

# Examination of Decision-Making Levels of Individual Sports Persons (Table Tennis Example)

ÜNAL TÜRKÇAPAR<sup>1</sup>, TAHMIRA SABRALIYEVA<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Kyrgyzstan Turkey Manas University Faculty of Sports Sciences-Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University Faculty of Sports Sciences

<sup>2</sup>Kyrgyzstan Turkey Manas University Faculty of Sports Sciences

Correspondence to: Ünal Türkçapar, Email. [turkcaparunal@hotmail.com](mailto:turkcaparunal@hotmail.com), Orcid: 0000-0002-4205-6446

## ABSTRACT

**Aim:** This study is to determine how the decision-making levels of individuals who play table tennis in Kyrgyzstan are shaped.

**Material and Methods:** Scanning method was used in this study. This study has a descriptive and inferential nature. The study group of this research consists of 369 participants, 168 women and 201 men, who played table tennis in Kyrgyzstan in 2020. The study was shaped on the basis of voluntary participation criteria. In this study, a personal information form prepared by the researcher and a Decision Making Scale were used to collect data. Personal information form; Gender, age, education level, how many years have you been a licensed athlete, monthly income level, place of residence, profession and do you have any harmful habits? In addition, in order to determine the decision-making levels of the participants; The decision making scale (MDMS I-II) prepared by Mann et al. (1998) and adapted into Turkish by Deniz (2004) was used. The obtained data were transferred to the computer environment and evaluated with the SPSS 21.0 statistical program.

**Results:** There is no significant difference in the decision-making levels of the table tennis players participating in the study in terms of gender, year of sport, education level, monthly income level and profession, but it was concluded that there was a significant difference in the do you have any harmful habits? variable.

**Conclusion:** It has been concluded that the variables of gender, year of sport, education level, monthly income level and profession are not the determining factors of the decision-making levels of table tennis players.

**Keywords:** Table tennis, Sports, Decision making.

## INTRODUCTION

Decision making is one of the important life skills. While appropriate and timely decisions cause positive changes in the life of the individual, erroneous decisions can affect life negatively. Decision-making skills include both making choices and taking responsibility at the end of this choice. Because a person has to face the consequences of his decision. Decision-making is affected by both emotional and cognitive features<sup>1,2,3</sup>.

Decision making; It is the whole of resources, opportunities, tools, techniques and methods that can enable institutions or individuals to reach their goals and objectives. In summary, it expresses a preference and decision-making process<sup>3</sup>. The choice made by the administrators or a person who is not an administrator in a matter is expressed as a decision. Therefore, it is seen that the concept of decision is closely related to adopting, taking a stand, preference, and choosing. As a result of the decision maker's thinking about the issue, the way he sees as a solution or remedy is his decision. Right or wrong, good or bad, making a decision means making a choice. Indecision means not being able to make a choice, not being able to decide. But management is a decision-making job. Therefore, a person who cannot make a decision will not be able to act as a manager<sup>3</sup>.

Every person reacts differently to a decision-making situation. Decision-making style is different for each individual, and it is a situation that includes the habits of the individual, his approach and the action in which he exhibits his reactions. In the decision-making situation, the individual is based on their decision-making styles<sup>4</sup>.

It is possible to count the qualifications of the decision makers, the information about the decision to be made by the decision makers, and the purpose of the decision

among the factors that affect the decision-making action. In general, it is possible to count two groups in which there are instant decisions and the decisions made at the end of the processes. Decisions made in daily pursuits that are not even aware of are instantaneous. While there is mostly stress and time pressure when making instant decisions, it is possible to say that there is less stress in the decisions made as a result of the decision-making process. In the right and wise decisions, the best among different options is chosen<sup>5</sup>.

The concept of decision making is explored by many scientific fields. According to Glovich, the sports field is the most appropriate field for the examination of decision-making studies<sup>6</sup>.

Today, the games played in many sports, the exercises, the warm-up methods applied before the competition have taken a rapid shape based on tactics<sup>7,8,9,10</sup>. In sports, the decisions made by the referees and trainers as well as the athletes can affect the course of the game. For this reason, the decision of the athlete in critical situations changes the game.

It is also of great importance which style the athlete applies during the decision making during the competition. Which of the decision-making styles is used, the results of the decisions and the result of the competition are concrete indications that only the physical characteristics or capacity of the athlete will reach a certain point in the branch<sup>11</sup>.

The aim of this study is to determine how the decision-making levels of individuals who play table tennis are shaped.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

**Research Design:** The research is descriptive in nature and the decision-making levels of table tennis players were

examined. In this study, the model of the research was created by considering the "screening model". Screening models are research models that aim to identify a condition that has existed in the past or present in the way that it has. The event, person, or object that is the subject of the research is tried to be depicted in its own conditions and as it is. There is no purpose to change or affect these conditions in any way<sup>12</sup>.

**Study Group:** The study group of this research consists of 369 participants, 168 women and 201 men, who played table tennis in Kyrgyzstan in 2020.

**Data Collection Tools:** In order to determine the demographic characteristics of the university students participating in the study, the "Personal Information Form" developed by the researcher was used. This form; gender, education level, how many years have you been a licensed athlete, monthly income level, profession and do you have any harmful habits? consists of questions.

The 'decision-making scale' used in the research; It was prepared by Mann, Burnett, Radford, and Ford with reference to the Flinders Decision-Making Scale I-II. Mann et al. (1998) comparatively examined six countries in terms of MDMS I-II<sup>13</sup>. Adaptation of MDMS I-II into Turkish, validity and reliability analyzes were carried out by Deniz<sup>14</sup>. The aim of the MDMS-I is to determine the self-esteem (self-confidence) levels of the participants in the decision-making stages. There are 6 items in total in the scale, and the statements are 3-point Likert type. Also, 2nd-4th-6th items were coded in reverse. In determining the scores obtained from the scale, the "Correct" answer given to the statements is 2 (two), the "Sometimes True" answer is 1 (one), and the "Not True" answer is 0 (zero). The highest score that can be obtained from this scale is 12 (twelve), and high scores mean that the individual's self-esteem level in decision making is high. The MDMS-II consists of 22 items in total and is used to determine the decision-making styles of individuals. In determining the scores obtained from the scale, the "Correct" answer given to the statements is 2 (two), the "Sometimes True" answer is 1 (one), the answer "Not True" is 0 (zero), and the expressions are 3-point Likert type statements. This scale consists of 4 sub-dimensions<sup>14</sup>:

1 Careful Decision-Making Style: It is the state of making the decision after the person tries to find what is necessary before reaching a decision and considers the

situations that can create another alternative. This sub-dimension consists of 6 items, item numbers; It is 2-4-6-8-12-16. There is no reverse item in the sub-dimension.

2 Avoidant Decision-Making Style: It covers issues such as individuals exhibit avoidant behaviors during a decision-making phase and refrain from making decisions, leaving the decision-making processes to someone else, and not taking responsibility. This sub-dimension consists of 6 items, item numbers; It is 3-9-11-14-17-19.

3 Postponing Decision-Making Style: It is the continuous postponement, procrastination and delay of a decision that should be taken without giving an excuse. This sub-dimension consists of 5 items and item numbers are 5-7-10-18-21.

4 Panic Decision Making Style: It is the effort to reach a solution as soon as possible by making hasty actions due to the feeling of pressure in various ways (time, space, etc.) when the person remains in a decision-making position. This sub-dimension consists of 5 items and item numbers are 1-13-15-20-22.

The reliability study of MDMS I-II was done with the contribution of Deniz<sup>14</sup>, and the reliability of the scale was investigated with internal consistency and test-retest methods. As a result of the test-retest measurement of the scale, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be  $r=0.760$  and it was determined to be reliable.

**Analysis of the Data:** In order to provide descriptive information about the individuals participating in the study, the data of the study were evaluated in the SPSS 21 program. In order to determine the type of analysis suitable for the analysis of the data, first of all, the normality test (Kolmogorov-Smirnov test) was performed and it was determined whether they were homogeneous or not. Since the data of the study showed a normal distribution enough to apply parametric test, t-test (independent sample) for pairwise comparisons and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for multiple comparisons were used. In statistical analysis, the level of significance was chosen as  $p<0.05$ .

## Results

The data obtained from the research group were analyzed and presented in tables below.

Table 1: The results of the analysis conducted to compare the scores of the participants from the MDMS-I and MDMS-II scales according to the gender variable.

		Gender	N	Mean	SS	sd	t	P
MDMS-II	Careful Decision Making	Female	168	8,6254	2,46168	367	1,383	0,16
		Male	201	8,6546	2,13553			
	Avoidant Decision Making	Female	168	8,7224	2,22368	367	1,281	0,27
		Male	201	8,6876	2,31753			
	Postponing Decision Making	Female	168	9,6131	2,20214	367	-,449	0,65
		Male	201	9,7214	2,39416			
	Panic Decision Making	Female	167	9,4790	2,39939	367	-,281	0,77
		Male	201	9,5522	2,56291			
MDMS-I	Female	168	10,7440	1,75778	367	2,376	0,01	
	Male	201	10,3085	1,75054				

$P<0.05$ , MDMS-I/II; Melbourne Decision Making Scale-I/II

When the table is examined, there is no significant difference between the sub-dimensions of the MDMS-II

scale and the gender variable ( $p>0.05$ ). However, there is a significant difference between the MDMS-I scale and the

gender variable ( $p < 0.05$ ). This difference is in favor of female participants. In other words, the self-esteem (self-confidence) of the women participating in the study was higher than that of the men.

Table 2: The results of the analysis conducted to compare the scores of the participants from the MDMS-I and MDMS-II scales according to the education level variable.

		Education Level	N	Mean	SS	df	F	P	Group Difference
MDMS-II	Careful Decision Making	Middle School <sup>1</sup>	114	8,4474	2,30080				
		High school <sup>2</sup>	62	9,6129	2,80137	2	6,376	0,00	3>2,1
		University <sup>3</sup>	193	10,4404	2,22388				
	Avoidant Decision Making	Middle School	114	12,1140	2,43048				
		High School	62	11,8871	2,92028	2	0,652	0,52	
		University	193	12,3057	2,59904				
	Postponing Decision Making	Middle School	114	9,5263	2,59411				
		High School	62	9,6613	2,41541	2	0,373	0,68	
		University	193	9,7617	2,08796				
	Panic Decision Making	Middle School	114	9,1667	2,58969				
		High School	61	9,4590	2,46017	2	1,977	0,14	
		University	193	9,7461	2,42014				
MDMS-I		Middle School <sup>1</sup>	114	10,6316	1,72572				
		High School <sup>2</sup>	62	10,9194	1,79524	2	3,339	0,03	3>2,1
		University <sup>3</sup>	193	11,3005	1,75679				

$P < 0.05$ , MDMS-I/II; Melbourne Decision Making Scale-I/II

Table 3: The results of the analysis made to compare the scores of the participants from the MDMS-I and MDMS-II scales according to the income level variable

		Income	N	Mean	SS	df	F	P
MDMS-II	Careful Decision Making	Low	106	8,4057	2,25422			
		Middle	146	8,8630	2,47367	2	1,196	,304
		Good	117	8,5726	2,39005			
	Avoidant Decision Making	Low	106	12,0755	2,50978			
		Middle	146	12,1301	2,45023	2	,292	,747
		Good	117	12,3248	2,87327			
	Postponing Decision Making	Low	106	9,6792	2,30340			
		Middle	146	9,7329	2,34091	2	,125	,882
		Good	117	9,5897	2,28244			
	Panic Decision Making	Low	106	9,7358	2,50448			
		Middle	146	9,3288	2,55183	2	,845	,430
		Good	116	9,5603	2,38943			
MDMS- I		Low	106	10,6604	1,64974			
		Middle	146	10,4726	1,80496	2	,602	,548
		Good	117	10,4103	1,82016			

$P > 0.05$ , MDMS-I/II; Melbourne Decision Making Scale-I/II

Table 4: The results of the analysis conducted to compare the scores of the participants from the MDMS-I and MDMS-II scales according to the LSY variable.

		LYS	N	Mean	SS	df	F	P
MDMS-II	Careful Decision Making	1-3	169	8,4675	2,36551	3	,807	,490
		4-6	96	8,8646	2,47352			
		7-9	50	8,9000	2,16889			
		10 +	54	8,5370	2,50066			
	Avoidant Decision Making	1-3	169	12,4201	2,36186	3	1,530	,206
		4-6	96	12,0625	2,63903			
		7-9	50	12,2200	2,83772			
		10 +	54	11,5741	2,97538			
	Postponing Decision Making	1-3	169	9,7811	2,04255	3	2,356	,072
		4-6	96	9,2917	2,39700			
		7-9	50	10,2800	2,77040			
		10 +	54	9,4444	2,36856			
Panic Decision Making	1-3	169	9,4911	2,52162	3	1,222	,301	
	4-6	95	9,2000	2,26255				
	7-9	50	9,9600	2,70268				
	10 +	54	9,7593	2,53232				
MDMS- I		1-3	169	10,4260	1,66427			
		4-6	96	10,5104	1,80055		,373	,772
		7-9	50	10,7200	1,99018			
		10 +	54	10,5556	1,81884			

P>0.05, MDMS-I/II; Melbourne Decision Making Scale-I/II, LSY; Licensed sports year

When the table is examined, there is a significant difference between the MDMS-II scale sub-dimensions and the education level variable ( $p<0.05$ ). This difference is only in favor of the participants with careful decision making sub-dimension and university level education. In other words, individuals with university-level education have the ability to make more careful decisions than individuals with secondary and high school education. In addition, there is a significant difference between the MDMS-I scale and the education level variable ( $p<0.05$ ). This difference is in favor of the participants with a university education level. In other words, the self-esteem (self-confidence) of the individuals participating in the study was higher in participants with

university education.

When the table is examined, there is no significant difference between the sub-dimensions of the MDMS-I scale and MDMS-II scale and the income variable ( $p>0.05$ ). In other words, the income level is not an important phenomenon in the self-esteem and decision-making processes of the participants.

When the table is examined, there is no significant difference between MDMS-I scale and MDMS-II scale sub-dimensions and LSY variable ( $p>0.05$ ). In other words, LSY does not reveal a significant effect on influencing participants self-esteem and decision-making processes.

Table 5: The results of the analysis conducted to compare the scores of the participants from the MDMS-I and MDMS-II scales according to the profession variable.

		Profession	N	Mean	SS	df	F	P
MDMS-II	Careful Decision Making	Public Employee	65	8,4462	2,37849			
		Self Employment	244	8,7459	2,44128	2	,716	,489
		Private Sector	60	8,4167	2,17296			
	Avoidant Decision Making	Public Employee	65	12,5077	2,40522			
		Self Employment	244	12,0902	2,53374	2	,660	,518
		Private Sector	60	12,1667	3,06520			
	Postponing Decision Making	Public Employee	65	9,6154	2,64984			
		Self Employment	244	9,6967	2,19760	2	,042	,959
		Private Sector	60	9,6333	2,37905			
	Panic Decision Making	Public Employee	65	9,9538	2,63053			
		Self Employment	244	9,4139	2,46222	2	1,222	,296
		Private Sector	59	9,4746	2,41658			
MDMS- I	Public Employee	65	10,1846	1,77564				
	Self Employment	244	10,5902	1,79048	2	1,359	,258	
	Private Sector	60	10,5167	1,63118				

P>0.05, MDMS-I/II; Melbourne Decision Making Scale-I/II

When the table is examined, there is no significant difference between the sub-dimensions of the MDMS-I scale and the MDMS-II scale and the variable of

occupation ( $p>0.05$ ). In other words, the professions of the participants do not have a significant effect on influencing their self-esteem and decision-making processes.

Table 6: The results of the analysis conducted to compare the scores of the participants from the MDMS-I and MDMS-II scales according to the variable of using harmful habits.

		Bad Habits	N	Mean	SS	df	t	P
MDMS-II	Careful Decision Making	Yes	131	8,9084	2,38085			
		No	238	8,4916	2,38268	367	1,587	,109
	Avoidant Decision Making	Yes	131	12,0382	2,48505			
		No	238	12,2521	2,66789	367	-,570	,451
	Postponing Decision Making	Yes	131	9,6947	1,98026			
		No	238	9,6597	2,47130	367	,139	,889
	Panic Decision Making	Yes	131	9,2901	2,26847			
		No	237	9,6456	2,59581	367	1,327	,190
MDMS- I	Yes	131	10,7710	1,86286				
	No	238	10,3613	1,69502	367	2,597	,033	

P>0.05, MDMS-I/II; Melbourne Decision Making Scale-I/II

When the table is examined, there is no significant difference between the MDMS-II scale sub-dimensions and the variable of using harmful habits ( $p>0.05$ ). However, there is a significant difference between the MDMS-I scale and the harmful habit variable ( $p<0.05$ ). This difference is in favor of the participants who answered yes to the question "Do you have any harmful habits?" In other words, the self-esteem of the individuals who participated in the study and stated that they used harmful habits was higher than those who did not.

## DISCUSSION

The research conducted is evaluated in the light of the literature information according to the variables taken into consideration.

It was concluded that there was a significant difference in the research group according to the gender variable, and this difference was in favor of the female participants. As a matter of fact, Taşgıt<sup>15</sup> found that there was a significant difference between the level of self-

esteem and gender in decision-making in his research titled "Examination of self-esteem and decision-making levels of university students". Köse<sup>16</sup> stated that individuals sense of self-esteem stems from their self-confidence. Accordingly, the fact that female students' self-esteem levels are higher than male students can be explained by the fact that women feel free when making decisions, and that they feel confident in expressing what they think to the other party in a comfortable way.

It was concluded that there was a significant difference according to the education level variable of the research group, and this difference was in favor of the participants with a university level education level and in the decision-making sub-dimension. Aksu<sup>17,23,24</sup>, in his study with referees, found no difference with the education level in the careful and impressive decision-making subgroups, while a significant difference was found in the avoidant and panic decision-making sub-dimensions. When the decision-making scale scores are examined in terms of educational status; It was conducted in studies that concluded that there was no significant difference in the rational-systematic, impulsive, dependent, unstable subscales<sup>18,19,20,25,26</sup>.

It was concluded that there was no significant difference according to the income level variable of the research group. When the literature is examined, it has been determined that there is a difference in the avoidant and panic decision-making styles, and it has been revealed that the decision-making scores increase as the income level increases<sup>17,21</sup>. Although these results are in parallel with our study, there is a difference in the intuitive decision making sub-dimension. It has been observed that different findings have been found in the studies carried out. In terms of economic income; only in the impulsive decision-making subscale, studies that reached significant findings in favor of those with low income were also found in the literature<sup>20</sup>.

There is no significant difference according to the licensed sporting variable of the research group. When the literature is examined, it has been reported that there is no significant relationship between the years of refereeing and decision-making styles<sup>17,20</sup>. In some studies; Although there are differences in decision-making levels, it has been stated that there is a significant difference in sub-dimensions<sup>22</sup>.

## CONCLUSION

It was concluded that there was no significant difference between the profession variable of the research group. However, Uzunoğlu<sup>21</sup>, unlike the result of our research, in his study on football referees, according to occupational groups in terms of self-esteem in decision making; It has been determined that there is a significant difference between worker referees and self-employed, civil servants, teachers and other professional referees.

It was concluded that there was no significant difference between the variable of using harmful habits of the research group. However, it was concluded that there was a significant difference between the MDMS-I scale and the harmful habit variable, and this difference was in favor of the participants who answered yes to the question "Do you have any harmful habits?" In other words, the self-

esteem of the individuals who participated in the study and stated that they used harmful habits was higher than those who did not.

## REFERENCES

- Gürçay, S. (1998). Bazı kişisel değişkenler, algılanan sosyal destek ve atılganlığın karar verme stilleri ile ilişkisi. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 2(9), 7-16.
- Şeyhun, H. (2000). Karar verme becerisi eğitimi ilköğretim son sınıf kararının verilmesi karar verme becerisinin etkisi (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Yeşilyaprak, B. (2000). Eğitimde rehberlik hizmetleri. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Öztabak, M. Ü. (2013). Farklı okul türlerinde eğitim gören lise öğrencilerinin sınıf seviyelerine göre düşünme stilleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Aytaç, M., ve Gürsakal, N. (2015). Karar Verme. Bursa: Dora Basım.
- Vural, M. (2013). Spor genel müdürlüğü merkez ve taşra teşkilatında görev yapan spor yöneticilerinin düşünme ve karar verme stillerinin incelenmesi (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Selçuk Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Eken, Ö., Bayer, R. (2022). Acute effects of proprioceptive neuromuscular facilitation stretching, massage and combine protocols on flexibility, vertical jump and hand grip strength performance in kickboxers. *Pedagogy of Physical Culture and Sports*, 26(1), 4-12.
- Bayer, R., Eken, Ö. (2021). The acute effect of different massage durations on squat jump, countermovement jump and flexibility performance in muay thai athletes. *Physical education of students*, 25(6), 353-358.
- Bayer, R., Eken, Ö. (2021). Some Anaerobic Performance Variations From Morning To Evening: Massage Affects Performance and Diurnal Variation. *Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional*.
- Eken, Ö. (2021). The acute effect of different specific warm-up intensity on one repeat maximum squat performance on basketball players. *Pedagogy of Physical Culture and Sports*, 25(5), 313-318.
- Akcan, İ. O. (2016). Elit oryantiring sporcularının görsel reaksiyon süreleri ile karar verme stilleri arasındaki ilişki (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Karasar, N. (2009). "Araştırmalarda Rapor Hazırlama" Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.
- Mann, L., Burnett, P., Radford, M., & Ford, S. (1997). The Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire: An instrument for measuring patterns for coping with decisional conflict. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 10(1), 1-19.
- Deniz, M. (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 (EJER)*, 15, 23-35.
- Taşgıt, M. S. (2012). Üniversite öğrencilerinin benlik saygısı ve karar verme düzeylerinin incelenmesi (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Karaman.
- Köse, A. (2002). Psikolojik danışma ve rehberlik birinci sınıf öğrencilerinin cinsiyet ve algılanan sosyo-ekonomik düzey açısından psikolojik ihtiyaçları ve karar verme stratejilerinin incelenmesi (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Aksu, A. (2016). Farklı Klasmanlardaki Futbol Hakemlerinin Karar Verme Stilleri ve Özgüven Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi.

- Yüksek lisans tezi, Fırat Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Diyarbakır.
18. Kao, HP.( 2005). "Taiwanese Executive's Leadership Styles and Their Preferred Decision-Making Models Used in Mainland China", The University of the Incarnate Word, The School of the Graduate Studies of The University of the Incarnate Word, Doctorate Thesis, Texas.
19. 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.
20. Selvi, S. and Karagün, E.(2017). An Analysis of Decision Making Strategies of Kocaeli Region Football Referees. SHS Web of Conferences 37;(01043). (DOI:10.1051/shsconf/20173701043).
21. Uzunoğlu, Ö.F.(2008). Türk Futbol Hakemlerinin Karar Verme Stillerinin Klasmanlarına ve Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi, Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.
22. Şen, N.(2017). Kamu Sağlık Sektöründe Yönetici Karar Verme Stillerinin ve İlişkili Olduğu Faktörlerin İncelenmesi. Yüksek lisans tezi, İstanbul Medipol Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
23. İlkim M. Çelik T., Mergan B.(2021) Investigation of Sports Management Students' Perceptions and Attitudes towards the COVID-19 Pandemic, Pakistan Journal Of Medical & Health Sciences, Volume15 Issue 2 Page799-803
24. İlkim M.,Mergan B.,Karadağ H.,Rüzgar K..(20219 Investigation Of Attitudes Of Pre-Service Teachers Of Exercise And Sports Education For Disabilities Towards Children With Mental Disabilities, Pakistan Journal Of Medical & Health Sciences, Volume15, Issue 9,Page 2641-2645.
25. Karaca Y., İlkim M., Investigation Of The Attitudes Distance Education Of The Faculty Of Sport Science Students In The Covid-19 Period, Turkish Online Journal Of Distance Education Volume22, Issue 4, Page114-129,2021
26. Yurtseven C.N.,Duman F.K., Evaluation of Boss Phubbing in Sports Businesses, Pakistan Journal Of Medical & Health Sciences, 15(2).2021, 839-844.