



P-ISSN: 2394-1685
E-ISSN: 2394-1693
Impact Factor (ISRA): 5.38
IJPESH 2018; 5(5): 26-33
© 2018 IJPESH
www.kheljournal.com
Received: 30-07-2018
Accepted: 29-08-2018

Huei-Wen Pan

Instructor of the Sports Room of
the National Cheng Kung
University, Tainan, Taiwan

Wei-Yang Huang

Office of Student Affairs,
Physical Education Leader,
National Taiwan College of
Performing Arts, Taipei, Taiwan

Jung-Yi Lee

Manager, Youjing Construction
Co., Ltd, Taiwan Taipei City
Planning, Taiwan

A study on the personality tendency of male and female basketball Coaches in South Taiwan schools

Huei-Wen Pan, Wei-Yang Huang and Jung-Yi Lee

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to explore the differences in personality trends and work stress between male and female coaches in schools in the south of Taiwan (south of Chiayi), and to understand the prevalence of personality trends in job stress. Research methods: Questionnaire survey was applied. The questionnaires were compiled according to the literature and relevant domestic research scales. The questionnaire was named as "questionnaire of the basketball coach personality tendency and work stress in the school of south Taiwan (South of Chiayi)"; the content includes basic information, scale of personality orientation and work stress. Total of 155 questionnaires were sent to male and female coaches in the south Taiwan (South of Chiayi). Found and deleted 25 out of 155 the invalid questionnaires, 130 valid questionnaires were filed. The results of this study: the type of external control accounted for 25.38% and internal control accounted for 74.62% from the South Taiwan school male and female basketball coaches, which has indicated that internal control personality tendencies for most of the basketball coaches at south Taiwan schools. The work stress scale shows that about 65.4% of the basketball coaches in south Taiwan have a reasonable working pressure, and only 4.5% have the pressure of working height. Among them, there are significant differences between "working time pressure" and "training work pressure". The more the school coaches are biased towards the internal control personality traits, the higher the "work time pressure" and "training work pressure". The conclusion of this study: More than 70% of male and female basketball coaches in south Taiwanese schools are "internal control personality trends", and they will face positively when faced with work pressure. School male and female basketball coaches have significant differences in work pressure, and women are higher than male coaches. Therefore, the more the school basketball coaches are biased towards the internal control personality traits, the higher the pressure on working hours and training. Because the internal control type of personality is enthusiasm, will not delay work, do things to pursue speed, often do two things at the same time.

Keywords: Personality traits, Job stress

Introduction

The education nowadays are facing the phenomenon of declining birthrate among the countries, that is, the player's sharp reduction affects the less of classes and the lack of school coaches which also has resulted in the insufficient enrollment in schools. Today, the school coaches who serve the South Taiwan from public Elementary to Senior High School have already felt the lack of talents since ten years ago. Therefore, coaches who serve grassroots' schools required to provoke all the affairs of the team, and must also assist the school's administrative work, even for what's more the multi-roles of teacher as a coach whom takes the heavier workload, such as coach effectiveness training, professionalization, and also the coach evaluation work by active development now. The school coaches in invisible should be more intensively trained which to correspondence the nowadays declining birthrate as well as facing pressure of brain-drain of talent in South Taiwan and the outstanding players to develop to the North.

In 1966, Julian Rotter proposed the ideas of internal and external personality traits. He defines internal and external control personality tendencies as a perception of self-behavior and event results whether the outcome of the event is determined by factors of its own or external. Internal Locus of Control tends to believe that success comes from self-hard work. Believe in own destiny and future are responsible by self who can control it; External locus of control

Correspondence

Huei-Wen Pan

Instructor of the Sports Room of
the National Cheng Kung
University, Tainan, Taiwan

Thinks success or not has nothing to do with ability or effort but determined by their own destiny, such as luck, opportunity, background and other factors that are out of self-control. Indeed everyone owns these two qualities and just biased towards internal control or external control. For person tends to Internal Locus of Control often takes control of own destiny and success comes from own efforts. He will still take a positive attitude in the face of pressure. On the other hand, external control type of personality tendencies, facing the problem requires external strength, relies on luck and opportunity as key factors influencing success. However, this research is related to the personality tendency of school coach and to explore both internal and external control types. The purpose is to understand how the school coaches are exposed to work stress, and how they tend to be influenced by internal and external control personality differences. This is one of the motivations for this study to explore the personality tendencies of school coaches.

Stress is both the physiological and psychological reaction of the mind and the body to internal and external events. The following characteristics: 1. Subjectivity: Some people feel pressured in the same incident, but others don't feel like it. 2. Evaluation: The same pressure is considered helpful to others, but some people think that they have side effects 3. Activity: Stress can be different because of the severity of each person's severity. When pressure occurs in the workplace, it is called working pressure. When the coach keep request the players to meet results and behaviors 100% perfectly, the relationship turns weak among teachers and unable to get off work on time. When coach is fully engaged in training which results in no time to participate in leisure, so the coach itself will exert pressure on the workplace. In recent years, with the changes in the social environment, family structure and values, the social problems caused by many unsound families, the problems of parent-child relationships, the inappropriate words and deeds of the players at school, especially the basic stage of the primary to high school, are coaches. The problems that must be faced every day, the researchers have been serving students in basketball for many years, and the pressure of coaching work is increasing and empathetic. Coach work stress comes mainly from player behavior and time pressure (Borg & Riding, 1991) [8], followed by salary, social status, training, colleagues, and school environment. At present, the average domestic level a coaches are on average 10 hours a day. At any time, they must pay attention to the players. Any behavior of the players is harmful to others and their own safety. They are the responsibility of the school and the coach. After all, these children are still in the basic stage. The mind is immature, and the coach and teacher should take up the work of training and life care. Therefore, school coaches not only need to focus on training, but also have to take up the responsibility of class or parenting in their spare time. School sports team training still belongs to the school education. The first line of the child is the coach, of course the child's behavior. Expectations with parents are a source of stress for school coaches, and this is one of the motivations for this study.

Based on the above motivations, this study intends to explore the relationship between work stresses from Taiwanese school coaches' personality tendencies, and hopes to assist current school coaches to face their work pressure and propose appropriate strategies to improve training quality. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to understand the differences between personality and work pressure between male and female coaches in schools in south Taiwan (South of Chiayi),

and to understand whether the male and female coaches' personality tendencies have predictive work pressure.

Research Methods and Steps

I. Research objects and sampling

This research adopts the questionnaire survey, and the research object is the school basketball coach who is employed in the Public Elementary School to High School in south Taiwan (South of Chiayi). It includes the full-time school coach and the school-specific physical education teacher as the coach. Through the questionnaire survey, we can understand the difference between personality traits and work pressure between public and private elementary school to high school basketball coaches in south Taiwan (South of Chiayi), and whether personality traits can effectively predict work pressure. A total of 155 questionnaires were distributed, and the questionnaires were collected and excluded from the invalid questionnaires. A total of 130 valid questionnaires were collected, and the effective questionnaire rate was 83.9%.

2. Research tools

The self-edited "Southern Taiwan (South of Chiayi) School Coach Personality Tendency and Work Stress Questionnaire" is conducted in three parts: the first part is the basic information; the second part is the personality tendency scale; the third part the work pressure scale is explained as follows:

The basic information of the first part of this questionnaire is mainly to understand the background information of male and female basketball coaches. In the second part of the questionnaire, the school coach "Personality Orientation Scale" uses the "internal and external control scale" revised by Wu Zihui (1975) [2]. However, this study considers that some of the questions are unclear and is not conducive to the subject's answer. Excerpts from the questions the best apply to this study. In the third part of the questionnaire, the school coach "Working Stress Scale" used Liu Yahui to compile the "National Primary and Secondary School Teachers' Work Stress Scale" in 2011, taking into account Wang Shanggang (1994) [1] stressors, stress perception and work pressure. The relationship research questionnaire, revised and selected 12 questions, is divided into four dimensions of player behavioral pressure, time pressure, training work pressure, and co-worker relationship pressure to understand the tendency of school coaching work pressure.

3. The tooling

(1) The second part of the school coach personality orientation scale: using the "internal and external control scale" revised by Wu Zihui (1975) [2], the original scale was developed by Rotter in 1966, but this study believes that some of the questions are unclear and not conducive to The subjects answered, so only the questions that best applied to the study were extracted, totaling 5 questions, as shown in Table 1.

I. Scoring method: The method of answering the scale adopts forced selection. Each question includes two different statements. The subject chooses one of his most convincing arguments, and the question is ticked as two options for the same question. Select option 1 and get 1 point. Select option 2 and get 2 points. The total score is 10 points, and the score is equal to or higher than 8 points, indicating that the more internal control belief tendency, the lower the score, the lower than 8 points means the more external control belief tendency.

II. Scale reliability: This study used the scale to analyze its reliability by $\alpha=0.5837$. It shows that the internal consistency of this scale is good.

Table 1: School coach personal quality table contents

Question number	content
1	<input type="checkbox"/> ❶ Without proper transportation, one cannot succeed. <input type="checkbox"/> ❷ Talented people fail to succeed because they fail to take advantage of opportunities.
2	<input type="checkbox"/> ❶ I often find that what happens is always going to happen. <input type="checkbox"/> ❷ For me, it is better to believe in fate than to decide to take certain actions to be effective.
3	<input type="checkbox"/> ❶ It is not a smart move to plan too far, because things are just a matter of luck. <input type="checkbox"/> ❷ When I made the plan, I was almost sure that I had a way to make the project a success.
4	<input type="checkbox"/> ❶ Who can become a boss, often rely on who is lucky, can take advantage of the first place. <input type="checkbox"/> ❷ To make a person's success a success depends on his ability and has nothing to do with luck.
5	<input type="checkbox"/> ❶ Many times, I feel that I can't do anything about what happened to me. <input type="checkbox"/> ❷ I don't think that opportunity or luck plays an important role in my life.

(2) **School coaching work stress scale:** Using Liu Yahui to compile the "National primary and secondary school teacher work stress scale" in 2011, and taking into account Wang Shanggang's (1994) ^[1] research questionnaire on the relationship between stressors, stress perception and work stress, Four directions of dealing with player's behavioral pressure, time pressure, training work pressure, and co-worker relationship pressure were selected, and 12 questions were selected, as shown in Table 2.

I. Scoring method: This scale is scored by the Likert five-

point scale and given 1, 2 respectively according to "very disagree", "disagree", "ordinary", "consent" and "very agree"., 3, 4, 5 points. The work stress scale has a total of 12 questions, the total score is 60 points, the score is 35-44, the pressure is moderate, and the 45 points is the higher pressure in the workplace. Therefore, the higher the score is, the higher the work pressure tendency is. The opposite is the lower.

II. Scale reliability: This study is based on the reliability analysis results, which has $\alpha = 0.6414$. It shows that the internal consistency of this scale is good.

Table 2: School coach work stress scale contents

Question number	content
1	My team has a lot of players who do not act well and often make me worry.
2	I often communicate with the team instructors about the status of the players.
3	I can't get off work on time, and I often have to train my sports team after school.
4	I need to do things very quickly, because I always feel that time is not enough.
5	When the training progress is delayed by the school activities, I will be anxious to keep up with the progress I set.
6	When the player's motor skills learning performance is low, I will question my training style.
7	I have a strong preference for sports training, and I also require players to strive for perfection.
8	I will develop a training plan for the entire semester and follow the progress.
9	School administrators are often busy with work and meetings, and rarely contact physical education teachers.
10	I would rather be a sports and coaching faculty than an executive.
11	School administrators and teachers only manage their own work.
12	I am always devoted to the work of school sports training, and I am not involved in leisure activities.

4. Data processing

In this study, the questionnaire survey was used. After the questionnaire was collected and collected, the invalid questionnaire was deleted. The SPSS for Windows 12.0 software package was used for statistical analysis to verify the hypotheses:

- Descriptive statistics:** the allocation of the number of times, the percentage, the average and the standard deviation to describe the distribution of male and female coaches in the school.
- Independent sample t-test:** It is mainly used to analyze the difference between male and female school coaches' personality tendency and work pressure.
- Regression analysis:** Using the school coach personality traits to predict the stress of school coaching work, the relationship obtained is used as a linear correlation indicator. The square of the correlation system (R^2) also indicates the proportion of the interpretation of the variation in this study.
- Significant level:** This study used $\alpha=.05$ as a significant level for statistical analysis.

Results and Discussion

1. The questionnaire describes statistics

From Tables 3 and 4, to understand the results and description statistics of the male and female basketball coaches'

personality orientation scales in the South Taiwan School, 130 subjects were found to have different answers. The results showed that the minimum value was 5 and the maximum value was 10. The average score for men and women is 8.25, with an average of 1.64 (5 questions in total). Approximately 55.4% of the total number of subjects was internally controlled.

Table 4, to understand the internal and external control of male and female basketball coaches in South Taiwan School, found that the average score of all subjects in the external control type was 1.26, and the average of the internal control type was 1.75 (according to the questionnaire, a total of five questions, The highest score is 10 points and the minimum score is 5 points. The choice of 1 is 1 point, and the choice of 2 is 2 points, so the subject has 8 points or more (internal control type). School male and female basketball coaches tend to have internal control tendencies in both internal and external control. The average number of boys and girls answered, 8.15 for boys and 8.49 for girls.

Table 5, to understand the distribution of internal and external control personality tendencies of male and female basketball coaches in South Taiwan School, found that external control type accounted for 25.38%, internal control type accounted for 74.62%, indicating that most of the South Taiwan school basketball coaches are internal control personality tendencies.

Table 3: Summary of the results of the school male and female basketball coach personality orientation scale

Total number of personality	points (person)	Percentage (%)	Cumulative percentage (%)	Internal and external control distribution
5	2	1.5	1.5	external control
6	11	8.5	10.0	external control
7	20	15.4	25.4	external control
8	39	30.0	55.4	Internal control
9	35	26.9	82.3	Internal control
10	23	17.7	100.0	Internal control
total	130	100.0		

Table 4: School male and female basketball coach personality tendency description statistics summary table

Gender	points (person)	average score	standard deviation	Sig.
male	89	8.15	1.221	.00
female	41	8.49	1.287	.00
total	130	8.25	1.247	.00

* $p < .05$

Table 5: School male and female basketball coach internal and external control personality tendency description statistics summary table

Factor	male n=89	female n=41	total (person)	Percentage (%)
external	25	8	33	25.38%
Internal	64	33	97	74.62%

N=130

Table 6: Summary of the results of the school men and women basketball coach work stress scale

Total number of working pressures	points (person)	Percentage (%)	Cumulative percentage (%)	Working pressure distribution
36	2	1.5	1.5	Moderate pressure
37	2	1.5	3.1	Moderate pressure
39	17	13.1	16.2	Moderate pressure
40	20	15.4	31.5	Moderate pressure
41	4	3.1	34.6	Slightly high pressure
42	15	11.5	46.2	Slightly high pressure
43	28	21.5	67.7	Slightly high pressure
44	17	13.1	80.8	Slightly high pressure
45	16	12.3	93.1	Slightly high pressure
46	3	2.3	95.4	Slightly high pressure
47	2	1.5	96.9	High pressure
48	2	1.5	98.5	High pressure
51	2	1.5	100.0	High pressure
total	130	100.0		

Table 7, to understand the four dimensions of the men and women basketball coach work stress scale in South Taiwan School, to describe the statistical analysis of the subjects' data, found 130 subjects, the player's behavioral pressure, working time pressure, training work pressure, Colleague relationship pressure isometric response, the average value of the

responses tends to the "consent" option, and the four standard deviations (the player's behavioral pressure $M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.045$; the working time pressure $M = 3.57$, $SD = .769$; training work pressure $M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.297$; co-worker relationship pressure $M = 3.52$, $SD = 1.669$) showed that there was no difference in the subject's answer.

Table 7: School male and female basketball coaches work stress scale description statistics summary table

Factor	points (person)	mean	standard deviation
Player behavioral pressure	130	3.40	1.045
Working time pressure	130	3.57	.769
Training work pressure	130	3.59	1.297
Colleague relationship pressure	130	3.52	1.669

Table 8 shows the relevant analysis of the orientation of the work stress scales of male and female basketball instructors in South Taiwan School, and the subjects responded to the option of consent. There is no significant correlation between the various aspects of the school basketball coach's work

stress scale. The orientations are independent and separated from each other, indicating that the school male and female coaches work stress scales are four dimensions, each representative.

Table 8: Summary table of school-based male and female basketball coaches' work stress scales

Factor	Player behavioral pressure	Working time pressure	Training work pressure	Colleague relationship pressure
Player behavioral pressure	1	-.070	.033	.136
Working time pressure	-.070	1	.129	-.031
Training work pressure	.033	.129	1	.073
Colleague relationship pressure	.136	-.031	.073	1

* $p < .05$

2. Analysis of the differences between personality male and female basketball coaches in personality orientation and work stress

Table 9 shows the difference between the male and female basketball coaches of the South Taiwan School on the personality orientation scale. The male and female basketball

coaches on the personality orientation scale have no significant difference between men and women $t=1.46$ and the total average number of boys and girls is biased towards internal control. Type (average of boys = 8.15; average of girls = 8.49).

Table 9: Summary of differences between School Male and Female Basketball Coaches and Personality Tendency Scale

Factor	number	average	standard deviation	t
male	89	8.15	.244	1.46
female	41	8.49	.257	

* $p < .05$

Table 10, t test the difference between the male and female basketball coaches in the South Taiwan School on the work stress scale, the school male and female basketball coaches in the work stress scale to "the player's behavioral pressure",

"working time pressure", "training work pressure" There were no significant differences at the factor level. Only in the "colleague relationship pressure ($t = 2.75$)", there is a significant difference between men and women.'

Table 10: Summary of the differences in the response of school male and female basketball coaches in the work stress scale

Factor	male (n=89)		female (n=41)		t	Sig.
	M	SD	M	SD		
Player behavioral pressure	3.41	.527	3.38	.510	.269	.17
Working time pressure	3.60	.383	3.53	.387	.980	.08
Training work pressure	3.57	.322	3.62	.331	.744	.10
Colleague relationship pressure	3.54	.412	3.46	.429	2.75*	.01

* $p < .05$

Table 11, this study scale understands the influence of personality attitudes of male and female basketball coaches in South Taiwan School on work stress. The results of the survey show that the male and female basketball coaches have a moderate work pressure of 80% and work pressure is 20%; external control Personality and moderate work pressure accounted for 20%, external control personality and work

pressure is high 5%, internal control personality and work pressure accounted for 60%, internal control personality and work pressure is high 15%; from the above data shows South Taiwan (south of Chiayi) School male and female coaches tend to prefer internal control personality, and work stress is moderate.

Table 11: Relationship between school male and female basketball coaches' personality tendency and work stress scale

Scale		working pressure scale		total
		moderate pressure	slightly high pressure	
personality tendency scale	external control	27 (20%)	6 (5%)	33 (25%)
	internal control	78 (60%)	19 (15%)	97 (75%)
total =130				

Table 12, analysis of the variance of the Personality Tendency Scale and the Work Stress Questionnaire for the male and female basketball coaches in the South Taiwan School. The F value of the Work Stress Scale is not significantly different from the .916. However, in the "Working Time Pressure" and

"Training Work Stress" The two dimensions are significantly different, and their F values are 2.28 and 1.78, respectively. It shows that the personality tendency of school basketball coaches is different from the pressure of "working hours" and "training work".

Table 12: Summary of Analysis of Variability of Work Stress Scale for Male and Female Basketball Coaches in South Taiwan School

	variation	square sum	degree	mean square	F
Player behavioral pressure	SSb	4.156	5	.831	.75
	SSw	136.644	124	1.102	
	SSt	140.800	129		
Working time pressure	SSb	5.641	5	1.128	2.28*
	SSw	61.222	124	.494	
	SSt	66.863	129		

Training work pressure	SSb	11.335	5	2.267	1.78*
	SSw	157.773	124	1.272	
	SSt	169.108	129		
Colleague relationship pressure	SSb	5.096	5	1.019	.36
	SSw	354.412	124	2.858	
	SSt	359.508	129		
working pressure scale total	SSb	52.456	5	10.491	.92
	SSw	1420.179	124	11.453	
	SSt	1472.635	129		

* $p < .05$

Table 13, it can be seen that there is a significant difference between the internal control and external control personality tendencies of the male and female basketball coaches in South Taiwan and the pressure on the "working hours". The results of the personality orientation scale are 8-10 points, which tend

to be internal control personality. 5-7 points tend to be externally controlled, so Table 11 shows the tendency of internal control personality, which is higher than the external control personality tendency in the "working time" pressure dimension.

Table 13: South Taiwan School Male and Female Basketball Coach Personality Tendency Scale and Working Time Pressure LSD Summary Table

Working time pressure/ Average difference	5 points	6 points	7 points	8 points	9 points	10 points
5 points	-	-.64	-1.00	-1.75*	-1.80*	-2.12*
6 points	.64	-	-.36	-.21	-1.84*	-1.75*
7 points	1.00	.36	-	.15	-1.75*	-1.84*
8 points	1.75*	.21	.15	-	-.05	-.154
9 points	1.80*	1.84*	1.75*	.05	-	-.20
10 points	2.12*	1.75*	1.84*	.15	.20	-

* $p < .05$

Table 14 shows that there is a significant difference between the internal and external control personality tendencies of the male and female basketball coaches in South Taiwan School and the "training work" pressure orientation. The personality orientation scale is 8-10 points, which is the tendency to

internal control personality, 5- The 7 points tend to be externally controlled, so Table 12 shows the tendency of internal control personality, which is higher than the external control personality tendency in terms of the stress level of "training work".

Table 14: South Taiwan School Male and Female Basketball Coaching Coach Personality Tendency Scale and Training Work Stress LSD Summary Table

Training work pressure / Average difference	5 points	6 points	7 points	8 points	9 points	10 points
5 points	-	.91	.60	1.71*	1.96*	2.13*
6 points	-.91	-	-.31	1.83*	2.45*	2.78*
7 points	-.60	.31	-	-.52	1.74*	1.87*
8 points	-1.71*	-1.83*	.52	-	.38	.05
9 points	-1.96*	-2.45*	-1.74*	-.38	-	-.33
10 points	-2.13*	-2.78*	-1.87*	-.05	.33	-

* $p < .05$

3. Analysis of the predictive power of male and female basketball coaches' personality tendencies

In this paragraph, the "personality quality table" is used as a control variable, and the regression analysis of the four factors of "work stress" is carried out to confirm the explanatory power of the personality traits of male and female basketball coaches in South Taiwan School.

(1) Regression analysis of personality quality table on overall work pressure

Table 15 shows that the personality quality table can only explain the 11% variation of the overall working pressure ($R^2=0.011$, $p<0.001$), indicating that there is no significant difference between the internal and external control personality traits on the overall working pressure, and the overall working pressure scale is high or low. There is no obvious influence on the personality traits of the school coach.

Table 15: Regression analysis table of personality quality table for overall working pressure

Variable name	Beta	t	p
Overall work pressure	0.075	0.650	0.120
R	0.103		
R Square	0.011		

Forced into law, significant level * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

(2) Regression Analysis of Personality Quality Table on Players' Behavioral Stress

Table 16, which shows that the personality quality table can explain the variation of the player's behavioral stress by only

12% ($R^2=0.012$, $p<0.001$), indicating that the difference in school coach personality traits does not affect the "player's behavioral stress".

Table 16: Regression Analysis Table of Personality Quality Table for Players' Behavioral Stress

Variable name	Beta	t	p
Player behavioral pressure	0.016	0.524	0.294
R	0.110		
R Square	0.012		

Forced into law, significant level $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.01$, $***p < 0.001$

(3) Regression Analysis of Personality Quality Table on Stress in Working Hours

Table 17, showing that the personality quality table can explain the 41% variation in working time pressure ($R^2=0.041$, $p < 0.001$), and the personality quality table has a significant positive influence on the working time pressure, the more the school coach is biased towards internal control. Personality traits, the higher the pressure is during working hours.

Table 17: Regression analysis table of personality quality table for working time pressure

Variable name	Beta	t	p
Working time pressure	0.119***	3.650	0.000
R	0.203***		
R Square	0.041***		

Forced into law, significant level $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.01$, $***p < 0.001$

(4) Regression Analysis of Personality Quality Table on Training Work Stress

Table 18 shows that the personality quality table can explain the 48% variation of training work pressure ($R^2=0.048$, $p < 0.001$), and the personality quality table has a significant positive influence on the training work pressure, and the school coach is more internal control. Personality traits, the higher the stress of training work.

Table 18: Regression Analysis Table of Personality Quality Table for Training Work Stress

Variable name	Beta	t	p
Training work pressure	0.088***	3.669	0.008
R	0.219***		
R Square	0.048***		

Forced into law, significant level $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.01$, $***p < 0.001$

(5) Regression Analysis of Personality Quality Table on Colleagues' Relationship Pressure

Table 19 shows that the personality quality table can explain the 14% variation of the co-worker relationship pressure ($R^2=0.044$, $p < 0.001$), and the internal and external control personality traits have no significant effect on the relationship pressure of colleagues.

Table 19: Regression Analysis Table of Personality Quality Table for Colleague Relationship Stress

Variable name	Beta	t	p
Colleague relationship pressure	0.030	0.927	0.354
R	0.120		
R Square	0.014		

Forced into law, significant level $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.01$, $***p < 0.001$

Conclusion and Suggestion

I. Conclusion

1. Analysis of the current situation of male and female basketball coaches and personality trends in South Taiwanese schools: More than 70% of school coaches are "internal control personality trends". It stated the fate is controlled by oneself and believed that the success of training or competition comes from its own efforts. When faced with work pressure, it will face with a positive attitude. There is no difference in the personality tendencies of male and female basketball coaches in schools.

2. Analysis of the current situation of male and female basketball coaches and work stress in South Taiwan School: The work pressure of school basketball coaches is still in a reasonable range, and only 4.5% has the pressure of working height. Therefore, to prevent the occurrence of work stress, you can self-adjust and establish a strategy of stress perception, such as strengthening the professional quality of school coaches, in order to facilitate the reconstruction of stress. As for the male and female basketball coaches, the work pressure is significantly different, and women are higher than male coaches.

3. Predictive analysis of personality traits and work stress of male and female basketball coaches in South Taiwan School:

(1). There is no obvious difference between the work pressure and the internal and external control personality traits. It mainly indicates that the school coach has work pressure in both internal control and external control, and there is no individual difference.

(2). The more the school basketball coaches are biased towards the internal control personality traits, the higher the pressure on the working hours and the higher the pressure on the training work. Because the internal control type of personality is enthusiasm, will not delay work, do things to pursue speed, often do two things at the same time.

II. Suggestion

(1) "Internal control personality tendencies" is the majority of the personality tendencies of current school basketball coaches. Internal control personality tendencies can improve job satisfaction, because internal control coaches can maintain their duties in the workplace with a positive and self-expected attitude, constantly pursue higher levels.

(2) Benefits of internal control type personality tendency: School basketball coaches have an internal control personality that tends to be a kind of personality that is full of enthusiasm, has strong self-requirements and expectations, and pursues desire. The internal control school basketball coach believes that the success of the work is controlled and assumed by the individual.

References

1. Wang SG. Research on the relationship between stressors, pressure perception and work stress. National Sun Yat-Sen University has not published a master's degree thesis, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, 1994.
2. Wu ZH. The influence of internal and external control orientation and free choice on reading test scores. National Chengchi University not published Master's thesis, Taipei, Taiwan, 1975.
3. Lin SW. Research on the work pressure and social support of the teachers in Taoyuan County. The Department of Education, National Taiwan University of Taitung did not publish a master's thesis, Taitung, Taiwan, 2010.

4. Chen WJ. The cause of physical education teachers' job burnout and prevention. *Sports Research Review*. 2000; 50:102-108.
5. Liu YH. The preparation of the national work stress scale for primary and secondary school teachers. *The Republic of China School of Administrative Research*. 2011; 74:60-78.
6. Xiao SH. Research on the Influence of work Instructor's work stress and personality traits on Job performance: Take the American fitness club as an example. Da Ye University has not published a master's thesis, Changhua, Taiwan, 2007.
7. Akpochafo GO. Perceived sources of occupational stress among primary school teachers in Delta State of Nigeria. *Education*. 2012; 132(4):826-833.
8. Borg MG, Riding RJ. Occupational stress and satisfaction in teaching, *British Educational Research Journal*. 1991; 17(3):263-281.
9. Lee Y, Shin S. Job stress evaluation using response surface data mining. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*. 2010; 40(4):379-385.
10. Rotter JB. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of Reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*. 1966; 81:1-27.
11. Yong IT. Factors affecting occupational stress among teachers of a secondary school in Sarawak. Masters project report, University Pertanian Malaysia, 1999.