



www.ijonSES.net

Social Capital and Satisfaction with Life during the COVID -19 Pandemic: A Case Study on Coaches

Davut Atılgan 
Kahramanmaraş Sutçu İmam University, Turkey

Yalçın Tükel 
Necmettin Erbakan University, Turkey

To cite this article:

Atılgan, D. & Tükel, Y. (2021). Social capital and satisfaction with life during the COVID-19 pandemic: A case study on coaches. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences (IJonSES)*, 3(2), 342-359. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijonSES.185>

International Journal on Social and Education Sciences (IJonSES) is a peer-reviewed scholarly online journal. This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Authors alone are responsible for the contents of their articles. The journal owns the copyright of the articles. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of the research material. All authors are requested to disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest including any financial, personal or other relationships with other people or organizations regarding the submitted work.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.



International Journal on Social and Education Sciences (IJonSES) is affiliated with
[International Society for Technology, Education, and Science \(ISTES\): www.istes.org](http://www.istes.org)

Social Capital and Satisfaction with Life during the COVID -19 Pandemic: A Case Study on Coaches

Davut Atılgan, Yalçın Tükel

Article Info

Article History

Received:

03 January 2021

Accepted:

20 April 2021

Keywords

COVID-19

Coach

Social capital

Life satisfaction

Abstract

This study aims to examine whether there is a difference between the social capital levels and life satisfaction of coaches in terms of some demographic variables. The research sample consists of 251 coaches working at Directorates of Youth Services and Sports of Kahramanmaraş and Konya Provincial located in Turkey. The research is a quantitative study carried out in the relational survey model. The data of the research were analyzed using the Jamovi 1.6.12 statistical software program. Arithmetic means, standard deviation, t-test, and One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests were used for data analysis. In addition, correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between variables while regression analysis was used to test the predictive effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable. As a result of the research, it was found that the social capital scale mean score of the participants was high, and the mean score of the coaches regarding the life satisfaction scale was moderate. It was determined that participants' scores on the social capital scale differed significantly in terms of gender, active participation in sports, age, coach rank, and branch variables and that the scores of the life satisfaction scale differed significantly in terms of marital status and income-welfare variables. It was concluded that as the perceived social capital of the coaches increases, their life satisfaction increases and that the social capital scale is a significant predictor of life satisfaction.

Introduction

Coaches are the main sports figures with a direct impact on athletes' participation. Coaches are expected not only to coach technically and tactically but also to coach and assist a person's physical, emotional, social, and cognitive development (Christensen, 2014; Lisinskiene, 2018). In this respect, coaches with strong social skills and high satisfaction with life build an appropriate environment that supports the development of life and sport skills of athletes (Asztalos, De Bourdeaudhuij & Cardon, 2010; Nakamura et al., 2014; Pedišić et al., 2015; Nakamura et al., 2014).

Interaction with others in many jobs depends on the individual's career success and the individual's interpersonal perception level and skill. It is easier for people who perceive and understand the emotions of others to be

socially resourceful and to relate well to others. These traits help individuals give safe positive reactions and help them be praised by others –e.g. appraisal from superiors for appropriate performance-, foster and maintain high-level relationships with others, and increase social capital (Musson & Rousselière, 2020; Vemuri & Costanza, 2006). Thus, individuals who communicate well will perform better and will be able to have a better effect on others' evaluations of their own performance. Satisfaction and activity in social life emerge as a result of social relationships that an individual establishes both with his/her friends and work and in his/her professional career. In order to achieve this professional life and satisfaction with life, it is necessary to have social competencies in addition to financial competencies. The broad concept that encompasses all of these is social capital (Becchetti et al., 2017; Mikucka et al., 2017; Musson & Rousselière, 2020). Considering the opposite of this situation, it can be argued that it is very difficult for individuals with high perceived professional burnout to develop a healthy sense of organizational commitment (Aydoğmuş & Tükel, 2019).

Social capital theory suggests that interpersonal relationships create value for individuals as they provide resources that can be used to achieve desired results (Hung & Lau, 2019). Burt (1992) defines social capital as "friends, colleagues, and general contacts the player receives opportunities to use his or her financial and human capital". Nahapiet & Ghoshal (1998) acknowledges that one of the most popular conceptualizations of social capital focuses solely on the structure of networks developed in organizations. Adler and Kwon (2002) describe social capital as "the goodwill available to individuals and groups". In this respect, the root of social capital lies in the structure and content of the social relations of the player.

There are many different types of social capital, but there is a notable distinction between structural and cognitive forms of social capital. Structural social capital refers to externally observable aspects of social organization such as roles, rules, procedures, and precedents (ICM, 2016), such as civic engagement or group membership. Cognitive social capital is more internal and subjective, referring to shared norms, values, attitudes, and beliefs (ICM, 2016). Although they are presented as mutually reinforcing components, it is still important to distinguish between these categories of social capital because they can have different effects depending on both the characteristics of the individual and the characteristics of the community (Kawachi & Berkman, 2000). Researchers have shown that social capital has three dimensions. These are called structural, relational, and cognitive. Structural capital represents the general communication model between individuals (Castro & Roldán, 2013). This dimension reflects the users' position in the social system and defines the users' ability to access resources. By the way, a concept is defined as "social nodes" that show the degree of connectivity and availability of members with the friend list in the network. Social nodes reflect the nature and quality of the relationship in the social network. Relational capital defines the level of trust in communication between members. This factor reflects the nature of the work done with other members and the quality of personal relationships. The cognitive dimension refers to the resources that support individual-individual and individual system perception (Zhao, Tang, Liu & Liu, 2016).

Social capital is the best resource created through the exchange. Such a resource deals with different types of relationships, including interpersonal relationships and organizational networks (Lin, 2017). Social capital research was initially discussed too much in studies on community relations. It was proved as a result of this that

social capital is a determining factor in daily interactions and relationships among individuals and groups (Aldrich & Meyer, 2015). The nature of existing social capital in the structure of relationships among individuals emerges as the most important factor in the application of this concept to social phenomena. The two leading reasons for failing to build social capital in interpersonal interactions are the lack of enthusiasm and satisfaction and failure to view others' experiences, feelings, and thoughts from their perspectives. Two individuals experience the same event very differently since every individual is different and unique. Therefore, they have different feelings and thoughts in the same event. We define empathy as the capacity to feel and experience another person's emotions as close as that person experiences. Studies reveal that there is a high relationship between individuals' social capital competencies, satisfaction with life, and empathic tendencies.

Life satisfaction is a longer-term cognitive assessment of one's own life and this assessment does not mandate the use of specific criteria such as health, career, and family. Instead, individuals may use any criteria they think relevant (Yang & Srinivasan, 2016). Life satisfaction is defined as a general cognitive and judgmental assessment of the personal quality of life according to self-selected criteria (Diener et al., 1985; Gilman & Huebner, 2003). Bottom-up theoretical approaches towards life satisfaction have suggested that satisfaction with life depends on the level of satisfaction a person feels about different life spheres (Schnettler et al., 2018). Life satisfaction is a stabilised trait relatively bound to have more systematic and chronic factors rather than transient and temporary affective states (Black, 2020; Pavot & Diener, 2008). Cognitive judgment of personal life satisfaction has been shown to be an essential component of subjective well-being and a valid indicator of the general quality of life (Eid & Diener, 2004). Therefore, life satisfaction is one of the central structures in the field of positive psychology (Pedišić et al., 2015).

Life satisfaction is one of the concepts in which one makes sense of his/her own emotional and satisfactory processes. It represents the mental aspect of one's state of happiness and well-being. In other words, life satisfaction is an evaluation of one's own life process in contexts such as social relations, working life, daily life, psychological and physical health, and income. The determinants of life satisfaction were expressed as realizing social, physical, affective, emotional, psychological health, psychological well-being, and effective communication skills, the ability to create and maintain social connections, and having positive social connections (Boyce, Delaney & Wood, 2018). According to Onyishi & Okongwu (2013), life satisfaction reflects an evaluation of the products and results obtained by individuals about their expectations about life. Satisfaction with life is a perception about how events and phenomena encountered in the life process occur and should occur. The less and the more compatible distance between these two dimensions are (how they occur and how they should occur), the more people have life satisfaction. Life satisfaction is an aspect of subjective well-being and can be a useful measure in sports research, especially for coaches (Ahmad et al., 2021).

According to Veenhoven (2014), the sources of life satisfaction are not yet fully understood, but what is known is that it emerges as a complex combination of many factors in life. However, collective action, metacognitive processes, individual characteristics, family environment, social environment, mental and physical health status, extraversion and empathy, and past experiences have a decisive effect on life satisfaction. Research has shown that highly extroverted individuals with strong social capital tend to participate in more social activities

(Srivastava, Angelo & Vallereux 2008) react to situations and experiences (Lischetzka A & Eid, 2006) more positively in than introvert peers (Hounkpatin et al., 2018). These behaviors contribute to individuals developing more positive emotions and increase life satisfaction directly or indirectly (Watson & Naragon-Gainey, 2010; Dunn, 2012). Most of the literature on social capital and life satisfaction has been based on the background of developed countries and their general population distribution. However, it has been observed that very little research has been done on sports managers and coaches. Understanding the relationship between individual social capital and life satisfaction in coaches can make important contributions to improving sporting performance in the future. This study will examine the psychological and social aspects of sports professions by focusing on the relationship between social capital and life satisfaction in the field of coaching. In this context, the social capital levels and life satisfaction of coaches were comparatively investigated in terms of some demographic variables. And, the research questions were as follows:

- Do social capital and life satisfaction of coaches differ according to gender?
- Do social capital and life satisfaction of coaches differ according to the marital status variable?
- Do social capital and life satisfaction of coaches differ according to the age variable?
- Do social capital and life satisfaction of coaches differ according to their income?
- Do social capital and life satisfaction of coaches differ according to the active participation in sports variable?
- Do social capital and life satisfaction of coaches differ according to the sports branch variable?
- Is there a significant relationship between social capital and the life satisfaction of coaches?

Method

Research Model

The research is a quantitative study carried out in a relational survey model. Relational survey models are aimed at determining whether there is a relationship between two or more variables, and if so, the degree and level of the relationship (Karasar, 2015). In this study, the opinions of the coaches about their social capital levels and life satisfaction were determined, and the differentiation of the participants' opinions was examined in terms of some demographic variables. Besides, there was an attempt to reveal the predictive power of the social capital perception levels of the coaches on their life satisfaction. The "Voluntary Informed Consent Form" was obtained from all participating coaches.

Study Group

According to Karasar (2015), the survey model refers to the arrangements made on the sample or sampling, using the whole of the population or a group from the population in a population consisting of many elements, to make a general judgment about the population. The population of the research was composed of coaches working at Konya and Kahramanmaraş Youth Services and Sports Provincial Directorates. Since all the coaches in the research population were included in the research sample, no other sample selection was made. The online method was used for the coaches to fill in the scales and usable feedback was provided from 251 coaches.

Results

Personal information of the coaches participating in the study is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Information Regarding the Participants Included in the Research Group

Demographic Variables	Options	N	%
Active participation in sport	Yes	158	62.9
	No	93	37.1
Gender	Female	66	26.3
	Male	185	73.7
Marital status	Married	179	71.3
	Single	72	28.7
Age	25 and under	33	13.1
	26-35	74	29.5
	36-45	101	40.2
	46 and over	43	17.1
Income-Welfare	Low	34	13.5
	Good	217	86.5
Coach – Rank	1 st rank	81	32.3
	2 nd rank	85	33.9
	3 rd rank and over	85	33.9
Branches	Orienteering	55	21.9
	Ring and mat sports	65	25.9
	Racquet sports	46	18.3
	Indoor sports	53	21.1
	Other sports	32	12.7

Data Collection Tools

Social Capital Scale: The validity and reliability test of the Social Capital Scale, which was developed by Onyx & Bullen (2000), for the Turkish society, was performed by Ardahan (2012). When the explanatory factor analysis was applied to the Social Capital Scale, which consists of 34 items, six items were removed for various reasons, and the remaining 28 items were subjected to factor analysis again, and the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was found to be .71 with the new version of the scale after varimax rotation.

Within the scope of this study, a 28-item 4-point scale was used including 1: absolutely no, 2: often no, 3: often yes, and 4: absolutely yes. In this study, the internal consistency coefficient of the scale was found to be .86. Confirmatory Factor Analysis was conducted within this study to confirm the structure of the scale. As a result of the analysis, the structure of the scale was confirmed and the fit indices of the model were at good fit ($\chi^2 / sd = 1.86$) and acceptable levels (CFI = .87, TLI = .85, RMSEA = .059, SRMR = .070).

Satisfaction With Life Scale: The Satisfaction with Life Scale” developed by Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffin (1985, 72) was adapted into Turkish by Dağlı & Baysal (2016). The original form of the scale consists of a factor, five items, and a 7-point Likert-type rating. The scale was previously adapted into Turkish by Köker (1991) and used as a 7-point scale for various purposes in Turkey. The scale can be scored between 5 and 35. The higher the score is, the higher the life satisfaction is. The Cronbach's alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was determined as .88. In this study, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was found as .89. Confirmatory Factor Analysis was conducted within the scope of this study to confirm the single factor structure of the scale. As a result of the analysis, the single-factor structure of the scale was confirmed and the fit indices of the model were at good fit levels ($\chi^2 / sd = 1.44$, RMSEA = .042, SRMR = .014, CFI = 1.00, TLI = .99).

Data Analysis

The data of the study were analyzed using the Jamovi 1.6.12 statistical software program. To determine the tests to be used in the study, whether the scores obtained were normally distributed or not was tested by the skewness coefficient method (Büyüköztürk, 2018). The skewness values obtained as a result of the analysis were calculated as “-.165” for the 'Social Capital Scale' and as “-.359” for the 'Satisfaction with Life Scale'. It was accepted that the values ranged between +1 and -1 and the distribution was normal. The t-test and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) tests were used to determine the differentiation of participants' opinions in terms of demographic variables. Post-Hoc tests were used to determine the source of the difference in groups with significant differences. Also, whether there was a significant relationship between the 'Social Capital Scale' and the 'Satisfaction with Life Scale' or not was tested.

Findings

This section includes the findings in Tables related to the analysis of the problems identified within the scope of the study conducted to determine the relationship between the social capital levels and life satisfaction of the coaches based on the variables including gender, marital status, active participation in sports, income status, age, coach level, and the type of branch.

Findings regarding the arithmetic average and standard deviation values of the scores of the coaches obtained from the social capital scale and the life satisfaction scale are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Arithmetic Means and Standard Deviation Values of the Social Capital Scale and Satisfaction with Life Scale Scores of the Participants

Scales	N	Min-Max	\bar{X}	SS
Social Capital Scale	251	1- 4	2.90	.44
Satisfaction with Life Scale	251	1- 7	4.45	1.49

Table 2 reveals that the mean Social Capital Scale scores of the participants were high while the mean scores of the satisfaction with life scale of the participants were moderate.

Findings regarding the distribution of scores obtained by the coaches from the life satisfaction scale are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. The Distribution of Scores Obtained from the Satisfaction with Life Scale Used in the Study

Scale	N	Min-Max	\bar{X}	SS
Satisfaction with Life Scale	251	5-35	22.27	7.45

The scale can be scored between 5 and 35. The higher the score is, the higher the life satisfaction is. Considering the distribution of score ranges according to happiness levels specified by Atılgan (2020), it is seen in Table 3 that the scores of the happiness level revealed according to the responses given by the coaches participating in the study to the statements on the scale were moderate.

The t-test results of the social capital and life satisfaction scale scores according to the gender and marital status of the coaches are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Independent Group t-Test Results According to Gender and Marital Status of the Participants

Scales	Gender	N	\bar{X}	SS	sd	t	p
Social Capital Scale	Female	66	2.80	.43	249	-2.02	.044*
	Male	185	2.93	.43			
Satisfaction with Life Scale	Female	66	4.52	1.26	249	.444	.657
	Male	185	4.43	1.57			
Scales	Marital Status	N	\bar{X}	SS	sd	t	p
Social Capital Scale	Married	179	2.90	.42	249	.188	.851
	Single	72	2.89	.47			
Satisfaction with Life Scale	Married	179	4.61	1.43	249	2.64	.009*
	Single	72	4.07	1.56			

*($p < 0.05$)

Table 4 reveals that as a result of the analysis, no statistically significant difference was found in terms of the gender variable in the satisfaction with life scale. In terms of the social capital scale, a statistically significant difference was found in terms of the gender variable ($t(249) = -2.02, p < .05$). It was determined that the social capital scale perception scores of the female participants were significantly lower than the scores of the male participants. No statistically significant difference was found in the social capital scale of the participants in terms of the marital status variable. In terms of the satisfaction with life scale, a statistically significant difference was found in terms of the marital status variable ($t(249) = 2.64, p < .05$), and it was determined that the satisfaction with life scale perception scores of the married participants were significantly higher than the scores of the single participants.

The t-test results of the social capital and life satisfaction scale scores according to the active participation in

sports and income-welfare of the coaches are shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Independent Group t-Test Results According to Active Participation in Sports and Income-Welfare Scores of the Participants

Scales	Active Participation in Sports	N	\bar{X}	SS	sd	t	p
Social Capital Scale	Yes	158	2.94	.41	249	2.28	.023*
	No	93	2.81	.46			
Satisfaction with Life Scale	Yes	158	4.41	1.51	249	-	.578
	No	93	4.52	1.46			
Scales	Income-Welfare	N	\bar{X}	SS	sd	t	p
Social Capital Scale	Low	34	2.88	.41	249	-	.838
	Good	217	2.90	.44			
Satisfaction with Life Scale	Low	34	3.12	1.47	249	5.97	.000*
	Good	217	4.66	1.38			

*($p < 0.05$)

As a result of the analyzes made and as shown in Table 5, no statistically significant difference was found in terms of the active participation in sports variable in the satisfaction with life scale while in the social capital scale levels, a statistically significant difference was found in terms of the active participation in sports ($t(249) = -2.28, p < .05$). It was also determined that active participants in sports had significantly higher social capital perception scores than those failing to actively participate in sports. No statistically significant difference was found in the social capital scale of the participants in terms of the income-welfare variable. In terms of the satisfaction life scale, there was a statistically significant difference in terms of the income-welfare variable ($t(249) = 5.97, p < .05$), and those with a good level of income-welfare had significantly higher satisfaction with life scale perception score than those with a low level of income-welfare.

According to the results of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) in factor dimensions, in terms of demographic variables of the life satisfaction scale scores of the participants, no statistically significant differences were found in terms of age, coach rank, and branch variables. In the social capital scale, statistically significant results were found and are shown in Table 6.

The results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test in factor dimension according to age, coach level, and the type of branch variables regarding the social capital scale scores of the coaches are shown in Table 6.

Table 6. One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Results of the Participants' Social Capital Scale Scores in Factor Dimensions According to Demographic Variables

Factors	Branch	N	\bar{X}	SS	F	p	Groups with a difference (Post-Hoc Test)
Age	25 and under	33	2.96	.44	3.12	.027*	4 – 2,3
	26-35	74	2.82	.46			
	36-45	101	2.86	.41			
	46 and over	43	3.05	.42			
Coach Rank	1 st rank	81	2.88	.44	3.35	.036*	2 - 3
	2 nd rank	85	2.99	.42			
	3 rd rank and over	85	2.82	.43			
Branch	Orienteering	55	3.01	.43	5.22	.000*	1, 2 - 4
	Ring and Mat Sports	65	3.02	.44			
	Racquet Sports	46	2.84	.38			
	Indoor Sports	53	2.73	.43			
	Other Sports	32	2.78	.38			

*($p < 0.05$)

Table 6 reveals that as a result of the analysis, in terms of age variable, there was a statistically significant difference in the social capital scale scores of the participants $F(3,247) = 3.12$; $p < .05$. It was observed that the social capital scale perception scores of the coaches aged 46 years and older were significantly higher than the scores of the participants between the ages of 26-35 and 36-45.

A statistically significant difference was found in the social capital scale scores of the participants in terms of the coach rank variable $F(3, 247) = 3.35$; $p < .05$. It was also found that the social capital scale perception scores of the 2nd rank coaches were significantly higher than those of the 3rd rank coaches. In terms of the branch variable, a statistically significant difference was found in the social capital scale scores of the participants $F(3, 247) = 5.22$; $p < .05$. It was also found that the social capital scale perception scores of the Orienteering and Ring and Mat sports coaches were significantly higher than those of the indoor coaches.

The results of the correlation analysis between the life satisfaction levels of the coaches and their perceived social capital are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Correlation Results between Satisfaction with Life Scale and Social Capital Scale

Variable	Social Capital
Satisfaction with Life	.258*

N=251; * $p < 0.05$

Table 7 reveals that there is a low, positive, and significant relationship between the satisfaction with life scale and the social capital scale scores of the participants ($r = .258$). It can be stated that as the social capital

perceptions of the participants increase, their life satisfaction increases.

The results of the regression analysis regarding the predictive power of the social capital scale of the coaches on life satisfaction are shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Regression Analysis Result of the Predictive Effect of the Social Capital Scale on Satisfaction with Life

Variable	B	Sh	B	t	p
Fixed	1.891	.614	-	3.08	.002
Social Capital	.885	.210	.258	4.22	.000

R= .258 R²= .067
F (1, 249)=17. 82 p= .000

According to Table 8, the social capital variable collectively has a low and significant relationship with the life satisfaction scores of the participants ($R = .258$ $R^2 = .067$ $p < .05$). The social capital scale and the life satisfaction scores of the participants collectively explain about 7% of the total variance. When the result regarding the significance of the regression coefficients was examined, it was seen that the social capital scale was a significant predictor of life satisfaction.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study has been designed to investigate whether there is a significant difference between the social capital and satisfaction with life scales of the coaches in terms of some demographic variables as well as the predictive power of the coaches' social capital perceptions on their life satisfaction. The results of Cociver (2002) & Lowndes (2000) show similarity to the results of this study. Individuals in social and professional fields show positive skills in influencing people around them and establishing healthy interactions. Ardahan (2014) found that there is a linear relationship between students' perceptions of social capital and their life satisfaction and academic achievement. According to the findings of the study, the higher the coach rank, the higher the level of social capital. In this context, it was determined that the social capital scale perception scores of the 2nd rank coaches were significantly higher than the 3rd rank coaches. Rynne (2014) stated that, in general, the probability of the coaches furnished with high-level coaching to gain access to opportunities that are hardly possible is an indicator of their social capital levels.

It was observed that the gender and age of the participants are significant determinants in revealing the relationship between social capital and demographic variables. In terms of gender variable, it was concluded that the social capital scale perception scores of the female participants were significantly lower than the scores of the male participants. These findings are similar to the research findings of Leeves & Herbert (2014), Moss (2002), Eriksson et al., (2010) and Karhina et al., (2019). Leeves & Herbert (2014) suggest that women tend to invest more in social relationships and thus have higher linking social capital. Moss (2002) also stated that although the expectations of women based on gender restrict their social networks, they exhibit strong characteristics of social capital in terms of family support. In contrast, a study conducted in northern Sweden

found that women are more involved in building bridges between social networks compared to men (Eriksson et al., 2010).

Moreover, the types of associations in which women and men are involved were found to be different. It was also found that men tend to be more active in sports and recreational associations, while women were more active in social services and health-related associations (Lowndes, 2000). On the other hand, it was concluded that in terms of the age variable, the social capital scale perception scores of the participants aged 46 and over were significantly higher than the scores of the participants between the ages of 26 and 35 and between the ages of 36 and 45. These findings are similar to the research findings of Mavhungu, Dhlandhlara & Grace (2015). According to Mavhungu et al., (2015), as the age and education level increase, social capital competence and the capacity to interact with others increase.

In general, research on social capital reveals that sport can improve social capital (Dyreson, 2001). In the study, it was concluded that the social capital scale perception scores of the participants who actively participate in sports are significantly higher than the scores of the participants who do not actively participate in sports in terms of the active participation in sports variable. Also, the social capital scale of perception scores of 'orienteering and ring and mat sports coaches' were significantly higher than those of 'indoor sports coaches. Jarvie (2003), Maguire et al., (2002), Smith & Ingham (2003) focused on the role of sport in the renewal of social capital. According to the researchers, although it is not always assumed that sport increases social capital, sport can contribute positively to the social capital of society. On the other hand, Jarvie (2003) points out that due to its nature, participation in sport within some sports clubs is sometimes seen as a field for the creation of social capital.

In this study, it was observed that the scores obtained by the coaches on the satisfaction with life scale were at a moderate level. However, the life satisfaction of the participants did not differ in terms of gender variable. This finding is similar to the literature (Er et al., 2019; Işık et al., 2014; Hintikka, 2001). Although Hyde's (2005) meta-analytical analysis of 124 studies examining the differences between women and men found small differences in terms of life satisfaction in terms of gender, most of the studies did not find a significant difference in the life satisfaction of both genders. However, it is possible to come across studies in the literature showing that the life satisfaction of men is at a higher level than women (Livd, 2019).

Demographically, the married participants' perceptions of life satisfaction scale scores were significantly higher than those of single participants. In the study conducted by Diener (1984), it was found that awareness and vision of career and life develop with the change in the marital status of individuals and the increase in their age. Married individuals become more balanced, more harmonious, and more satisfied with life than single youth. Therefore, it is possible to talk about the relationship between marital status and life satisfaction. On the other hand, another finding of the study is that the life satisfaction of the participants is related to their income level. In terms of the income-welfare variable, it was concluded that the life satisfaction scale perception scores of the participants with good income-welfare status were significantly higher than the scores of the participants with low income-well-fare. It was observed that as the monthly income of the

participants increased, their life satisfaction increased significantly.

According to Kong & You (2013), Margolis & Myrskylä (2013), and the OECD (2020) report, there is a positive and high relationship between quality of life, satisfaction, income, or life expectancy. Onyishi & Okongwu (2013) stated that life satisfaction reflects an assessment of the products and the results people obtain associated with their expectations from life. According to these researchers, the wealth and well-being in the social environment, which increase with the income level of the individual, positively affect people's expectations from their lives as well as enhance their life satisfaction.

Life satisfaction is an important indicator of a person's well-being and is associated with mental and physical health. Understanding its relationships and determinants can provide further insight into such relationships and ways in which life satisfaction measures can be used in public health research and practice. Although there is strong evidence that being employed, educated, married, and financially stable is positively associated with life satisfaction, such studies (Fernandez-Ballesteros et al., 2001; Rajani, Skianis & Filippidis, 2019) are relatively limited as they focus on individual factors. For this reason, there is a need to analyse the relationship between demographic factors and satisfaction with life using multivariate analysis.

Another finding of the research is about the relationship between active participation in sports of the coaches and branch variable and life satisfaction. According to the findings, as people are more involved in physical activity, life satisfaction increases. These findings are similar to the results of the studies of Pedišić et al., (2015), Nakamura et al., (2014), Şener et al., (2007), and Asztalos, De Bourdeaudhuij & Cardon (2010). The World Health Organization (WHO, 2010) emphasized the positive effects of physical activity of moderate and high density required for life satisfaction. In addition, Sivri & Özbek (2019) reported that the sport helps the development and protection of social capital. Unlike the findings of our study, Tükel & Temel (2020) found that active sports activity did not cause a significant difference in terms of life satisfaction as a result of their study. They also added that the concept of life satisfaction is related to not only one dimension but all dimensions of an individual's life.

The last finding reached in the study is that there is a positive and significant relationship between the life satisfaction of the coaches and their social capital levels. It was observed that as the social capital perceptions of the participants increase, their life satisfaction increases. These findings support the research findings of Wang & Li (2020), Wong, Huang & Fu (2019), Nguyen & Tran (2015), Hoogerbrugge & Burger (2018), Zhao (2007), and Wei & Han (2018). The social capital of individuals is an important factor of life satisfaction with a significant impact on the social problems of individuals and growing life satisfaction (Nguyen & Tran, 2015). As stated by Hoogerbrugge and Burger (2018), there is an important relationship between social capital and the life satisfaction of residents. This relationship can improve trust and social connections, making it easier for individuals to overcome problems (Wong, Huang & Fu, 2019). Social capital has a significant impact on the life satisfaction of residents by strengthening social ties and cohesion; that is, individuals with more social capital show faster social and psychological development by rebuilding resources through formal and informal networks (Zhao, 2007; Wei & Han, 2018).

As a result, it is suggested that various aspects of the social environment, such as physiological factors, socioeconomic characteristics, sports and social behaviors (for example, leisure activities, physical activity), as well as social capital and psychological variables are related to individuals' life satisfaction (Fox, 1999; Kim, Linton & Lum, 2015; Lee et al., 2019). The research findings of this study and current studies have provided evidence of the relationship between social capital and life satisfaction at the individual and collective levels.

This study has two main limitations. First, our study involved participants who are engaged in coaching based on the relationship between social capital and life satisfaction. Therefore, addressing the variables such as sports managers, coaches, and athletes in even line by a holistic approach is expected to provide significant contributions to the sport. The second limitation of the study is that it examines the social capital perceptions and life satisfaction based on the participants' self-reports. In future studies, these variables can be examined in depth by using research methods with mixed models.

Acknowledgments

There is no financial support and conflict of interest in this study. The authors would like to thank 251 participating coaches for their cooperation and willingness to respond to this research. Also, the authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers and editors for their comprehensive and constructive feedback that guided us to improve the manuscript.

References

- Ahmad, H., Ada, E. N., Jowett, S., Alabduljader, K., & Kazak, Z. (2021). The Validation of Direct and Meta Versions of the Coach-Athlete Relationship Questionnaire (ArCART-Q) in the Arabic Language: Their Relationship to Athlete's Satisfaction with Individual Performance. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 18(4), 1998-2005.
- Aldrich, D. & Meyer, M. (2015). Social capital and community resilience. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(2), 254-269. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0002764214550299>
- Ardahan, F. (2012). Adaption of 'social capital scale': validity and reliability study. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 9(2), 773-789. Retrieved from <https://j-humansciences.com/ojs/index.php/IJHS/article/view/2394>
- Ardahan, F. (2014). Examining the relation between social capital, life satisfaction and academic achievement: school of physical education and sport case. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 11(1), 1212-1226. Retrieved from <https://www.j-humansciences.com/ojs/index.php/IJHS/article/view/2754>
- Asztalos, M., De Bourdeaudhuij, I., Cardon, G. (2010) The relationship between physical activity and mental health varies across activity intensity levels and dimensions of mental health among women and men. *Public Health Nutrition*, 13, 1207-1214. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1368980009992825>
- Atılgan, D. (2020). Investigation of happiness levels of individuals actively exercising for recreational purposes during the COVID-19 outbreak. *Journal of Education and Recreation Patterns (JERP)*, 1(1), 7-18.
- Aydoğmuş, M., & Tükel, Y. (2019). Testing the mediating role of collective efficacy perceptions on the

- relationship between teachers' perceptions of professional burnout and organizational commitment. *ie: inquiry in education*, 11(2), 2. <https://digitalcommons.nl.edu/ie/vol11/iss2/2>.
- Becchetti, L., L. Corrado., & P. Conzo (2017). Sociability, altruism and well-being. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 41(2), 441–486. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cje/bew033>
- Boyce, C.J., Delaney, L., & Wood, A.M. (2018). The Great Recession and subjective well-being: How did the life satisfaction of people living in the United Kingdom change following the financial crisis? *PLOS ONE* 13(8)1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0201215>
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2018). *Manual of data analysis for social sciences*. 24. Edition. Ankara: Pegem Academy.
- Castro-Abancéns, I. & Roldán, J. (2013). A mediation model between dimensions of social capital. *International Business Review*, 22(6), 1034-1050. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2013.02.004>
- Christensen, M. (2014). Exploring biographical learning in elite soccer coaching. *Sport Educ. Soc.* 19, 204–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2011.637550>
- Cocivera, T. (2002). *İnfluence in organization. testing an integrative model agents' decision-making processer for selecting tactics*. Guelph, Ontario: The University Of Guelph. Unpublished Doctoral's Thesis.
- Dağlı A. & Baysal N. (2016). Adaptation of the satisfaction with life scale into turkish: the study of validity and reliability. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 15(59), 1250-1263. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17755/esosder.75955>.
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J. and Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Dunn B. D. (2012). Helping depressed clients reconnect to positive emotion experience: Current insights and future directions. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 19(4), 326–340. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.1799>
- Dyreson, M. (2001) Maybe It's Better to Bowl Alone: Sport, Community and Democracy in American Thought. *Culture, Sport, Society* 4(1), 19-30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713999807>
- Eid, M., Diener, E. (2004). Global judgments of subjective well-being: Situational variability and long-term stability. *Soc Indic Res* 65, 245–277.
- Er, Y., Koç, M. C., Demirel, M., & Çuhadar, A. (2019). The meaning of leisure and life satisfaction: The sample of university students. *International Journal of Culture and History*, 6(2), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijch.v6i2.14923>
- Eriksson M., Dahlgren L., Janlert U., Weinehall L., & Emmelin M. (2010). Social capital, gender and educational level: Impact on self-rated health. *The Open Public Health Journal*, 3, 1–12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2174/1874944501003010001>
- Fernandez-Ballesteros, R., Dolores, Zamarrón, M., Angel, & Ruíz, M. (2001). The contribution of socio-demographic and psychosocial factors to life satisfaction. *Ageing Soc*, 21(1), 25-43.
- Fox, K.R. (1999). The influence of physical activity on mental well-being. *Public Health Nutr.* 2, 411-418. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980099000567>
- Gilman, R., & Huebner, S. (2003). A review of life satisfaction research with children and adolescents. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 18(2), 192–205. <https://doi.org/10.1521/scpq.18.2.192.21858>
- Hintikka, J. (2001). Religious attendance and life satisfaction in the finnish general population. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 29(2), 158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009164710102900207>

- Hoogerbrugge, M.M., & Burger, M.J. (2018). Neighborhood-based social capital and life satisfaction: the case of Rotterdam, the Netherlands. *Urban Geogr.* 39(10), 1484-1509. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2018.1474609>
- Houkpatin, H. O., Boyce, C. J., Dunn, G., & Wood, A. M. (2018). Modeling bivariate change in individual differences: Prospective associations between personality and life satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 115(6), e12–e29. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000161>
- Hung, N., & Lau, L.L. (2019). The relationship between social capital and self-rated health: a multilevel analysis based on a poverty alleviation program in the Philippines. *BMC Public Health* 19, 1641 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-8013-5>.
- ICM. 2016–17 Annual Report. International Care Ministries. Available from: <https://indd.adobe.com/view/a3c1a9e0-ce66-45e7-9ebd-eebb88faa059>. Accessed 09 Aug 2017.
- Işık, Ö., Gümüş, H., Okudan, B., & Yılmaz, M. (2014). Evaluation of the effects of the quality of life levels of university students upon their depression levels. *International Journal of Science Culture and Sport (IntJSCS)*, 2(5), 836-843.
- Jarvie, G. (2003). Communitarianism, sport and social capital: Neighbourly insights into Scottish sport'. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 38(2), 139-153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690203038002001>
- Kara, S. (2020). Investigation of job satisfaction and burnout of visual arts teachers. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)*, 6(1), 160-171. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijres.v6i1.817>
- Karasar, N. (2015). *Scientific research method*. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.
- Karhina, K., Eriksson, M., Ghazinour, M., & Ng, N. (2019). What determines gender inequalities in social capital in Ukraine?. *SSM-Population Health*, 8, 100383. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2019.100383>
- Kawachi, I., & Berkman, L. (2017). *Social cohesion, social capital and health*. In: Berkman L, Kawachi I, Glymour M, editors. *Social Epidemiology*. New York: Oxford University Press; 2000. p. 174–90., Lin, N. Building a network theory of social capital. *Social capital*. New York: Routledge, pp. 3-28.
- Kim, B.J., Linton, K.F., & Lum, W. (2015). Social capital and life satisfaction among Chinese and Korean elderly immigrants. *J. Soc. Work*, 15:87–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468017313504699>
- Köker, S. (1991). *Comparison of normal and problematic adolescents' life satisfaction levels*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Ankara University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Lee, H. J., Lee, D. K., & Song, W. (2019). Relationships between Social Capital, Social Capital Satisfaction, Self-Esteem, and Depression among Elderly Urban Residents: Analysis of Secondary Survey Data. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(8), 1445. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16081445>
- Leeves, G.D., & Herbert R. (2014). Gender differences in social capital investment: Theory and evidence. *Economic Modelling*, 37, 377–385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econmod.2013.11.030>
- Lisinskiene, A. (2018). The Effect of a 6-Month Coach Educational Program on Strengthening Coach-Athlete Interpersonal Relationships in Individual Youth Sport. *Sports (Basel, Switzerland)*, 6(3), 74-80. <https://doi.org/10.3390/sports6030074>
- Litwin, H. (2003). Social Predictors of Physical Activity in Later Life: The Contribution of Social-Network Type. *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity*, 11, 389-406. <https://doi.org/10.1123/japa.11.3.389>

- Lowndes, V. (2000). Women and social capital: A comment on Hall's 'social capital in Britain. *British Journal of Political Science*, 30(3), 533–537. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123400210223>
- Maguire, J., Jarvie, G., Mansfield, L., & Bradley, J. (2002). *Sport Worlds: A Sociological Perspective*. Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL.
- Margolis, R., & Myrskylä, M. (2013). Family, money, and health: regional differences in the determinants of life satisfaction over the life course. *Advances in life course research*, 18(2), 115–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.alcr.2013.01.001>
- Mavhungu A. M., Dhladhlahla, W. & Kancheya, G. (2015). Socio-Demographic Factors Affecting Social Capital Development, Continuity and Sustainability Among Microfinance Adopting Households in Nyanga, Zimbabwe. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 6(1), 70-79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2014.954257>
- McGregor, J. A. & Pouw, N. (2017). Towards an economics of well-being. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 41(4), 1123–1142. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/bew044>
- Mikucka, M., Sarracino, F. & Dubrow, J.K. (2017). When does economic growth improve life satisfaction? multilevel analysis of the roles of social trust and income inequality in 46 countries 1981–2012. *World Development* 93, 447–459. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.01.002>.
- Musson, A. & Rousselière, D. (2020). *Social capital and life satisfaction : a new approach*. Economics Bulletin. p. 40.
- Nakamura, P.M., Teixeira, I.P., Smirmaul, B.P.C., Sebastiao, E., & Papini, C.B. et al. (2014). Health related quality of life is differently associated with leisure-time physical activity intensities according to gender: a cross-sectional approach. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 18(12), 98. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-12-98>
- Nguyen, TA, & Tran, Q.A. (2015) Social capital in rural areas of Vietnam and its impact on households' life satisfaction. *J Econ Dev.* 17(3),60–88. <https://doi.org/10.33301/2015.17.03.04>
- OECD (2020). *OECD Life index*. <http://www.oecdbetterlifeindex.org/#/111111111111>, 11.03.2021
- Onyishi, I. E. & Okongwu, O.E. (2013). Personality and social support as predictors of life satisfaction of Nigerian prisons officers. *The Social Sciences*, 8(1), 5-12. <https://doi.org/10.3923/sscience.2013.5.12>
- Onyx, J., & Bullen, P., (2000). Measuring social capital in five communities. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 36(1), 23-42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886300361002>
- Ortín, F.J., Maestre, M., & García-de-Alcaraz, A. (2016). Football coaches training and satisfaction of young athletes. *SPORT TK Revista EuroAmericana de Ciencias del Deporte*, 5(1), 11-17. <https://doi.org/10.6018/249031>
- Pavot W, Diener E (2008) The Satisfaction With Life Scale and the emerging construct of life satisfaction. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3(2), 137–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760701756946>
- Pedišić, Ž., Greblo, Z., Phongsavan, P., Milton, K., & Bauman, A. E. (2015). Are total, intensity- and domain-specific physical activity levels associated with life satisfaction among university students?. *PLoS one*, 10(2), e0118137. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0118137>
- Rajani, N. B., Skianis, V., & Filippidis, F. T. (2019). Association of environmental and sociodemographic factors with life satisfaction in 27 European countries. *BMC public health*, 19(1), 534. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-6886-y>

- Rynne, S. (2014). 'Fast track' and 'traditional path' coaches: Affordances, agency and social capital. *Sport, Education and Society*, 19(3), 299-313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2012.670113>
- Schnettler, B., Miranda-Zapata, E., Lobos, G., Saracostti, M., Denegri, M., Lapo, M., & Hueche, C. (2018). The mediating role of family and food-related life satisfaction in the relationships between family support, parent work-life balance and adolescent life satisfaction in dual-earner families. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15(11), 2549. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15112549>
- Sivri, S., & Özbek, O. (2019). From social capital to sportive capital. *SPORMETRE The Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences*, 17(1), 156-166. <https://doi.org/10.33689/spormetre.487394>
- Smith, J. M. & Ingham, A. G. (2003). On the waterfront: retrospectives on the relationship between sport and communities. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 20(3), 252-74. <https://doi.org/10.1123/SSJ.20.3.252>
- Srivastava, S., Angelo, K. M., & Vallereux, S. R. (2008). Extraversion and positive affect: A day reconstruction study of person-environment transactions. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(6), 1613-1618. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.05.002>
- Şener, A., Terzioğlu, R. G., & Karabulut, E. (2007). Life satisfaction and leisure activities during men's retirement: A Turkish sample. *Aging & Mental Health*, 11(1), 30-36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13607860600736349>
- Tükel, Y. & Temel, A.S. (2020). Examining the levels of freedom, life satisfaction and happiness perceived by college students in leisure time. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)*, 6(4), 668-678.
- Veenhoven, R. (2015). *A comparative study of satisfaction with life in Europe*. Eötvös University Press, <https://personal.eur.nl/veenhoven/Pub1990s/96d-full.pdf>, 9.03.2021
- Vemuri, A.W. & R. Costanza (2006). The role of human, social, built, and natural capital in explaining life satisfaction at the country level. *Ecological Economics* 58, 119-133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2005.02.008>
- Wang, D., & Li, D. (2020). Social capital, policy fairness, and subjective life satisfaction of earthquake survivors in Wenchuan, China: a longitudinal study based on post-earthquake survey data. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*, 18(1), 350. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-020-01594-8>
- Watson D., & Naragon-Gainey K. (2010). On the specificity of positive emotional dysfunction in psychopathology: Evidence from the mood and anxiety disorders and schizophrenia/schizotypy. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30(7), 839-848. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2009.11.002>
- Wei, J., & Han, Y. (2018). Pre-disaster social capital and disaster recovery in Wenchuan earthquake-stricken rural communities. *Sustainability*, 10(6), 2046. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10062046>
- Wong, H., Huang, Y., & Fu, Y. (2019). Impacts of structural social capital and cognitive social capital on the psychological status of survivors of the Yaan earthquake. *Appl Res Qual Life*, 14(5), 1411-1433. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-018-9661-9>
- World Health Organization. (2010). *Global recommendations on physical activity for health Geneva, CH: World Health Organization*.
- Yang, C., & Srinivasan, P. (2016). Life satisfaction and the pursuit of happiness on twitter. *Plos One*, 11(3), e0150881. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0150881>
- Zhao, X. & Tang, Q. & Liu, S. & Liu, F. (2016). Social capital, motivations, and mobile coupon sharing.

Industrial Management & Data Systems. 116(1), 188-206. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-05-2015-0184>

Zhao, Y. (2007). Social capital and post-disaster recovery: a sociological study of natural disaster. *Sociol Study*, 5, 164–187.

Author Information

Davut Atılgan

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8475-4488>

Kahramanmaraş Sutçu İmam University

Avşar Campus

Kahramanmaraş

Turkey

Contact e-mail: davutatilgan@ksu.edu.tr

Yalçın Tükel

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3843-5889>

Necmettin Erbakan University

Köyceğiz Campus, Meram

Konya

Turkey