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ABSTRACT

The present research examined the relationship between coaches’ leadership behaviors and levels of burnout experienced by college athletes in Jordan. A sample of 162 male and female college athletes completed a modified version of the Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980), and the Athlete Burnout Questionnaire (ABQ; Raedeke & Smith, 2001). Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, and stepwise regression. The results of this study revealed that there was a significant relationship between coaches’ leadership behaviors and athlete burnout. Athletes who perceived their coaches as providing more training and instruction and exhibiting more democratic behavior and less autocratic behavior were less burned out.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Few psychological concepts during recent years have generated as much discussion and interest, as has burnout. Farber and Heifetz (1982) described burnout as the “catch phrase” of the 1980s whereas Maslach (1983) labeled it as “the disease of modern life.” This popular psychological phenomenon was defined as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, de-personalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who work with people in some capacity” (Maslach, Jackson, & Leiter, 1996, p. 4).

In the athletic community, burnout is a catchphrase that has raised considerable concern among coaches, athletes, and sport psychologists (Raedeke, 1997; Raedeke, Lunney, & Venables, 2002). Most athletes, coaches, and sport psychologists have used the term “burnout” and most have probably also experienced burnout at some point of their lives (Vealey, Armstrong, Comar, & Greenleaf, 1998).

Burnout among athletes has been grounded in Maslach and Jackson’s (1981, 1986) seminal work. They studied the phenomenon in human service workers and characterized it into three different sub structures: sustained feelings of emotional exhaustion, de-personalization (negative attitudes and feelings toward the recipients of the service), and inadequate personal accomplishment (Cresswell & Eklund, 2006). The most widely regarded conceptualization of athlete burnout was forwarded by Raedeke (1997). Based on Maslach and Jackson’s (1981, 1986) conceptualization Raedeke characterized athlete burnout by an enduring experience of emotional and physical exhaustion, sport devaluation, and reduced sense of accomplishment. Emotional/physical exhaustion refers to feelings associated with being emotionally and physically exhausted by the demands of training and competition (Raedeke, 1997; Raedeke & Smith, 2001). Sport devaluation refers to a loss of interest, a “don’t care” attitude, or resentment toward performance and the sport (Raedeke, 1997; Raedeke & Smith, 2001). Finally, a reduced sense of accomplishment in athletes is related to skills and abilities. It has been characterized by unmet expectations and inability to reach personal goals (Gould, Tuffey, Udry & Loehr, 1998; Raedeke & Smith, 2001).

Burnout is of great interest to sport researchers because it involves the psychological, emotional, and physical withdrawal from activities previously enjoyed and pursued vigorously by athletes, coaches, and officials (Smith, 1986).

Research in the exercise and sport sciences has identified difficulties with coaches and problems with leadership and supervisory support as sources of stress and burnout for athletes (e.g., Altahayneh, 2003; Harris, 2005; Price & Weiss, 2000; Sunar, Omar-Fauzee, & Yusof, 2009; Udry, Gould, Bridges, & Tuffey, 1997; Vealey et al., 1998; Zardoshtian, Hossini, & Mohammadzade, 2012).

In an early sport study, Vealey et al. (1998) examined the effects of perceived coaching behaviors on athlete burnout. Results indicated that athletes who scored higher on a burnout inventory also perceived their coach’s leadership style to be more autocratic in nature. Other research has demonstrated similar trends. Ryan and Deci (2000) and Harris (2005) have suggested that an appropriate leadership style prevents athletes’ burnout.
Price and Weiss (2000) and Altahayneh (2003) found that athletes reported higher levels of burnout in response to perceived coaching behaviors that were autocratic in nature. A democratic style was associated with less burnout in these athletes. More recently, Zardoshtian and her colleagues (2012), and Sunar et al., (2009) found that leadership styles of coaches were significantly related to burnout of the players. Those who perceived their coaches as providing more social support, more training and instruction and exhibiting more democratic behavior and less autocratic behavior were less burned out.

Although the associations between coaches leadership behaviors and athlete psychological outcomes are well established in Western literature, a very few studies have been conducted to assess how various coach characteristics and behaviors relate to athletes’ burnout in the Arab world and Jordan is being no exception.

It should be noted that cross-cultural research has begun to demonstrate that while the concept of athletes’ burnout is important and valued across cultures, the interpretation and effect may not be. Cross cultural studies are very important for development of burnout theory as some researchers argue that research on athletes’ burnout must go beyond the Euro-American cultural boundaries if the aim is to develop more universal theory in athletes’ burnout. The present study attempts to address this gap in research and aims to investigate the relationship between coaches’ leadership behaviors and athletes’ burnout the Hashemite University in Jordan. This type of investigation would allow researchers to understand more fully the athlete burnout phenomenon and could eventually lead to more effective burnout prevention and treatment interventions.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Participants

Participants in this study were 162 college athletes (93 males, 69 females). They ranged in age from 18-24 years ($M = 20.5, SD = 1.43$), had played an average of 2.4 years of varsity sports ($SD = 1.08$), and reported that they spent about 11 hours per week in participating in sport ($M = 11.12, SD = 6.23$). Many of the athletes had been involved in organized sports for about 6 years ($M = 6.61, SD = 2.88$). Additional demographic information indicated that 19.8% of the athletes were freshmen, 25.9% were sophomore, 28.4% of them were juniors, and 25.9% were seniors.

2.2. Instruments

2.2.1. Leadership Scale for Sports

A modified version of the Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980) was used to assess athletes’ perceptions of their coaches’ behaviors. The items are measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale with a response options that range from 1 “never” to 5 “always”. The 43 items of the LSS are grouped into five dimensions: training and instruction (13 items), democratic behavior (9 items), autocratic behavior (8 items), Social support (8 items), and positive feedback (5 items).

Validity and reliability for the LSS dimensions have been demonstrated through different studies (e.g., Chelladurai, 1996; Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980; Price & Weiss, 2000). Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) reported internal consistency estimates (Cronbach’s alpha) for the perceived form of LSS of .93,.87,.79,.86,.92 for training and instruction, democratic behavior, autocratic behavior, social support, and positive feedback, respectively. In addition, the test-retest reliability was adequate and ranged from .71 (Social Support) to .82 (Democratic Behavior) (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980).

2.2.2. Athlete Burnout Questionnaire (ABQ)

The Athlete Burnout Questionnaire (Raedeke & Smith, 2001) is a 15-item multidimensional questionnaire that measures three components of burnout in athletes, emotional/physical exhaustion (E), reduced sense of accomplishment (RA), and devaluation (D). Each subscale consists of 5 items measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from “almost never” to “almost always.”

Raedeke and Smith (2001) demonstrated reliability for each subscale with test-retest. Good test-retest reliability values emerged for all three subscales: emotional/physical exhaustion ($r = .92$), reduced sense of accomplishment ($r = .86$), and devaluation ($r = .92$).

2.3. Translation of Surveys

The LSS and the ABQ were translated from English into Arabic language after getting the required permissions from the original authors. A standard three-step protocol reported by Blaschko and Burlingame (2002) was used when translating the questionnaires. First, the instruments were translated from English into Arabic language by a professional scholar who is fluent in both English and Arabic languages. Second, the instruments were translated back from Arabic into English language by a second scholar who is also competent in both English and Arabic languages. In the final step, a third professional scholar, fluent in both English and Arabic languages compared and evaluated the original English and the translated-back copies in order to verify the accuracy and validity of translation.

2.4. Pilot Test

The Arabic version of the surveys was pilot tested with a group of 30 college athletes to collect feedback about instrument content and usage. This feedback did not lead to any fundamental changes.
2.5. Procedures
Surveys were distributed to the sample athletes by either their coaches or by the researcher. Participants answered their surveys anonymously. In those instances when the respondents enclosed a return address label to receive feedback, the completed survey forms and address labels were immediately separated, so that the confidentiality of their responses could be secured. Of the initial 180 questionnaires distributed, and with a follow-up letter and/or phone call, 165 surveys were returned. From the total returned, 3 were omitted from all analyses because of missing or unusable data. The final usable return rate was 90% \((N = 162)\).

2.6. Data Analysis
Statistical analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package of Social Sciences (SPSS). Data were analyzed descriptively to determine the basic characteristics of the participants. Correlation coefficients and linear regression analysis were also utilized to investigate the effects of coaches’ leadership behaviors on athletes’ burnout. Additionally, the internal consistency of the instruments used in this study was determined by calculating Cronbach alpha coefficients.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Descriptive Statistics and Scale Reliabilities
Internal consistency measures of reliability were computed for the questionnaires used in the study by calculating Cronbach’s alpha coefficients (See Table 1). As shown in Table 1, all coefficients met the.70 criterion alpha level advocated by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994). Also, means, standard deviations, skewness, and kurtosis for the five styles of leadership and the three factors of athlete burnout are provided in Table 2. As shown in the table, the kurtosis and skewness values for all of the variables were different from zero, indicating that none of the distributions was perfectly normal. However, further examination showed that all of the values were within ±1 from zero, indicating no substantial departure from normality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSS (Athletes’ Perceptions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Instructions</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Sense of Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devaluation</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional/Physical Exhaustion</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficients for Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional/Physical Exhaustion</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Devaluation</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Sense of Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Instruction</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Summary of Athlete Responses

3.2. Are Coaches’ Leadership Behaviors Related to Athletes’ Burnout?
To examine the relationship between coaches’ leadership behaviors and athletes’ burnout, Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficients (PPMC) were computed. The results presented in Table 3 show that significant, negative, and moderate to moderately high correlations were found between all athlete burnout variables and coaches’ leadership behavior of training and instruction, democratic behavior, social support, and positive feedback \((r’s = -.42 \text{ to } - .72)\). The correlations between autocratic behavior and the three variables of athlete burnout ranged from .41 to .47. These correlations were moderate, positive, and significant.
Scales were significantly correlated with athlete burnout scales; autocratic behavior was

determined as the most significant predictor of athletes’ burnout, and accounting for a range of 36% to 51% of the variance in athletes’ levels of devaluation and physical/emotional exhaustion. The two-variable prediction model was statistically significant and accounted for 43% of the variance in athletes’ physical/emotional exhaustion. With regard to athletes’ reduced sense of accomplishment, training and instruction behavior was the only significant predictor and accounted for 51% of the variance (see Table 4).

To expand upon the correlational findings and the significant relationships observed between coaches’ behaviors and athletes’ levels of burnout, athletes’ burnout variables (i.e., devaluation, reduced sense of accomplishment, and physical/emotional exhaustion) were used as dependent variables separately in three linear regression analyses. The perceived leadership behaviors of training and instruction, democratic behavior, autocratic behavior, social support, and positive feedback were used as predictor variables.

The results of stepwise regression analyses presented in Table 4 indicated that training and instruction behavior was the most significant predictor of athletes’ burnout, and accounting for a range of 36% to 51% of the variance in these factors. Coaches’ autocratic behavior was also found to predict significant amounts of variance in some athlete burnout variables. Specifically, training and instruction behavior and coach autocratic behavior were significant predictors of athlete devaluation and physical/emotional exhaustion. The two-variable prediction model was statistically significant and accounted for 43% of the variance in athletes’ levels of devaluation and for 39% of the variance in athletes’ physical/emotional exhaustion. With regard to athletes’ reduced sense of accomplishment, training and instruction behavior was the only significant predictor and accounted for 51% of the variance (see Table 4).

The results pertaining to the relationship between perceived coaches’ behaviors and athletes’ burnout revealed that all LSS scales were significantly correlated with athlete burnout scales; autocratic behavior was positively correlated while the other four scales (training and instruction, democratic behavior, social support, and positive feedback) were negatively correlated with all athlete burnout scales (devaluation, reduced sense of accomplishment, and emotional/physical exhaustion). Athletes who scored higher on the burnout dimensions of devaluation, reduced sense of accomplishment, and emotional/physical exhaustion perceived their coaches as making more autocratic and fewer democratic decisions, providing less training and instruction, less social support, and less feedback.

The regression analyses demonstrated unique contributions of coaching behaviors to the variance explained in athletes’ burnout. Specifically, the perceived coaching behavior of training and instruction was found to be the most important contributor to athlete burnout. It accounted for 51% of the variance in athlete reduced sense of accomplishment, 40% of the variance of devaluation, and 36% of the variance in emotional/physical exhaustion. Training and instruction is a coaching behavior aimed at improving the athletes’ performance by emphasizing and facilitating hard and strenuous training, instructing them in the skills, techniques, and tactics of the sport, and structuring and coordinating the members’ activities (Chelladurai, 1996). It seems that having a coach who provided more training and instruction could possibly decrease athletes’ levels of burnout. Price and Weiss (2000) stated that “athletes liked playing, felt more proficient, and felt less burned-out when their coaches allowed them to determine their own goals, participate in team decisions, and provide input into training sessions” (p. 404).

Perceived autocratic behavior, which refers to coaching behavior that involves independent decision-making and stresses personal behavior authority (Chelladurai, 1996), was also found to be a significant contributor to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DEV</th>
<th>RSA</th>
<th>EPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and Instruction</td>
<td>-.64**</td>
<td>-.72**</td>
<td>-.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Behavior</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td>-.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>-.54**</td>
<td>-.54**</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: DEV = Devaluation; RSA = Reduced Sense of Accomplishment; EPE = Emotional/Physical Exhaustion
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4. Linear Regression of Coach Behaviors as Predictors of Athletes’ Burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>ΔF</th>
<th>Overall F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Devaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Instruction</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-7.74**</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>108.57**</td>
<td>60.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>2.89**</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>8.35**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reduced Sense of Accomplishment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Instruction</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>-12.99**</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>168.78**</td>
<td>168.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional/Physical Exhaustion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Instruction</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>-7.07**</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>91.14**</td>
<td>50.62**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic Behavior</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>2.61**</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>6.79**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p <.01

4. DISCUSSION

The main purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between levels of burnout experienced by college athletes and their perceptions of the coaching behaviors of their coaches.

The results pertaining to the relationship between perceived coaches’ behaviors and athletes’ burnout revealed that all LSS scales were significantly correlated with athlete burnout scales; autocratic behavior was positively correlated while the other four scales (training and instruction, democratic behavior, social support, and positive feedback) were negatively correlated with all athlete burnout scales (devaluation, reduced sense of accomplishment, and emotional/physical exhaustion). Athletes who scored higher on the burnout dimensions of devaluation, reduced sense of accomplishment, and emotional/physical exhaustion perceived their coaches as making more autocratic and fewer democratic decisions, providing less training and instruction, less social support, and less feedback.

The regression analyses demonstrated unique contributions of coaching behaviors to the variance explained in athletes’ burnout. Specifically, the perceived coaching behavior of training and instruction was found to be the most important contributor to athlete burnout. It accounted for 51% of the variance in athlete reduced sense of accomplishment, 40% of the variance of devaluation, and 36% of the variance in emotional/physical exhaustion. Training and instruction is a coaching behavior aimed at improving the athletes’ performance by emphasizing and facilitating hard and strenuous training, instructing them in the skills, techniques, and tactics of the sport, and structuring and coordinating the members’ activities (Chelladurai, 1996). It seems that having a coach who provided more training and instruction could possibly decrease athletes’ levels of burnout. Price and Weiss (2000) stated that “athletes liked playing, felt more proficient, and felt less burned-out when their coaches allowed them to determine their own goals, participate in team decisions, and provide input into training sessions” (p. 404).

Perceived autocratic behavior, which refers to coaching behavior that involves independent decision-making and stresses personal behavior authority (Chelladurai, 1996), was also found to be a significant contributor to
athlete burnout, meaning that having a coach who controls all potentials of the athletes, makes decisions without asking for athletes' opinions, and monitors athletes' performance in order to detect mistakes could possibly help generate increased levels of burnout among athletes.

Autocratic behavior accounted for 3% of the variance explained in athlete devaluation and emotional/physical exhaustion. Although the contribution of the perceived autocratic behavior to the variance explained in athletes’ devaluation and emotional/physical exhaustion was small, this variable was of practical importance according to the criteria established by Tate (1998) that a standardized coefficient of .01 or greater may be of practical importance.

The link between perceived coaches’ behaviors and athletes’ burnout found in this study supports previous research that found strong relationships among coaches’ behaviors and athletes’ burnout (e.g., Altahayneh, 2003; Price & Weiss, 2000; Udry et al., 1997; Vealey et al., 1998). Udry et al. (1997) conducted in-depth retrospective interviews with athletes who experienced burnout or season-ending injuries. They found that positive influence from coaches (i.e., providing support, empathy, belief in athletes, instructions) was related to lower levels of burnout in junior-elite tennis players. In contrast, negative coach influence (i.e., pressure, unrealistic expectations, conflicting ideas, lack of confidence in athlete) was related to higher levels of athlete burnout. Price and Weiss (2000) found that coaches who were perceived as making fewer democratic and more autocratic decisions and giving less training and instruction, less social support, and less positive feedback were associated with athletes who reported higher levels of burnout and anxiety. Altahayneh (2003), Zardoshtian et al., (2012), and Sunar et al., (2009) found that athletes who perceived their coaches as providing more social support, more training and instruction and exhibiting more democratic behavior and less autocratic behavior were less burned out. Vealey et al. (1998) concluded that coaches with stronger feelings of personal accomplishment were perceived as having greater tendency to use praise, communicate effectively, and display empathy, and fewer tendencies to use dispraise and an autocratic coaching style. Additionally, coaches higher in emotional exhaustion gave less praise and more dispraise as well as made more autocratic decisions according to their athletes.

The link between perceived coaching behaviors and athlete burnout further expanded Chelladurai’s (1980, 1990) theoretical model, which only specifies outcomes of athlete satisfaction and performance. The results of this study showed that coaching behaviors are associated with feelings of athletes’ burnout, which is an important contributor to an athlete’s continued participation in sport. These results also support Horn’s (1992) argument that coaching behaviors within Chelladurai’s model should have an effect on athlete outcomes other than just performance and satisfaction. Understanding how coaching behaviors influence the psychological well-being of athletes will enable coaches and educators to perform and conduct themselves in a manner that maximizes athletes’ sporting experiences (Price & Weiss, 2000). Overall, the findings from this study appear to support a relationship between perceived coaching behaviors and athletes’ burnout. The results indicate that the coach plays an important role in influencing the levels of burnout felt by their athletes. A greater understanding of the mechanisms that influence burnout and satisfaction in athletes could facilitate the development of more effective coaching methods. In addition, recognizing the influence and importance of coaches in the lives of their athletes could help create strategies and interventions that may decrease negative outcomes such as stress, dropout, and burnout while increasing positive outcomes such as enjoyment and satisfaction.

5. IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this study suggest that coaches should provide more training and instruction, feedback, and social support for their athletes, and allow athletes’ to participate in the formulation of team goals, practice methods, and game strategies in order to increase the levels of satisfaction and decrease the levels of burnout among athletes. Moreover, a greater understanding of the mechanisms that influence burnout and satisfaction in athletes could help develop more effective coaching methods (Raedeke & Smith, 2001). The results of this study indicate that the coach plays an important role in influencing the athlete psychological responses. By recognizing the effects of the coach in athlete burnout, strategies and interventions can be created which may decrease negative outcomes such as stress, anxiety, and burnout while increasing positive outcomes such as satisfaction and enjoyment. Finally, recognizing the symptoms of burnout and understanding its process will enable the coaches and the athletes to effectively adapt for the changing environment. Hence, programs that help detect burnout while still in the early stages need to be introduced.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Based on the literature review and the findings of this study, the following recommendations are presented:

a) Longitudinal studies should be conducted to determine the onset of burnout overtime and to see if the behaviors change as the burnout changes.

b) Qualitative studies should also be implemented. Interviews with coaches, athletes, and managers may yield a more in-depth understanding of the burnout phenomenon.

c) Future research should study former coaches. These coaches may be the ones who were truly burned out. Their reasons for leaving the profession may be very different from those currently employed in coaching positions.

d) Future research should attempt to examine the relationship between coaches’ leadership behaviors and athlete psychological outcomes in different sports. Each of these sports may have unique characteristics that could affect the leader-athlete relationship.

e) Future research should examine the situational and personal demands of both individual and team sports to determine how the demands of particular sports contribute to athlete burnout.
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