Journal of Kyzylorda Scholarly Review

P-ISSN:3006-0265 | E-ISSN:3007-4681. Published by the Open University of Kyzylorda
Copyright © Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY).
https://bulletin.ouk.kz/index.php/bulletin/index



# TEMPORARY EMOTIONAL BREAKDOWN AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO TACTICAL DECISION-MAKING AMONG FOOTBALL PLAYERS DURING COMPETITION

**Ali Janjoun Ghadab**[1]
[1]Ministry of Education, General Directorate of Basrah Education, Basrah, Iraq.
*Correspondance**:** alialsaedy062@gmail.com

**Article History:**
Received: 18th August 2026; Revised: 21th September 2026; Accepted: 21th Oct 2026; Published: 31th Oct 2026

**Abstract**. The study aims to build two scales for football players during competition, one measuring temporary emotional breakdown and the other tactical decision-making, and to identify the level of each variable and the correlation between them. The researcher used the descriptive method with survey and correlational approaches. The population of 180 players was divided into a construction sample (100), a pilot sample (16), and a final application sample (64). The results showed that temporary emotional breakdown was at a moderate level, that perceived tactical decision-making was significantly higher than the hypothetical mean, and that the two variables were negatively and significantly correlated (r = -0.350). The researcher recommended training players to regain focus and control their emotions in the minutes after errors or loss of possession.

**Keywords:** temporary emotional breakdown, tactical decision-making, competition, football.

## 1. Introduction

Events in a football match change quickly, and every minute the player has to choose between passing, keeping the ball, moving forward, and covering space. Physical and technical ability alone do not decide these choices, since the player's emotional state at the moment of decision also affects the outcome (Allawi, 1998; Rateb, 2000). Lazarus (2000) treated emotions as part of competitive performance and noted that their effect differs between players according to how each one appraises the situation.

A technical error, an easy ball lost, or an unexpected refereeing decision can suddenly unsettle a player. Some regain their composure within seconds, while others stay preoccupied with what happened for several minutes. Studies have examined how players control their emotions during competition (Allawi, 1998; Jasim, 2024). Control here means the player adjusting his emotions and reactions after they arise (Gross, 1998).

In this study, temporary emotional breakdown refers to a brief disturbance in

emotional intensity, attention, and response control that follows a stressful competitive situation, lasts a few minutes, and then fades. The term does not refer to a psychological disorder. A tactical decision is the action a player chooses after reading the situation, comparing the alternatives, and deciding when to act.

## 2. Research Problem

Football players with similar skill levels still differ in how they handle stressful situations. Some put the error behind them and get back into the game, while others rush the next action or are slow to change their decision, which affects the team both in possession and after losing the ball. Anxiety and intense emotion make it harder to direct attention to the task and leave a person more open to distraction (Eysenck et al., 2007). In football, reading the situation depends on gathering information about the positions of teammates and opponents and about the available space (Asaad & Kadhim, 2023).

Iraqi studies have linked emotion to decision-making, covering emotional intelligence in football coaches and futsal referees (Al-Khafaji & Talib, 2020; Al-Moamen, 2015), emotional stability in university teachers (Safar, 2014), and emotional suppression in futsal referees (Jasim, 2024). The link between short-lived emotion after a stressful situation and the tactical decisions of players themselves has received less attention, so this study measures the two variables together in players competing in real matches.

The research problem can be stated as a question: what is the relationship between temporary emotional breakdown and tactical decision-making in football players during competition?

## 3. Objectives and Hypotheses

### 3.1 Research Objectives

The research aims to:

1. Build two scales to measure the level of temporary emotional breakdown and the level of tactical decision-making among football players.
2. Identify the level of temporary emotional breakdown and the level of tactical decision-making among football players.
3. Identify the nature of the correlational relationship between temporary emotional breakdown and tactical decision-making among football players.

### 3.2 Research Hypotheses

1. There is a statistically significant correlation between the level of temporary emotional breakdown and the level of tactical decision-making among football players.

### 3.3 Research Domains

Human domain: football players.

Time domain: during the year 2026.

Spatial domain: Al-Basra, Al-Mina, and Al-Bahri football clubs.

## 4. Methods and Materials

### 4.1 Research Method

The study used the descriptive method with survey and correlational approaches: the survey approach describes the level of each variable, and the correlational approach shows the direction and strength of the relationship between them. The researcher built two scales. The first measures temporary emotional breakdown (emotional intensity, attention distraction, weak response control), and the second measures perceived tactical decision-making (reading the situation, choosing the alternative,

timing and adaptation). Players answered both scales with reference to one stressful situation from their last match, describing their state in the five minutes that followed. After checking validity and reliability and analyzing the items statistically, the researcher applied the final versions to the research sample.

### 4.2 Research Population and Sample

The research population consisted of (180) players from Al-Basra, Al-Mina, and Al-Bahri football clubs for the year 2026. To build and standardize the scales, the researcher divided the population into three separate samples:

1. Construction sample: (100) players.
2. Pilot sample: (16) players.
3. Final application sample: (64) players.

The construction sample is the largest because item analysis and the validity and reliability estimates are based on it. The final application sample was kept for testing the relationship between the two variables, so that the standardization stage would not affect the results (Imam et al., 1990, 16).

### 4.3 Field Research Procedures

#### 4.3.1 Scale Construction Procedures

The researcher first defined the theoretical basis of each variable, then carried out the field application and the statistical item analysis, with attention to validity, reliability, and discriminatory power (Allawi & Radwan, 2008). The construction steps were as follows:

##### 4.3.1.1 Defining the Purpose of the Scales

The first scale measures temporary emotional breakdown as the player rates it himself for the minutes after a stressful competitive situation: how intense his emotion was, how distracted his attention was, and how well he controlled his reactions.

The second scale measures perceived tactical decision-making in the same minutes: how the player read the situation, chose an alternative, timed its execution, and adapted when the situation changed.

Both scales depend on the player recalling a situation from a real match, so their scores are self-assessments.

##### 4.3.1.2 Defining the Domains of the Scales

The domains were based on the literature on emotion in competition and decision-making in football, and on what happens to players after errors. The researcher drew on the Brief In-Competition Emotion scale of Freemantle et al. (2021), which measures emotion with short statements close to the time of the situation, and on the technical-tactical decision test of Calle-Jaramillo et al. (2023), which links the decision to execution time. The temporary emotional breakdown scale consists of three domains:

1. Emotional intensity: the escalation of emotion after the situation and difficulty regaining calm.
2. Attention distraction: the mind's preoccupation with what happened and losing track of the course of play (Eysenck et al., 2007).
3. Weak response control: impulsiveness and difficulty inhibiting one's reaction (Gross, 1998, 55; Jasim, 2024).

The perceived tactical decision-making scale consists of three domains:

1. Reading the situation: observing teammates' positions, the spaces, and the state of play (Ahmed & Saleh, 2022).

2. Choosing the alternative: weighing the available actions and choosing the one that serves the team's objective (Ahmed & Saleh, 2022).
3. Timing and adaptation: deciding when to act and adjusting the decision when the situation changes.

This division follows the player's sequence after an error, from emotion to attention to the next decision. The domains cover what the player can assess about himself, not a full account of his emotional state or actual performance.

#### 4.3.1.3 Preparing the Initial Form of the Scales

After setting the domains, the researcher drafted an initial pool of items for each scale, drawing on the theoretical framework and the views of specialists in sport psychology, training, and measurement and evaluation. The items described clearly and directly what the player feels or does in the five minutes after the situation. Most were positively worded, and each scale included three reversed items (items 4, 8, and 12) to reduce patterned responding.

#### 4.3.1.4 Presenting the Initial Form to the Experts

The initial version of both scales was given to a panel of (7) experts in sport psychology, sports training, and measurement and evaluation, who judged each item on:

1. Their relevance to the specified domain
2. Clarity of the linguistic wording
3. Their suitability for the research sample
4. Validity of the response scale

An item was accepted if at least (80%) of the experts agreed on it (Allawi & Radwan, 2008, 98). All domains and items reached (80%) agreement or higher and were kept.

**Table 1.** Experts' agreement percentages on the items of the temporary emotional breakdown scale

| Item | Agreement % | Item | Agreement % | Item | Agreement % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 100 | 5 | 100 | 9 | 100 |
| 2 | 85.7 | 6 | 85.7 | 10 | 100 |
| 3 | 100 | 7 | 85.7 | 11 | 85.7 |
| 4 | 85.7 | 8 | 85.7 | 12 | 85.7 |

**Table 2.** Experts' agreement percentages on the items of the tactical decision-making scale

| Item | Agreement % | Item | Agreement % | Item | Agreement % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 100 | 5 | 100 | 9 | 100 |
| 2 | 85.7 | 6 | 85.7 | 10 | 85.7 |
| 3 | 85.7 | 7 | 85.7 | 11 | 100 |
| 4 | 100 | 8 | 85.7 | 12 | 85.7 |

#### Choosing the Rating Scale

Responses were recorded on a five-point Likert scale (Allawi & Radwan, 2008), which

is easy to answer and to score.

**Table 3.** The adopted scoring key

| Item direction | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Direct | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Reversed | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

#### 4.3.1.5 The Final Form of the Scales

In the final version, each scale had (12) items, four in each of its three domains. Each item is scored from (1-5), and items (4, 8, 12) in each scale are reverse-scored by subtracting the player's response from (6). Total scores therefore range from (12-60), with a hypothetical mean of (36). On the first scale, a higher score means greater emotional disturbance; on the second, it means a better assessment of tactical decision-making. Players were asked to recall the first stressful competitive situation they clearly remembered from their last match, such as a technical error or losing the ball, and to answer both scales about the five minutes that followed it, within (24) hours of the match. The final version was applied to the final application sample during 2026.

### 4.4.3 The Pilot Experiment

The pilot experiment was conducted on (16) football players.

Its purpose was to check that the instructions were clear and to measure how long the scales took to complete. Players needed (7.4) minutes on average, with a range of (6.2) to (8.8) minutes. The instructions for the first scale were clear to (15) players, and one player asked what was meant by the minutes after the situation. The instructions for the second scale were clear to (14) players, and two players asked for clarification about when the action should be chosen and about the meaning of a tactical alternative. The researcher therefore unified the wording about the five minutes after the situation in the instructions and added explanations of when the action is chosen and what a tactical alternative means.

### 4.4.4 Applying the Scales to the Construction Sample

The two scales were applied to the construction sample of (100) players. After collection, the questionnaires were checked for:

1. Completeness of the answers.
2. Adherence to the scale instructions.
3. Absence of formal errors in the questionnaires.
4. Suitability of the data for statistical analysis, (The valid questionnaires were subjected to statistical analysis).

#### 4.4.4.1 Item Discriminatory Power

Discriminatory power is an item's ability to separate individuals with high and low levels of the measured trait (Allawi & Radwan, 2008). It was calculated using the following steps:

a. Calculating the total score of each player on each scale after excluding the score of the tested item from it.
b. Ranking the scores in descending order; when scores were tied, the questionnaires were ordered according to their code.
c. Selecting the highest (27%) of the scores as the upper group and the lowest

(27%) as the lower group, i.e., (27) players in each group.

d. Applying the independent-samples (T) test to compare the means of the two groups on each item with (52) degrees of freedom.

**Table 4.** Discriminatory power of the items of the temporary emotional breakdown scale

| Item | Mean (upper) | SD (upper) | Mean (lower) | SD (lower) | T | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3.70 | 0.91 | 2.15 | 0.86 | 6.43 | 0.000 |
| 2 | 3.89 | 0.75 | 2.19 | 0.88 | 7.66 | 0.000 |
| 3 | 3.74 | 1.02 | 2.04 | 0.90 | 6.51 | 0.000 |
| 4 | 3.70 | 0.82 | 2.00 | 0.83 | 7.56 | 0.000 |
| 5 | 3.52 | 0.85 | 2.26 | 0.94 | 5.15 | 0.000 |
| 6 | 3.44 | 1.01 | 2.15 | 0.86 | 5.06 | 0.000 |
| 7 | 3.63 | 0.93 | 2.04 | 0.65 | 7.32 | 0.000 |
| 8 | 3.48 | 0.80 | 1.81 | 0.79 | 7.71 | 0.000 |
| 9 | 3.74 | 0.81 | 1.85 | 0.86 | 8.27 | 0.000 |
| 10 | 3.67 | 0.96 | 2.07 | 0.78 | 6.68 | 0.000 |
| 11 | 3.63 | 0.97 | 2.30 | 0.87 | 5.33 | 0.000 |
| 12 | 3.52 | 1.01 | 1.89 | 0.70 | 6.88 | 0.000 |

Table (4) compares the responses of the upper group (top 27% of total scores) with those of the lower group (bottom 27%) using the independent-samples (T) test. (T) values ranged from (5.06) to (8.27), and (Sig) was below (0.05) for every item, in favor of the upper group, so all items of the scale were kept.

**Table 5.** Discriminatory power of the items of the tactical decision-making scale

| Item | Mean (upper) | SD (upper) | Mean (lower) | SD (lower) | T | Sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4.22 | 0.85 | 2.56 | 1.09 | 6.29 | 0.000 |
| 2 | 4.30 | 0.82 | 2.56 | 1.05 | 6.78 | 0.000 |
| 3 | 4.30 | 0.87 | 2.59 | 1.12 | 6.25 | 0.000 |
| 4 | 4.30 | 0.91 | 2.41 | 1.05 | 7.07 | 0.000 |
| 5 | 4.26 | 0.81 | 2.48 | 0.98 | 7.27 | 0.000 |
| 6 | 4.22 | 0.75 | 2.63 | 0.88 | 7.14 | 0.000 |
| 7 | 4.26 | 0.66 | 2.63 | 1.04 | 6.87 | 0.000 |
| 8 | 4.26 | 0.71 | 2.44 | 0.80 | 8.80 | 0.000 |
| 9 | 3.93 | 0.92 | 2.78 | 0.97 | 4.46 | 0.000 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | 4.15 | 0.95 | 2.44 | 0.97 | 6.51 | 0.000 |
| 11 | 4.15 | 0.95 | 2.41 | 0.93 | 6.81 | 0.000 |
| 12 | 4.30 | 0.78 | 2.89 | 0.97 | 5.87 | 0.000 |

Table (5) gives the same analysis for the tactical decision-making scale. (T) values ranged from (4.46) to (8.80), (Sig) was below (0.05) for every item, and the upper group's means were higher than the lower group's, so all items were kept.

### 4.4 Scientific Coefficients of the Scales

#### 4.4.1 Validity

Validity is the degree to which a scale measures what it was designed to measure (Imam et al., 1990). Two methods were used to check it:

First: Face Validity

Face validity concerns whether the items, as worded, appear suitable for measuring the intended variable. Specialists in sport psychology, sports training, and measurement and evaluation reviewed the initial version and judged each item's clarity, wording, and fit with its domain. Items with at least 80% agreement were retained, which indicates that both scales have face validity.

Second: Construct Validity

Construct validity concerns how well the items fit the theoretical structure of the scale. The researcher checked it through item analysis using the upper and lower groups and through the correlation of each item with the rest of the scale score. All items were statistically significant, meaning they distinguish between players with high and low levels of each variable. This is only preliminary evidence of construct validity. The study used no factor analysis or external criterion and did not compare players' self-ratings with an independent evaluation of match recordings, so future studies should address these points.

#### 4.4.2 Reliability of the Scales

Reliability is the consistency of a scale's results. The researcher calculated Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951) from the construction sample data for each scale and each domain. Alpha was 0.891 for the temporary emotional breakdown scale and 0.911 for the tactical decision-making scale. The six domain coefficients ranged from 0.709 (attention distraction) to 0.820, lower than the whole-scale values because each domain has only four items. The scales were not administered twice to the pilot sample, so reliability rests on internal consistency only.

**Table 6.** Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the two scales and their domains

| Scale / Domain | No. of items | Alpha coefficient |
|---|---|---|
| **Temporary emotional breakdown scale** | | |
| Emotional intensity | 4 | 0.779 |
| Attention distraction | 4 | 0.709 |
| Weak response control | 4 | 0.752 |
| Whole scale | 12 | 0.891 |
| **Tactical decision-making scale** | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Reading the situation | 4 | 0.809 |
| Choosing the alternative | 4 | 0.820 |
| Timing and adaptation | 4 | 0.757 |
| Whole scale | 12 | 0.911 |

### 4.4.3 Internal Consistency of the Scales

Internal consistency shows whether the items of a scale measure the same construct. The researcher calculated Pearson's correlation between each item score and the total scale score with that item removed. All correlations were significant at 0.05, ranging from 0.47 to 0.69 for the temporary emotional breakdown scale and from 0.56 to 0.69 for the tactical decision-making scale.

**Table 7.** Correlation coefficients between the items and the total score of the temporary emotional breakdown scale

| Item | Correlation coefficient | Item | Correlation coefficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.57 | 7 | 0.60 |
| 2 | 0.62 | 8 | 0.63 |
| 3 | 0.69 | 9 | 0.62 |
| 4 | 0.64 | 10 | 0.58 |
| 5 | 0.53 | 11 | 0.55 |
| 6 | 0.47 | 12 | 0.66 |

**Table 8.** Correlation coefficients between the items and the total score of the tactical decision-making scale

| Item | Correlation coefficient | Item | Correlation coefficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.67 | 7 | 0.66 |
| 2 | 0.66 | 8 | 0.68 |
| 3 | 0.66 | 9 | 0.58 |
| 4 | 0.67 | 10 | 0.65 |
| 5 | 0.68 | 11 | 0.60 |
| 6 | 0.69 | 12 | 0.56 |

### 4.4.4 Objectivity of the Scales

Objectivity comes from clear instructions and a fixed scoring key, so the researcher's personal judgment does not affect the results. In this study it was limited to standardized instructions and scoring, and no inter-rater agreement coefficient was calculated.

### 4.5 Statistical Methods

The data were analyzed by computer using:

1. Arithmetic mean.
2. Standard deviation.
3. Pearson's correlation coefficient.
4. Independent-samples (T) test.
5. One-sample (T) test.
6. Cronbach's alpha coefficient.
7. Percentages.
8. Standard scores (Z).
9. Modified standard scores (T).

## 5. Results and Discussions

### 5.1 Presentation and Discussion of the Results of the Temporary Emotional Breakdown Scale

**Table 9.** Standard levels of the temporary emotional breakdown scale

| Standard levels | Raw scores | Modified standard scores | Number | Percentage % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| High | 45 - 60 | More than 60 | 13 | 20.3% |
| Moderate | 30 - 44 | From 40 to 60 | 40 | 62.5% |
| Low | 12 - 29 | Less than 40 | 11 | 17.2% |

Most players (62.5%) fell at the moderate level, followed by the high level (20.3%). The players' mean score was (36.86), against a hypothetical mean of (36). The t-value was (0.93) with (63) degrees of freedom and (Sig = 0.357), which is above (0.05), so the two means do not differ significantly and the players' level of temporary emotional breakdown is moderate. The three domain means were close, between (3.05) and (3.10) out of (5), with weak response control highest and emotional intensity lowest. This may be because each player recalled a stressful situation of his own choosing and so described its effect as moderate.

### 5.2 Presentation and Discussion of the Results of the Tactical Decision-Making Scale

**Table 10.** Standard levels of the tactical decision-making scale

| Standard levels | Raw scores | Modified standard scores | Number | Percentage % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| High | 48 - 60 | More than 60 | 13 | 20.3% |
| Moderate | 32 - 47 | From 40 to 60 | 39 | 60.9% |
| Low | 12 - 31 | Less than 40 | 12 | 18.8% |

Most players (60.9%) were at the moderate level of tactical decision-making, (18.8%) at the low level, and (20.3%) at the high level. The mean was (39.42) against a hypothetical mean of (36), with a t-value of (3.38), (63) degrees of freedom, and (Sig = 0.001), so the players rated their tactical decisions significantly higher than the hypothetical mean. One explanation is that tactical decision-making has several parts, since its level depends on how the player reads the situation,

chooses an alternative, and times his action (Calle-Jaramillo et al., 2023, 110). The three domain means ranged from (3.26) to (3.31) out of (5), with choosing the alternative highest and reading the situation lowest. Players may also have rated their decisions higher than they really were, since the ratings are self-reports made after the situation was over.

### 5.3 Presentation and Discussion of the Arithmetic Means

**Table 11.** Arithmetic mean and standard deviation of the two scales

| Scale | Mean | ± SD | Hypothetical mean | T value | Sig | Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Temporary emotional breakdown | 36.86 | ±7.41 | 36 | 0.93 | 0.357 | Moderate |
| Tactical decision-making | 39.42 | ±8.10 | 36 | 3.38 | 0.001 | Above the hypothetical mean |

Temporary emotional breakdown was moderate. Its mean of (36.86), compared with the hypothetical mean of (36), gave a t-value of (0.93) with (63) degrees of freedom and (Sig = 0.357), above (0.05), so it does not differ significantly from the hypothetical mean. Tactical decision-making had a mean of (39.42), a t-value of (3.38) with (63) degrees of freedom, and (Sig = 0.001), below (0.05), so it is significantly above the hypothetical mean. These standard levels are relative to the application sample and are not general norms for football players.

### 5.4 Presentation and Discussion of the Relationship between Temporary Emotional Breakdown and Tactical Decision-Making

**Table 12**. Pearson's correlation coefficient between the two variables

| Scale | No. of pairs | r value | T value | Sig | Significance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Temporary emotional breakdown and tactical decision-making | 64 | -0.350 | -2.94 | 0.005 | Significant |

There was a significant negative correlation between temporary emotional breakdown and tactical decision-making (r = -0.350), a moderate inverse relationship by Cohen's criterion (Cohen, 1988, 63). The two variables share about 12% of their variance, and since Sig = 0.005 is below 0.05, the research hypothesis is supported. One explanation is that a player who stays emotional and distracted after an error takes in less information about the positions of teammates and opponents, which affects which alternative he chooses and when he acts. The result agrees in general direction with Eysenck et al. (2007, 53), who reported that intense emotion weakens the direction of attention; with Lazarus (2000, 77), who argued that emotion affects performance through the player's appraisal of the situation; and with Al-Khafaji and Talib (2020, 255), Al-Moamen (2015, 52), and Jasim (2024, 373), who found a link between emotion and decision-making, although their variables and samples differed.

**Table 13.** Pearson's correlation coefficients between the domains of the two scales

| Emotional breakdown domains | Reading the situation | Choosing the alternative | Timing and adaptation | Total decision score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Emotional intensity | -0.216 | -0.213 | -0.237 | -0.252* |
| Attention distraction | -0.313* | -0.368* | -0.284* | -0.367* |
| Weak response control | -0.221 | -0.153 | -0.315* | -0.259* |
| Total score | -0.299* | -0.291* | -0.336* | -0.350* |

* Significant at the (0.05) level.

All coefficients in Table (13) are negative. Attention distraction had the strongest correlation with the total decision score (-0.367), its correlation with choosing the alternative was (-0.368), and its correlations with all three decision domains were significant. Emotional intensity did not correlate significantly with any single decision domain, although its correlation with the total score (-0.252) was negative. Weak response control correlated significantly with timing and adaptation (-0.315) but not with choosing the alternative (-0.153). Preoccupation with what just happened is therefore the factor most clearly tied to a weaker next decision, which fits attentional control theory (Eysenck et al., 2007, 88). These coefficients should be read with caution, since they come from (64) players and from domains of four items each. Correlation does not establish causation, and a poor decision could just as easily heighten a player's emotions as result from them. Both scales also rely on players' self-ratings after the match, so a player who found the situation confusing may also rate his decision as poor, and players may differ in how well they remember the minutes that followed.

## 6. Conclusions and Recommendations

Both scales showed adequate preliminary psychometric properties (validity, reliability, discriminatory power, and internal consistency) and can be used to measure temporary emotional breakdown and tactical decision-making in football players, although factorial verification is still needed. The sample members were distributed across three standard levels (high, moderate, and low) on both scales. Temporary emotional breakdown was moderate and did not differ significantly from the hypothetical mean, while players rated their tactical decisions significantly above the hypothetical mean. Temporary emotional breakdown and tactical decision-making were negatively and significantly correlated ($r = -0.350$), so greater emotional disturbance after a stressful situation went with lower self-rated decisions. Of the emotional breakdown domains, attention distraction was the one most clearly related to tactical decision-making. Furthermore, using the two scales to assess temporary emotional breakdown and tactical decision-making in football players, after checking their validity on other samples. Including training in regaining focus and controlling emotion in the minutes after errors and lost possession in psychological preparation programs. Although, designing drills that require a quick decision after a confusing moment, such as passing straight after losing the ball, with particular attention to attention distraction, the domain most clearly related to decision-making. Finally, carrying out similar studies with other age groups and levels of play that compare players' ratings of their decisions with an independent evaluation of match recordings

and run a factor analysis of both scales.

## References


1. Ahmed, A. S., & Saleh, A. Y. (2022). Evaluating the level of tactical behavior among players of some second-division football clubs in Nineveh Governorate. Journal of Sport Sciences, 14(52).
2. Asaad, J. A.-A., & Kadhim, A.-H. K. (2023). Some aspects of attention and their relationship to the accuracy of the most important basic skills among football players. Raseen Journal of Sports Activities and Movement Sciences, 4(1).
3. Imam, M. M., et al. (1990). Evaluation and measurement. Dar Al-Hikma.
4. Jasim, D. R. (2024). Emotional suppression and its relationship to decision-making among futsal referees in Al-Najaf Al-Ashraf Governorate. Misan Journal for Physical Education Sciences, 29(1).
5. Al-Khafaji, H. A.-R., & Talib, Q. M. H. (2020). Decision-making in terms of emotional intelligence among football coaches. Journal of Physical Education Sciences, 13(8).
6. Rateb, O. K. (2000). Sport psychology: Concepts and applications (3rd ed.). Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi.
7. Safar, S. N. (2014). Emotional stability and its relationship to decision-making. Lark Journal, 6(2).
8. Allawi, M. H. (1998). Introduction to sport psychology. Al-Kitab Publishing Center.
9. Allawi, M. H., & Radwan, M. N. E.-D. (2008). Measurement in physical education and sport psychology. Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi.
10. Al-Mashhadani, M. H., & Hurmuz, A. H. (1989). Statistics. University of Baghdad, Bayt Al-Hikma.
11. Al-Moamen, H. S. (2015). Emotional intelligence as a predictor of decision-making among first-division futsal referees. Journal of Physical Education, 27(4).
12. Calle-Jaramillo, G. A., Gonzalez-Palacio, E. V., Perez-Mendez, L. A., Rojas-Jaramillo, A., & Gonzalez-Jurado, J. A. (2023). Design and validation of a test to evaluate the execution time and decision-making in technical-tactical football actions (passing and driving). Behavioral Sciences, 13(2), 101.
13. Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
14. Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16(3), 297–334.
15. Eysenck, M. W., Derakshan, N., Santos, R., & Calvo, M. G. (2007). Anxiety and cognitive performance: Attentional control theory. Emotion, 7(2), 336–353.
16. Freemantle, A. W. J., Stafford, L. D., Wagstaff, C., Akehurst, L., & Van Laar, D. L. (2021). Development and validation of an in-competition emotion measure: The Brief In-Competition Emotion (BICE) scale. Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 57, 102050.
17. Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review. Review of General Psychology, 2(3), 271–299.
18. Lazarus, R. S. (2000). How emotions influence performance in competitive sports. The Sport Psychologist, 14(3), 229–252.

Appendix (1)
Dear player... Greetings,
Attached is a questionnaire entitled:
(Temporary Emotional Breakdown and Its Relationship to Tactical Decision-Making among Football Players during Competition)
Please read each item carefully and indicate how much you agree with it, based on your own opinion and without hesitation or outside influence. Your answers are important for this scientific research.

**Instructions:**
1. Do not write your name.
2. The questionnaire is not a test, and there is no right or wrong answer.
3. Recall the first stressful competitive situation you clearly remember from your last match, such as a technical error or losing the ball, and answer both scales about the five minutes that followed it.
4. Please answer within (24) hours of the match.
5. Each item has five response options; choose the one that best reflects your opinion.
6. Put a mark (√) next to the option that matches your view.

**Temporary emotional breakdown scale**

| No. | Statements | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Emotional intensity** | | | | | | |
| 1 | I felt that my emotion suddenly intensified after the situation. | | | | | |
| 2 | I found it difficult to calm my tension in the following minutes. | | | | | |
| 3 | I remained upset even after play resumed. | | | | | |
| 4 | I quickly regained my composure after the situation. | | | | | |
| **Attention distraction** | | | | | | |

| No. | Statements | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | My mind remained occupied with what happened instead of following the play. | | | | | |
| 6 | I missed some cues on the pitch because of my emotion. | | | | | |
| 7 | I found it difficult to follow the movement of the ball after the situation. | | | | | |
| 8 | I maintained my focus on the course of play after the situation. | | | | | |
| **Weak response control** | | | | | | |
| 9 | I acted impulsively in the moments following the situation. | | | | | |
| 10 | I found it difficult to restrain my reaction when the pressure was renewed. | | | | | |
| 11 | My emotion affected the way I communicated with my teammates. | | | | | |
| 12 | I was able to control my reactions in the following minutes. | | | | | |

**Tactical decision-making scale**

| No. | Statements | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Reading the situation** | | | | | | |
| 1 | I noticed my teammates' positions before choosing my action. | | | | | |
| 2 | I paid attention to the spaces left by the opponent. | | | | | |
| 3 | I took the state of play into account when choosing my action. | | | | | |
| 4 | I chose my action before looking at the available options. | | | | | |
| **Choosing the alternative** | | | | | | |
| 5 | I chose the action that served my team's objective in the situation. | | | | | |
| 6 | I balanced keeping the ball and moving forward according to the situation. | | | | | |
| 7 | I distinguished when I needed to support a teammate and when to cover space. | | | | | |
| 8 | I stuck to the first option that came to my mind even though a more suitable alternative appeared. | | | | | |

| No. | Statements | Strongly agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Timing and adaptation** | | | | | | |
| 9 | I chose the time of action according to the movement of teammates and the opponent. | | | | | |
| 10 | I adjusted my decision when the available space changed. | | | | | |
| 11 | I changed my choice when the initial plan became unsuitable. | | | | | |
| 12 | I was slow to change my decision after the state of play changed. | | | | | |

Appendix (2)

List of experts and reviewers

| No. | Name | Academic title | Workplace | Specialization |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Dr. Ahmed Hassan Ali | Assistant Professor | University of Basrah | Sports Management |
| 2 | Dr. Mohammed Abdul-Kareem Jasim | Professor | University of Misan | Physical Education |
| 3 | Dr. Ali Hussein Abbas | Assistant Professor | University of Baghdad | Measurement and Evaluation |
| 4 | Dr. Hussein Fadhil Mohammed | Lecturer | University of Thi-Qar | Educational Administration |
| 5 | Dr. Qasim Abdullah Kareem | Assistant Professor | University of Kufa | Sports Training |
| 6 | Dr. Ali Kadhim Mahdi | Lecturer | University of Basrah | Sports Psychology |
| 7 | Dr. Saadoon Jabbar Ali | Professor | University of Wasit | Administration and Organization |