

The Relationship of Coaching Behavior Towards the Motivation of Football Athletes in Malaysia Sports' School

Nurhasni Mohd Noor

Mohamad Faithal Haji Hassan

Soh Kim Geok

Jane Francisca Seruti

ABSTRACT

This study is aimed to compare coaching behavior among football coaches and to determine its' effects on the motivation of football athletes in Malaysian sports' school. A total of 123 football athletes (mean age = 15.30 years, SD = 1.61 years) from three different sport schools were chosen using the simple random sampling method. The survey used Coaching Behavior Scale for Sport (CBS-S) to measure coaching behavior and Sport Motivation Scale (SMS) to measure the athletes' motivation. Descriptive and inference analysis, one-way ANOVA and regression analysis were used to analyze the collected data. The results showed that there are significant differences in coaching behaviors among the football coaches in six out of seven dimensions of coaching behaviors. There are also significant differences showed in two out of the seven types of motivation and there are significant relationships between four coaching behaviors dimensions and six types of motivation and only negative personal rapport significantly associated to motivation. The Regression analysis result shows that physical training and planning has significant, dominant influence on identified extrinsic motivation ($\beta = .31, p < .05$) and external regulation extrinsic motivation ($\beta = .34, p < .01$). Meanwhile, negative personal rapport ($\beta = .42, p < .01$) has a dominant influence on amotivation. This study suggests that coaches should give attention the identified dominant influence factors in coaching behavior during training and competition.

Keyword: *coaching behaviour, motivation, sports school, footballers*

INTRODUCTION

Motivation is important in determining the success of a team (Pearlman, 2009). Motivation is closely linked to the desire to achieve excellence in every effort made (Ntoumanis & Standage, 2009). Motivation can also be defined as a force that helps increase and retain the behavior of an individual (Shaharudin, 2001). Motivation emphasizes the level of effort a person issues to achieve a goal. In general, motivation is divided into intrinsic (internal) and extrinsic motivation (external). Intrinsic motivation refers to when one is engaged in a behaviour for self-fulfillment, enjoyment and satisfaction from participating activities. While, extrinsic motivation refers to consideration for rewards such as compliment, incentives and names (Vallerand & Perreault, 1999).

In the sports context, one of the motivational theories is Self-determination Theory or SDT (Deci & Ryan, 1985a, 2000). It represents the social and cognitive factors and assumes that human beings are motivated naturally and proactively to master their social environment (Mallett et al., 2007).

Furthermore, in sports, a coach has been identified as a social factor that affects athlete's success at all competitive levels (Horn, 2002; Smoll, & Smith, 2002; Barnett, Smith, & Smoll, 1992; Scanlan, 1986). The way a coach structures his coaching in training and in competition situations, how to make decisions, the quality and quantity of feedback given based on athlete's performance, the relationship created with the athlete and a coach's leadership style can impact athlete's behavior, cognition and affective responses (Amorose, 2007). These coaching behaviors can influence the involvement of athletes in sports as well as their success. This statement is supported through several coaching models proposed by Chelladurai (1993), Horn (1987, 2002), Mageau dan Vallerand, (2003), as well as Smoll and Smith (2002) which stated that coaches can influence the learning process of their athletes, the excitement of doing activities, the competencies and the construct of athlete's achievement motivation.

Meanwhile, coaching behavior could also lead to psychological and negative consequences such as poor performance, high levels of concern, low self-esteem and fatigue (Amorose, 2007). As mentioned, coaching behavior can influence the involvement of athletes in sports as well as the success of athletes. Earlier coaching models by Chelladurai (1993), Horn (1987, 2002), Mageau dan Vallerand, (2003), as well as Smoll dan Smith (2002) have discussed that coaches can influence the learning process of their athletes, the excitement of doing activities, their competencies and building up of athlete's achievement motivation. As such, the focus given on both types of questionnaires is relevant in examining the motivation and conduct of coaching.

In addition, compatibility with coaches and the way a coach trains a team could increase motivation, especially among young athletes. Ntoumanis & Standage, (2009) have identified that motivation is a important contributor to team success. This statement has been confirmed by Zourbanos, Hatzigeorgiadis, Tsiakaras, Chironi & Theodorakis (2010) that stated that effective coaching behavior can produce more motivated players.

Coaching behavior has been studied for a variety of reasons, for example, to look at the pattern of behaviors shown by coaches and its effect on athlete motivation. Previous

studies have shown that coaching behavior based on athlete's assessment may affect athlete's motivation (Ommundsen & Bar-Eli, 1999; Amorose & Horn, 2000; Amorose & Weiss, 1998; Black & Weiss, 1992). Alina & Liliana (2010) also stated that intrinsic motivation is a very important factor in the base of the hierarchy where it is a motivating factor for the success of a team. Besides, Alejo, & Eduardo (2011) showed that there is a relationship between football players and achievements. Through the statements made by the researcher, it was found that defeat is also closely related to motivation. In addition, Pearlman (2009) stated that success is related with motivation. Study by Juan, David, Jose, & Eduardo (2010) demonstrate there is an association between the coach and the enhancement of abilities among students to increase intrinsic motivation and performance.

According to Zourbanos, et. al. (2010), the effectiveness of coaching behaviors can produce motivated players, and motivation is crucial in determining the success of a team as well as achieving success with motivation, (Pearlman, 2009) can reinforce the importance of this study. Therefore, this study aims to compare the coaching behaviors among football instructors at Malaysian Sports School. Second, it aims to identify motivational patterns among football athletes at the Malaysian Sports School as well as to analyze the relationship of coaching behavior with the motivation of the Malaysian Sports School football athlete.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study is a quantitative research using the survey method. Data were collected from two questionnaires. A total of 123 football athletes (age min = 15.30-year-old, SD = 1.61 years) from three Sports Schools in Malaysia were selected for this study. The simple random sampling method was used to select 41 respondents from each sports school.

There are two questionnaires used in this study; Coaching Behavior Scale for Sport (CBS-S) and Sport Motivation Scale (SMS) which have been translated into Malay (Nurhasni, Mohamad Faithal, Syed Kamaruzaman, Soh, & Seruti, 2017). The Malay version of both questionnaires were measured for reliability and the Cronbach's alpha analysis show the high-reliability values for CBS-S (.96 with item correlation, $r = .82$ to $.94$) while SMS shows sufficient reliability with .79 and the item correlation, $r = .59$ to $.88$.

Each questionnaire is divided into two parts: Part A contains demographic questions and Part B contains questions to measure coaching behavior and athlete motivation. CBS-S contains 47 items and using a 7 point Likert Scale s (1 = never, 7 = always). It is used to measure the effectiveness of coaches based on the perception of athletes in dimensions of coaching ie physical training and planning, technical skills, personal rapport, goal setting, mental preparation, and negative rapport constructed by Côté, Yardley, Hay, Sedgwick dan Baker (1999). The reliability of this original English version questionnaire, as reported by its writers is alpha .85 with the coefficient and reliability test re-test of .80.

Meanwhile SMS is used to measure the motivation of athletes built by Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand, Tuson dan Briere (1995). It is divided into seven subscales that assess intrinsic motivation (to know, to implement and to experience stimulation), extrinsic motivation (to identified, external rules and introjected) and amotivation and contains 28 items rated using 7 points Likert Scale (1= does not correspond at all, 7 = correspond exactly). The validity of this questionnaire in the English and French versions were reported

by Pelletier & Sarrazin, (2007) in their studies on Canadian athletes from individual sports and teams). The results showed satisfactory internal consistent where the seven-factor structure corresponding to the motivational form targeted by the scale and there is a sufficient construct validity and moderate to high temporal stability index (Pelletier & Sarrazin, 2007).

The respondents were given the questionnaire an hour before the training session started and the researcher had briefed them on the purpose of the study and how to answer the questionnaire. The respondents were given 45-minute to answer the Malay version of the CBS-S and SMS questionnaires. Once the data collection was completed, the researcher started the process of analyzing the data. Statistical analyses will be conducted on the data obtained by using with the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) software.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Table 1 shows the highest pattern of coaching behavioral behavior for each sports school is ‘the mental preparation dimension of SSBJ’ (M = 5.60, SD = 1.04), while the dimension of technical skill’s pattern of coaching behavior’ recorded the highest score for SSTMI (M = 6.12, SD = .57) and SSMP (M = 5.29, SD = 1.34).

Table 1: Descriptive Coaching Behavior Score (Mean and Standard Deviation)

Dimension	Sports School		
	SSBJ (M, SD)	SSTMI (M, SD)	SSMP (M, SD)
Physical Training and Planning	5.18 ± .87	5.44 ± .67	4.76 ± 1.48
Technical Skill	5.48 ± 1.08	6.12 ± .57	5.29 ± 1.34
Mental Preparation	5.60 ± 1.04	5.53 ± .97	5.16 ± 1.46
Goal Setting	5.16 ± .86	5.37 ± .93	4.74 ± 1.63
Competition strategies	5.51 ± .92	5.98 ± .73	5.07 ± 1.60
Personal rapport	4.64 ± 1.25	5.30 ± 1.81	4.34 ± 1.72
Negative Personal Rapport	3.63 ± 1.29	3.59 ± 1.25	2.47 ± 1.10

Table 2: The Difference Behavioral Patterns

Dimension	Between-Group	Within Group	Total	F	Sig.
Physical Training and Planning	2	120	122	4.27	.016*
Technical Skill	2	120	122	6.99	.001**
Mental Preparation	2	120	122	1.70	.187
Goal Setting	2	120	122	6.42	.002**
Competition strategies	2	120	122	6.49	.002**
Personal rapport	2	120	122	3.87	.024*
Negative Personal Rapport	2	120	122	12.09	.000**

* Significant level at $p < .05$

** Significant level at $p < .01$

The one way ANOVA analysis (Table 2) shows that there is a significant difference in coaching behavior score in six dimensions of coaching behavior; $F(2,120) = 4.27, p < .05$ for

the dimensions of physical training and planning, technical skills [$F(2,120) = 6.99, p < .01$], goal setting [$F(2,120) = 6.42, p < .01$], Competition strategies [$F(2,120) = 6.49, p < .01$], personal rapport [$F(2,120) = 3.87, p < .05$] and negative personal rapport [$F(2,120) = 12.09, p < .01$] while only the mental preparation dimensions do not show significant difference in scores [$F(2,120) = 1.70, p > .05$].

Table 3: Comparison Descriptive (Mean and Standard Deviation) Score Athlete Motivation

Dimension	Sports School		
	SSBJ (M, SD)	SSTMI (M, SD)	SSMP (M, SD)
Intrinsic Motivation (to know)	5.90 ± .80	5.82 ± 1.02	5.34 ± 1.05
Intrinsic Motivation (to accomplish things)	5.30 ± .98	5.88 ± 2.57	5.14 ± 1.17
Intrinsic Motivation (to experience stimulation)	5.18 ± 1.01	5.13 ± 1.02	4.84 ± 1.12
Extrinsic Motivation (identified)	5.57 ± 1.03	5.45 ± .95	5.20 ± 1.05
Extrinsic Motivation (Introjected)	5.90 ± .75	5.90 ± .77	5.46 ± 1.04
Extrinsic Motivation (external rules)	5.03 ± 1.00	4.98 ± .86	4.60 ± 1.18
Amotivation	2.84 ± 1.61	2.74 ± 1.34	2.40 ± 1.09

Table 3 shows the motivational pattern of football athletes in Malaysian sports school. It is shown that the dimension 'intrinsic motivation to know' had the highest score ($M = 5.90, SD = .80$) followed by extrinsic motivation introjected ($M = 5.90, SD = .75$) for SSBJ, extrinsic motivation introjected ($M = 5.90, SD = .77$) and SSTMI and SSMP ($M = 5.46, SD = 1.04$).

Table 4: The Difference of Motivation Patterns of Footballers in Malaysian Sports School

Dimension	Between group	Within Group	Total	F	Sig.
Intrinsic Motivation (to know)	2	120	122	4.00	.021*
Intrinsic Motivation (to accomplish things)	2	120	122	2.06	.132
Intrinsic Motivation (to experience stimulation)	2	120	122	1.26	.287
Extrinsic Motivation (identified)	2	120	122	1.44	.242
Extrinsic Motivation (introjected)	2	120	122	3.58	.031*
Extrinsic Motivation (external rules)	2	120	122	2.19	.117
Amotivation	2	120	122	1.20	.305

* Significant level at $p < .05$

In general, the one-way ANOVA analysis (Table 4) shows the significant difference in two-dimensional motivation that is intrinsic motivation (to know) with $F(2,120) = 4.00, p < .05$ and extrinsic motivation (introjected) $F(2,120) = 2.19, p < .05$.

Table 5: Correlation between Coaching Behavior with Footballers Motivation.

	Intrinsic Motivation (to know)	Intrinsic Motivation (to accomplish things)	Intrinsic Motivation (to experience stimulation)	Extrinsic Motivation (identified)	Extrinsic Motivation (introjected)	Extrinsic Motivation (external rules)	Amotivation
Physical Training and Planning	.40**	.23*	.43**	.35**	.45**	.44**	.07
Technical Skill	.40**	.21*	.41**	.31**	.42**	.31**	.07
Mental Preparation	.38**	.24*	.40**	.31**	.39**	.35**	.15
Goal Setting	.40**	.20*	.40**	.24*	.42**	.36**	.12
Competition strategies	.44**	.18	.38**	.32**	.44**	.36**	.10
Personal rapport	.32**	.08	.18	.15	.28**	.16	-.09
Negative Personal Rapport	.16	.17	.18	-.06	.09	.25*	.40**

* Significant level at $p < .05$

** Significant level at $p < .01$

Table 5 shows the four dimensions of coaching behaviors comprise of physical training and planning, technical skills, mental preparation and goal setting, show strong and significant correlation with six-dimensional motivation of other athletes, except the dimensions of the amotivation. The match strategy dimensions show a strong and significant correlation with five dimensions of athlete motivation, except the intrinsic motivation (to accomplish things) with $r = .18, p > .05$ and amotivation ($r = .10, p > .05$). The findings also show that only the dimensions of extrinsic motivation (external rules) have a significant strong correlation with negative personal rapport dimensions ($r = .16, p < .05$). Meanwhile, only the dimensions of the amotivation show a strong and significant correlation with the negative personal rapport dimensions ($r = .40, p < .01$).

Table 6: Regression Analysis of the Coaching Behavior Dimensions on Footballers Motivation

Predictors	Criteria Variables		
	Extrinsic Motivation (identified)	Extrinsic Motivation (external rules)	Amotivation
Physical training and planning	.31*	.34**	
Negative personal rapport			.42**
R ²	18.1%**	23.7%**	19.5%**

* Significant levels at $p < .05$

** Significant level at $p < .01$

This study uses footballer’s motivation as the variable on the criteria while coaching behavior is chosen as the predictor variable. Based on the regression analysis, shown in Table 6, coaching behavior can significantly predict the dimensions of physical training and planning ($\beta = .31, p < .05$). It is a major factor in coaching behavior that affects athlete motivation in terms of their extrinsic motivation (identified) by contributing as much as 18.1% to variants in athlete motivation [$F(7, 94) = 2.96, p < .01, R^2 = .181$]. In this light, the higher the scale of

physical exercise and the training gained, the higher the athlete's extrinsic motivation. This means that through good physical training the coach will be able to develop the personal aspects of the athlete and it is a great way to maintain a good relationship with athletes.

Physical training and planning ($\beta = .34$, $p < .01$) is the coaching behavior related to extrinsic motivation (external rule). It contributes 23.7% change in variance in athlete motivation [$F(7, 94) = 4.17$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .237$]. This regression analysis also shows that the higher scale of physical training and planning, the higher the athlete's extrinsic motivation. This analysis also means that good physical training from the coach will improve fitness and the esteem of an athlete.

The findings of this study also show that the dimensions of negative personal rapport are the main factors affecting athlete's motivation ($\beta = .42$, $p < .01$) where the higher the scale of negative personal rapport, the higher the athlete's motivation and it contributes to 19.5% of the change in variance of athlete's amotivation [$F(7, 94) = 3.25$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .195$]. This analysis shows that negative coaching behavior like screaming, not accepting athletes' opinions and scaring athletes will demotivate athletes.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study show that coaching behavior has indeed been associated with athlete's motivation. The coach has been identified as a factor that affects athlete's success at all competitive levels (Horn, 2002; Smoll, & Smith, 2002). This statement can clearly demonstrate whether significant differences in ANOVA analysis and post hoc for both questionnaires have been answered by all respondents from the three sports schools. The findings of this study are clearly supported by a past study by Ommundsen & Bar-Eli, 1999; Amorose & Horn, 2000; Black & Weiss, 1992, where they stated coaching behaviors can influence the athlete's motivation.

In addition, the findings of this study are in line with the Coaching Model proposed by Chelladurai (1993), and the study conducted by Horn (1987, 2002), Mageau & Vallerand, (2003), Smoll & Smith (2002). They stated that a coach can influence the learning process, as well as the construction of athlete's achievement motivation. This statement can be explained as the findings reveal that coaching behavior can also influence the athlete's motivation. Based on the regression analysis, there are two coaching behaviors that have a significant impact on the athlete's motivation; physical training and planning are two predictable coaching behaviors that are the main contributors to extrinsic motivation (identified) and extrinsic motivation (external rules). The analyses also predicted that the dimensions of negative personal rapport could be the major factors affecting athlete's amotivation.

This finding is consistent with Smoll and Smith (1984) which presented about the influence of coaching behavior in sports, specifically in coaching behavior. Here, it is influenced by the perception and memory of athletes, coach perception towards athlete's attitudes as well as athlete's assessment reactions to coaches. This can be attributed to the athlete's motivation as shown by the findings. Thus, undoubtedly, coaching behaviors affect the motivation of football athletes.

Apart from that, this study found that physical training is a factor which contribute to athlete's extrinsic motivation as supported by Amorose (2007). He discusses that how a coach structure the training and coach style of leadership can have an impact on athlete's behavior, cognition and affective responses. The findings of this study are also supported by Høigaard, et al., (2008) which stated that the preferable coaches behavior include giving positive feedback, good training behavior and instruction, democratic behavior and providing social support.

The influence of coaching behavior on athlete motivation is also in line with the Coaching Model proposed by Côté, et al., (1995) where the center of the coaching process is the behavior of coaches in the context of training, competition and organization. The variables can also be influenced by personal characteristics of a coach, personal characteristics and athlete development stage, as well as contextual factors. This statement is consistent with the dimensions of coaching behavior used in this study and the dependent variable is athlete's motivation.

This study also supports the previous study conducted by Kipp dan Amorose (2008) which stated that the efficiency and autonomy are predictably positive for SDT motivation. Efficiency refers to the ability to determine how good a coach could plan and manage training programs and facilities during training and competition. This can be seen in the dimensions of coaching behaviors such as physical training and planning which can significantly influence intrinsic motivation of soccer athletes. As described, this intrinsic motivation is encompassing the enjoyment of learning new techniques and exercises as well as the importance of sports to stay fit and feel good about one-self. Hence, the higher an athlete perceive the coach's efficiency to provide a detailed and challenging physical and athletic training program as well as the management of sports facilities and equipment, the motivation of athletes to practice sports will be increased.

The study also found that coaches' negative personal rapport decrease motivation. This finding is supported by Barić & Bucik (2009) who stated that coaches with high ego orientation contributed to the low motivation among athletes. In short, to avoid negative personal rapps that contribute to amotivation, Zourbanos, Hatzigeorgiadis, Tsiakaras, Chroni & Theodorakis (2010), stated that effective coaching behavior can produce motivated players while Surujlal & Dhurup (2012) also stated that the least favored coaching behavior is autocratic behavior. This is because negative coaching behaviors such as being autocratic contribute to amotivation.

A coach's negative personal rapport is seen to have a significant impact on the athlete's amotivation where negative conduct in coaching could contribute to the decline of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of athletes during training and competition such as screaming and scaring athletes physically, spending more time training more athletes well, using personal comments on athletes, and ignoring athlete's opinions. The findings of this study support the findings of a study by Barić & Bucik (2009) which found that a coach with a high ego orientation contribute to the low motivation among athletes. Coaches with high ego tend to be not supportive and provide negative feedback. This could be attributed to negative personal rapport or relationships. Consequently, athletes' intrinsic, motivation, task orientation and ego are decreased. The decline in intrinsic motivation and goal orientation is referred to the amotivation in this study as the athletes are unclear and doubtful over the purpose for them to practice sport.

The findings of this study have several implications and contributions to coaches and athletes from various angles. The first implications can be seen in the effectiveness of coaching, especially for sport teams. By knowing the dimensions of coaching behaviors that influence the athlete's motivation, a coach can determine the appropriate behavior to be shown to the athlete to increase their motivation. The second implication refers to the motivation and development of young athlete's achievement where athlete motivation factors motivate athletes' engagement in sports. The higher motivation for them to practice sports can help athletes to improve their capabilities and achievements, especially for young athletes who are still in the process of building motivation. This study allows researchers to identify how coaching behaviors affect athlete motivation. Therefore, coaches need to use coaching behavior dimensions, such as the dimensions of physical training and planning to enhance the intrinsic motivation of athletes to practice and to improve and refine their techniques and skills. This coaching strategy will benefit not only the coaches but the athletes, especially in terms of improving the competitive performance of athletes internationally.

REFERENCE

- Amorose, A. J. (2007). Coaching Effectiveness. Exploring the Relationship between Coaching Behavior and Self-Determined Motivation. In Hagger, M.S. & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (Eds.), *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Exercise and Sport*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Amorose, A. J., & Horn, T. S. (2000). Intrinsic motivation: Relationships with collegiate athletes' gender, scholarship status, and perceptions of their coaches' behavior. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 22, 63-84.
- Amorose, A. J., & Weiss, M. R. (1998). Coaching feedback as a source of information about perceptions of ability: A developmental examination. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 20, 395-420.
- Barić, R., Bucik, V. (2009). Motivational differences in athletes trained by coaches of different motivational and leadership profiles. *Kinesiology*, 41 (2), 181 – 194.
- Barnett, N., Smith, R. L., & Smoll, F. (1992). Effects of enhancing coach-athlete relationships on youth sport attrition. *The Sport Psychologist*, 6, 111-127.
- Black, S. J., & Weiss, M. R. (1992). The relationship among perceived coaching behaviors, perceptions of ability, and motivation in competitive age-group swimmers. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 14, 309-325.
- Chelladurai, P. (1993). Leadership. Dalam R.N. Singer, M. Murphy, & L. K. Tennant (Eds.), *Handbook of research on sport psychology*. New York: Macmillan.
- Côté, J., Yardley, J., Hay, J., Sedgwick, W., & Baker, J. (1999). An exploratory examination of coaching behavior scale for sport. *Avante*, 5(2), 82 – 92.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985a). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Horn, T. S. (1987). The influence of teacher-coach behavior on the psychological development of children. Dalam D. Gould & M.R. Weiss (Eds.), *Advances in pediatric sport sciences. Vol. 2: Behavioral issues* (121 – 142). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Horn, T. S. (2002). Coaching effectiveness in the sport domain. In T.S. Horn (Ed.), *Advances in sport psychology*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

- Kipp, L., & Amorose, A. J. (2008). Perceived motivational climate and self-determined motivation in female high school athletes. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 31 (2), 108 – 129.
- Mageau, G. A., & Vallerand, R. J. (2003). The coach-athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 21, 883-904.
- Mallett, C., Kawabata, M., Newcombe, P., Otero-Forero, A., & Jackson, S. (2007). Sport motivation scale-6 (SMS-6): A revised six-factor sport motivation scale. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 8 (5), 600-614.
- Mohd Noor, N., Hassan, M. F., Syed Ali, S. K., Soh, K. G., & Seruti, J. F. (2017). *Kebolehpercayaan Coaching Behavior Scale for Sport dan Sport Motivation Scale Versi Bahasa Melayu: Satu Kajian Rintis*. *JuPiDi: Jurnal Kepimpinan Pendidikan*, 4(4), 56-64.
- Ntoumanis N. & Standage, M. (2009). Motivation in physical education classes. A self-determination theory perspective. *Theory and Research in Education*. Retrieved June 30, 2009
- Nurhasni, M. N., Mohamad Faithal, H., Syed Kamaruzaman, S. A., Soh, K. G., & Seruti, J. F. (2017). *Kebolehpercayaan Coaching Behavior Scale For Sport dan Sport Motivation Scale Versi Bahasa Melayu: Satu Kajian Rintis*. *JuPiDi: Jurnal Kepimpinan Pendidikan*, 4(4), 56-64.
- Ommundsen, Y., & Bar-Eli, M. (1999). Psychological outcomes: Theories, research, and recommendations for practice. In Y.V. Auweele, F. B. Bakker, S. Biddle, M. Durand, & R. Seiler (Eds.), *Psychology for Physical Education* (pp. 13-114). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Pearlman, J. (2009). Winners & Losers. *Psychology Today*, 42(2), 94-97
- Pelletier, L. G., Fortier, M. S., Vallerand, R. J., Tuson, K. M., & Briere, N. M. (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.
- Pelletier, L. G., & Sarrazin, P. (2007). Measurement Issues in Self-Determination Theory and Sport. Dalam M.S. Hagger & N.L.D. Chatzisarantis (Eds.), *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Exercise and Sport* (143 – 152). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Scanlan, T. K. (1986). Competitive stress in children. In M.R. Weiss, & D. Gould (Eds.), *Sport for children and youth*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Shaharudin, A. Z. (2001). *Mengaplikasikan teori psikologi dalam sukan*. Kuala Lumpur: Utusan Publication & Distributors Sdn. Bhd.
- Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (1984). Leadership research in youth sports. In Silva, J. M., & Weinberg, R. S. (Eds.), *Psychological Foundations of Sport*, (pp. 371 – 386), Champaign, IL: Human Kinetic.
- Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (2002). Coaching behavior research and intervention in youth sport. In Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (Eds.), *Children and youth in sport*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Surujlal, J., & Dhurup, M. (2012). Athlete preference of coach's leadership style. *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation and Dance*, 18 (9), 111 – 121.
- Vallerand, R. J., & Perreault, S. (1999). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in sport: Toward a hierarchical model. Dalam Lidor, R., & Bar-Eli, M. (Eds.), *Sport psychology: Linking theory and practice*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology Inc.
- Zourbanos, N., Hatzigeorgiadis, A., Tsiakaras, N., Chroni, S., & Theodorakis, Y. (2010). A multimethod examination of the relationship between coaching behavior and athletes' inherent self-talk. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psych*