The relation between coaches' decision-making styles to the rate of satisfaction & burnout of Iran men & women basketball of preferred league players

Mohammad Reza Esmaeili ¹, Vali Nowzari ^{2*}, Farzad Ghafouri ³, Abbas Nazarian Madavani ⁴

¹ Department of Sport Management, faculty of physical education and sports sciences, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran; ² Department of Sport Management, faculty of physical education and sports sciences, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran; ³ Allameh Tabatabei University, Tehran, Iran; ⁴ Faculty of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Shahid Rajaee Teacher Training University, Tehran, Iran Corresponding author; Email: v_nowzari@yahoo.com

Abstract: The research has been performed with the aim of considering the relation between coaches' decision-making styles with the rate of satisfaction & burnout of preferred league players of Iran' men & women basketball in the year 2011-2012. The method of doing research is of the correlation type. The statistical sample in the research included 201 male & female athletes (110 female & 91 male). The tool of in use include decision – making style questionnaire of Scat & Borous, burnout questionnaire of athletes of Radak & Smit & also Athletes satisfaction questionnaire of Cheladorai & Rimer which tool reliability was confirmed by cronbach alpha coefficient & it's validity in the method of factor analysis. For analyzing data, mean, frequency, percent, correlation coefficient, regression in step-by-step method, T-test & one-way variance analyze were used. The findings showed that: There is a positive & significant relation between coaches' decision-making styles (intellectual, perceptual, sudden, avoiding & dependency) & athletes' burnout (emotional exhaustion, performance decrease & devaluation). There is a positive & significant relation between coaches' decision making styles (intellectual, perceptual, sudden, avoiding & dependency) & athletes' satisfaction (practice & training, personal behavior, individual & team accomplishment). Decision – making styles of intellectual, dependency, sudden & avoiding explain 61% of athlete's burnout changes & have direct & positive effect on athletes satisfaction explains.

[Esmaeili MR, Nowzari V, Ghafouri F, Nazarian Madavani A. The relation between coaches' decision-making styles to the rate of satisfaction & burnout of Iran men & women basketball of preferred league players. *J Am Sci* 2012;8(12):671-675]. (ISSN: 1545-1003). http://www.jofamericanscience.org. 93

Key words: decision-making styles, burnout, satisfaction, athletes.

1. Introduction

Coach and coaching in exercise psychology has attracted a special attention (Martnz 2006). The coaches are the main bases of athletic teams and among three factors of "athletes, coach and fan", the coach is strong organizer and basic of every athletic or team development. So, an effective coaching involves different roles and styles (Ramezaninejad et al. 2010). So different roles and styles of coach as leader of athletic teams will be more obvious when he can act well in leading and conducting athletic teams and would have an appropriate decision making (Moradi 2004). An appropriate decision making needs decision -making models and styles in order to that the coaches could take on team leadership in the best possible manner, although studying decision - making process hasn't regarded a fresh discussion, But during the recent years, different researches are performed in different area and courses about decision-making. Which as a result of it, diverse classifications were done about decision-making styles and models by ideologists (Vealey et al. 1998). One of the models is general style of decision-making that is compiled by Scat & Bruce (1995). They have presented in their model and pattern, five decision-making styles include: decision-making style, intellectual perceptual decision-making style, dependency decision-making style, sudden decision-making style and avoiding decision-making style (Baiocco et al. 2009; Parker et al. 2009). Although burnout study is present in the area of human services occupations, but its study is applicable in other areas (Maslach; Jackson 1986). On the basis, different models of burnout are presented, but Smith; Raedecke (2001) suggested a model for burnout that is determined in exercise and many studies have used the model. Their suggestive model includes three dimension of emotional exhaustion, reduced sense of accomplishment and devaluation. Athlete's satisfaction is also regarded one of important factors of team and athletic success, Maday (2000) believe that satisfaction is an integrative part of partnership and enjoyment in exercise, without satisfaction, the athletes come toward other resources for success and enjoy. The satisfaction in exercise is being studied widely along

with other variants particularly leadership different researches in athletic psychology used athlete's satisfaction as a basic variant or result variant in their works. For example, leadership multifactor model, has regarded satisfaction as a result variant along with accomplishment. While Chelladurai; Reamer (1997) suggested athlete's satisfaction classification model which involve satisfaction with training and exercise, satisfaction with personal behavior, with team and personal accomplishment.

Many studies have identified that coach behaviors has a relation with athletes burnout significantly (Bagheri 2004; Mohamadzade 2000; Udry et al. 1997). In the studies, coaches behaviors were included reflection type, social support, the rate and kind of training, practice and decision making styles (Harris 2005). While some studies have also identified that coach behaviors has a significant relation to athlete's satisfaction. (Chelladurai; Arnott 1985; Ramezaninejad et al. 2010; Sriboon 2001).

Challace; McMillin (1990) indicated also player's perception from leader behavior is predictive of athlete's satisfaction from coach behaviors. The rate of work satisfaction is indicative of athlete's sensations about environments of athletic team (Collins 2002). Satisfaction also is regards as the predictive result of coach efficacy (Smith 1986). Regarding to theoretical basics and the performed studies, the goal of present research include: determining the relation between coaches decisionmaking styles to players burnout in basketball, determining the relation between coaches decisionmaking styles to player's satisfaction coaches decision-making styles to players satisfaction in basketball, predicting athletes burnout based a coaches decision-making styles in basketball, predicting athletes satisfaction based on coaches decision-making styles in basketball.

2. Material and Methods Research Method

The research is descriptive and of the correlation research type statistical society was included all coaches and athletes of Iran men and women basketball teams who participated in the competitions of preferred league in the year 2011-2012. The volume of statistical society included 316 athletes (144 men & 168 women) which because little volume of statistical society, the number of sample people was supposed identical with statistical society which regarding to the inclusion standards (at least 6 month cooperate with the team, having the least elementary studies, non injury of more than two months from the

time of performing research, non dismissal or coach change in less than 6 months before executing research), the final sample was reduced to 201, 110 woman and 91 men.

Equipment and Tools

Scat; Bruce self-perception questionnaire (1995) which was provided for the purpose was used for evaluating coach's decision-making style. The questionnaire includes twenty-five questions in fiveselection spectrum of likert (from one, the least rate of agreement to 5, the most rate of agreement) which engage to evaluate decision-making styles of Smith (2004) burnout coaches. Radecke; questionnaire (ABQ) was used for athlete's burnout. questionnaire is a multidimensional. Questionnaire which involve 15 questions that determine three sub-scale in athletes burnout which include: emotional exhaustion, reduced sense of accomplishment and devaluation. Challudurai; Rimer (1998) athlete's satisfaction questionnaire (ASQ) was used for athlete's satisfaction evaluation. The questionnaire include 14 questions that the examinee uses for responding questions using likert' sevenscores scale with the range from one (I am not agreed at all) to seven (I am very agreed). The dimensions of the questionnaire include: agreed with coach's training and practice (three questions), agreed with coach's behaviors and interaction (five questions). agreed with group accomplishment (three questions) and agreed with personal accomplishment (three questions). Validity and reliability of the questionnaires was evaluated in the present research. Questionnaire reliability of decision-making styles with cronbach alpha method for sub-scales was calculated from %80 to %90 and total questionnaire 91%, reliability coefficient of burnout questionnaire with the methods of cronbach alpha was confirmed from 79% to 91% and athletes' satis faction questionnaire from 83% to 92%. Validity of determination tool was confirmed through content validity and also factor analysis method.

3. Results

In considering the relation between coaches' decision-making styles to player's burnout in basketball, as the table 1 shows, a negative and significant correlation is observed between all subscales of decision-making style and all sub-scales of athlete's burnout. Also there is a negative and significant relation (r=0/694) between coach's decision-making style perception and athlete's burnout. In order to identify the role of every dimensions of decision-making styles an athlete's .

Table 1: Relation between coaches' decision making style and athlete's burnout

Variable	Devaluation	Physical Emotional	Decrease of physical performance	burnout
Intellectual	-0.480	-0.367	-0.373	-0.501
Perceptual	-0.272	-0.246	-0.257	-0.321
Sudden	-0.463	-0.272	-0.395	-0.465
Avoiding	-0.438	-0.291	-0.326	-0.432
Dependency	-0.262	-0.278	-0.279	-0.341
Decision-making style	-0.562	-0.426	-0.477	-0.604

Table 2: Step by step regression athletes' burnout based on coaches' decision -making styles

Model	Variable	β	t	sig	R	R ²	F	sig
1	Intellectual	-0.501	-8.16	0.000	0.50	0.25	66.68	0.000
2	Intellectual	-0.452	-7.53	0.000	0.56	0.31	45.11	0.000
	Dependency	-0.254	-4.22	0.000				
3	Intellectual	-0.433	-7.33	0.000	0.59	0.34	34.50	0.000
	Dependency	-0.195	-3.16	0.000				
	Perceptual	-0.189	-3.07	0.002				
4	Intellectual	-0.335	-4.56	0.000	0.60	0.36	27.62	0.000
	Dependency	-0.177	-2.86	0.000				
	Perceptual	-0.170	-2.78	0.005				
	Sudden	-0.167	-2.22	0.006				
5	Intellectual	-0.219	-2.58	0.011	0.61	0.38	24.08	0.000
	Dependency	-0.149	-2.41	0.017				
	Perceptual	-0.084	-1.207	0.229				
	Sudden	-0.232	-2.96	0.003				
	Avoiding	-0.200	-2.59	0.01				
6	Intellectual	-0.193	-2.34	0.020	0.61	0.38	29.67	0.000
	Dependency	-0.161	-2.63	0.009				
	Sudden	-0.257	-3.40	0.001				
	Avoiding	-0.246	-3.63	0.000				

Table 3: Relation between coaches' decision making style and athlete's satisfaction

<u>Variable</u>	Training & Teaching	Personal behavior	Team accomplishment	Individual accomplishment	Satisfaction
Intellectual	-0.637	-0.232	-0.235	-0.456	-0.456
Perceptual	-0.401	-0.428	-0.310	-0.372	-0.372
Sudden	-0.532	-0.200	-0.232	-0.314	-0.314
Avoiding	-0.522	-0.388	-0.299	-0.553	-0.553
Dependency	-0.356	-0.407	-0.307	-0.368	-0.368
Decision-making style	-0.718	-0.494	-0.409	-0.613	-0.613

Table 4: Step by step regression athletes' satisfaction base on coaches' decision-making styles

Model	Variable	β	t	sig	R	\mathbb{R}^2	F	sig
1	Avoiding	-0.585	10.18	0.000	0.585	0.34	103.67	0.000
2	Avoiding	-0.472	8.63	0.000	0.682	0.47	86.29	0.000
	Dependency	-0.369	6.76	0.000				
3	Avoiding	-0.363	6.24	0.000	0.72	0.51	68.63	0.000
	Dependency	-0.320	5.96	0.000				
	Perceptual	-0.239	4.27	0.000				
4	Avoiding	-0.243	3.92	0.000	0.74	0.55	61.11	0.000
	Dependency	-0.302	5.86	0.000				
	Perceptual	-0.278	4.93	0.000				
	Intellectual	-0.239	4.34	0.000				

Bum out step by step regression was performed (table 2), which the results shows that in step6, decision-making styles of intellectual, dependency, sudden and avoiding are able to explain 38% of athletes burnout changes, Regarding to coefficients β and significance levels t, it can be said that decision-making styles of intellectual, dependency sudden and avoiding have a direct and negative effect on athletes burnout.

In considering the relation between coach's decision-making style and athlete's satisfaction, the results of table 3 determine that there is a positive and significant correlation between the variants, so that a positive and significant relation (r=0/613) is observed between athlete's decision-making and satisfaction styles. In table 4 the results imply that decision-making avoiding, dependency, perceptual and intellectual styles are able to explain 55% of athlete's satisfaction changes and coefficients β significance levels t determine that decision-making

avoiding, dependency, perceptual and intellectual styles, have a direct and positive effect an athlete's satisfaction.

4. Discussions

The research findings indicate that there is significant and reverse relation from the statistical view between subscales of physical-emotional exhaustion, devaluation and accomplishment reduction in athletes burnout to intellectual, perceptual, sudden, avoiding and dependency decision-making styles, the findings imply that with increasing every of coaches' decision making styles, the rate of sub-scales and burnout scale are reduced, so there is a significant relation between coaches decision-making styles and athletes burnout.

In order to identify the role of very decisionmaking styles on athletes burnout, the results of stepby-step regression indicated that intellectual, dependency, sudden and avoiding decision making styles have negative and direct effect on athletes burnout, so it can be said that in addition to all decision making styles in the Scat; Bruce model which has negative and significant relation to athletes burnout, intellectual, dependency, sudden; avoiding styles have the most role (38%) on athletes burnout reduction. So, in considering the research proceeding. there is no study that would consider to the role of Scat; Bruce model on athletes burnout, but regarding to the studies which have engaged to evaluate coaches behavior and it's role an athlete's burnout, it can be said that the finding of the present research had not been far-expect and from the aspect, it is in direction of Altahayneh (2003), Mohammadzade (2010) and Inderjitgoman (2010).

The research's findings indicated that there is direct and significant relation from statistical view between satisfaction of practice, sub-scales and training, agreed with personal accomplishment, agreed with group accomplishment, agreed with athletes' personal behavior with intellectual, perceptual, sudden, avoiding and dependency decision making styles and the scale of decision-making styles, the findings imply that with increase of every decision-making styles of coaches, the rate of sub-scales and scale of athletes satisfaction is increased, and with its reduction, decision-making styles deal with reduction.

So, there is a significant relation between coaches' decision-making styles and athlete's satisfaction. In order to identify the role of every decision-making styles on athletes satisfaction, the results of step-by-step regression indicated that avoiding, dependency, perceptual and intellectual decision-making styles has direct and positive effect on athletes satisfaction, so it can be said that in

addition to all decision waking styles in the Scat & Bruce model that has positive and significant relation to athletes satisfaction, avoiding, dependency, perceptual and intellectual styles have the most role (75 percent) on athletes satisfaction.

So the result have not been unlikely, so the research finding is in direction with other researches include Ghodratabadi (2005), mohamadzade (2000), Challudurai (1984), and Shaizman (1987), Challudurai; others (1988), feletz; Chase (1996), Altahayneh (2003), in the researches, high roles of coaches behaviors on athletes satisfaction have been confirmed.

5. Conclusion

The finding refers to the important role of coaches' decision-making styles on athlete's satisfaction and it can be said that the types of decision-making styles include avoiding, dependency, perceptual and intellectual decision-making styles from Scat; Bruce model refer to player satisfaction and as was determined, the effect can predict athlete's satisfaction positively and directly. In theoretical researches and views, it is determined that coaches behaviors and their leading styles, are strong predictor of athletes satisfaction.

Corresponding Author:

Vali Nowzari

Department of Sport Management Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University Tehran, Iran

E-mail: V Nowzari@yahoo.com

References

Altahayneh, Z.L., 2003: The effects of coach's behaviors and burnout on the satisfaction and burnout of athletes. Florida University, Department of sport management.

Bagheri, G., 2004: The relation between leadership styles of football coaches to the rate of player burnout & commitment & pattern offering. Unpublished doctoral dissertation of physical education management & planning, The University of Teacher-training of Iran, Physical education Collogue.

Baiocco, R., L.Fiorenzo and L. Alessio., 2009: Decision Making Style among adolescents: Relationship with sensation seeking and locus of control. *Journal of Adolescence*, **32** (3): 963-967.

Challace J., M., 1990: The relationship of athlete self-perceptions and athlete perceptions of leader behaviors to athlete satisfaction, University of Virginia, available on: http://www.proquest.umi.com.

- Chelladurai, P., 1984: Discrepancy between preferences and perceptions of leadership behavior and satisfaction of athletes in varying sports. *Journal of sport psychology*, **6** (12): 27-41.
- Chelladurai, P., and M. Arnott., 1985: Decision styles in coaching: Preferences of basketball players. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, **56**:15-24
- Chelladurai, P.H., Y. Imamura., Y. Yamaguchi., T. Oinuma., and Miyauchi, 1988: Sport leadership in a cross-national setting: The case of Japanese and Canadian University athletes. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, **10** (3): 374-389.
- Chelladurai, P., and H. Riemer., 1997: A classification of facets of athletic satisfaction. *Journal of Sport Management*, **11** (4) 133-159.
- Collins, K.C., 2002: An examination of factors influencing entrapment and burnout among collegiate female field hockey and lacrosse coaches. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina, Greensboro.
- Feltz, D.L., M.A. Chase., C.N. Hodge., S.G. Simensky., and J. Shi., 1996: Preliminary test of the model of coaching efficacy: Sources and outcomes. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, **1**(44)"18-28.
- Feu, S., S.J. Ibanez., M. Gozalo., and A. Lorenzo., 2010: Decision and Planning Style of Spanish Handball Coaches. *The Open Sports Sciences Journal*, 3 (11): 111-117.
- Harris, B.S., 2005: Coach and athlete burnout: The role of coach's decision-making style. West Virginia University School of Physical Education.
- Koontz, H., and H. Weirich., 1998: Management. 9th, ed, MCGraw Hill: 135.
- Maday, K.M., 2000: Goal orientation and level of satisfaction in runners. Unpublished master's thesis, Springfield College, MA.
- Martnz, R., 2006: Athletic Psychology of Coaches Guidance, Khabiri, M. Book morning publication.
- Mohamadzade, Y., 2000: Considering the relation between burnout & leadership behavior in coaches to burnout & work satisfaction of handball, basketball & volleyball teams athletes of preferred league & class one unpublished doctoral dissertation, Islamic Azad University Sciences & Researches Branches.
- Moradi, M., 2004: Considering the relation between Coaches' leadership styles to player's group consolidation in basketball teams of country club's

- preferred league, unpublished master dissertation, university of teacher training of Tehran.
- Maslach, C., and S.E. Jackson., 1986: Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Parker, A.M., W.B. Brunic., and B. Fichhoff., 2007: Maximizes versus Satisfiers: Decision Making Styles Competence and Outcomes. *Judgment and Decision Making*, **2** (6): 342-344.
- Price, J.L., and M.R. Weiss., 2000: The influence of leader behaviors, coach attributes and institutional variables on performance and satisfaction of collegiate basketball teams. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, **8** (3): 332-346.
- Ramezaninejad, R., M. Hosseini Keshtan., N. Benar., and F. Mohades., 2010: The relation of coaching Styles to group Consolidation & Volleyball teams Success of Islamic Azad Universities' Educators. *Journal of Athletic Management*, **6**: 29-46.
- Schliesman, E.S., 1987: Relationship between the congruence of preferred and actual leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction with leadership. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, **5** (10): 157-166.
- Scott, S.G., and R.A. Bruce., 1995: Decision-making style: the development and assessment of a new measure. *Educational and Psychological Measures*, **55** (5), 818-831.
- Smith, R.E., 1986: Toward a cognitive-affective model of athletic burnout. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, **8** (4): 36-50.
- Smith, A.L., and T.R. Raedeke., 2001: Development and preliminary validation of an athlete burnout measure. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, **23**: 281-306.
- Sriboon, N., 2001: Coach leadership behaviors, team cohesion, and athlete satisfaction, in relation to the performance of athletes in the 1999 Rajabhat Games. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, Tallahassee.
- Udry, E., D. Gould., D. Bridges., and S. Tuffey., 1997: People helping people? Examining the social ties of athletes coping with burnout and injury stress. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, **19** (3): 68-95.
- Vealey, R.S., L. Armstrong., W. Comar, and C. Greenleaf., 1998: Influence of perceived coaching behaviors on burnout and competitive anxiety in female college athletes. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 10 (16): 297-318.

11/15/2012