Vilnius University Press

Content lists are available at VilniusUniversity Press

Transformations In Business & Economics
2025, Vol. 24 No 1 (64), pp.339-354.

E-ISSN 2538-872X
https://doi.org/10.15388/Tibe.2025.24.1.16

Chapter: A Comprehensive Analysis of Leadership Skills and Navigating Employment Trends

HOW DOES PERCEIVED LEADERSHIP STYLE IMPACT ATHLETES' VALUES?

Diana Reklaitiene
E-mail: diana.reklaitiene@lsu.lt
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5930-9377
Affiliation: Department of Coaching Science, Lithuanian Sports University, Lithuania
ROR: https://ror.org/00hxk7s55

Zilvinas Stankevicius
E-mail: zstankevicius@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2528-0497
Affiliation: Department of Coaching Science, Lithuanian Sports University, Lithuania
ROR: https://ror.org/00hxk7s55

Jolita Vveinhardt
E-mail: jolita.vveinhardt@lsu.lt
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6231-9402
Affiliation: Institute of Sport Science and Innovations, Lithuanian Sports University, Lithuania
ROR: https://ror.org/00hxk7s55

Annotation. Athletes' values are essential to the development of the sports industry, but it is not clear how different leadership styles of coaches contribute to the promotion of moral, personal development, and competitive values. To fill this gap, this study aims to determine the impact of perceived leadership style on athletes' values. A total of 493 paper-pencil survey questionnaires were collected. Correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between personal values and leadership in young athletes, while linear regression models were constructed to determine the influence of specific leadership styles on individual values. The results show that the charismatic style had a negative effect on athletes' competence, status and moral values. Other styles, such as democratic, bureaucratic, authoritarian, laissez-faire, and demographic characteristics, had different impacts on values depending on the team or individual sport environment. This study contributes to the understanding of the influence of different leadership styles on athletes' values and helps coaches to better understand which factors positively or negatively influence athletes' orientation towards excellence, competitiveness, and fair play in competitions.

Keywords: leadership styles in sports, athlete development, personal values, individual sport, team sport, coaches, youth athletes.

JEL classification: M12, J24, L83.

Introduction

Values shape a sporting culture in which young athletes can grow as individuals and professionals, contributing to the development of the sports industry and its prestige in the eyes of society. For society, values are the criteria by which athlete behaviour is judged (Lee *et al.*, 2000), and for athletes, they are

Submitted on April 2024. **Accepted** on September 2024.

the standards of moral behaviour that they adopt from those important to them (Danioni, Barni, 2019; Yaffe *et al*., 2021; Lee *et al*., 2013).

Lee *et al*. (2008) proposed a set of values, which were subsequently categorised into moral, sporting competence, and social status values (Lee *et al*., 2013). This model predicts the extent to which an athlete will behave with integrity in different situations and the extent to which he or she will be oriented towards personal development and the pursuit of a victory that ensures a certain status. Research has shown that the model can be used to predict clean sportsmanship (Lucidi *et al*., 2017; Mortimer *et al*., 2020) or asocial behaviour in young athletes (Danioni, Barni, 2019). Previous research has explored the connection between goal orientation and cheating behaviours (Ring, Kavussanu, 2018) and investigated the impact of life skills training on prosocial behaviour and the development of sporting values (Nascimento *et al*., 2020). Additionally, studies have highlighted the influential roles of parents (Yaffe *et al*., 2021) and coaches (Ntoumanis *et al*., 2012) in shaping value formation.

Yaffe *et al*. (2021) reported that athletes who perceived their parents as authorities cheated less to achieve results and had stronger moral values. This finding supports Lee *et al.'s* (2013) insight that individuals who are important to the athlete can encourage them to strive for greater personal excellence and competitive success while promoting honesty and respect for rules and opponents. One such key figure for a young athlete should be the coach, and in this context, it is important to be aware of the qualities of coaches as leaders who can lead to appropriate moral decisions that are consistent with the pursuit of excellence and status.

Research on leadership can predict how different leadership styles of a coach influence athlete behaviour (Lisá *et al.*, 2023; McGuckin *et al.*, 2022; Turnnidge, Côté, 2018). By contrast, Corti *et al.* (2023) reported that the effect of leadership may be reduced by individual athlete characteristics associated with low aspiration to improve, which emphasises the importance of cultivating values that promote personal development. However, previous research using Lee *et al.'s* (2013) model has not explored the relationship between coaches' values and young athletes' values. To fill this gap, further research investigating the relationships between different leadership styles and followers' moral, developmental, and status values is needed. Addressing this gap in the scientific research will provide researchers and practitioners with more clarity on how specific leadership styles influence young athletes' moral, personal development and status values. Therefore, the aim of the present study is to determine the impact of the perceived leadership style on athletes' values.

The main concepts used in the study are discussed, in particular, the values model proposed by Lee *et al.* (2013) and the six leadership styles, such as authoritarian, laissez-faire, autocratic, charismatic, bureaucratic and democratic. The methodological parameters of the empirical study and the results are presented in the study below. Finally, the main results are discussed, highlighting their theoretical and practical implications.

1. Theoretical Background

According to Lee *et al.* (2008; 2013), the first group of values (moral values) reflects an athlete's commitment to ethics. A group of moral values includes qualities such as adherence to rules, being honest and helping others. The second group (competence values) consists of values that emphasise sporting goals, striving to become better players, better utilisation of skills, and achieving higher results. The third group consists of values that reflect the competitiveness of the athlete (status values) and

promote leadership, superiority and performance. These values are closely related to universalism, self-regulation and power, as identified by Schwartz (1992) (Lee *et al*., 2008).

Authoritarianism is understood as a leader's authority and dominance over subordinates, which requires subordinates to follow the leader's orders unconditionally (Jing-Horng Lu, Hsu, 2015). Research highlights that the authoritarian leadership style is characterised by high levels of control, clear instruction, and a strong emphasis on power, discipline and obedience (Jin *et al*., 2022; Li, Li, 2021). This means that each athlete is given specific instructions on what he/she should do in a given situation, with the attitude that all team members should recognise and accept the coach's instructions without reservation. Despite the negative view of the authoritarian style, a study by Jing-Horng Lu and Hsu (2015) revealed that it 'interacted with achievement goals to predict sportspersonship'.

According to de Albuquerque *et al*. (2021), autocratic coaches emphasise personal power and decision-making without considering the opinions of athletes. Athletes who perceived the coach's behaviour as autocratic, emphasising personal power and decision-making without considering athletes' opinions, were less likely to develop personal and social skills. On the other hand, Hanin (2012) suggested that an autocratic leadership style may be the best solution, especially in highly stressful and important situations where athletes themselves, for various reasons, cannot find the best solution. It is also suitable for managing less experienced, less motivated athletes.

The bureaucratic management style is based on procedures, detailed rules, and decisions made by the manager, who imposes sanctions if subordinates fail to meet standards (Ramírez-Herrero *et al*., 2024). It is considered a form of autocratic leadership, where the only appropriate approach of the manager is replaced by rules and norms. Although it limits creativity and autonomy, it can be effective in the long run if team members feel comfortable in a highly structured environment (Al Khajeh, 2018; Soto-Morettini, 2023).

Laissez-faire, as classically understood in organisational management, is characterised by managers avoiding taking responsibility, not being present when needed, not responding to requests for help, and avoiding expressing their views on important issues (Bass, 1997). However, Yang (2015) suggested that this style does not imply zero leadership but rather a managerial disengagement. Moreover, the impact depends on the context, and leadership itself can demonstrate trust and promote autonomy. This implies that coaches would allow athletes to perform without constant supervision, expecting them to find the right solutions independently, which can be understood as trust. It is often effective in creating contingent situations to identify potential leaders and in situations where athletes are skilled, motivated and able to work independently (Hanin, 2012).

Democratic coaches allow athletes to be involved in group decision-making, setting goals, training methods, tactics and game strategies (de Albuquerque *et al*., 2021). Such leadership is characterised by collaboration, inclusiveness, objectivity, and attention to the input and needs of each team member. However, this style is more suited to skilled, motivated and experienced players, as well as to a well-developed team that has been successful in the past and plays well (Hanin, 2012). Research shows that athletes who perceive their coaches as democratic leaders, motivators, emotionally supportive, and providers of clear instructions experience significant positive outcomes across various domains (de Albuquerque *et al*., 2021).

Charismatic coaches create forward-looking visions (similar to transformational leaders), offer them to a wide range of followers, use positive emotional tactics, and achieve multidimensional results (Pankow *et al.*, 2018). In this context, Lachore *et al*. (2023) reported that football players' satisfaction was strongly influenced by charismatic leadership (e.g., idealised influence and inspiration), therefore, the authors suggest the maximum use of this factor in the coaching profession.

2. Methodology

Considering that, according to the data of the Lithuanian Sport Centre (http://lscentras.lt/en/), there are 41,000 athletes under 18 years of age in Lithuania (Olympic sports), it was necessary to survey at least 396 respondents using the Taro Yamane formula (Yamane, 1973). A paper-pencil survey method was chosen for data collection. To obtain representative data, the questionnaires were distributed in different places of residence in Lithuania (cities, towns and villages) to representatives of individual and team sports. A total of 600 questionnaires were distributed, and 493 were returned, which accounts for 82% return rate.

The values of young athletes were measured using Lee *et al.'s* (2008) questionnaire, which was adapted for Lithuania (Šukys, 2010). Each statement was scored on a scale from 1 to 7, with 1 being 'extremely important' and 7 being 'the opposite of what I believe'. The respondents also evaluated their coaches' leadership, which was determined by adapting Chelladurai's (1990) questionnaire to the traits of coach leadership identified in the literature review. Thirteen statements were rated in a 5-point Likert scale, with the options 'always', 'often', 'sometimes', 'rarely' and 'never'. Demographic data (age, sex, sport) were also collected.

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee of Lithuanian Sports University. Since the participants were minors, informed consent was obtained from their parents/guardians and the respondents themselves. The subjects and their parents/guardians were informed about the purpose of the study, their rights to refuse to participate in the study, and guarantees of anonymity and confidentiality. The study was risk-free for the respondents; questions that could discriminate, violate the dignity or beliefs of the subjects, or lead to the identification of an individual on the basis of the provided sociodemographic data were avoided. The subjects filled out the questionnaire in their usual environment during the training sessions after arranging the time in advance with the head of the school and the coach. It was possible to ask the data collector about any uncertainties.

The psychometric validation of the questionnaire revealed that the highest Cronbach's alpha value was 0.94 (moral values and Spearman-Brown 0.91, respectively), and the lowest was 0.84 (status values and Spearman-Brown 0.83, respectively). The explained variance on the values scale was 67.62% for status values, 80% for moral values, and 80.66% for competence values. On the leadership scale, democratic leadership explained 55.49%, bureaucratic leadership explained 58.69%, authoritarian leadership explained 60.69%, laissez-faire leadership explained 65.73%, charismatic leadership explained 67.85%, and autocratic leadership explained 70.89% of the spread. Correlation analysis was used to calculate the relationship between personal values and leadership in young athletes, and linear regression models were constructed to determine the influence of specific types of leadership on individual value groups.

3. Results of the Research

3.1 Demographics

More than half of the respondents were male (63.1%). A significant proportion of athletes lived in the cities (63.9%), while 29.6% resided in towns, and 6.5% in villages. The age of the respondents ranged from 11 to 15 years. Almost 90% of the athletes had been training with their current coach for more than a year, indicating that most respondents could fully form an opinion about their coaches' leadership.

3.2 Results of the Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis was performed to determine the relationships between athletes' value groups and leadership styles. *Table 1* shows the correlations between leadership styles (authoritarian, laissez-faire, autocratic, charismatic, bureaucratic, and democratic) and other variables, such as age, period of being involved in sports, and duration of time under the supervision of the same coach.

Table 1. Relationships between Athletes' Values and Leadership Styles

Group	Values	Authoritarian	Laissez-Faire	Autocratic	Charismatic	Bureaucratic	Democratic	Age	Duration of sporting activity	With the same trainer
A (N_{min} = 247; N_{max} = 255)	Competence	0.000 0.663	0.000 0.736	0.000 0.537	-0.128* 0.045	0.255** 0.000	0.149* 0.019	-0.134* 0.036	0.269** 0.000	0.355** 0.000
	Status	0.000 0.867	0.000 0.232	0.000 0.083	-0.208** 0.001	0.180** 0.004	0.000 0.518	0.000 0.653	0.204** 0.001	0.206** 0.001
	Moral	0.000 0.153	0.00 0.484	0.000 0.816	0.000 0.693	0.173** 0.006	0.000 0.099	0.000 0.195	0.275** 0.000	0.276** 0.000
B (N_{min} = 217; N_{max} = 225)	Competence	0.000 0.268	0.000 0.571	-0.126* 0.032	 0.297	0.242** 0.000	0.135* 0.024	-0.138* 0.021	0.113* 0.048	0.000 0.577
	Status	0.267** 0.000	0.247** 0.000	0.140* 0.037	-0.222** 0.001	0.193** 0.004	0.374** 0.000	-0.290** 0.000	0.263** 0.000	0.206** 0.002
	Moral	0.263** 0.000	0.229** 0.001	0.000 0.328	0.000 0.449	0.209** 0.002	0.317** 0.000	-0.239** 0.000	0.327** 0.000	0.153* 0.024

Notes: A – team sports, B – individual sports. **Reliability 0.01; *Reliability 0.05. Pearson correlation coefficients: moderate association – 0.4 < r <= 0.6; weak association – 0.2 < r <= 0.4; very weak association – 0.1 <= r <= 0.2.

Source: own calculations.

In the team sports group, competence values were found to correlate most strongly with bureaucratic leadership style ($r = 0.255$, $p < 0.01$), experience of training with the same coach ($r = 0.355$, $p < 0.01$), and duration of participation in the sport ($r = 0.269$, $p < 0.01$). This suggests that a strict, rule-based form of coaching may be beneficial for improving competence. Meanwhile, a coach's charismatic leadership style is negatively related to the perception of athletes' personal competence because it is possible that more attention is paid to the coach's personal characteristics than to the athlete's competence. In the individual sports group, a weak negative relationship between competence values and autocratic leadership emerged ($r = -0.126$, $p < 0.01$), which may indicate that autocratic behaviour reduces the perception and meaning of personal competence. The comparison of the two groups reveals that, unlike in team sports, competence was not related to charismatic leadership, and the strength of the relationships with bureaucratic, democratic styles and athlete age were similar. In addition, among

individual sports, the duration of sport participation was weakly related to their endorsement of competence values (r = 0.113, p < 0.05).

Status values negatively correlated with charismatic leadership in both sports groups. Although the relationships are not strong, they are statistically significant (r = -0.208, p = 0.001 in Group A, and r = -0.222, p = 0.001 in Group B). This suggests that coach charisma may be perceived as a hindrance to athletes' desire for personal recognition and efforts to excel. Unlike in team sports, in individual sports, a democratic leadership style is positively related to status values (r = 0.374, p < 0.001). Furthermore, weak, robust positive correlation were found between status values and authoritarian and laissez-faire leadership styles in individual sports.

In team sports, no correlation was found between authoritarian leadership and perceived morality. Unlike in individual sports, authoritarian leadership positively correlates with a greater sense of morality. This suggests that individual athletes are more responsive to rules and control, which can help ensure fairness and adherence to moral norms. Notably, a bureaucratic style based on rules, norms, and strict procedures with defined responsibilities positively correlates with moral values in both groups, despite the relationship being not strong. Moreover, in individual sports, a laissez-faire style was positively associated with moral perceptions (r = 0.229, p = 0.001), whereas in team sports, there was no such association. This may be because too much freedom and uncertainty in team dynamics can lead to chaos and reduce the importance of adhering to moral norms. In both groups, moral values were also positively related to the duration of sports participation, although the relationship was slightly stronger for individual sports (r = 0.275, p < 0.001 in Group A, and r = 0.327, p < 0.001 in Group B).

3.3 Results of the Regression Analysis

Three linear regression models are constructed below to explain the influence of different variables on individual groups of values. First, the values of competence are examined. Then, the influence on status and ultimately moral values is explored in sequence.

3.3.1 Impact on Competence Values

The regression model was found to be statistically significant and appropriate and can be used further, as the coefficients of determination in groups A and B are R^2A = 0.260, R^2B = 0.271, and adjusted R^2A = 0.251, R^2B = 0.266. The significance level (p < 0.001) of both groups indicates that the model is statistically significant and that the independent variables significantly predict the dependent variable (competence). The values of the standardised beta coefficients indicate which regressor is more influential in the model, which indicates the influence of x9 (playing sport with current coach) in group A and x5 (bureaucratic leadership style) in group B. Meanwhile, the p values explain the statistical significance of the influence of each independent variable on the dependent variable.

The regression analysis results revealed that x8 (duration of sport) in group A (β A = -0.191) and x6 (democratic style) in group B (β B = 0.017) were not only weakly significant but also statistically insignificant (p A = 0.135 and p B = 0.850) as regressors. Thus, the model needs further refinement, and the regression analysis should be repeated after removing the named regressors.

A multicollinearity problem exists when the VIF > 4.00 and the tolerance is less than 0.25. In this particular regression model, the multicollinearity problem could not be avoided because for regressor x8 in sport group A, the VIF is greater than 5, and the tolerance is less than 0.25, so this variable had to be

removed. The model was also checked for statistical outliers: Cook's distance and the DFBet were calculated for each regressor observation. Cook's distance was found to be 0.293 in group A and 0.200 in group B, which is significantly less than one. The maximum value of the DFBet in each sport group varies from 0.01352 to 0.04816 in Group A, and from 0.01001 to 0.04777 in Group B, and is below unity in all the regressors, suggesting that there are no outliers in the data. This conclusion is supported by the screening results obtained with Mahanalobis distance. Since the Mahanalobis distance is 27.65 in Group A and 20.51 in Group B, and below the critical value of 27.86 in Group A and 20.52 in Group B, there are no multidimensional differences. The normality of the data was tested via the Kolmogorov–Smirnov criterion ($p = 0.201$ in group A, $p = 0.071$ in group B ($p > 0.05$)) and the Shapiro–Wilk criterion ($p = 0.389$ in group A, $p = 0.081$ in group B ($p > 0.05$)). Thus, the results do not contradict the normality assumption. The residual error plots and the Breusch–Pagan test, with $p = 0.067$ in group A and $p = 0.059$ in group B ($p > 0.05$), show that the assumptions of normality and heteroskedasticity of the model are met. The Durbin–Watson index is 1.608 in Group A and 1.739 in Group B, which is close to 2, suggesting that there is no autocorrelation.

After the repeated regression analysis, the correlation and determination coefficients changed very little. The results show that $R = 0.503$ in Group A and $R = 0.519$ in Group B, indicating a moderate direct relationship between the dependent variable (competence values) and the independent variables, such as charismatic, bureaucratic, democratic leadership styles, age of the athletes and the length of time they have been training with their current coach in Group A and independent variables, such as autocratic, bureaucratic styles, age of athletes and duration of training in Group B. The coefficients of determination $R^2A = 0.253$ and $R^2B = 0.269$ indicate that the variables x4, x5, x6, x7, and x9 explain more than 36% of the variation in Group A, and variables x3, x5, x7, and x8 explain almost 27% of the variance in group B. Taking into account the standardised beta coefficients and the p values for statistical significance, we can assert that of all the regressors, x9 ($\beta A = 0.397$; $p < 0.001$) is the most influential and significant in group A and x5 ($\beta B = 0.301$; $p < 0.001$) in group B, whereas x4 ($\beta A = -0.140$; $p < 0.05$) is the least influential and significant in group A and x8 ($\beta B = 0.139$; $p < 0.005$) in group B. The final model is presented in *Table 2*.

Two regression equations were then constructed on the basis of the results:

- (Group A) Competence values = 5.480 - 0.178 x4 + 0.316 x5 + 0.249 x6 - 0.187 x7 + 0.326 x9;
- (Group B) Competence values = 6.480 - 0.243 x3 + 0.397 x5 - 0.182 x7 + 0.142 x8.

Thus, in team sports, charismatic leadership traits and athletes' age have a negative effect on the competence score (the increase of each unit decreases the competence score by 0.178 and 0.187 units, respectively). In contrast, the traits of bureaucratic leadership and democratic leadership have positive effects on competence values (an increase of one unit respectively increases competence values by 0.316 and 0.249 units). Moreover, the longer the same coach has been in charge, the stronger was the influence on the perceived value of competence (each unit increase increases the competence score by 0.326 units).

Table 2. Regression Model with the Dependent Variable Competence Values

		Dependent variable - Competence					
	Group	***R***	***R^2***	***R^2 Correction.***	***F statistics***	***Reliability, p***	
	A	0.503	0.253	0.247	16.431	0.0001	
	B	0.519	0.269	0.265	7.313	0.0001	
Group	***Independent variables***	***Non-standardised β coefficient.***	***Standardised Beta coefficient.***	***t***	***p***	***Diagnosing multicollinearity***	
						Tolerance	***VIF***
A	**Constanta**	5.480		10.305	0.000		
	x_4 Charismatic	-0.178	-0.140	-2.358	0.019	0.868	1.152
	x_5 Bureaucratic	0.316	0.298	3.339	0.001	0.871	1.148
	x_6 Democratic	0.249	0.168	2.686	0.008	0.788	1.269
	x_7 Age	-0.187	-0.167	-3.435	0.001	0.932	1.073
	x_9 With the current trainer	0.326	0.397	6.872	0.000	0.923	1.084
B	**Constanta**	6.480		9.386	0.000		
	x_3 Autocratic	-0.243	-0.193	-2.687	0.008	0.801	1.248
	x_5 Bureaucratic	0.397	0.301	4.231	0.000	0.820	1.220
	x_7 Age	-0.182	-0.165	-2.439	0.016	0.901	1.110
	x_8 Duration of exercise	0.142	0.139	2.088	0.038	0.931	1.074

Source: created by the authors.

In individual sports, strict and controlling autocratic leadership has a negative effect on athletes' perceptions of competence: the more the coach uses an autocratic style, the less competent the athletes feel (decreasing by 0.243 units). In contrast, a clear bureaucratic style structure, rules and procedures positively affect competence values (increasing by 0.397 units). Similar to team sports, increase of each unit of age decreases the value of competence values by 0.182 units. On the other hand, the longer sporting experience positively affects this group of values (increase of 0.142 units).

3.3.2 Impact on Status Values

The initial analysis revealed that there is a multicollinearity problem because in group A, the variance inflation factor (VIF) for the regressor in group x8 (duration of sport) is greater than 4, and the tolerance is less than 0.25. Therefore, this variable is dropped. The model was also checked for statistical outliers. Cook's distance in Group A was 0.391, and that in Group B was 0.257, which was significantly less than one. The maximum value of DFBet varies from 0.02585 to 0.09735 in Group A, from 0.00837 to 0.06019 in Group B, and is less than one in all regressors. Thus, there are no outliers in the data. This is confirmed by Mahanalobis distance calculation results, which are 22.62 in Group A and 24.21 in Group B, and are below the critical values (23.51 in Group A and 27.88 in Group B). The normality of the data was tested via the Kolmogorov–Smirnov criterion ($p = 0.069$ in group A and $p = 0.133$ in group B ($p > 0.05$)) and the Shapiro–Wilk criterion ($p = 0.075$ in group A and $p = 0.155$ in group B ($p > 0.05$)). The results do not contradict the normality assumption. The residual error plots and the Breusch–Pagan test result of $p = 0.069$ in group A and $p = 0.157$ in group B ($p>0.05$) indicate that the assumptions of normality and heteroskedasticity of the model are met. The Durbin–Watson index values of 1.238 in Group A and 1.280

in Group B are significantly lower than the corresponding two scores, suggesting that there is no autocorrelation. The final model is presented in *Table 3*.

After reanalysis, the correlation and determination coefficients changed very little. The results show that R = 0.522 in Group A and R = 0.606 in Group B. A moderate–strength direct relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables (x4 charismatic, x5 bureaucratic leadership styles of coaches, x9 length of time playing sport with current coach) was recorded in Group A, and the regressors (x1 autocratic, x2 laissez-faire, x4 charismatic, x6 democratic leadership styles of coaches, x7 age of athletes and x8 length of time playing sport) were recorded in Group B. The coefficients of determination in Group A (R^2 = 0.273) and Group B (R^2 = 0.367) mean that variables x4, x5, x9 explain just over 27% of the variance of status values in Group A, and variables x1, x2, x4, x6, x7, x8 explain over 36% of the variance of status values in Group B. Considering the standardised beta coefficients and the p values for statistical significance, it can be concluded that, of all the regressors, the most influential and significant is x9 (the length of time playing sport with current coach, βA = 0.301; p < 0.001) in Group A and x4 (charismatic leadership, βB = -0.342; p < 0.001) in Group B. The least influential but statistically significant is x5 (bureaucratic leadership, βA = 0.187; p < 0.01) in group A and x2 (laissez-faire leadership, βB = 0.155; p < 0.05) in group B.

Table 3. Regression Model with Dependent Variable Status Values

	Group	*R*	R^2	R^2 *Correction*	*F statistics*	*Reliability, p*	
	A	0.522	0.273	0.269	17.175	0.0001	
	B	0.606	0.367	0.349	21.036	0.0001	
	Independent variables	*Nonstandardised β coefficient.*	*Standardised Beta coefficient*	*t*	*p*	*Diagnosing multicollinearity*	
						Tolerance	*VIF*
A	Constanta	5.700		10.430	0.000		
	x_4 Charismatic	-0.388	-0.228	-3.826	0.000	0.944	1.059
	x_5 Bureaucratic	0.286	0.187	3.137	0.002	0.947	1.056
	x_9 With the current trainer	0.139	0.301	3.167	0.000	0.991	1.009
B	Constanta	5.513		4.827	0.000		
	x_1 Authoritarian	0.504	0.232	3.843	0.000	0.797	1.255
	x_2 Laissez Faire	0.295	0.155	2.397	0.017	0.691	1.448
	x_4 Charismatic	-0.846	-0.342	-5.686	0.000	0.803	1.245
	x_6 Democratic	0.453	0.185	2.665	0.008	0.601	1.663
	x_7 Age	-0.265	-0.211	-3.376	0.001	0.741	1.349
	x_8 Duration of exercise	0.209	0.227	3.788	0.000	0.811	1.233

Source: own calculations.

On the basis of the results, multiple regression equations by sport group are as follows:

(Group A) Status values = 5.700 - 0.388 ×4 + 0.286 ×5 + 0.139 × 9.

(Group B) Status values = 5.513 + 0.504 × 1 + 0.295 × 2 - 0.846 × 4 + 0.453 × 6 - 0.265 × 7 + 0.209 × 8.

The first equation shows that in a team environment bureaucratic leadership and training with the current coach positively affect status values (in the first case, an increase of one unit in the variable leads to an increase in the status value by 0.286, and in the second case, it increases by 0.139). Meanwhile, the

negative effect of the charismatic leadership is highlighted (an increase of the variable by one unit decreases by 0.388).

The second equation explains how the regressors work in the individual sport environment. The effect of the charismatic leadership was slightly greater than that in the team setting (an increase of the variable by one unit decreases by 0.846). Moreover, authoritarian and democratic leadership styles have the strongest positive effects (an increase of the variable by one unit in both cases increases approximately by 0.5).

3.3.3 Impact on Moral Values

The linear regression model with the dependent variable moral values was constructed in two stages. Although the values obtained (R^2 = 0.273, adjusted R^2 = 0.269 in group A and R^2 = 0.367, adjusted R^2 = 0.349 in group B, p = 0.0001 in both cases) indicated that the model was statistically robust, there was a multicollinearity problem. The VIF value of the regressor for the duration of the sporting activity was greater than 5, and the tolerance was less than 0.25, so it was removed. The model was also checked for statistical outliers: Cook's distance in Group A was 0.101, and 0.241 in Group B (i.e. much less than one). The maximum value of DFBet varied from 0.00712 to 0.01103 in group A and from 0.00715 to 0.04059 in group B. Thus, no statistical outliers were found; an additional calculation of Mahalanobis distance was 25.69 in Group A and 22.51 in Group B, which were below the critical values (25.90 and 24.32, respectively). Thus, no multidimensional outliers were found. The normality of the data was tested via the Kolmogorov–Smirnov criterion (p = 0.100 in group A and p = 0.162 in group B (p > 0.05)) and the Shapiro–Wilk criterion (p = 0.404 in group A and p = 0.534 in group B (p > 0.05)). Thus, the results do not contradict the normality assumption. The residual error plots and the Breusch–Pagan test results in group A (p = 0.069) and group B (p = 0.157 (p > 0.05)) indicate that the assumptions of normality and heteroskedasticity of the model are satisfied. The Durbin–Watson index is 2.132 in Group A and 2.112 in Group B, which is close to 2, indicating that there is no autocorrelation. The adjusted model is presented in *Table 4*.

Table 4. Regression Model with Dependent Variable Moral Values

	Group	*R*	R^2	R^2 *Correction*	*F statistics*	*Reliability, p*	
	A	0.502	0.252	0.249	22.086	0.0001	
	B	0.526	0.277	0.273	20.291	0.0001	
	Independent variables	*Nonstandardised β coefficient.*	*Standardised Beta coefficient.*	*t*	*p*	*Diagnosing multicollinearity*	
						Tolerance	*VIF*
A	Constanta	5.195		19.656	0.000		
	x_5 Bureaucratic	0.155	0.153	2.599	0.010	0.997	1.003
	x_9 With the current trainer	0.355	0.350	5.959	0.000	0.997	1.003
B	Constanta	5.787		8.626	0.000		
	x_1 Authoritarian	0.251	0.179	2.983	0.003	0.951	1.052
	x_5 Bureaucratic	0.201	0.147	2.458	0.015	0.950	1.053
	x_7 Age	-0.354	-0.296	-4.840	0.000	0.913	1.095
	x_8 Duration of exercise	0.423	0.392	6.475	0.000	0.931	1.074

Source: own calculations.

In the adjusted model (R = 0.502 in group A and R = 0.526 in group B), moderate–strength direct correlation was found between moral values and the independent variables, such as bureaucratic leadership and coaching duration of the current coach, in group A, and independent variables, such as authoritarian and bureaucratic leadership styles, age and coaching duration of exercise, in group B. The coefficients of determination show that the variables explain more than 25% of the variance in Group A and more than 27% in Group B. Considering the standardised beta coefficients and the p values for statistical significance, it can be concluded that, of all the regressors, x9 (playing sport with current coach) has the largest effect in group A (βA = 0350; $p < 0.001$) and x8 (duration of playing sport) in group B (βB = 0.392; $p < 0.001$).

Based on the results obtained, multiple regression equations were constructed:

(Group A) Moral values = 5.195 + 0.155 × 5 + 0.355 × 9

(Group B) Moral values = 5.787 + 0.251 × 1 + 0.201 × 5 - 0.354 × 7 + 0.423 × 8

Therefore, in a team environment, the bureaucratic style has a positive but relatively insignificant effect on a team's moral values. The duration of training with a single coach has a significantly greater influence (the increase of time with a coach by one unit increases agreement with moral values by 0.355 units). In contrast, in an individual sport setting, the importance of moral values is mostly influenced by the length of time spent playing the sport: an increase of one unit increases agreement with moral values by 0.423 units. Meanwhile, age has a negative effect on moral values: with increasing age, the endorsement of moral values decreases. The positive effects of authoritarian and bureaucratic styles are almost the same.

4. Discussion

This study aimed to broaden the understanding of how different perceived leadership styles influence young athletes' moral, athletic competence, and status values. What makes this study stand out from other previous work is that it enriches the list of leadership styles and compares them across individual and team sports groups and across demographic criteria. This approach is important because research on leadership from the athletes' perspective may lead to the better understanding of coaches' leadership behaviours and their potential impact on youth (McGuckin *et al.*, 2022).

The assessment of personal values and coaches' leadership styles revealed important links between coaches' leadership styles and perceptions of competence. Some results were unexpected. Bureaucratic leadership styles are usually contrasted with democratic leadership styles (Gómez-Hurtado *et al.*, 2020), but in this study, both styles positively affected the values related to young people's aspirations for greater sporting excellence. This contrasts with charismatic leadership, which has a negative effect on both competence (for team sports) and status (for individual and team sports) values.

According to Aaltio-Marjosola and Takala (2000), charismatic leadership is often criticised for creating additional space for persuasion and manipulation, which is used to gain personal power. Charismatic coaches can be great inspirers, but their charisma can sometimes diminish athletes' focus on values related to competence and competitiveness by diverting attention to the coach's personality. Moreover, democratic leadership is positively associated with athletes' task orientation (Syrmpas, Bekiari, 2018) and moral behaviour (Azimkhani *et al.*, 2021). This can be explained by the fact that the respect shown by the coach and the creation of a rich coach-athlete relationship increase the athlete's openness to

accepting the coach's moral standards (Peláez *et al.*, 2013). As democratic coaches provide athletes with more opportunities to contribute to team decisions, this may enhance their sense of competence.

A negative attitude towards the bureaucratic leadership style was developed when examining the relationship between leaders and adult employees and the efficiency of organizations, primarily in the public sector, while research on this style in the field of sports (especially among young athletes, in connection with the formation of their values) could not be found. On the other hand, Zang *et al.* (2022) reported that a bureaucratic management approach, complemented by professional strategies, helped teachers learn in a results-oriented way. Thus, it cannot be ruled out that coaches with bureaucratic leadership traits also create a structure that makes athletes feel more secure and confident in their abilities and clearly articulate the value guidelines related to the competencies to be achieved. This assumption seems rather speculative, but the results of the present study suggest that it is worth continuing to work in this direction to find the answers, especially since bureaucratic leadership positively impacted moral and status values, although the effects differed between team and individual sport environments.

Although Yaffe *et al.* (2021) reported some differences in attitudes toward values in team and individual sports, they did not find an interaction effect between parenting styles and sport type on moral and sporting values. In contrast, our study revealed that in team sports, competence, status, and moral values are influenced by the duration of training with one coach. Moreover, in individual sports, the duration of sport coaching had a positive influence. This partially supports Liu *et al.'s* (2023) insights that sportsmen's moral cognition, value enrichment and moral practice skills develop over time. However, in this study, this relationship emerged only in the group of individual sports, whereas no statistical confirmation of the relationship was found in team sports.

Although this study provides new insights into the influence of coaches' leadership types and demographic characteristics on the value orientations of young athletes, certain limitations prevent unambiguous conclusions and encourage further research. First, it was not possible to assess the influence of the variables studied on values in specific sports in terms of their dynamics. For example, basketball, football, hockey and swimming have unique and specific aspects that were not included in the analysis. Therefore, other studies need to consider the specific nature of the sport and the gender of the respondents, as these aspects were not taken into account in this study. In addition, a longitudinal study would allow a more accurate assessment of the influence of time on the formation of different value groups.

Another limitation relates to the list of leadership styles, as other leadership models can be used in modern sporting practices. On the other hand, the aim was to go beyond the most common leadership styles and take a broader view, but at the same time, this also led to limited comparability of results. Cultural differences are also related to this, as the studies with which the results were compared and conducted in different cultural settings may influence value orientations and reactions to leadership styles. Notably, the study relied on young athletes' subjective perceptions of their competence, status and moral values; therefore, personal factors may have influenced the respondents' answers.

Conclusions

This study extends our understanding of the influence of different leadership styles on young athletes' moral, personal development and status values. In contrast to previous studies, the comparison of leadership styles has been extended, and the results provide a basis for further research on the influence

of the specificity of a particular leadership style on athletes' value formation. Most importantly, the complex effects of different leadership styles and contextual circumstances were revealed from both theoretical and practical perspectives. This encourages the researchers not to restrict themselves to a single leadership style but to look for the features of other styles that may be useful in a specific situation.

The results of this study may be useful for the training of sports professionals, who should be trained to apply different elements of leadership in a flexible way, depending on the context and specific situations. In addition to the fact that coaches should not emphasise their personality, but rather foster long-term relationships with athletes based on personal respect and trust, it makes sense to develop clear structures, rules, procedures, and responsibilities to reinforce value orientations. This can help athletes to understand clearly what is expected of them and what values they should focus on.

Literature

Aaltio-Marjosola, I., Takala, T. (2000), "Charismatic leadership, manipulation and the complexity of organizational life", Journal of Workplace Learning, Vol. 12, No 4, pp.146-158. https://doi.org/10.1108/13665620010332750.

Al Khajeh, E. H. (2018), "Impact of leadership styles on organizational performance", Journal of Human Resources Management Research, Vol. 2018, pp.1-10. https://doi.org/10.5171/2018.687849

Azimkhani, A., Islamieh, S.A., Kasraei, R. (2021), "The role of ethical values and coaching styles in adherence to sports in group and individual athletes", Sport Sciences and Health Research, Vol. 14, No 1, pp.73-88. https://doi.org/10.22059/sshr.2022.89702.

Bass, B.M. (1997), "Does the transactional–transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries?", American Psychologist, Vol. 52, No 2, pp.130-139.

Chelladurai, P. (1990). Leadership in sports: a review", International Journal of Sport Psychology, Vol. 21, pp.328-354.

Corti, J.F., Raimundi, M.J., Celsi, I., Alvarez, O., Castillo, I. (2023), "The Moderating Effect of Athletes' Personal Values on the Relationship between Coaches' Leadership Behaviors and the Personal and Social Skills of Young Basketball Players", Sustainability, Vol. 15, No 5, pp.4554. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15054554.

Danioni, F., Barni, D. (2019), "Parents' sport socialization values, perceived motivational climate and adolescents' antisocial behaviors", Europe's Journal of Psychology, Vol. 15, No 4, pp.754. https://doi.org/10.5964%2Fejop.v15i4.1598.

de Albuquerque, L.R., Scheeren, E.M., Vagetti, G.C., de Oliveira, V. (2021), "Influence of the coach's method and leadership profile on the positive development of young players in team sports", Journal of Sports Science & Medicine, Vol. 20, No 1, pp.9-16. https://doi.org/10.52082/jssm.2021.9.

Gómez-Hurtado, I., González-Falcón, I., Coronel-Llamas, J.M., García-Rodríguez, M.D.P. (2020), "Distributing leadership or distributing tasks? The practice of distributed leadership by management and its limitations in two Spanish secondary schools", Education Sciences, Vol. 10, No 5, pp.122. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/educsci10050122.

Hanin, J. (2012), "An investigation into the coaching approach of a successful world class soccer coach: Anson Dorrance: A commentary", International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, Vol. 7, No 3, pp.453-455. https://doi.org/10.1260/1747-9541.7.3.453.

Jin, H., Kim, S., Love, A., Jin, Y., Zhao, J. (2022), "Effects of leadership style on coach-athlete relationship, athletes' motivations, and athlete satisfaction", Frontiers in Psychology, Vol. 13, pp.1012953. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1012953.

Jing-Horng Lu, F., Hsu, Y. (2015), "The interaction between paternalistic leadership and achievement goals in predicting athletes' sportspersonship", Kinesiology, Vol. 47, No 1, pp.115-122.

Lachore, M., Bayeta, G.T., Mekesa, A.B. (2023), "The Impact of Coaches' Transformational Leadership on Soccer Players' Satisfaction in Selected Ethiopian Super and National League Football Clubs", European Journal of Sport Sciences, Vol. 2, No 5, pp.26-36. http://dx.doi.org/10.24018/ejsport.2023.2.5.102.

Lee, M.J., Whitehead, J., Ntoumanis, N., Hatzigeorgiadis, A. (2008), "Relationships among values, achievement orientations, and attitudes in youth sport", Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, Vol. 30, No 5, pp.588-610. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.30.5.588.

Lee, M.J., Whitehead, J., Ntoumanis, N., Hatzigeorgiadis, A. (2013), "How do values influence attitudes and achievement goals?: Relationships between values, achievement orientations and attitudes in youth sport", In Values in Youth Sport and Physical Education (pp.85-103). Routledge.

Lee, M.J., Whitehead, J., Balchin, N. (2000), "The Measurement of Values in Youth Sport: Development of the Youth Sport Values Questionnaire", Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, Vol. 22, No 4, pp.307-326. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.22.4.307.

Li, S., Li, J. (2021), "Fostering trust: Authoritarian, benevolent, and moral paternalistic leadership styles and the coach–athlete relationship", Social Behavior and Personality: An international Journal, Vol. 49, No 12, pp.e10452. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.10452.

Lisá, E., Sousa, J., Morais, C., Gomes, A.R. (2023), "Leadership cycles, styles, and antecedent factors: the perspective of coaches and young soccer athletes from national Slovak leagues", Frontiers in Psychology, Vol. 14, pp.1218290. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1218290.

Liu, C., Qu, G., Gao, R. (2023). Defining sports moral character and clarifying its related concepts", Frontiers in Sports and Active Living, Vol. 5, pp.1101377. https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2023.1101377.

Lucidi, F., Zelli, A., Mallia, L., Nicolais, G., Lazuras, L., Hagger, M.S. (2017), "Moral attitudes predict cheating and gamesmanship behaviors among competitive tennis players", Frontiers in Psychology, Vol. 8, pp.571. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00571

McGuckin, M. E., Turnnidge, J., Bruner, M. W., Lefebvre, J. S., Côté, J. (2022), "Exploring youth sport coaches' perceptions of intended outcomes of leadership behaviours", International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, Vol. 17, No 3, pp.463-476. https://doi.org/10.1177/17479541221076247.

Mortimer, H., Whitehead, J., Kavussanu, M., Gürpınar, B., Ring, C. (2020), "Values and clean sport", Journal of Sports Sciences, Vol. 39, No 5, pp.533-541. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2020.1835221.

Nascimento Jr, J.R D.A.D., Freire, G.L.M., Moraes, J.F.V.N.D., Fortes, L.D.S., Oliveira, D.V.D., Cronin, L.D. (2022), "Does life skills development within sport predict the social behaviours and sports values of youth futsal players?", International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, Vol. 20, No 3, pp.981-995. https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2021.1907764.

Ntoumanis, N., Taylor, I.M., Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C. (2012), "A longitudinal examination of coach and peer motivational climates in youth sport: implications for moral attitudes, well-being, and behavioral investment", Developmental Psychology, Vol. 48, No 1, pp.213.

Pankow, K., Mosewich, A.D., Holt, N.L. (2018), "The development of leadership in model youth football coaches", The Sport Psychologist, Vol. 32, No 4, pp.253-262. https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.2017-0129.

Peláez, S., Aulls, M.W., Rossi, A., Bacon, S.L. (2013), "The coach as a contributor to the socio-moral context: A literature review", Psychology Research, Vol. 3, No 3, pp.113.

Ramírez-Herrero, V., Ortiz-de-Urbina-Criado, M., Medina-Merodio, J.A. (2024), "Intergenerational leadership: a leadership style proposal for managing diversity and new technologies", Systems, Vol. 12, No 2, pp.50. https://doi.org/10.3390/systems12020050.

Ring, C., Kavussanu, M. (2018), "The impact of achievement goals on cheating in sport", Psychology of Sport and Exercise, Vol. 35, pp.98-103. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.11.016.

Schwartz, S.H. (1992), "Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries", in: M.P. Zanna (ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 25, pp.1–65). London: Academic Press.

Soto-Morettini, D. (2023), "'Trust me, kid': leadership style and how we train directors to talk to actors", Theatre, Dance and Performance Training, Vol. 14, No 3, pp.326-338. https://doi.org/10.1080/19443927.2023.2243173.

Šukys S. (2010), "Prosocialaus ir antisocialaus elgesio skalės bei jaunimo vertybių sportinėje veikloje klausimyno adaptavimas lietuviams", Sportas, Vol. 3, No 78, pp.97-104, [Adaptation of the prosocial and antisocial behavior scale and the questionnaire on youth values in sports activities for Lithuanians, in Lithuanian].

Syrmpas, I., Bekiari, A. (2018), "Differences between leadership style and verbal aggressiveness profile of coaches and the satisfaction and goal orientation of young athletes", Journal of Physical Education and Sport, Vol. 18, pp.1008-1015. https://doi.org/10.7752/jpes.2018.s2149.

Turnnidge, J., Côté, J. (2018), "Applying transformational leadership theory to coaching research in youth sport: A systematic literature review", International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, Vol. 16, No 3, pp.327-342. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2016.1189948.

Yaffe, Y., Levental, O., Arey, D.L., Lev, A. (2021), "Morality and values in sports among young athletes: The role of sport type and parenting styles–a pilot study", Frontiers in Psychology, Vol. 12, pp.618507. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.618507.

Yamane, T. (1973). Statistics: An Introductory Analysis. London: John Weather Hill, Inc.

Yang, I. (2015), "Positive effects of laissez-faire leadership: conceptual exploration", Journal of Management Development, Vol. 34, No 10, pp.1246-1261. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2015-0016.

Zhang, X., Wong, J.L., Wang, X. (2022), "How do the leadership strategies of middle leaders affect teachers' learning in schools? A case study from China", Professional Development in Education, Vol. 48, No 3, pp.444-461. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2021.1895284.

KAIP SUVOKIAMOS LYDERYSTĖS STILIUS VEIKIA SPORTININKŲ VERTYBES?

Diana Rėklaitienė, Žilvinas Stankevičius, Jolita Vveinhardt

Santrauka. Sportininkų vertybės neatsiejamos nuo sporto industrijos vystymo, tačiau vis dar trūksta aiškumo, kaip skirtingi trenerių lyderystės stiliai prisideda prie moralinių, asmeninio tobulėjimo ir konkurencingumo siekiančių vertybių ugdymo. Todėl šio tyrimo tikslas yra nustatyti suvokiamos lyderystės stiliaus poveikį sportininkų vertybėms. Surinktos 493 popierinės anketos užpildyto ranka. Siekiant nustatyti jaunųjų sportininkų asmeninių vertybių ir trenerių lyderystės stiliaus ryšius taikytas koreliacinės analizės metodas, o nustatant konkrečios lyderystės įtaką atskiroms vertybių grupėms sudaryti – tiesinės regresijos modeliai. Rezultatai atskleidžia, kad charizmatiškas stilius neigiamai veikė sportininkų kompetencijos, statuso ir moralines vertybes. Kitų stilių (demokratinio, biurokratinio, autoritarinio, *laissez fire*) ir demografinių charakteristikų poveikis vertybėms skirtingas, atsižvelgiant į komandinio ar individualaus sporto šakos aplinką. Šis tyrimas papildo žinias apie skirtingų lyderystės stilių poveikį sportininkų vertybėms ir padeda treneriams geriau suprasti, kokie veiksniai teigiamai arba neigiamai veikia sportininkų orientaciją į meistriškumą, konkurencingumą ir skatina varžytis sąžiningai. Skirtingai nei ankstesniuose tyrimuose, šiame tyrime buvo išplėstas lyderystės stilių palyginimas, o gauti rezultatai sukuria pagrindą tolimesniems tyrimams, skatina aiškintis, kaip konkrečios lyderystė specifika paveikia sportininkų vertybių formavimąsi. Tiek teoriniu, tiek praktiniu požiūriu svarbu tai, kad buvo atskleistas kompleksinis skirtingų lyderystės stilių ir kontekstinių aplinkybių poveikis. Tai skatina neapsiriboti vienu lyderystės stiliumi, o ieškoti, kurie skirtingų stilių bruožai gali būti naudingi konkrečioje situacijoje. Šio tyrimo rezultatai gali praversti rengiant sporto specialistus, kurie turėtų būti mokomi lanksčiai taikyti skirtingus lyderystės elementus atsižvelgiant į kontekstą ir konkrečias situacijas. Be to, kad treneriai turėtų pabrėžti ne savo asmenybę, bet puoselėti ilgalaikius asmenine pagarba ir pasitikėjimu grįstus santykius su sportininkais, stiprinant vertybines orientacijas, prasminga kurti aiškią struktūrą, taisykles, procedūras, numatant atsakomybę. Tai gali padėti sportininkams aiškiai suprasti, ko iš jų tikimasi ir į kokias vertybes reikėtų orientuotis.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: lyderystės stiliai sporte; sportininkų ugdymas; asmeninės vertybės; individualus sportas; komandinis sportas; treneriai; jaunieji sportininkai.