
Peer-reviewed

Leadership as a Fundamental Factor for Human Societies Progress – a Historical Review of the Leadership Theories

Leadership jako základní faktor pokroku lidských společností – historický přehled teorií vedení

Elitsa Petrova

Abstract: The article attempts to make a historical review of leadership theories and, on this basis, to derive their approximate systematization. The article emphasizes the importance of the phenomenon of leadership as a major factor in the management of human resources and security in human societies. The exposition goes through the various leadership theories that have existed to date. The research methodology includes etymological analysis, historical analysis, content analysis, the methods of induction and deduction, reveals logical connections and dependencies between related and similar concepts and phenomena.

Abstrakt: Článek se pokouší o historický přehled teorií leadershipu a na tomto základě odvodit jejich přibližnou systematizaci. Článek zdůrazňuje význam fenoménu leadershipu jako hlavního faktoru řízení lidských zdrojů a bezpečnosti v lidských společnostech. Výklad prochází různými dosud existujícími teoriemi vedení, které dosud existovaly. Metodologie výzkumu zahrnuje etymologický rozbor, historický rozbor, obsahový rozbor, metody indukce a dedukce, odhaluje logické souvislosti a závislosti mezi souvisejícími a podobnými pojmy a jevy.

Keywords: Leadership; Leadership Theories; Historical Review.

Klíčová slova: leadership; teorie leadershipu; historický přehled.

INTRODUCTION

The article attempts to make a historical review of leadership theories and, on this basis, to derive their approximate systematization. The article emphasizes the importance of the phenomenon of leadership as a major factor in the management of human resources and security in human societies. The exposition goes through the various leadership theories that have existed to date. The article emphasizes the leading leadership definitions in the relevant researched leadership theory, examines the opinions of famous scientists and the latest reflections on the phenomenon, covers diverse literary sources, which is a prerequisite for an in-depth scientific study of the phenomenon and its critical examination. The research methodology includes etymological analysis, historical analysis, content analysis, the methods of induction and deduction, reveals logical connections and dependencies between related and similar concepts and phenomena.

The subject of the scientific development is the presentation of a historical overview of leadership theories and their systematization. The object of scientific development is the variety of leadership theories existing mainly from the 19th century to the 21st century. The main thesis defended is that leadership is inextricably linked to human survival and to the social environment in which humanity exists and develops, given the adaptation of humanity to the specific conditions of the environment. Leadership is shown not only as a significant but as a major factor in the management of human societies. Twenty-one important leadership theories are explored, presented, and described.

1 GENESIS OF LEADERSHIP THEORIES RESEARCH

The Great Man theory of leadership explains human history in terms of the impact on other people of highly influential and unique individuals who, because of their natural, genetic, or divinely inspired qualities, such as physical attractiveness, intellectual prowess, or divine power, have created and changed and can create or change human history.

The theory is attributed to the Scottish philosopher Thomas Carlyle, who in 1840 stated that universal history, the history of what man has achieved in the world, is the history of great men. These are „*the leaders, the modellers, the examples, and in a broad sense the makers, the mass of men who try to do or achieve, and all the things which we see accomplished in the world are the result of the practical realization and embodiment of the thoughts of great men – the soul of all world history*“ (Carlyle1840). Carlyle tried to identify the talents, skills and physical characteristics of men who had access to power and who had ascended to power, and as a result of his research he identified six types of leaders, calling them: „*the divine, the prophet, the poet, the priest, the man of letters, and the ruler*“ (Carlyle1840). In 1869, Francis Galton examined the leadership qualities and personality traits in the families of men who had acquired power and positions of authority. Galton arguing: „*leaders are born, not developed*“ (Zaccaro, and Banks 2001). In 1913, Frederick Woods supported the Great Man theory in his work *The Influence of Monarchs: Steps in the New Science of History*. He examined 386 Western European

rulers from the 12th century to the French Revolution at the end of the 18th century and revealed their influence on the course of events in human history (Woods, F. 1913). William James also defended the theory of the great man as follows: „*Men whose genius was so adapted to the receptivity of the moment, or whose accidental position of power was so critical, became precedent-makers and even breakers.*“ (James 1880) in the history of humankind. Furthermore, explaining leadership with some exceptional qualities in the individual's personality, the theory tries to describe some innate characteristics of a leader.

Searching the traits that leaders possess and that a leader should possess has been going on for centuries. Even the philosophical writings by Plato and Plutarch addressed the question „What qualities are necessary to distinguish one man from another to be a leader?“. Over the years, scholars have pointed out different sets of qualities, the combination of which in the form of different configurations builds a person as a leader and establishes him (and later in human evolution – her) as such. Trait scientists have persistently tried over time to identify certain reliable and leader-matching physiological characteristics (appearance, height, and weight), demographic characteristics (age, education, and socioeconomic background), personality characteristics (dominance, self-esteem, aggressiveness), intellectual characteristics (intelligence, decisiveness, judgment, knowledge), task-related characteristics (achievement, initiative, persistence), and social characteristics (sociability and cooperativeness), etc. but seemingly with partial success.

However, the impossibility in practice of deriving such a precise list does not mean that leadership traits are not important to the development of the concept, and despite questions surrounding the validity of leadership trait theory, it is reasonable to assume that certain personality traits are indeed related to leadership. After that the number of qualities is too great to ever be possessed by a single man or woman. In addition, different situations in life, as indicated later by the scientific situational theories of leadership, require different qualities for the leader to possess so that he can help the group or organization to solve a given problem. However, the benefit of the type of theories built on leader qualities lies in the added value it brings to all other leadership theories. It even has a certain charm, which is still used in scientific circles by teachers who introduce young learners to the world of leadership.

While trait theory suggests that leaders are born with specific traits, behavioural theories of leadership and style theories suggest that we can learn to be good leaders.

In the late 1940s and early 1950s, a series of studies conducted by Byrd (Bird 1940), Stogdill and Mann led researchers to think and form a new perspective on the main drivers of leadership. Stogdill and Mann argue that people who are leaders in one situation are not necessarily leaders in other situations (Stogdill 1948, 35–71), therefore leadership cannot be defined as an enduring individual trait (Mann 1959, 241–270) whence the focus of research moves on to the study of leader behaviour. This approach dominated research of leadership for the next several decades.

Theorists began to examine leadership as a set of behaviours, evaluating the behaviours of successful leaders and defining different leadership styles. In 1939, Kurt Lewin, Ronald Lippitt and Ralph White developed the basis of the theory of the influence of management styles and concluded that a manager exerts influence using three styles: authoritarian, democratic and liberal (Lewin, Lippitt, and White 1939, 271–301).

By identifying in which situations which style is most appropriate, it appears that the authoritarian management style is appropriate in periods of crisis, but it fails to win the hearts and minds of followers in day-to-day management, the democratic management style is effective in situations that require deliberation, creativity, innovation, respect for the opinion of everyone, while the liberal management style is used in situations of high maturity of subordinates, because of the huge degree of freedom it gives them in terms of self-management.

In 1945, a study was conducted at Ohio State University that examined the behaviour of effective leaders, as a result of which the researchers were able to identify two important differences or dimensions in leader behaviour (iEduNote Ohio State 2017). The first dimension is called the initiating structure. It describes how the leader communicates with followers, sets goals, and how tasks are accomplished, i.e. it is a task-oriented managerial or leadership behaviour. The second dimension shows the manager's or leader's ability to build interpersonal relationships with followers and establish mutual trust, i.e. this is the so-called socially oriented behaviour.

Almost at the same time, researchers at the University of Michigan studied leadership behaviour and found similar two dimensions and correspondingly two types of leadership behaviour: employee-oriented behaviour and task-oriented behaviour. Employee-oriented behaviour involves attention and support for organizational members, while job-oriented behaviour is devoted to supervisory functions, forecasting, planning, coordinating work activities, and providing the resources needed to accomplish tasks without regard to the employees' needs (Bright, Cortes, Gardner, etc. 2019). The two dimensions of behaviour identified at the University of Michigan undoubtedly correspond to the two dimensions Ohio University, moreover, the great similarity of the findings of the two independent studies actually carried out further verifies their credibility.

The Management Grid, which first appeared in the early 1960s and was later renamed the Leadership Grid, explained how the managers/leaders could help organization to achieve its goals by using the dimensions already mentioned above in the previous studies considered: care for production and care for people. The model was developed by Robert Blake and Jane Mouton in 1964 and offers a potential wealth of styles that can be represented primarily, but not exclusively, in the form of five domains of behaviour. The 1.1 style is characterized by a low degree of concern for production and a low degree of concern for people. Style 1.9 is characterized by a high degree of concern for people and a low degree of concern for production. A strong focus on the task and little or no concern for people can be found in the 9.1 style. Style 9.1 is often controlling, demanding and autocratic. Style 5.5 describes managers and leaders who show some care, sometimes described as balanced, for the task and people. This is a style of compromises and intermediate results. Style 9.9 is characterized by a high degree of concern for people and a high degree of concern for production. Style 9.9 involves significant dialogue and shared rather than imposed motivation to achieve organizational goals. According to the authors, this is the most effective management/leadership style. (Blake and Mouton 1964)

Based on the behavioural approach, leaders can evaluate their actions, but would they make an effort to change and improve their leadership behaviour and are they able to actually do it!? Contingency theories or situational leadership attempt to overcome

the limitations of trait theory and behavioural theories. The representatives of this group of theories believe that leadership is a product of the situation. Each situation is said to require a certain set of personality traits, whereby in different situations different group members emerge as leaders.

One of the most well-known contingency theories was originally developed by Paul Hersey and Ken Blanchard, who in 1982 developed a theory of situational leadership that used a task versus people dimension. The combination of the styles depends on follower maturity, as defined by Hersey and Blanchard as the ability and willingness of individuals to take responsibility for directing their own behaviour. (Hersey and Blanchard 1993) Based on that, Hersey and Blanchard identified four leadership styles: directing, coaching, supporting, and delegating. (Hersey and Blanchard 1993) According to the theory, effective leadership reflects whether followers apply or reject the leader, an important point that is not present in most leadership theories.

The Stinson-Johnson situational leadership model added to other theories that the leader's interest in relationships was more important when followers are performing highly structured work (Stinson and Johnson 1974).

One of the earliest, most famous, and most controversial theories in the world of leadership science belongs to Fred Fiedler. It argues that some situational components can determine whether task-oriented behaviour or relationship-oriented behaviour is more appropriate for a given situation (Fiedler 1964, 149–190). Fiedler found that task-oriented leaders were more effective in extremely favourable or unfavourable situations, while relationship-oriented leaders performed best in situations of intermediate favourableness. situation (Fiedler 1967). The main thesis of the author is that because the management/leadership styles are relatively inflexible and no one style is suitable for every situation, effective management can be achieved by changing the situation to suit the leader. If this cannot be done, then a manager or a leader with an appropriate style must be chosen for the relevant situation.

The path-goal situational approach was developed by Martin Evans and Robert House in 1971. The approach is based on expectancy theory, according to which individual motivation depends on the expectation of a reward and its value to the individual, and the manager or leader is seen as a source of rewards.

In 1973, Victor Vroom and Phillip Yetton developed their own situational model in which leadership styles were linked to situational variables that determined which style was appropriate for which situation. The model is intended to help leaders to decide when and to what extent they should involve subordinates in problem solving. (Vroom and Yetton 1973)

It could be concluded that the contingency-situational theories are developed to show that the style to be used depends on such factors as situation, people, task, organization and other environmental factors. They are based on the ability of leaders to adapt and change himself or herself according to the situation.

The attributive model of leadership is based on the arguments that the influence of individual characteristics on outcomes is best understood by viewing the person as an integrated whole (Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs, and Fleishman 2000, 11–35). An attribute is a quality or characteristic of a person or thing that is an important part of his/her nature (Vocabulary.com 2022).

A good overview of this approach can be found in two studies conducted by Ralph Stogdill and published in 1948 and 1974 (Stogdill 1948, 35–71). In the first one, Stogdill analysed and synthesized more than 124 leadership traits, in studies conducted between 1904 and 1947. In the second one he analysed another 163 traits, between 1948 and 1970. Stogdill's first study showed that the average individual in a leadership role was different from the average group member in terms of: intelligence, alertness, insight, responsibility, initiative, persistence, self-confidence and sociability. Stogdill's second study, published in 1974, argued that both trait and situational factors are determinants of leadership, i.e. the traits that leaders possess should be relevant to the situations in which the leader functions. (Northouse 2018)

Over a period of several decades, hundreds of studies have been conducted to determine how personality traits, human characteristics, or attributes relate to career development, the generation and maintenance of leadership, and the leader effectiveness. Certain traits and skills have been found to increase the likelihood that a leader will be effective, but they do not guarantee leadership or managerial effectiveness by themselves.

Here it is the place to mention that the majority of leadership theories are also aimed directly at management. Even in some of them, the two phenomena are mixed, which causes difficulty in considering the relevant theory as only and only a theory of leadership, or only as a theory aimed at management. Sometimes it is not clear enough whether the conclusions are for one of the two phenomena or, on the contrary, they are aimed at both, which is characteristic mostly of the theories of the 19th and 20th centuries.

2 ROLES, FUNCTIONS AND CHARISMA IN LEADERSHIP

According to the Robert Blaise's theory of management-leadership roles, the manager or leader fulfils two main roles: solving problems and maintaining group activity. According to Blaise, for the group to be effective, both strands of leadership must be represented. (Johnev 1996, 117) In each group there are different persons who fulfil one or the other role, but nothing prevents them from being taken over by one person.

Functional theories of leadership logically follow leadership theories of managerial and leadership roles by emphasizing the various primary functions that a leader should perform in an organization. John Adair uses a very simple model to explain his ideas of practice-based leadership. It outlines three circles – the circle of the task, the circle of the individual, and the circle of the group, and the way in which the three circles overlap or do not overlap indicate the fit or mismatch that exists between the needs of the group, the individuals in the groups, and the needs of the task itself. John Adair saw the primary role of the leader in synchronizing and balancing the needs of the individual, the group, and the task into an effective productive whole. Adair argued that for a leader to be effective, he had to fulfil the following roles: initiator; ambassador; standardizer; focus. (Adair 1983)

In addition, functional leadership highlights five important functions that a leader performs when promoting organizational effectiveness – monitoring the environment, organizing the activities of subordinates, training subordinates, motivating others, and actively controlling and intervening in the work of the group (Zaccaro and Banks 2001), which, we must admit, are very close, if not common, to some of the basic functions of management. Adair believes that leadership can be taught and learned and is not dependent only on personality traits.

The theories of charismatic leadership attempt to capture the attributes and behaviour of extraordinary leaders in extraordinary situations to explain the unusual or unique responses of their followers (Bass and Bass 2008).

In the past the word „charisma“ was used to describe a special gift that only certain people possess or it is „an irresistible appeal or magnetic charm that can inspire devotion in others“ (Stevenson and Lindberg ed. 2010). A Latinized form of the Greek word „charisma“ means „a favour, a divine gift“, „a favour given freely“ or „a gift of grace“ derived from the word „χάρις“ – „charis“, which means „a grace, a charm, a beauty, a goodness“ (Joose 2014, 266–283). In 1947, Weber used the term to describe a form of influence based not on tradition or official authority, but on the perceptions of the follower. According to his definition, personal charisma is „a quality of the individual personality, thanks to which a person differs from ordinary people and is treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman and extraordinary powers or qualities that are not available to the average person, and are considered qualities with divine origin and on their basis the respective person is perceived as a leader“ (Weber 1924/1947, 328-358).

In 1976, House published his theory of charismatic leadership, which attempted to explain how leaders lead and manage, but also inspire their followers in unique ways. According to the theory, followers' attribution of leader charisma depends on several characteristics of the leader's behaviour: new and attractive look; emotional appeals to values; unconventional behaviour; self-sacrifice; confidence and optimism. (Yukl 2013)

Some scholars attempt to explain the unusual influence of a number of charismatic leaders who are idolized as superhumans or revered as spiritual figures, linking charisma to psychodynamic processes occurring in followers. It could be concluded that the phenomenon of charismatic leadership involves a complex interaction between the characteristics of the leader, the needs, values, beliefs and perceptions of the followers. At its extreme, the relationship between a charismatic leader and a follower is characterized by unconditional acceptance by followers, trust in leader, affection, voluntary obedience, emulation, identification with the leader, and emotional commitment.

The views of transformational and transactional leadership emerged as a result of political sociologist James Burns' work entitled Leadership (1978), for which he received the Pulitzer Prize. The book is dedicated to political leadership and contrasts two leadership styles – the transactional style, which motivates followers, emphasizing their personal interest, and the transformational style, which appeals to the moral values of followers, provoking their sensitivity on various moral issues.

Transactional leadership includes: contingent reward, which is an exchange process between leaders and followers in which followers' efforts are exchanged for certain rewards and exception management, which includes corrective criticism, negative feedback, and even negative reinforcement (Northouse 2018). Very different, the

transformational leadership is a process that changes and transforms people. It deals with emotions, values, ethics, standards and long-term goals. This includes valuing followers' motives, meeting their needs, and treating them as full human beings. Through „charisma (idealized influence), individualized consideration (follower focus), intellectual stimulation (challenging the status quo), and inspirational motivation (articulating a compelling vision)“ (Bright, Cortes, Gardner, etc. 2019) transformational leaders draw others to themselves.

In 1985, Bernard Bass provided an expanded and refined version of transformational leadership that was based on the scholarly work of Burns (1978) and House (1976). In his approach, Bass extend the work of Burns by paying more attention to the emotional elements and origins of charisma. (Northouse 2018) Transformational leaders, according to Bass, earn the trust, respect and admiration of the followers. (Bass 1990, 19–31)

Among the first to try to find the answer to the question of the foundations of leadership in the family and the group, as constructive and basic social units for society, is Sigmund Freud. According to Freud, relations similar to those in the family are established between the members and the leader, i.e. the paternalistic image of the leader intervenes, to whom the functions of the father are attributed. The fear of being abandoned manifests itself in the individuals' need to be reassured that the persons important to them will not break the attachment bonds with them (Johnev 1990, 58-59). In conditions of human multitudes, leadership is „*a phenomenon of the group psyche, and with their will, the leaders impose themselves on the crowd, which has lost its own will, is looking for such individuals to lean on*“ (Johnev 1996, 161).

The theory of Serge Moscovici on the leadership of large groups provides a specific assessment of the foundations of leadership success claiming: „*A leader becomes one who succeeds in penetrating the subconscious of the masses and extracting from there the forgotten past sealed in their culture...For leadership to be successful, there needs to be a common current problem affecting everyone.*“ (Johnev 1996, 172).

According to the hypnotic thesis, the leadership induces a state of hypnosis. The leader can occupy the consciousness of the participants, dictate their feelings, desires and behaviour. The emergent norms theory claims that the homogenization of crowd behaviour could be explained by the emergence of normative models that unify the behaviour of the crowd. Faced with problems, which are unstructured situations for which there are no established paths of solution, individuals need standards of behaviour that are widely followed by all and thus ensure the cooperation necessary for success. (Johnev 1996, 171-173)

The Oxford Program on Strategic Management presents leadership as an impression created by the communication of information to the leader or by other stakeholders, rather than by the actual actions of the leader himself or herself (Sadler 2003, 108). In other words, the reproduction of information or stories forms the basis of the perception of the leader and leadership by the majority. This type of false leadership is also characterized by ideologization through image building. For the purpose, the individual leader's behaviour is changed, which is done after careful examination of the audience, its problems, needs, cultural and intellectual level, value system. An image is created to sell the product of the false leadership.

The integrated theory about leadership is an attempt to synchronize the strengths of some of the theories already presented (trait theories, behavioural theories, situational and functional theories), introducing a new element – the practice of psychological mastery.

Integrated psychological theory began to gain attention after the publication of *The Three Levels of Leadership* in 2011, when James Schooler highlighted some limitations of older leadership theories. Schooler proposed the Three Levels of Leadership model, which aim to summarize what leaders must do, not only to attract followers, but also to develop and prepare them to be the next leaders. The first level of leadership – public leadership refers to the actions or behaviours that leaders take to influence two or more people simultaneously. The second level of leadership – private leadership refers to the leader's individual attitude towards people. The third level of leadership – personal leadership refers to the development and growth of the person. (Schooler 2011)

3 LEADERSHIP THEORIES FROM THE PRESENT

The concept about military leadership is not new, but it is extremely relevant to the Armed Forces as an institution in the process of its transformation and modernization, as an institution that is inspired and filled with leadership. At the beginning of the 21st century, there are increasing factors affecting the professional military environment that every commander must consider when making management decisions. The growing participation of national armies in peacekeeping operations, the multinational environment, cultural awareness, modernized weapon systems require the application of new approaches in building modern military leaders of all ranks in the structures of the national armed forces. These advanced features, which are also security challenges for any country, are changing the ways in which military leaders express themselves and influence their subordinates. Professionally, active and hard work is needed both on the part of the cadets and on the part of the teachers of military and civilian disciplines to increase the creativity and initiative of the cadets, to build teamwork skills and quick and correct decision-making, to develop social competences and build emotionally stable people who are loyal to others, follow the rules of interpersonal communication and who are confident in their choice of appropriate behaviour for any situation (Atanasova-Krasteva 2015, 154-159).

Some of the latest and attention-grabbing leadership ideas and concepts are those of authentic leadership, shared leadership, servant leadership, leader-follower exchange theory, the idea of adaptive leadership, the application of the idea of gender equality in management and leadership, etc. They all begin to recognize the significance of the followers and the importance of the relationship between them and leaders.

The idea of authentic leadership is relatively new and began to receive much attention in the late 20th century. Authentic leaders possess positive values such as honesty, altruism, kindness, justice, accountability and optimism. These values motivate authentic leaders to do what is right and fair for their followers and to create a special type of

relationship between each other that includes high mutual trust, transparency, open and honest communication, with an emphasis on the well-being of followers (Yukl 2013).

Most leadership theories emphasize leadership from the perspective of either the leader, the follower, or the context of the situation. Leader-follower exchange theory takes a different approach and conceptualizes leadership as a process that focuses on the interaction between leader and followers and builds the dyadic relationship between them.

Servant leadership is more than a concept. Every great morally responsible leader sees himself or herself first and foremost as a person who must serve the group or organization. Servant leadership is a philosophy in which leaders focus on caring for other people. (Kolzow 2014)

Shared leadership is a type of leadership that distributes leadership responsibility so that people in a team or organization can lead and manage each other (Bolden 2011, 251–269). Shared leadership can be defined in many ways, but almost all of the definitions describe a management phenomenon where individual team members influence the team, and leadership emanates from the team members rather than from a predetermined leader (Pearce and Sims 2001, 115–139).

Through the adaptive leadership, leaders encourage people to adapt and deal with problems, challenges and changes. Instead of seeing the leader as a saviour who solves their problems, the leader plays the role of a person who supports people who must deal with difficult problems of a personal or professional nature.

Ethical leadership is built on those high standards of moral behaviour to which we adhere in our personal and professional lives. Ethics establishes the levels of honesty, empathy, trustworthiness, loyalty, and other virtues by which we identify our personal behaviour and sets norms for the ways in which we interact in society. By upholding and applying the same values regardless of the context of the environment, people are much more likely to trust someone because they see the manifested behaviour as morally sustainable.

Spiritual leadership describes how leaders can improve the intrinsic motivation of followers by creating conditions that increase followers' sense of spiritual meaning in the work they do. Spiritual leaders can enhance the meaning of professional activity by connecting it to the values and identities of followers. Spiritual leaders are those who increase mutual understanding and trust between the members of the organization. (Yukl 2013)

Women's inclusion in leadership. One of the most discussed and promising topics in the world of people management and more specifically in the world of leadership science and practice, significantly updated by the beginning of the 21st century, is related to gender issues. According to many authors, equality between women and men is not a factor whose influence should be applied only to half of humanity. This is why the understanding of equality between men and women and their right to be managers and leaders has a long history and significant implications for society. The opportunity that society should give to women to be in management and leadership positions and the women's empowerment is an important task facing human society. And like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states: „*All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights*“. (Atanasova-Krasteva 2017, 9-14)

CONCLUSION

Undoubtedly, the interest in leadership dates back to ancient times, since the dawn of human civilization, when it was formed as a practice in human life. Much later, leadership took shape as a scientific branch of management science, bordering and intertwining its practical and applied features with psychology, ethics, aesthetics, economics, political science, rhetoric, etc. The earliest scientific researchers of leadership tried to find those qualities that distinguished the great people of history from the so-called ordinary people, believing that leaders possessed some unique set of sufficiently stable and unchanging qualities over time that distinguished them from non-leaders.

The article provides a brief overview of scientific theories of leadership in the 19th-21st century. Both basic theoretical propositions with practical-applied significance, as well as some of the latest, current and interesting theories of leadership in the modern science of human management, were examined. The presented study is also associated with certain scientific limitations. The study presents a brief and probably insufficiently complete systematization of leadership theories, which is based on the different views of scholars of different eras and which will inevitably undergo changes over time. In the systematization, the theories are arranged according to their origin following the relevant timeline. The theories that are presented in the resulting systematization are accompanied by the corresponding motto or basic belief, characteristic of the theory, as follows:

1. The Great Man theory of leadership. Motto: „Leaders are born, not made.“
2. Trait theory of leadership. Main belief: „Leaders have some unique set of qualities that distinguish them from non-leaders.“
3. Behavioural leadership theories or theories of behaviour and style. Motto: „Our actions or what we do, our behaviour determines our effectiveness in the leadership process.“
4. Contingency or situational theories. Motto: „Different situation –different leader.“
5. Attributive model of leadership. Main belief: „A leader is seen as an integrated set of possessed attributes.“
6. Management/leadership roles theories. Main belief: „In order for group activity to be effective, the various strands of leadership roles must be represented in it.“
7. Functional leadership. Main belief: „The leader must synchronize and balance the needs of the individual, the group, and the task into an effective productive whole.“
8. Charismatic leadership. Motto: „The leader is extraordinary!“
9. Transactional and transformational leadership. Main belief: „The transaction manager has power to assign the performance of undefined tasks, to reward or sanctions, while the transformational leader motivates the team with skills, experience and expertise.“
10. Leadership in conditions of human multitudes. Motto: „With their will, the leaders impose themselves on the crowd, which having lost its own will seeks such persons on which to rely on.“
11. Oxford School Leadership Theory. Main belief: „The leader is artificially created.“
12. Integrated psychological theory of leadership. Main belief: „The leaders should to develop their leadership presence through practice of psychological mastery.“

13. Military leadership. Main belief: „A combination of commanding skills, leadership abilities and management knowledge.“
14. Authentic leadership. Main belief: „It involves high mutual trust, transparency, open and honest communication, with an emphasis on the well-being of followers.“
15. Leader-follower exchange theory. Motto: „Leadership as a process that focuses on the interaction between a leader and followers.“
16. Servant Leadership. Motto: „A leader must serve the group or organization, not the other way around.“
17. Shared leadership. Motto: „Shared duties, rights and responsibility.“
18. Adaptive leadership. Main belief: „Leaders encourage people to adapt and deal with problems on their own while supporting them.“
19. Ethical leadership. Main belief: „Leadership that is built on high standards of moral behaviour.“
20. Spiritual leadership. Motto: „Leadership is a form of spirit.“
21. Women’s inclusion in leadership. Main belief: „All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.“

Leadership is as old as humanity itself, universal and inevitable. Leadership is a phenomenon of informal personal relationships. The group members accept the leadership completely voluntarily, build their own attitude towards the leader. It could be confidently stated that leadership is a form of spirit, behaviour, expression and has nothing to do with imposition and coercion. It is a consequence of personality development and the acquisition of knowledge, experience, skills, providing a personal example.

Acknowledgement: The article is the result of the scientific work on the National Scientific Program – Security and Defence of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Bulgaria.

REFERENCES

Adair, John. 1983. *Effective Leadership: A Self-development Manual*. Aldershot, Hants, England. Gower.

Atanasova-Krasteva, N. 2015. „Comparative analysis of the components of the leadership style of the Bulgarian cadets.“ *Knowledge-based organization International Conference 21 (1)*. Sibiu. Romania. pp. 154-159.

Atanasova-Krasteva, N. 2017. „Role of women in security and defense: Bulgarian national policies and experience.“ *Knowledge-based organization International Conference 23 (1)*. Sibiu. Romania. pp. 9-14.

Bass, Bernard. 1990. „From transactional that transformational leadership: Learning that share the vision.“ *Organizational Dynamics*. 18 (3): 19–31. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S.

Bass, BM. and R. Bass. 2008. *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research, And Managerial Applications*. New York: Free Press.

Bird, C. 1940. *Social Psychology*. New York: Appleton-Century.

Blake, R. and J. Mouton. 1964. *The Managerial Grid: The Key to Leadership Excellence*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.

Bolden, R. 2011. „Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research“. *International Journal of Management Reviews*. 13 (3): 251–269. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00306.x. S2CID 6235095.

Bright, David, Anastasia Cortes, Donald Gardner, etc. 2019. *Principles of Management*. OpenStax. Rice University. <https://openstax.org/details/books/principles-management>, available 08.06.2022.

Carlyle, Thomas. 1840. *The Hero as Divinity. Heroes and Hero-Worship*. Available from: <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1091/1091-h/1091-h.htm>. Accessed 08.06.2023.

Fiedler, F. 1967. *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. McGraw Hill.

Fiedler, Fred. 1964. A Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. 1 (1): 149–190. doi:10.1016/s0065-2601(08)60051-9. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0065260108600519?via%3Dihub>. Accessed 12.08.2023.

Hersey, P. and K. Blanchard. 1993. *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*. Gfh. Ed. Prentice Hall, Inc.

iEduNote Ohio State. Leadership Studies Explained with Examples. iEduNote. 2017. Available from: <https://www.iedunote.com/ohio-state-leadership-studies>. Accessed 06.08.2023.

James, William. October 1880. „Great Men, Great Thoughts, and the Environment.“ Lecture delivered before the Harvard Natural History Society. *The Atlantic Monthly*. Available from: <https://web.archive.org/web/20190328055722/http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/jgreatmen.html>. Accessed 08.06.2023.

Johnev, S. 1990. *Managerial strategies in interpersonal relations*. Science and Art Publishing House. Sofia. pp. 58-59.

Johnev, S. 1996. *Social Psychology*. Volume II. Publisher: Sophie R. Sofia.

Johnev, S. 1996. *Social Psychology*. Volume III. Publisher: Sophie R. Sofia.

Joosse, Paul. 2014. „Becoming a God Max Weber and the social construction of charisma.“ *Journal of Classical Sociology*. 14 (3): 266–283. doi:10.1177/1468795X14536652.

Kolzow, David. 2014. *Leading from within: Building Organizational Leadership Capacity*. Iedconline. Available from: <https://www.iedconline.org> › Downloads › edrp › LEADING FROM WITHIN: Building Organizational Leadership CapacityPDF. Accessed 08.06.2022.

Lewin, Kurt, Ronald Lippitt and Ralph White. 1939. „Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates.“ *The Journal of Social Psychology*: 271–301.

Mann, R. 1959. „A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups.“ *Psychological Bulletin*. 56 (4): 241–270. doi:10.1037/h0044587.

Mumford, M., S. Zaccaro, F., Harding, T. Jacobs, and E. Fleishman. 2000. „Leadership skills for a change world solving complex social problems.“ *The Leadership Quarterly*. 11: 11–35. doi:10.1016/s1048-9843(99)00041-7.

Northouse, Peter. 2018. *Leadership – Theory and Practice*. Eighth Edition. SAGE Publications, Inc. California. Available from: <https://studydaddy.com> › attachment › Peter_G_ Northouse PDF. Accessed 27.01.2023.

Pearce, C. and H. Sims. 2001. „Shared leadership: towards a multi-level theory of leadership.“ *Advances in Interdisciplinary Studies of Work Teams*. 7: 115–139. doi:10.1016/S1572-0977(00)07008-4. ISBN 0-7623-0747-1.

Sadler, Philip. 2003. *The development process. Leadership*. MBA masterclass series (2 ed.). London: Kogan Page Publishers. p. 108.

Scouller, J. 2011. *The Three Levels of Leadership: How that Develop Your Leadership Presence, Knowhow and Skill*. Cirencester: Management Books Ltd.

Stevenson, Angus and Christine Lindberg ed. 2010. *New Oxford American Dictionary*. Oxford University Press.

Stinson, J. and T. Johnson. 1974. „The Path-Goal Theory of Leadership: A Partial Test and Suggested Refinement.“ *Academy of Management Journal*, 18. June. #2.

Stogdill, R. 1948. „Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature.“ *Journal of Psychology*. 25: 35–71. doi:10.1080/00223980.1948.9917362. PMID 18901913.

Vocabulary.com. Attribute. Vocabulary.com Inc. 2022. Available from: <https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/attribute>. Accessed 10.06.2023.

Vroom, Victor and Phillip Yetton. 1973. *Leadership and Decision-Making*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Weber, Max. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. translated by AM Henderson and Talcott Parsons. Free Press. 1924/1947. pp. 328-358.

Woods, F. 1913. *The Influence of Monarchs: Steps in a New Science of History*. New York: Macmillan.

Yukl, Gary. 2013. *Leadership in organizations*. 8th ed. Pearson Education Inc. publishing as Prentice Hall.

Zaccaro, S. and D. Banks. 2001. *Leadership, vision and organizational effectiveness*. In S. Zaccaro and R. Klimoski (Editors), *The Nature of Organizational Leadership: Understanding the Performance Imperatives Confronting Today's Leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Author: **Assoc. Prof. Elitsa Petrova, PhD, DSc.** is PhD in Economics and Management and DSc. in Security and Defence, born 1978. A graduate of „St. St. Cyril and Methodius” University (2003). She worked at leadership and teaching positions in the management and social field. She currently works at the Vasil Levski National Military University, Bulgaria. Currently active as lecturer, LEA Representative for Horizon, Departmental Coordinator of Erasmus+. She focuses on the topic of Management, Strategic Management, Human Resources Management, Project Management, Management of Innovation, Organizational Behaviour. She is the author of 3 own monographs, co-author in 5 monographs, 15 published textbooks, over 150 articles in domestic and foreign journals.