

## SELF-ESTEEM IN DECISION MAKING AND DECISION MAKING STYLES OF VOLLEYBALL PLAYERS IN TERMS OF SOME VARIABLES

Elif USTUN, Veysel TEMEL, Sefa Sahan BIROL

*Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University, Physical Education and Sports High School, Karaman.*

### ABSTRACT

**Purpose:** This research was done with the aim of revealing whether decision making styles differ in terms of different variables or not. Descriptive method, one of the quantitative research methods, was adopted as the search model.

**Materials and Methods:** Research group consisted of 50 male and 59 female players who play at youth volleyball league in Konya city center. In this study, "Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire" developed by Mann, Burnett, Radford and Ford (1997) and the adaptation work of this scale to Turkish was conducted by Deniz (2004) and "Personal Information Form" which was developed by researcher in order to determine personal characteristic of athletes, were used as data collection tool. The unique Kolmogorov Smirnov Test was used in order to determine whether measures are suitable for normal dispersion or not. Kruskal Wallis-H test and Mann Whitney-U test were used on analyzing and evaluating the data, and meaningfulness was obtained as  $P < 0,05$ . SPSS (Statistical package for social sciences) package programme was used on evaluating data and finding calculated values.

**Findings:** It can be said that the self-esteem in decision making making point average of the athletes participated in the research with (Mean=9,0000) and careful decision-making style point average with (Mean=8,4587), sub dimension of decision making styles, were high, but avoidant decision-making style point average with (Mean=4,8716), suspensive decision-making style point average with (Mean.=4,5505) and panic decision-making style point average with (Mean.=4,3670) were low.

**Results:** Meaningful difference was found in terms of personal characteristic on self-esteem in decision making, careful decision-making style, suspensive decision-making style, panic decision-making style and avoidant decision-making style of participants' team which they play at, gender, education and sport beginning age variables whereas meaningful difference was not found on their parents education, parents occupation, family income and place in which they spend most of their life variables.

**Key Words:** Decision Making, Self-Esteem, Decision Making Styles, Athletes, Volleyball

### INTRODUCTION

Decision-making could be explained as variability of information/interest or both [18]. Decision-making is not only a period to choose and aim the best alternatives for personal value and life style, but also to specify alternatives having regard to various incidents and activities [11].

Individuals should make decisions in every stage of their lives, both in their professional and their private life. Problems could be very simple and also very complex which are triggered by many factors. Decision-making and problem-solving terms are usually confused with each other. In narrow sense, decision making is a process in which individual choose one thing from many options. On the other hand, problem could be defined as deviation from a standart or aimed performance. Problem-solving; is a detection

process in which individual choose essential action, proper reaction for smoothing the problem. Problem-solving includes decision-making; however all decisions does not include problems. On the other hand; almost every decision; is tend to solve a problem or to avoid from problem [16].

Researchers have been studying on relation between sportive success and athlete's decision-making ability and have tried to determine decision-making's effectiveness on sportive performance. It is known that mental factors whose absolute physiologic, psychologic and technic-tactic studies are not sufficient, also are effective on the occurrence of sportive success. While determining sportive success, the most important ability is the decision-making ability. Decision of the athlete will affect his team's success positively or negatively. Hence, sport researchers and

sport trainers makes researchs on development of athletes' decision-making ability. These studies, sportive success is considerably important and necessarily. As a result of application of these studies on workouts, it turns out that athletes' creativities and decision-making abilities improve and become more successful [5].

Decision-making is essential for whole lifespan and it takes place in all incidents from simple to complex. Individual's decisions could lead to his life better or worse way. All these incidents are also valid for athletes. On field, in box-ring or in gym, athlete should adjust his position and move regarding to his team-mates' and opponents' positions and moves. Nowadays, there are so many influencing factors for sportive efficiency level. These are environmental and internal factors [8]. These large number of factors' importance could diversify with respect to conditions and could not form success or failure by itself. For instance, being high-condition is not enough for being successful. It is though that an athlete making sensible and fast decision is an advantage on a sport branch in which people have complex attitudes [6]. Sanchez and ark. state that plays in almost any sport branch has become faster and is based on more technic and tactic [17]. During competition, athletes should make new decision due to changing dynamics and unexpectable changing on game system, especially on matchs with ball [12].

Decision-making process depends on individual. One's attitude for his reaction in uncertain situation is his strategy for decision-making [10]. Decision-making is composed of different periods. Before decision-making process, individual evaluates the result which could arise from making decision. In decision-making process, individual evaluates his options and eliminates the options but the ideal one. After decision-making process, individual assesses revealed result and interprets [20].

Although, there is not a specific decision-making type in sport, it is considered that sport holds some characterist features. Being natural is the key feature of decision-making in sport. With lots of duties in game, player has multiple potential options. For instance, if he wants to use his decision, responsibility and creativity freely, he can not apply them as it is written on paper, on the contrary, he has to decide during the game in the happenstances.

Secondly, most decisions made in sport have external dynamics. In other words, sport has external dynamics changing with time. Due to this dynamic structure, sport requires athlete's ability to create knowledge.

Athlete's dynamic situation is complicated during competition. Thirdly, decisions making during sportive events, are made overt behaviours and under highly time pressure. This pressure is especially about dynamic structure of decision-making. Most moves of athletes in the game are taken evidently [13]. Seiller [19] suggests that decision-making varies in time-limitations [19]. While sports such as; golf, sailing do not have time-limitation, ball games, team games have time limitations that make difficult to decide [21]. Aune and ark. (2008) states that volleyball is one of the main factors that has impose on success by means of making decision fast and reacting fast and accurate to stimulant (Günay, Çelik, Aksu and Çoksevım, 2011).[1],[7].

#### **METHOD**

This section is about research model, research staff, data acquisition, data acquisition tools and operations during data analysis.

#### **Research Model**

Research, is a descriptive study. Descriptive statistic is a statistic operation which enables to collect, describe and present numerical value related to a factor (Büyüköztürk, 2010).

#### **Research Staff**

Research staff consists of total 109 athlete of which 50 men and 59 women players who play in youth volleyball league in Konya.

#### **Data Acquisition**

First of all, datas about research are given systematically after scanning literature. Thus, a theoretical frame of the subject is formed.

#### **Data Acquisition Tool**

The necessary data acquisition tool for reach the determinated aims could be seen below:

#### **Personal Information Form**

In order to create independant variances of examination on research and to acquire data about personal characterists of 109 players who play in youth volleyball league in Konya.

#### **Melbourne Decision-Making Questionary (MDMQ)**

Melbourne Decision-Making Questionary is developed by Mann and ark. (1998), Deniz(2004) adapts the questionnaire in turkish and exercises reliability study [15],[4]. Melbourne Decision-Making Questionary has two sections:

Section I: It aims to determine self-reliance in decision-making. It is composed of 6 articles and three articles of grade straightly and the other three articles of it grade reversely. Grading measures as 2 points for "True" answer to articles, 1 points for "Sometimes True" answers, 0 points for "Not True" answers. Maximum point for questionnaire is 12 point. Maximum points stand for maximum self-reliance in decision-making.

Section II: It is composed of 22 articles and measures decision-making styles. It has 4 subfactors [4].

1. Carefully Decision-Making Style: Individual searches for essential data prudentially and evaluates alteranatives carefully before decision-making and then he chooses. This factor is explained in 6 articles [2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 16].

2. Avoidant Decision-Making Style: Individual avoids decision-making, has tendency to give decision-making to someone and thus attempts to get rid of responsibility of decision-making. This factor is explained in 6 articles [3, 9, 11, 14, 17, 19].

3. Postponer Decision-Making Style: Individual always postpones, procrastinates and suspends without any reason. This factor is explained in 5 articles [5, 7, 10, 18, 21].

4. Panic Decision-Making Style: Individual is willing to reach fast solutions with hasty actions as a consequence of feeling under pressure when he has to decide. This factor is explained in 5 article [1, 13, 15, 20, 22].

#### **Melbourne Decision-Making Questionary's Reliability**

I – II MDMQ 's reliability is calculated with repetition of the test and with internal consistency. With this aim, 56 student of computer systems' and automative teaching in 2002-2003 educational year, in Technical Education Faculty, S. University were tested. With the repetition method of test, reliability parameter obtained from subscale is self-reliance in decision-making  $r=.85$ , in carefully decision-making method  $r=.83$ , in avoidant decision-making style  $r=.87$ , postponing decision-making style  $r=.68$ , in panic decision-making style  $r=.84$ . When calculating, internal consistency, article analysis is made. Analysis result turns out that 26 articles' correlations out of total 28 articles are over .33 ; other 2 articles' correlations are .26 and .27. This demonstrates that result is statistically sufficient level. Conducted on 154 university

student, MDMQ III's internal consistencies are for self-reliance in decision-making Cronbach Alpha=.72, for carefully decision-making in subdimension of decision-making style Cronbach Alpha=. 80, for avoidant decision-making style Cronbach Alpha= .78, for postponing decision-making Cronbach Alpha=.65, for panic decision-making Cronbach Alpha=.71 [4].

#### **Melbourne Decision-Making Questionary's Validity Studies**

Content validity and similar scales validity is used for Melbourne Decision Making Questionary's Validity Studies. Content validity occurs consulting an expert's opinion. After examining MDMQ I-II, people who works in this field as experts state that contents and quality of scale articles would calculate related subscales. Similar scales' validity is created with Decision Strategies Scale developed by [22]. MDMQ I-II and Decision Strategies Scale are tested at the same time on students. It is fixed that correlation parameters between MDMQ I-II's subscales and Decision Strategies Scale's subscales varies from  $r=.15$  to  $r=.71$  and MDMQ I-II and Decision Strategies Scale have significant relations between 0.01 and 0.05 level. It illustrates that MDMQ I-II is highly valid with this result [4].

#### **Evaluation of Melbourne Decision Making Scale**

EMDMS I: It is a scale that aims to determine self-esteem (self-confidence) when making a decision. It is formed by six (6) item and it is scored as the opposite of three items (2, 4, 6). The scoring is done in this way; each "correct answer" that is given for items are 2 points, the answer of "sometimes correct" is 1 point, the answer of "not correct" is 0 points. 12 points are the maximum that an be taken from the scale. High scores are an indicative of high self-esteem in making decisions [4].

EMDMS II: It is formed by twenty-two (22) items. The scale measures the decision-making styles. The questions covering subscales are;

1. Attentive: 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 16 items
2. Avoidant: 3, 9, 11, 14, 17, 19 items
3. Post poner: 5, 7, 10, 18, 21 items
4. Panic: 1, 13, 15, 20, 22 items

In scoring EMDMS I; the items are evaluated with score range like, attentive (0-12), avoidant (0-12), post poner (0 - 10) and panic (0-10). This scale are answered like EMDMS II. The height of the points indicate that the use of the relevant decision-making style [4].

During scale, the coefficient of self-esteem, decision-making, internal consistency reliability of physical education and sports teachers was found 0.74,8 and the coefficient of internal consistency of decision-making style's reliability was found 0.76.

**Data Analysis**

While the solution and interpretation of data, with the usage of Kruskal-Wallis H and Mann-Whitney U test, significance was estimated as  $P < 0,05$ . In the evaluation and the calculation of the data, SPSS 21 (Statistical package for social sciences) packaged program was used.

**FINDINGS**

**Table 1.** Sub-dimensions of participants in general problem solving and the results of the total score's average and standard deviation values

	n	Mean	Ss	Min	Max	The lowest and the highest score that can be obtained from the scale
<b>Self-Esteem on Decision Making</b>	109	9,0000	3,17105	,00	12,00	0-12
<b>Careful Decision Making</b>	109	8,4587	3,20165	,00	12,00	0-12
<b>Avoidant Decision Making</b>	109	4,8716	3,05232	,00	12,00	0-12
<b>Post-poner Decision Making</b>	109	4,5505	1,96961	1,00	10,00	0-10
<b>Panic Decision Making</b>	109	4,3670	2,25528	,00	10,00	0-10

In Table 1, it is indicated that, the point average of decision making (Mean. = 9,0000), the point average of careful decision making which is the sub-dimension of decision making skills (Mean. = 8,4587) are in high level, however, the point average of avoidant decision making (Mean. = 4,8716), the point average of post-poner decision making (Mean. = 4,5505), the point average of panic decision making (Mean. = 4,3670) are in low level.

**Table 2.** The total and sub-dimension results of Mann Whitney U test according to the participants genders related to problem-solving

		N	Mean Rank	Rank Sum	U	Z	P
Self-Esteem on Decision Making	Female	50	74,86	3743,00	482,000	-6,206	,000*
	Male	59	38,17	2252,00			
Careful Decision Making	Female	50	72,19	3609,50	615,500	-5,282	,000*
	Male	59	40,43	2385,50			
Avoidant Decision Making	Female	50	49,24	2462,00	1187,000	-1,779	,075
	Male	59	59,88	3533,00			
Post-poner Decision Making	Female	50	46,01	2300,50	1025,500	-2,790	,005*
	Male	59	62,62	3694,50			
Panic Decision Making	Female	50	44,35	2217,50	942,500	-3,317	,001*
	Male	59	64,03	3777,50			

\* $p < 0,05$

In Table 2, it was examined the total and sub-dimension results with Mann Whitney U test according to the participants genders related to decision making. In the study results, there wasn't any sub-dimension substantive for avoidant decision making (U: 482,000  $P < 0,05$ ), however, in the dimensions

of Self-Esteem on Decision Making (U: 482,000 P<0,05), Careful decision making (615,500 P<0,05), Post-poner decision making (1025,500 P<0,05), and Panic decision making (U: 942,500 P<0,05), the differences was founded substantive.

**Table 3.** The result of Kruskal-Wallis test related to the participant’s education factor according to problem-solving total and sub-dimensions.

		N	Mean Rank	Sd	X <sup>2</sup>	P	Meaningful Differences
<b>Self-Esteem on Decision Making</b>	High school	48	39,04	2	38,719	,000*	<b>1-3</b>
	University	11	34,36				
	Other	50	74,86				
<b>Careful Decision Making</b>	High school	48	39,88	2	27,978	,000*	<b>1-3</b>
	University	11	42,86				
	Other	50	72,19				
<b>Avoidant Decision Making</b>	High school	48	58,20	2	3,919	,141	-----
	University	11	67,23				
	Other	50	49,24				
<b>Post-poner Decision Making</b>	High school	48	61,32	2	8,232	,016*	<b>2-3</b>
	University	11	68,27				
	Other	50	46,01				
<b>Panic Decision Making</b>	High school	48	63,01	2	11,283	,004*	-----
	University	11	68,45				
	<b>Other</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>44,35</b>				

\*p<0,05

In Table 3, it was examined the total and sub-dimension results with Mann Whitney U test according to the participants education factor related to decision making. In the study results, there wasn’t any sub-dimension substantive for avoidant decision making, however, in the dimensions of Self-Esteem on Decision Making (X<sup>2</sup> =38,719 P<0.05), Careful decision making (X<sup>2</sup> =27,978 P<0.05), Post-poner decision making (X<sup>2</sup> =8,232 P<0.05), and Panic decision making (X<sup>2</sup> =11,283 P<0.05), the differences was founded substantive.

**Table 4.** According to the team variables of participants , Kruskal-Wallis test results for the total and sub-dimensions in problem solving

		N	Mean Rank	Sd	X <sup>2</sup>	P	Meaningful Differences
<b>Self-Esteem on Decision Making</b>	Güneşspor (female)	13	71,08	6	40,355	,000*	<b>1-6</b>
	Konya fener (female)	14	63,18				
	Selçuklu belediye (female)	14	65,89				
	Gençlik spor (female)	13	38,12				
	Konya spor (male)	12	31,83				
	Konya büyükşehir (male)	14	32,75				
	Gençlik spor (male)	14	28,43				
<b>Careful Decision Making</b>	Güneş spor (female)	13	70,23	6	26,523	,000*	<b>1-6</b>
	Konya fener (female)	14	54,11				
	Selçuklu belediye (female)	14	62,54				
	Gençlik spor (female)	13	45,15				
	Konya spor (male)	12	35,71				
	Konya büyükşehir (male)	14	36,57				

Avoidant Decision Making	Gençlik spor (male)	14	27,96				
	Güneş spor (female)	13	37,38	6	8,065	,233	----
	Konya fener (female)	14	52,54				
	Selçuklu belediye (female)	14	42,43				
	Gençlik spor (female)	13	47,62				
	Konya spor (male)	12	62,04				
	Konya büyükşehir (male)	14	39,68				
	Gençlik spor (male)	14	52,18				
Post-poner Decision Making	Güneş spor (female)	13	43,31	6	8,841	,183	----
	Konya fener (female)	14	35,18				
	Selçuklu belediye (female)	14	41,75				
	Gençlik spor (female)	13	48,81				
	Konya spor (male)	12	55,88				
	Konya büyükşehir (male)	14	47,50				
	Gençlik spor (male)	14	61,07				
Panic Decision Making	Güneş spor (female)	13	36,88	6	9,178	,164	----
	Konya fener (female)	14	42,79				
	Selçuklu belediye (female)	14	39,14				
	Gençlik spor (female)	13	50,92				
	Konya spor (male)	12	54,54				
	Konya büyükşehir (male)	14	46,89				
	<b>Gençlik spor (male)</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>61,82</b>				

\*p<0,05

In Table 4, it was examined the total and sub-dimension results with Mann Whitney U test according to the participant's team factor related to decision making. In the study results, there wasn't any sub-dimension substantive for avoidant decision making, post-poner decision making, panic decision making, however, in the dimensions of self-esteem on decision making ( $X^2 = 40,355$   $P < 0.05$ ) and careful decision making ( $X^2 = 26,523$   $P < 0.05$ ), the differences was founded substantive.

**Table 5.** The result of Kruskal-Wallis test related to the participant's starting sports factor according to problem-solving total and sub-dimensions.

		N	Mean Rank	Sd	X <sup>2</sup>	P	Meaningful Differences
Self-Esteem on Decision Making	5-7	11	82,95	2	14,588	,001*	<b>1-3</b>
	8-10	31	61,53				
	11-13	67	47,39				
Careful Decision Making	5-7	11	76,45	2	7,977	,019*	<b>1-3</b>
	8-10	31	59,52				
	11-13	67	49,39				
Avoidant Decision Making	5-7	11	29,68	2	10,071	,007*	<b>3-1</b>
	8-10	31	51,35				
	11-13	67	60,84				
Post-poner Decision Making	5-7	11	25,86	2	13,609	,001*	<b>3-1</b>
	8-10	31	50,60				
	11-13	67	61,82				
Panic Decision Making	5-7	11	28,64	2	14,959	,001*	<b>3-1</b>
	8-10	31	46,71				
	<b>11-13</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>63,16</b>				

\*p<0,05

In Table 4, it was examined the total and sub-dimension results with Mann Whitney U test according to the participant's starting sports factor for volleyball players related to decision making. In the study results, in the dimensions of Self-Esteem Decision ( $X^2 = 14,588$  P<0.05), careful decision making ( $X^2 = 7,977$  P<0.05), avoidant decision making ( $X^2 = 10,071$  P<0.05), post-poner decision making ( $X^2 = 13,609$  P<0.05), panic decision making ( $X^2 = 14,959$  P<0.05) the differences was founded substantive.

## THE DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

It was indicated that mean total score of decision making of volleyball players and the point average of careful decision making from decision making skills is in high level, however, it can be stated that average scores of avoidant decision making, post-poner decision-making and panic decision scores are low.

According to gender factor, self-esteem decision making, careful decision making, post-poner decision making, panic decision making in total score has been identified as significant in all sub-dimensions. These results are in line with the work that has done by [9]. Education variables; self-esteem decision making and careful decision making in the lower size, the proportion of those with another educational option, educational level seems to be higher than that of high school. In the sub-dimension of post-poner decision making and panic decision making, according to educational level, the proportion of the university, seems to be higher than those with other educational options. We can state that education level may influence the size of decision making. The finding from the study of Çetin (2009) are showing similarities with our study results.[3].

According to the factor of the team they play volleyball; with related to the sub-dimensions of self-esteem on decision making and careful decision making; the ratio of volleyball player in Gençlik Spor Erkek team is higher than the volleyball players who play in Güneş Spor Kız team. When considering other findings on these results, when decision making, acting together with the team for men is considered effective.

According to the starting age of volleyball factors, it is shown that in the dimension of self-esteem decision making, the rate for starting sport between the ages 5-7 is higher than the age group of 11-13 and the rate for starting sport between ages 5-7, is higher than the age group of 8-10. In this case, we can

interpret that self-esteem prevents adolescents from using the opportunities that were given to them. In the sub-dimension of careful decision making, the rate for the age group of 5-7 is higher than the group of 11-13; and in the sub-dimension of avoidant decision-making, the rate for starting sport between the ages 11-13 is higher than the age group of 5-7 and the rate for starting sport between ages 11-13, is higher than the age group of 8-10. and in the sub-dimensions of postponed decision making and panic decision making, the age of starting sports for the age group 5-7 is higher. Leaving the decision making to others, delaying and feeling under pressure in the event of deciding leads to be in thoughtless attitudes and behave in a hurry tend to get solutions, and it is believed that the age period of starting sports may have an effect on behavior model.

## REFERANCE

- [1.] Aune T.K., Ingvaldsen R.P., Ettema G.J. (2008) Effect of Physical Fatigue on Motor Control at Different Skill Levels. *Percept Mot Skills*;106:371-386.
- [2.] Büyükoztürk, Ş. (2010) Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- [3.] Çetin, M. Ç. (2009) Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin karar verme stilleri sosyal beceri düzeyleri ve stresle başa çıkma biçimlerinin bazı değişkenler açısından karşılaştırmalı olarak incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- [4.] Deniz, M. E. (2004) Üniversite öğrencilerinin karar vermede öz saygı, karar verme stilleri ve problem çözme yöntemleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi üzerine bir araştırma. *Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(15), 25- 35.
- [5.] Egesoy H., Eniseler N., Çamlıyer H., Çamlıyer H. (1999) Elit Ve Elit Olmayan Futbol Oyuncularının Karar Verme Performanslarının Karar Verme Hızı Ve Verilen Kararın Doğruluğu Açısından Karşılaştırılması, *BESBD*, 3(2), 24.

- [6]. **Gülşen, D. (2008)** Farklı Lig Düzeyinde Oynayan Futbolcuların Oynadıkları Mevkilere, Öğrenim Durumu Ve Spor Yaşlarına Göre Problem Çözme Becerilerinin İncelenmesi, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Adana
- [7]. **Günay E., Çelik A., Aksu F., Çoksevim B. (2011)** 14 - 16 Yaş Voleybol ve Tenis Oyuncularının Görsel ve İşitsel Reaksiyon Zamanlarının İncelenmesi, DEÜ Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi, 25(2), 64.
- [8]. **Gürçay S. S. (1998)** Aile ve Arkadaşlardan Algılanan Sosyal Destek, Bireyler Arası İlişkilerde Yeterlik ve Karar Verme ilişkileri. Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi, 2 (9), 7-16.
- [9]. **Gürçay S. S. (2001)** Ergenlerde Karar Verme Davranışlarının Öz Saygı Ve Problem Çözme Becerileri Algısı İle İlişkisi, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 8(8), 116.
- [10]. **Ersever, H.Ö. (1996)** Karar Verme Becerileri Kazandırma Programının ve Etkileşim Grubu Deneyiminin Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Karar Verme Stilleri Üzerindeki Etkileri, Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara
- [11]. **Harris, R. (1998)** Introduction to decision making. Vanguard University Of Southern California, California, USA.
- [12]. **Kelecek S., Altıntaş A., Aşçı F.H. (2013)** Sporcuların Karar Verme Stillerinin Belirlenmesi, CBÜ Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 8(1), 22.
- [13]. **Johnson, JG. (2006)** Cognitive modeling of decision making in sports. Psychology of sport and exercise,; 7: 631–52.
- [14]. **Mann L, Burnett P, Radford M, Ford S (1997)** The Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire: An instrument for measuring patterns for coping with decisional conflict. J. Behav. Dec. Mak.. 10: 1-19.
- [15]. **Mann L, Radford M, Burnett P, Ford S, Bond M, Leung K, Nakamura H, Vaughan, G, Yang K (1998)** Cross-cultural differences in selfreported decision making style and confidence. Int. J. Psy.. 33(5): 325-335.
- [16]. **Rue & Byars (2003)** Decision Making Skills, Management skills and application mcgraw hill, 68.
- [17]. **Sanchez, A.C.J., Calvo, A.L., Bunuel, P.S., Godoy, S. J. I. (2009)** Decision-making of spanish female basketball team players while they are competing. *Revista de Psicología del Deporte*, (18), 369.
- [18]. **Satman, C. (2005)** The Analysis Of Audience Voice On The Decisions Of Football Referees, Publicized M.A. Thesis, Published Master Thesis, Ankara University, The Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- [19]. **Seiller, R. (1997)** Decision making in sport. International Symposium of the Turkish Association of Sport Psychology, Mersin,10-12.
- [20]. **Tatlıhoğlu, K. (2014)** Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Karar Vermede Öz-Saygı Düzeyleri İle Karar Verme Stilleri Arasındaki İlişkinin Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi, Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 2(1), 150-170.
- [21]. **Vural, M. (2013)** Spor Genel Müdürlüğü Merkez Ve Taşra Teşkilatında Görev Yapan Spor Yöneticilerinin Düşünme Ve Karar Verme Stillerinin İncelenmesi, Selçuk Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Konya, 30.
- [22]. **Kuzgun Y (1992).** Decision Strategies Scale: Development and standardization. VII. National Psychology Congress Scientific Studies. Turkish Psychologists Association, pp. 161-170.