



Performance Enhancement Model for Sports Coaches Based on Motivational Job Factors with Emphasis on Herzberg's Two-Factor Motivation-Hygiene Theory

Ali Akbar Ghadernejad¹, Hassan Fahim Devin^{2*}, Amir Moghaddam², Mohamadreza Esmailzadeh Ghandehari²

¹ PhD student, Department of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Mashhad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mashhad, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Mashhad Branch, Islamic Azad University, Mashhad, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: fahim_pe@yahoo.com

Editor	Reviewers
Khadijeh Irandoust Associate Professor, Department of Sport Sciences, Imam Khomeini International University, Qazvin, Iran irandoust@ikiu.ac.ir	Reviewer 1: Yaghub Badriazarin Associate Professor of Sport Sciences, Tabriz University, Tabriz, Iran. Email: badriazarin@tbzmed.ac.ir Reviewer 2: Abolfazl Farahani Professor, Department of Physical Education, Payam Noor University, Tehran, Iran. Email: afarahani@pnu.ac.ir

1. Round 1

1.1 Reviewer 1

Date: 03 November 2023

Reviewer:

While the research question is clear, providing more depth regarding how each motivational job factor specifically influences the performance of sports coaches could enhance understanding. For example, exploring how each factor uniquely contributes to motivation or hygiene needs in the sports coaching context would add value.

The paper establishes a strong foundation for linking motivational factors to coach performance enhancement. However, integrating more comparative analysis with other motivational theories could solidify the argument. Exploring how Herzberg's theory specifically applies to the sports coaching context, in contrast with other motivational frameworks, would enrich the narrative.

The review effectively highlights the relevance of Herzberg's theory but could be expanded to include more recent studies specifically related to sports coaching. Additionally, a more critical evaluation of conflicting findings in the literature would strengthen the review. Identifying gaps in the current research that this study aims to fill would also be beneficial.

The paper utilizes appropriate methods for its analysis; however, discussing potential limitations of the chosen statistical tools or models could provide a more nuanced understanding of the results. Additionally, a more detailed examination of how each motivational factor's influence on performance was measured and interpreted would add clarity.

Although the methodology is sound, elaborating on the rationale for the sample size selection and addressing any potential biases in sampling or data collection methods would enhance the study's rigor. Moreover, including a section on how the study addresses or mitigates these potential biases would be insightful.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

1.2 Reviewer 2

Date: 13 November 2023

Reviewer:

Ensure consistency in formatting throughout the document, including headings, subheadings, and reference lists, to meet the publication's standards.

While the overall quality of writing is high, a thorough proofreading for minor grammatical errors and syntactical improvements could enhance the manuscript's clarity and readability.

Updating the literature review to include the most recent research related to motivational factors and sports coaching would ensure the study's relevance and comprehensiveness.

The conclusion effectively ties the findings back to practical implications for sports organizations and coaches. However, offering specific, actionable recommendations for sports organizations based on the findings would make the implications more tangible. For instance, suggesting particular motivational strategies or programs that could be implemented to enhance coach performance.

Providing clear definitions or explanations for specific technical terms or statistical methods used in the study could make the paper more accessible to readers unfamiliar with those concepts.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the updated document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.