# DECISION-MAKING STYLES: Athletes Playing At University Teams

***[1]Kazım NAS***
*[1]Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University, Physical Education and Sports High School, Karaman/TURKEY*

## Abstract
The aim of the study was to examine the self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles of the Table Tennis and Wushu athletes playing at university teams in terms of some variables. The research group consists of a total of 289 (184 Male&105 Female) athletes participating in Turkish Universities Table tennis (118 Athletes) and Wushu (171 Athletes) championships.The data collection tool was the Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire I-II, developed by Mann and et al., (1998) and translated to Turkish by Deniz (2004).For finding the differences, Analysis of variance (ANOVA) test, tukey test, t-test were used. According to the findings, Self-esteem of the athletes' rate is low ( $\overline{X}$ =3,38) and Vigilance decision-making rate from the sub-dimentions of the decision making was low ( $\overline{X}$ =2,59). But the Buck-Passing decision-making rate was high ( $\overline{X}$ =6,78) , the procrastination decision-making rate was mid-level ( $\overline{X}$ =5,36) and the Hyper-Vigilance decision-making rate was mid-level, too ( $\overline{X}$ =4,95). A statistically meaningful relationship was found according to the branch, class level at university and difficulty in the leisure time while there is not a statistically meaningful relationship according to athletes' gender, age, duration of the doing sports and leisure time is enough?

**Key Words:** Sport, Athlete, Self-esteem and Decision-making styles

# KARAR VERME STİLLERİ: *Üniversite Takımlarında Görev Alan Sporcular*

## Özet
Bu çalışmanın amacı, üniversite takımlarında masa tenisi ve wushu sporu yapan öğrencilerin karar verme stilleri ile karar vermede öz saygı düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesidir. Araştırma grubunu, Türkiye üniversiteler masa tenisi ve wushu şampiyonasına katılan 184 kadın, 105 erkek toplamda ise 289 kişi oluşturmaktadır. Veri toplama aracı olarak 2004 yılında Deniz tarafından Türkçeye uyarlanan ve 1998 yılında Mann ve arkadaşları tarafından geliştirilen Melbourne Karar ver ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Farklılıkları bulmak için, varyans analizi (Anova), Tukey testi ve t-testi kullanılmıştır. Bulgulara göre, sporcuların karar vermede öz saygı düzeyleri( $\overline{X}$ =3,38) ile dikkatli karar verme düzeyleri( $\overline{X}$ =2,59) düşük, fakat kaçıngan karar verme düzeyleri( $\overline{X}$ =6,78) yüksek, erteleyici karar verme düzeyleri ( $\overline{X}$ =5,36) ile panik karar verme düzeyleri orta düzeydedir( $\overline{X}$ =4,95). Sporcuların branşlarına, sınıf düzeylerine, boş zamanlarını değerlendirmede güçlük çekme durumuna göre anlamlı farklılık bulunurken, sporcuların cinsiyet, yaş, spor yapma süresi ve boş zaman yeterlimi değişkenlerine göre anlamlı bir fark bulunamamıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Spor, Sporcu, karar vermede öz saygı ve karar verme stilleri

**Introductıon**

Decisions made prior to teaching might relate to organizing the content material or designing activities to maximize student interest and engagement. Decisions during teaching might focus on whether students are learning or the types of adjustments that are needed, and judgments made after teaching could determine the types of feedback or grades that students should receive or the need for follow-up activities. All of these decisions are influenced by the ongoing classroom context, as well as a teacher's experiences, values, and knowledge of content, pedagogy, and individual students (Bernstein-Colton & Sparks-Langer, 1993). The act of making instructional decisions during and after the act of teaching requires several skills. First, teachers must assess students' ongoing performance and learning by observing their responses, examining their writing, communicating, or interacting with students, and providing multiple choice, true/false, or similar forms of selected response assessments. These methods of formative assessment, which can be planned ahead of time or employed spontaneously, enable teachers to identify difficulties with students' participation and/or learning (Bell & Cowie, 2001; Shepard, 2005). Second, teachers must interpret and react to information about student learning by providing richer explanations or demonstrations, altering students' assignments, or adjusting their learning goals to add or subtract complexity from the lesson. Wilson et al. (1987) describe this process as ''mediation'' because the continuous adjustment of instruction enables the teacher to mediate students' current understandings and the goals of a lesson.

Decision-making is important in organisations including schools because the success of an organisation depends on the quality of the decisions taken (Robbins et al. 2009). Different decision-making contexts can encourage the use of a different decision-making style to achieve the most desirable alternative outcome (Scott & Bruce, 1995).

How decisions are effectively made in a school is usually reliant on principals because they are the ones who are usually in charge of setting up the decision-making process (Nutt, 2008). This decision-making process can help accommodate inputs from teachers and achieve effective decision-making. Effective decision-making, according to Rausch (2005), involves the following steps: defining issues to be addressed, identifying alternatives, finding relevant information, evaluating the alternatives, selecting the most desirable alternative, implementing the alternative and monitoring the progress of the implementation towards the desired outcome. Effective decision-making will help teachers fulfil their job satisfaction.

Literature suggests a positive correlation between participative decision-making and staff's productivity (Dickson, 1982; Driscoll, 1978). Extensively, many theories of job satisfaction have been proposed, but one of the most common and widely utilised in educational settings has been that of Hersberg and his associates (Abu Sad & Isralowits, 1992; Derlin & Schneider, 1994; Dinham & Scott,

1999; Lester, 1987; Mercer, 1997). In terms of Research Question 2 (Can the model of the teacher-perceived principal decision-making styles significantly predict teacher job satisfaction?), we found that rational, intuitive, dependent and avoidant decision-making styles are significant predictors of teacher job satisfaction. In terms of Research Question 3 (Can the model of the teacher-perceived principal decision-making styles still significantly predict teacher job satisfaction after the possible effects of gender, marital status, teacher certification and school location are controlled for?), we found that teacher-perceived principal decision-making styles (except spontaneous decision-making style) are still significant predictors of teacher job satisfaction even after the possible effects of gender, marital status, teacher certification and school location are controlled for.

## METHODS

### Research Model

The research is a descriptive study. Descriptive statistics are statistical transactions that provide gathering, describing and presenting numeric values (Büyüköztürk, 2010).

### Research Group

Research group; held in Antalya on 10-14 April 2017, consist of a total of 289 athletes who participated in Turkey universities table tennis (118 athletes) and Wushu (171 athletes) championships.

**Table 1.** The Distribution of the Sample Group's Age and Branch

| | | **n** | **%** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Age** | 17-18 | 14 | 4,8 |
| | 19-20 | 97 | 33,6 |
| | 21-22 | 108 | 37,4 |
| | 23-24 | 50 | 17,3 |
| | 25-26 | 20 | 6,9 |
| **Brach** | Wushu | 171 | 59,2 |
| | Table Tennis | 118 | 40,8 |

### Data Collection

Firstly, existing data related to aim of research was given systematically by scanning literature. Thus, a theoretical frame was constituted about the issue. Secondly, the Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire I-II, developed by Mann and et al., (1998) and translated to Turkish by Deniz (2004)., applied to participants in point (Trans., Savaşır and Şahin, 1997).

### Data Collection Tools

Necessary data collection devices in an attempt to reach aims related to the research is given respectively below;

**Personal Information Form**

A personal information form consisting of 8 questions was developed in the study to determine participants' gender, age, branch, class level at university, duration of sports, Leisure time is enough? and difficulty in the leisure time.

**Decision-Making Questionnaire (DMQ)**

The Melbourne Decision-Making Questionnaire consisted of two parts. The Decision-Making Questionnaire I (DMQ) measured self-esteem as a decision maker. It consisted of six items (sample item: "I think I am a good decision maker") to which the respondent checked "True for me" (score 2); "Sometimes true" (score 1); "Not true for me" (score 0). The maximum score was 12. Decision-Making Questionnaire II consisted of 22 items and used the same response format as DMQ. One scale measured vigilance (sample item: "When making decisions I like to collect lots of information"). Each of the six vigilance items related to a step in sound decision making, such as defining goals, collecting information, considering alternatives, and checking alternatives. The buck-passing scale consisted of six items (sample item: "I prefer to leave decisions to others"). The procrastination scale consisted of five items (sample item: "I put off making decisions"). The hyper vigilance scale consisted of five items, (sample item "I feel as if I'm under tremendous pressure when making decisions") (Mann et al., 1998). In data analysis, descriptive statistical methods, including frequency (n), percentage (%), mean ( $\overline{X}$ ) and standard deviation (SD) were used for personal information. Normal distribution was used to highlight the differences using analysis of variance (ANOVA) test, tukey test, t-test, which are non-parametric tests, which were used because of effectuation of homogeneity conditions.
In this study, internal consistency index (Cronbach Alpha) of the self-esteem in decision-making was found as 0.74 and skills of decision making was found as as 0.76.

## Analyzing Data

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 21 (Statistical package for social sciences) package programme was used on evaluating data and finding calculated values.

***One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Tests***

In this part, One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests table is shown which indicate normal or aberrant dispersion for analysis that are related to the self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles of the Table Tennis and Wushu athletes.

**Table 2.** One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test That Indicate the self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles of Participants

| | self-esteem in decision making | Careful decision-making | Inevitable decision making | Deferential decision making | Panic decision making |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **n** | 289 | 289 | 289 | 289 | 289 |
| **Mean** | 3,3841 | 2,5882 | 6,7785 | 5,3599 | 4,9550 |
| **Std. Deviation** | 2,20193 | 2,26078 | 3,23277 | 2,70325 | 2,68510 |
| **KolmogorovSmirnov Z** | 2,145 | 2,598 | 2,171 | 1,621 | 1,387 |
| **p** | ,000 | ,000 | ,000 | ,010 | ,043 |

It is seen on Table 3 that the self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles sub dimensions is $P<0.05$. This shows us that data is not suitable for normal dispersion.

## FINDINGS

### Personal Features of Research Group

Data related to demographic features of volleyball players and their interpretations are given below.

**Table 3.** The Dispersion of Related to Demographic Features of Participant Sample Group,

| **Personal Features of Participants** | | **n** | **%** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Gender** | Male | 184 | 63,7 |
| | Female | 105 | 36,3 |
| **Age** | 17-18 | 14 | 4,8 |
| | 19-20 | 97 | 33,6 |
| | 21-22 | 108 | 37,4 |
| | 23-24 | 50 | 17,3 |
| | 25-26 | 20 | 6,9 |
| **Brach** | Wushu | 171 | 59,2 |
| | Table Tennis | 118 | 40,8 |
| **Class Level at University** | 1. Class | 77 | 26,6 |
| | 2: Class | 97 | 33,6 |
| | 3. Class | 58 | 20,1 |
| | 4. Class | 57 | 19,7 |
| **Duration of the Sports** | 0-2 Year | 33 | 11,4 |
| | 3-5 Year | 74 | 25,6 |
| | 6-8 Year | 64 | 22,1 |
| | 9 and + | 118 | 40,8 |
| **Leisure time is enough?** | Absolutely Inadequate | 16 | 5,5 |
| | Insufficient | 56 | 19,4 |
| | Normal | 130 | 45,0 |
| | Enough | 72 | 24,9 |
| | Absolutely Adequate | 15 | 5,2 |
| **Difficulty in leisure time** | Always | 22 | 7,6 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Sometimes | 188 | 65,1 |
| | Never | 79 | 27,3 |

According to Table 3, there were 184 (63.7%) male participants and 105 (36.3%) female participants according to the gender of the participants. According to the age variable, 14 persons (4.8%) were between the ages of 17-18 years, 97 persons (33.6%) were between 19-20 years old, 108 persons (37.4%) were between 21-22 years old and 50 people (17.3 %)were between 23-24 years and 20 persons (6.9%) were between 25-26 years. According to the branch variable, 171 people (59,2%) were Wushu and 118 people (40,8%) were table tenis. For the class level variable at university, 77 people (26.62%) were in the first class, 97 people (33.62%) were in the second class, 58 people (20.1%) were in the third class and 57 people (19.7%) were in the fourt class. According to the variance of participants' sporting duration, 33 persons (11.4%) were 0-2 years, 74 persons (25.6%) were 3-5 years, 64 persons (22.1%) were 6-8 years and 118 persons (40% , 8) were 9 and over years. According to the "Is leisure time sufficient ?" for participants, it was said that people (5.5%) were definitely inadequate, 56 people (19.4%) were insufficient, 130 people (45%) were normal, 72 people (24.9%) were adequate and 15 people were enough. Finally, according to the variable of difficulty in the leisure time of the participants, 22 participants (7.6%) answered "always", 188 (65.1%) were "sometimes" and 79 (27.3%) were "never".

**Table 4**. Results of participitans related to $\overline{X}$ and Ss Values of the self-esteem in decision-making sub dimentions points

| | **n** | $\overline{X}$ | **Ss** | **Min** | **Max** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Self Esteem** | 289 | 3,3841 | 2,20193 | 0 | 12 |
| **Vigilance** | 289 | 2,5882 | 2,26078 | 0 | 12 |
| **Buck-Passing** | 289 | 6,7785 | 3,23277 | 0 | 12 |
| **Procrastination** | 289 | 5,3599 | 2,70325 | 0 | 10 |
| **Hyper-Vigilance** | 289 | 4,9550 | 2,68510 | 0 | 10 |

In the Table 4, self-esteem in the decision- making and decision-making sub-dimentions points of athletes participating in the research were analyzed. According to the results in Table 4, self –esteem dimesnsions of the athletes was found as $\overline{X}$ =3,38 (min 0 – max 12). So self-esteem of the athletes' rate is low. Vigilance decision-making rate from the sub-dimentions of the decision making was $\overline{X}$ =2,59 (min 0 – max 12). So it can be said that it is low. Buck-Passing decision-making rate

was $\overline{X}$ =6,78 (min 0 – max 12). So it is high. Procrastination decision-making rate was $\overline{X}$ =5,36 (min 0 – max10). So it can be said that it is mid-level. Hyper-Vigilance decision-making rate was $\overline{X}$ =4,95 (min 0 – max 10). So it is mid-level, too.

**Tablo 5.** Mann Whitney U Test Results of participitans' self-esteem in decision- making and sub dimentions of the decision making points according to the branch variable

| | | N | Range Average | Range Total | U | Z | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Self Esteem** | Wushu | 171 | 123,65 | 21144,50 | 6438,50 | -5,274 | ,000* |
| | Table Tennis | 118 | 175,94 | 20760,50 | | | |
| **Vigilance** | Wushu | 171 | 133,66 | 22855,50 | 81493,50 | -2,813 | ,005* |
| | Table Tennis | 118 | 161,44 | 19049,50 | | | |
| **Buck-Passing** | Wushu | 171 | 160,58 | 27458,50 | 7425,50 | -3,832 | ,000* |
| | Table Tennis | 118 | 122,43 | 14446,50 | | | |
| **Procrastination** | Wushu | 171 | 159,51 | 27276,50 | 7607,50 | -3,576 | ,000* |
| | Table Tennis | 118 | 123,97 | 14628,50 | | | |
| **Hyper-Vigilance** | Wushu | 171 | 158,46 | 27096,50 | 7787,50 | -3,315 | ,001* |
| | Table Tennis | 118 | 125,50 | 14808,50 | | | |

* p<.05

In Table 5, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to find out whether the mean points of participants' self-esteem and decision making subscales differed according to the branch variable. According to "branch variable", the athletes' points of self –esteem in decision-making are $\overline{X}$ =123,65 for wushu athletes and $\overline{X}$ =175,94 for table tenis athletes and there was a statistically meaningful difference in self esteem in decision making (U:6438,50 p<0,05).

The athletes' points in Vigilince making decision style are $\overline{X}$ =133,66 for wushu athletes and $\overline{X}$ =161,44 for table tenis athletes and there was a statistically meaningful difference in Vigilince making decision making (U:81493,50 p<0,05).

The athletes' points in Buck passing making decision style are $\overline{X}$ =160,58 for wushu athletes and $\overline{X}$ =122,43 for table tenis athletes and there was a statistically meaningful difference in Buck passing making decision making (U:7425,50 p<0,05).

The athletes' points in Procrastination making decision style are $\overline{X}$ =159,51 for wushu athletes and $\overline{X}$ =123,97 for table tenis athletes and there was a statistically meaningful difference in Procrastination making decision making (U:7607,50 p<0,05).

The athletes' points in Hyper-Vigilance making decision style are $\overline{X}$ =158,46 for wushu athletes and $\overline{X}$ =125,50 for table tenis athletes and there was a statistically meaningful difference in Hyper-Vigilance making decision making (U:7787,50 p<0,05).

**Table 6.** Kruskal-Wallis H Test Results of participitans' self-esteem in decision- making and sub dimentions of the decision making points according to the class level at university variable

| | | N | Sıra Ortalaması | Sd | $X^2$ | P | Fark |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Self Esteem** | 1. Class | 77 | 148,56 | 3 | 4,084 | ,253 | - |
| | 2: Class | 97 | 152,88 | | | | |
| | 3. Class | 58 | 145,95 | | | | |
| | 4. Class | 57 | 125,82 | | | | |
| **Vigilance** | 1. Class | 77 | 149,65 | 3 | 1,564 | ,668 | - |
| | 2: Class | 97 | 148,60 | | | | |
| | 3. Class | 58 | 144,22 | | | | |
| | 4. Class | 57 | 133,39 | | | | |
| **Buck-Passing** | 1. Class | 77 | 137,07 | 3 | 8,643 | ,034* | 2-4<br>2-5 |
| | 2: Class | 97 | 131,69 | | | | |
| | 3. Class | 58 | 154,20 | | | | |
| | 4. Class | 57 | 169,01 | | | | |
| **Procrastination** | 1. Class | 77 | 134,98 | 3 | 12,958 | ,005* | 4-2<br>4-1 |
| | 2: Class | 97 | 131,34 | | | | |
| | 3. Class | 58 | 148,53 | | | | |
| | 4. Class | 57 | 178,19 | | | | |
| **Hyper-Vigilance** | 1. Class | 77 | 146,02 | 3 | 5,353 | ,148 | - |
| | 2: Class | 97 | 133,48 | | | | |
| | 3. Class | 58 | 142,84 | | | | |
| | 4. Class | 57 | 165,41 | | | | |

*p<.05

In Table 6, the Kruskal-Wallis H test was used to find out whether the mean points of participants' self-esteem and decision making subscales differed according to the class level variable at university.

According to "class variable at university", the athletes' points of buck-passing decision-making are $\overline{X}$ =137,07 for 1. class, $\overline{X}$ =131,69 for 2. class, $\overline{X}$ =154,20 for 3. Class and $\overline{X}$ =169,01 for 4. Class ($X^2$= 8,643, p<0,05).

The athletes' points of procrastination decision-making are $\overline{X}$ =134,98 for 1. class, $\overline{X}$ =131,34 for 2. class, $\overline{X}$ =148,53 for 3. Class and $\overline{X}$ =178,19 for 4. Class ($X^2$= 12,958, p<0,05).

**Table 7.** Kruskal-Wallis H Test Results of participitans' self-esteem in decision- making and sub dimentions of the decision making points according to Difficulty in leisure time

| | | N | Sıra Ortalaması | Sd | $X^2$ | P | Fark |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Self Esteem** | Always | 22 | 191,66 | 2 | 25,796 | ,000* | 1-3 |
| | Sometimes | 188 | 155,19 | | | | |
| | Never | 79 | 107,75 | | | | |
| **Vigilance** | Always | 22 | 159,77 | 2 | 1,410 | ,494 | - |
| | Sometimes | 188 | 146,41 | | | | |
| | Never | 79 | 137,52 | | | | |
| **Buck-Passing** | Always | 22 | 100,34 | 2 | 16,351 | ,000* | 1-3<br>2-3 |
| | Sometimes | 188 | 138,52 | | | | |
| | Never | 79 | 172,87 | | | | |
| **Procrastination** | Always | 22 | 90,86 | 2 | 23,854 | ,000* | 1-3 |
| | Sometimes | 188 | 137,25 | | | | |
| | Never | 79 | 178,51 | | | | |
| **Hyper-Vigilance** | Always | 22 | 95,84 | 2 | 29,968 | ,000* | 1-3 |
| | Sometimes | 188 | 133,72 | | | | |
| | Never | 79 | 185,54 | | | | |

*p<.05

In Table 7, the Kruskal-Wallis H test was used to find out whether the mean points of participants' self-esteem and decision making subscales differed according to the Difficulty in leisure time. According to "Difficulty in leisure time variable", the athletes' points of self esteem in decision-making are $\overline{X}$ =191,66 for they said "always" , $\overline{X}$ =155,19 for they said "sometimes" and $\overline{X}$ =107,75 for they said " never" ($X^2$= 25,796, p<0,05).

The athletes' points of Buck-Passing decision-making are $\overline{X}$ =100,34 for they said "always" , $\overline{X}$ =138,52 for they said "sometimes" and $\overline{X}$ =172,87 for they said " never" ($X^2$= 25,796, p<0,05).

The athletes' points of Procrastination decision-making are $\overline{X}$ =90,86 for they said "always" , $\overline{X}$ =137,25 for they said "sometimes" and $\overline{X}$ =178,51 for they said " never" ($X^2$= 23,854, p<0,05).

The athletes' points of Hyper-Vigilance decision-making are $\overline{X}$ =95,84 for they said "always" , $\overline{X}$ =133,72 for they said "sometimes" and $\overline{X}$ =185,54 for they said " never" ($X^2$= 29,968, p<0,05).

**DISCUSSION AND RESULTS**

This study was carried out to find out whether or not the self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles of the athletes differs according to the variables of gender, age, branch, class level at university, duration of sports, Leisure time is enough? and difficulty in the leisure time. As a result of study, the results obtained in this study in order to identify self- esteem in the making decision and sub-dimensions of the athletes' making decision are as follows;

Self-Esteem dimensions of the athletes was found as $\overline{X}$ =3,38. So self-esteem of the athletes' rate is low. Vigilance decision-making rate from the sub-dimentions of the decision making was $\overline{X}$ =2,59. So it can be said that it is low. The Buck-Passing decision-making rate was $\overline{X}$ =6,78. So it is high. The Procrastination decision-making rate was $\overline{X}$ =5,36. So it can be said that it is mid-level. The Hyper-Vigilance decision-making rate was $\overline{X}$ =4,95. So it is mid-level, too. On the study done by Çetin (2009) which is oriented to determine students‟ decision making styles, their social skill levels and their keeping up with stress manners who study at Physical Training and Sport Academy, students‟ self-esteem levels were seen high on decision making. It can be said that students‟ carefully decision making is high; that is to say, they make decisions after looking for needed data and evaluating alternatives carefully. On the other hand, they do not show tendency of passing the buck and giving the responsibility to others which is reason for low points of avoidant decision making style. In other words, it can be said that students, who trust and respect their own decisions, show carefully decision making style rather than avoiding it. Students‟ tendency to postpone their decisions and making their decisions quickly under the pressure of time in the event of problem seems to be at mid-level. So It is understood that these findings are not parallel to the work done. And
According to the Temel and et al.(2017ab), the disable athletes' self esteem and vigilance decision making levels are low. With this result, it paralels with this study (Temel et al., 2017a;.Temel et al.,2017b). On the other hand, according to the Akpınar et al.(2015), athletes' self esteem and vigilance decision making levels are high. So it doesn't paralel with this study.

A statistically meaningful relationship was found according to the branch, class level at university and difficulty in the leisure time while there is not a statistically meaningful relationship according to athletes' gender, age, duration of the doing sports and leisure time is enough?

On the other hand, according to the evaluation of athletes' branch variable, athletes playing table tenis is more confident than wushu athletes. When athletes playing table tennis decide, they are

more careful than wushu athletes. On the other hand, athletes doing wushu are more forbearer than table tennis athletes. They behave in an act of postponing the decision. In addition that, wushu athletes are an enhanced state of sensory sensitivity accompanied by an exaggerated intensity of behaviors whose purpose is to detect threats when they want to decide. According to the study of Temel (2015), there isn't any difference between branch variable of the athletes. So It is understood that this one is not parallel to the work done.

According to the evaluation of athletes' class level at university, athletes studying at 2. Class at university are more forbearer than the athletes at 3. And 4. Class. athletes studying at 1. and 2. Class at university tend to more procrastinate for decision making than athletes at 4. Class. According to Avşaroğlu (2007), it was found that there was statistically any difference about the class of the students for self esteem of the decision making. And there wasn't a statistically difference about the class of the students for decision making skills. These results are not paralel to this work.

According to the evaluation of athletes' difficulty in leisure time variable, athletes said "always" have no self-respect at decision making, but athletes said "never" have. On the other hand, athletes said "never" tend to take evasive action at decision making, postpone at decision making and be more panic at decisipn making than the others. According to the study of Birol (2016), there isn't any difference about difficulty in leisure time variable of the students. So It is understood that this one is not parallel to the work done.

**REFERENCE**

Abu Saad, I. & Isralowitz, R.E. (1992). Teachers' Job Satisfaction in Transitional Society within the Bedouin Arab Schools of the Negev. *The Journal of Social Psychology,132 (6),* 771-781.

Akpınar, S., Bay, M., Şule, U., Temel, V. and Nas, K. (2014). The examination of some variables in terms of some deciding styles of students who study at Physical education and sports high school. Prime Journal of Social Science(PJSS), Vol. 3(3), pp. 642-647.

Avşaroğlu, S. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinin karar vermede özsaygı, karar vermeve stresle başaçıkma stillerinin benlik saygısı ve bazı değişkenler açısından İncelenmesi. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya.

Bell, B., & Cowie, B. (2001). Formative assessment and science education. Norwell, MA: Kluwer.

Bernstein-Colton, A., & Sparks-Langer, G. M. (1993). A conceptual framework to guide the development of teacher reflection and decision-making. Journal of Teacher Education, 44(1), 45–54.

Birol, S.Ş. and İnce, A. (2016). *Sportif Rekreasyon Aktivitelerine Katılan Öğrencilerin Karar Vermede Özsaygı Ve Karar Verme Stillerinin Belirlenmesi.* Uluslararası Anadolu Spor Bilimleri Dergisi / The Journal of International Anatolia Sport Science Cilt/Volume:1 Sayı/Issue:1.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Çetin, M.Ç. (2009). Physical Education and Sports School Students' Decision-making Styles, Social Skill Levels and Coping with Stress in terms of format Comparative Study of Some Variables, Gazi University, Institute of Education Sciences, PhD Thesis, Ankara.

Deniz, M.E. (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.

Derlin, R., Schneider, G. (1994), "Understanding job satisfaction: principals and teachers, urban and suburban", *Urban Education*, Vol. 29 No.1, pp.63-88.

Dickson, J.W. 1982. Top managers' beliefs and rationales for employee participation. Human Relations, 35(3): 203-217.

Dinham, S., Scott, C. (1999), "The relationship between context, type of school and position held in school and occupational satisfaction, and mental stress", paper presented at the Australian College of Education/Australian Council for Educational Administration, National Conference, Darwin.

Lester, P.E. (1982). Development and Factor Analysis of the Teacher Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (TJSQ). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 47 (1),* 223-233.

Mann, L., Radford, M., Burnett, P., Ford, S., Bond, M., Leung, K., Nakamura, H., Vaughan, G. and Yang, K. S. (1998). Cross-Cultural Differences in Self-Reported Decision-Making Style and Confidence. International Journal of Psychology. 33, 325-335.

Mercer, D. (1997), "Job satisfaction and the secondary school teacher: the creation of a model of job satisfaction".

Nutt, P.C. 2008. Investigating the success of decision making processes . *Journal of Management Studies* 45 , no. 2 : 425 – 55 .

Akpınar, Ö., Temel,V., Birol,S.Ş., Akpınar,S. Ve Nas, K.(2015). Üniversitede okuyan hokey sporcularının karar Verme stillerinin belirlenmesi. Kastamonu üniversitesi iktisadi ve idari bilimler fakültesi dergisi, sayı:9, s.92-99.

Rausch , E. 2005 . A practical focus on leadership in management – For research, education and management development. *Management Decision* 43 , nos. 7/8 : 988 – 1000 .

Savaşır, I. ve Şahin, N. H. (1997). *Bilişsel ve davranışçı terapilerde değerlendirme: Sık kullanılan ölçekler.* Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.

Scott, S.G. and Bruce, R.A. (1995). Decision-making style: The development and assessment of a new measure .*Educational and Psychological Measurement* 55 , no. 5 : 818 – 31 .

Temel, V. (2015). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin, problem çözme becerisi, karar verme stilleri ve öfke tarzları. Karadeniz teknik üniversitesi, eğitim bilimleri enstitüsü, beden eğitimi ve spor anabilim dalı, doktora tezi, Trabzon.

Temel, V., Birol, S.Ş.(2017a). Bedensel engelli sporcuların problem çözme becerilerinin karar verme Stillerine olan etkisinin belirlenmesi. Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, Cilt: 10 Sayı: 49, s. 800-807.

Temel, V., Birol, S.Ş., Akpınar, S., Nas, K.(2017b). Öğrencilerin karar verme düzeyleri ile sürekli öfke ve Öfke ifade tarzlarının belirlenmesi. *Uluslararası anadolu spor bilimleri dergisi, cilt/volume: ağs./aug. Sayı/ıssue:3, 122-132.*

Wilson, S. M., Shulman, L. S., & Richert, A. E. (1987). ‘‘150 different ways’’ of knowing: Representations of knowledge in teachers. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), Exploring teachers’ thinking (pp. 104–124). London: Cassell.