



Chaos Theory and Garbage Can Model as Effective Strategies for Decision Making in Educational Institutions

Süleyman GÖKSOY^{a++*}

^a *Department of Education Sciences, Faculty of Education, Düzce University, Turkey.*

Author's contribution

The sole author designed, analysed, interpreted and prepared the manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i111653>

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/126970>

Minireview Article

Received: 20/09/2024
Accepted: 23/11/2024
Published: 27/11/2024

ABSTRACT

Chaos is explained as complexity, instability, unpredictability, nonlinearity, and in the trash can model, conflicts, restrictions, differences, dynamic environment, instability of participation, complex organizations, and unstable conditions have importance. The garbage can model explains this tendency in organizations that often experience very high degrees of uncertainty. The aim of the current study is to discuss how the manager can benefit from the trash can model within the framework of their proactive personality in cases of chaos that may occur during the education management process. A case study design from qualitative research methods was used in the study. The research data were obtained, analyzed, evaluated and interpreted with the document analysis technique. The literature on chaos theory and the garbage can model used in administrative decision-making was systematically examined and synthesized. In general, the question sought to be answered is how education and school systems can effectively manage chaos and complexity. Thus, a new and different understanding and perspective will be tried to be created for effective school management.

⁺⁺ Professor;

*Corresponding author: Email: suleymangoksoy@duzce.edu.tr;

Cite as: GÖKSOY, Süleyman. 2024. "Chaos Theory and Garbage Can Model As Effective Strategies for Decision Making in Educational Institutions". *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies* 50 (11):285-93.
<https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2024/v50i111653>.

Within the scope of the current research, the following suggestions can be offered to education administrators: Creating a simple and flexible organization and organizational structure, giving importance to the detection of pre-learning and experiences (cognitive, emotional, motor, social aspects) in individuals, the need for education and school administrators to be proactive and behave accordingly. As a result, in school improvement efforts, despite linear organizational charts and development plans, schools are not linear but chaotic systems. This situation brings about the fact that schools cannot be managed from the top. Also, plans in schools should be short-term (1-2 years) rather than long-term (5-10 years) and should focus on the process rather than the product.

Keywords: Chaos theory; educational institutions; organisational chaos; garbage can model.

1. INTRODUCTION

Many external factors also affect education and school systems. These factors include demographic changes (population growth, migration, displacement), technological progress, changes and transformations, changing ideologies, legislative changes, equal opportunities, political and administrative changes and transformations, international relations, globalization, increasing influence of multinational companies, changes and transformations in nation states and government systems, changing perspectives on curriculum, health services, increases in life expectancy, increases in the duration and expectation of schooling and compulsory education, changes in the understanding of the social and economic state, redefinition of the individual and individual rights, and responsibilities and duties in the international legal system. Current changes require reorganization in terms of many processes such as structure, organization, culture, management, culture, infrastructure, division of labor, cooperation, planning and decision-making.

The differences in the internal environmental conditions and external context of institutions have brought about the situational leadership role and leadership roles that can change according to the situations, and leadership roles and styles created by the situations and conditions. Since the internal and external environments and conditions of each institution are different, naturally and naturally, their needs and expectations, as well as their goals, targets, achievements (cognitive, emotional, biological, social characteristics desired in the individual to be trained), strategies, visions and ideals will also be different. These differences will also lead to the emergence of different leadership styles and leadership roles. In short, it is not possible to defend and apply a universal principle or rule such as applying every management or every

leadership approach, style and role in every institution. All these variables have paved the way for the emergence of the institution-centered management approach.

The constant increase in the expectations and demands of the society and other stakeholders from the education and school systems and the fact that they continue to increase, reward and punishment systems, teaching-learning processes, the existence of various roles, duties, responsibilities within the school, boards and commissions, communities, the dynamics of the school climate and culture, the diversification and increase of learning skills show how difficult and complex it is to manage the education and school systems and cause chaos.

1.1 Organisational Chaos

Chaos, as a concept, is seen as a lack of order, disharmony, and complexity, as well as an unstable, unpredictable, and uncontrollable situation (Gleick, 1995). It is claimed that, especially in cases of dependence on initial conditions and chain events, very small changes at the beginning can cause large effects and results later. Chaos theory generally does not evaluate events and phenomena in a simple linear and cause-effect relationship (Altun, 2001). Chaos theory challenges to deal with unpredictability and indeterminism in human behavior (Cziko, 1999). Chaos theory has revealed that organizations should be perceived as organisms living in complex relationships rather than machines. Chaos is the result of non-linear and deterministic dynamic systems producing irregular and unpredictable behavior and extreme sensitivity to initial values (Koçel, 2007). According to Gleick (1987; cited in Patton, 2014), some of the foundations and assumptions of chaos theory are as follows: not being based on a cause-effect relationship (non-linearity), the absence of a simple cause-effect relationship in a linear system. In school development

efforts, despite linear organizational charts and development plans, schools are not linear systems, but chaotic systems. This situation leads to the fact that schools will not be managed from the top (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross, 2014). Sensitivity to initial conditions (butterfly effect), another basic principle of chaos theory, is known as sensitive dependence on initial conditions. According to chaos theory, a small and seemingly unconnected event occurring in one part of a system can have a huge impact on other parts of the system. A consequence of sensitive dependence on initial conditions is the impossibility of predicting the long-term future of a chaotic system. Similarly, it is impossible to predict long-term effects in school development. This means a unique type of planning is needed. Plans in schools should be short-term (1-2 years) rather than long-term (5-10 years) and focus on the process rather than the product (Patterson, Purkey, & Parker, 1986 as cited in Glickman, Gordon, & Ross, 2014).

In summary, the general principles contained in chaos theory are as follows.

- ✓ Not being based in cause-effect relationship (non-linearity)
- ✓ Sensitivity to initial conditions (butterfly effect)
- ✓ Subsystems having the characteristics of the whole system (fractals)
- ✓ Feedback mechanism
- ✓ Instability in the system (turbulence)
- ✓ Unpredictable patterns (unusual attractors)

2. METHODS

2.1 Research Model

The case study design, one of the qualitative research designs, was used in the research (Saban and Ersoy, 2019). The situation was discussed with a holistic approach, considering how the garbage can model could be used within the framework of the principal's proactive personality in the chaotic situations that may occur during the management of schools with a complex structure, and various analyzes, explanations and comments were made within this scope.

In order to ensure validity and reliability in the research (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2011), the research topic was explained in detail. The

document analysis method was preferred in the data collection process.

2.2 Data Collection Tools and Data Analysis

In the research, data were collected and analyzed through document analysis technique. Document analysis is a systematic method used to examine and evaluate printed documents and it requires the examination and interpretation of data in order to derive meaning and create an understanding of the relevant subject (Corbin and Strauss, 2008; Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2016). Conclusions were determined and interpretations were made based on the data.

2.3 Chaos in Educational Institutions

Schools, which are social systems, are also complex structures. Many factors and variables (formal and informal groups, power structure of the environment) can affect the educational management process. Also, in education systems, the pre-learning/life experiences, readiness levels or entry behaviors of the educators and the students show that the need and importance of the starting conditions and their sensitive attachment to the starting positions should be taken into consideration. While each class can be considered as a pattern in educational environments, conflicts that occur or may occur also create turbulence situations (disorder, complexity, disorganization). In addition, the fact that graduates, who are the output of the system, come back as input to the system and the inclusion of continuous measurement and evaluation in the teaching-learning process shows that the feedback and correction dimension is indispensable in educational management. Therefore, it is possible to say that schools contain the general characteristics of chaotic systems.

Experiencing very rapid changes and transformations, events not being based on a simple cause and effect situation, prior learning and experiences affecting the quality and outcome of the process, continuous measurement and evaluation of the results and process within the scope of feedback, the necessity and necessity of participation of all education stakeholders in managerial decisions, the system constantly experiencing entropy the state of a system tending to deteriorate and disorder over time (Verma, 2005), considering the aspects such as the fact that the subsystems

play an important role in determining the quality of the entire system, that the subsystems even carry the characteristics of the whole system, and that there are constant conflicts, it can be said that the education system and schools are completely chaotic environments.

The basis of self-recreating structures is the idea that a new order will emerge from chaos. While the chaos system disrupts its balance, it is possible for a situation to emerge in which it can reorganize itself, that is, it can recreate itself (Morgan, 1998). Naturally, chaos can present opportunities as well as a negative situation for organizations.

Cohen and his colleagues called this unstable situation "organizational anarchy." According to the authors, organizations with organizational anarchy have basic characteristics such as problematic preferences, poorly structured technology, and unstable participation (Cohen et al., 1972). Considering the fact that managerial problems do not come to managers clearly, and ready for solution, the chaotic environment and/or situations that cause chaos must be handled with an approach and method in line with this understanding and solutions must be developed accordingly. One of the solution models suitable for situations in chaotic environments may be the Garbage Can Model.

According to the rational model, the decision-making process is generally divided into six parts: defining the problem, creating options, evaluating options, choosing between options, implementing the decision, and evaluating the decision. Few important decisions in management are simple enough to use the assumptions of the rational model (Robbins S., P. and Judge, 2012). Because many factors such as unclear problems, uncertainties, changing and constantly developing internal and external environments, social structure and the values, norms, principles, uncertainties, conflicts that make up the social structure, individuals and their cognitive, emotional, social and physical characteristics affect the environment and organization. It can affect the management directly or indirectly, in positive or negative ways. All these situations that the organization and management have experienced or may experience should be handled with a unique approach, philosophy, understanding and method. In this context, the Garbage Can Model may be one of the approaches to be considered.

2.4 Managerial Decision Making and Garbage Can Model

The decision-making process in organizations is affected by many factors such as the internal structure of the organization and the degree of stability of the external environment. Rational (the process of making decisions, choosing among available alternatives to achieve goals and objectives), limited rational and intuitive (based on experiences and feelings, not rational) processes are used in decision-making. Nobel Prize-winning organizational academic Herbert Simon questioned these assumptions half a century ago and suggested that people make decisions with limited rationality because they process limited and imperfect information and rarely choose the best option (Hill et al., 2016). Organizational decisions can contain many errors, especially in situations of complete uncertainty. Cognitive biases are thinking errors that prepare the environment for all people to make bad choices and direct preferences (Daft, 2015). The traditional decision-making strategy assumes that decisions should be completely rational and is a balancing strategy that searches for the most appropriate option in order to maximize the level of goal achievement (Hoy & Miskel, 2012). However, even if school administrators want to make the best decisions, the realities of school life affect rational decision making. These include internal and external politics, available conflict resolution techniques, delegation of authority and duties, time constraints, cost, inability to process information, and other limitations of human rationality (Lunenburg and Ornstein, 2013).

Decision making occurs in response to a problem. This term points out the difference between the situation we are in and the situation we want to be in and the actions that need to be taken to reach this situation (Robbins and Judge, 2012). As a matter of fact, in organizational management, decision is to distinguish, discuss and choose (management's action is the result of its choices). Decisions are made rationally (identifying the problem, determining decision-making criteria, determining and evaluating alternatives, choosing the best alternative, implementation, reporting), within bounded rationality (a decision-making model that does not cover all aspects of the problem but takes into account its important features) or through intuition (based on past experiences, feelings, emotions, unconscious mental processes, and culture). The managerial decision-making

process also involves judging and taking precautions. In organizations, managerial decisions are made by the manager together with the employees (participants, those affected by the decision) or by the central management.

The garbage can model, which has important similarities with the bounded rationality approach used in organizational decision-making, was devised by Michael D. Cohen, James G. March and Johan P. Olsen (1972). It is stated that the model will give the expected results, especially if used in more complex organizations where information flow procedures are not clear and technology use is low (Lipson, 2004). The model is based on a number of assumptions. Namely, the choice and decision-making process in organizations is problematic and far from providing general satisfaction. Human behavior is not completely rational. There are technological problems in organizations. Most of the time, the processes carried out by the organization itself can be complicated and incomprehensible even for the employees. There is a variable participation process in organizations. Participants may change, which prevents continuity of management in the execution of any work in the subunits of the organization. The existence of cross-relationships and the details of the organization's structure make the decision-making process difficult. There are multiple, unclear and conflicting goals. There are ways to achieve poorly understood goals and unstable participation in decisions. The starting and ending points of the process are not clear (Cohen et al. 2006). According to the garbage can model, when reaching decisions to solve a problem, organizations should not have an obligation to define the problem and then follow other steps, as decision-making approaches generally envisage. There are many contradictions and differences in organizations, just like in a garbage can model. In this situation, which evokes an anarchic environment, decision makers/managers can actually start from the stage they deem appropriate for solution, choice and decision, without being bound to any process or sequence (Schermerhorn et al., 2004).

In businesses that are social organisms, problems, conflicts, restrictions, differences, groupings, solutions, participants, and choice opportunities should be able to flow independently of each other. Other reasons that require the application of the garbage can model may be as follows: Dynamic internal and external

environment of the organization, variability of technology, conflicting demands and unclear goals, a structure in which the conflicts and differences of organizational members stand out, poorly structured information and communication technologies, reluctance to participate in decisions, complex, hierarchical and centralized organization and organization management, and instability of conditions.

In decision making according to the garbage can model, certain decisions are taken without following a regular way of thinking, reason and logic, without being examined, without determining cause and effect relationships, and without knowing whether they are practical or not. This decision-making model addresses the fact that there is no connection between the problems sought to be solved and the proposed solution methods, and in addition, the decision-makers' lack of interest and knowledge in the solution.

2.5 Some Similarities of Chaos Theory and the Trash Can Model

One of the basic principles of chaos theory, which is not based on a result relationship (non-linearity), is parallel to the principle of not having clear starting and ending points of the process advocated by the garbage can model. In the chaos and trash model, the organization is a dynamic environment. Naturally, the variables, expectations, structure, employees of the environment, the organization, the structure and functioning of the organization affect the organization directly and indirectly.

There are similarities between the basic paradigms of chaos theory and the general features of the trash can model. Chaos theory features such as sensitivity to initial conditions (butterfly effect), subsystems carrying the characteristics of the whole system (fractals), feedback mechanisms, instability in the system (turbulence), unpredictable patterns (unusual attractors) are similar to the non-staged nature of the garbage can model.

Rational decision making for schools has many limitations. Using the rational decision-making model is a troubling choice for schools. Teaching technologies are diverse and poorly understood. Additionally, schools have multifaceted and conflicting purposes that are unclear and ambiguous. As a matter of fact, schools lack clearly defined success criteria. Therefore,

problems and solutions cannot be translated into a rational decision-making model. Confusing problems, solutions, and decision participants often leads to decisions that do not fit the rational decision-making model set (Lunenburg and Ornstein, 2013).

3. RESULTS

Chaos theory has revealed that organizations should be perceived as organisms living in complex relationships rather than machines. A school is a complex structure and is not just a building with people in it. In order to change a school, it is necessary to consider the impact of change on all parts of the structure. Each part is dependent on the other parts and all parts react to changes in any other part. In school development efforts, schools are not linear systems but chaotic systems, despite linear organizational charts and development plans. This situation both brings about the fact that schools cannot be managed from the top and creates the necessity for plans in schools to be short-term (1-2 years) rather than long-term (5-10 years) and to focus on the process rather than the product (Glickman et al., 2014).

In the 21st century, the duties, authorities and responsibilities of school principals have both increased and become more complex. In addition, expectations from schools have also increased. This situation has increased the expectations of school principals regarding their role as educational leaders (Gümüşeli, 2014). In the face of the complexity of school principals' new duties, authorities and responsibilities, it has also necessitated the implementation of new and different decision-making models such as the garbage can model.

Schools are under tremendous pressure to change, and school leaders must ensure that teachers and students cope effectively with change processes (OECD, 2009). Data and experience sources should be created for effective management of situations such as risk, crisis, conflict, stress, chaos and change for education and school systems.

As a result, it can be said that all these indicate a need to redefine and develop the authorities, competencies, roles, responsibilities, work and processes of school principals.

3.1 Strategies for Overcoming Chaos in Educational Institutions

- ✓ A lean organizational structure (in which all unnecessary activities are identified and eliminated from the system) should be created (Danabaşoğlu, 1995).
- ✓ An organizational structure of flexibility (being in constant communication with the internal and external environment) should be created (Aldrich & Pfeffer, 1976).
- ✓ Since sensitive dependence on the initial state (butterfly effect) (Wheeler, 1989) is important, it is important in education systems to identify preliminary learning, readiness, entry behaviors (cognitive, emotional, motor, social aspects) and life experiences, and to complete and eliminate deficiencies. and should be given priority.
- ✓ Considering that in some chain events, small changes can lead to big problems (Gleick, 2000), all events, facts and situations related to students, teachers, management, office, environment, office work and transactions in education and school systems should be handled meticulously and taken into consideration.
- ✓ In accordance with the principle of non-linearity (Gleick, 1987), the relationship of problems in education and school systems with many different variables should be discussed and it should be noted that the results arise from many reasons.
- ✓ Some patterns are fractal and appear as self-similar structures (Gleick, 1987), in this respect, each subsystem of the education system can be considered as a fractal. For a school, each subsystem, namely the classroom, management processes, and management functions, can also be fractals. Each subsystem not only carries all the features of the upper system, but also has a fundamental role in the success of the upper system. The success, efficiency and necessity of the smallest unit and subsystem of education and school systems should always be taken into consideration.
- ✓ Turbulence means complexity, disorder, disorganization, imbalance, and conflict

(Gleick, 1987). In education and school systems, this situation should not be seen as a state of anxiety and panic, but should be treated as an inevitable situation for living, vibrant organizations. Rather than ignoring, covering up, or pretending that conflicts and imbalances do not exist, the reasons that create conflict should be addressed and energy should be spent on how to manage them.

- ✓ Rather than identifying faulty people, the education manager should focus on solutions, develop various strategies for chaotic situations, include stakeholders in the management process, provide opportunities and environments for different opinions. They should not ignore chaotic situations, instead they should have data, act fairly, and use all communication channels.
- ✓ School principals should have a proactive personality or develop themselves towards it. Many positive qualities are emphasized in the literature for the proactive personality trait. A proactive personality includes being patient, influencing environmental change, looking for opportunities, taking initiative, being able to take action, being a pioneer of change, challenging the status quo, leading behaviors, focusing on the future, bringing changes to actions when necessary or changing oneself, improving oneself, connecting with individuals, shows perseverance in the face of obstacles, seeing and seizing opportunities, turning problems into opportunities, having the power to make constructive changes, questioning the current situation, tackling problems, looking for new alternatives, being responsible, having creative ideas, trying to do the best, looking for ways to do things and being innovative (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Bindl & Parker, 2010; Crant, 2000; Eby & Reeves, 2006; Grant & Ashford, 2008; Lambert, Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 1999; Seibert, Kraimer, & Crant, 1999).
- ✓ School principals and members should produce alternative solutions, take important features of the problems into account by simplifying them, and include their intuition in the decision-making process.
- ✓ School principals and school members should thoroughly analyze the situation and conditions in decision situations, get to know the organizational culture, pay attention to misconceptions and prejudices, combine rationality and intuition if possible, increase productivity, pay attention to organizational and environmental obstacles and try to minimize them.
- ✓ As the garbage can model advocates, there may be problems, conflicts, restrictions, differences, formal and especially informal groups in educational organizations, just like other organizations that are social organisms. For this reason, most of the time, a linear path may not be followed in solving the problems encountered. It can be started from a different stage in solving the problem (such as starting directly from the solution). Especially in emergency situations, situations of crisis and chaos, and in situations and environments that require security measures, decisions may be taken for direct and immediate solutions rather than rational decision steps.
- ✓ In one aspect, the garbage can model emphasizes that the manager should act situation-specific, make decisions, develop solution alternatives, and even stay ahead of problems and problems (take measures, suggest solutions, develop scenarios before problems, crises and problems occur).
- ✓ In the twenty-first century, education and school systems, whose internal and external environments are increasingly complex, chaotic and uncertain, may prefer the garbage can model, especially at the administrative stage. For this, they can include informal groups in the decision-making process, develop various game theories, and act strategically. However, in order to do all this, it is necessary to act systematically in education and school organizations, use information and communication technologies, master the data, and establish a healthy communication and interaction system.

4. CONCLUSION

Creating a simple and flexible organization and organizational structure, giving importance to the

detection of pre-learning and experiences (cognitive, emotional, motor, social aspects) in individuals, the need for education and school administrators to be proactive and behave accordingly.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author hereby declares that no generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators have been used during the writing or editing of this manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Author has declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

- Aldrich, H. E., & Pfeffer, J. (1976). Environments of organizations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 83–91.
- Altun, S. A. (2001). Chaos and management. *Educational Administration in Theory and Practice*, 28(28), 451–469.
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(2), 103–118.
- Bindl, U. K., & Parker, S. K. (2010). Proactive work behavior: Forward-thinking and change-oriented action in organizations. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 567–598). APA.
- Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1), 1–25.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Sage.
- Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 435–462. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600304>
- Cziko, G. A. (1999). Unpredictability and indeterminism in human behavior: Arguments and implications for educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 18(3), 17–25.
- Daft, R. L. (2015). *Organization theory and design*. Cengage Learning Canada.
- Danabaşoğlu, B. (1995). Lean production system versus agile production system. *Automation Journal*, 72, 15–21.
- Gleick, J. (1987). *Chaos: Making a new science*. Viking Penguin.
- Gleick, J. (1995). *Kaos: Yeni bir bilim teorisi*. TÜBİTAK Popüler Bilim Kitapları.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross, J. M. (2014). *Denetim ve öğretimsel liderlik* (M. B. Aksu & E. Ağaoğlu, Trans.). Anı Yayıncılık.
- Grant, A. M., & Ashford, S. J. (2008). The dynamics of proactivity at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 3–34.
- Gümüşeli, A. İ. (2014). *Eğitim ve öğretim yönetimi*. Pegem Akademi.
- Hill, M., McShane, S. L., & Von Glinow, M. A. (2016). *Örgütsel davranış* (A. Günsel & S. Bozkurt, Trans.). Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2012). *Eğitim yönetimi* (S. Turan, Trans.). Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Koçel, T. (2007). *Business management*. Arıkan Press.
- Lambert, T. A., Eby, L. T., & Reeves, M. P. (2006). Predictors of networking intensity and network quality among white-collar job seekers. *Journal of Career Development*, 32(4), 351–365.
- Lipson, M. (2004). A garbage can model of UN peacekeeping. Paper presented at *The Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association*, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (2013). *Educational administration* (G. Arastaman, Trans.). Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Morgan, G. (1998). *Yönetim ve örgüt teorilerinde metafor* (G. Bulut, Trans.). MESS Yayıncılık.
- OECD. (2009). *Improving school leadership*. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/publishing/corrigenda>
- Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (M. Bütün & S. B. Demir, Trans.). Pegem Akademi.
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2012). *Organizational behavior* (İ. Erdem, Trans.). Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Robbins, S. P. (1991). *Essentials of organizational behavior*. Prentice Hall.
- Saban, A., Ersoy, A. F., Özden, M., Bozkurt, M., Ersoy, A., Akar, H., & Yahşi, Z. (2017).

- Eğitimde nitel araştırma desenleri.* Anı Yayıncılık.
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (2004). *Organizational behavior* (9th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- Seibert, S. E., Crant, J. M., & Kraimer, M. L. (1999). Proactive personality and career success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(3), 416–427.
- Verma, S. (2005). *Little book of scientific principles.* TÜBİTAK Popüler Bilim Kitapları.
- Wheeler, D. D. (1989). Problems with chaotic cryptosystems. *Cryptologia*, 13(3), 243–250.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2016). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri.* Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/126970>