

# An investigation of book reading habits levels and correct decision-making styles in terms of some variables: A research on coach and referees

Mihriay Musa

Department of Coaching Education, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Usak University, Usak, Turkey.

Accepted 11 November. 2020

---

## ABSTRACT

In this study, it was aimed to examine the reading habits levels and making the correct decision styles of basketball, handball, volleyball, and football coaches and referees in terms of some variables, the research was carried out with the general survey model, one of the quantitative research designs, the active coaches and referees of basketball, football, volleyball, and handball in İzmir, Denizli and Uşak provinces constituted the universe of the study, the sample of the study, on the other hand, consisted of 98 participants, 52 of whom were coaches and 46 were referees, determined by the simple random sampling method, one sample t-test at a 0.05 significance level was conducted to determine whether the sample represented the universe equally and homogeneously. Melbourne decision making scale I-II, and book reading habits scale were used to collect data in the study. Since the data are suitable for normal distribution, the t-test in comparing the pairwise means; parametric tests such as one-way ANOVA tests were used at 0.05 significance level in comparing the mean scores of more than two groups. In terms of education levels, it has been observed that female coaches and referees studying at faculties of sports sciences have higher levels of reading habit, love of reading, and being influenced by books. In addition, it was determined that individuals who trust and respect the decisions of their families have higher reading habits and correct decision-making styles and do not panic during the decision-making process.

**Keywords:** Coach, referee, reading habits, decision making.

---

E-mail: mihriay.musa@usak.edu.tr, tel: +902762212121-5727.

---

## INTRODUCTION

In our study, it was aimed to examine the habit of reading book levels and the correct decision-making styles of coaches and referees according to some variables. The development of the reading skills of coaches and referees has an important effect on the development of their ability to produce new ideas, abstract thinking skills, imagination power, and cognitive and affective skills just like other people. Coaches and referees are also a manager who performs management functions. Therefore, decision-making is a very important activity for them (Bayansalduz, 2012; Can et al., 2009; Şahin, 2018). The management process is the transformation of information into action, and the transformation process is the decision-making process. Therefore, decision making is the operation of processing information. The operation

begins with defining the problem required for selection and includes determining the purpose, finding alternatives, evaluating, and processing the information (Bayansalduz et al., 2014; Karademir et al., 2013). For this reason, the most basic factor for coaches and referees to access information is their reading habits.

Considering the historical process of the habit of reading books in Turkey, we concluded that the books are no active source in people's lives. The two main reasons for this situation are the low rate of literacy rate in the population and the difficulties in accessing books.

In his definition, bamberger (1990) also focuses on the mental process of the act performed. He states that the phenomenon of reading is a multi-dimensional activity that countless brain cells are involved in the analysis and

transformation of symbols and graphics into meaningful concepts and has a large share in the development of the mind. The act of reading somewhat critically questions it. Thinking power can be improved with critical thinking power. Critical thinking has been tried to be defined over the basic disciplines of psychology and philosophy (Şahinel, 2002). Reading, which occurs in line with the need for communication, is one of the four basic language skills, with the advancement of education, the importance of reading skills increases. Students' access to information on their plays an important role in independent knowledge acquisition.

The act of reading has an important effect on the development of new ideas, abstract thinking, imagination, cognitive and psychomotor skills. In this context, it also improves the skills of individuals to express themselves more accurately and better. It can be said that reading consists of three stages in general, reading in the first stage is a means of communication. The messages conveyed by the person who wrote the article are transmitted to the reader through many presses or written communication means in which the text is published. In the second stage, reading activity expresses a perception process. He should reflect on and comment on the expressions he perceives, after these stages, the learning process takes place (Dökmen, 1994).

The environment of the person has a very active role in acquiring a habit. In his life, he is influenced by his environment, parents, teachers, and especially the behaviors and thoughts of the group with which he acts together in adolescence. The cognitive and behavioral effects of the environment in which a person is located constitute a part of the habits of the person in later life. For this reason, habits are one of the most important consequences of being a society (Bamberger, 1990).

In the process of making a habit out of reading, the person should first realize that reading is beneficial for him in personal, social, and professional terms. This process, which starts with the fulfillment of interests and needs since birth, continues with the understanding of the gain of reading, reading becomes a habit, a connection is established between the book and the person, and this process continues in every book read. As in the concept of habit, the environmental factor is very important in the formation of reading habits (Bamberger, 1990).

Individuals often face problems in both their personal and organizational activities, and they must make some decisions to overcome these problems. Problems are the obstruction of one's existing forces that it directs to reach his goals. The problems that occur when the conditions of real situations differ from the conditions of the desired situations partially help create new opportunities. These problems can be in simple forms or very complex forms, decision making is choosing one of the various modes of action in achieving goals and objectives and is at the core of all management functions. Therefore, decision making is a very important activity for the manager who performs

management functions (Forman and Selly, 2001). According to another view, the main purpose of decision making is problem-solving, and in this view, problem-solving is considered as part of decision making. Schermerhorn accepts decision making as a process of problem-solving (Lang et al., 1978). Simon argues that decision-making starts with finding the reason for making a decision, that is, the existence of a problem, and that the decision-maker is the way of determining the problem (Simon, 1987).

## METHODOLOGY

For the research design, the general survey model, one of the quantitative research designs, was used. It was aimed to examine the reading habits and correct decision-making styles of coaches and referees in basketball, football, volleyball, and handball branches according to some variables. The universe of the study consists of referees and trainers in basketball, football, volleyball, and handball branches in İzmir, Denizli and Uşak provinces. The sample of this study, which was collected by a simple random sampling method, consisted of 100 participants. Since 2 questionnaire forms were eliminated because they did not comply with the rules, the data were analyzed over 98 questionnaires in the study.

Within the scope of the study, frequency and percentage values, normality analysis, and averages of the information that constitute the personal characteristics of the referees and trainers were determined. Two scales were used to collect data within the scope of the study, the first scale is the attitude towards book reading habits scale. The second is the Melbourne decision making scale I-II. Also, information was used to determine the demographic characteristics of those who took the scales, the information about the scales is as follows, in data collection, the Reading Habit Scale developed by Gömleksiz, 2004); and Melbourne decision-making scale, presented by (Mann et al., 1997), and validity and reliability studies of which were conducted by Deniz (2004) were used. The book reading habit scale consists of 30 items and 6 sub-dimensions: love, habit, necessity, desire, effect, and benefit, it is a 5-point Likert type scale. Melbourne decision making scale I-II; scale Part I: explains self-esteem (self-reliance) in decision making, it consists of 6 questions. The second part consists of 22 questions and measures formation and decision-making styles. Part 2 falls into a 3-point Likert-type scale class consisting of 22 questions and 4 sub-dimensions: careful decision, avoidant decision, delaying the decision, and panic decision. Since the data collected in the study are suitable for normal distribution; the t-test was used to compare the paired group averages among the parametric tests, and the one-way ANOVA tests were used to compare the means of more

than two groups.

**FINDINGS**

When Table 1 is evaluated, 57.1% of the participants are men. 52% are from sports sciences faculty. 38.8% are from football branch, 52% are referees, 46.9% are non-referees, and more than half 51% consists of non-coaches.

When Table 2 is evaluated, in the scales and sub-dimensions we will use in our study; the mode, median and mean values are very close to each other; moreover, since kurtosis and skewness values were determined to be between ±1.96, our data was found to be suitable for normal distribution. According to this result, it was decided to use parametric analysis in analyzing the data in our study.

When Table 3 is evaluated, it is determined that individuals' habit of reading books and decision-making styles are at a medium level.

When Table 4 is evaluated, when the analysis regarding the differences of the participants' gender, decision-making styles and reading habits is examined; there was no statistically significant difference between the reading all scale level of the participants ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.053$ ) and the sub-dimensions of love ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.431$ ), habit ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.886$ ), necessity ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.236$ ), effect ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.094$ ). In addition to this, according to the gender of the participations, a significant difference was found in sub-dimensions of claim ( $t = -2.162$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = .033$ ) and benefit ( $t = -2.952$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = .004$ ) at a level of 95%. At the level of claim to read books ( $\bar{x} = 10.43$ ) women's claim to read books is higher than men ( $\bar{x} = 9.25$ ). Based on the averages of the benefit sub-dimension, it was found that the level of benefit ( $\bar{x} = 28.05$ ) obtained by women from reading books was higher than that of men ( $\bar{x} = 24.07$ ).

In addition, there was no statistically significant difference between the gender variable and decision-making styles of the individuals with sub-dimensions such as total scale level ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.786$ ), self-esteem ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.754$ ), careful ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.712$ ), avoidant ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.173$ ), delaying ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.951$ ), and panic ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.708$ ).

When Table 5 is evaluated, according to the results of the analysis performed to determine the reading habits and decision-making styles of the participants according to the faculty variable, no statistically significant difference was found between reading books all scale levels ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.142$ ), and sub-dimensions of love ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.704$ ), habit ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.498$ ), necessity ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.737$ ), claim ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.222$ ), and effect ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.406$ ). In the benefit sub-dimension, a statistically significant difference was found between the participants' level of claim to read books and the faculty variable ( $t = -2.304$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;

**Table 1.** Descriptive statistics on variables.

Variables	Groups	f	%
Gender	Male	56	57.1
	Female	42	42.9
Faculty	Sports Sciences	51	52
	Other Faculties	47	48
Sports Branch	Football	38	38.8
	Basketball	18	18.4
	Volleyball	27	27.6
	Handball	15	15.3
Profession	Refereeing	51	52
	Coaching	47	48
Division	Candidate	15	15.3
	Province	24	24.5
	Regional	11	11.2
	C Division	1	1
	A Division	1	1
Rank	Not a referee	46	46.9
	Assistant Coach	4	4.1
	Coach	17	17.3
	Senior Coach	25	25.5
	Head Coach	1	1
	Technical Director	1	1
Total	Not a Coach	50	51
		98	100

$p = .023$ ). According to this result, it was determined that individuals studying at the faculty of sports sciences have higher levels of desire to read books ( $\bar{x} = 27.27$ ) than those studying at other faculties ( $\bar{x} = 24.15$ ). No statistically significant difference was found between the faculty variable of individuals and their decision-making styles, total scale level ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.737$ ) and sub-dimensions such as self-esteem ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.178$ ), careful ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.402$ ), avoidant ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.995$ ), delaying ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.114$ ), and panic ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.802$ ).

When Table 6 is examined, according to the results of the analysis performed to determine the participants' level of reading habits and decision-making styles according to the sports branch variable, there was no statistically significant difference between the reading all scale level of the participants ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.266$ ) and the sub-dimensions of love ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.602$ ), habit ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.658$ ), necessity ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.294$ ), claim ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.060$ ), and effect ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.245$ ). In the benefit sub-dimension, a statistically significant difference

**Table 2.** Normality analysis regarding scales of book reading habits and decision making styles.

Scales and sub-dimensions	Mean	Median	Mode	Skewness	Kurtosis
Habit	11.28	11.00	11.00	0.124	0.137
Necessity	11.37	12.00	12.00	0.117	-0.455
Claim	9.75	9.00	9.00	0.38	-0.47
Effect	13.16	13.00	10.00	0.171	-0.935
Benefit	25.75	24.00	18.00	0.426	-0.945
Careful decision	5.51	5.51	5.50	0.129	-0.472
Avoidant decision	5.88	6.00	6.00	0.231	-0.025
Delaying decision	4.55	5.00	5.00	0.167	-0.113
Panic decision	4.93	5.00	4.00	0.069	-0.585
Book reading habit total	90.57	89.00	88.00	0.461	-0.594
Decision making styles total	26.33	26.50	27.00	-0.287	0.483

**Table 3.** Average values for scales.

Scales	N	$\bar{x}$	Std. d.
Book reading habit	98	90.57	13.44
Decision making styles	98	26.34	2.88

**Table 4.** Book reading habit levels and decision making styles variable analysis according to gender of participants.

Scale and sub-dimensions	Gender	N	$\bar{x}$	Std. d.	Levene Test		t	p
					F	p		
Love	Male	56	19.45	2.94	0.333	0.565	0.791	0.431
	Female	42	18.98	2.88				
Habit	Male	56	11.25	2.85	0.012	0.914	-0.143	0.886
	Female	42	11.33	2.85				
Necessity	Male	56	11.64	2.73	1.987	0.162	1.194	0.236
	Female	42	11.02	2.26				
Claim	Male	56	9.25	2.76	0.015	0.903	-2.162	<b>0.033*</b>
	Female	42	10.43	2.55				
Effect	Male	56	12.64	3.55	0.000	0.995	-1.692	0.094
	Female	42	13.86	3.46				
Benefit	Male	56	24.07	6.33	1.585	0.211	-2.952	<b>0.004*</b>
	Female	42	28.05	6.94				
Reading book level total	Male	56	88.30	13.14	0.015	0.903	-1.956	0.053
	Female	42	93.60	13.40				
Self-respect	Male	56	5.96	1.44	0.355	0.553	0.314	0.754
	Female	42	5.88	1.09				
Careful	Male	56	5.82	2.21	0.712	0.401	0.371	0.712
	Female	42	5.67	1.80				
Avoidant	Male	56	5.25	1.75	0.513	0.476	-1.373	0.173
	Female	42	5.76	1.92				

Table 4. Continues.

Delaying	Male	56	4.79	1.84	0.009	0.926	-0.062	0.951
	Female	42	4.81	1.93				
Panic	Male	56	4.45	1.64	1.279	0.261	0.375	0.708
	Female	42	4.31	1.97				
Decision making styles total	Male	56	26.27	2.69	1.84	0.178	-0.272	0.786
	Female	42	26.43	3.15				

\*P &lt; 0.05.

Table 5. Reading habits levels of participants according to their faculties and analysis of decision making styles according to variables.

Scales and sub-dimensions	Faculties	N	$\bar{x}$	Std. d.	Levene Test		t	p
					F	p		
Love	Sports Sciences	51	19.35	2.65	1.175	0.281	0.381	0.704
	Other Faculties	47	19.13	3.19				
Habit	Sports Sciences	51	11.10	2.74	0.237	0.628	-0.681	0.498
	Other Faculties	47	11.49	2.96				
Necessity	Sports Sciences	51	11.29	2.39	1.581	0.212	-0.336	0.737
	Other Faculties	47	11.47	2.73				
Claim	Sports Sciences	51	10.08	2.91	1.716	0.193	1.229	0.222
	Other Faculties	47	9.40	2.48				
Effect	Sports Sciences	51	13.45	3.74	0.885	0.349	0.835	0.406
	Other Faculties	47	12.85	3.34				
Benefit	Sports Sciences	51	27.27	7.04	1.631	0.205	2.304	<b>0.023*</b>
	Other Faculties	47	24.15	6.32				
Reading book level total	Sports Sciences	51	92.49	13.90	0.365	0.547	1.481	0.142
	Other Faculties	47	88.49	12.75				
Self-respect	Sports Sciences	51	6.10	1.24	0.719	0.398	1.356	0.178
	Other Faculties	47	5.74	1.34				
Careful	Sports Sciences	51	5.92	2.02	0.075	0.785	0.842	0.402
	Other Faculties	47	5.57	2.06				
Avoidant	Sports Sciences	51	5.47	1.58	3.301	0.072	0.007	0.995
	Other Faculties	47	5.47	2.09				
Delaying	Sports Sciences	51	4.51	1.71	1.746	0.189	-1.593	0.114
	Other Faculties	47	5.11	1.99				
Panic	Sports Sciences	51	4.43	1.63	0.515	0.475	0.251	0.802
	Other Faculties	47	4.34	1.95				
Decision making styles total	Sports Sciences	51	26.43	2.63	2.622	0.109	0.337	0.737
	Other Faculties	47	26.23	3.15				

\*P &lt; 0.05.

**Table 6.** Analysis of participants according to the variable of their reading habit levels and decision-making styles according to the sports.

Scales and sub-dimensions	Sports branches	N	$\bar{x}$	Std. d.	df	F	p
Love	Football	38	19.74	3.20	94	0.624	0.602
	Basketball	18	18.94	3.17			
	Volleyball	27	18.81	2.73			
	Handball	15	19.13	2.07			
Habit	Football	38	11.61	3.27	94	0.537	0.658
	Basketball	18	10.89	2.49			
	Volleyball	27	10.89	2.34			
	Handball	15	11.67	2.97			
Necessity	Football	38	11.89	2.86	94	1.256	0.294
	Basketball	18	10.72	2.08			
	Volleyball	27	11.44	1.97			
	Handball	15	10.73	3.01			
Claim	Football	38	9.05	2.61	94	2.559	0.060
	Basketball	18	9.72	2.70			
	Volleyball	27	10.89	2.69			
	Handball	15	9.53	2.67			
Effect	Football	38	12.29	2.99	94	1.408	0.245
	Basketball	18	14.06	3.73			
	Volleyball	27	13.74	3.66			
	Handball	15	13.27	4.23			
Benefit	Football	38	23.32	5.39	94	3.737	<b>0.014*</b>
	Basketball	18	26.89	7.59			
	Volleyball	27	28.70	6.79			
	Handball	15	25.40	7.65			
Reading book level total	Football	38	87.82	12.71	94	1.341	0.266
	Basketball	18	91.22	13.87			
	Volleyball	27	94.48	12.88			
	Handball	15	89.73	15.23			
Self-respect	Football	38	5.95	1.58	94	0.198	0.898
	Basketball	18	5.89	1.23			
	Volleyball	27	5.81	1.08			
	Handball	15	6.13	0.99			
Careful	Football	38	6.11	2.42	94	1.064	0.368
	Basketball	18	6.00	1.41			
	Volleyball	27	5.33	1.84			
	Handball	15	5.33	1.88			
Avoidant	Football	38	5.39	1.90	94	0.203	0.894
	Basketball	18	5.33	1.14			
	Volleyball	27	5.70	2.13			
	Handball	15	5.40	1.92			
Delaying	Football	38	4.42	1.48	94	2.098	0.106
	Basketball	18	5.44	2.06			
	Volleyball	27	5.19	2.20			
	Handball	15	4.27	1.62			

Table 6. Continues.

Panic	Football	38	4.47	1.77	3	1.385	0.252
	Basketball	18	3.67	1.53			
	Volleyball	27	4.74	2.07			
	Handball	15	4.40	1.40			
Decision making styles total	Football	38	26.34	3.12	3	0.593	0.624
	Basketball	18	26.33	1.97			
	Volleyball	27	26.78	2.93			
	Handball	15	25.53	3.16			

\*P &lt; 0.05.

was found between the participants' claim to read books and the faculty variable ( $F(3-94) = 3.737$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = .014$ ). According to this result, it has been determined that individuals whose sport is volleyball ( $\bar{x} = 28.70$ ) have higher levels of benefit from reading books than individuals whose sport is Basketball ( $\bar{x} = 26.89$ ), football ( $\bar{x} = 23.32$ ), and Handball ( $\bar{x} = 25.40$ ). No statistically significant difference was found between the sports branch variable of individuals and their decision-making styles, total scale level ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.624$ ) and sub-dimensions such as self-esteem ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.898$ ), careful ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.398$ ), avoidant ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.894$ ), delaying ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.106$ ), and panic ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.252$ ).

When Table 7 is examined, according to the results of the analysis performed to determine the participants' level of reading habits and decision-making styles according to the profession variable, there was no statistically significant difference between the reading all scale level of the participants ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.071$ ) and the sub-dimensions of love ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.757$ ), habit ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.504$ ), necessity ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.213$ ), claim ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.195$ ), and effect ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.191$ ). In the benefit sub-dimension, a statistically significant difference was found between the participants' willingness to read books and the profession variable at the 95% level ( $t = 2.999$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = .004$ ). According to this result, it was determined that individuals whose profession is coaching have higher levels of benefit from reading books ( $\bar{x} = 27.87$ ) than those of refereeing ( $\bar{x} = 23.84$ ).

No statistically significant difference was found between the profession variable of individuals and their decision-making styles, total scale level ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.409$ ) and sub-dimensions such as self-respect ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.682$ ), careful ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.151$ ), avoidant ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.230$ ), delaying ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.781$ ), and panic ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.353$ ).

When Table 8 is examined, according to the results of the analysis performed to determine the participants' level of reading habits and decision-making styles according to the division variable, there was no statistically significant difference between the reading all scale level of the participants ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.243$ ) and the sub-dimensions

of love ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.347$ ), habit ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.370$ ), necessity ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.321$ ), claim ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.602$ ), and effect ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.421$ ). In the benefit sub-dimension, a statistically significant difference was found between the participants' level of desire to read books and the division variable ( $F(3-94) = 4.128$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = .009$ ). According to this result, there is a significant difference between candidate referees and non-referees, between regional referees and non-referees, according to this result, it was determined that the level of benefit ( $\bar{x} = 27.70$ ) that non-referee individuals get from reading a book is higher than those who are candidate referees ( $\bar{x} = 22.40$ ) and regional referees ( $\bar{x} = 21.83$ ). No statistically significant difference was found between the division variable of individuals and their decision-making styles, total scale level ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.958$ ) and sub-dimensions such as self-respect ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.99$ ), careful ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.248$ ), avoidant ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.843$ ), delaying ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.781$ ), and panic ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.762$ ).

When Table 9 is examined, according to the results of the analysis performed to determine the participants' level of reading habits and decision-making styles according to the rank variable, there was no statistically significant difference between the reading all scale level of the participants and the sub-dimensions of love ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.347$ ), habit ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.370$ ), necessity ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.321$ ), and claim ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.602$ ). In the benefit sub-dimension, a statistically significant difference was found between the participants' level of claim to read books and the rank variable ( $F_{(3-94)} = 6.614$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ;  $p = .000$ ). According to this result, there are significant differences between assistant coach and senior coach, and between senior coach and the non-coach. According to this result, it was determined that the benefit levels ( $\bar{x} = 29.92$ ), of individuals who are senior coaches from reading books are higher than those of an assistant coaches ( $\bar{x} = 19.75$ ), and individuals who are not coaches ( $\bar{x} = 23.82$ ). In the effect sub-dimension, a statistically significant difference was found between the participants' effect levels on reading books and the rank variable at 95% confidence level ( $F(3-94) = 4.548$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = .005$ ). According to this result, there are significant

**Table 7.** Reading habits of participants according to their profession and analysis of decision making styles according to variables.

Scale and sub-dimensions	Profession	N	$\bar{x}$	Std. d.	Levene test		t	p
					F	p		
Love	Refereeing	51	19.16	3.04	0.213	0.645	-0.311	0.757
	Coaching	47	19.34	2.78				
Habit	Refereeing	51	11.47	2.94	0.453	0.503	0.670	0.504
	Coaching	47	11.09	2.73				
Necessity	Refereeing	51	11.69	2.53	0.041	0.840	1.254	0.213
	Coaching	47	11.04	2.55				
Claim	Refereeing	51	9.41	2.84	0.198	0.657	-1.306	0.195
	Coaching	47	10.13	2.57				
Effect	Refereeing	51	12.71	2.96	6.667	0.011	-1.318	0.191
	Coaching	47	13.66	4.07				
Benefit	Refereeing	51	23.84	5.83	5.029	0.027	-2.999	<b>0.004*</b>
	Coaching	47	27.87	7.32				
Reading book level total	Refereeing	51	88.22	12.40	1.956	0.165	-1.829	0.071
	Coaching	47	93.13	14.19				
Self-respect	Refereeing	51	5.98	1.56	2.701	0.104	0.411	0.682
	Coaching	47	5.87	0.95				
Careful	Refereeing	51	6.04	2.11	0.005	0.945	1.447	0.151
	Coaching	47	5.45	1.93				
Avoidant	Refereeing	51	5.25	1.80	0.047	0.829	-1.209	0.230
	Coaching	47	5.70	1.86				
Delaying	Refereeing	51	4.75	1.86	0.108	0.743	-0.279	0.781
	Coaching	47	4.85	1.89				
Panic	Refereeing	51	4.55	2.00	3.558	0.062	0.934	0.353
	Coaching	47	4.21	1.50				
Decision making styles total	Refereeing	51	26.57	3.09	2.813	0.097	0.829	0.409
	Coaching	47	26.09	2.64				

\*P &lt; 0.05.

differences between assistant coach and coach, senior coach and non-coach, between senior coach and non-coach, based on the averages, it was determined that senior coaches have higher reading levels ( $\bar{x} = 95.92$ ) than assistant coaches ( $\bar{x} = 73.75$ ), coaches ( $\bar{x} = 92.83$ ), and non-coaches ( $\bar{x} = 88.32$ ). According to this result, the higher the coaching experience, the higher the reading level, if the habit of reading book is at the level of the

whole scale, a statistically significant difference is found between the participants' reading levels and the level of their rank variable at the 95% confidence level ( $F(3-94) = 3.510$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = .018$ ). According to this result, there are significant differences between assistant trainer and coach, senior trainer, and non-trainer, based on the averages, the book reading effect levels of individuals who are senior coaches ( $\bar{x} = 14.46$ ) were found to be



**Table 8.** Analysis of the book reading habit levels and decision making styles according to the division of the participants.

Scale and sub-dimensions	Division	N	$\bar{x}$	Std. d.	df	F	p	Difference LSD
Love	Candidate Referee	15	19.33	3.54				
	Province Referee	25	19.60	2.75	3	1.114	0.347	
	Regional Referee	12	17.83	2.76	94			
	Not a Referee	46	19.39	2.79				
Candidate Referee	15	12.33	2.26					
Habit	Province Referee	25	10.80	2.93	3	1.061	0.370	
	Regional Referee	12	11.67	3.50	94			
	Not a Referee	46	11.11	2.76				
	Candidate Referee	15	12.07	2.89				
Necessity	Province Referee	25	11.20	2.36	3	1.182	0.321	
	Regional Referee	12	12.25	2.26	94			
	Not a Referee	46	11.02	2.58				
	Candidate Referee	15	9.20	3.21				
Claim	Province Referee	25	9.92	2.78	3	0.622	0.602	
	Regional Referee	12	9.08	2.94	94			
	Not a Referee	46	10.02	2.49				
	Candidate Referee	15	11.93	3.43				
Effect	Province Referee	25	13.48	2.95	3	0.948	0.421	
	Regional Referee	12	12.58	2.71	94			
	Not a Referee	46	13.54	4.03				
	Candidate Referee	15	22.40	6.27				
Benefit	Province Referee	25	26.16	5.82	3	4.128	<b>0.009*</b>	<b>1-4 3-4</b>
	Regional Referee	12	21.83	4.95	94			
	Not a Referee	46	27.70	7.30				
	Candidate Referee	15	87.07	14.03				
Reading book level total	Province Referee	25	91.16	12.21	3	1.415	0.243	
	Regional Referee	12	85.25	11.43	94			
	Not a Referee	46	92.78	14.14				
	Candidate Referee	15	5.87	1.64				
Self-respect	Province Referee	25	6.00	1.38	3	0.038	0.990	
	Regional Referee	12	5.92	1.93	94			
	Not a Referee	46	5.91	0.91				
	Candidate Referee	15	5.73	2.31				
Careful	Province Referee	25	6.16	1.57	3	0.87	0.460	
	Regional Referee	12	6.17	2.79	94			
	Not a Referee	46	5.43	1.95				
	Candidate Referee	15	5.73	2.09				
Avoidant	Province Referee	25	5.20	1.58	3	1.398	0.248	
	Regional Referee	12	4.67	1.78	94			
	Not a Referee	46	5.74	1.87				
	Candidate Referee	15	5.73	2.09				

Table 8. Continues.

Delaying	Candidate Referee	15	4.60	1.55	3 94	0.275	0.843
	Province Referee	25	4.60	2.18			
	Regional Referee	12	5.08	1.56			
	Not a Referee	46	4.89	1.89			
Panic	Candidate Referee	15	4.73	1.83	3 94	0.388	0.762
	Province Referee	25	4.28	2.25			
	Regional Referee	12	4.67	1.83			
	Not a Referee	46	4.26	1.48			
Decision making styles total	Candidate Referee	15	26.67	2.53	3 94	0.103	0.958
	Province Referee	25	26.24	3.73			
	Regional Referee	12	26.50	3.15			
	Not a Referee	46	26.24	2.44			

\*P &lt; 0.05.

Table 9. Analysis of the participants according to their level of reading habits and their decision-making styles variables.

Scale and sub-dimensions	Rank	N	$\bar{x}$	Std. d.	df	F	p	Difference LSD
Love	Assistant Coach	4	17.75	0.50	3 94	1.121	0.311	
	Coach	18	20.28	2.95				
	Senior Coach	26	19.00	2.70				
	Not a Coach	50	19.12	3.06				
Habit	Assistant Coach	4	9.00	3.16	3 94	1.227	0.304	
	Coach	18	11.56	2.64				
	Senior Coach	26	10.92	2.76				
	Not a Coach	50	11.56	2.90				
Necessity	Assistant Coach	4	9.50	1.91	3 94	1.225	0.305	
	Coach	18	11.39	2.91				
	Senior Coach	26	11.00	2.32				
	Not a Coach	50	11.72	2.54				
Claim	Assistant Coach	4	8.75	0.50	3 94	1.32	0.272	
	Coach	18	9.67	2.52				
	Senior Coach	26	10.62	2.67				
	Not a Coach	50	9.42	2.86				
Effect	Assistant Coach	4	9.00	2.16	3 94	3.510	<b>0.018*</b>	<b>1-2</b>
	Coach	18	13.39	4.19				<b>1-3</b>
	Senior Coach	26	14.46	3.74				<b>1-4</b>
	Not a Coach	50	12.74	2.98				
Benefit	Assistant Coach	4	19.75	3.59	3 94	6.614	<b>0.000**</b>	<b>1-3</b>
	Coach	18	26.56	6.20				<b>1-4</b>
	Senior Coach	26	29.92	7.42				
	Not a Coach	50	23.82	5.89				
Reading book level total	Assistant Coach	4	73.75	5.06	3 94	4.548	<b>0.005*</b>	<b>1-2</b>
	Coach	18	92.83	12.31				<b>1-3</b>

Table 9. Continues.

	Senior Coach	26	95.92	14.14			1-4
	Not a Coach	50	88.32	12.50			3-4
Self-respect	Assistant Coach	4	5.50	0.58			
	Coach	18	5.83	1.15			
	Senior Coach	26	5.96	0.82	0.205	0.892	
	Not a Coach	50	5.98	1.57			
Careful	Assistant Coach	4	4.00	1.83			
	Coach	18	5.50	2.01			
	Senior Coach	26	5.69	1.85	1.392	0.250	
	Not a Coach	50	6.02	2.12			
Avoidant	Assistant Coach	4	6.50	1.29			
	Coach	18	5.06	1.83			
	Senior Coach	26	5.96	1.89	1.554	0.206	
	Not a Coach	50	5.28	1.81			
Delaying	Assistant Coach	4	4.00	2.16			
	Coach	18	5.33	1.75			
	Senior Coach	26	4.73	1.95	0.789	0.503	
	Not a Coach	50	4.70	1.85			
Panic	Assistant Coach	4	5.25	1.71			
	Coach	18	4.28	1.36			
	Senior Coach	26	4.08	1.57	0.685	0.563	
	Not a Coach	50	4.52	2.01			
Decision making styles total	Assistant Coach	4	25.25	3.40			
	Coach	18	26.00	2.50			
	Senior Coach	26	26.42	2.74	0.327	0.806	
	Not a Coach	50	26.50	3.09			

\*p < 0.05; \*\*p < 0.001.

higher than assistant coach ( $\bar{x} = 9.00$ ), coach ( $\bar{x} = 13.39$ ), and the non-coaches ( $\bar{x} = 12.74$ ).

No statistically significant difference was found between the individual's rank variable and its sub-dimensions such as decision-making total scale level ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.806$ ), self-esteem ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.892$ ), careful ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.250$ ), avoidant ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.206$ ), delaying ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.503$ ), and panic ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.563$ ).

When Table 10 is examined, according to the results of the analysis performed to determine the participants' level of reading habits and decision-making styles according to the trust in family decision variable, there was no statistically significant difference between the reading all scale level of the participants ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.076$ ) and the sub-dimensions of slope ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.072$ ), habit ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.913$ ), necessity ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.490$ ), and claim ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.264$ ). In the benefit sub-dimension,

a statistically significant difference was found between the participants' level of claim to read books and the trust in family decision variable ( $t = 2.504$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = .014$ ). According to this result, it was determined that individuals who trust the family's decision have higher levels of benefit ( $\bar{x} = 26.68$ ) from reading a book than individuals who do not trust the family's decision ( $\bar{x} = 22.64$ ). In the effect sub-dimension, a statistically significant difference at the level of 95% was determined between the participants' reading effect levels and the variable of trust in family decision ( $t = 2.326$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = .036$ ). According to this result, it has been determined that individuals who trust the family's decision have higher reading effect levels ( $\bar{x} = 13.57$ ) than individuals who do not trust the family's decision ( $\bar{x} = 11.77$ ).

A statistically significant difference was determined at the 95% confidence level between the variable of trust in family decision to and being careful about Decision

**Table 10.** Reading habits levels of participants according to the variable of trust in family decision and analysis of decision making styles according to variables.

Scale and sub-dimensions	Trust in family decision	N	$\bar{x}$	Std.D.	sd	Levene Test		t	p
						F	p		
Love	Yes	76	18.96	2.86	96	0.004	0.952	-1.821	0.072
	No	22	20.23	2.93					
Habit	Yes	76	11.30	2.88	96	0.034	0.855	0.109	0.913
	No	22	11.23	2.74					
Necessity	Yes	76	11.47	2.51	96	0.557	0.457	0.693	0.490
	No	22	11.05	2.72					
Claim	Yes	76	9.92	2.82	96	1.095	0.298	1.124	0.264
	No	22	9.18	2.32					
Effect	Yes	76	13.57	3.59	96	2.326	0.13	2.125	<b>0.036*</b>
	No	22	11.77	3.07					
Benefit	Yes	76	26.68	6.77	96	0.269	0.605	2.504	<b>0.014*</b>
	No	22	22.64	6.35					
Reading book level total	Yes	76	91.87	13.60	96	0.849	0.359	1.795	0.076
	No	22	86.09	12.15					
Self-respect	Yes	76	5.92	1.36	96	0.154	0.695	-0.106	0.916
	No	22	5.95	1.05					
Careful	Yes	76	5.97	2.09	96	1.883	0.173	2.006	<b>0.048*</b>
	No	22	5.00	1.66					
Avoidant	Yes	76	5.49	1.79	96	0.677	0.413	0.174	0.862
	No	22	5.41	2.02					
Delaying	Yes	76	4.97	1.91	96	0.547	0.461	1.772	0.080
	No	22	4.18	1.59					
Panic	Yes	76	4.12	1.77	96	0.713	0.401	-2.888	<b>0.005*</b>
	No	22	5.32	1.52					
Decision making styles total	Yes	76	26.47	2.91	96	0.000	0.995	0.874	0.384
	No	22	25.86	2.77					

\*P &lt; 0.05.

Makings ( $t = 2.006$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.048$ ). Based on the averages, it was seen that those who trust in their family's decision had higher levels of careful ( $\bar{x} = 5.97$ ) than those who did not trust in their family decision ( $\bar{x} = 5.00$ ). In the panic sub-dimension, a statistically significant difference was found at 95% confidence level between individuals' trust in family decision and feel panicked about decision-making ( $t = -2.888$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.005$ ). According to this result, it was determined that those who do not trust the family decision have higher levels of panic ( $\bar{x} = 5.32$ ) than those who trust the family decision ( $\bar{x} = 4.12$ ).

No statistically significant difference was found between the individual's trust in family decision variable and its sub-dimensions such as decision-making total scale level ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.384$ ) self-esteem ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.916$ ), avoidant ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.862$ ), delaying ( $p > 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.080$ ).

When Table 11 is examined, according to the results of the analysis performed to determine the participants' level of reading habits and decision-making styles according to the environmental effect in decision making variable, there was no statistically significant difference between

**Table 11.** Reading habit levels of participants in decision making according to the environmental effect variable and analysis of decision making styles according to variables.

Scale and sub-dimensions	Environmental effect in decision making	N	$\bar{x}$	Std. d.	sd	Levene Test		t	p
						F	p		
Love	Yes	55	19.55	2.90	96	0.137	0.712	1.159	0.249
	No	43	18.86	2.91					
Habit	Yes	55	10.82	2.80	96	0.074	0.787	-1.869	0.065
	No	43	11.88	2.80					
Necessity	Yes	55	11.04	2.43	96	0.338	0.562	-1.510	0.134
	No	43	11.81	2.65					
Claim	Yes	55	9.84	2.55	96	0.669	0.415	0.333	0.74
	No	43	9.65	2.95					
Effect	Yes	55	12.98	3.37	96	2.542	0.114	-0.57	0.57
	No	43	13.40	3.79					
Benefit	Yes	55	26.07	7.19	96	1.298	0.257	0.483	0.630
	No	43	25.40	6.47					
Reading book level total	Yes	55	90.29	13.14	96	0.213	0.645	-0.232	0.817
	No	43	90.93	13.98					
Self- respect	Yes	55	6.00	1.37	96	0.017	0.896	0.616	0.539
	No	43	5.84	1.19					
Careful	Yes	55	5.60	1.83	96	0.921	0.34	-0.852	0.397
	No	43	5.95	2.28					
Avoidant	Yes	55	5.69	1.62	96	2.124	0.148	1.358	0.178
	No	43	5.19	2.06					
Delaying	Yes	55	4.47	1.78	96	0.045	0.832	-1.967	0.052
	No	43	5.21	1.91					
Panic	Yes	55	4.20	1.70	96	0.000	0.984	-1.184	0.240
	No	43	4.63	1.86					
Decision making styles total	Yes	55	25.96	2.65	96	0.033	0.856	-1.459	0.148
	No	43	26.81	3.12					

p > 0.05.

the reading all scale level of the participants (p > 0.05; p = 0.817) and the sub-dimensions of love (p > 0.05; p = 0.249), habit (p > 0.05; p = 0.65), necessity (p > 0.05; p = 0.134), and claim (p > 0.05; p = 0.074), and benefit (p > 0.05; p = 0.630).

In addition, no statistically significant difference was found between individuals' environmental impact in decision making and decision-making total scale level (p > 0.05; p = 0.148) and sub-dimensions such as self-

esteem (p > 0.05; p = 0.539), careful (p > 0.05; p = 0.397), avoidant (p > 0.05; p = 0.178), delaying (p > 0.05; p = 0.052), and panic (p > 0.05; p = 0.240).

When Table 12 is examined, according to the results of the analysis performed to determine the participants' level of reading habits and decision-making styles according to the Number of Books Read by Participants variable, a significant difference was determined between the sub-dimension of love and number of the books read by

**Table 12.** Reading habits according to the number of books read by participants and analysis of decision making styles according to variables.

Scale and sub-dimensions	Number of books	N	$\bar{x}$	Std. d.	sd	F	p	Difference
Love	5-16	41	19.63	3.04	2.95	3.261	<b>0.043*</b>	<b>1-3</b> <b>2-3</b>
	17-26	33	19.70	2.86				
	27-65	24	17.96	2.44				
Habit	5-16	41	11.51	2.87	2.95	0.502	0.607	
	17-26	33	11.36	3.39				
	27-65	24	10.79	1.79				
Necessity	5-16	41	11.71	2.97	2.95	0.625	0.538	
	17-26	33	11.06	2.55				
	27-65	24	11.25	1.62				
Claim	5-16	41	8.41	2.07	2.95	20.784	<b>0.000**</b>	<b>1-2</b> <b>1-3</b>
	17-26	33	9.64	2.28				
	27-65	24	12.21	2.65				
Effect	5-16	41	11.90	3.12	2.95	13.253	<b>0.000**</b>	<b>1-3</b> <b>2-3</b>
	17-26	33	12.67	2.80				
	27-65	24	16.00	3.69				
Benefit	5-16	41	22.85	5.27	2.95	19.978	<b>0.000**</b>	<b>1-3</b> <b>2-3</b>
	17-26	33	24.79	5.86				
	27-65	24	32.13	6.60				
Reading book level total	5-16	41	86.02	10.79	2.95	10.623	<b>0.000**</b>	<b>1-3</b> <b>2-3</b>
	17-26	33	89.12	12.43				
	27-65	24	100.33	14.34				
Self-Respect	5-16	41	5.73	1.52	2.95	0.97	0.383	
	17-26	33	6.15	0.94				
	27-65	24	5.96	1.30				
Careful	5-16	41	5.34	1.87	2.95	1.469	0.235	
	17-26	33	6.06	2.22				
	27-65	24	6.04	2.01				
Avoidant	5-16	41	5.32	1.74	2.95	1.298	0.278	
	17-26	33	5.88	1.93				
	27-65	24	5.17	1.83				
Delaying	5-16	41	4.80	1.79	2.95	0.012	0.988	
	17-26	33	4.76	2.15				
	27-65	24	4.83	1.63				
Panic	5-16	41	4.66	1.74	2.95	1.446	0.241	
	17-26	33	3.97	1.96				
	27-65	24	4.50	1.53				
Decision making styles total	5-16	41	25.85	2.95	2.95	1.079	0.344	
	17-26	33	26.82	2.81				
	27-65	24	26.50	2.83				

\*p &lt; 0.05; \*\*p &lt; 0.001.

participants at 95% confidence level ( $F(2-95) = 3.261$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.043$ ). According to this result, a significant difference was found among those who read 5-16 books and 27-65; and those who read books between 17-26 and between 27-65. It is found that those who read books between 17-26 had higher levels of love for reading ( $=19.70$ ) than those who read between 5-16 ( $=19.63$ ) and those who read books between 27-65 ( $=17.96$ ).

A statistically significant difference was found between the sub-dimension of claim and the number of reading books at the 99% confidence level ( $F(2-95) = 13.253$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ). According to this result, a significant difference was found between those who read 5-16 books and between 17-26 and 27-65. It is seen that those who read books between 27-65 had higher levels of claim to read ( $=12.21$ ) than those who read between 5-16 ( $=8.41$ ) and those who read books between 17-26 ( $=9.64$ ). A statistically significant difference was found between the sub-dimension of effect and the number of reading books at the 99% confidence level ( $F(2-95) = 20.784$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ). It has been seen that the effect levels of those who read books between 27-65 ( $=16.00$ ) were higher than those who read between 5-16 ( $=11.90$ ) and those who read books between 17-26 ( $=12.67$ ), a statistically significant difference was determined between the sub-dimension of benefit and the number of reading books at the 99% confidence level ( $F(2-95) = 13.253$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ). Significant differences were found between individuals reading 5-16 books and 27-65, individuals reading 17-26 books, and 27-65 books. It has been found that the effect levels of those who read books between 27-65 ( $=32.13$ ) were higher than those who read between 5-16 ( $=22.85$ ) and those who read books between 17-26 ( $=24.79$ ). A statistically significant difference was found between the book reading habit and the number of reading books at the 99% confidence level ( $F(2-95) = 10.623$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $p = 0.000$ ). It is seen that the effect levels of those who read books between 27-65 ( $=100.33$ ) were higher than those who read between 5-16 ( $=86.02$ ) and those who read books between 17-26 ( $=89.12$ ) has been seen. Considering all these results, as the number of books read by individuals increases, their reading habit also increases.

## DISCUSSION

In our study, it was aimed to examine the habit of reading books and the correct decision-making styles of coaches and referees according to some variables. It can be said that the reading habits and correct decision-making levels of the coaches and referees, in general, are at a moderate level. In this context, a significant difference was found between the gender of the coaches, referees, and the claim and influence sub-dimensions of the reading habit. According to this result, it can be said that

women are more eager about reading habits than men and the effect of the books they read is higher. The reason for this may be that women spend most of their time at home, while men spend most of their time outside. The study conducted by Ballı (2019) and Karademir (2018), which is consistent with our study, concluded that female students are more willing and more influenced than male students. No significant difference was found between the correct decision-making styles of referees and trainers and their gender. In the study of Kuzgun (1992) and Tiryaki (1997) on university students, no difference was found according to gender variables.

In our study, a significant difference was found between the reading habits of referees and trainers between the utility sub-dimension and the other faculty variable. Accordingly, it has been observed that the benefit of those studying at the faculty of sports sciences from reading books is higher than those who study at other faculties. This may be because the theoretical courses of those studying in sports science faculties are less than other faculties and therefore they have more time for reading books. Saracaloğlu et al. (2007) found that students' interest and habits in reading did not change significantly in terms of education styles. On the other hand, there was no difference between the correct decision making and its sub-dimensions and the faculty variable. In other studies conducted on university students, it was concluded that the faculty variable did not make a significant difference (Eraslan, 2015; Memiş, 2016). In a study examining the decision-making levels of university students, the avoidant, delaying, and panic decision-making style scores of the faculty variable were found to be higher (Taşgıt, 2012).

In the variable of the sports branch of the coaches and referees, there was a significant difference between the levels of reading habits and the benefit sub-dimension. Accordingly, it has been determined that the coaches and referees whose sports branch is volleyball benefit more from reading books. It can be said that the reason for this is that the trainers have to follow the scientific publications related to their fields more and they have to improve themselves continuously. In the study conducted by Çınar and Sanioğlu (2004), it was observed that the reading book variable did not differ in terms of student branches. In the studies conducted by Coşkun (2012) and Ballı (2019), it has been observed that there are differences in terms of student branches. There was no difference between correct decision-making styles and sub-dimensions and sports branches. Tekin and Taşgın (2009) found in their research that there was no significant difference between students' decision-making styles and branch variables. Temel (2015) reported in his study that there was no significant difference between teachers' sports branches and their decision-making style. Contrary to the literature research, Çetin (2009) found a significant difference between physical education and sports college students' sports branch and their

decision-making styles.

In our study, a significant difference was found between their profession and the sub-dimension of the benefit they gained from the habit of reading books. According to this result, it was determined that the benefit levels of the participants, whose profession is coaching, from reading books are higher than the referees. This may be because those who are coaches work more scientifically to develop themselves.

A significant difference was found in the classification variable of the coaches and referees with the benefit sub-dimension of the habit of reading. Accordingly, it has been observed that the benefit of non-referee individuals from reading a book is higher. The fact that they have more free time than the referees, maybe because they spend this free time reading books. There was no difference between the correct decision-making styles and sub-dimensions and the classification variable. Uzunoğlu (2008) in his study on Turkish football referees; showed that there are differences between decision-making styles depending on the classification variables.

In our study, a significant difference was observed in the reading habit of the coaches and referees in the variable of rank degree and the sub-dimensions of effect and benefit. According to this result, it can be said that senior coaches have higher levels of reading habits, effects, and benefits compared to other coaches. This may be because the senior trainer wants to constantly improve and keep up to date to get higher. There was no difference between correct decision-making styles and sub-dimensions and sports branches. A significant difference was found between the benefit and effect sub-dimensions of the habit of reading the book of coaches and referees and trust in family decisions. According to this result, it has been observed that individuals who trust in the family decision have higher levels of benefit and effect from their reading habits than those who do not trust. Correct decision making is in the careful sub-dimension; It has been determined that individuals who trust their family's decision act more carefully and make their decisions. Also, it was determined that coaches and referees who did not trust the decision made by their family experienced more panic in decision-making. There was no difference between the correct decision-making styles and sub-dimensions and individuals who trust their family's decisions.

In our study, significant differences were found between the number of books read by coaches and referees and their reading habits. According to this result, as the number of books, they read increases, their love for the habit of reading, their claim, the benefit they obtain, and their level of being influenced by the book also increase.

## CONCLUSION

In general, it was determined that the habit of reading

books and the correct decision-making levels of the trainers and referees were at a medium level. The highlights of our study are as follows. It was observed that female coaches and referees studying at the faculty of sports sciences had higher reading habits, love of reading, and levels of being influenced by books. It was determined that individuals whose profession is coaching have higher reading habits than referees. Also, individuals who trust and respect their family's decisions have higher reading habits and correct decision-making styles; during the decision-making phase, it was observed that they did not panic.

## REFERENCES

- Ballı, A. (2019).** Öğretmen Adaylarının Türkçe Kullanımına Karşı Duyarlılıkları İle Kitap Okuma Alışkanlığına İlişkin Tutumlarının İncelenmesi, tokat Gazi Osmanpaşa University, institute of Educational Sciences. Unpublished Master's Thesis.
- Bamberger, R. (1990).** Okuma Alışkanlığını Geliştirme (Çev, Bengü Çapar), kültür Bakanlığı, Ankara.
- Bayansalduz, M. (2012).** Analyzing the relationship between task and ego orientation, collective efficacy and perceived coaching behavior: A research on footballers, energy Education Science and Technology Part B-Social and Educational Studies. 4(1): 481-494.
- Bayansalduz, M., Afyon, Y. A., Kepoglu, A., Dalli, M., and Mulazimoglu, O. (2014).** Examination of self-leadership characteristics of football coaches. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 152(7): 500-502.
- Can, Y., Soyer, F., and Bayansalduz, M. (2009).** Sporcuların iş tatmini ile lider bağlılığı ve örgütsel bağlılık duyguları arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi. niğde Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 3(3): 228-238.
- Çetin, M. Ç. (2009).** Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Karar Verme Stilleri, sosyal Beceri Düzeyleri Ve Stresle Basa Çıkma Biçimlerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından Karşılaştırmalı Olarak İncelenmesi. Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis.
- Çinar, V., and Sanioğlu, A., (2004).** Farklı Branşlardaki Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksek Okulu Öğrencilerinin Rekreasyon Faaliyetlerine Katılımlarının Değerlendirilmesi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. (11).
- Coşkun, A. (2012).** Öğretmen Adaylarının Türkçe Kullanım Duyarlılık Düzeyleri. Ahi Evran University Institute of Social Sciences. Unpublished Master's Thesis.
- 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, 15: 23-35.
- Dökmen, Ü. (1994).** Okuma Becerisi. İlgisi ve Alışkanlığı Üzerine Psikolojik Sosyal Bir Araştırma. Milli Eğitim Basımevi, İstanbul.
- Eraslan, M. (2015).** Üniversite Spor Bölümü Öğrencilerinin Atılganlık Ve Karar Verme Stillерinin Çeşitli Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi. Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 4(1): 214-223.
- Forman, E. H., and Selly, M. A. (2001).** Decision by Objectives (How to Convince others that you are right). World Scientific Pub, Co., USA, Petersburg.
- Karademir, T., Bayansalduz, M., Kucuk, V., and Acet, M. (2013).** Investigation of decision making styles of Turkish football coaches association administrators with respect to some parameters. Energy Education Science and Technology Part B: Social and Educational Studies, 5(1): 353-362.
- Karademir, M. (2018).** İlkokul 4. sınıf Öğrencilerinin Kitap Okuma Alışkanlıklarının Düzeyi Nedir? İstanbul Aydın University, Institute of Social Sciences. Unpublished Master's Thesis.
- Kuzgun, Y. (1992).** Karar Stratejileri Ölçeği: Geliştirilmesi ve Standardizasyonu. VII. ulusal Psikoloji Kongresi Bilimsel Çalışmaları, türk Psikologlar Derneği, Ankara. 161-170.



- Lang, J. R., Dittich, J. E., and White, S. E. (1978)**, management problem solving models: A review and proposals. *Academy of Management Review*, 3(4): 854-865.
- Mann, L., Burnett, P., Radford, M., and Ford, S. (1997)**. The Melbourne decision making questionnaire: An instrument for measuring patterns for coping with decisional conflict. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 10: 1-19.
- Memiş, K. E., Bozkurt, R., Cevizci, E., Avunç, F., and Öğretmen, B. (2016)**. Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Karar Verme Stratejisi ve Fen Okuryazarlık Düzeylerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education*, 5(4): 16-30.
- Şahin, T., and Güçlü, M. (2018)**. Resilience in athletes effects of emotion regulation skills: 1. Protected football league player of Turkey, Ankara University. *Spormetr Journal of Physical Education and Sports Science*, 16 (3): 204-216.
- Şahinel, S. (2002)**. Eleştirel Düşünme, pegem A Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Saracaloğlu, A. S., Karasakaloğlu, N., and Yenice, N. (2007)**. Öğretmen Adaylarının Problem Çözme Becerileri İle Okuma İlgisi Ve Alışkanlıkları Arasındaki İlişki, vı, Ulusal Sınıf Öğretmenliği Sempozyumu, 27-29 Nisan 2007, Eskişehir. 384-389.
- Simon, H. (1987)**. Decision making and problem solving. *Interface*, 17: 11-31.
- Taşgıt, M. S. (2012)**. Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Benlik Saygısı ve Karar Verme Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi, karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Institute of Social Sciences. Unpublished Master's Thesis..
- Tekin, M., and Taşgıtın, Ö. (2009)**. Kick Boks Antrenörlerinin Karar Verme ve Düşünme Stilllerinin İncelenmesi. *Türkiye Kick Boks Federasyonu Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 1: 11-27.
- Tiryaki, M. G. (1997)**. Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Karar Verme Davranışlarının Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. Hacettepe University. Unpublished Master's Thesis.
- Uzunoğlu, Ö. F. (2008)**. Türk Futbol Hakemlerinin Karar Verme Stilllerinin Klasmanlarına Ve Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi. Selçuk University, Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Physical Education and Sports. Unpublished Master's Thesis.

---

**Citation:** Musa, M. (2020). An investigation of book reading habits levels and correct decision-making styles in terms of some variables: A research on coach and referees. *African Educational Research Journal*, 8(4): 849-865.

---