

Leadership in Multinational Missions:

Findings from EUFOR in Bosnia and Herzegovina Revisited

By Gregor Richter

The question as to what is the appropriate leadership style in military organizations, whether in their “cold” or “hot” conditions, has always been a major topic in military psychology and sociology. Yet assertions such as “(...) *it is unlikely that a meaningful integrated theory of leadership effectiveness can be developed in a foreseeable future*” (Halpin, 2011, p.486) seem to hold true for both military and general leadership theory. Studies in military history often stress the cardinal influence of military leaders on the success of military missions – see historical figures like Alexander, Hannibal, and Caesar (Strauss, 2012) – or, while reinterpreting the historical facts and sources, emphasize that the choice of the appropriate leadership style in a given context and its special circumstances was crucial for mission accomplishment – as Keith Grint (2008) did in his analysis of the 1944 allied landing in Normandy : “(...) *what counts as legitimate authority depends upon a persuasive rendition of the context and a persuasive display of the appropriate authority style*” (Grint, 2008, p.15). That author differentiates “*critical, tame, and wicked*” situations demanding different forms of authority – respectively, command, management, and leadership. The most central task of military leaders is to identify the nature of the situation and pick the most adequate type of authority in it. In this view, leadership is not merely a matter of personal style, but a skill – that of how to respond appropriately to different situational requirements.

Ideas and modes of leadership are changing in military contexts in reaction to processes of transformation, new mission types, and technological and cultural change (Olivetta, 2017). Over and beyond the debate on the changing roles of leaders, there always has been a direction of research that challenges the importance of leaders and of leader-follower relations. Kerr and Jermier (1978), for instance, relativize the hierarchical superiors’ ability to exert either positive or negative influence over subordinate attitudes and organizational effectiveness. There exist several substitutes for leadership to solve problems of cooperation and coordination in organizations, like budgets, plans, balanced score-cards, manuals, etc. Leadership research may be characterized by an oscillation between strong leadership influence highlighting the “*genius of leadership*” (Strauss, 2012) on the one hand, and leadership as a mode of coordination of organizational behaviour on the other. It is contingent, and substitutes can be found for it (Kerr & Jermier, 1978), which may be why it has lost and still is losing importance: “*Leadership has a long history and a clear trajectory. More than anything else it is about the devolution of power – from those up to those down below*” (Kellerman, 2012, p.3).

In what follows, the influence of leadership style on followers' attitudes toward the organization is investigated with a focus on affective organizational commitment (AC), commonly regarded of great importance in the military. After a short introduction on the concept of leadership style in general, the results of research on a special type of organization : multinational military headquarters, are presented. Secondary analysis of survey data from four national contingents in the EU's 2006 Mission "ALTHEA" in Bosnia and Herzegovina¹ follows, before its bi- and multivariate results and the study's limits are finally discussed.

Leadership Style: What Is It?

Leadership style can be understood as a permanent pattern of behaviour deriving from certain ethical standards or personality traits. The distinction between an employee-driven leadership style (consideration) and a task-driven style (initiating structure) pointed the way ahead for further research. While these two leadership styles were initially regarded as opposite poles on a continuum (that is to say, an increase in the focus on tasks would necessarily come at the expense of the focus on employees, and vice versa), the idea that leaders can resort to both types largely independently of each other later took hold. This concept of two- and multi-dimensional leadership styles is found, for instance, in the well-known 'Managerial Grid' developed in the 1960s by Blake & Mouton (1964). It calls upon superiors to maintain a leadership style that largely cares for the concerns of the led while showing no less concern for the goals (interests of the company, productivity, sales, etc.). Technically, the original one-dimensional continuum turns into an orthogonal construct with separate variables.

However, one-dimensional leadership style concepts have prevailed to the present in another research vein which considers the degree of participation in decision-making processes in terms of a continuum from directive to participative leadership styles (Bass & Stogdill, 1990, pp.436-471). There is controversy over whether employees should be involved in the decision-making of a superior and, if so, to what extent. There is also controversy over the question of whether leadership style depends or should depend more on the leader's personality traits, individual dispositions and values, or rather on situational factors like the consequences for the led of the decisions made and the level of information of the superior. The model developed by Vroom & Yetton (1973) considers a large number of situational variables and produces a sophisticated decision tree that identifies which leadership style along the continuum should be applied under what conditions in order to achieve decisions that are not only socially acceptable, but also effective or efficient from the point of view of the organization. Although such "*decision logic in decision-making*" would probably not be very feasible in leadership practice, particularly in military settings, it clearly indicates that no simple answer can be given to the issue of the comparative advantages of leadership styles without consideration being given to the overall conditions.

¹ Cf. Leonhard *et al.*, 2008. I am grateful to Nina Leonhard and Heiko Biehl (Bundeswehr Centre for Military History and Social Sciences) for allowing me to use data from their earlier research in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

It has proved useful for empirical studies of leadership styles to break up the continuum into a discrete typology of four leadership styles: the authoritarian, paternalistic, participative, and democratic styles.² A leader who makes decisions quickly, communicates them to his subordinates clearly and without further ado and expects the instructions to be carried out loyally and without criticism is said to have an authoritarian leadership style. One who usually makes decisions alone, but tries to explain the rationale behind them and answers questions asked by subordinates is said to be paternalistic. Participation in decision-making begins when subordinates are consulted and pros and cons are weighed up jointly before the leader makes the final decision. The democratic leadership style fundamentally requires a discussion to be held with the team in which arguments are put forward and the majority opinion is binding for the making of the decision. In the democratic leadership style, the superior plays the role of a facilitator.

It is important to point out that the fundamental assumption in research on leadership is that leaders cultivate a certain (individual) leadership style which the led perceive as a more or less distinct and consistent mode of behaviour. That is to say, the led can attribute to their leader a certain modal leadership style, which always needs to be adjusted to specific situations that involve interaction. The results obtained by researchers who have looked into the question of which style subordinates prefer vary and situational factors play quite a significant role. In his overview of research on the leadership style continuum, the doyen of leadership studies, Bernard M. Bass, has this to say: “*Generally, participative leadership will be favoured over directive leadership*”.³

Research on Leadership Style in Multinational Headquarters

The former Bundeswehr Institute of Social Sciences (SOWI) and cooperating research institutions have conducted several studies on vertical integration in headquarters of NATO and EU missions in the 2000s. In addition to a wide range of questions on enhanced military cooperation among the participating nations from the military and defence policy angle as well as from the point of view of organizational culture, the researchers were interested in the topic of leadership. The leadership style continuum and the abovementioned four-part typology were used in a questionnaire study on the Multinational Headquarters South-East (MNHQ/SE), the headquarters of the ALTHEA mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina,⁴ as well as in a study on the Headquarters of the 1st German/Netherlands Corps (HQ1 [GE/NL] Corps) in Germany.⁵

Special attention is drawn to the following empirical findings on the *antecedents* of leadership styles:

² Santero & Navarro, 2006 ; Richter, 2018.

³ Bass & Stogdill, 1990, pp.441-442.

⁴ Santero & Navarro, 2006.

⁵ Hagen, Moelker & Soeters, 2006.

- a. A majority of personnel (57 percent) at HQ 1 (GE/NL) Corps preferred the participative leadership style,⁶ while it was favoured by 42% at MNHQ/SE.⁷
- b. The preference patterns for leadership styles differ across nations : national cultures are apparently reflected in their leadership culture. For instance, 53 percent of the German personnel at MNHQ/SE preferred the participative leadership style, while only 45 percent of the French did so.⁸
- c. The preferred leadership style is dependent on military hierarchy : the higher the rank, the greater the preference for the participative and democratic leadership styles. At MNHQ/SE, for instance, 71 percent of the senior officers preferred the participative style, but only 50 percent of the non-commissioned officers.⁹
- d. The leadership style that soldiers see practised by their direct superior does not necessarily correspond with the leadership style they would prefer. At HQ 1 (GE/NL) Corps, 62 percent of the Dutch personnel favoured the participative style, whereas only 39 percent saw their immediate superiors practicing it.¹⁰ For quite a few interviewees, there was a gap between what they preferred to see and what they actually experienced.

In a recent study of NATO's military headquarters (SHAPE),¹¹ some of the previous findings could be replicated (Richter, 2018) : a 70 percent majority there preferred the participative leadership style – i.e., even more than in the two HQs mentioned above. The leadership style actually encountered does not necessarily correspond with the preferred style: this is the case for 47 percent of staff members. Among this group the vast majority expressed preference for more participation in decision-making processes.

The SHAPE study expanded the research by investigating *consequences* of leadership styles. Astonishingly, no significant statistical effect was found between leadership styles and variables like mission clarity and affective organizational commitment (AC). Whether or not staff members encounter a leadership style in line with their preferences does not have an effect on their attitudes towards the organization they are serving in. This result may be traced back to the special type of organization investigated : SHAPE is a highly political and strategic HQ with a lot of bureaucratic routine activities and paper work (“cold” organization), whereas HQs like MNHQ/SE deal with operational activities and are closer to the field (“hot” organization). Can it be the case that leadership styles may not be very important in the one type of HQ but are in the other ? Secondary analysis of the data collected during the ALTHEA mission makes it possible to answer such a question.

Hypotheses

For the purpose of examining whether leadership styles have an effect on affective commitment, a distinction will be made here between cases where encountered and desired

⁶ Hagen, Moelker & Soeters, 2006, p.76.

⁷ Santero & Navarro, 2006, p.165.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p.168.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p.167.

¹⁰ Hagen, Moelker & Soeters, 2006, p.76.

¹¹ Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe, Mons, Belgium.

leadership styles coincide and cases where they do not. These ‘coherent’ and ‘incoherent’ cases form a binary independent variable whose influence on the chosen organizational parameter can then be probed.

The concept of organizational commitment has often found an echo in military psychology and military sociology. Recourse is often taken to the Three Component Model (TCM) of Allen and Meyer (1990), according to which a distinction can be made between *affective* commitment (AC), i.e. a member’s emotional attachment and identification with the organization, *continuance* commitment (CC) based on the awareness of the costs of leaving the organization, and *normative* commitment (NC), i.e. a sense of obligation towards the organization:

Employees with strong affective commitment remain because they *want* to, those with strong continuance commitment because they *need* to, and those with strong normative commitment because they feel they *ought* to do so (Allen & Meyer, 1990, p.3 ; emphasis in the original).

It can plausibly be assumed that active involvement in decision-making and the satisfaction of a psychological need for coherence between wishes and actual experience regarding the leadership behaviour of superiors also manifest themselves in a positive attitude and the attachment associated with AC. But what about the other two types of commitment? Unfortunately, CC and NC could not be examined here because they had not been considered in the ALTHEA study.

In addition to leadership style (in)coherence and socio-demographic variables, the variables considered in the analysis below include (a) preparation and training ahead of deployment, (b) job satisfaction during deployment, and (c) career prospects. The varying preparation and training programmes make it possible to measure how well staff members feel prepared for a posting and whether they have the impression of having received sufficient and adequate advance training. Psychological studies explain the emergence of AC (in addition to other influencing factors) by satisfaction at work – Meyer and colleagues (2013, p. 387) did so recently for the military sector. Last but not least, AC is expected to be higher if career prospects at home and personal development opportunities are assumed likely to improve at a later stage as a result of participation in the mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina. On the strength of these considerations, 4 hypotheses concerning AC were formulated:

- H1** : Among HQ personnel, the greater the coherence between the leadership style they prefer and the one that their direct superior practises, the closer their identification with the organization (higher AC).
- H2** : The better they are prepared and trained in advance of the deployment, the greater their identification with the organization (higher AC).
- H3** : The more satisfied they are with their jobs during deployment, the closer their identification with the organization (higher AC).
- H4** : Their identification with the organization will be greater (higher AC) if they expect their career prospects to improve as a result of deployment.

Method and Measurements

In Multinational Task Force South-East (MNTF-SE) in Mostar, Italian, French, German and Spanish soldiers served together in order to stabilize the country and to guarantee public order and structures. The ALTHEA Study was conducted by four research teams from the participating nations.¹² The fieldwork comprised participatory observation, semi-structured interviews, and a quantitative survey by means of a common (paper and pencil) questionnaire. Altogether, 551 (289 Spanish, 138 French, 76 Italian and 48 German) soldiers answered the questionnaire (see Table 1 below). The survey took place between August and October 2006. Due to national logistic reasons, it was not possible to do the fieldwork at the same time.

Table 1 : Demographics of Survey Population (%)

| | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Gender | | | | | | |
| Male 92 | | | Female 8 | | | |
| Age | | | | | | |
| ≤ 24 years 23 | 25-30 years 34 | 31-35 years 18 | 36-40 years 9 | 41-45 years 6 | 46-50 years 7 | > 50 years 2 |
| Citizenship | | | | | | |
| Italian 14 | French 25 | | German 9 | | Spanish 52 | |
| Soldiers whose first-line superior has the same citizenship | | | | | | |
| Italian 53 | French 93 | | German 74 | | Spanish 95 | all 87 |
| Rank | | | | | | |
| Private 25 | Corporal 28 | | NCO 30 | | Subaltern or captain 12 | Senior officer 6 |
| Months already spent in Bosnia and Herzegovina | | | | | | |
| <1 month 9 | 1 month 43 | 2 months 5 | 3 months 23 | 4 months 5 | 5 months 6 | >5 months 9 |

Source : HQ of MNTF SE in Mostar (BiH), internal survey, 2006.

The variables used to test the hypotheses were operationalized as follows :

Leadership Style. The survey used the scenario technique, whereby the participants were given four types of leaders and asked to state separately what type they would prefer and what type of direct superior they actually had :

Superior 1 is, in general, quick at decision-making and communicates the decisions clearly and plainly to subordinates ; he/she expects them to carry out the decisions loyally and without trouble. Superior 2 is, in general, quick at decision-making, but tries to explain orders to his/her subordinates before taking

¹² For the aims of the EUFOR mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the purposes of the multinational research project in detail, see Leonhard *et al.*, 2008.

action ; he/she states the reasons for the decisions and answers any questions. Superior 3 generally consults his/her subordinates before taking a decision, hears their advice, and weighs pros and cons before announcing the decision ; he/she expects everyone – even those who were of a different opinion – to carry out the decision loyally. Superior 4 in general organizes a meeting with all subordinates first before making a decision ; he/she explains the problem to the group, encourages discussion, and accepts the opinion of the majority as the decision.

The corresponding type designations (1 = authoritarian, 2 = paternalistic, 3 = participative, and 4 = democratic) were not mentioned in the questionnaire. The way coherent and incoherent cases are constructed is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Comparison of Preferred and Encountered Leadership Styles

| % | Superior Encountered | | | | Total | |
|--------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|------------|-------|-----|
| | Authoritarian | Paternalistic | Participative | Democratic | | |
| Preferred Superior | Authoritarian | 8* | 6 | 4 | 1 | 18 |
| | Paternalistic | 7 | 15* | 4 | 1 | 27 |
| | Participative | 12 | 10 | 17* | 2 | 42 |
| | Democratic | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4* | 13 |
| Total | | 30 | 34 | 28 | 8 | 100 |

* Coherent cases.

Data source : HQ of MNTF SE in Mostar (BiH), internal survey, 2006. Figures given in rounded percentages.

Affective Organizational Commitment. AC was measured by means of three items on a four-level Likert-scale (disagree – agree) on the basis of the instrument supplied by Gade, Tiggler & Schumm (2003, pp.193-194). Example item: “I feel ‘part of the family’ in the multinational HQ/Force/Unit” ($\alpha=0.79$).

Preparation and Training. The newly developed variable was measured through five items on a four-level Likert-scale (totally disagree – totally agree). Example item : “Before coming to Bosnia, I was specially trained for the ALTHEA mission” ($\alpha=0.73$).

Job Satisfaction. An index was constructed out of eight aspects, each measured on a five-level Likert-scale (dissatisfied – satisfied). Example item: “During deployment, how satisfied are you with (...) working conditions ?”.

Career Prospects: The newly developed variable was measured by means of one item on a five-level Likert-scale (totally disagree – totally agree). The question was: “How do you evaluate the ALTHEA operation for you personally?”. Example item: “I expect my career prospects as a soldier to improve”.

Results

MNHQ/SE survey respondents’ answers in Mostar included 44 percent incoherent vs. 56 percent coherent cases concerning preferred and encountered leadership styles (Table 2). There was thus a moderate, though clear tendency towards more democratic and participative leadership when incoherence occurs. Table 3 (below) reveals the descriptive

statistics and correlations of all variables needed to test the hypotheses. On the bivariate level, AC does not depend on socio-demographic factors, i.e. gender, age, rank, and time already spent in the ALTHEA mission. Moreover, AC does not correlate with leadership style (in)coherence either. Job satisfaction is the only variable that correlates slightly positive with leadership style coherence.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

| | M | SD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
|--------------------------------------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|
| 1 Gender (female=1) | .08 | .26 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Age ¹ | 2.70 | 1.58 | -.08 | | | | | | | |
| 3 Rank ² | 2.45 | 1.15 | -.08 | .68♣ | | | | | | |
| 4 Time spent in mission ³ | 2.24 | 1.78 | -.06 | .17♣ | .27♣ | | | | | |
| 5 Leadership style (coherent=1) | .45 | .50 | -.07 | .03 | -.00 | .04 | | | | |
| 6 Preparation and Training | .55 | .24 | .04 | -.26♣ | -.23♣ | -.08 | -.04 | | | |
| 7 Job satisfaction | .70 | .18 | .06 | -.02 | .12♦ | .23♣ | .14♦ | .20♣ | | |
| 8 Career prospects | .62 | .32 | -.00 | -.30♣ | -.26♣ | -.18♣ | .02 | .36♣ | .18♣ | |
| 9 Affective commitment | .66 | .26 | .05 | -.00 | -.00 | -.04 | .00 | .32♣ | .33♣ | .32♣ |

Data source : HQ of MNTF SE in Mostar (BiH), internal survey, 2006. Figures: Means, Standard Deviations, and Pearson Correlations. ♣p<0.001; ♦p<0.01; others p<0.05. ¹Seven age groups (1=to 24 years, [...], 7= over 50 years) ; ² Five rank groups (=soldier, [...], 5=officer) ; ³ Seven intervals (1= less than 1 month, [...], 7= more than 5 month).

Three consecutively conducted linear regression models were calculated (Table 4, below). Significant betas occur only if the three variables “preparation and training”, “job satisfaction”, and “career prospects” are included (= Model 3). AC grows with better preparation and training, higher job satisfaction, and the perception of growing career prospects in association with the deployment in the EUFOR mission. H1 is thus rejected, while H2, H3, and H4 hold.

Table 4 : Regression Models to Explain Affective Organizational Commitment (AC)

| Variables | Model 1 (n=412) | | Model 2 (n=367) | | Model 3 (n=344) | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|------|-----------------|------|-----------------|------|
| | Beta | Sig. | Beta | Sig. | Beta | Sig. |
| Gender (female=1) | .05 | n.s. | .03 | n.s. | .02 | n.s. |
| Age | -.03 | n.s. | -.00 | n.s. | .07 | n.s. |
| Rank | .03 | n.s. | .05 | n.s. | .03 | n.s. |
| Time spent in mission | -.04 | n.s. | -.06 | n.s. | -.03 | n.s. |
| Leadership style (coherent=1) | | | -.00 | n.s. | -.03 | n.s. |
| Preparation and Training | | | | | .20 | ♣ |
| Job satisfaction | | | | | .24 | ♣ |
| Career prospects | | | | | .19 | ♦ |
| Adapted R ² | | -.00 | | -.01 | | .17 |

Data source : HQ of MNTF SE in Mostar (BiH), internal survey, 2006. ♣p<0.001; ♦p<0.01.

Summary and Discussion

All three available surveys in multinational headquarters (HQ 1 [GE/NL] Corps, MNHQ/SE, and SHAPE) clearly indicate a preference of the staff for the participative leadership style. In all three HQs, about half of the staff members encounter first-line superiors who lead in a manner that deviates from the preferred style. Analysis in two HQs, namely MNHQ/SE and SHAPE¹³ shows that leadership incoherence does not negatively affect the identification with the organization and the mission – a finding one might not have expected. In other words, the results of the 2014 SHAPE survey are not at variance, and can be cross-validated, with the data from the survey conducted in the 2006 ALTHEA mission.

A first-line superior of different nationality – a configuration prevailing at SHAPE where officers from 28 nations are on site – may not have a big influence on the careers of subordinates as he or she only has limited possibilities to sanction their behaviour whether positively or negatively. So leadership style incoherence may not be perceived as such a bad thing and in consequence does not play an important role at all for the led and their attitudes towards the organization. But even in the case of ALTHEA mission where in 87 percent of cases the first-line superior is of the same nationality (see Table 1), the relative unimportance of leadership style can be detected. The findings of the two studies in multinational HQs support the direction of research that challenges the importance of leaders and the importance of leader-follower relations (at least in the case of military organizations).

Limitations

The study at hand, based on a secondary analysis and comparison of data collected during the 2006 ALTHEA mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in 2014 at SHAPE, has at least three limitations. Firstly, the results are restricted to AC as the dependent variable. If incoherence of leadership style does not affect AC, there is no reason to believe that there will be no effect on other attitudinal and organizational variables, like citizenship behaviour or organizational effectiveness. In future studies, other variables will need to be included to widen the scope of potential relations. Secondly, contemporary leadership involves more than just answering the doubtlessly important question of participation in decision-making. Leadership processes especially in multinational military environments are more complex and more dimensions of leadership should be considered in future. Thirdly, multinational military headquarters, regardless of whether they are hot or cold military organizations, are a very special type of entity: results as regards the effects of leadership styles can be extrapolated only to a limited extent to other types of organizations, whether in the military or in the non-military world (private enterprises, public or non-profit organizations, etc.).

¹³ The questionnaire administered in HQ 1 (GE/NL) Corps did not include items on this particular topic.

References

- ALLEN, N.J. & J.P. MEYER, "The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization", *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, vol.63, n°1, 1990, pp.1-18.
- BASS, B.M. & R.M. STOGDILL, *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership : Theory, Research, and Managerial Applications* (3rd ed.), New York/London, The Free Press, 1990.
- BLAKE, R.R. & J.S. MOUTON, *The Managerial Grid: The Key to Leadership Excellence*, Houston, Gulf Publishing, 1964.
- GADE, P.A., R.B. TIGGLE & W.R. SCHUMM, "The Measurement and Consequences of Military Organizational Commitment in Soldiers and Spouses", *Military Psychology*, vol.15, n°3, 2003, pp.191-207.
- GRINT, K., *Leadership, Management and Command : Rethinking D-Day*, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- HAGEN, U. von, R. MOELKER & J. SOETERS (eds.), *Cultural Interoperability : Ten Years of Research into Cooperation in the First German-Netherlands Corps*, SOWI-Forum International, vol.27, Breda & Strausberg, 2006.
- HALPIN, S.M., "Historical Influences on the Changing Nature of Leadership within the Military Environment", *Military Psychology*, vol.23, n°5, 2011, pp. 479-488.
- KELLERMAN, B., *The End of Leadership*, New York, Harper Collins, 2012.
- KERR, S. & J.M. JERMIE, "Substitutes for Leadership : Their Meaning and Measurement", *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, vol.22, n°3, 1978, pp.375-403.
- LEONHARD, N., G. AUBRY, M.C. SANTERO & B. JANKOWSKI (eds.), *Military Cooperation in Multinational Missions : The Case of EUFOR in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, SOWI-Forum International, vol. 28), Strausberg, SOWI, 2008.
- MEYER, J.P., C. KAM, I. GOLDENBERG & N.L. BREMNER, "Organizational Commitment in the Military: Application of a Profile Approach", *Military Psychology*, vol.25, n°4, 2013, pp.381-401.
- OLIVETTA, E., "Relationships and Empathy: What is Changing in Military Leadership ?", *Res Militaris*, vol.7, n°2, 2017.
- RICHTER, G., "Antecedents and Consequences of Leadership styles : Findings from Research in Multinational Headquarters", *Armed Forces & Society*, vol.44, n°1, 2018, pp.72-91.
- SANTERO, M.C. & E.S. NAVARRO, "Leadership in Mission Althea 2006-2007", pp.161-190 in N. Leonhard, G. Aubry, M.C. Santero & B. Jankowski (eds.), *Military Cooperation in Multinational Missions : The case of EUFOR in Bosnia and Herzegovina*, SOWI-Forum International, vol.28, Strausberg, SOWI, 2008.
- STRAUSS, B., *Masters of Command : Alexander, Hannibal, Caesar, and the Genius of Leadership*, New York, Simon & Schuster, 2012.
- VROOM, V.H. & P.W. YETTON, *Leadership and Decision-Making*, Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973.