

Field : Sport Psychology

Type : Research Article

Received: 13.06.2017 – Corrected: 27.06.2017 - Accepted: 14.07.2017

Assessment of the Correlation between Self-esteem in Decision-Making and Decision-Making Styles of Football Referees in terms of Their Refereeing Experience and Violence Perceptions

Mahmut GÜLLE¹, M. Çağrı ÇETİN¹, İhsan SARI², Ramazan ŞEKER¹

¹Mustafa Kemal University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Hatay, TURKEY

²Sakarya University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Sakarya, TURKEY

Email: mhmtgulle@gmail.com

Abstract

The study was conducted in order to determine self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles of football referees in terms of their experience and violence perceptions and to examine the correlation between their self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles. The population of the study was composed 1080 referees who were assigned to the matches of the 7th region where there were 8 provinces under Turkish Football Federation during 2014-2015 football season. The sample of the study was composed of 554 referees who were recruited with random sampling method. As the data collection tool and in order to determine referees' self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles; Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire I-II -designed by Mann et al. (1998) and adapted by Deniz (2004) into Turkish was used. As the result of the study; it was seen that there was a significant difference in self-esteem in decision-making and procrastination decision-making style in terms of refereeing experiences and in self-esteem in decision-making and buck-passing decision-making style in terms of their violence perceptions. It was noted that there were significant correlations between referees' self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making subscales.

Keywords: Football Referee, Decision-making, Violence, Experience, Exposure Community Violence, Workplace Violence

Introduction

Human beings are social creatures that lead their lives in a certain group and because they do not adapt themselves to the environment automatically and instinctually they make decisions almost in all aspects of their lives (Koçel, 2001). Decision-making is not only identification of the alternatives in relation with events and developments but also a choice-making process by wishing and aiming at the most appropriate alternatives for the best life style (Harris, 1998).

Decision-making is a choosing-process among the alternatives in order to obtain the best and the most suitable outcome after information on alternatives is learnt (Chatoupis, 2007). In a sense; decision-making may be regarded as a balancing process for one's inner world. Those to decide tend to meet and to satisfy both the needs of their inner worlds and the needs of their environment. To do so; individuals need to use their personal and environmental sources in an effective and positive way (Marco et al., 2003). The effectiveness of decision-making process depends on the individuals who decide because their methods used and personality characters are important (Shiloh et al., 2001). One of these characteristics is self-esteem. Self-esteem is the judgment concluded as a result of individuals' reflections and evaluations on themselves as an object. Again; self-esteem emerges from considering oneself important and self-acceptance (Kuzgun and Bacanlı, 2005). Individuals' self-esteem and self-confidence are the dominant variables in the decision-making process (Mann et al., 1998).

Decision-making style is another important determinant of the decision-making process. Decision-making style is an approach used by individuals when they act and react in face of a situation for which they should make decisions (Phillips et al., 1984). Therefore; during decision-making process it is important how individuals behave and adopt an attitude towards a situation. Decision-making strategy that includes one's methods to be used while making decisions and finding the appropriate approaches will affect the quality of the decision (Kuzgun, 2000). Janis and Mann (1977) explain in their conflict theory which decision-making styles are used by individuals while making decisions and to what degree these decision-making styles affect individuals' self-esteem and anxiety levels. Each decision-making style is related with some degree of psychological stress level in order to find solutions to time pressure and conflicts. Therefore; authors who are interested in decision-making (Friedmann and Mann, 1993; Mitchell and Krumboltz, 1984; Mann et al., 1998) sort out decision-making styles into four: vigilance, hypervigilance, procrastination, buck passing.

Accordingly; individuals employing vigilance decision-making style make choices after careful, unbiased, and thorough evaluation of alternatives and thus rational decision-making is reached. Individuals employing buck passing decision-making style leave decisions to others and avoid responsibility. In this way; they try to abstain from decision-makings by leaving decisions to others. Individuals using procrastination decision-making style delay decisions. They always try to delay the decisions without showing a valid and good reason. Individuals employing hypervigilance decision-making style feel under time pressure in case of making decisions and thus they tend to behave thoughtlessly and to reach hurried decisions (Mann et al., 1998; Deniz, 2004).

While solving a problem in sportive competitions, decisions made are generally complex and stressful (Fontona, 2007). Football refereeing is a physical activity with psychological and mental aspects. Referees are supposed to decide instantly as soon as they realize the situation in the competition (Cel, 1994). According to decision-making process in a sportive setting and information processing theory, made by Tenenbaum and Bar-Eli (1993), information obtained from all of the sources is treated through analyses in memory, assessment of the

alternatives and making decisions. These are evaluated in short-term memory and long-term memory, perception capacity, mental imagination, attention, concentration and experience.

According to Rasmussen; inexperienced referees show acts based mainly on rules and information while experienced referees demonstrate acts based mainly on ability and instructions (Mac Mahon, 1999). On the other hand; in the studies on the correlation between referee experience and inconsistent decisions; it is decided that under intense stress, experienced referees are better at keeping their emotions and feelings under control than inexperienced referees and ground on task-related information while deciding in stressful situations (Nevill et al., 2002).

That football referees are always on the public agenda with their decisions and their responsibilities are heavy directs the attention towards them further (Karagün et al., 2012). When the studies on referees are examined; they mainly focus on the fact that referees' stress sources are caused by time pressure and violence perception (Constable, 1996; Folkesson et al., 2002; Hughes, 2001; Rainey and Hardy, 1999; Nik, 1994). The referees' perceived anxiety that they are subjected to violence will considerably affect their decisions.

In light of the introductory information presented above; it is known that football referees who are in charge of football matches drawing the attention of huge masses across the world and being a spectacular sportive event work under hard conditions such as intense supporter/spectator pressure, oral and physical violence possibility and responsibility to decide in a very short time. It is important to discover self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles of the referees in terms of their experience and exposition to violence and to assess the correlation between these points.

Methodology

In the study; a model of descriptive survey and relational survey was used (Karasar, 2004).

Sample

The population of the study was composed 1080 referees who were assigned to the matches of the 7th region where there were 8 provinces (Hatay, Mersin, Adana, Osmaniye, Gaziantep, Kilis, Kahramanmaraş, Karaman) under Turkish Football Federation during 2014-2015 football season. The sample of the study was composed of 554 referees who were recruited from the population with random sampling method. All of the participant referees were male. When the refereeing category was examined; it was seen that 130 of them were candidate referees, 213 of them were province referees, 143 of them were regional referees and 68 of them were national referees.

Data Collection Instrument

Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire I-II (MDMQ I-II): As the data collection tool; Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire I-II (MDMQ I-II) -designed by Mann et al. (1998) and adapted by Deniz (2004) into Turkish to determine referees' self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles- was used. Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire is consisted of two parts: the first part -MDMQ I- measures self-esteem in decision-making and is composed of 6 items and one subscale. The second part -MDMQ II- is composed of 22 items and four subscales and measures decision-making styles. There are four subscales. Both of the questionnaires are three-point Likert-type questionnaires: 1=true; 2=somewhat true; 3= false. Upon the administration on 154 university students, internal

consistency coefficients of the MDMQ I-II were found by Deniz (2004) as follows: Cronbach Alpha self-esteem in decision-making: .72; vigilance: .80; buck-passing: .78; procrastination: .65; and hypervigilance: .71 (Deniz, 2004). In this study; internal consistency coefficients of the MDMQ I-II were as follows: self-esteem in decision making: .71; vigilance: .76; buck-passing: .72; procrastination: .61 and hypervigilance: .67. The highest score that can be obtained from MDMQ I is 12. Scoring MDMQ II is done with the score ranges of the subscales: vigilance (0 - 12), buck-passing (0 - 12), procrastination (0 - 10) and hypervigilance (0 - 10).

Analysis of Data

In determining self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles of the football referees; such descriptive statistical techniques as \bar{X} , SS, Range, min. scores and max. scores were used. While determining whether or not self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles of the football referees differed in terms of refereeing experience and violence perceptions; Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was employed to see whether or not the data followed a normal distribution and as the result of the test, non-parametric tests were used because the data did not follow a normal distribution. For pair-wise comparisons, Mann-Whitney U Test was used while Kruskal-Wallis Variance Analysis was used for multiple comparisons. To find out the correlation between self-esteem in decision-making levels and decision-making styles of the football referees; Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (r) was used. The data obtained were assessed with SPSS (Statistical Package For Social Scientists for Windows Release 18.0) and Level of significance was set at 0.05. The results were presented in Tables.

Results

Table 1. X, Sd, min. and max. scores relating self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles of the football referees

MDMQ I-II	n	X	SS	Min	Max	Minimum and maximum scores of the subscales
Self-esteem	554	10.86	1.26	5	12	0-12
Vigilance	554	9.73	1.80	6	12	0-12
Buck passing	554	2.75	2.06	0	10	0-12
Procrastination	554	2.62	1.93	0	8	0-10
Hyper vigilance	554	1.94	1.73	0	8	0-10

According to the findings in Table 1; it was found out that referees' mean score for the self-esteem in decision-making was $X = 10.86$ ($SS = 1.26$), $X = 9.73$ ($SS = 1.80$) for vigilance decision-making style, $X = 2.75$ ($SS = 2.06$) for buck passing decision-making style, $X = 2.62$ ($SS = 1.93$) for procrastination and $X = 1.94$ ($SS = 1.73$) for hypervigilance.

Table 2. Kruskal Wallis Test done to determine whether or not decision-making and decision-making styles of the football referees differed in terms of refereeing experience

MDMQ I-II	Refereeing experience (years)	N	Mean Rank	Df	X ²	P	Significance
Self-esteem	a 1-3	180	239.17	2	12.967	0.002*	a<b a<c
	b 4-8	233	296.47				
	c ≥ 9	141	282.96				
Vigilance	a 1-3	180	271.52	2	5.295	0.071	
	b 4-8	233	266.36				
	c 9	141	303.54				
Buck passing	a 1-3	180	293.49	2	2.843	0.241	
	b 4-8	233	272.01				
	c ≥ 9	141	266.15				
Procrastination	a 1-3	180	326.55	2	25.924	0.000*	a>b a>c b>c
	b 4-8	233	279.37				
	c ≥ 9	141	236.66				
Hyper vigilance	a 1-3	180	294.03	2	5.855	0.054	
	b 4-8	233	280.27				
	c ≥ 9	141	251.82				

* $P < 0.05$

According to the findings in Table 2; it was found out that there was no significant difference in vigilance decision-making style [$X^2(2)=5.295$; $P > 0.05$], buck passing decision-making style [$X^2(2)=2.843$; $P > 0.05$] and hypervigilance decision-making style [$X^2(2)=5.855$; $P > 0.05$] as far as refereeing experience variable was concerned. Yet; it was seen that there was significant difference in self-esteem in decision-making style [$X^2(2)=12.967$; $P < 0.05$] and procrastination decision-making style [$X^2(2)=25.924$; $P < 0.05$].

Table 3. Mann Whitney U Test done to determine whether or not decision-making and decision-making styles of the football referees differed in terms of violence experience

MDMQ I-II	Being subjected to violence	n	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
Self-esteem	Yes	126	207.33	26123.00	18122.00	0.000*
	No	428	298.16	127612.00		
Vigilance	Yes	126	265.70	33478.00	25477.00	0.338
	No	428	280.97	120257.00		
Buck passing	Yes	126	288.56	30231.00	22230.00	0.002*
	No	428	239.93	123504.00		
Procrastination	Yes	126	258.71	32597.50	24596.50	0.127
	No	428	283.03	121137.50		
Hyper vigilance	Yes	126	271.40	34197.00	26196.00	0.620
	No	428	279.29	119538.00		

* $P < 0.05$

According to the findings in Table 3; it was found out that there was a significant difference in self-esteem in decision-making style ($U=18122.00$; $P < 0.05$) and buck passing decision-making style ($U=22230.00$; $P < 0.05$) as far as violence experience variable was concerned. Yet; it was seen that there was no significant difference in vigilance decision-making style ($U=25477.00$; $P > 0.05$), procrastination decision-making style ($U=24596.50$; $P > 0.05$) and hypervigilance decision-making style ($U=26196.00$; $P > 0.05$).

Table 4. Results of Spearman's rank correlation coefficient done to determine the correlation between decision-making and decision-making styles of the football referees

	Vigilance	Buck passing	Procrastination	Hyper vigilance
Self esteem	0.140**	-0.178**	-0.244**	-0.398**

* significant at $P < 0.05$ ** significant at $P < 0.01$

According to the findings in Table 4; it was found that there was a positive and significant correlation between self-esteem in decision-making and vigilance decision-making style ($P < 0.01$). On the other hand; there was a negative and significant correlation between self-esteem in decision-making and buck passing decision-making style, procrastination decision-making style and hyper vigilance decision-making style ($P < 0.01$).

Discussion

When the scores obtained by the football referees from self-esteem in decision-making and subscales of decision making questionnaires were generally examined; it was seen that their self-esteem in decision-making style and vigilance decision-making style was high but their buck passing decision-making style, procrastination decision-making style and hyper vigilance decision-making style were low (Table 1). In light of these findings; it may be argued that football referees were self-confident during decisions-making, made decisions after having meticulously assessed their knowledge levels and perceptions, showed no tendency to leave the responsibility and decisions to others and did not delay their decisions and did not feel under pressure in face of problematic situations and did not make decisions in haste.

The study of Çetin (2009) on the students of physical education and sports, the study of Şirin et al. (2011) on orienteering athletes, the study of Vural (2013) on sport managers reported that the level of vigilance decision-making style was high but buck passing, procrastination and hyper vigilance decision-making styles were low among these participants. The findings of these studies were in line with our findings.

According to the findings of our study; it was explored that the experienced referees had significantly higher level of self-esteem in decision-making but low level of procrastination decision-making as compared with the inexperienced referees. Although there was no significant difference in vigilance, buck passing and hyper vigilance decision-making styles; it was noted that referees with higher experience had higher scores in vigilance decision-making style but lower scores in procrastination and hyper vigilance decision-making styles (Table 2).

As far as these findings were concerned; it was possible to say that those experienced referees were more self-confident and showed confident attitudes. In the study of Brown and Mann (1991); it was emphasized that individuals with high self-esteem were more qualified and competent in decision-making behaviors and thought more systematically and thoroughly while making decisions.

There are studies that concur with our study in the literature. The studies of Vural (2013) and Açık (2012) on sports managers, the study of Certel et al. (2013) on athletes pointed out that participants with higher experience had higher level of self-esteem in decision-making. The studies of Uzunoğlu (2008) on football referees and the studies of Koçak and Özbek (2010) on tennis referees found that there was no significant difference between self-esteem in decision-making and refereeing experiences but mean scores of the experienced referees were higher. These findings were partly in agreement with our findings. On the other hand; our findings demonstrated that the referees with 1-3 years experience employed procrastination decision-making style more as compared with the referees with 4-8 years experience whereas the referees with 4-8 years experience employed procrastination decision-making style more as compared with the referees with ≥ 9 years experience.

We were of the opinion that mean number of the matches to which referees are appointed increases with their refereeing age; which makes the referees use their knowledge and perception more. Tenenbaum and Bar-Eli (1993) suggested that another important point in decision-making is experience. Being experienced or being inexperienced plays a key role in performing motor performance. After the identification of knowledge; perceptual mechanism controls most of the knowledge concerning the perceived performance that is

about to occur through selective perception and rules out the irrelevant knowledge. In this sense; the more experienced individuals are the quicker and the more effective the process will be (Tenenbaum and Bar-Eli, 1993). There are studies in the literature the findings of which were in line with our findings. In the study of Uzunoğlu (2008); it was explored that junior referees used procrastination decision-making style more as compared with senior referees. In the study of Certel et al. (2013); it was noted that there was no significant difference between experience levels of team players and their procrastination decision-making style but less experienced players had higher scores in procrastination decision-making style as compared with more experienced players. The findings of the study of Koçak and Özbek (2010) on tennis referees and the study of Tekin and Taşgın (2009) on kick box trainers indicated no difference between tennis refereeing experience, kick box training experience and procrastination decision-making style; which contradicted our study findings.

According to the study findings; it was found out that those referees who were not subjected to violence had higher level self-esteem in decision-making but lower level of buck passing decision-making style as compared with those referees who were subjected to violence. As for the vigilance, procrastination and hypervigilance decision-making styles; no difference existed in terms of whether or not being subjected to violence (Table 3).

It was seen that those referees who were not subjected to violence were more competent than those referees who were subjected to violence in terms of self-esteem in decision-making. Lack of self-confident experienced by the referees who are subjected to violence may be resulting from the possibility that they may be exposed to oral or physical violence by athletes and supporters due to their wrong decisions. In a study done by Özmaden (2004) on supporters/spectators; it was argued that referees' unfavorable decisions were concluded to be regarded as "very effective" behaviors upon spectator violence. In other words; violence perception may be considered as an increasing factor of anxiety and alertness level. Kaissidis and Anshel (2000) reported that stress perceived by referees was negatively correlated with self-confidence. According to the Nideffer (1959); increase in anxiety and alertness levels may negatively affect vigilance decision-making style (Tenenbaum and Bar-Eli, 1993).

Another finding was that referees who were subjected to violence used buck passing decision-making style more as compared with those who were not subjected to violence. The studies of Constable (1996), Folkesson et al. (2002), Lane et al. (2006), Hughes (2001), Rainey and Hardy (1999) and Nik (1994) on referees revealed that the most common stress source of the referees was being subjected to physical and oral violence. These situations may cause the referees to show buck passing behavior for a while or to make decisions after consulting with their assisting referees. According to the decision-making theory; it is claimed that defensive avoidance avoids conflicts by delaying decisions, passing the buck or making up excuses in order to support the least possible option when a difficult and personal decision is to be made by individuals (Mann et al., 1998).

As far as our study findings were concerned; there was positive and significant correlation between football referees' self-esteem in decision-making levels and their vigilance decision-making style whereas a negative and significant correlation between their self-esteem in decision-making levels and procrastination, hypervigilance and buck passing decision-making styles (Table 4).

It may be argued that as the self-confidence levels of the referees increase during decision-making process they show vigilance decision-making style while procrastination, hypervigilance and buck-passing decision-making styles are used less. On the other hand; referees

who do not trust in their decision-making process move away from vigilance decision-making style while procrastination, hypervigilance and buck-passing decision-making styles are used more. In literature; there are studies with findings similar to ours. In the study of Koçak and Özbek (2010) on tennis referees, the study of Açık (2012) on sports managers, the studies of Deniz (2004), Mann et al. (1998) and Çolakadioğlu (2010) on university students, the study of Mann et al., (1989) on adolescents, the study of Yılmaz and Yıldız (2013) on the tourism managers, it was reported that there was a positive and significant correlation between self-esteem in decision-making and vigilance decision-making style but a negative and significant correlation between buck passing, procrastination and hypervigilance decision-making styles.

Conclusion

As a conclusion; it may be suggested that football referees' self-esteem in decision-making were generally high and that the referees used decision-making styles more effectively. It was seen that self-esteem in decision-making levels of the football referees who had higher level of experience and were not subjected to violence were higher. It may be said that the football referees who were subjected to violence showed avoidance tendency but those football referees who were less experienced showed a tendency to delay decisions. The fact that the referees have higher level of self-esteem in decision-making makes them use vigilance decision-making style but avoid from buck passing, procrastination and hypervigilance decision-making styles. In sum; it may be recommended that Turkish Football Federation should organize the necessary educational activities in which they should take measures against the possible violence events against the referees, cognitive decision-making process programs should be given to the less experienced referees and the referees should be supported in order to increase their motivational levels; which—we thought- are considered important in terms of referees' personal development and refereeing career. On the other hand; researchers should increase the number of the relevant studies with different scales and methods so that abilities relating cognitive decision making process of the football referees can be consolidated.

Corresponding Author

Mahmut GÜLLE

Address: Mustafa Kemal University School of Physical Education and Sports, Hatay, 31000, TURKEY.

Telephone: +90 (326) 245 5216 Email: mhmtgulle@gmail.com

Conflict of Interest

The authors have not declared any conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

- Açık M (2012). An Examination of The Decision-Making Styles of Hearing-Impaired Sports Club Managers in Turkey. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6 (28): 8310-8319.
- Brown J, Mann, L (1991). Decision-Making Competence And Self-Esteem: A Comparison of Parents And Adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 14 (4): 363-371.
- Cel A (1994). Hakemlik Psikolojisi. *Futbol Bilim ve Teknoloji Dergisi*, 1 (1): 21-23.
- Certel Z, Bahadır Z, Sönmez GT (2013). Investigation of Empathy and Self-Esteem in Decision Making and Decision-Making Styles Among Those Who Played Team Sport. *Nigde University Journal of Physical Education And Sport Sciences*, 7 (1):16-27.
- Chatoupis C (2007). Decision-Making in Physical Education: Theoretical Perspectives. *Studies in Physical Culture and Tourism*, 14 (2): 195-204.
- Constable DH (1996). *Sources of Stress in Hockey Referees*. Master Thesis, Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Çetin MÇ (2009). *In Terms of Some Variables the Comparatively Analysis of Decision-Making Styles, Social Skill Levels, and Forms of Coping With Stress the Students of the Physical Education and Sports School*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Gazi University, Ankara.
- Çolakkađıđlu O (2010). *The Effect of Conflict Theory Based Decision-Making Skill Training Group Applications on Decision Making Styles of Adolescents*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Çukurova University, Ankara.
- Deniz ME (2004). Investigation of the Relation Between Decision-Making Self-Esteem, Decision-Making Style and Problem Solving Skills of University Students. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 15 (2): 23-35.
- Folkesson P, Nyberg C, Archer, T. Norlander, T (2002). Soccer Referees' Experience of Threat and Aggression: Effects of Age, Experience, and Life Orientation on Outcome of Coping Strategy. *Journal of Aggressive Behavior*, 8 (4): 317- 327.
- Fontana FE (2007). *The Effects of Exercise Intensity on Decision Making Performance of Experienced and Inexperienced Soccer Players*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of Pittsburg.
- Friedmann IA, Mann L (1993). Coping Patterns in Adolescent Decision Making: An Israeli-Australian Comparison . *Journal of Adolescence*, 16 (2): 187-199.
- Harris R (1998). *Introduction to Decision-Making*. Vanguard University of Southern Colifornia. Colifornia.
- Hughes S (2001). *New Mexico High School Sports Officials' Perceptions of Athlete Coach and Spectator Conduct*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis. Albuquerque, The University of New Mexico.
- Kaissidis RA, Anshel MH, Porter A (1997). Personal and Situational Factors that Predict Coping Strategies for Acute Stress among Basketball Referees. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 15 (4): 427- 436.
- Karasar N (2005). *Bilimsel Arařtırma Yöntemi*. Ankara, Nobel Yayınları.

- Kargün M, Albay F, Canikli A, Güllü M (2012). Investigation of Work Satisfaction and Fatigue Levels of Turkish Football Referees. *Journal of Sports and Performance Researches*, 3 (2): 30-38.
- Koçak F, Özbek O (2010). Decision-Making Self-Esteem and Decision-Making Styles of Turkish Tennis Referees. *Ovidius University Annals, Series Physical Education and Sport / Science, Movement and Health*, 10 (2): 494-496.
- Koçel T (2001). *İşletme Yöneticiliği*. İstanbul: Beta Basım.
- Kuzgun Y (2000). *Meslek Danışmanlığı*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kuzgun Y, Bacanlı F (2005). *Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmada Kullanılan Ölçme Araçları ve Programlar Dizisi*. Ankara, Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Lane AM, Nevill AM, Nahid SA, Nigel B (2006). Soccer Referee Decision-Making: Shall I Blow The Whistle?, *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, 5 (2): 243–253.
- Mac MC (1999). *Making Sense of Chaos: Decision-Making By High and Low Experienced Rugby Referees*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, School of Human Kinetics University, Ottawa.
- Mann L, Beswick G, Allouache P, Ivey M (1989). Decision Workshops for the Improvement of Decision-Making Skills and Confidence. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 67 (8): 478-481.
- Mann L, Radford M, Burnett P, Ford S, Bond M, Leung K, Nakamura H, Vaughan G, Yang KS (1998). Cross-Cultural Differences in Self-Reported Decision-Making Style and Confidence. *International Journal of Psychology*, 33 (5): 325-335.
- Marco CD, Hartung P., Nevman I, Parr P (2003). Validitiy of the Decisional Process Inventory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63 (1): 1-19.
- Mitchell LK, Krumboltz YD (1984). *Research on Decision-Making: Implications for Career Decision-Making and Counseling*. (Ed: R.W. Lent, S.D. Brown). Awiley-Inter Science Publication, USA.
- Nevill AM, Balmer NJ, Mark WA (2002). The Influence of Crowd Noise and Experience Upon Refereeing Decisions In Football. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 3 (4): 261 – 272.
- Nik A (1994). *Sources of and Responses to Acute Stress in Sport as a Function of Selected Personal Dispositions Situational Appraisals and Cultural Differences*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of Wollongong, Australia.
- Özmaden MA (2004). Research Factor of the Promoting Soccer Aggressiveness According to Spectaclers. Unpublished Ph. D Thesis, Gazi University, Ankara.
- Phillips SD, Paziienza NJ, Ferrin HH (1984). Decision-Making Styles and Problem-Solving Appraisal. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31 (4): 497-502.
- Rainey D, Hardy L (1999). Assault on Rugby Union Referees: A Three Union Survey. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 22 (1): 105 - 113.
- Shiloh S, Koren S, Zakay D (2001). Individual Differences in Compensatory Decision-Making Style and Need for Closure as Correlates of Subjective Decision Complexity and Difficulty. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30 (4): 699-710.

Şirin EF, Bektaş F, Duman S (2011). The Relationship between Orienteering Athletes Multiple Intelligence Domains and Their Decision-Making Style. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 14 (2), 228-234.

Tekin M, Taşgın Ö (2009). Analysis of Decision-Making and Thinking Styles of Kickboxing Trainers. *Türkiye Kick Boks Federasyonu Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2 (1), 11- 27.

Tenenbaum G, Bar-Eli M (1993). *Decision-Making in Sport: A Cognitive Perspective*. In R. N. Singer M, Murphy LK, Tennant (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Sport Psychology*, 171-192. New York: Macmillan.

Uzunoğlu ÖU (2008). *Investigation Styles of Decision-Making of Turkish Football Referees According to Their Classifications and Some Variables*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.

Vural M (2013). *The Research of Decision-Making and Thinking Styles of Sports Managers Working in the Central and Provincial Organizations*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Selçuk University, Konya.

Yılmaz Y, Yıldız S (2013). The Relation Between Self-Esteem in Decision-Making, Decision-Making Styles and Problem Solving Skills. *Ist International Conference on Economic and Social Studies*, 10-11 May, 2013 Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.