

COMPARISON OF RISK ASSESSMENT LEVELS OF HANDBALL COACHES IN TURKISH SUPER LEAGUE WITH CERTAIN DEMOGRAPHICAL VARIABLES

Özgür KARATAŞ¹, Cemal GÜNDOĞDU²

¹ *Inonu University, Department of Health, Culture and Sports*

² *Firat University, Physical Education and Sports Colleges*

Abstract: This study is performed with the aim to compare risk assessment levels of handball coaches in Turkish Super League with certain demographical variables. “General survey method” is utilized in the study as one of the descriptive survey method. 49 coaches, who worked for the teams in Turkish Handball Super league, constituted population of the study; and 45 coaches that were selected randomly and working in different clubs constituted the sample group. Risk assessment scale of Gök (2006) and Çobanoğlu (2008) is used as data tool in the study. Significant differences among the risk assessment levels of coaches attending the study are found according to the variables of gender, age, education background ($p < 0,05$). On the other hand, no significant difference is specified according to the variables of marital status and coaching duration ($p > 0,05$).

Key Words: Risk, Risk Assessment, Handball

INTRODUCTION

The fact that the sports have become a growing industry, has highlighted the concepts of risk and risk management in the sport management. The protection of investments, athletes, workers and spectators from the identified risks in all the sporting activities from the small-scale recreational activities organized within the sporting events to the large-scale organizations such as the Olympics, is under the risk management in the sports (Aydin et al., 2013).

Although the term risk management is being very much pronounced in the recent years, the risk definition, risk assessment, risk control and risk financing which are the elements of risk management, are issues as old as mankind itself. The humankind has tried to assess and identify the hazards that damage him from time immemorial times and pose a threat to the existence of his family and goods. Therefore, the practical implementation of risk management is not so new. Every culture that has survived until today has applied and has been applying the elements



of risk management in practice (Emhan, 2009; Öрге, 2010). Risk management in sports is the evaluation of the risk factors that may arise from the security auditing in any sport program (Appenzeller and Lewis, 2000). Basically, the risk management is required in order to reduce disability, death arising from the content of sports and recreation programs and services and the possible obligations that may arise later (Spengler et al., 2006).

The risk takes a place in the human mind as a concept consisting anxiety, fears that are pointing to the dangers and refers to events, the emergency of which are expected and likely to happen in future, even though not for certain. Hence the risk, besides the occurrence of an undesired event, is being described as an uncertainty of the events both with its way of formation and with its results (Willet, 1971). The quantity of the perceived risk depends on the individual because individuals identify and evaluate the potential risks according to their own perspective. The risk perception and the form of perception vary from person to person. Any situation that may be dangerous and risky for any person may not be risky for another person. Thus, the risk perception is the subjective evaluations of people about the importance and characteristics of the risk. In addition, according to the norms theory, besides the personal values, socio-demographic, socio-structural characteristics and religious beliefs also directly affect risk perception (Gursoy et al., 2008).

The process of risk assessment is thus: the risks are being assessed and analyzed to provide the basis for determining how should any determined risks be managed. In the process of risk assess-

ment and analysis, both the possibility of the risk occurrence and its effect is taken into account (Küçükyılmaz, 2007). The main purpose of risk assessment is to protect the health and safety of the employees. For reducing the danger in the enterprises to keep working conditions healthy, is possible through minimizing these effects. Moreover, it is to estimate the magnitude of risk in the whole process and to take decisions whether it is possible to endure against the risks, or not. This means to help to have an awareness raised concerning the occupational diseases and accidents in the enterprises. In this way, more effective measures can be provided with regard to the detected danger and the damage it can cause. Thus, the mode of operation and the methods of production chosen with the present preventive measures, should raise the level of protection in terms of the health and safety of the employees and should be applied at all levels of the administrative structure of the workplace (Öktem, 2011).

This study was conducted in order to evaluate the risks perceived by the coaches at the Handball Super League clubs in Turkey and to compare the level of the risk assessment of the coaches according to some of the demographic variables.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In the survey “general screening model” has been used, which is one of the descriptive screening method. The population of the survey is consisted of 49 coaches, working with the Turkish Handball Super League teams, and its sampling is consisted of 45 coaches selected at random with a random method and working with Turkish Handball Super League clubs.

In the survey, as a data tool, was used the risk assessment scale in sport of Gök (2006) and Çobanoğlu (2008). The risk assessment scale, the items (1,11,12,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,25,26, 28,29,30,31) available at the item pool were taken from the measurement device developed by Gök (2006), and the items (2,3,4, 5,6,7,8,9,10,13,23,24,27) available at the item pool were taken from the measurement device developed by Çobanoğlu (2008). As the result of the factor analysis performed on the data, the items (8,9,10,12,18,23,26,27) with low factor loadings or taking high load values from multiple factors have been excluded from the scale. As the result of a repeated factor analysis, it was observed that the total variance of the 23 items available on the scale, was stated to be 51,64 %. This value shows that the scale ensured the construct validity as is. The Cronbach's alpha

internal consistency coefficient on the reliability of the scale was found .921 respectively. These results are proving that the scores obtained from the scale are reliable. Data were analyzed with the help of a statistical software package. The numerical values obtained have been evaluated according to the significance level of p.05.

The answers of the coaches given to the risk assessment scale have been placed at the risk rating matrix and the risks were rated. The risk rating matrix provides the opportunity for identification, prioritization, and the management of the effects of the risks which are most critical for a program (10). Five rating scale ranges of the scale for correct interpretation of the data; very little level of risk (1.00-1.80), low risk (1.81-2.60), moderate risk (2.61-3.40), too risky (3:41 to 4:20), too much risk (4.21-5.00), respectively.



FINDINGS

Table 1: Distribution Of Coaches Related To The Demographic Variables

Variables		f	%
Gender	Male	33	73,3
	Female	12	26,7
	Total	45	100,0
Age	27-33	4	8,9
	34-40	12	26,7
	41-47	17	37,8
	48-54	5	11,1
	55 and over	7	15,6
	Total	45	100,0
Marital Status	Married	35	77,8
	Single	10	22,2
	Total	45	100,0
Education Status	High School	-	-
	University	36	80,0
	Postgraduate	9	20,0
	Total	45	100,0
Coaching Period	1-5	2	4,4
	6-10	12	26,7
	11-15	13	28,9
	16-20	10	22,2
	21 and over	8	17,8
	Total	45	100,0

When we look at the distribution of gender variable in Table 1, it is seen that 73.3 % are male and 26.7% are female coaches, when we look at the distribution of age variable, 8.9 % are between 27-33 years of age, 26.7 % are between the ages of 34-40, 37.8% aged between 41-47, 11.1 % are between the ages of 48-54, and 15.6% aged 55 and over, when we look at the distribution of marital status variable, 77,8 % are married

and 22.2% are single, when we look at the distribution of educational status variable 80,0 % are university graduate, 20.0 % are of post graduate education, that there is no any coaches having an education at a high school level, when we look at the distribution of the variable of tenure, 4.4 % served between 1 to 5 years, 26.7 % between 6 to 10 years, 28.9 % between 11 to 15 years, 22.2 % between 16 to 20 years, and 17.8 % served for 21 years and above as handball coaches.

Table 2: Results Of t Test Of The Independent Groups Conducted To Determine Whether The Risk Assessment Scale For Coaches Differs According To The Gender Variable

Gender	N	X	SS	Sd	t	p
Male	33	3,95	,44	43	2,443	,019
Female	12	3,55	,58			

As seen in Table 2, the difference between the scores of a risk assessment scale of the coaches constituting the study group and the average values of the groups according to gender variable was found to be statistically significant ($p < 0,05$). When the risk assessment scale according to the gender

variable of the coaches is being placed on the risk assessment matrix as the result of the arithmetic mean, it is seen that its degree of impact is at a very risky level and the risk averages of the male coaches ($x=3,95$) is higher than the risk averages of the female coaches ($x=3,55$).

Table 3: Results Of One-way Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA) Conducted To Determine Whether The Risk Assessment Scale For Coaches Differs According To The Age Variable

Age	N	X	SS	VK	KT	Sd	KO	F	p
27-33	4	3,72	,19	Inter-group	3,438	4	,860	4,183	,006
34-40	12	3,50	,56						
41-47	17	3,84	,39	Intra-group	8,220	40	,206	4,183	,006
48-54	5	4,09	,51						
55 and over	7	4,32	,41	Total	11,658	44			
Total	45	3,84	,51						

As seen in Table 3, the difference between the scores of the risk assessment scale of the coaches constituting the study group and the group averages according to the age variable, was found to be statistically significant ($p < 0,05$). It was determined that this difference was between 34 to 40 years and 55 years or older. When the risk assessment scale according to the age variable of the coaches is being placed on the risk assessment matrix as the result of the arithmetic mean, it is seen that

its degree of influence on the coaches is ($x=3,72$) between the ages 27-33, ($x=3,50$) between the ages 34-40, ($x=3,84$) between the ages 41-47 and ($x=4,09$) between the age range of 48-54, and its degree of influence on coaches between the age of 55 and older is risky at a very high level ($x=4,32$). The risk averages of coaches of 55 age on older, is higher than the risk averages of the coaches of other age groups.



Table 4: Results Of t Test Of The Independent Groups Conducted To Determine Whether The Risk Assessment Scale For Coaches Differs According To The Variable Of Marital Status

Marital Status	N	\bar{X}	SS	Sd	t	p
Married	35	3,83	,56			
Single	10	3,87	,27	43	-,196	,845

As seen in Table 4, the difference between the scores of the risk assessment scale of the coaches constituting the study group and the group averages according to the variable of marital status, was not found to be statistically significant ($p>0,05$). When the risk assessment scale according to the marital status variable of the coaches

is being placed on the risk assessment matrix as the result of the arithmetic mean, it is seen that its degree of influence is at a very risky level. It is seen that the risk averages of single coaches ($x=3,87$) is higher than the risk averages of the married coaches ($x=3,83$).

Table 5: Results Of One-way Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA) Conducted To Determine Whether The Risk Assessment Scale For Coaches Differs According To The Variable Of Educational Status

Educational Status	N	X	SS	VK	KT	Sd	KO	F	P
High School	-	-	-	Inter-Group	3,412	1	3,412	17,793	,000
University	36	3,98	,42	Intra-Group	8,246	43	,192		
Post Graduate	9	3,29	,47	Total	11,658	44			
Total	45	3,84	,51						

As seen in Table 5, the difference between the scores of a risk assessment scale of the coaches constituting the study group and the average values of the groups according to variable of educational status was found to be statistically significant ($p<0,05$). When the risk assessment scale according to the variable of educational status of the coaches is being placed on the risk assessment matrix as the result of the arithmetic

mean, it is seen that the degree of influence of the coaches having a university degree is at a very risky level ($x=3,98$), the degree of influence on the coaches having a postgraduate degree is at medium risky level ($x=3,29$), and the risk average of the coaches having a university degree is higher than the risk averages of the coaches having a postgraduate degree.

Table 6: Results of One-way Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA) Conducted To Determine Whether The Risk Assessment Scale For Coaches Differs According To The Variable Of Coaching Period

Coaching period	N	X	SS	VK	KT	Sd	KO	F	p
1-5	2	3,82	,36	Inter group	2,030	4	,508	2,109	,98
6-10	12	3,95	,28						
11-15	13	3,57	,58	Intra-group	9,628	40	,241		
16-20	10	3,80	,64						
21 and over	8	4,17	,31	Total	11,658	44			
Total	45	3,84	,51						

As seen in Table 6, the difference between the scores of a risk assessment scale of the coaches constituting the study group and the average values of the groups according to variable of coaching tenure was not found to be statistically significant ($p > 0,05$). When the risk assessment scale according to the variable of coaching tenure is being placed on the risk assessment matrix as the result of the arithmetic mean, it is seen that its degree of influence is ($x=3,82$) for 1 to 5 year, ($x=3,95$) for 6 to 10 years, ($x=3,57$) for 11 to 15 years, ($\bar{x}=3,80$) for 16 to 20 years, and ($x=4,17$) for 21 years and over is at a very risky level, and the risk averages of the coaches with a tenure of 21 years and over is ($x=4,17$) is higher than the risk averages of the coaches with other coaching tenures.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

When we look at Table 2, the scores of a risk assessment scale of the coaches constituting the study group and the average values of the

groups was found to be statistically significant according to gender variable ($p < 0,05$). The level of the average values of risk assessment of the male coaches ($x=3,95$) was found higher than the average values of risk assessment of the female coaches ($x=3,55$). Men and women are exposed to different risks during their lives, they perceive risks in different ways and find themselves in the risks in different ways. (Slovic,1992; Gustafson, 1997). In a study conducted by Byrnes and Miller (1999), it was observed that men were more willing than women to take risks. It is being considered that the reason of finding the scores of the risk assessment scale significant according to the gender variable, and finding the average of risk assessment level of the male coaches higher than that of the female coaches, is that the female coaches in the handball super league have an assisting coach status and that the female coaches take lesser risks compared to the male coaches and that their perceptions is effective to have this result.



In Table 3, the scores of the risk assessment scale of the coaches were found to be statistically significant according to the age variable ($p < 0.05$). It was found this difference to be between the ages of 34 to 40 and age of 55 and older coaches. It is seen that the average risk ($x=4,32$) of the coaches of age 55 and above is higher than the average risk of the other age groups. It can be said that our study is similar to the opinion of Keles (2011) that there was a statistically significant difference for the types of the perceived risks between the age groups; the opinion of Demirhan et al. (2004) that students, teachers and lecturers perceived lower risks, and the opinion of Alexander et al. (1990) that ‘the young people cannot perceive the risks as much as adults’. As the result of our study, it is being considered that having significant scores in the risk assessment scale according to the variable of gender, is due to the young coaches who are not ready to assume risks, that there is an increase in the level of perceiving the risk factors as the coaches become older, that, compared to the young coaches, the 55 years old and older coaches perceive the anxiety, stress and risk brought about due to the competition environment of handball in a higher levels according to their experiences.

The scores of the risk assessment scale of the coaches constituting the study group were not found significant according to the variable of marital status ($p > 0,05$). It is seen that the risk averages of the single coaches ($x=3,87$) were found higher compared to the married coaches ($x=3,83$) (Table 4). Yao and Hanna (2005) found out that single men compared to married men, single women compared to married women had more risk tolerance. Single people have fewer

responsibilities, so they can take more risks (Saraç and Kahyaoğlu, 2011). Having insignificant score of risk assessment scale of the coaches according to the variable of marital status, is being considered that the risk factors that may threaten the teams of the married and the single coaches and their levels of assessing the potential problems at their clubs, are similar.

The scores of the risk assessment scale of the coaches constituting the study group, were found to be significant according to the variable of educational status ($p < 0,05$). It is seen that the risk averages ($x=3,98$) of the coaches whose education level is a university degree, is higher than the risk averages ($x=3,29$) of the coaches whose educational level is a postgraduate degree (Table 5). According to Ceyhan (2008), the education affects how a person thinks and takes decision about any matter. Relying on the opinions of Soysal et al. (2011) that ‘those with higher educational degrees have abilities such as to find solutions for the problems in a faster way compared to those with lesser educational degrees’; as the result of the research conducted by Dorak and Vurgun (2012), Kalkavan and Bektas (2012), Tatar et al. (2012), Yalcin et al.(2012) have identified a significant difference between those with low educational level and those with a higher educational level. According to the results of our study, it can be said that the coaches with license level of education were more anxious when assessing the risks, perceived the risks in a higher level compared to the coaches with postgraduate level of education and the variable of educational level was effective in the assessment of risks.

The scores of the risk assessment scale of the coaches constituting the study group, were found to be insignificant according to the variable of coaching tenure ($p>0,05$). It is seen that the risk averages ($x=4,17$) of the coaches with a tenure of 21 years and over, is higher than the risk averages of the other coaching tenure (Table 6). However, it was determined that these differences were not significant. Grable (2000), Grable and Lytton (1999), Küçüksille (2004) have found different results from our findings. Saraç and Kahyaoğlu (2011) have found the risk averages of 41-55 age group higher than that of the 26-40 age group. Gök (2006) identified that there was no any significant difference in the risk assessment levels of the coaches according to the tenure. This situation is in line with the results of our survey. It is thought that the experienced coaches do not hesitate to take risks compared to the coaches with lesser tenure of coaching and while they evaluate the risk factors that may occur due to their experience, they were more worried than the coaches with lesser tenure of coaching.

Thus, when we take into consideration the results of the arithmetic mean of the risk assessment scale, we reach the conclusion that the male coaches perceive the risk at a higher level than the male coaches; that the 55 years and over old coaches perceive the risk at a higher level than the coaches of 27-33, 34-40, 41-47, 48-54 years of age; the coaches having a college education perceive the risk at a higher level than the coaches having a postgraduate education; the coaches having a tenure of 21 years and above perceive the risk at a higher level than the coaches having a tenure of 1-5, 6-10, 11-15, 16-20 years; and the single

coaches perceive the risk at a higher level than the married coaches.

RESOURCES

ALEXANDER, D.S., YOUNG, Y.J., ENSMIN-GER, M., JOHNSON, K.E., SMITTH, B.J., DOLAN, L.J., (1990). ‘‘A measure of risk taking for young adolescents: reliability and validity assessments’’. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*.19 (6), 559-569

APPENZELLER, H., LEWIS, G., (2000). ‘‘Successful Sport Management’’. North Carolina: Carolina Academic Press, 313-314-317

AYDIN, G., YANARDAG, M., ERKAN, M., YALIZ, D., (2013). ‘Risk Management in Sport’.(Editor: Yılmaz, İ.), Anadolu University Publication Issue 2884. The Open Education Faculty Publication No. 1841. Edition 1. Anadolu University. Eskişehir

BYRNES, J.P., MILLER, D.C.,(1999). ‘‘Gender Differences in Risk Taking: A Meta Analysis’’. *Psychological Bulletin*, May 1999 , Vol. 125, Issue 3. p.367

CEYHAN, G., (2008). ‘‘An Application on the Effects of Lifestyle on the Financial Risk Tolerance’’. Hacettepe University. Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara

COBANOGLU, H.O.,(2008). ‘‘Risk Management in Sport : A Study on the Risk Assessment of Athletes in the Turkcell Super League’’. Anadolu University Institute of Health Sciences. Department of Physical Education and Sports. Master Thesis, Eskişehir



- G., GÜVEN, B., AÇIKADA, A., (2004).** "Perception of Risks Associated with Sports Disciplines". Journal of Sports Sciences. Hacettepe 1. Of Sports I Sciences 15 (2),65-75
- DORAK, F., VURGUN, N., (2012).** "Empathy and Team Unity Relation in terms of TeamSports". http://www.sporbilim.com/dosyalar/8.SPK_Poster_SunumlarA.pdf/17.05.2012
- EMHAN, A., (2009).** "Process of Risk Management and Techniques Used in Risk Managing". Ataturk University Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 23 (3), 209-220
- GÖK, Y., (2006).** "Evaluation of the Sport Clubs in the Turkish First League Volleyball in terms of Risk Management". Gazi University. Institute of Health Sciences. Department of Physical Education and Sports. Master's Thesis. Ankara
- GRABLE J. E., (2000).** "Financial Risk Tolerance and Additional Factors That Affect The Risk Taking in Everyday Money Matters". Journal of Business and Psychology, 14 (4) 25-63
- GRABLE, J.E., LYTTON, R.H., (1999).** "Assessing Financial Risk Tolerance: Do Demographic, Socioeconomic and Attitudinal Factors Work?". Family Relations and Human Development / Family Economics and Resource Management Biennial, 1-9
- GUSTAFSON , E.J. (1997).** Kon, Risk Och Olyckor: The Most Forskningsoversikt. Research Report, University of Karlstad. 97 (9)
- GÜRSOYŞ.T., ÇİÇEKLIOĞLU, M., BÖREKÇİ, N., TÜRKSOYER, M., ÖCEK, Z., (2008).** "Level of Environmental Risk Perception of Employees of Izmir Karşıyaka Municipality". C. University, Journal of Medicine, 30 (1), 20-27
- KALKAVAN, A., BEKTAS., F. (2012).** "Opinions and Expectations of the Executives and Fans of the Teams Competing in the Second Football League Regarding the Club". http://www.sporbilim.com/dosyalar/8.SPK_Poster_SunumlarA.pdf/17.05.2012
- KELES, C., (2011).** "Consumers' Relation of the Whisper Communications and Purchasing Desire with the Risk Types Perceived Related to the Genetically Modified Food Products". Çukurova University. Institute of Social Sciences. Department of Business Administration. Ph.D. Thesis, Adana
- KÜÇÜKSİLLE, E., (2004).** "A Behavioral Approach to Creating Optimal Portfolio". Süleyman Demirel University. Institute of Social Sciences, Master Thesis, Isparta
- KÜÇÜKYILMAZ, A. (2007).** "Enterprise Risk Management in the Airports: Suggestion of Model for Enterprise Risk Management for the Enterprise of the Ataturk Airport Terminals". Anadolu University. PhD Thesis. Eskişehir
- ÖKTEM, Ç., (2011).** "Survey on Archery Sport in Turkey in terms of Risk Management". Akdeniz University, Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Sport Management. Master's Thesis. Antalya

- ÖRGE, O., (2010).** “Risk Management in Hospitals and Risk Management Applications”. 2nd International Congress for Performance and Quality in Health. Ankara
- SARAC, M., KAHYAOGU, M. B., (2011).** “the Demographic and Socio - economic Factors Affecting the Financial Risks Perception of the Individual Investors”. BRSA Banking and Financial Markets, Volume: 5, Issue: 2. p.141
- SLOVIC, (1992).** “Perception of Risk: Reflections on the Psychometric Paradigm, In: Social Theories of Risk”. Krimsky, S., Golding, D. (eds .), Westport, CT, .pp.117 -152. Praeger Publishers
- SOYSAL, A., PAKSOY, H. M., ÖZÇALICI, M., (2011).** “Survey on Leadership Talent During the Times of Crisis in Terms of Some Demographic Variables”. Journal of Entrepreneurship and Development. (6:1)
- SPENGLER, J. O., CONNAUGHTON, D. P., PITTMAN. A.T. (2006).** “Risk Management in Sport and Recreation”. Human Kinetics, United States, 2-9, 12-20
- TATAR, G., PEHLIVAN, Z., ÇAMLIGÜNEY, F., (2012).** , “Investigation of Factors Affecting the Sport Doing Status of Sedentary and Working Women between the ages of 20-40”. http://www.sporbilim.com/dosyalar/8.SPK_Poster_Sunumlar-A.pdf/ 17.05.2012
- WILLET, A.M., (1971).** “The Economic Theory of Risk and Insurance”. Huebner Foundation Studies, New York
- YALCIN, H.B, OZSOY, S, YÜKTAŞIR, B., UÇAN, Y., (2012).** “Profile of Sports Consumers and the Preferences of SportsMedia”.http://www.sporbilim.com/dosyalar/8.SPK_Poster_Sunum_A.pdf/ 17.05.2012
- YAO, R , HANNA, S. D., (2005).** “The Effect of Gender and Marital Status on Financial Risk Tolerance”. Personal Finance Journal, 4, (1), 66 85



TÜRKİYE HENTBOL SÜPER LİGİ ANTRENÖRLERİNİN RISK DEĞERLENDİRME DÜZEYLERİNİN BAZI DEMOGRAFİK DEĞİŞKENLERLE KARŞILAŞTIRILMASI

Özet: Risk, insan zihninde tehlikeye işaret eden endişe, korku içeren bir kavram olarak yer edinmekte ve ileride ortaya çıkması beklenen, kesinlik taşımaya bile gerçekleşmesi muhtemel olayları belirtmektedir. Dolayısıyla risk, arzulanan bir olayın meydana gelebilmesinin yanı sıra hem oluşma biçimi hem de sonuçları ile olaylara ait belirsizlik olarak açıklanmaktadır (Willet, 1971). Risk değerlendirme süreci ise belirlenen risklerin nasıl yönetilmeleri gerektiğinin belirlenmesi için temel oluşturmak üzere riskler değerlendirilir ve analiz edilir. Değerlendirme ve analiz sürecinde riskin hem olma ihtimali hem de etkisi dikkate alınmaktadır (Küçükylmaz, 2007). Bu araştırma Türkiye Hentbol Süper Ligi kulüplerindeki antrenörlerin risk değerlendirme düzeylerinin bazı demografik değişkenlerle karşılaştırılması amacıyla yapılmıştır. Araştırmada betimsel tarama yöntemlerinden biri olan “genel tarama modeli” kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın evrenini Türkiye Hentbol Süper Ligi takımlarında görev yapan 49 antrenör oluştururken, örneklemini ise; rastgele ve tesadüfi yöntemle seçilmiş farklı kulüplerde antrenörlük yapan 45 antrenör oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada veri aracı olarak Gök (2006) ve Çobanoğlu (2008)’nin sporda risk değerlendirme ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Risk değerlendirme ölçeği madde havuzunda yer alan (1,11,12,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,25,26,28,29,30,31) maddeler Gök (2006)’ün geliştirdiği ölçme aracından, madde havuzunda yer alan (2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,13,23,24,27) maddeler ise Çobanoğlu (2008)’nin geliştirdiği ölçme aracından alınmıştır. Elde edilen veriler üzerinde yapılan faktör analizi sonucunda düşük faktör yükü olan ya da birden fazla faktörden yüksek yük değeri alan (8,9,10,12,18,23,26,27) maddeler ölçekten çıkarılmıştır. Tekrarlanan faktör analizi sonucunda ölçekte yer alan 23 maddenin toplam varyansın % 51,64’ünü açıkladığı görülmüştür. Bu değer ölçeğin bu haliyle yapı geçerliliğini sağladığını göstermektedir. Ölçeğin güvenilirliğine ilişkin Cronbach alpha iç tutarlılık katsayısı .921 olarak bulunmuştur. Bu sonuçlar ölçekten elde edilen puanların güvenilir olduğunu kanıtlamaktadır. Veriler istatistik paket programı yardımıyla analiz edilmiştir. Elde edilen sayısal değerler p.05 anlamlılık düzeyine göre değerlendirilmiştir. Antrenörlerin risk değerlendirme ölçeğine verdikleri cevaplar risk derecelendirme matrisine yerleştirilerek riskler derecelendirilmiştir. Risk derecelendirme matrisi; bir program için en kritik olan risklerin tanımlanması, öncelikle dirilmesi ve etkilerinin yönetilmesine imkân sağlar (10). Verilerin sağlıklı yorumlanabilmesi için ölçeğin beşli derecelendirme aralıkları; çok az düzeyde riskli (1.00-1.80), az riskli (1.81-2.60), orta düzeyde riskli (2.61-3.40), çok riskli (3.41-4.20), çok fazla riskli (4.21-5.00) şeklinde belirlenmiştir. Araştırmaya katılan antrenörlerin risk değerlendirme düzeyleri cinsiyet değişkenine göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark bulunmuştur ($p<0,05$). Risk değerlendirme ölçeği puanları cinsiyet değişkenine göre anlamlı bulunması ile erkek antrenörlerin risk değerlendirme düzeyleri ortalamaları kadın antrenörlere göre daha yüksek çıkmasının nedeninin hentbol süper ligindeki kadın antrenörlerin yardımcı antrenör statüsünde bulunmasından kadın antrenörlerin erkek antrenörlerde göre daha az risk almaları bu sonucun çıkmasında etkili olduğu düşünülmektedir. Araştırmaya katılan antrenörlerin risk değerlendirme düzeyleri yaş değişkenine göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark bulunmuştur ($p<0,05$). Çalışmamız sonucunda genç antrenörlerin riskleri üstlenmeye hazır olmadıkları, antrenörlerin yaşı ilerledikçe risk faktörlerini algılama düzeylerinde de artış olduğu, 55 yaş ve üstü antrenörlerin tecrübelerinden dolayı hentbolun yarışma ortamının getirdiği yüksek düzeydeki kaygı, stres ve riski genç antrenörlere göre daha yüksek düzeyde algılamaları



larından dolayı risk değerlendirme ölçeği puanlarının yaş değişkenine göre anlamlı çıkmasına neden olduğu düşünülmektedir. Araştırmaya katılan antrenörlerin risk değerlendirme düzeyleri eğitim durumu değişkenine göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark bulunmuştur ($p<0,05$). Çalışmamız sonuçlarına göre lisans düzeyinde eğitime sahip olan antrenörlerin, lisansüstü düzeyinde eğitime sahip olan antrenörlere göre riskleri değerlendirirken daha kaygılı oldukları, riskleri daha yüksek düzeyde algıladıkları ve eğitim seviyesi değişkeninin riskleri değerlendirmede etkili olduğu söylenebilir. Araştırmaya katılan antrenörlerin risk değerlendirme düzeyleri medeni durum ve antrenörlük süresi değişkenlerine göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark bulunmamıştır ($p>0,05$).

Anahtar Kelimeler: Risk, Risk Değerlendirme, Hentbol