

Investigation of the Effect of Job Stress on Sports Coaches' Job Performance***İş Stresinin Spor Antrenörlerinin İş Performansına Etkisinin İncelenmesi****ORİJİNAL ARAŞTIRMA/
ORIGINAL RESEARCH**Suleyman M. YILDIZ^{1†},İlker GUNEL²,Mehdi DUYAN³¹Mugla Sitki Kocman University,
Faculty of Sport Sciences, Sport
Management Department, Turkey,
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5335-3593>²Directorate of Youth and Sport,
Antalya, Turkey
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7642-1707>³Bitlis Eren University, School of
Physical Education and Sports, Turkey
<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1060-0838>**Yayın Bilgisi**

Gönderi Tarihi: 27.03.2019

Kabul Tarihi: 01.06.2019

Online Yayın Tarihi:30.06.2019

Abstract

This study examined the effect of job stress on the performance of sports coaches. Sports coaches who worked in the Directorate of Youth and Sport at Antalya, Kutahya, Karaman, and Muğla Provinces, in Turkey, participated in the study (n = 168). As a data collection tool, the job stress and job performance scales adapted by Ornek (2017), from Turkmen's (2015) research were used. For the reliability of the scales, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was determined and correlation and hierarchical regression analyses were performed to determine the relationships among the variables. Correlation analysis showed that the performance variable was significantly and negatively correlated with all stress sub-dimensions (p < .01). The strongest relationship was with the management structure (r = -.376). In addition, the performance variable was significantly and negatively correlated with the age variable (r = -.163). The performance variable was significantly and positively correlated with the income variable (r = .171) and the educational degree variable (r = .171). According to the hierarchical regression analysis, the performances of the sports coaches were not affected by any of the demographic variables, but were affected significantly and negatively ($\beta = -.338$; p < .001) by stress.

Key Words: Job Stress, Job Performance, Sports Coaches**Öz**

Bu çalışma, iş stresinin antrenörlerin iş performansı üzerindeki etkisini incelemek amacıyla yapılmıştır. Çalışmaya Antalya, Kütahya, Karaman ve Muğla illerindeki Gençlik ve Spor Müdürlüğünde çalışan spor antrenörleri katılmıştır (n = 168). Veri toplama aracı olarak, Örnek (2017) tarafından Türkmen'in (2015) araştırmasından uyarlanan iş stresi ve iş performansı ölçekleri kullanılmıştır. Ölçeklerin güvenilirliği için Cronbach's Alpha katsayısı belirlenmiş ve değişkenler arasındaki ilişkileri belirlemek için korelasyon ve hiyerarşik regresyon analizleri yapılmıştır. Korelasyon analizi, performans değişkeninin tüm stres alt boyutları ile anlamlı ve negatif ilişkili olduğunu göstermiştir (p < .01). En güçlü ilişki yönetim yapısı ile olmuştur (r = -.376). Ayrıca, performans değişkeni yaş değişkeniyle anlamlı ve negatif olarak ilişkilidir (r = -.163). Bununla birlikte, performans değişkeni, gelir değişkeni (r = .171) ve eğitim derecesi değişkeni (r = .171) ile anlamlı ve pozitif olarak ilişkilidir. Hiyerarşik regresyon analizine göre, spor antrenörlerinin performansı demografik değişkenlerin hiçbirinden etkilenmemiş, ancak stresten anlamlı ve negatif olarak etkilenmiştir ($\beta = -.338$; p < .001).

Anahtar Kelimeler: İş Stresi, İş Performansı, Spor Antrenörleri

*This paper was presented at the Proceeding of the II. World Congress of Sport Sciences Researches, 21-24 March 2019, Manisa, Turkey

† Sorumlu yazar: *E-Mail*: smyildiz@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Coaching is an important profession in the sport sector (Yildiz, 2009). Sports coaches are tasked with improving the performance of a sports team and athletes. For the success of teams and athletes, the relations between a sports coach and athlete are very important. Sports coaches prepare athletes for competitions by applying various training programs. Additionally, they pay attention to all aspects of athletes, motivating each of them. Briefly, sports coaches play an important role in determining the performance of athletes (Gullu, 2018).

Stress and performance, which are very important phenomena in the organizational environment, are closely related to the sports coaches. The phenomenon of competition, inherent in sport, forces the teams to succeed, which leads their coaches to make more effort. Good play in sports, championships, and winning a cup or a medal is considered a measure of success. At this point, the success of teams and athletes are directly affected by the performance of coaches (training knowledge and practice, leadership, motivation, etc.). The performance of coaches can be affected by some factors (work structure, management structure, organizational structure, physical condition, etc.). In case of failure to meet these expectations, negative perception may be a source of stress for coaches.

Stress is a phenomenon that affects people's behavior, work efficiency and relationships with others (Eren, 2001). Stress is defined by Selye (1976) as the non-specific reaction of the body against any request. Schermerhorn, Osborn, Uhl-Bien, & Hunt (2012) defined stress as a state of tension experienced by individuals facing extraordinary demands, constraints, or opportunities.

The work environment, the general environment, and a person's own environment can be sources of stress for an employee (Yildiz, 2017). The stress leads to a number of negative effects on employees; one of them is job performance. Schermerhorn et al. (2012) defined job performance as the quality and quantity accomplished by individuals or groups after fulfilling a task. Job performance has an important role and direct impact on the performance of the organization.

There are some studies in the literature about relationship between stress and performance in various occupational groups (De Ruyter, Wetzels, & Feinberg, 2001). In the field of sports, research on both variables is mostly about athletes (Erdogan, Zekioglu, & Dorak, 2014) and

referees (Gullu & Yildiz, 2019). There is no research on the relationship of both variables in context of coaching. Hence, present study focused investigation the effect of job stress on job performance of sports coaches in various branches of sports.

METHOD

Sample Size and Procedure

The research population of this study were the coaches in different sports branches, who worked in Provincial Directorate of Youth and Sports of Antalya, Kutahya, Karaman, and Mugla Provinces of Turkey. The universe of this study was 4524, one hundred sixty-eight sports coaches participated as voluntary subjects, and the communication with them was provided via pollsters. First, the coaches were informed about the purpose and content of the study, and surveys were distributed to 204 coaches to participate voluntarily in the study. Then, 182 voluntary participants were identified (89% return rates). As a result of the examination, 14 forms were lacking information, and therefore 168 forms were found appropriate for the analysis to test the relationships between the variables identified.

Measurement Instruments

As a data collection tool, the job stress and job performance scales adapted by Ornek (2017) from Turkmen's (2015) research were used. The work stress scale consists of 13 items and 4 sub-dimensions: work structure, organizational structure, management structure, and physical condition. The job performance scale consists of 6 items and 2 sub-dimensions: job success and job satisfaction. All items answered on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 "strongly disagree" to 5 "strongly agree."

Statistical Analysis

In this study, descriptive statistics were used in the analysis of demographic variables. Cronbach's Alpha was calculated to determine the reliability of the scales. Correlation and hierarchical regression analysis were used to determine the relationships between variables.

FINDINGS

Sample Characteristics

Most of the participants were male (75%), married (73.2%), 31-40 years of age (50.6%), and have an undergraduate degree (64.3%), had 473-660 USD income (20.2%). A majority (53%) of the participants were permanent staff (Table 1).

Table 1. Sample characteristics

Variables		f	%	Variables		f	%
Gender	Male	16	75	Marital status	Married	123	73.2
	Female	42	25		Single	45	26.8
	Total	168	100		Total	168	100
Age	20 to 30 years	36	21.4	Employment status	Permanent staff	90	53.6
	31 to 40 years	85	50.6		Fixed-term contract	10	6
	41 to 50 years	31	18.5		Outsourcing	55	32.7
	51 to 60 years	16	9.5		Others	13	7.7
	Total	168	100		Total	168	100
Monthly income (USD)	Less than 283	2	1.2	Education	Secondary	11	6.5
	284-472	34	20.2		Lycee	13	7.7
	473-660	89	53		Associate degree	24	14.3
	661-850	27	16.1		Undergraduate	108	64.3
	More than 851	16	9.5		Master	12	7.1
Total	168	100	Total	168	100		
Length of employment in current institution	Less than 5 years	69	41.1	Total length of working life	Less than 5 years	53	31.5
	6 to 10 years	65	38.7		6 to 10 years	65	38.7
	11 to 15 years	14	8.3		11 to 15 years	16	9.5
	16 to 20 years	5	3		16 to 20 years	7	4.2
	21 to 25 years	5	3		21 to 25 years	10	6
	26 to 30 years	10	6		26 to 30 years	17	10.1
	Total	168	100		Total	168	100

Test for Reliability

Results of the reliability test showed that Cronbach's Alpha was found to be .85 for the stress scale, and .83 for the job performance scale. According to these results, the reliability of the scales is quite high.

Correlation Analysis

According to the results of correlation analysis, the stress variable was significantly and negatively correlated with the monthly income ($r = -.255$; $p < .01$) and the educational level ($r = -.295$; $p < .01$), whereas employment status was significantly and positively related ($r = .164$; $p < .05$). On the other hand, the stress variable was significantly and negatively correlated with

performance ($r = -.364$) and job satisfaction ($r = -.301$) at the $p < .01$ level. The performance variable was significantly and negatively related to the stress sub-dimensions at the $p < .01$ level. The strongest relationship was with the management structure ($r = -.376$). In addition, performance variable was significantly and negatively related with age ($r = -.163$), whereas it was significantly and positively related with monthly income ($r = .171$) and education ($r = .171$). As main variables, there was a significant and negative relationship between stress and performance ($r = -.382$) at the $p < .01$ level (Table 2).

Table 2. Results of correlation analysis

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Gender	1							
2. Age	-.265**	1						
3. Marital status	-.008	-.205**	1					
4. Monthly income	.090	.098	-.086	1				
5. Education	.039	-.274**	.070	.349**	1			
6. Employment status	.156*	-.384**	.204**	-.362**	-.170*	1		
7. Total length of working life	-.188*	.693**	-.136	.347**	.022	-.370**	1	
8. Length of employment in current institution	-.127	.585**	-.086	.174*	-.072	-.303**	.754**	1
9. Work structure	.034	.092	-.005	-.242**	-.261**	.174*	.047	.028
10. Organizational structure	.068	.031	-.007	-.161*	-.234**	.198**	-.008	-.029
11. Management structure	-.050	.108	.092	-.245**	-.234**	.193*	-.025	.024
12. Physical condition	-.112	.137	.054	-.149	-.190*	-.044	-.017	.047
13. Job success	-.048	-.160*	.013	.220**	.246**	-.051	-.031	-.072
14. Job satisfaction	-.035	-.123	.066	.080	.057	-.086	-.039	-.061
15. Stress	-.022	.119	.044	-.255**	-.295**	.164*	-.003	.023
16. Performance	-.048	-.163*	.046	.171*	.171*	-.080	-.040	-.077

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

Table 2. Results of correlation analysis (continue)

Variables	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Gender							
2. Age							
3. Marital status							
4. Monthly income							
5. Education							
6. Employment status							
7. Total length of working life							
8. Length of employment in current institution							
9. Work structure	1						
10. Organizational structure	.537**	1					
11. Management structure	.516**	.615**	1				
12. Physical condition	.358**	.387**	.381**	1			
13. Job success	-.308**	-.254**	-.330**	-.242**	1		
14. Job satisfaction	-.247**	-.183*	-.322**	-.189*	.506**	1	
15. Stress	.761**	.824**	.807**	.703**	-.364**	-.301**	1
16. Performance	-.319**	-.250**	-.376**	-.247**	.860**	.876**	-.382**

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$

Hierarchical Regression Analysis

According to the hierarchical regression analysis, the performance variable was not affected by any of the independent variables, but was only significantly and negatively affected by stress ($\beta = -.338$; $p < .001$), (Table 3).

Table 3. The results of the hierarchical regression analysis aiming to identify the relationship between job performance and independent variables

Independent variables	Step 1			Step 2		
	Beta	t	p	Beta	t	p
Gender	-.106	-1.319	.189	-.099	-1.294	.198
Age	-.239	-1.931	.055	-.195	-1.656	.100
Marital status	.030	.376	.707	.046	.620	.536
Monthly income	.149	1.613	.109	.092	1.040	.300
Education	.037	.410	.683	-.027	-.315	.753
Employment status	-.094	-1.028	.306	-.055	-.630	.530
Total length of working life	.051	.352	.725	.066	.485	.629
Length of employment in current institution	-.038	-.322	.748	-.048	-.432	.667
Stress	-	-	-	-.338**	-4.375	.000
<i>F</i>		1.853			3.962	
<i>R</i> ²		.085			.184	
<i>Adjusted R</i> ²		.039			.138	

Note: Standardized beta values were used. ** $p < 0.001$; * $p < 0.05$

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this study focused on sports coaches, the effect of job stress on performance of coaches was examined. Stress was significantly and negatively related to monthly income and educational level, and significantly and positively related employment status.

Coaches with low 'incomes', and low levels of 'education', and coaches who had 'other' employment status had more job performance than others. This may be because these coaches do not see their own employment as guaranteed and want to demonstrate their performance to management. Performance was significantly and negatively related to age. That is, as age increased performance decreased. Considering that coaches perform both mentally and physically, this can be attributed to general fatigue caused by advancing age. On the other hand, performance increased as monthly income and education increased. It can be said that high income and high education level increases the job satisfaction of the coaches and this leads to high performance. Similarly, Dagdeviren et al. (2011) found that job satisfaction increased as the income and education level of

employees increased. Judge et al. (2001) argued that there is much evidence that job satisfaction increases job performance in employees.

On the other hand, performance was significantly and negatively related to stress and its sub-dimensions (work structure, organizational structure, management structure, and physical condition). Among these, the highest relationship was to management structure. Accordingly, it may be said that sports coaches have some problems caused by managers. Yildiz (2015) stated that it may be beneficial for managers to make efforts to improve the quality of their relations with employees to reduce such a problem. The high-quality relationships between managers and coaches (Yildiz, 2011a), and a focus on the needs of coaches will lead to extra-role behaviors of coaches (Yildiz, 2011b). In addition, work structure, organizational structure and physical conditions need to be improved by management in order not to negatively affect performance of the coaches.

In summary, this study emphasizes that the performance of sports coaches is negatively affected by stress. For this problem, Saunders et al. (1996) stated that stress training for coaches would be useful, and that such training may eliminate performance decreases. Periodic stress training for sports coaches within the Provincial Directorates of Youth and Sports may be useful in preventing potential performance decline.

REFERENCES

- Dagdeviren, N., Musaoglu, Z., Omurlu, I.K., & Oztora, S. (2011). Factors effecting job satisfaction among academic staff. *Balkan Medical Journal, 28*, 69-74.
- De Ruyter, K. Wetzels, M., & Feinberg, R. (2001). Role stress in call centers: Its effects on employee performance and satisfaction. *Journal of Interactive Marketing, 15(2)*, 23-35.
- Eren, E. (2001). *Orgutsel davranis ve yonetim psikolojisi*. (7. Baski), İstanbul: Beta Basim Yayim.
- Erdogan, N., Zekioglu, A., & Dorak, F. (2014). According to handball coaches, what are the psychological factors that affect the performance of athletes? A qualitative study. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport, Special Issue 1*, 194-207.
- Gullu, S. (2018). Sporcularin antrenor-sporcu iliskisi ile sportmenlik yonelimleri uzerine bir arastirma. *SPORMETRE, 16(4)*, 190-204.
- Gullu, S., & Yildiz, S.M. (2019). Investigation of the effect of the stress resources on football referees' performance. *SPORMETRE The Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, 17(1)*, 146-155.

Yildiz, S.M., Gunel, I., & Duyan, M. (2019). Investigation of the effect of job stress on sport coaches' job performance. *Celal Bayar University, Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 14(1), 97-104.

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C.J., Bono, J.E., & Patton, G.K. (2001). The job satisfaction–job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376-407.

Ornek, F.E. (2017). *Orgutsel stresin is goren performansi uzerinde etkileri ve stres yonetimi: Kamu ve ozel sektor bankaciligi uzerine bir uygulama*. Yuksek Lisans Tezi, Ufuk Universitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu, Isletme Anabilim Dalı, İnsan Kaynakları Yonetim Bilim Dalı, Ankara.

Saunders, T., Driskell, J.E., Johnston, J.H., & Salas, E. (1996). The effect of stress inoculation training on anxiety and performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 1(2), 170-186.

Schermerhorn, J.R., Osborn, R.N., Uhl-Bien, M., & Hunt, J.G. (2012). *Organizational behavior*, Twelfth Edition, Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Selye, H. (1976). *The stress of life* (Revised ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Turkmen, A. (2015). *Saglik isletmelerinde orgutsel stresin isguclu performansina etkilerinin arastirilmesi (Bandirma Devlet Hastanesi Ornegi)*. Yuksek Lisans Tezi, Okan Universitesi Saglik Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Saglik Yonetimi Anabilim Dalı, Istanbul.

Yildiz, S.M. (2009). Sport and physical activity services: A broad classification. *Balikesir University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 12(22), 1-10.

Yildiz, S.M. (2011a). The relationship between leader member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior in public organizations providing sports services. *Selcuk University Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science*, 13(3), 323-329.

Yildiz, S.M. (2011b). The relationship among internal marketing, job satisfaction and organizational commitment: An investigation of coaches working in sports schools. *Selcuk University Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science*, 13(2), 216-225.

Yildiz, S.M. (2015). *Lider-uye etkilesimi, is yerinde mobbing ve mesleki tukenmislik iliskisi*. Ankara: Detay Yayınevi.

Yildiz, S.M. (2017). *Orgutsel davranis secme konular*. Ankara: Detay Yayınevi.