their self-esteem, decision making style sup-scales and problem solving skill points in decision making according to gender variable.

Variable		Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	F	P
Gender	Self-esteem	Female	309	6,33	1,23	440	-1,34	,18
		Male	133	6,50	1,24			
	Cautious	Female	309	10,48	1,59	440	,04	,96
		Male	133	10,47	1,64			
	Abstaining	Female	309	12,04	4,32	440	,34	,73
		Male	133	11,89	4,12			
	Dilatory	Female	309	2,76	1,97	440	1,01	,31
		Male	133	2,56	2,00			
	Panic	Female	309	2,41	2,54	440	-,68	,50
		Male	133	2,58	1,91			
	Problem solving skills	Female	309	77,89	16,58	440	,93	,35
		Male	133	76,36	14,33			

When the Table 2 is examined, a significant difference was not found between self-esteem, decision making style sub-dimensions and problem solving skills according to gender variable of the participants in T Test results.

T test was carried out in order to compare self-esteem, decision making style sup-scales and problem solving skill points in decision making in terms of marital status and the results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. T test results of the participants regarding their self-esteem, decision making style sup scales and problem solving skill points in decision making according to marital status variable.

Variable		Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	df	F	P
Marital status	Self-esteem	Married	251	6,36	1,24	440	-,39	,70
		Single	191	6,41	1,23			
	Cautious	Married	251	10,43	1,62	440	-,64	,52
		Single	191	10,53	1,59			
	Abstaining	Married	251	12,17	4,37	440	1,02	,31
		Single	191	11,75	4,12			
	Dilatory	Married	251	2,75	2,09	440	,57	,57
		Single	191	2,64	1,84			
	Panic	Married	251	2,38	2,65	440	-,89	,37
		Single	191	2,58	1,93			
	Problem solving skills	Married	251	77,16	15,99	440	-,41	,68
		Single	191	77,78	15,90			

When the Table 3 is examined, a significant difference was not found between self-esteem, decision making style sub-dimensions and problem solving skills according to marital status variable of the participants in T Test results.

Results regarding self-esteem, decision making style sup-scales and problem solving skill points in decision making in terms of the participants' age variable are shown in Table 4, Table 5, Table 6, Table 7, Table 8, Table 9 and Table 10.

Table 4. Self-esteem points variance analysis results of the participants according to age variable.

Variable	Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Age	30 and below	120	6,52	1,30	Between Groups	11,17	6	1,86	1,23	,29
	31-35	81	6,16	1,31	Within Groups	659,54	435	1,52		
	36-40	107	6,23	1,21	Total	670,71	441			
	41-45	52	6,47	1,07						
	46-50	42	6,55	1,06						
	51-55	19	6,47	1,35						
	56 and above	21	6,56	1,23						
	Total	442	6,38	1,23						

When the Table 4 is examined, according to the one way variance analysis carried out in order to determine whether there is a significant difference or not between self-esteem and ages of the participants in decision making process, there was not found a significant difference between self-esteem and ages of the participants in decision making process.

When the Table 5 is examined, according to the one way variance analysis carried out in order to determine whether there is a significant difference or not between DECISION MAKING STYLES CAREFUL SUB-TEST POINT levels and ages of the participants in decision making process, there was not found a significant difference between DECISION MAKING STYLES CAREFUL SUB-TEST POINT levels and ages of the participants in decision making process.

Table 5. Decision making styles careful sub-test points variance analysis results according to age variable of the participants.

Variable	Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Age	30 and below	120	10,61	1,57	Between Groups	7,08	6	1,18	,46	,84
	31-35	81	10,46	1,62	Within Groups	1127,69	435	2,59		
	36-40	107	10,41	1,55	Total	1134,78	441			
	41-45	52	10,41	1,63						
	46-50	42	10,36	1,66						
	51-55	19	10,16	2,01						
	56 and above	21	10,76	1,55						
	Total	442	10,48	1,60						

Table 6. Decision making STYLES avoidant SUB-TEST point variance analysis results according to age variable of the participants

Variable	Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Age	30 and below	120	11,73	4,00	Between Groups	83,92	6	13,99	,77	,60
	31-35	81	11,92	4,25	Within Groups	7921,78	435	18,21		
	36-40	107	12,04	4,51	Total	8005,70	441			
	41-45	52	11,95	4,19						
	46-50	42	12,39	4,47						
	51-55	19	11,11	3,63						
	56 and above	21	13,59	4,80						
	Total	442	11,99	4,26						

When the Table 6 is examined, according to the one way variance analysis carried out in order to determine whether there is a significant difference or not between decision making STYLES avoidant SUB-TEST point levels and ages of the participants in decision making process, there was not found a significant difference between decision making STYLES avoidant SUB-TEST point levels and ages of the participants in decision making process.

As it is understood from the Table 7, when the decision making style dilatory sub-test points of the participants according to their age variable, it was found that decision making style dilatory sub-test point averages of the participants/individuals was .05 statistically. LSD test was applied in order to determine the group causing this difference and it was seen that the individuals whose ages range between 51 and 55 caused this difference.

Table 7. Decision making STYLES dilatory SUB-TEST point variance analysis results according to age variable of the participants.

Variable	Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Age	30 and below	120	2,80	1,95	Between Groups	60,36	6	10,06	2,61	,02*
	31-35	81	2,34	1,69	Within Groups	1674,71	435	3,85		
	36-40	107	2,60	2,05	Total	1735,08	441			
	41-45	52	2,77	1,99						
	46-50	42	2,55	2,04						
	51-55	19	4,26	2,02						
	56 and above	21	2,76	2,28						
	Total	442	2,70	1,98						

***.** *The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.*

Table 8. Decision making STYLES panic SUB-TEST point variance analysis results according to age variable of the participants.

Variable	Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Age	30 and below	120	2,758	2,004	Between Groups	37,01	6	6,17	1,10	,36
	31-35	81	2,618	3,736	Within Groups	2430,40	435	5,59		
	36-40	107	2,109	2,000	Total	2467,41	441			
	41-45	52	2,391	1,730						
	46-50	42	2,190	1,838						
	51-55	19	3,035	1,902						
	56 and above	21	2,190	1,662						
	Total	442	2,463	2,365						

When the Table 8 is examined, according to the one way variance analysis carried out in order to determine whether there is a significant difference or not between decision making STYLES panic SUB-TEST point levels and ages of the participants in decision making process, there was not found a significant difference between decision making STYLES panic SUB-TEST point levels and ages of the participants in decision making process.

When the Table 9 is examined, according to the one way variance analysis carried out in order to determine whether there is a significant difference or not between problem solving skill point levels and ages of the participants, there was not found a significant difference between problem solving skill point levels of the participants and ages of the participants.

Table 9. Problem solving point variance analysis results according to age variable of the participants.

Variable	Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Age	30 and below	120	79,90	16,10	Between Groups	1775,85	6	295,98	1,17	,32
	31-35	81	78,07	15,47	Within Groups	110243,96	435	253,43		
	36-40	107	74,61	15,08	Total	112019,81	441			
	41-45	52	77,64	18,68						
	46-50	42	75,89	15,20						
	51-55	19	78,83	16,47						
	56 and above	21	76,48	14,13						
	Total	442	77,43	15,94						

Table 10. Self-esteem point variance analysis results in decision making process according to educational status of the participants.

Variable	Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Education	High school	54	6,15	1,20	Between Groups	4,09	3	1,36	,90	,44
	College	108	6,35	1,23	Within Groups	666,62	438	1,52		
	University	250	6,42	1,22	Total	670,71	441			
	Postgraduate	30	6,54	1,38						
	Total	442	6,38	1,23						

When the Table 10 is examined, according to the one way variance analysis carried out in order to determine whether there is a significant difference or not between self-esteem variance analysis in decision making process and educational status of the participants, there was not a significant difference between self-esteem variance analysis and educational status of the participants in decision making process.

As it is understood from the Table 11, when the decision making style careful sub-test points of the participants according to their education variable, it was found that decision making style careful sub-test point averages of the participants/individuals was .05 statistically. LSD test was applied in order to determine the group causing this difference and it was seen that the individuals whose were post graduates caused this difference.

When the Table 12 is examined, according to the one way variance analysis carried out in order to determine whether there is a significant difference or not between the variances of decision making styles careful sub- test point and educational status of the participants, there was not a significant difference between the variances of decision making styles careful sub- test point and educational status of the participants.

Table 11. Decision making styles careful sub-test point variance analysis results of the participants according to their educational status.

Variable	Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Education	High school	54	10,06	1,85	Between Groups	25,65	3	8,55	3,38	,02*
	College	108	10,53	1,65	Within Groups	1109,13	438	2,53		
	University Postgraduate	250	10,46	1,55	Total	1134,78	441			
		30	11,20	1,13						
	Total	442	10,48	1,60						

***.** *The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level*.

.

Table 12. Decision making styles avoidant sub-test point variance analysis results of the participants according to their educational status variance.

Variable	Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Education	High school	54	12,51	4,13	Between Groups	17,96	3	5,99	,33	,80
	College	108	11,83	3,83	Within Groups	7987,74	438	18,24		
	University Postgraduate	250	11,95	4,41	Total	8005,70	441			
		30	12,01	4,76						
	Total	442	11,99	4,26						

Table 13. Decision making styles dilatory sub-test point variance analysis results of the participants according to their educational status variance.

Variable	Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Education	High school	54	2,58	1,93	Between Groups	6,46	3	2,15	,55	,65
	College	108	2,57	1,82	Within Groups	1728,61	438	3,95		
	University Postgraduate	250	2,74	2,05	Total	1735,08	441			
		30	3,03	2,14						
	Total	442	2,70	1,98						

When the Table 13 is examined, according to the one way variance analysis carried out in order to determine whether there is a significant difference or not between the variances of decision making styles dilatory sub- test point and educational status of the participants, there was not a significant difference between the variances of decision making styles dilatory sub- test point and educational status of the participants.

Table 14. Decision making styles panic sub-test point variance analysis results of the participants according to their educational status variance.

Variable	Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Education	High school	54	2,31	1,76	Between Groups	3,52	3	1,17	,21	,89
	College	108	2,48	1,85	Within Groups	2463,89	438	5,63		
	University	250	2,52	2,74	Total	2467,41	441			
	Postgraduate	30	2,23	1,57						
	Total	442	2,46	2,37						

When the Table 14 is examined, according to the one way variance analysis carried out in order to determine whether there is a significant difference or not between the variances of decision making styles panic sub- test point and educational status of the participants, there was not a significant difference between the variances of decision making styles panic sub- test point and educational status of the participants.

Table 15. Problem solving skill point variance analysis results of the participants according to their educational status variance.

Variable	Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P
Education	High school	54	79,82	18,69	Between Groups	1491,93	3	497,31	1,97	,12
	College	108	78,92	14,78	Within Groups	110527,88	438	252,35		
	University	250	76,91	15,95	Total	112019,81	441			
	Postgraduate	30	72,03	13,51						
	Total	442	77,43	15,94						

When the Table 15 is examined, according to the one way variance analysis carried out in order to determine whether there is a significant difference or not between problem solving skill point levels and educational status of the participants, there was not found a significant difference between problem solving skill point levels and educational status of the participants.

Results and Suggestions

It was found that 69.9% of the participants are male, 56.8% of them are married, 56.6% of them are graduates of bachelors degree and 27.1% of them are 30 years old or below. In T Test results, it was observed that there is not significant difference between self-esteem, decision making style sub-dimensions and problem solving skills of the participants according to the variables of age, marital status in T Test results.

When it is examined, according to the one way variance analysis carried out in order to determine whether there is a significant difference or not between the variances of decision making styles careful, avoidant and panic sub- test point level and ages of the participants, there was not a significant difference between the variances of decision making styles careful, avoidant and panic sub- test point level and ages of the participants while it was determined that decision making style dilatory sub-test statistical point averages of the participants/individuals changed significantly and the difference was caused by the age group of 51–55 when the dilatory sub-test points of the participants are observed.

According to the one way variance analysis carried out in order to determine whether there is a significant difference or not between the variances of self-esteem, dilatory, panic sub- test point level and education of the participants, there was not a significant difference between the level of self-esteem and education of the participants while it was determined that decision making style careful sub-test statistical point averages of the participants/individuals changed significantly and the difference was caused by the post graduate individuals when the careful sub-test points of the participants are observed.

References

1. ADAIR, J. (2000). Karar Verme ve Problem Çözme. Çeviren: Nurdan Kalaycı. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
2. ARIN, A. (2006). Lise Yöneticilerinin Öğretim Liderliği Davranışları ile Kullandıkları Karar Verme Stratejileri ve Problem Çözme Becerileri Arasındaki İlişki Düzeyi. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Eskisehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
3. BAGLEY C., VERMA, G. K. and MALLICK K. (1983). The Comparative Structure of Self- Esteem in British and Indian Adolescents. Verma G. K. and Bagley C. (Eds.). Self Concept, Achievment And Multicultural Education, London: Macmillan Pres, 212226.
4. BATMAN, O., YILDIRGAN, R. and DEMİRTAş, N. (2000). Turizm Rehberliği, Adapazarı: Değişim Yayınları.
5. BINGHAM, A. (2004). Çocuklarda Problem Çözme Yeteneklerinin Geliştirilmesi (Çev: A. Ferhan Oğuzkan), Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınları, No:3130, İstanbul.
6. BROWN, B. (2006), Working The Problems of Tourism, *Annals of Tourism Research*, **24** (2), 364383.
7. BROWN, J.E. and MANN, L. (1991). Decision- Making Competence And Self-Esteem: A Comparision Of Parents And Adolescent. *Journal Of Adolescence*, **14**, 363371.
8. BUDAK. S. (2000). Psikoloji Sözlüğü. Ankara: Bilim ve Sanat Yayınları.
9. COHEN, E. H., IFERGAN, M. and COHEN, E. (2002). A New Paradigm in Guiding, The Madrich as a Role Model. *Annals of Tourism Research*, **29** (4), 919932.
10. COOPERSMITH, S. (1967). The Antecedents of Self-esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
11. CRICK, M. (1992), Life in the Informal Sector: Street Guides in Kandy, Sri Lanka. Tourism & The Less Developed Countries, Editor: David Harrison, London: Belhaven Press.
12. ÇOLAKKADIOĞLU, O. (2003). Ergenlerde Karar Verme Ölçeğinin Uyarlama Çalışması. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

13. DAHLES, H. (2002), The Politics of Tour Guidıng: Image Management in Indonesia, *Annals of Tourism Research*, **29** (3), 783800.

14. DENIZ, M.E. (2004). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Karar Vermede Özsaygı, Karar Verme Stilleri ve Problem Çözme Becerileri Arasındaki Ġliğkinin Ġncelenmesi Üzerine Bir AraÇtırma. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, **15**, 2335.

15. DOSWELL, R. (1979), Further Case Studies in Tourism University of Strathclyde, 5. Tourism Services and Tourist Guides by Thierry Quintrie Lamothe, London.

16. HEPPNER, P.P. and ANDERSON, W.P. (1985). The Realionship Between Problem- Solving Self-Appraisal and Psychological Adjustment. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*. **4**, 415427.

17. HEPPNER, P.P. and KRAUSKOPF, C.J. (1987). An Information-Processing Approach to Personal Problem Solving. *The Counseling Psychologist*. **15** (3), 371447.

18. HULDERMAN, A.M. (2003). "Decision-Making Styles and Learning Strategies of Police Officers: Implications for Community Policing", Doctorate Thesis. Oklahoma State University Faculty of the Graduate College, Oklahoma.

19. IZGAR, H., GÜRSEL, M., KESICI, ġ. And NEGIğ, A. (2004). Önder DavranıÇlarının Problem Çözme Becerisine Etkisi. XIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı Bildiri Kitabı. Malatya.

20. KAğIK, D.Z. (2009). Ergenlerde Karar Verme Stilleri ve Algılanan Sosyal Destek Düzeylerinin Sosyal Yetkinlik Beklentisi ve Bazı DeğiÇkenler Açısından Ġncelenmesi. YayınlanmamıÇ Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.

21. KRUGER, L.J. (1997). Social Support and Self- Efficacy in Problem Solving Among Teacher Assistance Teams and School Staff. *Journal of Educational Research*. **90** (3), 164168.

22. KUZGUN, Y. (1992). Karar Stratejileri Ölçeği: GeliÇtirilmesi ve Standardizasyonu. VII. Ulusal Psikoloji Kongresi Bilimsel ÇalıÇmaları. Türk Psikologlar Derneği, 161170.

23. KUZGUN, Y. and BACANLI, F. (2005). Rehberlik ve Psikolojik DanıÇmada Kullanılan Ölçme Araçları ve Programlar Dizisi. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

24. MANN, L., RADFORD, M., BURNETT, P., FORD, S., BOND, M., LEUNG, K., NAKAMURA, H., VAUGHAN, G. and YANG, K.S. (1998). Cross-Cultural Differences in Self-Reported Decision-Making Style and Confidence. *International Journal of Psychology*. **33** (5), 325335.

25. MEAD, G. H. (1934). Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

26. MORGAN, C.T. (1999). Psikolojiye GiriÇ Çev: H. Arıcı ve Diğ. Meteksan Yayınları, 13. Baskı, Ankara.

27. PHILIPS, S.D., PAZIENZA, N.J. and FERRIN, H.H. (1984). Decision-Making Styles and Problem-Solving Appraisal. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, **31**(4), 497502.

28. RIZVANÇE, ġ. (2005). Türkiye ve Makedonya'daki Lise Öğrencilerinin Özsaygı Düzeylerinin KarÇılaÇtırılması. YayınlanmamıÇ Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

29. ROGERS, C. R. (1951). Client- Centered Therapy. Boston: Hougthon Mifflin Conpany.

30. ROSENBERG, M. (1965). Society and The Adolescent Self- Ġmage. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

31. SAVAğIR, I. ve ġAHIN, N.H. (1997). BiliÇsel-DavranıÇçı Terapilerde Değerlendirme: Sık Kullanılan Ölçekler. Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.

32. SCOTT, G.S. and BRUCE, A.R. (1995). Decision Making Style: The Development and Assessment of a New Measure, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. **55** (5), 818831.

33. SHEWCHUK, R.M., JOHNSON, M.O. and ELLĠOTT, T.R. (2000). Self-Appraised Social Problem Solving Abilities, Emotional Reactions and Actual Problem Solving Performance. *Behavior Research and Therapy*. **38**, 727740.

34. SHILOH, S., KOREN, S. and ZAKAY, D. (2001). Individual Differences in Compensatory Decision Making Style and Need for Closure as Correlates of Subjective Decision Complexity and Difficulty. *Personality and Individual Differences*, **30**, 699710.

35. SNELL, S. and CARPENTER, J. (1992), Commucitaions in Travel and Tourism. "Practical guide-lines and assigments for students of travel and tourism." Hodder&Stoughton, London Sydney Auckland, Toronto.

36. TANGÜLER, A. (2002). Profesyonel Turist Rehberliği ve Profesyonel Turist Rehberlerinin Seyahat Acentası ve Müşteri İlişkileri (Kapadokya Örneği). Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara. http://www.tureb.net/tanguler/2-anabolum.doc, Erişim Tarihi: 22.06.2011.

37. TEKIN, Ö.A. and EHTIYAR, R. (2010). Yönetimde Karar Verme: Batı Antalya Bölgesindeki Beş Yıldızlı Otellerde Çalışan Farklı Departman Yöneticilerinin Karar Verme Stilleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Journal of Yaşar University*. **20** (5), 33943414.

38. THUNHOLM, P. (2004). Decision Making Style: Habit, *Style or Both? Personality and Individual Differences*. **36**, 931–944.

39. TÜMER, A. ġ. (1999). Endüstriyel Örgütlerde Davranışsal Açıdan Karar Stillerinin Belirlenmesi ve Bir Uygulama Örneği: Ford Otosan A.ġ., Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.

40. von WINTERFELD, D. and EDWARDS, W. (1986). Decision Analysis and Behavioral Risk. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

41. WELLS, R. and MARWELL, G. (1976). Self- Esteem: Its Conceptualisation and Measurements. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

42. YALOM, I. (2002). Grup Terapisinin Teori ve Pratiği (Çev. T. Ataman ve K. Özgür). Ġstanbul: Kabalcı Yayınevi.

43. YARCAN, ġ. and PEKÖZ, M. (1998), Seyahat Öğretmeleri, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi, Ġstanbul.

44. YILMAZ, E. and ALTINOK, V. (2010). Öğretmen Adaylarının Duygusal Zekâ Düzeylerinin Karar Vermede Özsaygı ve Karar Verme Stillerini Yordama. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, **30** (3), 685705.

45. YÖRÜKOĞLU, A. (1998). Çocuk Ruh Sağlığı (22. baskı). Ġstanbul: Özgür Yayınları.