

ANUAR DIN, SALLEH ABD RASHID & SITI AJAR MOHD NOH

## The Relationship and Influence of Coaching Leadership Style in Training Program towards Student Athletes' Satisfaction

**ABSTRACT:** This study aims to identify the relationship and influence of coaching leadership style during the implementation of training program towards the satisfaction of student athletes. A total number of 206 student athletes from two sports school in Malaysia were selected using the simple random sampling method. This research is a non-experimental qualitative study using a survey method in order to answer the objectives and hypothesis. A set of questionnaire for measuring the LSS (Leadership Scale for Sport) and the ASQ (Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire) were used for this study. Pearson Correlation and Multiple Regression were used to test the null hypothesis at significance level of  $p < 0.05$ , while SPSS program version 19 was used to analyze the data collected. The findings show that there is a positive and significant correlation ( $r = .586, p < .05$ ) between the leadership style of coaching from all dimensions with athletes satisfaction. These findings also show that the training and instruction dimension is a significant dominant influence ( $\beta = .68, t(206) = 13,497, p < .05$ ) for coaching leadership style of athlete satisfaction. As a result, the factors such as training and instruction dimension in coaching leadership style need to be addressed by trainer during the implementation of training program.

**KEY WORD:** Leadership style, athlete satisfaction, sports school, training and instruction, coaching, student athlete, and implementation of training program.

**INTISARI:** "Hubungan dan Pengaruh Gaya Kepimpinan Jurulatih dalam Program Latihan terhadap Kepuasan Atlet Pelajar". Kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengenal pasti hubungan dan pengaruh gaya kepimpinan jurulatih semasa pelaksanaan program latihan terhadap kepuasan atlet pelajar. Seramai 206 orang atlet pelajar dari dua buah sekolah sukan di Malaysia telah dipilih dengan menggunakan pensampelan rawak mudah. Kajian ini adalah satu kajian kuantitatif bukan eksperimen dengan menggunakan kaedah tinjauan untuk menjawab objektif dan hipotesis kajian. Satu set borang soalselidik bagi LSS (Skala Kepimpinan dalam Sukan) dan ASQ (Soalselidik Kepuasan Atlet) digunakan dalam kajian ini. Analisis statistik inferensi seperti Korelasi Pearson dan Regresi Pelbagai digunakan untuk menguji sembilan hipotesis nol pada aras signifikan  $p < 0.05$ . Program yang digunakan untuk menganalisis data adalah program SPSS versi 19. Dapatan kajian menunjukkan terdapat hubungan yang positif dan signifikan ( $r = .586, p < .05$ ) antara gaya kepimpinan jurulatih dari semua dimensi dengan kepuasan atlet. Dapatan kajian juga menunjukkan dimensi latihan dan arahan merupakan pengaruh dominan yang signifikan ( $\beta = .68, t(206) = 13.497, p < .05$ ) bagi gaya kepimpinan jurulatih terhadap kepuasan atlet. Oleh yang demikian, faktor seperti dimensi latihan dan arahan dalam gaya kepimpinan jurulatih perlu diberikan perhatian oleh jurulatih semasa melaksanakan program latihan.

**KATA KUNCI:** Gaya kepimpinan, kepuasan atlet, sekolah sukan, latihan dan arahan, jurulatih, atlet pelajar, dan pelaksanaan program latihan.

### INTRODUCTION

The success of an athlete at national and international levels is influenced by various

factors. Among them are the intrinsic factors, moral support from surrounding, good performance skills, and the coaching

**About the Authors:** Dr. Anuar Din is a Senior Lecturer at the Faculty of Psychology and Education UMS (Malaysia University of Sabah), 88400 Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia; Prof. Dr. Salleh Abd Rashid is a Lecturer at the Center of Human Development and Techno-Communication UNIMAP (Malaysia University of Perlis), 02600 Jejawi, Perlis, Malaysia; and Siti Ajar Mohd Noh is a Lecturer at the IPGM (Malaysia Institute of Teacher Education) Campus Gaya, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia. The authors can be contacted via e-mails address at: [anudin@ums.edu.my](mailto:anudin@ums.edu.my), [salleh@unimap.edu.my](mailto:salleh@unimap.edu.my), and [sitimdnoh@gmail.com](mailto:sitimdnoh@gmail.com)

**How to cite this article?** Din, Anuar, Salleh Abd Rashid & Siti Ajar Mohd Noh. (2015). "The Relationship and Influence of Coaching Leadership Style in Training Program towards Student Athletes' Satisfaction" in *SIPATAHOENAN: South-East Asian Journal for Youth, Sports & Health Education*, Vol.1(1) April, pp.125-138. Bandung, Indonesia: Minda Masagi Press, APAKSI Bandung, and KEMENPORA RI Jakarta, ISSN 2407-7348. Available online also at: <http://sipatahoenan-journal.com/10-the-relationship-and-influence-of-coaching-leadership-style/>

**Chronicle of the article:** Accepted (February 13, 2015); Revised (March 15, 2015); and Published (April 21, 2015).

leadership style (Abd Aziz, 2005). In addition, the extrinsic factors, such as the job satisfaction in coaching, training program management conducted, and recognition and reward (title given, money, medal of excellence) also lead to the outstanding performance of an athlete.

Meanwhile, in the aspect of leadership styles, an effective coach must successfully influenced the atmosphere and attitude of an athlete in responding towards the duties and responsibilities assigned. Indirectly, this can enhance and influence the satisfaction and performance of athletes themselves (Smoll & Smith, 1989). This situation takes place by the interaction between coach and athlete.

According to D.E. Fouss & R.J. Troppmann, the interaction between coach and athlete is an important criteria in determining the effectiveness of a training program (Fouss & Troppmann, 1981). Anuar Din also stated that the leadership style of a coach or team manager when interacting with the athletes in managing training programs, either on the off or onsite competition, gives affects to those athletes (Din, 2010). The effects gained by the athlete are directly proportional if significant positive relationship from interaction aspects between the needs and requirements of coaches, team managers, and athletes; thus, will increase the satisfaction and performance and athletes will achieve success.

Meanwhile, the process of interaction between coach and athlete is a very important component to improve the performance and satisfaction of an athlete (Serpa, Pataco & Santos, 1991; Gibbons *et al.*, 2003; and Frontiera, 2006). According to C.J. Mallet (2003) and Lim Khong Chiu *et al.* (2013), the coach plays an important role in producing athletes with the knowledge and skills that is necessary in increasing the performance of athletes in their field. The coach also has a huge influence in creating excitement, satisfaction, and continuous participation of athletes (Ehsani *et al.*, 2013; and Khong Chiu *et al.*, 2014). This is reinforced by the model of P. Chelladurai's Multidimensional Model of Leadership, which focuses on the congruence among the

three leadership behaviors, that is: required behavior, the actual behavior, and the behavior desired (Chelladurai, 1990).

The roots of the three things mentioned in the leadership behaviour are characteristic of the situation, leaders, and also the members (Chelladurai, 1978, 1990, and 1993; and Chelladurai & Carron, 1983). In addition, P. Hersey & K.H. Blanchard, through situational leadership theory, stated that effective leaders can adapt their leadership style based on the needs of the group and situation (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). Subordinated maturity is the deciding factor to the most effective leadership style.

F.L. Smoll & R.E. Smith (1989) and Sven Lindberg (2013) also noted that the coaching leadership style influenced attitudes and attributes the athletes themselves. F.L. Smoll & R.E. Smith also proposed a Leadership Behavior Model that favors leader behavior situations (Smoll & Smith, 1989). Centralization process model is termed as a branch that led from the coaching behavior towards athlete perception based on the behavior of the coach and also the responses by the athlete. This model establishes that the main effect of behavioral coaching can be seen through the athlete character. In other words, the cognitive and affective process acts as a filter between coaching behavior and youth attitudes toward their coach.

Therefore, this model defines the relationship that exists between: (1) what is always done by coaches; (2) how this behavior is understood by the players; and (3) respond to children's attitude toward the situation thoroughly (Smoll & Smith, 1989). In this model, the difference in coach variable as individuals consists of factors, such as goals, objectives, self or athlete perception, and gender. Differences in individual players variable involves age, coach's gender and perceptions, motivation, anxiety, and self-confidence (Smoll & Smith, 1989).

Apart from that, this study has also been conducted by Lim Khong Chiu & Ahmad Tajuddin (2005) on adolescent athletes who took part in team sports at District Schools Sport Event or MSSD (*Majlis Sukan Sekolah-sekolah Daerah*). Findings of the

study showed that coaching leadership style with patterned training and commands are the most frequently used in training those athletes (Khong Chiu & Tajuddin, 2005). Besides, it is also found that there is a significant relationship between achievement orientation with leadership style of training patterns and instruction, democratic, and compensate for athletes who participate in sport held at the field and stadium.

As a reference, J.W. Beam, T.S. Serwatka & W.J. Wilson (2004)'s findings stated that the differences between athletes based on the leadership style. They found that male athletes are more likely to have a manager or coach with an autocratic and social support given through their leadership style. Instead, female athletes favor coaches or managers who use the leadership style focused on training and instruction. Overall, the study found that the dimensions of their training and instruction are very significant aspect in improving the performance of an athlete (Beam, Serwatka & Wilson, 2004).

While L.H.P. Vilani & D.M. Samulski conducted a study on the players and coaches of Brazil tennis team. The study was conducted over 61 national players and 10 national coaches of Brazil. Overall of the athletes are in the range of 12 to 18 years old and divided into three age groups, namely the first group of 12 to 13 years old, the second group of 14 to 15 years old, and the third group 16 to 18 years old. The findings of the study found that athletes and coaches are very fond of leadership style of positive feedback dimension, followed by the dimensions of training and instruction. The findings also showed that both respondents did not favor the autocratic leadership style dimension (Vilani & Samulski, 2009). While Sven Lindberg (2013) states that the dimensions of training and instruction and positive feedback are highly favored by athletes.

#### **PROBLEM STATEMENT, OBJECTIVE, HYPOTHESES, AND RESEARCH METHOD**

During operating and managing a team, whether at the school, district, state, and country level, a coach or team manager

should have its own leadership style.

Coaching leadership style in training is important, because it is one of the factors for athletes to achieve satisfaction and big success in tournaments they joined (Smoll & Smith, 1989; and Pilus & Saadan, 2005).

Among the most significant factor, that causes an athlete is not satisfied, is that the coach does not have a particular style of leadership in conducting the training program. This statement is supported by A. Cakioglu (2003) and Ziad Al-Tahayneh (2003), which explain that coach does not have a particular style of leadership in conducting the training program with an athlete. Therefore, this study was undertaken to investigate the relationship and influence of coaching leadership style in a training program designed to improve the satisfaction of an athlete.

Generally, this study aims to identify the leadership style in training programs that can have an impact on satisfaction of the sport school athlete. Objective of this study also focuses on identifying whether there is a relationship or influence either directly or indirectly to the variables of coaching leadership style in coaching program with satisfaction of the athletes.

These objectives are detailed as follows: (1) Determining the relationship between coaching leadership style in the training program to the satisfaction of the sports school athletes; and (2) Identifying the most influential factor between coaching leadership style in a training program with school sport athlete satisfaction.

Based on the objectives of the study that has been built, there are nine hypotheses that have been set. In this study, a significant level of 0.05 was used for the purpose of implementing the statistic inferential data. In addition, the null hypothesis is also used in this study.

The null hypothesis is Ho1: "There was no significant relationship between the coaching leadership style with athletes' satisfaction"; Ho2: "There was no significant relationship between all leadership style in coaching with aspects of athlete satisfaction"; Ho3: "There was

*no significant effect between coaching leadership style among athletes for athlete satisfaction*"; Ho4: "There was no significant difference between coaching leadership style among athletes of various aspects of athlete satisfaction in individual achievement"; Ho5: "There was no significant relationship between coaching leadership style to athlete satisfaction in the aspects of team performance"; Ho6: "There was no significant difference between coaching leadership style among athletes of strategic satisfaction"; Ho7: "There was no significant difference between coaching leadership style among athletes for satisfaction in training and instruction"; Ho8: "There was no significant relationship between coaching leadership style to the ratio on dedication of individual athlete satisfaction"; and Ho9: "There was no significant relationship between coaching leadership style to the ratio on athlete's treatment satisfaction".

This study is a form of descriptive, comparison, correlation, and influence research to examine the relationship between one variable with another variables. The design of the study is a quantitative survey form and non-experimental, using a questionnaire as a research instrument. Mohd Najib Gaffar (2000) stated that quantitative studies enable data obtained through objective measurement.

This study was also conducted using a questionnaire; and according to E.R. Babbie (2001), the questionnaire used in a study is particularly suitable to obtain the required data. In addition, this is a surveyed research because, according to Chua Yan Piau (2006a and 2006b), this method is one of the most popular non-experimental research, which is used in various fields, especially in the social sciences.

For the purposes of this study, the researchers chose two sports schools, namely Bukit Jalil Sports School or SSBJ (*Sekolah Sukan Bukit Jalil*) in Kuala Lumpur and Bandar Penawar Sport School or SSBP (*Sekolah Sukan Bandar Penawar*) in Johor for athletes, who took part in this study is composed of athletes who have taken

part in the MSSM (*Majlis Sukan Sekolah-sekolah Malaysia* or Schools Sports Event of Malaysia) and SUKMA (*Sukan Malaysia* or Malaysia Games) championship, SEA (South East Asian) Games, and Asian Games.

In this study, purposive sampling was used followed by cluster sampling, due to the relatively large size of the population with the various sports categories like an individual sports, team sports, field sports, and courts sports. This study was conducted covering all athletes representing either of MSSM, SUKMA, SEA Games, and the Asian Games. Firstly, researchers use the probability sampling methods. After that, they will determine the subject using stratified random sampling before, finally, using simple random sampling. This is due to the heterogeneous sampling frame which consisted of a sub-sample, such as gender and level of involvement in the sport (Mohd Noah, 2003).

With reference to the determination size of the sampling schedule by R.V. Krejcie & D.W. Morgan (1970), the population study for these two sports school is 871 students (467 students from the SSBJ and 404 students from SSBP) and, then, the selected study subjects were 260 people. The instrument for this study was a questionnaire. A set of questionnaire for athletes divided into three parts, namely Part A, Part B, and Part C. Part A is related to the subject of biography; while Part B consists of a Sports Leadership Scale questionnaire; and Part C is questionnaires for Athlete Satisfaction.

The questionnaire for Part B is a questionnaire of Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS) designed and developed by P. Chelladurai & S.D. Salleh (1980), which was later translated by Shaharudin Abd Aziz (2005). This questionnaire includes 43 items designed to measure five dimensions of leader behavior or coach, that is: (1) Training and Instruction Dimension; (2) Democratic Dimension; (3) Autocratic Dimension; (4) Social Support Dimensions; and (5) Positive Feedback Dimension.

In addition, Part C of the questionnaire was measured using an "Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire" developed by H.A. Riemer &

**Table 1:**  
Number of Athletes based on their Involvement in Sport

Level of Involvement	Frequency	Percent
State (MSSM)	62	30.1
State (SUKMA)	47	22.8
National	97	47.1
	<b>206</b>	<b>100.0</b>

n = 206

**Table 2:**  
Pearson Correlation between Coaching Leadership Styles among Athletes towards Athlete Satisfaction

Coaching Leadership Style		Athlete Satisfaction
Training and Instruction Dimension	Pearson Correlation	.687(**)
	Sig. (2-tail)	.000
Democratic Dimension	Pearson Correlation	.493(**)
	Sig. (2-tail)	.000
Autocratic Dimension	Pearson Correlation	.153(*)
	Sig. (2-tail)	.028
Social Support Dimension	Pearson Correlation	.434(**)
	Sig. (2-tail)	.000
Positive Feedback Dimension	Pearson Correlation	.461(**)
	Sig. (2-tail)	.000
Overall Coaching Leadership Style	Pearson Correlation	.586(**)
	Sig. (2-tail)	.000

n = 206

\*\* Significant Level:  $p < 0.01$  (two-tailed); \* Significant Level:  $p < 0.05$  (two-tailed).

P. Chelladurai (1998). In this questionnaire, there are 56 items that was divided into 15 sub-scales, namely: (1) the achievement of individual, (2) team performance, (3) leveraging the capabilities, (4) strategies, (5) personal care, (6) training and instruction, (7) contribution and service to the team, (8) social contribution of a team, (9) ethics team, (10) team unity, (11) individual dedication, (12) the budget, (13) existence of medical panel, (14) assistant academic referees, and (15) agents abroad.

In this study, only 7 sub-scales used, that is: (1) the individual performance, (2) team performance aspects, (3) strategic aspects, (4) training and instruction aspect, (5) aspects of team unity, (6) dedication aspects of individual, and (7) personal aspects of treatment. Each item in the ASQ (Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire) consist of 35 subject that athlete will need to answer each question using a five-point Likert scale of: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Fair;

4 = Agree; and 5 = Strongly Agree (Riemer & Chelladurai, 1997).

The reliability aspect of this ASQ is based on the study of H.A. Riemer & P. Chelladurai (1998) and H.A. Reimer & K. Toon (2001) that on the value of Cronbach Alpha of .78 to .99 for each subscale. Next, all questionnaire are processed using the Statistical Package of Social Science (SPSS) version 19 from J.S. Coakes, L. Steed & C. Ong (2009) to process the data and information obtained from the respondents. After entering all the data, statistical analysis was conducted based on the objectives and hypotheses.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

According to table 1, the results show that most athletes are representative of the country that were 97 (52.9%), followed by athletes who represent the state at the MSSM (*Majlis Sukan Sekolah-sekolah Malaysia* or Schools Sports Event of Malaysia) total of 47 (22.8%), and athletes who represent

**Table 3:**  
Pearson Correlation between Coaching Leadership Style among Athletes with Athletes Satisfaction

Satisfaction Aspects of Athlete		Coaching Leadership Style
Individual Performance	Pearson Correlation	.393(**)
	Sig. (2-tail)	.000
Team Performance	Pearson Correlation	.479(**)
	Sig. (2-tail)	.000
Strategy	Pearson Correlation	.590(**)
	Sig. (2-tail)	.000
Training and Instruction	Pearson Correlation	.501(**)
	Sig. (2-tail)	.000
Team Unity	Pearson Correlation	.421(**)
	Sig. (2-tail)	.000
Individual Dedication	Pearson Correlation	.418(**)
	Sig. (2-tail)	.000
Treatment	Pearson Correlation	.636(**)
	Sig. (2-tail)	.000

n = 206

the state at the SUKMA (*Sukan Malaysia* or Malaysia Games) championship that were 47 people (22.8%). Almost 50% of athletes who were representing the country in their level of involvement in sport.

Based on table 2, study shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between coaches leadership style among athletes for training and instruction dimension with athletes satisfaction ( $r = .687, p < .05$ ). Meanwhile, the study also found that there was a positive and significant relationship between democratic dimension with athletes satisfaction ( $r = .493, p < .05$ ). In addition, the study also found that there is a positive and significant relationship between autocratic dimension with athletes satisfaction ( $r = .153, p < .05$ ). The result also show that there is a positive and significant relationship for social support dimension, with satisfaction athletes ( $r = .434, p < .05$ ).

Moreover, the study also shows that there is a positive and significant relationship between the dimensions of positive feedback with an athlete satisfaction ( $r = .461, p < .05$ ). As a conclusion, there are positive and significant relationship between the overall leadership style among athletes and coaches in term of athlete satisfaction ( $r = .586, p < .05$ ). Therefore, the null hypothesis 1 states that “*there is no significant relationship*

*between all coaching leadership style with athlete satisfaction*” was rejected.

Based on table 3, findings show that there is a positive and significant relationship between aspects of individual achievement athlete satisfaction with coaching leadership style ( $r = .393, p < .05$ ). Meanwhile, the study also found that there was a positive and significant relationship between aspects of athlete satisfaction in team performance with coaching leadership style ( $r = .479, p < .05$ ). In addition, the study also found that there is a positive and significant relationship between athlete satisfaction with aspects of strategy in coaching leadership style ( $r = .590, p < .05$ ).

Moreover, for athletes satisfaction in training and instruction, the study also shows that there is a positive and significant relationship with the coaching leadership style ( $r = .501, p < .05$ ). There is also a positive and significant relationship between aspects of athlete satisfaction in team unity with coaching leadership style ( $r = .421, p < .05$ ). The findings also show that there are positive and significant relationship between individual dedication aspects of athlete satisfaction with coaching leadership style ( $r = .418, p < .05$ ).

Furthermore, this study also found that there is a positive and significant relationship between job satisfaction and treatment aspects of coaching leadership

**Table 4:**

Stepwise Regression Analysis for Coaching Leadership Style among Athletes for Athletes Satisfaction

Coaching Leadership Style	$\beta$	$t$	$p$
Training and Instruction Dimension	.687	13.497	.000

**Info:**

Training and Instruction Dimension:

\* $p < 0.05$  $R^2 = .472$  $AR^2 = .469$  $F = 182.170$  $p = .000$ 

n = 206

\*\* Significant level:  $p < 0.01$  (two-tailed).**Table 5:**

Stepwise Regression Analysis for Coaching Leadership Style among Athletes for Athletes Satisfaction Aspects of Individual Achievement

Predictor Variable	$\beta$	$t$	$p$
Training and Instruction Dimension	.479	7.798	.000

**Info:**

Training and Instruction Dimension:

\* $p < 0.05$  $R^2 = .230$  $AR^2 = .226$  $F = 60.802$  $p = .000$ 

n = 206

style ( $r = .636$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Therefore, the null hypothesis 2 which states that “*there is no significant relationship between coaches leadership style with all aspects of athlete satisfaction*” was rejected.

Based on table 4, the criterion variable in this study is the satisfaction of athletes, while the predictor variables were coaching leadership style, which is divided into five dimensions, namely: (1) the dimension of training and instruction, (2) dimensions of democratic, (3) autocratic dimension, (4) a dimension of social support, and (5) positive feedback dimension. The findings indicate that a significant predictor variables, the dimension of training and instruction ( $\beta = .68$ ,  $t(206) = 13,497$ ,  $p < .05$ ), is a major factor for coaching leadership style to the satisfaction of an athletes.

Only one predictor variable accounted for 47.2 percent ( $r = .687$ ) changes in the variance in satisfaction of athletes [ $F(1, 204) = 182,170$ ,  $p < .05$ ]. Therefore, the third null hypothesis states that “*there is no effect*

*significantly between coaching leadership style among athlete’s overall satisfaction*” was rejected. There is a significant predictor variable, the dimension of training and instruction.

Based on table 5, the findings indicate that a significant predictor variables, namely the dimension of training and instruction ( $\beta = .479$ ,  $t(206) = 7.798$ ,  $p < .05$ ), is a major factor coaching leadership style to the athlete satisfaction. Only one predictor variable accounted for 23.0 per cent ( $r = .479$ ) changes in the variance in satisfaction of athletes [ $F(1, 204) = 60,802$ ,  $p < .05$ ]. Therefore, the null hypothesis 4 that “*there is no significant difference between coaching leadership style among athlete to athlete ratio of individual achievement overall satisfaction*” was rejected. There is a significant predictor variable, namely the dimension of training and instruction.

Based on table 6, the findings showed that the three predictor variables, namely: (1) the dimension of training and instruction, (2)

**Table 6:**  
Stepwise Regression Analysis for Coaching Leadership Style  
among Athletes for Athletes Satisfaction Aspects of Team Performance

Predictor Variables	$\beta$	$t$	$p$
Training and Instruction Dimension	.551	9.431	.000
Autocracy Dimension	.573	2.742	.007
Democracy Dimension	.589	-2.381	.018

**Info:**  
 Training and Instruction Dimension:  $*p < 0.05$   
 $R^2 = .304$   
 $AR^2 = .300$   
 $F = 88.938$   
 $p = .000$   
 n = 206

Autocracy Dimension:  $*p < 0.05$   
 $R^2 = .328$   
 $AR^2 = .322$   
 $F = 49.651$   
 $p = .000$

Democracy Dimension:  $*p < 0.05$   
 $R^2 = .347$   
 $AR^2 = .337$   
 $F = 35.751$   
 $p = .000$

**Table 7:**  
Stepwise Regression Analysis for Coaching Leadership Style  
among Athletes to Satisfaction of Athletes in Aspects of Strategy

Predictor Variable	$\beta$	$t$	$p$
Training and Instruction Dimension	.669	12.864	.000

**Info:**  
 Training and Instruction Dimension:  $*p < 0.05$   
 $R^2 = .448$   
 $AR^2 = .445$   
 $F = 165.487$   
 $p = .000$   
 n = 206

dimension of autocracy, and (3) dimension of democracy, are the predictor for coaching leadership style and management trainers for training programs on aspects of team achievement in athlete satisfaction. Predictor variables, such as dimensions of social support and the dimensions of the positive feedback, are not a factor in coaching leadership style of its achievements the athlete team satisfaction.

Significantly, coaching leadership style ( $\beta = .551$ ,  $t(206) = 9431$ ,  $p < .05$ ) accounted for 30.4 per cent ( $r = .551$ ) changes in the variance in satisfaction of athletes [ $F(1, 204) = 88,938$ ,  $p < .05$ ]. The combination of these two variables predictor, the variable of dimension of training and instruction ( $\beta = .529$ ,  $t(206) = 9107$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and dimensions of autocracy ( $\beta = .159$ ,  $t(206) = 2.742$ ,  $p < .05$ ) accounted for 32.8 per cent ( $r = .573$ ) changes in the variance in terms of individual achievement of athlete satisfaction

[ $F(2, 203) = 49,651$ ,  $p < .05$ ]. In addition, when the predictor variable, democratic dimension ( $\beta = -.198$ ,  $t(206) = -2.381$ ,  $p < .05$ ) taken together, the three predictor variables accounted for 34.7 per cent ( $r = .589$ ) changes in the variance in satisfaction of athletes [ $F(3, 202) = 35,751$ ,  $p < .05$ ].

Based on the results of the regression analysis range from table 6, the dimension of training and instruction, dimension of autocracy, and dimension of democratic are a factor in terms of the achievement of athlete team satisfaction. Thus, the null hypothesis 5, which states that “*there is no significant influence between coaching leadership style towards its achievements in athlete team satisfaction*” was rejected. There are three significant predictors’ variables, that were: the dimensions of training and instruction, dimension of autocratic, and dimension of democratic.

Based on table 7, the results showed that

**Table 8:**  
Stepwise Regression Analysis for Coaching Leadership Style  
among Athletes for Athletes Satisfaction Aspects of Training and Instruction

Predictor Variable	$\beta$	$t$	$p$
Training and Instruction Dimension	.608	10.933	.000

**Info:**

Training and Instruction Dimension:

\* $p < 0.05$

$R^2 = .369$

$AR^2 = .366$

$F = 119.540$

$p = .000$

$n = 206$

**Table 9:**  
Analysis of Stepwise Regression for Coaching Leadership Style  
among Athletes for Athletes Satisfaction Aspects of Individual Dedication

Predictor Variable	$\beta$	$t$	$p$
Training and Instruction Dimension	.523	8.772	.000
Social Support Dimension	.537	-1.993	.048

**Info:**

Training and Instruction Dimension:      Social Support Dimension:

\* $p < 0.05$

$R^2 = .274$

$AR^2 = .270$

$F = 76.953$

$p = .000$

$n = 206$

\* $p < 0.05$

$R^2 = .288$

$AR^2 = .281$

$F = 41.024$

$p = .000$

significantly a predictor variables, namely the dimension of training and instruction ( $\beta = .669$ ,  $t(206) = 12,864$ ,  $p < .05$ ), is a major factor in coaching leadership style to the satisfaction of athletes.

Only one predictor variable accounted for 44.8 percent ( $r = .669$ ) changes in the variance in satisfaction of athletes [ $F(1, 204) = 165,487$ ,  $p < .05$ ]. Predictor variables, such as dimension of democratic, dimension of autocratic, dimension of social support, and the dimension of the positive feedback are not a factor in coaching leadership style to aspects of athlete satisfaction strategy. Thus, the null hypothesis 6 stated that “*there is no significant difference between coaching leadership style among athletes of various aspects of athlete satisfaction strategy as a whole*” was rejected. There is a significant predictor variable, which is training and instruction dimension.

Based on table 8, the findings indicate that a significant predictor variables, namely the dimension of training and instruction

( $\beta = .608$ ,  $t(206) = 10,933$ ,  $p < .05$ ), that is a major factor of coaching leadership style to the satisfaction of athletes. Only one predictor variable accounted for 36.9 percent ( $r = .608$ ) changes in the variance in satisfaction of athletes [ $F(1, 204) = 119,540$ ,  $p < .05$ ]. Other predictor variables, namely the dimension of democratic, autocratic dimension, a dimension of social support, and positive feedback dimension, are not a factor in coaching leadership style of athlete training and instruction satisfaction. Therefore, the null hypothesis 7 that stated that “*there is no significant difference between the style of leadership in coaching among athletes in aspects of training and instruction satisfaction in overall*” was rejected. There is a significant predictor variable, which is dimension of training and instruction.

Based on table 9, the findings indicate that two-dimensional predictors' variables, namely: (1) training and instruction; and (2) social support dimension, are the predictor for coaching leadership style to

**Table 10:**  
Stepwise Regression Analysis for Coaching Leadership Style  
among Athletes for Athletes Aspects of Treatment Satisfaction

Predictor Variable	$\beta$	$t$	$p$
Training and Instruction Dimension	.688	13.526	.000
Democratic Dimension	.698	2.372	.019

**Info:**

Training and Instruction Dimension:	Democratic Dimension:
* $p < 0.05$	* $p < 0.05$
$R^2 = .473$	$R^2 = .487$
$AR^2 = .470$	$AR^2 = .482$
$F = 182.948$	$F = 96.362$
$p = .000$	$p = .000$

n = 206

individual dedication aspects of athlete satisfaction. Other predictor variables, such as the dimension of democratic, autocratic dimension, and the dimension of positive feedback, are not a factor in coaching leadership style to individual aspects of athlete satisfaction.

Significantly, training and instruction dimension ( $\beta = .523$ ,  $t(206) = 8.772$ ,  $p < .05$ ) accounted for 27.4 per cent ( $r = .523$ ) changes in the variance in satisfaction of athletes [ $F(1, 204) = 76,953$ ,  $p < .05$ ]. The combination of these two predictor variable dimension of training and instruction ( $\beta = .634$ ,  $t(206) = 7.815$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and dimensions of social support ( $\beta = -.162$ ,  $t(206) = -1.993$ ,  $p < .05$ ) accounted for 28.8 per cent ( $r = .537$ ) changes in the variance in individual dedication aspects of athlete satisfaction [ $F(2, 203) = 41,024$ ,  $p < .05$ ].

Based on the multiple regression analysis results of table 9, the dimensions of training and instruction and dimension of social support were a factor in the dedication of individual athlete satisfaction. Therefore, the null hypothesis 8 which states that "there is no significant relationship between coaching leadership style to athlete individual dedication satisfaction" was rejected. There are two variables that were significant predictors, namely: (1) the dimensions of training and instruction; and (2) social support dimension.

Based on table 10, the findings indicate that two-dimensional predictor variables, namely: (1) dimensions of training and

instruction, and (2) democratic dimension, are a predictor for coaching leadership style of the aspects athlete satisfaction on treatment. Other predictor variables, namely autocratic dimension, a dimension of social support, and positive feedback dimension, are not a factor in coaching leadership style of an athlete treatment satisfaction.

Significantly, aspects of training and instruction dimensional ( $\beta = .688$ ,  $t(206) = 13,526$ ,  $p < .05$ ) accounted for 47.3 per cent ( $r = .688$ ) changes in the variance in satisfaction of athletes [ $F(1, 204) = 182,948$ ,  $p < .05$ ]. The combination of these two variables predictors: variable dimension of training and instruction ( $\beta = .570$ ,  $t(206) = 8055$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and democratic dimension ( $\beta = .168$ ,  $t(206) = 2.372$ ,  $p < .05$ ) accounted for 48.7 per cent ( $r = .698$ ) changes in the variance in treatment aspects of athlete satisfaction [ $F(2, 203) = 96,362$ ,  $p < .05$ ].

Based on the multiple regression analysis results of table 10, the dimensions of training and instruction and democratic dimension are a predictor for coaching leadership style on the aspects of athlete treatment satisfaction. Thus, the null hypothesis 9 stating that "there is no significant relationship between coaching leadership style to athlete treatment satisfaction" was rejected. There are two variables that were significant predictors that is: (1) the dimensions of training and instruction; and (2) democratic dimension.

Based on the research objectives in this study, it indicates that there is a positive

relationship between leadership style among athletes and coaches in athlete satisfaction. The study also found that the five dimensions of leadership style coaches, namely: (1) training and instruction dimensions, (2) dimension of democratic, (3) autocratic dimension, (4) a dimension of social support, and (5) positive feedback dimension, are significantly related with the athlete satisfaction.

The findings of this study are consistent with the findings of the study conducted by Asiah Mohd Pilus & Rosli Saadan, who find that there is a relationship between coaching leadership style with athletes' satisfaction (Pilus & Saadan, 2005). This finding coincides with the recommendations of F.L. Smoll & R.E. Smith, through the Leadership Behavior Model, stating that the relationship between coach and athlete leadership style, when coaches do their job as planned and athletes can understand the things done by their coach and react based on the current situation conducted when training program takes place either in the preparatory phase, competition phase, or transition phase (Smoll & Smith, 1989). In addition, the relationship that exists also because that the coach must play their role as the athletes made up of various personalities differences as in gender, and level of involvement in the sport arena. For athletes who represent MSSM (*Majlis Sukan Sekolah-sekolah Malaysia* or Schools Sports Event of Malaysia) championship, coaching leadership style differed compared to athletes who represent SUKMA (*Sukan Malaysia* or Malaysia Games) and international games.

Furthermore, this study is also in line with the findings by Shahrudin Abd Aziz, which states that there is a relationship between coaching leadership style with athletes' satisfaction (Abd Aziz, 2005). His findings were also consistent with the findings of the study conducted by P. Chelladurai (1984); Lim Khong Chiu & Ahmad Tajuddin (2005); L.H.P. Vilani & D.M. Samulski (2009); and Sven Lindberg (2013), which stated the same relationship, emphasizing that the dimension of training and instruction

as well as dimensional positive feedback athlete satisfaction in three groups studied of basketball player, athletics, and wrestling.

In addition, this study also directly proportional with the findings of the study conducted by T. Horne & A.V. Carron, which states that there is a relationship between coaching leadership style and the satisfaction of athletes, and they also expressed positive feedback dimension is a dimension that affects many athletes satisfaction than autocratic dimension (Horne & Carron, 1985). This finding is also supported by Ziad Al-Tahayneh, who found that the relationship between coaching leadership style with athlete satisfaction in training and instruction dimension, democratic dimension, social support dimension, and positive feedback dimension (Al-Tahayneh, 2003).

Meanwhile, A. Cakioglu also noted a lack of focus by coach on their leadership style that lead to the level of achievement and athletes satisfaction decreases (Cakioglu, 2003). This finding is further strengthened by J. Frontiera (2006) and Lim Khong Chiu *et al.* (2013) that states by identifying the most favorable dimensions of leadership style by athletes to help coaches to plan and manage training programs with more confident, motivated and at the same time athletes enjoyed themselves during the training session. Effect of the action by the coach may indirectly increase the satisfaction of athletes (Frontiera, 2006; and Khong Chiu *et al.*, 2013).

The findings also show that the dimensions of coaching leadership style in training and instruction are key variables of athlete satisfaction of individual performance aspects, aspects of strategy, training, and instruction. In addition to the aspects of team performance athlete satisfaction, there are three predictor variables coaching leadership style of: (1) training and instruction dimensions, (2) the dimension of autocratic, and (3) democratic dimension. Meanwhile, for the dedication of individual aspects of satisfaction of athletes, there are two predictor variables coaching leadership style of: (1) training dimension and direction, and (2) dimension of social support.

There are aspects of the treatment of athlete satisfaction, which is the main predictor variable for coaching leadership style is the dimension of training and instruction and democratic dimensions. Therefore, based on these findings, showing that the dimensions of coaching leadership style training and instruction are a major influence on the satisfaction of all aspects of an athlete. To enhance the effectiveness of the training program, the trainers should use the dimensions of training and instruction as required by athletes from both sport school of SSBJ (*Sekolah Sukan Bukit Jalil* or Bukit Jalil Sports School) in Kuala Lumpur and SSBP (*Sekolah Sukan Bandar Penawar* or Bandar Penawar Sport School) in Johor, Malaysia. This shows that the dimensions of coaching leadership style in training and instruction have enormous influence on satisfaction and performance of athletes (*cf* Chelladurai, 1984; Horne & Carron, 1985; Al-Tahayneh, 2003; Mallet, 2003; Beam, Serwatka & Wilson, 2004; Khong Chiu & Tajuddin, 2005; and Vilani & Samulski, 2009).

However, these findings differ with E.S. Schliesman, who found a democratic dimension and the dimension of social support are a major predictor for coaching leadership style of athlete satisfaction (Schliesman, 1987). Therefore, the coach should give attention and focus on this dimension when dealing with athletes in sport school. Among the things that should be focused in talking to athletes is in sports techniques and tactics, teaching athletes individually for each skill, identify weaknesses and strength of an athletes, make every effort to monitor athletes, and provide a detailed explanation related to the athlete's skills, strategies, and aspects sports science. This aspect of the study is along with Lim Khong Chiu *et al.* (2014).

Although these findings differ or line with previous findings, but the findings of researchers have permission if referred to the F.L. Smoll & R.E. Smith (1989), which states that the coaching leadership style influenced attitudes and attributes of the athletes themselves. If athletes who have a low level of confidence, leadership style

may be used by the coach is different with athletes who have a high level of confidence, or any coach would use leadership styles for different dimensions of athletes who represent the country compared to athletes who represent only MSSM (*Majlis Sukan Sekolah-sekolah Malaysia* or Schools Sports Event of Malaysia) championship, as well as junior athletes with a senior athlete.

According to F.L. Smoll & R.E. Smith (1989), the use of different leadership styles is done with a purpose and a common goal, namely coach can satisfy athletes they train. This is consistent with studies that state athletes with young and low-skilled prefer individual leadership style compared with athletes who are highly skilled and senior, and different situations lead trainer will use different leadership styles (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982; and Neil & Kirby, 1985). Trainers need to use different leadership styles based on the maturity level of the athlete as described by P. Hersey & K.H. Blanchard (1982) in the theory of situational leadership; for examples: the level of involvement of athletes, athletes' age, category of sport athletes, and others.

Maturity level of an athlete in this study can be divided into two, the first is by a period of participation in sport. Nearly sixty-eight percent of surveyed athletes involved in sports over the past five years. The longer the athlete is in a sport environment, their maturity level will rise, especially athletes who always participate in the international competitions. Their experience competing at a high level and challenging contributed to their maturity level in sports undertakings. The second is the level of involvement in the sport athletes surveyed, nearly forty-seven percent of both schools of SSBJ in Kuala Lumpur and SSBP in Johor represent the country.

Therefore, at this stage of the game that is challenging and intense as the School Championship ASEAN (Association of South East Asian Nations)-school, SEA (South East Asian) Games, and Asian Games can further enhance the level of maturity, especially when athletes can compete and beat with athletes from abroad. The effect increases the confidence level of an athletes, and

indirectly also increase the maturity level of those athletes. This statement was reinforced by the findings that there is a difference between athletes who represent the MSSM with athletes representing the country.

Finally, proposed for the future as researchers may add one independent variable, such as management training programs for satisfaction and achievement of athlete. Respondents could provide information through an interview or answer questions shaped structure in addition to the questionnaire.

## CONCLUSION

There are two influential factors in achieving the level of satisfaction of athletes in sports, among which are intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Although the intrinsic factor is internal factors may give satisfaction athletes in sports, but also extrinsic factors contributing to satisfaction level athletes in the sport. As a result of factors, such as the dimensions of training and instruction in coaching leadership style, knowledge of coaches, aspects of equipment and sports facilities as well as aspects of the training program should be given attention by the instructor during the training program.

Therefore, the coach should give attention and focus on this dimension when dealing with school athletes in sports. Among the things that should be focused in talking to athletes in sports techniques and tactics, teaching athletes individually for each skill, identify weaknesses and strength athletes, make every effort to monitor athletes, and provide a detailed explanation related to the athlete's skills, strategies, and aspects of sports science. Meanwhile, based on these findings show that the dimensions of coaching leadership style, training and instruction are a major influence on the satisfaction of all aspects of an athlete. To enhance the effectiveness of the training program, the coaches should use the dimensions of training and instruction as required by athletes from both schools.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>**Statement:** We would like to declare that this article is our original work; so, it is not product of plagiarism and not yet also be reviewed and published by other scholarly journals.

## Bibliography

- Abd Aziz, Shahrudin. (2005). "Perkaitan antara Matlamat dan Stail Kepimpinan dengan Pencapaian Atlet Sukma Negeri Perak di Kejohanan Sukma 2004" in *Wacana Penyelidikan UPSI*, 13.
- Al-Tahayneh, Ziad. (2003). "The Effects of Coaches' Behaviors and Burnout on the Satisfaction and Burnout of Athletes". *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation*. Florida USA [United States of America]: Department of Sport Management, Recreation Management, and Physical Education FSU [Florida State University].
- Babbie, E.R. (2001). *The Practice of Social Research*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Thompson Learning, 9th edition.
- Beam, J.W., T.S. Serwatka & W.J. Wilson. (2004). "Preferred Leadership of NCAA Division I and II Intercollegiate Student-Athletes" in *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 27(1), pp.3-17.
- Cakioglu, A. (2003). "Leadership and Satisfaction in Soccer: Examination of Congruence and Players' Position". *Unpublished Master Thesis*. Tehran: Department of Physical Education and Sport, Middle East Technical University.
- Chelladurai, P. (1978). "A Contingency Model of Leadership in Athletics". *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*. Canada: University of Waterloo.
- Chelladurai, P. (1984). "Discrepancy between Preferences and Perceptions of Leadership Behavior and Satisfaction of Athletes in Varying Sports" in *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 6, pp.27-41.
- Chelladurai, P. (1990). "Leadership in Sport: A Review" in *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 21, pp.328-354.
- Chelladurai, P. (1993). "Leadership" in R.N. Singer *et al.* [eds]. *Handbook of Research on Sport Psychology*. New York: Macmillan, pp.47-671.
- Chelladurai, P. & S.D. Salleh. (1980). "Dimensions of Leader Behavior in Sports: Development of a Leadership Scale" in *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2, pp.34-45.
- Chelladurai, P. & A.V. Carron. (1983). "Athletic Maturity and Preferred Leadership" in *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 5, pp.371-380.
- Coakes, J.S., L. Steed & C. Ong. (2009). *SPSS Version 16.0 for Windows: Analysis without Anguish*. Queensland: John Wiley & Sons Australia Ltd.
- Din, Anuar. (2010). "Gaya Kepimpinan, Kepuasan Kerja, dan Pengurusan Program Latihan Jurulatih terhadap Kepuasan Atlet Sekolah Sukan". *Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis*. Kota Kinabalu: UMS [Universiti Malaysia Sabah].
- Ehsani, Mohammad *et al.* (2013). "The Relationship between Perceived Power Sources of Coaches and Satisfaction of Iranian Elite Judokas" in *International Journal of Sport Studies*, 3(3), pp.292-298.
- Fouss, D.E. & R.J. Troppmann. (1981). *Effective Coaching: A Psychological Approach*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Frontiera, J. (2006). "The Relationship between Leadership, Efficacy Belief, and Performance among Boys' High School Basketball Players". *Unpublished Master Thesis*. West Virginia, USA [United States of America]: West Virginia University.
- Gaffar, Mohd Najib. (2000). *Penyelidikan Pendidikan*. Skudai, Johor: Penerbit UTM [Universiti Teknologi Malaysia].
- Gibbons, T. et al. (2003). *U.S. Olympians Describe the Success Factors and Obstacles that Most Influenced their Olympic Development, Phase II: Results of the Talent Identification and Development Questionnaire to U.S. Olympians*. USA [United States of America]: Community Outreach and Coaching and Sport Sciences Divisions.
- Hersey, P. & K.H. Blanchard. (1982). *Management of Organization: Utilizing Human Resources*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 4th edition.
- Horne, T. & A.V. Carron. (1985). "Compatibility in Coach – Athlete Relationships" in *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 7, pp.137-149.
- Khong Chiu, Lim & Ahmad Tajuddin. (2005). "Athletes' Perceptions towards Coaches Leadership Behaviors and its Relationship with Achievement Orientation" in *Proceeding the 1<sup>st</sup> Asia Pacific Sports Science Conference in Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia*, on 27 – 29 March, pp.234-243.
- Khong Chiu, Lim et al. (2013). "Student-Athletes' Perceptions of Coaches' Coaching Competency at the Malaysian Public Institution of Higher Learning" in *World Journal of Education*, 3(1), pp.13-22.
- Khong Chiu, Lim et al. (2014). "Student-Athletes' Evaluation of Coaches' Coaching Competencies and Their Sport Achievement Motivation" in *Review of European Studies*, 6(2), pp.17-30.
- Krejcie, R.V. & D.W. Morgan. (1970). "Determining Sample Size for Research Activities" in *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, pp.601-608.
- Lindberg, Sven. (2013). "The Influence of Perceived Teacher-Student Congruence on Students' Satisfaction in Physical Education" in *Journal of Studies in Education*, 3(2), pp.183-209.
- Mallet, C.J. (2003). "Why the Fire Burn so Brightly" in *International Journal of Sports Psychology*, 3, pp.117-131.
- Mohd Noah, Sidek. (2003). *Reka Bentuk Penyelidikan: Falsafah, Teori, dan Praktis*. Serdang: UPM [Universiti Putra Malaysia].
- Neil, G. & S.L. Kirby. (1985). "Coaching Styles and Preferred Leadership among Rowers and Paddlers" in *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 8, pp.3-17.
- Piaw, Chua Yan. (2006a). *Kaedah dan Statistik Penyelidikan, Buku 1: Kaedah Penyelidikan*. Kuala Lumpur: McGraw Hill.
- Piaw, Chua Yan. (2006b). *Kaedah dan Statistik Penyelidikan, Buku 2: Asas Statistik Penyelidikan*. Kuala Lumpur: McGraw Hill.
- Pilus, Asiah Mohd & Rosli Saadan. (2005). "Coaching Leadership Style and Athlete Satisfaction in Sport Team" in *Proceeding the 1<sup>st</sup> Asia Pacific Sports Science Conference in Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia*, on 27 – 29 March, pp.501-535.
- Reimer, H.A. & K. Toon. (2001). "Leadership and Satisfaction in Tennis: Examination of Congruence, Gender, and Ability" in *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 72(3), pp.243-256.
- Riemer, H.A. & P. Chelladurai. (1997). "A Classification of Athlete Satisfaction" in *Journal of Sport Management*, 11, pp.133-159.
- Riemer, H.A. & P. Chelladurai. (1998). "Development of the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ)" in *Journal of Sport Exercise Psychology*, 20, pp.127-156.
- Schliesman, E.S. (1987). "Relationship between the Congruence of Preferred and Actual Leader Behavior and Subordinate Satisfaction with Leadership" in *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 10, pp.157-166.
- Serpa, S., V. Pataco & F. Santos. (1991). "Leadership Patterns in Handball International Competition" in *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 22, pp.78-89.
- Smoll, F.L. & R.E. Smith. (1989). "Leadership Behaviors in Sport: A Theoretical Model and Research Paradigm" in *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19, pp.1522-1551.
- Vilani, L.H.P. & D.M. Samulski. (2009). "Situational Leadership II and the Coach-Athlete Relationship in Brazil Table Tennis". Available online also at: [http://www.cbtm.org.br/scripts/arquivos/Artigo\\_vilani\\_9\\_ITTF.pdf](http://www.cbtm.org.br/scripts/arquivos/Artigo_vilani_9_ITTF.pdf) [accessed in Kota Kinabalu, Malaysia: January 14, 2015].