

ARKADIUSZ JABŁOŃSKI
AGNIESZKA MAREK
ADAM ZADROGA

THE CONTEMPORARY UNDERSTANDING OF FREE WILL AND TYPES OF LEADERSHIP

INTRODUCTION

In this article we attempt to answer the question of how findings about what free will is influence our understanding of particular leadership styles. We assume that depending on how people understand free will we will gain another perspective on understanding leadership: its legitimisation (choice), exercise (moral responsibility), and relations with others (basic merit). Arguments for accepting or rejecting free will are construed within different planes and logical frameworks serving to describe leadership styles. It is within one plane that we interpret choices made by people who are in control of their actions. However, human behaviours as manifestations of blind chance conditioned by uncontrolled constitutive or incidental occurrences are considered from a different angle.

ARKADIUSZ JABŁOŃSKI, PhD, Habil., Associate Professor at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Institute of Sociological Sciences; correspondence address: Al. Raławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, Poland; e-mail: arkadiusz.jablonski@kul.pl; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8081-2217>.

AGNIESZKA MAREK, PhD, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Institute of Economics and Finance; correspondence address: Al. Raławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, Poland; e-mail: agnieszka.marek@kul.pl; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2803-1194>.

ADAM ZADROGA, PhD, Habil., Associate Professor at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Faculty of Theology, Lublin Theological Studies; correspondence address: Al. Raławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, Poland; e-mail: adam.zadroga@kul.pl; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1706-9106>.

Articles are licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

Reflections on free will allow us to grasp the differences in legitimising leadership, exercising this role, and relating to others. To this end, we will compare the classical Augustinian approach to freedom of will with its contemporary concepts of libertarianism, compatibilism, hard incompatibilism, and revisionism (FISCHER ET AL. 2007). Then, within specific planes and a logical framework of description, we will indicate the dominant leadership style and its understanding. We want to defend the thesis that different leadership styles, in order to have a chance of being implemented and go beyond the self-centred process of executing power, should not only go beyond the libertarian way of perceiving free will, but also adopt a more synthetic theological approach in which leaders choose to be obedient to God's will out of love of God and people.

1. FREE WILL AND LEADERSHIP STYLES

In the classical approach, free will is a human faculty connected with memory and reason, but it has a separate function that ensures that the human being enjoys a special place in the world (AUGUSTINE 2010, Book 3, 3.8, 34-35).¹ In this approach, human will is not only where desire stems from, but, more importantly, it is the basis of the subject's agency and moral responsibility (KOSZKAŁO 2016). Making choices, undertaking actions, and bearing moral responsibility make man a fallible being who is likely to err. This illustrates the basic and inseparable attribute of the human will, which is one's freedom; it not only means freedom of choice and will, but essentially the ability to shun evil and choose good (AUGUSTINE, Book 2). That is why St. Augustine combined his philosophical inquiries about the will with the practical search for happiness (BENEDICT XVI 2007, 11; 2009, note 88), and this trend is still present today determining our understanding of the human condition. Hannah Arendt states in this context: "The will decides how to use memory and intellect, meaning that it directs [reason and memory] to another goal.... Yet, not everyone rejoices who uses [achieves a thing] if he desired it not for its

¹ In the dialogue *On Free Will*, St. Augustine states: "Thus it turns out both that we do not deny that God has foreknowledge of everything that will be, and nevertheless that we do will what we will. For although He has foreknowledge of our will, it is the will of which He has foreknowledge. Therefore, it is going to be our will, since He has foreknowledge of our will. Nor could it be our will if it were not in our power. Therefore, He has foreknowledge of our power. Hence power is not taken away from me due to His foreknowledge – it is thus mine all the more certainly, since He whose foreknowledge does not err foreknew that it would be mine."

own sake, but for some other purpose. That is why the will is never satisfied. Satisfaction means that the will is at rest, whereas nothing, certainly not even hope, can quiet the restlessness of the will or provide it with that calm and lasting joy in what is present” (ARENDR 1996, 149–50; own translation).

Despite the passage of centuries, the dilemmas highlighted by Augustine dominate contemporary discussions on whether or not the will is man’s autonomous capacity to control actions, thoughts, and attitudes in view of the lack of one’s full power over the causes or blind chance shaping these capacities (APPIAH-SEKYERE 2013; JIN 2023). In our opinion, resolving this issue significantly impacts our understanding of leadership (DENNETT and CARUSO 2022). Leadership is a social construct embedded in human systems forged in various processes and meaning-making. Being a leader involves a number of qualities that shape our understanding of leadership, and changing one of them can bring about an overall change in how it is understood (LADKIN 2010; LAKOMSKI 2016). There is no definition of leadership that would be unanimously accepted by scholars. On the contrary, the concept was framed by philosophers, psychologists, business practices or politicians. Having reviewed relevant literature, Silva defines leadership as “the process of interactive influence that occurs when, in a given context, some people accept someone as their leader to achieve common goals” (SILVA 2016, 3). Instead of looking for a formal definition, scholars tend to enumerate some elements needed to define leadership. First of all, leadership does not consist of a single action; rather, it is a process that evolves with the leader. Second, leadership needs two subjects—a leader and followers—who enter into a relationship. Third, leadership ought to contain some goals connected with the leader’s vision. Last but not least, leadership cannot rely on force and blind obedience but requires trust and inspiration to jointly work towards common goals (BUGAJ and SULIMA 2022; MALIK and AZMAT 2019).

In leadership studies, there is a clear trend of moving away from leader-centred leadership towards participatory leadership, which is oriented towards followers or distributed leadership (THOROUGHGOOD ET AL. 2018; CRAWFORD 2012). There is also a clear shift away from classical concepts based on the characteristics and behaviours of a leader towards concepts analysing the functions performed by the leader and the leadership styles used (VAN VUGT 2006). In this spirit, embedding his considerations in Emmanuel Levinas’ theory, McGhee proposes a typology of leadership depending on the orientation of a given type towards the other person. Starting with the most egocentric type, he distinguishes transactional and transformational types of leadership,

and, moving on to less egological types, positive and relational leadership (MCGHEE 2023).

The oldest types of leadership identified by McGhee as transformational styles date back to the late 19th and the early 20th century and refer to the thoughts of management classics. Scientific leadership (MIRSAFIAN 2023) subsumed under transactional leadership can hardly be called leadership, similarly to McGregor's X theory (LAWTER ET AL. 2015), or task-oriented leadership resulting from the management style grid by Blake and Mouton (1964). Individual types of leadership later emerged from these fragments of the achievements of historical management schools.

Transformational styles include visionary leadership (TAYLOR ET AL. 2014), charismatic leadership (LE BLANC ET AL. 2021), and heroic leadership (YUKL 1999), all signifying styles based on exceptional features and their role in winning people over and implementing a specific vision of the future. It should be noted that transformational leadership is sometimes criticised for its lack of an ethical dimension (NASSIF ET AL. 2021).

McGhee enumerates ethical (BROWN ET AL. 2005), authentic (WALUMBWA ET AL. 2008), spiritual (FRY 2003; VEDULA and AGRAVAL 2024; NAYYAR 2024), and servant leadership (GREENLEAF 2002) among positive styles (BLANCH ET AL. 2016). Despite points of convergence and grounding in moral values, these concepts differ in many respects, which makes it increasingly worthwhile specifying definitions, models and applications of positive styles not only within positive psychology, but also in the world of business.

Analysing the relational styles—distributed leadership (DONGXIAN and BATOOL 2024), shared leadership (BOLDEN 2011; PEARCE ET AL. 2009; ABSON ET AL. 2024), and emerging leadership (HANNA ET AL. 2021; CARTE ET AL. 2006)—one notices their mutual similarities and congruity with the paradigm of organic leadership. This requires self-management by each employee and allows for the lack of formal leadership, although employees adopt temporary leadership roles. At the same time, it assumes that people are aware of the goal they are striving for and the autonomy they have in specific contexts (AVERY 2004).

The above model of approaching leadership styles is of an ordering nature, and individual styles rarely occur in pure form in management. On the contrary, taking into account institutional conditions, the stage of the organisation's development cycle, the experience of co-workers or the current situation in an organisation's environment, we are dealing with a combination of

various aspects of leadership types known in organisations. This is an expression of human reflexivity which allows one to use the entire repertoire of possible behaviours as a leader, depending on the way he or she perceives their agency and the ability to accept responsibility in a world governed by necessary cause-effect laws (SEARLE 2007).

2. LIBERTARIANISM

The outlook on free will that seems to be most closely related to the understanding of leadership is libertarianism (KANE 2007). It rejects determinism and starts from the research-confirmed, indeterministic beliefs of most people who believe that human behaviour is based on freedom of will. Indeterminism here, however, does not mean spontaneous, unspecified or random events that are in no way controllable. However, it does mean that—taking into account exactly the same past, up to the moment of choosing—different outcomes are possible. This is incompatible with determining only one line of future choices, due to past events that shaped the subject of action. Libertarians recognise that the ability to act is important here and now, taking into account all the facts at hand. Based on inductive generalisations of previous cases, the subject is responsible for everything that is a sufficient cause or motive for his or her actions.

In this approach, consequences are not derived from a person's past that shaped them, but the existence of individual actions that contribute to gaining the current form (self-forming actions) is recognised (LEACH 2022). It follows that, even if someone says they could not have acted differently, this does not mean that their behaviour is directed by external forces, but—taking into account the developed character and motives of their behaviour—that they could not have done otherwise at a given time and place.

However, people bear full responsibility for their actions as they move within the framework of a will forged by choices made or actions taken in the past—when they could have acted differently. Therefore, the libertarian notion of free will makes the leader totally responsible for all of the organisation's activities (JIN 2023). The closest thing to understanding free will in this way is transactional leadership, which is based on the power resulting from one's position and the administration of rewards and punishments (DONG 2023). This is tantamount to treating people as morally responsible by virtue of using freedom and controlling one's behaviour as the ability to choose from

among realistically available alternative possibilities (KANE 2007; CALLENDER 2010).

On this view, possessing free will, in contrast to ordinary freedom of action, consists in self-formation and shaping one's character and motives, which are the sources or beginnings of actions. Individuals are responsible for the actions that stem from their attitudes, and they are also responsible for forming the will in which their actions are grounded. To have free will, the person must not only be the ultimate source of their actions, but also the ultimate source of their will to perform them. This approach allows one, as part of a utilitarian search for generalised rules of conduct, to indicate the possible choices a leader makes in difficult situations, when he or she is torn between competing goals of their conduct—morality or ambition, short-lived satisfaction or long-term contentment.

Decision-making under such conditions of uncertainty is taken to follow from the earlier formation of will in the presence of conflicting motivations, where specific instances of choice-making were devised to deal with a given situation. Indeterminism needn't undermine control and responsibility, because it can be treated as background noise or a distraction that can be tackled with some effort. Will is moulded in the act of independent decision-making, whereas free will thrives on failures and successes, through conflict resolution choice-making voluntarily and purposefully, and not by chance or error.

This approach is dominated by retributivism which means that a person deserves punishment because they chose evil, or a reward because they chose good. All other considerations are only additional values to the basic principle of punishment due to the very fact of deserving punishment. It is similar to a reward for choosing the good, and the other consequences are less important. In this context, a transactional leader can adopt an active or a passive management style by way of exception and react only when problems arise (AVOLIO ET AL. 1999; NAWAZ and KHAN 2016), leaving decisions in the hands of employees with the company's operations uninterrupted and believing that the initial contracts are a sufficient guide for subordinates. The leader assumes that there are different paths leading into the future, and by assigning responsibility he or she recognises that specific agents had other paths to follow (APPIAH-SEKYERE 2013; LAKOMSKI 2016). The transactional leader also assumes that they want to be recognised for their ability to choose a given path, even if it involves punishment. There is a basic system of merits that can be invoked even when it is not the result of consequentialist premises (importance for the future) or contractualist premises (due to the community)

(KANE 2007). Therefore, the evaluation of conduct is not contingent simply on past actions, but according to how a person shaped their biography by making the effort to make choices, so now one is better or less capable of making an effort to make further choices.

3. COMPATIBILISM

The position conventionally called compatibilism has its roots in the classical philosophical thoughts of Aristotle and the Stoics, but it has gained the greatest significance in modern philosophy thanks to thinkers such as Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, David Hume, and John Stuart Mill (KANE 2005). According to compatibilism, espoused today by Daniel C. Dennet and John Martin Fischer, to name but a few, it is agreed that even in a completely deterministic world there is a fundamental difference between people who are free from external coercion, addictions or oppression, and those who suffer from these limitations (EPICTETUS 1961, 17).² In this approach, will is conditioned by the fact that in everyday life people prefer to be free from limitations. They do not need the falsification of determinism in the world for this, but they rely more on the logic of dialectical elimination of contradictions (TIMPE 2008).

If we are ontologically determined by the past, scientifically determined cause-effect laws (physical, chemical, biological, psychological or sociological), then in everyday life we are still able and willing to distinguish between what is controlled by us, what we are responsible for, and what is not dependent on us (FISCHER 2007).

This means that a person, despite recognising the necessary laws governing reality, has a sense of freedom in the sense that they always have more than one option for actions to choose from (“the garden of forking paths”). This is based on the belief originally formulated by Harry Frankfurt (1969): although it seems that a person does not have the ability to do something else, this lack in itself does not mean that they are not free. Common sense, as well as morality and law, tell us there is a distinction between actions that someone is forced to perform and free actions. People have more than one path available to them, and the competencies they acquire help them to cope with, on the one hand, their dependence on the past factors that constituted them, and random circumstances beyond their control, on the other hand.

² In this spirit, Epictetus stated: “Do not try to bend the course of events to your will, but bend your will to the course of events, and your life will pass in prosperity” (own translation).

Such logic can be traced in followers of transformational leaders, however charismatic or visionary the latter may be. The followers are inspired by leaders' vision, unique personality and their commitment to changing existing conditions for the better. Is this a free choice or just getting entangled with a vision that was once attractive? It seems that we are dealing with the latter scenario, because after a period of unconditionally following the leader, there comes routinisation of charisma, the leader's authority is now taken for granted, and the only option is to stay on the chosen path or to relinquish the previous vision.

Such behaviour rests on the assumption that employees are at least partly responsible for who they are and how they shape their will. If this were not the case, then nothing could be done to change (or improve) one's actions.

Following this line of reasoning, it is natural and likely to think of people as having (at least sometimes) more than one path to choose from in their lives. Therefore, choosing one of them may be rewarding, but picking another may bring a punishment. Expecting a reward or punishment is, in this approach, natural in their condition as free agents of action. They even prefer a well-deserved punishment than being placed in, as Dennett called it, "an institution for the morally incompetent" (DENNET and CARUSO 2022, 37). In their treatment of the leader as a role model, members of the organisation follow his or her vision, and this recognition and attainment of the intended change can be seen as a reward. If they choose their leader consistently, he or she will determine subsequent decisions on the way to achieving the intended goals.

4. HARD INCOMPATIBILISM

Incompatibilism, especially so-called hard incompatibilism, treats all rules in force in the world as belonging to the same type, meaning that reality is governed by deterministic laws and indeterministic sets of cases (PEREBOOM 2001, 2007). Therefore, saying that free will puts one in control of their actions is a sort of cognitive naivety. This results in scepticism towards free will, which makes a person's behaviour dependent on various causes, circumstances or cases beyond one's control. Such reasoning, formulated in modern times by Peter van Inwagen, is called the argument based on consequences (VAN INWAGEN 1983, 2017).

Incompatibilism in perceiving free will can adopt positive leadership styles. These focus on a leader's behaviour and relationships with employees

that strengthen their self-confidence and cause the development of their potential (HOCH ET AL. 2018). Although each of the four subtypes of leadership hinges on moral values, it should be noted that authentic and ethical leadership assumes management based on a leader's established moral standards. Meanwhile, servant and spiritual types of leadership stem from altruistic love and the desire to accept and help every member of an organisation. Therefore, we can assign the first two types to the deterministic world and assume that both the leader and his or her fellow employees are exempt from moral responsibility based on merit, because they are determined by set standards.

In the case of spiritual and servant leadership, different scenarios are possible depending on the relationships that the leader builds with his followers, which is why they can be accepted as characteristic of the indeterministic world. However, leaders only think they are guided by altruistic love, because they cannot be responsible for the choices of their employees, but they must accept what they jointly establish and also help the employees maintain the adopted path of development. In fact, they are guided by the idea that there is no fundamental difference between the desired effect of a choice achieved through manipulation and being under the influence of necessary cause-and-effect laws.

In this approach, leadership is tied with the rejection of moral responsibility resulting from the fact that every normal person possesses minimal moral competences based on the basic principles of merit. According to hard incompatibilists, retributivist thinking must be rejected as taking into account only past actions, not future effects, when a reward is given or a punishment imposed. However, we can furnish a number of examples where, in both legal proceedings and moral judgements, the merit system adopted leads in practice to the abuse of punishments and reprimands, so that they do not produce the expected improvement in terms of security, moral development and reconciliation. It is only acceptable to seek premises taking into account what is yet to happen to judge someone's behaviour as good or bad. When the balance and well-being of employees are respected and their individuality cherished (MULLAMAA 2024), it is difficult to be guided by the logic of rewards and punishments—they are supplanted by intuitive choices that ban harming employees and prevent the creation of permanent rules of conduct. To simplify, we can say that concern for the future and its consequences determines the criteria for the current assessment of human actions.

Some degree of dualism can be seen in ethical leadership. On the one hand, a person in power acts in line with previously formed personal ethical principles; on the other hand, an ethical leader takes care that company standards are maintained, presents them to co-workers and, by establishing justified rewarding criteria, makes sure that they are compliant (TREVINO ET AL. 2000; DANAF and BERKE 2021). Moral responsibility is associated with moral anger whenever there are cases of abuse, discrimination and oppression; it is harmful when someone is considered guilty of such a state of affairs. The key to the ethical understanding of free will in the case of incompatibilism may be to recognise the leader's ethical reflection, which allows them to overcome the established patterns and habits rooted in the uncritical acceptance of previously formed standards. Only ethical reflection combined with critical thinking can be the basis for ethical judgment (LARRES and KELLY 2023).

According to Caruso, people do not deserve praise or blame; nor do they need to be rewarded or punished in everyday situations (DENNETT and CARUSO 2022). He cites Einstein's achievements, which the genius himself considered to be due to accidental circumstances or necessary conditions—not his merit. He claims that a system devoid of rewards and punishments would be better for humans, pointing to research according to which accepting or rejecting free will is correlated with a greater or lesser tendency to inflict painful punishments. Such an approach is characteristic of spiritual and servant leadership, in which, based on altruistic love, the leader does not assume the ill will of his co-workers and takes on the role of mentor to assist them in developing their full potential and meeting their needs. This increases intrinsic motivation, thanks to which work itself becomes a reward (FRY 2003).

5. REVISIONISM

This position does not require that we reject the attractiveness of our incompatible self-concept constructs, nor does it demand that we deny the claims of the compatibilists and libertarians saying that we are free and responsible. Instead, it requires that we approach the intuitive, common-sense concept critically, disregarding those issues of our understanding of free will that are the least plausible or plainly useless. The revisionist approach assigns evidential status to common-sense, pre-philosophical intuitions or reflective judgments about what we should say about various thought experiments and phenomenological beliefs or those based on introspection (DOUBLE 1996).

At stake here is such an understanding of free will that aligns with common sense, not an explanation that clarifies or rectifies the common-sense approach. Free will, in one's reflection or action, is the ability to discover moral considerations and be directed by them. Recognising this capacity does not necessitate that indeterminism be embraced, but it draws new lines dividing human abilities that can be controlled by humans even when surrounded by a deterministic world order. There are many real options in a person's life that reveal one's free will, either weak or strong, when we are able to detect moral considerations and then guide our actions accordingly. This ability is very specific and depends on many facts about ourselves and the context that we find ourselves in, often in ways that are invisible to us.

If we consciously admit that something is an expression of free will in one context, it may turn out to be of little use in another. Thus, free will appears as a relatively fragile conscious recognition of the subjectivity of our actions. We often credit ourselves with more free will than we actually possess. What is more, we may not notice it, even if it actually constitutes our actions (VARGAS 2007). This is characteristic of relational styles in which leadership is informal or divided among group members. A leading person undertakes to coordinate group activities and make decisions when, in their judgement, they have the appropriate competences to implement a specific project.

However, a person willingly submits to others' decisions if they find that their own skills are not sufficient and require support. Such a temporary leader often implements an adaptive style, which is dictated not only by the frequently volatile needs of customers or stakeholders but also by changing global economic or demographic trends. The real challenge, then, is to create a work environment based on trust, cooperation and autonomy among the organisation's members (AMIL 2024).

In revisionism, moral responsibility hinges on its proper recognition, well-formed sensitivity and the capacity for self-direction. Just like in compatibilism (including John Fischer's semi-compatibilism), revisionism emphasises that libertarianism can do without the libertarian concept of agency. However, the question of whether common-sense thinking about moral responsibility is compatible with determinism is a different matter. It is accepted that a flawed understanding of subjective action—which requires a naturalistically credible and normatively appropriate account of moral responsibility—should be eliminated. Therefore, invoking common-sense intuitions that are inherent in the concepts and ideas of moral responsibility must take into account the balance between these pre-philosophical approaches to the problem and the typically

diverse results of the theoretical and empirical research. It is obvious, then, that we must realise how much depends on our common-sense intuitions.

This approach assumes that we always have to somehow identify this essential human capacity for praise or blame, reward or punishment, although our reconsideration of thinking of free will can change the facts about it. The concepts of free will and moral responsibility allow us to organise, track, and justify different ways of treating each other. If we can demonstrate their significance, this should be enough to prove that free will and moral responsibility do exist, even if they are somewhat different from what we thought. In the worst case, it would transpire that there is something functionally equivalent (or nearly so) to free will and moral responsibility.

Even if this is not the complete picture of free will, it would make sense to apply it to the libertarian concept of power or ability, the presence or absence of which is essential for assessing merit or fault. Perhaps we do not need to inquire into the nature of free will at all, considering the perfectly functional concepts, practices, and attitudes that refer to it. In the case of relational styles, a reward or punishment may be determined by the team's success or failure, because responsibility is shared by its members. In group action, will may also be seen not as individual but as collective will. On this view, everyone can decide to cooperate for shared goals and jointly change the system if it limits the possibility of achieving them (GENTILE 2005).

6. AUGUSTINISM

In the Christian approach, free will conceived as the human power and ability to self-direct should be viewed in the context of the universal biblical description of the expulsion from the Garden of Eden, where man wilfully (i.e. freely) embraced the wrong values. Therefore, will must not simply be free, but also good, because evil resulting from the lack of will and its frailty calls man's subjectivity into question (GOLKA 2015). The tradition of such thinking, derived from St. Augustine, to this day determines the level of the theological understanding of free will. This perspective significantly changes the seemingly compatibilist understanding of free will. What matters most is not so much people's ability to direct their own lives, but rather the loving acceptance of God's will. In this way, man strives to become one with God while retaining his ontological distinctiveness. Augustine associates the act of creating man in the image of God with the ontological theory of the analogy of

the Trinity (*vestigia trinitatis*). It confirms the soul's similarity to God in its unity and triplicity. This results not only from the biblical understanding of being created in the image of God, but is also part of our natural knowledge about God (RIST 1994).

“Augustine, seeing in man the image of God, most often enumerates the three main powers of one's mental life: memory, intelligence and will” (KOWALCZYK 2016, 29). The analogy, based on the similarity between the triunity of the human being as a soul and God's triunity, is a way to portray God from the point of view of His creation. The limit of this analogy, however, lies in the difference between human self-knowledge and God's self-awareness. God knows Himself perfectly, while we may know ourselves only imperfectly, although we can become more like God as we advance in self-knowledge. The structure of the analogy refers to an ontological relationship in the mind as a kind of common essence, perfect in God but imperfect in humanity (SPENCER 2015).

Augustine's understanding of human as a being dependent in his or her existence requires the currently forgotten distinction between using (*uti*) a thing and liking it (*frui*) for the sake of the thing or being itself. “Augustine here arrives at a concept of moral and social life based on one single principle: the virtuous man uses everything, including himself, for God's sake and desires that all beings in the universe use themselves as he does, solely for God's sake” (GILSON 1953, 223). Man is the only being that God created in his image and likeness, giving him an immortal soul and free will. A reflection on the leadership theory requires that the meaning of theological reflection be taken seriously and it is more than just leaders invoking biblical truths.

Augustine's acknowledgement of God's will puts the theological approach to free will on a par with the above-mentioned approaches to free will—as the ability and power of self-made man according to libertarianism and partly in compatibilism, as a semblance in a world that relies on necessary laws, historical circumstances or, according to incompatibilists, blind fate—or, in revisionist terms, as the need to appeal to unanimous acceptance of universal values. On this view, defending free will is an attempt to solve the problem of evil, which also depends on human choices. Despite such consequences, without free will, according to Augustine, there would be neither moral good nor evil in creation. There would be no true responsibility or guilt, and creatures could not choose to love God by their free will. Love is a greater good when given freely (KANE 2005). It is man who, by virtue of original sin, is unable to remain completely focused on the Good that is in love with God. Self-loving

man can turn away from God and be interested only in his own good, in contrast to what the Good really is. Augustine calls this inappropriate attachment of man to himself and his own good pride (*superbia*) (FREDE 2011).

The theological understanding of free will in the logic of the analogy to the Holy Trinity is a synthesising understanding of leadership. Here, the leader chooses actions with the common good in mind, not personal interests, so we can consider his authority as morally justified (GREENLEAF 2002). The goals of the organisation combine society's development in unity with God, and this accords to man—who was created in His image—special significance. Therefore, people's well-being should be the objective of all social processes taking place in a lasting relationship, first with God, then with other people, and also with the natural environment.

In the same way, the leader, when setting organisational goals, should take the value of relationships seriously (PEIRONG 2019). Without God's guidance, human reason is too weak to undertake the tasks of directing the activities of given institutions. A leader, when guided by his or her theological outlook, perceives their leadership as a call from God. Therefore, they pursue a goal of supporting their colleagues in their own integral development, building relationships with clients or the local community according to the received principles (Pontifical Council of Justice and Peace, no. 67).

Although a leader can adopt, in principle, any of the above-mentioned leadership styles, the style closest to Augustinism will be servant leadership, followed prototypically by Jesus Christ.³ His teaching offers guidance for future Church leaders. Jesus' attitude not only won the hearts of his disciples, but also built a culture of service among his followers (HENSON and HEMBY 2023). However, even He, being an integral part of the Holy Trinity, subordinated His mission to the will of God, saying: "I came from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him who sent me" (J 6:38).

The basis of servant leadership is the will to serve, which is the foundation of a good society ("the rock upon which a good society is built"; GREENLEAF 2002, 62). Therefore, it is important to note to what extent free will is the real ability to direct his own behaviour. A servant leader, making conscious decisions based on ethical principles and moral values, assesses the consequences of the actions undertaken and is held accountable for moral irresponsibility (SOUSA and VAN DIERENDONCK 2017).

³ This is evidenced by Jesus' statements about authority (Mt 25–28) and the ritual of washing the apostles' feet before the Last Supper (J 13:17).

The matter becomes even more complicated when we analyse choice-making and decision-making in an institution. The leader sets the cultural tone of the organisation, providing a context for other members to connect them with a deeper sense of meaning and thus influence the overall goal (IRVING 2018). Keeping or changing a specific institutional order is not determined by the game of selfish interests, but by the real influence of people who have the ability to make choices. They recognise that all authority comes from God and therefore earthly leadership gains justification only through submission to God's will. It is merely the repayment of a loan that every person takes from God when starting their earthly life (BLANCHARD 2007).

This submission, or godliness, can be based either on fear or love (BOCHEŃSKI 1992; JABŁOŃSKI 2002). Fear of God, who punishes evil and rewards good, was mirrored in Christianity by love—therefore, man fulfils God's will in order to avoid offending the highest object of love. Such a relationship, called *paternalism*, was rejected to emphasise man's attainment of maturity (*Enlightenment reason*), which excludes dependencies characteristic of childhood in human development. This is a state that Delsol (2018) describes as depriving the subject of the cover of transcendence.

The theological understanding of freedom of will takes into account the assumptions that guide servant leadership. Here, the leader not only becomes part of a team, a group, but builds relationships with his co-workers based on mutual respect and love. His or her power, resulting from free will, is a kind of ability for self-control, self-shaping, using the laws of nature or chance, or finally creating conventional points of reference. Therefore, the leader treats colleagues as partners in the pursuit of a common goal and helps them achieve their full potential, allowing for both individual and collective growth (AKELLA and EID 2020).

Losing faith in power that transcends the temporal dimension ends, however, with the fact that the system of the fullest possible openness and transparency—causing the integration of all prohibitions and orders in human minds—is subject to the action of irrational forces. Therefore, servant leadership, based on transcendent values, allows the leader to play a stabilising role, indicating direction and giving meaning to the activities of the community following the principles of moral responsibility (MAREK and JABŁOŃSKI 2021).

What do employees gain from this take on leadership? First of all, they are dealing with a leader who wants their good and not only material benefits. Second, every employee has the opportunity to have their rights respected and participate in management not only as a submissive colleague, but as an equal

partner. In addition, having a mentor who does not simply seek his or her own good but serves with their experience and helps choose a path of development, the employee (follower) is guided by free will to accept or reject the path shown and is certain that their choice will be accepted. Instead of punishments and rewards, we deal here with mentoring and constructive criticism aimed at the good and development of employees and jointly seeking solutions to maintain a balance between their goals and the company's goals.

By accepting the theological understanding of free will as a gift from God, a leader assumes that authority and care for all co-workers have been entrusted to him or her as a unique talent, for the exercise of which they will have an account before God. Therefore, leadership is an element of the path to achieving happiness not only in one's worldly life, but also after death. Moreover, he knows that his reward does not depend on any human being, but was promised to him by God, who guarantees it.

CONCLUSIONS

The comparison of different ways of understanding free will (Table 1) made it possible to determine the levels and logical framework of showing the sense of the dominant leadership style, role performance (taking responsibility) and relationships with others (reward and punishment).

We have shown that the logic of the libertarian understanding of free will best suits classical transactional leadership presented in the logic of inductive reasoning in utilitarian terms. Compatibilism based on the logic of dialectical elimination of ontological contradictions in the understanding of free will best suits transformational leadership focused on change and future effects. Understanding free will in the spirit of incompatibilism and reducing it to facts in both the deterministic and indeterministic world points to positive leadership styles of mutual support that eliminate moral responsibility. For the revisionist understanding of free will in the abductive pursuit of the best explanation, the most appropriate seem to be relational styles assuming the division of power between the leader and co-workers, and even the lack of a formal leader in the network structures of contemporary organisations.

Table 1. The concept of free will and types of leadership

Concept of free will / Understanding leadership	Libertarianism	Compatibilism	Hard incompatibilism	Revisionism	Augustinism
Levels and logical frameworks of description	Ethical approach within the framework of inductive generalisation in the indeterministic order	Ontological approach within dialectical resolution of contradictions in a deterministic order	Scientific approach within the framework of reductive discovery of necessary laws or chance	Epistemological approaches to abductive justification of the best explanation	Theological approach within the framework of analogical reference to the order of divine providence
Dominant role style	Transactional: full moral responsibility due to merit	Transformational: limited moral responsibility due to merit	Positive: lack of moral responsibility due to merit	Relational: moral responsibility by a recognized convention of merit	Synthetic: full moral responsibility due to transcendent references
Relationships with others	Retributive system of rewards and punishments	A system of rewards and punishments oriented towards the future	Prevention without a system of rewards and punishments	Conventional and common-sense rewards and punishments	System of rewards and punishments in the supernatural order

We have compared the range of these positions, which are connected by the necessity of subordinating more or less voluntarily accepted principles established by the organisation or leader, with the theological understanding of free will in its analogous relation to the divine order. In this way, we have gained a perspective of understanding leadership as stemming not only from the principles of this world, but also from respecting the divine order. Such a leader sees the challenges and opportunities to achieve the goals of the organisation but evaluates them in the light of spiritual values, making them the foundation of his decisions and relationships (VAN DIERENDONCK 2011). Guided by love, the leader adopts a servant attitude to God as the one to whom he owes everything, as well as to people who strive for salvation through work, just like he does (Pontifical Council of Justice and Peace, no. 87). Therefore, the ultimate goal of such a leader is not to be the master of the universe and accumulate wealth, but to properly use talents to achieve eternal happiness.

The theological perspective somehow improves each type of leadership presented in all concepts of free will. Recognising the primacy of the divine order gives the logic of utilitarian transactional leadership a dimension that introduces into negotiations based on material rewards and punishments an element of appreciating the human being as capable of sanctifying and improving themselves and the world around them through their work, without constant control, as Theory X assumes. Theological recognition of the superiority of God's will allows us to assign to transformational leadership a meaning consistent with the indications of the Revealed Word, action based on mutual respect, love and striving for the common good of humanity and transforming the world for the better.

In positive styles, both deterministic order and coincidence have their source in God, which allows us to treat co-workers as the goal of the leader's actions, and not only a means to achieve material goals. In the case of relational leadership styles, when searching for God's will, man gains another aspect of discernment in the sense that he is an autonomous person and that his choices are determined. Leadership styles that incorporate the assumption that all authority comes from God and that it is through His will that the human being receives specific talents make it possible to reconcile the autonomy of action with the Divine reasons serving his self-determination in the service of the Good.

REFERENCES

- ABSON, Emma, Peter SCHOFIELD, and James KENNEL. 2024. "Making Shared Leadership Work: The Importance of Trust in Project-Based Organisations." *International Journal of Project Management* 42 (2): 102575. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2024.102575>.
- AKELLA, Devi, and Niveen EID. 2020. "Social Entrepreneurs as Servant Leaders: Revealing the Implied Nature of Power in Servant Leadership." In *Leadership Styles, Innovation, and Social Entrepreneurship in the Era of Digitalisation*, edited by Caglar Dogru, 73–100. Hershey, PA: IGI Global, Business Science Reference.
- AMIL, Alinor C. 2024. "Leadership Decision-Making in VUCA Bureaucracy: Global Turbulence, Influence, Challenges, and Strategies." *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research & Reviews* 3 (3): 109–27. <https://doi.org/10.56815/IJMRR.V3I3.2024/109-127>.
- APPIAH-SEKYERE, Paul. 2013. "Determinism, Free Will, and Moral Responsibility." *Philosophy Study* 3 (11): 1032–41. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5313/2013.11.006>.
- ARENDT, Hannah. 1996. *Wola*. Translated by Robert Piłat. Warszawa: Czytelnik.
- AUGUSTINE. 2010. *On the Free Choice of the Will, On Grace and Free Choice, and Other Writings*. Edited and translated by Peter King, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- EVERY, Gayle C. 2004. *Understanding Leadership*. London: Sage.

- AVOLIO, Bruce J., Bernard M. BASS, and Dong I. JUNG. 1999. "Re-examining the Components of Transformational and Transactional Leadership Using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire." *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology* 72 (4): 441–62. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317999166789>.
- BENEDICT XVI. 2007. Encyclical Letter *Spe salvi*, 30 November 2007. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- BENEDICT XVI. 2009. Encyclical Letter *Caritas in veritate*, 20 June 2009. Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.
- BLAKE, Robert R., and Jane S. MOUTON. 1964. *The Managerial Grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.
- BLANCH, Javier, Francisco GIL, Mirko ANTINO, and Alfredo RODRÍGUEZ-MUÑOZ. 2016. "Positive Leadership Models: Theoretical Framework and Research." *Papeles del Psicólogo* 37 (3): 170–76. <https://doi.org/10.23923/pap.psic2016.2772>.
- BLANCHARD, Ken. 2007. *Przywództwo wyższego stopnia*. Translated by Adam Bekier. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- BOCHEŃSKI, Józef M. 1992. *Podręcznik mądrości tego świata*. Kraków: Philed.
- BOLDEN, Richard. 2011. "Distributed Leadership in Organisations: A Review of Theory and Research." *International Journal of Management Reviews* 13 (3): 251–69. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00306.x>
- BROWN, Michael E., Linda K. TREVIÑO, and David A. HARRISON. 2005. "Ethical Leadership: A Social Learning Perspective for Construct Development and Testing." *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes* 97 (2): 117–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002>.
- BUGAJ, Justyna, and Alla SULYMA. 2022. "Problems in Defining Leadership—A Systematic Literature Review." *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie / Krakow Review of Economics and Management*, no. 2, 99–117. <https://doi.org/10.15678/ZNUEK.2022.0996.0206>.
- CALLENDER, John S. 2010. *Free Will and Responsibility: A Guide for Practitioners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CARTE, Traci A., Laku CHIDAMBARAM, and Aaron BECKER. 2006. "Emergent Leadership in Self-Managed Virtual Teams: A Longitudinal Study of Concentrated and Shared Leadership Behaviours." *Group Decision and Negotiation* 15:323–43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10726-006-9045-7>.
- CRAWFORD, Megan. 2012. "Solo and Distributed Leadership: Definitions and Dilemmas." *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 40 (5): 610–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143212451175>.
- DANAF, Ramona A., and Szilárd BERKE. 2021. "Social Responsibility and Sustainable Leadership: A Case Study Based in Lebanese Private Universities." *International Business Management* 15 (4): 147–65. <https://doi.org/10.36478/ibm.2021.124.137>.
- DELSOL, Chantal. 2018. *Kamienie węgielne. Na czym nam zależy*. Kraków: Znak.
- DENNETT, Daniel C., and Greg D. CARUSO. 2022. *Wolna wola. Czy jesteśmy odpowiedzialni za nasze czyny?* Translated by Łukasz Kurek. Kraków: Copernicus Center Press.
- DION, Michael. 2012. "Are Ethical Theories Relevant for Ethical Leadership?" *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal* 33 (1): 4–24. <http://doi.org/10.1108/01437731211193098>.

- DONG, Bo. 2023. "A Systematic Review of the Transactional Leadership Literature and Future Outlook." *Academic Journal of Management and Social Sciences* 2 (3): 21–25. <https://doi.org/10.54097/ajmss.v2i3.7972>.
- DONGXIAN, Liao, and Hira BATOOL. 2024. "Influence of Distributed Leadership on Employee Innovative Behaviour: The Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment." *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship* 13 (1): 82. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-024-00448-7>.
- DOUBLE, Richard. 1994. *Metaphilosophy and Free Will*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- EPICTETUS. 1961. *Diatryby. Encheiridion*. Translated by Leon Joachimowicz. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- FISCHER, John Martin, Robert KANE, Derk PEREBOOM, and Manuel VARGAS. 2007. *Four Views on Free Will*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- FISCHER, John Martin. 2007. "Compatibilism." In FISCHER ET AL. 2007, 44–84.
- FRANKFURT, Harry. 1969. "Alternate Possibilities and Moral Responsibility." *The Journal of Philosophy* 66:829–39. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2023833>.
- FREDE, Michael. 2001. *A Free Will: Origins of the Notion in Ancient Thought*. Edited by A. A. Long. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- FRY, Louis W. 2003. "Toward a Theory of Spiritual Leadership." *The Leadership Quarterly* 14 (6): 693–727. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.001>.
- GENTILE, Mary C. 2005. "Is There Free Will in Business? Leadership and Social Impact Management." In *Handbook on Responsible Leadership and Governance in Global Business*, edited by Jonathan P. Doh and Stephen A. Stumpf, 221–42. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar Publishing.
- GILSON, Étienne. 1953. *Wprowadzenie do nauki św. Augustyna*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX.
- GOLKA, Marian. 2015. "Wolna wola czy złudzenie?" In *Nauki humanistyczne i społeczne wobec problemów współczesnego świata*, edited by Zbigniew Drozdowicz, Roman Kubicki, Jacek Sójka, Jerzy M. Brzeziński, and Rafał Drozdowski, 507–27. Wydawnictwo Naukowe WNS UAM.
- GREENLEAF, Robert K. 2002. *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- HANNA, Andrew A., Troy A. SMITH, Bradley L. KIRKMAN, and Ricky W. GRIFFIN. 2021. "The Emergence of Emergent Leadership: A Comprehensive Framework and Directions for Future Research." *Journal of Management* 47 (1): 76–104. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316665461>.
- HENSON, Joshua, and Samuel HEMBY. 2023. "Authentic Credible Leadership: An Examination of Jesus's Leadership in the Farewell Discourses." *Scandinavian Journal for Leadership and Theology* 10:513–32. <https://doi.org/10.53311/sjlt.v10.96>.
- HOCH, Julia E., William H. BOMMER, James H. DULEBOHN, and Dongyuan WU. 2018. "Do Ethical, Authentic, and Servant Leadership Explain Variance above and Beyond Transformational Leadership? A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Management* 44 (2): 501–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316665461>.
- IRVING, Justin A. 2018. "Leader Purposefulness and Servant Leadership." In *Practicing Servant Leadership: Developments in Implementation*, edited by Dirk van Dierendonck and Kathleen Patterson, 25–42. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

- JABŁOŃSKI, Arkadiusz. 2002. "Etyka biznesu a mądrość, bogobożność i autorytet." In *Status teoretyczny i funkcja techniczna wiedzy o społeczeństwie. Wokół myśli Karla R. Poppera i Józefa M. Bocheńskiego*, 217–36. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- JIN, Yingxian. 2023. "The Conflict of Free Will and Moral Responsibility." *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences* 8:1139–45. <https://doi.org/10.54097/ehss.v8i.4440>.
- KANE, Robert. 2005. *A Contemporary Introduction to Free Will*. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- KANE, Robert. 2007. "Libertarianism." In FISCHER ET AL. 2007, 5–43.
- KOSZKAŁO, Martyna. 2006. "Koncepcja woli według Św. Augustyna – perspektywa antropologiczna." *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 64 (3): 5–37.
- KOWALCZYK, Stanisław. 2016. *Idea duszy – w refleksji filozoficznej*. Wydawnictwo KUL.
- LADKIN, Donna. 2010. *Rethinking Leadership: A New Look at Old Leadership Questions*. Cheltenham–Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- LAKOMSKI, Gabriele. 2016. "Why Leaders Are Not Always to Blame: From 'Free Will' to Responsible Action." *The Dark Side of Leadership: Identifying and Overcoming Unethical Practice in Organisations*, edited by Anthony H. Normore and Jeffrey S. Brooks, 253–67. Leeds: Emerald Group Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-36602016000026014>.
- LARRES, Patricia, and Martin KELLY. 2023. "A Framework for Authentic Ethical Decision Making in the Face of Grand Challenges: A Lonerganian Gradation." *Journal of Business Ethics* 182 (2): 521–33. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04974-2>.
- LAWTER, Leanna, Richard E. KOPELMAN, and David J. PROTTAS. 2015. "McGregor's Theory X/Y and Job Performance: A Multilevel, Multi-Source Analysis." *Journal of Managerial Issues* 27 (1–4): 84–101.
- LEACH, Stephen. 2022. "Free Will: An Impossible Reality or An Incoherent Concept?" *Human Affairs* 32 (4): 413–19. <https://doi.org/10.1515/humaff-2022-0035>.
- LE BLANC, Pascale M., Vicente GONZÁLEZ-ROMÁ, and Haijiang WANG. 2021. "Charismatic Leadership and Work Team Innovative Behaviour: The Role of Team Task Interdependence and Team Potency." *Journal of Business and Psychology* 36 (2): 333–46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-019-09663-6>.
- MALIK, Muhammad Abid, and Sameen AZMAT. 2019. "Leader and Leadership: Historical Development of the Terms and Critical Review of Literature." *Annals of the University of Craiova for Journalism, Communication and Management* 5 (1): 16–32.
- MAREK, Agnieszka, and Arkadiusz JABŁOŃSKI. 2021. "Care of the Common Good as a Responsibility of Business Leaders. Catholic Social Teaching Perspective." *Religions* 12 (2): 125. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel12020125>.
- MCGHEE, Peter. 2023. "The Management Practice of Servant Leadership: A Levinasian Enrichment." *Philosophy of Management* 22 (3): 321–46. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40926-022-00214-3>.
- MIRSAFIAN, Arvand. 2023. "Taylorism, Worker Resistance, and Industrial Relations in Sweden." *International Review of Social History* 68 (3): 429–51. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002085902300041X>.
- MULLAMAA, Kristina. 2024. "Empathetic Leadership and Cultural Consciousness in Leading: Lessons from Iceland, Sweden, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland." *European Journal of Business and Management Research* 9 (6): 7–14. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2024.9.6.2460>.

- NASSIF, Afif G., Rick D. HACKETT, and Gordon WANG. 2021. "Ethical, Virtuous, and Charismatic Leadership: An Examination of Differential Relationships with Follower and Leader Outcomes." *Journal of Business Ethics* 172 (3): 581–603. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04491-8>.
- NAWAZ, Allah, Zakeer A. KHAN, and Irfan Ullah KHAN. 2016. "Leadership Theories and Styles: A Literature Review." *Journal of Resources Development and Management* 16 (1): 1–7.
- NAYYAR, Saroj, Lubhawani TRIPATHI, Harsha SHARMA, Gulsan Kumar BEHERA, Asha SAHU, and Jayati SAHU. 2024. "Spiritual Leadership in Modern Organisation: A Study Based On Bibliometric Analysis." *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice* 30 (5): 4741–49. <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i5.2980>.
- PEARCE, Craig L., Charles C. MANZ, and Henry P. SIMS. 2009. "Is Shared Leadership the Key to Team Success?" *Organisational Dynamics* 38 (3): 234–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2009.04.008>.
- PEIRONG, Lin. 2019. "Christianity and Servant Leadership." In *Servant Leadership, Social Entrepreneurship and the Will to Serve: Spiritual Foundations and Business Applications*, edited by Luk Bouckaert and Steven C. van den Heuvel, 12–39. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- PEREBOOM, Derk. 2007. "Hard Incompatibilism." In FISCHER ET AL. 2007, 123–24.
- PEREBOOM, Derk. 2001. *Living Without Free Will*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- PONTIFICAL COUNCIL OF JUSTICE AND PEACE. 2012. *Vocation of the Business Leader: A Reflection*. Città del Vaticano: Dicastery for Promoting Integral Human Development.
- RIST, John M. 1994. *Augustine: Ancient Thought Baptised*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SEARLE, John R. 2007. *Freedom and Neurobiology. Reflections on Free Will, Language, and Political Power*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- SILVA, Alberto. 2016. "What Is Leadership?" *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly* 8 (1): 1–5.
- SOUSA, Milton, and Dirk VAN DIERENDONCK. 2017. "Servant Leadership and the Effect of the Interaction Between Humility, Action, and Hierarchical Power on Follower Engagement." *Journal of Business Ethics* 141 (1): 13–25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2725-y>.
- SPENCER, Archie J. 2015. *The Analogy of Faith: The Quest for God's Speakability*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- TAYLOR, Collette M., Casey J. CORNELIUS, and Kate COLVIN. 2014. "Visionary Leadership and Its Relationship to Organisational Effectiveness." *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal* 35 (6): 566–83. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-10-2012-0130>.
- THOROUGHGOOD, Christian N., Katina B. SAWYER, Art PADILLA, and Laura LUNSFORD. 2018. "Destructive Leadership: A Critique of Leader-Centric Perspectives and toward a More Holistic Definition." *Journal of Business Ethics* 151 (3): 627–49. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3253-4>.
- TIMPE, Kevin. 2008. *Free Will: Sourcehood and its Alternatives*. London–New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- TREVIÑO, Linda Klebe, Laura PINCUS HARTMAN, and Michael BROWN. 2000. "Moral Person and Moral Manager: How Executives Develop a Reputation for Ethical Leadership." *California Management Review* 42 (4): 128–42. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41166057>.

- VAN DIERENDONCK, Dirk. 2011. "Servant Leadership: A Review and Synthesis." *Journal of Management* 37 (4): 1228–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310380462>.
- VAN INWAGEN, Peter. 1983. *An Essay on Free Will*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- VAN INWAGEN, Peter. 2017. *Thinking about Free Will*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316711101>.
- VAN VUGT, Mark. 2006. "Evolutionary Origins of Leadership and Followership." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 10 (4): 354–71. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1004_5.
- VARGAS, Manuel. 2007. "Revisionism." In FISCHER ET AL. 2007, 126–65.
- VEDULA, Sai Bhargavi, and Rakesh Kumar AGRAWAL. 2024. "Mapping Spiritual Leadership: A Bibliometric Analysis and Synthesis of Past Milestones and Future Research Agenda." *Journal of Business Ethics* 189 (2): 301–28. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-023-05342-8>.
- WALUMBWA, Fred O., Bruce J. AVOLIO, William L. GARDNER, Tara S. WERNING, and Suzanne J. PETERSON. 2008. "Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Measure." *Journal of Management* 34 (1): 89–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307308913>.
- WINSTON, Bruce E. 2004. "Servant Leadership at Heritage Bible College: A Single-Case Study." *Leadership & Organisation Development Journal* 25 (7): 600–617. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730410561440>.
- YUKL, Gary. 1999. "An Evaluative Essay on Current Conceptions of Effective Leadership." *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology* 8 (1): 33–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/135943299398429>.

THE CONTEMPORARY UNDERSTANDING OF FREE WILL AND TYPES OF LEADERSHIP

SUMMARY

Our article addresses the question of possible connections between contemporary concepts of free will and the understanding of different leadership styles. For this purpose, we will conduct a phenomenological and conceptual analysis. We will start by presenting the ways of understanding free will and the typology of leadership contained in the literature. Then, the perspectives circumscribed by individual concepts of free will be assigned dominant leadership styles in terms of three aspects: choice, moral responsibility and basic merit. Libertarianism is linked to transactional leadership, compatibilism to transformational leadership, hard incompatibilism corresponds to positive leadership styles, and revisionism is associated with the relational styles of leadership. In light of our analyses, we recognise the theological perspective (derived from the thought of St. Augustine) of the understanding of free will as enabling the fullest understanding of leadership. From this perspective, a leader's ultimate goal is not to be a master of themselves, dominate the environment and accumulate wealth, but to properly use talents and inspire the followers to transcend the earthly order to achieve eternal happiness.

Keywords: free will; leadership styles; Augustinism; theological perspective

WSPÓŁCZESNE ROZUMIENIE WOLNEJ WOLI A STYLE PRZYWÓDZTWA

STRESZCZENIE

Artykuł podejmuje problem możliwych powiązań między współczesnymi koncepcjami wolnej woli a rozumieniem różnych stylów przywództwa. W tym celu wykorzystane zostaną metody analizy fenomenologicznej i konceptualnej. Najpierw zostaną przedstawione sposoby rozumienia wolnej woli oraz typologie przywództwa zawarte w literaturze. Następnie, w ramach perspektyw określonych przez poszczególne koncepcje wolnej woli, zostaną im przypisane dominujące style przywództwa w kluczu obejmującym trzy aspekty: kwestię wyboru, kwestię ponoszenia odpowiedzialności moralnej oraz kwestię podstawowych zasług. Libertarianizm zostanie powiązany z przywództwem transakcyjnym, kompatybilizm z przywództwem transformacyjnym, natomiast z twardego inkompetybilizmem korespondować będą pozytywne style przywództwa, zaś z rewizjonizmem – relacyjne style przywództwa. Głównym wnioskiem wypływającym z przeprowadzonych analiz będzie uznanie teologicznej perspektywy (wywodzącej się z myśli św. Augustyna) rozumienia wolnej woli jako zapewniającej możliwość najpełniejszego zrozumienia przywództwa. W tym podejściu ostatecznym celem przywódcy nie jest bycie panem samego siebie, dominowanie nad otoczeniem i gromadzenie bogactwa, ale właściwe wykorzystanie talentów i inspirowanie podwładnych do wykraczania poza ziemski porządek w celu osiągnięcia szczęścia wiecznego.

Słowa kluczowe: wolna wola; style przywództwa; Augustynizm; perspektywa teologiczna