BASKETBOL SPORCULARIN RISK DEĞERLENDİRME
DÜZEYLERİNİN İNCELENMESİ ¹

ANALYZING RISK ASSESSMENT LEVEL OF BASKETBALL PLAYERS

Özgür KARATAŞ¹, A. Serdar YÜCEL², Emine Öztürk KARATAŞ³¹ İnönü University, School of Physical Education and Sports, Malatya / Turkey² Fırat University, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Elazığ / Turkey³ İnönü University, Institute of Health Sciences, Malatya / Turkey

Öz: Bu araştırmanın amacı Türkiye Basketbol Ligi kulüplerindeki sporcuların risk değerlendirme düzeylerini ortaya koymak ve sporda risk yönetiminin önemini vurgulamaktır. Araştırmada “genel tarama modeli” kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın evrenini, Türkiye Basketbol ligi takımlarında aktif olarak oynayan sporcular oluştururken, örneklemi ise; rastgele ve tesadüfi yöntemle seçilmiş farklı kulüplerde oynayan 229 sporcu oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada veri aracı olarak Gök (2006) ve Çobanoğlu (2008)’nin sporda risk değerlendirme ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Ölçeğin güvenirliliğine ilişkin Cronbach alpha iç tutarlılık katsayısı .921 olarak bulunmuştur. Bu sonuçlar ölçekten elde edilen puanların güvenilir olduğunu kanıtlamaktadır. Veriler SPSS 22.0 istatistik paket programı yardımıyla analiz edilmiştir. Elde edilen sayısal değerler 0.05 anlamlılık düzeyine göre değerlendirilmiştir. Araştırmaya katılan basketbol sporcularının risk değerlendirme düzeyleri cinsiyet, yaş, medeni durum, eğitim durumu ve basketbol oynama yılı değişkenlerine göre istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir fark bulunmamıştır ($p>0,05$).

Anahtar Kelimeler: Risk, Risk Yönetimi, Risk Değerlendirme, Basketbol

Abstract: The aim of this research is to present risk assessment level of the players in teams of Turkish Basketball league and to emphasize the importance of risk assessment in sports. General screening model was used in this research. The active players in Turkish Basketball League are the target population of the study and randomly selected 229 players playing in different clubs constitute the research sample. Risk assessment scale in sports belonging to Gök (2006) and Çobanoğlu (2008) was used in this study as a risk assessment scale. Regarding the reliability of the scale, .921 value was found as Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient. These results prove that the points obtained from the scale are reliable. Data were analyzed with SPSS 22.0 statistical package program. Numerical values obtained were evaluated by the significance level of 0.05. There are no statistically significant differences between the risk assessment level of participant basketball players and the variables of gender, age, marital status, educational status and number of years spent playing basketball. ($p>0.05$)

Key Words: Risk, Risk Management, Risk Assessment, Basketball

Doi: 10.17363/SSTB.20162124005

(1) *Corresponding Author: Ali Serdar YÜCEL, 2Fırat University, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Elazığ / Turkey alsetu_23@hotmail.com Received: 13.09.2016 Date of Arrangement 21.10.2016 Accepted: 16.12.2016 Type of article (Research -Application) Conflict of Interest: None / “None of Ethics Committee”*

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

October / November / December - Autumn Winter Period Issue: 21 Year: 2016

GEL CODE: D80-D81-G10-G11-H50-H51-M42 ID:307 K:129

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Document No: 12880)

(TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

INTRODUCTION

Risk is a condition in which a return depends on the alternative situations of future and at least one of these situations results in negative or positive return (Usta, 2008: 253).

Risk is defined as the probability of not reaching a desired result or the probability of the occurrence of an undesired incident and a function of the violence created in case it occurs (Başak & Gülen, 2008: 57, cited from Brehmer, 1994; Vaughan, 1997; Adler v.d., 1999; Ruan, 2001).

While some people take risk in their daily life and at work, some others prefer avoiding risks. There are three main components of risk; the first one is the incident, i.e. an undesired change, the second one is the probability of the occurrence of this incident and the last one is the effect of this incident when it occurs (Kerzner, 1998).

Establishing the risks to be encountered by companies in the future and managing these risks is highly important. Moreover, determining the risk level of the company and developing the policies that will ensure recovery with minimum damage is only possible with risk management (Kara & Yereli 2012). It can be uttered that this situation becomes more of an issue in terms of the sports clubs that incorporate and conduct transactions within the

growing sports industry and develop as economic units.

Risk management is a rational and systematic method that determines, analyzes, applies, operates and establishes relation between risks related to any activity, function and operation. It is also a system directed to minimizing the losses of enterprises and maximizing the opportunities (Topçu, 2013: 19). The actual purpose of risk management is to reveal risk being an abstract concept and to make it concrete – i.e. measurable with numbers – in order to control it (Almassri, 2013: 12).

Risk management in sports is an administrative approach that requires strategy, plan and program and related to the fulfilment of loss and removal of the responsibilities after incidents. Risk management in sports is directed to the protection of sports clubs, their organizations, players, trainers and managers, income and image of sports organization (Çobanoğlu & Güven, 2013: 2). All sports branches or recreational activities include a set of risk seven if appropriate precautions are taken and in that case, players, trainers or fans may come across lots of dangers (Nohr, 2009: 3).

It Risk?? may create negative effects on the institutions where competition conditions become fiercer, the balance of risk and income cannot be established well and risk manage-

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

October / November / December - Autumn Winter Period Issue: 21 Year: 2016

GEL CODE: D80-D81-G10-G11-H50-H51-M42 ID:307 K:129

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Document No: 12880)

(TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

ment is not conducted appropriately and effectively. Therefore, it is an extremely important subject to establish, measure and manage the risks today in ensuring the continuity of the existence of sports clubs and helping them reach their targets (Günel, 2015: 2).

For an effective risk management, risks should be planned, evaluated, controlled and financed if necessary. In that case, risks can be determined and controlled for every individual facing with risks and an effective management is ensured. Not only the managers of sports clubs but also players and trainers have responsibilities concerning risk management. Players and trainers should fulfil these responsibilities in order to reach the targets set. The studies and researches conducted in this topic in the world emphasize the importance of creating a risk management department within the body of every sports club or institution (Fuller & Drawer, 2004).

The process of risk assessment is a stage in which risks are defined by determining and analyzing them together with the concepts of probability and result. This is the hardest and most time-consuming stage of risk management (Küçük, 2003). The main purpose of risk assessment is to protect the health and safety of employees, to reduce all kinds of health dangers and to minimize the effects (Öktem, 2011: 12). The aim of this research is to present risk assessment level of the players

in teams of Turkish Basketball League and to emphasize the importance of risk assessment in sports.

MATERIAL and METHOD

“General screening model” being one of the descriptive screening methods was used in this research. Players playing in basketball clubs of Turkey constitute the research population and a total of randomly selected 229 players playing in basketball clubs of Turkey are the sample group of the research. Risk assessment scale in sports belonging to Gök (2006) and Çobanoğlu (2008) was used in this study as the data tool. The items (1, 11,12,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,25,26, 28,29,30,31) in the item pool of risk assessment scale were taken from the measurement tool developed by Gök (2006) and the items (2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,13,23,24,27) in the item pool were taken from the measurement tool developed by Çobanoğlu (2008). As a result of the factor analysis conducted on data obtained, the items (8,9,10,12,18,23,26,27) with low factor load or with high load value from more than one factor were excluded from the scale. Following the recurrent factor analysis, it has been observed that 23 items in the scale explain 51.64% of total variance. This value indicates that the scale ensures the construct validity as is. Regarding the reliability of the scale, .921 value was found as Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient. These

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

October / November / December - Autumn Winter Period Issue: 21 Year: 2016

GEL CODE: D80-D81-G10-G11-H50-H51-M42 ID:307 K:129

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Document No: 12880)

(TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

results prove that the points obtained from the scale are reliable. Data were analyzed with statistical package program. Numerical val-

ues obtained were evaluated by the significance level of p0.05.

RESULTS

Table 1. Analysis on Risk Assessment Levels of Players by the Sex Variable

Sex	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	t	p
Male	123	74,81	14,54	-,741	,460
Female	106	76,46	19,08		

p>0,05

As can be seen in Table 1, the difference between the group averages of the risk assessment scale points of basketball players that constitute the research group by the sex vari-

able was not found statistically significant (p>0,05). It is observed that the risk averages of female players ($\bar{x}$ =76,46) are higher than the male players ($\bar{x}$ =74,81). However, it has been determined that this difference is not significant.

Table 2. Analysis on Risk Assessment Levels of Players by the Age Variable

Age	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	F	p
14-17	69	79,11	18,81	9,634	,052
18-21	48	71,00	17,33		
22-25	51	75,03	13,73		
26-29	29	75,62	12,17		
30 and over	32	75,62	18,44		

p>0,05

As can be seen in Table 2, the difference between the group averages of the risk assessment scale points of basketball players that constitute the research group by the age variable was not found statistically significant

(p>0,05). Concerning the arithmetic average result of risk assessment scale of players by the age variable, it is observed that the risk averages of the players aged between 14-17 is ($\bar{x}$ =79,11), this average for those aged between 18-21 is ($\bar{x}$ =71,00), 22-25 is ($\bar{x}$ =

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

October / November / December - Autumn Winter Period Issue: 21 Year: 2016

GEL CODE: D80-D81-G10-G11-H50-H51-M42 ID:307 K:129

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Document No: 12880)

(TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

=75,03), 26-29 is ($\bar{x}\bar{x}$ =75,62) and 30 and over is ($\bar{x}\bar{x}$ =75,62). Risk averages of players aged between 14 and 17 ($\bar{x}\bar{x}$ =79,11) are observed

to be higher than the risk averages of other age groups. However, it has been determined that this difference is not significant.

Table 3. Analysis on Risk Assessment Levels of Players by the Marital Status Variable

Marital Status	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	t	p
Married	30	72,70	14,09	-1,007	,315
Single	199	76,01	17,13		

$p>0,05$

As can be seen in Table 3, the difference between the group averages of the risk assessment scale points of basketball players that constitute the research group by the marital

status variable was not found statistically significant ($p>0,05$). It is observed that the risk averages of single players ($\bar{x}\bar{x}$ =76,01) are higher than the married players ($\bar{x}\bar{x}$ =72,70). However, it has been determined that this difference is not significant.

Table 4. Analysis on Risk Assessment Levels of Players by the Education Variable

Education	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	F	p
High School	96	77,29	18,10	,868	,421
University	122	74,38	15,64		
Graduate Program	11	73,81	17,12		

($p>0,05$).

As can be seen in Table 4, the difference between the group averages of the risk assessment scale points of basketball players that constitute the research group by the education variable was not found statistically significant ($p>0,05$). It is observed that the risk averages of high school graduate players ($\bar{x}\bar{x}$

=77,29) are higher than the university graduate players ($\bar{x}\bar{x}$ =74,38) and the players having graduate education ($\bar{x}\bar{x}$ =73,81). However, it has been determined that this difference is not significant.

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

October / November / December - Autumn Winter Period Issue: 21 Year: 2016

GEL CODE: D80-D81-G10-G11-H50-H51-M42 ID:307 K:129

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Document No: 12880)

(TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

Table 5. Analysis on Risk Assessment Levels of Players by the Variable of Number of Years Spent Playing Basketball

Number of Years Spent Playing Basketball	N	$\bar{x}$	Ss	F	p
1-5	35	75,00	20,73	,612	,654
6-10	97	76,50	16,78		
11-15	58	74,98	15,59		
16-20	24	71,70	17,24		
21 and more	15	79,40	9,06		

$p>0,05$

As can be seen in Table 5, the difference between the group averages of the risk assessment scale points of basketball players that constitute the research group by the variable of number of years spent playing basketball wasn't found statistically significant ($p>0,05$). It is observed that the risk averages of players playing basketball for 1-5 years are ($\bar{x}=75,00$), the averages of those playing basketball for 6-10 years are ($\bar{x}=76,50$), it is ($\bar{x}=74,98$) for 11-15 years, ($\bar{x}=71,70$) for 16-20 years and ($\bar{x}=79,40$) for 21 years and more. It has been established that the risk averages of the players playing basketball for 21 years and more ($\bar{x}=79,40$) are higher than the risk averages of other years. However, it has been determined that this difference is not significant.

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

Concerning Table 1, the difference between the group averages of the risk assessment scale points of basketball players that constitute the research group by the sex variable was not found statistically significant ($p>0,05$). It is observed that the risk averages of female players ($\bar{x}=76,46$) are higher than the male players ($\bar{x}=74,81$). However, it has been determined that this difference is not significant. Kayalar and Ömürbek (2007: 15) have stated that there is not a significant difference between female and male students regarding the perception of the tendency for taking risks primarily, in the study of Demirhan et al. (2004: 72) on risk perception regarding sports branches, risk averages of female participants have been found to be higher than the risk averages of male participants. The results of these researches support the findings of our study.

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

October / November / December - Autumn Winter Period Issue: 21 Year: 2016

GEL CODE: D80-D81-G10-G11-H50-H51-M42 ID:307 K:129

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Document No: 12880)

(TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

In our research, risk assessment scale points of basketball players were not found statistically significant by the age variable ($p>0,05$). Risk averages of players aged between 14 and 17 ($\bar{x}=79,11$) are observed to be higher than the risk averages of other age groups (Table 2). However, it has been determined that this difference is not significant. In the study of Gök (2006) on volleyball players and the study of Karataş (2012: 101) on handball players regarding their risk assessment, they have specified that there is not a significant difference between the risk assessment levels of players in terms of age groups. According to a research conducted by Bayar (1999), the risk-taking behaviors of individuals increase till the senior year of high school and decrease during university. This can also be explained with the fact that individuals grow to maturity in years and approach to situations in a more realistic way and comply with the requirements of life more realistically (Aktaş & Erhan, 2015: 48). The findings of our research are in line with the literature.

As can be seen in Table 3, the difference between the group averages of the risk assessment scale points of basketball players that constitute the research group by the marital status variable was not found statistically significant ($p>0,05$). It is observed that the risk averages of single players ($\bar{x}=76,01$)

are higher than the married players ($\bar{x}=72,70$). However, it has been determined that this difference is not significant. Saraç and Kahyaoğlu (2011) could not find a significant difference between single and married groups regarding the tendency for taking risk. In the study of Çobanoğlu (2008: 45) on risk assessment of football players, a significant difference could not be found between groups by the marital status variable.

As can be seen in Table 4, the difference between the group averages of the risk assessment scale points of basketball players that constitute the research group by the education variable was not found statistically significant ($p>0,05$). It is observed that the risk averages of high school graduate players ($\bar{x}=77,29$) are higher than the university graduate players ($\bar{x}=74,38$) and the players having graduate education ($\bar{x}=73,81$). However, it has been determined that this difference is not significant. According to the results of various researches conducted by Erdem (2014: 105-112), Erel (2008: 64), Laughhunn et al. (1980) and McInish (1982), a significant relation couldn't be found between education level and risk tendency. These results comply with the findings of our research.

As can be seen in Table 5, the difference between the group averages of the risk as-

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

October / November / December - Autumn Winter Period Issue: 21 Year: 2016

GEL CODE: D80-D81-G10-G11-H50-H51-M42 ID:307 K:129

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Document No: 12880)

(TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

sessment scale points of basketball players that constitute the research group by the variable of number of years spent playing basketball was not found statistically significant ($p>0,05$). It has been established that the risk averages of the players playing basketball for 21 years and more ($\bar{x}=79,40$) are higher than the risk averages of other years. However, it has been determined that this difference is not significant. Gök (2006) has determined that the risk assessment level of volleyball players does not differ significantly by the variable of term of office. Karataş (2012) has stated that the difference between the risk assessment scale points of handball players and group averages by the variable of number of years spent playing handball was not found statistically significant. Erdem (2014) has concluded that the more professional experience is, the higher the risk perception is. The results of these researches show parallelism with the findings of our study.

REFERENCES

- ADLER, R. T., LEONARD, R. K., NORDGREN, R. K., (1999).** Improving Risk Management: Moving From Risk Elimination To Risk Avoidance, Information and Software Technology, 29-34
- AKTAŞ, İ., ERHAN, S.E., (2015).** Spor Yapan ve Spor Yapmayan Bireylerin Benlik Saygısı ve Risk Alma Düzeylerinin

İncelenmesi (Erzurum İli Örneği). Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi. 2(2): 40-51

ALMASSRI, F., (2013). Yapım Projelerinde Karşılaşılan Riskler ve Risk Yönetimi. Yıldız Teknik University Institute of Science Department of Civil Engineering, Building Program Master's Thesis. İstanbul. p.12

BAYAR, N., (1999). Ergenlerde Risk Alma Davranışı: İçtepisellik, Aile Yapısı ve Demografik Değişkenler Açısından Gelişimsel Bir İnceleme. Hacettepe University Institute of Social Sciences. Master's Thesis. Ankara

BAŞAK, H., GÜLEN, M., (2008). İnsansız Hava Aracı Kazalarının Önlenmesi İçin Risk Ölçümü ve Yönetimi Modeli Pamukkale Üniversitesi Mühendislik Fakültesi, Mühendislik Bilimleri Dergisi. 14 (1): 55-65

BREHMER, B., (1994). The Psychology of Risk, Singleton, W. T. and Hovden, J., John Willey & Sons, West Sussex

ÇOBANOĞLU, H.O., (2008). Sporda Risk Yönetimi: Turkcell Süper Ligindeki Sporcuların Risk Değerlendirmeleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. Anadolu University Institute of Health Sciences Depart-

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

October / November / December - Autumn Winter Period Issue: 21 Year: 2016

GEL CODE: D80-D81-G10-G11-H50-H51-M42 ID:307 K:129

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Document No: 12880)

(TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

ment of Physical Education and Sports.
Master's Thesis, Eskişehir

ÇOBANOĞLU, H.O., GÜVEN, S., (2013).

Sporda Risk Yönetimi: Üst Düzey
Futbolcuların Risk Değerlendirmeleri
Üzerine Bir Araştırma. CBU Beden
Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi. 8(2): 2

DEMİRHAN, G., GÜVEN, B., AÇIKADA,

A., (2004). Spor Dallarına İlişkin Riskin
Algılanması. Spor Bilimleri Dergisi.
Hacettepe 1. Of Spor I Sciences. 15 (2):
65-75

ERDEM, E., (2014). Kurumsal Risk Yöneti-

minde Çalışanların Risk Algısı: Bir
Kalkınma Ajansı Örneğinde. Gazi Uni-
versity Institute of Social Sciences. De-
partment of Public Administration Mas-
ter's Thesis Ankara. p.105-112

EREL, C., (2008). İnternette Alışverişlerde

Algılanan Risk Üzerine Bir Uygulama.
Hacettepe University Institute of Social
Sciences Department of Business Ad-
ministration Marketing Program. Mas-
ter's Thesis. Ankara, p.64

GÖK, Y., (2006). Türkiye Voleybol Birinci

Liginde Yer Alan Spor Kulüplerinin Risk
Yönetimi Açısından Değerlendirilmesi.
Gazi University Institute of Health Sci-
ences Department of Physical Education
and Sports. Master's Thesis, Ankara

GÜNAL, N., (2015). Sağlık İşletmelerinde

Finansal Risk Yönetimi. Beykent Uni-
versity Institute of Social Sciences. De-
partment of Business Administration.
Management of Hospital and Medical In-
stitutions. Master's Thesis. İstanbul. p.2

FULLER, C., DRAWER, S., (2004). The Ap-

plication of Risk Management in Sport.
Sport Medicine. 34(6): 349-356

KARA, S., YERELİ, A.N., (2012). İç De-

netimde Risk Yönetimi ve İstanbul Men-
kul Kıymetler Borsası - İmalat Sanayi
Sektöründe Bir Uygulama. Muhasebe ve
Finansman Dergisi. April. p.66

KARATAŞ, Ö., (2012). Sporda Risk Yöneti-

mi: Türkiye Hentbol Süper Ligi Örneği.
Fırat University Institute of Health Sci-
ences Department of Physical Education
and Sports, Doctoral Thesis, Elazığ

KAYALAR, M., ÖMÜRBEK, N., (2007).

Girişimci Adaylarının Risk Almaya Yat-
kınlık Özelliğinin Cinsiyet Bağlamında
İncelenmesi. Atatürk University İktisadi
ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, Volume: 21 Ja-
nuary, Issue:1. p.185-200.

KERZNER, R.H., (1998). Project Manage-

ment: A Systems Approach to Planning,
Scheduling and Controlling", John Wil-
ley & Sons, Canada, pp.87-88

SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

October / November / December - Autumn Winter Period Issue: 21 Year: 2016

GEL CODE: D80-D81-G10-G11-H50-H51-M42 ID:307 K:129

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

(ISO 9001-2008 Document No: 12879 & ISO 14001-2004 Document No: 12880)

(TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

KÜÇÜK, A.Y., (2003). Havacılıkta Emniyet Açısından Risk Yönetimi ve Havacılık Örgütlerinden Uygulama Örnekleri. Anadolu University, Institute of Social Sciences. Master's Thesis, Eskişehir

LAUGHUNN, D.J., PAYNE, J.W., CRUM, R., (1980). "Managerial Risk Preferences for Below Target Returns" Management Science, Vol:26: 1238-1249

MCINISH, T.H., (1982). "Individual Investor and Risk Taking", Journal of Economic Psychology, Vol: 2: 125-136

NOHR, K.M., (2009). Managing Risk in Sport and Recreation. II: Human Kinetics

ÖKTEM, Ç., (2011). Türkiye'de Okçuluk Sporunun Risk Yönetimi Açısından İncelenmesi. Akdeniz University Institute of Social Sciences. Department of Sports Management. Master's Thesis. Antalya

RUAN, D., KACPRZYK, J., FEDRIZZI, M., (2001). Soft Computing for Risk Evaluation and Management, Physica-Verlag, Heidelberg

SARAÇ, M., KAHYAOĞLU, M.B., (2011). Bireysel Yatırımcıların Finansal Risk Algılamalarını Etkileyen Demografik ve Sosyo-ekonomik Faktörler. BDDK Bankacılık ve Finansal Piyasalar, 5 (2): 141

TOPÇU, B., (2013). İşletmelerde Kurumsal Risk Yönetimi. İstanbul Ticaret Odası Akademik Yayınları, Publication No: 19. p.19

USTA, Ö., (2008). İşletme Finansı ve Finansal Yönetim, Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara. p.253

VAUGHAN, E. J., (1997). Risk Management, John Willey & Sons, New York 7-123