

IS THERE A DIFFERENCE AMONG SOCCER CLUBS' RISK ASSESSMENTS?¹

FUTBOL KULÜPLERİNİN RİSK DEĞERLENDİRMELERİ ARASINDA FARKLILIK VAR MIDIR?

Halil ORBAY ÇOBANOĞLU

Anadolu University, Institute of Health Sciences, Physical Education and Sports Department, Eskisehir / Turkey

Öz: Bu araştırmanın genel amacı futbol kulüplerinin risk değerlendirmeleri arasındaki farklılığı ortaya koymaktır. Araştırma genel tarama modelinde yapılmıştır. Araştırmanın evrenini 2006–2007 sezonu Turkcell Süper Lig’indeki futbol kulüpleri oluşturmuştur. Araştırmaya 15 futbol kulübü katılmıştır. Araştırma verilerinin toplanması amacıyla 30 soruluk iki bölümlü 5 seçenekli Likert ölçeğine göre değerlendirilmesi istenen bir ölçek uygulanmıştır. Araştırmada istatistiksel teknikler olarak frekans dağılımı, yüzde, ortalama, standart sapma kullanılmış ve istatistiksel testler olarak non-parametrik testlerden Kruskal-Wallis Testi kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen sayısal değerler $p < 0.01$ anlamlılık seviyeleri ile test edilmiştir. Araştırma sonucunda futbol kulüplerinin finans yönetimi açısından risk değerlendirmeleri arasında ($p=0.00$), sigorta yönetimi açısından risk değerlendirmeleri arasında ($p=0.00$), tesis yönetimi açısından risk değerlendirmeleri arasında ($p=0.00$), sağlık yönetimi açısından risk değerlendirmeleri arasında ($p=0.00$) istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık bulunmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Risk, Sporda Risk Yönetimi, Sporda Risk Faktörleri, Risk Değerlendirme

Abstract: The main purpose of this research is to clarify a difference among the soccer clubs' risk assessments. The research was performed as a general scanning model. The research population consisted of the soccer clubs in Turkcell Super League in the season 2006-2007. Fifteen soccer clubs participated in research. A two-section scale, including 30 questions each having five options and was required to be evaluated according to the Likert scale, was performed to get the research data. In the research, the frequency distribution, the percentage, the mean, the standard deviations were used as statistical techniques and the Kruskal-Wallis test was used as statistical tests. The quantitative datas were tested with a level of significance of $p < 0.01$. As a result of the research; a statistically meaningful difference was found among the soccer clubs' risk assessment related to finance management ($p=0.00$), related to insurance management ($p=0.00$), related to facility management ($p=0.00$), related to injury management ($p=0.00$).

Key Words: Risk, Risk Management in Sports, The Risk Factors in Sports, Risk Assessment

Doi: 10.17363/SSTB.20151714055

(1) *Corresponding Author: Halil ORBAY ÇOBANOĞLU, Anadolu University, Institute of Health Sciences, Physical Education and Sports Department, Eskisehir / orbay_79@hotmail.com Arrival Date 11.08.2015 Date of Admission: 19.10.2015 Article Type: (Research and Practice) Conflict of Interest No "Ethics Committee No"*



INTRODUCTION

Most of the activities that people are carrying out there are a number of risks that depend on the nature of that activity (Fıkrıkoca, 2003). Sports clubs are faced with a number of risks in all the activities that made in order to maintain and develop the existence of the club and success of the club. The success of the sports club will increase with the arrival of the prevention of these risks or overcome these risks (Gök, 2006).

Risk is a concept which means uncertainty, probability of occurrence of an event that may cause damage or loss, the possibility of encountering unexpected results (Gök, 2006; Sevil, 2001).

To identify the risks primarily you need to determine the resources, events and effects which create this risk (Fıkrıkoca, 2003). There are 4 main sources of risk which are fields, equipment and materials, programs and humans in terms of structure of the sports clubs (Corbett, 2002). Lack of team's fields owned or trained, unable to build a secure environment in the field, lack of lighting and cleaning can be given as an example in the fields' sources of risk. Don't regularly maintenance and control of the equipment, used in the sports activities, is seen as a source of risk in terms of equipment. Identificate but can not manage of technique, cost, schedule and time risks, to achieve targets developed in line with the team's and the club's general and specific aims, brings with program risk. Athletes, coaches, volunteers, administrators,

peers, and fans, have unpredictable and uncertain behaviour, may make mistakes and may cause trouble. In this regard, seen as a source of risk.

Risk management in sport is a method for identifying risks and developing and implementing programs to protect the organization and prevent loss (Special Olympics Coaching Guide, 2003). According to Spengler et al. (2006) risk management in sport is a comprehensive resource for those charged with the responsibility of providing for the safety of participants and spectators in a sport or recreation setting. Risk management in sport is defined as a systematic process not only protects individual members from injury, but also protects the organization to damages due to the financial losses (Bucher and Krotee, 2002). There are a number of fundamental and distinguishing features of risk management in sport (Miller, 2006; Sevil and Çobanoğlu, 2009; US. Youth Soccer Risk Management Committee, 2007). Risk management in sport is a managerial approach that requires plans, programs and strategies, is related to fulfilling the loss and eliminating the responsibilities of the sports events. Risk management in sport is intended to protect the income and the image of the sports organization, clubs and sport organizations, athletes, coaches and managers.

Risk management consists of 4 main ongoing process. (Appenzeller, 1998; Bucher and Krotee, 2002; Fıkrıkoca, 2003; Mull et al., 2005). These processes are risk planning, risk assessment, risk



mitigation, risk monitoring and control. The risk assessment process is stage of risk identification as determined by the concept of the probability and consequences of risk and analyzed (quantified, rated and prioritized) (Küçük, 2003). The impact of risk can be rated as low, medium and high (Fıkrıkoca, 2003).

As evidenced by the description of the risk management in terms of risk management approach sports organizations can be possible to examine four key management approach (Corbett, 2002; Delforge, 2002; Parks et al., 2007; Sawyer and Smith, 1999; Special Olympics Coaching Guide, 2003). These are financial management, insurance management, facility management and injury management.

Risk Factors in Sports

Risk Factors Relating to Financial

Sports clubs continue their existence and their image through a number of financial support. The income of football clubs; the audience income, broadcasting rights sales revenue, sponsorship income, transfer income and other income (membership fees, publications of the association, lotteries, entertainment, concerts and sports competitions revenues, grants, subsidies, advertising revenue and so on) (Dorukkaya et al., 1998).

Risk Factors Relating to Insurance

Insurance ensures financial results under a certain risk. Insurance related to sport can be listed

as personal accident and life insurance for athletes, assets for the club, profit loss and liability insurance. In general liability insurance policy applied in sports clubs. Sports clubs transferred the significant risks to someone else by means insurance and contracts that they don't want to take on them. Insurance is used as a risk transfer means (Gök, 2006).

Risk Factors Relating to Facility

Don't take measures against natural disasters (such as lightning), heating and/or cooling problem indoor space, insufficient safety distance between the audience and the players area, insufficient training or competition field, insufficient lighting of the field or the hall's, lack of cleanliness of the facility, the playing area/floor that has lost its stability, to provide failure security in the field and/or facility, don't make control exactly (Miller, 1997).

Risk Factors Relating to Injury

General health status of the athlete (acute and sudden death induced by chronic problems), injuries resulting from equipment (lack of supervision on clothes, shoes and the tools on playground), overloading in training, overtraining and other factors (nutrition, experience, education and culture, game rules) (Acar, 2001; Ateş and Gür, 2005; Bavlı and Kozanoğlu, 2007; Bompa, 2001; Ergen et al., 2003; Kuter, 2007; Miller, 1997; US. Consumer Product Safety Commission, 1995;



US. Youth Soccer Risk Management Committee, 2007).

Risk management in sport that make easily to guarantee the future of the sports club on every aspect, is of paramount importance. The purpose of this research is to reveal the differences between the risk assessment of the football clubs. For purpose of the study will be sought answers to the following questions.

1. For soccer clubs is it a risk that does not fairly implement to finance management, insurance management, facility management and injury management?
2. Is there a difference among soccer clubs' risk assessments in terms of finance management, insurance management, facility management and injury management?

METHODS and MATERIALS

Research Model

General screening models are screening arrangement on all of the universe or a sample to be taken from, consist of many components in the universe, with the purpose of reaching an overall judgment about the universe (Karasar, 2005). This research was conducted in the general screening model.

Sample

The universe of this research constituted Turkcell Super League' clubs in 2006-2007 soccer season in Turkey. Due to the universe was accessible,

'self-sampling universe' has been recognized as the universe in the research.

Participants

Contributions for research based on willingness. 426 scale were distributed during the research. 273 scale were answered one of them, 153 scale did not answer of them. Scale return rate of 64%. Fifteen soccer clubs participated in the research situated in the Turkcell Super League of the 18 soccer clubs. Trabzonspor, Gaziantepspor and Konyaspor did not participate in the study.

Reliability and Validity of Risk Assessment Scale in Soccer

Soccer Risk Assessment Scale applied for the purpose of the collection of research data had been prepared based on Appenzeller Risk Management Form developed by Appenzeller (1998), the risk factors in sport (Kuter, 2007) and Volleyball Risk Assessment Scale (Gök, 2006). Soccer Risk Assessment Scale was composed of two parts. In the first section of the scale, there were questions about players' age, educational background, professional age, tenure and status at the club their questions. In the second section, there were statements related to finance management, insurance management, facility management and injury management, each having five options and was required to be evaluated according to the Likert scale 5-choice requested 25 expression. Reliability analysis of Soccer Risk Assessment Scale was made and the Alpha value was found



as 0.933. At this point, it said that the scale was reliable (Kangalgil et al., 2006; Tunçkol and Güven, 2014). Soccer Risk Assessment Scale had been prepared by some scientists' studies (Appenzeller, 1998; Gök, 2006; Kuter, 2007) who previously worked risk management field and had been benefited from two experts within the scope of validity. Scale could be said was valid in that context.

Data Analysis

For the analysis of the data SPSS 18.0 for Windows Program was used. As the statistical techniques, frequency, percentage, average, standard deviation were used and Kruskal-Wallis test was used as statistical tests. The obtained numerical values were tested $p < 0.01$ significance level.

RESULTS

Soccer clubs and players participated in research is given on Tablo 1.

Tablo 1. Soccer Clubs and Players Participated in Research

Soccer Clubs	Players Participated in Research	Rate (%)
1. Fenerbahce	10	3,7
2. Besiktas	10	3,7
3. Galatasaray	15	5,5
4. Genclerbirligi	10	3,7
5. Sivasspor	16	5,9
6. Vestel Manisaspor	16	5,9
7. Sakaryaspor	17	6,2
8. Caykur Rizespor	23	8,4
9. Ankaragücü	26	9,5
10. Antalyaspor	24	8,8
11. Erciyesspor	25	9,2
12. Bursaspor	27	9,9
13. Ankaraspor	26	9,5
14. Kayserispor	23	8,4
15. Denizlispor	5	1,8
Total	273	100

When Table 1. investigated, 15 soccer clubs participated in the research situated in the Turk-cell Super League of the 18 soccer clubs. Trabzonspor, Gaziantepspor and Konyaspor did not participate in the research.

Table 2. Kruskal-Wallis Test Results in terms of the Financial Management Risk Assessment of the Soccer Clubs

Soccer Clubs	N	Mean Rank	Kruskal-Wallis Test Statistics
Fenerbahce	10	190,40	Chi-square 72,319 df 14 Asymp. Sig. (p) 0,000*
Besiktas	10	188,90	
Galatasaray	15	116,40	
Genclerbirligi	9	93,00	
Sivasspor	15	145,57	
VestelManisaSpor	16	215,56	
Sakaryaspor	17	125,26	
CaykurRizespor	23	171,57	
Ankaragucu	26	107,17	
Antalyaspor	23	78,24	
Erciyesspor	25	112,18	
Bursaspor	27	86,91	
Ankaraspor	26	158,77	
Kayserispor	23	156,83	
Denizlispor	5	205,80	
Total	270		

*p<0.01

When Table 2. investigated, a statistically significant difference was found between the risk

assessment level of soccer clubs in terms of financial management (p=0.00<0.01).

Table 3. Kruskal-Wallis Test Results in terms of the Insurance Management Risk Assessment of the Soccer Clubs

Soccer Clubs	N	Mean Rank	Kruskal-Wallis Test Statistics
Fenerbahce	10	193,00	Chi-square 78,571 df 14 Asymp. Sig. (p) 0,000*
Besiktas	10	184,25	
Galatasaray	15	136,37	
Genclerbirligi	10	103,00	
Sivasspor	16	77,59	
VestelManisaSpor	16	200,53	
Sakaryaspor	16	147,28	
CaykurRizespor	23	203,24	
Ankaragucu	26	111,25	
Antalyaspor	24	94,65	
Erciyesspor	25	88,12	
Bursaspor	27	112,98	
Ankaraspor	26	184,60	
Kayserispor	23	127,09	
Denizlispor	5	131,80	
Total	272		

*p<0.01

When Table 3. investigated, a statistically significant difference was found between the risk

assessment level of soccer clubs in terms of insurance management (p=0.00<0.01).

Table 4. Kruskal-Wallis Test Results in terms of the Facility Management Risk Assessment of the Soccer Clubs

Soccer Clubs	N	Mean Rank	Kruskal-Wallis Test Statistics
Fenerbahce	10	211,30	Chi-square 73,139 df 14 Asymp. Sig. (p) 0,000*
Besiktas	10	150,20	
Galatasaray	15	170,60	
Genclerbirligi	10	104,85	
Sivasspor	14	76,14	
VestelManisaSpor	16	168,09	
Sakaryaspor	14	153,54	
CaykurRizespor	22	115,23	
Ankaragucu	26	151,38	
Antalyaspor	22	111,80	
Erciyesspor	25	64,98	
Bursaspor	27	148,87	
Ankaraspor	26	183,58	
Kayserispor	22	98,20	
Denizlispor	5	68,90	
Total	264		

***p<0.01**

When Table 4. investigated, a statistically significant difference was found between the risk

assessment level of soccer clubs in terms of facility management ($p=0.00<0.01$).

Table 5. Kruskal-Wallis Test Results in terms of the Injury Management Risk Assessment of the Soccer Clubs

Soccer Clubs	N	Mean Rank	Kruskal-Wallis Test Statistics
Fenerbahce	10	208,10	Chi-square 113,786 df 14 Asymp. Sig. (p) 0,000*
Besiktas	10	180,35	
Galatasaray	15	161,33	
Genclerbirligi	10	83,65	
Sivasspor	13	84,35	
VestelManisaSpor	14	217,46	
Sakaryaspor	16	125,34	
CaykurRizespor	23	150,43	
Ankaragucu	24	99,10	
Antalyaspor	20	81,83	
Erciyesspor	25	55,24	
Bursaspor	27	111,31	
Ankaraspor	26	204,40	
Kayserispor	20	115,03	
Denizlispor	5	129,40	
Total	258		

***p<0.01**

When Table 5. investigated, a statistically significant difference was found between the risk assessment level of soccer clubs in terms of injury management ($p=0.00<0.01$).

A statistically significant difference found among the risk assessment level in terms of insurance management of soccer clubs. Cobanoglu and Seville (2013) stated that soccer players who play soccer long term in his club evaluate insurance risk as high risk, whereas soccer players who play soccer short term in his club evaluate insurance risk as low risk.

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

A statistically significant difference found among the risk assessment level in terms of financial management of football clubs found. The differences between risk assessment level of the soccer clubs in terms of financial management may be due to differences in financial support provided.

A statistically significant difference found among the risk assessment level in terms of facility management of soccer clubs. The fact that the financial possibilities' differences lead to the dif-

ferent facility in soccer clubs. Therefore facility risks in soccer clubs will differ also.

A statistically significant difference found among the risk assessment level in terms of injury management of soccer clubs. In their study Çobanoğlu and Sevil (2013) stated that risk assessments level of soccer players differs from according to the age.

Kuter (2007) also emphasized that age is an important factor in risk assessment. Inexperience for the young athletes is an important risk factor. In this age group do not hesitate to take risks without thinking about their future lives. These athletes are at risk in training or competition without realizing themselves. These risks may sometimes lead to injury them or their friends. In addition, inexperienced behavior may bring with it the unnecessary waste of energy and poor performance. This would jeopardize the overall performance of the team.

In their study Çobanoğlu and Sevil (2013) stated that soccer players' risk assessment level differs according to education level. Kuter (2007) stated that players' level of education and culture will affect the performance and the risk taken by revealing the sport will allow them to better analyze performance.

Although it is a very important administrative unit of risk management in sports today is still unknown by sports federations and sports clubs in Turkey. Located in different areas such as finance, insurance, facility and injury risk man-

agement is a management approach that requires expertise. Therefore, as a result of the research our suggestion is risk management experts must work in the Turkish soccer clubs.

RESOURCES

ACAR, M.F., (2001). Training Science Handbook With The Theoretical Dimensions. Meta Printing, Istanbul

APPENZELLER, H., (1998). Risk Management in Sport Issues and Strategies. Carolina Academic Press, Durham North Carolina

ATEŞ, F. and GÜR, H., (2005). Sudden Death in Sports. Access Date: 29.07.2007, <http://sportmed.home.uludag.edu.tr/sporano.htm>

BAVLI, Ö., and KOZANOĞLU, E., (2007). Sudden Death in Sports. Fırat University Journal of Health Sciences, 21(3): pp.149-152

BOMPA, T.O., (2001). Quick Strength Training in Sports. Translation: Tüzemen, E. Translation Arrangements: Bağırhan, T. Bağırhan Publishing, Ankara

BUCKER, C.A. AND KROTEE, M.L., (2002). Management of Physical Education and Sport, Twelfth Edition, Mc Graw- Hill.

CORBETT, R., (1993). Risk Management For The Recreation Professional, Recreation Alberta. 12 (2)

CORBETT, R., (2002). Risk Management For Sport Organizations And Sport Facilities. Access Date: 29.07.2007, <http://www.sport-law.ca/2002/08/risk-management-for-sport-organizations-and-sport-facilities/>

ÇOBANOĞLU, H.O. AND SEVİL, G. (2013). Risk Management in Sports: A Research On The Risk Assessment Of The Elite Soccer Players. Celal Bayar University Journal Of Physical Education And Sport Sciences, 8(2), pp.1-15

DELFORGE, G., (2002). Musculoskeletal Trauma Implications For Sports Injury Management. Arizona School of Health Sciences. Human Kinetics, United States

DORUKKAYA, Ş., KIRATLI, A. AND EBİÇLİOĞLU, F.K., (1998). Incorporation, Public Offering, Financing And Taxation Of The Soccer Clubs in Turkey. Globus World Publishing, Istanbul

ERGEN, E., GÜNER, R., ZERGEROĞLU, A.M., ULKAR, B. AND KUNDURACIOĞLU, B., (2004). Sports Medicine And Sports Injuries, Nobel Publishing, Ankara

FIKIRKOCA, M., (2003). Holistik Risk Management, Pozitif Printing, Ankara

GÖK, Y., (2006). Evaluation of Sports Clubs Which Are in The Turkish Volleyball First Division in Terms of The Risk Management.

Master Thesis, Gazi University, Institute of Health Sciences, Ankara, Turkey

KANGALGİL, M., HÜNÜK, D. AND DEMİRHAN, G., (2006). To Compare The Attitudes Towards of Physical Education And Sports of Elementary School, High School and University Students. Hacettepe J. of Sports Sciences, 17 (2): pp.48-57

KARASAR, N., (2005). Scientific Research Methodology, 14 Printing, Nobel Publications, Ankara

KUTER, M., (2007). Risk Factors in Sports, Access Date: 24.03.2007. <http://www.sporbilim.com/index.php?s=icerik&katid=85&id=169>

KÜÇÜK, A.Y., (2003). Risk Management in The Aerospace in Terms Of Safety And Practises From Aerospace Organizations. Master Thesis, Anadolu University, Institute of Social Sciences, Eskişehir, Turkey

MILLER, J., (2006). Youth Sport or Recreation Injuries Protection: How School Policymakers Can Help? Access Date: 29.07.2007. <http://www.nasbe.org/>

MILLER, L.K., (1997). Sport Business Management, Edd, Mba, Director, Sport Administration Program, Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas, An Apsen Publication

MULL, R.F., BAYLESS, K.G. AND JAMIESON, L.M., (2005). Recreational Sport Manage-



SSTB

www.sstbdergisi.com

Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor Sağlık Ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi

Ekim / Kasım / Aralık – Sonbahar Kış Dönemi Sayı: 17 Yıl:2015

International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports, Health and Medical Sciences

October / November / December - Autumn Winter Term Issue: 17 Year: 2015

GEL CODE: D81-M41-M49 ID:246 K:317

ISSN Print: 2146-8508 Online 2147-1711

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

(MARKA PATENT NO: TRADEMARK)

(2015/04315- 2015-GE-18972)

ment, Fourth Edition, Indiana University,
Human Kinetics

**PARKS, J.B., ZANGER, B.R.K. AND QUAR-
TERMAN, J. (2007).** Contemporary Sport
Management, Human Kinetics, Third Edition,
United States

SAWYER, T.H. AND SMITH, O. (1999). The
Management of Clubs, Recreation And Sport
Concepts And Applications, United States

SEVİL, G., (2001). In The Framework of Financial
Risk Management Market Volatility Estimation
And Portfolio VAR Calculations. Anadolu
University Publications, Number: 1323, The
School of Tourism And Hotel Management
Publications, Number. 3, Eskişehir

SEVİL, G. AND ÇOBANOĞLU, H.O., (2009).
Risk Management in Sports. Editor: Basım,
H.N. and Argan, M., Sports Management,
pp.259-283. Detay Publishing, Ankara

**SPECIAL OLYMPICS COACHING GUIDE,
(2003).** Sport Safety And Risk Management
For Coaches, General Section Created:
December

**SPENGLER, J.O., CONNAUGHTON, D.P. AND
PITTMAN, A.T. (2006).** Risk Management
in Sport And Recreation, Human Kinetics

TUNÇKOL, H.M., AND GÜVEN, Ö., (2014).
Reliability and Validity Study of Leaving
Professional Soccer Life The Perception
Scale. Journal of Sport and Performance
Research. 5(1), pp.49-55

**US. CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COM-
MISSION, (1995).** Guidelines For Movable
Soccer Goal Safety. Access Date: 28.07.2007.
[http://www.cpsc.gov/en/Safety-Education/
Safety-Guides/Sports-Fitness-and-Recreation/
Guidelines-for-Movable-Soccer-Goal-Safety/](http://www.cpsc.gov/en/Safety-Education/Safety-Guides/Sports-Fitness-and-Recreation/Guidelines-for-Movable-Soccer-Goal-Safety/)

**US. YOUTH SOCCER RISK MANAGEMENT
COMMITTEE (2007).** US. Youth Soccer
Risk Management Beyond Kidsafe. Access
Date: 29.07.2007. [http://www.usyouthsoccer.
org/risk_management/](http://www.usyouthsoccer.org/risk_management/)

**Author's Note: This study 'ÇOBANOĞLU, H. O.,
Sports Risk Management Turkcell SuperRisk
Assessment of the athlete in the leagueA
Research on. Master Thesis, Anadolu Uni-
versity, Health Sciences Institute, Eskişehir,
Turkey. 'Thesis from It is derived.**