

Article

An Exploratory Study of the Use of Values by Coaches in the Czech Republic

William Crossan^{1,*}, Milos Bednar¹, Timothy Baghurst², and Martin Komarc¹

¹ Faculty of Physical Education and Sport, Charles University

² Florida State University

* Correspondence: William.crossan@gmail.com

Received: June 2020; Accepted: December 2020; Published: September 2021

Abstract: Without deliberate reflection on and implementation of values in the coaching process, coaches are unlikely to emphasize moral values and may miss opportunities for their instrumental use. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to explore the values which coaches desired to be guided by in their coaching practice, and the values which they hoped to develop in the athletes entrusted to their care. Participants were 571 coaches from seven sports in the Czech Republic who were asked to complete a survey containing open and closed responses concerning coaching values. Specifically, they were asked to identify the values that guided their coaching and the values they sought to develop on their teams. Results indicated that values of Hard Work and Respect for Others were the most important, regardless of gender, age coached, experience, licensing, or level coached. We suggest that Eastern coaches, who are largely still heavily influenced by the coaching methodology of the former Soviet Bloc, would benefit from the intentional implementation of instrumental development values that align with the developmental needs of the athletes they coach.

Keywords: values; coaching; philosophy; moral; Czech Republic; Youth Sport Values Questionnaire

Introduction

Values in sport has been studied from a variety of perspectives, including the value of sport (Fraleigh, 1983; Kretchmar, 2005; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995), sport for moral development (Lumpkin et al., 2002; Shields et al., 2018; Simon, 2003; Stoll & Beller, 2012), the values of youth in sport (Danish et al., 2005; Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005; Hansen et al., 2003; Koh et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2000, 2008), values of winning coaches (Gearity et al., 2013; Gould et al., 2017; Jones et al., 2003; Schroeder, 2010; Wang & Straub, 2012), and the absence of values in sport (Fraser-Thomas & Côté, 2009; Gearity & Murray, 2011; Lumpkin et al., 2002; Stoll & Beller, 2012). According to Rokeach (1973), a value is “an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence” (p. 5). For this study, values can be described as norms or principles that guide an individual’s interactions and convictions. This study sought to examine the values that coaches desired to be guided by in their coaching practice, and the values which they hoped to develop in the athletes entrusted to their care.

A coach’s job is composed primarily of helping athletes reach their potential (Hansen et al., 2003) and improving their performance (Jones et al., 2008). However, the success of these goals is largely dependent on their knowledge and values, which ultimately determines both their role in athletes’ lives and their own coaching philosophy (Nash et al., 2008). Thus, knowledge and values acquired in life, through coaching experience and through formal and informal education, are two of the most important tools of a coach. Most literature on coaching philosophy posits that a coach’s philosophy is constructed over time as a result of one’s values, personal and coaching sport experience, and coaching education (Cassidy et al., 2008; Jenkins, 2017; Nash et al., 2008). Some have suggested a coaching philosophy is singularly guided by a coach’s core values (Camiré et al., 2012; Collins et al., 2009). While Rokeach’s (1973) research showed values and value priorities to be relatively static, other researchers have found the intentional, instrumental use of values can be used to increase teamwork, achieve team goals, and improve performance (Gould et al., 2017; Schroeder, 2010; Wang & Straub 2012). Unfortunately, as Cushion and Partington (2016) noted, most coaches have not developed a coaching philosophy, choosing to coach based on their common sense, without adjustment to the specific needs of the current athletes or team they are coaching.

Sport values typically have a collective nature and develop within specific cultures slowly over time (Girginov, 2004). Keshock (2009) suggested that the deeply held value of Hard Work among Czech athletes and coaches is rooted in over 1,000 years of history. Among coaches from Eastern Europe, an authoritarian coaching style is common, often lacking ability to relate to and motivate athletes on a personal level (Girginov & Sandanski, 2004). The sport system has a long history of being highly focused on early specialization, with an emphasis on repetition of precise physical movement. Green and Oakley (2001) stated that in the Eastern Bloc, “the scientization of sport training was taken to unprecedented lengths” (p. 253). The emotional desires of athletes were overlooked as unnecessary, as athletes were typified as workers or human machines. With the fall of the political system, the choices of athletes have expanded, but many coaches are behind the curve in changing to meet the demands of the athletes. Kavalir’s (2004) research shows values of Czech sport and Czech youth are misaligned and create barriers to sport participation. Therefore, this study investigated the values coaches use to guide their coaching process, and those values that they believe will help their athletes achieve their maximum potential and improve performance. In this sense, the instrumental use of values by Czech coaches is evaluated and introduced to improve performance, while retaining and engaging athletes.

Sport Values

In sport, values have been delineated in various ways. To define a “good” sport contest, Fraleigh (1983) classified sport values as inherent, instrumental values. Martinkova (2012) posited for the inclusion of inherent values in sport, trying to broaden Fraleigh’s definition by delineating between competitive and humanistic values. Kretchmar (1994, 2005), in trying to bring clarity to the fair play movement, divided sport values into moral and non-moral. Those evaluating sport for fair play have built on Kretchmar’s delineation and switched the terms to moral and performance values (Lumpkin et al., 2002; Simon, 2003). More recent definitions have included the terms of competence, moral, and status (Lee et al., 2013). While recognizing the contributions of each of these categorizations, the instrumental use of values for both moral and performance outcomes are of particular interest in the present study. Fraleigh (1983) defined instrumental values as values which are not inherent to the sport activity itself, but are used in a utilitarian manner to bring about a given end. Many of the moral values emphasized by Kretchmar (1994, 2005) as essential for fair play, or by Brand (2006) in defending sport as educational, are not values which occur automatically when sport is played (inherent values), but values instrumentally adopted for the protection of good sport.

Most research on the use of values in sport has focused on youth sports (Danish et al., 2005; Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005; Hansen et al., 2003; Koh et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2008; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). Research on elite level sports has focused primarily on the decline in moral values over time (Burton & Welty Peachey, 2014; May, 2001; Shields et al., 2018; Stoll & Beller, 2012). However, few studies have considered the coach’s personal values.

Several authors attribute this lack of focus on values in the coaching literature to the philosophical pragmatism common among coaches (Cushion & Partington, 2016; Jenkins, 2017; Nelson & Groom, 2012). Isidoria et al. (2015), found most coaches were unaware and unreflective of their values paradigm, yet stated that self-awareness of one’s own practice (critical reflection) and experience when engaged in sport is the fundamental condition for the understanding of sport values. Therefore, there is a need for coaches to exercise critical reflection on their own guiding values before they will be able to instrumentally implement developmental values with the teams they coach.

Although a coach will have personal values, occasionally a sport organization will establish a set of values from the top they expect coaches to adopt with their teams. For set values to have significance, coaches must lead with the particular values espoused (Koh et al., 2017; Simon, 2003). When coaches lead with values, there is an amplifying effect on the athletes they coach, which significantly increases the instrumental benefit on performance (Cameron et al., 2014). One such example examined by Pim (2016) is the West Point Competitive model, a program focused on developing character through sports by identifying core values, and tying these core values to observable behaviors. The adaptation of this program led to significant performance success among elite university athletes (i.e., 36 national championships were won during the 7-year period after the implementation of their values program). The specific values emphasized developmentally in this model included Trust, Respect, Loyalty, Responsibility, Courage, Commitment, and Teamwork (Pim, 2016).

Coaches must also understand the ever-changing needs of their athletes based on developmental and cultural changes. For example, Partington et al. (2014) collected data on the coaching behaviors of 12 male professional youth football coaches in England. They found that to understand performance demands, coaches must be aware of how the needs of athletes change across the age and developmental spectrum. This is significant, as others

have reported that a mismatch between developmental needs and coaching behaviors led to high dropout and injury rates (Fraser-Thomas & Côté, 2009) as well as shorter careers (Gearity & Murray, 2011) than when athletes were trained by a competent age- and skill-appropriate coach (Côté & Gilbert, 2009). These findings highlight the importance of delineating between a coach's guiding (i.e., core or permanent values) and developmental values (i.e., personal philosophy which changes based on who is being coached).

Coaches have an enormous role in athletes' lives, and athletes may acquire their values of integrity, respect, commitment, and resilience most often from their coaches (Koh et al., 2016). Furthermore, athletes reported being able to transfer these values beyond sport. "It is not sport per se that teaches life skills; it is a sport experience that is designed in such a fashion that its participants can transfer what is learned to other domains" (Danish et al., 1997, p. 103). For a coach to achieve this, they must critically reflect on their own guiding values as well as create a culture in which the values they aspire to develop in their athletes are both relevant to their athletic needs and transferable to life.

The Youth Sport Values Questionnaire (YSVQ), an instrument developed by Lee et al. (2000), has been used in multiple contexts to assess the values of youth in sport (Lee et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2008; MacLean & Hamm, 2008; Whitehead & Gonçalves, 2013). Lee and colleagues (2013), surveying youth aged 12-15, found that competence and moral values led to prosocial attitudes, while a lack of moral values coupled with status values led to antisocial attitudes. Values most important to youth were: Enjoyment, Achievement, Sportsmanship, Contract Maintenance, Fairness, Compassion, Tolerance, Skills, Obedience and Team Cohesion. This is important, for while the demands of youth ought not be the driving force in a coach's choice of values, to ignore these demands in a crowded marketplace of youth activities is to increasingly drive them away. Furthermore, the more aligned the coaching behavior and athlete's perception of desired values are, the more maximized are skill acquisition and training (Weaver & Chelladurai, 1999).

Much of the research on the implementation of values focuses on youth sport. Elite athletes are typically older, and have established their own values systems that may or may not coalesce or conflict with their coach. Value research at the elite level tends to focus on the decline of moral values among those who stay in sport for extended periods of time. Therefore, understanding and supporting the development of values systems in youth sports can be beneficial. We believe it is necessary to set a starting point with the coach's own personal value system. It is unlikely coaches will act deliberately in instrumentally emphasizing particular values to those entrusted to them unless they are aware of their own guiding values (Jenkins, 2010). Thus, we have examined the literature for values which coaches themselves have expressed, which are presented in Table I. It should be noted that most coaches did not delineate between guiding and developmental values. Rather, they tended to relate how they arrived at these values for themselves, and then how they implemented them developmentally with their teams. Researchers chose to study these coaches based on their performance success. While each study places emphasis on the moral development of the athletes in their charge, they were studied because of their multiple years of historical success in the sport and level coached. Thus, while we believe these coaches are authentic in their belief in the moral value of the values by which they are guided, most other coaches who follow them as models are adopting their values paradigms pragmatically.

Table 1. Representative Values of Elite Winning Coaches.

Coach	Sport/Level	Values
Pete Carroll ¹	American football/ NCAA	Confidence, courage, discipline, passion, resilience, responsibility, trust
Phillip Fulmer ²	American football/ NCAA	Balanced life, communication, fun, hard work, positive, respect for others
Anson Dorrance ³	Women's football/ NCAA and US national team	Balanced life, care, hard work, positivity, respect for others, striving for excellence
Pat Summitt ⁴	Women's basketball/ NCAA	Fairness, hard work, loyalty, respect for others, responsibility, self-discipline, trust, unselfishness, winning and losing with grace
J Robinson ⁵	Wrestling/NCAA and youth	Accountability, dedication, discipline, hard work, responsibility, sacrifice, service
Steve Harrison ⁶	Football/ Premier League	Empathy, friendship, positivity, respect for others, responsibility, trust
Changing team culture: The perspectives of ten successful head coaches ⁷	Varied/ NCAA and professional	Communication, discipline, effort, hard work, passion, respect for others, responsibility, self-esteem, team-oriented, trust, unselfishness

(²Gearity et al., 2013; ⁵Gould et al., 2017; ⁶Jones et al., 2003; ⁷Schroeder, 2010; ⁴Summitt & Jenkins, 2013; ¹Voight & Carroll, 2006; ³Wang & Straub, 2012)

Literature indicates that if a coach's values (e.g., winning, personal achievement) do not complement those they seek to impart to athletes (e.g., teamwork, effort), a dichotomy exists, and conflict is likely (Koh et al., 2017; Simon, 2003). However, little is known about what coaches value personally and what they want their athletes to value. Therefore, the purposes of this study were to ascertain (a) the guiding values of coaches, and (b) the values they sought to instill within their athletes. Because no study has been conducted within this topic in the Czech Republic, or on Eastern European coaches, this study was considered exploratory in nature.

Procedures

Participants

Participants were 571 coaches from the Czech Republic who completed an in-person survey (88.3% response rate) about their coaching values (Table 2). The vast majority (92%) were male and represented seven sports (Floorball, 122; Ice Hockey, 106; Football, 88; Basketball, 85; Handball, 69; Hockeyball, 53; and Baseball, 48). Included within the convenience sample were professional and amateur teams across three divisions of competition that included both youth and adult athletes. Czech sport leagues, like many other European leagues, are composed of teams within clubs, often with a professional team at the top. Each age group team competes in a relegation system with two to five levels of competition. The average age of coaches was 34.7 ($SD = 9.6$) years of age, and coaching experience ranged from 1-40 years, with a mean of 7.1 years ($SD = 6.7$).

Table 2. Demographic Percentages of Coaches Sampled.

Coach gender			Age coached			
Male	Female		up to 8	8 to 14	15 to 19	20 +
84.3%	15.7%		7.9%	43.4%	28.8%	19.9%
Level coached			Coach experience			
1 st league	2 nd league	3 rd league or lower	1 to 4	5 to 9	10 to 15	16+
34.5%	32.6%	32.9%	50.1%	25.4%	13.8%	10.7%

Instruments

Participants were asked to complete demographic information in addition to questions pertaining to values. Demographic variables collected included coach's gender (M/F), gender coached (M/F), age coached (up to 8, 8-14, 15-19, 20+), level coached (1st league, 2nd league, 3rd league or lower), coaching experience (1-4 years, 5-9 years, 10-15 years, 16+ years), license level (A – highest, B, C or unlicensed), and whether they were a head or assistant coach.

The survey was written in the Czech language and used previously in research (Crossan & Bednář, 2018). It included two parallel open and closed questions that evaluated coaching values. These two non-demographic questions were the same in both open-ended and closed form: “What 3-5 values guide you as a coach?” and “What 3-5 values do you as a coach hope to develop in the team/players you are currently coaching?” With respect to closed questions, participants were asked to choose 5 values from a randomly ordered list of 37 generated from those identified by Coubertin (Müller, 2000), Tyrš (1926), the fair play movement (Lumpkin et al., 2002; Simon, 2003), the National Collegiate Athletic Association (Brand, 2006), and Kretchmar (1994, 2005). Items were randomly ordered to help address the possibility that participants would simply choose items near the top or early in the list.

Methods

Surveys were conducted by the primary researcher at coaching education seminars hosted by sport federations in the Czech Republic between March and May of 2018. Prior to data collection, permissions and approval were acquired from all relevant individuals and organizations. The paper surveys were introduced by a sport federation official to help improve coaching education in the sport's federation. Surveys were anonymous and completion was voluntary.

Demographic and open-ended questions were distributed first. Coaches were orally given the simple definition of values as, “Values are norms or principles which guide your interactions and convictions.” After approximately six minutes, coaches were given the second section of the survey containing the closed questions. Surveys were distributed in two stages to encourage respondents to record their guiding and developmental values in the open-ended questions before potentially being biased by the list of values presented in the closed questions. Surveys were collected after approximately 15 minutes had elapsed.

Data Analysis

Basic descriptive statistics (mean, variability, counts, proportions) for all variables of interest (demographics, guiding and developmental values preference) were calculated.

Group differences in values preference based on gender coached, age coached, level coached, coaching license level, and coaching experience were assessed using Pearson's Chi-square test (or Fisher exact test, where appropriate). Pearson and Spearman correlation coefficients were used to express the strength of association between continuous and ordered categorical variables, respectively. Significance was set at $p < .05$. P values were based on omnibus chi squared tests comparing all levels of grouping variables. Results which had group differences in values endorsement greater than 5%, which we considered practically significant, even while $p > .05$, are also presented. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 25 (SPSS Statistics for Windows, 2017).

Results

Correlations are presented in Table 3. The strongest association was observed between years coached and license level ($r = -.525, p < .001$), where a longer coaching history was related with a higher license level. Strong correlations were also found between years coached and age ($r = .39, p < .001$), sex of the coach and sex of the athletes ($r = .51, p < .001$), and years coached to being a head or assistant coach ($r = .35, p < .001$).

Table 3. Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Variables of Interest.

	Gender coached (M=0; F=1)	Head Coach / Assistant	Age Coached	Level coached	Coach's age	Male / Female	Experience	License level
Head Coach (0) /Assistant (1)	-.120*							
Age coached (Yrs)	.077	-.138*						
Level coached	-.073	.054	-.332*					
Coach's age (Yrs)	-.005	-.116*	.131*	-.025				
Male (0) /Female (1)	.509*	.050	-.114*	.044	-.106*			
Experience (Yrs coached)	.019	-.349*	.225*	-.134*	.390*	-.102*		
License level	.013	.196*	-.323*	.271*	-.259*	.126*	-.525*	
Education	-.040	.115*	.014	.052	-.195*	-.020	-.232*	.171*

Note. * $p < 0.05$; Level coached was coded as follows: 1st League (1), 2nd League (2), 3rd league or lower (3); License level was coded highest (1) to lowest (3) as the actual certification levels varied by sport.

Open Responses

Coaches were asked to list the top three to five values which guide them as coaches, followed by three to five values that they would like to develop in their team (Table 4). On average, there were slightly more values ($M = 3.73; SD = .93$) given for themselves than their team ($M = 3.38; SD = 1.0$). There was a 28% overlap between the values listed as their guiding values and values they would like to develop on their current teams, but 235 coaches (43.8%) presented a completely different set of values for those which guided them and what they desired to develop in their athletes.

Common values reported by coaches for themselves included Fairness (24.1%), Fair Play (23.1%), and Hard Work (20.7%). Consistent with Kretchmar (1994, 2005) and Simon (2003), in this study we equated Fair Play to Sportsmanship, and defined Fairness in Kantian terms as "equality of opportunity to perform." Other values are presented in Table 4.

Common values desired by the coaches in their athletes included Team Spirit (26.4%) and Hard Work (25.1%).

Table 4. Guiding (A) and Developing (B) Values from Open-ended Questions.

(A) Guiding value	N	%	(B) Developing value	N	%
Fairness	129	24.1%	Team spirit	140	26.4%
Fair play	124	23.1%	Hard work	133	25.1%
Hard work	111	20.7%	Respect	75	14.2%
Respect	95	17.7%	Humility	61	11.5%
Team spirit	74	13.8%	Friendship	57	10.8%
Friendship	68	12.7%	Fair play	55	10.4%
Fun	68	12.7%	Responsibility	53	10.0%
Patience	61	11.4%	Trust	45	8.5%
Honesty	59	11.0%	Patience	38	7.2%
Humility	57	10.6%	Fun	36	6.8%
Trust	56	10.4%	Goal oriented	36	6.8%
Responsibility	41	7.6%	Discipline	35	6.6%
Discipline	36	6.7%	Honesty	30	5.7%
Sincerity	32	6.0%			
Goal oriented	29	5.4%			

Closed Responses

Participants were asked to choose values that guided them from a list of 37 values (Table 5). Tables 5 and 6 list only the top 10 values identified by coaches; when values below the top 10 are discussed, we have provided their relative position for reference (i.e., noted as a # to indicate ranking). The top guiding values were Fun (38.5%), followed closely by Respect for Others (36.1%), Patience (34.3%), and Hard Work (32.4%). The congruence between coaches guiding and developmental values was evident, as Respect for Others (35%) and Hard Work (34.6%) occupied the top two developmental value positions. Among the top 10 guiding and developmental values, 7 overlapped, with a remarkable number of coaches expressing them as desired. Differences in endorsement of developmental versus guiding values larger than 10% were observed in the values of Fun (38.5% to 21.9%), Health (23.5% to 14.8%); Fairness (21.9% to 8.3%), and Courage (9.8% to 19.3%), which were all significant at $p < .001$.

Guiding and Developmental Values Based on Level Coached and Experience

As guiding values, the values of Fun (45.5% to 28.5%, $p < .01$) and Fairness (24.1% to 19.0%, $p = .44$) both decreased as coaches move up in level coached (Table 5), while Patience (32.5% to 38.0%, $p = .46$) and Hard Work (26.7% to 39.7%, $p = .03$) increased with level coached. As developmental values, Hard Work (30.4% to 42.5%, $p = .02$) again increased with level coached, along with an increased emphasis on Humility (21.5% to 26.8%, $p = .48$) and Courage (16.2% to 24.0%, $p = .15$); while Winning and Losing with Grace (39.3% to 27.4%, $p = .05$) and Sportsmanship (25.1% to 14.5%, $p = .04$) both decreased when coaches coached higher level teams.

Table 5. Prevalence of Guiding (A) and Developmental (B) Values by Level Coached and Experience (top 10 preferences).

Type	Value	Total	Level coached				Experience				
			1 st league	2 nd league	3 rd league or lower	<i>p</i>	1 to 4	5 to 9	10 to 15	16+	<i>p</i>
A	Fun	38.5%	28.5%	41.2%	45.5%	0.00	47.1%	36.4%	23.5%	28.1%	0.00
	Respect for others	36.1%	39.1%	32.7%	35.1%	0.46	34.4%	34.3%	39.5%	43.9%	0.49
	Patience	34.3%	38.0%	32.7%	32.5%	0.46	40.2%	31.4%	27.2%	24.6%	0.03
	Hard Work	32.4%	39.7%	31.5%	26.7%	0.03	28.2%	40.7%	25.9%	38.6%	0.03
	Friendship	30.0%	27.4%	33.3%	29.3%	0.47	32.8%	27.9%	30.9%	22.8%	0.44
	Responsibility	28.9%	27.4%	26.7%	32.5%	0.41	27.4%	32.9%	30.9%	24.6%	0.57
	Health	23.5%	23.5%	22.4%	24.6%	0.89	23.9%	19.3%	27.2%	26.3%	0.52
	Trust	22.2%	20.1%	23.0%	23.6%	0.70	21.2%	22.1%	27.2%	21.1%	0.72
	Winning and losing with grace	22.2%	22.3%	19.4%	24.6%	0.50	23.9%	21.4%	19.8%	21.1%	0.85
	Fairness	21.9%	19.0%	23.6%	24.1%	0.44	21.2%	25.0%	25.9%	12.3%	0.2
B	Respect for others	35.0%	37.4%	32.1%	36.6%	0.54	35.9%	31.4%	38.3%	33.3%	0.72
	Hard Work	34.6%	42.5%	30.9%	30.4%	0.02	31.3%	44.3%	24.7%	40.4%	0.01
	Winning and losing with grace	32.6%	27.4%	31.5%	39.3%	0.05	35.9%	26.4%	39.5%	21.1%	0.03
	Responsibility	30.2%	32.4%	27.3%	29.8%	0.58	31.3%	26.4%	35.8%	24.6%	0.37
	Humility	23.9%	26.8%	23.6%	21.5%	0.48	22.0%	22.9%	22.2%	15.8%	0.30
	Friendship	23.0%	20.1%	25.5%	23.0%	0.50	25.1%	18.6%	21.0%	28.1%	0.36
	Fun	21.9%	19.0%	27.9%	19.4%	0.08	21.6%	22.1%	22.2%	22.8%	1.00
	Sportsmanship	19.8%	14.5%	20.0%	25.1%	0.04	23.2%	19.3%	14.8%	14.0%	0.23
	Courage	19.3%	24.0%	18.2%	16.2%	0.15	18.9%	21.4%	18.5%	15.8%	0.82
	Patience	18.9%	19.0%	20.6%	17.8%	0.80	19.3%	18.6%	21.0%	15.8%	0.89

Note: bold *p* values are significant

These patterns in value importance were reflected in coaches' experience. Specifically, Fun (47.1% to 28.1%, $p < .01$) and Patience (40.2% to 24.6%, $p = .03$) as guiding values, and Humility (27.0% to 15.8%, $p = .30$) and Sportsmanship (23.2% to 14.0%, $p = .23$) as developmental values, all decreased as coaches gained experience. Interestingly, there were no clear guiding values which coaches who had more experience were likely to hold. Similar findings existed with coaching license level, where those with more licensing education were less likely to value Fun (A 29.7%, B 34.6%, C 43.2%, $p = .03$), Patience (A 29.7%, B 26.4%, C 39.1%, $p = .01$), Friendship (A 23.1%, B 30.8%, C 31.2%, $p = .31$), Health (A 16.5%, B 18.9%, C 26.2%, $p = .06$), and Respect for the Rules (A 14.3%, B 17.0%, C 24.9%, $p = .03$).

Guiding and Developmental Values Based on Gender and Age Coached

When coaching females verses males, coaches placed more emphasis on the guiding values of Patience (46.9% to 32.4%, $p = .02$), Responsibility (35.9% to 28.0%, $p = .19$), Fairness (29.7% to 19.9%, $p = .07$), and Respect for the Rules (#12, 29.7% to 19.9%, $p = .07$). In addition, those coaching females reported Sportsmanship as a more important developmental value when coaching females than males (37.5% to 17.7%, $p < .01$). Other developmental values those coaching females placed considerably more emphasis on were Respect for Others (42.2% to 33.4%, $p = .16$), Winning and Losing with Grace (43.8% to 30.4%, $p = .03$), and Friendship (32.8% to 21.7%, $p = .05$). The only value emphasized more by those coaching males than females was Humility (24.9% to 9.4%, $p = .01$).

Values that guide coaches appear to change by what age groups are being coached (Table 6). Specifically, values of Fun (46.7% to 23.9%, $p < .01$), Patience (51.1% to 31.9%, p

= .09), Friendship (37.8% to 29.2%, $p = .55$), Fairness (28.9% to 11.5%, $p < .01$), Sportsmanship (#11, 28.9% to 11.5%, $p < .01$), and Respect for the Rules (#12, 33.3% to 18.6%, $p = .17$), all decrease as the age group coached goes up. Conversely, Respect for others (26.7% to 36.3%, $p = .58$), and Hard Work (20.0% to 35.4%, $p < .01$), increased with age group coached.

Table 6. Prevalence of Guiding (A) and Developmental (B) Values by Gender and Age of Athletes (top 10 preferences).

Type	Value	Total	Gender			Age				
			Male	Female	p	up to 8	8 to 14	15 to 19	20+	p
A	Fun	38.5%	38.2%	42.2%	0.53	46.7%	49.8%	30.8%	23.9%	0.00
	Respect for others	36.1%	34.0%	37.5%	0.58	26.7%	36.8%	37.7%	36.3%	0.58
	Patience	34.3%	32.4%	46.9%	0.02	51.1%	34.1%	31.4%	31.9%	0.09
	Hard Work	32.4%	32.8%	28.1%	0.45	20.0%	26.5%	42.1%	35.4%	0.00
	Friendship	30.0%	29.2%	34.4%	0.40	37.8%	30.9%	27.0%	29.2%	0.55
	Responsibility	28.9%	28.0%	35.9%	0.19	22.2%	30.5%	30.2%	26.5%	0.64
	Health	23.5%	22.7%	21.9%	0.89	26.7%	28.3%	18.2%	20.4%	0.11
	Trust	22.2%	22.5%	21.9%	0.92	28.9%	18.4%	22.6%	26.5%	0.23
	Winning and losing with grace	22.2%	22.3%	18.8%	0.52	28.9%	20.2%	25.2%	19.5%	0.39
	Fairness	21.9%	19.9%	29.7%	0.07	28.9%	27.4%	19.5%	11.5%	0.00
B	Respect for others	35.0%	33.4%	42.2%	0.16	46.7%	34.5%	32.1%	35.4%	0.34
	Hard Work	34.6%	34.6%	29.7%	0.44	26.7%	30.9%	37.1%	41.6%	0.14
	Winning and losing with grace	32.6%	30.4%	43.8%	0.03	31.1%	38.1%	28.9%	27.4%	0.14
	Responsibility	30.2%	29.4%	32.8%	0.58	24.4%	25.1%	34.0%	37.2%	0.07
	Humility	23.9%	24.9%	9.4%	0.01	22.2%	20.2%	31.4%	21.2%	0.07
	Friendship	23.0%	21.7%	32.8%	0.05	26.7%	30.0%	19.5%	12.4%	0.00
	Fun	21.9%	21.7%	18.8%	0.59	22.2%	23.8%	19.5%	21.2%	0.80
	Sportsmanship	19.8%	17.7%	37.5%	0.00	33.3%	20.6%	16.4%	17.7%	0.08
	Courage	19.3%	19.7%	15.6%	0.44	15.6%	19.7%	19.5%	19.5%	0.93
	Patience	18.9%	20.1%	20.3%	0.97	20.0%	18.4%	18.2%	20.4%	0.96

Note: bold p values are significant

Developmentally, Respect for others (46.7% to 35.4%, $p = .34$), Friendship (26.7% to 12.4%, $p < .01$) and Sportsmanship (33.3% to 17.7%, $p = .08$) each decreased in emphasis as age coached increased. In contrast, coaches placed more emphasis on the developmental values of Hard Work (26.7% to 41.6%, $p = .14$) and Responsibility (24.4% to 37.2%, $p = .07$), when coaching older athletes. We observed several values which appeared to be particularly emphasized within specific age groups, presumably corresponding with aged developmental needs. The ability to Win and Lose with Grace appeared to be most important among those coaching 8-14-year-old athletes (38.1%), Humility with those ages 15-19 (31.4%), and Resilience (#13, 24.8%) among those over 20.

It is necessary to remember that the correlations between level coached, experience, and age coached were all high (Table 3). Thus, the findings in Tables 5 and 6 have some similarities. Developmentally, Fun is replaced with Hard Work as the level goes up. Also, the leagues are divided into levels within all age groups. Similar to guiding values, developmentally, Family Friendly Relationships decreased (#18, 15.2% to 8.4%, $p = .06$) inversely to level of competition, and Winning and Losing with Grace (39.3% to 27.4%, $p = .05$), and Sportsmanship (25.1% to 14.5%, $p = .04$) also appear less important to coaches coaching higher level teams. These values appear to be replaced by Hard Work (30.4% to 42.5%, $p = .02$) and Courage (16.2% to 24.0%, $p = .15$) developmentally.

Values Not Valued by Czech Coaches

Values reported were those stated by at least 10% of the coaches within the sample. However, some values were less considered by coaches. These were evenly represented by inherent, instrumental, and added values. Values chosen by 5-9% of coaches (27-56 coaches) were composed primarily of instrumental and added values (Faith, Bravery, Civility, Striving for Excellence, Truthfulness). Several added and inherent values were selected by only a few coaches (0-5%; Hope, Balanced Life, Love, Wisdom, Strength, Morality, Unselfishness, Relevant Skills, Relevant Knowledge, Integrity, Reputation and Welfare).

Combining Open and Closed Responses

Hard Work

When results from both open and closed responses were combined, the value of Hard Work was represented most often (Tables 4 - 6). As a developing value, it was the second most listed on both the open and closed questions with the least discrepancy between percentages (Table 4, Type B: 25.1% and Table 5, Type B: 34.6%). Hard Work was significantly influenced as both a guiding and developmental value by age and level coached, and by the coach's experience, which was highly correlated with these two variables.

Respect

In the open values, the general value of Respect was listed as a developmental value by 14.2% (Table 4, Type B); coaches most likely meant respect for others, which was the top closed developmental value by 35% (Table 5, Type B) of coaches. However, Respect for the Rules was also ranked 16th in the closed question and chosen again by 14.1% of coaches. As a guiding value, while coaches were general in the open responses in terms of respect (Table 4, Type A, 17.7%), in the closed responses, Respect for Others ranked 2nd (Table 5, Type A, 36.1%) and Respect for the Rules was 12th (20.9%), both higher than the general respect expressed previously. As guiding values, Respect for Others increased with age coached, while Respect for the Rules decreased with age coached.

Fun

Only 12.7% of coaches listed Fun, or some form of the joy/entertainment component as a guiding value in the open questions (Table 4, Type A), yet when choosing among a "bag of virtues" (represented by Table 5, Type A), a full 38.5% of coaches said they are guided by the value of Fun. Coaches felt little need to develop the value of Fun in open questions, only being chosen by 6.8% (Table 4, Type B) and 21.9% (Table 5, Type B) of coaches in the closed question. Perhaps one of the more interesting findings is the value of Fun, which while decreasing in guiding influence of coaches (Table 6, Type A), is a consistent developmental value across ages (19.5%-23.8%) (Table 6, Type B). The value of Fun was significantly influenced only as a guiding value, by age and level coached, and by the coach's experience, all at $p < .01$.

Fairness

The percent of coaches who stated they are guided by the value of Fairness remained consistent between the open (Table 4, Type A, #1, 24.1%) and closed (Table 5, Type A, #10, 21.9%) questions, even though its ranking dropped considerably. This was similar to the open value of Fair Play (Table 4, Type A, #2, 23.1%), which is similar to Sportsmanship in the closed question (#11, 21.5%).

As guiding values, Patience, Hard Work and Friendship (Table 4, Type A, values 8, 3, and 6) all remained in similar priority positions among coaches even though the percentages are 12-22% higher on the closed questions (Table 5, Type A, values 3, 4, 5). Similarly, the values of Responsibility, Humility, Friendship, Sportsmanship, and Patience all held very similar positions both times asked as developmental values, and thus probably accurately represent the values coaches truly desired to develop in their athletes.

Discussion

The study and use of values in coaching is important, as a mismatch of coaching behaviors to developmental needs has a negative impact on continuation in sport (Partington et al., 2014). Other studies illustrate that involvement in sport does not automatically lead to the development of positive moral values (Fraser-Thomas & Côté, 2009; Priest et al., 1999), and the choice and implementation of values needs to be based on the developmental needs of the athletes (Danish et al., 2005; Fraser-Thomas et al., 2005; Koh et al., 2017). For a coach to move away from just a pragmatic coaching philosophy, they need to critically reflect on their own guiding values, then assess the current team they are coaching per player needs before instrumentally implementing appropriate developmental values. Thus, the present study's finding that there are few instrumental moral values evident among the developing values of those coaching preadolescent and youth under 15 years old is concerning. Also alarming was the decreasing support of moral values that was replaced by hard work and responsibility; this correlated significantly with increased coaching experience and education. A coach's philosophy should be more influenced by the needs of the athletes than the coach's experience and level of education or licensing (Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Jones et al., 2003; 2008).

As Girginov and Sandanski (2004) illustrated in discussing Eastern Bloc coaches, "the message brought by the East was unequivocal – elite gymnastics is not fun but hard work," (p.825). Girginov and Sandanski (2004) discussed how Eastern coaches who come to the West have to learn to be "motivators and managers, not just coaches" (p.827). The instrumental use of developmental values can serve to meet this need, while still producing winning teams, as illustrated with the West Point Model (Pim, 2016) as well as others (Gould et al., 2017; Schroeder, 2010). However, chosen developmental values must be both authentically held by the coach (Cameron et al., 2014; Camiré et al., 2012) and in some degree of alignment with the desired values of the athletes being coached.

In comparison to the results from Lee et al. (2000, p. 320-321) on their widely used and adapted YSVQ survey, there is an overlap of five values, which can be termed demand overlap. The values of Enjoyment/Fun (YSVQ #1, Guiding #1, Developmental #7), Sportsmanship (YSVQ #3, Guiding #11, Developmental #8), Contract Maintenance/Responsibility (YSVQ #4, Guiding #6, Developmental #4), Fairness (YSVQ #5, Guiding #10, Developmental #21), and Team cohesion/Friendship (YSVQ #10, Guiding #5, Developmental #6) are each similarly valued between athletes and coaches (Lee et al., 2000). In contrast to the present findings, the YSVQ survey (Lee et al., 2000) does not display the decreases in the values of enjoyment, fairness, or sportsmanship, which we observed among coaches either between age groups or level played. This is a significant point in need of reflection for Czech coaches given the decreasing trends in sport participation (Novotny, 2015).

With respect to coaches who are coaching older teams or teams at the highest level, it is helpful to compare their stated values to those of the elite coaches (Gearity et al., 2013; Jones et al., 2003; Schroeder, 2010; Summitt & Jenkins, 2013; Voight & Carroll, 2006; Wang

& Straub, 2012) and the West Point Competitive model (Pim, 2016). These coaches and their programs were researched due to their performance success, which is what coaches strive and are often paid for. Thus, their use of values frequently has instrumental value. The most common values of the elite coaches researched correspond to those coaching at the highest level in the present study with respect to Responsibility, Trust, Hard Work, and Respect for Others. Of the other values which the elite coaches researched had in common with each other: Courage, Balanced Life, Positivity, and Unselfishness, each moral or instrumental values, only Courage was held by a significant number of Czech coaches. This could represent a growth area for elite Czech coaches.

The analysis of values of elite coaches also emphasized the amplifying effect of a coach who develops the values which guide them personally (Jones et al., 2003; Voight & Carroll, 2006; Wang & Straub, 2012; Wooden & Jamison, 2005). This amplifying effect is emphasized in the values-based leadership business literature as essential to the implementation of effective values programs for achieving success (Cameron et al., 2014). An evaluation instrument comparing coaches desired guiding and developmental values with those of the perceived values of the athletes they coach would be a useful tool in researching this amplifying effect.

Limitations

The surveys conducted in this study asked the coaches to self-report their guiding values. Self-reporting often leads one to report their idealized self. Future studies could include third party identification of values to eliminate this bias. Due to the nature of conducting a paper survey, the closed list of values from which participants chose was ordered the same for all respondents. This did not appear to have a significant effect on the results, which is evidenced by the number of values placed near the bottom of the list, as well as the correspondence between open response values listed and closed response values. However, this limitation could be eliminated with the use of digital surveys. Additionally, as most coaches in the Czech Republic are male, not enough female coach responses were received to make generalizations between value differences of male and female coaches. The results of this study only reflect the expressed values of coaches; they do not measure either the experienced values or the desired values of the athletes coached. These comparisons are recommended for further research. Further, a qualitative study examining how and why these coaches choose their values, in addition to how they implement them, would bolster this research area.

Conclusions

The present study of Czech coaches highlights the value they place on Hard Work and Respect for Others, regardless of coach gender, age, experience, licensing, or level coached. There is an alarming trend of decreasing moral values as the coach ages and acquires licensing. While self-reporting is limited in presenting coaches' idealized self, we strove to decrease this by asking the same questions in both an open and closed manner. Coaches did not vary significantly in their answers to the two sets of questions except for the value of Fun, which was much more highly valued both as a guiding and developmental value in the closed responses. This would indicate that coaches know Fun should be valued, which is consistent with the results of others who evaluated youth values using the YSVQ instrument (MacLean & Hamm, 2008; Whitehead & Gonçalves, 2013). There was also significant incongruence between Czech coaches and the elite coaches studied by others in

the use of moral and instrumental values. Despite higher than expected differences between choice of guiding and developmental values, Czech coaches appeared to be more influenced in their choice of developmental values by experience and licensing level than the developmental needs of the athletes they coach.

These findings are significant in their evaluation of coaches' values regardless of performance, which stands in contrast to the many studies of the values of successful elite coaches. Additionally, comparison of coaches' values over and against youth values from the widely used YSVQ instrument provides a first step in uncovering the value-percept disparity. Based on the findings of this study, there appears to be a lack of understanding by Eastern European coaches of the potential developmental use of instrumental values to aid athletes in maximization of skill acquisition and training.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, W.C. and M.B.; methodology, W.C., M.B., and M.K.; software, M.K.; validation, W.C., M.B., and M.K.; formal analysis, M.K. and W.C.; investigation, W.C. and M.B.; resources, W.C.; data curation, W.C.; writing – original draft preparation, W.C. and T.B.; writing – review and editing, W.C. and T.B.; visualization, M.K. and W.C.; supervision, W.C.; project administration, W.C.; funding and acquisition, W.C. and M.B.

Funding: This research was partially funded by the Charles University Grant Agency, Progres Q19 grant.

References

- Brand, M. (2006). The role and value of intercollegiate athletics in universities. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 33(1), 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00948705.2006.9714687>
- Burton, L., & Welty Peachey, J. (2014). Ethical leadership in intercollegiate sport: Challenges, opportunities, future directions. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 7(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jis.2014-0100>
- Cameron, K., Quinn, R., Degraff, J., & Thakor, A. (2014). *Competing values leadership*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Camiré, M., Trudel, P., & Forneris, T. (2012). Coaching and transferring life skills: Philosophies and strategies used by model high school coaches. *The Sport Psychologist*, 26(2), 243–260.
- Cassidy, T. G., Jones, R. L., & Potrac, P. (2008). *Understanding sports coaching: The social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice*. Routledge.
- Collins, K., Gould, D., Lauer, L., & Chung, Y. (2009). Coaching life skills through football: philosophical beliefs of outstanding high school football coaches. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 3(1) 29–54.
- Côté, J., & Gilbert, W. (2009). An integrative definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 4(3), 307–323. <https://doi.org/10.1260/174795409789623892>
- Crossan, W., & Bednar, M. (2018). A critical evaluation of the development and use of values in coaching. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae: Kinaanthropologica*, 54(2), 96–117. <https://doi.org/10.14712/23366052.2018.8>
- Cushion, C., & Partington, M. (2016). A critical analysis of the conceptualisation of “coaching philosophy.” *Sport Education and Society*, 21(6), 851–867. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2014.973644>
- Danish, S., Forneris, T., & Wallace, I. (2005). Sport-based life skills programming in the schools. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 21(2), 41–62. https://doi.org/10.1300/J370v21n02_04
- Danish, S., & Nellen, V. (1997). New roles for sport psychologists: Teaching life skills through sport to at-risk youth. *Quest*, 49(1), 100–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.1997.10484226>
- Fraleigh, W. (1983). An examination of relationships of inherent, intrinsic, instrumental, and contributive values of the good sports contest. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 10(1), 52–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00948705.1983.9714400>

- Fraser-Thomas, J., & Côté, J. (2009). Understanding adolescents' positive and negative developmental experiences in sport. *The Sport Psychologist*, 23(1), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.23.1.3>
- Fraser-Thomas, J., Côté, J., & Deakin, J. (2005). Youth sport programs: An avenue to foster positive youth development. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 10(1), 19–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1740898042000334890>
- Gearity, B., Callary, B., & Fulmer, P. (2013). Learning to coach: A qualitative case study of Phillip Fulmer. *Journal of Coaching Education*, 6(2), 65–86. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jce.6.2.65>
- Gearity, B., & Murray, M. (2011). Athletes' experiences of the psychological effects of poor coaching. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 12(3), 213–221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.11.004>
- Girginov, V., & Sandanski, I. (2004). From participants to competitors: The transformation of British gymnastics and the role of the Eastern European model of sport. *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 21(5), 815–832.
- Girginov, Vassil. (2004). Eastern European sport: Nomen. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 21(5), 690–709.
- Gould, D., Pierce, S., Cowburn, I. H. J., & Driska, A. (2017). How coaching philosophy drives coaching action: A case study of renowned wrestling coach J Robinson. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 4(1), 13–37.
- Green, M., & Oakley, B. (2001). Elite sport development systems and playing to win: Uniformity and diversity in international approaches. *Leisure Studies*, 20(4), 247–267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614360110103598>
- Hansen, D., Larson, R., & Dworkin, J. (2003). What adolescents learn in organized youth activities: A survey of self-reported developmental experiences. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 13(1), 25–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1532-7795.1301006>
- Isidori, E., Migliorati, M., Maulini, C., & Echazarreta, R. (2015). Educational paradigms and philosophy of football coaching: A theoretical and practical perspective. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 614–621. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.203>
- Jenkins, S. (2017). Beyond 'crude pragmatism' in sports coaching: Insights from CS Peirce, William James and John Dewey. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 12(1), 8–19.
- Jenkins, S. (2010). Coaching philosophy. In J. Lyle & C. Cushion (Eds.), *Sports coaching: Professionalisation and practice* (1st ed., pp. 233–242). Churchill Livingstone.
- Jones, R., Armour, K., & Potrac, P. (2003). Constructing expert knowledge: A case study of a top-level professional soccer coach. *Sport, Education and Society*, 8(2), 213–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573320309254>
- Jones, R., Cassidy, T., & Potrac, P. (2008). *Understanding sports coaching: The social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice*. Routledge.
- Kavalir, P. (2004). Sport in the value system of Czech adolescents: Continuity and change. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 21(5), 742–761.
- Keshock, C. (2009). Historical, psychological and cultural influences upon the sport success of Czechoslovakian athletes. *European Journal for Sport and Society*, 6(2), 179–188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16138171.2009.11687837>
- Koh, K., Camiré, M., Bloom, G., & Wang, C. (2017). Creation, implementation, and evaluation of a values-based training program for sport coaches and physical education teachers in Singapore. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 12(6), 795–806. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747954117730987>
- Koh, K., Ong, S., & Camiré, M. (2016). Implementation of a values training program in physical education and sport: Perspectives from teachers, coaches, students, and athletes. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 21(3), 295–312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2014.990369>
- Kretchmar, R. (1994). *Practical Philosophy of Sport*. Human Kinetics.
- Kretchmar, R. (2005). *Practical Philosophy of Sport and Physical Activity*. Human Kinetics.
- Lee, M., 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*, 22(4), 307–326. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.22.4.307>
- Lee, M., Whitehead, J., Ntoumanis, N., & Hatzigeorgiadis, A. (2008). Relationships among values, achievement orientations, and attitudes in youth sport. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 30(5), 588–610. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.30.5.588>

- Lee, M., Whitehead, J., Ntoumanis, N., & Hatzigeorgiadis, A. (2013). How do values influence attitudes and achievement goals? In *Values in youth sport and physical education* (pp. 85–103). Routledge.
- Lumpkin, A., Stoll, S., & Beller, J. (2002). *Sport ethics: Applications for fair play* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill Humanities/Social Sciences/Languages.
- MacLean, J., & Hamm, S. (2008). Values and sport participation: Comparing participant groups, age, and gender. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 31(4), 352–367.
- Martinkova, I. (2012). Teaching values in movement activities: Inherent and added values. *Acta Universitatis Carolinae: Kinanthropologica*, 48(2), 111–119.
- May, R. (2001). The sticky situation of sportsmanship contexts and contradictions in sportsmanship among high school boys basketball players. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 25(4), 372–389. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193723501254003>
- Müller, N. (2000). Olympism: Selected writings of Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937. IOC.
- Nash, C., Sproule, J., & Horton, P. (2008). Sport coaches' perceived role frames and philosophies. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 3(4), 539–554. <https://doi.org/10.1260/174795408787186495>
- Nelson, L., & Groom, R. (2012). The analysis of athletic performance: Some practical and philosophical considerations. *Sport, Education and Society*, 17(5), 687–701.
- Novotny, J. (2015). Sport clubs in the Czech Republic. In C. Breuer, R. Hoekman, S. Nagel, & H. van der Werff (Eds.), *Sport clubs in Europe: A cross-national comparative perspective* (pp. 69–84). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-17635-2_5
- Partington, M., Cushion, C., & Harvey, S. (2014). An investigation of the effect of athletes' age on the coaching behaviours of professional top-level youth soccer coaches. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 32(5), 403–414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2013.835063>
- Pim, R. (2016). Values-based sport programs and their impact on team success: The Competitive Sport Model at the United States Military Academy. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 3(3), 307–315. <https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2016-0071>
- Priest, R., Krause, J., & Beach, J. (1999). Four-year changes in college athletes' ethical value choices in sports situations. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 70(2), 170–178. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.1999.10608034>
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. Free Press.
- Schroeder, P. (2010). Changing team culture: The perspectives of ten successful head coaches. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 33(1), 63–88.
- Shields, D., Funk, C., & Bredemeier, B. (2018). Relationships among moral and contesting variables and prosocial and antisocial behavior in sport. *Journal of Moral Education*, 47(1), 17–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2017.1350149>
- Shields, D., & Bredemeier, B. (1995). *Character development and physical activity*. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycinfo/1994-98550-000>
- Simon, R. (2003). *Fair Play: The ethics of sport* (2nd Ed.). Westview Press.
- SPSS Statistics for Windows (Version 25). (2017). IBM Corp.
- Stoll, & Beller. (2012). Moral reasoning in athlete populations a 20 year review. Retrieved March 9, 2016, from https://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/center_for_ethics/research_fact_sheet.htm
- Summitt, P., & Jenkins, S. (2013). *Sum it up: A thousand and ninety-eight victories, a couple of irrelevant losses, and a life in perspective*. Crown Archetype.
- Tyrš, M. (1926). *Tělocvik v ohledu estetickém*. Knihovna Tyršův odkaz.
- Voight, M., & Carroll, P. (2006). Applying sport psychology philosophies, principles, and practices onto the gridiron: An interview with USC football coach Pete Carroll. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 1(4), 321–331. <https://doi.org/10.1260/174795406779367800>
- Wang, J., & Straub, W. (2012). An investigation into the coaching approach of a successful world class soccer coach: Anson Dorrance. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 7(3), 431–448. <https://doi.org/10.1260/1747-9541.7.3.431>
- Weaver, M. & Chelladurai, P. (1999). A mentoring model for management in sport and physical education. *Quest*, 51(1), 24–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.1999.10491666>

- Whitehead, J., & Gonçalves, C. (2013). Are sport values similar in other nations? Exploring cross-cultural value systems. In J. Whitehead, H. Telfer, & J. Lambert (Eds.), *Values in youth sport and physical education* (pp. 104–118). Routledge.
- Wooden, J., & Jamison, S. (2005). *Wooden on leadership: How to create a winning organization*. McGraw-Hill Education.