

# Building A Measure Of The Psychological Pressures Of

# Football

## coaches In light of the new social

Dr. Mohamed Abdel Salam Abu Rayya

*Department of Sports Psychology,  
Faculty of Physical Education,  
Kafr El-Sheikh University, Egypt*

### Abstract

*The research aims to build a measure of the psychological pressures of football coaches league Egyptian public in light of the new social, and use researcher method survey of descriptive method for appropriateness nature of the research, and was research sample (26) coach of the football coaches for some clubs the Egyptian Premier League, and the researcher used a form of pressure psychological football coaches for Premier League clubs league Egyptian public, was reached by the results of this study to build a measure of the psychological pressures of football coaches league Egyptian public, and recommended the researcher developed a measure of psychological pressure to trainers rest individual games, and compared psychological pressure located on the coaches mass games and individual games.*

### Key words

*psychological measure - football coaches - new social*

## Introduction

Play evaluation and measurement big role and effective in reaching resolve many of the problems that we face in the sports field in general and in the field of psychology private Perhaps the rhythm of life rapidly puts rights in many situations may cause him some stress which affect professional performance or relationships with others and physical activity in general and Activity football in particular surpassed many of the psychological pressure that rests on the shoulders of works considering that football is most popular sport, which became associated with many aspects of economic, political, social and other various aspects so it became works is almost always subject to many psychological pressure. That coaches differ in their tendency or inclination towards influencing the pressures to which they are exposed due to individual differences in evaluate them for positions that cause these pressures, which lies on them[1]. It is noteworthy that psychological stress affect the behavior of the coach feels tired physically and mentally whenever he went to the club for training[2].

Given the importance of psychological pressures on the shoulders of coaches sports activities have focused on several studies to identify the sources of these pressures, for example, each of the study [3-4-5-6-7].

This is what Social and the accompanying change in the composition of society with a clear and significant impact on the performance of workers in the field of sports in general and football especially resulting in powerful and influential pressure on workers in the field of football. As

the stress a significant impact on the performance of the football coaches, whether from increased physical and psychological burden which evolves to become a burden mentally and emotionally affecting landing on the level of achievement of the coach. Due to the impact of the performance of football coaches pressures psychological located on their shoulders with a note differences that pressure and quantity were the researcher studying precedent to identify construction factorial to psychological pressures of football coaches have reached researcher on the impact of the presence of four major dimensions represent more dimensional psychological pressure on coach foot a (psychological stress associated with competitions and results, psychological stress associated support and reinforcement, psychological stress associated with Power Load training for competition, psychological stress is linked with the masses) this and due to the importance of identifying the degree of stress for football coaches and their impact on the performance of the coach saw the researcher do a measure of this pressure Psychological using the previous four dimensions major scale building and through a set of statements which express sources of stress for football coaches.

### Aim:

Building a measure of psychological pressure for football coaches Egyptian league in the light of social developments

### Hypotheses:

- Learned factors can be represented through phrases express sources of stress for football coaches.

## Materials And Methods:

### *Approach:*

### *Methodology used:*

Researcher use the survey method of descriptive method for appropriateness nature of the research

*Sample:* The sample search (26) coach of football coaches for some Premier League clubs place.

## Data collection tools:

- ✓ Use of research results that have been reached in the previous study psychological stress for football coaches beat the Egyptian public.
- ✓ Building a measure of psychological pressure in light of the results of a previous study by researcher which appeared four key dimensions:
- ✓ Psychological pressure associated with competitions and results.

- ✓ Psychological pressure associated with the masses.
- ✓ Psychological pressure associated with the support and reinforcement.
- ✓ Power Load psychological stress associated with training during the competition.

## Transactions scientific a scale:

### *1- Validity measure:*

The researcher used the internal consistency of the scale and dimensions words where the measure was applied to a sample of 26 representing some of the coaches coach Egyptian league year. This was done by creating correlation coefficients between the degree of each statement and overall dimension to which it belongs phrase inside the meter under Search, And were excluded dimension and phrases that have not achieved the level of significance of the scale.

### *Table 1:*

*Validity internal consistency coefficients between the degree of each dimension And overall the rest of the dimensions of the scale under consideration*

|   | <i>Dimensions</i>   | <i>value (T)</i> |
|---|---|------------------|
| 1 | <i>Psychological stress associated with competitions and results</i>      | <i>0.730 *</i>   |
| 2 | <i>Psychological stress associated with the support and reinforcement</i> | <i>0.779 *</i>   |
| 3 | <i>Psychological stress associated with Load training and competition</i> | <i>0.650 *</i>   |
| 4 | <i>Psychological pressures associated with the masses</i>                 | <i>0.640 *</i>   |

*Table 1* that the correlation coefficients between the total score of each and overall the rest of the dimensions of the scale under consideration statistical significance at the level of significance 0.5

**Reliability of the scale under consideration:**

Been found Reliability dimensions the scale under consideration using alpha Cronbakh to find reliability coefficient

kidney category the scale under discussion), and it became clear that the phrases four dimensions statistically significant at the abstract level 0.5 with the exception of the phrase number 4,18, 20 of the phrases first dimension.

**Table 2:**

*the arithmetic mean and the standard deviation and the percentage and the significance of the differences and order of the first dimension statements In light of the relative weight of the sample responses (n = 26)*

| Serial phrase | Mean | SD±   | agree |        | some extent |        | non agree |        | value Ca 2 | relative importance | Relative weight | Ar     |
|---------------|------|-------|-------|--------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|------------|---------------------|-----------------|--------|
|               |      |       | Re    | Ratio% | Re          | Ratio% | Re        | Ratio% |            |                     |                 |        |
| 1             | 2.73 | 0.452 | 19    | 73.07  | 7           | 26.92  | 0         | -      | 5.53       | 91.02               | 71              | 1      |
| 2             | 1.76 | 0.764 | 5     | 19.23  | 10          | 38.46  | 11        | 42.30  | 2.38       | 58.97               | 46              | 17     |
| 3             | 2.46 | 0.859 | 18    | 47.92  | 2           | 76.92  | 6         | 23.07  | 16.00      | 82.05               | 64              | 9      |
| 4             | 2.11 | 0.908 | 12    | 46.15  | 5           | 19.23  | 9         | 34.61  | 2.84       | 70.51               | 55              | 14     |
| 5             | 2.57 | 0.702 | 18    | 69.23  | 5           | 19.23  | 3         | 11.53  | 15.30      | 85.89               | 67              | 4      |
| 6             | 1.73 | 0.724 | 4     | 15.38  | 11          | 42.30  | 11        | 42.30  | 3.76       | 57.69               | 45              | 18     |
| 7             | 1.76 | 0.651 | 3     | 11.53  | 14          | 53.84  | 9         | 34.61  | 7.00       | 58.97               | 46              | 17 bis |
| 8             | 1.50 | 0.509 | 0     | -      | 13          | 50.00  | 13        | 50.00  | 55         | 50.00               | 39              | 20     |
| 9             | 2.34 | 0.689 | 12    | 46.15  | 11          | 42.30  | 3         | 11.53  | 5.61       | 78.20               | 61              | 11     |
| 10            | 2.07 | 0.744 | 8     | 30.76  | 12          | 46.15  | 6         | 23.07  | 2.15       | 69.23               | 54              | 15     |
| 11            | 2.46 | 0.706 | 15    | 57.69  | 8           | 30.76  | 3         | 11.53  | 8.38       | 82.05               | 64              | 9 bis  |
| 12            | 2.73 | 0.452 | 19    | 73.07  | 7           | 26.92  | -         | -      | 5.53       | 91.02               | 71              | 1 bis  |
| 13            | 2.46 | 0.508 | 12    | 46.15  | 14          | 53.84  | -         | -      | 0.154      | 82.05               | 64              | 8 bis  |
| 14            | 2.57 | 0.702 | 18    | 69.23  | 5           | 19.23  | 3         | 11.53  | 15.30      | 85.89               | 67              | 4 bis  |
| 15            | 2.69 | 0.470 | 18    | 69.23  | 8           | 30.76  | -         | -      | 3.84       | 89.74               | 70              | 3      |
| 16            | 2.30 | 0.837 | 14    | 53.84  | 6           | 23.07  | 6         | 23.07  | 4.92       | 76.92               | 60              | 12     |
| 17            | 1.92 | 0.560 | 3     | 11.53  | 18          | 69.23  | 5         | 19.23  | 15.30      | 64.10               | 50              | 16     |
| 18            | 1.42 | 0.757 | 4     | 15.38  | 3           | 11.53  | 19        | 73.07  | 18.53      | 47.43               | 37              | 21     |
| 19            | 2.26 | 0.874 | 14    | 53.84  | 5           | 19.23  | 7         | 26.92  | 5.15       | 75.64               | 59              | 13     |
| 20            | 1.80 | 0.895 | 8     | 30.76  | 5           | 19.23  | 13        | 50.00  | 3.76       | 60.25               | 47              | 17     |
| 21            | 2.53 | 0.508 | 14    | 53.84  | 12          | 46.15  | -         | -      | 0.15       | 84.61               | 66              | 6      |
| 22            | 1.57 | 0.808 | 5     | 19.23  | 5           | 19.23  | 16        | 61.53  | 9.30       | 52.56               | 41              | 19     |
| 23            | 2.50 | 0.707 | 16    | 61.53  | 7           | 26.92  | 3         | 11.53  | 10.21      | 83.33               | 65              | 7      |
| 24            | 2.50 | 0.707 | 16    | 23.07  | 7           | 26.92  | 3         | 11.53  | 10.23      | 83.33               | 65              | 7 bis  |

\*Re=Repetition, Ar=Arrangement

Table 2 significant differences between the responses of a sample Search (agree / To some extent / not agree) is related in the first dimension terms, And describes the results of the table that the relative weight of words this dimension may ranged between 71 - 37 and phrase No. 1 was ranked first on this dimension, reaching relative importance her 91.02 while the phrases 18 less phrases response the sample reaching the relative importance of each of them 47,43.

**Table 3:**

*the arithmetic mean and the standard deviation and the percentage and the significance of the differences and order of the second dimension statements in light of the relative weight of the sample responses (n= 26)*

| Serial phrase | Mean | SD±   | agree |        | some extent |        | non agree |        | value Ca 2 | relative importance | Relative weight | Ar    |
|---------------|------|-------|-------|--------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------|
|               |      |       | Re    | Ratio% | Re          | Ratio% | Re        | Ratio% |            |                     |                 |       |
| 1             | 2.57 | 0.503 | 15    | 57.69  | 11          | 42.30  | -         | -      | 0.615      | 85.89               | 67              | 5     |
| 2             | 2.50 | 0.509 | 13    | 20.00  | 13          | 50.00  | -         | -      | 0.00       | 83.33               | 65              | 6     |
| 3             | 2.61 | 0.469 | 16    | 37.86  | 10          | 38.46  | -         | -      | 1.385      | 87.17               | 68              | 3 bis |
| 4             | 2.65 | 0.485 | 17    | 65.38  | 9           | 34.61  | -         | -      | 2.462      | 88.46               | 69              | 2     |
| 5             | 2.50 | 0.509 | 13    | 50.00  | 13          | 50.00  | -         | -      | 0.00       | 83.33               | 65              | 7 bis |
| 6             | 1.69 | 0.617 | 2     | 7.69   | 14          | 53.84  | 10        | 38.46  | 8.615      | 56.41               | 44              | 9     |
| 7             | 2.61 | 0.496 | 16    | 61.53  | 10          | 38.46  | -         | -      | 1.385      | 87.17               | 68              | 3     |
| 8             | 2.76 | 0.429 | 20    | 76.92  | 6           | 23.07  | -         | -      | 7.538      | 92.30               | 72              | 1     |
| 9             | 2.11 | 0.711 | 8     | 30.76  | 13          | 0.50   | 5         | 19.23  | 3.769      | 70.51               | 55              | 8     |

\*Re=Repetition, Ar=Arrangement

Table 3 significant differences between the responses of a sample Search (agree / To some extent / not agree) is related to the second dimension terms. And describes the results of the table that the relative weight of words this dimension may ranged between 72 - 44 and phrase No. 8 was ranked first on this dimension, reaching relative importance her 92.30, while phrase 6 less phrases response the sample reaching the relative importance of each of them 56.41.

**Table 4:**

*the arithmetic mean and the standard deviation and the percentage and the significance of the differences and order of the third dimension statements In light of the relative weight of the sample responses (n= 260)*

| Serial phrase | Mean | SD±   | agree |        | some extent |        | non agree |        | value Ca 2 | relative importance | Relative weight | Ar    |
|---------------|------|-------|-------|--------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------|
|               |      |       | Re    | Ratio% | Re          | Ratio% | Re        | Ratio% |            |                     |                 |       |
| 1             | 2.73 | 0.452 | 19    | 73.07  | 7           | 26.92  | -         | -      | 5.53       | 91.02               | 71              | 1     |
| 2             | 2.34 | 0.845 | 15    | 57.69  | 5           | 19.23  | 6         | 23.07  | 7.00       | 78.02               | 61              | 9     |
| 3             | 2.69 | 0.470 | 18    | 69.23  | 8           | 30.76  | -         | -      | 3.84       | 89.74               | 70              | 2     |
| 4             | 2.69 | 0.470 | 18    | 69.23  | 8           | 30.76  | -         | -      | 3.84       | 89.74               | 70              | 2 bis |
| 5             | 2.61 | 0.496 | 16    | 61.53  | 10          | 38.46  | -         | -      | 1.38       | 78.17               | 68              | 9 bis |
| 6             | 2.61 | 0.496 | 16    | 61.53  | 10          | 38.46  | -         | -      | 1.38       | 78.17               | 68              | 9 bis |
| 7             | 2.53 | 0.508 | 14    | 53.84  | 12          | 46.15  | -         | -      | 0.154      | 84.64               | 66              | 5 bis |
| 8             | 2.53 | 0.646 | 16    | 61.53  | 8           | 30.76  | 2         | 7.69   | 11.38      | 84.61               | 66              | 5 bis |
| 9             | 2.65 | 0.485 | 17    | 56.38  | 9           | 34.61  | -         | -      | 2.46       | 88.46               | 69              | 4     |
| 10            | 1.53 | 0.508 | 14    | -      | 12          | 53.84  | -         | 46.15  | 0.154      | 84.61               | 66              | 5     |
| 11            | 2.26 | 0.666 | 10    | 38.46  | 13          | 50.00  | 3         | 11.53  | 6.07       | 75.64               | 59              | 12    |
| 12            | 2.42 | 0.702 | 14    | 53.84  | 9           | 43.61  | 3         | 11.53  | 7.00       | 80.76               | 63              | 8     |
| 13            | 2.15 | 0.833 | 11    | 42.30  | 8           | 30.76  | 7         | 26.92  | 1.00       | 71.79               | 56              | 13    |

Table 4 significant differences between the responses of a sample Search (agree / To some extent /not agree) is related terms, the third dimension. And describes the results of the table that the relative weight of words this dimension may ranged between 71 - 56 and phrase No. 1 was ranked first on this dimension, reaching relative importance her 91.02 while the phrase 13 less phrases response the sample reaching the relative importance of each of them 71.79.

**Table 5:**

*the arithmetic mean and the standard deviation and the percentage and the significance of the differences and order of the fourth dimension statements In light of the relative weight of the sample responses (n = 26)*

| Serial phrase | Mean | SD±   | agree |        | some extent |        | non agree |        | value Ca 2 | relative importance | Relative weight | Ar    |
|---------------|------|-------|-------|--------|-------------|--------|-----------|--------|------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------|
|               |      |       | Re    | Ratio% | Re          | Ratio% | Re        | Ratio% |            |                     |                 |       |
| 1             | 2.69 | 0.470 | 18    | 69.23  | 8           | 30.76  | -         | -      | 3.84       | 89.74               | 70              | 4     |
| 2             | 2.80 | 0.401 | 21    | 80.76  | 5           | 19.23  | -         | -      | 9.84       | 93.56               | 73              | 1 bis |
| 3             | 2.65 | 0.485 | 17    | 65.38  | 9           | 34.61  | -         | -      | 2.46       | 88.46               | 69              | 5     |
| 4             | 2.80 | 0.401 | 21    | 80.76  | 5           | 19.23  | -         | -      | 9.84       | 93.59               | 73              | 1     |
| 5             | 2.46 | 0.706 | 15    | 57.69  | 8           | 30.76  | 3         | 11.53  | 8.38       | 82.05               | 64              | 7     |
| 6             | 2.42 | 0.702 | 14    | 53.84  | 9           | 34.61  | 3         | 11.53  | 7.00       | 80.76               | 63              | 11    |
| 7             | 2.46 | 0.706 | 15    | 57.69  | 8           | 30.76  | 3         | 11.53  | 8.38       | 82.05               | 64              | 7 bis |
| 8             | 1.61 | 0.697 | 3     | 11.53  | 10          | 38.46  | 13        | 50.00  | 6.07       | 53.84               | 42              | 15    |
| 9             | 2.53 | 0.706 | 17    | 65.38  | 6           | 23.07  | 3         | 11.53  | 12.53      | 84.61               | 66              | 10    |
| 10            | 2.46 | 0.811 | 17    | 65.38  | 4           | 15.38  | 5         | 19.23  | 12.07      | 82.05               | 64              | 7 bis |
| 11            | 2.07 | 0.744 | 8     | 30.76  | 12          | 46.15  | 6         | 23.07  | 2.15       | 69.23               | 54              | 12    |
| 12            | 2.61 | 0.496 | 16    | 61.53  | 10          | 38.46  | -         | -      | 1.38       | 87.17               | 86              | 6     |
| 13            | 2.80 | 0.401 | 21    | 80.76  | 5           | 19.23  | -         | -      | 9.84       | 93.59               | 73              | 1 bis |
| 14            | 1.88 | 0.908 | 9     | 38.76  | 5           | 19.23  | 12        | 46.15  | 2.84       | 62.82               | 49              | 13    |
| 15            | 1.73 | 0.827 | 6     | 23.07  | 7           | 26.23  | 13        | 50.00  | 3.30       | 57.69               | 45              | 14    |
| 16            | 1.57 | 0.808 | 5     | 19.23  | 5           | 19.23  | 16        | 61.53  | 9.30       | 52.56               | 41              | 16    |

Table 5 significant differences between the responses of a sample Search (agree / To some extent / not agree) is related terms, the fourth dimension. And describes the results of the table that the relative weight of words this dimension may ranged between 73 - 41 and phrase number 4 was ranked first on this dimension, reaching relative importance her 93.59 while the phrase 16 less phrases response the sample reaching the relative importance of each of them 52.56.

### ***The final image of the a scale:***

*The results of the previous steps for extracting number 62 is enjoying truthfulness, fortitude and fall under four main dimensions distributed as follows:*

- ✓ The first dimension: psychological stress associated with competitions and results 24 .
- ✓ Second dimension: psychological stress associated with the support and reinforcement 9 phrases.
- ✓ The third dimension: Power Load psychological stress associated with training 13.
- ✓ The fourth dimension: psychological stress associated with the masses 16 . Attachment 3.

*And can represent these dimensions and axes belong to the final image to a scale stress the football coaches so these results can be calculated using the total score for each axis and the total score for the a scale of all alone.*

### ***Conclusion***

#### ***The Researcher Concludes the Following:***

- ✓ That stress plays a major role and an important role in the performance of football coaches both on and off the pitch.
- ✓ A a scale of psychological pressure for football coaches beat the Egyptian public.

#### ***Recommendation: The researcher recommends the following:***

- ✓ A a scale of psychological pressure to individual instructors for the rest of the games.
- ✓ Compared to psychological pressures in intramural sports trainers and individual games.

## References

- 1- Mufti Ibrahim Hammad,1998: *modern sports training, planning, implementation, leadership*, Arab Thought House, Cairo,p: 362 .
- 2- Osama Kaml Rateb,1997: *combustion stress between sports training and emotional stress*, dar al-fkr al-araby, No12, Cairo, pp273:.(in Arabic).
- 3- Adel Abdel Halim Haider, amal Helmy elgamal,2001: *Factorial construction a scale combustion symptoms in some sports activities trainers selected*, Journal of Physical Education College, the first issue, Ain Shams University.
- 4- Azza Shawky alwesame, Maysa Mohammed Al Banna,1999: *Burnout and his personal traits coaches some sports activities*, the Third International Scientific Conference for Sport and the mirror, Faculty of Physical Education for Girls, University of Alexandria 19 - 21 October.
- 5- Mohamed Abdel Salam Abu Rayya,2012: *Factorial structure of psychological pressure in football coaches*.
- 6- Betty . C. & Kelley,1993 :*A model Of Stress And Burnout In Collegiate Coaches Effects Of Gender And Time Of Season*, Research Quarterly For Exercise And Sport, V65, Mar .
- 7- Hunt, K, Miller S.,1994: *Comparison Of Level Of Perceived Stress And Burnout Among College Basketball And Tennis Coaches*. Applied Research In Coaching And Athletics Annual (Boston) United States.