

Examining Decision Making Level of Wrestlers in Terms of Some Variable

Şihmehmet Yiğit^a, İbrahim Dalbudak^b, Mihriay Musa^c, Alper C. Gürkan^d, Mehmet Dalkılıç^e

^aNamık Kemal University, Tekirdağ, TURKEY; ^bSüleyman Demirel University, Isparta, TURKEY; ^cUşak University, Uşak, TURKEY; ^dGazi University, Ankara, TURKEY; ^eKilis 7 Aralık University, Kilis, TURKEY

ABSTRACT

The aim of this research is to examine decision making level of wrestlers who joined Turkey inter university wrestling championship, according to variables as wrestlers' sex, age, grade, department, and education type. Study group consists of 34 females and 196 males, totally 230 athletes, who joined Turkey Inter University Wrestling Championship at the academic year of 2014-2015.

In this research, personal information form, and Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire (MDMQ I-II) are used in order to research decision making level of wrestlers who joined Turkey Inter University Wrestling Championship. SPSS20 statistics package program is used in analysis and explication of data.

At the end of the research; according to sex, department, grade, education type, and age variables: self-esteem in decision making, careful decision making, avoidant decision making, suspensive decision making, and panic decision making situations of students, who joined Wrestling Championship, are evaluated. While significant difference was statistically found according to sex, department, grade, education type variables; significant difference was not found in the variable of age.

KEYWORDS

Physical education, decision making, wrestling

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 23 May 2016

Revised 24 July 2016

Accepted 24 July 2016

Introduction

It is known that the main factor which underlies that some people are successful in different job fields is to make right and appropriate decision. However, it cannot be said that right and effective decision making is so easy. As much as person's inborn characteristics, and education, his/her competences

CORRESPONDENCE Şihmehmet Yiğit ✉ syigit@nku.edu.tr

© 2016 Yiğit et al. Open Access terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) apply. The license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, on the condition that users give exact credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if they made any changes.

about the job he/she does have important role in this decision making process (Bono, 1989).

When decision making process is faced with, it is not mostly possible to simultaneously evaluate features and possible consequences of each one of the opinions. So, these processes are made according to a certain order and order of processes can create strong impressions for decisions (Newell et al. 2004).

There are a lot of basic cognitive mechanisms which join in action, which consists for actualization of decision making process. When a problem is presented specifically, the most important features are determined. Previous knowledge is recalled from memory and a significant organization of this knowledge is realized. Other knowledge resources are also evaluated, integrated, and decided. For this, it is necessary to research cognitive processes about an athlete's decision making performance and it is necessary to mention factors as emotion, perception, memory, concentration, general ability, and problem solving. This knowledge which is about cognition is connected with two main hypotheses (Tenenbaum and Eli, 1993).

As the strategies which are used in situation of making decision can be implemented as pre-planning, they can also be determined at the moment of making decision. It is possible to use some strategies as combined with each other (Ersever, 1996).

Rational decision making style is that: In situation of making decision, people make research and investigation about the situation that they need to decide and then they choose the best alternative. People who have the style of rational decision making have a more careful attitude (Avşaroğlu, 2007).

People who implement careful decision making style carefully look for related knowledge and after carefully assessing the alternatives they make decision. People who implement avoidant decision making style avoid making decision, they are in tendency to leave decisions to other people. So, they pass responsibility to another people and they try to get rid of making decision. People who implement suspensive decision making style always try to leave decision in suspension, delay, and abeyance. They always try to postpone decision without a reason. People who implement panic decision making style feel themselves under the pressure of time when they come up against a decision making situation. As a result, they act without thinking and are in tendency to reach hasty solutions (Deniz, 2004).

In the light of this information, the purpose of the research is to examine decision making level of students who joined Turkey inter university wrestling championship and who study at School of Physical Education and Sports, department of Physical education and sports teaching, department of Coaching training, and department of Sport management in terms of different variables.

Method

Research Group

Research group consists of 34 female, 196 male, totally 230 athletes who joined Turkey inter university wrestling championship at the academic year of 2013-2014, who study at School of Physical Education and Sports, department of Physical education and sports teaching, department of Coaching training, and department of Sport management.

Data Collection

In research, personal information form which was composed by researcher, and "Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire" (MDMQ I-II) which was

developed by Mann et al. (1998) are implemented in order to gather information about decision making level of wrestlers who joined Turkey inter university wrestling championship. SPSS20 statistics package program is used in analysis and explication of data.

At the personal information form, athletes' personal information as sex, age, grade, department, education type is taken for using them in research. Firstly, current information about the aim of research is given systematically with literature review. So, a theoretical frame is formed about the subject. **Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire (MDMQ I-II)**

Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire (MDMQ I-II) was developed in an intercultural research, which included six countries, in order to compare self-esteem of university students in decision making, and style of decision making by Mann et al. (1998). It is a questionnaire which consists of two parts. Questionnaire was adapted into Turkish by Deniz (2004) for determining decision making styles of Turkish university students, and making comparative studies with students of other countries (Deniz, 2004). Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire consists of two parts. I. Part aims to determine self-esteem in decision making. It consists of 6 items and one sub factor. II. Part is a questionnaire which aims to determine the style of decision making and consists of 22 items, and 4 sub factors.

Data Analysis

In analysis and explication of data, before testing decision making level of students who joined Turkey inter University Wrestling Championship according to different variables, Kruskal Wallis Test determined if research data had normal distribution features or not, and it was confirmed that they were not appropriate for normal distribution, and then Mann Whitney U Test, and Kruskal Wallis H Test were used.

Findings

In this part, the answers that athletes gave, and points that they took are presented with statistical method and interpreted.

Table 1. Mann-Whitney U Test Results Which Show Self-Esteem in Decision Making, And Decision Making Level of Wrestlers According To Sex Variable

	Sex	N	Mean Rank	Rank Sum	U	Z	p
Self-esteem in Decision Making	Male	196	113.04	22156.00	2850.00	-	.174
	Female	34	129.68	4409.00			
Careful Decision Making	Male	196	118.32	23190.00	2780.00	-	.119
	Female	34	99.26	3375.00			
Avoidant Decision Making	Male	196	117.61	23052.50	2917.50	-	.242
	Female	34	103.31	3512.50			
Suspensive Decision Making	Male	194	118.41	22972.00	2539.00	-	.030
	Female	34	92.18	3134.00			
Panic Decision Making	Male	196	119.40	23402.00	2568.00	-	.031
	Female	34	93.03	3163.00			

As it is seen on Table 1; it is determined that difference between sex variable of wrestlers, and self-esteem level in decision making is not significant (2850,00, $p = 0.174 > 0.05$). If we look at mean rank, while rank sum of (female) wrestlers is (A.O. = 129,68), rank sum of (male) wrestlers is (A.O. = 113,04). It is determined that difference between sex variable, and careful decision making level is not significant (2780,00, $p = 0.119 > 0.05$). Female students had lower points in suspensive decision making and panic decision making than male students.

It is determined that difference between sex variable and avoidant decision making level is not significant (2917,50, $p = 0.242 > 0.05$). It is determined that difference between sex variable and suspensive decision making level is significant (U value = 2539,00, $p = 0.030 < 0.05$). If we look at mean rank, (1) while mean rank of wrestlers is (A.O. = 118.41), (2) mean rank of wrestlers is (A.O. = 92.18). It is determined that difference between sex variable and panic decision making level is significant (U value = 2568,00, $p = 0.031 < 0.05$). If we look at mean rank, while rank sum of (Male) wrestlers is (A.O. = 119,40), rank sum of (Female) wrestlers is (A.O. = 93.03).

Table 2. Kruskal Wallis Test Results Which Show Self-Esteem in Decision Making, And Decision Making Level of Wrestlers According To Department Variable

	Department	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X ²	p	Significant Difference
Self-esteem in Decision Making	Teaching	100	116.57	2	.148	.928	No
	Coaching	94	113.54				
	Management	36	117.65				
Careful Decision Making	Teaching	100	115.92	2	.077	.962	No
	Coaching	94	114.23				
	Management	36	117.65				
Avoidant Decision Making	Teaching	100	104.66	2	5.99	.050	No
	Coaching	94	119.94		4		
	Management	36	134.03				
Suspensive Decision Making	Teaching	100	116.37	2	.173	.917	No
	Coaching	92	113.62				
	Management	36	111.57				
Panic Decision Making	Teaching	100	108.40	2	3.64	.161	No
	Coaching	94	125.46		9		
	Management	36	109.21				

As it is seen on Table 2; it is determined that difference between department variable and self-esteem level in decision making is not significant (X² value = .148, $p = 0.928 > 0.05$). It is determined that difference between department variable and careful decision making level is not significant (X² value = .077, $p = 0.962 > 0.05$). It is determined that difference between department variable and avoidant decision making level is not significant (X² value = 5.994, $p = 0.050 > 0.05$). It is determined that difference between department variable and suspensive decision making level is not significant (X² value = .173, $p = 0.917 > 0.05$). It is determined that difference between department variable and panic decision making level is not significant (X² value = 3.649, $p = 0.161 > 0.05$).

Table 3. Kruskal Wallis Test Results Which Show Self-Esteem in Decision Making, And Decision Making Level of Wrestlers According To Grade Variable

	Grade	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X ²	p	Significant Difference
Self-esteem in Decision Making	1	108	128.44	3	10.378	.016	1-3
	2	61	113.35				1-4
	3	40	93.03				

	4	21	98.02				
Careful Decision Making	1	108	118.06	3	4.597	.204	No
	2	61	117.24				
	3	40	97.26				
	4	21	132.02				
Avoidant Decision Making	1	108	122.11	3	2.718	.437	No
	2	61	112.94				
	3	40	110.04				
	4	21	99.36				
Suspensive Decision Making	1	106	111.92	3	3.397	.334	No
	2	61	121.38				
	3	40	121.55				
	4	21	94.12				
Panic Decision Making	1	108	121.01	3	8.545	.036	1-4
	2	61	126.17				2-3
	3	40	98.40				2-4
	4	21	88.71				

As it is seen on Table 3; it is determined that difference between grade variable and self-esteem level in decision making is significant (X^2 value = 10.378, $p = 0.016 < 0.05$). As a result of this difference; 1st grade students' self-esteem levels in decision making are higher than 3rd and 4th grade students' self-esteem levels in decision making. It is determined that difference between grade variable and careful decision making level is not significant (X^2 value = 4.597, $p = 0.204 > 0.05$). It is determined that difference between grade variable and avoidant decision making level is not significant [X^2 value = 2.718, $p = 0.437 > 0.05$]. It is determined that difference between grade variable and suspensive decision making level is not significant (X^2 value = 3.397, $p = 0.334 > 0.05$). It is determined that difference between grade variable and panic decision making level is significant (X^2 value = 8.545, $p = 0.036 < 0.05$). As a result of this difference; 1st grade students' panic decision making levels are higher than 4th grade students' panic decision making levels; 2nd grade students' panic decision making levels are higher than 3rd and 4th grade students' panic decision making levels.

As it is seen on Table 4; it is determined that difference between wrestlers' education type variable and self-esteem level in decision making is not significant (2539,50, $p = 0.110 > 0.05$). It is determined that difference between education type variable and careful decision making level is significant (2128,00, $p = 0.005 < 0.05$). If we look at mean rank, (1) while mean rank of wrestlers is (A.O. = 110,69), (2) mean rank of wrestlers is (A.O. = 146,35). It is determined that difference between education type variable and avoidant decision making level is not significant [U value = 2877,00, $p = 0.543 > 0.05$]. It is determined that difference between education type variable and suspensive decision making level is significant (=2633.50, $p = 0.211 > 0.05$). It is determined that difference between education type variable and panic decision making level is significant (2684,00, $p = 0.240 > 0.05$).

Table 4. Mann-Whitney U Test Results Which Show Self-Esteem in Decision Making, And Decision Making Level of Wrestlers According To Education Type Variable

Education Type	N	Mean Rank	Rank Sum	U	Z	p
----------------	---	-----------	----------	---	---	---



Self-esteem in Decision Making	Daytime	199	112.76	22439.50	2539.50	-1.599	.110
	Education	31		4125.50			
Careful Decision Making	Evening		133.08				
	Education						
Avoidant Decision Making	Daytime	199	110.69	22028.00	2128.00	-2.805	.005
	Education	31		4537.00			
Suspensive Decision Making	Evening		146.35				
	Education						
Panic Decision Making	Daytime	199	114.46	22888.00	2877.00	-.609	.543
	Education	31		3788.00			
Suspensive Decision Making	Evening		122.19				
	Education						
Panic Decision Making	Daytime	197	116.63	22976.50	2633.50	-1.251	.211
	Education	31		3129.50			
Panic Decision Making	Evening		100.95				
	Education						
Panic Decision Making	Daytime	199	113.49	22584.00	2684.00	-1.175	.240
	Education	31		3981.00			
Panic Decision Making	Evening		128.42				
	Education						

Table 5. Kruskal-Wallis Test Results Which Show Decision Making Level of Wrestlers According To Age Variable.

	Age	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X ²	p	Significant Difference
Self-esteem in Decision Making	1.(18-20)age	93	123.07	2	3.183	.204	No
	2.(21-23)age	120	112.60				
	3.(24-26)age	17	94.56				
Careful Decision Making	1.(18-20)age	93	114.82	2	.085	.959	No
	2.(21-23)age	120	115.41				
	3.(24-26)age	17	123.59				
Avoidant Decision Making	1.(18-20)age	93	123.91	2	3.400	.183	No
	2.(21-23)age	120	107.84				
	3.(24-26)age	17	123.59				
Suspensive Decision Making	1.(18-20)age	93	121.05	2	3.934	.140	No
	2.(21-23)age	118	106.75				
	3.(24-26)age	17	132.47				
Panic Decision Making	1.(18-20)age	93	127.92	2	5.891	.053	No
	2.(21-23)age	120	105.86				
	3.(24-26)age	17	115.56				

As it is seen on Table 5; it is determined that difference between age variable and self-esteem level in decision making is not significant (X^2 value = 3.183, $p = 0.204 > 0.05$). It is determined that difference between age variable and careful decision making level is not significant (X^2 value = .085, $p = 0.959 > 0.05$). It is determined that difference between age variable and avoidant decision making level is not significant (3.400, $p = 0.183 > 0.05$). It is determined that difference between age variable and suspensive decision making level is not significant (3.934, $p = 0.140 > 0.05$). It is determined that difference between age variable and panic decision making level is not significant (5.891, $p = 0.053 > 0.05$).

Discussion

Basing on the findings which are obtained from this study, subject of the research, and consequences of similar studies are compared and discussions are given.

As a result of this study; according to Sex, Department, Grade, Education type, and Age variables: Self-esteem in Decision Making, Careful Decision Making, Avoidant Decision Making, Suspensive Decision Making, and Panic Decision Making situations of students, who joined Wrestling Championship, are evaluated.

According to Sex variable: while there is not a significant difference in self-esteem, careful decision making, avoidant decision making; there is a significant difference in suspensive decision making and panic decision making. When we look at the study that Eraslan (2012) did towards university students, it is seen that careful decision making sub dimension has parallels with our study in terms of sex variable. According to Department variable there is not a significant difference in any assessment. According to Grade variable: while there is not a significant difference in careful decision making, avoidant decision making, suspensive decision making; there is a significant difference in self-esteem, and panic decision making. According to Education Type variable: while there is not a significant difference in self-esteem, and avoidant decision making; there is a significant difference in careful decision making, suspensive decision making, and panic decision making. There is not a significant difference in Age variable. When we look at the study that Dalkılıç (2015) did towards difference sport branches, it shows parallelism with our study in terms of sport age variable. Also, Demirbaş (1992) stated in his study that as age increases, there is an increase in decision making ability and decisions are more bounding. Deniz (2004), and Mann et al. (1998) stated that there is a positive significant relation between self-esteem, and careful decision making style in decision making. It was determined in a different study that people who have higher self-esteem make right decisions, in this case, they use more logical strategy (Tiryaki 1997). Brown and Mann (1991) pointed out in the study they did that people who have higher self-esteem are more competent and capable in the behaviour of decision making, and also they think more systematically and detailed when they make decision. Avşaroğlu (2007) found out that there is strong relation between students' self-esteem levels in decision making, and self-respect levels, so self-regard positively affects self-esteem level in decision making.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Şihmehmet Yiğit holds a PhD in science education and now is an associate professor at Namık Kemal University, Tekirdağ, Turkey.

İbrahim Dalbudak holds a PhD in science education and now is an associate professor at Süleyman Demirel University, Isparta, Turkey.

Mihriay Musa holds a PhD in science education and now is an associate professor at Uşak University, Uşak, Turkey.



Alper C. Gürkan holds a PhD in science education and now is an associate professor at Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.

Mehmet Dalkılıç holds a PhD in science education and now is an associate professor at Kilis 7 Aralık University, Kilis, Turkey.

References

- Avşaroğlu S. (2007). Selçuk University Social Sciences Institute Department of Educational Sciences Department of Psychological Services in Education. Doctorate Thesis, Konya.
- Brown EJ and Mann L (1991). The Relationship Between family Structure and Process
- Dalkılıç M. (2015). The Anthropologist, International Journal of Contemporary and Applied Studies Of Man. 21(1,2): 31-38 (2015) Delhi, India.
- Deniz, E. (2004). Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi. 4 (15), 25-35.
- De Bono, Edward, (1989), Başarı Taktikleri, İlgı Yayıncılık.
- Demirbaş H (1992). Comparing Decision Making Behaviours of Guilty and Not Guilty Teenagers, Master Thesis, Ankara University Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.
- Ersever ÖH (1996). Karar Verme Stratejileri Kazandırma Programın ve Etkileşim Grubu Deneyiminin Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Karar Verme Stilleri Üzerine Etkileri, Ankara.
- Mann, et al. (1998). Cross-Cultural Differences in Self-Reported Decision-Making Style and Confidence. International Journal of Psychology, 33, 325-335.
- Newell BR, Rakow T., Weston NT, Shanks DR (2004) Search Strategies in Decision Making: The Success of 'Success, Journal of Behavioural Decision Making.10
- Tenenbaum G, Eli MB (1993) Decision making in Sport: A cognitive Perspective, Handbook of Research of Sport Psychology, Macmillan Publishing Company New York.