

DOI No: <http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/Joh.47414>

Authenticity process is conducted by



Makale Türü: Araştırma makalesi
Geliş Tarihi: 06-11-2020
Kabul Tarihi: 08-04-2021
On-line Yayın: 30-04-2021

Article Type: Research article
Submitted: 06-11-2020
Accepted: 08-04-2021
Published Online: 30-04-2021

Atıf Bilgisi / Reference Information

Karataş, Ö., Yılmaz T., Savaş, B.Ç. (2021). Analysis on Risk-Taking Behaviors of Students Studying in School of Physical Education and Sports in Terms of Some Variables. *Journal of History School*, 51, 1164-1178.

ANALYSIS ON RISK-TAKING BEHAVIORS OF STUDENTS STUDYING IN SCHOOL OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORTS IN TERMS OF SOME VARIABLES¹

Özgür KARATAŞ², Tugay YILMAZ³ & Buğra Çağatay SAVAŞ⁴

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to analyze the risk-taking behaviors of the students studying in school of physical education and sports in terms of some variables. General screening model, which is one of the descriptive methods, was used in the research. The research contains a total of 418 students composed of 264 males and 154 females studying in the schools of physical education and sports in Gaziantep University, İnönü University, Atatürk University and Van Yüzüncü Yıl University for 2017-2018 academic year. As the data collection tool of the research, 'Risk-Taking Scale' developed by Blais and Weber (2006) was used. Descriptive statistical methods were used in evaluation of the study, T-Test was used for pairwise groups and One Way Anova and a post hoc test Scheffe were used for multiple groups. It has been established that there are significant differences between the sub-dimensions of risk-taking behaviors of the participant

¹ Bu araştırma 1. Uluslararası Battalgazi Multi Disipliner Çalışmalar Kongresinde özet bildiri olarak sunulmuştur.

²Doç. Dr. İnönü Üniversitesi, Spor Bilimleri Fakültesi, Spor Yöneticiliği Bölümü, ozgur.karatas@inonu.edu.tr, Orcid: 0000-0002-7863-2898

³Doktora Öğrencisi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı, tugayyilmaz027@gmail.com, Orcid:0000-0003-3335-5361

⁴Doktora Öğrencisi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Anabilim Dalı, b_c_savas@hotmail.com, Orcid: 0000-0002-8698-6311

students studying in school of physical education and sports by the variables of age, sex, monthly income and status of doing sports. It has been concluded following the research results that the variables of age, sex, monthly income and status of doing sports are the important determinants affecting the risk-taking behaviors of the students studying in school of physical education and sports. Protecting students from the possible negative consequences of risk taking behaviors of physical education and sports college students is important for their future.

Keywords: Risk, Risk Taking, Physical Education, Sports.

Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Risk Alma Davranışlarının Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi

Öz

Bu araştırmanın amacı beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin risk alma davranışlarının bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesidir. Araştırmada betimsel yöntemlerden biri olan genel tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Araştırma 2017-2018 eğitim öğretim yılında Gaziantep Üniversitesi, İnönü Üniversitesi, Atatürk Üniversitesi ile Van Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesinin beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokullarında okuyan 264'ü erkek, 154'ü kadın olmak üzere toplam 418 öğrenciyi kapsamaktadır. Araştırmada veri aracı olarak Blais ve Weber (2006) tarafından geliştirilen 'Risk Alma Ölçeği' kullanılmıştır. Toplanan veriler değerlendirilirken tanımlayıcı istatistiksel tekniklerle birlikte, ikili gruplar için t testi ve çoklu gruplar için One Way Anova testine başvurulmuş, farklılığın kaynağını belirlemek için Scheffe testi kullanılmıştır. Araştırmaya katılan beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin yaş, cinsiyet, aylık gelir ve spor yapma durumu değişkenleri risk alma davranışları alt boyutları arasında anlamlı farkların olduğu belirlenmiştir. Araştırma sonucunda beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokullarında okuyan öğrencilerin yaş, cinsiyet, aylık gelir ve spor yapma durumu risk alma davranışlarını etkileyen en önemli değişkenler olduğu sonucuna varılmıştır. Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin risk alma davranışlarının olası olumsuz sonuçlarından öğrencileri korumak onların geleceklere açısından önemlidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Risk, Risk Alma, Beden Eğitimi, Spor.

INTRODUCTION

The word risk is a concept that is always encountered in sports organizations and trainings and in various branches of sports. Uncertainty, danger, damage are the components of the risk (Karataş, Yücel, Gündoğdu & Öztürk Karataş, 2018). Risk usually refers to situations in which it generally threatens the existence, life, goals and resources of people but it cannot be prevented because it isn't known when and how it will occur (Kızıldağ, 2011).

This concept involves the avoidance of some risk behaviors that are frequently observed in the society, causing death and crippling at the highest rate known to ensure protection from preventable diseases and prolong the healthy timespan (Çamur, Üner, Çilingiroğlu & Özcebe, 2007).

Risk is a concept that can be encountered at every stage of life, it is observed not only in the case of states, large corporations or complex transactions, but also in individuals' daily lives (Ekici, 2015).

Risk taking involves making decisions in an unknown area or under unknown circumstances without knowing what the results will be (Wakkee, Elfring & Monaghan, 2010). The concept of perceived risk implies that the current stimuli can be perceived differently by different people with the effect of various factors and their condition and as a result, they can be interpreted differently and direct the individuals towards different behaviors because of this different interpretation (Saraç & Kahyaoğlu, 2011).

Risk taking behavior is defined as a life-threatening and psychosocial behavior that may result in illness or death (Gonzalez & Tiffany, 1994). Undesirable risky behaviors are alcohol use and smoking, unprotected sex, dangerous and careless driving, eating disorders, interpersonal aggression, suicidal behavior and dangerous sports (Boyer, 2006; Michael & Ben-Zur, 2007). Displaying such negative behaviors may negatively affect the individual's life about herself/himself and the surrounding. According to Gullone and Moore (2000), if the positive sides of a behavior are more than its negative aspects, then this behavior is rarely considered risky. On the other hand, if the negative sides outweigh the positive sides, that behavior is a risky behavior and even it is unreasonable to exhibit that behavior.

Determining the risk taking behaviors encountered in every period of our lives will affect the future life of the person positively or negatively. Thus, the purpose of our study is to analyze the risk taking behaviors of students studying in school of physical education and sports by some variables. Determining the students' risk taking behaviors of the school of physical education and sports will contribute to their efforts to be successful and happy in their future lives.

Sentence of problem

Do the risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students differ in terms of some variables?

Subproblems of research

The subproblems of the study are listed as follows:

1. Is there a significant difference in risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students according to the age variable?
2. Is there a significant difference in risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students according to the gender variable?
3. Is there a significant difference in risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students according to the income level variable?
4. Is there a significant difference in risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students according to the doing sports variable?

MATERIAL AND METHOD

General screening model, which is one of the descriptive methods, was used in the research. While the research population involves the students studying in schools of physical education and sports, the sample consists of a total of 418 students composed of 264 males and 154 females studying in the schools of physical education and sports in Gaziantep University, İnönü University, Atatürk University and Van Yüzüncü Yıl University. Domain Specific Risk Taking Scale (DOSPERT) developed by Blais and Weber (2006) was used together with the personal information form prepared by the researcher with the purpose of obtaining research data. The scale is composed of 5 sub-dimensions (ethical, social, health, recreation and financial) each one containing 6 items and it is evaluated over 7-point Likert type scale from 1 “strongly disagree” to 7 “strongly agree” (Blais and Weber 2006). The computer package program was used in the interpretation of data. Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of the research was found as $\alpha=0.93$. The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients of the sub-dimensions of the scale have been found to be ($\alpha=0.87$) for ethical sub-dimension, ($\alpha=0.70$) for social sub-dimension, ($\alpha=0.72$) for health sub-dimension, ($\alpha=0.73$) for recreation sub-dimension and ($\alpha=0.89$) for financial sub-dimension. Descriptive statistical methods (Frequency, Mean, Standard Deviation and Percentage) were used in evaluation of the study, T-Test was used for pairwise groups and One Way Anova and a post hoc test Scheffe were used for multiple groups.

FINDINGS

Table 1.

Personal Information of School of Physical Education and Sports Students

		N	%
Age	18-21	177	42.3
	22-25	181	43.3
	26-29	37	8.9
	30+	23	5.5
Gender	Male	264	63.2
	Female	154	36.8
Income Level	500 TL and below	113	27.0
	501-1250 TL	142	34.0
	1251-2000 TL	83	19.9
	2001-2750 TL	29	6.9
	2751 TL and above	51	12.2
Doing Sports	Yes	308	73.7
	No	110	26.3
Total		418	100.0

Analyzing the personal information of school of physical education and sports students constituting the research group in Table 1, it is observed that the majority (181 people) are at the age group of 22-25 (43.3%), 264 participants (63.2%) are male, the income level of 142 people (61%) is 501-1250 TL and 308 people (73.7%) do sports mostly.

Table 2.

Analysis on risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students by the variable of age

	Age	N	Mean	SS	F	P	Sign. Difference
Ethical Dimension	a.18-21	177	2.82	1.74	1.506	.212	-
	b.22-25	181	3.06	1.83			
	c.26-29	37	3.27	1.47			
	d.30+	23	2.50	1.41			
Social Dimension	a.18-21	177	4.66	1.23	3.664	.012*	b-c
	b.22-25	181	4.89	1.05			
	c.26-29	37	4.24	1.39			
	d.30+	23	4.63	.95			
Health Dimension	a.18-21	177	3.76	1.75	.317	.813	-
	b.22-25	181	3.90	1.66			
	c.26-29	37	3.87	1.43			
	d.30+	23	3.63	1.16			
Recreation Dimension	a.18-21	177	4.35	1.71	1.139	.333	-
	b.22-25	181	4.51	1.48			
	c.26-29	37	4.18	1.25			
	d.30+	23	3.99	1.16			
Financial Dimension	a.18-21	177	3.23	1.81	2.145	.094	-
	b.22-25	181	3.63	1.76			
	c.26-29	37	3.74	1.37			
	d.30+	23	3.15	1.30			
General Risk Taking	a.18-21	177	3.76	1.32	1.388	.246	-
	b.22-25	181	4.00	1.31			
	c.26-29	37	3.86	1.17			
	d.30+	23	3.58	.88			

($p < 0.05$)

Statistically significant difference is observed in the social sub-dimension of risk taking behaviors by the variable of ages of school of physical education and sports students ($p < 0.05$). It is also seen that social sub-dimension scores of students at the age group of 22-25 (4.89 ± 1.05) are higher than the social sub-dimension scores of students at the age group of 26-29 (4.24 ± 1.39). No statistically significant difference is observed in other sub-dimensions ($p > 0.05$).

Table 3.

Analysis on Risk Taking Behaviors of School of Physical Education and Sports Students According to Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	SS	t	p
Ethical Dimension	Male	264	2.94	1.70	-.095	.924
	Female	154	2.96	1.83	-.093	
Social Dimension	Male	264	4.71	1.13	-.127	.899
	Female	154	4.73	1.23	-.124	
Health Dimension	Male	264	3.96	1.43	2.201	.044
	Female	154	3.59	1.96	2.029	
Recreation Dimension	Male	264	4.51	1.56	2.137	.033
	Female	154	4.17	1.52	2.153	
Financial Dimension	Male	264	3.48	1.71	.481	.630
	Female	154	3.39	1.77	.477	
General Risk Taking	Male	264	3.92	1.21	1.158	.266
	Female	154	3.77	1.40	1.113	

($p < 0.05$)

Statistically significant difference is observed in the sub-dimensions of health and recreation between women and men in risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students by the variable of sex ($p < 0.05$). It is seen that health sub-dimension scores of men (3.96 ± 1.14) are higher than women (3.59 ± 1.96) and the men's score in the sub-dimension of recreation (4.51 ± 1.56) is higher than women (4.17 ± 1.52). No statistically significant difference is observed in other sub-dimensions ($p > 0.05$).

Table 4.

Analysis on Risk Taking Behaviors of School of Physical Education and Sports Students by the Variable of Income

	Monthly Income	N	Mean	SS	F	p	Signf. Difference
Ethical Dimension	a.500 TL and below	113	2.93	1.95	3.417	.009	b-c
	b.501-1250 TL	142	2.58	1.54			
	c.1251-2000 TL	83	3.40	1.74			
	d.2001-2750 TL	29	3.00	1.84			
	e.2751 TL +	51	3.25	1.62			
Social Dimension	a.500 TL and below	113	4.79	1.15	3.512	.008	c-d
	b.501-1250 TL	142	4.74	1.04			
	c.1251-2000 TL	83	4.40	1.37			
	d.2001-2750 TL	29	5.30	.91			
	e.2751 TL +	51	4.69	1.22			
Health Dimension	a.500 TL and below	113	3.76	2.01	.799	.527	-
	b.501-1250 TL	142	3.83	1.40			
	c.1251-2000 TL	83	3.65	1.69			
	d.2001-2750 TL	29	4.02	1.35			
	e.2751 TL +	51	4.13	1.50			
Recreation Dimension	a.500 TL and below	113	4.23	1.57	2.102	.080	-
	b.501-1250 TL	142	4.42	1.42			
	c.1251-2000 TL	83	4.17	1.51			
	d.2001-2750 TL	29	4.95	2.32			
	e.2751 TL +	51	4.66	1.33			
Financial Dimension	a.500 TL and below	113	3.32	1.85	1.682	.153	-
	b.501-1250 TL	142	3.26	1.67			
	c.1251-2000 TL	83	3.61	1.73			
	d.2001-2750 TL	29	3.55	1.67			
	e.2751 TL +	51	3.91	1.61			
General Risk Taking	a.500 TL and below	113	3.81	1.46	1.197	.312	-
	b.501-1250 TL	142	3.77	1.11			
	c.1251-2000 TL	83	3.84	1.36			
	d.2001-2750 TL	29	4.16	1.15			
	e.2751 TL +	51	4.13	1.25			

(p<0.05)

Statistically significant difference is observed between those with an income level of 501-1250 TL and 1251-2000 TL in the ethical sub-dimension and those with an income level of 1251-2000 TL and 2001-2750 TL in the social sub-dimension of risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports

students by the variable of income level ($p < 0.05$). Ethical sub-dimension scores of those with an income level of 501-1250 TL (2.58 ± 1.54) are lower than those with an income level of 1251-2000 TL (3.40 ± 1.74). Social sub-dimension scores of those with an income level of 1251-2000 TL (4.40 ± 1.37) are lower than those with an income level of 2001-2750 TL ($5.30 \pm .91$). No statistically significant difference is observed in other sub-dimensions ($p > 0.05$).

Table 5.

Analysis on Risk Taking Behaviors of School of Physical Education and Sports Students by the Variable of Exercise Status

	Doing Sports	N	Mean	SS	t	p
Ethical Dimension	Yes	308	2.87	1.78	-1.528	.127
	No	110	3.17	1.65	-1.582	
Social Dimension	Yes	308	4.81	1.04	2.693	.022
	No	110	4.46	1.45	2.308	
Health Dimension	Yes	308	3.91	1.50	1.812	.116
	No	110	3.58	2.01	1.582	
Recreation Dimension	Yes	308	4.48	1.53	2.095	.037
	No	110	4.12	1.59	2.058	
Financial Dimension	Yes	308	3.40	1.73	-.960	.338
	No	110	3.58	1.75	-.956	
General Risk Taking	Yes	308	3.89	1.24	.781	.462
	No	110	3.78	1.40	.737	

($p < 0.05$)

Looking at Table 5, statistically significant difference is observed in the social and recreation sub-dimensions of risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students by the variable of doing sports ($p < 0.05$). It is observed that social sub-dimension scores of those doing sports (4.81 ± 1.04) are higher than those not doing sports (4.46 ± 1.45) and in the recreation sub-dimension, the scores of those doing sports (4.48 ± 1.53) are higher than those not doing sports (4.12 ± 1.59). No statistically significant difference is observed in other sub-dimensions ($p > 0.05$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this section, the results obtained from the findings collected to examine the risk taking of school of physical education and sports students in terms of some variables will be discussed.

The first subproblem of the study is to determine whether the risk-taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students differ significantly in terms of age variable.

Statistically significant difference is observed in the social sub-dimension of risk taking behaviors of students by gender. This result is supported by Bayar and Sayıl (2005) have found that risk taking behaviors generally increase with age and then decrease. The research results of Hosker-Field, Molnar & Book (2016), Vredenburg (2014), Mancini and Huebner (2004) support the findings of our study.

The second subproblem of the study is to determine whether the risk-taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students differ significantly in terms of gender variable.

Risk taking scores of male students were found to be higher than female students in the sub-dimension of health and recreation when the risk taking behaviors of students are evaluated by the variable of sex. Aktaş and Erhan (2015), have determined in their study that health sub-dimension scores of men are higher than women by sex. In the researches of Uludağlı and Sayıl (2009), Gullone, Moore, Moss & Boyd, (2000), Uysal and Bingöl (2014), Hu and Xie (2012), Yılmaz (2000), it has been determined that risk taking behaviors differ by sex. The reason being effective in this result is that our society generally sets boys more free than girls, girls are more restricted; so, risk-taking behaviors of boys are higher than girls.

The third subproblem of the study is to determine whether there is a significant difference in risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students in terms of income level variable.

Statistically significant difference is observed between those with an income level of 501-1250 TL and 1251-2000 TL in the ethical sub-dimension and those with an income level of 1251-2000 TL and 2001-2750 TL in the social sub-dimension of risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students by the variable of income level. It has been observed that an increase in income level of the family increases risk taking behavior (Hawkins, Catalona & Miller, 1992; Gündoğdu, Korkmaz & Karakuş, 2005; Rockett, Spirito, Fritz, Riggs & Bond, 1991). These studies performed on risk taking behavior and income level support the findings of our study. We can say that an improvement in the income level of individuals makes the person relax and feel free, so their risk taking behavior increases.

The fourth subproblem of the study is to determine whether the risk-taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students show a significant difference in terms of doing sports.

Statistically significant difference is observed in the social and recreation sub-dimensions of risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students by the variable of exercise status. We can state that the students participating in sports events can get rid of their shyness and negative feelings from their minds, they can accommodate themselves with difficult conditions, they develop such behaviors as self-confidence, success, ambition and self-control and risk taking behaviors of those doing sports are higher than those who don't due to the fact that sports increase competition and courage. The research results of Aktaş and Erhan (2015) comply with our findings.

In conclusion, we can express that the older the students are, the more their risk taking behaviors are, men are more inclined to take risk than women, risk taking behaviors of the students with low income level are lower than those with a high income level and those doing sports tend to take risk more than those not doing sports. This study analyzes the risk taking behaviors of the students studying in school of physical education and sports, which appear as an important problem, and thus contributes to the relevant literature. This study is important in that it protects students studying in school of physical education and sports from the possible negative results of risk taking behaviors.

REFERENCES

- Aktaş, İ. & Erhan S.E. (2015). Spor yapan ve spor yapmayan bireylerin benlik saygısı ve risk alma düzeylerinin incelenmesi (Erzurum İli Örneği). *Sportif Bakış: Spor ve Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(2),40-51.
- Bayar, N. & Sayıl, M. (2005). Brief report: Risk taking behaviors in a non-western urban adolescent sample. *Journal of Adolescence*, 28,671-676.
- Blais, A.R. & Weber, E.U. (2006). A domain specific risk taking scale for adult populations. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 1,33-47.
- Boyer, Ty W. (2006). The developmental of risk-taking: A multi-perspective review. *Developmental Review*, 26,291-345.
- Çamur, D., Üner, S., Çilingiroğlu, N. & Özcebe, H. (2007). Bir üniversitenin bazı fakülte ve yüksekokullarında okuyan gençlerde bazı risk alma davranışları. *Toplum Hekimliği Bülteni*, 26(3),32-38.

- Ekici, H. (2015). *Kurumsal Risk Yönetimi Kalkınma Ajansları Uygulaması*. Çizgi Kitabevi.
- Gonzalez, J. & Tiffany, F. (1994). Adolescents perceptions of their risk taking behaviour. *Adolescence*, 29(115),701-711.
- Gullone, E. & Moore, S. (2000). Adolescent risk-taking and the fivefactor model of personality. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23(4),393-407.
- Gullone, E., Moore, S., Moss, S. & Boyd, C. (2000). The adolescent risk-taking questionnaire: development and psychometric evaluation. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 15,231-250.
- Gündoğdu, M., Korkmaz, S. & Karakuş, K. (2005). Lise öğrencilerinde risk alma davranışı. *M.U. Atatürk Faculty of Education Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 21,51-160.
- Hawkins, J.D., Catalona, R. F. & Miller, J.Y. (1992). "Risk and protective factors for alcohol and other drug problems in adolescence and early adulthood." *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 64-105.
- Hosker-Field, A.M., Molnar, D.S.& Book, A.S. (2016). Psychopathy and risk taking: examining the role of risk perception. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 91,123-132.
- Hu, X.& Xie, X. (2012). Validation of the domain-specific risk-taking scale in chinese college students. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 7(2),181-188.
- Karataş, Ö., Yücel, A., S. Gündoğdu, C. & Öztürk Karataş, E. (2018). Risk yönetimi ve sporda risk yönetimi. Meriç, Eraslan (Ed). *Spor Bilimlerinde Akademik Araştırmalar* içinde s.27-59, Gece Kitaplığı. Bizim Büro Matbaa.
- Kızıldağ, D. (2011). *ISO 31000 Risk Yönetimi*. Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Mancini, J.A. & Huebner, A.J. (2004). Adolescent risk behavior patterns: effects of structured time-use, interpersonal connections, self-system characteristics and socio-demographic influences. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 21(6),647-668.
- Michael, K. & Ben-Zur, H. (2007). Risk taking among adolescents: association with social and affective factors. *Journal of Adolescence*, 30,17-31.
- Rockett, I.R.H., Spirito, A., Fritz, G.K., Riggs, S. & Bond, A. (1991). Adolescent risk takers: A trauma center study of suicide attempters and driver. *The International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 37, 285-292.

- Saraç, M. & Kahyaoglu, M.B. (2011). Bireysel yatırımcıların risk alma eğilimine etki eden sosyo-ekonomik ve demografik faktörlerin analizi. *BDDK Bankacılık ve Finansal Piyasalar*, 5(2), 135-157.
- Uludağlı, P.N. & Sayıl, M. (2009). Orta ve ileri ergenlik döneminde risk alma davranışı: ebeveyn ve akranların rolü. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 12(23), 14-24.
- Uysal, R. & Bingöl, Y.T. (2014). Ergenlerde risk alma davranışının öz-yeterlik ve farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2(8), 573-582.
- Vredenburg, A.N. (2014). Reported risk behaviors and perceived riskiness of activities using a risk-taking scale by adolescents and young adults. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society 58th Annual Meeting*, 58(1), 544-548.
- Wakkee, I. Elfring, T. & Monaghan, S. (2010). Creating entrepreneurial employees in traditional service sectors the role of coaching and self-efficacy. *International Entrepreneurship Management*, 6, 1-21.
- Yılmaz, T. (2000). *Ergenlikte Risk Alma Davranışlarının İncelenmesi*. Master's thesis, Ege University Institute of Social Sciences Department of Psychology.

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

Purpose: Determining the risk taking behaviors encountered in every period of our lives will affect the future life of the person positively or negatively. Thus, the purpose of our study is to analyze the risk taking behaviors of students studying in school of physical education and sports by some variables. Determining the students' risk taking behaviors of the school of physical education and sports will contribute to their efforts to be successful and happy in their future lives.

Method: General screening model, which is one of the descriptive methods, was used in the research. While the research population involves the students studying in schools of physical education and sports, the sample consists of a total of 418 students composed of 264 males and 154 females studying in the schools of physical education and sports in Gaziantep University, İnönü University, Atatürk University and Van Yüzüncü Yıl University. Domain Specific Risk Taking Scale (DOSPERT) developed by Blais and Weber (2006) was used together with the personal information form prepared by the researcher with the purpose of obtaining research data. The scale is composed of 5 sub-dimensions (ethical,

social, health, recreation and financial) each one containing 6 items and it is evaluated over 7-point Likert type scale from 1 “strongly disagree” to 7 “strongly agree” (Blais and Weber 2006). The computer package program was used in the interpretation of data. Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient of the research was found as $\alpha=0.93$. The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients of the sub-dimensions of the scale have been found to be ($\alpha=0.87$) for ethical sub-dimension, ($\alpha=0.70$) for social sub-dimension, ($\alpha=0.72$) for health sub-dimension, ($\alpha=0.73$) for recreation sub-dimension and ($\alpha=0.89$) for financial sub-dimension. Descriptive statistical methods (Frequency, Mean, Standard Deviation and Percentage) were used in evaluation of the study, T-Test was used for pairwise groups and One Way Anova and a post hoc test Scheffe were used for multiple groups.

Findings: Analyzing the personal information of school of physical education and sports students constituting the research group, it is observed that the majority (181 people) are at the age group of 22-25 (43.3%), 264 participants (63.2%) are male, the income level of 142 people (61%) is 501-1250 TL and 308 people (73.7%) do sports mostly.

Statistically significant difference is observed in the social sub-dimension of risk taking behaviors by the variable of ages of school of physical education and sports students ($p<0.05$). It is also seen that social sub-dimension scores of students at the age group of 22-25 (4.89 ± 1.05) are higher than the social sub-dimension scores of students at the age group of 26-29 (4.24 ± 1.39). No statistically significant difference is observed in other sub-dimensions ($p>0.05$).

Statistically significant difference is observed in the sub-dimensions of health and recreation between women and men in risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students by the variable of sex ($p<0.05$). It is seen that health sub-dimension scores of men (3.96 ± 1.14) are higher than women (3.59 ± 1.96) and the men’s score in the sub-dimension of recreation (4.51 ± 1.56) is higher than women (4.17 ± 1.52). No statistically significant difference is observed in other sub-dimensions ($p>0.05$).

Statistically significant difference is observed between those with an income level of 501-1250 TL and 1251-2000 TL in the ethical sub-dimension and those with an income level of 1251-2000 TL and 2001-2750 TL in the social sub-dimension of risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students by the variable of income level ($p<0.05$). Ethical sub-dimension scores of those with an income level of 501-1250 TL (2.58 ± 1.54) are lower than those with an income level of 1251-2000 TL (3.40 ± 1.74). Social sub-dimension scores of those with an income level of 1251-2000 TL (4.40 ± 1.37) are lower than those with an income level of 2001-2750 TL (5.30 ± 0.91). No statistically significant difference is observed in other sub-dimensions ($p>0.05$).

Statistically significant difference is observed in the social and recreation sub-dimensions of risk taking behaviors of school of physical education and sports students by the variable of doing sports ($p < 0.05$). It is observed that social sub-dimension scores of those doing sports (4.81 ± 1.04) are higher than those not doing sports (4.46 ± 1.45) and in the recreation sub-dimension, the scores of those doing sports (4.48 ± 1.53) are higher than those not doing sports (4.12 ± 1.59). No statistically significant difference is observed in other sub-dimensions ($p > 0.05$).

Discussion & Conclusion: In conclusion, we can express that the older the students are, the more their risk taking behaviors are, men are more inclined to take risk than women, risk taking behaviors of the students with low income level are lower than those with a high income level and those doing sports tend to take risk more than those not doing sports. This study analyzes the risk taking behaviors of the students studying in school of physical education and sports, which appear as an important problem, and thus contributes to the relevant literature. This study is important in that it protects students studying in school of physical education and sports from the possible negative results of risk taking behaviors.