

[DOI: 10.20472/IAC.2015.015.195](https://doi.org/10.20472/IAC.2015.015.195)

ILIMDAR YALCIN

Firat University, Turkey

ATALAY GACAR

Firat University, Turkey

EMINE BAGCI

Kutahya University, Turkey

EXAMINATION ON THE DECISION MAKING LEVELS OF THE PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS AND SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT STUDENTS' IN TERMS OF CERTAIN VARIABLES

Abstract:

Decision making is the act of choosing consciously one of the present alternatives in order to obtain the intended result or achieve the determined goals. On the basis of these considerations, we aim to examine the decision making levels of the physical education and sports and sociology department students' in terms of certain variables in our study.

□Our study has been conducted on 42 final year undergraduate students of Elazig Firat University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports Teaching and 37 final year undergraduate students of Kutahya Dumlupinar University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Sociology Department.

It was used a personal information form and the "Melbourne Decision Making Scale" developed by Mann and et.al. (1998) in order to determine the research participant's demographic information such as "age, gender and department of study". The acquired data were evaluated by the SPSS programme and the level of significance is considered as $p < 0.05$.

□Consequently, in the examination of the participant students' level of self-respect and decision making styles with regard to their demographic information "age, gender and department of study", it has been found out that any difference has not been observed in terms of gender and department of study variables. However, pursuant to the age variable, it has been observed that the difference between the point average of the decision making styles subscales has shown a significant differentiation between the age of 21-23 and 27 and above at the subscale of careful decision making style.

Keywords:

Decision making, Sports, Physical Education and Sports, Sociology

2. INTRODUCTION

Individuals often confront with situations in which they need to make decisions in developing and changing world. Particularly, technology enables individuals to face with several options. Individuals render not only very basic decisions in daily life but also life changing social, economic, educational, political and professional decisions. If individuals make effective decisions, it ensures their satisfaction of life increases and makes them feel good. On the other hand, if they cannot make decisions effectively, this results in individuals' feeling their life is getting more complicated and they feel unwell about it (Colakkadioglu and Guçray, 2007, p.655).

We are confronted with decisions in every step of life. As a member of society, individuals are consistently obliged to make decisions because of their status. For instance, a woman makes countless decisions every day on what to cook at home as a mother and wife, which project to begin at work as an employee and which brand to choose at supermarket as a customer. The fundamental point is the word "which" since it gives more than one alternatives to people. Decision, in fact, represents a state waiting for taking action. The decisions we take within the day represent our choice between current alternatives. Thus, decision, with a simple definition, is the choice or preference done between present alternatives (Onaran, 1975, p.6, Sarikaya, 2013, p.4).

Making decisions is the process of choosing one of the alternatives at situations of which results cannot be foreseen clearly. In order to choose the best option while deciding, the notions "data" and "processing the data" have a strategic meaning and importance (Gonenc and Wolflin, 2004, p.14, Cetinkaya, 2013, p.58).

Making decision is the process of choosing between several options. In other definition, making decision is the art of preference. Individuals are obliged to make decisions both at their private life and at work in every step of life. Problems confronted by individuals can be very simple and also complicated affected by many factors (Rue and Byers, 2003, p.68, Mutlu, 2012, p.17). The process of making decisions can be regarded as individuals' process of balancing their inner world. While deciding upon, individuals incline to meet and satisfy the needs of their inner world and also the expectations of the environment. In order to accomplish this, they need to use their personal and environmental sources sufficiently and positively (Marco et al., 2003, p.3, Akbulut, 2012, p.32).

The most time-consuming part of decision making process is not the phase of deciding but the phase of implementing the decision. This is because, the decisions that are not implemented are just intentions, they do not have the characteristics of decision. Thus, practicality of decision has capital importance at decision making process. Also, decision making has risks most of the time because it is a future-oriented process. For the future is uncertain. When decision maker analyzes the uncertainty in the future well and considers it, turns into a risk (Yaralioglu, 2010, p.4, Sarikaya, 2013, p.5).

It is primarily necessary to bring up a problem at decision making process. The next step that must be done is to collect essential information. When there are some critical information that cannot be reached, adjourning decision making is a correct

and clear approach. Then, suitable options must be set to come to conclusion. At least three or more options must be set to make effective decisions. It must be looked at cases from different aspects to think all the possibilities with several dimensions (Gacar, 2011, p.12).

According to Demir (1985), decision making is considered and described from different angles; however, any general description cannot be made by arriving at a consensus. The common traits of the description about decision making are indicated below:

1. It is choice of effective action,
2. It is every kind of judgment affecting the action,
3. It is an adjudication process in consequence of carried out evaluations,
4. It is process of choosing the active one among alternatives consisting of different behaviors to achieve the goal,
5. It is problem solving process,
6. It is to come a conclusion by interpreting the datas about the case or problems and making comparisons,
7. It is a process (Demir, 1985, p.3, Deryahanoglu, 2014, p.23).

This study is held to examine the decision making levels of Physical Education and Sports and Sociology students and it has importance with the thought that it will be literature information for different studies.

3. MATERIAL METHOD

Research Group

In the study, "Survey Method" was used with the purpose of examining the decision making level of Physical Education and Sport and Sociology students in terms of some variables.

Our study was applied to 42 final year students who study at the Department of Physical Education and Sports in Faculty of Sports Sciences in Elazig Firat University and 37 final year students who study at the Department of Sociology in Faculty of Science and Literature in Kutahya Dumlupinar University and 31 female and 48 male students ,totally 79 volunteer students, attended the study.

Data Gathering Tools

In the study, "Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire" which was developed by Mann, Harmoni and Power (1998) was used. This scale was developed to compare university students' self-esteem and decision making styles in decision making in a cross-cultural study including six countries. It consists of two parts. Questionnaire was adapted to Turkish to identify Turkish university students' decision making styles and do comparative researches with other countries students by Deniz (2004) (Mann, Harmoni and Power, 1998, pp.325-335, Deniz, 2004, pp.25-35, Deryahanoglu, 2014, p.41).

Analysis of Data

In the study, parametric tests were used to analyze the datas. Gathered datas was evaluated with SPSS by being entered into the computer and significance level was taken as $p < 0.05$. Frequency distribution, arithmetic average, t test and One-Way

Anova was found by the help of SPSS statistic program and Tukey test results were used to identify among which groups the difference is at the results which there is a significant difference.

4. FINDINGS

In this part, the average of distribution function values style of self-esteem and decision making styles scale points of the final year students at the department of Physical Education and Sports and Sociology who attended our study at decision making in relation to variables (age, gender and department) were examined.

Table 1. Distribution Function Values of Self-Respect in Decision Making and Decision Making Styles Scale Points in Terms of Age Variables.

	Age	N	\bar{x}	Ss	F	p
Self-Respect in Decision Making	21 – 23	25	10,08	1,63	2,32	0,10
	24 – 26	32	10,68	1,37		
	27 and over	22	9,86	1,42		
	Total	79	10,26	1,49		
Careful Decision Making	21 – 23	25	8,72 *	1,90	5,49	0,00
	24 – 26	32	9,90	2,60		
	27 and over	22	10,77 *	1,54		
	Total	79	9,77	2,25		
Avoidant Decision Making	21 – 23	25	3,32	2,28	0,01	0,98
	24 – 26	32	3,37	2,48		
	27 and over	22	3,27	2,64		
	Total	79	3,32	2,43		
Suspensive Decision Making	21 – 23	25	3,04	1,64	1,74	0,18
	24 – 26	32	3,37	1,96		
	27 and over	22	4,09	2,26		
	Total	79	3,46	1,97		
Panic Decision Making	21 – 23	25	3,08	2,05	0,00	0,99
	24 – 26	32	3,03	2,16		
	27 and over	22	3,04	1,96		
	Total	79	3,05	2,05		

In Table 1, when analysis of variance results in relation to self-respect and decision making styles scale points at decision making as to age variable of physical education and sport and sociology final year students were examined, it was observed that there was not a significant differentiation between sub-dimension levels of avoidant decision making, suspensive decision making and panic decision making styles from sub-dimensions of self-respect and decision making styles at decision making ($p < 0.05$). It was found that there was a significant difference between sub-dimension level of careful decision making style ($p < 0.05$). Tukey test was used to identify significant variance. When the statistical values were examined with relation to applied Tukey test and the difference between sub-dimensions point average of

decision making styles in terms of age variable was considered, it was found that there was a significant differentiation between 21-23 aged and 27 and over aged people at sub-dimension of careful decision making style ($p < 0.05$).

Table-2. Distribution Function Values of Self-Respect in Decision Making and Decision Making Styles Scale Points in Terms of Gender Variables.

	Gender	N	\bar{x}	Ss	F	p
Self-Respect in Decision Making	Female	31	10,32	1,44	0,26	0,78
	Male	48	10,22	1,54		
Careful Decision Making	Female	31	10,16	1,75	1,23	0,22
	Male	48	9,52	2,51		
Avoidant Decision Making	Female	31	3,25	2,48	-0,20	0,83
	Male	48	3,37	2,42		
Suspensive Decision Making	Female	31	3,41	1,80	-0,17	0,86
	Male	48	3,50	2,10		
Panic Decision Making	Female	31	2,87	1,89	-0,62	0,53
	Male	48	3,16	2,15		

In Table 2, when analysis of variance results in relation to self-respect and decision making styles scale points at decision making as to gender variable of physical education and sport and sociology final year students were examined, it was stated that there was not any significant differentiation between panic decision making, suspensive decision making, avoidant decision making and careful decision making styles from sub-dimensions of self-respect and decision making styles at decision making ($p > 0.05$). The point average of males was higher than female's at avoidant decision making, suspensive decision making and panic decision making styles. However, the point average of females at sub-dimension of self-respect and careful decision making style was higher than males at decision making.

Table-3. Distribution Function Values of Self-Respect in Decision Making and Decision Making Styles Scale Points in Terms of Department of Study Variables.

	Department of Study	N	\bar{x}	Ss	F	p
Self-Respect in Decision Making	Physical Education And Sports Teaching	42	10,33	1,42	0,42	0,67
	Sociology	37	10,18	1,59		
Careful Decision Making	Physical Education And Sports Teaching	42	9,73	2,59	-0,14	0,88
	Sociology	37	9,81	1,83		

Avoidant Decision Making	Physical Education And Sports Teaching	42	3,52	3,52	2,50	0,75
	Sociology	37	3,10	3,27		
Suspensive Decision-Making	Physical Education And Sports Teaching	42	3,66	2,00	0,94	0,34
	Sociology	37	3,24	1,94		
Panic Decision Making	Physical Education And Sports Teaching	42	2,80	1,81	-1,11	0,26
	Sociology	37	3.32	2,28		

In Table 3, when the department of study variables of physical education and sports and sociology students were examined and when we have a look at analysis of variance results in relation to self-respect and decision making styles scale points at decision making, it was indicated that there was not any significant difference between panic decision making, suspensive decision making, avoidant decision making, careful decision making styles from sub-dimensions of self-respect and decision making styles in terms of department variable at decision making ($p>0.05$).

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this part, the findings about careful decision making, avoidant decision making, suspensive decision making and panic decision making from sub-dimension of Physical Education and Sports and Sociology final year students' self-respect and decision making styles at decision making and the finding about age, gender and department of study variables were discussed and interpreted.

When analysis of variance results in relation to self-respect and decision making styles scale points at decision making as to age variable of the students who attended our study were examined, it was discovered that there was not any significant differentiation in terms of panic decision making, suspensive decision making, avoidant decision making from sub-dimensions of self-respect and decision making styles at decision making ($p>0.05$, Table 2). When the difference between sub-dimensions point average of decision making styles was considered, it was found that there was a significant differentiation between 21-23 aged and 27 and over aged people at sub-dimension of careful decision making style ($p<0.05$, Table 1). In the master thesis study which was conducted by Arin (2006) and was about the relationship level between high school directors' education leadership behaviors and their decision making strategies and problem solving skills, it showed that there was a significant difference among participants whose ages were between 31-40 and 51-60 statistically in the research intended for decision making styles and this result supports our study (Arin, 2006, p.105). When the other studies were taken into consideration, it was seen that there was not any significant differentiation at significance level. In the study which was intended for decision making styles of high school directors by using

Kuzgun's (1992) Decision Making Strategies Scale, it was observed that the decision making styles except for dependent decision making style did not vary depending on age variable (Kuzgun, 1992, pp.161-170). Sanders (2008) also ascertained in his doctoral thesis study that decision making styles did not differ considerably according to individuals' age group (Sanders, 2008, p.71).

When analysis of variance results in relation to self-respect and decision making styles scale points at decision making as to gender variable of the students who attended our study were examined, it was stated that there was not any significant differentiation in terms of sub-dimensions variables of self-respect and decision making styles at decision making ($p>0.05$, Table 2). It was observed that there was not a significant differentiation at gender variable of individuals who attended "Camp Leadership Training" by Gacar and his colleagues (2013) and this supports our study (Gacar et al., 2013, p.207). Similarly, the gathered datas from the study which was conducted by Tasdelen (2001) and was about decision making styles of teacher candidates as to different psychosocial variables shared similarity with our study and any differentiation as to gender could not be observed at the study results (Tasdelen, 2001, p. 45).

When analysis of variance results in relation to self-respect and decision making styles scale points at decision making as regards department variable of the students who attended our study were examined, it was stated that there was not any significant difference between panic decision making, suspensive decision making, avoidant decision making, careful decision making styles from sub-dimensions of self-respect and decision making styles in terms of department variable ($p>0.05$, Table 3). Unlike our study, Tasgit (2012) found in his master thesis study that the differences among self-respect levels, avoidant decision making levels, suspensive decision making levels and panic decision making levels were significant at decision making as to department variable. When these difference results were examined, self-respect levels, avoidant decision making levels, suspensive decision making levels and panic decision making levels of School of Physical Education and Sports students at decision making were higher than the students studying at Public Administration, Department of Business and Economics (Tasgit, 2012, p.76). In another study, Cetin (2009) found a significant differentiation between variable of students' department and self-respect at decision making. It was indicated that self-respect point average of Department of Sport Management students at decision making were higher than Department of Coaching Education students at significant level (Cetin, 2009, p.195).

As a result, a statistically significant difference between 21-23 aged and 27 and over aged people at careful decision making style from sub-dimensions of decision making styles of age variable from vigilance decision making styles was observed at demographic information section of our study. At the same time, when we have a look at gender variable results, it was stated that females have more careful decision making level than males while males have more suspensive decision making level than females.

Our study was applied to Physical Education and Sports and Sociology students. It can also be applied to students from different departments or athletes from different sports clubs to get results from broader populations.

We believe that our study will help the upcoming studies as literature information.

6. REFERENCES

- Akbulut A. K. (2012) *Examination of Amateur and Professional Male Footballers' Decision Making, Problem Solving and Communication Skills in Terms of Some Variables*. Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Department of Physical Education and Sports Teacher, Doctoral Thesis, Ankara.
- Arin, A. (2006) *The Relationship Level Between High School Directors' Education Leadership Behaviors and Their Decision Making Strategies and Problem Solving Skills*. Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences, Department of Educational Administration, Supervision, Planning and Economics, Master Thesis, Eskisehir.
- Cetinkaya, E. (2013) *Examination on the Decision-Making Skills of Senior Throwing Athletes Who Take Part in Contests at Their Branch on Their Performance*. Dumlupınar University, Institute of Medical Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Master Thesis, Kutahya.
- Cetin, M. C. (2009) *Examination Comparatively of School of Physical Education and Sports Students' Decision Making Styles Social Skills Level and The Ways of Coping With Stress in Terms of Some Variables*. Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Department of Physical Education and Sports Teacher. Doctoral Thesis. Ankara.
- Colakkadioglu, O. and Guçray, S. S. (2007) The Effect of Decision Making Skill Training Psycho-Education Group Life That Was Developed As Based on Conflict Theory to Adolescents' Decision Making Styles. *Theory and Educational Sciences on Practice, Theory&Practice*, Vol.12(2) Spring, pp. 655 – 676.
- Demir, M. (1985) *Administrative Decision Making*. Bilgehan Printing House, p.3-4, İzmir.
- Deniz, E. (2004) An Investigation on Examination of The Relationship Between University Students' Self-Esteem, Decision Making Styles and Problem Solving Methods on Decision Making. *Magazine of Educational Researches*. Vol. 4 (15), 25-35.
- Deryahanoglu, G. (2014) *Examination of The Impact of Kickbox Referees' Decision Making and Assertiveness Levels on Perceived Professional Competency Kick Boks*. Sakarya University Institute of Educational Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports, Master Thesis, Sakarya.
- Gacar, A. et al. (2013) Examination of self-respect and decision-making styles in decision making of individuals participating in the training of camp leadership. *International Journal of Sport Studies*. Vol. 3 (2), p. 205-211.

- Gacar, A. (2011) *Examination of Physical Education and Sports Instructors' Decision Making and Assertiveness Levels in Turkey in Terms of Some Variables*. Firat University Institute of Health Sciences Department of Physical Education and Sports, Doctoral Thesis, Elazığ.
- Gonenc, I. E. and Wolflin, J. (2004) *Sustainability, Sustainable Management and Decision Making Process*. p. 14.
- Kuzgun, Y. (1992) Decision Strategies Scale: Development and Standardisation. VII. Scientific Researches of National Psychology Congress. *Turkish Psychological Association*. p, 161-170. Ankara.
- Mann, L., Harmoni, R. and Power. C. (1998). Cross-Cultural Differences in Self-Reported Decision-Making Style and Confidence. *International Journal of Psychology*. 33(5),s. 325-335.
- Marco, C. D. et al. (2003) Validity of the Decisional Process Inventory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. Vol. 63, p. 1-19.
- Mutlu, M. (2012) *Women's Decision Making Practice and Problems in The Family, The City Example Sanlirfa*. Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences, The Department of Family Economics and Nutrition, Master Thesis, Ankara.
- Onaran, O. (1975) *Decision Making at Organizations*. Second Edition, Ankara University Faculty of Political Sciences Publications No: 321, Ankara.
- Rue, L and Byars, L.L. (2003) *Decision Making skills*. Management skills and application mc graw hill.
- Sanders, R. P. (2008) *The Decision-Making Styles, Ways of Knowing, and Learning Strategy Preferences of Clients At a One-Stop Career Center*. Southern Oklahoma State University, Faculty of the Graduate College of the Oklahoma State University, Doctorate Thesis, Stillwater, Oklahoma.
- Sarikaya, M. (2013) *Decision Making Processes and Organizational Silence*. Pamukkale University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration, The Management and Organization Department, Master Thesis. Denizli.
- Tasgit M. S. (2012) *Examination of University Students' Self-Respect and Decision Making Levels*. Karamanoglu Mehmetbey University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports Teacher, Master Thesis. Karaman.
- Tasdelen, A. (2001) Teacher Candidates' Decision Making Styles According to Some Psychosocial Variables. Pamukkale University. *Magazine of Educational Sciences* . No:10, p. 40-52.
- Yaralioglu, K. (2010) *Decision Making Methods*. 1. Edition, Detay, Ankara.