Coaches and Athletes' Assessment of Leadership Behaviors in High School Female Volleyball Players

Dale G. Pease
Deborah J. Rhea
James J. Zhang

Leadership has been identified as an important component in achieving organizational success. In the sport literature, the focus when studying leadership has been primarily on the roles and behaviors of the formal leader, i.e., the coach (e.g., Balaguer, Crespo, & Duda, 1996; Chelladurai, 1984, 1990; Chelladurai & Carron, 1977; Smith, Smoll, & Hunt, 1977; Smoll & Smith, 1989; Trail, 2004). There is limited research addressing player leadership behavior, and even less research that attempts to identify personal characteristics associated with player leadership behavior and roles (Horn, 1992). This is especially true when studying the emergence of leadership within a team and/or the distribution of leadership roles that do not carry a designated title (e.g., captain) that are considered "informal". While many questions can be asked concerning the emergence and distribution of both formal and informal player leadership roles and behaviors, it was the purpose of this study to investigate the role of one's achievement motivation in exhibiting selected task and social leadership behaviors within the sport team structure. Specifically, the purpose of this study was to examine the functionality of a player's motivational goal orientation, perceived competence, and affiliation to the exhibited players' behavior identified as task and social behaviors associated with leadership of high school female varsity volleyball players.

Player Leadership Research

In the leadership research literature there are numerous theories offering different leadership definitions and conceptual approaches. Trait-center approaches have emphasized personality traits as being important in particular leadership styles, behaviors, and situations. Traits associated with sensitivity to the needs of the group as related to the situation, and with people who have a more varied repertoire of responses, have been found to be reflected in successful leaders (Kenny & Zaccaro, 1983). A meta-analysis by Lord, DeVader, and Alligar (1986) found that perceived leadership accounted for by traits could be as high as 59%. Follow-

ing a somewhat different line of thinking in the study of leadership, training-center, transactional, and contingency approaches have been used, all of which typically emphasize the importance of knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs). The KSAs include structuring and organizing, communicating effectively, developing abilities of others, etc. In summary, of great importance seems to be the individual's ability to provide appropriate structure and social behaviors to meet group needs as dictated by the situation.

Early sport studies investigating player leadership roles and behaviors focused on player position and visibility within the structure of the game. For example, player leadership roles as viewed by Centrality Theory were based on the spatial location (i.e., position) of the athlete that provided greater opportunity for player interaction (e.g., Grusky, 1963; Loy & Sage, 1970). Chelladurai and Carron (1977) based their leadership study on propinquity and task dependence. Here the leadership role was due to observability and visibility of an athlete by teammates, and the importance of the interaction to success of the task. Based on the above research, Cox (1994)) concludes "...we can predict that leadership opportunities in football, baseball, and volleyball would fall primarily to quarterbacks, point guards, and setters, respectively." (p. 345).

In examining other potential variables influencing player leadership, Yukelson, Weinberg, Richardson, and Jackson (1983) report player leader status being associated with player skill level, being upperclassmen, and locus of control. Studying high school girl soccer teams, Glenn and Horn (1993) report sport competence, global self-esteem, perceptions of control, and psychological androgyny as predicting factors of leadership when assessed by peers. Coaches were reported using skill level as the primary predictor of leadership; thus it appears from this research that coaches and players may use different criteria in the selection of player leaders. This incongruence between player and coach assessments received further support in research by Engelman and Pease (1991) studying youth soccer teams, and by Kozub and Pease (1991) with varsity boys and girls basketball teams. Pease and Kozub (1991) report that with boy basketball teams, the team captains were often selected because of seniority or personal popularity, and sometimes viewed as not having a major leadership influence by teammates.

Further review examining such psychological factors as locus of control and self-esteem (Yukelson et al., 1983; Glenn & Horn, 1993) found emerging leadership or informal leadership behaviors to be associated with the more general concept of achievement motivation (Helmreich, Spence, Beane, Lucker, & Mathews, 1980). Achievement motivation is a multidimensional concept that includes factors such as skill mastery, a strong work ethic and competitiveness components, all of which have been related to leadership development. Helmreich's et al. research found skill mastery and work ethic were positive factors in leadership development. Competi-

tiveness, when focused at other members of the group, was negatively associated with leadership development. Sorrentino and Field (1986) report that while high achievement motivation by itself may be detrimental to leadership emergence, it may become a positive factor when combined with a high level of affiliation motivation. They suggest that only when a person is concerned about friendship relations (i.e., social relations) with group members do they have an opportunity to emerge as a strong leader. This would seem to suggest that a high need-achievement person must direct the competitiveness component away from their teammates, and work to establish positive personal relationships with team members if a player designated leadership role is desired.

Achievement Motivation

Recent achievement motivation research has focus on goal perspectives as proposed by Nicholls (1989), and as related to the physical activity and sport setting by Duda and associates (e.g., 1989, 1992, 1996). While the initial work of Nicholls and others was focused on academic educational settings, Duda (e.g., 1992, 1996) has consistently presented research evidence that task and ego orientations are important factors in understanding sport participant behavior. Ego oriented people are concerned with demonstrating normatively referenced high ability whereby they must surpass the others by demonstrating high ability. Task oriented people are focused on personal improvement, effortful involvement and increased insight. Task-oriented athletes have been found to endorsed prosocial purposes of sport, while ego-oriented athletes endorsed achieving status through sport (Roberts, Hall, Jackson, Kimiecik, & Tonymon, 1995). These different orientations raise questions concerning why and how one would seek a team leadership role, and how they would be perceived, and accepted by others due to one's goal orientation. For example, would an athlete with a high ego orientation, and maybe low task orientation (i.e., always competing with others) be accepted as a leader by peers?

While there are numerous goal-oriented studies to draw from, the two that seemly had the most relevance to this leadership behavior study will be presented. Duda (1989) investigated the relation of goal orientations and the perceived purposes of sport among high school students. Athletes high in task orientation tended to believe that sport should increase the desire for personal mastery and enhance cooperative skills. Athletes high in ego orientation reported that sport should increase career mobility, increase one's popularity, and build a competitive spirit. Negative relations were found for task orientation athletes concerning the view that sport should enhance social status, with ego orientation athletes viewing sport as fostering good citizenship. Lochbaum and Roberts (1993) examined the relation of the two implicit goal orientations to achievement behaviors: beliefs concerning determinants of success, practice and

competition strategies, practice benefits, and enjoyment. Studying high school male and female athletes, task athletes focused on adoptive achievement strategies while ego-oriented athletes were more likely to have maladaptive strategies. For example, task oriented athletes tended to exert effort, persist, considered their own performance important, and work hard in practice. They did not endorse chance as an element of success and did not rely on normative ability in demonstrating success. Ego oriented athletes endorsed chance and social approval as causes of success, and practiced to demonstrate superior athletic ability. These athletes were reported to avoid the exertion of effort and persistence as achievement strategies, and to focus more on normative ability assessments alone, and external sources of success.

Duda and Hall (2001) more recently have linked goal orientation theory research findings to predictions of cognitive evaluation theory. A major tenant of cognitive evaluation theory is focused on perceptions of competence and self-determination. Deci and Ryan (1985) suggest sport provides for individual comparisons resulting in affecting perceived competence depending on functional significance. With these factors in mind, and how achievement goals may be related to domains other than motivation, Urdan and Maehr (1995) have suggested the need for research focusing on social goals. They suggest affiliation, other relationships, and seeking approval from others as being worthy of examination. Ryan and Deci (2000) have shown that the role of the social context affects the self-determination and perceived competence. Therefore, when examining formal and emerging leadership behaviors and roles, a multivariate approach should be taken that should include potentially modifying variables (e.g., affiliation).

Hypotheses

To focus on the behavior of the formal or appointed leader without including follower behavior is a simplification of reality, which does not facilitate understanding the role of leadership within the group structure (Meindl, Ehrlick, & Dukerich, 1985). Presented research suggests that players in the designated formal leadership roles may not be the most influential members on the team (Pease & Kozub, 1991). Informal leaders may emerge to meet player and task needs which follows the unstructured team theory presented by Terry (1993) where depending on the task at hand, or the situation, leadership is shifted from person to person. To assess the role of achievement motivation using a goals orientation approach, and its associated components, perceived competence and affiliation, a prediction model was tested to determine the role these predictor variables would play in exhibited player social and task behaviors associated with leadership. It was hypothesized that task orientation, affiliation, and perceived competence would be positive predictors of both task and social leadership behaviors while an ego orientation would be negatively associ-

ated with task and social behaviors. It was further hypothesized that the four predicting variables would have a stronger association with the task and social behaviors when assessed by the players as compared to player behavior assessments by the coaches.

Method

Participants

Female varsity volleyball players (N=153) from 13 large urban high school teams in Texas participated in this study. The age of the subjects ranged from 14 to 18 (M = 16.31; SD = 0.95) years. The population consisted of 8 (5%) freshman, 25 (17%) sophomores, 52 (34%) juniors, and 68 (45%) seniors. A majority of the players reported starting at least 50% of the games during the season. The ethnicity of the athletes included 73% Caucasians, 10% African Americans, 11% Hispanics, 3% Asians, and 3% others. Season won/loss records ranged from the most successful team with 32 wins and 2 losses (including State tournament play) to the least successful team with 18 wins and 12 losses. Permission from parents, coaches, school administrators, and the athletes for participation in the study was obtained prior to data collection as directed by the University Human Subjects Committee. Thirteen coaches, all female, evaluated their own players on task and social behaviors associated with leadership.

Instruments

Four instruments obtained from a search of the literature were adopted to assess the four predicting variables and two leadership variables: affiliation, perceived competence, ego and task goal orientation, and task and social behaviors associated with leadership. Additionally the players responded to a questionnaire relating to socio-demographic variables (e.g., age, grade, race, and games started). Of practical importance in the selection process of the instruments was the time required by the players to complete the survey as most coaches in the initial contact asked that the survey not take more than 30 minutes to complete.

Affiliation Scale (AS). The AS scale was developed by Klint and Weiss (1987) to measure athlete social connection behavior with team members. This social connection behavior was believed to be an important moderating variable based on the research of Sorrentino and Field (1986). The scale includes 7 items in Likert 5-scale format anchored by "not important" to "extremely important." Klint and Weiss reported the alpha coefficient for internal consistency was .85.

Intrinsic Motivation Scale (IMS). The IMS scale was developed by McAuley, Duncan, and Tammen (1989) to measure four aspects of athlete motivation: perceived competence, interest/enjoyment, effort, and tension. The scale has 16 items in Likert 7-scale anchored by "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Reported alpha coeffi-

cients for the subscales ranged from .68 to .84. For the purpose of this study only the perceived competence subscale with 4 items was utilized. According to McAuley et al. (1989), each of the IMS subscales may be used individually since the scale development procedures included a factor analysis with an orthogonal rotation.

Task and Ego Orientation in Sport Questionnaire (TEOSQ). The TEOSQ was developed by Duda (1989, 1992) to measure goal orientations of athletes labeled "task" and "ego". The scale includes 12 items in a Likert 5-scale format. The scale anchors are "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree". The average internal consistencies based on 56 studies were .79 and .82 for the task and ego orientation scales, respectively (Duda & Whitehead, 1998). Test-retest reliability was also found to be acceptable. For the data analysis, it was assumed the achievement goals were orthogonal (Duda & Whitehead, 1998; Roberts, Treasure, & Kavussanu, 1996). This was confirmed in the present study by the intercorrelation of $r = -.09$ between the two scales. (For more information on the TEOSQ, see Duda and Whitehead, 1998, pp. 21-48).

Athlete Leadership Scale (ALS). The leadership literature has consistently defined two general dimensions when studying leader behavior: task behaviors and social behaviors. Using Chelladurai and Saleh's (1980) LSS scale and Stogdill's (1962) LBDG scale as references, Kozub (1994) developed ALS that focused on task and social behaviors associated with leadership. A panel of five faculty members from the Departments of Psychology and Human Performance with expertise in leadership psychology reviewed the original instrument with 28 items for content validity. A factor analysis from a pilot study revealed two identifiable factors with each having 6 items without double loadings, which could be clearly identified as representing task behaviors and social behaviors. Examples of task behavior questions are "helps instruct other team members in volleyball skills and strategies" and " helps set goals for the team". Examples of social leadership behavior questions are "helps settle conflicts among the team members" and "is warm and friendly toward teammates". This instrument used a 5-point Likert scale response anchored by "almost never" to "almost always". Kozub (1994) reported the ALS internal consistencies to be .88 and .86 for task and social leadership behaviors respectively. (Also see Kozub and Pease, 2001).

To administer the ALS scale, a grid was developed for each team with the players' names placed along the top of the grid with the 12 scale items on the vertical axis with task and social items presented in random order. The names of players for each team were obtained from the coach prior to the administration of the instrument. Each player evaluated all players on their team including themselves. Coaches evaluated all players on her team.

Procedures

Approximately three weeks before the end of the regular season, 18 high school varsity girl volleyball coaches in three leagues were contacted requesting participation in the study. Thirteen of the coaches received permission from their school administration and agreed to participate. At the end of the official high school volleyball season, one of the investigators met with each coach and team at a team meeting to explain the project and to administer the questionnaire. A total of 153 questionnaires were completed and usable. Since the 13 teams involved had a membership of 12-15 girls per team, this represented a return of approximately 90%.

Procedures from the SPSS (1999) were utilized to conduct the statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics were calculated for the four predicting variables and two leadership variables for the players and for the two leadership variables representing the coaches' evaluations. For purposes of data analysis a player received six social and six task scores from each teammate and self that were summed and averaged. The self-score was used because in maintaining confidentially it was impossible to identify the responding player. Alpha reliability coefficients were calculated for the variables. According to Baumgartner and Jackson (1999), the reliability of a scale is sample specific and should be examined following each data collection. Zero-order correlations were examined among the predictor and leadership behavior variables. Canonical correlations were conducted to examine the relationship of affiliation, competence, ego motivation, and task motivation to leadership behaviors as perceived by the players and coaches. Based on Stevens (1996) a canonical variate equal or greater than .30 was used to define a function. A standardized coefficient equal to or greater than .30 was used as a criterion to examine variable redundancy.

For the data analysis of the TEOSQ, recent recommendations (Duda & Whitehead, 1998; Roberts et al., 1996) focusing on the importance of examining the interaction of ego and task (e.g., high ego/high task, high ego/low task, low ego/high task, or low ego/low task) were initially considered. Addressing the issue of interaction, Roberts et al. (1996) used an extreme groups design while Hodge and Petlichkoff (2000) recommended the use of cluster analysis. However, in the belief that the sample would be very homogeneous, a decision was made to not use an extreme groups analysis. Following the descriptive statistical analysis it became obvious we had a sample of high task oriented people (M = 27.23; SD = 2.91) who had a middle range of ego orientation (M = 17.54; SD = 5.43) with relatively small variance effects for both measures. Therefore the possibility of examining ego/task interaction effects on leadership behaviors was eliminated due to resulting small cell size (e.g., high ego/low task, low ego/low task) for an extreme groups design or a cluster analysis. Therefore, for this analysis, ego and task scores were separately

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for Affiliation, Competence, Goal Orientation and Leadership Variables (N=153)

Variable		*M*	SD	*Alpha*
Affiliation		28.88	3.09	.62
Competence		19.52	2.23	.62
Goal Orientation	Task	27.23	2.91	.83
	Ego	17.54	5.43	.88
Leadership (Athlete)	Task	21.48	3.07	.90
	Social	23.41	2.69	.89
Leadership (Coach)	Task	19.40	5.22	----
	Social	20.67	4.92	----

entered into the model since they were found in previous studies, and also in this study, to be orthogonal.

Results

Descriptive statistics for the socio-psychological variables are present in Table 1. All of the variables had alpha coefficients equal to or greater than .60 suggesting they had acceptable internal consistency according to Baumgartner and Jackson (1999). Zero order correlations among the variables are presented in Table 2. It appears that affiliation and perceived competence were significantly ($p < .05$) related to athlete task and social leadership behaviors as perceived by the players. Only perceived competence was found to be significantly ($p < .05$) related to athlete social leadership behaviors as evaluated by the coach.

Test of canonical correlations revealed that for the player perceptions of athlete leadership behaviors, two functions were formulated explaining a total of 12% of the variance by the four predicting variables (i.e., affiliation, perceived competence, ego motivation, and task motivation). However, only the first function was statistically significant ($p < .05$) accounting for 9% of the variance (Table 3). In examining the canonical variates and standardized coefficients, it was found that both social and task leadership roles were predictable although more so for the social leadership variable. Affiliation, perceived competence, ego motivation and task motivation were all found to be significant contributors to predict athlete leadership behavior, and the first two (i.e., affiliation and perceived competence) were the most important factors (Table 4).

Table 2
Zero-Order Intercorrelations for Affiliation, Competence, Goal Orientation and Leadership Variables

Variable		Affiliation	Competence	Motivation		Athlete Leadership		Coach Leadership	
				Ego	Task	Social	Task	Social	Task
Affiliation		1.000	.040	.144	.279**	.229**	.190*	.099	.065
Competence		.040	1.000	.173	–.034	.178*	.144	.187*	.143
Motivation	Ego	.144	.173*	1.000	–.080	.151	.013	–.083	–.111
	Task	.279**	–.034	–.080	1.000	.085	.142	.160	.121
Athlete Leadership	Social	.229*	.178*	.151	.085	1.000	.626**	.446**	.269**
	Task	.190*	.144	.013	.142	.626**	1.000	.434**	.617**
Coach -Social	Social	.099	.187*	–.083	.160	.446**	.434**	1.000	.657**
	Task	.065	.143	–.111	.121	.269**	.617**	.657**	1.000

* Significant at .05 level.
** Significant at .01 level.

Table 3
Canonical Correlations Examining the Relationship of Affiliation, Competence, Motivation to Leadership Behaviors of Athletes

Version	Root Number	Eigenvalue	Variance Explained	Cumulative %	Canonical R	R^2	Wilk's Lambda	F	Hypothesized df	Error df	p
Athlete	1	.103	79.810	79.810	.306	.094	.880	2.180	8.000	272.000	.029
	2	.026	20.190	100.000	.160	.026	.980	1.190	3.000	137.000	.314
Coach	1	.085	96.030	96.030	.280	078	.920	1.190	8.000	218.000	.306
	2	.004	3.960	100.000	.059	.003	.999	.013	3.000	110.000	.942

Table 4
Canonical Variate and Standardized Coefficients Predicting Leadership Behaviors as Perceived by Athletes

Variable		Canonical Variate		Standardized Coefficient	
		Function I	Function II	Function I	Function II
Criterion Variable—Leadership	Social	.984	−.176	.843	−.967
	Task	.754	.657	.226	.262
Predicting Variable	Affiliation	.770	.113	.658	.034
	Competence	.597	.057	.515	.226
	Ego Motivation	.425	−.810	.280	−.807
	Task Motivation	.338	.612	.200	.539

For the coach perceptions of athlete leadership behaviors, two functions were similarly formulated explaining a total of 8% variance by the four predicting variables. However, neither function was statistically significantly ($p > .05$), suggesting that the four predicting variables were not related to coach perceptions of athlete leadership behaviors (Table 4).

Discussion

This study was designed to examine the multivariate relation of perceived competence, affiliation, and achievement motivation, as viewed from a goals orientation perspective, to player leadership behaviors identified as task or social. Achievement motivation, being multidimensional in nature, includes competence and competitiveness as being related to leadership development (Helmreich et al., 1980). However, competitiveness has been shown to be detrimental to leadership emergence unless combined with a high level of affiliation with team members (Sorrentino & Field, 1986). Following a goals orientation an athlete high in ego orientation, and low in task orientation, would be focused on competing with and surpassing others, and therefore would seem to need a high level of affiliation with team members as a moderating influence to gain a player designated leadership role.

The findings of this study partially support the primary hypothesis that three of the predictor variables (task orientation, perceived competence and affiliation) would be positive predictors of both task and social leadership behaviors when using player evaluations. The prediction that ego orientation would be negatively associated with task and social behaviors was not supported. From the canonical analysis of the players' leadership assessments, the four predicting variables did significantly predict task and social leadership behaviors with social behaviors having a stronger relation than task. Of the predictor variables, affiliation and perceived competence had a stronger relation to the two leadership variables. The second hypothesis that the achievement motivation model would be more applicable for the players than the coaches was supported. The canonical analysis while providing a significant relationship for the players did not produce a significant function when using the coaches' social and task evaluations.

The group profile based on descriptive statistics showed mean scores for affiliation to be relatively high (28.88 out of a possible 35 points), competence was judged to be above average (19.52 out of a possible 28 points), task orientation was extremely high (27.23 out of possible 30) and ego much lower than task (17.54 from a possible 30 points). Most important to the development of the achievement orientation component of the model were the resulting means and standard deviations for ego and task as discussed in the Procedures section. The proposed interaction suggested for investigation (e.g., Duda & Whitehead, 1998; Hodge & Petlichkoff, 2000; Roberts et al., 1996) could not be completed

due to resulting cell size when employing an extreme groups design or using cluster analysis.

The zero order intercorrelations for the predictor variables and leadership variables produce some interesting relations. As expected from the player assessments, affiliation was found significantly associated with social leadership behavior and also with task leadership behaviors to a lesser extent. Perceived competence was significantly related to social leadership behaviors while the expected perceived competence relation with task leadership behavior was not found. The notion that players having higher levels of perceived competence would exhibit higher levels of task leadership behaviors in this competitive setting was not supported. Some explanation of this might be found when viewing the relation of the goal orientation predictor variables (ego/task). Ego goal orientation was significantly correlated with perceived competence while task goal orientation had a low negative correlation with perceived competence.

The second objective of the study was to observe the congruence between coach and athlete behavior assessments and the strength of the relationship of the predictor variables to coach assessments. While the model significantly predicted athlete assessed leadership behavior, it did not predict coach leadership assessment. This is somewhat consistent with previous research (Glen & Horn, 1993; Engelman & Pease, 1991; Kozub & Pease, 1991) suggesting different variables are being used in determining player leadership qualities by coaches and athletes. However, further review showed there was a significant athlete/coach relation in the evaluation of social and task behaviors of the athletes. It appears that coaches and players were observing similar task and social behaviors on the part of the athletes. In the previous studies coaches seem to place greater value on playing ability than did players in the evaluation and selection of athlete leaders (Glen & Horn, 1993; Engelman & Pease, 1991). Although players provided a perceived competence evaluation, no direct evaluation or other determinants of playing ability was done in this study. Future studies might include a stronger performance assessment to further identify potential differences in such assessments by players and coaches.

In examining the findings of this study, the nature of the leadership scale used was first reviewed. While the internal consistency for the social and task leadership behavior scales was very acceptable, the high correlation between the social and task scales for both the athletes and the coaches (e.g., $r = .62$ and .66 respectively) suggests a lack of subscale independence that had been previously reported by Kozub (1994). This could be explained as resulting from subject gender differences as Kozub studied male basketball teams all with male coaches where this study used female volleyball teams and female coaches. Differences in leadership roles and styles between male and female athletes and coaches have been reported in the sport literature (Carron &

Hausenblas, 1998). Also the studies involved two different sports although both would be classified as interacting in nature. It also may be that by the end of the season leadership roles had been clearly established resulting in the players who emerged as leaders having both strong social and task leadership behaviors. Using a more in-depth analysis of leadership behaviors, and data collection at different times during the season, in future studies might clarify this relationship.

Using the coaches' assessments of leadership behavior, the only significant correlation was between social leadership behavior and perceived competence. Of interest is that for the coaches' leadership evaluations, although not significant, both task and social behaviors were negatively correlated with ego orientation and positively correlated with task behaviors. This will be discussed later when considering gender socialization.

The lack of finding any significant relations between motivational goals orientation and leadership behaviors was unexpected. Interestingly, this subject pool was found to be highly task goal oriented with moderate levels of ego orientation. Based on previous studies which reported task oriented athletes to be more prosocial while ego athletes focused on achieving status through sport (Roberts et al., 1995), it was believed these athletes would show a high relation between task orientation and both leadership behaviors. This belief was based on work by Balaguer et al. (1996) where a task-involving climate was found to be related to greater perceived social support provided by the coach.

The stronger relation between ego goal orientation and athlete determined social leadership behaviors, although not significant, might provide some support for Kaplan and Maehr (as cited in Duda & Howard, 2001) who proposed that achievement goals may operate as social schemas providing a differential awareness of self. It is suggested that when an ego goal is endorsed, attention is focused on "who one is", "what one can be", and "what one can do." While this explanation for the findings in this study was originally dismissed since the group collectively showed a high task orientation, the following notion should receive consideration. The TEOSQ had a lead statement directing the athletes to specifically relate the following questions to their volleyball playing experience for skill development. It may be that leadership behaviors, and roles, are more independent of one's volleyball skill. In further review of this issue, Duda and Hall (2001) explained that ego orientation seems to correspond to the view that one's social status and sense of self-importance can occur through sport development. Therefore, the leadership component may be more closely tied to the social context of the experience, and especially since the sample for this study was female. This notion would also find support in the work of Ames (1992) where motivational climate and perceived environmental structure were suggested to make task and ego goals differentially salient. In this study,

social leadership roles were found to be more predictable by ego and task motivations than task leadership roles. Yet, because there are so few studies focused on athlete leadership and no previous studies have made gender comparisons on athlete leadership in a context similar to this study, it is unsure if *the finding can be attributed to the fact* that only females were involved in the study. Apparently, future studies in this regard are necessary.

Summary and Recommendations

To date, no studies were found investigating the interrelationships of motivational goal orientation, perceived competence and affiliation, to athlete leadership behaviors. The closest study may be one by Balaguer et al. (1996) that examined motivational climate and athletes' goal orientation to perceived/preferred leadership style of the coach and reported significant findings. Although only 12% of the variance was explained in the multivariate analysis, the present study does suggest that motivational goal orientation and associated variables of perceived competence and affiliation play a significant role in players perceptions of peer leadership social and task behaviors. It was also shown that this model was not as strong a predictor when using the coaches' assessment of player's social and task behaviors as the dependent variable. For coaches who are concerned with athlete leadership on their teams, it is important for them to understand the possible incongruence in the leadership selection process between them and their athletes. However, it is important to remember this study made no attempt to determine the leadership effectiveness of the evaluated behaviors from either the players' or coaches' perspective. It should be noted that all the teams involved were successful teams *based on won/loss records. Future research* needs to address more directly the role of motivational goal orientations in emerging leadership in relation to roles and behavioral styles and the resulting leadership effectiveness within a team and team outcomes (win/loss). Also it would be important to investigate the role of gender difference, nature and importance of the sport, success of coaches and sport programs, etc.

References

Ames, C. (1992). Achievement goals, motivational climate, and motivational processes. In G. Roberts (Ed.), *Motivation in sport and exercise* (pp. 161-176). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Balaguer, I., Crespo, M., & Duda, J.L. (1996). The relationship of motivational climate and athletes' goal orientations to perceived/preferred leadership style. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 18,* S13.

Baumgartner, T.A., & Jackson, A.S. (1999*). Measurement for evaluation in physical education and exercise science* (6th ed.). Dubuque, IA: W. C. Brown.

Carron, A.V., & Hausenblas, H.A. (1998). *Group dynamics in sport* (2nd ed.). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Chelladuria, P. (1984). Discrepancy between preferences and perceptions of leadership behavior and satisfaction of athletes in varying sports. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 6, 27-41.

Chelladuria, P. (1990). Leadership in sports: A review of relevant research. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 21,* 328-354.

Chelladuria, P., & Carron, A.V. (1977). A reanalysis of formal structure of sport. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 2,* 9-14.

Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1980). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: Development of a leadership scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 2,* 34-45.

Cox, R.H. (1994). *Sport psychology: Concepts and applications.* Madison, WI: W. C. Brown & Benchmark.

Deci , E., & Ryan, R. (1985*). Intrinsic motivation and the self-determination of human behavior.* New York: Plenum.

Duda, J.L. (1989). Relationship between task and ego orientation and the perceived purpose of sport among high school athletes. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 11,* 318-335.

Duda, J.L. (1992). Sport and exercise motivation: A goal perspective analysis. In G. Roberts (Ed.*), Motivation in sport and exercise* (pp. 57-91). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Duda, J.L. (1996). Maximizing motivation in sport and physical education among children and adolescents: The case for great task involvement. *Quest*, 48, 290-302.

Duda, J.L., & Whitehead, J. (1998). Measurement of goal perspectives in the physical domain. In J. L. Duda (Ed.*), Advances in sport and exercise psychology measurement* (pp. 21-48). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Duda, J.L., & Hall, H. (2001). Achievement goal theory in sport: Recent extensions and future directions. In R. N. Singer, H. A. Hausenblas, & C. M. Janelle (Eds.), *Handbook of Sport psychology* (2nd ed.) (pp. 417-443). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Engelman, M.E., & Pease, D.G. (1991, April). *Relationship of selected variables in the assessment of participant leadership qualities.* Paper presented at the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance Annual Convention, San Francisco.

Glenn, S.D, & Horn, T.S (1993). Psychological and personal predictors of leadership behavior in female soccer athletes. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 5*(1), 17-34.

Grusky, O. (1963). The effects of formal structure on managerial recruitment: A study of baseball organization. *Sociometry, 26,* 345-353.

Helmreich, R. M., Spence, J.T., Beane, W.E., Lucker, G. W., & Mathews, K.A. (1980). Making it in academic psychology: Demographic and personality correlates of attainment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39,* 896-908.

Hodge, K., & Petlichkoff, L. (2000). Goal profiles in sport motivation: A cluster analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 22,* 256-272.

Horn, T.S. (1992). *Advances in sport psychology*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Kenney, D.A. &. Zaccaro, S.J. (1983). An estimate of variance due to traits in leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68,* 678-685.

Klint, K.A., & Weiss, M. R. (1987). Perceived competence and motives for participating in youth sports: A test of Harter's competence motivation theory. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 9,* 55-65.

Kozub, S.A. (1994). *Exploring the relationships among coaching behavior, team cohesion, and player leadership*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, Houston, TX.

Kozub, S.A., & Pease, D.G. (1991, June). *The relationship among coaches' and players' perceptions of leadership*. Paper presented at the North American Society for the Psychology of Sport and Physical Activity Conference, Monterey, CA.

Kozub, S.A., & Pease, D.G. (2001). Coach and player leadership in high school basketball. *Journal of Sport Pedagogy, 7,* 1-15.

Lochbaum, M.R., & Roberts, G.C. (1993). Goal orientations and perceptions of the sport experience. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology,15,* 160-171.

Lord, R.G., Devader, C.L., & Alligar, G.M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 402-410.

Loy, J.W., & Sage, J.N. (1970). The effects of formal structure on organizational leadership: An investigation of interscholastic baseball teams. In G. S. Kenyon (Ed.), *Contemporary psychology of sport* (pp. 363-373). Chicago: The Athletic Institute.

Meindl, J.R., Ehrlick, S.B., & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 30,* 78-102.

McAuley, E., Duncan, T., & Tammen, V.V. (1989). Psychometric properties of the intrinsic motivation inventory in a competitive sport setting: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport,* 60, 48-58.

Nicholls, J.G. (1989). *The competitive ethos and democratic education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Pease, D.G., & Kozub, S.A. (1991, Oct.). *Leadership: Emerging and informal roles on sport teams*. Paper presented at the Association for the

Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology Annual Conference, Savannah, GA.

Roberts, G.C., Hall, H., Jackson, S., Kimiecik, J., & Tonymon, P. (1995). Implicit theories of achievement and the sport experience: The effect of goal orientations on achievement strategies and perspectives. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 81,* 219-224.

Roberts, G.C., Treasure, D.C., & Kavussanu, M. (1996). Orthogonality of achievement goals and its relationship to beliefs about success and satisfaction in sport. *The Sports Psychologist, 10,* 398-408.

Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55,* 68-78.

Smith, R.E., Smoll, F.L., & Hunt, E.B. (1977). A system for the behavioral assessment of athletic coaches. *Research Quarterly, 48,* 401-407.

Smoll, F.L., & Smith, R.E. (1989). Leadership behaviors in sport: A theoretical model and research paradigm. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19,* 1522-1551.

Sorrentino, R.M., & Field, N. (1986). Emergent leadership: The functional value of positive motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16,* 1091-1099.

SPSS. (1999). *SPSS 10.0: Guide to data analysis.* Upper Saddle River, NY: Prentice Hall.

Stevens, J. (1996). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stogdill, R.M. (1962). Intra-group—intergroup theory and research. In M. Sherif (Ed.), *Intergroup relations and leadership.* New York: Wiley.

Terry, R.W. (1993). *Authentic Leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Trail, G.T. (2004). Leadership, cohesion, and outcomes in scholastic sports. *International Journal of Sport Management. 5,* 111-132.

Urdan, T.C., & Maehr, M.L. (1995). Beyond a two-goal theory of motivation and achievement: A case for social goals. *Review of Education Research, 65, 213-243.*

Yukelson, D., Weinberg, R., Richardson, P., & Jackson, A. (1983). Interpersonal attraction and leadership within collegiate sport teams. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 6,* 28-36.

Dr. Pease teaches at the University of Houston; Dr. Rhea is a faculty member at Texas Christian University, and Dr. Zhang teaches at the University of Florida.