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ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to explore the Risk Management Practices of Physical Education (RMPPE) Lecturers at the Institute of Teacher Education (ITE). This study focuses on the elements of the risk management practices of the dominant program of Physical Education and demographic differences between the risk management practices. A total of 39 respondents involved in this study is a lecturer at the Institute of Teacher Education consists of 32 Lecturer males and 7 females. Data were collected through questionnaires five point scale was analyzed using the Rasch model with V3.69.1.11 software. The findings of a pilot analysis, the Cronbach alpha reliability and trustworthiness of individuals was 0.99 (very good) and the reliability of the ITEs was 0.75 indicating a good level. The findings show that elements RMPPE Lecturer ITE at the high level and the dominant element is the selection of operations, implementation, identification and assessment. Analysis of the differences between demographic and RMPPE element shows all the elements are not significant differences with the t > 2.00 and a value of p <0.05. This shows RMPPE Instrument is suitable and able to measure the elements RMPPE Lecturer Institute of Teacher Education.
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1.0 Introduction

Risk management is very important in the industry Sport and Physical Education (Van der Smissen, 1990). Risk management in sports is an issue of growing concern to the organization of sports especially school sports program. Sports risk management is gaining attention in the early 1970s (Aman, 2006) and has become increasingly serious in the beginning of this new millennium. Sekendiz (2011) and Laroche & Corbelt (2010) argue that sport has now shifted from leisure activities to professional activities including industrial, professional athletes and coaches. Anyone who is in the profession of sports including athletes, team managers, coaches, officials, organizers of the games or sporting goods manufacturers are exposed to risks related to security issues.

Physical Education for marketing organizations, students and athletes are a customer and Physical Education activities is the product (Chen 2012). The problem often faced by students in physical education activities are as achievement in physical education dropped them due to the absence of risk management practices, the education system, Lecturer incompetent, the parents are not encouraging, infrastructure facilities and equipment (Farzalipour, S. et.al. 2012, Omar 2012, Goodarzi, 2012, Boon and Sabtu, 2011, Singh and Surujlal 2010, and Zuber 2003). In risk management, the risk of negligence and anxiety often used as a key issue by parents and guardians to allow their child custody involved in physical education activities for fear of injury. All the problems arising as a Lecturer in Physical Education or personal incompetent risk management and organization of Physical Education no model of Physical Education Risk Management Practices (RMPPE) standard, which can be applied (Mustaffa 2013, 2014). Risk management is not emphasized in Physical Education by Lecturer cause many accidents and this figure increases further concern on students to participate in physical education activities (Sekendiz 2011, Ang 2007, Amrin 2007, and Leyk, Erley and Bilzon 2007). If the issue persists and No action, feared would be a cancer in Physical Education and its impact the downturn in the industry of Physical Education that will hurt many parties such as athletes, coaches and physical education organizations.

Implementation of risk management in the Physical Education program not emphasized the implications lead to claims of lack of supervision or supervision (Olsen and Kowalski, 2010 and Van der Smissen 1996). Among the cases categorized as supervisory negligence court cases involving physical education occurred in New York, namely negligence Lecturer softball using the tool face barriers to
athletes (Lachapelle 2004). There are also cases of failure of Physical Education training organization providing catcher during a training session is contrary to the standard rules of Physical Education in New York for example the case Zmitrowitz sued the Roman Catholic in 2000 (Lachapelle 2004). In addition, there are also cases of Physical Education organization sued for failure to improve risk control hazards inherent in Physical Education (Lachapelle 2004).

Thus, with the problem as stated, it is necessary to study to measure the elements of risk management practices to identify practices Physical Education Lecturer in managing risk in the Physical Education program. Clearly here there is a serious need for us to prepare lecturers should capture the risk management practices of Physical Education to establish and maintain the security situation in each of the Physical Education program.

1.1 Purpose of the study

This study was undertaken to identify the elements of Risk Management Practices of Physical Education (RMPPE) Lecturer Institute of Teacher Education. RMPPE element studied is the identification, evaluation, operation selection and implementation.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

This research aims to achieve the following objectives.

1. Identify the elements RMPPE dominant among Lecturer Institute of Teacher Education.
2. Identify differences by demographic RMPPE element among Lecturer Institute of Teacher Education.

2.0 Review of Literature.

Risk is the probability of exposure or hazard or harm (Standards Australia, 2004 and Farmer, Mulrooney and Ammon, 1996) or uncertainty about the occurrence of a loss (Rejda, 2011). Risk management is the culture, models and structures that are directed towards more effective management and avoidance of adverse effects (Standards Australia, 2004). Risk management has been defined as a measure to control the financial loss and personal injury sudden, unexpected, unusual accidents and intentional torts (Rejda, 2011 and Ammon, 2001). Risk management practices are preventive measures of accident / injury.

Mohd Sharif (2011) and Abdul Hamid (2010) concur said that among the causes of individual risk factors such as lack of knowledge and skills, physical and mental problems, and lack of employee motivation. Labour factor is the type of work that are more exposed to hazards such as that described in the theory Hendrich on the first domino. Among the equipment sports equipment low quality, low maintenance frequency levels and insufficient number of staff (Sekendiz, 2011 and Miller, 2011).

Mun (2004) explains that risk management in the context of sports is a responsibility to identify and determine the methods used against potential threats negative impact on sporting events. Lachapelle (2004) states that "risk management exercise" is a term coined by experts to cover all of a strategy to give consideration when dealing with risks. The main focus of risk management is to reduce the exposure to danger, harm, or danger (Berlonghi, 1990; Kaiser, 1986) as well as to prevent and minimize legal liability business entities (Zimmerman, 2004, Sekendiz, 2011 and Herb, 2012).

Van der Smissen (1990) explains the importance of risk management in the sports industry by declaring that managers and administrators who provide services for the leisure and education agree, and aggressive attention to: i) financial risk management and planning to reduce costs; and ii) allow a reasonable and service programs implemented effectively (Herb, 2012; Hood, 2012; Sekendiz, 2011). Shamsuddin (2013). Lhotsky (2006) and Appenzeller (1998) concurred stating that risks remain in force in the sport. Although there are programs that are the safest, the risk of accidents and injuries remain
inevitable, but only needs to be controlled. Sports managers need to devise and develop risk management to ensure a safe environment program and the joint venture.

Sharp (1990) lists three main reasons for the purposes of risk management programs in education and sports in America. First, because the action and posture relative odds with sports athletes and lawyers do not trust in the performance of their duties concerned with wealth. The second reason is concern over judicial liability related to sports. Liability has been extended to individuals who administer programs for the integrity of sport and recreation liability risk is omitted since the past few years. The third factor is the trend towards the abolition of government immunity, which most states, school districts and state universities can now be prosecuted.

By providing an environment that is safe program of Physical Education, honest, and efficient, organizations can reduce legal liability and improve the positive reputation of the organization (Clement, 1998). Effective risk management should identify the liability and risk factors as alternative solutions exist, and to make recommendations for cost-effective.

2.1 Risk Management Practice Model.

There are many risk management plans and models that have been created by experts in sports law. Six models of risk management are summarized in the following section. Risk management model is presented on a number of measures incorporated in each model. Existing Risk Management Model, which Hronek and Spengler (2002), Carpenter (2000), Fuller (1999), Mulrooney and Farmer (1998) and Van der Smissen (1990) was used as the conceptual framework for this model focuses on risk management coach sports and physical education. Figure 2.1 describes all models are examined in terms of similarities and differences. It can be concluded that the components that often arise concerning risk management are categorized into four main constructs, namely the identification, evaluation, selection and implementation of operations. In fact, this thesis will be one of the first and most important aspect in the construction of model risk management practices of Physical Education. Next, youth and sports organizations can learn something from many risk management models that differ Physical Education as well as the importance of being proactive in efforts to assess, reduce and control the risk of their participants, volunteers and the organization as a whole. With this there is a need to conduct a study to test the validity of this model.

Table 2.1 Comparison of Risk Management Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Risk Management Strategy Carpenter (2000)</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
<th>Phase 4</th>
<th>model touching / respect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management Cycle Hronek and Spengler's (2002)</td>
<td>Risk identification</td>
<td>Risk assessment: frequency experienced or expected and the severity of the incident.</td>
<td>Treatment of risk: Earnings, reduced, transferred, and avoid the risk of</td>
<td>Execution risk: When a repaired, converted, or built to handle the risk. Policy, warning, publishing.</td>
<td>Recreation and leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Risk Management Strategy Carpenter (2000)</td>
<td>Risk identification</td>
<td>Risk Assessment: Risk is life-threatening or could lead to injury? If the liability will bear all the risks, what would be the financial risk or a risk to the</td>
<td>Risk management: waste, reduce, or transfer risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sports, Recreation, and Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management cycle</td>
<td>Risk management process</td>
<td>Risk assessment: Based on the number of incidents and the number of financial losses that may arise from risk.</td>
<td>Risk treatment: avoidance, transfer or save and reduce risk.</td>
<td>Implement a risk management model.</td>
<td>Sports, Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>Risk recognition - only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implement a risk management model.</td>
<td>Program manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cycle Fuller (1999)</td>
<td>identified risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>Statement related</td>
<td>Statement related policies recommended by the entities that build the base.</td>
<td>State fair operating practices are identified and formatted to the model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Mulrooney</td>
<td>and determine the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Farmer (1998)</td>
<td>approach to control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model risk management</td>
<td>Risk assessment:</td>
<td>Risk assessment: Determining the potential losses in a given period, and the financial resources available to meet those losses</td>
<td>Selection of risk treatment: avoid, reduce, maintain and transfer risk.</td>
<td>Implementing Risk Management Plan: Creation of policies and procedures manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Smissen</td>
<td>Risk identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>Risk identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process Kaiser</td>
<td>Risk assessment:</td>
<td>Risk assessment: Determining the potential losses in a given period, and the financial resources available to meet those losses</td>
<td>Selection of risk treatment: avoid, reduce, maintain and transfer risk.</td>
<td>Implementing Risk Management Plan: Creation of policies and procedures manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1986)</td>
<td>Risk identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Risk Management Practices of Physical Education Institute of Teacher Education

Risk management is the formal process for training organizations have adopted a risk management standard (Richard, 2005; Aaron, 2004; Lachapelle, 2004). The risk of accidents is something that cannot be anticipated and may occur especially in an environment of activities and sports program. Risk management is one of the methods to prevent, protect and provide guidelines to avoid risk (Rejda, 2011; Hsiu-Chin and Chao-Schein, 2010; OCG 2003). Institute of Teacher Education (ITE) in particular and the Ministry of Education (MOE) has generally not been RMPPE the standard model, which can be adopted to enhance safety activities and sports programs in ITE (Ang, 2007; Amrin, 2007; Zuber, 2003). Therefore, it is very important to establish a model RMPPE as guidelines for the prevention of accidents and increasing safety in ITE sports program.

MOE and ITE only guided Manual Safe Schools and Circular Professional as a reference to the security measures in order to prevent the risk of accidents and injuries in schools and institutes. Manual Circular Professional Schools Safe and more emphasis on building safety, cleanliness, beautification and safety and return to school (Che Lan, 2012; MOE, 2012; Sang, 2011; MOE, 2002). The main purpose of the instructions and circulars is to guide implementation towards making schools, communities and families safe for children. Risk management in sports programs are less stressed and too general.

Security in ITE is under the governance of the Committee of Safety, Health, Joy, Health and Welfare (5K) and Occupational Safety and Health (DOSH). The Committee is involved in identifying the status and provides security planning, health, cleanliness institute; monitor the safety institute of theft, fire and other safety aspects; providing and documenting the movement plan for action in case of fire and fire drills held at the premises of the institute; check all equipment, buildings and infrastructure of the institute is in a safe condition; A healthy workforce and establish a conducive working atmosphere;
providing the relevant cafeteria, monitoring reports, analysis workplace safety and health, the next monitoring report will be tabled at the meeting of the Council for Professional and Administrative Management (MPPP) periodically.

In addition to the governance committee and JKKP 5K, quality manual also apply in strengthening security in ITE. Quality is the Quality Procedures Manual (PK), Work Order (AK) and the Reference Document which includes deed, circulars, rules and guidelines adopted in the implementation of security measures ITE activities and sports program. Risk management measures and safety activities and sports programs are outlined in the PT-05 quality procedures and supporting documents, namely Circular Professional (SPI) and the Safe Schools Manual. Documents adopted by the ITE in risk management to ensure the safety of more emphasis on aspects of building, fire, and went back to school but less emphasis RMPPE. Therefore, there should be a standard model that RMPPE to serve as a guide in establishing security in the sports program ITE. Therefore, this study is necessary to produce a model RMPPE, as well as managing a sound risk management practices for ITE.

3.0 Methodology Study

This study is a survey of the relationship between the dependent variable and independent. In this study, an alternative explanation is related elements RMPPE among Lecturer Institute of Teacher Education, while the variable is RMPPE element itself.

The population for this study is a Lecturer Institute of Teacher Education. A total of 39 respondents involved in this study Physical Education Lecturer who is a lecturer at the Institute of Teacher Education consists of 32 people Lecturer male and 7 female lecturers.

In this study, data on the observatory using the questionnaire for the quantitative data. This questionnaire using Likert scale as options with five options. Five-level Likert scale selection is the adaptation of the study Hassan (2012). Five-level Likert scale selection because it can represent a more accurate answer than respondents with just four stages.

A pilot study for this study was conducted with a sample size of 30 people is a lecturer of Physical Education Institute of Teacher Education South Zone. The appropriate number of samples is minimum because even though the minimum sample size, it is still able to produce findings that are accurate and reliable if the data were collected and analyzed efficiently (Bryman and Bell, 2003). To determine the validity and reliability of the instrument and the respondents, data were analyzed using the Rasch model. Rasch model was used because it is suitable for the construction of an instrument that uses a Likert scale (Bond and Fox, 2007). The findings of a pilot analysis, the Cronbach alpha reliability and trustworthiness of individuals was 0.99 (very good) and the reliability of items was 0.75 indicating a good level. This show is built instrument can be used for the actual study.

To answer the research question regarding the difference between the demographic and RMPPE, data were analyzed using the Rasch model analysis using DGF (Differential Group Functioning). Software used is Winsteps V3.69.1.11. The results showed that there was a difference if the value of t obtained less than 2.0 and there will be a significant difference if the p-value was less than 0.05.

4.0 Findings.

4.1 RMPPE the dominant element among Lecturer ITE

To see the dominant element in the element RMPPE among respondents, data were analyzed using the Rasch model and software Winsteps V3.69.1.11. The mean value of negative measure indicates that element is dominant among the respondents. For a positive value means that these elements are difficult to answer and less agreed upon by the respondent. Data were analyzed according to the four elements that have been assigned the identification, evaluation, selection of operations and implementation.
Table 1: The mean size of each element according to the level of dominance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Highest size</th>
<th>Lowest size</th>
<th>Mean mesure (logit)</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating selection</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identification</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to Table 1 above, the control manager for RMPPE is high that they agree that the PRS should be practiced in the operations choices (mean = -0.14 logit scale; mean = 4.18), performance (mean = -0.11 logit scale; mean = 4.17), identification (mean = -0.06 logit scale; mean = 4.14) and Assessment (mean size = 0.19 logit; mean score = 4.01). The results of this analysis showed that the coach of the dominant RMPPE operations of choices, implementation, identification and assessment. The mean scores were seen to refer to the logit, the logit of the greater of the logit of the respondents indicated that respondents more easily recognize ITEs RMPPE is given and the logit smaller shows respondents increasingly difficult to recognize ITEs RMPPE given.

4.2 The difference between sex and domination RMPPE

Researchers analyzed in order to identify whether there are differences between the sexes for the elements of the risk management practices of sports coaches Institute of Teacher Education. According to Bond and Fox (2007) to identify the differences established criteria is the value of t must be greater than 2 (t > 2) and the p-value is to be less than 0.05 (p <0.05). If this value has been determined eligible, so it can be concluded that there is no difference between the sexes for each of the elements of the risk management practices of the sport. Table 6.4 below shows a summary of the differences between the sexes for each of the elements of the risk management practices of the sport.

Table 2: The difference between sex and domination RMPPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>identification</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>there is no significant difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>there is no significant difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation choices</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>there is no significant difference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>there is no significant difference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analysis of this study the researchers to conclude that the elements of the risk management practices of this sport there is no difference between the sexes. This indicates that the instrument was built to measure the appropriate and effective RMPPE. The results of the analysis of this study the researchers to conclude that the elements of the risk management practices of this sport there is no difference between the sexes. This indicates that the instrument was built to measure the appropriate and effective RMPPE.

5.0 Discussion

5.1 Identify the most dominant element

Based on the analysis carried out, the respondents agreed to all elements of the risk management practices of Physical Education Lecturer listed in the questionnaire. Respondents who worked as a
lecturer at ITE throughout Malaysia, and provide high approval of the elements of risk management practices of Physical Education dominant namely the operation selection, implementation, identification and assessment. These findings are consistent with studies Hronek and Spengler's (2002) and Carpenter (2000) stated the elements of risk management practices of Physical Education identification, evaluation, selection operations, and the implementation will create a safe environment Physical Education program and minimize losses to the organization of Physical Education. This statement is also supported Attarian (2012) elements of risk management can reduce the probability of Physical Education, severity of accidents and injuries, thus to reduce exposure to legal liability to the organization.

5.2 Identifying gender differences for each of the elements of the risk management practices of Physical Education.

Based on the analysis carried out, as a whole, there are no significant gender differences on the elements of the risk management practices of Physical Education Lecturer. This finding is consistent Rippetone (2009) in a study measuring the mean score of male and female teachers about three SRO role, there is no significant difference. Scores min study male and female teachers' not quite different but not enough to reject the hypothesis. This finding is not consistent with the study Mohamad. Fauzee, Lee, Shukri and Zainuddin (2006) and Hsiao (2005) states that male managers are more concerned than the risk management practices of female managers (Kilpatrick, M., Hebert, E. and Bartholomew, J, 2005). The state’s performance is better men than women ratio challenges, strength and endurance, competition and social recognition.

6.0 Conclusion

Researchers can determine the appropriate elements and dominant RMPPE is the identification, Assessment, operations choices and implementation. All RMPPE elements are formed, namely by looking at the mean measure, which has a negative value is the most dominant element of most elements agreed by the respondents, while if the mean measure, which has a positive value it is an element that is less dominant or less agreed upon by the respondents. Therefore, researchers have devised a mean measure of each element in the order of the most negative to the positive. In addition, the researchers also made the assessment that all the elements are formed at a high level according Wiersma (2000), namely, if the mean scores obtained over 3 floors so these ITEs are of a higher level.

In addition, the researchers also learned that all the elements of the risk management practices of sports coaches who formed no difference between the sexes is all because of the values obtained did not meet the conditions and criteria for 'significant difference' has been established that the value of t must be greater than 2 and the p-value is to be less than 0.05.

7.0 Recommendations

The results and findings of this study are useful to teachers, trainers, lecturers, researchers and all those who want to carry out further research. For the purpose of expansion and extension of the research, the following recommendations submitted:

i. This study focused on RMPPE coach ITE. The ITE there for Individuals with Special Needs Sports, and is intended to be reviewed RMPPE for Individuals with Special Needs Sports;

ii. This study is a quantitative exploratory study and the findings obtained only by the feedback given in the questionnaire. Accordingly, the same study can be conducted in a qualitative way to obtain more accurate information on the practice coach and expert opinion in the field of sports risk management.
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