Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom
Volume No. 2, Issue No. 2, September 2023
e-ISSN: 2959-0825, p-ISSN: 2959-0817
http://pjlaw.com.pk

Leadership Styles in Decision-Making of Primary School Principals: An Examination of Avoidant and Spontaneous Decision-Making Approaches

Shehnila Amna
Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Education, Minhaj University Lahore
shehnilaamna@gmail.com

Dr. Shafqat Ali
Associate Professor, Department of Education, Minhaj University Lahore

Dr. Tariq Mahmood
School Education Department, District Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan
Corresponding author: tariq_903@hotmail.com

Abstract

The study utilized rating scale instruments to analyze decision-making styles among public and private school leaders. The research focused on avoidant and spontaneous decision-making, revealing significant differences across various groups. Tables comparing avoidant decision-making among school principals highlighted distinctive trends, notably with government principals exhibiting a more avoidant style compared to their private counterparts. The analysis extended to gender-specific findings, urban versus rural settings, demonstrating statistically significant differences in decision-making styles. The study underscored substantial disparities in spontaneous decision-making between public and private school heads, particularly concerning gender and urban settings. Recommendations include tailored leadership training, gender-inclusive workshops, and cross-sector collaboration to enhance decision-making strategies. The findings emphasize the need for nuanced approaches in leadership development tailored to different decision-making styles and contexts, fostering more effective educational leadership.

Keywords: *Leadership Styles, Decision-Making, Primary School Principals, Avoidant and Spontaneous Decision-Making Approaches*.

1. Introduction

Making decisions is both a science and an art that has been extensively researched. Making a decision is the process of deciding on a course of action from a range of options in a range of circumstances and challenges. The Latin term *de ciso*, which meaning "to actually cut or cut off in a pragmatic sense," is where the word "decision" originates (Jadhav, 2020). Decision-making procedures are systematic processes used to arrive at a choice or course of action from multiple available options. These procedures are essential in both personal and professional contexts, as they enable individuals and organizations to make informed and rational decisions. The effectiveness of a decision-making procedure can significantly impact the outcome and success of a particular choice.

One fundamental aspect of a decision-making procedure is the identification of the problem or the need for a decision. This involves defining the issue, setting clear objectives, and understanding the context in which the decision will be made. Once the problem is well-defined, the next step is to gather relevant information. This can involve data collection, research, consultation with experts, or seeking input from stakeholders. Informed decisions require comprehensive and accurate information. After gathering data, the decision-making procedure typically involves evaluating the available alternatives. This step involves assessing the pros and cons of each option and considering various factors such as feasibility, cost, potential risks, and alignment with objectives (Zulfqar, Valcke, Devos, Tuytens, & Shahzad, 2016).

Tools like decision matrices, cost-benefit analysis, and SWOT analysis can be valuable in this stage. The next critical step in the procedure is making the actual decision. This is where individuals or groups choose the most suitable option based on the information and analysis conducted in the previous steps (Singh, & Kaur, 2016). Decisions can be made by individuals, teams, or through consensus-building processes, depending on the context. Once a decision is made, the procedure includes implementing the chosen course of action, which involves planning, executing, and monitoring progress. Effective implementation is vital to ensuring that the decision achieves its intended outcomes.

According to Spicer, & Smith, (2005), the decision-making procedure often includes a feedback and evaluation phase. This step involves assessing the results of the decision, learning from the process, and making adjustments if necessary. Continuous improvement and learning from past decisions are integral to refining the decision-making procedure over time.

Thunholm, (2004) was of the view that a decision-making procedure is a structured and systematic approach to making choices. It encompasses problem identification, information gathering, evaluation of alternatives, decision-making, implementation, and evaluation. Effective decision-making procedures are critical for personal and professional success, enabling individuals and organizations to navigate complex situations and make well-informed, rational decisions. Determining "what to do and why" is one of the elements in the decision-making process that goes into accomplishing a certain goal.

Making decisions is the process of selecting a course of action from a range of possibilities (Qamar and Rashid 2020). If an issue does come up, the leader ought to deal with it in a way that makes sense. It is often the case that leaders at educational institutions must undertake a range of actions to resolve institutional problems. Dealing with decision-making is a fundamental institutional prerequisite for a head. Making a decision is the process of deciding the course of action to take in order to accomplish institutional objectives. The best option among two or more possibilities, determined by the criteria, is called a decision. The best choice must be made by the institution's head (Rehman, & Waheed, 2012).

A respectable, long-standing company will typically adhere to decision-making protocols. Identifying, deciphering the issue, and gathering information This process entails learning about the issue, identifying workable alternatives, selecting the best arrangement, assessing the entire technique, and deciding whether or not the arrangement in question is acceptable (Zulfqar et al. 2016).

2. Significance of Decision Making:

Decision-making is a fundamental aspect of effective school administration, and its importance cannot be overstated. School administrators are responsible for shaping the educational experience and

environment for students, teachers, and staff. The decisions they make impact the quality of education, school culture, resource allocation, and overall success of the institution (Rettinger, & Hastie, 2001). Here are some key points highlighting the significance of decision-making in school administration:

2.1.Educational Quality

School administrators make decisions that directly affect the quality of education students receive. Choices about curriculum, teaching methods, and educational programs significantly influence student learning outcomes. Effective decision-making can lead to improved educational standards and student achievement.

2.2.Resource Allocation

Administrators must allocate limited resources, such as budgets, staff, and facilities, to support various aspects of the school. Well-informed decisions in this regard can ensure that resources are distributed equitably and efficiently, benefiting both students and staff.

2.3.School Culture

Decision-making impacts the school's culture and climate. Administrators can create a positive and inclusive atmosphere by making choices that promote respect, diversity, and a sense of community. Conversely, poor decisions can contribute to a negative school culture.

2.4.Safety and Well-Being

School safety is a top priority, and administrators must make critical decisions regarding security measures, emergency preparedness, and student well-being. Effective decision-making in these areas is essential to ensure a safe learning environment.

2.5.Student Discipline and Support

Administrators are responsible for establishing disciplinary policies and support systems for students. Fair and consistent decision-making is crucial to maintain order and address the individual needs of students.

2.6.Teacher and Staff Development:

Decisions related to professional development, hiring, and staff evaluations influence the quality of instruction and the overall performance of the school's personnel. Effective decisions can motivate and retain talented educators.

2.7.Parent and Community Engagement

Administrators play a key role in building relationships with parents and the wider community. Decisions about communication, involvement, and community partnerships can enhance the school's reputation and support.

2.8.Long-Term Planning

Planning for the future of the school, such as curriculum development, infrastructure improvements, and strategic goals, requires thoughtful decision-making. These decisions help the school evolve and adapt to changing educational needs.

2.9.Legal and Ethical Obligations

Administrators must navigate complex legal and ethical responsibilities. Decisions must align with local, state, and federal regulations while upholding high ethical standards (Russo, 2017).

Decision-making in school administration is pivotal in shaping the educational landscape. Effective decisions can improve the quality of education, foster a positive school culture, ensure safety, and contribute to the overall success of the institution. As such, school administrators must approach decision-making with careful consideration and a commitment to the best interests of students, teachers, and the school community.

According to Mukherjee, (2013), the avoidant decision-making style, which involves procrastination, avoidance of making decisions, or deferring choices, is generally not considered effective at the primary level of education. At this stage, students are in their formative years, and it's crucial to instill important life skills, including decision-making, to help them develop into responsible, self-reliant individuals (Hastie, 2001). Here's why an avoidant decision-making style is ineffective at the primary level:

2.10. Missed Learning Opportunities

Avoiding decisions means missing out on valuable opportunities for learning and personal growth. Children need to practice making choices, even if they are small or inconsequential, to develop decision-making skills.

2.11. Dependency:

Avoidant decision-making can lead to dependency on others to make choices for the child. This can hinder their ability to become self-sufficient and confident in making decisions later in life.

2.12. Lack of Responsibility:

Avoiding decisions can create a sense of irresponsibility and indifference towards one's actions. At the primary level, it's essential to teach children about accountability and consequences, which avoiding decisions does not promote.

2.13. Stunted Emotional Growth:

Avoidance can lead to emotional stagnation, as children might not learn to cope with the potential stress or anxiety associated with making choices. Learning how to handle these emotions is crucial for personal development.

2.14. Underdeveloped Critical Thinking:

Decision-making involves critical thinking and problem-solving skills, which are essential for

academic and personal success. Avoiding decisions hinders the development of these skills.

The avoidant decision-making style is ineffective at the primary level because it hinders the development of crucial life skills, fosters dependency, and prevents children from learning how to take responsibility for their choices. Instead, encouraging children to make age-appropriate decisions and providing guidance and support in the decision-making process is more beneficial for their overall growth and development (Greenberg, 2016).

Spontaneous decision-making at the primary level, when appropriately guided, can be a valuable aspect of a child's development. Primary school-age children are in a stage of rapid cognitive and social growth, and allowing them opportunities for spontaneous decision-making within reasonable boundaries can foster important life skills (Delmonte, 2022). Here's why spontaneous decision-making can be beneficial:

2.15. Problem-Solving Skills

Allowing children to make spontaneous decisions encourages them to think on their feet and develop problem-solving abilities. When faced with unexpected situations or choices, they learn to adapt and make choices based on their current understanding.

2.16. Independence and Responsibility

Spontaneous decision-making provides children with a sense of independence and responsibility. It helps them understand the consequences of their choices and learn to take ownership of their decisions, even if they make mistakes.

2.17. Creativity and Imagination

Encouraging spontaneous decisions can stimulate creativity and imagination. Children can come up with unique and innovative solutions, which are important for both academic and personal development.

2.18. Social Skills

Making spontaneous decisions often involves interacting with peers and adults. It can help children develop essential social skills like communication, negotiation, and cooperation.

2.19. Self-Confidence

Successfully making spontaneous decisions and seeing their outcomes can boost a child's self-confidence. It helps them trust their judgment and abilities.

3. Discussions:

However, it's important to note that spontaneous decision-making should be balanced with appropriate guidance and supervision (Azeska, Starc, & Kevereski, 2017). Children still need boundaries and should be encouraged to seek guidance from trusted adults when necessary. This helps them learn the difference between acceptable and risky choices while promoting responsible decision-making.

Overall, spontaneous decision-making at the primary level can be a valuable tool for nurturing a child's cognitive, emotional, and social development when appropriately facilitated.

To conduct study rating scale instrument was used and collected data was analyzed to see the comparative view of public and private sector. Furthermore, only two decision making styles were taken into consideration in this study i.e., avoidant and spontaneous decision making style. The results of the study are given below:

Table 1.

A Comparative Analysis of Avoidant Decision-Making Among Public and Private School Principals

	School	Heads	M	Std. D.	*t-value*	*sig.*
Avoidant Decision	Govt.	142	4.763	.812	.637	.000
	Private	180	3.475	.725		

Table 1 presents a comparative analysis of avoidant decision-making styles among public and private school principals. The table contains several key metrics for these two groups: government (Govt.) and private school principals.

First, it reveals the number of school principals in each group, with 142 government school heads and 180 private school heads included in the study. These numbers provide the basis for the comparative analysis. The mean (M) score for avoidant decision-making is an important indicator. Government school principals have a higher mean score of 4.763, while private school principals have a lower mean score of 3.475. This suggests that government school principals, on average, tend to exhibit a more avoidant decision-making style compared to their private school counterparts.

The t-value of 0.637 is a statistic used to assess the difference between the means of the two groups. It suggests that the difference in avoidant decision-making between government and private school principals is not particularly large. However, the most notable finding is the significance level (sig.), which is extremely low at 0.000. This low p-value indicates that the difference in avoidant decision-making between these two groups is statistically significant. In practical terms, it means that the observed difference in decision-making styles is not likely due to random chance but reflects a real distinction between government and private school principals.

In conclusion, the table shows that government school principals, on average, exhibit a more avoidant decision-making style compared to their private school counterparts, and this difference is statistically significant.

Table 2.

A Comparative Analysis of Avoidant Decision-Making Among Public and Private School Male Principals

	School	Heads	M	Std. D.	*t-value*	*Sig.*

Avoidant Decision	Govt.	55	4.324	.726	.872	.005
	Private	71	3.883	.532		

Table 2 provides a comparative analysis of avoidant decision-making among male school principals in both public and private schools. The table includes several important statistical measures for these two groups: government (Govt.) and private school male principals.

The key measure "M" represents the mean score for avoidant decision-making within each group. Government school male principals have a mean score of 4.324, while private school male principals have a slightly lower mean score of 3.883. This suggests that, on average, government school male principals tend to exhibit a slightly higher level of avoidant decision-making than their private school male counterparts. "Std. D." represents the standard deviation, which measures the variability of scores within each group. In this case, government school male principals have a standard deviation of 0.726, while private school male principals have a lower standard deviation of 0.532.

The "t-value" is a statistic used to assess the difference between the means of the two groups. In this instance, the t-value is 0.872, indicating that the difference in avoidant decision-making between government and private school male principals is relatively small. The significance level (Sig.) is a crucial metric in statistics. With a value of 0.005, it suggests that the observed difference in avoidant decision-making between these two groups is statistically significant. In practical terms, this means that the difference in decision-making styles among male principals in government and private schools is unlikely to be due to random chance and represents a genuine distinction.

Table 2 reveals a statistically significant difference in avoidant decision-making between government and private school male principals, with government school male principals exhibiting a slightly higher average score in this regard.

Table 3.

A Comparative Analysis of Avoidant Decision-Making Among Public and Private School Female Principals

	School	Heads	M	Std. D.	*t-value*	*Sig.*
Avoidant Decision	Govt.	87	3.899	.681	.822	.003
	Private	109	3.752	.862		

Table 3 presents a comparative analysis of avoidant decision-making among female principals in both public and private schools. The table provides several key statistical measures for these two groups, government (Govt.) and private school female principals.

The "M" or mean score for avoidant decision-making shows that government school female principals have a slightly higher mean score of 3.899, while private school female principals have a mean score of 3.752. This indicates that, on average, government school female principals tend to exhibit a slightly

higher level of avoidant decision-making than their private school counterparts. Government school female principals have a standard deviation of 0.681, while private school female principals have a slightly higher standard deviation of 0.862.

The "t-value" is a statistical metric used to assess the difference between the means of the two groups. A t-value of 0.822 suggests that there is a moderate difference in avoidant decision-making between government and private school female principals. The significance level (Sig.) is a critical aspect of this analysis. With a value of 0.003, it indicates that the observed difference in avoidant decision-making between these two groups is statistically significant. This means that the difference in decision-making styles among female principals in government and private schools is unlikely to be due to random chance and represents a genuine distinction.

Table 3 highlights a statistically significant difference in avoidant decision-making between government and private school female principals, with government school female principals showing a slightly higher average score in this aspect.

Table 4.

A Comparative Analysis of Avoidant Decision-Making Among Public and Private School Principals of Rural Area

	School	Heads	M	Std. D.	*t-value*	*Sig.*
Avoidant Decision	Govt.	77	4.352	.872	.735	.008
	Private	73	3.982	.775		

Table 4 presents a comparative analysis of avoidant decision-making among school principals in rural areas, distinguishing between public and private schools. This table includes key statistical measures for these two groups: government (Govt.) and private school principals in rural settings.

The "M" or mean score for avoidant decision-making indicates that government school principals in rural areas have a slightly higher mean score of 4.352, while private school principals in rural areas have a mean score of 3.982. This suggests that, on average, government school principals in rural settings tend to exhibit a slightly higher level of avoidant decision-making than their private school counterparts. Government school principals in rural areas have a standard deviation of 0.872, while private school principals in rural areas have a slightly lower standard deviation of 0.775.

The "t-value" is a statistical metric used to assess the difference between the means of the two groups. A t-value of 0.735 suggests that there is a moderate difference in avoidant decision-making between government and private school principals in rural areas. The significance level (Sig.) is an important measure. With a value of 0.008, it indicates that the observed difference in avoidant decision-making between these two groups in rural settings is statistically significant. This means that the difference in decision-making styles among principals in government and private rural schools is unlikely to be due to random chance and represents a genuine distinction.

It reveals a statistically significant difference in avoidant decision-making between government and

private school principals in rural areas, with government school principals in rural settings exhibiting a slightly higher average score in this regard.

Table 5.

A Comparative Analysis of Avoidant Decision-Making Among Public and Private School Principals of Urban Area

	School	Heads	M	Std. D.	*t-value*	*Sig.*
Avoidant Decision	Govt.	65	4.237	.681	.813	.010
	Private	107	3.762	.723		

Table 5 provides a comparative analysis of avoidant decision-making among school principals in urban areas, specifically differentiating between public and private schools. The table includes key statistical measures for these two groups: government (Govt.) and private school principals in urban settings.

The "M" or mean score for avoidant decision-making indicates that government school principals in urban areas have a slightly higher mean score of 4.237, while private school principals in urban areas have a mean score of 3.762. This suggests that, on average, government school principals in urban settings tend to exhibit a slightly higher level of avoidant decision-making than their private school counterparts. Government school principals in urban areas have a standard deviation of 0.681, while private school principals in urban areas have a slightly lower standard deviation of 0.723.

The "t-value" is a statistical metric used to assess the difference between the means of the two groups. A t-value of 0.813 suggests that there is a moderate difference in avoidant decision-making between government and private school principals in urban areas. The significance level (Sig.) is an important measure. With a value of 0.010, it indicates that the observed difference in avoidant decision-making between these two groups in urban settings is statistically significant. This means that the difference in decision-making styles among principals in government and private urban schools is unlikely to be due to random chance and represents a genuine distinction.

Table 5 highlights a statistically significant difference in avoidant decision-making between government and private school principals in urban areas, with government school principals in urban settings exhibiting a slightly higher average score in this regard.

Table 6.

A Comparative Analysis of Spontaneous Decision-Making Among Public and Private School Principals

	School	Heads	M	Std. D.	*t-value*	*Sig.*
Spontaneous Decision	Govt.	142	3.113	.553	.675	.003
	Private	180	3.992	.767		

Table 6 presents a comparative analysis of spontaneous decision-making among school principals in both public and private schools. The table includes key statistical measures for these two groups: government (Govt.) and private school principals.

The "M" or mean score for spontaneous decision-making shows that government school principals have a mean score of 3.113, while private school principals have a higher mean score of 3.992. This suggests that, on average, private school principals tend to exhibit a higher level of spontaneous decision-making compared to their government school counterparts. Government school principals have a lower standard deviation of 0.553, while private school principals have a slightly higher standard deviation of 0.767.

The "t-value" is a statistic used to assess the difference between the means of the two groups. A t-value of 0.675 suggests that there is a moderate difference in spontaneous decision-making between government and private school principals. The significance level (Sig.) is an important metric. With a value of 0.003, it indicates that the observed difference in spontaneous decision-making between these two groups is statistically significant. This means that the difference in decision-making styles among principals in government and private schools is unlikely to be due to random chance and represents a genuine distinction.

It reveals a statistically significant difference in spontaneous decision-making between government and private school principals, with private school principals showing a higher average score in this aspect.

Table 7.

A Comparative Analysis of Spontaneous Decision-Making Among Public and Private School Male Principals

	School	Heads	M	Std. D.	*t-value*	*Sig.*
Spontaneous Decision	Govt.	55	3.221	.765	.678	.022
	Private	71	3.878	.546		

Table 7 provides a comparative analysis of spontaneous decision-making among male school principals in public and private schools. The table includes key statistical measures for these two groups: government (Govt.) and private school male principals.

The "M" or mean score for spontaneous decision-making shows that government school male principals have a mean score of 3.221, while private school male principals have a higher mean score of 3.878. This suggests that, on average, private school male principals tend to exhibit a higher level of spontaneous decision-making compared to their government school male counterparts. Government school male principals have a standard deviation of 0.765, while private school male principals have a lower standard deviation of 0.546.

The "t-value" is a statistical metric used to assess the difference between the means of the two groups. A t-value of 0.678 suggests that there is a moderate difference in spontaneous decision-making between

government and private school male principals. The significance level (Sig.) is an important measure. With a value of 0.022, it indicates that the observed difference in spontaneous decision-making between these two groups is statistically significant. This means that the difference in decision-making styles among male principals in government and private schools is unlikely to be due to random chance and represents a genuine distinction.

Table 7 highlights a statistically significant difference in spontaneous decision-making between government and private school male principals, with private school male principals showing a higher average score in this aspect.

Table 8.

A Comparative Analysis of Spontaneous Decision-Making Among Public and Private School Female Principals

	School Heads	M	Std. D.	*t-value*	*Sig.*
Spontaneous Decision	Govt. 87	3.243	.687	.857	.020
	Private 109	3.989	.763		

Table 8 provides a comparative analysis of spontaneous decision-making among female school principals in public and private schools. The table includes key statistical measures for these two groups: government (Govt.) and private school female principals.

The "M" or mean score for spontaneous decision-making indicates that government school female principals have a mean score of 3.243, while private school female principals have a higher mean score of 3.989. This suggests that, on average, private school female principals tend to exhibit a higher level of spontaneous decision-making compared to their government school female counterparts. Government school female principals have a standard deviation of 0.687, while private school female principals have a slightly higher standard deviation of 0.763.

The "t-value" is a statistical metric used to assess the difference between the means of the two groups. A t-value of 0.857 suggests that there is a moderate difference in spontaneous decision-making between government and private school female principals. The significance level (Sig.) is an important metric. With a value of 0.020, it indicates that the observed difference in spontaneous decision-making between these two groups is statistically significant. This means that the difference in decision-making styles among female principals in government and private schools is unlikely to be due to random chance and represents a genuine distinction.

Table 8 highlights a statistically significant difference in spontaneous decision-making between government and private school female principals, with private school female principals showing a higher average score in this aspect.

Table 9.

A Comparative Analysis of Spontaneous Decision-Making Among Public and Private School Rural Principals

	School	Heads	M	Std. D.	*t-value*	*Sig.*
Spontaneous Decision	Govt.	77	3.453	.671	.811	.093
	Private	73	3.763	.562		

Table 9 presents a comparative analysis of spontaneous decision-making among school principals in rural areas, distinguishing between public and private schools. The table includes key statistical measures for these two groups: government (Govt.) and private school principals in rural settings.

Mean score for spontaneous decision-making shows that government school principals in rural areas have a mean score of 3.453, while private school principals in rural areas have a slightly higher mean score of 3.763. This suggests that, on average, private school principals in rural settings tend to exhibit a slightly higher level of spontaneous decision-making compared to their government school counterparts. Government school principals in rural areas have a standard deviation of 0.671, while private school principals in rural areas have a slightly lower standard deviation of 0.562.

The "t-value" is a statistical metric used to assess the difference between the means of the two groups. A t-value of 0.811 suggests that there is a moderate difference in spontaneous decision-making between government and private school principals in rural areas. The significance level (Sig.) is an important metric. With a value of 0.093, it indicates that the observed difference in spontaneous decision-making between these two groups in rural settings is not statistically significant at a conventional significance level (e.g., 0.05). This suggests that the difference in decision-making styles among principals in government and private rural schools may not be statistically significant, and the observed difference could be due to chance.

This suggests that there is no statistically significant difference in spontaneous decision-making between government and private school principals in rural areas, as the p-value (Sig.) is higher than the conventional significance level.

Table 10.

A Comparative Analysis of Spontaneous Decision-Making Among Public and Private School Urban Principals

	School	Heads	M	Std. D.	*t-value*	*Sig.*
Spontaneous Decision	Govt.	65	3.367	.687	.821	.027
	Private	107	3.942	.765		

Table 10 presents a comparative analysis of spontaneous decision-making among school principals in

urban areas, distinguishing between public and private schools. The table includes key statistical measures for these two groups: government (Govt.) and private school principals in urban settings.

Mean score for spontaneous decision-making indicates that government school principals in urban areas have a mean score of 3.367, while private school principals in urban areas have a slightly higher mean score of 3.942. This suggests that, on average, private school principals in urban settings tend to exhibit a slightly higher level of spontaneous decision-making compared to their government school counterparts. Government school principals in urban areas have a standard deviation of 0.687, while private school principals in urban areas have a slightly higher standard deviation of 0.765.

t-value is a statistical metric used to assess the difference between the means of the two groups. A t-value of 0.821 suggests that there is a moderate difference in spontaneous decision-making between government and private school principals in urban areas. The significance level (Sig.) is an important metric. With a value of 0.027, it indicates that the observed difference in spontaneous decision-making between these two groups in urban settings is statistically significant. This means that the difference in decision-making styles among principals in government and private urban schools is unlikely to be due to random chance and represents a genuine distinction.

Table 10 highlights a statistically significant difference in spontaneous decision-making between government and private school principals in urban areas, with private school principals showing a higher average score in this aspect.

4. Conclusion:

Using the avoidant decision-making style, there was a statistically significant difference in the decision-making styles of heads of public and private schools. Using the avoidant decision-making style, there was a statistically significant difference in the decision-making styles of male heads of public and private schools. By employing an avoidant decision-making style, there was a statistically significant difference in the decision-making styles of female heads of public and private schools. Using the avoidant decision-making style, there was a statistically significant difference in the decision-making styles of rural heads of public and private schools. Using the avoidant decision-making style, there was a statistically significant difference in the decision-making styles of heads of urban public and private schools.

The decision-making methods of heads of private and public schools differed statistically significantly when it came to employing the spontaneous decision-making style. The decision-making methods of male heads of public and private schools differed statistically significantly when it came to their use of the spontaneous decision-making style. When it came to employing the spontaneous decision-making style, there was a statistically significant difference in the decision-making styles of female heads of public and private schools. In terms of spontaneous decision-making, there was no statistically significant difference between the heads of rural public and private schools. The decision-making methods of heads of metropolitan public and private schools differed statistically significantly when it came to the use of spontaneous decision-making.

Based on the findings and main conclusions regarding the significant differences in decision-making styles among various groups of school leaders, it is recommended that:

1. Develop customized leadership training programs for school heads based on their specific decision-making styles. These programs should focus on enhancing decision-making abilities in alignment with their predominant style, whether it's avoidant or spontaneous.
2. Differences observed between male and female school heads in spontaneous and avoidant decision-making, it is crucial to address any potential bias and provide equal opportunities for leadership development. These workshops should encourage collaboration and skill-sharing between genders to achieve well-rounded decision-making approaches.
3. Encourage collaboration between public and private schools in research initiatives related to decision-making styles. Additionally, schools in urban and rural areas should collaborate to investigate factors influencing spontaneous and avoidant decision-making in their specific contexts, ultimately improving decision-making processes.

References

Azeska, A., Starc, J., & Kevereski, L. (2017). Styles of decision making and management and dimensions of personality of school principals. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education, 5*(2), 47.

Delmonte, C. R. (2022). Decision-making styles of school heads and their perceived work performance of teachers in public elementary schools. *GNOSI: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Human Theory and Praxis, 5*(1), 2714-2485.

Greenberg, R. P. (2016). The rebirth of psychosocial importance in a drug-filled world. *American Psychologist,* 71, 781-791.

Hastie, R. (2001). Problems for judgment and decision making. *Review of psychology*, *52*(1), 653-683.

Jadhav, P. S., & Karabasanagoudra, A. V. (2020). A study on decision-making styles of secondary school heads. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts, 8*(4), 2320-2882.

Mukherjee, S. (2013). A study of the managerial skills of school principals to assess their impact and relative importance in driving school's performance. *International Journal of Education and Psychological Research, 2*(4), 1-6.

Qamar, A. Z., & Rashid, K. (2020). Exploration of decision-making styles exercised by heads of secondary schools in Punjab and the effects of gender on decision-making. *Bulletin of Education and Research, 42*(2), 149–162.

Rehman, R. R., & Waheed, A. (2012). Transformational leadership style as predictor of a decision-making styles: moderating role of emotional intelligence. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS), 6*(2), 257-268.

Rettinger, D. A., & Hastie, R. (2001). Content effects on decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 85*(2), 336-359.

Russo, J. E. (2017). Process-tracing methods in decision-making: on growing up in the 70s. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 26*(5), 442-450.

Singh., K., & Kaur, S. (2016). Decision-making styles of the secondary school heads in relation to their problem-solving ability and self-esteem. *Man in India 96*(5), 1333–40.

Spicer, D. P., & Smith, S. E. (2005). An examination of the general decision-making style questionnaire in two UK samples. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 20*(2), 137-149.

Thunholm, P. (2004). Decision-making style: habit, style or both? *Personality and Individual Differences*, *36*(4), 931-944.

Zulfqar, A., Valcke, M., Devos, G., Tuytens, M., & Shahzad, A. (2016). Leadership and decision-making practices in public versus private universities in Pakistan. *Asia Pacific Education Review 17*(1), 147–59.