LEADERSHIP AND MOTIVATION: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Sisay Mengistu Alemu[1] and Syam Babu[2]

[1]Ph.D. Scholar, Andhra University, India
Email: livsis@gmail.com
[2]Professor, Andhra University, India

ABSTRACT

In any sport, Coaches means the overall leader of the team. The coach leadership style plays a key role in overall performance of the team. Many studies have shown that coaching leadership style affect both players motivation and effectiveness. Leadership and Motivation is at the heart of many of sport's most interesting problems, both as a developmental outcome of social environments such as competition, and as a developmental influence on behavioral variables such as persistence, learning, and performance (Duda, 1989; Vallerand, Deci, & Ryan, 1987). To have better understanding and achieving the objective of the team, the coach leadership styles and motivation should be critically examined. Therefore, in this review, the leadership theories, motivation and their relationship are reviewed.

Keywords: Leadership Theories, Motivation, Leadership Styles

INTRODUCTION

Leadership is defined as the use of non coercive and symbolic influence to direct and coordinate the activities of the members of an organized group toward the accomplishment of group objectives (Jago, 1982). Over time, leadership has been defined in terms of individual traits, leader behavior, interaction patterns, role relationships, follower perceptions, influence over followers, influence on task goals, and influence on organizational culture (Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). During the 20th century, researchers have utilized several approaches to studying leadership including the trait approach, behavioral approach, power and influence approach, and situational approach. Recent theories including transformational and charismatic leadership incorporate elements from prior approaches.

Leadership is an important component of overall effectiveness because it is seen as the force that energizes and directs group behavior. Legendary basketball coach John Wooden wrote, "A leader, particularly a teacher or coach, has a most powerful influence on those he or she leads, perhaps more than anyone outside of the family. Therefore, it is the obligation of that leader, teacher, or coach to treat such responsibility as a grave concern" (Wooden & Jamison, 1997, p. 111). Wooden's reverence for leadership reflects the impact leadership has on follower behavior. Given the centrality of leadership to the behavior of people in groups,

it is important to define the impact of leadership on attitudes such as motivation. Since leadership affects attitudes, and attitudes drive behavior, leadership can be viewed as a catalyst for behavior change among athletes.

The purpose of this paper is to review related literature of soccer coach's leadership styles and player's motivation. The coach's leadership styles have a great impact on player's motivation. Different studies, on the relationship between the coaches' leadership styles and player's motivation, showed that the coach's leadership styles have an impact on the motivation of players.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The main objective of this paper is to explore the type of coaching leadership theories that soccer coaches uses to make effective players motivation and to increase their active participation in soccer.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this paper empirical research has been organized under six sections: A/ leadership theories B/ multidimensional leadership model C/motivation in sport D/ Motivation and leadership.

Leadership Theories

Trait Theory

Over the past decades, diverse theories and approaches have been developed to try to explain and investigate leadership. One of the earliest developments in the field is the trait theory. Trait theorists stated that leaders have common physical features and the same personality characteristics. A person is born a leader. Barker (2001) refers to this theory the 'Great Person Theory' as demographics and characteristics of the leader differentiate him or her from a 'normal' person. In a study by House, Shane and Herold (1996) the most important characteristics of an outstanding leader are an everlasting drive for achievement, honesty, integrity and the willingness and ability to share and motivate employees towards common goals. When you have these characteristics you are more likely to lead than to follow.

Furthermore, these kinds of people believe in themselves and more importantly, they can easily adapt to continuously changing environments (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991). There is a lot of disagreement if traits are important and can actually define a leader. Clegg, Kornberger and Pitsis (2005) argue that characteristics trait theorists believe to be critical for successful leaders are actually made important through social norms and the dominant culture in Western society. When a detailed look at current leaders and CEOs is taken, most of them are white and male according to Clegg *et al.* (2005). Those two characteristics seem to be important. When you are female and black your chances of becoming a successful leader are less than when you are white and male, however this does not mean becoming it is impossible. Social norms and culture make it simply much harder.

Although the trait theory has been criticized over the past decades it has developed and moved the leadership theory landscape further. To correct the assumption by trait theorists that leaders are born with certain characteristics that make it possible for them to develop into a successful leader, theories have been developed which take a closer look at the actions taken by successful leader instead of their characteristics. Some of these theories see

leadership as situational and contingent on other factors (Clegg *et al.,* 2005). Other theories see leadership as a social construct, meaning that what a leader defines changes over time.

Behavioral Theory

The behavioral theory studies observable behavior of the leader, rather than looking at innate traits of leaders. What a leader does is thus the most important moderator of successful leadership. The most important concept in behavioral theories is that the leader has an orientation towards interaction and relating to other human beings and the task at hand (Clegg *et al.* 2005). The managerial grid is a behavioral model developed by Blake and Mouton (1964). This theory is, at the moment, the most recognized approach to study leadership developed by the behavioral school. The managerial grid, refined by Blake and Mouton (1985) makes the distinction between five leadership styles, based on their focus on production or people or a combination of those two extremes. The five styles are Country Club (high concern for people and low concern for production), Team Leader (both high concern for people and production), Middle-of-the-Road (intermediate concern for both people and production), Impoverished (low concern for both people and production) and Produce or Perish (Low concern for people but high concern for production).

The Contingency Theory

The contingency model refers to the theory that there are specific situations in which a leader‟s behavioral tendency fits better for leadership effectiveness than other behaviors (Fiedler, 1995). According to Fiedler, leaders consistently maintain their leadership behaviors (relationship-oriented or task-oriented) and rarely change them, whereas the previously explained situational leadership model assumes that leaders can modify their behaviors depending on situations. In other words, the contingency model recommends that leadership effectiveness can be achieved by correctly matching a specific leadership style with a certain situation. Fiedler basically argued that there are some situations that some leaders can exercise their leadership styles well, while others cannot. Fiedler (1995) specifically explained situational factors using the concept situational favorability. Fiedler explained that situational favorability is the extent to which the leader can exercise control over followers. It is determined by three elements: leader-member relations, task structure, and position power. If situational favorability is high in considering the combined level of these three elements, the situation is favorable to a leader. Fiedler emphasized that as it is very difficult for leaders to change their behaviors which are developed through lifetime experiences, leaders should be trained to recognize and change important situational factors in order to make them fit well with their leadership behaviors rather than changing leaders‟ behaviors.

The most desirable leader style would be the Team Leader style since this style scores very high on both axis (Blake and Mouton, 1964). However, several studies are in contradiction with this finding as they state that a leader cannot have both styles (e.g. Fiedler 1967, Burns 1978 and Bass 1985). Nonetheless, the managerial grid can still be useful to map different leader styles. Although the model has been criticized it is recognized that certain situations call for people oriented leaders while other situations need a task-oriented leader.

Another approach to see leadership is the theories and according models that see leadership as situational or contingent. Contingency theories differ significantly from behavioral

theories as their focus is on factors outside the leader instead of behavior shown by the leader in question.

The Path-Goal Theory

The path-goal theory basically attempts to explain how to induce followers" work effort through motivation and to achieve high levels of performance (Daft, 1999). Daft (1999) explained that a leader can motive followers "…by either (1) clarifying the follower's path to the rewards that are available or (2) increasing the rewards that the follower values and desires" (p. 102). In other words, the leader's behavior should be able to increase followers" expectancy, and with leader efforts, followers will be able to successfully complete the task and achieve valued rewards (House & Dressler, 1974). House (1971) identified four leadership behaviors: directive leadership, supportive leadership, participative leadership, and achievement-oriented leadership. The path-goal theory claimed that leaders can vary such leadership behaviors as the situational leadership model assumes, depending on the follower and the situation characteristics (House, 1971; House & Dressler, 1974). With regard to the follower factor, the path-goal theory explains that followers take the leader's behavior when the leader can satisfy them. Depending on followers" locus of control, experience, and their perceived abilities, a leader needs to vary leadership styles to satisfy them (House & Dressler, 1974). In addition, depending on situational factors such as the level of task structure, formal authority system, and norm of work group, an appropriate leadership style should be selected to motivate followers to put forth effort and eventually satisfy them (House & Dressler, 1974). Hughes (2008) explained the four types of leadership styles according to the path-goal theory: supportive, directive, achievement-oriented, and participative styles. Supportive leadership style refers to the leader behavior that shows individual concerns for followers" development and needs. Directive leadership style refers to the leader characteristic that directs all the specifics and logistics related to task performance.

Participative leadership style refers to the leader effort that seeks opinions from followers and encourages group discussions. Achievement-oriented leadership style refers to the leader behavior of setting high objectives for followers and leading them to achieve the goals with relevant supports (Hughes et al., 2008).

Situational Leadership Theory

The situational leadership model was developed based on the Ohio State studies" two leader behaviors explained previously: initiating structure and consideration (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). The situational leadership model considers leaders" task behaviors (i.e., initiating structure), relationship behaviors (i.e., consideration), situational factors, and most importantly follower readiness (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). Hersey and Blanchard explained that follower readiness refers to followers" abilities to take on a specific task rather than a personality factor. They explained that leadership effectiveness can be improved if the two leader behaviors are appropriately combined considering the followers" readiness level (i.e., high task readiness versus low task readiness) and the situation at the moment. Daft (1999) explained that the *telling* style (a very directive form) is appropriate for low-readiness followers while the *selling* style (a mixture form that contains a leader direction and seeks input from followers) and the *participating* style (a form that supports followers" development) are appropriate for moderate-readiness followers. He also stated that the

delegating style (a form of little direction and little support) is appropriate for high-readiness followers.

Normative Decision Theory

The normative decision model explores how leaders determine an optimal level of followers" participation in the decision-making process for effective group performance depending on various situations (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). In other words, the normative decision model investigates leadership in terms of the leader-follower-situation framework (Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Depending on the level of a group members" participation in decision-making, Vroom and Yetton (1973) put a leader's completely autocratic leadership style at one end of a continuum of decision-making style and equal group participation together with followers at the other end, while placing consultative decision style at the middle. Some researchers (e.g., Field, 1982; Vroom & Jago, 1988) showed that leaders taking the normative decision model tend to be more effective decision-makers, but not the other way around, meaning that effective decision-makers are not necessarily equal to effective leaders (Miner, 1975).

Multidimensional Model of Leadership

Chelladurai (1980) developed the multi-dimensional model of leadership in sport. According to him, this model emphasizes the appropriate combination of three characteristics (i.e., the leader, the situation, and the members), which forms congruent leadership by reflecting three leadership aspects (i.e., required, preferred, and actual leadership). He claimed that congruent leadership significantly affects team outcomes and member satisfaction. In addition, Chelladurai (1993) stated that the leaders need to train themselves so as to make their leadership behaviors better and that such training efforts should be assessed in the perspective of the influences of their behavioral improvement on followers" performance and satisfaction.

On the other hand, Chelladurai and Haggerty (1978) introduced a normative model of three decision-making leadership styles. According to this model, proper leadership styles are determined by taking into consideration environmental factors and followers" perceived opinions on the leaders" leadership styles. Chelladurai and Haggerty (1978) explained this model as follows. First, the autocratic decision style results in dogmatic decision making by the leaders. Second, the delegative style refers to leadership that the leaders implement delegation efforts of transferring the decision-making power and authority to followers. Third, the participative decision style combines these two extreme leadership styles such that decision-making is implemented by both the leaders and followers. Chelladurai and Haggerty (1978) explained that the choice of a decision-making style needs to be made by considering situational factors associated with the decision topics and contexts.

Motivation

Motivation is at the heart of many of sport's most interesting problems, both as a developmental outcome of social environments such as competition and coaches' behaviors, and as a developmental influence on behavioral variables such as persistence, learning, and performance (Duda, 1989; Vallerand, Deci, & Ryan, 1987). In light of the importance of these consequences for athletes, one can easily understand researchers' interest in motivation as it pertains to sport settings. Several conceptual perspectives have been proposed to better

understand athletes' motivation (see Roberts, 1992). One perspective that has been found to be useful in this area posits that behavior can be intrinsically motivated, extrinsically motivated, or amotivated (Deci, 1975; Deci &Ryan, 1985, 1991). This theoretical approach has generated a considerable amount of research and appears pertinent to the field of sports (Bribre, Vallerand, Blais, & Pelletier, in press; Deci & Ryan, 1985, chap. 12; Fortier, Vallerand, Brikre, & Provencher, in press; Vallerand, Deci, & Ryan, 1987). Recently, a new measure of motivation toward sport was developed that is based on the tenets of Deci and Ryan's theory. The scale, written in French, is entitled 1'Echelle de Motivation vis-h-vis les Sports (EMS; Bribre et al., in press). The purpose of this paper is to present the results of two studies dealing with the validation of this scale into English. The scale is composed of seven subscales that measure the different forms of motivation outlined in Deci and Ryan's theory

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation

According to self-determination theory, intrinsically motivated behavior is associated with satisfaction of three psychological needs (Deci & Ryan, 1991; Ryan & Deci, 2000). The need for autonomy reflects the need to perceive behavior as freely chosen (deCharms 1968). The need for competence refers to the urge to effectively interact with the social environment (White, 1959). The need for relatedness pertains to the desire to feel connected with other individuals (Richer & Vallerand, 1998). Vallerand and his colleagues (Vallerand, Blais, Brière, & Pelletier, 1989; Vallerand, Pelletier, Blais, Brière, Senécal, & Vallières, 1992) suggested that three dimensions of intrinsic motivation exist: intrinsic motivation to know, intrinsic motivation to accomplish things, and intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation. Firstly, intrinsic motivation to know involves engaging in sport for pleasure and satisfaction experienced while one is learning and exploring something new. Secondly, intrinsic motivation to accomplish things operates when one is engaged in an activity for the pleasure derived from trying to surpass oneself or to improve skills. Thirdly, intrinsic motivation to experience stimulation refers to engaging in sport in order to experience the pleasant sensations derived from the activity itself. In the sport domain, many studies have corroborated this tripartite conceptualization of intrinsic motivation (Brière, Vallerand, Blais, & Pelletier, 1995; Pelletier *et al.*, 1995).

Extrinsic motivation is also considered to be a multidimensional construct. Deci and Ryan (1985) have identified fours forms of extrinsic motivation that can be classified on the self-determination continuum from high to low levels of self-determination. These different types of extrinsic motivation (e.g., integrated regulation, identified regulation, introjected regulation, and external regulation) occupy the continuum between intrinsic motivation and amotivation. Research in sport has supported the presence of this continuum (Chatzisarantis, Hagger, Biddle, Smith, & Wang, 2003; Li & Harmer, 1996). Firstly, integrated regulation deals with behaviors that are so integrated in one's life that they are part of the individual's self and value system. Secondly, identified regulation reflects participation in an activity because one holds outcomes of the behavior to be personally significant, although one may not enjoy the activity itself. Thirdly, introjected regulation refers to behaviors that are partly internalized by the individual but that remain non-self-determined because contingencies from external control sources have been internalized without having been endorsed by the person.

Determinants of Motivation

Cognitive evaluation theory (Deci, 1975; Deci & Ryan, 1985), a sub theory within the larger self-determination theory, details the environmental factors that promote and undermine the development of intrinsic motivation trough their impacts on perceptions of competence and autonomy. According to Deci and Ryan (1985), when there is a shift from an internal to an external perceived locus of causality, one's feelings of self-determination and consequently, one's intrinsic motivation toward the activity decreases. The concept of perceived locus of causality refers to the degree to which individuals feel that they are the origin of their own behavior (Deci & Ryan, 1985). On the one hand, when athletes experience an internal locus of causality, their actions are self-determined and volitional. On the other hand, when they experience an external locus of causality, the initiation of behavior is influenced by external factors.

In the sport domain, many environmental and interpersonal factors (e.g., rewards, coaches' leadership behaviors) may affect athletes' feelings of competence, autonomy, and relatedness, and, in turn, intrinsic motivation (for a review, see Vallerand & Losier, 1999). For instance, scholarship athletes exhibited higher levels of perceived competence (Hollembeak & Amorose, 2005) and intrinsic motivation (Amorose & Horn, 2000) than non scholarship athletes. Sport competition also constitutes a social factor that may affect feelings of autonomy and intrinsic motivation because emphasizing winning at all costs may lead individuals to adopt an external perceived locus of causality. Vallerand, Gauvin and Halliwell (1986a) have conducted a research to examine the effects of competition on intrinsic motivation. Twenty-three subjects aged between 10 and 12 years were randomly assigned to one of two conditions: competition or intrinsic-mastery orientation. The task was a stabilometer motor task. In the competition condition, subjects were told that they were competing against other participants. In the intrinsic-mastery condition, subjects were encouraged to perform as well as they could. The amount of time spent on the stabilometer during a free-choice period served as the dependent measure of intrinsic motivation. Results revealed that participants in the intrinsic mastery condition were more intrinsically motivated than those in the competition condition.

Fortier, Vallerand, Brière and Provencher (1995) have examined the relationships between competitive and recreational sport structures, gender, and athletes' sport motivation. Participants were 399 athletes aged between 17 and 25 years and involved in four different sport activities (soccer, basketball, volleyball, and badminton). Results revealed that recreational athletes demonstrated more intrinsic motivation to accomplish things and to experience stimulation than competitive athletes, while exhibiting less identified regulation and less amotivation than this group. Many other studies have clearly revealed that competition undermined individuals' intrinsic motivation (e.g., Deci, Betley, Kahle, Abrams, & Porac, 1981; Vallerand, Gauvin, & Halliwell, 1986b). However, when competition represents an interesting challenge, ones intrinsic motivation may be boosted (Reeve & Deci, 1996; Tauer & Harackiewicz, 1999, 2004; Weinberg & Ragan, 1979). For instance, results from four studies conducted by Tauer and Harackiewicz (2004) with boys from a youth basketball camp showed that intergroup competition was consistently conducive to intrinsic motivation.

According to Vallerand (2007), measurement and methodological issues could explain the inconsistent findings in the literature. Deci and Ryan (1985) also suggested that competition may enhance or reduce intrinsic motivation functions of individual perceptions of the competitive situation. As a consequence, Vallerand (2007) considers that future studies are required to better understand and analyze the effects of competition on intrinsic motivation. In accordance with Vallerand's (1997) postulates, we consider that researchers need to take into consideration perceptions of competence, autonomy and relatedness in order to understand and explain the links between competition and motivation in the sport context. However, a few studies in sport have included both environmental factors and basic need satisfaction as predictors of motivation (e.g., Hollembeak & Amorose, 2005; Sarrazin, Vallerand, Guillet, Pelletier, & Cury, 2002). In addition, all of these motivational studies have used scales developed and validated in other contexts in order to measure these feelings because there was not a scale for measuring perceptions of autonomy, competence and relatedness in the sport domain.

Motivation and Leadership

In the Coaches Guide to Sport Psychology, Rainer Martens (1987) stated, "Leadership emphasizes interpersonal relationships and has direct impact on motivation, whereas management necessarily does not (p. 34)." Furthermore, according to Kotter (1988), "Effective leadership for some activity in complex organizations is the process of creating a vision of the future that takes into account the legitimate long-term interests of the parties involved in that activity; of developing a rational strategy for moving toward that vision; of enlisting the support of the key power centers whose cooperation, compliance, or teamwork is necessary to produce that movement; and of motivating highly that core group of people whose actions are central to implementing the strategy." Therefore, a primary anticipated outcome of effective leadership is a core group of motivated followers.

CONCLUSION

The review also details Deci and Ryan's (1985) Cognitive Evaluation Theory, which posits that behavior can be intrinsically motivated, extrinsically motivated, or amotivated. Researchers have examined the relationships of competitive and recreation sport structures and gender to athlete sport motivation (Fortier, Vallerand, Briere, & Provencher, 1995), motivation and elite performance (Chantal, Guay, Dobreva-Martinova, & Vallerand, 1996), and differences in motivation between skill levels (Sloan and Wiggins, 2001; Miller, 2000; MacDougall, 2000).

The results support the framework of Deci and Ryan's (1985) Cognitive Evaluation Theory and the notion of defining motivation in terms of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, and amotivation. Martens (1987) and Kotter (1988) have proposed that motivation is a consequence of leadership behavior, a recent study conducted by Charbonneau, Barling, and Kelloway (2001) also supported a mediating role for intrinsic motivation between the relationship of leadership and sports performance.

REFERENCES

1. Burns 1978 Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row.

2. Chelladurai and Haggerty (1978) Chelladurai, P. & Saleh, S. D. (1978). Preferred leadership in sports. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences*,

3. Chelladurai (1980 Chelladurai, P. (1980). Leadership in sport organizations. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 5,* 226-231.

4. Chelladurai (1993) Chelladurai, P. (1993). Leadership. In R. N. Singer, M. Murphey & L. K. Tennant (Eds.), *Handbook of research on sport psychology* (pp. 647-671). New York: Macmillan.

5. Deci and Ryan (1985) Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.

6. Duda, 1989; Duda, J.L. (1989). Goal perspectives and behavior in sport and exercise settings. In C. Ames & M. Maehr (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement* (Vol. 6, pp. 81-1 15). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press

7. Fiedler, 1995 Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York McG

8. Hersey & Blanchard, 1969 Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

9. Jago, 1982 Jago, A. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Management Sciences, 28*, 315-336.

10. Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991

11. Martens (1987) Martens, R. (1987). *Coaches guide to sport psychology*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

12. Kotter (1988), Kotter, J. P. (1988). *The leadership factor*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

13. Rainer Martens (1987)

14. Smith, & Wang, 2003

15. Tauer and Harackiewicz (2004)

16. Vallerand, Deci, & Ryan, 1987 Vallerand, R.J., Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1987). Intrinsic motivation in sport. *Exercise and Sport Sciences Review.* **15,** 389-425.

17. Vallerand (2007)

18. Wooden & Jamison, 1997, Wooden, J., & Jamison, S. (1997). *Wooden: A lifetime of observations and reflections on and off the court*. Lincolnwood, IL: Contemporary Publishing Company.

19. Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D. D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership in organizations. In M..D. Dunnette and L. M. Hough, *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (2nd ed.)*, Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.