



SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF MANAGEMENT STYLES IN THE MINISTRY OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF THE REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA

Zahari Goranov, Ph.D.

Assos. Professor, Academy of ministry of interior, Bulgaria

zgoranov27@e-dnrs.org

Abstract

Management in public sector organizations is a key element of the effective functioning of the state apparatus. In structures with highly regulated activities, hierarchy and public importance, such as the Ministry of Interior (MIA), it operates in a complex social environment, where interactions between managers and subordinates have a direct impact on the effectiveness of official activities. This study examines sociological relations in the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The official relations and the structure of the police are examined. Relations in teams are very important and therefore recommendations are examined and given.

Keywords: Police, team, team relations, social relations, perceptions, social role

INTRODUCTION

Management styles in the units of the MIA are of great importance for the way in which managers interact with their subordinates, distribute responsibilities, make decisions, because this has a direct impact on motivation, job satisfaction, organizational culture and the general level of professional effectiveness and image of the organizational unit itself. From a sociological perspective, management styles are not limited to rules and administrative models, but represent a complex of social relationships, organizational norms, cultural attitudes and communication practices within the organization itself. Understanding these aspects allows for a

more in-depth analysis of the factors that influence motivation, job satisfaction, discipline, professional ethics and trust in the institution itself.

Sociological aspects can be viewed as various social characteristics, processes and relationships that influence the behavior of people in an organization. Sociological aspects include:

- Cultural aspects
- Group and role aspects
- Structural aspects
- Socio-psychological aspects

Cultural aspects can be viewed as norms, values, traditions, organizational culture, and also professional subculture such as the ethical and moral rules of behavior of a police officer.

Group and role aspects are determined by group dynamics, leadership and obedience, and loyalty to the group.

Structural aspects are associated with hierarchy and power in an organization, formal and informal roles, centralization and decentralization.

Socio-psychological aspects play an important role in motivation, job satisfaction, and also in trust and justice.

The sociological aspects of management encompass the entire management cycle from planning, organizing, motivating, and controlling, not solely as an administrative or technical process, but rather as a social phenomenon, which in turn is influenced by people, groups, and society as a whole [Gekov B., 2005, Sofia].

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF MANAGEMENT

First of all, we must distinguish between "Management" and "System" as two separate concepts. "The system" can be defined as a large set of interconnected elements or components, each of which has a specific function that it performs, working together and looking in one direction to achieve their common goal. Each component or element of the system with its actions contributes to the effectiveness and functioning of the system itself. Systems can be biological systems, technical systems, public systems, social systems, etc. "In social management systems, it is characteristic that both as an object and as a subject are social relations, behind them are people or their goals, aspirations, tasks, behavior and action".

"The concept of "social" is equivalent to "public", expressed in the presence of society, of people, but is rather related to social existence, to certain social, i.e. public relations. Social management is the management of social relations. Social relations are the social essence of social management. Neither management nor relations are possible without the existence of a

system [Marinov A., Stoyanov S., Stanchev M., Todorov V., Goranov Z., Ivanova T., Karastoyanov G., 2021, Sofia,].

"Management" is perceived as a preliminary determination and subsequent purposeful impact on a given object or system, so that its (its) behavior, in accordance with the objective conditions and possibilities, can change its state or behavior in the desired direction.

It is about qualitative changes in the state and behavior of social systems, of people who are in certain relationships. From this brief definition, it is not difficult to understand that social management contains both something objective and something subjective as two sides of a single whole. There are objective needs for the creation of a social system of relationships between people in the process of management, as well as a certain amount of individual, human, subjective relationships between people. On the one hand, social relationships arise and develop independently of the consciousness and will of people. In this sense, society can be considered as a complex self-governing system that has created its regulators-laws, objectively underlying social life. They are realized and implemented through the actions of people. On the other hand, people act consciously, organizedly and strive to realize precisely such relationships, dictated by objective laws and their requirements. People themselves create certain management systems, consciously build them, create management bodies and in any case strive to comply with objective requirements. Perceiving management only as an activity aimed at achieving a certain goal means that someone has set such a goal in advance. This interpretation of the concept is too limited, although true. It is inherent in management in technical (mechanical) systems, in which man has laid down a program for their behavior. The multitude of these complex dynamic systems created by man are the fruit of his scientific and technical daring, models of natural or artificial controllable processes. This is already a broader view that considers management as a process intrinsic to the system itself, to its governing and governed part as a single whole, regardless of their material and energetic nature. This process is inherent in every controllable system - mechanical, biological, social, because in each of them there are information connections and interaction.

The basis of management are its functions. Functions are separate operations that are carried out throughout the management process. They are interconnected and form the entire management cycle, if one of them is missing, the management process is disrupted and efficiency is lost. Management functions are four in number and are:

- Planning
- Organizing
- Leadership
- Control

Of the four functions, planning is the main one. Through planning, the goals for achieving the organization are set and the actions that need to be taken to achieve them are set. The main function also determines the resources that are needed, as well as the deadlines for completing the tasks and possible risks that could hinder the implementation of the tasks. It is for this reason that planning as a function sets the intellectual part of the management cycle. Planning itself goes through several stages. Initially, the goals of the organization are determined, then the internal and external environment are analyzed, and then in the course of planning, several options are developed and subsequently the most suitable one for action is selected. The types of planning are also determined according to the time range. They can be strategic planning, where the planning is in the long term and defines the very vision of the organization, as well as its mission. The next planning is tactical, it is in the medium term, but in general the following.

Management Theories

The foundations of management were laid at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century after all the experience gained in this activity had been summarized. This entire attempt to lay the foundations of management was made with the clear goal of responding to the growing needs for management and rational organization in production. In the 20th century, in its first half, three management schools were built, developed and improved, namely: the classical school, the school of human relations and the school of organizational behavior.

The classical school of management unites the three management theories, the bureaucratic, the administrative and the scientific theory of management into one whole.

The administrative theory of management was founded by the French theorist and industrialist Henri Fayol (1841 – 1925). His management theory determines the performance of numerous functions. A. Fayol built Administrative Management with the following principles:

- Division of Labor
- Authority
- Discipline
- Unity of Command
- Unity of Action
- Centralization
- Hierarchy
- Initiative

The principle of division of labor aims to achieve efficiency in the quantity and quality of tasks performed.

Authority, this is the principle according to Fayol, which goes hand in hand with responsibility. According to him, authority is the right to order by the leader and at the same time the emission of force.

Discipline is the basis of everything according to Fayol's administrative management. Compliance with discipline and established rules helps to fulfill daily tasks in the organization.

Fayol defines unity of command in administrative management as the right to issue orders and orders from one manager to employees, most often this is the direct manager of the team. Accordingly, to be responsible for the completed tasks only to him, and if there is a violation of discipline, he himself imposes penalties.

Unity of action defines it as unifying the efforts of the actions of similar tasks and their implementation by a team of people who are under the leadership of one person.

Through centralization, the goal is to determine the distribution of labor vertically in the organization. The basis of this principle and the achievement of good results is the ratio of centralization and decentralization of management.

According to A. Fayol, hierarchy predisposes the definition of different positions in the hierarchical pyramid of management in relation to the rights and responsibilities that are carried by the respective position.

Initiative is the principle that helps employees to offer non-standard ideas and proposals within the framework of their delegated powers in accordance with the tasks assigned to them.

The theory of scientific management was founded by Frederick Taylor (1856 – 1917). The basis of his management theory is the application and use of methods such as analysis and synthesis, timing and observation, which can contribute to the improvement of the work cycle. According to Taylor, there should be a certain quantitative daily norm, which the employees should comply with. He believes that this is the surest way to increase the productivity of employees, and from another point of view, setting norms leads to the elimination of losses of resources such as labor (task performance) and working time. Frederick Taylor defines four principles that he believes are most effective when applied in the work process, namely:

- Scientific approach to performing individual elements of work
- Scientific approach to selecting and training employees
- Application of learned knowledge by employees in the task they perform.
- Division of responsibilities for work results between managers and workers.

In his management theory, Taylor very accurately and clearly sets a boundary between employees in an organization, those who must think like managers and those who must act, that

is, perform tasks like workers. He also supports the idea that human needs should be satisfied in the work process, because in this way the efficiency of the tasks performed increases. Another factor that he emphasizes is the moral and psychological one for encouraging employees, but the main thing in his theory is that all employees should be materially stimulated in order to achieve higher results in the work process.

The founder of the bureaucratic school of management is the German sociologist Karl Emil Maximilian Weber, briefly Max Weber, born on April 21, 1864. in the city of Erfurt, Thuringia. His research is focused entirely on the structures of power and the very nature of organizations. He himself is the author of the concept of the perfect, ideal (bureaucratic) organization, to which, by the way, all other organizations should subsequently strive to improve. In connection with the concept of the ideal organization, Max Weber points out several characteristics that should be contained in the organization such as: Formal hierarchy (the so-called hierarchy of power), secondly, "Rules" (a whole system of rules), instructions, standards and last but not least, the attraction of human resources to the organization with technical qualifications. In the hierarchy, Weber distinguishes three types of power, the first being traditional power built on traditions and habits. Second is the power of charm, with this type of power the obedience, trust and loyalty of employees in the specific organization is built entirely on the personal qualities of the leader himself. The third is rationally legal power. In it, obedience is based on where the individual himself is in the hierarchy of power. Max Weber calls this common form of power bureaucratic. Behind every human action that is purposeful for the effective achievement of the set goals, there are principles. The principles on which the foundations of bureaucratic management are laid, which principles Max Weber himself are founded by:

- Establishing a hierarchy
- Division of labor
- Creating work rules
- Positioning power
- Stimulating achievements
- Evaluating employees

In each organizational unit, the place in the hierarchy of the manager himself is determined. At each hierarchical level, responsibilities and duties are described and regulated. The higher the manager is in the hierarchy, the more his power increases and his influence is strengthened. This is expressed in establishing a hierarchy [Vladimirova K., Gabrovski K., Stefanov N., 2007, Sofia].

With the division of labor, each employee is aware of what exactly he has to do, what his duties are, thus narrowly specializing in this area. In this way, productivity in the organization increases.

Through the principle of creating work rules, Max Weber describes precise procedures and work rules that are written for a specific job description. In this way, in an organization where there is a large number of employees, the responsibilities and duties for a specific position are standardized.

By positioning power, the German sociologist aims to ensure that the power that individual managers have at certain positions in the hierarchy can be controlled by those higher up in the organization. The higher a manager is in the hierarchy, the more responsibility he has for controlling lower levels of managers.

The principle of stimulating achievements is determined by incentives for a well-performed task or overall for a certain period of time for results achieved in official work.

The principle of employee evaluation aims to motivate employees to achieve high results in daily activities.

By establishing and observing all these principles listed so far, M. Weber believes that with the precise and clearly regulated responsibilities and powers of the individual employee and hierarchical level in the organization, all this contributes to more effective management in the structure. „As shortcomings of bureaucratic organizations, one can point out the poor adaptation and flexibility to the external environment and the underestimation of human and social aspects. In their studies, F. Taylor, A. Fayol and M. Weber did not deal with the social aspects of management. Their discussions were limited to such aspects as: fair pay, reduction of production costs, economic stimulation, etc. This led to the need to create a new school, in which the main importance for effective work in the enterprise is given to the human factor. Thus, the new approach to management, called behavioral (behaviorist) ", gradually took shape.

Mary Follett and Elton Mayo are the authors of the school of human relations. According to M. Follett, the effectiveness of management in the organization is built on the ability of managers to convince and motivate employees to act with them and for them. She is of the opinion that control and coercion should not be applied to implement daily tasks in the organization, but it is necessary to apply techniques with which employees can coordinate their efforts to achieve the common goal of the organization. According to M. Follett, managers should issue their orders to subordinate employees in such a way as to cause the effective implementation of tasks. Their orders should contain precise guidelines for the problem situation and should not include a personal attitude from one person to another.

The Australian by birth Elton Mayo (1880 - 1949) is one of the leaders in the study of the behavioral approach to human management a resource that studies the factors that influence labor productivity. The professor of research at the Harvard School of Business Administration proves the thesis that there are strong group motivational factors in organizations. With the research conducted by E. Mayo in a company in Hawthorne on the influence of motivational factors in the organization, he gained wide fame as a researcher of human relations. The research itself included four stages, each of which contributed to the conclusion he made at the end of the study. In the first stage, Mayo placed workers in different "workplace lighting", this did not affect the work process and the motivation of employees. In the second stage, he placed them in different working hours, longer, and reduced the workers' breaks, the method of payment, his observations showed that there is a connection between the various factors and this affected labor productivity. In the third stage, the researcher conducted interviews with employees regarding their attitude towards managers and working conditions. Mayo's conclusion was that the main factor in the management of the organization is the already established relationship between managers and workers. At the final stage, Mayo separated a group of workers in separate rooms to carry out their duties at their workplace, under exactly the same conditions as the others, the only condition being that these workers themselves determine the method of payment, working hours, norms, etc. The conclusion he made was that the group had developed its own internal rules of conduct.

The conclusion that E. Mayo reached from the research conducted at the enterprise is that in the very process of interaction between workers, strong group motivational factors are observed. In some cases, employees reacted more strongly to the pressure of members of individual groups than to material incentives and orders from managers. This showed that the head of the organization must closely monitor the behavior of informal groups in the organization, because they sometimes contradict the direction of action by the management to achieve the common goal. In the school of human relations, E. Mayo and M. Follett attach great importance to the human factor, to the social relations themselves during work. Both of them prove that socio-psychological factors and people's needs are of great importance, and not only economic incentives.

Some of the main representatives of the school of organizational behavior are Douglas McGregor, Chester Bernard and Chris Argyris. With the study of interpersonal relations in the organization, this type of school appears and develops. These authors conduct their research entirely on the sociological and psychological aspects of interactions in the organization, the motivation for work on the part of employees and the tools for motivation, as well as the authority of the manager in relation to the nature of power. They examine the organizational unit

itself from within the very core, how exactly the communication itself flows in the structure, the leadership within it, whether the work done by the employees is of high quality. The authors attach importance to the satisfaction with work and the level of motivation on the part of the employees as their individual differences. They develop mechanisms for more effective work precisely in relation to the motivation and satisfaction with the work of the individual employee. D. McGregor, C. Bernard and K. Argyris look not only at the organizational and technical system in the structure for achieving success, but also at the social system, the interaction between the formal and informal structure. They make the connection between the satisfaction with the work of the workers and the efficiency of production, the higher the satisfaction with the work, the higher the efficiency of production. Representatives of this school observe in their research that job satisfaction increases in more decentralized and flexible organizations, when the manager applies a democratic management style and includes the individual employee in the development and making of decisions in the organization. In their research, the authors come to the conclusion that the most important thing is that job satisfaction is increased, that higher motivation is observed among employees, because in this way not only more efficient production is achieved, but also conflict situations in interpersonal relationships or from changes made in the organization are reduced.

After the Second World War, "Management" continued to develop in its essence, new schools of management entered, such as the quantitative and empirical school.

The quantitative school, or in other words, the quantitative approach, is characterized by the fact that its theorists make attempts to include in management the exact sciences such as modeling, mathematical methods for studying operations, as well as network methods for planning, etc. The quantitative school also included the so-called "Objective Tree", which is still known today, and is used by managers to develop and make management decisions.

The empirical school also emerged and developed after 1950. It is characterized by observing and analyzing the practice of management in the organization, after which recommendations are developed for the managers themselves in order to improve the management process. One of the most prominent representatives of the empirical school is Peter Drucker. He is of the opinion that each manager in an organization must perform several functions. The first and main function that the manager must perform according to P. Drucker is to determine the goals of the structure and, of course, their implementation. To form work teams, to organize and distribute work between individual members of the team. To motivate, analyze, evaluate and control the activity in the organizational unit. P. Drucker believes that management in the 20th century should be considered from the perspective of human, material and financial resources, as well as marketing, innovation and labor productivity. Another

representative of the empirical school is Louis Newman, who, as a practitioner and manager, supports the thesis that behind every success of the organization are the philosophy and personal qualities of the manager. He is of the opinion that the basis of the philosophy of good management are good relationships in the organization, therefore those employees who achieve the best results should be promoted in the service hierarchy and the remuneration for the work performed should be in proportion to the work performed. [Iliev I., 2000, "Albatross"]

„ The growing needs for products and services, as well as the construction and functioning of large companies led to the emergence and development of various theories and schools of management. An important place is occupied by the classical school, the school of human relations and the school of organizational behavior. They consider individual aspects of the management of organizations and thus help to better clarify the issues of management.

Management styles as part of management

Any organization can be successful or unsuccessful in relation to how it is managed. At the heart of whether it will develop and have a good image or, on the contrary, will suffer collapse and disintegration, lies its leadership. Leadership is one of the most important factors for the organizational unit and its functioning. If we take, for example, two different sectors in one department with managers of the same experience and professional training and analyze and evaluate their activities, we will come to the conclusion that in one case the employees are motivated, satisfied with their work, interact and cooperate in daily work. In this way, the sector gives a positive image to the department, and this in turn is the excellent assessment given to the manager for the work he has done in managing the sector. In other cases, we can observe weak or almost no motivation for work, disinterest of employees in their daily activities, almost no or no satisfaction with work, and this in turn leads to poor performance of tasks. This may be due to the manager's poor judgment of the management style used in his/her activities.

„ The concept of "Management Style" is very close to the concept of "Management Method", which in many cases leads to their identification. It should be noted that management methods (administrative, economic, socio-psychological, etc.) are developed and described in the literature, regulatory documents (laws, regulations, instructions), the organizational-staff structure, etc., i.e. they exist objectively outside the personality of the manager. While the style, also objectively existing, is mediated by the personal qualities of the manager. There are opinions that the concept of "Management Style" covers not only the individual manager, but also the entire management apparatus. This opinion contains certain grounds, since one of the main style-forming factors is the management style at the higher management level. In this

regard, it is necessary to emphasize that style is a special form of combining the management function with the need to regulate interpersonal relations between subordinates.

For the first time in 1939, the prominent psychologist and considered the father of modern social psychology, Kurt Lewin, built the theory of "Management Styles", after developing three main management styles, which he called "Authoritarian", "Democratic" and "Liberal" management style. Even the fact that it was created almost a century ago, it is still relevant in the management of organizations today. He believes that each of the management styles or in other words, "Leadership Styles" has its advantages and disadvantages.

The authoritarian management style, sometimes found in the literature as "Autocratic", is characterized by the fact that power is concentrated entirely in the hands of the leader (leader). The leader makes management decisions alone and expects employees to obey him unconditionally. He looks with great distrust at his subordinates and expects them to follow his instructions to achieve the goals of the organization. Communication in the organization is carried out entirely "top-down", with the leader exercising strict control over the orders issued by him and relying on discipline and the achievement of high results in the tasks set by him. The advantages of the authoritarian management style are, first of all, it ensures quick decision-making on how to act in a certain situation, especially when it comes to managing crisis situations or managing crises of any nature. This style is most effective in such situations, because the time for making a management decision is then in great scarcity. Secondly, the advantage of this style is that communication is carried out entirely by the leader-manager to the subordinates, the tasks are achieved exactly as planned, without wasting additional time discussing decisions on how to act. Another advantage of the authoritarian style is that it is suitable for practicing with subordinates who are in the early stages of training in order to more easily coordinate their actions or with such employees who have lower competence in the organization [Arabadzhiyski N., 2002, Sofia].

The disadvantages of the authoritarian management style are that it limits the individuality of the actions of employees to the maximum and other consequences that arise from this type of management are, for example, if we look at the action of the tasks performed in the short term, this type of management style can be called the most appropriate, but this is not the case if we want to develop the potential of employees and look in the long term or in other words, strategically, at the plans of the organizational unit. By limiting the individuality of the actions of employees, they place themselves in dependence on the manager himself, when he is not among them. On the other hand, a disadvantage can also be called the fact that they cannot show personal initiative to implement a given task. Disadvantages can also be attributed to this type of management style, that over time it reduces and even leads to no motivation of

employees to develop and look for new methods for performing tasks or to show creativity in their activities. With the constant use of the authoritarian style, the risk of creating conflicts in the organizational unit and the overall good working climate within the organization itself deteriorates. It is very suitable and gives good results in the short term, but after achieving the results in the long term, it suffers more negatives than positives. We can describe the authoritarian management style with more negatives than positives, but it remains the only possible solution for leadership in crisis situations and when it is necessary to act quickly and structuredly.

The democratic management style or also called the "supportive" management style is characterized by the fact that the leader in the organization is interested in the opinion of the employees in the organization and asks for their opinion. "The leader encourages, stimulates the discussion of the tasks facing the group and decision-making is collective. Such a leader does not limit the freedom of the members of the organization, but on the contrary - encourages every initiative. The advantages of the democratic management style in the modern organization are undeniable, since the very way of treating the members of the team creates significant socio-psychological comfort and a high degree of satisfaction with the work performed. The democratic style creates a creative atmosphere in which there is no need for external control, and individuals perform their tasks, feeling internally motivated and fairly evaluated." In the short term, the organization's results are initially delayed given the fact that decision-making is discussed by the entire team and this contributes to some delay in the actions of the employees, but in the long term, the organization suffers and achieves high results, and this is solely due to the advantage that the team members are motivated considering that they are given individuality and the opportunity to express their suggestions for making management decisions. They actively participate in management activities and this leads to satisfaction with the work they do. Through this management style, good communication is also achieved within the organization itself, the creativity of the employees is stimulated, and this in turn contributes to building skills and leadership potential in the team. The motivation of the employees in the democratically managed organization is very strong, and the feeling of satisfaction with the work is at the highest levels. Like each of the three leadership styles, the democratic one also has its disadvantages. One of the disadvantages is slow decision-making, and sometimes it also leads to irresponsibility for the decisions made. Another disadvantage is that this management style cannot function well in organizations with low discipline and low competence of the employees themselves. It is important to emphasize that despite the implementation of the democratic management style in the organization with all its advantages for the management of the organization, the leader-manager reserves the right to

make the final decision, despite the fact that he has previously listened to the entire team with their proposals. We can describe the democratic management style with more positive than negative sides in management. If we look at the long-term development of the organization, this is the style that is most suitable for leading the organizational unit, considering that it stimulates initiative, creativity and obtains the highest satisfaction from the work done by the employees.

The liberal management style, or in other words, also called in the literature the "delegating" management style, is distinguished from the other two styles by its complete freedom of action on the part of the team in the organization. In this management style, the control on the part of the organization's leader is minimal or almost nonexistent. He, in turn, delegates his rights to the team members to plan and prepare the relevant decisions, intervening at certain times with advice or expressing an opinion on a specific issue, and most often simply observing the work of the team from the sidelines. Motivation and satisfaction with the work done are higher only if the team members are aware of and appreciate their delegated freedom of action, but also if they have previously set a clear goal to achieve. On the other hand, greater creativity is observed on the part of the employees, which is entirely due to the lack of strict control on the part of the leader, but all this also hides its risks of creating conflicts within the organization due to the lack of a prominent leader who can give guidelines and orders (orders) for the performance of tasks. The advantages of this type style are that it encourages a sense of responsibility and individuality in the actions of employees, given the fact that they have complete freedom of action and are now trusted in their work, and this in turn leads to employee creativity. With this type of management style, there are more disadvantages than advantages, such as the lack of a leader-manager to lead the team to achieve the goals set for the organization. On the other hand, the lack of a leader leads to poor organization of the team's work, no control over the activities of the employees, and this leads to low efficiency of the team's actions. Another disadvantage is that when distributing tasks, an uneven distribution of responsibilities and efforts made by the employees can be observed, with some being more burdened with duties and responsibilities, and others not so much. The effectiveness of achieving the goals set for the organization with this management style depends solely on the team. If the team is highly motivated and responsible, this leads to high results and reliability in the organization as a whole, and vice versa, with weak motivation on the part of the team and no responsibility for their actions, poor or no results are observed.

A few words about leadership

What is the factor that turns a group of individuals not just into a "group of individuals", but into a team? Even if the members of a group are united by common interests and values,

profess the same (or different) philosophy, religion and morality, if there is no one in this group of individuals to guide, unite and lead it, it would sooner or later fall apart. It is precisely because of this that the concepts of “leader” and “leadership” are leading concepts in organizational psychology. In fact, leadership is very often spoken of as a synonym for management, and vice versa – for management as a synonym for leadership. In fact, “leader” translated into Bulgarian means “leader”, “leader”, “leadership”, “leadership”; “leadership” means “leadership”, “leadership”, “leadership”, “management”, and “manager” can be translated as “manager”, “director”, “chief”, “leader”, “supervisor”, “administrator”. We can summarize that the leader is the one who “connects” with the group (team), while the manager – with administrative and managerial functions.

The manifestation of leadership is part of human relationships. It contains elements of leadership, but remains much more informal, unregulated and necessarily relies on emotional attachment. The leader is the person with the highest authority in the group. The leader is always active, acting, and proactive. A person becomes a leader in a group when he stops seeing the problems in the group with the eyes of an ordinary performer and starts seeing them with the eyes of a manager. This is precisely the similarity between the leader of a group and its official leader. But there are also a number of differences:

- The leader is officially appointed, and the leader is issued unofficially;
- The manager has regulated rights and means to influence the group, while the leader uses his personality, his own ideas and behavior to influence others;
- The manager represents the group to external organizations and maintains broad social contacts, the leader acts in intra-group relations. Hence, the responsibility of the former is clearer and higher, while the responsibility of the latter is undefined.

There are many definitions of leadership. According to the most common, it is a process involving two or more people, in which one seeks to influence the behavior of others in order to achieve some goal. Leadership is the ability of a person to convince others to strive enthusiastically towards achieving the set goals. An important feature of leadership is the process in which one individual exerts influence on others. There are several attempts to clarify and describe the grounds that enable one individual to influence another or a group, described by leadership theories. In this paper, we will present a brief description of the main theories of leadership.

Leadership Theories

Leadership research and theorizing have a long history. Leadership theories typically build on each other, with later models borrowing components of earlier models and expanding

or using them in new ways. In general, there are four widely used approaches to studying leadership: trait theories, personality-behavioral theories, situational theories, and transformational theories. Situational and transformational theories borrow some of the premises from trait and personality-behavioral theories. Therefore, the four categories of theories are generally considered to have very similar premises, but also differences. For example, trait theory emerged in the early 20th century and is associated with research that focuses on isolating specific (characteristic) traits or consistent and enduring physical and psychological attributes that are associated with leadership success. In this sense, trait theory relies on common personality traits that are valid for all effective leaders. It assumes, for example, that social intelligence, extraversion, flexibility, and charisma are invariably associated with the image of a successful leader.

After a long period of research on the characteristics of a leader, some researchers have abandoned this idea and pointed out that effective leadership depends not so much on who the leader is, but on what he does and how he adapts to the changing demands of different situations. Moreover, it is unlikely that the same traits are associated with effective leadership in all situations, on all types of tasks, and in all teams. On the other hand, complex constellations of leadership characteristics, such as “flexibility” (described as “the ability to perceive the needs and goals of followers and to adjust one’s personal approach to group action in accordance with them”) may be related to leadership effectiveness, but these complex leadership traits involve the adaptation of the leader’s behavior to the leadership situation. In the late 1940s and 1950s, leadership studies were conducted in the United States.

(1) initiating structure (leadership behaviors that define, organize, and structure the work situation); (2) thoughtful decision-making (behavior that shows concern for the feelings, attitudes, and needs of employees). Task orientation is related to the attention that a manager gives to getting the job done through activities such as allocating and organizing work, making decisions, monitoring performance, and evaluating performance. People orientation involves the sincerity and friendliness of the manager and the concern shown for the well-being of subordinates. The two orientations are often presented as a two-dimensional system. This system reflects the concept that a manager’s style of behavior can vary along each of the dimensions across a wide range of possible leadership styles. For example, different styles can be distinguished, characterized by: moderate task orientation and low people orientation; high task orientation and moderate people orientation; low task orientation and high people orientation, and so on.

The main disadvantage of the behavioral approach is that, like trait theory, it is too general and universal. For example, a task-oriented leader may be effective in certain situations

under certain conditions, while a relationship-oriented leader may be effective in another situation.

Speaking of leadership theories, and more specifically from the perspective of leaders' orientation to staff or to the task, we cannot fail to mention the popular leadership intervention program developed by Blake and Mouton, known as the Leadership Grid. It also emphasizes staff and productivity, but unlike the behavioral studies described above, it relies on attitudes. A basic principle of the Leadership Grid is that the best leaders are those who demonstrate both concern for the task (the first dimension) and a strong interest in people (the second dimension). In this sense, each leader is assessed on both dimensions using a nine-point scale, distinguishing five leadership styles (high/low concern for the task – high/low concern for people), the fifth of which is "average" (called "middle-of-the-road management"). However, the criticism of the program is again related to its universality and categoricalness.

Unlike Fiedler's theory, this theory assumes that these four styles can be used by the same leader in different situations. The key point in the theory is the way in which the leader influences the paths that lie between the behavior of subordinates and goals. The leader can influence the process of achieving goals by:

- recognizing and encouraging through rewards those needs of subordinates over which the leader has some control;
- rewarding the achievement of goals;
- stimulating the efforts of subordinates to achieve goals;
- assisting in removing barriers to achieving goals;
- improving the opportunities for personal satisfaction of subordinates.

The most important conclusion from the "path-goal" theory is that before leaders choose a particular leadership style, they must diagnose the situation. Since improved effectiveness is the result of increased motivation of subordinates, they must first organize the factors that support or limit the level of motivation. Then the leader can select and carry out the necessary behavior. This situation is best served by rejecting the approach to leadership that recognizes the existence of a "single best style."

Unlike Fiedler's model, the "path-goal" approach emphasizes concern for results that benefit the organization and the employee. Because of its focus on both results and satisfaction, the "path-goal" approach is considered a much more comprehensive and perhaps more realistic situational model of leadership than Fiedler's alternative model.

Situational theories of leadership include the decision-making model developed by Vroom and Yetton. It combines the characteristics of the situation with the leader's decision-making strategies. According to him, the leader can make decisions using a variety of

strategies, ranging from acting alone (authoritarian decision-making) to reaching a decision through group consensus. The model suggests five decision-making strategies: (1) authoritarian I – in which the leader makes the decision alone, using only the information that is available to him; (2) authoritarian II – in which the leader receives information from his subordinates, but makes the decision himself; (3) consultative I (decision after consultation) – the leader shares the problem with his direct subordinates, takes into account their ideas individually, but makes the decision himself; (4) consultative II – in which, unlike the previous style, he shares the problems with his subordinates in a group, and not individually, again making the decision alone; and (5) group – the leader shares the problem with his subordinates as a group and together they reach a consensus on the solution.

The leadership style is determined depending on the characteristics of the situation, which Vroom and Yetton describe in the so-called “Vroom-Yetton Decision Tree”. The leadership style derived from their theory must be consistent with the characteristics of the environment. Later, this model was expanded and improved and remains one of the most widely used leadership models.

The last model from the perspective of situational theory that we will focus on is the so-called leader-member exchange model. It is based on the notion that effective leadership is determined by the quality of the interaction between the leader and certain members of the group. According to this theory, the employee is the situation; between the leader and each employee, dyadic relationships develop that are unique to each interaction and, in this sense, different. The nature of the leader-member exchange can range from low quality – in which the leader has a negative view of his subordinate, and the latter does not respect or trust the leader, to high quality – in which the leader has a positive attitude towards the employee, and the employee feels that the leader supports and encourages him. The authors of the model claim that their approach is an improvement on other theories of leadership because previous models assume that leaders act in a relatively uniform manner towards all employees.

The fourth strand of theories related to leadership are the so-called transformational theories. While situational theories of leadership place the main emphasis on the interaction between the leader and the elements of the situation, supporters of transformational theories place emphasis on “exceptional” leaders. Thus was born the theory of charismatic leadership (created by the German psychologist Max Weber), according to which leaders possess some exceptional characteristics that make employees loyal and inspired. Such leaders are likely to be able to “energize” their employees and “transform” work groups into effective teams. There are some theoretical hypotheses according to which characteristics or qualities of charismatic leaders are related to having exceptionally developed social skills and the ability to build

relationships. The theory of charismatic leadership examines the interaction between the characteristics of the leader (namely: communication of vision and goals, self-confidence and self-reliance in employees, ability to inspire, desire for change and innovation, risk-taking and sensitivity to employees and situations), those of employees (identification with the leader, emotional susceptibility and desire for change and growth) and elements of the situation (conditions of uncertainty, uncertainty or crisis; opportunities for growth, change or innovation). The emphasis of transformational leadership is on the ability of the leader to provide common values and a vision for the future of the work group (team). The leader inspires employees to develop their team vision, develops the office culture that stimulates the achievement of high results. With their charismatic attitude, they are “responsible” for the performance of their subordinates, as they instill a sense of mission, stimulate them to learn and inspire new and creative ways of thinking.

Numerous studies on charismatic and transformational leadership in recent years testify to their effectiveness in organizations. The success is probably due to the above-described behaviors of the leader and his attitude towards employees. On the other hand, this approach is the most comprehensive and simultaneously combines and develops previous theories. It considers not just the interaction leader - employee - work situation, but this interaction, refracted through metacharacteristics of the leader such as charisma, attitudes and beliefs.

From everything said so far, we can summarize that leadership theories are dynamic and evolving constructs that are directly related to organizational development and culture. Regardless of which leadership theory we will consider a given organization through, we cannot help but pay attention to its structure. And because the system of the Ministry of Internal Affairs functions hierarchically, leadership in it is not just leadership, but rather managerial guidance.

LEADERSHIP IN THE MINISTRY OF INTERIOR SYSTEM

A characteristic of the management of hierarchical organizations is the tendency towards forceful, commanding, unquestioning leadership. In such organizations, horizontal contacts are not relied on; the leader relies on a service team, not a strategically thinking team, functional envy arises, a consequence of the lack of real principles and criteria for evaluating work.

In hierarchical structures, the rules and procedures by which they function play a stabilizing role, create reliable order in the organization, but very often become a “brake” to the adoption of the new. In principle, hierarchies have a hard time “tolerating” innovations, especially those that require restructuring of the structure, information flows and interaction between units and people. Even if the innovation is adopted, the hierarchical structure

incorporates it into its rules extremely slowly; control is a connecting matter; formal power, coercion and influence are the leading ones.

In order to change the leadership style in the Ministry of Interior system, a possible option for impact is training the management staff in basic leadership skills.

The basic skills in terms of managing people, teams and organizations can be generally separated into six categories. These are (1) communication skills; (2) skills for a rational approach to what is happening, (3) administrative skills, (4) skills for influencing others, (5) skills for interpersonal interaction and (6) change management. Their skillful practice and balanced application by the management staff guarantees success in terms of efficiency and coping with tasks, deadlines and unforeseen situations.

The indicated basic leadership skills are the result of numerous studies in this area. Based on them, some ideas and guidelines can be outlined to help train people holding various management positions in the organization, namely:

- Building among managers a common conceptual framework of target orientations for influencing employees (associates);
- Developing managers' skills to analyze in more depth the reasons for their actions towards employees;
- Developing managers' convictions that a rich repertoire of tactics makes them more successful;
- Creating managers' readiness to deal with the challenges that arise from individual differences between employees.

In this regard, since the spring of this year, with a resolution of the Secretary General of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the “Consultative Psychology” sector has been conducting leadership skills trainings with middle management staff on the territory of one of the key regional departments in the capital. Our experience from these trainings shows that, in general, the participants demonstrate conviction that their practical experience is sufficient for the implementation of effective management practices. In addition to maintaining their position as successful managers, they thereby emphasize as a primary deficit - the unresolved problems with the greatly reduced staff in the RUP and the material and technical base. The participants insisted that before solving the personnel problem and the ultimate limitation of material and technical resources, the search for any other solutions is a displacement from the problem.

Their sensitivity to the fact that 2/3 of the management activity is related to the management of human relations and communication is greatly underestimated. The main management tool that managers use is direct orders.

There is a lack of understanding of giving and receiving feedback as a management tool. This leads to blocking any conflict situation, due to the practical blocking of communication itself. They perceive the use of feedback as a characteristic of informal relationships and are far from understanding outgoing communication as a lever for managing official interaction.

There is a blurring of boundaries in relationships - more emphasis is placed on personal interaction than on official interaction - effective communication is associated with closeness based on informal relationships and to a lesser extent in relation to the work task. This can probably be attributed to an organizational culture left over from the past, namely - to promote employees in the hierarchy based on personal devotion, rather than on professional skills and competence. This presupposes the presence of diffusion and fusion, due to the lack of clear rules, roles and boundaries.

The current organizational culture does not encourage innovation. In this sense, there is little interest in learning new things; even those employees who have potential are left to the general flow. The hierarchical system itself implies greater inertia and intolerance towards innovative thinking in order to keep its boundaries more protected and its norms clear and visible, but this comes at the expense of stagnation regarding the opportunities for development and change, according to the dynamics of the social context.

MANAGEMENT IN THE MINISTRY OF INTERIOR SYSTEM

In every country and its management, ensuring public order and security is of key importance for its development, economic growth and, in general, for the well-being of society.

“Management in the field of public order and national security protection is part of state management”

In the state apparatus, the Ministry of Interior occupies a key place in the system of state management. According to Art. 2, para. 1 of the Law on the Interior

“The activities of the Ministry of Interior are aimed at protecting the rights and freedoms of citizens, combating crime, protecting national security, preserving public order and fire safety and protecting the population”.

The system of the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Bulgaria is made up of various structures and bodies that perform their functions and activities in the service of society in ensuring public order and security of the country. This system includes, first of all, the main body that manages the entire system, namely the Ministry of Interior. The Ministry of Interior has five main directorates as subordinate bodies, these are:

The Main Directorate of National Police (GDNP), whose main function is to maintain public order, intercept, prevent and investigate crimes. The second directorate is the Main

Directorate of Border Police (GDGP), whose function is to guard and control the state border of the Republic of Bulgaria, which generally includes the prevention of illegal entry into the country through state borders, countering smuggling and illegal migration and human trafficking. The third directorate is the Main Directorate for Combating Organized Crime (GDBOP). Its main task is to combat serious intentional crimes, those that are described in the Criminal Code and for which more than five years of imprisonment are provided, cybercrime and drug trafficking. The fourth directorate of the Ministry of Internal Affairs is the General Directorate of Gendarmerie, Special Operations and Combating Terrorism (GDZSOBT), whose function is to respond to high-risk situations, counter terrorism and ensure public order. Last but not least is the General Directorate of Fire Safety and Population Protection (GDPBZN), whose main function is to eliminate, limit and prevent fires, as well as protect the population in disasters, accidents and emergencies. These main directorates have twenty-eight regional directorates (ODMVR), as many as there are districts in the country and to them, respectively, in the cities, regional administrations (RU). All these organizational units (structures) make up the system of the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

For the capital of the Republic of Bulgaria (Sofia), the competent institution that takes care of public order in the city is the Metropolitan Directorate of Internal Affairs (SDVR). The SDVR has nine regional departments, which are responsible for maintaining public order, combating crime and protecting the rights and freedoms of citizens in their assigned territories in the capital. The SDVR also has additional staff, such an additional staff is the "Metropolitan" sector of the Security Police Department of the SDVR.

The staff of the entire "Metropolitan" sector is three hundred and thirteen people (313). The highest in the hierarchy is the head of the sector - chief inspector, after which the sector is divided into two groups, each of which is headed by a senior inspector. In each group there are six platoons, which platoons are led by one inspector and two, and in some platoons there are three department commanders. The police officers and senior police officers in the first group are one hundred and thirty-five people (135), and in the second group there are one hundred and thirty-four people. All these police officers and senior police officers are distributed on average twenty-two, twenty-three in each of the six platoons. The entire "Metropolitan" sector takes care of the security of citizens and the protection of public order at all metro stations (forty-seven in number) on the territory of the city of Sofia.

Through "Decree No. 181 of the Council of Ministers of 2009 on the determination of strategic objects and activities that are important for national security", according to Art. 1 (1) "Identifies strategic objects and activities that are important for the national security of the Republic of Bulgaria and which are part of the critical infrastructure in a single list.

-Strategic sites:

- Metropolitan - Sofia “ .

According to Art. 92, para. 1 of the Law on the Interior, “The Ministry of the Interior, on the basis of a contract concluded with the interested parties, may provide security by police authorities, including with signal-security and other equipment, to:

T.1 Strategic sites of national security importance”.

The security of the Sofia metro is carried out by one police officer at each metro station, and only at certain metro stations are there two officers, such as M.S. “Serdika” and M.S. “SU St. Kl. Ohridski”.

“Each metro station has separate sections and boundaries for service by the police officer on duty. The outer boundaries of the route are the exits and entrances of the metro station, as well as the sidewalk areas connecting the entrances/exits. The inner boundaries for movement are the track at the platform level of the metro station and the service premises. Each metro station is characterized by the specifics of the area it serves. For example, if we take the metro station “Mladost 1”.

It is characterized by intensive passenger flow and direction of movement in time zones from 06.30 to 11.00 in the direction from M.S. “Mladost 1” to the center and from 15.00 to 23.00 back in the direction of M.S. “Mladost 1”. Significant amounts of money are collected in the cash registers every day and for this reason, cashiers are assisted in moving them from the cash registers to the metro station command post and back. Each metro station has vulnerable points, where the police officer focuses his actions when executing an order. At M.S. “Mladost 1” such a vulnerable place is the eastern pedestrian underpass with the adjacent commercial facilities and the main cash register, and when large-scale mass events are held, such vulnerable places are the platforms, staircases, vestibules with the technical devices built there for the passage of citizens and the entrances and exits of the metro station. The police officers assigned to the duty carry out their activities according to instruction No. 8121z-792/17.06.25 for patrol and post activity (in force from 01.10.25). The duty is round-the-clock, two-shift, mobile, with the shifts being twelve hours from 07.00 to 19.00 (day shift) and from 19.00 to 07.00 (night shift). The police officers on duty maintain constant contact with the Operational Duty Control Center (ODCC) and report on changes in the operational situation, observe the ordered hours and places for concentrating the order or the work options according to the changed operational situation.

There are three types of work options:

Option 1 - in normal operational situations, the hours and places for concentrating the order for the day and night shift are mandatory. In accordance with the operational situation,

physiological breaks, meal times and rest times are observed, all of which are reflected in the information card hourly. Outside the time for concentrating the order, preparing official documentation, video surveillance, in accordance with the operational situation, periodic patrols of vestibule 1, vestibule 2, the platforms and the boundaries of the guarded route are carried out, and timely reporting is made to the ODCC [Clark T., 2021].

Option 2 - during mass events, specific tasks are carried out, periodically patrolling the metro station through all places for concentrating the order and timely reporting on the operational situation to the ODCC.

Option 3 - in a complicated operational situation, the ordered specific tasks are performed, the metro station is patrolled through all the places for concentrating the order and a timely report is made on any changes in the operational situation to the ODCC.

The order for patrolling the serviced territory by the police officer is in accordance with the specifics of the operational situation and is determined by the head of the sector, group heads, police inspectors, department commanders, determining the option (1, 2 or 3) for the respective work shift. During the continuous implementation of the PPD, the officer ensures public order on the territory of the metro station, and is obliged to prevent, intercept and detect crimes and violations of public order. The police officer at the metro station is vigilant and identifies persons who can be assumed to commit a crime or other illegal acts. He warns verbally or in writing persons about whom there is sufficient data and it is assumed that they will commit a crime or violation of public order. Providing assistance, if necessary, to neighboring routes and other officials (Urban Mobility Center) are also part of the duties of the employee assigned to the assignment. The police officer or senior police officer at the metro station strictly observes the law, carefully and objectively examines cases of violations of public order, and also takes measures to prevent hooliganism, illegal trade, begging, vagrancy, use and distribution of narcotic and intoxicating substances in the metro station area and adjacent territories (entrances/exits and pedestrian zones). Part of the duties is to monitor the passenger flow, ensuring that passengers strictly comply with the "Regulation on the carriage of passengers and conditions for travel by mass urban transport on the territory of the Sofia Municipality", and not to allow flammable, explosive, air-polluting substances, bulky and large-sized objects and luggage to be brought into the territory of the metro station. The police officer is particularly vigilant when large groups of young people and children enter, before and after sports and other mass public events, when persons with suspicious behavior and luggage are present in the metro station. In the event of a terrorist act or a threat of such an act, the police officer carries out measures set out in the "Plan for interaction between "Metropolitan" EAD and the Sofia Police Department in the event of a threat of a terrorist act on the territory of the Sofia

Metro", approved by the Director of the Sofia Police Department and the Director of "Metropolitan" EAD. The employees assigned to the task interact with each other, the ODCC, the sector management, as well as with the police inspectors and the department commanders via radio or internal telephone line. In case of official necessity, they interact or provide assistance to employees from other structural units of the Ministry of Interior, to officials from the company "Metropolitan" EAD and other officials [Weber M., 2024, Sofia].

Effective management in the Ministry of Interior is a decisive factor for the trust of society and the stability of the state. In a dynamic environment, public pressure, growing risks, the management of the Ministry of Interior requires high professionalism and strategic planning for the activities and vision of the ministry. Management in the Ministry of Interior is characterized by a strongly expressed hierarchical structure, centralization of power and strict regulatory regulation. The management itself in the Ministry of Interior is built on several basic principles such as legality, discipline, subordination and co-subordination and responsibility. Management in the Ministry of Interior system often requires making quick management decisions and timely coordination between the individual structures, which requires well-trained management personnel in the ministry. All management decisions are made first and foremost in accordance with the law. Unity of command, subordination and co-subordination guarantee the rapid reaction of employees in their official actions in the system, which in turn are generated by discipline. In the system of the Ministry of Interior, the management process is carried out entirely with the four functions of management: planning, organizing, leading and controlling the activities related to the protection of public order and security of the state. It is carried out within the framework of a strictly regulated regulatory framework, which includes the Constitution of the Republic of Bulgaria, the Law on the Ministry of Interior and subordinate regulations. The Ministry of Interior operates through clearly defined management levels - strategic, tactical and operational levels. The Minister of Interior exercises strategic leadership, sets priorities and is responsible for the overall policy of the ministry. This is the highest management in the system of the Ministry of Interior and it determines the vision and mission of the ministry in the long term. In mid-level management or tactical management, it is carried out by the heads of the main directorates, who coordinate the activities of the structures subordinate to them. Management at the operational level includes the implementation of specific tasks, which require professionalism, speed and a high degree of coordination of actions in the field. The management mechanism of the Ministry of Interior is characterized by planning (the three types of planning), control within the organizational unit itself, risk analysis, as well as interaction with other state bodies and international organizations. These mechanisms achieve a high degree of efficiency with a good distribution of responsibilities and fruitful communication. The most

important factor for the effective management of the Ministry of Interior is human resources. The selection, training and motivation of employees in the system play an important role in achieving high results in daily activities and it is for this reason that human resources management is aimed at the development of professional competence, ethical standards and leadership skills. Leadership in the Ministry of Interior is of great importance, because the leader in his actions does not only manage processes, he is also an example of behavior. An effective leader has authority, competence and the ability to make management decisions in crisis situations without harming the image of the institution. Management in the Ministry of Interior is a complex and responsible process that requires legal regulation, organizational efficiency and, last but not least, a quality human factor. Improving management mechanisms and increasing professionalism are key conditions for the successful functioning of the Ministry of Interior and for strengthening public trust in the institution itself [Maxwell J., 2017, Sofia,].

With the improvement of organizations and the increasing need for the human factor within them during the late 19th century and early 20th century, various theories and schools of management emerged and developed. The foundations of management are the classical school, the school of human relations and the school of organizational behavior, which schools consider separate aspects of the management of organizations, but each of them contributes to the effective management process to this day. These schools and their application in management practice in the Ministry of Internal Affairs shows that the development of management thought is closely related to the specific obligations of the institution and its functions of guaranteeing public order and the security of citizens. The main school, which is widely used in the Ministry of Internal Affairs system, is the classical school, which is distinguished from the other two by a clearly expressed hierarchical structure, strict normative regulation of activity, which leads to discipline, subordination and coordination in the performance of official tasks. On the other hand, excessive use of techniques and methods from the classical school can lead to formalism, limited initiative and, in general, low motivation on the part of employees. The school of human relations focuses mainly on social and psychological factors in the management of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The emphasis that this school places on interpersonal relationships, as well as on the leadership style that is practiced in the management of the organization and the motivation of employees for more effective performance of their tasks. In general, the school of human relations strives to improve the moral and psychological climate within the organizational unit itself, by improving internal communication and promoting a sense of belonging, which have a positive impact on the professional behavior, loyalty and efficiency of employees, especially under high workload and stress. The school of organizational behavior can be said to build on the previous two schools

by paying special attention to individual and group behavior, management decisions and organizational culture as a whole, because it considers these processes in the Ministry of Internal Affairs as a complex social system and interconnectedness. On the other hand, this school applies principles such as conflict management, teamwork and professional development and others related to leadership, which helps the Ministry of Interior to integrate into the dynamic environment and this in turn contributes to the expectations of transparency and efficiency in the performance of tasks. In conclusion, we can say that in the successful management of the Ministry of Interior, we cannot measure efficiency using only one management theory, but rather it is necessary to require an integrated and balanced approach, which approach would unite the positive qualities such as structural stability and discipline of the classical school with an orientation towards the human factor and behavioral processes in the organization. This is an approach that would increase the professionalism and sustainable development of the institution, and this in turn will lead to strengthening public trust in the Ministry of Interior [Arabadzhiyski N., 2002, Sofia].

In the management of a strictly hierarchical structure such as the Ministry of Interior, management styles also play an important role in the management process. If a more thorough analysis of the three management styles (authoritarian, democratic and liberal) is made, the conclusion will be reached that none of them would independently lead to the effective functioning of the institution. The authoritarian style achieves very strict control, speed in completing tasks, but its excessive use leads to little or no self-initiative and demotivation among employees. The democratic style stimulates dialogue between management and subordinates, as well as trust, but at the expense of this, management decision-making is significantly slowed down. The liberal style is characterized by a high degree of freedom in the actions of employees, which is delegated by management, but this poses a huge risk of lack of control over employees and ambiguity about the responsibility they must bear in performing their tasks. Therefore, in practice, we can say that effective management in the Ministry of Internal Affairs is present when the three styles are combined flexibly and in a balanced manner, of course, all this must be taken into account with the specific obligations of police activity and public expectations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis of the data obtained from the empirical sociological survey in the “Metropolitan” sector at the OOP at the SDVR, the following recommendations can be made.

The positive assessment by the majority of employees suggests the need to institutionalize good practices through clear internal rules, procedures and feedback

mechanisms. Regular meetings, consultations and discussion formats should be held to ensure the sustainability of the dialogue between management and employees. The maintenance and standardization of good management practices should be achieved through the existing mechanisms for formulating and transmitting instructions, which should be systematized through internal rules, instructions and procedures, ensuring sustainability and consistency in management actions. In order to increase the effectiveness of communication, it is appropriate to encourage a two-way exchange of information, in which employees have the opportunity to specify the tasks set and signal any difficulties that have arisen. It is recommended to conduct regular internal surveys or analyses of the organizational climate in order to identify possible communication deficits and take timely measures. corrective actions. Improving the motivational potential of the management style could be done through further development of practices aimed at recognizing achievements, encouraging professional initiative and supporting individual development. It is recommended to systematically monitor the motivational climate by introducing periodic internal surveys to track the dynamics of attitudes and the level of motivation among employees. To improve communication channels by maintaining and developing formal and informal ones for information exchange in order to ensure timeliness and clarity of management messages. It is advisable to conduct additional research in order to identify groups that do not perceive communication as sufficiently effective and to take specific measures. It is recommended to maintain a high level of institutional trust, as management should continue to apply transparent and consistent management practices that strengthen the legitimacy of decisions made. Regular communication with ordinary employees and providing opportunities for expressing opinions will further contribute to the sustainability of trust over time.

In conclusion, the study of the sociological aspects of management styles within the specific structural unit confirms that management practices are not only an instrumental mechanism for coordinating activities, but a social process in which relations of power, trust, identity and organizational culture are constructed. The empirical results clearly outline a relationship between the perceived management style and employee motivation, job satisfaction and intra-group cohesion. The data indicate that employee participation in the decision-making process, transparency of management actions and consistency in communication create prerequisites for a very high degree of trust in management and for a stronger identification with the goals of the unit. This confirms the understanding that management style functions as a mediator between the formal organizational structure and the actually occurring social interactions. The analysis of the collected empirical data allows us to conclude that effective management in the strictly hierarchical structures of the Ministry of Internal Affairs requires a

balance between regulatory regulation and social sensitivity to the needs of team members. The sociological perspective reveals that the sustainability of management models depends not only on their functional reality, but also on the extent to which they are perceived as legitimate and fair by employees. The present empirical sociological study contributes both theoretically and appliedly. On the one hand, it contributes to the analysis of management styles by integrating sociological categories such as power, social capital and organizational culture. On the other hand, it provides empirically substantiated recommendations for improving management practices in the studied structural unit, aimed at increasing efficiency and social integration.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study of the sociological aspects of management styles within the specific structural unit confirms that management practices are not only an instrumental mechanism for coordinating activities, but a social process in which relations of power, trust, identity and organizational culture are constructed. The empirical results clearly outline a relationship between the perceived management style and employee motivation, job satisfaction and intra-group cohesion. The data indicate that employee participation in the decision-making process, transparency of management actions and consistency in communication create prerequisites for a very high degree of trust in management and for a stronger identification with the goals of the unit. This confirms the understanding that management style functions as a mediator between the formal organizational structure and the actually occurring social interactions. The analysis of the collected empirical data allows us to conclude that effective management in the strictly hierarchical structures of the Ministry of Internal Affairs requires a balance between regulatory regulation and social sensitivity to the needs of team members. The sociological perspective reveals that the sustainability of management models depends not only on their functional reality, but also on the extent to which they are perceived as legitimate and fair by employees. The present empirical sociological study contributes both theoretically and appliedly. On the one hand, it contributes to the analysis of management styles by integrating sociological categories such as power, social capital and organizational culture. On the other hand, it provides empirically substantiated recommendations for improving management practices in the studied structural unit, aimed at increasing efficiency and social integration.

The social element in police management is of great importance because the system is made up of people. The present study suggests deepening the study even more in detail to see what the needs of the police officers are. In the future, I plan to expand the study with a larger number of anchored and more questions in order to obtain a high added value of the study.

REFERENCES

Arabadzhiyski N., 2002, Sofia, Police Administration.

Bayraktarov M., 2005, Sofia, Effective Management of a Territorial Police Service.

Clark T., 2021, Sofia, To lead with character and competence.

Gekov B., 2005, Sofia, Police Management Model – Problems and Guidelines for Improvement.

Iliev I., 2000, "Albatross", Police and Special Services Management.

Marinov A., Stoyanov S., Stanchev M., Todorov V., Goranov Z., Ivanova T., Karastoyanov G., 2021, Sofia, Lecture course for a management position in the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Maxwell J., 2017, Sofia, The 5 levels of leadership.

Vladimirova K., Gabrovski K., Stefanov N., 2007, Sofia, Strategic Management and Strategic Planning.

Weber M., 2024, Sofia., Sociology of Domination.