

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FIVE PERSONALITY FACTORS WITH DECISION MAKING STYLES OF COACHES

Mandana Heidari¹ and Masoud Rahmati Arani²

¹Urmia Payam-e-nour University, Department of Physical Education, Urmia, Iran

²BuAli Sina University, Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Hamadan, Iran

Original scientific paper

Abstract

The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between five personality factors with decision making styles of coaches. The method of this research is correlation and samples included 86 mails coaches that were presented in international games of handball in Mashhad city. NEO personality inventory and Melbourne Decision Making Style Questionnaire were used to evaluate personality factors and decision making styles. The findings of Pierson correlation indicated that there was significant relationship between neuroticism with all decision making styles, extraversion with vigilance and hypervigilance, openness to experience with vigilance, agreeableness with vigilance, procrastination and hypervigilance, and conscientiousness with all decision making styles. Also, the findings of regression showed that conscientiousness and openness to experience can be express %45 of changes coaches vigilance style. %18 of changes buck passing style and %26 of changes hypervigilance style through neuroticism is elaborated, and finally neuroticism and conscientiousness can be express %45 of changes coaches procrastination style. Thus, in order to analyze competence and evaluate coaches' decision making, personality factors can be used in competition conditions, conscientiousness and openness coach's offer a more appropriate decision-making style.

Key words: personality, decision making, sport coaches

Introduction

Today, sport coaching is of interest to researchers as a necessity in the area of sport psychology. The coaches direct the most important schedules of a sport team and they are responsible for the wins and especially losses of the team. A coach not only has the role of leading and organizing the team, but also should observe mental and physical preparations of team members. Sports science researchers take into account coaching a hard and essential job and express that they are expected to be superior type of human beings (Kaya, 2014). Recently, researchers believe that athletes' success at the championship is not merely limited to having a good physical preparation and upper limit domination on techniques and tactics of the sport, because there is another important factor "The impact of psychological phenomena on the teaching and learning of motor skills and better enforcement techniques" one of which the coaches should not neglect in education (Boostani & Nozari, 2014). So knowledge, attitude, personality, decision-making, leadership style, ethics and communication of trainer can have significant effects on his adopted approaches and consequently on physical and mental performance of sports team (Kaya, 2014). The coach's decisions are really vital, because not only it affects process and result of team performance, but also it is immediately examined by fans, veterans and the media. People often judge based on the obtained result and do not know about intention and decision of the coach. Researchers have shown that a trainer should have a teacher's training skill, psychological understanding of a psychologist and a manager's leadership style in his/her business simultaneously.

High level coaches should be competent enough for interaction and physical, technical, tactical and mental communication with the athlete. The fact that which style of training (direct- indirect), tactical style and method of leadership is used by the mentor depends on his true decision-making power in limited time (Dewberry, Juanchich, & Narendran, 2013). Sports environment is a dynamic environment, as a result adopting a particular style of decision-making and problem solving probably would not be compatible with sporting environmental needs which is faced with new changes in every moment. Besides, researchers indicate that long experience in sports, coaching and participation in sports, cannot predict mentor's competency in decision making and problem solving (Gilbert & Trudel, 2005). Indeed, researchers reach a consensus that it is the educator's behavioral and personality characteristics which likely determines his competence for leadership, training and decision making (Dewberry et al. 2013). Although scholars believed that coach's decisions are associated with his personality, very few studies in this field is done. Many psychologists believe that the main building of human personality is shown through five general characters that include: Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness. Originality of these five factors is approved by scholars and it is shown that the five factors have well convergent and discriminant validity between the tool and supervisors and remain relatively stable during growth and individual changes (Goetzman et al. 2007). Personality characteristics have been

studied by many variables. Gender, age, behavior patterns, motivational approaches and mood are including cases which are studied with the kind of personality (Fazel, 2012; Goetzman et al. 2007; Goldberg, Sweeney, Merenda & Hughes, 1998). Physical activity and athleticism are among these variables. Five personality factors were compared between men and women athletes and non-athletes, the results showed that athletes and non-athletes are remarkably different in neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness (Fazel, 2012). The results of the meta-analysis suggests that psychological traits and emotional stability are relative to operation in a variety of different activities (Dudley, Orvis, Lebiecki & Cortina, 2006). Also, the influence of personality is evident in all aspects of decision-making (Lauriola, Russo, Lucidi, Violani, & Levin, 2005). Actually on one hand, the association between personality and choices was obvious in social, ethical and recreation decisions. On the other hand, the impression of personality on promotion and scope of the decision making was approved (Soane, Dewberry & Narendran, 2010). There are some evidences showing the relationship between personality and general performance (job) and the influence of it on decision making. These evidences are likely aligned with daily changes in the decision-making skills and top decision-making style (Lauriola et al. 2005).

Moreover, the probability of being interaction between changes related to character (five characteristic features) and decision-making styles and stylistics of the person has been approved (Dewberry et al. 2013; Kaya, 2005). A review study refers to the factors affecting the decision-making styles of coaches and athletes and indicates that improvement in decision-making styles of coaches and athletes results in tactical and technical improvement in team performance. Hence, it's essential to define style of decision-making (Kaya, 2014). Indeed, relationship between styles of decision-making and exhaustion is referred simultaneously. Albeit, Gulle et al. (2014) studied the relationship between styles of decision-making and exhaustion level in team sports. The results represent a connection between exhaustion levels and scales of decision-making styles (Gulle et al. 2014). Furthermore, Boostani and Nozari (2013) studied satisfaction of basketball players in major leagues according to the decision-making styles of coaches as well as burnout level. The results demonstrate that by increasing each of the styles of decision-making of the coaches, the scales and the satisfaction of the athletes increase and as the styles of decision-making decrease, they decrease as well (Bosstani & Nozari, 2014). Recently, the relationship between decision making styles and decision-making competence has been specified. In fact, it was found that personality affects the decision-making and decision-making competence. The results of regression analysis also revealed that characters can predict the variance of the decision-making. Dewberry and colleagues report in 2013 shows that kind of personality can influence the decision-making competence in all aspects of

life. The findings show the predictive power of decision-making competencies through individual personality factors. The theoretical basis of this impact is explained as the principle of individual differences. People with different personality characteristics and different decision-making styles show different decision-making competence in crucial situations of life (Dewberry et al. 2013). Surely making a decision in situations that one must make the best and most effective decisions in a short time is additionally sensitive. Mentor's decision is of critical decisions. The mentor not only should take all aspects into account and decide about technical and tactical functions and team members' performance, but also should be knowledgeable and ready enough to make the best decisions and implement them. Hence, evaluation of the trainer's personality type in interaction with his decision-making style can indicate the authority to make decisions and even the value of a coach. The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between personality and style of decision-making of coaches at the International handball Competition.

Materials and methods

This study is a description of correlation. In International Handball Tournament of presidency cup in 2015 Mashhad city, 96 teams were participated including 90 domestic and 6 foreign teams. The questionnaires were distributed and collected among all local coaches and finally after eliminating defaced questionnaires, 86 ones were studied. Coaches age range was 22 to 63 years with an average of (± 11.46) 31.06 years old and 5 to 40 years of coaching experience with an average of (± 7.46) 8.91 years. To determine the type of personality of the mentors NEO Five-Factor personality questionnaire (1986) was used and to clarify the decision-making style of coaches Melbourne Decision Making Style Questionnaire (1997) was used.

NEO Five-Factor personality questionnaire (short form)

The short form of NEO personality questionnaire (1986) is a questionnaire of 60 questions and is used to assess five personality factors including neurosis, extraversion, flexibility, agreeableness and accountability. In the short form each factor is measured by 12 questions. Method of grading questions is as Likert five-options: Totally disagree (0) disagree (1), no idea (2), Agree (3) and strongly agree (4); though some questions are graded vice versa. The investigations conducted by McCrae, Costa (1992) showed that the correlation of five subscales of short form with the long form is from 0.77 to 0.92. The internal consistency of its subscales is also ranged from 68/0 to 86/0. Also in the study of Anisi and colleagues (2011) that was conducted on 630 students, it was found that Cronbach's alpha of all subscales of the questionnaire is higher than 0.55. The correlation coefficient of the questionnaire was reported 47/0 to 68/0 by questionnaire Eysenck (Anisi, MAjdiyan,

JoShanlou & Gohari Kamel, 2011). Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire (1997):This questionnaire contains 28 items including self esteem, vigilance, hyper vigilance, buck-passing and procrastination. Therefore, each item consists of three answers that are scored as follows: true (2), sometimes true (1) and not true (0).Cronbach's alpha is reported 0.8 for vigilance, 0.74 for hyper vigilance, 0.87 for buck-passing, 0.871 for procrastination and 0.74 for self-esteem.

Dennis (2004) specified reliability of the test between 0.68 to 0.87. Kajbaf and colleague (2014) also reported Cronbach's alpha higher than 0.5 for each factor done on 232 students and examined concurrent validity with the scale of problem-solving styles of Cassidy & Long (1996).The results showed that the correlation coefficient in subscale self-esteem decisions with constructive problem solving style is 0.51 and with creative problem-solving, confidence in problem solving and trends style is 0.8, 0.79 and 0.66 respectively that all coefficients were meaningful. The correlation coefficient in subscale self-esteem decisions with unconstructive problem solving style was -0.44 and with insolvency, controlling the problem and

avoidance style is -0.49, -0.43 and -0.1 respectively which all were meaningful (Kajbaf, Ranjbar & Sajjadikejhah, 2014). In the present study, Cronbach's alpha for components obtained 0.67. Descriptive statistics is used to data clustering, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is used to normality test of data distribution and Pearson correlation coefficient test and regression analysis is used to analyze data.This process was done using SPSS20 software and meaningful level was 0.05.

Findings

In order to In order to check the status of data distribution in all of the research components, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used.Given the meaningful level in all the variables obtained higher than 0.05, the assumption of abnormality is rejected and finally, assuming normal distribution of data is confirmed. Thus parametric statistics can be used for the study of hypothesis.The mean and standard deviation of variables are shown in Table 1 and in Table 2 you can see the results of Pearson correlation test to examine the relationship between decision making styles and personality types of coaches (Table 1).

Results

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

variable	Neurosis	Extraversion	Openness to experience	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Self-esteem	vigilance	Buck-passing	procrastination	Hyper-vigilance
average	19.36	31.00	25.4	29.6	36.59	6.22	9.9	3.94	3.49	4.55
The standard deviation	6.711	4.655	4.847	4.478	6.207	1.69	2.223	2.694	2.365	2.189

Table 2. The relationship between personality type and style of decision-making

Variable	Self-esteem	vigilance	Buck-passing	procrastination	Hyper-vigilance
Neurosis	0.186	-0.452**	0.423*	0.531**	0.509**
	0.087	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
Extraversion	0.013	0.397**	-0.175	-0.150	-0.305**
	0.902	0.001	0.106	0.169	0.004
Openness to experience	-0.018	0.288**	-0.208	-0.118	-0.192
	0.87	0.007	0.054	0.281	0.076
Agreeableness	-0.058	0.248**	-0.102	-0.290**	-0.244**
	0.594	0.022	0.348	0.007	0.023
Conscientiousness	-0.169	0.642**	-0.378**	-0.511**	-0.361**
	0.121	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001

Contents of Table 2 show that neurosis variable has a meaningful connection with all decision-making styles except self-esteem. The extraversion variable demonstrates a significant relation with vigilance and hyper-vigilance styles. For the Openness to experience variable, just the relation with vigilance style is defined. The Agreeableness variable has a punctual connection with the styles vigilance, procrastination and hyper-vigilance and shows disaffiliation with self-esteem and buck-passing. Finally, conscientiousness variable has affiliation with all decision-making styles except self-esteem.

With regard to the significance of the correlation specified, stepwise regression was used to determine the role of each personality type on decision-making styles of the mentors (Table 3).

The results show that the personality types of conscientiousness and openness to experience are able to explain 45% of vigilance style changes.Due to beta coefficient and significance levels of T it can be expressed that the personality styles of conscientiousness and openness to experience have a direct and positive effect on the vigilance decision-making style.

The results also suggest that 18% of buck-passing style changes and 26% of hyper-vigilance style changes are explained through neurosis personality type.

Thus according to beta coefficient and significance levels of T we can indicate that neurosis personality type has a direct and positive influence on the buck-passing and hyper-vigilance decision-making

style. Eventually the results indicate that personality types of neurosis and conscientiousness are able to explain 34% of procrastination style changes. Due to beta coefficient and significance levels of T we can say that neurosis personality type has a direct and positive influence on the conscientiousness decision-making style and a direct and negative effect on procrastination decision making style of the coaches.

Table 3. Stepwise regression of decision-making styles based on type of personality

Variable	Model	Variable	β	T	Meaningful	Correlation	The coefficient of determination	F	Meaningful
Vigilance	1	conscientiousness	0.642	7.681	0.001	0.642	0.413	58.994	0.001
	2	conscientiousness	0.613	7.433	0.001				
		Openness to experience	0.194	2.356	0.021	0.670	0.449	33.869	0.001
Buck-passing	1	Neurosis	0.170	4.278	0.001	0.423	0.179	18.298	0.001
Procrastination	1	Neurosis	0.531	5.749	0.001	0.531	0.282	33.048	0.001
	2	Neurosis	0.350	3.123	0.002				
		conscientiousness	-0.299	-2.664	0.009	0.582	0.339	21.271	0.001
Hyper-vigilance	1	Neurosis	0.509	5.425	0.001	0.509	0.259	29.435	0.001

Discussion and conclusion

This study is aimed to investigate the relationship between personality factors and instructors’ styles of decision-making. The results of Pearson correlation showed the relevance between vigilance and all factors of personality. For buck-passing style, a significant connection with neurosis and conscientiousness variables was obtained. Also the relation between procrastination and personality factors of neurosis, agreeableness and conscientiousness was defined. Finally, for the hyper-vigilance variable the relationship with personality factors are significant except the openness to experience variable.

Researches indicate that the personality is in connection with general performance and what affects decisions and it can somewhat evaluate the changes that commonly occur in decision-making (Dewberry et al. 2013). Indeed, competence in the type of the decision taken by the individual can be estimated based on personality traits. This relationship is explained by cognitive styles of the person. Cognitive style as Attitude is considered as intellectual priorities and permanent strategies that the person uses for thinking, problem-solving and decision-making (Messick & Fritzky, 1963). Cognitive styles can predict the behavior value observed in functional areas (Such as industrial psychology and education) (Kozhevnikov, 2007). With regard to the attitude of a person and his levels of experience and interaction with the environment, cognitive style is a purely individual feature and any person subject to these cases can apply a kind of cognitive style in their lives. This difference in cognitive style is also a result of differences in personality (Bensi, Giusberti, Nori, & Gambetti, 2010). Therefore, with regard to the type of personality and the fact that anyone can show a

stronger personality type, his/her cognitive style is different as well and he/she is likely to make different decisions in different situations due to these diversities (Karnowal, Inbar & Lerner, 2011). Hence, the communication between type of personality and decision-making styles for coaches in a particular situation also can be explained with regard to different cognitive styles. A person, who has an introvert character, probably uses avoidant decision making style more than other styles and does not involve himself/herself in problem-solving. Consequently, cognitive style as a result of economic, cultural and social factors of person, forms the character and explains the relation between personality and style of decision-making (Bensi, Giusberti, Nori, & Gambetti, 2010; Dewberry et al. 2013; Kozhevnikov, 2007). In the present study, the relevance of neurosis personality type is significant with all decision-making styles. Neurotic people have a general tendency to experience negative emotions such as Fear, sadness, confusion, anger, guilt and hatred.

Men and women with high scores are prone to irrational beliefs and are less able to control their impulsivity and cope with stress much weaker than others (Goldberg et al. 1998). So at any moment due to the specific characteristics locations can use of each style of decision-making. In fact, a neurotic mentor uses all styles of decision-making in particular situations of the match, because the more people are neurotic, the less emotional stability they have and the less are able to face stressful situations without mess or fuss. The relation between extroversion and vigilance and hyper-vigilance shows that the more a person is extroversion, the more he/she seeks accurately for new data without orientation; besides he/she rushes for a solution to relieve the problem and obtain urgent relaxation.

In fact, due to the characteristics of extraversion such as being active, brave and interested in community participation, show high risk-taking and sensation seeking (Eysenck, Nias & Cox, 1982). They probably acquire detailed information of the environment while decision-making and based on it, they may take a rash decision for a quick problem fixing. For the "openness to experience" (flexibility) the only relation was obtained with vigilance. Flexible people are willing to adopt new beliefs and bohemian values and they experience positive and negative emotions more deeply than non-flexible persons (Ayzenk et al. 1982). Hence, with regard to the relation of the vigilance, it can be said that the flexible coaches seek new data accurately, internalize these data without orientation and at last choose a decision according to the new position formed.

Actually, a flexible mentor evaluates new circumstances without orientation and then makes a decision according to the current situation. The connection between agreeableness and vigilance and procrastination also indicates that the person searches for new environmental information in a special condition while shows procrastination in decision-making and selection. The coach which is more agreeable almost shows characteristics of extroverts, the difference is that for a pleasant person, popularity and being loved is preferable and that is the reason why he/she postpones in decision-making so that he/she can increase his/her popularity while making the right decision (Karnoval et al. 2011; Kaya, 2014). Of course, this feature is considered as weakness in situations with limited time. Although in such conditions, the coach identifies environmental information, he/she has a delay in making decision that may completely change the individual and team performance.

The relationship of responsible character was meaningful with all decision-making styles (except self-esteem) like the neurosis. Responsible people take active planning power, organizing and desirable carrying out duties, priority to their behavior (Fazel, 2012). Accordingly, conscientious coaches also represent discipline, cohesion and accurately plan. So, in order to be able to well perform tasks those have been entrusted to them, they need openness to choose decision-making styles in particular situations. Indeed, a conscientious mentor tries to do his/her duties the best possible with timely use of diverse styles of decision-making which requires to decide according to the conditions and individual differences. Regression testing output well illustrates the responsibility for explaining a significant part of the vigilance decision-making style of the coaches. The results actually indicate that the conscientiousness variable could alone predict 0.413 of changes of mentors' vigilance decision-making style. Therefore, the responsibility of the coaches can be considered as a powerful predicting variable for vigilance style. Moreover, the results for the vigilance style showed that conscientiousness and flexibility can explain 0.449

of the changes simultaneously. So the coaches' personality type of conscientiousness and openness to experience affects vigilance decision-making style directly and positively. Besides, the neurosis variable elucidated 0.179 of buck-passing changes. With regard to neurotic people properties such as irrational beliefs, lack of impulse control and lack of ability to cope with stressful situations (Costa & McCare, 1986), they may frequently use buck-passing style in their decisions. On one hand, as the regression results show that the educator's vigilance personality can influence buck-passing style. On the other hand the capability of the neurosis variable to clarify a remarkable part of procrastination style is obtained so that neurosis variable alone predict 0.282 of changes of procrastination style. However, in simulations study of the variables neurosis and conscientiousness, the changes in procrastination style gained 0.339 which indicates that for a coach with neurotic and responsible character, procrastination style is significantly predicted. The final output of regression analysis showed that the neurosis variable alone can estimate 0.259 of vigilance style.

A neurotic mentor is likely to emphasize on searching frantically for a way out of the problem and stressful selecting of hasty solutions due to incompatibility with stressful situations (Ayzenk et al. 1982) and because of this a neurotic personality can affect vigilance style. Researchers have estimated somewhat the relationship between decision-making style and backgrounds of character (Bensi et al. 2010; Dewberry et al. 2013; Maner et al, 2007). In fact, evidence suggests that personality affects the decision-making authority. This relevance suggests that the decision-making authority have better to be investigated by focus on the style of decision-making in relation to character. As studies have shown 6% of Decision Outcomes Inventory is estimated through the personality scale (Bruenn, Parkrvfyshhvf, 2007; Dewberry et al. 2013). In line with this study, the results Dewberry et al. (2013) illustrated the role of decision-making styles and personality on competency of decisions. Competency in decision-making has in fact a direct connection with personality, styles of decision-making and cognitive styles (Dewberry et al. 2013).

The researchers have express that Competency in decision-making is important in all situations of life one of which stressful and high-pressure conditions are of high significance (Guliyo et al. 2014). To clarify disaffiliation of self-esteem with personality variables, it should be said that depended on the situation, especially in high-pressure situations like sports matches, behavioral reactions can vary according to the severity of ambient pressure and the situation. The results showed that in race situations there is no meaningful relation between coach's personality and self-esteem. The point is that self-esteem was not significantly associated with any of the components. The first explanation is that in Melbourne decision-making style scale, purpose of "self-esteem" is self-esteem in decision-

making, not self-esteem of personality. The second case is that in matching situation and according to the results obtained during the match, a coach may show different manner and behavior with regard to his/her experiences (Kaya, 2014). In other words, the problem is not the mentor's low or high self-esteem, but is not very accurate in using self-esteem in the present circumstances and probably has been influenced by race emotional and moral conditions. However, for better explanation more extensive research in this field is needed due to the lack of detailed evidence. Coaching has different roles and styles as the leader and coordinator of sports teams. A mentor necessarily has to be able to led sport team to do well according to his/her appropriate decisions. Therefore, coach's decision-making has major impact on his/her performance

and the team under coach's support which was referred in previous studies. But the results of present study represent that dominant personality type of a sports coach can predict the decision he/she makes in a particular condition. Also results reveal that the more the mentor is neurotic, flexible and responsible, the more flexibility he/she shows in decisions which in turn improve decision-making competencies of a coach and increases the collective confidence of the coach's decision. Studying variables only on male coaches in the field of handball was a limitation for this research. Hence, it's suggested to investigate the relevance of coaching style and personality in individual sports coaches with regard to gender so that the results can be presented with more control and generalizability.

References

- Anisi, J., Majdiyan, M., Joshanloo, M., & Ghoharikamel, Z. (2011). Validity and reliability of NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) on university students. *Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 5(4), .18-17
- Bensi, L., Giusberti, F., Nori, R., & Gambetti, E. (2010). Individual differences and reasoning: A study on personality traits. *British Journal of Psychology*, 101(3), .562-545
- Boustani, M. H., & Nowzari, V. (2014). The Relationship between Coaches' Decision-Making Styles and the Rate of Satisfaction and Burnout of Men and Women Basketball Premier League Players in Iran. *Journal of Sport Management Basics*, 1(1), .38-31
- Bruine de Bruin, W., Parker, A. M., & Fischhoff, B. (2007). Individual differences in adult decision-making competence. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 92(5), .938
- Carnevale, J. J., Inbar, Y., & Lerner, J. S. (2011). Individual differences in need for cognition and decision-making competence among leaders. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(3), .278-274
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1986). Cross-sectional studies of personality in a national sample: I. Development and validation of survey measures. *Psychology and aging*, 1(2), .140
- Dewberry, C., Juanchich, M., & Narendran, S. (2013). Decision-making competence in everyday life: The roles of general cognitive styles, decision-making styles and personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 55(7), .788-783
- Dudley, N. M., Orvis, K. A., Lebiecki, J. E., & Cortina, J. M. (2006). A meta-analytic investigation of conscientiousness in the prediction of job performance: examining the intercorrelations and the incremental validity of narrow traits. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), .40
- Eysenck, H. J., Nias, D. K., & Cox, D. (1982). Sport and personality. *Advances in behaviour research and therapy*, 4(1), .56-1
- Fazel, J. (2012). The Comparison of Big Five Personality Traits between Male and Female Athletes and Non-Athletes. *journal of development and motor learning*, 3(2), .98-81
- Gilbert, W. D., & Trudel, P. (2005). Learning to coach through experience: Conditions that influence reflection. *Physical Educator*, 62(1), .32
- Goetzman, L., Moser, K. S., Vetsch, E., Grieder, E., Klaghofer, R., Naef, R., . . . Buddeberg, C. (2007). The interplay of "big five" personality factors and metaphorical schemas: A pilot study with 20 lung transplant recipients. *The Qualitative Report*, 12(3), .413-397
- Goldberg, L. R., Sweeney, D., Merenda, P. F., & Hughes, J. E. (1998). Demographic variables and personality: The effects of gender, age, education, and ethnic/racial status on self-descriptions of personality attributes. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 24(3), .403-393
- Gülle, M., Kabadayı, M., Bostancı, Ö., Çetin, M. Ç., & Şeker, R. (2014). Evaluation of the Correlation between Decision-making Styles and Burnout Levels of the Team-trainers who Competed in Regional Amateur League. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 152, .487-483
- Kajbaf, M., RanjbarKohan, Z., & SajadiNezhad, M. S. (2014). The study of psychometric properties of Melbourne Decision Making Style Questionnaire in Isfahan University of Medical Sciences. *Cheshmandaz Amin in Applied Psychology and aging*, 1(1), .1-9
- Kaya, A. (2014). Decision Making by Coaches and Athletes in Sport. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 152, .338-333
- Kozhevnikov, M. (2007). Cognitive styles in the context of modern psychology: toward an integrated framework of cognitive style. *Psychological bulletin*, 133(3), .464
- Lauriola, M., Russo, P. M., Lucidi, F., Violani, C., & Levin, I. P. (2005). The role of personality in positively and negatively framed risky health decisions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38(1), .59-45
- Maner, J. K., Richey, J. A., Cromer, K., Mallott, M., Lejuez, C. W., Joiner, T. E., & Schmidt, N. B. (2007). Dispositional anxiety and risk-avoidant decision-making. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(4), .675-665

- Messick, S., & Fritzky, F. J. (1963). Dimensions of analytic attitude in cognition and personality1. *ETS Research Bulletin Series*, 1963(1), i- .39
- Soane, E., Dewberry, C., & Narendran, S. (2010). The role of perceived costs and perceived benefits in the relationship between personality and risk-related choices. *Journal of Risk Research*, 13(3), .318-303
-

ODNOS IZMEĐU PET FAKTORA LIČNOSTI SA STILOVIMA DONOŠENJA ODLUKA TRENERA

Sažetak

Cilj ovog istraživanja bio je ispitati odnos između pet faktora ličnosti sa stilovima odlučivanja trenera. Metoda ovog istraživanja je korelacija i uzorak je uključivao 86 trenera koji su prezentirani na međunarodnim igrama rukometa u Mashhadu. NEO inventar ličnosti i Melbourne upitnik o stilu odlučivanja se koristio za procjenu faktora ličnosti i stilova odlučivanja. Nalazi Pierson korelacije pokazuju da postoji značajna povezanost između neuroticizma sa svim stilovima odlučivanja, ekstraverzije s budnošću i hiperbudnošću, otvorenost za iskustvo sa budnosti, ugodnost sa budnosti, odugovlačenje i hiperbudnost, i savjesnost svake odluke i stilova. Također, rezultati regresije pokazali su da savjesnost i otvorenost prema iskustvu može biti 45% promjene stila trenera u vezi budnosti. 18% promjene prolazi Buck stil i 26% promjene hiperbudnosti stila razrađeno je kroz neuroticizam, a na kraju neuroticizam i savjesnost mogu biti izričito 45% promjene stila odugovlačenja trenera. Stoga, kako bi se analizirala kompetencija i procjene donošenja odluka trenera, faktori ličnosti mogu se koristiti u uvjetima tržišnog natjecanja, savjesnosti i otvorenosti ponudi prikladniji stilu odlučivanja trenera.

Ključne riječi: *osobnost, donošenje odluka, sportski treneri.*

Received: December 24, 2016

Accepted: February 18, 2017

Correspondence to:

Mandana Heidari

Hashemite University

Faculty of Physical Education and Sports Science

Zarqa, Jordan

E-mail: huniv@hu.edu.jo