Turkish Journal of Sport and Exercise /Türk Spor ve Egzersiz Dergisi
http://dergipark.gov.tr/tsed
Year: 2020 - Volume: 22 - Issue: 2 - Pages: 255-264
DOI: 10.15314/tsed.578645

ISSN: 2147-5652

The Investigation Of Elit Table Tennis Sportsmen In Terms Of Their Risk Evaluations

Mahmut Esat UZUN [1A], Mehibe AKANDERE[2B],Yalçın TÜKEL[3C]

[1]*Konya Province Directorate of Youth and Sports, Konya, Turkey.*
[2]*Selcuk Universty, Faculty of Sport Science, Konya, Turkey.*
[3]*Ministry of Labour, Social Services and Family, Konya, Turkey.*

Address Correspondence to M. E. UZUN:esat1054@hotmail.com

(Received): 17.06.2019/ (Accepted): 31.08.2020

A:Orcid ID: 0000-0001-6304-0227- B:Orcid ID: 0000-0003-3825-0622-C: Orcid ID: 0000-0003-3843-5889

Abstract

Aim of this study is analyzing risk assessment of elite table tennis players. In parallel with this aim, risk assessment level of elite table tennis players is compared in respect to gender, age, education level, marital status, perceived level of income, duration of training and taking part in national team. 186 sportsmen, who play actively table tennis at elite level in different sports club, participated to study. Criterion sampling, which is one of the purposeful sampling method, is used to define participators. Study is supported by descriptive survey model. Research data is gained through Personal Information Forms and Risk Assessment Scale (29). Mann Whitney-U test and Kruskall Wallis-H test, which are non-parametric tests, are used to determine whether there is a statistically significant relationship between independent variables (gender, age, education level, marital status, perceived level of income, duration of training and taking part in national team) and points which are gained through Risk Assessment Scale at analyzing gained data. p value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant. The study results show that, points of participators, which are obtained from Risk Assessment Scale and its' sub-factors, demonstrates meaningful distinction according to gender, education level, duration of training and taking part in national team while it does not show meaningful distinction according to age, marital status and perceived income level. As a conclusion, variables such as gender, education level, duration of training and taking part in national team are effective on risk assessment level at the study which is conducted in order to investigate risk assessment conditions of elite table tennis sportsmen.

Key Words: Risk Assessment, Sport, Table Tennis, Sportsman

INTRODUCTION

The risk comes from the Italian, and which means the risk of an event that could lead to a damage or loss. It is a concept in French (Risque) and means disadvantage. (20). Failure of structured plans, wrong decision-making opportunities, loss or not to make a profit are generally defined as risk (4). Risk management is the process of attempting to prevent the potential for loss due to hazards such as personal injury, damage to assets or economic losses. The risks in nature cannot be eliminated but can be managed with good planning (41). Risk management is a three-step process. The first is to determine and measure, the second is to develop and implement a plan to manage these losses, and finally to review the plan once it has been implemented. The risk management process generally requires the following steps (14); Step 1: Measure and identify potential losses Step 2: Choose and apply the most effective methods to control and finance potential losses. Step 3: Examine the results. Step 3: Examine the results. While physicians argue that the changes between mental and physical activities at regular intervals increase the mental and physical health in a balanced way, psychologists express the sport as an effective antidote that is competing over time despite the negativity such as friction and tension brought by daily life and finally social behaviorists

their main task is to explain and reinforce determinative values and to bring solutions to the problems we face in life (18).

Risk Factors in Sport: In order to define the risks, first of all, it is necessary to determine the sources, events and effects that will constitute that risk (17).

Internal Factors: Psychomotor Development, Physical Fitness, Resilience, Strength and Speed, Physical Structure and Coordination, Gender and Age, Height, Body Weight and Body Fat Percentage, Previous Injuries and Diseases, Muscle Tension and Frequency, Weakness and Inequality of Lower Extremity, Physical Defect, Psychological Factors, Personality and Self, Motivation and Concentration, Perception, Winning Emotion and Risk, aggression and Anxiety, Fear and Stress, Psychological Loads, Emotional and Mental Conflict, Sudden Deaths in Sport. (15, 24). (33). (16).

External Factors in Sports: Factors Related to the Field (31). Factors Related to Tools, (7). Clothes, Footwear & Protective Materials, Social Factors

Parent Factor: Coach, Referee and Media Factor (23). Education and Culture Factor, Spectator Factor (2).

Factors Related to Training: Warming, Wrong Training and Overtraining (5). Weight Training

Environmental Factors: Circudian Rhythm, Height, Hot (Heat Strike) and Cold, (22).

Factors Related to Habits: Alcohol and Smoking (1). Nutrition and Weight Loss (13). Ergogenic Help, Doping, Sexual Experience and sleeping pattern.

Table Tennis Sports and Risk Factors

Table tennis is a sports branch where a table tennis player on both sides of a tennis table uses a racket in their hands to throw a ball, which is small, onto the opposite side of the table via a net that is stretched in the middle of the table (39).

According to Turhan (2007), the risk factors experienced in table tennis branch are;

Timing: The table tennis branch is a sports branch that requires the right decision in a very short period of time during the game. Performing the proper stroke on time, smooth movement is important for table tennis performance and is an important criterion for success. Punching and responding to the ball by applying force in place is an important step to make an effective hit.

Distinction: This ability allows you to distinguish between slow spin, fast spin, ball spin, soft attack, hard attack, smash, etc. in different situations and conditions.

Feeling the Ball: Feeling the ball means that ball violence, spins, speed, directions of the ball is estimated. This ability makes it possible to get a good number of difficult positions (38).

Correction Ability: It is the control of the faults by correcting and comprehending the movement with the Kassal perception. It is a coordinating feature to adapt to the situations in which sudden changes are observed in different sports activities.

Vision and Motoric Skill: During the competition, it is very important to follow the ball and take the position of movement at the same time.

MATERIALS & METHODS

Research Model: The research was supported in a descriptive screening model. The screening model is a research approach that aims to describe a situation that has existed in the past or the present (27). The fact that the data of this type of research is collected from different sources, having detailed information about the researched subject and the data being collected from too many people is one of the most important features of the researches designed in the survey model (26).

Research Group: Turkey Table Tennis Federation 2016-2017 season in Super League, which competes in the 1st semester and 89 women and 97 men, including 186 athletes participated in the research. The research group was formed by face-to-face interviews and e-mails with athletes participating in competitions in Yalova 1st League, Eskişehir 2nd League and Isparta and Ordu 3 leagues. Athletes aged 16 and over were evaluated. Targeted 100 male and 100 female athletes were reached; however, 14 scales were excluded and excluded from the evaluation because they were randomly filled. As a result, 89 female and 97 male table tennis athletes were reached. Demographic data of the research group are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Information of the Research Group

Variable		f	%
Gender	Woman	89	47,8
	Man	97	52,2
Age	16-21 age	91	48,9
	22-27 age	35	18,8
	28-33 age	27	14,5
	34 years and older	33	17,7
Education	Grade School	14	7,5
	High school	85	45,7
	Undergraduate	75	40,3
	Post Graduate	12	6,5
Marital status	Single	141	75,8
	Married	45	24,2
Perceived income status	Lower	63	33,9
	Middle	47	39,8
	Upper	49	26,3
Sport Experience	1-5 years	20	10,8
	6-10 years	63	33,9
	11-15 years	42	22,6
	16-20 years	33	17,7
	21 year and older	28	15,1
Taking Place in the National Team	Yes	70	37,6
	No	116	72,4

Table 1. When examined, a total of 186 athletes (89 female, 47.8%) and 97 male (52.2%) participated in the study. Of the participants is, 91 were in the 16-21 age group (48.9%), 35 in the 22-27 age group (18.8%), 27 in the 28-33 age range (14.5%),and 33 were 34 years and older (17.7%). According to the education level, 14 of the participants were in secondary school (7.5%), 85 in high school (45.7%), 75 in undergraduate (40.3%) and 12 in postgraduate (6.5%). According to marital status, 141 of the participants were single (75.8%) and 45 were married (24.2%). According to the learned income situation, 63 of the participants were in the lower income level (33.9%), 47 were in the middle income level (39.8%) and 49 were in the upper income level (26.3%). According to the duration of sports, 20 of the participants were 1-5 years (10,8%), 63 were 6-10 years (33,9%), 42 were 11-15 years (22,6%), 33 were 15-20 years (17.7%) and 28 of them have 21 years and more (15.1%) of sports. According to the national team, 70 of the participants were in the national team (37,6%), 116 of them were not in the national team (21,42%).

Data Collection Tools

The data included in the study were obtained by using "Person Information Form"and " Risk Assessment Scale" Personal Information Form: This form has been formed in order to obtain information about the gender, age, educational status, marital status, perceived income status, sport experience and participation in the national team.

Risk Assessment Scale: The risk assessment scale developed by Karatas (2012) includes how the athletes and trainers evaluate the questions on the scale in terms of their own risk. The scale items were prepared using the studies of (20 and 9). As a result of the analysis, some items with low criteria or more than one criterion were excluded from the scale. As a result of repeated analysis, the scale has a total of 4 factors with 23 items; the first factor (1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8) related to health management of the substances, the second factor (9,10,11,12,13) related to facility management, the third factor (14,15,16,17,18,19)related to financial management, the fourth factor (20,21,22,23) related to of the social security management. As a result of the analysis, it was seen that these items consisted of risk assessment elements related to social security management. Considering the variance explanation rates of the scale; 15.95% of the health management factor variance; 12.64% of the facility management factor variance; 10.73% of the variance of financial management factor; 12,31% of the social security management factor variance is explained. All 23 items in the scale explained 51.64% of the total variance. Factor variance for each factor should be looked at in order for the factor analysis results to be sufficient. If these values are above 0.50, it is decided that the number of factors is sufficient (25). The

values obtained indicate that the scale is valid in this form. Cronbach Alpha calculations for the internal reliability of the scale; for the sub factor of health management .82, for facility management sub-factor.78, for the financial management sub-factor.73, for social security management sub-factor.81, for the whole scale.92 was found.

Data Analysis

The statistical analysis of the data obtained from the study was carried out through SPSS 20.00 package program. In the data analysis, it was tested whether the data set showed normal scatter. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to evaluate the normal scatter of data. As a result of the normality test of the data, it was concluded that the scatter did not fulfill the assumption of normality in the overall scale and sub-factors according to all variables ($p<0.05$). Therefore, the relationship between independent variables (gender, age, and educational status, perceived income status, marital status, sporting exprience and taking part in the national team) and the scores obtained from the risk assessment scale were evaluated using non-parametric tests such as Mann Whitney-U test and Kruskall Wallis. H-test. According to the Kruskal-Wallis test, the difference between the groups was examined by the Mann-Whitney U test using the binary combinations of the groups (6).

FINDINGS

The findings of elite table tennis athletes are evaluated according to gender, age, education level, marital status, perceived income level, sporting experience and taking part in national team.

Table 2. Mann-Whitney U Test Results for Determining Whether The Points Obtained From the Risk Assessment Scale Differ According to the Gender Variable

Factors	Gender	N	Mean Rank	Line Total	U	p
Healthcare Management	Woman	89	112,07	9974,00	2664,00	0,000**
	Man	97	76,46	7417,00		
Facility Management	Woman	89	110,68	9850,50	2787,50	0,000**
	Man	97	77,74	7540,50		
Finance Management	Woman	89	109,42	9738,00	2900,00	0,000**
	Man	97	78,90	7653,00		
Social Security Management	Woman	89	107,28	9548,00	3090,00	0,001*
	Man	97	80,86	7843,00		
Total	Woman	89	114,53	10193,50	2444,50	0,000**
	Man	97	74,20	7197,50		

Table 2. When examined, the health management of the athletes with the Risk Assessment Scale (U=2444,50, p<0,001) (U=2664,0, p<0,001), facility management (U=2787.50,p<0.001),finance management (U = 2900.00, p <0.001) and social security management (U = 3090,00, p <0,01) scores were found to be significantly different from gender variable.

Table 3. The Results of The Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Determine Whether the Points Obtained from the Risk Assessment Scale Differ According to the Age Variable

Factors	Age	N	Mean Rank.	Sd	X^2	p
Healthcare Management	16-21	91	94,37	3	1,215	0,749
	22-27	35	88,71			
	28-33	27	87,81			
	34 years and older	33	100,82			
Facility Management	16-21	91	89,88	3	2,204	0,531
	22-27	35	88,84			
	28-33	27	98,98			
	34 years and older	33	103,94			
Finance Management	16-21	91	88,40	3	2,913	0,405
	22-27	35	90,97			
	28-33	27	106,54			
	34 years and older	33	99,59			
Social Security Management	16-21	91	91,32	3	2,427	0,489
	22-27	35	85,06			
	28-33	27	101,28			
	34 years and older	33	102,09			
Total	16-21	91	89,43	3	2,753	0,431

Table 3. As seen in the above, athletes, with the overall "Risk Assessment Scale" ("2 (3) = 2.753, p> 0.05), health management (p2 (3) = 1,215, p> 0,05), facility management (p2 (3) = 2,204, p>0,05), financial management (p2 (3) = 2,913, p>0,05) and social security management (lılık2 (3) = 2,427, p> 0,05) and between points obtained from their sub-factors big difference were not detected according to age variables.

Table 4. The Results of the Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Determine Whether The Points Obtained from the Risk Assessment Scale Differ According to Marital Status

Factors	Marital Status	N	Mean Rank	Line Total	U	p
Healthcare Management	Single	141	94,49	13323,00	3033,00	0,657
	Married	45	90,40	4068,00		
Facility Management	Single	141	97,26	13713,00	2643,00	0,091
	Married	45	81,73	3678,00		
Finance Management	Single	141	95,09	13408,00	2948,00	0,474
	Married	45	88,51	3983,00		
Social Security Management	Single	141	95,07	13404,50	2951,50	0,481
	Married	45	88,59	3986,50		
Total	Single	141	95,52	13468,50	2887,50	0,365
	Married	45	87,17	3922,50		

Table 4. As seen in the above, athletes, with the overall "Risk Assessment Scale" (U = 2887,50, p>0,05) and health management (U=3033,00, p>0,05), facility management (U=2643,00,p>0,05),financial management (U=2948,0, p>0,05) and social security management (U=2951,50, p>0,05) and between points obtained from their sub-factors big difference were not detected according to marital status.

Table 5. The Results of the Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Determine Whether the Points Obtained from the Risk Assessment Scale Differ According to Education

Factors	Education	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X^2	p	Difference
Healthcare Management	1. Grade School	14	57,79	3	16,227	0,001*	1-2 1-3 1-4 2-3, 2-4
	2. High school	85	84,05				
	3. Undergraduate	75	106,59				
	4. Post Graduate	12	120,29				
Facility Management	1. Grade School	91	75,61	3	14,913	0,002*	1-3 1-4 2-3 2-4
	2. High school	35	81,15				
	3. Untergraduate	27	105,09				
	4. Post Graduate	33	129,46				
Finance Management	1. Grade School	91	72,71	3	18,097	0,000**	1-4 2-3 2-4
	2. High school	35	80,76				
	3. Untergraduate	27	104,85				
	4. Post Graduate	33	137,04				
Social Security Management	1. Grade School	91	68,75	3	12,423	0,006*	1-3 1-4 2-3 2-4
	2. High school	35	84,45				
	3. Untergraduate	27	103,02				
	4. Post Graduate	33	127,00				
Total	1. Grade School	91	61,71	3	25,663	0,000**	1-3 1-4 2-3 2-4
	2. High school	35	78,91				
	3.Untergraduate	27	108,71				
	4. Post Graduate	33	138,92				

Table 5. As seen in the above, athletes, with the overall "Risk Assessment Scale" ($\chi 2$ (3) = 25,663, p<0,001), health management (p2 (3) = 16,227, p<0,01), facility management (,2 (3)=14,913, p<0,01) financial management (,2 (3) = 18,097,p<0,001) and social security management ($\chi 2(3)$= 12,423, p<0,01) and between points obtained from their sub-factors difference were detected according to education.

Table 6. The Results of the Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Determine Whether the Points Obtained from the Risk Assessment Scale Differ According to Perceived Income Status

Factors	Perceived Income Level	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X²	p
Healthcare Management	Lower	63	98,86	2	1,501	0,472
	Middle	74	93,70			
	Upper	49	86,32			
Facility Management	Lower	63	94,67	2	1,076	0,584
	Middle	74	96,90			
	Upper	49	86,86			
Finance Management	Lower	63	93,71	2	0,696	0,706
	Middle	74	96,68			
	Upper	49	88,43			
Social Security Management	Lower	63	91,72	2	0,112	0,945
	Middle	74	94,06			
	Upper	49	94,94			
Total	Lower	63	95,97	2	0,755	0,686
	Middle	74	95,18			
	Upper	49	87,80			

Table 6. As seen in the above, athletes, with the overall "Risk Assessment Scale" ($\chi 2(2)$=0,755, p>0,05) and health management ($\chi 2(2)$=1,501, p>0,05), facility management ($\chi 2(2)$=1,076, p>0,05), financial management ($\chi 2(2)$=0,696, p>0,05), and social security management ($\chi 2(2)$= 0,112, p>0,05), and between points obtained from their sub-factors big difference were not detected according to perceived income status.

Table 7. The Results of The Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Determine Whether the Points Obtained from the Risk Assessment Scale Differ According to Sport Experience

Factors	Sport Experience	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X²	p	Difference
Healthcare Management	1. 1-5 years	20	82,95	4	15,304	0,004**	1-4
	2. 6-10 years	63	80,80				2-4
	3. 11-15 years	42	85,96				2-5
	4. 16-21 years	33	118,09				3-4
	521 years and older	28	111,93				3-5
Facility Management	1. 1-5 years	20	90,38	4	18,402	0,001**	1-4
	2. 6-10 years	63	77,55				2-4
	3. 11-15 years	42	87,05				2-5
	4. 16-21 years	33	124,39				3-4
	5. 21 years and older	28	104,89				
Finance Management	1. 1-5 years	20	76,13	4	16,357	0,003**	1-4
	2. 6-10 years	63	76,25				1-5
	3. 11-15 years	42	102,27				2-3
	4. 16-21 years	33	113,85				2-4
	5. 21 years and older	28	107,57				2-5
Social Security Management	1. 1-5 years	20	81,68	4	10,843	0,028*	2-4
	2. 6-10 years	63	79,05				2-5
	3. 11-15 years	42	99,07				
	4. 16-21 years	33	110,61				
	5. 21 years and older	28	105,95				
Total	1. 1-5 years	20	78,05	4	24,690	0,000***	1-4
	2. 6-10 years	63	74,84				1-5
	3. 11-15 years	42	91,25				2-4
	4. 16-21 years	33	126,59				2-5
	5. 21 years and older	28	110,89				3-4

Table 7. As seen in the above, athletes, with the overall "Risk Assessment Scale" (χ2(4)=24,690, p<0,001), health management (χ2(4)=15,304, p<0,01), facility management (χ2(4)=18,402, p<0,01), financial management (χ2(4)=16,357, p<0,01) , and social security management (χ2(4)= 10,843, p<0,05) and between points obtained from their sub-factors difference were detected according to education.

Table 8. The Results of The Kruskal-Wallis H Test to Determine Whether the Points Obtained from the Risk Assessment Scale Differ According to Taking Place in the National Team

Factors	Taking part in the National Team	n	Mean Rank	Line Total	U	P
Healthcare Management	Yes	70	117,58	8230,50	2374,50	0,000*
	No	116	78,97	9160,50		
Facility Management	Yes	70	111,37	7796,00	2809,00	0,000*
	No	116	82,72	9595,00		
Finance Management	Yes	70	115,91	8113,50	2491,50	0,000*
	No	116	79,98	9277,50		
Social Security Management	Yes	70	115,71	8099,50	2505,50	0,000*
	No	116	80,10	9291,50		
Total	Yes	70	121,82	8527,50	2077,50	0,000*
	No	116	76,41	8863,50		

Table 8. As seen in the above, athletes, with the overall "Risk Assessment Scale" (U= 2077,50, p<0,001) health management (U= 2374,50, p<0,001), facility management (U=2809,00, p<0,001), financial management (U=2491,50, p<0,001) and social security management (U= 2505,50, p<0,001) and between points obtained from their sub-factors difference were detected according to taking place in the National Team.

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

In this study, the risk assessment levels of elite table tennis athletes were examined in terms of gender, age, educational status, marital status, perceived income level, sporting experience and taking part in the national team, and the following results were obtained.

When the findings related to the risk assessment levels of the participants were evaluated according to the gender variable (Table 3.2.), the risk assessment levels of the participants in their sub-factors were detected difference according to the gender (p<0.01, p<0.001). Considering the average of the scores obtained from the risk assessment scale of the participants, the risk assessment levels of the female athletes were found to be higher than the male athletes. This result is consistent with the results obtained in the studies conducted by (40, 28 and 36). In these studies, it is revealed that women perceive the risk more than men. In addition, it is emphasized that women pay more attention to risk taking than men (35) and women are more likely to focus on the negative aspects of risky situations than males (10). Although there are studies showing that women have a higher level of risk assessment compared to men, there are studies suggesting that there is no difference between the risk assessment levels of women and men. For example; (29) in his research on the handball athletes engaged in the sports, the level of risk assessment of athletes showed no significant difference according to the gender variable. Similarly, (11) found no significant difference between gender and risk preferences in his research on the perception of risks in outdoor sports.

According to Schrader and Wann (1999), most of the studies have shown that men are likely to participate in high-risk activities and that most of the risk recipients are young and middle-class (12). In their study, (30) found that women and men do not have different risk levels. (37) did not detect any difference between risk assessments of boys and girls. (32), in their study on handballers, volleyball players, athletes and taekwondo determined that women's volleyball players have a high level of risk taking. It is accepted that women's and men's risk perceptions are different. Women and men are exposed to different risks in their lives, they perceive risks differently and find themselves in risks in different ways. It is noteworthy that men perceive

lower risk than women. This is mainly due to biological and social factors (42).

When the findings about the risk assessment levels of the participants were analyzed (Table 3.3.), It was found that the risk assessment levels of the participants did not show a significant difference according to the age variable in the overall scale and sub-factors of the scale ($p> 0.05$). When the researches in the related field writings are examined, it is seen that there are more researches suggesting that there is no significant difference between the level of risk assessment of athletes and age variables. (29), research in the handball branch and (20) in the study of volleyball players engaged in the volleyball branch of the risk assessment level showed that there is no significant difference according to the age variable. (28) found that there was no significant difference between the risk perception of basketball players and age variables in basketball players playing in league. (19)found that there was no significant difference between of the managers and expert the risk factors and the level of evaluation according to age variables. On the other hand, (8) found that there was a significant difference between the risk assessment levels of the athletes according to the age variable in examining the risk assessment levels of the top players. According to (9), inexperience is an important risk factor for young athletes. These age groups are not afraid to take risks without thinking about their future life. Especially with the dynamism of the youth, inexperienced athletes risk themselves without realizing it in training or competition. This risk may occasionally lead to injury to them or their friends. In addition, inexperienced behavior may lead to unnecessary energy consumption and poor performance. This puts the team's overall performance at risk.

When the findings related to the risk assessment levels of the participants were taken into consideration according to the educational status variable (Table 3.5.), It was determined that the risk assessment levels of the participants differed significantly according to the educational status variable in the overall scale and sub-factors ($p<0.01$, $p<0.001$). When the average of the scores of the participants from the risk assessment scale was taken into consideration, it was seen that the athletes with undergraduate and graduate education level had a higher risk assessment level compared to the athletes with secondary and high school education level. This result is in the same direction with some studies in the related field and it is in contrast with some studies. (8) found that the level of risk assessment of top athletes differed significantly different according to educational variable. (28) found a significant difference between the risk perceptions of the athletes dealing with the basketball branch according to the educational status variable. On the other hand, Karatas (2012) found in another study that the risk assessment levels of handball athletes did not differ significantly different according to the age variable. Similarly, (34, 21,3) suggested a negative relationship between education level and risk perception.

When the findings related to the risk assessment levels of the participants were examined according to the marital status variable (Table 3.4.), it was determined that the risk assessment levels of the participants did not show a significant difference in the overall scale and sub-factors of the scale compared to the marital status variable ($p> 0.05$). In the related field writings, there is no significant difference between the risk assessment levels of the athletes and marital status variables in (29, 28, 9). In these studies, it was found that whether the athlete was single or married had no effect on the level of risk assessment.

When the findings about the risk assessment levels of the participants were analyzed according to the perceived income level variable (Table 3.6.), it was determined that the risk assessment levels of the participants did not show a significant difference according to the perceived income level variable in the overall scale and sub-factors of the scale ($p>0.05$).

When the findings related to the risk assessment levels of the participants according to the duration of sports experience (Table 3.7.), It was found that the risk assessment levels of the participants showed a significant difference according to the sport experience variable in the overall scale and sub-factors of the scale ($p<0.05$, $p<0.01$, $p<0.001$).). When the average score of the participants from the risk assessment scale was taken into consideration, it was determined that the athletes with higher sports experience had higher risk assessment levels. In the related writings, it was seen that the researches which examined the relationship between the risk assessment levels of the athletes and the sport experience variable showed different results. For example; (28) found a significant difference between basketball players' risk perceptions according to the sport experience

variable. Similarly, (8) suggested that the level of risk assessment of top players differed according to the variable sport experience. (40) found that there was a significant difference between the level of risk assessment of the archers engaged in archery sports according to archery experience. On the other hand, (29) determined that there is no significant difference between the risk assessment levels of handball athletes according to sports experience variable. In the study conducted by (20), it was revealed that volleyball players' risk assessment levels did not differ significantly according to the sport experience variable.

When the findings related to the risk assessment levels of the participants were examined according to the taking part in the national team (Table 3.8.), It was determined that the risk assessment levels of the participants showed a significant difference according to the national team participation variable in the overall scale and the sub-factors ($p < 0.001$). This result is consistent with the results of the study conducted by (40) in order to examine the perceived risk level of athletes in archery branch. In the study, it was determined that there was a significant difference between the perceived risk levels of archery athletes according to taking part in the national team.

As a result of the study, it was concluded that gender, education level, spor experience and taking place in the national team were effective on the risk assessment levels of elite table tennis athletes. Elite table tennis athletes may face risk factors arising from a variety of reasons within the active sports lives. The extent to which the athletes are affected by the risk factors they face, and to what extent they consider them risky is seen as extremely important in terms of their success in sports. For this reason, in the light of the findings obtained from the results of this research, in which the risk assessment of elite table tennis athletes were examined, some suggestions were made below.

- Units related to risk assessment and management can be established at the relevant sports clubs, especially in sports federations.

- Coordination committees for cooperation in the area of risk assessment

and management between relevant institutions may be formed from specialized academics.

- Inexperienced athletes take more risks than experienced athletes and become impatient. For this, long-term training and hard work should be increased patience and experience.

- When it is not the right technique, unnecessary energy is consumed and lost. Table tennis should be taught with the right technique.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson P, Baumberg B. Avrupa'da alkol kullanımı halk sağlığı bakış açısıyla, avrupa komisyonu için rapor. İngiltere: Alkol Araştırmaları Enstitüsü, 2006.
2. Arslan C, Yenel F, Başaran Z, Işık E. Bir takımın taraftarı olmaya iten motivasyonel ve psikolojik etkenler üzerine bir araştırma. Türkiye Amatör Spor, 1992; 49: 24–26.
3. Bajtelsmith VL. Evidence of risk aversion in the health and retirement study. March, 1999; 1,
4. Bolak M. Risk ve yönetimi. İstanbul: Birsen Yayınevi, 2004.
5. Bompa T. Periodization traning for sports. Champaing, IL: Human Kinetics, 1999.
6. Büyüköztürk Ş. Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı (Genişletilmiş 20. baskı), Ankara: Pegem Akademi, 2014.
7. Can S. Çeşitli spor branşlarında sakatlık oluşumuna; boy, kilo, vücut kütle indeksi, cinsiyet ve el tercihi gibi faktörlerin etkisi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Fizyoloji Anabilim Dalı, Erzurum, 1997.
8. Çobanoğlu HO, Sevil G. Sporda risk yönetimi. Üst Düzey Futbolcuların Risk Değerlendirmeleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma, CBÜ Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 2013; 8(2), s. 1-15.
9. Çobanoğlu HO. Sporda risk yönetimi. Turkcell Süper Ligindeki Sporcuların Risk Değerlendirmeleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı, Eskişehir, 2008.
10. Daruvala D. Gender, risk and stereotypes. Working Papers in Economics, Göteborg University, Sweden, 2006.
11. Demirhan G. Doğa sporlarına ilişkin risklerin algılanması. Spor Bilimleri Dergisi. Hacettepe, 2003; 14 (1), s. 1-13
12. Demirhan G, Güven B, Açıkada A. Spor dallarına ilişkin riskin algılanması. Spor Bilimleri Dergisi. Hacettepe 1. Of Spor I Scieıices, 2004; 15 (2), s. 65-75.
13. Deutz RC, Benardot D, Martın DE, Cody MM. Relationship between energy deficits and body composition in elite female gymnasts and runners, Med. Sci. Sports Exerc, 2000; 32 (3), s. 659–668.
14. Dorfman MS. Introduction to risk management and ınsurance. N.J.:Prentice Hall, 1998.
15. Dupuis JM, Tabib A, Reix P, Dupuis L, Daudet G, Jocteur-Monrozier D, Malicie D, Bellon G. Sudden unexpected death of cardiac origin in the 6 to 18 years population.pathological data. Role of the sport? How can we prevent It?". Archives de Pédiatrie, 2005; 12: 1204–1208. 127.
16. Ekstrand J, Karlsson J, Hodson A. Football medicine. Taylor and Francis group, 2003; 39-121.
17. Fıkırkoca M. Bütünsel risk yönetimi, Pozitif Matbaacılık, Ankara, 2003.
18. Fişek K. Devlet politikası ve toplumsal yapıyla ilişkileri açısından spor yönetimi. Bağırgan Yayınevi, 2. Bası, Ankara, 1998.
19. Gök Y, Şahin H, Balcı V. Spor organizasyonlarının maliyet boyutunun risk yönetimi açısından değerlendirilmesi. I. Uluslararası Spor Ekonomisi ve Yönetimi Kongresi, İzmir, 2011.
20. Gök Y. Türkiye birinci voleybol liginde yer alan spor kulüplerinin risk yönetimi açısından değerlendirilmesi.

Yüksek Lisans Tezi Ankara Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2006.
21. Grable JE, Lytton RH. Investor risk tolerance: Testing the Efficacy of Demographics as Differentiating and Classifying Factors. Financial Counseling and Planning, 1998; 9 (1), 61-73.
22. Güllü A, Güllü E. Genel antrenman bilgisi. İstanbul: Umut Matbaacılık, 2001
23. Güzel İİ. Amatör sporcuların antrenörlerinden beklentileri üzerine bir araştırma. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Anabilim Dalı, Ankara, 2008.
24. Jouven X, Zureik M, Desnos M, Guerot C, Ducimetiere P, Resting heart rate as a predictive risk factor for sudden death in middle-aged men. Elsevier Science B.V. Cardiovascular Research, 2001; 50: 373–378.
25. Kalaycı Ş. SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri. İstanbul: Brc Matbaacılık, 2005.
26. Karakaya İ. Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri. A.Tanrıöğen. (Edt.).Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri. 2. Baskı. Ankara: Anı, 2011; ss.57-87.
27. Karasar N. Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi. Ankara: Nobel, 2014.
28. Karataş Ö. A research into evaluation of basketball athletes risk perception level. International Education Studies, 2016; 9(5), 108-114.
29. Karataş Ö. Sporda risk yönetimi. Türkiye Hentbol Süper Ligi Örneği, Fırat Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Elazığ, 2012.
30. Keer JH, Cecillia KF, Lindner KJ. Motivation and level of risk in male and famele recreational sport participation.Personality and İndividual Differences, 2004.
31. Kirişci İ. Takım sporu yapan bireylerde görülen sakatlık türleri ve bu sakatlıkların çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi (bursa örneği). Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Sakarya, 2011.
32. Koruç Z, Bayar P. Hentbolcu, voleybolcu, atlet ve taekwondocuların kişilik örüntüleri üzerine bir araştırma, Ankara: Spor Bilimleri II. Ulusal Kongre Bildirisi. Hacettepe, 1992.
33. Kuter M, Kuter ÖF. Sporda riskler, 2011. http://www.sporbilim.com/index.php?s=detay&id=170.
34. Küçüksille E. Optimal portföy oluşturmaya davranışsal bir yaklaşım. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Isparta, 2004.
35. Larkin J, Pines H. Gender and risk in public performance. Sex Roles, 2003; 49, 197-210.
36. Lieberman Y, Stashevsky S. Perceived risks as barriers to ınternet and e-commerce usage, Qualitive Market Research: An International Journal, 2002; 5(4):291-300, s. 295-298.
37. Martin CL. A ratio measure of sex stereotyping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1987; 52(3); 489–499.
38. Mengütay S. Çocuklarda hareket gelişimi ve spor.Morpa Kültür Yayınları, İstanbul, 2005.
39. Morpa Spor Ansiklopedisi. 5. cilt. Orhan Ofset, İstanbul, 1997.
40. Öktem Ç. Türkiye'de okçuluk sporunun risk yönetimi açısından incelenmesi. Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Antalya, 2011.
41. Schwarz EC, Hall SA. Shibli s.sport facility. USA: Elsevier, 2010.
42. Yıldırım F. Üniversite öğrencilerinin yaşamdaki riskleri algılamaları üzerinde toplumsal cinsiyet etkisinin incelenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara, 2007.