Modern economy is the economy of information and knowledge, resulting in increasing speed of changes occurring in it; accordingly, it requires new tools and approaches to industrial activity. In conditions of high degree of uncertainty in the environment and in order to enhance their role, the entire staff and not only the top management become the protagonists in the organization. Thanks to the skills, abilities, knowledge of each organization item, one can not only achieve their strategic objectives (this is the role of management care in the classical management), but also form a strategic aim (which featured the activities of management in the classical management). Objective intellectual limitation of the organization leader is due to the fact that speed of changes in the external environment makes it necessary to use the potential of subordinates, who often have greater intellectual potential than leaders do. Thus, by combining efforts, the organization receives a significant synergetic effect. But this approach requires changes in organization management: control system based on coercion needs to be changed to a system based on the cooperation of all organization subjects, on the interaction of leadership qualities, leadership potential of every individual, but on condition that they are all ready to take on leadership functions.
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INTRODUCTION

Perhaps leadership is one of the most multifaceted phenomena of social science. Leadership occurs in different groups of people: a primitive tribe, peasant communities, a knight's order, a merchant guild, and finally in a modern organization (Burns, 1978). Leadership manifests itself in many areas of human activity - you can talk about political, social, religious, organizational, athletic, economic, military leadership. Consequently, this phenomenon is studied in many social sciences, including management by many authors such as Goodworth (1988).

As one scientist has remarked, leadership is one of the most popular research topics, yet it remains one of the most unexplored ones. Search for the word "leadership" on Google, it gives 21,600,000 results, which is two times more than for the word "democracy" and a little less than for the words "politics" and "economy".

It seems that the relevance of leadership has never decreased, and now, it only increases when the organization in conditions of intensifying competitiveness and low world economic growth is looking for new reserves to increase efficiency and maintain market position. Development of organizational leadership is seen as one of the solutions.

Why is it important to talk about leadership in Russian and Serbian conditions? One can hardly agree with the fact that the organization needs a leader, especially when control is lost. It seems that leadership in the organization is needed not only for a breakthrough, but also for maintenance of stable development. In our view, it is leadership or vision for a broad perspective, the ability to take initiative in one’s hands and inspire others to achieve the goals needed to turn Russia’s economic
growth into a sustainable and long-term trend, which is largely caused by a favorable external environment today. In addition, Russian managers, traditionally known as authoritarian leaders who rely on intuition rather than on scientific approach, after getting acquainted with the theoretical developments in this area, would be able to revise their leadership portfolio and make it more diverse. From the point of view of the study, this would strengthen the competitiveness of Russian enterprises in various world markets. Furthermore, it should be noted that, in comparison with Western science, the level of scrutiny of the problem in Russia is low. Domestic studies in the field of leadership are often based on an uncritical transposition of the material of Western authors, for example, Fiedler and Chemers (1984) and Fleishman et al (1991). Development of the national leadership school is seen as a powerful engine for improving the practice of leadership in Russia.

THE PROBLEM AND ITS RELEVANCE

Researchers estimate that over the past 50 years, 65 different classifications that described various aspects of leadership were suggested. In this article, the most complete and coherent version proposed by Stogdill and Bass is taken as a basis. After the analysis of a great number of sources, theorists have identified the following approaches to definition of leadership.

Leadership as a center of group processes

Within this framework, the following definitions have been proposed. According to Blackmar (1911), "leadership" is a "centralization of efforts in one person as an expression of power of all people." According to Bernard (1927), leaders are influenced by the needs and desires of group members. In their turn, leaders focus and forward energy of the group in the desired direction. For Redl (1942), a leader is the central figure, which integrates the group.

Thus, this approach emphasizes the importance of the group structure and group processes in the study of leadership.

Leadership as an expression of personality

The concept of identity is fundamental to the works of early theorists in the field of leadership, which tried to determine why some people are more successful leaders than others. For example, Bernard (1927) argues that "any person who effectively conveys the psychological stimulus to others more than usually and hence determines the reaction of the team can be called a leader." By Tead (1929), leadership is a combination of traits that allow a person to encourage others to perform certain actions.

Theorists in this direction tend to treat leadership as a process of unilateral effects and do not recognize the mutuality of leadership.

Leadership as the art of inducement to compliance

Moore (2007) defines leadership as "the ability to persuade people to the will of the leader and cause obedience, respect, loyalty and willingness to cooperate." This approach is, even more than the previous one, focused on leadership as a unilateral use of power and as a tool of "adaptation" to the will of the leader.

Leadership as an exercise of influence

The concept of influence makes the definition of leadership more abstract. Stogdill (1950) defines leadership as "a process of influencing the actions of an organized group, aimed at setting and achieving goals." Hollander and Julian (1969) suggest that leadership implies the existence of relations of influence between two or more people.

This concept recognizes that people differ according to the degree of influence that their behavior has on actions of others (Foster and Kaplan, 2001). Definition of leadership as a successful impact, which is reflected in achievement of the goals by the followers, allows avoiding unidirectionality of the previous theories and focusing on the relationship of leaders and their followers.

Leadership as an action or behavior

By leadership, Fiedler recognizes behavior in certain actions, in which the leader is involved, by directing and coordinating the work of group members.

Leadership as a form of persuasion

Some theorists try to avoid connotations of coercion in defining leadership, while maintaining an understanding of the fact that a leader is a determining factor in dealing with the followers. The concept of persuasion seems appropriate from this point of view. Schenk (1927) suggests considering leadership as management of people through persuasion and inspiration rather than by direct or implied threats and coercion. Stogdill (1950) also suggests similar opinion: Leadership is the act of persuading people to cooperate in achieving common goals. The concept of persuasion is popular in determining political, social and religious leadership, where persuasion is a powerful instrument in shaping expectations and beliefs.
Leadership as relations of power

Janda (1960) describes leadership as a definite type of power relations, when group members believe that another member of their party has the right to prescribe specific behavior to others. Bass (1960) has a similar opinion: if the goal of one team member, A, is to change the other, B, and when B changes its behavior - it rewards and reinforces the behavior of A, then an attempt of A to reach the goal - is leadership. Power is perceived as a form of relationship of influence.

Leadership as a tool to achieve goal

Numerous theorists include the idea of achieving the goal in defining leadership. Some of them talk about leadership as a tool to achieve the objectives of the group and to satisfy needs. Cattel believes that the leader is a person who leads the group to a particular state, which it would not have reached without him. This special condition includes various actions taken by the group to achieve the goal. Classics of organizational theory also define leadership in terms of achieving group goals. So, Davis (1962) believes that we are talking about the "human factor, which maintains the integrity of the group and motivate it to achieve goals."

Leadership as a consequence of the interaction

Some researchers see leadership as not the cause of action or control over them, but as a consequence of the latter (Bento, 2010). For example, Merton (1967) considers leadership as interpersonal relationship in which others obey willingly, and not under pressure.

This group of theories is important due to the fact that it recognizes leadership as a result of interaction. In fact, leadership only exists if it is recognized by other members. Essentially, this approach to the definition implies that the group does not just passively accept the status of the leader as such. Rather, leadership arises as a consequence of intra-group interaction, which gives rise to expectations that a specific person may be more useful for the group in achieving its objectives.

Leadership as a special role

In modern sociology, the role theory has been developed in accordance with which each member of society takes a position of status in society and its various institutions and organizations. Moreover, it is expected that a person plays more or less definite role in each of these positions. In this case, leadership may be regarded as one of such roles. Sherif and Sherif (1956) suggest that leadership is a role in the scheme of relations, which is determined by mutual expectations of the leader and other participants in this relationship. Newcomb et al. (1956) conclude that various members of the group contribute to a different extent to achieving the goal. Those, whose contribution to the achievement of the goal is recognized by others as indispensable, can be identified as leaders. This definition is mostly supported by one of the leadership definitions by empirical studies. As well as the theory of interaction, the role theory of leadership recognizes that the followers in a certain extent shape the leaders, projecting on them the expectations regarding the role of the latter.

Leadership as an establishment of structure

Some scholars consider leadership not simply as a passive exercise of a certain position or acquisition of a role, but as a process of creating and maintaining the role structure. Smith (1997) equates leadership with the management of social diversity by providing a stimulus to which the group responds as a whole. Gouldner (1950) believes that there is a difference between the response to stimuli that the leader and a follower give, and this difference is in the probability with which it structures the behavior of the group. This probability is mostly for the leader, because the group suggests that the leader is a legitimate source of such a stimulus. Stogdill (1950), by defining leadership as "creation and maintenance of the structure of expectations and interactions," emphasizes that the maintenance of the structure is not less important than its creation. Generally, the maintenance of the structure forms an important part of leadership, because very few teams will participate in the interaction only in order to create a leader and then to get rid of him as soon as possible.

Summarizing the discussion, Stogdill (1950) and Bass (1990) define leadership as the group interaction where the leader is the initiator of changes, a person who influences others to a greater extent than they have on him. We speak about leadership when one team member modifies the motivation or abilities of others. It is also important to understand that leadership serves for achievement of goals and solution of problems of the group, that is, each team member can be a leader to a greater or lesser degree. Not less important components of leadership are those that emphasize the manner in which it is supported, and here the theory of roles, of securing a certain behavior or structuring of expectations, should be included in the definition of leadership.

Even though the definition of Stogdill (1950) and Bass (1990) is considered to be a working definition, we would like to highlight the fact of diversity of existing leadership definitions. Firstly, the concepts are not mutually exclusive but rather complementary, only setting the different accents in the definition. Thus, the theory of leadership as a tool for achieving the goal is mentioned in a number
of definitions (leadership as influence, as a form of persuasion, as relations of power, as a role). Moreover, for example, leadership as a result of interaction seems to include leadership as a center of group interests, as an expression of personality and as an action (Robert, 1999). Secondly, in our opinion, the reason for such diversity of definitions lies in the multiplicity of the phenomenon itself, that is, leadership can be manifested in different degrees and different forms. For example, it is obvious that leadership, the essence of which is seen as an influence or power relations, and which focuses on changing of behavior of others, is different from leadership emerging in the group as a result of group interaction and reflected in the fact that others obey willingly, and not under pressure (Ivanova, 2006). These two types of leadership differ, probably in the causes of their emergence as well as in their essence and in the conditions of maintenance of such leadership.

RESULTS

The main goal in the new management concept is creation of a viable organization, the team of people connected by the idea, and the profit and capture of the market in a competitive environment are secondary and are themselves "attached" in the course of evolution. New concept corresponds to a creative organization. The idea of a creative organization was first presented in the research of V.L. Inozemtsev (1998) who believes that "the essential feature of the modern corporation is to connect people with the ability to work as well as with the means of production into a single social mechanism. This is an organization which doesn’t dictate certain specified principles to its members, but which is on the contrary an expression of their interacting individualities". Why is this happening? First of all, it is because qualities of the employee, new features of their activities, actual organizing principles that determine the internal structure of the company and subordination of its elements, have changed.

To confirm this hypothesis, a survey was conducted among specialists from 35 different companies of the Ulyanovsk region. Today, the Ulyanovsk Region is distinguished by its creativity. Private (individual, not group) interviews were carried out. To fix the results of interviews, a questionnaire was used consisting of 30 open and closed questions, including questions using a scale of ranked answers.

The sample was chosen randomly. The total number of respondents, who formed the sample for the survey, was 485 people, including 255 women and 230 men.

In processing the results, all respondents were divided into 5 age groups and, despite the available information about the level of education, official position, membership to a particular enterprise and other characteristics of the respondents, it was this division that was taken as a basis for comparing results on the major issues of questionnaire, since the greatest differentiation in responses of the surveyed people was observed on this basis (age group), as shown by survey results (Figure 1).

Nowadays, a significant part of the staff are intelligent workers (Figure 2), many of them (and this proportion tends to rise) identify their most fundamental interests not in terms of maximizing the granted benefits but in the category of intellectual growth and development. Thus, according to the end of the survey, though not an overwhelming majority, but a significant number of individuals in companies are oriented not towards material wealth, but towards intellectual growth (Figure 3).

There is a sharp increase in individuality of workers. Besides the flexibility of the employee, their ability to do a wide range of activities is a direct reflection on the extent of their potential and real creativity. The word "creativity" is relatively new; it was mentioned for the first time in the edition of Webster's Dictionary in 1875; and represents the personality traits of the individual, their ability for creative process.

Activity in modern company is becoming more coordinated in terms of overall goals, but more autonomous and individualized in terms of form of involving specific employee into it. From the point of view of the mentioned circumstances, intellectual workers should be managed in such a way as if they were members of voluntary organizations but that is difficult to implement with the traditional principles of management. It is not enough to build an adaptive corporation, which appears as an element of economic structures and serves as the solution of economic problems, not creating and studying, teaching or self-learning organization, but it defines the trends, developing the very nature of social structure. The modern reality is that the volatility of the market environment today is a factor which is present in the activities of organizations. Therefore, adaptive organizations of Toffler and his followers should be subject to the objective modernization, they should lose their temporary character which was put into them, as in the modern enterprise the constantly ongoing change of management system through management of flows of information and knowledge in infinitely renewable resources is already required. As for the management of organizational changes, creative organization provides a new type of economic organization. Without destroying the existing
social continuity, it optimally combines the uniqueness of the individual and collective goal. Creative organization is formed by a system of creative activity within the organization as a result of timely and all-embracing management of knowledge within the organization. "The business world has begun to realize the need for continuous learning, because this approach prepares the staff for all changes and allows you to achieve the desired result." As Morgunov (2001) writes: "Tomorrow's adhocracies will demand an entirely different set of human characteristics. They will require people who are able to learn quickly in accordance with new circumstances and problems, and, endowed with imagination for new solutions."

But is there a necessity to initiate creativity, is there really a leader for changes or is it "inside" each of us? The answer to this question may be provided by the results of the survey (Figure 4). Half of the respondents are creative by nature. It is certainly important to find fundamentally different tools of interaction between...
Conclusion

From the point of view of this study, attribution of leadership qualities must not only be addressed to the company managers, but also to their immediate subordinates. It is the only way possible to realize the intellectual and human potential and its use in organizational changes. Leadership must not be the priority of the elected but of the majority. This aspect allows us to
assert the need for a system of total leadership.

Theorists argue whether the leader’s qualities are those constituted from birth, or leader’s qualities are those acquired. In literature, a metaphor is often cited: not everyone is destined to become a great pianist or an Olympic champion, but everyone can develop their skills by practicing. The same stands for leadership: although such a paradigmatic leader as Alexander of Macedonia is an exceptional example, most authors agree that everyone is able to develop his leadership potential. When it comes to leadership development in an organizational context, what is important is management development (existing and potential) in the organization. This idea seems to be fair, because the very nature of the tasks of management in the organization meets the definition of leadership: the impact on people, management of motivation or ability to develop others, forwarding of a team to achieve the objectives, the initiation of changes. Furthermore, it is leadership potential that becomes a key factor for success of a manager. In support of this premise, we have found considerable similarity in those issues that are discussed in terms of leadership development, and development of managers. In this case, it seems logical to consider these two theoretical areas together.

Already at the level of definitions, the existence of a watershed in the theory of leadership development may be noted. Authors give a different significance to institutionalization of leadership development. Some of them consider the existence of formal programs in the organization of this development important; others note that the development of leaders takes place in the absence of targeted programs. This difference in definitions, in fact, distinguishes two concepts of leadership development. One assumes that the leader is at the same time both subject and object of development process, that is, it acts as an initiator and the agent of his own development (subject), while being at the same time the one whom development is directed to (object). Another scheme presupposes that organization itself serves as the subject of leadership development through the HR-department, mentor and leader, and so on, i.e. it initiates the process and manages it, while a leader himself, being the object plays a more passive role and is actually located in the wake of this process.

In modern organizations, importance of horizontal communication is increasing, and staff are becoming more authoritative and getting an ability to initiate changes. Hence, it is impossible to talk about the development of leaders as a caste approach aimed primarily at managers with high potential. The subject of leadership development in the rank of usual employees is becoming increasingly popular in the literature. Attention is drawn to the fact that a significant number of respondents are cultivating in themselves the desire to take responsibility for doing business (Figure 5).

Discussion about what leadership development is inevitably leads to the question, why it is necessary, because it can not be an aim itself. Some believe that the development of managers is the primary way to implement organizational changes. Others recognize the development of managers as a process of educating leaders, which is a key initiator of organizational renewals. Apparently, just being involved in this process, organizations can create a competitive advantage and successfully exist in the market.
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