

Stress Management mechanism among Football players

Dr. Mohibullah Khan Marwat

Professor, Department of Sports Sciences and Physical Education, Faculty of Allied Health Sciences, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Email: mohibullah.khan@ed.uol.edu.pk

Dr. Rahila Nizami

Assistant Professor, Department of Sports Sciences & Physical Education, Faculty of Allied Health Sciences, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Email: rahilanizami@gmail.com

Dr. Hummaira Farah

Assistant Professor, Department of Sports Sciences & Physical Education, Faculty of Allied Health Sciences, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Email: hummaira.farah@sps.uol.edu.pk

Dr. Farooq Hussain

Associate Professor, Department of Physical Education & Sports, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, Email: farooqhussain@awkum.edu.pk

Nadeem Ahmad

Lecturer, Department of Physical Education & Sports Sciences, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Bahawalnagar Campus, Email: nadeemahmadc@gmail.com

Samera Saman

PhD Scholar, Department of Sports Sciences and Physical Education, Gomal University Dera Ismail Khan, Email: samerasaman83@gmail.com

Kashif Mehmood

Lecturer, Department of Sports Sciences and Physical Education, Faculty of Allied Health Sciences, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Email: kashif.mehmood@sports.uol.edu.pk

Abstract

Background: In the present Scenario, Stress and coping are interchangeable terms that aren't always well understood. They are psychological problems that affect individuals, and people's reactions to them are characterized and interpreted in different contexts. **Objectives:** This research was conducted with the objectives; (1) To explore the stress and coping mechanisms among the Football players; (2) To find out the relationship between stressor and coping mechanisms among the Football players. **Methodology:** The study design is analytical and cross-sectional in nature. Researcher used 5-point Likert scale for the

collection of data for detailed analysis. Purposive sampling technique was used for the selection of sample. Collected data have been reported in frequency distribution, mean value \pm standard deviation. Pearson Correlation Test has been used to check relationship between variables and regression analysis has been used to find out the impact between the variables. Results: The overall reliability of both the scales was 0.746 which is in acceptable range. Significant value of Stress scale is 0.075 and Coping Strategies scale value is 0.063 which is greater than 0.05 which shows that the data is normal. The relationship between Stressor and Stress Coping Strategies, both the variables have low positive correlation with the value ($r=0.318$) and significant p-value. Effect of stressor on stress coping strategies is 19%. Conclusion: The relationship between Stressor and Stress Coping Strategies, both the variables have low positive correlation and significant p-value. Stress coping strategies have positive effect on reducing stressors of the respondents.

Keywords: *Football, Players, Stress, Stressor, Coping, Mechanism.*

INTRODUCTION

Stressors and how they are handled is the focal point of this research study. It represents a critical field of applied sport, more specifically within active sports. It is critical that we acquire awareness and understanding of what stressors exist and the resulting coping mechanisms that are commonly followed. The athlete's and coach's stress levels can have a major effect on results. Coach stress may have a negative effect on an athlete, demonstrating the need for stressors to be investigated further within a coaching environment. The Transactional Model of Stress and Coping (TMSC) were used to underpin this study. The model portrays stressors and coping scenarios as arising in a series of steps, the first of which is the primary assessment. The primary assessment represents a stage in which a hazard, harm, or challenge must be addressed. Following this is the secondary assessment, which includes an examination of available coping tools. Constructive coping in athlete research as seeing conditions as obstacles rather than risks. A strategy either focusing the

problem or emotion or avoidance are the most commonly used coping dimensions. The Transactional Model of Stress and Coping (TMSC') has been investigated in sport and coaching and it has also found proof of

coaching's negative psychological impact, such as self-doubt and frustration. These are examples of the stressors that coaching can cause for the player in different environment. According to previous research, a Football coach's stress is caused by poor results, ineffective training environments, and officiating, as well as the competition atmosphere and athlete behavior.

Players face a variety of stressors in the Football related to training, performance, personal capacities, coach, team-mates and spectator's expectations. Since stress and coping are transactional processes that do not occur in isolation, it is important to understand the coping mechanisms used by players when confronted to stressors. Problem solving, knowledge gathering, self-reliance, and seeking help were the most prominent coping mechanisms in players. Capturing stress and coping data from a participant later on can be skewed by memory decay or information about the task's performance, resulting in biased results.

In terms of promotion of health and well-being, participation in recreational activities play significant role. Success in professional sports is determined by the physical abilities as well as mental toughness of the players in terms of dealing with the different types of stresses.

Competency and emotional soundness of the player have significant impact on their performance. Football is a game asking for a combination of mental calmness, power, strength, skill, speed and fitness on part of the player. In the process of domination in performance players pass through different types of critical situations like physical hurt, mental disappointment, biased decisions etc. This is part and regular feature of the game and players' must should know the art of how to deal with these types of situation. This is the most prevalent factor influencing players' performance, well-being and success. Sports psychology researchers are interested in its implications and evolution. Everyone is exposed to stressful events; however, the level of stress associated with a specific situation is determined by individual interpretation. Stress, in general, decreases creativity, efficiency, and one's ability to show their best in performance, so it is important to be able to minimize stress in order to achieve higher quality.

Numerous studies have shown that stress decreases success in sports, so reducing stress is critical (Amoura and Baldes, 2017). Players face a variety of stressors in sports. Few sport experts have arranged these stressors in a meaningful way other than mentioning the sport challenge during which they occurred to date. The stressors that resulted could be traced back to the organization and were divided into four categories: setting, personal, leadership, and teamwork. Selection, finances, and training climate, as well as housing, transport, and competition environment, were all environmental concerns. Nutrition, injury, and goals and expectations were among the personal concerns. Coaches and coaching styles were among the leadership concerns, while the team environment, support network, responsibilities, and communication were among the issues raised by team members. In

the context of this pretext, each of these sources may potentially lead to a player's stress. Coping with stress is a personal response, and everyone handles stress differently. This research will fill in the gaps by identifying and explaining the importance of understanding the social dynamics of understanding the Football Player's' behavior in terms of dealing with different types of stressful environment. Pivot of this research study is to identify the stressor and its coping mechanisms among Football Players of six different universities in Hazara division, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

Literature Review

Identifying the stressors and evaluating the right strategy to cope with the prevailing stressors is a key factor in deciding whether or not athletes can reach their desired level of success and whether or not participating in sport will be a rewarding experience for them (Zullov et al., 2017).

Stressors

Competitive, operational, and personal stress are the three forms of stress (Beach, Nien, & Duda, 2018). Understanding the phenomenon of stress will aid both coach and the player in having a big picture perspective of what is hindering or supporting results.

(a) Competition Stressors: There are stressors that are specifically linked to the player's playing environment. They are, in essence, the most noticeable stressors, and they are most specifically related to what occurs during preparation or during a game. Injury, return from injury, pressures leading up to game day, pressures to win during a big game are all common competition stressors (Çetinkaya and Ğmamoğlu, 2018). (b) Organizational Stressors: Common organizational stressors include the changes in the working

environment in terms of changes in the coach training material, training practicalities (Clayton et al., 2018). Internal friction among the teammates and coaches, a perceived lack of cooperation, assistance with each other, and travel and housing problems. The coaching and organizational set up that affects a team can be related to, and thereby solved, organizational stressors. (c) Personal Stressors are environmental and personal demands associated with the player as a result of personal life activities. Health problems, financial issues, stressful life experiences, and outside obligations are all common personal stressors. Personal stressors are impossible to detect by default. Players can bring problems from their personal lives into competition and training with them. As a consequence, it's important for the player to build a healthy, trustworthy relationship with the coach and trainer so that they can share about their personal problems (Hanton et al., 2016).

Coping Strategy:

In light of various assessments, literature has established three main forms of strategies; Problem-focused coping, Emotion-focused coping and Avoidance coping (Zullov et al., 2017).

Problem-focused Coping

Problem-focused coping includes both therapeutic and interpersonal attempts to collect knowledge on what to do as well as trigger behaviors to modify the stressor's reality (Cooper et al., 2016). Problem-focused coping is widely used where a person feels that the situation can be improved by intervention (Cowburn & Foster, 2018). Several studies have suggested that using Problem-focused coping mechanisms is linked to improved implementation (Dorsey et al., 2017).

Emotion-focused Coping

Emotionally driven Coping refers to intellectual and relational efforts to steer stressor-induced emotions without ever affecting the underlying causes of the distress (Flournoy & Browne, 2018). Emotionally driven coping tends to operate in two ways; by shifting the meaning of what has arisen by reappraising the disturbing situation in a less compromising context, or changing how the person interacts with the unfortunate circumstances (Gloppen & Markham, 2018). Refusal, unwinding, self-fault, shirking, acknowledgment, and impractical rationale are some examples of possible feeling-centered adapting methodologies.

Avoidance Coping

Avoidance Coping refers to when a person ignores and doesn't cope with a stressor specifically by suffocating both the stressor and the bad emotions that come with it. Evasion adaptation entails both behavioral and emotional efforts to remove oneself from a distressing situation (Farkas et al., 2019). Disregarding, restricting, mental deleting, and engaging in another irrelevant task are also examples of templates. Despite popular opinion, one of the most common ways people, especially teens, cope with stress is through avoidance coping (Wentura et al., 2016). It may be either maladaptive or appropriate in many critical situations (Yamak et al., 2016).

Material & Methods

Analytical and cross-sectional study design was used for this research study. The population of the study includes all 114 Football male players from six different universities of Hazara division (KPK) who were selected through purposive sampling technique.

Objectives

1. To explore the stress among the Football players.
2. To explore the coping mechanisms among the Football players.

Hypotheses

H1 There is stress among the Football players.

H1 There are coping mechanisms among the Football players.

Data Collection & Data analysis

After explaining different aspects of the questionnaire before the respondents the questionnaire was distributed among the respondents. Quantitative analysis was done because all questions were close-ended. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS; version 23.0).

1. Collected data have been reported in frequency distribution, mean value \pm standard deviation.

2. Pearson Correlation Test.

3. Regression analysis has been used to find out the impact between the variables.

Results

Analysis of data consists of two scales one is stress scale and other is coping scale. The main purpose of the study was to calculate stressors and its coping mechanisms among Football players. The data were accordingly collected from the male students of six different universities of Hazara

division and analyzed as follows;

Table 1 Correlation of mean value of Stressor and Stress Coping Strategies (N=114)

	Mean value of Stress Coping Strategies
Mean value of Stressor	0.318**
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

This table shows that the relationship between Stressor and Stress Coping Strategies, both the variables are low positive correlate with the value ($r=0.318$) and significant.

Table 2 Model Summary of Stressor and Stress Coping Strategies

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.318 ^a	.191	.093	.35600	1.413

a. Predictors: (Constant), Stressor, b. Dependent Variable: Coping Strategies

In the column labeled R are the values of the multiple correlation coefficients between the predictors and the outcome which is 0.318.

The next column gives us a value of R², which is a measure of how much of the variability in

the outcome is accounted for by the predictors. For the model its value is 0.191, which means that Stressor 19.1% of the variation in Coping Strategies.

The adjusted R² gives us some idea of how well our model generalizes and ideally, we would like its value to be the same, or very close to, the value of R². In this example the difference for the final model is small.

Finally, the Durbin–Watson statistic, the data value is 1.413, which is approximately in the range of 1.5-2.5 that the assumption has almost certainly been met.

Table: 3 ANOVAa of Stressor and Stress Coping Strategies

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.595	1	1.595	12.584	.001 ^b
	Residual	14.194	112	.127		
	Total	15.789	113			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Stressor, b. Dependent Variable: Coping Strategies

The next part of the output, which contains an ANOVA that tests whether the model is significantly better at predicting the outcome. The model has two coefficients (one for each of the three predictors and one for the constant, and has 113 degrees of freedom. The average

sum of squares is then calculated for each term by dividing the square sum by the df and F-ratio is 12.584, we can interpret these results as meaning that the model predicts the outcome variable.

Table 4 Coefficients^a Stressor and Stress Coping Strategies

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	VIF
		B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	1.629	.328		4.960	.000	
	meanPNSES	.377	.106	.318	3.547	.001	1.180

a. Dependent Variable: Coping Strategies

Linear regressions model takes the form above equation and in that equation, there are several unknown quantities (the b-values). The first part of the table gives us estimates for these b-values and these values indicate the individual contribution of each predictor to the model. If

we replace the b-values in equation, we find that we can define the model as follows:

$$\text{Coping Strategies}_i = (b_0 + b_1 \text{Stressor}_i)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Coping Strategies}_i \\ = (1.629 + 0.377 \text{Stressor}_i) \end{aligned}$$

The b-values tell us about the relationship between Coping Strategies and each predictor. If the value is positive, we can tell that there is a positive relationship between the predictor and the outcome, whereas a negative coefficient represents a negative relationship. For these data all predictors have positive b-values indicating positive relationships.

Each of these beta values has an associated standard error indicating to what extent these values would vary across different samples, and these standard errors are used to determine whether or not the b-value differs significantly from zero. In linear regression, it is easiest to conceptualize the t-tests as measures of whether the predictor is making a significant contribution to the model. Therefore, if the t-test associated with a b-value is significant then the predictor is making a significant contribution to the model. The smaller the value of Sig. the greater the contribution of that predictor.

Discussion

During practices, the Football players were subject to a number of stressors, which seemed to have an effect on the team's overall results. Specifically, team sport players described communal sources of stress as "our" problem, which included social pressure issues (e.g., opponents' provocation, coaches' behaviors), interpersonal relationships (e.g., negative behaviors, negative social interactions), performance issues (e.g., low controllability of the score or situation, opponents' dominance), and logistical adversity (e.g., equipment). Overall, the results corroborated prior studies that looked at team sport athletes' individual causes of stress from an intrapersonal perspective.

Interpersonal aspects of stress and its coping in sports setting has been a new spectrum of the

problem (Zullov et al., 2017; Farkas et al., 2019). While previous studies have looked at communal coping mechanisms in a sport environment, such as inside coach-athlete (Fiske et al., 2017) or within communities (Gordan, 2017) no work has looked at them in team sports.

The aim of this research was found out the major stressors of Football players and coping mechanisms used to deal with these stressors. This study lends methodological support to previous studies on stressors and coping mechanisms in sports environments. Football players used a number of mechanisms to cope with sports related stressors, according to the results. Problem-centered copying, emotion-focused copying, passive copying, and evasion copying are all techniques used in difficult environments (Yamak et al., 2016). Majority of the players used problem-focused coping and emotion-focused coping as their main coping mechanisms. Passive copying and omission coping were less common, but a few players used them in circumstances where they feared they couldn't manage themselves, such as playing in difficult conditions or following the decisions of controversial referees. Just a few players use tactics like self-criticism, accusing others, adopting a pessimistic mindset, taking / abusing drugs, and appealing to religion.

Furthermore, in contrast to other fields (Bray & Born, 2016), it is critical to recognize the uniqueness of communal coping in the context of team sport, where performance goals, exceeding limits, and facing adversity are all commonplace. In order to achieve good team results, team sport players use complex communal coping mechanisms to cope with mutual stressors by pooling their energy and developing cooperative behavior (Del Pilar Vélchez, & De Francisco, 2017).

Furthermore, in contrast to other fields Busse (2018) has confirmed that it is critical to recognize the uniqueness of communal coping in the context of team sport, where performance goals, exceeding limits, and facing adversity are all commonplace. In order to achieve good team results, team sport players use complex communal coping mechanisms to cope with mutual stressors by pooling their energy and developing cooperative behavior.

Reference

- Ali, A., Azam, M., & Khaskheli, N. (2022). PSYCHOPHYSICAL HEALTH, RECREATIONAL PARTICIPATION AND PERCEIVED BARRIERS TO LEISURE-TIME PHYSICAL ACTIVITY AMONG WIDOWS: EVIDENCE FROM THE CITY OF BAHAWALPUR, PAKISTAN. *THE SKY-International Journal of Physical Education and Sports Sciences (IJPESS)*, 6, 58-71. <https://doi.org/10.51846/the-sky.v6i0.1039>
- Amoura, S., and Baldes, B. (2017). Influence of coaches' autonomy support on athletes' motivation and sport performance: a test of the hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Psychol. Sport Exerc.* 11, 155–161.
- Beach, F. A., Nien, C.-L., & Duda, J. L. (2018). Antecedents and consequences of approach and avoidance achievement goals: A test of gender invariance. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 9, 352–372
- Bray, S.R., & Born, H.A. (2016). Transition to university and vigorous physical activity: Implications for health and psychological well-being. *Journal of American College Health*, 52, 181-188.
- Busse, A. (2018). Understandings of children's influence in parent-child relationships: A Q methodological study. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 25, 359-379.
- Çetinkaya, G. and G. Ğmamoğlu, (2018). Research on leadership tendency of students taking sports education according difference variations. *The Journal of International Social Research*, 11(59): 719-725.
- Clayton, S. Warner, S. M., & Bruening, J. E. (2018). More than just letting them play: parental influence on women's lifetime sport involvement. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 25(4), 538-559.
- Cooper, N., Schuett, P. A., & Phillips, H. M. (2016). Examining intrinsic motivations in campus intramural sports. *Recreational Sports Journal*, 36(1), 25-36.
- Cowburn, G., & Foster, C. (2018). Understanding participation in sport and physical activity among children and adults: A review of qualitative studies. *Health Education Research*, 21(6), 826-835.
- Del Pilar Vílchez, M., & De Francisco, C. (2017). Reduced Spanish version of participation motives questionnaire for exercise and sport: Psychometric properties, social/sport differences. *Journal of Sports Science & Medicine*, 16(3), 365–374.
- Dorsey, S., Harvey, S., & Memmert, D. (2017). Why children join and stay in sports clubs: Case studies in Australian, French and German swimming club. *Sport, Education and Society*, 18(4), 550-566.
- Farkas, A., Deaner, R. O., Carter, R. E., Joyner, M. J., & Hunter, S. K. (2019). Men are more likely than women to slow in the marathon. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 47, 607– 616.
- Fiske, S. T., Hönekopp, J., & Schuster, M. (2017). A metaanalysis on 2D:4D and

athletic prowess: Substantial relationships but neither hand out-predicts the other. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 4–10.

students' physical activity motivation. *International Journal of Exercise Science*, 7(2), 98-109.

Flournoy, B., Browne, K. R. (2018). The trichotomous achievement goal model and intrinsic motivation: A sequential meditational analysis. In T. K. Shackelford & V. Weekes-Shackelford (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of evolutionary perspectives on violence, homicide, and war* (pp. 372–392). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Gloppen, K. M., & Markham, C. M. (2018). A review of positive youth development programs that promote adolescent sexual and reproductive health. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 46, S75–S91.

Gordan M. B. (2017). Who's mental? Who's tough and who's both? Mutton constructs dressed up as lamb. In D. F., (Eds.), *Mental toughness in sport: Developments in research and theory* (pp. 69-88). Routledge; New York.

Hanton, S, Mellalieu, SD, Neil, R (2016) A conceptual framework of organizational stressors in sport performers. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports*, 22, 545-557. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0838.2010.01242.x.

Wentura, D., Crosnoe, R., & Elder, G.H. (2016). From childhood to the later years: Pathways of human development. *Research on Aging*, 26, 623–654.

Yamak, B., O. Ğmamoğlu and M. Cebi, (2016). The effects of the physical fitness levels of adolescents on body image, self-concept and stress levels. *The Journal of Academic Social Science*, 4(34): 191-201

Zullov, H. M., Madonia, J. S., Cox, A. E., & Zahl, M. L. (2017). The role of high school physical activity experience in college