



International Journal of Development and Sustainability

ISSN: 2186-8662 – www.isdsnet.com/ijds

Volume 7 Number 10 (2018): Pages 2469-2475

ISDS Article ID: IJDS18052102



Self-reliance levels and decision making styles of management of 17th Mediterranean games organization committee

Dursun Katkat ^{1*}, Emre Belli ², Yeşim Bayrakadaroğlu ³, Orcan Mızrak ², Alparslan Kurudirek ⁴, Engin Gezer ⁴

¹ Department of Sport Management, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey

² Faculty of Sport Sciences, Atatürk University, Erzurum, Turkey

³ Department of Sport Education and Sciences, Gümüşhane University, Gümüşhane, Turkey

⁴ Department of Sport Education and Sciences-Sarıkamış, Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine decision making skills and decision making styles of individuals who are at management levels at 17th Mediterranean Games and to make comparisons as per variables of age, work experience, and positions. In gathering the data, Melbourne Decision Making Questionary, which has been developed by Mann et al¹ and which has been adopted to Turkish by Deniz² has been used. 72 people being composed of board members, directors, and assistant directors within the body of General Coordinatorship of 17th Mediterranean Games were included in the study. As a result; of statistical tests that was conducted with assistant directors, meaningful differences of directors was found.

Keywords: Mediterranean Games; Sports Organization; Decision Making; Self-Reliance

Published by ISDS LLC, Japan | Copyright © 2018 by the Author(s) | This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Cite this article as: Katkat, D., Belli, E., Bayrakadaroğlu, Y., Mızrak, O., Kurudirek, A. and Gezer, E. (2018), "Self-reliance levels and decision making styles of management of 17th Mediterranean games organization committee", *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, Vol. 7 No. 10, pp. 2469-2475.

* Corresponding author. E-mail address: dkatkat@hotmail.com

1. Introduction

Decision making is the most important process in management. It bears meanings such as decree, sustainability, continuity, determination, order, appropriate predictions as a result of thinking and reasoning. While the concept of decision is separated from action, it denotes the passage from immobility and indifference to action and movement (Tosun, 2012). Effective decisions can cause to increase life satisfaction of people and to make people feel themselves well, while ineffective decisions can cause people's lives to get hard and for them to feel (Çolakkadioğlu et al., 2007). Decision making is the process of choosing one of the probable occurrences (Furby et al., 1992). According to Carroll, decision making is an activity in which an individual is faced with a situation necessitating for a decision to be taken and relating to which he determines what kind of a decision to take and when to take it (Carroll et al., 1990). In this process the individual has an approach that is convenient for him (Beyth-Marom et al., 1991), he evaluates the situation and directs himself to one of the choices (Klaczynski et al., 1984). The define decision making as the process starting from the moment when they realize the conflict between the current situation of person and the position he is targeting at (Nelson, 1984; Miller et al., 2001). During this process the individual realizes processes such as defining various options, evaluating and selecting them, determining an action plan, implementing the necessary actions, evaluating the outcomes of actions, processing information relating with effectiveness of action, and storing the relevant feed backs in order to reduce the existing conflict (Scott et al., 1995; Von Winterfeldt et al., 1986; Zunker, 1998).

Mann has stated that the act of decision making is a very complex process and that variables such as research and processing, decreeing, learning and memory influence the process of decision making. Decision making styles are generally gathered in two groups as being positive and negative (Mann, 1989). In the act of decision making when decision is taken by applying the decision making steps, positive decision making style is being used and when one of the decision making steps is skipped, sufficient time is not allocated, or when responsibilities are assigned to someone else, negative decision making style is being used. Individuals can use of of these styles depending on the situations (Harris, 1998). In individuals having positive decision making style, there are features such as considering probable outcomes of various aspects of action, physical health, emotional health, having financial income, reducing uncertainty, discovering good options, having power to evaluate the options, activating and implementing relevant information and values in decision making situations.

In the act of decision making, a person's having these features and his implementing these decision making steps shows that he is using positive decision making style and when he does not meet these criteria, it means that he is using negative decision making style. It was seen that individuals using negative coping style in decision making began to use positive coping style at the implemented skills training programs (Byrnes, 2005).

2. Material and method

72 people including board members, 24 directors, and 48 assistant directors were included in the study as they were authorized to make decisions at General Coordinatorship of 17th Mediterranean Games. In gathering the data, Melbourne Decision Making Questionary which was developed by Mann L. (Mann et al., 1998) in year

1998 and which was adopted to Turkish by Deniz M.E. (Deniz, 2004) in year 2004, has been used. It was reached to conclusions by using the gathered data with respect to average values and by making comparisons with statistical methods.

Melbourne Decision Making Questionary is composed of two parts.

1th Part: It aims to determine self-respect (self-reliance) in decision making. It comprises of 6 articles and one sub-dimension.

2nd Part: It aims to determine decision making styles. It consists of 22 articles and four sub-dimensions. These are specified below:

- i. Careful decision making style: It is the situation where the individual makes decision after searching for necessary information with care before decision making and evaluating the alternatives carefully.
- ii. Avoidant decision making style: It is the situation where the individual avoids from making decisions, has the tendency to leave decision making to others, and where he tries to reveal himself from decision making by assigning the responsibility to someone else.
- iii. Delaying decision making style: It is the situation where the individual continuously delays, postpones, and impedes decision making even though there are no valid reasons to do so.
- iv. Panic decision making style: It is the situation where an individual being faced with the case of decision making, exhibits urgent acts and tries to find urgent solutions by feeling himself under time pressure (Deniz, 2004).

Reliability and validity studies of Melbourne decision making questionnaire have been separately calculated by using methods such as reliability, test repetition and internal consistency relating with MDMQ I-II and it was determined that regarding reliability coefficients self-respect in decision making had the value of $r = .85$, and that it was $r = .83$ with careful decision making style, that it was $r = .87$ with avoidant decision making style, that it was $r = .68$ with delaying decision making style and that it was $r = .84$ with panic decision making style (Deniz, 2004).

Evaluation of Melbourne Decision Making Questionary (MDMQ):

MDMQ I: It is a scale aiming to determine self-respect (self-reliance) in decision making. It consists of six (6) articles and it is scored as the reverse of three articles (2, 4, and 6). Scoring is done as per the answers given to the articles, whereas "Correct answer" is given 2 points, "Sometimes Correct" answer is given 1 point, and "It is not correct" answer is given "0" points. Maximum score that can be obtained from the scale is 12 points. High scores is an indicator of high level of self-respect in decision making.

MDMQ II: It consists of twenty two (22) articles. The scale measures decision making styles. It has got four sub-scales. Questions covering the sub-scales are:

- 1- Careful: Articles with no.s of 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, and 16.
- 2- Avoidant: Articles with no.s of 3, 9, 11, 14, 17, and 19.
- 3- Delaying: Articles with no.s of 5, 7, 10, 18, and 21.
- 4- Panic: Articles with no.s of 1, 13, 15, 20, and 22.

In the scoring of MDMQ, careful, avoidant, delaying, and panic are evaluated with the score intervals of (0 - 12), (0 - 12), (0 - 10), and (0-10) respectively. High scores indicate that the relevant decision making style is being used (Deniz, 2004).

3. results

Table 1. Average values of ages and work experiences of managers

	N	Age averages (year)	Work experiences (year)
Director	24	45,25	20,1
Assistant Director	48	27,13	3,4
	72		

While directors were composed of 24 people, average of their ages was 45,25' and average of their work experiences had the value of 20,1. On the other hand, while assistant directors were composed of 48 people, average of their ages was 27,13 and average of their work experiences had the value of 3,4.

Table 2. Self-respect scores of managers

	Position	N	Mean	S.D.	p
Self-respect in decision making (self-reliance)	Director	24	10,42	1,82	.047*
	Asst.Director	48	8,17	1,53	

* $p < .05$

For the directors who were assigned at 17th Mediterranean Games, average value of self-respect (self-reliance) in decision making was determined as 10,42 (SD: 1,82), whereas for the assistant directors, average value of self-respect (self-reliance) in decision making was determined 8,17 (SD: 1,53). Furthermore, as per the results of t-test that was conducted with assistant directors, a meaningful difference in favor of directors was found (mean: 10,42).

Table 3. Scores of managers relating with their decision making styles

	Position	N	Mean	S.D.	p
Careful decision making	Director	24	10,42	1,82	.047*
	Asst.Director	48	8,17	1,53	
Avoidant decision making	Director	24	3,01	1,12	.056
	Asst.Director	48	3,82	1,23	
Delaying decision making	Director	24	2,22	1,01	.061
	Asst.Director	48	2,95	1,21	
Panic decision making	Director	24	1,98	1,63	.029*
	Asst.Director	48	3,10	1,41	

* $p < .05$

When the results of comparison being made with respect to decision making styles of trial groups are investigated, with regards to "careful decision making" and "panic decision making" styles, among assistant

directors and directors, meaningfulness at the level of .05 was determined in favor of directors. On the other hand, with regards to average values of “avoidant decision making” and “delaying decision making” styles, even though directors attained better scores with respect to assistant directors, no statistically meaningful difference could be found.

4. Discussion and conclusion

In the study, it was determined that age average of directors was 45,25 and that age average of assistant directors was 27,13. Directors being assigned at the games are composed of public personnel who are currently working at various divisions of the state (Korkmaz, 2013). If evaluation is made with respect to age averages, it can be reached to the conclusion that directors are working actively for long periods at the governmental departments. Working life generally makes individuals attain skills involving decision making strategies, methods, and providing solutions for personal communication problems (Mann et al., 1989). Furthermore, age factor and experiences in working life emphasize that there are scientific findings revealing that they improve logical decision making style of individuals, that they improve their self-reliance, and that they enable them to be more successful and happier in their lives (Phillips et al., 1984; Hammond et al., 2008).

Besides, in the study a meaningful difference at the level of .05 was found in favor of directors (mean: 10,42) between self-respect (self-reliance) of directors being assigned at 17th Mediterranean Games and self-respect (self-reliance) of assistant directors. The basic reason for this originates from the fact that directors are more competent than assistant directors with respect to age factor and that they have more expertise and working life duration with respect to their working experiences. Furthermore, Phillips has found out that individuals having high level of individual responsibility awareness, had effective decision making skills (Phillips et al., 1984). Accordingly, this reveals that directors being assigned at Mediterranean Games are more successful than assistant directors due to the reason that apart from their temporary duties, they have more responsibilities in their working lives.

In the study as the results of comparison being made with respect to decision making styles of sample group are investigated, it is determined that there is a meaningful difference in favor of directors between directors and assistant directors with respect to “careful decision making” and “panic decision making” styles. Careful decision making style can be attained with the training of individual and with accumulation of expertise in time (Botvin, 1983). By considering the age averages of directors being included in the study, it can be assumed that they have work experiences as being parallel and that they have got various training during their working life or that they have gained various experiences. In accordance, directors’ being more careful when making decision with regards to assistant directors can be considered to be normal. Besides, it could be stated that when making decisions directors did not exhibit panic acts in a meaningful way with respect to assistant directors and that the reason for this is due to the fact that individuals with more ages have tendency to exhibit more mature acts as compared to individuals with less ages (Mann et al., 1988). On the other hand, even though directors got better scores when compared with assistant directors with respect to average values of “avoidant decision making” and “delaying decision making” styles, a statistically meaningful difference could not be

found. Although avoidant acts of directors during decision making are less when compared with assistant directors, the difference is not meaningful. The reason for this could be due to the fact that during the organization of games, the final decision belongs to directors and since assistant directors only assist directors in that respect, there is no reason for them to avoid from decision making stage and thus the difference could not come out to be meaningful. Furthermore, even though directors revealed delaying behaviors less when compared with assistant directors, the difference did not come out to be meaningful. The reason for this could be due to the fact that in decision making assistant directors have the habit (Byrnes, 2005) or tradition (Mincemoyer et al., 2003) to get approval from directors and that they don't constitute a delaying factor in decision making and thus the difference could come out not to be meaningful.

References

- Beyth-Marom, R. Fischhoff, B. Jacobs-Quadrel, M. and Furby. L. (1991), *Teaching Decision Making to Adolescents: A Critical Review*, in J. Baron and R.V. Brown (Ed.), *Teaching Decision Making to Adolescents*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, New Jersey, pp. 19-60.
- Botvin, G.J. (1983), *Prevention of Adolescent Substance Abuse Through The Development of Personal and Social Competence*, in T.J. Glynn, C.G. Leukfeld and J.P. Ludford (Ed.), *Preventing Adolescent Drug Abuse: Intervention Strategies*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, United States of America.
- Byrnes, J.P. (2005), "Self-Regulated Decision-Making In Children And Adolescents". in Jacobs, J.E. & Klaczynski, P. A. (Ed.), *The Development of Judgment And Decision-Making In Children And Adolescents*, Lawrence Erlbaum, (Pp. 5-38).
- Caroll, S.J. and Johnson, J.E. (1990), *Decision Research: A Field Guide*, Sage Puplications, New Delhi.
- Çolakradioğlu, O. and Güçray. S.S. (2007), "Ergenlerde Karar Verme Ölçeği'ni Türkçe'ye Uyarlama Çalışması", *Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, Vol. 7 No. 26, pp. 61-71.
- 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*, Vol. 15, pp. 23-35.
- Furby, L. and Beyt-Marom, R. (1992), "Risk Taking In Adolescence: A Decision Making Perspective", *Developmental Review*, Vol. 12, pp. 1-44.
- Hammond, J.S., Raiffa, H. and Keeney, R.L. (2008), *Karar Verme Sanatı*, (Translate: Şebnem Özkan), Beyaz Publishing, Ankara, Turkey
- Harris, R. (1998), *Introduction to Decision Making*, Vanguard University of Southern Colifornia Publishing, United States of America.
- Klaczynski, P.A., Byrnes, J.B. and Jacobs, J.E. (2001), "Introduction: Special Issue on Decision Making", *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 22, pp. 225-236.

- Korkmaz, B., (2013), *Human Resouces Report of OCMG*, Organization Commette Mediteranean Games Archives, Mersin, Turkey
- Mann, L., Beswick, G., Allouache, P. and Ivey, M. (1989), "Decision Workshops for The Improvement of Decision-Making Skills and Confidence", *Journal of Counseling and Development*, Vol. 67, pp. 478-481.
- Mann, L., Harmoni, R. and Power, C. (1989), "Adolescent Decision-Making: The Development of Competence", *Journal of Adolescence*, Vol. 12, pp. 265-278.
- Mann, L., Harmoni, R., Power, C., Beswick, G. and Ormond, C. (1988), "Effectiveness of The Gofer Course in Decision Making for High School Students", *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, Vol. 1, pp. 159-168.
- 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*, Vol. 33, pp. 325-335.
- Miller, D.C. and Byrnes, J.P. (2001), "Adolescents' Decision Making In Social Situations: A Self-Regulation Perspective", *Applied Developmental Psychology*, Vol. 22, pp. 237-256.
- Mincemoyer, C.C. and Perkins, D.F. (2003), "Assessing Decision-Making Skills of Youth", *Family and Consumer Sciences*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 1-9.
- Nelson, G.D. (1984), *Assessment of Health Decision Making Skills of Adolescents*, US Department of Education, United States of America.
- Phillips, S.D., Paziienza, N.J. and Walsh, D.J. (1984), "Decision-Making Styles and Progress in Occupational Decision-Making", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Vol. 25, pp. 96-105.
- Scott, S.G. and Bruce, R.A. (1995), "Decision-making style: the development and assessment of a new measure", *Educ. Psychol. Meas*, Vol. 55, No. 5 pp. 818-831.
- Tosun, K. (2012), *İşletme Yönetimi, Savaş Publishing*, Ankara, Turkey.
- Von Winterfeldt, D. and Edwards, W. (1986), *Decision Analysis and Behavioral Research*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United States of America.
- Zunker, V.G. (1998), "Career Counseling: Applied Concepts of Life Planning" 5th Ed., *Brooks/Cole, Pacific Grove*, California, United States of America.