

Evaluation of risk identification level of Turkish handball super league coaches in the light of demographic variables

Cemal Gündoğdu

School of Physical Education and Sports, Firat University, Turkey

ABSTRACT

This study is realized with the aim to determine opinions of coaches in the clubs of Turkish Handball Super League about the risk they perceive by means of certain demographic variables. "General screening model" as one of the descriptive screening models is used in the study. Study population consists of 49 coaches actively working in the Turkish Handball Super League teams, and 45 coaches working as a coach in different clubs and selected randomly constitute sample of the study. Gök's risk determination survey in sports (2006) is utilized in the study as the data tool. Validation and reliability work of the survey used in the study is performed, and Cronbach Alpha value of the survey used is determined as 0.72. Data is analyzed by means of the statistical package program. Arithmetic mean (\bar{X}), Kruskal Wallis, Mann Whitney U tests are utilized in the analysis of data. Significance level is considered as .05 in the survey applied with the purpose to determine if there is any difference between the demographic variables. The difference between the risk determination levels of coaches participating in the research according to the sex variable is found statistically meaningful ($p < 0.05$). On the other hand the differences according to the variables of age, marital status, educational background, coaching duration are not found statistically meaningful ($p > 0.05$). At the end of the research, it is concluded that male coaches, coaches with university education, coaches at and over the age of 55, married coaches and coaches with coaching time of 21 years and over perceive risks at a higher level respectively in comparison to the female coaches, coaches with postgraduate education, coaches between ages 27-33, 34-40, 41-47 and 48-54, unmarried coaches and coaches with coaching time between 1-5, 6-10, 11-15 and 16-20 years.

Keywords: Risk, Risk identification, Handball, Coach

INTRODUCTION

Sports that form an inseparable whole together with the human life play a significant role in the health and success of human in his/her lifetime and in his/her high spirits [1].

Handball game is a sports branch which is applied at irregular times and intervals and based on a primary aerobic endurance, and which reflects anaerobic weighted game characteristics and requires versatile qualifications. Success is determined by the physical structure, condition, technique, strategy and ability of comprehending the game. Game is played in two halves, and it necessitates a distinct physical structure and conditional features [2, 3].

Risk is the possibility of not obtaining projected result or incurring losses or damages within a certain period of time. It is also defined as possibility of generation of an undesirable event or losses, damages, and in case it is generated severity of the adverse effect it shall cause. Risk signalizes potential problems, threats and hazards that may be encountered in the future [4].

Sports clubs also face risks in the sport activities. Problems encountered may destroy reputation of sport clubs and even have certain legal consequences. Thus, sports clubs or organizations have to avoid probable damages in order to ensure continuity, preserve their existence and to maintain their reputation. Primary target is to be successful in the sportive activities. Risks may have adverse effect on the success. It is very important to determine risks that may influence the targets in a negative way and to minimize them in order to achieve the targets.

Determining the risks that may be encountered and preventing them by taking the necessary precautions directly proportional with success [5]. We must not forget that work for prediction and reduction of risks shall enable avoidance of problems before they are observed, and also enable us to take significant opportunities [6].

Risk determination enables risks and sources to be detected before they are turned into a problem. Risks may not be evaluated or administered without determining or defining them. Risk determination is to define the risks that may influence the operating activities and to document their characteristic features. Purpose of risk determination process is to define the factors that may affect aims of the team and how these factors may originate. It is very important to define the most important risks [6, 7].

Potential risks are defined by means of the following actions [8, 9].

- Evaluation of program, administration
- Reviewing the documentation
- Evaluation of previous programs and data
- Brain storming
- Risk lists, documents
- Work groups
- Surveys
- Negotiations

This research is highly important in terms of determining risk factors of handball coaches and taking precautions beforehand, and completing their process concerning their activities successfully and without any problems. Purpose of this research is to determine the opinions of coaches in the Turkish Handball Super League clubs about the risks they perceive by means of various demographic variables.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

“General screening model” as one of the descriptive screening models is used in the study. Study population consists of 49 coaches actively working in the Turkish Handball Super League teams, and 45 coaches working as a coach in different clubs and selected randomly constitute sample of the study. Gök’s risk determination survey in sports (2006) is utilized in the study as the data tool. Validation and reliability work of the survey used in the study is performed, and Cronbach Alpha value of the survey used is determined as 0.72. Data is analyzed by means of the statistical package program. Arithmetic mean (\bar{x}), Kruskal Wallis, Mann Whitney U tests are utilized in the analysis of data. Significance level is considered as .05 in the survey applied with the purpose to determine if there is any difference between the demographic variables.

RESULTS

When we examine gender variable in Table 1, we see that 73.3% is male and 26.7% is female; when age variable is considered, 8.9% is between ages 27 and 33, 26.7% is between ages 34 and 40, 37.8% is between ages 41 and 47, 11.1% is between ages 48 and 54 and 15.6% is at 55 age and above; when marital status is examined, 77.8% is married and 22.2% is bachelor; when educational background is considered, 80.0% has graduated from university and 20.0% has a postgraduate education, and there is no coach having only high school education; when coaching period variable is examined it is seen that 4.4% has worked as handball coach for 1 and 5 years, 26.7% for 6 and 10 years, 28.9% for 11 and 15 years, 22.2% for 16 and 20 years, 17.8% for 21 years and above.

As it is seen in Table 2, as a result of the Mann Whitney U test performed to determine whether or not risk determination levels of coaches constituting the research group have differed according to the gender variable, the difference between is found meaningful statistically ($p < 0.05$). When sequence average of Mann Whitney U test is considered (Sequence average = 27.65; 10.21), it is seen that risk averages of male coaches are higher than the risk averages of female coaches.

Table 1: Distribution of coaches according to demographic variables

Variables		f	%
Gender	Male	33	73.3
	Female	12	26.7
	Total	45	100
Age	27-33	4	8.9
	34-40	12	26.7
	41-47	17	37.8
	48-54	5	11.1
	55 and above	7	15.6
	Total	45	100
Marital Status	Married	35	77.8
	Bachelor	10	22.2
	Total	45	100
Educational Background	High School	-	-
	University	36	80.0
	Post graduate	9	20.0
	Total	45	100
Coaching Period	1-5	2	4.4
	6-10	12	26.7
	11-15	13	28.9
	16-20	10	22.2
	21 and above	8	17.8
	Total	45	100

Table 2: Results of Mann Whitney U Test Performed to Determine Whether or Not Risk Determination Levels of Coaches Differentiated According to the Gender Variable

Gender	N	Sequence Average	Sequence Total	U	p
Male	33	27.65	912.50	44.500	.000
Female	12	10.21	122.50		

Table 3: Results of Kruskal Wallis Test Performed to Determine Whether or Not Risk Determination Levels of Coaches Differentiated According to the Age Variable

Age	N	Sequence Average	Sd	X ²	P
27-33	4	24.75	4	6.941	0.139
34-40	12	15.63			
41-47	17	24.35			
48-54	5	23.10			
55 and above	7	31.29			

As it is seen in Table 3, as a result of the Kruskal Wallis test performed to determine whether or not risk determination levels of coaches constituting the research group have differed according to the age variable, the difference between is not found statistically meaningful ($p > 0.05$). When sequence average of Kruskal Wallis test (Sequence Average = 24.75; 15.65; 24.35; 23.10; 31.29) is considered; risk averages of coaches at age 55 and above are higher than the risk averages of other age groups. However, it is established that this difference is not significant.

Table 4: Results of Mann- Whitney U, test performed to determine whether or not risk determination levels of coaches differentiated according to the marital status variable

Marital Stat	N	Sequence Average	Sequence Total	U	P
Married	35	23.31	816.00	164.000	0.762
Bachelor	10	21.90	219.00		

As it is seen in Table 4, as a result of the Mann Whitney U test performed to determine whether or not risk determination levels of coaches constituting the research group have differed according to the marital status variable, the difference between is not found statistically meaningful ($p > 0.05$). When sequence average of Mann Whitney U test is considered (Sequence average = 23.31; 21.90), it is seen that risk averages of married coaches are higher than the risk averages of bachelor coaches. However, it is established that this difference is not significant.

Table 5: Results of Kruskal Wallis Test Performed to Determine Whether or Not Risk Determination Levels of Coaches Differentiated According to the Variable of Educational Background

Educational Background	N	Sequence Average	Sd	X ²	P
University	39	23.28	1	0.082	0.775
Post Graduate	9	21.89			

As it is seen in Table 5, as a result of the Kruskal Wallis test performed to determine whether or not risk determination levels of coaches constituting the research group have differed according to the variable of educational background, the difference between is not found statistically meaningful ($p>0.05$). When sequence average of Kruskal Wallis test (Sequence Average = 23.28; 21.89) is considered; risk averages of coaches having an education in the university degree are higher than the risk averages of coaches having a post graduate education.

Table 6: Results of Kruskal Wallis Test Performed to Determine Whether or Not Risk Determination Levels of Coaches Differentiated According to the Variable of Coaching Period

Coaching Period	N	Sequence Average	Sd	X ²	p
1-5	2	26.50			
6-10	12	23.38			
11-15	13	15.54	4	7.118	0.130
16-20	10	26.25			
21 and above	8	29.63			

As it is seen in Table 6, as a result of the Kruskal Wallis test performed to determine whether or not risk determination levels of coaches constituting the research group have differed according to the variable of coaching period, the difference between is not found statistically meaningful ($p>0.05$). When sequence average of Kruskal Wallis test (Sequence Average = 26.50; 23.38; 15.54; 26.25; 29.63) is considered; it is seen that risk determination level risk averages of coaches whose coaching period is 21 years and above are higher than the risk averages of coaches whose coaching periods are between 1-5, 6-10, 11-15 and 16-20 years. However it is established that this difference is not significant.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

When we investigate Table 1, it is seen that 73.3% of coaches is male and 26.7% is female; 77.8% is married, and 22.2% is bachelor; 80.0% has university education and 28.9% has worked as handball coach for 11-15 years (Table 1). Öktem (2011) has determined that 42.9% of coaches dealing with archery is female and 57.1% is male, average age is 40, and 50% is married and 50% is bachelor, 50% is high school graduates and 42.9% has university degree and 7.1% is post graduates. These findings show parallelism with our study. It is seen that education level of handball coaches is higher than the coaches dealing with archery sports.

When Table 2 is examined, risk determination levels of coaches are found meaningful according to the gender variable ($p<0.05$). When sequence order of Mann Whitney U test is taken into consideration (Sequence Average = 27.65; 10.21), it is seen that risk averages of male coaches is higher than the risk averages of females (Table 2). Slovic (1992), Gustafson (1997) argue that women and men perceive risks differently; Özer and Gülpınar (2005) suggest that women perceive less risk than men [10, 11, and 12]. On the other hand Harranta and Vaillant (2008) claim that generally women avoid risks in many areas in comparison to men [13]. Dal (2009) determined in his research he performed with university students that risk levels perceived by men and women are significantly different [14]. These findings show parallelism with our study. It is considered that male coaches being more active than female coaches in the edge administration in the handball super league teams, male coaches being in the forefront in the activities related with sportsmen and club causes their risk determination level to be higher and results in a significant difference with the levels of female coaches.

When we examine Table 3; risk determination levels of coaches is not found meaningful according to the age variable ($p>0.05$). If sequence average of Kurskal Wallis test (Sequence Average = 24.75; 15.63; 24.35; 23.10; 31.29) is considered, Barak (2008) determined that risk averages of coaches at age 55 and over is higher than the other age groups; willingness of persons to take risks may change in time [15]. Gök (2006) has determined that risk determination levels of volleyball coaches did not differ significantly according to the age variable (Gök, 2006). These findings show parallelism with our study. It is considered that coaches at age 55 and over may forecast risks better and perceive them at a higher level when determining risks in comparison to the younger coaches since they have serviced handball for long years, and also that young coaches behave more timid when determining the risks.

When Table 4 is examined, risk determination levels of coaches is not found significant according to their marital status ($p>0.05$). When sequence average of Mann Whitney U test (Sequence Average = 23.31; 21.90) is considered; it is seen that risk averages of married coaches are higher than the risk averages of bachelor coaches. However, it is specified that this difference in not significant (Table 4). Liebarman and Stashevsk (2002), Karatay (2009) have concluded that married coaches perceive risk higher than the bachelors, and married ones can undertake more risks than the bachelors [16, 17]. These findings show parallelism with our study. It is considered that variable of marital status has no effect on risk determination.

Risk determination levels of coaches constituting the research group are not found significant according to their educational background ($p>0.05$). When sequence average of Kruskal Wallis test (Sequence Average = 23.28; 21.89) is taken into consideration; it is seen that risk averages of coaches having an university degree are higher than the coaches who have post graduate education (Table 5). Saraç and Kahyaoğlu (2011) have specified in their studies that risk levels of persons who have high school education are higher than people having university and post graduate educations, and that risk levels of university graduates are lower than post graduates [18]. Bellante and Gren (2004), Hanna and Lindamood (2005), Gutter and Fontes (2006), Coleman (2003), Brown and Taylor (2007) did not determined any relation between the educational background and risk determination. It is considered that there is nobody who received high school education among the handball coaches, thus risks to be determined by handball coaches shall be similar, since they have university degree or post graduate education [19, 20, 21, 22 and 23].

When we examine Table 6, risk determination of caches is not found meaningful according to the variable of coaching period ($p>0.05$). When sequence average of Kruskal Wallis test (Sequence Average = 26.50; 23.38; 15.54; 26.25; 29.63) is taken into consideration, it is seen that risk determination level risk averages of coaches whose coaching period is 21 years and above, are higher than the risk averages of coaches whose coaching periods are between 1-5, 6-10, 11-15 and 16-20 years. However it is established that this difference is not significant (Table 6). Gök (2006) has specified that risk determination levels of volleyball coaches did not differentiate significantly according to the variable of their coaching period (Gök, 2006). This finding shows parallelism with our study. It is considered that coaches whose coaching period is 21 years and above can observe risks more efficiently and perceive them more accurately in comparison to younger coaches because of their experience.

In consequence of the research, it is concluded that male coaches, coaches having university degree, coaches at the age of 55 and above, married coaches and coaches whose coaching period is 21 years and above perceive risks at a higher level respectively in comparison to female coaches, coaches who received post graduate education, coaches between ages 27-33, 34-40, 41-47, 48-54, bachelor coaches, and coaches whose coaching period is between 1-5, 6-10, 11-15 and 16-20 years.

REFERENCES

- [1] Yalçinkaya M, Saracaloğlu A, Varol R, *Sport Sciences Journal, Ankara*. **1993**; C: 4, p13.
- [2] Sevim Y, *Handball Technique-Strategy. Ankara: Gazi Bookstore, 1997.*
- [3] Taşkıran Y, *Performance in Handball. Ankara: Bağırgan Publishing House, 1997.*
- [4].Çobanoğlu HO, Post Graduate Thesis, Eskişehir: Anadolu University. *Institute of Medical Sciences. Department of Physical Training and Sports; 2008.*
- [5].Öktem Ç, Post Graduate Thesis, Antalya: Akdeniz University, *Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Sports Management; 2011*, p. 2.
- [6] Gök Y, Post Graduate Thesis, Ankara: Gazi University. *Institute of Medical Sciences. Department of Physical Training and Sports; 2006*, p.2, 3.
- [7] Küçük AY, Post Graduate Thesis, *Eskişehir: Anadolu University. Institute of Social Sciences; 2003.*
- [8] Acuner Ş.A, Stages of an Efficient Risk Management Process. *Active Journal*, **2006**, 47:1-6.
- [9] Fıkrıkoca M, *Integrated Risk Management. Ankara: Pozitif Printing Company; 2003.*
- [10] Slovic P, *Social Theories of Risk, Westport, 1992*. CT. pp.117-152. Praeger Publishers.
- [11] Gustafson EJ, *Research Report, University of Karlstad, 1997*; 97(9).
- [12] Özer L, Gülpınar S, *Commerce and Tourism Faculty of Education Journal, 2005*; Issue: 1
- [13] Harranta V, Vaillant NG, *Evolution and Human Behavior. 2008*; 29, 396–401.
- [14] Dal V, Post Graduate Thesis, Isparta. Süleyman Demirel University. *Institute of Social Sciences, Department of Business Administration; 2009.*
- [15] Barak O, *Behavioral Finance: Theory and Application. Ankara: Gazi Bookstore; 2008.*
- [16] Lieberman Y, Stashevsky S, *An International Journal, 2002*; 5(4):291-300.s.295-298.
- [17] Karatay Ö, *Institute of Social Sciences. Department of Labor Economics and Industrial Relations, 2009.*
- [18] Saraç M, Kahyaoğlu MB, *BDDK Banking and Financial Markets, 2011*; Vol. 5, Issue 2, pp.141.
- [19] Bellante D, Gren CA, *Review of Financial Economics, 2004*; Vol. 13, pp. 269–281.
- [20] Hanna SD, Lindamood S, *Presented at the Academy of Financial Services Meeting, October, 2005*; pp.1-28.
- [21] Gutter MS, Fontes A, *Financial Counseling and Planning, 2006*; Vol. 17, Issue 2, pp. 64-78.
- [22] Coleman S, *Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal. 2003*; Vol. 7, Issue 2, pp. 99-115.
- [23] Brown S, Taylor K, *Department of Economics, University of Sheffield. 2007*; January, pp.1-27.