CONTEMPORARY TENDENCIES IN SPORTS MANAGEMENT

Ivanka Gajić

Faculty of Sports, Union-Nikola Tesla University, Belgrade, Serbia

Abstract: *The paper presents contemporary leadership styles in sports, through a theoretical overview of contemporary authors, as well as an empirical study of the leadership style of coaches in team and individual sports in Serbia. The aim of this paper is to determine the characteristics of the management of top coaches in team and individual sports in Serbia, and to compare both groups, find common ground and differences, to empirically show the tendencies of management in sports. The study included 54 team sports coaches and 91 individual sports coaches. Two questionnaires were used. The first questionnaire measured the coach's self-perception. It consists of 40 questions, a five-point Likert scale. The second questionnaire was derived from situational management theory. It is based on 12 situations that can occur in the work environment. The result of the test is the predominant leadership style used by the coach. A comparison of the results showed that coaches of team sports are much less democratic in their leadership and much more directive than coaches of individual sports. Coaches of individual sports more often use a collaborative leadership style than coaches of team sports.*

Key words: *management, top coach, leadership style, team sport, individual sport.*

INTRODUCTION

Top sport today is still experiencing numerous developmental changes and rapid development. It is becoming an increasingly complex and dynamic system, and its operation is primarily dependent on the coach, ie. leader. His role is very important. He has a huge impact on group members, their behavior, motivation and, ultimately, the result.

Top sport is something that is inseparable from the way of life in the context of sports training, and is therefore much more than an occupation. There is no space in it for fixed working hours, in it the actors are almost completely committed to achieving top results.

Leading the process of sports training is the basic and most important task of every coach. In a narrower sense, this implies planning, implementation, supervision and evaluation of the process, and in a broader sense, the establishment of many intertwined relationships, which must be such, in order to achieve efficient operation of the system.

The study of leadership was an interesting and current area that is noticeable in the extensive professional and scientific literature on the subject. The desire to discover the ideal model is present, both among researchers and leaders in practice. Research in the last ten years has repeatedly confirmed that there is no universal way of leadership. The main reason why this is so, lies in the fact that leadership is situationally conditioned. Situational theories of leadership are those that do not reveal new leadership styles, but their contribution is to try to clarify when it is necessary to use which leadership style.

1. LEADERSHIP STYLES

Discussions related to successful management come down to the question of which leadership style to choose? Which method of management and leadership to apply? These are questions that are easy to ask, but there is no easy answer at all. Looking at the discussions in the literature, one could rather say that these are completely wrong questions.

There is an available list of leadership styles, there are even several lists. The leader cannot choose the style. It is a process and a phenomenon that happens or does not happen. Style depends on:
- personality of the leader;
- quality and the needs of the associates;
- limitations and reality of the surrounding; and
- goals that are supposed to be met (Novaković, Ilić, 2019).

By analyzing the nature of personality, we have shown that there are people who simply cannot be different than they are. Associates are also the way they are. The limitations and realities of the environment are given by themselves in a certain period of time. The goals that a manager or firm sets may be influenced by the manager's environment and knowledge. What to do in such a situation?

Well, that's why there is a theory or science of management so that people can see what they need to do so that the company does not fail or be better. The chairman of the board of directors can be changed, the directors of the sector can be changed - but how, why? How to create new, better or fix existing ones? What should they be like? This is a question that is partially answered in this whole chapter. Two leadership styles. Perhaps the most famous theory of leadership styles is that given by D. McGregor in his book The Human Side of Enterprise - Theory X and Theory Y, which was discussed in relation to theories of personality. Theory X and Theory Y have often been presented in the literature as leadership styles. However, what McGregor wanted to show were the notions of employees as seen by managers. According to Theory X, people are lazy, not very smart and irresponsible. According to Theory Y, people are responsible, motivated and creative. Depending on what kind of people they are, they should be treated differently when leading. They used to be "X", now they are more and more "Y" (McGregor, 2006). Chris Argyris later developed this basic idea of McGregor and developed two types of leaders or two leadership styles, which he called

autocratic (authoritarian) and democratic (participatory) in his book Management and Organizational Development: The Path From XA to YB. (Vurdelja, 2011)

Three leadership styles. The first theorist to investigate the relationship with subordinates, as we noted in the first part of this paper, was K. Levin.

He defined three leadership styles: authoritarian, lese-fair and democratic. Later in their research, theorists G. Lippett and R. U. White addressed this issue in the same way. (Ristić, 2012)

Authoritarian style is directive, impersonal and commanding for subordinates. Democratic style is encouraging for subordinates, with two-way communication, with joint decision-making and cooperative in every respect. The third style of leadership, which can be translated as "free leadership", gives full autonomy to associates, without providing a certain structure of responsibility and giving instructions for work. It cannot be said which style of the three listed is the best. It is so individual and so much depends on the above-mentioned circumstances that any suggestion is inappropriate.

The situations in practice are such that even the greatest authoritarians and tyrants declare themselves democrats, and sometimes true democrats resort to authoritarian methods in their work in order to solve a problem.

Four leadership styles. Rensis Likert, one of the leading theorists of leadership and organizational behavior of people, defined four leadership styles. Those are:

1. Exploitatively autocratic;
2. Good-naturedly autocratic;
3. Participatory and
4. Democratic.

Likert's leadership styles depend on variables such as: motivation, attitudes, and loyalty. Likert prefers the fourth style, but whether and when it is possible depends on the level of development of the economy and society. (Novaković, Ilić, 2019).

Five leadership styles. This group includes the theory of R. Blake and J. Mauton, known as the managerial grid. The network has two axes, "people orientation" and "task orientation". Every manager can find himself somewhere in that network.

Figure 1. Managerial grid
Source: Ristić, 2012.

Characteristic cases are the following:

a) In place 1.1. - "impoverished" style. In fact, he is not a manager if he is not oriented towards people or tasks. It is either a bad or a fired manager.

b) In place 1.9. - "folk club" style. This type of manager tries to please his subordinates. They cross all boundaries to make their staff happy. Of course, in this case the tasks to be performed are often sacrificed.

c) In place 9.1. - "authoritarian-obedient" style. This type of manager is obsessed with performing tasks, and subordinates are merely a means by which this is achieved. The result of this way of working is often the frustration and resistance of the staff.

d) In place 5.5 "man organization" style. It is a leader who can move: in the right direction, as an ambivalent compromiser or someone who sometimes strives to perform tasks and sometimes puts pressure on people.

e) In place 9.9 - "teamwork style". It is an ideal leadership style. It is most desirable that the manager manages to meet the needs of associates and perform tasks. But it is also the most difficult style to achieve, and therefore the least common.

There is no author who has described the six leadership styles, as far as it was possible to conclude from the available literature.

Seven leadership styles. R. Tannenbaum and Schmidt gave their classification of leadership styles as early as 1958 in an article in the Harward Business Review. Their scale of styles ranges from the type of managers who predominantly control (manage), to the other extreme when the group controls (manages):

a) The manager who makes the decisions himself and communicates them;

b) A manager who "sells" decisions;

c) A manager who presents ideas and requests questions;

d) A manager who sets out non-binding decisions subject to change;

e) A manager who presents problems, accepts suggestions and makes decisions;

f) A leader who defines the constraints and requires the group to make decisions;

g) A manager who allows associates to function (autonomously) within defined limits.

Here, in fact, we have variations and a gradual transition from authoritarian to fully democratic leadership (Mašić, 2010).

Eight leadership styles. Here we have two theories with eight leadership styles each, one by W. Reddin and the other by H.Hersey and Blanschard. Both are very similar. Both models are based on four basic types of managers that move along the axis and, if they go in one direction, then they are effective or efficient, and in the other direction they are unsuccessful.

Redin wrote a 325-page book on managerial success and became famous. An explanation of his leadership styles is given in the next chapter, which talks about the success of managers. Hersey and Blanchard marked unsuccessful styles with Q4, Q3, Q2, Q1 and successful styles are S1 (speaker), S4 (delegate), S3 (decision-maker) and S2 (seller). This classification of leadership styles is somewhat reminiscent of Likert's. (Ristić, 2012)

Redin's classification is better known, more widely accepted, and more frequently cited in the literature.

Ten leadership styles. Based on the previous review of leadership styles, Botwell himself says that the combinations of the number of leadership styles, depending on the variables observed, are in fact unlimited. He recommends a list of ten leadership styles available to managers for their choice, according to their preference.

Botwell's model of ten leadership styles is given more descriptively. In essence, it gives five independent styles in two variants, as follows:

1. Authoritarian;
• A manager who decides and orders execution himself;
• A manager who decides for himself and ensures execution;

2. Influential;
• The manager who decides for himself, modifies on the basis of suggestions, then gives for execution;
• Manager who decides tentatively (optional);
• Allows the influence of associates who express different opinions with significant arguments;

3. Consulting type;
• Consults with associates individually, decides and announces the decision;
• Consults with a group of associates, decides and then announces the decision;

4. Participatory;
• Explores and decides as a group where everyone is equal;

5. Excluding;
• A manager who defines limits and then allows associates to decide without him;
• A manager who completely excludes himself from the decision-making process, associates decide and act on their own.

In this scale of leadership styles, we notice that various types that lean towards a democratic style start from the second group, while the last type of leadership style is in fact the

same as the lese-fair style. There is a lack of leadership styles like bureaucratic, which are very present in our conditions and useful for studying. Therefore, in the further analysis we will focus more on the Redin scale and its consideration of management success. (Bothwell, 1983)

INTERNAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL MANAGERS

First of all, categories such as power, talent, experience and knowledge come to the fore here. The following figure shows the relationship between the internal characteristics of managers and the climate in organizations.136 A model of the relationship between these categories and the desirability or their presence in certain types of organizational climate, and thus their impact on the success of the organization.

From the above, we can conclude several interesting things related to the above success factors of managers.

1. Power. We see that power in the authoritarian and quasi-democratic climate of the organization is a decisive factor of influence. Power derives from ownership or formal position in the hierarchical structure of the organization. Power as a factor falls drastically in a lese-fair climate, while in a bureaucratic one it slowly stabilizes at a low level. In the co-operative (technocratic) and democratic climate, it is at the lowest level. Therefore, power is a source of power and influence only in the organizational climates mentioned on the left, present as a factor of success. In other organizational climates, the presence of this factor does not have such an impact on events. Other factors take precedence in influencing the emergence and formation of climate.

2. Talent. If it means management talent, that makes sense. Talent for entrepreneurship and talent for innovation are something else. However, if it is a top manager - the owner or founder of the company, then he as a leader must have all three talents in him. Of course, that is a real rarity, but that is why real leaders are still a rarity. Therefore, leadership talent is important in the first forms of organizational climate, later experience and especially knowledge take precedence. Hence the emergence of managers as a new social stratum, especially in large corporations where the influence of owners is lost and real power passes to managers. They are primarily people with experience and knowledge gained through education and training for the job. In the long run, the success of managers will increasingly depend on their training and knowledge acquired in the field.

3. Experience. Here we do not mean work experience or years of service as a time category. It is much more important what kind of teacher and what kind of role model someone had as a manager. Every such man, while creating a career, remembers the influence left on him by one of his former executives.

One of the very important components in the career management process is the adoption of models or role models. The process of identification is often much more important than the process of learning. Experience in leadership and management is also important because mature people, open to new things, learn the most from their own experience. It has already been noticed that successful managers and true leaders have one of the most important characteristics of not admitting defeat, that there is no failure for them, that these are all stages in the process of learning and growth.

4. Knowledge. Every knowledge is layered. Knowledge is acquired through the process of socialization and through the process of individualization. The process of individualization takes place at higher levels of education. Mostly managers are created through higher levels of education. It is also the explanation why the importance of power and talent is lost after the autocratic climate. If a person has not upgraded his base by educating, developing and directing talent, he is not able to build other leadership styles and create other organizational conditions that would be more successful.

In the process of individualization, when people are instilled with the germ of doubt in the acquired knowledge which in turn open areas for the development of creativity, research spirit and innovation, space is opened for the acquisition of necessary knowledge and development of skills necessary for successful leadership. That is why in the developed world there is an insistence on additional education of managers. That is why every manager in the West is additionally educated at least 15 days a year, and that is why there are 2,000 business schools in the USA, and 700 in Europe.

Determination in business means, above all, a man's courage to tackle all the challenges that lie ahead of him in business. Determination implies a strong person full of self-confidence, with a clear vision of what he wants to achieve and with faith in ultimate success.

Leadership. This refers to a person's quality of being "destined" to be a leader or to have a strong predisposition to take the initiative, instill trust and charisma. By the way, if someone enjoys the epithet of a leader, it is because he is successful, that is, able to achieve results in business development.

Personality integrity. A person must be mature, stable, reliable, recognizable, special in some way in order for his associates to trust him and to follow him in realizing his ideas.

Enthusiasm. If the leader does not bring a little more faith than others in what he personally strives for, then it will be difficult to gain followers. It is nice to meet a man at the age when he is almost childishly obsessed with an idea, talks about it and is getting ready to take action. In order to succeed in the world of business, a person must not only believe but also fully dedicate himself to what he believes in.

Imagination is the ability to imagine. This process is two-way. On the one hand, one should have the ability to create a vision of future situations and future solutions to problems. On the other hand, the ability to think (imagination) can enable the manager to explain what only he sees in a plastic and clear way to his followers and associates.

Willingness to work is a very common characteristic of successful managers. That in itself is not enough, because it can turn into an obsession and be counterproductive. Willingness to work seriously and persistently can have a mobilizing effect on associates.

The ability to be analytical is a particularly important characteristic of a successful manager in the process of making quality decisions. Through the process of analysis, possibilities are noticed that are usually not seen at first sight. If the manager is hasty or works only on the basis of intuition, he can miss significant solutions.

Understanding others means having a feeling for the needs of others as well, and not just for your own needs. As a rule, autocrats do not have this characteristic. Understanding others means the ability to transpose into the position of an associate or opponent and to look at things from the other side or from the position of the other. This is a very rare and difficult to achieve feature. The professional name for this is empathy.

Ability to spot chances. This is perhaps the basic characteristic of an entrepreneur. Those managers who have become entrepreneurs have both an entrepreneurial spirit and the ability to distinguish the useful from the useless and focus attention on what is important for the success of the venture. One could even say that successful managers not only notice and use the opportunities that are provided to them, but also have the ability to create opportunities.

Ability to deal with unpleasant situations. Every manager in his job must face unpleasant situations such as: frustrations, conflicts or bad interpersonal relationships, job loss, facing dismissal of workers, dismissal of associates or bankruptcy of the company he runs. That is why it is said that managerial work is very risky for health. There are known situations that are popularly called "managerial illness" or just psychosomatic illnesses, which are very common among managers. That is why there is more and more talk in the West about training managers to develop and form defense mechanisms against stress. Methods of psychophysical relaxation play an increasingly important role in this.

The ability to adapt quickly to change is related to the previous ability. Rapid change, even when it comes to change for the better, is shocking to say the least or can be frustrating. Any rapid change causes increased secretion of adrenaline and a disorder in the work of the heart and the entire nervous system in the human body. This ability is more innate than can be developed by learning. In any case, you should know that you need to be able to overcome the reaction to shocking situations.

Another possible component of this issue is overcoming resistance to change. Every person is prone to resistance to change. A successful manager must be ready to accept the changes initiated by his associates. This can be a key criterion for evaluating a successful manager. The autocrats "put the ideas of their associates in a drawer", then wait for some time to pass, then bring them to light and place them as their own. A successful manager will encourage associates to change and innovate.

Willingness to take risks is autochthonous and an immanent feature only to successful managers. Those who are not ready to take risks have no chance of success. There is an Aya-kok's famous saying that a successful manager must fall at least once in his career. When he was removed from the position of chairman of the board of directors of Ford Corporation, he thought that he had fallen from Mount Everest.

Willingness to take risks also applies to jobs. It is important to be better than average or among the few who win. Therefore, one must be prepared for losses, as well as defeats and mistakes.

Botwell's list of characteristics of a successful manager. He says: "If you do not find all these characteristics in yourself, do not give up. Remember, there are 1,390 other characteristics which can describe you. " Botwell's list contains the following characteristics of a successful manager:

1. Intelligence;
2. Ability to cooperate with others;
3. Experience in the field of technical competence;
4. Ability to motivate oneself and others;
5. Emotional stability and self-control;
6. Experience and skill of planning and organizing;
7. Strong desire to accomplish tasks;

8. Ability to use group processes;

9. Ability to be efficient and successful;

10. Determination.

Already at first glance, it can be seen that there are certain similarities on both of these lists of characteristics of successful managers, but that they differ slightly in the way they are formulated. Another conclusion is that order does not mean that characteristics are ranked in order of importance. Then, there are some characteristics that do not fall into the same category in terms of values, such as the ability to be efficient and determined. If someone has all the qualities from one to eight, then he will be successful (characteristic under ordinal number 9). (Bothwell, 1983)

Brief description of the characteristics of a successful manager:

Intelligence. This term in psychology is not yet unambiguously defined. It is difficult to distinguish intelligence from cleverness, creativity, and even the ability to understand. But, if we accept the definition that intelligence contains other mentioned terms, then it is important for the manager insofar as he must be intellectually stronger than his associates. Today, more and more creativity is separated from intelligence and the business sphere is given great importance. For now, the most famous are, in addition to natural, also emotional and spiritual intelligence. According to what is known about management intelligence, the other two are more important than the primary one - although natural intelligence dominated for a while.

The ability to cooperate with others is very similar to the already described characteristic of "understanding others". In order for a person to successfully cooperate with someone, he needs to get to know him well and understand each other. This means that he should anticipate reactions in certain situations and take them into account in mutual communication and cooperation.

Experience in the field of technical competence. Perhaps it is better to say affirmation in the area of your competence. This primarily means that a successful manager must be competent in a professional field. If he is an entrepreneur, he must know some technology, be very good at it and make a successful business based on it. If he is an expert in a technical field, on that basis his authority grew, and then his power arose from that and thus he reached the position of having power in the organization. By the way, as far as the necessary professional knowledge for managers is concerned, that issue was very early and very much researched. Fajol also determined that in smaller companies, the manager should be more competent in technology and production. In larger companies, he should be more competent in the field of marketing and finance.

The ability to motivate oneself and others has to do with "understanding others", but also with knowing oneself. The manager must be able to motivate himself and others, especially in crisis situations. Often, stubbornness, failure or vanity is a motive for many people for certain efforts and endeavors that they would not normally undertake. However, this is about healthy motivation and finding the right reasons to mobilize for the right actions.

Emotional stability and self-control. This is similar to the term "personality integrity" from the previous list of traits. This is also a concretization: we know what emotional stability is, as opposed to emotional lability.

It is also known what the ability of self-control is, unlike uncontrolled, fast and reckless reaction in interpersonal relationships. Over abrupt and conflicted man, who is too fast in his assessments and attitudes, has little chance to lead successfully.

Experience and skill of planning in organizing. If a manager wants to be more than just an administrator and organizer, he must at least be very good as a strategist. The ability to plan and organize work are the basic areas of competence of every manager. It is a "technology" that he must understand and on which the "craft" of the manager is based. These are the abilities into which all other qualities, characteristics and skills of successful managers merge. Of course, these are the elements through which the goals and tasks that the manager sets for himself, his associates and the company as a whole are directly achieved. Hence, the assessment of success can be done through the realization of set plans, the way the company is organized and the outcome of all that, and that is success.

Strong desire to accomplish tasks. A strong desire to achieve goals stems from motivation, the ability to predict events and faith in one's own ability to solve problems encountered in this area. "Tasks" are just the operationalization of goals. Tasks are a means to the realization of plans. Formulating tasks is always the hardest part of managerial work. Have a vision, make realistic plans, predict future events, make the right decisions - all these are activities that will be nothing if the tasks are not operationalized, properly delegated, if the conditions for their implementation are not provided and people are motivated to perform them and finally if there are no results .

The ability to use group processes is a basic characteristic of managers who are not autocrats. The entire management literature tends towards a commitment to democratic leadership styles in democratic organizational climates. Of course, many conditions need to be met for that. We have seen, above all, that it is the emotional maturity of people and knowledge. The culmination of these conditions is the creation of successful work teams. The group processes and the group decision- making effect are insisted on, among other things, due to the motivation of the staff (associates), but above all due to the synergetic effect. In team work, as a rule, creative solutions are reached, original solutions and, finally, a solution in general that often an individual is not able to come up with. Of course, a leader, innovator, entrepreneur and talent for management must have it all in them. If the effect of teamwork is added, then the guarantee of success is greater. Another important element related to teamwork is the development of a sense of belonging to the company, as a motivator for better work.

Ability to be efficient and successful. It all comes down to that. If someone has all the abilities from one to eight, as has already been noticed, then this under nine is solved by itself. However, this ability has another component that is most related to entrepreneurial projects. It is the literature on management. Serious people no longer rely on chance or luck, but try to overcome uncertainty. Prediction methods have been developed, and lately a new science - "studying the future" - has been increasingly used in business. Those who can see more are more capable. A good manager leaves nothing to chance. He must anticipate all the circumstances.

Determination. Determination is in both of these lists the characteristics of successful executives. There is nothing more to add here than what has already been said. It is interesting that this is a characteristic that is given explicitly and unambiguously in both models, with one word. Determination in itself implies a certain dose of authoritarianism. However,

a democrat must also be determined because that instills trust in associates and is probably the most important trait of true leaders.

Finally, regarding the internal characteristics of successful managers, we give the list that Harry Levinson published in an article in the Harvard Business Review.

Characteristics related to the ability to think are:

1. Ability of abstraction - to conceptualize, organize and combine different data into a coherent framework;

2. Tolerance in uncertainty - can withstand uncertainty until things become clear;

3. Intelligence - to have the ability not only for abstraction, but also for practicality and practical problem solving;

4. Ability to judge - knowledge of when to act.

Feelings and inner qualities are:

5. Authority - a sense of belonging to a leading role;

6. Activity - taking a decisive orientation to the problems and needs of the organization;

7. Achievement - focus on the successes of the organization rather than on personal affirmation or upliftment; others;

9. Engagement - seeing someone as a member of a participating organization;

10. Maturity - good relationships with influential people;

11. Interdependence - respect for the needs of others;

12. Articulation - making a good impression;

13. Endurance - possession of physical and mental energy;

14. Adaptability - good management in stressful situations;

15. Sense of humor, do not take everything too seriously.

Characteristics of behavior:

16. Vision - to have a clear idea of the course of one's own life, career and the progress of the organization;

17. Perseverance - the ability to adhere to tasks and the ability to see solutions in conflict with problems;

18. Personal organization - having a good sense of time;

19. Integrity - having a well-established value system, which has been tested in various ways in the past;

20. Social responsibility - the need to take on a leadership role with respect for the responsibility that role implies.

The impression left by this list of mentioned characteristics of successful executives is impressive. Each feature would require a separate and much broader explanation and description. (Ristić, 2012)

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

The goal of research

The aim of the research is to establish the characteristics of leading top coaches in team and individual sports in Serbia, to compare them, to find common characteristics and mutual differences, and to investigate the causes of knowledge. Leadership styles were examined and measured using two questionnaires.

Research hypotheses

H0 Team sports coaches are less democratic in their leadership than individual sports coaches.

H1 Coaches in individual sports use a collaborative leadership style more often than team coaches.

H2

Research method

Research sample

The research was conducted anonymously. 54 coaches of team sports and 91 coaches of individual sports participated in the research. The age of the coach was between 25 and 50 years. In team sports, the average age of coaches was 38.1 years, and in individual sports 39.2. The criterion for selecting coaches was that in the last five years they have trained athletes of top and international level.

Research instruments

Two questionnaires from different authors were used. Both measured the self-perception of the coach. The concept of the first questionnaire measures the stable dimensions of coaching, the concept of the second is a way of reacting in certain specific sports situations, which often occur.

We used the Leadership Scale for Sports, Chelladiurai from 1984.

The questionnaire has 40 Likert-type questions. The scale is used to measure the ideal image of the coach, to measure the understanding of the coach by the athlete and to measure the coach's understanding of his own leadership, ie. leadership (self-perception). It is composed of five dimensions and the dimensions of coaching-educational leadership, autocratic leadership, socially supportive and positive feedback.

Questionnaire – Leadership style in a situational model – personal evaluation (LEAD quaestionnaire: Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description) – Hersey in Blanchard, 2001.

This questionnaire has not previously been used for research purposes. It is basically intended for the education of managers. It was used in this research by adapting it to sports. The questionnaire consists of 12 situations that can occur in the work environment. For each situation, possible answers are listed, and the coach must choose the one that is closest to the way he would react himself. The result of the questionnaire is the predominant leadership style, used by the coach. The styles are: directive, persuasive, collaborative, delegation and flexibility. (Hersey, Blanchard, 2001)

Data were processed in SPSS 12.0, using descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance, which checked the difference in dimensions between coaches of team and individual sports.

The results and discussion

Analysis of differences in leadership styles between top coaches of team and individual sports

Table 1. Presentation of descriptive statistical data and results of one-way analysis of variance

	TEAM SPORTS		INDIVIDUAL SPORTS		F VALUE	
	M	SD	M	SD	F	F_{SIGN}
Leadership through training	4,37	0,31	4,31	0,38	1,10	**0,23**
Democratic leadership	2,62,881	0,64	3,07	0,57	20,10	**0,00***
Autocratic leadership	3,23	0,47	2,79	0,49	1,04	**0,31**
Social supported leadership	4,38	0,44	3,38	0,64	2,23	**1,13**
Positive feedback	4,11	0,53	4,49	0,47	1,46	**0,23**
Directive leadership	4,11	2,75	2,69	1,95	13,12	**0,00***
Leadership by persuasion	4,89	2,23	5,34	1,93	1,68	**0,20**
Collaborative leadership	2,24	1,50	2,93	1,53	6,98	**0,09 t**
Leadership by delegating	0,78	0,95	1,03	1,18	1,82	**0,18**
Adapted, flexible leadership	4,56	10,34	6,85	10,41	1,68	**0,20**

Legend: M = arithmetic mean, SD = standard deviation, F = F - value, Fsign = level of statistical significance, * statistically significant difference (p <0.05), t = tendency towards statistically significant differences (p <0.1) .

A statistically significant difference between the groups was in the dimension of democratic leadership (p = 0.00). A comparison of the arithmetic mean of team and individual sports coaches showed that team sports coaches are less democratic than individual sports coaches. In the dimension of socially supportive leadership, no significant tendency was shown (p = 0.13), although it would certainly have been shown in a much larger sample. Differences in other dimensions were not statistically significant.

There was also a statistically significant difference in the directive leadership style (p = 0.00). A comparison of arithmetic means among the research groups showed that team sports coaches are more directive in their guidance than individual sports coaches. There is also a visible tendency (p = 0.09) that individual sports coaches use a collaborative leadership style more often than team sports coaches. Differences in other dimensions were not statistically significant.

Differences in the dimension of democratic leadership among groups were expected.

The reasons for such results are not simple. The situation is precisely the factor that determines the appropriate style of coaching and with it the impact on athletes.

Team sports are more represented in the media compared to individual sports. The reason for that is their convenient competition calendar. In team sports, the calendar and the competition system determine a shorter preparation and a long competition period, while in individual sports it is the other way around. The system of competition in team sports is often absurdly set up for commercial reasons, which can be a big problem for the coach, the athlete and the team. On the other hand, the calendar and the competition system cause frequent interaction with the audience, and thus media attention. The calendar and system of competition in individual sports is less intense, in terms of the frequency of competitive performances, which affects a different motivational scheme of athletes.

The coach's leadership is largely dependent on the maturity of the athlete and the understanding of the importance of professionalism as a way of life. Leading a 20-year-old, because of his talent, full of uncontrolled energy and performance, as well as dizzying financial promises, which has been functioning for quite a long time with a disciplined and sports-subordinated way of life. It is not uncommon for coaches in team sports to combine young, strong, with excellent athletic abilities and experienced, emotionally stable, more stable and team-oriented athletes. It will depend on the coach's leadership style to what extent the various potentials of the athletes combined in this way will contribute to the new and balanced quality of the team..

On the other hand, there are coaches and athletes of individual sports, who do not have the appropriate drives to perform the transformation process. Obtaining financial resources in individual sports implies a huge investment of both coaches and athletes. That is why coaches of individual sports do not have as much social power as coaches of team sports.

CONCLUSION

Research has shown that coaches in team sports are significantly less democratic in their leadership and much more directive than coaches in individual sports. Coaches in individual sports prefer to opt for a collaborative leadership style.

Differences in leadership style on some dimensions appear depending on the situation based on the popularity of the sport and the expectations associated with it. The popularity of the sport largely depends on the competition system, which differs in team and individual sports.

There is a lot of talk about an ideal and always successful coach. Such a way of leading and training does not exist and, it can be said, that success requires combinations of leadership styles, which must always be adapted to specific situations. Proper guidance of a coach who cares about the balance between group and individual needs as well as relationships is crucial on the path to the goal.

REFERENCES:

Bothwell, L. (1983) The Art of Leadership: Skill-building techniques that produce results Englewood Cliffs. Prentice Hall Press. New York.

Challadurai, C. (1984). Leadership in Sports. V J.M. Silva in R.S. Weinberg (Ur.).

Hersey, P. And Blanchard, K.H. (2001). Management of Organizational Behavior: Leading Human Resources. Upper Saddle River: Pretence Hall.

Mašić, B. (2010) Menadžment, Singidunum, Beograd

McGregor, D. (2006) The Human Side of the Enterprise. The McGraw-Hill.

Novaković, I. Novaković, S. (2019) Menadžment u sportu, Singidunum, Beograd

Psychological Foundations of Sport. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Ristić, D. (2012) Osnove menadžmenta, Cekom, Sremski Karlovci

Vurdelja, I. (2011) »How Leaders Think: Measuring Cognitive Complexity in Leading Organizational Change«. Psychology, emanticscholar.org/paper/How-Leaders-Think%3A-Measuring-Cognitive-Complexity-Vurdelja/6ef4a69dcd3c5fe91993ae31453 7714b9f05a2df