Journal of Novel Applied Sciences

Available online at www.jnasci.org ©2022 JNAS Journal-2022-11-2/19-23 ISSN 2322-5149 ©2022 JNAS



Relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior of Tehran Municipality sports coaches

Nazila Salmanzadeh

Master of Sports Management, Islamic Azad University, South Tehran Branch, Iran.

Corresponding author: Nazila Salmanzadeh

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this article was to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior of sports coaches in Tehran Municipality. In the present study, the research method used is correlational. In this study, the emotional intelligence variable was considered as the predictor variable and the organizational citizenship behavior variable was considered as the criterion variable. The statistical population of the present study consisted of coaches working in Tehran Municipality who had at least a 3rd grade coaching card. The statistical clothing number was 2678 people, of which 2010 were women and 668 were men. The number of samples was estimated based on Morgan table 338 people who were selected by simple random sampling. The research instruments included Podsakoff et al. (1990) Organizational Citizenship Behavior Questionnaire, Schering Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire and Podsakoff et al.'s (1990) Organizational Citizenship Behavior Questionnaire. Statistical methods such as mean, frequency, standard deviation, percentage, correlation coefficient and independent t-regression and Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance were used to analyze the data. Also in this study, SPSS software was used to analyze the data.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence, Citizenship Behavior, Coach, Sports, Municipality.

INTRODUCTION

Exercise and physical activity have very beneficial effects on youth and adolescents. According to Malin & Cumming (2003), exercise has benefits such as the positive effects of growth and maturity, personal value, social competence and improved morality. Therefore, suitable conditions must be provided for this group, one of which is the existence of capable coaches. In this regard, Matins believes that coaching is different from other professions. This job is a promising and difficult job and requires skills. Coaching means investing in yourself, energy, knowledge, skills and knowledge. Emotion control is very important in people, especially sports coaches, and in the meantime, emotional intelligence in sports fields contributes a lot to the success of coaches in sports fields. Recognizing emotional intelligence helps sports coaches in selecting players and delegating different responsibilities and understanding their behavior and how to deal with them (Duglass, 2007). But the study of people's behavior in the workplace has long been considered by management thinkers, and with the emergence of organizational behavior in the early 1960s, it became more serious during this period. Many studies have tried to classify behaviors and their causes. Topics such as: Perception, motivation are among the issues that examine the roots of many human behaviors in the workplace, but the debate that has been raised in the last two decades and in addition to behaviorists, the attention of social psychologists and sociologists to Self-attracted, organizational citizenship behavior. Organizational researchers refer to efforts that go beyond the defined tasks of individuals in the organization as organizational citizenship behavior (Duff, 2001). Organizational citizenship behaviors are a set of voluntary behaviors that are not part of an individual's formal behaviors but are most beneficial to the organization (Padsakoff et al., 2000). Field studies have shown that organizational citizenship behavior increases effectiveness because it frees up resources for more productive purposes and, by coordinating activities, enables individuals to adapt effectively to

environmental change (Padsakoff et al., 2000). Having voluntary behaviors in organizations is encouraged due to creating a healthy work environment, improving work results and promoting organizational goals. These behaviors play a key role in increasing effectiveness, efficiency and creating a positive atmosphere in the workplace (Gadout, 2007). In line with research in this field, researchers have shown that among the components of emotional intelligence, self-awareness, self-motivation, empathy and social skills were positively related to organizational citizenship behavior of teachers. the research of Carlson (1998), Spector & Fox (2002), Somech & Ron (2007) showed a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior. Modassir & Singh (2008) research showed only a relationship between three components of organizational citizenship behavior and emotional intelligence. Ilgin (2009) showed a relationship between all components of organizational citizenship behavior of coaches, the present study seeks to answer the question whether there is a relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior of coaches in Tehran Municipality.²

Method:

In the present study, the research method used is correlational. In this study, the emotional intelligence variable was considered as the predictor variable and the organizational citizenship behavior variable was considered as the criterion variable. The statistical population of the present study consisted of coaches working in Tehran Municipality who had at least a 3rd grade coaching card. The statistical clothing number was 2678 people, of which 2010 were women and 668 were men. The number of samples was estimated based on Morgan table 338 people who were selected by simple random sampling.

Emotional intelligence in this study is the score that educators in each of the components (self-motivation, selfawareness, self-control, social awareness, social skills) Schering emotional intelligence guestionnaire. The scale is a distance measurement. Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Organizational citizenship behavior in this study is the score that educators in each of the subscales of organizational citizenship behavior (altruism, helpful behaviors, chivalry, organizational loyalty, organizational obedience, individual initiatives, behavior or civic virtue). And selfdevelopment in the organizational citizenship behavior questionnaire of Padsakoff & et al. (1990). The scale is a distance measurement. The meaning of sports coach in this study was a person who has coaching degrees at different levels and cooperates directly and indirectly with delegations and federations. Measurement tools include Shrink Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire. This test was compiled in 1996 based on Goleman (1995) theory by Schering and in February 2001 in Iran by Mansouri, it was initially standardized on master's degree students of Allameh Tabatabai University. The main form consists of 70 questions that assess several aspects of emotional intelligence (self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skills at work). However, after normalization in Iran, a number of test questions for various reasons. Such as lack of necessary specifications of the question, length of the question, non-compliance with Iranian culture has been removed. As a result, the standardized test has 33 questions. This test measures 5 components of emotional intelligence. These components are: selfawareness, self-control, self-motivation, social awareness, social skills. The next guestionnaire was Padsakov et al. (1990) organizational citizenship behavior questionnaire. This questionnaire was developed in 1990 by Padsakoff et al. The guestionnaire consists of 20 items that are scored on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high). Regarding the variables determined to measure organizational citizenship behavior in this questionnaire, which include: altruism, conscientiousness, chivalry, civic virtue and respect and honor. To measure altruism, questions 1 to 4 (work conscience), conscientiousness, questions 5 to 7, chivalry, questions 8 to 10, civic virtue, questions 11 to 13, and respect, questions 14 to 20 are considered, respectively. In this study, after identifying the research sample, the researcher referred to the teams' training place in Tehran to collect the information and data required for the research and then explained the purpose of the research to the instructors and asked them to Complete the research carefully and do not leave a question unanswered as much as possible. The statistical method used in this study was performed at two levels of descriptive and inferential statistics. So that for data analysis, statistical methods such as mean, frequency, standard deviation, percentage, correlation coefficient and independent t-regression and analysis of variance, Kruskal-Wallis test were used. Also in this study, SPSS software was used to analyze the data.

Results:

Among the sample, 131 are men (about 40%) and 195 are women (about 60%). Two municipal coaches also did not answer this question. Among the sample, 124 are single (about 38%) and 199 are married (about 61%). Five municipal educators did not answer this question. Among the sample, 78 people have a diploma (about 24%), 97 people have an associate degree (about 30%), 125 people have a bachelor's degree (about 38%) and 22 people

have a bachelor's degree. Are senior (about 7%). Six municipal coaches did not answer this question. Among the sample, 226 people have a third degree coaching degree (about 69%), 76 people have a second degree coaching degree (about 23%) and 18 people have a first degree coaching degree (about 5%). Eight municipal educators also did not answer this question.

Among the sample, 278 do not have a championship record (about 87%) and 38 have a championship record (about 12%). Three municipal educators did not answer this question.

Table	. 4 .			diatribution	~f	ah a m	nionahi	. record	atatua
Table	э і. г	requ	lency	distribution	0I	cnam	pionsni		status
	-								

Percentage	frequency	range
They have no championship record	278	87.5
They have a history of championship	38	11.6
Total	325	99.1
Unanswered	3	0.9
Total	328	100.0

In order to investigate the status of mean research variables, standard deviation, minimum and maximum values of each variable and the components related to that variable are presented in the following tables.

Table 2. Check the status of research variables								
Variables	Average	Standard deviation	The least	the most				
Emotional Intelligence	68.86	9.93	53.00	96.00				
Organizational citizenship behavior	105.98	15.71	63.00	150.00				

Table 3. Assessing the status of emotional intelligence components							
Variables	Average	Standard deviation	The least	the most			
self motivation	21.98	3.72	11.00	35.00			
Self-awareness	27.53	4.56	15.00	38.00			
Self-control	20.98	4.12	12.00	32.00			
Social awareness	18.90	3.66	8.00	29.00			
social skills	16.59	3.50	7.00	25.00			

The results of the following table, obtained from Pearson test, indicate that there is a significant positive relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and emotional intelligence of municipal educators (r = 0.59, p = 0.00) and hypothesis zero was rejected. Also, organizational citizenship behavior with components of emotional intelligence, which are self-motivation (r = 0.40, p = 0.00), self-awareness (r = 0.53, p = 0.00), self-control (r = 0.48), P = 0.00), social awareness (r = 0.44, p = 0.00) and social skills (r = 0.53, p = 0.00) have a significant positive relationship.

Table 4. Pearson correlation coefficient between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Pearson correlation coefficient	1						
Significance coefficients (sig)							
Pearson correlation coefficient	0.60**	1					
Significance coefficients (sig)	0.00						
Pearson correlation coefficient	0.60**	0.46**	1				
Significance coefficients (sig)	0.00	0.00					
Pearson correlation coefficient	0.57**	0.62**	0.51**	1			
Significance coefficients (sig)	0.00	0.00	0.00				
Pearson correlation coefficient	0.48**	0.58**	0.56**	0.56**	1		
Significance coefficients (sig)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
Pearson correlation coefficient	0.81**	0.83**	0.78**	0.81**	0.78**	1	
Significance coefficients (sig)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
Pearson correlation coefficient Significance coefficients (sig)	0.40** 0.00	0.53** 0.00	0.48** 0.00	0.44** 0.00	0.53** 0.00	0.59** 0.00	1
	Significance coefficients (sig) Pearson correlation coefficient Significance coefficients (sig) Pearson correlation coefficient	Significance coefficients (sig)Pearson correlation coefficient0.60**Significance coefficients (sig)0.00Pearson correlation coefficient0.60**Significance coefficients (sig)0.00Pearson correlation coefficient0.57**Significance coefficients (sig)0.00Pearson correlation coefficient0.48**Significance coefficients (sig)0.00Pearson correlation coefficient0.48**Significance coefficients (sig)0.00Pearson correlation coefficient0.81**Significance coefficients (sig)0.00Pearson correlation coefficient0.40**	Pearson correlation coefficient1Significance coefficients (sig)1Pearson correlation coefficient0.60**1Significance coefficients (sig)0.001Pearson correlation coefficient0.60**1Significance coefficients (sig)0.000.00Pearson correlation coefficient0.60**0.46**Significance coefficients (sig)0.000.00Pearson correlation coefficient0.57**0.62**Significance coefficients (sig)0.000.00Pearson correlation coefficient0.48**0.58**Significance coefficients (sig)0.000.00Pearson correlation coefficient0.81**0.83**Significance coefficients (sig)0.000.00Pearson correlation coefficient0.40**0.53**	Pearson correlation coefficient1Significance coefficients (sig)9Pearson correlation coefficient 0.60^{**} 1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 9Pearson correlation coefficient 0.60^{**} 0.46^{**} 1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 9Pearson correlation coefficient 0.57^{**} 0.62^{**} 0.51^{**} Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.48^{**} 0.58^{**} 0.56^{**} Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.81^{**} 0.83^{**} 0.78^{**} Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.81^{**} 0.83^{**} 0.78^{**} Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.40^{**} 0.53^{**} 0.48^{**}	Pearson correlation coefficient1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.60^{**} 1Pearson correlation coefficient 0.60^{**} 1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.60^{**} 0.46^{**} 1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.57^{**} 0.62^{**} 0.51^{**} 1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.48^{**} 0.58^{**} 0.56^{**} 0.56^{**} Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.81^{**} 0.83^{**} 0.78^{**} 0.81^{**} Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.81^{**} 0.83^{**} 0.78^{**} 0.81^{**} Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.40^{**} 0.53^{**} 0.48^{**} 0.44^{**}	Pearson correlation coefficient1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.60^{**} 1Pearson correlation coefficient 0.60^{**} 1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.60^{**} 0.46^{**} 1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.57^{**} 0.62^{**} 0.51^{**} 1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.48^{**} 0.58^{**} 0.56^{**} 1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.48^{**} 0.58^{**} 0.56^{**} 1 Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.81^{**} 0.83^{**} 0.78^{**} 0.81^{**} 0.78^{**} Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.40^{**} 0.53^{**} 0.48^{**} 0.44^{**} 0.53^{**}	Pearson correlation coefficient1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.60^{**} 1Pearson correlation coefficient 0.60^{**} 1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.60^{**} 0.46^{**} 1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.57^{**} 0.62^{**} 0.51^{**} 1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.57^{**} 0.62^{**} 0.51^{**} 1Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.48^{**} 0.58^{**} 0.56^{**} 1 0.56^{**} 1 Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.81^{**} 0.83^{**} 0.78^{**} 0.78^{**} 1 Significance coefficients (sig) 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 Pearson correlation coefficient 0.40^{**} 0.53^{**} 0.48^{**} 0.44^{**} 0.53^{**} 0.59^{**}

According to the value of multiple correlation coefficient 0.62 and the coefficient of determination obtained RR = 0.39 obtained from Table can be seen by knowing the components of emotional intelligence 39% will explain the changes in organizational citizenship behavior of municipal trainers. Considering the value of F statistic, analysis

table of variance F = 40.42 with degree of freedom (322 and 5) with a significance level of 0.00 and comparing this significance level with α = 0.05 in the tabl, a hypothesis is observed. Zero is rejected for not affecting the components of emotional intelligence on changes in organizational citizenship behavior of municipal educators.

Discussion and Conclusion:

The overall purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior of Tehran Municipality educators. The statistical population of the present study consisted of coaches working in Tehran Municipality who had at least a 3rd grade coaching card. The statistical population was 2678 people, of which 2010 were women and 668 were men. The number of samples was estimated based on Morgan table 338 people who were selected by simple random sampling. In the present study, Schering (1996) Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire, which includes 33 guestions and consists of 5 components of emotional intelligence, which are: self-awareness, self-control, self-motivation, social awareness, social skills, Also, from the organizational citizenship behavior questionnaire of Podsakoff et al. (1990), this questionnaire included 20 items that were scored on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high). Findings of descriptive statistics showed that among the participants, 131 were male (about 40%) and 195 were female (about 60%). Also, in terms of marital status, among the sample, 124 were single (about 38%) and 199 were married (about 61%). In terms of educational status, among the sample, 78 people have a diploma (about 24%), 97 people have an associate degree (about 30%), 125 people have a bachelor's degree (about 38%) and 22 People also had a master's degree (about 7%). Regarding the status of coaching degree, among the sample, 226 people have a third degree coaching degree (about 69%), 76 people have a second degree coaching degree (about 23%) and 18 people have a first degree coaching degree (about 5%). They were. Also, in terms of coaching experience, the highest range was related to 1 to 10 years (about 77%) with 252 people. In this study, according to the hypotheses and objectives set, the data were analyzed through correlation and regression methods and the results showed that the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and emotional intelligence of municipal educators (r = 0.59, 00, 00). (P = 0) There is a significant positive relationship. Also, organizational citizenship behavior with components of emotional intelligence, which are selfmotivation (r = 0.40, p = 0.00), self-awareness (r = 0.53, p = 0.00), self-control (r = 0.48), P = 0.00), social awareness (r = 0.44, p = 0.00) and social skills (r = 0.53, p = 0.00) have a significant positive relationship. The findings of the present study showed that there is a significant relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior. Findings of the present study with the results of Noorilla et al. (2009), Karimi et al. (2011), Asadi et al. (2011), Carson (1999), Wang and Love (2002), Solan (2008), Madasir and Singh (2008), Ilgin et al. (2009), Korkmaz and Arapaki (2009), Jordan et al. (2011), San Jang (2012) were consistent. Another finding of the present study was the existence of a significant relationship between all components of emotional intelligence with organizational citizenship behavior. The results of this part of the study with the findings of Korkmaz and Arapaki (2009), Ilgin et al. (2009), Madasir and Singh (2008), Carmeli and Kulak Oglu (2005), Sitter (2004), Karimi (2011), Karimi et al. (2011) was inconsistent. One of the possible reasons for this discrepancy is the difference in the statistical population. Inconsistent research has been done on different statistical communities, including administrators, teachers, librarians, so it is natural that the sports environment is different from other environments. Other possible reasons for the difference between the tools used and the professional thinking in sports with other professions. Instructors with high emotional intelligence not only control problematic athletes and co-workers in the workplace, but also manage situations with tact and intelligence. These people have a hearing ear to hear what others have to say and can empathize well with them. These people establish a friendly and intimate relationship with others in their personal and professional lives. Coaches who have high emotional intelligence can withstand difficulties in the most difficult and critical situations and increase their composure for proper performance. Paying attention to body language helps people recognize emotions. Considering that coaching is one of the most stressful jobs, self-control skills are one of the most essential skills for coaches. Instructors with high emotional intelligence maintain composure instead of venting anger, which reduces harmful effects such as anxiety and depression, increasing the opportunity for them to participate more effectively and pay more attention to their tasks. gives. Emotions cause people to show the necessary motivation to work or solve problems. Having a happy mood makes a person more flexible and increases his ability to find logical solutions to problems. Happy and optimistic people look at events and conflicts from different angles and take advantage of them. Satisfied and happy people have more acceptance among other colleagues and have more satisfaction with their work environment and interaction with colleagues and athletes. These people motivate themselves and always strive to achieve their goals. Based on the results, there is a significant relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior of trainers and considering that emotional intelligence increases with training and practice, it is suggested to hold training courses to increase organizational citizenship behavior of trainers. Considering the significant relationship between the components of emotional intelligence with organizational citizenship behavior and considering the stressful job of coaching, it is suggested that coaches improve their emotional intelligence components in order to control emotions. Due to the significant relationship between social skills and organizational citizenship behavior, holding practical workshops on social skills and improving interpersonal relationships is recommended for educators.

REFERENCES

- 1. Ilgın, B. & Guney, S. & Ergeneli, A. & Tayfur, O. (2009). The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and the Moderating Effects of Gender on This Relationship, Creativity, Innovation and Management Abstracts of the 10th International Conference Sousse, Tunisia.
- 2. Modassir, A. & Singh, T.(2008). Relationship of Emotional Intelligence with Transformational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior, International Journalof Leadership Studies, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 3-21.
- 3. George, J. M. (2000). Emotions and leadership: The role of emotional intelligence. Human Relations, 53: 1027-1055.
- 4. Bradbury, T. & Greaves, A.J. (2007) The Emotional Intelligence (skills and testes) ,Translated by M. Ganji ,Tehran, Savalan (in Persian).
- 5. Diggins, C. (2004), "Emotional Intelligence: The Key to Effective Performance and to Staying Ahead of the Pack at Times of Organizational Change", Human Resource Management International Digest, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp: 33-5.
- Stys, Y.& Brown, Sh. L.(2004). A Review of the Emotional Intelligence Literature and Implications for Corrections, Research Branch Correctional Service of Canada Available at http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/ text/rsrch/ reports/ r150/r150_e.pdf.
- 7. Salovey, P. & Grewal, D.(2005). The Science of Emotional Intelligence, Current Directions in Psychological Science, Vol.14, No. 6.
- 8. Ciarrochi, J. Forgas, J.P. & Mayer, J.D.(2007). (Eds.), Emotional Intelligence in everyday life, Translated by A., Noori Emamzadehi & H., Nasiri., Isfahan, Neveshte (in Persian).
- 9. Suliman, A. M. & Al-Shaikh, F.N. (2007) Emotional intelligence at work: links to conflict and innovation, Employee Relations, Vol. 29, PP.208-220.
- 10. Palomera, R. & Berrocal, P. F. & Brackett, M. A, (2008) Emotional intelligence as a basic. competency in pre-service teacher training, Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology, Vol. 6, No. 15.
- 11. Bar-on, R. (2000). The hand book of Emotional in telliyence: theory Develop ment, Assessment and application at home, School and work Place.
- 12. Golman, D. (1998). Working with emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.
- 13. Goleman, D. (1995). Emotional intelligence. New York: Bantam Books.
- 14. Lane,A. Thelwell,R.Lowther,J.& Davonport,T.J. (2009). Emotional intelligence and Psychological Skills use social behavior and personality. Journal of social behavior and personality, volume37, No: 2,(7), pp: 195-201.
- 15. Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D.R., & Salovey, P. (1999). Emotional intelligence meetstraditional standards for intelligence. Intelligence, 27, 267–298.
- 16. Richard, C.T., Andrew, M.L., Neil, J.V.W. Iain A.G. (2008). Examining relationship between emotional intelligence and coaching efficacy. IJSEP, 6: 224-235.
- 17. Appelbaum, S., Bartolomucci, N., Beaumier, E., Boulanger, J., Corrigan, R., Dore, I., Girard, C., & Serroni, C. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior: A case study of culture, leadership and trust. Management Decision, 42(1), 13-40.
- 18. Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H. & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. Academy of Management Review, 27(4), 505-522.
- Chen, X. P., Lam, S. S. K., Naumann, S. E., & Schaubroeck, J. M. (2005). Group citizenship behaviour: Conceptualization and preliminary tests of its antecedents and consequences. Management and Organization Review, 1(2), 273-300.