Impact of Personal Justice Perceptions of Students at the Faculty of Sport Sciences on Their Decision Making Level

Gökhan Acar

Faculty of Sport Sciences, Usak University, 64200 Usak, Turkey
E-mail: gokhnacar@gmail.com

ABSTRACT The present study aimed to reveal whether personal justice perceptions of the students at the faculty of sport science have impact on their decision making process. Based on the correlation table, it was observed that there is weak and positive relationship between their personal 'fair world perceptions' and dilatory decision making process. In the study, it was found that there is a significant relationship between students' personal perception concerning belief in a just world and their self confidence levels in decision making and dilatory decision making process. Hence, it could be concluded that as students' personal fair world perception increases, their dilatory decision making process develops in quite limited amount.

INTRODUCTION

Human beings tend to percept the world as a place where every individual gets what he or she deserves; goods are awarded when good deeds are done and vice versa. Accordingly, they believe that they deserve whatever happens in their life (Hafer and Begue 2005). This belief enables people to confront their physical and social environment as though it were stable and orderly (Peter et al. 2013). In this theory, "Belief in a Just World", is defined as the belief that everybody in the world eventually gets, good or bad, what he or she deserves. In other words, this theory pointed out to a tendency, to a belief of people that, the world is fair and they deserved whatever they face in this fair world (Acar 2012; Pittinsky and Matic 2005). Based on this hypothesis, human beings need to perceive the world as a place in which everyone gets whatever one deserves; good things happen to good people and bad things happen to bad people (Lerner 1965, Larner 2002; Lerner and Miller 1978). Thus, human beings are just motivated to protect their belief regarding the world as a just place (Dalbert 1997, 1999; Mohiyeddini and Montada 1998). Rubin and Peplau (1975) concluded that belief in a just world is inherent to faith in God. It is thought that people with

strong belief in a just world explain the relationship between outcomes and what is deserved by the means of supernatural powers and divine intervention beside the regular causes (Zuckerman 1975). The belief in a just world is also indicated as being inherent to religiosity and supporting an established political party (Dalbert et al. 2001). Many people are guided by values that they have internalised and that they accept as providing sensible and proper criteria by which actions can and should be judged (The Hon 2014). Elevated levels of belief in a just world allow spouses to exhibit higher tolerance to their negative attitude towards each other in their married life (Lipkus and Bissonnette 1996). Thus, beliefs can shape the learning process and the outcomes of teaching, which makes them a valuable research focus to investigate (Cephe and Yalcin 2015). It was reported that individuals with strong belief in a just world are more enterprising concerning social responsibility and charities for others (Otto and Dalbert 2005). Furnham and Karani's (1985) study carried out in Northern Ireland revealed that Catholic society members live under disadvantaged conditions compared to Protestants; although, the Catholic group is more religious, they believe that the world was not just due to adverse effects of their social circumstances (Goregenli 2003; Rubin and Peplau 1973). It is observed that people want to perceive social systems and regulations by which they live as a just order, and thus, they support and rationalize status quo as the legitimate and just order; this is consistent with their belief that they live in a just world (Jost 2001;

Address for correspondence:
Dr. Gökhan Acar
Usak University, Faculty of Sport Science
1 Eylul Campus, Usak, (64200,) Turkey
Telephone: (+90) 276 221 2221
E-mail: gokhnacar@gmail.com

Jost et al. 2001; Kay et al. 2002). The more individuals believe in a just world, the more they will trust in their future and in being treated fairly, and see events in their own life as just; this in turn can be expected to lead to better subjective well-being (Peter et al. 2013).

The decision making is intrinsic to human beings equipped with intelligence, thought, cognition and free-will (Kocel 2001). The need for decision making arises because of the uncertainty associated with the future and unavailability of all required relevant information (Vallabh and Singhal 2014). Individual differences from one person to another have influence over decision making processes (Deniz 2004). Composing right and accurate questions require that they comprehend choices, and then establish relationships between their requirements and available choices (Bakircioglu 2000). Individuals with rational decision making process exhibit more attentive attitude (Avsaroglu 2007). There are biological, psychological and sociological factors limiting the decision making process (Taymaz 2000). A well structured decision is required to be clear, certain and qualified so that applicators could understand conveniently (Gursel 1997). Simultaneously, this complexity of decision–making makes negative impact on the individual in decision–making (Acar 2012; Deniz 2004). The key for skills in decision making is to know who, when and how to make this decision. Traditionally, administrators and leaders have imposed decision making and execution solely on themselves (Yarmali 2000). Individuals play different roles in an organization by acting as an individual manager, as a team member and as an organization leader. We now examine the role played by the individual in influencing decision making at different levels (Vallabh and Singhal 2014). It is evident that the majority of the individuals do not use their cognitive capacities completely. Instead they prefer short-cuts in making decision process (Kokdemir 2003). The exclusive attention in the decision making process should be paid to what should be considered as foundation and how to make decision (Clemen and Reilly 2001). Detention or fear of being hindered causes anxiety, and accordingly individuals experience difficulties in decision making process (Atkinson et al. 1999). Only a minority of decisions are taken under complete certainty because

it is rare to collect thorough intelligence concerning all choices. Thus, each decision made is accompanied by a certain level of risk (Haris 1998). Most research on decision making focusses on the former type of information processing (Vallabh and Singhal 2014).

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Analysis

The data collected by the means of the study's survey was analyzed and assessed through SPSS 13.0 statistical software package. Frequency analysis was conducted to render demographical data concerning participant students. In determination of students' personal perception regarding a just world and decision making process, arithmetic mean and standard deviation values were taken into consideration. To identify whether the students' perception regarding a just world, and their decision-making process vary according to their demographic status, a t-test and one way Anova test were conducted. To determine whether there is significant relationship between students' just world perception and their decision making process, correlation coefficient between the two groups was taken into consideration and it was assessed based on the relevant Pearson Correlation coefficient.

Sample and Sampling

The study group consisted of 154 students selected randomly, of whom 106 students are from the department of Physical Science Teaching and 48 students are from the department of Sports Administration at Usak University in the academic year of 2014 - 2015.

Data Collection

As a primary data collection method in the research, personal belief in a just world scale (KADIO) developed by Dalbert (1999) and adapted by Goregenli (2003) into Turkish was used for the validity and reliability study. Another scale - Melbourne Decision Making Questionary developed by Mann et al. (1998) and adapted into Turkish by Deniz (2004) was used to assess its validity and reliability.

RESULTS

From Table 1, it is observed that students' perception of a just world does not vary according to various processes such as careful decision making, aversive decision making, dilatory decision making, and making decision in panic based on their residence places (P>0.05).

Table 1: Personal just world perceptions, self-confidence levels in decision making, students' correlation table

		Personal just world perceptions	Decision making process
Personal just world perceptions	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.201
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.013 **
	N	154	154
Decision making process	Pearson Correlation	-0.201	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.013**	
	N	154	154

** Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level duplex.

It is observed from Table 2, mean score of the first six items which determines self-confidence levels of the students was found as 2.53. This suggested "ACCURATE" level. Thus, it can be said that self-confidence levels of students were high during their decision making process.

Table 3 shows the mean of the students' answers given to questions regarding carefulness during making decision was found as 2.47. This suggested the "ACCURATE" level. Accordingly, it can be said that students were careful when they were making their decision.

It is evident from Table 4 that the students' just world perceptions, careful decision making, aversive decision making, dilatory decision making, and decision making in panic processes do not differ according to their residential places (p>0.05). Regarding factor of self confidence in decision making, a significant difference was found according to students' residential places (p<0.05).

It is evaluated from Table 5 that there were significant differences found between students residing in Private House and Government Dormitory; and between students residing in Private Dormitories and Government Dormitories. Mean self confidence level of students in decision making, who reside in Private House and in Private Dormitory were found significantly higher compared to the students who reside in government dormitory.

DISCUSSION

According to Table 4, the mean score of the students' answers given to the questions regarding carefulness in decision making process was found as 2.47. This suggested "ACCURATE" level. Accordingly, it can be said that the students were careful when they were making their decisions. Students are not always equipped with the requisite expertise to grow by them-

Table 2: Self-Esteem levels of participant students in regard to decision making

	N	Mean	SD
1 I have confidence in my decision making talent.	154	2.73	0.50
2. I feel small more than many people while making decision.	154	2.60	0.65
3. I consider myself successful at making decision.	154	2.55	0.66
4. I feel so desperate that I give up on making decision effort.	154	2.57	0.66
5. My decisions give successful outcomes.	154	2.32	0.59
6. It is easy for me to be convinced by other people about the superiority of their decision compared to mine.	154	2.42	0.68
Mean		2.53	0.62

Table 3: Carefulness level of participant students during decision making

	N	Mean	SD
8. I'd like to consider all choices.	154	2.57	0.68
10. I try to expose disadvantages of all choices.	154	2.40	0.64
12. I broadly consider how I would put the decision into action as much as possible.	154	2.56	0.60
14. While making decision, I'd like to collect data about decision as much as possible.	154	2.32	0.71
18. Before making decision, I try to clarify my targets.	154	2.51	0.63
Mean		2.47	0.65

.

Table 4: Comparison of students' personal just world perceptions, self-confidence levels in decision making, and decision making process based on their residential places.

Variables		Sum of squares	Mean squares	F	P
Just world perception	According to Residential Places	1.885	0.628	1.330	0.267
Self-confidence in decision making	According to Residential Places	1.342	0.447	3.152	0.027[*]
Carefulness in decision making	According to Residential Places	0.647	0.216	0.973	0.407
Aversive decision making	According to Residential Places	0.432	0.144	0.679	0.566
Dilatory decision making	According to Residential Places	0.238	0.079	0.375	0.771
Decision making in panic	According to Residential Places	0.090	0.030	0.393	0.758

[*]$P < 0.05$

selves, so outside facilitators may need to train students in mindfulness and compassion (Vallabh and Singhal 2014). In Calhoun and Cann's (1994) study, they reported that, whereas individuals view unjust situations in their regular life more objectively, they care about harmony and order in their inner world; and that they develop more positive attitude toward themselves. Dalbert and Filke (2007) reported that there was no any relationship between students' belief in a just world and any demographical variable in regard to age variable. On other hand, the results of the belief in just world concerning in regard to age can be explained by associating it with individual experiences and difficulties faced in life. In one of their studies, Bazerman et al. (1995) emphasized human beings need to believe that their world is a just place. Begue and Bastonus (2003) found that there is a positive and significant relationship between personal belief in a just world and general belief in a just world. According to Table 5 it is observed that students'

perception of a just world does not vary according to various processes such as careful decision making, aversive decision making, dilatory decision making, and making decision in panic based on their residence places ($P > 0.05$). Concerning self-confidence factor in decision making process, there is significant difference based on their residential places ($P < 0.05$). It was found that there is no significant relationship between residential place where students spend most of their time and self-confidence in decision making. Careful decision making mean score of students who spend most of their life in village/town, one of the sub-dimensions of decision making process type, were significantly higher than the ones who live in city center and the ones who live in county center. When it was viewed from the dilatory decision making process, mean scores of the students who spend most of their life in county centers were significantly higher than the ones who live in city center (Cetin 2009). It was reported that students

Table 5: Comparison of students' personal just world perception, level of self confidence in decision making, and decision making process according to their residential places

Variables	(I) Residential place	(J) Residential place	Mean difference (I-J)	Standard error	P
Self Confidence in Decision Making	Private house	Gov. dorm	0.264	0.098	0.039[*]
		Priv. dorm	-0.031	0.086	0.983
		Family house	0.096	0.074	0.562
	Government dorm	Priv. house	-0.264	0.098	0.039[*]
		Priv. dorm	-0.296	0.110	0.038[*]
		Family house	-0.168	0.100	0.337
	Private dorm	Priv. house	0.031	0.086	0.983
		Gov. dorm	0.296	0.110	0.038[*]
		Family house	0.127	0.088	0.474
	Family house	Priv. house	-0.096	0.074	0.562
		Gov. dorm	0.168	0.100	0.337
		Priv. dorm	-0.127	0.088	0.474

[*]$P < 0.05$

who play sports exhibited higher "total score", "loss of motivation", and "expectation for the future" compared to those who do not (Ozsaker and Vurgun 2012). The experiences can change beliefs; however, the role of teachers in change process is, also, crucial (Cephe and Yalcin 2015). In light of these results, future researches might design to investigate the relationships between the attitudes to moral decision making and perceived motivational climate or goal orientations (Gurpinar 2014). According to the Table 1, it can be observed that there is a weak positive relationship between students' personal belief in a just world and their self confidence in decision making (R=0.201). In the study carried out over German students, Appelbaum (2002) reached findings supporting the view that individual who exhibit more effort deserve to get more help. German students were asked for to evaluate people who want to live in Germany as refugee to take advantage of social benefits concerning how much these people deserve this. Further, they thought more systematically and detail-oriented during their decision making process. Teacher justice—or, more precisely, students' subjective experience of the justice of their teachers' behavior toward them personally—is evidently a key feature of schools (Peter et al. 2013).

CONCLUSION

According to Table 4, are significant differences between students residing at private house and the ones in government dormitories; and the ones in private dormitories. Self-confidence means of the students residing at private houses and in private dormitories are found significantly higher compared to the means of students residing at government dormitories. As a result, it was found that the ones with strong belief in a just world think people seeking for right of asylum deserve less aid compared to the ones with weaker belief in a just world. As a result of correlation analyses carried out so as to determine whether there is significant relationship between students' personal perception concerning a just world and self confidence in decision making and decision making processes, it was found that there is no significant relationship between students' personal perception concerning belief in a just world and careful decision making process, aversive decision making process, and decision making in panic. Accordingly, as students'

personal perception concerning just world develops, it can be said that their self confidence in decision making can elevate though it is in quite limited amount. According to the Table 1, it can be observed that there is weak positive relationship between the students' personal perception concerning just world and their dilatory decision making process (R=0.186). Finally, based on the findings acquired, it can be concluded that as students' personal perception concerning a just world develops, their dilatory decision making process could also develop in a limited amount.

REFERENCES

Acar G 2012. The effect of trainers' personal perceptions of justice (belief in a just world) on decision making. *Energy Education Science and Technology Part B*, 4: 1027-1030.

Appelbaum LD 2002. Who deserves help? students' opinion about the deservingness of different groups living in germany to receive aid. *Social Justice Research*, 15: 201-225.

Atkinson LR, Atkinson CR, Smith EE, Bem JS 1999. *Introduction to Psychology*. (Translate: Yavuz Alogan). Ankara: Arkadas Press.

Avsaroglu S 2007. *Investigation Of University Students' Self Confidence, Decision Making and Handling With Stress in Their Decision Making Process in Terms of Self Respect and Other Variables*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Konya: Selcuk Univeristy,

Bakircioglu R 2000. *Guidance and Psychological Councelling in Primary Education, Secondary Education, and Higher Education*. 5th Edition. Ankara, Turkey: Ani Press.

Bazerman MH, White SB, Lowenstein GF 1995. Perceptions of fairness in interpersonal and individual choice situations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science,* 4: 39-42.

Begue L, Bastounis M 2003. Two spheres of belief in justice: Extensive support for the bidimensional model of belief in a just world. *Journal of Personality*, 73: 435-463.

Calhoun L, Cann A 1994. Differences in as supptions about a just world: Ethnicity and point of view. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 134: 765-765.

Cephe PT, Yalcin CG 2015. Beliefs about foreign language learning: The effects of teacher beliefs on learner beliefs. *Anthropologist*, 19: 167-173.

Cetin MC 2009. *Comparative Investigation of Decision Making Styles, Social Skills and Stress Handling Styles of Univeristy Students at The Physical Education Sports Science College in Terms of Several Variables*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Ankara: Univeristy of Gazi.

Clemen RT, Reilly T 2001. *Making Hard Decisions with Decision Tools*. New York: Duxbury Thomson Learning Press, P. 404.

Dalbert C 1997. Coping With an unjust fate: The case of structural unemployment. job loss, unemployment and social injustices. *Social Justice Research,* 10: 175-189.

Dalbert C 1999. The world is more just for me than generally: About the personal belief in a just world scale's validity. *Social Justice Research,* 12: 79-98.

Dalbert C, Lipkus IM, Sallay H, Goch I 2001. A just and an unjust world: Structure and validity of different world beliefs. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 30: 561-577.

Dalbert C, Filke F 2007. Belief in a personal just world, justice judgments, and their functions for prisoners. *American Association for Correctional and Forensic Psychology*, 11: 1516-1527.

Deniz ME 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.

Furnham A, Karani Y 1985. A cross-cultural study of attitudes to women, just world, and locus of control beliefs. *Psychologia,* 28: 11–20.

Gurpinar B, 2014. Attitudes to moral decision making of the student athletes in secondary and high school level according to sport variables. *Education and Science*, 39: 413-424.

Gursel M 1997. *School Management*. Konya: Turkey, Mikro Press.

Goregenli M 2003. Lawyers' Role in Prevention of Torture Project report: Evaluations, Attitudes and Experiences Concerning Violence, Misbehavior, and Torture, Lawyers' Role in Prevention of Torture Project Report, *Series No. 1*, Izmir: Turkey.

Hafer CL, Bègue L 2005. Experimental research on just-world theory: Problems, developments, and future challenges. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131: 128-167.

Jost JT 2001. Outgroup favoritism and the theory of system justification: A paradigm for investigating the effects of socio-economic success on stereotype content. In: GB Moskowitz (Ed.): *The Princeton Symposium on The Legacy and Future of Social Cognition. Cognitive Social Psychology*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp.89-102.

Jost JT, Burgess D, Mosso C 2001. Conflicts of legitimation among self, group, and system: The integrative potential of system justification theory. In: JT Jost, B Major (Eds.): *The Psychology of Legitimacy: Emerging Perspectives on Ideology, Justice, and Intergroup Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 363-388.

Kay AC, Jimenez MC, Jost JT 2002. Sour grapes. sweet lemons, and the anticipatory rationalization of the status quo. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9: 1300-1312.

Kocel T 2001. *Business Administration*. Istanbul, Turkey: Beta Press.

Kokdemir D 2003. *Decision Making and Problem Solvin Under Undeterministic Conditions*. Ankara City, Ankara University, Institute of Social Sciences, pp. 77-78.

Lerner MJ 1965. Evaluation of performances as a function of performer's reward and attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 1: 355-360.

Lerner MJ 2002. Pursuing the justice motive. In: M Ross, DT Miller (Eds.): *The Justice Motive in Everyday Life* New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 109-126.

Lerner MJ, Miller DT 1978. Just world research and the attribution process: Looking back and ahead. *Psychological Bulletin,* 85: 1030–1051.

Lipkus I, Bissonnette V 1996. Relationships among the belief in a just world, willingness to accommodate and marital well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 22: 1943-1956.

Mann L, Radford M, Burnett P, Ford S, Bond M, Leung K, Nakamura H, Vaughan G, Yang KS 1998. Cross-cultural differences in self-reported decision-making style and confidence. *International Journal of Psychology,* 33: 325-335.

Mohiyeddini C, Montada L 1998. Belief in a just world and self-efficacy in coping with observed victimization: results from a study about unemployment. In: L Montada, MJ Lerner (Eds.): *Responses to Victimizations and Belief in a Just World*. New York: Plenum Press. pp. 257-284.

Otto K, Dalbert C 2005. Belief in a just world and it s function for young prisoners. *Journal of Research in Personality,* 39: 559-573.

Ozsaker M, Vurgun N 2012. A study on the hopelessness of Turkish physical education and sports school croatian student. *Croatian Journal of Education*, 16: 445-470.

Peter F, Dalbert F, Kloeckner N, Radant M, 2013. Personal belief in a just world, experience of teacher justice, and school distress in different class contexts. *Eur J Psychol Educ,* 28: 1221-1235.

Pittinsky TL, Matic T 2005. Global Bystander Nonintervention: Cross-level Insightson Cross-national Helping. *Faculty Research Working Papers Series*. John F. Kennedy School of Government or Harvard University, (in press).

Rubin Z, Peplau LA 1973. Belief in a just world and reactions to another's lot: A study of participants in the national draft lottery. *Journal of Social*, 4: 73-93.

Rubin Z, Peplau LA 1975. Who believes in a just world. *Journal of Social,* 29: 73-93.

Taymaz H 2000. *School Management*. Ankara, Turkey: Pagem Press.

The Hon R.S. AO QC 2014. Law and justice: Do they meet? Some personal reflections. Visiting Professional Fellow, Faculty of Law, University of New South Wales. *UNSW Law Journal,* 3: 1141-1163.

Vallabh P, Singhal M 2014. Buddhism and decision making at individual, group and organizational levels. *Journal of Management Development,* 33: 763-775

Zuckerman M 1975. Belief in a just world and altruistic behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5: 972-976.