

ISTRAŽIVANJE PROFESIONALNOG STATUSA MENADŽERA SA ASPEKTA SOCIO-DEMOGRAFSKIH OBELEŽJA

Dušanka Paspalj¹, Pavle Brzaković²

doi: 10.5937/Oditor2103135P

Originalni naučni rad

UDK: 005-051-057.86:314/316

005.216

Apstrakt

U savremenim uslovima poslovanja, rast i razvoj organizacija zavisi od sposobnosti njenih menadžera da na adekvatan način koordiniraju aktivnostima zaposlenih. Od menadžera se zahteva da sistematski i permanentno usavršavaju i razvijaju sopstvena znanja, sposobnosti i veštine u skladu sa dinamičnim promenama globalnog organizacionog okruženja. Sve se to reflektuje i na njihov status u organizaciji. Cilj ovog rada je istraživanje međusobne zavisnosti i povezanosti socio-demografskih obeležja menadžera i profesionalnog statusa. Prikupljanje podataka izvršeno je anonimnim anketom na uzorku od 110 menadžera različitih hijerarhijskih nivoa. U analizi podataka korišćena je deskriptivna statistika i faktorska analiza. Dobijeni rezultati pokazali su da praktično iskustvo i porodična situacija predstavljaju dominantne socio-demografske faktore. Samo oni zaposleni koji uspostave balans između profesionalnog i porodičnog života, mogu da se u potpunosti posvete poslu koji obavljaju i na taj način doprinesu unapređenju poslovanja.

Ključne reči: menadžeri, profesionalni status, socio-demografski obeležja, organizacioni ciljevi.

JEL: J24, M12.

Uvod

U savremenom poslovnom okruženju zaposleni čini najvredniji resurs organizacija. Svakog zaposlenog čine njegova znanja, sposobnosti i mogućnosti koje menadžeri treba da prepoznaju i da ih shodno tome rasporede na ona radna mesta gde će moći da najviše doprinesu u ostvarivanju postavljenih poslovnih ciljeva, što podrazumeva i odgovarajuću motivacionu klimu. Prvi korak

¹ Student doktorskih studija, Dušanka Paspalj, Univerzitet Privredna akademija u Novom Sadu, Fakultet za primenjeni menadžment, ekonomiju i finansije u Beogradu, Jevrejska br. 24/1, 11000 Beograd, Srbija, E-mail: duskapaspalj@gmail.com

² Docent, dr Pavle Brzaković, Univerzitet Privredna akademija u Novom Sadu, Fakultet za primenjeni menadžment, ekonomiju i finansije u Beogradu, Jevrejska br. 24/1, 11000 Beograd, Srbija, E-mail: pavle.brzakovic@mef.edu.rs

menadžera u stvaranju motivacione klime jeste da zaposlene sagleda kao specifičnu ličnost koja ima svoje potrebe, esencijalne vrednosti i očekivanja, što dovodi do jačanja njihovog samopouzdanja i veće motivisanosti. Motivisani zaposleni su energični, puni entuzijazma, uvek su uspešni u obavljanju svoga posla i, shodno tome, teže da dobiju šire nadležnosti. Oni se ne plaše promena, pozitivno pristupaju svakom izazovu, to prenose na ostale u organizaciji, što se pozitivno reflektuje na ukupne poslovne performanse. Na menadžerima je da odaberu ljude prema potrebnim veštinama, da imaju jasno određene ciljeve i da na adekvatan način nagrađuju ostvarene rezultate. Pri tome treba imati u vidu da sistem nagrađivanja ne čini samo novac koji najčešće daje kratkoročne rezultate, već i pokazivanje aktivnog zanimanja za karijeru svakog zaposlenog, pozitivne povratne informacije o njegovim rezultatima i proširenje nadležnosti kao priznanje sposobnosti.

Ovaj rad ima cilj da ukaže na to koje socio-demografske karakteristike menadžera utiču na njegov profesionalni status i kako se one grupišu u manji broj faktora. Polazna hipoteza istraživanja je da na motivaciju menadžera da se iskažu na profesionalnom nivou značajno utiču praktično iskustvo i porodična situacija.

Šta čini uspešnog menadžera

Osnovni cilj savremenog menadžera jeste da deluje efektivnije i efikasnije što doprinosi boljim organizacionim performansama. Često se ističe da „znanje o tome kako raditi s drugima i uz pomoć drugih predstavlja najvažniji kapital svakog menadžera“ (Heller, 2002). Posao menadžera nije usmeren samo na ličnu promociju, već i na pomaganje drugima da svoje poslove obave na što bolji način. U tu svrhu neophodno je sagledati njihove funkcije, uloge, veštine i osobine.

U odnosu na obavljanje određenih poslova i zadataka dok efikasno koordiniraju radom drugih, menadžeri obavljaju četiri funkcije: „planiranje, organizovanje, vođenje i kontrolu“ (Lekić, 2019: 41). U planiranju na osnovu istraživanja tržišta postavljaju misiju, viziju, ciljeve i strategiju. Organizovanje se odnosi na konkretizovanje ciljeva u specifične poslove i zadatke, i njihovu raspodelu na zaposlene. Vođenje je menadžerska funkcija koja obuhvata motivisanje, koordinaciju i komunikaciju zaposlenih u cilju njihovog podsticanja da daju maksimum od sebe u ostvarivanju organizacionih ciljeva. Kontrola je proces poređenja između ostvarenih rezultata sa prethodno postavljenim ciljevima, kako bi se u slučaju uočenih odstupanja preduzele odgovarajuće korektivne aktivnosti radi njihove eliminacije.

Minzberg je u svojim studijama zaključio da menadžeri u svom poslovanju ispoljavaju deset uloga, odnosno specifičnih načina ponašanja, koje je diferencirao u: „1) interpersonalne (glava kuće, lider, funkcija veze) – obuhvataju poslove i zadatke ceremonijalnog karaktera, 2) informativne (monitor, portparol, interni davalac informacija) – uključuju interno i eksterno primanje, sakupljanje i širenje informacija i 3) donošenje odluka (preduzetnik, alokacija resursa, pregovarač, rešavanje problema) odnose se na pravilan izbor u različitim poslovnim situacijama“ (Mintzberg, 1973).

Da bi izvršili svoje dužnosti i aktivnosti koje su povezane sa funkcijom koju obavljaju, menadžerima su potrebne tehničke, ljudske i konceptualne veštine (Katz, 1974). Tehničke veštine su bitne su za linijske menadžere, ljudske za sve nivoe menadžera, a konceptualne za top menadžere.

Osobine su „predispozicije koje predstavljaju crte određene ličnosti koja ih poseduje ili ne poseduje i koje joj omogućavaju da se na određeni način ponaša u datim situacijama, kao i da uspešno obavlja određene aktivnosti“ (Lekić, 2019: 46). Osobine efikasnog menadžera odnose se na to da je „vredan, inteligentan, pošten, ambiciozan, energičan, entuzijasta, fleksibilan, maštovit, optimista, hrabar, jaka i stabilna ličnost“ (Jovanović, 1997: 21–22). Teško je naći idealnu osobu koja poseduje sve navedene osobine. Po mišljenju Adižesa (1989: 88) „Idealni menadžer je proizvođač rezultata, izvrstan upravitelj, preduzetnik i integrator svih funkcija unutar kompanije. Svoj rad procenjuje prema tome koliko dobro funkcioniše grupa kojom upravlja, prema njihovim individualnim i grupnim rezultatima i u kojoj meri su realizovani postavljeni ciljevi i zadaci.“

Efikasnost menadžera ispoljava se na više načina. Prvo kao „menadžerski ili grupni učinak – menadžer je efikasan ako su i zaposleni kojima on upravlja efikasni“ (Elenkov, 2002; Riggio et al., 2003), potom kao „percipirana efektivnost menadžera/lidera – zaposleni smatraju da je menadžer/lider efikasan“ (Foti, Hauenstein, 2007; Anderson et al., 2008), zatim kao „samoefiksanost liderstva – menadžer procenjuje sebe kao efikasnog menadžera/lidera“ (Ng et al., 2008) i na kraju kao manifestovanje liderstva – menadžer daje dobar primer ponašanja i može da ubedi druge zaposlene da je kompetentan lider.

Na osnovu svega izloženog, uočava se da uspešnost menadžera zavisi od njegovog načina rada sa drugom zaposlenima. To znači da su za efikasno upravljanje ljudima menadžerima potrebne i upravljačke i liderske sposobnosti. Upravljanje se zasniva na „ostvarivanju organizacionih ciljeva na efektivan i efikasan način, kroz planiranje, organizovanje, vođenje i kontrolu organizacionih resursa“ (Daft, 2016: 4). Osnovne crte liderstva su lično ponašanje i stil. Lider

deluje na emocije kako bi zaposlene pokrenuo vizijom i inspirisao da tu viziju ostvare, što je karakteristično u vreme velikih promena. Emocije „podstiču, energizuju i usmeravaju ponašanje“ (Trebješanin, 2008: 283). Upravljanje i liderstvo mogu se posmatrati kao dve uloge koje su deo istog konstrukta: na jednom kraju racionalnim upravljanjem nadziru se sistemi i rad, dok se na drugom putem stila i ponašanja liderstvo obraća emocijama.

Stilovi upravljanja ljudskim resursima

Menadžeri imaju značajnu ulogu u podsticanju ljudskih resursa na određeno ponašanje koje treba da rezultira ostvarivanjem organizacionih ciljevi. Ljudski kapital obuhvata „kompetencije, sposobnosti i vrednosti zaposlenih“ (Bose, 2004), a na koji način će se one usmeriti zavisi od stila upravljanja (rukovođenja). Stil vođstva predstavlja „način na koji se uspostavlja odnosi između menadžera i saradnika, kao i ostalih zaposlenih u kompaniji, odnosno način na koji menadžer usmerava ponašanje podređenih i sredstava koja koristi da ih pridobije ili privoli na željeno ponašanje“ (Janićijević et al., 2020: 417). Različiti stilovi rukovođenja direktno ili indirektno utiču na poslovne performanse zaposlenih.

U ovom radu akcenat je na klasifikaciji stilova liderstva (rukovođenja) u odnosu na autoritet i na nove pristupe liderstvu. Najčešća podela je u odnosu na stepen korišćenja autoriteta, po kojoj se razlikuju „autokratski, demokratski i liberalni stil“ (Janićijević et al., 2020). Savremeni uslovi poslovanja nametnuli su potrebu za novim stilovima liderstva, kao što su: transakciono, transformaciono, harizmatično, vizionarsko, timsko i strategijsko liderstvo.

Autokratski lideri određuju zadatke svim zaposlenim i kontrolišu njihovo izvršavanje primenjujući sistem kažnjavanja i nagrađivanja. Oni nisu voljni da dele informacije sa svojim podređenima i usvajaju vertikalnu komunikaciju odozgo na dole ne dozvoljavajući zaposlenima samostalnost u izvršavanju postavljenih zadataka (Farh, Cheng, 2000). Na taj način stvara se distanca i nepoverenje između podređenih i vođa, što dovodi do neefiksanosti zaposlenih (Cheng, Wang, 2015). Jednom rečju, ovakav stil liderstva najčešće izaziva devijantno ponašanje zaposlenih, što se negativno odražava na poslovne rezultate (Wang et al., 2005).

Demokratski lider je okrenut ka ljudima i podstiče učešće svojih saradnika u rešavanju problema i donošenju odluka. Ovaj stil se često naziva participativnim stilom jer podstiče zaposlene da aktivno učestvuju u donošenju odluka vezanih za rešavanje uočenih organizacionih problema. Demokratski lider razume probleme svojih zaposlenih, i zajedno sa njima

radi na njihovoj identifikaciji i donošenju odluka za njihovo prevazilaženje (Sharma, Singh, 2013).

Liberalni stil je stil vođenja gde zaposleni imaju visok stepen slobode u odlučivanju o vlastitom ponašanju i radu. Ovi lideri dopuštaju podređenima visok stepen samostalnosti i utvrđivanju sopstvenih ciljeva i određivanju sredstva za njihovu realizaciju, pri čemu im pribavljaju potrebne informacije i povezuju sa eksternim okruženjem. Istraživanja su pokazala da su rezultati efikasniji kada ponašanje vođe odgovara očekivanjima sledbenika (Epitropaki, Martin, 2005), dok u slučaju razvijanja percepcije neefikasnosti kod podređenih lider možda neće moći da ih motiviše da rade u skladu sa zahtevima tržišta (Eagly et al., 2003).

Za dinamičnu ekonomiju i sticanje konkurentske prednosti ključno je deljenje znanja u kompaniji (Foss, Pederson, 2002). Istraživanja su pokazala da transakcioni stil rukovođenja značajno utiče na izbor, motivaciju i sposobnost deljenja znanja (Lu et al., 2006), kao i na povećanje zadovoljstva poslom i organizacionu posvećenost (Epitropaki, Martin, 2005). Veće zadovoljstvo poslom utiče i na veće zadovoljstvo životom (Unanue et al., 2017). Transakcioni lider usmerava ili motiviše svoje sledbenike tako što im objašnjava zadatke i potrebe posla. To je „liderstvo koje nastoji da održi stabilnost, kroz regularnu ekonomsku i socijalnu razmenu, kako bi se ostvarili specifični ciljevi, kako za lidere, tako i za sledbenike“ (Lussier, Achua, 2001: 383). Ovaj stil rukovođenja fokusira se na stvaranje podsticajnog okruženja za kreativnost zaposlenih kroz podršku (priznanja i nagrade) lidera (Oldham, Cummings, 1996) i njihovu konzistentnost sa zaposlenima (Amabile et al., 2004).

Transformacioni lideri su „sposobni da motivišu zaposlene da rade iznad svojih očekivanja i mogućnosti inspirišući ih vizijom i misijom u koju svi veruju“ (Bass, 1990). Oni pomažu svojim sledbenicima da se osećaju kao ključni faktor kompanije i pomažu im da shvate kako se njihovi poslovi uklapaju u viziju kompanije. Transformaciono liderstvo pozitivno utiče na performanse zaposlenih (Vincent-Höper et al., 2012; Lai et al., 2020), na njihovu samoeфикаsnost, motivaciju i kreativnost (Kim, Yoon, 2015; Bastari et al. 2021).

Harizmatični lideri su „lideri koji snagom svojih ličnih sposobnosti imaju specifičan i izuzetan uticaj na svoje sledbenike“ (House, 1977). To su lideri koji „definišu jasnu viziju budućnosti zasnovanu na čvrsto prihvaćenim vrednostima; potenciraju te vrednosti ponašanjem koje je u skladu sa vizijom; transformišu sledbenicima velika očekivanja u odnosu na performanse i veruju u sposobnost sledbenike da tu viziju ostvare“ (Wildman, Yammarono, 1999). U ovom stilu bitan je način prenošenja poruka lidera, što posebno

dolazi do izražaja u njegovoj neverbalnoj komunikaciji sa sledbenicima (Sacavém et al., 2017).

Vizionarski stil liderstva odnosi se na „sposobnost lidera da kreira pozitivnu sliku budućnosti koja motiviše zaposlene u kompaniji i pruža im smernice za buduće planiranje i postavljanje ciljeva“ (Thomas, Greenberger, 1995). Nakon određivanja vizije, lideri ovog stila pokazuju tri sposobnosti povezane sa efektivnošću njihovih vizionarskih uloga: „1) sposobnost da viziju objasne drugima, 2) sposobnost da viziju iskažu, kako verbalno, tako i na osnovu ponašanja kojim se vizija permanentno prenosi i pojačava i 3) sposobnost da viziju prošire ili primene u različitim oblastima liderstva“ (Robbins, Coulter, 2005: 434).

Izazov za menadžere jeste kako da postanu efektivni timski lideri što se odnosi na njihovu sposobnost da znaju kada treba ostaviti tim da sam radi, a kada se treba umešati. Efikasan tim je u stanju da deli i koristi talente i stručnost svojih članova kako bi nadomestio pojedinačne nedostatke, a integrišu ga četiri osnovna procesa: kognitivni, motivacioni, afektivni i koordinacioni (Zaccaro et al., 2001).

Strategijsko liderstvo podrazumeva sve one aktivnosti „koje utiču na ponašanje zaposlenih u njihovom naporu da formulišu i primene planirane strategije koje će kompaniji omogućiti realizaciju postavljenih poslovnih ciljeva“ (Inyang, 2010: 231). Danas kada se promene dešavaju u svakom segmentu poslovanja sve više se nameće potreba za stratezijskim liderstvom, koje se odnosi na „sposobnost pojedinca da spozna, predupredi, bude fleksibilan, razmišlja na duge staze i radi sa drugima na pokretanju promena kako bi kreirao održivu budućnost za organizaciju“ (Ireland, Hitt, 1999: 63).

Brojne studije za predmet su imale istraživanje uticaja upravljačkog i liderskog stila menadžera. Ponašanje lidera određuju njihove socio-biografske karakteristike. Pojedini autori ističu da se često zanemaruje rodna pripadnost (Hoobler et al., 2016). Identitet rodne uloge definiše „stereotipnu individualnu samopercepciju kao mušku ili žensvenu i obuhvata one kvalitete koji se smatraju idealnim za svaki pol u društvu“ (Wood, Eagly, 2009). Od muškaraca se očekuje da ispolje asertivnost, težnju za visokim rezultatima i kompetitivnost, a od žena empatiju, dobronamernost i ličnu brigu za sve druge u kompaniji (Diekmann, Eagly, 2000). Godine starosti utiču na sposobnost menadžera i na njihove poslovne performanse (Doucouré, Diagne, 2020), a kvalitet tima na ukupno zadovoljstvo zaposlenih (Lekić et al., 2020a). Wang & Chang (2005) ukazuju da radno iskustvo direktno utiče na lojalnost zaposlenih, a istraživanje Steenkamp & Kashyapa (2010) da lojalnost zaposlenih nema direktan uticaj na finansijske performanse, već indirektan preko relacionog

kapitala. Sa ljudskim i relacionim kapitalom direktno je povezan strukturni kapital (Lekić et al., 2020b) koji „pomaže zaposlenima u procesu stvaranja vrednost“ (Subramanian, Youndt, 2005).

Metodologija istraživanja

Predmetno istraživanje je sprovedeno u privatnim i javnim preduzećima, u periodu od februara do kraja aprila 2021. godine na području Grada Beograda. Podaci su prikupljeni anonimnim upitnikom na uzorku od 110 menadžera različitih hijerarhijskih nivoa i sektora. Socio-demografska struktura menadžera sagledana je kroz rodnu pripadnost (pol), starosnu i kvalifikacionu strukturu, bračni status, broj dece, radno iskustvo u rukovođenju, vremenski period rada na trenutnoj poziciji, hijerarhijski nivo (top menadžeri, srednji nivo menadžera i linijski menadžeri), prirodu odgovornosti koju imaju (generalni i funkcionalni menadžeri) i dužinu radnog staža. U analizi podataka socio-demografskih karakteristika menadžera korišćena je deskriptivna statistika i faktorska analiza.

Rezultati istraživanja i diskusija

Dobijeni rezultati pokazuju da je u ukupnog istraživačkom uzorku (N=110) iz privatnih preduzeća učestvovalo 67 ispitanika (60,91%), dok je iz grupe javnih preduzeća uključeno 43 ispitanika (39,09%). Prosečna dužina njihovog radnog staža iznosi 12,38 godina.

Tabela 1. Struktura uzorka prema polu, starosnoj i kvalifikacionoj strukturi

Pol, starosna i kvalifikaciona struktura		Frekvencija	%
Pol ispitanika	Muški pol	72	65,45
	Ženski pol	38	34,55
	Ukupno	110	100,00
Starosna struktura	Manje od 30 godina	20	18,18
	Između 30 i 40 godina	55	50,00
	Između 41 i 50 godina	26	23,64
	Preko 30 godina	9	8,18
	Ukupno	110	100,00
Kvalifikaciona struktura	Srednja stručna sprema	7	6,36
	Viša stručna sprema	20	18,18
	Visoka stručna sprema	52	47,27
	Naučno zvanje (master, magistar, doktor nauka)	31	28,18
	Ukupno	110	100,00

Izvor: Istraživanje autora

Iz Tabele 1. da je 65,45% ispitanika muškog i 34,55% ispitanika ženskog pola. Prema godinama starosti ispitanici su podeljeni u četiri grupe: 18,18 zaposlenih mlađih od 30 godina, 50,00% zaposlenih između 30 i 40 godina starosti, 23,64% između 41 i 50 godine starosti i samo 8,18% ispitanika koji imaju više od 50 godina života. Od ukupnog broja ispitanika, 47,27% ima visoku stručnu spremu

(fakultet), zatim 28,18% naučno zvanje (master, magistar, doktor nauka), 18,18% višu stručnu spremu, a samo 6,36% srednju stručnu spremu.

Tabela 2. Struktura uzorka prema bračnom statusu i broju dece

Bračni status i broj dece		Frekvencija	%
Braći status	Bračna/vanbračna zajednica	67	60,91
	Razveden/razvedena	21	19,09
	Udovac/udovica	3	2,73
	Neoženjen/neudata	19	17,27
	Ukupno	110	100,00
Broj dece	Bez dece	23	20,91
	Jedno dete	29	26,36
	Dvoje dece	46	41,82
	Troje dece	10	9,09
	Više od troje	2	1,82
	Ukupno	110	100,00

Izvor: Istraživanje autora

Na osnovu podataka prikazanih u *Tabeli 2.* uočava da od ukupnog broja anketiranih menadžera 60,91% živi u bračnoj/vanbračnoj zajednici, dok je 19,09% razvedeno. Pri tome, 79,00% ispitanika ispunilo se ulozi roditelja.

Tabela 3. Struktura ispitanika prema radnom iskustvu u rukovođenju

Radno iskustvo u rukovođenju	Frekvencija	%
Manje od 5 godina	27	24,55
Od 5 – 10 godina	50	45,45
Od 10 do 20 godina	26	23,64
Preko 20 godina	7	6,36
Ukupno	110	100,00

Izvor: Istraživanje autora

U odnosu na radno iskustvo u rukovođenju (*Tabela 3*), uzorak istraživanja je heterogen. Kreće se u rasponu manje od 5 godina do preko 20 godina, što im pruža mogućnost na blagovremeno reagujati na uočene probleme.

Tabela 4. Struktura ispitanika prema vremenskom periodu na trenutnoj instanci

Vremenski period rada na trenutnoj instanci	Frekvencija	%
< 6 meseci	10	9,09
Od 6 do 12 meseci	15	13,64
Od 1 do 5 godina	53	48,18
Od 5 do 10 godina	26	23,64
> 10 godina	6	5,45
Ukupno	110	100,00

Izvor: Istraživanje autora

Struktura ispitanika prema vremenskom periodu na trenutnoj instanci interesantna je sa aspekta procene fleksibilnosti menadžera specifičnostima posla koje

obavlja na toj instanci. Dobijeni rezultati u odnosu na ovaj pokazatelj prikazani su u *Tabeli 4*.

Tabela 5. Struktura ispitanika prema hijerarhijskom i funkcionalnom nivou

Hijerarhijski nivo menadžera	Funkcionalni menadžeri		Generalni menadžeri		Ukupno	
	Frekvencija	%	Frekvencija	%	Frekvencija	%
Linijski menadžeri	67	72,83	3	16,67	70	63,64
Srednji nivo menadžera	25	27,17	10	55,56	35	31,82
Top menadžeri	0	0,00	5	27,78	5	4,55
Ukupno	92	83,64	18	16,36	110	100,00

Izvor: Istraživanje autora

U Tabeli 5. prikazana je distribucija ispitanih menadžera po vertikalnoj i horizontalnoj strukturi. U odnosu na hijerarhijsku poziciju 70 ispitanika (63,64%) čine linijski menadžeri, 31,82% srednji nivo menadžera, a 4,55% top menadžeri. Sa aspekta nivoa odgovornosti koji 83,64% pripada funkcionalnim, a 16,36% generalnim menadžerima.

Na osnovu prikazane analize, može se zaključiti da je uzorak heterogen, što pruža zadovoljavajuću osnovu za proveru postavljene hipoteze istraživanja.

Faktorska analiza socio-demografskih karakteristika menadžera izvršena je rotacijom faktora primenom varimax metode.

Tabela 6. Faktorska analiza primenom varimax rotacija faktora

Attribute	Communality Estimates		Axis 1		Axis 2	
	Prior	Final	Corr.	Sq. (Cumul.)	Corr.	Sq. (Cumul.)
-	0,70100	0,78888	0,88809	0,79 (0,79)	0,01301	0,00 (0,79)
Deca	0,62947	0,68123	-0,79950	0,64 (0,64)	-0,20499	0,04 (0,68)
Broj dece	0,50141	0,52187	0,72014	0,52 (0,52)	-0,05718	0,00 (0,52)
Bračni status	0,13915	0,20002	-0,06256	0,00 (0,00)	0,44284	0,20 (0,20)
Hijerarhijski nivo	0,09446	0,11354	0,00229	0,00 (0,00)	0,33696	0,11 (0,11)
Kvalifikaciona struktura	0,10936	0,07894	-0,07572	0,01 (0,01)	0,27057	0,07 (0,08)
Starosna struktura	0,05870	0,04380	0,13365	0,02 (0,02)	-0,16104	0,03 (0,04)
Drutvo	0,12101	0,02786	-0,05898	0,00 (0,00)	-0,15616	0,02 (0,03)
Priroda odgovornosti	0,04931	0,01019	-0,00824	0,00 (0,00)	0,10059	0,01 (0,01)
Pol	-11,91921	0,00089	0,00303	0,00 (0,00)	0,02976	0,00 (0,00)
Dužina rada na trenutnoj poziciji	-11,91921	0,00089	0,00303	0,00 (0,00)	0,02976	0,00 (0,00)
Radno iskustvo	-11,91921	0,00089	0,00303	0,00 (0,00)	0,02976	0,00 (0,00)
Ukupan radi staž	-45,27298	2,46991	1,97762	-4 % (-4%)	0,49230	-1% (-5%)
Var. Expl.						

Izvor: Istraživanje autora

Metodom klastera (grozdova) izvršeno je grupisanje sličnih varijabli socio-demografskih karakteristika menadžera u klastere koji pokazuju između kojih varijabli postoji visoka korelacija. Korišćena je VARHCA metoda (Tabela 7).

Tabela 7. Korelacija klastera struktura

Attribute	# membership	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4
Društvo	0	0,1139	0,0601	-0,0445	0,2387
Pol	1	-0,0055	0,0314	-0,0467	0,7883
Kvalifikaciona struktura	0	0,0214	0,0660	0,3099	-0,0225
Starosna struktura	1	-0,0598	1,0000	0,3025	0,0557
Bračni status	1	0,8364	-0,0412	0,0341	-0,0376
Deca	1	0,9321	-0,0516	0,0184	0,0660
Broj dece	1	-0,8749	0,0651	-0,0411	-0,1109
Radno iskustvo	1	0,0372	0,3016	0,9936	-0,0556
Dužina rada na trenutnoj poziciji	1	0,0372	0,3016	0,9936	-0,0556
Priroda odgovornosti	0	-0,0569	-0,0340	0,0147	-0,6489
Hijerarhijski nivo	0	-0,0258	0,1191	0,3484	0,0346
Ukupan radni staž	1	0,0372	0,3016	0,9936	-0,0556

Izvor: Istraživanje autora

Rezultati prikazani u Tabeli 7. ukazuju da su se izdvojila četiri klastera. Klaster 1 ukazuje na jaku korelaciju između tri varijable: Deca, Broj dece i Bračno stanje, za koje se može reći da su uzročno-posledično povezane. Klaster 2. odnosi se na starosnu strukturu menadžera koja figuriše kao samostalna varijabla i ukazuje da su stariji menadžeri (na osnovu stečenog iskustva) uspešniji na profesionalnom planu. Klaster 3 pokazuje na značajnu korelaciju između radnih sposobnosti: Radno iskustvo, Dužina rada na trenutnoj poziciji i Ukupan radni staž. Klaster 4 odnosi se na Pol ispitanika koji predstavlja samostalnu varijablu u strukturi uticaja na ostale varijable.

Tabela 8. Višestruka faktorska analiza

Attribute	Axis 1	Axis 2	Axis 3	Axis 4	Axis 5
Društvo	-0,045500	-0,195509	0,365964	0,683499	-0,044932
Pol	-0,056816	0,001849	-0,529508	0,553383	0,414252
Kvalifikaciona struktura	0,307099	-0,006942	-0,243088	-0,310696	-0,058826
Starosna struktura	0,377429	0,110739	-0,046674	0,431426	-0,049054
Bračni status	0,056020	-0,824653	0,153614	-0,031031	0,201094
Deca	0,041244	-0,929459	-0,005737	0,005262	0,024169
Broj dece	-0,061833	0,870124	0,204297	0,102406	0,085684
Radno iskustvo	0,989993	0,014735	0,060554	0,014426	-0,037499
Dužina rada na trenutnoj poziciji	0,989993	0,014735	0,060554	0,014426	-0,037499
Priroda odgovornosti	0,013144	0,090973	0,633918	-0,163308	0,696486
Hijerarhijski nivo	0,346693	0,087494	-0,476006	-0,149999	0,549332
Ukupan radni staž	0,989993	0,014735	0,060554	0,014426	-0,037499

Izvor: Istraživanje autora

U Tabeli 8. prikazani su rezultati višestruke faktorske analize gde su se po značaju izdvojila dva faktora. U odnosu na značaj, prvi faktor sadrži varijable: Radno iskustvo, Dužina rada na trenutnoj poziciji i Ukupan radni staž, dok drugi faktor čine varijable: Deca, Broj dece i Bračno stanje.

U prikazanim faktorskim analizama došlo se do identičnih rezultata u domenu socio-demografskih karakteristika menadžera koje utiču na njegov profesionalni status.

Zaključak

Uspješnost savremenih kompanija zavisi od sposobnosti menadžera da istovremeno razvijaju upravljačke i leaderske sposobnosti. Samo oni menadžeri koji planiraju, organizuju i kontrolišu odvijanje poslovnih procesa, s jedne, i koji imaju sposobnost da utiču na zaposlene, s druge strane doprinose boljim poslovnim rezultatima i obezbeđuju konkurentnost svojim kompanija. Potrebno je odrediti takav sistem motivacije i nagrađivanja koji podstiče fleksibilnost, inovativnost, kontinuirani razvoj i obuku zaposlenih u cilju postizanja visokih poslovnih performansi. Upravljački stil menadžera mora biti koordiniran sa upravljačkim zadatkom, što znači da prvo mora poći od toga kojim tipom ljudi upravlja i koje zadatke oni treba da izvrše. Imajući to u vidu, menadžer će izabrati stil koji najviše odgovara datoj situaciji. U ovom istraživanju se pokazalo da je stil liderstva određen i socio-demografskim karakteristikama menadžera. Ove karakteristike mogu se podvesti pod dva faktora, od kojih svaki obuhvata tri varijable. Prvi faktor se odnosi na praktično iskustvo (radno iskustvo, dužina rada na trenutnoj poziciji i ukupan radni staž), a drugi porodični status menadžera (deca, broj dece i bračno stanje), čime je potvrđena polazna hipoteza istraživanja. Na taj način uočava da je uspješnost menadžera determinisana njihovom sposobnošću da uspostave ravnotežu između porodičnog i profesionalnog statusa.

Literatura

1. Adičes I. 1989. Kako riješiti krizu upravljanja. Zagreb, Globus.
2. Amabile T. M., E. A. Schatzel, G. B. Moneta, & S. J. Kramer. 2004. Leader Behaviors and the Work Environment of Creativity: Perceived Leader Support. *The Leadership Quarterly* 15, (1): 5–32. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.003
3. Anderson D. W., H. T. Krajewski, R. D. Goffin, & D. N. Jackson. 2008. A Leadership Self-Efficacy Taxonomy and its Relation to Effective Leadership, *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, (5): 597–608. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.07.003

4. Bass B. M. 1990. From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Stare the Vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18, (3): 19–31. doi: 10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S
5. Bastari A., A. Eliyana, & T. W. Wijayanti. 2021. Effects of Transformational Leadership Styles on Job Performance with Job Motivation as Mediation: A Study in a State-Owned Enterprise. *Management Science Letters*, 10, (12): 2883–2888. doi: 10.5267/j.msl.2020.4.019
6. Bose R. 2004. Knowledge Management Metrics. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 104, (6): 457–468. doi 10.1108/02635570410543.771
7. Cheng M. Y., & L. Wang. 2015. The Mediating Effect of Ethical Climate on the Relationship Between Paternalistic Leadership and Team Identification: A Team-level Analysis in the Chinese Context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 129, (3): 635–665. doi:10.1007//S10551-014-2189-5
8. Daft R. 2016. *Management*. 12th edition. Boston, Cengage Learning.
9. Diekmann A. B., & A. H. Eagly. 2000. Stereotypes as Dynamic Constructs: Women and Men of the Past, Present, and Future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, (10): 1171–1188. doi: 10.1177/0146167200262001
10. Doucouré B., & A. Diagne. 2020. The Effect of Size and the Performance of Senegalese Small Food Companies: The Role of Market Orientation. *Transnational Corporations Review*, 12, (4): 349–359: doi: 10.19186444.2020.1832426
11. Eagly A. H., M. C. Johannessen-Schmidt, & M. L. Van Engen. 2003, Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-fair Styles: A meta-analysis Comparing Women and Men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, (4): 569–591. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569
12. Elenkov D. S. 2002. Effects of leadership on organizational performance in Russian companies. *Journal of Business Research*, 55, (6): 467–480. doi: 10.1016/s0148/2963(00)00174-0
13. Epitropaki P., & R. Martin, 2005. From Ideal to Real: A Longitudinal Study of the Role of Impact Leadership Theories on Leader-Member Exchanges and Employee Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, (4), 659–676. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.659
14. Farh J. L., & B. S. Chang. 2000. A Cultural Analysis of Paternalistic Leadership and Chinese Organizations. In: J. T. Li, A. S. Tsui, & E. Weldon (Eds.), *Management and Organizations in the Chinese Context* (pp. 84–127). London, Palgrave Macmillan.

15. Foss N. J., & T. Pederson. 2002. Transferring Knowledge in MNCs: The Role of Sources of Subsidiary Knowledge and Organizational Context. *Journal of International Management*, 8, (1): 49–67.
16. Foti R. J., & N. M. A. Hauenstein. 2007. Pattern and Variable Approaches in Leadership Emergence and Effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, (2): 347–355. doi; 10.1037/0021-90.10.92.2.347
17. Heller R. 2002. *Manager's Handbook*. London: DK ADULT.
18. Hoobler J. M., C. R. Masterson, S. M. Nkomo, & E. J. Michel. 2016. The Business Case for Women Leaders: Meta-Analysis, Research Critique, and Path Forward. *Journal of Management*, 44, (6): 2473–2499. doi: 10.1077/0149206316628643
19. House, R. 1977. A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership. In: D. Haunt, & L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The Cutting Edge* (pp. 189–127). Carbondale, IL, Southern Illinois University Press.
20. Inyang B. J. 2010. Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM): A Paradigm Shift for Achieving Sustained Competitive Advantage in Organization. *International Bulletin of Business Administration*, 7, (23): 215–243.
21. Ireland D., & M. Hitt. 1999. Achieving and Maintaining Strategic Competitiveness in the 21st Century: The Role of Strategic Leadership. *Academy of Management Executive*, 13, (1): 63–71. doi: 10.5463/AME.1999.1567311
22. Janićijević, N., B. Bogićević Milikić, M. Petković., i A. Aleksić Mirić. 2020. *Organizacija*. 15. izdanje. Beograd, Centar za izdavačku delatnost – Ekonomski fakultet Beograd.
23. Jovanović P. 1997. *Kako postati dobar menadžer*. Beograd, Grafoslog.
24. Katz R. L. 1974. Skills of an Effective Administrator. *Harvard Business Review*, 52, (3): 90–102. Available online: <https://hbr.org/1974/09/skills-of-an-effective-administrator> (accessed on 15 October 2021).
25. Kim S., & G. Yoon. 2015. An Innovation-Driven Culture in Local Government: De Senior Managers Transformational Leadership and the Climate for Creativity Matter? *Public Personnel Management*, 44 (2): 147–168. doi: 10.117/0091026014568896
26. Lai F. Y., H. C. Tang, S C. Lu, Y. C. Lee, & C. C. Lin. 2020. Transformational Leadership and Job Performance: The Mediating Role

- of Work Engagement. *SAGE Open*, 10, (1) 1–11. doi: 10.1177/2158244019899085
27. Lekić S. 2019. *Menadžment*. 4. izdanje. Beograd, Akademija poslovnih strukovnih studija Beograd.
 28. Lekić S., J. Vapa-Tankosić, S. Mandić, J. Rajaković-Mijailović, N. Lekić, & J. Mijailović. 2020a Analysis of the Quality in the Employee-Bank Relationship in Urban and Rural Areas. *Sustainability*, 12, (13): 5488. doi: 10.3390/su12135448
 29. Lekić N., J. Vapa-Tankosić, J. Rajaković-Mijailović, & S. Lekić. 2020b. Analysis of Structural Capital as a Component of Intellectual Capital in ICT enterprises. *Oditor*, 6, (3): 33–54. doi: 10.5937/Oditor2003033L
 30. Lu L., K. Leung, & P. T. Koch. 2006. Managerial Knowledge Sharing: The Role of Individual, Interpersonal, and Organization. *Management and Organization Review*, 2, (1): 15–41. doi: 10.1111/j.1740-8784.2006.00029
 31. Lussier R. N., & C. F. Achua. 2001. *Leadership: Theory, Application, & Skill Development*. Cincinnati, OH, South Western College Publishing.
 32. Mintzberg H. 1973. *The Nature of Management Work*. New York, Harper & Row.
 33. Ng K. Y., S. Ang, & K. Y. Chan. 2008. Personality and Leader Effectiveness: A Moderated Mediation Model of Leadership Self-Efficacy, Job Demands, and Job Autonomy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, (4): 733–743. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010-93.4.733
 34. Oldham G. R., & A. Cummings. 1996. Employee Creativity: Personal and Contextual Factors at Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, (3): 607–634. doi: 10.2307/256657
 35. Riggio R. E., H. R. Riggio, C. Salinas, & E. J. Cole. 2003. The Role of Social and Emotional Communication Skills in Leader Emergence and Effectiveness. *Group Dynamic: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 7, (2): 83–103. doi: 10.1037/1089-2699.7.2.83
 36. Robbins S. P., & Coulter, M. 2005. *Menadžment*. Beograd, Data status,
 37. Sacavém, A., L. F. Martinez, J. V. do Cunha, & A. M. Abreu. 2017. Charismatic Leadership: A Study on Delivery Styles, Mood, and Performance. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 11, (3): 21–38. doi: 10.2001/jls.21519

38. Steenkamp N., & V. Kashyap. 2010. Importance and Contribution of Intangible Assets: SME Managers' Perceptions. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 11, (1): 368–390. doi: 10.1108/146919311011064590
39. Subramanian M., & M. A. Youndt. 2005. The Influence of Intellectual Capital on the Types of Innovative Capabilities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, (3): 450–463. doi: 10.5465/amj.2005.17407911
40. Trebješanin Ž. 2008. Rečnik psihologije. Beograd, Stubovi kulture.
41. Thomas P., & D. B. Greenberger. 1995. Training Business Leaders to Create Positive Organizational Visions of the Future: Is It Successful? *Academy of Management Journal*, (1): 212–216. doi: 105465/ambpp.1995.17536481
42. Unanue W., M. E. Gómez, D. Cortez, J. C. Ovanedel, & A Mendiburo-Seguel. 2017. Revisiting the Link Between Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Basic Psychology Needs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 680. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00680
43. Vincent-Höper S., C. Muser, & M. Janneck 2012. Transformational Leadership, Work Engagement, and Occupational success. *Career Development International*, 17, (7): 663–682. doi: 10.1108/13620431211283805
44. Zaccaro S. J., A. L. Rittman, & M. A. Marks. (2001). Team leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, (4): 451–483. doi: 10.1016/51048-9843(01)00093-5
45. Wang W. Y., & C. Chang. 2005. Intellectual Capital and performance in Causal Models: Evidence from the Information Technology Industry in Taiwan. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 6, (2): 222–236. doi: 10.1108/14691930510592816
46. Wang W. Y., K. S. Law, R. D. Hackett, D. Wang, & Y. X. Chen. 2005. Leader-Member Exchange as a Mediator of the Relationship Between Transformational Leadership and Followers' Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, (3): 420–432. doi: 104465/amj.2005.17407908
47. Wildman D., & F. J. Yammarono. 1999. CEO Charismatic Leadership: Levels-of-Management and Levels-of-Analysis Effects. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, (2): 266–285. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1999.1893936
48. Wood W., & A. H. Eagly. 2009. Gender Identity. In: M. R. Leary, & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of Individual Differences in Social Behavior* (pp. 109–125). New York, Guilford Publications.

PROFESSIONAL STATUS OF MANAGERS FROM THE ASPECT OF SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Dužanka Paspalj³, Pavle Brzaković⁴

Abstract

In modern business conditions, growth and development of an organization depends on the ability of its managers to adequately coordinate the activities of employees. Managers are required to systematically and permanently improve and develop their own knowledge, abilities and skills in accordance with the dynamic changes of the global organizational environment. All this is reflected on their status in the organization. The aim of this paper is to investigate the interdependence and connection between socio-demographic characteristics of managers and professional status. Data collection was performed by an anonymous survey on a sample of 110 managers of different hierarchical levels. Descriptive statistics and factor analysis were used in data analysis. The obtained results showed that practical experience and family situation are the dominant socio-demographic factors. Only those employees who establish a balance between professional and family life, can fully dedicate themselves to the work they do and thus contribute to the improvement of business.

Key words: managers, professional status, socio-demographic characteristics, organizational goals.

Introduction

In the modern business environment, employees are the most valuable resource of organizations. Each employee consists of his knowledge, abilities and possibilities that managers need to recognize and accordingly assign them to those jobs where they will be able to contribute the most in achieving the set business goals, which includes an appropriate motivational climate. The first step that managers take in creating a motivational climate is to see employees as a specific person who has their own needs, essential values and expectations, which leads to strengthening their self-confidence and greater motivation. Motivated employees are energetic, full of enthusiasm, always successful in doing their job and, accordingly, strive to gain broader competencies. They are

³ Dužanka Paspalj, Ph.D., Student, University Business Academy in Novi Sad, Faculty of Applied Management, Economics and Finance in Belgrade, Jevrejska 24/1, 11000 Belgrade, Republic of Serbia, E-mail: duskapaspalj@gmail.com

⁴ Assistant Professor Pavle Brzaković Ph.D., University Business Academy in Novi Sad, Faculty of Applied Management, Economics and Finance in Belgrade, Jevrejska 24/1, 11000 Belgrade, Republic of Serbia, E-mail: pavle.brzakovic@mef.edu.rs

not afraid of change, they take a positive approach to every challenge, they pass it on to others in the organization, which has a positive effect on overall business performance. It is up to the managers to select people according to necessary skills, to have clearly defined goals and to adequately reward the achieved results. It should be borne in mind that the reward system is not only money that usually gives short-term results, but also showing active interest in the career of each employee, positive feedback on his results and expanding competencies as recognition of ability.

This paper aims to point out which socio-demographic characteristics of a manager affect his professional status and how they are grouped into a smaller number of factors. The starting hypothesis of the research is that the motivation of managers to express themselves on a professional level is significantly influenced by practical experience and family situation.

What are the makings of a successful manager

The main goal of a modern manager is to act more effectively and efficiently, which contributes to better organizational performance. It is often pointed out that „knowledge of how to work with others and with the help of others is the most important asset of any manager“ (Heller, 2002). The job of a manager is not only focused on personal promotion, but also on helping others to do their jobs in the best possible way. For this purpose, it is necessary to consider their functions, roles, skills and characteristics.

In relation to performing certain tasks and duties, while effectively coordinating the work of others, managers perform four functions: „planning, organizing, leading and controlling“ (Lekić, 2019). In planning based on market research, they set a mission, vision, goals and strategy. Organization refers to the concretization of goals into specific jobs and tasks, and their distribution to employees. Leadership is a managerial function that includes motivating, coordinating and communicating with employees in order to encourage them to give their best in achieving organizational goals. Control is a process of comparing the achieved results with previously set goals, in order to take appropriate corrective actions in case of deviations in order to eliminate them.

In his studies, Mintzberg concluded that managers manifest ten roles in their business, i.e. specific ways of behaving, which he differentiated into: „1) interpersonal (head, leader, liaison function) - include tasks and tasks of a ceremonial nature, 2) informative monitor, spokesperson, internal information provider) - include internal and external reception, collection and dissemination of information and 3) decision making (entrepreneur, resource

allocation, negotiator, problem solving) refers to the right choice in different business situations“ (Mintzberg, 1973).

In order to perform their duties and activities related to the function they perform, managers need technical, human and conceptual skills (Katz, 1974). Technical skills are important for line managers, human skills for all levels of managers, and conceptual skills for top managers.

Traits are „predispositions that represent the characteristics of a certain person who possesses or does not possess them and which enable him to behave in a certain way in given situations, as well as to successfully perform certain activities“ (Lekić, 2019). The characteristics of an effective manager refer to the fact that he is „diligent, intelligent, honest, ambitious, energetic, enthusiastic, flexible, imaginative, optimistic, brave, strong and stable person“ (Jovanović, 1997). It is difficult to find an ideal person who has all the above qualities. According to Adizes (1989), „The ideal manager is a producer of results, an excellent manager, entrepreneur and integrator of all functions within the company. He assesses his work according to how well the group he manages works, according to their individual and group results and to what extent the set goals and tasks have been realized.“

Manager's efficiency is manifested in several ways. First as „managerial or group performance - the manager is effective if the employees he manages are effective“ (Elenkov, 2002; Riggio et al., 2003), then as the „perceived effectiveness of the manager/leader - employees believe that the manager/leader is effective“ (Foti, Hauenstein, 2007; Anderson et al., 2008), then as „self-efficacy of leadership - the manager evaluates himself as an effective manager/leader“ (Ng et al., 2008) and finally as a manifestation of leadership - the manager sets a good example behavior and can convince other employees that he is a competent leader.

Based on all the above, it can be seen that the success of the manager depends on his way of working with other employees. This means that effective management of people requires both managerial and leadership skills. Management is based on “achieving organizational goals in an effective and efficient manner, through planning, organizing, leading and controlling organizational resources” (Daft, 2016). The basic traits of leadership are personal behavior and style. A leader acts on emotions in order to move employees with a vision and inspire them to realize that vision, which is characteristic in times of great change. Emotions „encourage, energize and direct behavior“ (Trebješanin, 2008). Management and leadership can be seen as two roles that are part of the same construct: on the one hand, rational

management controls systems and work, while on the other, leadership addresses emotions through style and behavior.

Human resource management styles

Managers have a significant role in encouraging human resources to certain behaviors that should result in achievement of organizational goals. Human capital encompasses “employee competencies, abilities and values” (Bose, 2004), and how they will be directed depends on the management style. Leadership style is „the way in which relationships are established between managers and associates, as well as other employees in the company, or the way in which the manager directs the behavior of subordinates and the means he uses to win them over or persuade them to the desired behavior“ (Janićijević et al., 2020). Different management styles directly or indirectly affect the business performance of employees.

In this paper, the emphasis is on the classification of leadership styles in relation to authority and on new approaches to leadership. The most common division is in relation to the degree of use of authority, which distinguishes „autocratic, democratic and liberal style“ (Janićijević et al., 2020). Modern business conditions have imposed the need for new leadership styles, such as: transactional, transformational, charismatic, visionary, team and strategic leadership.

Autocratic leaders assign tasks to all employees and control their execution by applying a system of punishment and reward. They are reluctant to share information with their subordinates and adopt vertical communication from top to bottom, not allowing employees to be independent in performing assigned tasks (Farh, Cheng, 2000). This creates distance and mistrust between subordinates and leaders, leading to inefficiency of employees (Cheng, Wang, 2015). In a word, this style of leadership most often causes deviant behavior of employees, which has a negative impact on business results (Wang et al., 2005).

A democratic leader is people-oriented and encourages the participation of his associates in solving problems and making decisions. This style is often called participatory style because it encourages employees to actively participate in decision-making related to solving perceived organizational problems. A democratic leader understands the problems of his employees, and works with them to identify them and make decisions to overcome them (Sharma, Singh, 2013).

Liberal style is a leadership style where employees have a high degree of freedom in deciding on their own behavior and work. These leaders allow

their subordinates a high degree of independence and to determine their own goals and determine the means for their realization, while providing them with the necessary information and connecting with the external environment. Research has shown that results are more effective when a leader's behavior meets the expectations of followers (Epitropaki, Martin, 2005), while in the case of developing perceptions of inefficiency in subordinates, leaders may not be able to motivate them to act in line with market demands (Eagly et al., 2003).

Sharing knowledge within a company is crucial for a dynamic economy and gaining a competitive advantage (Foss, Pederson, 2002). Research has shown that transactional leadership style significantly affects the choice, motivation and ability to share knowledge (Lu et al., 2006), as well as increasing job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Epitropaki, Martin, 2005). Greater job satisfaction also affects greater life satisfaction (Unanue et al., 2017). A transaction leader guides or motivates his followers by explaining to them the tasks and needs of the business. It is „leadership that seeks to maintain stability, through regular economic and social exchanges, in order to achieve specific goals, both for leaders and followers“ (Lussier, Achua, 2001). This leadership style focuses on creating an enabling environment for employee creativity through the support (recognition and awards) of leaders (Oldham, Cummings, 1996) and their consistency with employees (Amabile et al., 2004).

Transformational leaders are “able to motivate employees to work beyond their expectations and capabilities by inspiring them with a vision and mission that everyone believes in” (Bass, 1990). They help their followers feel like a key factor in the company and help them understand how their business fits into the company’s vision. Transformational leadership positively affects employee performance (Vincent-Höper et al., 2012; Lai et al., 2020), their self-efficacy, motivation, and creativity (Kim, Yoon, 2015; Bastari et al. 2021).

Charismatic leaders are „leaders who, by the power of their personal abilities, have a specific and extraordinary influence on their followers“ (House, 1977). These are leaders the ones who „define a clear vision of the future based on firmly accepted values; emphasize these values by behavior that is in line with the vision; they transform followers’ high performance expectations and believe in the ability of followers to achieve that vision” (Wildman, Yammarono, 1999). In this style, the way the leader conveys messages is important, which is especially evident in his non-verbal communication with followers (Sacavém et al., 2017).

Visionary leadership style refers to „the ability of a leader to create a positive image of the future that motivates employees in the company and provides them with guidelines for future planning and goal setting” (Thomas, Greenberger, 1995). After defining vision, leaders of this style demonstrate three abilities related to the effectiveness of their visionary roles: “1) the ability to explain the vision to others, 2) the ability to express the vision, both verbally and based on behaviors that permanently convey and enhance vision and 3) the ability to expand or apply the vision in different areas of leadership” (Robbins, Coulter, 2005: 434).

The challenge for managers is how to become effective team leaders in terms of their ability to know when to leave a team to work and when to step in. An effective team is able to share and use the talents and expertise of its members to make up for individual shortcomings, and integrates four basic processes: cognitive, motivational, affective, and coordination (Zaccaro et al., 2001).

Strategic leadership includes all those activities „that affect the behavior of employees in their efforts to formulate and implement planned strategies that will enable the company to achieve business goals“ (Inyang, 2010). Today, when changes are happening in every segment of business, there is a growing need for strategic leadership, which refers to „the ability of an individual to recognize, warn, be flexible, think long-term and work with others to initiate change to create a sustainable future for organization” (Ireland, Hitt, 1999).

Numerous case studies have explored the impact of managerial and leadership style. The behavior of leaders is determined by their socio-biographical characteristics. Some authors point out that gender is often neglected (Hoobler et al., 2016). Gender role identity defines “stereotypical individual self-perception as male or female and encompasses those qualities that are considered ideal for each gender in society” (Wood, Eagly, 2009). Men are expected to show assertiveness, striving for high results and competitiveness, and women are expected to show empathy, goodwill and personal care for everyone else in the company (Diekmann, Eagly, 2000). Age affects the ability of managers and their business performance (Doucouré, Diagne, 2020), and the quality of the team affects the overall satisfaction of employees (Lekić et al., 2020a). Wang & Chang (2005) indicate that work experience directly affects employee loyalty, and Steenkamp & Kashyapa (2010) research that employee loyalty does not have a direct impact on financial performance, but indirectly through relational capital. Structural capital (Lekić et al., 2020b) is directly related to human and relational capital, which „helps employees in the process of creating value“ (Subramanian, Youndt, 2005).

Research methodology

The research subject was conducted in private and public companies, in the period from February to the end of April 2021 in the City of Belgrade. Data was collected by an anonymous questionnaire on a sample of 110 managers of different hierarchical levels and sectors. Socio-demographic structure of managers is considered through gender, age and qualification structure, marital status, number of children, work experience in management, time period of work in the current position, hierarchical level (top managers, middle managers and line managers), the nature of the responsibilities they have (general and functional managers) and the length of service. Descriptive statistics and factor analysis were used in the analysis of data on socio-demographic characteristics of managers.

Research results and discussion

Obtained results show that, out of the total research sample (N = 110), 67 respondents (60.91%) were from private companies participated, while 43 respondents (39.09%) were from the group of public companies. The average length of their work experience is 12.38 years.

Table 1. Sample structure by gender, age and qualification structure

Gender, age and qualification structure		Frequency	%
Gender structure	Male	72	65.45
	Female	38	34.55
	Total	110	100.00
Age structure	Less than 30 years of age	20	18.18
	Between 30 and 40 years of age	55	50.00
	Between 41 and 50 years of age	26	23.64
	Over 50 years	9	8.18
	Total	110	100.00
Qualification structure	Secondary education	7	6.36
	Higher education	20	18.18
	University degree	52	47.27
	Scientific title (master, doctor of science)	31	28.18
	Total	110	100.00

Source: Research by authors

From Table 1 it is evident that 65.45% of respondents are male and 34.55% of respondents are female. According to age, respondents are divided into four groups: 18.18 employees under the age of 30, 50.00% of employees between 30 and 40 years of age, 23.64% between 41 and 50 years of age and only 8.18% of respondents who are more than 50 years of age. Out of the total number of respondents, 47.27% have a university degree, then 28.18% have a scientific

title (master, doctor of science), 18.18% have bachelor's degree, and only 6.36% have a high school diploma.

Table 2. Sample structure according to marital status and number of children

Marital status and number of childer		Frequency	%
Marital status	Marital / extramarital union	67	60.91
	Divorced	21	19.09
	Widow / widower	3	2.73
	Unmarried	19	17.27
	Total	110	100.00
Number of children	Without children	23	20.91
	One child	29	26.36
	Two children	46	41.82
	Three children	10	9.09
	More than three	2	1.82
	Total	110	100.00

Source: Research by authors

Based on the data shown in Table 2, it is noticed that out of the total number of surveyed managers, 60.91% live in a marital/extramarital union, while 19.09% are divorced. At the same time, 79.00% of respondents fulfilled the role of parents.

Table 3. Structure of respondents according to work experience in management

Work experience in management	Frequency	%
Less than 5 years	27	24.55
From 5 to 10 years	50	45.45
From 10 to 20 years	26	23.64
Over 20 years	7	6.36
Total	110	100.00

Source: Research by authors

In relation to work experience in management (Table 3), the research sample is heterogeneous. It ranges from less than 5 years to over 20 years, which gives them the opportunity to react in a timely manner to perceived problems.

Table 4. The structure of respondents according to the time period at the current instance

Time period of work on the current instance	Frequency	%
< 6 months	10	9.09
From 6 to 12 months	15	13.64
From 1 to 5 years	53	48.18
From 5 to 10 years	26	23.64
> 10 years	6	5.45
Total	110	100.00

Source: Research by authors

The structure of the respondents according to the time period at the current instance is interesting from the aspect of assessing the flexibility of managers to the specifics of the work they performs at that instance. The obtained results in relation to this indicator are shown in Table 4.

Table 5. Structure of respondents according to hierarchical and functional level

Hierarchical level of managers	Functional managers		General managers		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Line managers	67	72.83	3	16.67	70	63.64
Mid-level managers	25	27.17	10	55.56	35	31.82
Top managers	0	0.00	5	27.78	5	4.55
Total	92	83.64	18	16.36	110	100.00

Source: Research by authors

Table 5 shows the distribution of surveyed managers by vertical and horizontal structure. In relation to the hierarchical position, 70 respondents (63.64%) are line managers, 31.82% are mid level managers, and 4.55% are top managers. From the aspect of the level of responsibility, 83.64% belongs to functional and 16.36% to general managers.

Based on the presented analysis, it can be concluded that the sample is heterogeneous, which provides a satisfactory basis for testing the set research hypothesis.

Factor analysis of socio-demographic characteristics of managers was performed by factor rotation using the varimax method.

Table 6. Factor analysis using varimax factor rotation

Attribute	Communality Estimates		Axis 1		Axis 2	
	Prior	Final	Corr.	Sq. (Cumul.)	Corr.	Sq. (Cumul.)
Children	0.70100	0.78888	0.88809	0.79 (0.79)	0.01301	0.00 (0.79)
Number of children	0.62947	0.68123	-0.79950	0.64 (0.64)	-0.20499	0.04 (0.68)
Marital status	0.50141	0.52187	0.72014	0.52 (0.52)	-0.05718	0.00 (0.52)
Hierarchical level	0.13915	0.20002	-0.06256	0.00 (0.00)	0.44284	0.20 (0.20)
Qualification structure	0.09446	0.11354	0.00229	0.00 (0.00)	0.33696	0.11 (0.11)
Age structure	0.10936	0.07894	-0.07572	0.01 (0.01)	0.27057	0.07 (0.08)
Society	0.05870	0.04380	0.13365	0.02 (0.02)	-0.16104	0.03 (0.04)
Nature of responsibility	0.12101	0.02786	-0.05898	0.00 (0.00)	-0.15616	0.02 (0.03)
Sex	0.04931	0.01019	-0.00824	0.00 (0.00)	0.10059	0.01 (0.01)
Length of work at current position	-11.91921	0.00089	0.00303	0.00 (0.00)	0.02976	0.00 (0.00)
Work experience	-11.91921	0.00089	0.00303	0.00 (0.00)	0.02976	0.00 (0.00)
Total work experience	-11.91921	0.00089	0.00303	0.00 (0.00)	0.02976	0.00 (0.00)
Var. Expl.	-45.27298	2.46991	1.97762	-4 % (-4%)	0.49230	-1% (-5%)

Source: Research by authors

Cluster method was used to group similar variables of socio-demographic characteristics of managers into clusters that show which variables are highly correlated. The VARHCA method was used (Table 7).

Table 7. Correlation of cluster structures

Attribute	# membership	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Cluster 4
Society	0	0.1139	0.0601	-0.0445	0.2387
Sex	1	-0.0055	0.0314	-0.0467	0.7883
Qualification structure	0	0.0214	0.0660	0.3099	-0.0225
Age structure	1	-0.0598	1.0000	0.3025	0.0557
Marital status	1	0.8364	-0.0412	0.0341	-0.0376
Children	1	0.9321	-0.0516	0.0184	0.0660
Number of children	1	-0.8749	0.0651	-0.0411	-0.1109
Work experience	1	0.0372	0.3016	0.9936	-0.0556
Length of work at current position	1	0.0372	0.3016	0.9936	-0.0556
Nature of responsibility	0	-0.0569	-0.0340	0.0147	-0.6489
Hierarchical level	0	-0.0258	0.1191	0.3484	0.0346
Total work experience	1	0.0372	0.3016	0.9936	-0.0556

Source: Research by authors

The results shown in Table 7 indicate that four clusters stood out. Cluster 1 indicates a strong correlation between three variables: Children, Number of Children and Marital Status, which can be said to be causally related. Cluster 2 refers to the age structure of managers, which appears as an independent variable and indicates that older managers (based on acquired experience) are more successful professionally. Cluster 3 shows a significant correlation between work abilities: Work experience, Length of work in the current position and Total work experience. Cluster 4 refers to the gender of the respondents, which is an independent variable in the structure of the influence on other variables.

Table 8. Multiple factor analysis

Attribute	Axis 1	Axis 2	Axis 3	Axis 4	Axis 5
Society	-0.045500	-0.195509	0.365964	0.683499	-0.044932
Sex	-0.056816	0.001849	-0.529508	0.553383	0.414252
Qualification structure	0.307099	-0.006942	-0.243088	-0.310696	-0.058826
Age structure	0.377429	0.110739	-0.046674	0.431426	-0.049054
Marital status	0.056020	-0.824653	0.153614	-0.031031	0.201094
Children	0.041244	-0.929459	-0.005737	0.005262	0.024169
Number of children	-0.061833	0.870124	0.204297	0.102406	0.085684
Work experience	0.989993	0.014735	0.060554	0.014426	-0.037499
Length of work at current position	0.989993	0.014735	0.060554	0.014426	-0.037499
Nature of responsibility	0.013144	0.090973	0.633918	-0.163308	0.696486
Hierarchical level	0.346693	0.087494	-0.476006	-0.149999	0.549332
Total work experience	0.989993	0.014735	0.060554	0.014426	-0.037499

Source: Research by authors

Table 8 shows the results of multiple factor analysis, where two factors stood out in terms of importance. The first factor contains the variables: Work experience, Length of work in the current position and Total work experience, while the second factor consists of the variables: Children, Number of children and Marital status.

In the presented factor analyzes, identical results were obtained in the domain of socio-demographic characteristics of the manager, which affects his professional status.

Conclusion

Success of modern companies depends on the ability of managers to simultaneously develop management and leadership skills. Only those managers who plan, organize and control the course of business processes, on one hand, and who have the ability to influence employees on the other, contribute to better business results and ensure the competitiveness of their companies. It is necessary to determine such a system of motivation and reward that encourages flexibility, innovation, continuous development and training of employees in order to achieve high business performance. The managerial style of a manager must be coordinated with the management task, which means that he must first start from what type of people he manages and what tasks they need to perform. With that in mind, the manager will choose the style that best suits the given situation.

This research showed that leadership style is also determined by the socio-demographic characteristics of managers. These characteristics can be summed up in two factors, each of which includes three variables. The first factor refers to practical experience (work experience, length of work in the current position and total work experience), and the second to the family status of the manager (children, number of children and marital status), which confirmed the initial research hypothesis. In this way, he notices that the success of managers is determined by their ability to strike a balance between family and professional status.

Literature

1. Adižes I. 1989. Kako riješiti krizu upravljanja. Zagreb, Globus.
2. Amabile T. M., E. A. Schatzel, G. B. Moneta, & S. J. Kramer. 2004. Leader Behaviors and the Work Environment of Creativity: Perceived Leader Support. *The Leadership Quarterly* 15, (1): 5–32. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.003

3. Anderson D. W., H. T. Krajewski, R. D. Goffin, & D. N. Jackson. 2008. A Leadership Self-Efficacy Taxonomy and its Relation to Effective Leadership, *Leadership Quarterly*, 19, (5): 597–608. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.07.003
4. Bass B. M. 1990. From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Stare the Vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18, (3): 19–31. doi: 10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S
5. Bastari A., A. Eliyana, & T. W. Wijayanti. 2021. Effects of Transformational Leadership Styles on Job Performance with Job Motivation as Mediation: A Study in a State-Owned Enterprise. *Management Science Letters*, 10, (12): 2883–2888. doi: 10.5267/j.msl.2020.4.019
6. Bose R. 2004. Knowledge Management Metrics. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, 104, (6): 457–468. doi 10.1108/02635570410543.771
7. Cheng M. Y., & L. Wang. 2015. The Mediating Effect of Ethical Climate on the Relationship Between Paternalistic Leadership and Team Identification: A Team-level Analysis in the Chinese Context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 129, (3): 635–665. doi:10.1007//S10551-014-2189-5
8. Daft R. 2016. *Management*. 12th edition. Boston, Cengage Learning.
9. Diekmann A. B., & A. H. Eagly. 2000. Stereotypes as Dynamic Constructs: Women and Men of the Past, Present, and Future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, (10): 1171–1188. doi: 10.1177/0146167200262001
10. Doucouré B., & A. Diagne. 2020. The Effect of Size and the Performance of Senegalese Small Food Companies: The Role of Market Orientation. *Transnational Corporations Review*, 12, (4): 349–359: doi: 10.19186444.2020.1832426
11. Eagly A. H., M. C. Johannessen-Schmidt, & M. L. Van Engen. 2003, Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-fair Styles: A meta-analysis Comparing Women and Men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 19, (4): 569–591. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569
12. Elenkov D. S. 2002. Effects of leadership on organizational performance in Russian companies. *Journal of Business Research*, 55, (6): 467–480. doi: 10.1016/s0148/2963(00)00174-0
13. Epitropaki P., & R. Martin, 2005. From Ideal to Real: A Longitudinal Study of the Role of Impact Leadership Theories on Leader-Member

- Exchanges and Employee Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, (4), 659–676. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.659
14. Farh J. L., & B. S. Chang. 2000. A Cultural Analysis of Paternalistic Leadership and Chinese Organizations. In: J. T. Li, A. S. Tsui, & E. Weldon (Eds.), *Management and Organizations in the Chinese Context* (pp. 84–127). London, Palgrave Macmillan.
 15. Foss N. J., & T. Pederson. 2002. Transferring Knowledge in MNCs: The Role of Sources of Subsidiary Knowledge and Organizational Context. *Journal of International Management*, 8, (1): 49–67.
 16. Foti R. J., & N. M. A. Hauenstein. 2007. Pattern and Variable Approaches in Leadership Emergence and Effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, (2): 347–355. doi; 10.1037/0021-90.10.92.2.347
 17. Heller R. 2002. *Manager's Handbook*. London: DK ADULT.
 18. Hoobler J. M., C. R. Masterson, S. M. Nkomo, & E. J. Michel. 2016. The Business Case for Women Leaders: Meta-Analysis, Research Critique, and Path Forward. *Journal of Management*, 44, (6): 2473–2499. doi: 10.1077/0149206316628643
 19. House, R. 1977. A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership. In: D. Haunt, & L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The Cutting Edge* (pp. 189–127). Carbondale, IL, Southern Illinois University Press.
 20. Inyang B. J. 2010. Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM): A Paradigm Shift for Achieving Sustained Competitive Advantage in Organization. *International Bulletin of Business Administration*, 7, (23): 215–243.
 21. Ireland D., & M. Hitt. 1999. Achieving and Maintaining Strategic Competitiveness in the 21st Century: The Role of Strategic Leadership. *Academy of Management Executive*, 13, (1): 63–71. doi: 10.5463/AME.1999.1567311
 22. Janićijević, N., B. Bogićević Milikić, M. Petković., i A. Aleksić Mirić. 2020. *Organizacija*. 15. izdanje. Beograd, Centar za izdavačku delatnost – Ekonomski fakultet Beograd.
 23. Jovanović P. 1997. *Kako postati dobar menadžer*. Beograd, Grafoslog.
 24. Katz R. L. 1974. Skills of an Effective Administrator. *Harvard Business Review*, 52, (3): 90–102. Available online: <https://hbr.org/1974/09/skills-of-an-effective-administrator> (accessed on 15 October 2021).

25. Kim S., & G. Yoon. 2015. An Innovation-Driven Culture in Local Government: Do Senior Managers Transformational Leadership and the Climate for Creativity Matter? *Public Personnel Management*, 44 (2): 147–168. doi: 10.1177/0091026014568896
26. Lai F. Y., H. C. Tang, S. C. Lu, Y. C. Lee, & C. C. Lin. 2020. Transformational Leadership and Job Performance: The Mediating Role of Work Engagement. *SAGE Open*, 10, (1) 1–11. doi: 10.1177/2158244019899085
27. Lekić S. 2019. Menadžment. 4. izdanje. Beograd, Akademija poslovnih strukovnih studija Beograd.
28. Lekić S., J. Vapa-Tankosić, S. Mandić, J. Rajaković-Mijailović, N. Lekić, & J. Mijailović. 2020a Analysis of the Quality in the Employee-Bank Relationship in Urban and Rural Areas. *Sustainability*, 12, (13): 5488. doi: 10.3390/su12135448
29. Lekić N., J. Vapa-Tankosić, J. Rajaković-Mijailović, & S. Lekić. 2020b. Analysis of Structural Capital as a Component of Intellectual Capital in ICT enterprises. *Oditor*, 6, (3): 33–54. doi: 10.5937/Oditor2003033L
30. Lu L., K. Leung, & P. T. Koch. 2006. Managerial Knowledge Sharing: The Role of Individual, Interpersonal, and Organization. *Management and Organization Review*, 2, (1): 15–41. doi: 10.1111/j.1740-8784.2006.00029
31. Lussier R. N., & C. F. Achua. 2001. Leadership: Theory, Application, & Skill Development. Cincinnati, OH, South Western College Publishing.
32. Mintzberg H. 1973. The Nature of Management Work. New York, Harper & Row.
33. Ng K. Y., S. Ang, & K. Y. Chan. 2008. Personality and Leader Effectiveness: A Moderated Mediation Model of Leadership Self-Efficacy, Job Demands, and Job Autonomy. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, (4): 733–743. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010-93.4.733
34. Oldham G. R., & A. Cummings. 1996. Employee Creativity: Personal and Contextual Factors at Work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, (3): 607–634. doi: 10.2307/256657
35. Riggio R. E., H. R. Riggio, C. Salinas, & E. J. Cole. 2003. The Role of Social and Emotional Communication Skills in Leader Emergence and Effectiveness. *Group Dynamic: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 7, (2): 83–103. doi: 10.1037/1089-2699.7.2.83

36. Robbins S. P., & Coulter, M. 2005. Menadžment. Beograd, Data status,
37. Sacavém, A., L. F. Martinez, J. V. do Cunha, & A. M. Abreu. 2017. Charismatic Leadership: A Study on Delivery Styles, Mood, and Performance. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 11, (3): 21–38. doi: 10.2001/jls.21519
38. Steenkamp N., & V. Kashyap. 2010. Importance and Contribution of Intangible Assets: SME Managers' Perceptions. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 11, (1): 368–390. doi: 10.1108/146919311011064590
39. Subramanian M., & M. A. Youndt. 2005. The Influence of Intellectual Capital on the Types of Innovative Capabilities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, (3): 450–463. doi: 10.5465/amj.2005.17407911
40. Trebješanin Ž. 2008. Rečnik psihologije. Beograd, Stubovi kulture.
41. Thomas P., & D. B. Greenberger. 1995. Training Business Leaders to Create Positive Organizational Visions of the Future: Is It Successful? *Academy of Management Journal*, (1): 212–216. doi: 105465/ambpp.1995.17536481
42. Unanue W., M. E. Gómez, D. Cortez, J. C. Ovanedel, & A Mendiburo-Seguel. 2017. Revisiting the Link Between Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Basic Psychology Needs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 680. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00680
43. Vincent-Höper S., C. Muser, & M. Janneck 2012. Transformational Leadership, Work Engagement, and Occupational success. *Career Development International*, 17, (7): 663–682. doi: 10.1108/13620431211283805
44. Zaccaro S. J., A. L. Rittman, & M. A. Marks. (2001). Team leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, (4): 451–483. doi: 10.1016/51048-9843(01)00093-5
45. Wang W. Y., & C. Chang. 2005. Intellectual Capital and performance in Causal Models: Evidence from the Information Technology Industry in Taiwan. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 6, (2): 222–236. doi: 10.1108/14691930510592816
46. Wang W. Y., K. S. Law, R. D. Hackett, D. Wang, & Y. X. Chen. 2005. Leader-Member Exchange as a Mediator of the Relationship Between Transformational Leadership and Followers' Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, (3): 420–432. doi: 104465/amj.2005.17407908

47. Wildman D., & F. J. Yammarono. 1999. CEO Charismatic Leadership: Levels-of-Management and Levels-of-Analysis Effects. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, (2): 266–285. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1999.1893936
48. Wood W., & A. H. Eagly. 2009. Gender Identity. In: M. R. Leary, & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of Individual Differences in Social Behavior* (pp. 109–125). New York, Guilford Publications.

Datum prijema (Date received): 11.09.2021.

Datum prihvatanja (Date accepted): 16.10.2021.