SELF-LEADERSHIP:
VOLLEYBALL STUDENT-PLAYERS
AND THEIR COMPETITION ACHIEVEMENT

Elif Bozyigit[i]
Pamukkale University,
Faculty of Sport Science,
Department of Sport Management,
Denizli, Turkey

Abstract:

Self-leadership is one of the topics that have been studied with interest in recent years. It can be described as self-leadership the emergence of self-leadership energy within the individual, fulfilling his/her self-affairs and self-duties, and create his/her self-motivation. The purpose of this study is to examine the self-leadership levels of volleyball players and determine the relationship with their competition achievement. The data were collected from volleyball players who studied at different university and played volleyball in 2. League of Turkish University Sports Federation (n=138; female 38%, male 62%). In this research, the short form adapted to Turkish (Şahin, 2015) of "Abbreviated Self-Leadership Questionnaire (ASLQ)" developed by Houghton et al. (2012) was used as data collection tool. The questionnaire consists of nine items and may be used as a general assessment of the global self-leadership construct. For this study, Cronbach's Alpha was found to be .824. In the results of analyzes, the level of self-leadership of the volleyball players was found to be high. There was no significant difference between variables and ASLQ scores. There was a low level, negative and significant of correlation between the volleyball players' achievement (ranking) and the ASLQ scores.

Keywords: self-leadership, volleyball player, student, competition achievement, university league

1. Introduction

It can be said that the concept of leadership has occurred since the times when the living beings began to live together. Şişman (2002) stated that historically, the concept that can be traced back to the existence of mankind began to be used in academic

---

[i] Correspondence: email ebozyigit@gmail.com

manners after the first half of the 19th century. Parlak (2016) also mentioned that leadership is an old phenomenon as much as human history. People who are social beings need leaders in every period of history. It is an inevitable reality that societies or organizations always need the leaders (Bayrak, 1997).

With the ever-growing technology, information sharing tools and the increasing number of individuals who produce information, there is a lot of definition of leadership. Leadership is one of the concepts that have been defined a lot. Some of these definitions are as follows: to lead a group, to act, to make their work more efficient by motivating the employees, to collect a group of people in the direction of a certain purpose, the person being treated in accordance with the orders and instructions, to perceive the problems and show the solution options to the members (Sungur, 1997; Koray, 1997; Eren, 2000; Doğan, 2007).

In 1980, Mans and Sims (1980), expressed that self-management can be describes as a process whereby a person is faced with immediate response alternative involving different consequences and the person chooses an apparent low-probability response. And, in the '90s, Bass (1990) stated that most relationships between the managers and their employees are quite different; this situation has continued to still improve since then. It is generally stated in the literature that there will be a need for greater intensity leadership in organizations in the coming years (Tengilimoglu, 2005), that it will not lose its importance (Parlak, 2016), and that today's organizations will need effective leaders who understand the complexity of the rapidly changing global environment (Nanjundeswaraswamy and Swamy, 2014). Today, however, it is expected that the individual can self-fulfill and self-accomplish to something, self-initiating, be entrepreneur, and be helpful for working life in terms of organizations.

Generally, leadership theories are categorized according to the leader definitions. The most common leadership theories are: Trait Theory (1930's-1940's), Behavioral Theories (1940's-1950's), Contingency Theories (1960's), Modern/Contemporary approaches to Leadership (1970's-1980's), and Neo-Charismatic Theories (1990's).

Looking at Modern Leadership Theories, leadership styles such as instructional leadership, cultural leadership, ethical leadership, visionary leadership, super leadership, self-leadership etc. appear to have emerged. It will continue to be a field of work on leadership, now and in the future, as it has in the past. Stewart et al. (2011) also indicated that important research focused on the concept of self-leadership over the last 30 years.

1.1 Self-Leadership

According to Pierce and Manz (2005), self-leadership represents an alternative to more traditional leadership and organizational perspectives that focus on the influence and control of designated leaders with formal hierarchical authority. Self-leadership theory is described as the 'process of influencing oneself' as opposed to the influence of leaders over followers. An individual's self-control system seems to be more effective as organizations and employees begin to be able to control and manage themselves. Self-leadership refers to the self-directing and influencing of individuals and their direct

self-motivation tasks (Manz, 1986). Self-leadership is conceptualized as process of influencing or leading (Neck and Manz, 1992). In another study, self-leadership is a process of self-influence to achieve an optimal state of motivation and self-direction needed to perform what one sees as essential and inevitable (Kazan, 1999). As Houghton and Neck (2002), self-leadership is a process through which people influence themselves to achieve the self-direction and self-motivation necessary to behave and perform in desirable ways. In this process, individuals influence themselves through cognitive strategies. Self-leadership consists of specific sets of behavioral and cognitive strategies designed to shape individual performance outcomes. Neck and Manz (1996) assert that self-leadership focuses on the individual's thoughts and self-behaviors. This focus is in the form of self-talk, mental imagery, thought patterns, beliefs and assumptions (Manz and Sims, 1980; Manz, 1986; Neck and Houghton, 2006). In another study, Godwin et al. (1999) pointed out that self-leadership focused jointly on behavior and cognition. Paksoy (2002) states that this leadership approach is the whole of the strategies that focus on behaviors and thoughts that individuals can use to influence themselves, and that it is the essence of individuals to control their behavior and that everything they do to guide their self is within the scope of this leadership. If a deduction is made in all these statements, *"Self-leadership can also be defined as the emergence of self-leadership energy within the individual even in the most unfavorable condition, the fulfillment of his/her self-affairs and self-duties, and to create his/her self-motivation"*.

According to Pearce and Manz (2005), there are some specific self-leadership skills areas and practical strategies. These include self-observation, self-goal-setting, self-reward, rehearsal, self-job redesign and self-management of internal dialogues and mental imagery.

Based on the theoretical bases in social cognitive theory and intrinsic motivation theory, self-leadership consists of three different strategies. Although different, these strategies complement each other (Anderson and Prussia, 1997; Kazan, 1999; Manz and Sims, 2001; Houghton and Neck, 2002; Manz and Neck, 2004; Neck and Houghton, 2006; Houghton et al., 2012). These strategies are:

1. behavior-focused strategies,
2. natural reward strategies, and
3. constructive thought pattern strategies.

1.1.1. Behavior-focused strategies

Behavior-focused strategies provide specific approaches for identifying ineffective behaviors and replacing them with more effective ones (Houghton et al., 2012). Behavioral strategies aimed at improving individual self-awareness include self-observation, self-goal setting, self-reward, self-punishment, self-cueing and are based on these processes (Manz and Sims, 1980; Manz and Neck, 2004; Neck and Houghton, 2006; Houghton et al., 2012; Doğan and Şahin, 2008a; Tabak, Sığrı and Türköz, 2013). Houghton and Neck (2002) stated that behavior-focused self-leadership strategies are designed to encourage positive, desirable behaviors that lead to successful outcomes,

while suppressing negative, undesirable behaviors that lead to unsuccessful outcomes. In another study by Neck et al. (2003), they expressed that the construct of the "organizational environment" constituted an important element in their comprehensive model. Environmental factors (e.g., other organizational participants) not only have a direct impacted on an individual's goal-setting participation behavior, but also affected behavior through the intermediary cognitive processes of the organizational participant.

Better performance is achieved with goal setting, and this provides beneficial results for both the individual and the organization (Tabak, Sığrı and Türköz, 2013). It is like a kind of celebration that rewards yourself for a difficult task that is accomplished. This reward can be physical or intangible awards (Mannz and Sims, 2001). Self-punishment may be a circumstance forgotten sometimes by individuals, unlike rewarding. However, individuals with self-leadership characteristics do not forget this circumstance, and maybe tend to do not it again by taking lessons from their mistakes. Examples of such strategies with regard to sports can be given as follows; *self-goal setting:* better training, better practice, managing a team to succeed, winning a competition, become a champion etc., *self-reward:* to go to dinner after a winning competition, to pause for excessive performance (rest), to get a new training equipment etc., *self-punishment:* making a little more self-enforcement because of unsatisfied from self-performance, workout to make better strikes after training, social life limitation according to others etc.

1.1.2. Natural reward strategies

Through these strategies, which focus on incorporating more enjoyable qualities into specific tasks that need to be achieved, the task itself is rewarded (Anderson and Prussia, 1997; Manz and Neck, 2004; Neck and Houghton, 2006; Manz and Sims, 2001). The emergence of enjoyable side of the task means rewarding by the task. In this way, the individual who focuses on the enjoyable side of the task displays have a better performance and improves this (Houghton and Neck, 2002). Individuals dealing with the performance dimension of the sport constantly experience win or lose, failure or success. But, an athlete may a good performance in a competition, try a new sportive move, and win by taking risk etc. These in sports are to reveal the enjoyable side of the task. For an athlete, being in a beautiful city for a competition, playing in a gorgeous gym, watched by thousands of spectators is rewarded by the task.

1.1.3. Constructive thought pattern strategies

These strategies refer to the change of beliefs and assumptions that do not function normally and properly, the identification of the good ones, the use of mental imagery, and self-positive talk. Positive and effective thought patterns are developed. Negative thoughts are reduced. Negative and destructive self-talk should be identified (Manz, 1986; Neck and Manz, 1992; 1996; Manz and Sims, 2001; Manz and Neck, 2004). These strategies are often used in all areas of performance sport. This mental imagery, also called "anticipation" (a term of sport), is often imagined as if it were done just before

making an action. The more thought is made in mind; the more ideas are formed and developed. In this way, forecasting also evolves. For example, for an athlete who plays volleyball, guessing where the rival will attack and taking precautions from that side is an example to the situation.

Research in the area of sport expertise has shown that athletes can benefit from the use of various cognitive strategies designed to regulate performance. For example, some of these strategies include learned techniques such as visualization, relaxation, goal-setting, and self-talk (Allen, 2006). In a study of Neck and Manz (1992) also stated that "*in sport psychology, mental imagery is viewed as a method involving rehearsal of a physical task in the absence of observable movement*" (according to Corbin, 1972; Richardson, 1967). In a research by Hardy et al. (2004) founded that athletes (%75) used self-talk in a significantly planned and consistent manner, as well as had a greater belief in the use of their self-talk. The study of Cleary and Zimmerman (2001) showed that basketball experts set more specific goals, selected more technique-oriented strategies, made more strategy attributions, and displayed higher levels of self-efficacy than non-experts and novices. In a study by Gilbert et al. (2006), someone shared that the student-athletes understood the importance of being overtly positive but had difficulty using positive self-talk. In another study by Kitsantas and Zimmerman (2001) found that experts volleyball players were superior to the other two groups in all measures: goal-setting, self-efficacy, self-monitoring, self-evaluation and self-satisfaction etc. Zaichkowsky (2006) also stated that the most useful skills to be learned by student-athletes included goal-setting, imagery, relaxation, self-talk, attention/concentration, and commitment to rigorous practice.

Individuals are more likely to work in different cultures with the reason of globalization (Alves et al., 2006). Globalization in the sports has long since realized. It is difficult to give a definite date. It is difficult to determine this and give a definite date. Today, there are a lot of athletes who make up a sports team from different cultures and countries. Volleyball is also a good example of this. In the same way, university sports teams also.

1.1.4. Volleyball and Team Composition

Volleyball is one of the most popular team sports in the world. It exhibits the best of ability, spirit, creativity and aesthetics. The volleyball game has a unique place amongst net games. Competitors use the framework to contest techniques, tactics and power. The framework also allows players a freedom of expression to enthuse spectators and viewers. The image of Volleyball is increasingly a good one (FIVB, 2016).

For the match, a team may consist of up to 12 player, coaching staff and medical staff. For FIVB, World and Official competitions for Senior up to 14 players may be recorded on the score sheet and play in a match. One of the players, other than the libero, is the team captain. Both the team captain and the coach are responsible for the conduct and discipline of their team members. When the team captain is not on the court, the coach or the team captain must assign another player on the court, but not the libero, to assume the role of game captain (FIVB, 2016). The captain has a distinctive

feature for the volleyball game as well as the general tasks of other sports and is the only player who has the authority to speak with the referees. In the absence of the coach, the captain may use authorizes of the coach. Therefore, it is expected that the athlete who is the captain has more self-leadership features than the other players.

1.1.5. Positions in Volleyball

Volleyball is one of high performance team games. If a fault is committed by the team, the opponent team wins a point. Therefore, the players try to play without fault. While volleyball is a team game, individual performance features of the players are even more in the foreground. Each player must make a special effort to achieve high performance and success. During the match, each player has different tasks from each other on the court. Volleyball court consists of front row and back row. The task zone of players is determined to these rows and it is called as the "position" in the volleyball. The positions of the players are numbered as front-row: 4 (front-left), 3 (front-middle), 2 (front-right), back-row: 5 (back-left), 6 (back-centre) and 1 (back-right). Player tasks are also determined according to these positions. Players who play in these positions called setter (2), hitters: middle hitter (3), outside hitter (4) and libero (only back-row). When the front players come to the back row and the back players come to the front line, they perform the same tasks in the game according to the positions of the players, except for the libero.

1.1.6. Player positions

Setter: This player distributes the ball to various hitters (area between 2 and 3). There is one setter on the court in an advanced volleyball team. *Middle hitter:* In front of the net in the front-middle (position 3) of the volleyball court, this player hits the ball to attack and blocks to defend. *Outside hitter:* This player hits the ball in front of the net in the front-left (position 4) of the volleyball court and usually the primary attacker on the team. *Weakside hitter:* This player hits the ball in front of the net in the front-right (position 2) of the volleyball court and is usually not the primary attacker. *The libero:* According to FIVB Glossary, the libero is a specialized defensive player and can perform only as back row (may not an attacking shot) (FIVB-Glossary, 2018). This player replaces any player on the back row.

As mentioned above, although volleyball is a team game, the volleyball players have separate tasks in accordance with the characteristics of the volleyball game. Therefore, in this study, it is expected to have high self-leadership characteristics of each player.

Day by day, individual characteristics and knowledge of people are increasing, and they want to use their potentials effectively. This desire can be achieved when the individual is self-manager and self-leader. As Hagler (2005) said, "*people do not want to be managed, they want to be a led!*" and "*manage yourself if you want to manage someone*". And also, in this Information Age, the number of more educated and more conscious athletes increases day by day. As a result of the survey research, there have been a few researches on self-leadership.

There have been many studies on the self-leadership in the literature besides the references used in the research. In contrast, studies in the sports literature focusing on the self-leadership are relatively sparse. In some studies, researches related to the leadership characteristics or behaviors of coaches were found. Some of these studies done in recent years;

Self-management and self-leadership reexamined: a levels-of-analysis perspective (Markham and Markham, 1995), A study of reliability, validity and adaptation of self-leadership questionnaire in Turkish context (Doğan and Şahin, 2008b), The socioemotionally intelligent self-leader: examining relations between self-leadership and socioemotional intelligence (Furtner et al., 2010), A research on self-leadership strategies (Uğurluoğlu, 2010), The relationships between self-leadership and critical thinking (Semerci 2010), Effects of Self-leadership, Knowledge Management and Culture on Creativity (Masood et al., 2011), Creativity, self-leadership and individual innovation (Kalyar, 2011), Self-leadership: the way forward for African managers? (Zyl, 2012), Exploring Self-Leadership across Eastern and Western Cultures (Ho and Nesbit, 2013), The merits of self-leadership (Khan, 2015), Turkish adaptation of self-leadership scale for educational organizations: validity and reliability studies (Konan and Atik, 2015), Leading the Self: Self-Leadership Skills of Lebanese Private School Principals (Al-Jammal and Ghamrawi, 2015), Relationship between self-leadership and critical thinking skills (Ay et al., 2015), The effect of core self-evaluation on self-leadership: a study on primary school teachers (Arlı and Avcı, 2017), Self-leadership behaviors as predictor of teachers' taking initiative (Konuk, 2017), Consequence of self-leadership: a study on primary school teachers (Sesen et al., 2017),

Some of studies about sports and leadership; Self-perceptions of leadership ability and achieving styles of female student-athletes (Swalley, 2004), Differences in self-regulatory skills among talented athletes: The significance of competitive level and type of sport (Jonker et al., 2010), Optimal development of young male volleyball players through transformational coach leadership (Kurukowska et al., 2015), The Relationship between leadership styles of coaches with motivational climate of Iranian Elite Male volleyball players (Mohammadzade et al., 2012), Examination of self-leadership levels of volleyball referees (Bozyiğit and Duğan, 2018).

In the light of this conceptual framework, I think this work will contribute to sports literature.

2. Method

The purpose of this study is to examine the self-leadership levels of volleyball players and determine relationship with athletes' achievement.

2.1 Sample and procedure

The data were collected from volleyball players who studied at different university and played volleyball in 2. League of Turkish University Sports Federation (TUSF) (n=138; female 38%, male 62%). In December 2017, 13 university volleyball teams participated

in TUSF 2nd League Group Competitions held in Eskisehir/Turkey, but 12 university volleyball teams' athletes filled the questionnaire. All athletes were informed about the study by the researcher. The questionnaire was completed anonymously and participation was voluntary.

2.2 Research Hypothesis

Hypothesis 1	H1: ASLQ scores of volleyball players are high.
Hypothesis 2	H2: There is no significant different between variables and ASLQ scores.
	H_0: There is no significant difference between gender and ASLQ scores.
	H_0: There is no significant difference between age and ASLQ scores.
	H_0: There is no significant difference between faculties and ASLQ scores.
	H_0: There is no significant difference between team captain status and ASLQ scores.
	H_0: There is no significant difference between positions and ASLQ scores.
	H_0: There is no significant difference between years of competitor and ASLQ scores.
Hypothesis 3	H3: There is a relationship between the athletes' ranking achievement and ASLQ scores

2.3 Participants

Participants were a sample of 138 students, 53 female (38%) and 85 male (62%). Participant's age groups were "20 years and below" 78 (56.5%) and "21-25 years" 60 (43.5%). Participants, according to faculties: FSS 44 (32%) and other faculties 94 (68%). Team captain status: captain 15 (11%) and non-captain 123 (89%). Volleyball players according to the positions: setter 25 (18%), the libero 21 (15%), middle hitter 30 (22%), outside hitter 50 (36%) and weakside hitter 12 (9%). Years of competitor: 5 years below 52 (38%), 5-10 years 63 (49%) and 11-15 years 23 (17%).

2.4 Measures

In the research, a "Personal Information Form" was created in order to determine the participants' characteristics such as gender, age groups, faculty, team captain status, position and years of competitor.

Self-leadership measures: The main data collection tool was "Abbreviated Self-Leadership Questionnaire (ASLQ)" developed by Houghton et al. (2012), but the Turkish version of ASLQ was used as a data collection tool in this research. It was adopted by Şahin (2015) the Turkish language, reliability, and validity. His study the results indicated that the one-factor model provided the best fit compared to the three-factor model of the ASLQ, which supported Houghton et al. (2012) recommendation for the use of the ASLQ as an overall measure of self-leadership. And also, he found that total score on the ASLQ correlated strongly with the RSLQ. Cronbach's Alpha value of the Turkish version of the ASLQ was found to be .75 (Şahin, 2015). The questionnaire included 9 items, and 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from "strongly disagree-1" to "strongly agree-5". The highest score that can be taken from the ASLQ is 45, and the lowest score is 9.

2.5 Analyses

In this study, SPSS 15.0 package program was used for statistical analysis. In the analysis of the data, Z-test and Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) tests were used to determine

whether the scores obtained from the variables are normally distributed. It has been determined that the resulting analysis data are not normally distributed. The Mann Whitney U-Test for independent samples was used to determine the difference between the two groups, the Kruskal Wallis H-Test for independent samples was used to determine the difference more than two groups, and the Spearman Brown test was used to examine the relationship between the two variables (Büyüköztürk, 2018). Level of significance was determined to be .05. For this study, Cronbach's Alpha for all score was found to be .824.

The ranking results were recorded by the researcher when the competitions were finished, and also, obtained from by verified from the TUSF official website (TÜSF, 2018a; TÜSF, 2018b).

3. Results

As a result of the reliability analysis for this research, the Cronbach's Alpha value was found .824.

The results of the data obtained from the volleyball players participating in the research were given in the tables below.

Table 1: Scores of min, max, mean and SS

ASLQ	N	min	max	$\bar{\text{x}}$	SS
Scores	138	17	45	39.25	4.74

The mean score of volleyball players is 39.25.

3.1 The results of the Personal Information Form

Table 2: The results of Mann Whitney-U test according to ASLQ

Variables	Groups	N	$\bar{x}_{sira}$	$\sum_{sira}$	U	z	p
Gender	Female	53	62.53	3314.00	1883.00	-1.625	.104
	Male	85	73.85	6277.00			
Ages groups	20 years and below	78	65.35	5097.50	2016.50	-1.396	.163
	21-25 years	60	74.89	4493.50			
Faculty	FSS	44	72.10	3172.50	1953.50	-.526	.599
	Other faculties	94	68.28	6418.50			
Team captain status	Captain	15	77.07	1156.00	809.00	-.780	.435
	Non-captain	123	68.58	8435.00			
	Total	138					

p>.05

There was no significant different between variables (gender, U=1883.00, p>.05; groups of age, U=2016.50, p>.05; faculty, U=1953.50, p>.05; and captain status, U=809.00, p>.05) and ASLQ scores.

Table 3: The results of Kruskal Wallis-H test according to ASLQ

Variables	Groups	N	$\bar{x}_{sira}$	x^2	sd	p
Positions	Setter	25	82.20			
	Libero	21	80.21			
	Middle hitter	30	61.08	6.278	4	.179
	Outside hitter	50	64.59			
	Weakside hitter	12	65.79			
Years of competitor	5 years below	52	71.93			
	5-10 year	63	63.83	2.931	2	.231
	11-15 year	23	79.52			

p>.05

There was no significant different between variables (positions, [x^2(4)=6.278, p>.05]; years of competitor, [x^2(2)=2.931, p>.05]) and ASLQ scores.

3.2 The results of ranking

Table 4: Female and male teams ranking and scores of min, max, mean and SS for ASLQ

Ranking	Universities	N	min	max	$\bar{x}$	SS
	Female Teams					
1.	Pamukkale University	14	36	45	41.21	3.490
2.	Eskişehir Osmangazi University	14	36	43	41.36	1.865
3.	Mehmet Akif Ersoy University	10	29	42	35.50	3.629
4.	Izmir Institute of Technology	6	32	40	36.17	3.189
5.	İzmir Katip Çelebi University	9	28	43	35.67	4.359
	Male Teams					
1.	Manisa Celal Bayar University	14	29	45	40.21	4.933
2.	Dokuz Eylül University	13	28	45	40.31	4.553
3.	Alanya Alaaddin Keykubat University	did not participate in the survey				
4.	İzmir Katip Çelebi University	10	37	44	38.40	2.221
5.	Eskişehir Osmangazi University	14	33	45	44.14	3.207
6.	Pamukkale University	14	31	42	37.57	3.480
7.	Bilecik Şeyh Edebali University	13	17	45	38.54	7.172
8.	Izmir Institute of Technology	7	31	41	36.00	4.397
	Total	138				

When the mean scores of the questionnaire was considered, it was seen that the teams with the highest mean scores in both females and males were ranked 1st and 2nd.

Table 5: Correlations between ranking and ASLQ total score

Variables	N	r	p
Team Ranking	138	-.200	.019*
Total Score			

p<.05

There was a low level, negative and significant of correlation between the ranking achievement of the volleyball players and the ASLQ scores (r= -.200, p<.05). This finding shows that the ASLQ scores of the volleyball players in the upper row increase.

4. Discussion

In this study, it was observed that the self-leadership levels of volleyball players were high, there was no significant difference between personal information variables and ASLQ scores, top-ranked volleyball teams were high scores of ASLQ, and there was a low level, negative and significant of correlation between the ranking of the volleyball players and the ASLQ scores. It can be said that there are very few studies on the level of self-leadership of athletes.

The highest score that can be obtained from the ASLQ is 45 points. The mean score of the volleyball players is 39.25 (Table 1). This result indicates that the self-leadership levels of volleyball players are high. In a research conducted by Türköz et al. (2013) with 167 university student-athletes, it was found that the mean score of the self-leadership was found to be 3.86.

There was no significant difference between personal information variables and ASLQ scores. In other words, no significant difference was found among the questionnaire scores and variables of gender, age groups, faculty, captain status, positions and year of the competitor. However, when the rank average of the groups was taken into consideration, it was seen that "male" have higher scores than "female"; those who was "between the ages of 21-25" have higher scores than those who was "under 20 years"; "SSF" students have higher scores than students of the "other faculties"; those who are "captains" have higher scores than those who are not "captain"; those who have years of competitor year "less than 5 years" have higher scores than those who have a "5 to 10 years" (Table 2 and 3). Similarly, in a study conducted by Kazan (1999), there was no significant difference between the self-leadership perceptions and gender, working period, too. Türköz et al (2013) also reported that the demographic characteristics of the university student-athletes such as age, education status of the mother, and monthly income were not created any statistical difference when analyzed in terms of self-leadership perceptions. But, they found that the variables that do create significant differences in the use of self-leadership perceptions include gender, place of the interested sport branch, taking place in the scholastic teams, club teams and national teams and personal history of athletics etc.

According to the results of ranking, the self-leadership mean scores of the team players who got the top-rankings in both men's and women's categories was higher than the other university team players (Table 4). This may be a sign that athletes with high self-leadership strategies will succeed their teams. Interestingly, the mean score of the Eskişehir Osmangazi University men's team is high. This can be explained by their self-goals because they might want to be champions in the domestic matches because of host university team. According to Pearce and Manz (2005), self-goal-settings are one of

the specific self-leadership skills areas and practical strategies. This can be caused by the use of thought self-leadership (TSL) techniques in goal performance positively stimulates goal-promoting attributes within cognitive categories (Godwin et al., 1999). When the scientific researches on the sports were examined, study about team ranking and self-leadership could not be found.

When the relationship between the ranking achievement of volleyball players and the ASLQ was examined, there was a low level, negative and significant of correlation between the ranking of the volleyball players and the ASLQ scores (Table 5). In other words, as the volleyball players were in the upper row (such as being 1st and 2nd) their levels of self-leadership also increased. This results shows that there is a correlation between self-leadership and achievement of athletes. Swalley (2004) founded that individual sport female student-athletes had a significantly greater preference for using the competitive direct achieving style than team sport female student-athletes. And also, both of the female student-athlete groups showed a similar perception of leadership ability. In a related research conducted by Torabi et al. (2013), there was no significant relationship between achievement motivation and self-efficiency of athletes (Iran's Taekwondo elites) in the study. And, regarding achievement motivation between male and female athletes, there was no significant difference.

5. Conclusion

In this research, volleyball players' self-leadership levels are examined. Results seem that the self-leadership levels of volleyball players are high and athletes' ranking achievements are associated with self-leadership.

Table 6: Results of the Research Hypotheses

		Hypothesis
Hypothesis 1	ASLQ scores of volleyball players are high.	Accepted
Hypothesis 2	There is no significant different between variables and ASLQ scores.	Accepted
	H_0: There is no significant difference between gender and ASLQ scores.	Accepted
	H_0: There is no significant difference between age and ASLQ scores.	Accepted
	H_0: There is no significant difference between faculties and ASLQ scores.	Accepted
	H_0: There is no significant difference between team captain status and ASLQ scores.	Accepted
	H_0: There is no significant difference between positions and ASLQ scores.	Accepted
	H_0: There is no significant difference between years of competitor and ASLQ scores.	Accepted
Hypothesis 3	There is a relationship between the athletes' ranking achievement and ASLQ scores	Accepted

Researchers continue to work on this because it is a phenomenon that has attracted attention since the time leadership has continued. Therefore, new ideas, new perspectives and new theories about leadership continue to be developed. The development of self-leadership strategies should be important in every field of sports

and this theory should be utilized in success stages. Thus, the athlete who is endeavoring (self-endeavor) for himself/herself will be useful to the club, team, country for national emotions, organization, workplace, etc. The results of this study are thought to contribute to the researches of sports sciences and help fill a gap in the self-leadership literature.

Bibliography

1. Al-Jammal, K. & Ghamrawi, N. (2015). Leading the self: Self-leadership skills of Lebanese private school principals, *International Journal of Social Science and Economics Invention*, 1(2), pp.1-20.
2. Allen, S. (2006). Expertise in sport: A cognitive-developmental approach, *Journal of Education*, 187(1), pp.9-29.
3. Alves, J.C., Lovelace, K.J., Manz, C.C., Matsypura, D., Toyasaki, F. & Ke, K. (2006). A cross-cultural perspective self-leadership, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(4), pp.338-359. Doi:10.1108/02683940610663123
4. Anderson, J.S. & Prussia, G.E. (1997). The self-leadership questionnaire: Preliminary assessment of construct validity, *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4, pp.119-143.
5. Arlı, Ö. & Avcı, A. (2017). The effect of core self-evaluation on self-leadership: A Study on Primary School Teachers, *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9(22), s.455-468.
6. Ay, F.A., Karakaya, A. & Yılmaz, K. (2015). Relationship between self-leadership and critical thinking skills, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, pp.29-41.
7. Bass, B.M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision, *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), pp.19-31.
8. Bayrak, S. (1997). Değişen liderlik anlayışı ve Türkiye gerçeği. In: *21. Yüzyıl Liderlik Sempozyumu*, Istanbul, Türkiye, 5-6 June 1997, 1 pp.355-358. Istanbul: DHO Matbaası.
9. Bozyiğit, E. & Duğan, Ö. (2018). Examination of self-leadership levels of volleyball referees. In: 6th International Conference on Science Culture and Sport (ed M Turkmen); Lviv-Ukraine, 25-27 April 2018, pp. 81, Ankara: International Science Culture and Sport Association.
10. Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2018). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabi*. 24. Baskı, Ankara: Pegem Akademi, Doi: 10.14527/9789756802748.
11. Cleary, T.J. & Zimmerman, B.J. (2001). Self-regulation differences during athletic practice by experts, non-experts, and novices, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 13(2), pp.185-206.
12. Doğan, S. (2007). *Vizyona dayalı liderlik*, 2. Baskı, İstanbul: Kare Yayınları.
13. Doğan, S. & Şahin, F. (2008a). Bireysel performansı ve verimliliği artIrmada kendi kendine liderlik yaklaşımının önemi, *İşGüç-Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 10(1), s.77-95.

14. Doğan, S. & Şahin F. (2008b). Kendi kendine liderlik ölçeğinin Türkçe uyarlaması, geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması, *H.U. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 26(1), s.139-164.

15. Eren, E. (2000). *Örgütsel davranış ve yönetim psikolojisi*, İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.

16. FIVB (2016). Official Volleyball Rules. 2017-2020 New Edition, Approved by the 35th FIVB Congress 2016. Retrieved from: http://www.fivb.org/EN/Refereeing-Rules/documents/FIVB-Volleyball_Rules_2017-2020-EN-v06.pdf (accessed: 29 June 2018)

17. FIVB-Glossary (2018). Federation Internationale De Volleyball, Glossary. Retrieved from: http://www.fivb.org/en/volleyball/Glossary.asp (accessed: 31 June 2018)

18. Furtner, R.M., RauthMann, J.F. & SachSe, P. (2010). The socioemotionally intelligent self-leader: examining relations between self-leadership and socioemotional intelligence, *Social Behavior and Personality*, 38(9), pp.1191-1196. Doi: 10.2224/sbp.2010.38.9.1191

19. Gilbert, J.N., Gilbert, W.D., Loney, B., Wahl, M.T. & Michel, E. (2006). Sport psychology in an urban high school: overview of a two-year collaboration, *Journal of Education*, 187(1), pp.67-87.

20. Godwin, L.J., Neck, C.P. & Houghton, J.D. (1999). The impact of thought self-leadership on individual goal performance: A cognitive perspective, *The Journal of Management Development*, 18(2), pp. 153-169.

21. Hagler, R.E. (2005). Leadership models and concepts, California Lutheran University, Project Management International, April 28, 2005.

22. Hardy, J., Hall, C. & Hardy, L. (2004). A note on athletes' use of self-talk, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 16(3), pp.251-257.

23. Ho, J. & Nesbit, P.L. (2013). Exploring self-leadership across eastern and western cultures, *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 6, pp.241-249.

24. Houghton, D.J., & Neck, C.P. (2002). The revised self-leadership questionnaire: Testing a hierarchical factor structure for self-leadership, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(8), pp.672-691.

25. Houghton, D.J., Dawley, D. & DiLiello, T.C. (2012). Abbreviated self-leadership questionnaire (ASLQ): A more concise measure of self-leadership, *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(2), pp.216-232.

26. Jonker, L., Elferink-Gemser, M.T. & Visscher, C. (2010). Differences in self-regulatory skills among talented athletes: The significance of competitive level and type of sport, *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 28(8), pp.901–908.

27. Kalyar, M.N. (2011). Creativity, self-leadership and individual innovation, *The Journal of Commerce*, 3(3), pp.20-28.

28. Kazan, A.L. (1999). Exploring the concept of self-leadership: Factors impacting self-leadership of Ohio Americorp's Members, Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio: The Ohio State University.

29. Khan, S.R. (2015). The merits of self-leadership: A commentary on R. Steinbauer, et al. (2014), *Business Ethics Journal Review*, 3(1), pp.1-6.

30. Kitsantas, A. & Zimmerman, B.J. (2002). Comparing self-regulatory processes among novice, non-expert, and expert volleyball players: A microanalytic study, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 14(2), pp.91–105.

31. Konan, N. & Atik, S. (2015). Turkish adaptation of self-leadership scale for educational organizations: validity and reliability studies, *e-International Journal of Educational Research*, 6(3), pp. 101-115.

32. Konuk, S. (2017). Self-leadership behaviors as predictor of teachers' taking initiative, *European Journal of Education Studies*, 3(11), pp.650-651. Doi: 10.5281/zenodo.1069687

33. Koray, M. (1997). 21. yüzyıl: Yeni beklentiler, yeni liderlik alanları ve kadınlar, 21.YY.da Liderlik Sempozyumu, İstanbul: DHO Matbaası.

34. Krukowska, A., Poczwardowski, A. & Parzelski, D. (2015). Optimal development of young male volleyball players through transformational coach leadership, *Polish Journal of Applied Psychology*, 13(3), pp.9-24. Doi: 10.1515/pjap-2015-0034

35. Manz, C.C. (1986). Self-leadership: Toward an expanded theory of self-influence processes in organizations, *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), pp.585-600.

36. Manz, C.C. & Neck, C.P. (2004). *Mastering self-leadership: Empowering yourself for personal excellence*, 3rd Edition, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

37. Manz, C.C. & Sims, H.P. (1980). Self-management as a substitute for leadership: A social learning theory perspective, *Academy of Management Review*, 5(3), pp.361-367.

38. Manz, C.C. & Sims, H.P. (2001). *The new superleadership: Leading others to lead themselves*, Berrett-Koehler Store.

39. Markham, S.E. & Markham, I.S. (1995). Self-management and self-leadership reexamined: a levels-of-analysis perspective, *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(3), pp. 343-359.

40. Masood, K., Shahzad, C., Nosheen, R. & Awais, K. (2011). Effects of self-leadership, knowledge management and culture on creativity, *European Journal of Business and Management*, 3(8), pp.1-11.

41. Mohammadzade, Y., Zardoshtian, S. & Hossini, R.N.S. (2012). The Relationship between leadership styles of coaches with motivational climate of Iranian elite male volleyball players, *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(1), pp.91-95.

42. Nanjundeswaraswamy T.S. and Swamy D.R. (2014) Leadership styles. *Advanced in Management* 7(2): 57-62.

43. Neck, C.P. & Manz, C.C. (1992). Thought self - leadership: The influence of self - talk and mental imagery on performance, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(7), pp.681-699.

44. Neck, C.P. & Houghton, J.D. (2006). Two decades of self-leadership theory and research: Past developments, present trends, and future possibilities, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, (21), pp.270-295.

45. Neck, C.P. & Manz, C.C. (1996). Thought self - leadership: The impact of mental strategies training on employee cognition, behavior, and affect, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17(5), pp.445-467.

46. Neck, C.P., Nouri, H. & Godwin, J.L. (2003). How self-leadership affects the goal-setting process, *Human Resource Management Review*, 13, pp.691-707.

47. Paksoy, M. (2002). *Çalışma ortamında insan ve toplam kalite yönetimi*, İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayın No: 4356, İstanbul: Çantay Yayın.

48. Parlak, B. (2016). *Yönetim bilimi ve çağdaş yönetim teknikleri*, 3. Baskı, İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım.

49. Pearce, C.L. & Manz, C.C. (2005). The new silver bullets of leadership: The importance of self-and shared leadership in knowledge work, *Organizational Dynamics*, 34(2), pp.130-140.

50. Şahin, F. (2015). The convergent, discriminant, and concurrent validity of scores on the abbreviated self-leadership questionnaire, *The Journal of Human and Work*, 2(2), 91-104.

51. Semerci, N. (2010). The relationships between self-leadership and critical thinking, *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(8), pp.1639-1643.

52. Sesen, H., Tabak, A., & Arlı, O. (2017). Consequences of self-leadership: A study on primary school teachers, *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 17, pp.945–968. http://dx.doi.org/10.12738/estp.2017.3.0520

53. Şişman, M. (2002). *Öğretim liderliği*, Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.

54. Sungur, N. (1997). *Yaratıcı düşünce*, Ankara: Evrim Yayınları.

55. Stewart, G.L., Courtright, S.H. & Manz, C.C. (2011). Self-leadership: A multilevel review, *Journal of Management*, 37(1), pp.185-222. Doi: 10.1177/0149206310383911

56. Swalley, S.C. (2004). Self-perceptions of leadership ability and achieving styles of female student-athletes, Master of Arts, The Graduate School, The University of Maryland, Maryland, USA.

57. Tabak, A., Sığrı, Ü. & Türköz, T. (2013). Öz liderlik ölçeğinin Türkçeye uyarlanması çalışması, *Bilig*, 67, s.213-246.

58. Tengilimoğlu, D. (2005). Kamu ve özel sektör örgütlerinde liderlik davranişi özelliklerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir alan çalışması, *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(14), s.01-16.

59. Torabi, M.A., Khodayari, A. & Kohandel, M. (2013). The relationship of leadership styles with achievement motivation and self-efficiency in Iran's Taekwondo elites, *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, 3(5), pp.540-545.

60. Türköz, T., Mutlu, T.O., Tabak, A. & Erdoğan, M. (2013). Examining the levels of self-leadership perceptions of university student-athletes in terms of saciodemographic characteristics, *Physical Culture and Sport Studies and Research*, Volume LVIII, pp.43-52. Doi: 10.2478/pcssr-2013-0011

61. TÜSF (2018a). Turkish University Sports Federation, Volleyball 2. League Osmangazi University, Eskişehir, Turkey, 2017-2018 Season, Domestic result-Women. Retrieved from: http://yurtici-

sonuclar.tusf.org/Default.aspx?b_id=36andf_id=865andd_id=11andktgr=2 (accessed 26 May 2018)

62. TÜSF (2018b). Turkish University Sports Federation, Volleyball 2. League Osmangazi University, Eskişehir, Turkey, 2017-2018 Season, Domestic result-Men. Retrieved from: http://yurtici-sonuclar.tusf.org/Default.aspx?b_id=36andf_id=865andd_id=11andktgr=1 (accessed 26 May 2018)

63. Uğurluoğlu, Ö. (2010). Kendi kendine liderlik stratejileri üzerine bir araştırma, *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 24(1), s.175-191.

64. Zaichkowsky, L. (2006). Sport psychology: A primer for educators, *Journal of Education*, 187(1), pp.1-8.

65. Zyl, E.S. (2012). Self-leadership: The way forward for African managers?, *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(1), pp. 118-128.