

CORRELATION BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLE AND ATHLETE MOTIVATION AMONG MALES AND FEMALES ADOLESCENTS

Raja Zulkhairil Ikram Raja Adzhar*, Shaharuddin Abd Aziz, Jaffry Zakaria,
Noorzaliza Osman, Siti Hartini Azmi

Faculty of Sport Science and Coaching,
Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Tanjung Malim Perak, Malaysia

*Email: zulkhaimal@gmail.com

(Received 28 December 2017; accepted 18 July 2018; published online 17 January 2019)

To cite this article: Raja Adzhar, R. J. I., Abd Aziz, S., Zakaria, J., Osman, N., & Azmi, S. H. (2019). Correlation between leadership style and athlete motivation among males and females adolescents. *Malaysian Journal of Movement, Health & Exercise*, 8(2), 45-56.

<https://doi.org/10.15282/mohe.v8i2.340>

Link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.15282/mohe.v8i2.340>

Abstract

The objective of this study is to examine the correlation between the leadership style and athlete motivation among males and females adolescent athletes at SMK Dato 'Lela Pahlawan, Padang Serai Kedah. There were a total of 64 respondents comprising 32 male athletes and 32 female athletes who participated in various sports and were experienced with coach leadership styles. The data collection instruments used in this study were Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS), which measured five leadership behaviours perceived by athletes and Sports Motivation Scales (SMS), which determined the three basic factors of motivation including the intrinsic, extrinsic and amotivation of the athletes. The findings from Pearson product moment correlation analysis showed a positive and significant relationship between leadership behaviours and intrinsic motivation for male athletes in the training and instruction dimension ($r = 0.64$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$), and democracy dimension ($r = 0.38$, $p = 0.032$, $p < 0.05$). Meanwhile, for female athletes, analysis also shows that there was a low and significant positive relationship between the leadership behaviours and the intrinsic motivation on training and instruction ($r = 0.62$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$), democratic ($r = 0.59$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$), positive feedback ($r = 0.50$, $p = 0.004$, $p < 0.05$), and social support ($r = 0.49$, $p = 0.005$, $p < 0.05$). Pearson product moment correlation analysis found a low and significant positive relationship between leadership behaviours and extrinsic motivation for male athletes for the training and instruction dimension ($r = 0.52$, $p = 0.002$, $p < 0.05$), and democracy dimension ($r = 0.51$, $p = 0.003$, $p < 0.05$). Meanwhile, for female athletes, analysis also shown that there was a low and significant positive relationship between the behavioural leadership behaviours and the extrinsic motivation on autocratic ($r = 0.60$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$), democratic ($r = 0.51$, $p = 0.003$, $p < 0.05$), social support ($r = 0.50$, $p = 0.003$, $p < 0.05$), and training and instruction ($r = 0.41$, $p = 0.020$, $p < 0.05$). Therefore, there were significant relationship differences between leadership behaviour of coaches

and athletes' motivation among males and females and either intrinsic or extrinsic motivation towards the athlete. In conclusion, relevant parties, especially coaches who play an important role as leaders in the developing of athletes' psychological aspects, especially motivation, can increase the satisfaction and performance among adolescent athletes.

Keywords: The multidimensional leadership model, coach leadership behaviour, athlete motivation, gender

Introduction

The success of an athlete at any levels is influenced by various factors. One such factor is the coach, who acts as a leader to an athlete and often addresses concerns from various parties including the athlete, management team of a sports organization and sports enthusiasts. The leadership issue plays an important role and directly affect athlete motivation. It might affect the performance and excellence of the athlete. In recent years, various issues related with coaching have shocked our country. One of them is the issue of Lim Teong Kim, who was sacked as the head coach of Malaysia's Under 16 squad (B-16) by the Ministry of Sports Malaysia after the Malaysian campaign ended in the B-16 Championship of the Asian Football Confederation (AFC) 2018. The team at that time was struggling to prepare the Malaysia Team to qualify in World Cup.

Coach Leadership has a considerable meaning in today's sporting era (Sofian, 2003). It is an issue that is often discussed and is a concern of all parties including athletes themselves, management teams of the sports organization and sports enthusiasts. This leadership issue also plays an important role in the performance and excellence of an athlete. According to Wildman, (2006), effective leadership is an important element and should be demonstrated in order to improve the performance and satisfaction of athletes and teams. Indirectly, this shows that performance of a team during training and winning of the team in a tournament or competition is not merely the quality and superiority of the athlete, but the collaboration of a group of individuals working in the team, including both the coach and the athletes.

Motivation is an important element in developing athletic performance in sport. Motivation influence development of behavioural variables such as persistence, learning and performance, as well as social environment development. A study done by Shaharudin (2005) stated that among others, there are intrinsic factors of an athlete such as the moral support from family, better skill performance and leadership style of guidance. A study by Alvarez et al. (2009) noted a significant relationship between athletic leadership and motivational leadership styles, which also include external factors that cause outstanding athletes such as coaching, and the recognition and appreciation factor as given by certain parties. Finally, amotivation is defined as feeling of less or no motivation. A study conducted by Vallerand et al., (1992) stated that this condition occurs when athletes experience an unwanted or disappointing experience that results in disappointment. This happen to someone then there is no motivation. Amotivation happens when people cannot see the correlation between their actions and results of the action. Thus, athlete motivation is related to as results or influenced by the coach leadership behaviour.

The theory that there is a close relationship between coach leadership and motivational behaviour is a form of human motivation and personality development known as Self-Determination Theory (Ryan and Deci, 2000). It was produced from several theories which were combined to offer a comprehensive understanding of human motivation and function. The Self-Determination Theory (SDT) is based on the fundamental humanistic assumptions that individuals strive to develop and understand themselves by integrating new experiences by nurturing their needs, desires and interests, and connecting with others. However, this natural development tendency cannot be assumed, and divisive, segregated and individuals can be controlled if their basic psychological needs for autonomy, efficiency, and interrelationships were undermined by less social environments. In summary, intrinsic motivation includes participation in activities for fun (Kaufman et al., 2011). A study by Alvarez et al. (2009) stated that extrinsic motivation is an external factor that motivate athletes to act excellently as coaching factor, recognition and award given by certain parties.

Psychological knowledge among athletes can help ease the development of specialized training programs for brilliant athletes and teams. Sports coaches and organizations emphasize athletic motivation to do their best in training or games. Measurement of leadership coaching behaviours is important to stabilize individual or athlete motivation. In addition, there is a lack of information relating to coaching leadership styles and athlete motivation such as the effects of coach behaviour on athlete motivation. Nowadays, most coaches are pose less attention to their leadership behaviours, either their actual behaviour as a coach, or behaviours required based on the situation, organization, or behaviour favoured by athletes and teams in influencing athlete motivation, satisfaction and performance. Therefore, this study aimed to examine the relationship between the dimensions of coaching leadership behaviours and the three motivational factors of male and female athlete and to study the dimensions of leadership behaviour dimensions with motivation factor between men and female athlete SMK Dato' Lela Pahlawan, Padang Serai Kedah.

Methodology

Participants

This research was conducted at SMK Dato' Lela Pahlawan, Padang Serai, Kedah and the sample for this study consisted of 64 athletes under the age of 13, 14 & 16 years old. The survey method was appropriate and has been widely used in educational research.

Table 1: Sampling age and gender

Athlete Ages	Male	Female
13 years old	20	20
14 years old	6	9
16 years old	6	3
Total	32	32

Instruments

The Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS) questionnaire (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980) consists of 40 Likert scale questions to test the 5 dimensions of coach leadership style. The questionnaire survey used was an adapted version of the LSS to suit the Malaysian context in the study. Participants were requested to respond to each of the 40 items by grading their preferences on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always). The scoring of each item is as follows: 1 = Never; 2 = Seldom; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Often; 5 = Always.

The Sports Motivation Scales (SMS) (Pelletier et al., 1995) is a measure of contextual motivation that was intended to identify the perceived reasons for participating in sport. As previously stated, the SMS measures three forms of motivation reflecting varying degrees of self-determination along a motivation continuum (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Participants were asked to respond to the question, “Why do you practice your sport?” with such items as, “for the pleasure I feel in living exciting experiences”. Participants responded using 7 steps ranging from 1 (Very disagree) to 7 (Strongly agreed). The scoring of each item is as follows: 1 = Very disagreed, 2 = Moderate disagreed, 3 = Slightly Disagreed, 4 = Neutral, 5 = Slightly agreed, 6 = Moderate agreed and 7 = Strongly agreed. An additional section of the questionnaire sought general demographic information such as the age, gender, ethnicity, type of sport, and highest level of participation of the respondents.

Data collection

The researcher conducted a study in a comfortable and appropriate area for athletes to answer the questionnaires. The place used to carry out this research is in the multipurpose hall. The questionnaire were distributed simultaneously to all the 64 samples. The respondents were not allowed to speak to their friends during answering session. However, the researcher allowed the respondents to ask questions or seek for clarification to avoid any problems that they supposed to encounter during responding to the questionnaire. The researcher have reminded the respondents to answer all the items contained in the questionnaire and to ensure that the respondents have answered their questionnaire clearly, so that no doubts would arise when the data were analysed. The respondents were also advised to answer the questionnaire honestly and sincerely. The respondents submitted the questionnaire after completing all items. The time given to answer the questionnaire was 15 to 30 minutes. The researcher then collected and reviewed all of the questionnaires for each item answered. If there was an incomplete questionnaire, the researcher asked the respondent to complete their questionnaire. Only completed questionnaires have been analysed. The understanding of the subjects on the questionnaire items is a guaranteed of the reliability and validity of the questionnaire. All of the information and answers provided were confidential and used solely for the purposes of this study.

Data analysis

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS - version 23) was used to analyse and create a report on the collected data. Descriptive statistic were used in the report of the data. Mean score, standard deviations and effect sizes were used in describing the data. Effect sizes were used as an appropriate indicator of the magnitude of differences between genders. The use of effect sizes had enabled conclusions to be drawn based entirely on descriptive

measures of the data. To determine the differences in the means of athletes gender is significant, the t-test and Pearson correlation using a significance level of 0.05 was utilized.

Results

Table 2: Compare the mean score of the coaching leadership dimension received by athletes between male and female athletes.

Coach Leadership Dimension		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
										Lower	Upper
Democratic Dimension	Equal variances assumed	.898	.347	2.030	62	.047	.34028	.16763	.00519	.67537	
	Equal variances not assumed			2.030	61.987	.047	.34028	.16763	.00518	.67537	
Social Support Dimension	Equal variances assumed	1.591	.212	.991	62	.326	.14844	.14981	-.15103	.44790	
	Equal variances not assumed			.991	60.765	.326	.14844	.14981	-.15115	.44803	
Autocratic Dimension	Equal variances assumed	1.850	.179	.248	62	.805	.05625	.22684	-.39719	.50969	
	Equal variances not assumed			.248	51.978	.805	.05625	.22684	-.39894	.51144	
Positive feedback Dimension	Equal variances assumed	2.500	.119	1.653	62	.103	.32500	.19666	-.06813	.71813	
	Equal variances not assumed			1.653	57.989	.104	.32500	.19666	-.06867	.71867	
Training and instruction Dimension	Equal variances assumed	2.686	.106	.407	62	.685	.06731	.16521	-.26294	.39755	
	Equal variances not assumed			.407	57.448	.685	.06731	.16521	-.26346	.39808	

An independent sample-t-test analysis was used to compare the mean score of the coaching leadership dimension received by athletes for both the male and female athletes. Based on table 2, the test shown the value of democratic dimension $t(62) = .347, p = .047$ is significant. The results showed that there were significant differences in the mean scores for the democratic dimension between the male athletes ($M = 3.86, SD = .675$) and female athletes ($M = 3.52, SD = .666$). The value of social support dimension $t(62) = .212, p = .326$ showed is significant. The results showed that there was no significant difference in the mean score on the social support dimension of the athlete between male athletes ($M = 3.46, SD = .555$) and female athlete ($M = 3.31, SD = .640$). The value of autocratic dimension $t(62) = .179, p = .805$ showed is significant. The results showed that there was no significant difference in the mean score on the autocratic dimension of the athlete between the male athletes ($M = 1.89, SD = .680$) and female athletes ($M = 1.83, SD = 1.088$). The value of positive feedback dimension $t(62) = .119, p = .103$ showed is significant. The results showed that there was no significant differences in the mean score on the positive feedback of the athletes received between male athletes ($M = 3.84, SD = .675$) and female athletes ($M = 3.52, SD = .884$). Finally, the value of training and instruction dimension $t(62) = .106, p = .685$ showed is significant. The results showed that there was no significant differences in the mean score on the training and instruction dimension between male athletes ($M = 4.11, SD = .560$) and female athletes ($M = 4.04, SD = .748$). Thus, there were differences showed in the t-test

finding in the coaching leadership behaviour among the male and female but there were no significant differences between male and female in the mean score.

Table 3: Compare the mean score of the athlete motivation aspects received by athletes between male athletes and female athletes

Motivation aspects	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
Extrinsic Motivation		.000	.992	-.297	62	.767	-.09115	.30662	-.70406	.52177
									Equal variances not assumed	-.297
Amotivation		.373	.544	-.597	62	.553	-.39844	.66795	-1.73364	.93677
									Equal variances not assumed	-.597
Intrinsic Motivation		2.480	.120	.443	62	.660	.10938	.24715	-.38466	.60341
									Equal variances not assumed	.443

Based on table 3, an independent sample-t-test analysis was used to compare the mean score of the athlete extrinsic motivation aspects received by the athletes between the male and female athletes. The test showed the value of $t(64) = .992$, $p = .767$ is significant. The results showed that there was no significant in the mean score on the athlete extrinsic motivation aspects received between male athletes ($M = 5.21$, $SD = 1.093$) and female athletes ($M = 5.67$, $SD = .872$). The mean score of the athlete amotivation aspects received by athletes between male and female athletes showed the value of $t(64) = .544$, $p = .533$ is significant. The results showed that there was no significant difference in the mean score on the athlete amotivation aspects received between male ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 1.605$) and female athletes ($M = 4.57$, $SD = 3.420$). Finally, the mean score of the athlete intrinsic motivation aspects received by athletes between male and female athletes showed the value of $t(64) = .120$, $p = .660$ is significant. The results showed that there was no significant in the mean score on the athlete intrinsic motivation aspects received between male ($M = 5.78$, $SD = 1.093$) and female athletes ($M = 5.67$, $SD = .872$). Thus, there were differences shown in the t-test finding in athletes motivation among males and females but there is no significant differences between male and female in the mean score.

Table 4: Correlation between coach leadership behaviour and athletes' motivation between male and female

Athlete gender			Intrinsic Motivation	Extrinsic Motivation	Amotivation
Male	Training Instruction Dimension	Pearson Correlation	.638**	.521**	.255
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.002	.158
	Democratic Dimension	Pearson Correlation	.379*	.515**	.384*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.032	.003	.030
	Autocratic Dimension	Pearson Correlation	-.200	-.018	.265
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.272	.921	.142
Social support Dimension	Pearson Correlation	.309	.280	.329	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.086	.120	.066	
Positive Feedback Dimension	Pearson Correlation	.243	.249	.444*	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.180	.169	.011	
Female	Training Instruction Dimension	Pearson Correlation	.620**	.409*	.170
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.020	.352
	Democratic Dimension	Pearson Correlation	.586**	.507**	.045
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.003	.805
	Autocratic Dimension	Pearson Correlation	-.082	.599**	.094
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.657	.000	.608
Social support Dimension	Pearson Correlation	.486**	.502**	.197	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005	.003	.279	
Positive Feedback Dimension	Pearson Correlation	.495**	.198	.169	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.277	.355	

Male (n=32), Female (n=32)

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Based on table 4 on the Pearson correlation analysis showed there were two dimensions of coaching leadership behaviours including training and instruction dimension ($r = 0.64$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$) and democratic dimension ($r = 0.38$, $p = 0.032$, $p < 0.05$) which have a moderate and positive significant relationship between coaching behaviour and intrinsic motivation among male athletes. Meanwhile, found that the female athletes showed a moderate and positive significant in four dimensions of coach leadership behaviour towards intrinsic motivation. There were training and instruction dimension ($r = 0.62$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$), democratic dimension ($r = 0.59$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$), positive feedback dimension (r

= 0.50, $p = 0.004$, $p < 0.05$), and social support dimension ($r = 0.49$, $p = 0.005$, $p < 0.05$). Thus, based on the findings, the coach leadership and intrinsic motivation between male and female have showed a correlation that there were two dimensions that were same to both gender in Training and instruction, and democratic dimension but there were additional dimension of coach leadership on female athletes positive feedback and social support dimension.

Coach leadership behaviour and extrinsic motivation in table 4 showed there were two dimensions of coaching leadership behaviours including training and instruction dimension ($r = 0.52$, $p = 0.002$, $p < 0.05$) and democratic dimension ($r = 0.51$, $p = 0.003$, $p < 0.05$) which have a moderate and positive significant relationship between coaching behaviour and intrinsic motivation among male athletes. Meanwhile for female athletes the finding showed a moderate and positive significant in four dimensions of coach leadership behaviour towards extrinsic motivation. These were the autocratic dimension ($r = 0.60$, $p = 0.000$, $p < 0.05$), democratic dimension ($r = 0.51$, $p = 0.003$, $p < 0.05$), social support dimension ($r = 0.50$, $p = 0.003$, $p < 0.05$), and training and instruction dimension ($r = 0.41$, $p = 0.020$, $p < 0.05$). Thus, the correlation of coach leadership behaviour and extrinsic motivation between the genders showed different correlations. The findings for the male athletes showed that training and instruction and democracy have significant correlation with extrinsic motivation, while female athletes had showed the autocratic, democratic, social support and training and instruction dimension have significant relationship with the extrinsic motivation.

Finally, table 4 also indicated athletes amotivation as shown on male athletes and there were two dimensions of coaching leadership behaviours including positive feedback dimension ($r = 0.44$, $p = 0.011$, $p < 0.05$) and democratic dimension ($r = 0.39$, $p = 0.030$, $p < 0.05$) which have a moderate and positive significant relationship between coaching behaviour and amotivation only on male athletes. Thus, only the male athletes showed the significant correlation on the coach leadership behaviour and amotivation and there were not found in the female. Therefore, there was significant relationship between male and female athletes, there were different relationship among male, and female showed towards athletes motivation have affected by the coach leadership behaviour were found in this study.

Discussion

This study on coach leadership behaviour and the gender athlete's intrinsic motivation has demonstrated that the training and instruction dimension is judged higher by both genders. This indicates that the coach plays a leadership role in terms of training and instruction that focus on their athletes' performance, skills, techniques, sports tactics and their organization. In addition, both gender of the athletes also respond to the democratic dimension of coaching leadership behaviours where the coach appreciates athletes as important individuals that contributing to the results that will be made through views and opinions on training and competition in order to achieve the best achievement. Coaches also have also applied it as a catalyst for athlete motivation.

Meanwhile, the findings of this study showed that the leadership behaviours of social support and positive feedback dimension have a positive and significant correlation with intrinsic

motivation was only in female athlete. This social support dimension was related to the athlete's welfare, creating a positive environment and interpersonal relationships. A positive feedback dimension of the coach leadership behaviour are associate with giving positive feedback to athletes and recognizing and rewarding better performance in women athletes. On the other hand, the male and female adolescents showed a positive and significant relationship between coach leadership behaviour and extrinsic motivation whereby both genders were judged higher in democratic and training instruction dimension of coach leadership behaviour. Meanwhile, there were two additional dimensions which showed the significant relationship with extrinsic motivation only at female athletes including autocratic and social support dimension.

The finding explained that the coaches and athletes have a dynamic relationship, and different approaches between adolescent male and female athletes. Researchers believe that both genders require the development of individual and team motivation focused during the training and competition. A study done by Buning & Thompson (2015) stated that athletes will be more motivated to do any activity or task when coaches are communicating clearly and directly with athletes. In addition, coaches and athletes need to build a relationship as a team by meeting the needs of one another can be seen as an influence on intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. A previous study based on this kind of behaviour, (Horine & Stotlar, 2004) suggested that members with their voices and opinions listen and collaborate with group members to create successful programs and eliminate bad ideas through group inputs. Social support and positive feedback dimension affects the increased athlete's confidence and motivation. This leadership behaviour demonstrates the positive emotions and attitudes of a coach who cares for athlete's virtues and uses constructive criticism as a platform to increase athlete motivation. Related study done by Abrahamsen et al., (2008) showed perceptions of a performance climate were related to the view that social support was higher in female athletes. Thus, (Chelladurai, 2007) indicated that athletes prefer to refer to leadership priorities with the training and guidance provided during the training process, the social support given, and the type and frequency of feedback provided by the trainer.

Therefore, a study was conducted to examine the effects of leadership behaviour on athlete motivation involving five dimensions of leadership behaviours including training and instruction, democratic, autocratic, social support and positive feedback to predict relationships with three motivational factors (intrinsic, extrinsic and amotivation). (Wang, Koh, & Chatzisarantis, 2009) showed that coaches played a variety of roles and responsibilities such as teachers, mentors, and leaders and interaction with athletes who greatly influenced the athlete's motivation and the pleasure of sports participation. The correlation analysis between male and female athletes demonstrates that leadership behaviour has a significant relationship and has a significant effect on the three motivational factors of their intrinsic, extrinsic and amotivation. This finding suggests that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of women athlete is higher and significant with the coach leadership behaviour than male. However, coach leadership behaviour on female athlete does not showed significant relationship to amotivation compared to male athlete.

Our findings showed there were no differences between the male and female athletes in autocratic dimension of leadership behaviour from coaches for intrinsic motivation and amotivation. Nevertheless, the finding showed significant correlation to extrinsic motivation among female athletes. A study by Turman, (2001) demonstrated the perception of athletes

which the behavioural leadership of autocratic dimensions was the determinant of athlete's success. The results of this study was also quite inconsistent with previous studies showing that the democratic dimension of leadership behaviour had a significant relationship with the amotivation of the male athlete. In this leadership behaviour, the coach allowed athletes to take part in the decision-making process on objectives, tactics and performance strategies, which can improve the performance and level of athlete's satisfaction in comparison with the autocratic behaviour of the coach that the decision was made alone without consultation with the athlete (Loughead & Hardy, 2005). The results of this study could be attributed to the situation or antecedents where application of coach leadership behaviour showed differences between male and female athletes. The condition of female athletes may be due to the need to be attentive or the characteristics of a coach who is favourable to the female athlete or that the desires or goals of the female athletes were more clearly compared to the male athletes. The Male athletes showed a significant relationship with amotivation were likely to be attributed to actual nature of the coach's behaviour, allowing more athletes engagement in every decision made. The results of the study indicated that coaching leadership behaviour needs to be adapted to the gender-based situation and needs that could enhanced the athlete's motivation to achieve the best achievement and satisfaction.

Conclusion

The results of our study showed that the perceptions of the relationship between coach leadership behaviour and athlete motivation were not necessarily due to communication alone or the style of autocratic or democratic dimension. To enhance the athlete's intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors, the coach must be wise to use all the dimensions of the coach's leadership behaviours appropriated to gender, including the dimensions of training and instruction, democratic, autocratic, social support, and positive feedback. In this context, the results obtained indicated that the female athletes chose the dimensions of training and instruction, democratic, social support and positive feedback of the coach as an intrinsic motivation catalyst. Compared to the men who chose training and instruction dimensions, and democratically acted as intrinsic motivators. Extrinsic motivation showed that both the male and female athletes chose training and instruction. This was democratically the catalyst and additional the two dimensions for the women athletes who chose autocratic and social support as an added dimension for extrinsic motivation. The results for amotivation or unmotivated were shown in democratic dimensions and positive feedback only among male athletes.

In the future, a proposal for further research is to provide longitudinal studies of leadership behaviour before and during a competition season in view of the differences in motivation of athletic motivation between sexes, for example based on individual sports and team sports or the type of sport participated. Therefore, in future study it is yearned to strengthen the findings and be used, and channelled to the relevant parties. In addition, this study should also be expanded by adding survey respondents from all sport schools across Malaysia.

References

- Abrahamsen, F. E., G. C. Roberts, et al. (2008). "Perceived ability and social support as mediators of achievement motivation and performance anxiety." *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports* 18(6): 810-821.
- Alvarez M, Balaguer I, Castillo I, Duda L, 2009. Coach autonomy support and quality of sport engagement in young soccer players. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 12(1), 138-148.
- Buning, M. M. and M. A. Thompson (2015). "Coaching Behaviors and Athlete Motivation: Female Softball Athletes' Perspectives." *Sport Science Review* 24(5/6): 345-370. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1515/ssr-2015-0023>
- Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1980). Dimensions of Leader Behavior in Sports: Development of Leader Scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2, 34-35
- Deci, E.L. (1975). Intrinsic motivation. New York: *Plenum Press*.
- Chelladurai, P. (2007) Leadership in Sports. In: Tenenbaum, G. & Eklund, R. C. (Eds.) *Handbook of sport psychology* (p. 113–135). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour. New York : Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “What” and “Why” of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268.
- Horine, L., & Stotlar, D., (2004). Administration of physical education and sport programs. New York, NY : McGraw-Hill.
- Kaufmann N, Schulze T, Veit D. (2011). More than fun and money. worker motivation in crowdsourcing—a study on mechanical Turk. *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Americas Conference on Information Systems, Detroit, Michigan August 4th-7th*, 1-11.
- Loughead, T. M., & Hardy, J. (2005). An examination of coach and peer leader behaviours in sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 6, 303-312.
- Pelletier, L. G., Fortier, M. S., Vallerand, R. J., Tuson, K. M., Briere, N. M., & Blais, M. R. (1995). Toward a new measure of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and amotivation in sports : The sport motivation scale (SMS). *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17, 35-53
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68

- Shaharudin Abd Aziz. 2005. Perkaitan antara matlamat dan stail kepimpinan dengan pencapaian atlet Sukma Negeri Perak Di Kejohanan Sukma 2004. *eWacana Penyelidikan UPSI*, 13.
- Sofian Omar Fauzee. (2003). *Penyelesaian masalah atlet melalui pendekatan psikologi*. Cheras: Utusan Publication & Distributor. Sdn. Bhd.
- Turman, P. D. (2001). Situational coaching styles: The impact of success and athlete maturity level on coaches' leadership styles over time. *Small Group Research*, 32, 576-594.
- Vallerand, R.J. & Bissonnette, R. (1992). Intrinsic, extrinsic, and amotivational styles as predictors of behaviour: A prospective study. *Journal of Personality*, 60, 599-620.
- Wang, C. K. J., K. T. Koh, et al. (2009). "An Intra-Individual Analysis of Players' Perceived Coaching Behaviours, Psychological Needs, and Achievement Goals." *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching* 4(2): 177-192.
- Wildman, J. C. (2006). The athlete leader role: interaction of gender, sport type, and coaching style. *University of North Texas*.