



ISSN: 2146-1961

Görgüt, İ., Çakto, P., Demir, O. & Çimen-Binkuyu, G. (2024). Evaluation of Self-Respect and Decision-Making Styles of Students Continuing Their Education in Secondary Education Institutions, *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences (IJOESS)*, 15(58), 1814-1825.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.35826/ijoess.5612>

ArticleType: Research Article

## EVALUATION OF SELF-RESPECT AND DECISION-MAKING STYLES OF STUDENTS CONTINUING THEIR EDUCATION IN SECONDARY EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

**İlyas GÖRGÜT**

Assoc. Prof. Dr., Kütahya Dumlupınar University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Kütahya, Turkey, e-mail: [ilyasgorgut@hotmail.com](mailto:ilyasgorgut@hotmail.com) ORCID: 0000-0002-1497-4493

**Piyami ÇAKTO**

Kütahya Dumlupınar University, Graduate Education Institute, Physical Education and Sports (DR), Kütahya, Turkey, e-mail: [piyamii1011@gmail.com](mailto:piyamii1011@gmail.com)  
ORCID: 0000-0002-8675-3753

**Orhan DEMİR**

Kütahya Dumlupınar University, Graduate Education Institute, Physical Education and Sports (DR), Kütahya, Turkey, e-mail: [orhandmr21@gmail.com](mailto:orhandmr21@gmail.com)  
ORCID : 0000-0002-6546-184X

**Gökçe BİNKUYU ÇİMEN**

Kocaeli University, Institute of Social Sciences, Sport Management (MA), Kocaeli, Turkey, e-mail: [binkuyug123@gmail.com](mailto:binkuyug123@gmail.com)  
ORCID: 0009-0001-4967-3682

Received: 05.10.2024 Accepted: 15.11.2024 Published: 01.12.2024

### ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to examine the self-respect and decision-making styles of students studying in secondary education institutions. In this study, which is a quantitative research, the survey model was adopted. The population of the study consists of secondary education institutions affiliated to Kütahya Provincial Directorate of National Education, while the sample group includes a total of 442 participants, 250 males and 192 females, who continue their education in these secondary education institutions. As a measurement tool, Melbourne Decision Making Scale I-II which was developed by Mann et al. (1998) and was adapted into Turkish by Deniz (2004) was used. T-test and ANOVA tests were applied to analyse the obtained data. Based on the assumption of homogeneous distribution of the data, Welch values were taken into consideration and Tamhane's T2 test values from Post Hoc tests were analysed. The results showed statistically significant differences according to the participants' gender, sport type, competition participation status and education level variables. Factors such as gender, sport type and competition participation status can affect decision making styles. Therefore, determining the variables affecting self-respect and decision-making styles is important for students.

**Keywords:** Decision-making, secondary education, student, learning, self-respect.

**Corresponded Author:** Piyami ÇAKTO, Kütahya Dumlupınar University, Graduate Education Institute, Physical Education and Sports (DR), Kütahya, Turkey, e-mail: [piyamii1011@gmail.com](mailto:piyamii1011@gmail.com).

**Ethics Committee Approval:** Kütahya Dumlupınar University Social Sciences and Humanities Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee Ethics committee permission was obtained with the decision dated 11.09.2024 and numbered 403.

**Plagiarism/Ethics:** This article has been reviewed by at least two referees and has been confirmed to comply with research and publication ethics, containing no plagiarism.

**INTRODUCTION**

Acting with the power of reason and thought, human beings are in a continuous evaluation process in order to make decisions in accordance with the conditions they face throughout their lives. In some cases, this decision-making effort involves mental processes such as problem solving, predicting future outcomes, emotion, risk assessment and analysing available data (Güçray, 2021). Therefore, this process, the ability to reach the most accurate result by choosing among alternative options (Özdemir & Bedel, 2021), refers to the decision-making ability, which is also described as one of the important life skills of the individual (Kaşık, 2009). In short, it is the process of choosing one of the different paths to the goal that the individual is trying to reach (Tatlıoğlu, 2014). As a result of this decision-making process, the individual's decision-making behaviour emerges.

Decision-making behaviour refers to producing alternative options and choosing the most appropriate one in line with the prior knowledge acquired for the purposes to be achieved (Güçray, 2001). However, this is not just a matter of choosing one option over another. It is a complex process that also includes the individual's past experiences, values, emotions and expectations. In addition, individuals need to develop effective decision-making strategies in order to make the right decision in a constantly changing and developing world (Avşaroğlu & Üre, 2007). Scott and Bruce (1995) emphasize that the decision-making process is not only a rational thinking but also a habit shaped by the individual's experiences, learning and personal characteristics. Therefore, it can be said that individuals' personality traits play an important role in decision-making processes and determining their strategies (Deniz & Avşaroğlu, 2014). The criteria determined in the decision-making process, the criteria to be considered and the strategies to be used in decision-making behaviour are also important (Çakto & Akın, 2022). This approach allows for a more holistic understanding of the decision-making process. According to Mann et al. (1998), people have four different decision-making approaches in decision-making: attentive decision-making style, which involves making a decision after a comprehensive research and meticulous evaluation, avoidant decision-making style, which waits for others to make a decision and leaves the responsibility to others, procrastinatory decision-making style, which prolongs the decision-making process and leaves the decision to a later time, i.e. uncertainty, and panic decision-making style, which tries to find a solution without evaluating all options under time pressure (Eser, 2022). In this process, an individual's self-confidence or self-respect directly affects the quality of the decisions to be taken.

After the individual's family, education environments are the most important areas where the individual interacts socially. Places of education play an active role in the developmental processes of the individual (Kaya, 2011). Thus, educational locations can be decisive for both self-respect and decision-making. Especially during adolescence, when an individual's self-respect is shaped and reinforced and he/she is in search of identity, it is a period when students studying at the secondary education level make important decisions about their educational lives, social relationships and future goals. For this reason, education systems should prioritize providing students with decision-making skills. In addition, in this period, students can communicate directly with sports activities, especially in establishing social relations in the decision-making process. These social relationships established by students have important effects on their self-respect and decision-making

skills. Certel et al. (2013) state that practicing sports directly affects self-respect and decision-making. Therefore, this study aims to determine the variables that affect the self-respect and decision-making styles of students studying in secondary education institutions.

## **METHOD**

### **Research Model**

In this quantitative study, the general survey model was adopted. The aim of the survey model is to describe a situation that has been experienced before or is still being experienced as it is. Any object or individual can be the subject of the research. In these studies, the priority is to define the subject in its own conditions without any intervention (Karasar, 2013). In this study, the relational survey design, which is the comparison type of the general survey model, was used. There are at least two variables in comparative relational research. Among these, groups are formed according to the independent variable and it is examined whether there is a difference between them and the dependent variable (Karasar, 2016, p.117).

### **Population and Sample**

The study population includes secondary education institutions affiliated to Kütahya Provincial Directorate of National Education. The sample group consists of 442 participants, 250 males and 192 females, who were selected from this population (Sports High School, Anatolian High School, Anatolian Imam Hatip High School) by random sampling method.

### **Data Collection Tool**

The measurement tool used in the study contains two sections; in the first section, there are four questions prepared by the researcher to determine the demographic information of the participants. In the second part, the "Melbourne Decision Making Scale I-II which was developed by Mann et al. (1998) and was adapted into Turkish by Deniz (2004) was used to determine students' self-respect and decision-making styles. The first part of the Melbourne Decision-making Scale, which consists of two parts, consists of 6 items in total, three of which are reverse scored, aiming to determine self-respect in decision-making. In the scale, participant responses were scored as not true, sometimes true and true (0-1-2), and the highest score that could be obtained in this section was determined as 12. The high scores obtained indicate high self-respect in decision-making. The second part consists of 22 items and 4 sub-dimensions aiming to measure decision-making styles. These sub-dimensions are attentive (items 16, 12, 8, 4 and 2), procrastinating (items 21, 18, 10, 7 and 5), avoidant (items 19, 17, 14, 11, 9 and 3) and panic (items 1, 13, 15, 20 and 22) decision-making styles. The sub-dimensions in the scale are as follows: Attentive decision-making style is when an individual carefully searches for the necessary information before making a decision and makes a choice after carefully evaluating the alternatives, while the Avoidant decision-making style is when an individual stays away from making decisions, tends to leave decisions to others and expects this responsibility from others. The procrastinatory decision-making style is when an individual postpones, delays or does not finalise the decisions that he/she has to make

continuously without looking for a valid reason. Also, Panic decision-making style is when an individual who feels himself/herself under time pressure exhibits hasty behaviours in order to respond quickly.

### Data Analysis

The data were subjected to Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality tests through SPSS 23.0 package programme. Although the test results did not show normal distribution, it can be assumed that the data show normal distribution if the skewness and kurtosis values are between -2 and +2 (George & Mallery, 2010), t-test (independent sample test) and One Way ANOVA (one-way analysis of variance) were applied to the data. Again, as a second level test Tamhane's T2 test, was applied by taking into account the Welch values based on the homogeneity assumption (Hochberg & Tamhane, 1987). In the evaluation of the findings,  $p < .05$  was taken as significance value.

**Table 1.** Mean, Standard Deviation, Skewness and Kurtosis Values of Variables and Dimensions

Variable and Dimension	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Skewness	Kurtosis
Gender	1.43	.496	.266	-1.938
Sport Type	10.4	1.00	.011	-1.064
Competition Participation	1.23	.427	1.223	-.507
Classroom	1.35	.659	1.342	1.027
Attentive Decision-making	8.46	1.96	1.011	.959
Procrastinatory Decision-making	11.6	2.41	-.664	-.323
Avoidant Decision-making	12.97	2.18	-.505	-.070
Panic Decision-making	11.00	2.33	-.485	-.404
Self Respect	8.43	1.73	1.019	1.809

### FINDINGS

In this section, students' self-respect and decision-making styles were analysed through the findings obtained within the scope of the purpose of the study. The results of the analyses are given in tables below.

**Table 2.** Participants' Self-Respect and Decision-Making Styles According to Gender Variable

Dimension	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	t	p
Attentive Decision-making	Male	250	8.32	1.90	-1.664	.097
	Female	192	8.64	2.02		
Procrastinatory Decision-making	Male	250	11.6	2.52	.023	.982
	Female	192	11.6	2.26		
Avoidant Decision-making	Male	250	12.8	2.23	-1.194	.233
	Female	192	13.1	2.12		
Panic Decision-making	Male	250	11.2	2.29	2.183	.030*
	Female	192	10.7	2.35		
Self-Respect	Male	250	8.16	1.61	-3.796	.000*
	Female	192	8.78	1.81		

\* $p < 0.05$

Results in Table 2 show that, while the scores of the participants regarding attentive, procrastinatory and avoidant decision-making styles were not significant according to the gender variable, panic decision-making and self-respect dimension were found significant ( $p < .05$ ). It was found that there was a significant relationship in terms of panic decision-making style on behalf of male participants and in terms of self-respect dimension on behalf of female participants.

**Table 3.** Participants' Self-Respect and Decision-Making Styles According to Sport Type

Dimension	Sport Type	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	t	p
Attentive Decision-making	Team	336	8.48	2.01	.406	.685
	Individual	106	8.39	1.80		
Procrastinatory Decision-making	Team	336	11.5	2.49	-2.273	<b>.024*</b>
	Individual	106	12.1	2.09		
Avoidant Decision-making	Team	336	12.8	2.22	-1.677	.094
	Individual	106	13.2	2.05		
Panic Decision-making	Team	336	10.9	2.42	-1.123	.262
	Individual	106	11.2	2.01		
Self Respect	Team	336	8.45	1.80	.452	.651
	Individual	106	8.36	1.47		

\*p&lt;0.05

When the results of Table 3 are analysed, it is determined that there is statistically no meaningful difference in attentive, avoidant, panic decision-making styles and self-respect dimension, whereas there is a statistically meaningful difference in procrastinatory decision-making style according to the type of sport the participants do (p<.05). It was found that the meaningful difference in the procrastinatory decision-making style was in favour of the participants who did individual sports.

**Table 4.** Participants' Self-Respect and Decision-Making Styles According to Their Participation in Competitions

Dimension	Participation	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	t	p
Attentive Decision-making	Yes	293	8.49	2.00	.434	.664
	No	148	8.40	1.87		
Procrastinatory Decision-making	Yes	293	11.4	2.44	-2.255	<b>.025*</b>
	No	148	12.0	2.31		
Avoidant Decision-making	Yes	293	12.7	2.10	-3.431	<b>.001*</b>
	No	148	13.4	2.21		
Panic Decision-making	Yes	293	10.7	2.29	-3.149	<b>.002*</b>
	No	148	11.5	2.31		
Self-Respect	Yes	293	8.47	1.58	.782	.435
	No	148	8.33	2.00		

\*p&lt;0.05

When Table 4 was analysed, it was found that there was no meaningful difference in the attentive decision-making style and self-respect dimension, whereas there was a meaningful difference in the procrastinating, avoidant and panic decision-making styles according to the participation status of the participants in the competition (p<.05). It was seen that the statistically significant difference in procrastinator, avoidant and panic decision-making style was in favour of the participants whose participation status in the competition was no.

**Table 5.** Participants' Self-Respect and Decision-Making Styles According to Class Variable

Dimension	Classroom	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	F	p	Difference
Attentive Decision-making	9	90	8.63	2.19	1.651	.177	
	10	134	8.68	2.22			
	11	142	8.28	1.67			
	12	76	8.19	1.62			
	9	90	11.6	2.20			
Procrastinatory Decision-making	10	134	11.5	2.73	1.616	.185	
	11	142	11.4	2.14			
	12	76	12.2	2.49			

	9	90	12.7	1.92		
Avoidant Decision-making	10	134	13.1	2.36	2.349	.072
	11	142	12.7	1.97		
	12	76	13.4	2.45		
	9	90	10.6	2.48		
Panic Decision-making	10	134	11.1	2.27	1.731	.160
	11	142	10.9	2.15		
	12	76	11.3	2.53		
	9	90	8.56	1.55		d-a
Self-Respect	10	134	8.70	2.09	4.775	.003*
	11	142	8.42	1.49		
	12	76	7.80	1.49		

\*p&lt;0.05

When Table 5 is analysed, there was no statistically meaningful difference in the attentive, procrastinating, avoidant and panic decision-making styles of the participants in terms of class level, while a meaningful difference was found in the self-respect dimension ( $p<.05$ ). Tamhane's T2 test, one of the Post Hoc tests, was applied to determine the difference between groups, and cross-comparison analyzes are presented below (Table 6).

**Table 6.** Comparison Of Self-Respect Dimension According to Class Variable

(I) Classomm	(J) Classomm	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	P
9 <sup>th</sup> grade	10 <sup>th</sup> grade	-.1422	.244	.993
	11 <sup>th</sup> grade	.1370	.206	.986
	12 <sup>th</sup> grade	.7640*	.237	.009*
10 <sup>th</sup> grade	9 <sup>th</sup> grade	.1422	.244	.993
	11 <sup>th</sup> grade	.2793	.220	.750
	12 <sup>th</sup> grade	.9063*	.249	.002*
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade	9 <sup>th</sup> grade	-.1370	.206	.986
	10 <sup>th</sup> grade	-.2793	.220	.750
	12 <sup>th</sup> grade	.6269*	.212	.022*
12 <sup>th</sup> Grade	9 <sup>th</sup> grade	-.7640*	.237	.009*
	10 <sup>th</sup> grade	-.9063*	.249	.002*
	11 <sup>th</sup> grade	-.6269*	.212	.022*

\*p&lt;0.05

When Table 6 is examined, a difference was found to be statistically significant in the self-respect dimension ( $p<.05$ ), and it was determined that there was a meaningful difference between the 12th grade participants and the 9th, 10th and 11th grade participants. It was determined that the self-respect level of the participants with education levels of 9th, 10th and 11th grades was higher than 12th grades.

## CONCLUSION and DISCUSSION

In this study, self-respect and decision-making styles of students were examined; statistically meaningful differences were found in terms of gender, type of sport, competition participation status and grade level of the participants. A significantly difference was determined in the dimensions of panic decision-making style and self-respect by gender variable of the participants, no difference was found in the attentive, procrastinatory and avoidant decision-making styles. Significant differences were found in terms of male participants in panic decision-making style and female participants in self-respect dimension (Table 2). Aydın et al. (2020) examined the decision-making skills of individuals participating in youth camps affiliated to the Ministry of Youth and

Sports, and while no meaningful difference was found in procrastinatory decision-making style according to gender variable, a significant difference was obtained in self-respect dimension in the same study. Again, in the study conducted by Taşgit (2012), the self-respect dimension was significant for the participants according to the gender variable. In addition, Bartley, Blanton, and Gilliard (2005) argue that gender variable is effective on decision-making skills. When both the literature and the findings of this study are examined, social roles and individual differences are thought to be the reason for the significant differences in terms of male participants in panic decision-making style and female participants in self-respect dimension.

While a significant difference was determined in the dimension of procrastinatory decision-making according to the type of sport the participants practiced, no statistically difference was found in the dimension of attentive, avoidant, panic decision-making styles and self-respect. In the procrastinatory decision-making style, the difference was found to be in terms of the participants who practiced individual sports (Table 3). When the related literature is examined, in the study by Vural et al. (2019), in which self-respect and decision-making styles of national athletes studying in secondary education were examined, no statistically difference was determined in the dimensions of avoidant decision-making and attentive decision-making, while a difference was found in the dimension of procrastinatory decision-making based on the sport branch of the participants. In the study conducted by Kelecek, Altıntaş, and Aşçı (2013) on the determination of decision-making styles of athletes, it is argued that competitive athletes mostly prefer procrastinatory decision-making style. When the relevant literature and the findings of this study are examined, it is thought that the significant difference seen in favor of the participants who play individual sports in the dimension of procrastinatory decision-making is due to the different characteristics of the types of sports that the participants do. Because while the decisions made by the participants who play individual sports affect only themselves, the decisions made by the participants who play team sports also affect other team members.

While a significant difference was found in procrastinating, avoidant and panic decision-making styles, no statistically meaningful difference was found in attentive decision-making style and self-respect dimension. It was determined that the difference in procrastinating, avoidant and panic decision-making styles was in favor of the participants whose competition participation status was no (Table 4). Kabadayı et al. (2020) conducted a study on the decision-making levels of elite athletes and sedentary athletes and found that there was no meaningful difference in the attentive decision-making style and self-respect dimensions according to the participants' sports participation status. In the study conducted by Şenbakar (2021) on the decision-making styles of football players, it was determined that there was a significant difference in the dimension of procrastinatory decision-making depending on the training frequency of the football players, while there was no meaningful difference in the dimension of attentive decision-making. Again, in the study conducted by Certel et al. (2013) on the decision-making and self-respect levels of taekwondo athletes, it is argued that doing sports directly affects decision-making styles. The fact that the significant difference that emerged both in the literature and in this study was in favor of those whose participation status in the competition was "no" in procrastinator, avoidant and decision-making style suggests that it is due to the experiences of the participants.

While there was a statistically meaningful difference in the self-respect dimension based on the grade level of the participants, there was no statistically significant difference in the attentive, procrastinator, avoidant and panic decision-making styles (Table 5). It is observed that there is a meaningful difference between the participants whose education level is 12th grade and the participants whose education level is 9th, 10th and 11th grades. It was found that the self-respect level of the participants whose education level was 9th, 10th and 11th grades was higher than 12th grades (Table 6). When the related literature is examined, in the study conducted by Ulaş et al. (2015) on self-respect and decision-making styles of prospective teachers in decision-making, no meaningful difference was found in the attentive and panic decision-making style of prospective teachers according to their grade level. In the study conducted by Yılmaz (2023), no statistically meaningful difference was found in the panic, procrastinatory and avoidant decision-making dimensions according to the grade level of the participants. In the study conducted by Mutlu, Kaya, and Altınışık (2023), panic, cautious, procrastinatory and avoidant decision-making styles did not differ statistically in terms of the grade level of the students. According to the studies in the literature and the findings of this study, this situation is thought to be due to the increase in graduation and exam anxiety with grade level.

In conclusion, this study reveals that self-respect and decision-making styles of secondary school students differ according to various variables. Factors such as gender, sport type and competition participation status can affect decision-making styles. Individual differences of the participants cause significant effects on self-respect and decision-making styles depending on gender. The characteristics of the type of sport that the participants do can direct their decision-making. Again, students' gaining experience by participating in competitions has significant effects on their decision-making styles. In addition, the increase in the grade level of the students can positively affect the self-respect level of the students. These findings suggest that students' participation in sports activities and educational level play an important role in improving their self-respect and decision-making skills.

## **SUGGESTIONS**

The following suggestions were made to improve the self-respect and decision-making styles of students.

- ✓ Qualitative and mixed design studies can be included.
- ✓ Studies can be conducted in which the population and sample groups of the research are diversified and the number of participants is increased.
- ✓ Studies can be conducted on the self-esteem and decision-making styles of primary school and university students.
- ✓ Guidance services can provide early psycho-social support services for secondary school students.
- ✓ Taking into account the individual differences of students, activities to improve psychological processes such as self-respect and panic can be organised.
- ✓ Activities to improve the ability to act together can be organised for secondary school students.
- ✓ Curricula can be updated to support students' self-respect and decision-making.



- ✓ Stakeholders can work in a coordinated manner to address graduation and exam anxiety that is likely to arise with grade level.
- ✓ Students who want to continue their lives as athletes can be directed to branches suitable for their characteristic structures.
- ✓ Considering the difficulties experienced by students who do not compete competitively in procrastinating, avoidant and decision-making styles, students can be encouraged to be in competition environments and help them gain experience.

## REFERENCES

- Avşaroğlu, S., & Üre, Ö. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinin karar vermede özsaygı, karar verme ve stresle başa çıkma stillerinin benlik saygısı ve bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*(18), 85-100.
- Aydın, C., Sertbaş, K., Uzuner, M. E., & İlgörmüş, Y. (2020). Gençlik ve Spor Bakanlığı'na bağlı gençlik kamplarına katılan bireylerin karar verme becerilerinin incelenmesi: İstanbul örneği. *Journal of Individual Differences in Education*, 2(1), 12-30.
- Bartley, S. J., Blanton, P. W., & Gilliard, J. L. (2005). Husbands and wives in dual-earner marriages: Decision-making, gender role attitudes, division of household labor, and equity. *Marriage & family review*, 37(4), 69-94. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J002v37n04\\_05](https://doi.org/10.1300/J002v37n04_05)
- Certel, Z., Aksoy, D., Çalışkan, E., Lapa, T.Y., Özçelik, M.A., & Çelik, G. (2013). Research on self-esteem in decision-making and decision-making styles in taekwondo athletes. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 1971-1975. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.10.150>
- Çakto, P., & Akin, S. (2022). Üniversite öğrencilerinin spor yapma durumuna göre öz saygı ve karar verme stillerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Avrasya Spor Bilimleri Araştırmaları*, 7(2), 109-118. <https://doi.org/10.29228/ERISS.25>
- Deniz, M., & Avşaroğlu, S. (2014). Üniversite öğrencilerinin duygusal zeka yeteneklerinin karar vermede özsaygı ve karar verme stillerini açıklama düzeyinin incelenmesi. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 16(1), 121-138. <https://doi.org/10.17556/jef.95251>
- Deniz, M.E. (2004). Üniversite öğrencilerinin karar vermede özsaygı karar verme stilleri ve problem çözme becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi üzerine bir araştırma. *Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 15(4), 23-35.
- Eser, G. (2022). Karar verme stilleri ve kişilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişki üzerine bir inceleme. *İktisat İşletme ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*, 1(2), 146-161. <https://doi.org/10.58654/jebi.1207271>
- George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for windows step by step: a simple guide and reference*, 17.0 update (10a ed.) Boston: Pearson.
- Güçray, S. (2001). Ergenlerde karar verme davranışlarının öz saygı ve problem çözme becerileri algısı ile ilişkisi. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 8(8), 106-121.
- Hochberg Y., & Tamhane, A.C. (1987). *Multiple comparison procedures*. New York: John Wiley & Sons press. DOI:10.1002/9780470316672

- Kabadayı, M., Abış, S., Yılmaz, A. K., Bostancı, Ö., & Şebin, K. (2020). Elit sporcular ile sedanterlerin problem çözme becerileri ve karar verme düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Güncel Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(2), 325-337.
- Karasar, N. (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Karasar, N. (2016). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi kavramlar teknikler ilkeler*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kaşık, D. Z. (2009). *Ergenlerde karar verme stilleri ve algılanan sosyal destek düzeylerinin sosyal yetkinlik beklentisi ve bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Bilim Dalı, Konya.
- Kaya, A. M. (2011). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin rekreatif faaliyetlere yönelik tutumları ve boş zaman motivasyonlarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Sivas.
- Kelecek, S., Altıntaş, A., & Aşçı, F. H. (2013). Sporcuların karar verme stillerinin belirlenmesi. *CBÜ Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 8(1), 21-27.
- Mann, L., Radford, M., Burnett, P., Ford, S., Bond, M., Leung, K., ... & Yang, K. S. (1998). Cross-cultural differences in self-reported decision-making style and confidence. *International Journal of Psychology*, 33(5), 325-335.
- Mann, L., Radford, M., Burnett, P., Ford, S., Bond, M., Leung, K., . . . Yang, K.-S. (1998). Cross-cultural differences in self-reported decision-making style and confidence. *International Journal of Psychology*, 33(5), 325-335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/002075998400213>
- Mutlu, Ş., Kaya, Z. & Altınışik, K. (2023). Üniversite öğrencilerinin karar verme stilleri ile üniversite yaşamına uyum düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 60, 56-70
- Özdemir, B., & Bedel, A. (2021). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin problem çözme becerilerinde otomatik düşüncelerinin ve karar verme stillerinin rolü. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 53(53) 309-325. <https://doi.org/10.15285/maruaeabd.732700>
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1995). Decision-making style: The development and assessment of a new measure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 55(5), 818-831. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316449505500501>
- Şenbakar, K. (2021). Elazığ ilindeki futbolcuların karar verme stillerinin incelenmesi. *Spor Eğitim Dergisi*, 5(2), 11-17.
- Taşgıt, M.S. (2012). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin benlik saygısı ve karar verme düzeylerinin incelenmesi* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Karamanoğlu Mehmet Bey Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Ana Bilim Dalı, Karaman.
- Tatlıoğlu, K. (2014). Üniversite öğrencilerinin karar vermede öz-saygı düzeyleri ile karar verme stilleri arasındaki ilişkinin bazı değişkenlere göre incelenmesi. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2(1), 150-170. <https://doi.org/10.16992/asos.46>

Ulaş, A. H., Epçaçan, C., Epçaçan, C., & Koçak, B. (2015). Öğretmen adaylarının karar vermede özsaygı düzeyi ve karar verme stillerinin incelenmesi. *Turkish Studies*, 10(3), 1031-1052. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.7831>

Vural, M., Özdemir, A., Özdemir, H., Çoruh, Y., Peker, A. T. & Zengin, S. (2019). Lise düzeyindeki milli sporcuların karar vermede özsaygı ve karar verme stillerinin incelenmesi. *Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(2), 106-114.

**Ethics Statement:** In this article, journal writing rules, publication principles, research and publication ethics rules, journal ethics rules have been followed. The responsibility for any violations that may arise regarding the article belongs to the author (s). Kütahya Dumlupınar University Social Sciences and Humanities Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee Ethics committee permission was obtained with the decision dated 11.09.2024 and numbered 403.

**Declaration of Author(s)' Contribution Rate:** The contribution rates of the authors are as follows: the first author contributed 40%, the second author contributed 40%, the third author contributed 10% and the fourth author contributed 10%.

CONTRIBUTION RATE	CONTRIBUTORS
Idea or Notion	İlyas GÖRGÜT, Piyami ÇAKTO
Literature Review	Orhan DEMİR, Gökçe ÇİMEN BİNKUYU
Method	İlyas GÖRGÜT, Piyami ÇAKTO
Data Collecting	Piyami ÇAKTO, Orhan DEMİR
Data Analysis	Piyami ÇAKTO
Findings	Piyami ÇAKTO
Discussion and Commentary	İlyas GÖRGÜT

**Funding:** No contribution and/or support was received during the writing process of this study.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Informed consent forms were obtained from all participants who participated in the study.

**Data Availability Statement:** For questions regarding data sets, etc., the corresponding author should be contacted.

**Conflict of Interest:** No conflict of interest has been declared regarding the article.



This study is licensed under CC BY (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en>).

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of IJOESS and/or the editor(s). IJOESS and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.