LEADERSHIP IN SPORT

**LEADERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS**

A donkey army led by a lion is worth more than an army of lions led by a donkey.

                                                                                                    (Napoleon)

Leadership is one of the most frequently researched phenomena in organization and management. Due to the fact that the influence of leaders on the performance of the organization is very important. Working with them creates an additional energy, makes heavy stuff easier - and the entire team functions as a well-trained orchestra. Leaders create a special atmosphere that arouses enthusiasm. And enthusiasm is known to be contagious, so positive creative energy spreads like a contagion. The power and gift to create such an environment is not common, that is why there are no leaders all around us in unlimited quantities.

The essence of leadership is in the influence, that is, in the power it exercises over its followers. He defines reality and offers it, but in a specific way, most often easily. It has an unexplained and palpable power that no other employees, even those of high positions, managers. The leader must be up -  because he gives his followers a legitimate right for them to articulate the meaning of things, events and phenomena in the region and to develop actions regarding these phenomena that should be taken. The leader determines the meaning and explains everything - from what happens in the organizations and around it, from which it derives his primary influence on the behavior of all members of the organization, but also the organization as a whole. Leadership presumes that there is a relationship/dependence that is formed between the leader and his followers. That addiction is voluntary. This means that followers believe that it is better for them that instead of them, someone else interprets reality and determine courses of action.

**The concept of leadership**

In addition to leadership, as a sub-process of the global management process, recent theories of management say a lot about leadership in a broader sense, which refers to influencing people and directing them to the implementation of change and adaptation of the sports organization to a changing environment.

Leadership today is defined as the ability of one person, leader, to lead other people, to influence them to follow him in achieving the set goal and achieving the desired and necessary changes.

A leader is a person who has the ability to lead other people to follow him, to do what he suggests. He knows how to get a group of people to follow his decisions.

Leaders exist everywhere - in sports, politics, culture and business, in every human activity. There are people everywhere who lead the organization forward. They are not satisfied only with the fact that the company is doing well today and achieving good results, but they also think about tomorrow, the changes that need to be made today in order to do well tomorrow.

Effective leadership requires leaders to be good psychologists, good communicators and animators, to know how to work with people, to convince them and lead them forward, towards the set goals. They must be both good visionaries and forecasters, so that they can well predict future goals and the necessary changes and actions for their realization.

Looking at leadership as the ability to lead and direct people towards a certain vision of the organization in the future, certain characteristics that define this process can be listed. These are the following characteristics:

Leadership and leaders are inseparable from the notion of power and authority, because leadership is also seen as a specific way of using power and authority. Authority implies power and influence over other people, to follow it, towards the goal it sets. Consequently, each leader must possess a certain authority that allows him to influence others and lead them in the direction he determines.

A leader may have *official or positional authority*, which derives from the position he holds. A leader can also have *informal or personal authority*, which stems from the qualities and strengths of his personality, and is usually called "charisma."

Because:

- A leader can only be one who has a vision and followers.

- Leaders are not the ones that people look at with admiration, leadership does not make popularity but results.

- Leadership is not a position, title, privilege or money, leadership is above all a responsibility.

- Leaders must be an example to others.

There is an opinion that leaders who have the ability to teach others to lead themselves are the most suitable for modern organizations. This is called *super-leadership*. The focus is on a new form of leadership to enable self-leadership energy in each person. Super leadership represents a broader framework of behaviors and cognitive strategies created to lead others to lead themselves to perfection. It is primary to activate the potential and internal leadership of the followers. This should help individual behavior to be effective. This enables individuals to set achievable goals on their own. The super-leader goes on strengthening the desired behavior of the associates. The task is that super leadership provides the framework, process and set of strategies to achieve people’s excellence in organizations.

The topic of leadership in the 21st century has been debated for a couple of years now. Everyone who writes on this topic points out that there has never been a greater need for leaders, hence, that leaders too will be needed, and not just managers. In a global and dynamic economy, resources are not just natural ones that come from the country. Sources are increasingly coming from people's minds in the form of ideas and information. Due to increased competition and high rates of change, flexible organizations and a new way of leading them are needed to maximize people’s contribution. To meet these changes, new leadership must be distributed, shared, and create self-directed teams of determined, responsive associates capable of responding to rapid change. These are situations in which the space for expressing leadership is narrowed to a large extent - to significantly influence others. In modern organizations, there are organized groups that are highly connected and highly educated individuals who do not require leadership to achieve goals. When the group is goal oriented there is no need for a leader. The inner satisfaction that group members feel in doing work does not require leadership. The developed information system enables team members to obtain the necessary information to perform their activities without the mediation of leaders. Professional norms direct individual members to effectively achieve group goals.

A large number of authors pointed out the interdependence of leadership and culture. Most of them sees the problems in participatory leadership in US companies in the excessive distance of power. Namely, power is unevenly distributed in a good number of American companies. This is not the case in some Western European countries with developed industrial democracies and decision-making. Leaders cannot freely choose their style of behavior. They need to ask their associates what they think about the "right" distance of power between leaders and followers. Attitudes towards the importance of leadership vary in certain cultures, which is very noticeable in transnational companies that conduct their business in a number of countries.

In the literature, a large number of differentiated access to the effectiveness of the leadership . The first significant approach has been focused on identifying of the qualities that contribute to effective leadership. Other temporarily dominant approach to explaining behavior - the study of the specific behavior that exhibits an effective leader. Quite a lot of attention - the price is contingent or situational approach to leadership. Special attention is paid to the characteristics of situations in which different types of leaders (oriented to interpersonal relationships or task-oriented) are most effective. One of the most effective is a goal-oriented approach that studies how an effective leader motivates his associates. One of the popular approaches, in turn, focuses on studying situations in which the leader should involve his associates in the decision-making process. The theory of the exchange of leaders and followers focuses on the type of personal relationships that a leader develops with his followers.

Some attention has been drawn to the approach of limiting or substituting leadership that studies situations where leadership is unnecessary and when the leader is limited to exerting his influence on followers. Some attention in the literature is paid to the mood of the leader as his feelings affect the effectiveness. In recent years, the differences between men and women as leaders have been studied in particular.

**General characteristics of leadership**

The general characteristics of leaders in the literature are:

- Reality-based *self-confidence*. It is not just a personal trait, but it refers to the behavior of a person in different situations.

- *Honesty, integrity and credibility*.

- *Dominant personality*- the ability to influence others with one's will.

- *Extroversion*- that his thoughts and actions are directed towards things, even the people around him.

- *Ability to give explanations and explanations*. He is direct when he expresses his opinions, feelings and attitudes. He is neither aggressive nor passive.

- *Emotional stability*- is able to control emotions so that they are in line with the situation.

- *Enthusiasm*- employees react positively to the enthusiasm of leaders and consider it a reward for constructive behavior.

- *Sense of humor*. Some see it as a trait and some as behaviour.

- *The warmth*that enables relationships with people.

- *Tolerance*for frustration because the leader is often exposed to resistance to change.

- *Self-awareness and self-objectivity*. An effective leader is aware of his strengths and weaknesses.

The following are also important features of effective leaders:

- *Initiative*- he moves himself into action without support or stimulation by others. That is the proactive side of leadership.

- *Sensitivity*to others and the ability to put oneself in the position of others. It is necessary to know the attitudes and position of the group in order to be able to influence it.

- *Flexibility and adaptability*. This is necessary in the face of change. Flexibility is the ability to adapt to different situations. Without this trait, a person is capable of being a leader in only one or two situations.

- *Ability to initiate action*. He is confident in his ability to initiate action of change.

- *Courage to accept challenges and risk change*. He is ready to put his reputation on the line.

- *Elasticity*- he sets an example to others but is able to quickly deviate from something, if he sees that it leads to wrong action and results. In doing so, he tries to keep things going as normal.

An effective leader must be willing to use the power at his disposal. He must be ready to help create a leader for the future. To develop others a leader needs to know how to motivate them to learn.

They often stand out as the basic three personality traits of a leader: *intelligence*, *personality,*and *ability*. Intelligence means judgment, knowledge, expression and determination in decision making. Personality has characteristics such as adaptability, alertness, creativity, personal integrity, self-confidence and emotional stability. Priority is given to the ability to ensure cooperation, popularity and prestige, sociability (interpersonal expertise), social participation and tact.

A person's mental abilities are essential for leadership success. An intelligent and competent leader is considered to make more effective decisions than one who is less intelligent and competent. Research has shown that intelligence is more important for a directive than a non-directive leader. Intellectual ability is closely related to business knowledge. An effective leader must be technically or professionally competent in an activity, especially when leading a group of specialists. A leader's creativity means his ability to find an original solution to complex problems. Innovation is especially valued. The ability to understand people and situations is needed. Foresight is seen as the ability to understand the long-term consequences of individual decisions as well as actions taken.

**Types of leaders in sports**

In the theory of management, a lot is written about the leader, his abilities and characteristics. Certain classifications of leaders are made, most often depending on the personal approach to the realization of leadership.

Given the level it has in the organizational structure of the sports organization , leadership is divided into: *strategic leadership*(defining the vision and goals of the activity) and *operational leadership*(successful achievement of set goals).

In traditional organizations, most employees were not able to perform any leadership position. The success of managers was then assessed according to the ability to create a system in which the improvisation of employees is minimized, so that everything is done according to established procedures and methods. A new type of company creates a system that stimulates employees to express themselves at work.

*There is a division into formal and informal leaders. A formal or appointed leader*is a person appointed by an organization with appropriate authority based on the company’s bylaws. A formal leader is a person whose leadership position derives from the position in which he is appointed. These include different types of managers and other executives in different areas of activity. Depending on the position and authority that gives him the place where he is, such a leader has more or less the ability to lead. And in this case, it is possible that the leader is not able to use the real possibilities of the leader, which a certain position provides him. Without personal abilities and authority, it is difficult to realize the opportunities provided by a certain position. In contrast, an informal leader becomes one because he is chosen by the members of the group as their recognized leader. Most organizational groups have a normally elected leader.

*Informal leaders*have great influence on group members but are not appointed by the organization. He does not have a whole set of managerial responsibilities because he does not perform all managerial functions. Informal leader can benefit or harm to an organization for - Courtesy of whether its influence encourages group members to act consistently with the goals of the organization.

From the standpoint of ethics and morality, leadership is divided into *moral*and *immoral*. *Moral leadership*obliges leaders to do the things they promised. It refers to values ​​and requires that associates have better knowledge of alternatives, to make intelligent choices when it comes time to respond to the leader's suggestion to lead. It is the kind of leadership that allows for social change that will meet the authentic needs of followers. Other people's needs and desires should be treated as their own. It is obvious that leadership has a moral dimension.

Moral values ​​are considered absolute. For one who adheres to them they are often universal. Ethical values are associated with the national and organizational culture.

When personal characteristics and their influence on the performance of organizations are used as criteria, then three types of leaders are observed: a *person of trust*, *transitional*and *toxic*(toxic).

*A leader as a man of trust*is a good and moral leader. He can be trusted to put the goals of the organization and the well-being of his followers first. He wants to prove himself and allow others to do the same if they want to. It opens the way for individuals and organizations to progress, increase productivity, growth and development.

*The transition leader*is occupied with himself and is selfish. It has no long-term effect on others, although it is not malicious in relation to them. He wants to be accepted by others, he is occupied with his role as a leader. He is timid. He is too careful when he decides to grow. He lets it be guided by existing events and trends.

*A toxic*(poisonous) *leader*is poorly adapted to the situation and is often malicious. It succeeds, obliging others from positions of power. He prefers to be a patron and to control, than to promote followers. It closes the growth paths of the organization. In order to hide his inadequacy for work, he is poisoned in relation to everything around him.

Employees in organizations are often inclined to expect a lot from leaders. They do the same in the case of a toxic leader, albeit with reservations. They passively let him solve problems. Instead of reacting, the employees withdraw into themselves, which leads to agony in the company. Toxic leaders are the opposite of a trusted leader. As leaders of trust open the way for progress, toxic ones close it. It is dangerous if it is not discovered early in the organization, so employees perceive them as leaders of trust, for a longer period of time.

*A charismatic leader*is a man whose influence and ability to lead stem from his personality. It is an individual who is characterized by a strong personality and who possesses a certain "charisma", on the basis of which he exerts influence on people. A number of military leaders, politicians and businessmen belong to this group of leaders.

*A traditional leader*is a person who acquires a leadership position by birth or inheritance. This group includes kings, religious leaders, tribal leaders and the like. These people are few and they do not have to be leaders in the classical sense, although the position gives them great power, such leaders do not have to be able to use their position.

*A situation leader*is a person who is able to accept the role of a leader in a certain period, in different situations. He can only be successful if he is always in the right place at the right time. Given the temporary role of such a leader, he is not suitable for business situations.

These are basic characteristics of leaders . However, each leader has its own specifics. "Guru" of modern management, PhD Peter Drucker, in his own words, met many successful leaders during his long professional career: “They all differed from each other. Some of them did not leave their office, while others were often absent from it. Some were extremely pleasant (though not many), while others were rigid and inaccessible. Some were quick and impulsive, while others needed eternity and a lot of thinking until they made a decision. Some immediately talked about their family, others did not mention anything other than the specific job. Some were great listeners, but there were also those who followed only their instinct. All this confirms that there is no authentic leadership style. However, they all had one common personal characteristic - and that is that they had little or no "charisma". They were not "born" leaders, but became leaders thanks to successful and thoughtful work. "

*Drucker's opinion on leadership is very interesting*. He does not rule out the possibility that there are "born leaders", but points out that few people depend on them. He believes that leadership can and must be learned. He believes that something like "leader's personality", "leadership style" and "leadership qualities" do not exist. Among the effective leaders he met in his life were very different people. What all the leaders he worked with have in common are some four things. First, the only correct definition of a leader is that it is someone who *has followers*. There are thinkers and prophets and they are undoubtedly needed people but without followers there is no leader. According to Drucker, an effective leader is not one *who is loved or respected*. He is someone whose *followers do the right things*. Popularity does not mean leadership, but results. Leaders are very visible because they set an example for their followers. Ultimate leadership is not rank, privilege, title or money. That is a responsibility.

The question is why do some managers succeed in their efforts and others do not, or why do some obviously qualified managers not achieve the expected results in the new conditions? Experts believe that the answer does not lie in the intellectual ability or knowledge that the manager has, but in his leadership qualities.

**Leadership styles**

One of the most important factors in interpersonal relations and the effectiveness of leaders are the styles of leadership. Although each leader has his own specific style of work, all of them can still be classified into three basic ones: autocratic, democratic and liberal.

With an autocratic leadership style, the leader holds everything in his hands. He has absolute power and seeks blind obedience. He "talks" only through legal paragraphs. Keep your distance from other members of the group. He is a single subject, and all other objects are guided. The initiative of the employees is stifled. He decides everything on his own. The "fate" of the members of the group is in his hands. He both rewards and punishes.

The autocratic leader demands that the group function in a well-established way. He does not want any relations between the members of the group, except for the official, business ones. He strives for everything to go through him, to be present everywhere, to be informed about everything.

With the autocratic style of leadership, a cult of personality is often formed. This style implies that the first presumed person has a universal knowledge. The responsibility for carrying out the task is rarely taken upon itself. It is more often transmitted to team members.

This style of leadership is sometimes even very effective. Significant results are being achieved. However, work ethic is very low. There is dissatisfaction among the members of the group. It has a negative effect on interpersonal relationships. There is a very high degree of fluctuation.

The democratic or participatory leadership style is based on the cooperation of the leader with the members of the working group. He does not make decisions alone. All members of the group are involved. They discuss, propose, decide. That is why the orders of the leader are accepted as their own.

He seems to be a devalued and disenfranchised leader here. That does not correspond to reality. If we compare these two styles of leadership, it can be seen that the difference is not in the degree of power that leaders have, but in the way they do it.

The democratic leader not only issues orders, but also tries to hear the opinions and suggestions of other members. -new new group. He not only does not forbid, but encourages communication between people. It requires everyone to get involved, engage in the planning and execution of the task. Therefore, the responsibility is not concentrated in the leader but is distributed among the members of the group, including and the leader himself.

This style creates a very suitable psychosocial atmosphere. A solid hierarchical structure is not created. All members participate in solving problems. This increases their interest in the business.

In this style of leadership, the leader must also have the professional knowledge and sense to communicate with people. It is easier to lead from a position of strength than in this way. This style implies more knowledge, abilities and patience to work with people.

From the point of view of efficiency, this style proved to be more suitable in practice than the autocratic one. It is completely appropriate for democratic circles.

Style of individual freedom (liberal or lazy style - faire style). Here the role of the leader is reduced to a minimum. It is "leadership without a leader." The leader has a major, coordinating role. He transfers the tasks to the group and registers the achieved results. The members of the group are left completely free to choose the way to perform the task. The connection between the leader and the members of the group is weak, and there is no connection between the members themselves. The responsibility for carrying out the task lies with the direct executors themselves.

The precondition for the application of this style of leadership is that there is such a division of labor and indebtedness. that everyone is directly responsible for their work. Executors must have complete independence in their work. Therefore, they need to be trained so that they can perform their work tasks on their own. Finally, it implies a high degree, not only of knowledge and responsibility, but also of consciousness and discipline. not. It is recommended or used in collectives where employees with the highest level of education (faculties, institutes, institutes, clinics) are employed.

Each of the mentioned styles has its advantages and disadvantages. Which of them will be applied in practice depends on the specific circumstances: type of work, nature of the task , the people themselves - knowledge, independence, responsibility. In practice, all three styles are often combined.

**Motives of the leader**

Being a leader means both *satisfaction*and *frustration*. The satisfaction that someone has because he is a formal leader depends on a certain leadership position. Factors such as the amount of money received and the group to which it belongs affect satisfaction. The literature lists a number of sources of satisfaction experienced by a leader:

- A *sense of power and attention*. By becoming an individual leader, he acquires a certain power automatically. Prestige is gained because many people think very highly of people who are leaders.

- *Opportunity to help others*. The leader works directly with GA - smoke and helping them to acquire the expertise to solve business problems.

- *High earnings*. If money is the motive to be a leader, then great satisfaction is gained. There is always more than other members of the top management team.

- *Respect and status*. He often received respect from associates. He has a higher status than others. When his qualifications are aligned with the position, his status is even higher.

- *Good opportunity for advancement*. Gaining a leadership position is a vital step in creating a career in a number of organizations.

- *The feeling that you are a "participant in the events"*. Much more inside information is obtained.

- *Ability to control money and other sources*. Many leaders in larger organizations control significant financial resources.

Some refuse to accept the role of leader because it can be a source of much dissatisfaction and frustration:

- *Too much unpaid overtime*.

- *A lot of "headaches"*. Those who cannot withstand stress are afraid of leadership positions.

- *Insufficient authority to deal with responsibilities*. This is especially true if he has to cooperate with the incompetent and cannot replace them.

- *Loneliness*. The higher the leader, the more lonely he is. He communicates with a very limited number of people.

- *Too many problems with people*. Most of the frustration comes from working with people. The lower the leadership position, the more it deals with people.

- There are *too many organizational policies that a leader must know about*. That leader can hardly avoid. Political tactics such as forming alliances and coalitions are part of the role of leaders.

- *Striving to achieve continuous goals*(long-term in relation to short-term, maintenance or changes, etc.

The term expertise refers to the ability of a leader to perform various activities in the leadership process. Like traits and expertise is determined by shared learning and heritage. There are usually three types of expertise: *technical*, *interpersonal*and *conceptual.*Technical expertise is primarily related to subjects, interpersonal for people and conceptual for ideas and concepts.

Leadership can exist at all levels of the fragmented organizational structure of a modern enterprise. The essence of the role of a leader is persuasion - to inspire followers to unite in an effort to achieve the goals of the group and the organization. For the group to do something she should have known of - mostly questions of why and how. The leader must have a major role in akcen - aw ay goals of the group. A leader must learn from experience and be able to adapt to the situation.

**Leadership approaches**

By the nature of things, the CEO of a company is expected to have leadership skills. He has to learn that at work based on the experience of how to run a company. He learns leadership under the supervision of all the company's stakeholders. He must create a guiding philosophy that determines his approach to leadership. The approach implies which areas of business policy (for example, strategic planning, research and development or human resources) occupy his greatest attention, which type of people and behavior he values ​​most in the company, which decisions he makes personally and which he delegates and how he spends his working day. A leadership approach is a coherent, explicit management style rather than a reflection of a personal style. That is the basic distinction. Leaders should not choose a style that suits them personally, but an approach that best suits the needs of the organization and its business situation. There are several approaches that can be used in practice.

*The first is strategic*. Those who use this approach believe that their most important job is to create, test and design the implementation of a long-term strategy. These CEOs dedicate up to 80% of their time to the external environment of the company, and less to business control. *Another approach is to treat staff as a priority asset of the company*. The point is the administration - its growth and development of individuals in the company. The goal is to have people at all levels in the organizational structure who make decisions as he would do himself. *The third is the expert approach*. General di - rector believes that its primary task is to select areas of the company where expertise is the basis for competitive advantage in the market. *The fourth approach aims to create a system of control*- financial, cool - touring or both - which will ensure uniformity and predictability in the behavior of employees in serving their customers. *The fifth is the approach to change*, that is, the continuous renewal of the organization, even if the environment does not always react favorably to it. In the most successful companies, CEOs record the situation well, establish what the company expects from its leader and choose the approach to leadership that best meets these requirements.

Today, it is considered that leadership skills can be learned. It is necessary to create conditions that favor the development of talent, which can become a significant source of competitive advantage for the company. Creating a leader is in itself the responsibility of leadership. If talents are developed by gaining different experience, you need to find people who need to gain experience.

**Leadership and power**

There are several sources of power that a leader can use. Each of the sources of power a leader can possess to a different degree. The use of one power affects the others. The tendency to use power can result in greater effectiveness if power is used successfully by a leader while failure to use power can have the opposite effect.

Acquiring power largely depends on the type of power he wants to acquire. Therefore, anyone who wants to gain power must understand the mechanism of acquiring power, that is, the different types of power that exist and the sources and emergence of these types of power.

For the first time, the basics or sources of power are discussed in a systematic way in a study by the University of Michigan Institute in the late 1950s. The study identified six bases of power: 1. the *power of reward*, 2. the *power of coercion*, 3. the *legitimate power*, 4. the *power of reference*, 5. the *power of experts*and 6. the *power of information*.

The first three sources arise from positional power and the other three from personal power.

**Sources of positional power**

An important source of power in the organization is the position of the leader in the company. A certain position in the hierarchy of authority gives the leader theoretical power. How real that power will be depends on the personality of the leader. There are usually three types of positional power: the *power of reward*, *coercive*and *legitimate power*.

*The power of reward*refers to the leader's privilege of being able to reward the right person. The leader is in a position to be able to increase the salary, to determine bonuses, to give oral and written praise, as well as to give other privileges to those who he believes have deserved it with their work. The power of reward is "Carrot", and the power of coercion is "beating".

*The power of coercion*is based on authority or the possibility of punishment if the job is not done properly, or the employee is insufficiently engaged or does not behave appropriately. Sometimes this can only end with verbal reprimands, or other milder or more severe punishments. In more drastic cases, there may be a proposal for exclusion from the organization.

*Legitimate power*is based on the formal control of the authorities. The leader gives directions and subordinates according to what he thinks is best for the given situation. Using his position, he convinces people of the need to perform a given job in the way he has determined.

It comes from a position in the managerial hierarchy and authority based on that position.

Legitimate power is based on the willingness of others to accept it. That is why orders that are known in advance not to be executed should not be given. It is important that the requirements and directives are given clearly, that the persons to whom they are addressed fully understand them.

**Sources of personal power**

Sources of personal power derive from personal characteristics and skills of manager. This, above all, refers to leadership abilities, and not to positional power. Personal power refers to *reference*, *expert*and *information power*.

*Referent power*is a very important feature of the leader. It is the ability to make people do what he wants, through admiration and identification with him as a leader. Reference power comes from charisma or from the attractiveness of the leader in communicating with other people.

It is necessary to maintain these features and develop them in order to last as long as possible. Positional power is never enough in an effort to subordinate to do what they want. They also need to have strong personal power, which is the main characteristic of a leader, through expertise and reference power.

The manager should always be ready to acquire new knowledge and information in order to be always up to date and to be able to respond to the complex problems that are set before him. It is certain that in solving these problems, where possible, it should be left to employees to contribute through the delegation of power where their expertise allows it.

*Expert power*is based on knowledge and talent. An individual with the power of an expert is in a situation to influence others, because it can be seen that he has knowledge and talent in a given field. The power of experts is based on expertise that others do not possess.

It is often necessary to use expertise and give the right arguments in favor of a decision. The leader must avoid making contradictory decisions or taking an inconsistent position. Trust increases if expertise is demonstrated. That is why managers are obliged to constantly improve, to be up to date with the latest knowledge.

*Information power*is based on access to and control over the distribution of important information about a company's business and its plans. In a modern company, the emphasis is on controlling vital information, because power goes along with those who control important information. It is very important to be constantly, well and timely informed.

In addition to the above six bases or sources of power, some very important sources are being talked about and written about today. This is how the *power of a position*based on formal authority is spoken of. He believes that legitimate power, the power of reward, the power of coercion and the power of information arise from the power of position. The power of a position is the power gained from an organization.

*Personal or personal power*derives from personality characteristics. From the behavior and characteristics of the one who possesses power, the power of the expert, the reference power and the power of prestige emerge. It is all characterized as personal power, because it is derived from the person before the organization. *The power of prestige*stems from status and reputation. A manager who has important business successes behind him gains the power of prestige.

According to new research, personal power is leadership power, that is, the use of personal power. To effectively use a position of power a leader needs to have characteristics such as: integrity, initiative and desire to lead, expertise in command, and emotional stability. Sometimes power is gained from intimacy, that is, intimacy with those who have power.

*Political power*includes control over the decision-making process, coalition building, and co-opting into the board of directors of people of influence in the economy and society. Politics is the acquisition, development and use of power in achieving goals.

*Ownership*is an undoubted source of power in a company. Leaders hold executive management positions in the company and gain power in their function as someone who works on behalf of shareholders (company owners). The strength of ownership depends on how closely the leader is connected to shareholders and board members. His power increases if he is also a shareholder of the company. Then there is less danger of losing his job.

Power is also gained by the ability to provide the scarce resources a company needs to gain a competitive advantage. Practice has shown that the one who loses control over the sources also loses power. An individual or organizational unit that can provide resources gains power. Power is also gained when someone is in the right place at the right time and takes appropriate action. A leader expands his power by meeting the needs of the company at the right time. A leader who successfully implements a turn strategy gains more power in the company.

The various sources of power and influence on which it is based are the basis for three known types of leadership: transactional, charismatic, and transformational.

*Transactional leadership is based on coercion*. Power is derived from rewards and punishments, which are determined and exercised by the leader. The power of influence is the power of effects on each other and results from the effects of individuals, but also from the coordination of actions of several people. Transactional leadership is control over others.

*Charismatic leaders*base their power on the degree to which followers identify with them. There is a danger that charismatic leaders translate their quest for power into the need for directive, control, and even domination over others. From an ethical point of view, that is very important. Firstly, because it is often in practice, and secondly, it leaves major consequences.

*Transformational leadership*, unlike transactional and charismatic, differs in the behavior of a leader who seeks to influence employees by internalizing certain values. In contrast to the transactional and charismatic leader, the transformation leader seeks to define and make explicit the important values ​​that leaders and employees have in common. That is why the transformation leader is seen by many as a servant rather than a boss in the organization. A transformational leader does not base his power on rewards and punishments. We are going to authorize associates. Empowering leaders and associates is driven by a shared vision. There are situations when transformational leaders can act in a way that not only generates a charismatic feeling among followers but also consciously creates and exploits that charismatic effect.

**Leaders and followers**

Leadership is defined as a way of behaving that influences others. It is also defined as an instrument for achieving goals. Namely, leadership is a process in which an individual influences a group of people to achieve a goal. Without influence there is no leadership. A group or organization is the context in which leadership is achieved. Leaders are not above followers or better than them, they perform different roles. Leaders and followers need to understand each other.

Leadership does not exist without followers. In order for a group or organization to do something, they need to know why and how. Leaders must have followers and this does not require the existence of a formal organization. The qualities needed by a leader become more complex as responsibilities and job structures expand.

There is a kind of exchange between leaders and followers. Namely, different types of relationships are created between leaders and followers, and it is not easy to understand what someone gives and receives from that relationship. Relationships in the group between leaders and followers are characterized by trust, loyalty and cooperation. Followers develop relationships with the leader of their choice, not necessarily with those who have authority over them. In organizations, the same people are not leaders in all situations.

The leader should constantly demonstrate special competence that followers respect. Otherwise, his authority is in question. Only the business success of the company maintains the leader's authority. The freedom of the leader to choose solutions brings a sense of independence and allows him to look at his own interest, to evaluate alternatives from the point of view of benefits and costs. In order to make rational choices, an individual must learn to suppress feelings and impulses. Businesses need talented people who can improve business performance continuously. Unfortunately, imagination and creativity are not qualities that a large number of people possess. In addition to a leader who needs to lead, a successful organization needs followers who know how to follow. Therefore, ineffective followers can be a handicap for an organization. It is considered that effective followers should have the following characteristics:

- *To manage themselves well*. That they are able to think for themselves. To be able to work independently and without direct supervision.

- *That they are attached to the group, organization and idea*, despite the fact that they take care of themselves. Most people like to work with colleagues who are emotionally attached to their work.

- *To create their competence*and focus their efforts on achieving the best possible results. To improve in their profession, to be useful to their organization and to have higher standards of performance than the job or organizational unit requires.

- *That they are brave, honest, reliable and efficient followers*and set themselves up as independent thinkers whose creative opinion and assessments can be trusted.

They should have high ethical standards. They praise when it is needed, but they are not afraid to point out mistakes. Of course, they do it with the best of intentions.

Leadership is the process of directing and influencing activities relevant to achieving the goals of group members. This definition of leadership has three implications. First, it is people - associates or followers - who are willing to accept directives from leaders and make the leadership process possible, because without associates all the qualities of a leader become irrelevant. Second, leadership involves an unequal distribution of power between leaders and group members. The members of the group are not powerless. They can and do perform group activity in a variety of ways. Yet it is normal for a leader to have more power. Power is spo - Rooms to influence, that is, to change the attitudes or behavior of group members. The third aspect of leadership is the ability to use different forms of power to influence associates to behave in a certain way. An impact is any action or behavior that causes changes in the attitudes or behavior of other people or a group as a whole.

Gaining followers for change is the goal of leadership in modern companies. True leadership is finding solutions to adapt to changes in the modern global economy. Managers decide for themselves, and leaders use employees to find a common solution. This introduces certain disturbances in the company, because employees need to learn new roles. The way the business is done in the company is changing. The leader must always keep in mind the context and therefore it is not good to be self-engaged in the implementation of the solution. A leader must know how capable employees are of learning new ways of doing things. It is very important to create confidence that the job can be done in a new way.

It should always be borne in mind that the interaction of leaders and followers does not take place in a vacuum but is located in a historical and cultural framework and certain institutional conditions. These conditions affect the character of the interaction and the attributes of leadership. Great leaders emerge when their attributes are aligned with the context and conditions in which they operate.

It is believed that leadership should be a balance between a directive style that shows direction and a milder one that maximizes the potential of individuals in the organization. Borders are needed. Within the limits of the work takes place, and after - only children have the freedom to be creative and to take responsibility for their actions. Boundaries allow the leader to be both - the one who enables and the one who maintains. Leadership is not so much what the leader does but how much he influences those around him. But what he does largely determines the degree of influence on his followers. The ways in which leadership behavior influences followers is communicating messages of what is expected and what can be achieved. The leader communicates the goals of the organization through actions and behaviors using an appropriate form of communication.

Empowerment of staff is related to the transformational leader - leadership. The emphasis shifts from the leader as an individual with certain personal characteristics, to the leader of the organization. The focus changes from the effectiveness of the leader to the effectiveness of the organization. The end result is empowered leadership - empowerment. Not only the profits and earnings that usually accompany empowerment, but also the culture of the organization is important so that employees understand the meaning of their work and have the desire to change, to improve the success of the organization.

**Management and leadership**

**Managers and leaders as individuals**

When it comes to leadership and leaders, it is necessary to make a parallel and distinction between managers and leaders. Although both the manager and the leader guide people in performing certain activities, there are significant differences between them. The manager performs all sub-processes of management: planning, organizing, staffing, leading and controlling. Its role is reflected, above all, in planning goals and actions, organizing and leading people to their execution, as well as in controlling execution. The leader deals only with guiding people and directing them and motivating them to follow them in achieving the future goals and strategic visions of the company.

A manager does not have to be a leader, and also, a leader does not have to be a manager. Managers have the formal authority on which they act, while leaders do not have to have it. They may have informal power provided by the role of leader. The manager, therefore, has an officially assigned function, an official position in the organization, which allows him to perform his managerial tasks. A manager must be successful in doing the work he is in charge of, but he does not have to be successful in influencing other people to follow and listen to him.

A leader does not have to have an official function or position in the organization, but he can still convince other people to follow and listen to him. He has a special ability, a special power or authority, which enables him to convince and motivate people to follow him and do what he tells them. For every company, ie for every organization, it is very important to have managers with the characteristics of leaders, that is - leaders in managerial affairs. This means that there is a manager who is a leader, and he leads people from the official managerial position in the organization to achieve changes and strategic goals of the company. Managers with leadership characteristics are the most important for the successful development of any organization. Because only managerial leaders can lead good and successful organizations and realize the strategic visions of the company.

In today's complex environment of changing environments, companies cannot adapt to change and move forward without managerial leadership. Only strategically oriented leaders, who can predict future events and actions, can lead people to follow them in realizing the planned actions and changes.

In the Western world, especially in the United States, it is believed that modern companies have too many managers and too few leaders. This is, among other things, presented as a significant shortcoming that hinders the rapid development of companies and leads to the fact that companies in Japan work much more productively and efficiently compared to similar companies in the West.

If we want to briefly list the main differences between managers and leaders, then, first of all, it is necessary to emphasize that the manager is a man who knows how to adapt well to different situations and conditions in the company, while the leader is a man who strives for innovation and with them he tries to bring the company on the path of progress. The manager strives to achieve stable business conditions and, on that basis, more efficient results, while the leader strives exclusively to introduce changes that bring a better position in the future and more efficient results.

The manager bases his approach to leadership on a rational approach to planning and controlling jobs and tasks, in order to achieve positive business results, while the leader creates his own vision of the future place and business of the company, and directs and leads people to achieve that vision. The manager tries to follow the known paths in the realization of his managerial functions, and to take as few risks as possible. The leader consciously takes the risk, because only in that way can he achieve the future goals and strategies that he has foreseen and defined. Risk is a part of the daily business and behavior of a leader, and a companion of future actions and events to which he aspires.

The main question in this area is: what can lid - is primarily different from the managers, what's two - me and makes specific? The first studies in this area focused on personal characteristics. Price - line has been that some people are born leaders, and that leadership is an inborn talent. If that were so, it would be extremely easy to identify features which makes people leaders, or leaders who have and do not have them "ordinary people". If we identify these properties, it would be relatively simple to be able to choose people for the position - is in need of a lid - er. However, the matter is far more complex. As in many other areas of life, a little talent, developed emotional intelligence, a lot of knowledgeable - and I work on it, are the basic prerequisites for the development of leaders.

The question is, how do they differ from other managers in the organization? There are highly efficient individuals who work quickly, concentrated, and perform their tasks properly. But if you ask them to start teams for big changes, to carry out a revolution in terms of reorganization, that would be very difficult.

Managers are, however, crucial layer control in all organizations. Management provides the basic preconditions for the efficient functioning of an organization, but leadership is needed to take the organization further, often with courage - into new changes. The complexity of daily operations management up - are run through planning and organizing, conducting a true organization begins with the development vision and communication between those who are on the road of realizing vision. The leaders are great communicators, have a developed sense of empathy and human them in the truth - ski respect.

Management realizes the plan for organizing and control and leadership reaches whose inspiration people. Leaders inspire faith and create energy  that moves people to action. The manager therefore develops control, while the leader builds trust. It is often said that a manager asks how and when, a leader asks what and why. The point is that the manager in essence administrator, he maintains the system working status - it performs "minor repairs and regular check-ups."  Managers can also contribute to business growth by doing the same thing they do all the time, only a little better, faster and more efficiently.

So the manager maintains, and the leader develops. It follows that the manager of struggling with the complexity and the lid - also with uncertainty. Due to the fact that mainly works the same actions and fight for accuracy of the system is considered to be the manager - imitator, and that the leader - the innovator. That is why the manager works with certainty, and the leader with probability.

Sometimes the differences between a manager and a leader are dramatized: the manager implements, and the leader innovates; the manager is a copy and the leader is the original; the manager has a focus on systems and structures, and the leader is focused on people; managers rely on control, and the leader inspires behavior; the manager has a short-term and the leader a long-term view; the manager asks how and when, and the leader asks what and why; the manager focuses his eyes on the baseline of the performance, and the leader on the horizon; the manager imitates, and the leader is original; the manager accepts the status quo, and the leader questions it; the manager is a classic good soldier, and the leader is a special person.

While leaders create the mission of the organization and create strategies to achieve it, managers are responsible for its realization. In practice, many leaders are responsible for managerial affairs. Hence, although there is a distinction between leaders and managers, the difference is often blurred in practice.

**Management and leadership as processes**

The problems that companies face in the 21st century can hardly be solved well without successful organizations, and organizations cannot be successful without effective leadership. All other sources that it lacks (technology, capital, etc.) the company can obtain with more or less effort. However, companies that do not have leadership have limited chances to face the problems that the globalization of the world economy brings. In the absence of leadership they continue to deal with those which have been practicing, and the way in this field. The improvement of existing routines and existing business orientation continues.

Kotter is the most important author who makes a clear distinction between management and leadership.His thesis is that leadership and management are two different and complementary systems of action. Each system of action has its own functions and characteristics. Both systems are needed in the modern economy. According to him, management refers to dealing with complexity, and leadership to dealing with change. Businesses manage the complexity of planning and budgeting activities. On the contrary, leadership is setting the direction, the vision of the future with the strategy for leading change to realize the vision. Management creates the ability to realize the plan by organizing (providing the necessary staff and creating an organizational structure). Leadership is connecting people, conceiving a new direction that creates a coalition that understands the vision and is interested in its realization. Management relies on control and problem solving, and leadership requires motivation and inspiration for people to go in the right direction. Since the function of leadership is to bring about change, that vision or setting the direction of change is fundamental to leadership.

When the environment in which a company conducts its business activity changes, it becomes clear that the leadership expertise of managers must be increased. Namely, managers can be leaders. In general, managers solve problems rationally, and leaders are more intuitive and more visionary. Leaders are primarily interested in the results.

Moving from manager to leader requires a significant change in their position and role in the company. The manager is understood as the "boss" in the company, and the leader trains associates for action. The manager strives to control people, and the leader to empower them to express their professional abilities more freely. Managers often seek to centralize authority, and leaders tend to “distribute” leadership to have it at multiple levels in the organization. Managers are often internally oriented and mostly deal with problems in their company, and leaders are externally oriented and deal with events in the environment and the place of the company in the branch and economy. Managers emphasize the obedience of their associates, and leaders win them over to cooperation. Managers are predominantly focused on tasks and figures, and leaders on quality, services, and consumers. Managers make changes out of necessity or in a crisis situation, and leaders are continuously learning and prone to innovations of various kinds.

Many see the differences between leaders and managers in their specific characteristics. The manager is characterized by - resource power, the leader - integrative power. The manager is characterized by a hierarchical position, and the leader by consciousness management. The manager plans, organizes and controls, and the leader creates and leads change. The manager implements, and the leader creates the vision. The manager strives to achieve the highest possible efficiency, and the leader strives to achieve the highest possible efficiency. The manager wants stable business conditions, and the leader perceives turbulent conditions as a challenge and an opportunity.

Modern management realizes its essence through the following phases:

- *Planning and budgeting*- setting goals for the future, defining the stages to achieve these goals, which includes determining the time, job sketches and allocating resources to achieve these plans.

- *Organizing and providing staff*- establishing the organizational structure and determining the tasks for the implementation of the plan, appointing individuals to jobs that are qualified, communicating the plan, delegating responsibility to do the job and implement the plan and setting up a monitoring system.

- *Control and problem solving*- monitoring the results in relation to the plan in detail, formally and informally through reports, standards and the like, identifying deviations that are usually called "problem" and then planning and organizing to solve problems.

While management ensures order and consistency, leadership does not, it produces movement. Always the leaders brought a change, sometimes for the better and sometimes not. Leadership is associated with constructive and participatory change. This is accomplished through the following activities:

- *Determining the direction*- by creating a vision of the future, often for the future, together with strategies to implement the intended changes in order to achieve the vision.

- *Connecting people*- communicating the direction to those who cooperate, it is necessary to create a coalition that understands the vision and is ready to make it happen.

- *Motivation and inspiration*  ensures that people move in the right direction, according to important, but often unclear needs of people, values ​​and emotions.

Management and leadership defined in this way are similar. Both include what needs to be decided to do something, creating a network of people and relationships that can achieve a given goal. Both are complex systems of action. Those who sma - lasting that management is only part of the implementation of leadership forget chi - The fact that the leadership has its own application process: connecting people to new direction, inspiring them to achieve it. It is similar with those who think of leadership as part of management - the aspect of motivation, ignoring the aspect of guidance in leadership.

Management provides a degree of predictability and order and has the potential for consistency by delivering the key results expected by different stakeholders. Leadership results in change often to a dramatic degree and has the potential to do so. Leadership results in beneficial change, and management results in regular results that enable efficiency. This is not to say that management is never associated with change in tandem with effective leadership. It can help bring about a real process of change. However, management itself never leads to significant radical changes. Both systems are needed for an organization to thrive.

Setting a direction in leadership does not result in a plan, but in creating a vision and strategy. The process of guidance, once it begins, proceeds continuously, although it usually goes through periods of large and small activities. Neither plans, nor visions and strategies are substitutes for each other, because they serve different purposes.

In leadership, networking refers to getting people to stand behind the vision and set of strategies, to successfully deal with problems in the environment in which the company conducts its business activity. The main challenge of communicating is to contact a large number of people so that they understand and believe in the vision and strategy. Connecting helps to ensure better organization and use of people in the company.

**Charismatic leadership theory**

The essence of charismatic leadership is that it is based on the personal charisma of the leader, on the basis of which he attracts a large number of followers. According to this understanding, the leader creates and develops specific relationships with followers, which inspires them and gives them the strength to achieve success even in the most difficult moments. Charismatic leaders are able to motivate subordinates so much that they can even exceed their expectations. They have a clear vision and a developed value system. They create an atmosphere of change and are full of ideas. This type of leader is dynamic, restless, and less predictable than other types of leaders.

It is paradoxical, but there are two contradictory positions of forming the image of a leader. One denies any influence of the leader on organizational effectiveness at all, and the other overemphasizes the importance of it and leads to the formation of leadership charisma and the attempt of followers to attribute to the leader almost magical, and in some cases divine qualities , Stalin, Hitler). Charisma is a form of influencing others through personal attraction, which evokes support and recognition and provides the bearer of charisma with power over followers. Many believe that the acquisition of charisma is related to the ability of leaders to find their fans and admirers, and even to change their composition depending on the situation. Others define charisma as the sum of specific leadership qualities. Based on that, the concept of charismatic leadership was created, which is in its essence a continuation of the concept of attributive leadership and which is built by a combination of characteristics and behaviors of leaders.

A leader who is able to leave a strong impression on his followers with the strength of his personal qualities is considered charismatic. Leaders of this type have a strong desire for power, have a strong need for action, and are convinced of the moral correctness of what they stand for and what they believe in. The desire for power motivates them in their efforts to become leaders. Belief in their correctness reinforces this need. Such a person's desire for activity leaves the impression, in people, that he is capable of being a leader. These qualities develop such characteristics of charismatic behavior as role shaping, creating a pattern of behavior, the ability to present big goals as realistic and accessible, awakening hope for success and inspiration for work with followers.

Research shows that charisma has a negative side (usurpation of personal power, or completely directing the leader to emphasize his personality), but also a positive side (distribution of power between leaders and followers and their strong motivation).

In general, the charismatic leader is characterized by belief in themselves, a high sense of environment, vision solutions to the problems in and out of the current situation, input reduction of vision to a level that is understandable and acceptable for followers and fans, inserted mobilizing and encouraging the masses to exceptional activity for the realization of its visions.

Models of charismatic leadership differ in the degree of development of charisma itself and in the relationship with followers. But the process of creation is, for the most part, standard. It is believed that the problem should be demystified first so that it can be criticized later . Next, a vision of idealized solutions to that problem needs to be created. The vision should contain a new proposal that no one has announced before , as well as that what is being proposed means a radical and quick solution to the problem.

The next step involves the ability of the leader to communicate his vision to the  
followers. The way of communication must be spectacular, have a very convincing effect on the masses and mobilize them. In order to gain followers around him, the leader must create relationships of trust, demonstrate his abilities, knowledge, skills, taking the risk and responsibility for the successful outcome of the radical measures he proposes. In the last phase, the leader is obliged to demonstrate the ability to realize his vision. He accomplishes this by delegating authority to his followers. He includes them in the decision-making process, entrusts them with the realization of difficult and important tasks, removes various bureaucratic barriers, and rewards them for the achieved results. Experience shows that in ordinary situations, charismatic leadership does not necessarily require major business results. It approaches this, especially when the followers strongly ideologize their desires and the ways of their realization. In business, the importance of charismatic leadership grows as the need to implement radical changes in the organization, in relation to the critical situation. In these situations, a different concept of leadership is born - the concept of a transitional leader or a reformer leader.

Charismatic leadership is characterized by the emotional attachment of followers to the leader. Followers accept the leader primarily out of respect and identify with him.

Charismatic leadership is possible under certain conditions. The beliefs of the followers must be similar to those of the leader. Unconditional acceptance and commitment to the leader must exist. Members of a group or organization are willing to listen to the leader, and must be emotionally involved in the mission of the charismatic leader. Followers must have a strong desire to identify with the leader. Some believe that charismatic leaders have followers who are susceptible to influence and dependent. That explains the acceptance of a self-confident and directive charismatic leader. Followers are more likely to attribute charisma to leaders who use personal power and successful persuasion performances than to those who use authority or a participatory decision-making process. A leader who seems confident in his proposal will be seen as charismatic rather than one who is in doubt or confused. If the leader does not show confidence in communication, the success of the innovated strategy will be attributed to happy circumstances, rather than to his expertise. The leader's self-confidence and enthusiasm are very important.

Charismatic leadership is seen primarily as a collective rather than a dual process. Personal identification with a leader may occur for some followers, but social identification is more important as a process of influence. People who identify with a group or organization become proud to be a part of something and view their membership (in a group or organization) as their most important identity. A charismatic leader can increase social identification. Giving a group a unique identity that is different from others (groups and organizations) makes it look special.

Numerous conditions contribute to the emergence of charismatic leadership. The charismatic leader will likely find when an organization has a mission that can be associated with the values of followers, and their identity, charismatic leaders before appearing in the organization that are in the establishment where it is not clear what should be done to ensure the survival and prosperity. These conditions favor the role of a leader who is able to define a crisis situation and offer compelling strategy for successfully coping with the crisis. However, the charismatic effect of such leaders will be temporary if the vision is not continuously realized, as the immediate crisis is overcome. Charismatic leaders can also emerge in organizations that have the opportunity to undertake a new activity that is acceptable to the followers as an idea.

Charismatic leaders transform the needs, values, preferences and aspirations of followers from personal interests to common interests. They enable followers to become very willing to personally commit and sacrifice for the realization of the leader's mission and to work beyond what is their obligation.

That is why a leader who engages in very different and idealized visions and who uses unconventional ways to realize the vision, is seen by employees as a charismatic leader. Especially if he takes a high personal risk.

Numerous characteristics of a charismatic leader are listed in the literature:

- *Vision*. A charismatic leader offers an exceptional image of the path the organization should take and how to get there. A vision is more than a prediction because it describes an ideal version of the future of an entire organization or organizational unit.

- *Mastery of communication skills*. To inspire people, a charismatic leader uses a special way of expression with many metaphors and anecdotes.

- *Ability to inspire the trust*of group members (organizations) and stakeholders. They are very confident in the integrity of the charismatic leader and are willing to risk their careers to realize his vision.

- *Ability to make group members feel capable*. One of the techniques to make group members feel more capable is to enable them to succeed on relatively easier projects. The leader encourages group members to achieve success and gives them more complex tasks.

- *Energy and action orientation*. As entrepreneurs, many charismatic leaders are active and serve as a model to get things done on time.

- *Emotional expressiveness and warmth*. A key characteristic of a charismatic leader is his ability to openly express his feelings. This also applies to non-verbal expressions.

- *Willingness to take personal risk*. A charismatic leader is typically risk-averse, which contributes to his charisma.

- *Using unconventional strategies*. A charismatic leader inspires others by formulating unusual strategies for achieving important goals.

- *A self-promoting person*. A charismatic leader is not modest and he always emphasizes how important he is.

- *Ability to appear during a crisis*. Earlier, it was pointed out that the charismatic leader appears in response to the crisis. This is typical of political leadership.

- *Minimum intimate contacts*. A charismatic leader is confident and convinced that he is right, even if he encounters opposition. He has fewer internal conflicts between emotions, impulses, feelings and their consequences than most people. Because he believes that he is right, he has less guilt due to incompatibility with his associates.

*Newer theories*of charismatic leadership have several characteristics. First, they all try to explain how a leader is able to lead an organization - to achieve more significant results. It can be a leading position of the company in the branch, a successful strategy of turning in a very competitive environment, as well as major social reforms. Second, theories of this paradigm seek to explain how certain leaders are able to achieve an extraordinary level of follower motivation, appreciation, loyalty, and performance. Third, they emphasize symbolic and emotional performances in the behavior of leaders, as well as visionary, a certain degree of risk-taking. Fourth, the effects include leadership commitment, sensitivity and identification with the leader's vision, stimulation and performance trail - servants.

From an ethical point of view, it is an interesting and very important fact that charismatic leadership can be used for ill-intentioned purposes. According to some, charismatic leaders are experts in the promise of utopia. Since the goal is ideal, many actions are initiated according to the rule "the goal justifies the means". Sometimes actions are taken for immoral purposes, and followers, since they blindly follow the leader because of their referential power, are set up in a certain way.

It was noted several serious problems that occur with charismatic leaders, which in some cases can occur in charismatic political leader. First are bad interpersonal relationships. Some are so narcissistic that they don't pay attention to others. Second, there are negative consequences of impulsive and uncontrolled behavior. That is why people's attitude towards the charismatic leader is polarized - some adore him and some despise him. Third, there are negative con - sequences management through impressions. New charismatic leaders strive to create the impression that they are exceptional and that they are very important to the organization. Charismatic leaders deny responsibility for mistakes. Negative charismatically leaders are not willing to learn from mistakes. Fourth, poor governance - detachments practice. The reason for that is only the preoccupation with the whole and the lack of ability to notice the details of everyday work. They are good at defining but not implementing the vision. Fifth, the negative consequences are confident charismatic leader as he often lost in the facing problems of applying vision.

These are leaders who do not have many restrictions on the use of power so that they can best serve their interests. It is a leader who imposes his goals on a group or organization and respects employees only if they support his goals. His followers are usually dependent, obedient, and can be more easily influenced.

The third type is a charismatic leader who is more in position

has in the organization, rather than personal characteristics and therefore enjoys trust while in office. If he has a high position, he also has a high status.

The fourth type is a personal-charismatic leader. He is the opposite of the third type. He is a leader whom his followers trust because of his personal qualities. He enjoys respect regardless of the position he occupies, due to his personal qualities and characteristics.

**Transformational leadership**

This leadership emerged from the waves of major organizational changes that took place in the 1980s.

Transitional leadership or leadership for change has many similarities with charismatic leadership, but also certain specifics, which is why it is analyzed separately. Leadership for change is tied to leaders who have a vision and have the ability to drive innovation and change. These leaders are able to devise a vision of change, as well as the strategy and tactics of achieving it. The relationships they establish with their followers are not based on order, but on voluntary cooperation, trust, joint sharing of results and responsibilities. The reforming leader motivates followers by increasing their level of knowledge of the importance and value of set goals, explains the possibility of harmonizing their personal interests with the general social ones, creating an atmosphere of trust and convincing followers of the necessity of relying on their own strength.

A reforming leader is a transformer, a bearer of change, not a savior. He announces creativity, not routine. Behind it is reality, not myths. He leads followers from result to result, not from promise to promise. It directs people to work and not to dividends. His goal is not to change the world, but to change the world, through development.

The model of transformational or reformist leadership implies such a character of leaders and followers that can be used for creative problem solving in crisis situations. The model has a number of specifics. First, it is considered necessary for a leader to gain his followers through their involvement in management, to be part of the collective himself, and not to "stand above it". He enthusiastically supports joint efforts. Followers are not asked to blindly follow the leader, but to critically evaluate the set goals and the announced path of their realization, reduce the influence of emotions, and increase rationality in behavior. Second, if the atmosphere of trust grows into a strong interdependence between the leader and the followers, then there is a serious danger that the leader will surround himself with like-minded people, or vice versa, that the leader will start following the followers. These two traditional approaches are not suitable for a reformist leader.

Precisely because of that possible use, but also the abuse of charisma, it must always be considered in the context of certain moral principles. This is how the *model of a moral and immoral charismatic leader*was created. While an immoral charismatic leader uses power solely to pursue personal interests, a moral charismatic leader does so in the interests of others. An immoral charismatic leader expands his personal vision, and a moral one creates a vision in accordance with the needs of the company and the interests of his followers. An immoral leader does not tolerate criticism of his work, either publicly or secretly.

If that happens, he strongly opposes it and immediately interrupts it. A moral leader even stimulates criticism. He understands this as a well-meaning conversation and tries to learn lessons for himself from it.

The immoral charismatic leader insists on the strict execution of his orders, without discussion. A moral leader asks followers to take a creative approach to carrying out his orders.

An immoral leader communicates one-way, from himself down to his associates. Communication is sparse, short, sharp. It comes down to command. A moral leader prefers two-way communication. He is ready to issue orders, but he also wants to hear feedback.

An immoral leader has no ear for the needs and problems of his followers. He attributes all the glory of success to himself, and blames others for his failures. A moral leader, on the other hand, has a lot of understanding for the needs and problems of his associates. He shares the glory of success with others. He tries to emphasize everyone's merit in that. He also bravely stands behind personal failure.

An immoral leader often invokes some external moral standards that support him, and a moral leader also invokes and relies on internal moral standards to meet the interests of the organization and society.

CONCLUSION

When we talk about leadership in sports, we primarily mean coaches and athletes who have

the role of team captain. However, today we must by no means neglect whose sports managers

the role and position increasingly gained in importance and responsibility. Insufficiently informed individuals they often confuse the roles and activities of sports managers with the role of a club coach. Lawrence points out that the title of manager in British football is clearly different from coaching, and that it is very close to the responsibilities that head coaches have in American sports or sports directors.

While Weinberg and Gould consider the roles of manager and leader differing from each other, Crust and Lawrence point out that the role of a football manager sums up in itself elements of both roles. While management implies leadership, leaders do not necessarily be and managers. The role of the manager is to maximize the results of the organization through organizing, planning, staffing, guidance and control. Leadership is just one aspect of a managerial guiding role. Weinberg and Gould point out that the manager is generally focused on taking care of things like planning, organizing, programming, budgeting, staffing and recruitment. Although leaders often perform these same functions (or delegate them to others),

they do it in a much different way. They provide a vision that helps determine direction in which the organization or team will go, including their goals and tasks. Leaders are trying to provide resources and support to get the job done. Many coaches become excellent managers when you accept such activities that contribute to the smooth running of the business. You should have u

seeing that there is a big difference in providing the leadership that players and teams need who are in the process of growing and maturing in relation to the leadership needed by adult seniors amateur and / or professional athletes and teams. So the manager takes care of things like programming, budgeting, planning and organizing, while being a leader is more concentrated on directing the organization, including its goals and tasks.

***How are sports leaders chosen?***When it comes to coaches as leaders, they are usually chosen as well appointed by the sports director or the board of directors of the sports organization. Such as

the school principal elects the teachers, the director of the clinical center the physician, and the sports director elects hires a coach when he expects to successfully fulfill the goals and tasks of the organization, follow its policy and contribute to its further affirmation. However, when we talk about game leaders, ie team captains, then in practice it exists more options:

a. A team captain may be ***appointed***or ***imposed***by an authority (usually from by the coach, at the suggestion of the professional team or sports director) and then we talk about to an appointed or imposed leader.

b. The captain may be ***elected***by team members in a regular democratic procedure.

c. A captain can become a player who spontaneously imposes his leadership, teammates accept him and then we talk about a ***spontaneously "emerging"***leader. The management of the club, as well as the players in the democratic selection of the captain, are guided similar criteria. The captain is usually chosen, if not the best athlete, then certainly one of the better ones, a player whose behavior instills confidence that he will successfully take care of achieving team goals, who has developed communication skills, who knows how to nurture good team relations. For club leaders, an important criterion in choosing a player leader is his loyalty to the club, as well as the fact whether he is a "child of the club", whether he grew up in the club or came from the side, how long he has been in the team, and it is desirable that he be among the older and more experienced individuals because rich experience, combined with favorable personality traits, is an assumption successful team management in crisis and conflict situations, gaining the trust of teammates in captain and good mutual communication. The captain has specific duties and arrangements, both in relation to team members and in in relation to the coach (usually said to be the "extended arm of the coach"), the media, more broadly socially the environment. Similar to a coach, he is also expected to possess pronounced personal attributes and skills such as: high cognitive abilities, analytical, thoughtful, high level sports knowledge (technique, tactics, strategy), responsibility, communication, empathy, honesty, morality, dedication, high work ethic, ability to motivate and move on action, to inspire, cooperate, influence others, provide support, acknowledge, resolve conflicts, harmonizes relationships, encourages a positive team atmosphere. Of course, these are only desirable attributes and it is unrealistic to expect them all to be found in one person. Each captain is characterized by a specific leadership style - some care more about the team 's tasks (on the field, everything works properly, to achieve the set sports goals), while others focus more on team relations, make sure they are friendly, non-conflicting,

that all players are satisfied, the cohesiveness of the team is high, mutual trust and cooperation on the highest level. About whether the more successful leaders in sports are task-oriented or they are primarily oriented to interpersonal relationships can be discussed a lot, as well as everything else important aspects of the role of the captain, his relationship with teammates and the coach, functioning team in conditions when there are more leaders and the like. Those who are especially interested can look for it research that sheds more light on these and other topics related to leadership in sports.