Leadership has probably been written about, formally researched and informally discussed more than any other single topic by many behavioural scientists and even psychologists. Despite all this leadership is still an elusive concept and researchers are continually coming up. Stogdill (1974) who has studied leadership for thirty years says "There are almost as many definitions as leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept," but it is too complex and too variable to a phenomenon to be captured in any definition. Every theorist, every scientist, political orator, business executive, social worker and educated has defined leadership in his own way. Everyone has ideas and opinions about leadership even children. All agree that leadership is important but no one can define it to the satisfaction of everyone. Yuke (1981) opined the numerous definitions of leadership that have been proposed appear to have littles else in common.

Leadership is the ability to persuade others to seek defined objectives enthusiastically. It is the human factor that
binds a group together and motivates it toward goals. Bavide Mc Clellond (1961) emphasizes a strong drive for achievement as an important attribute for motivation and the quality which characterizes outstanding leaders.

Leadership is an interesting social phenomenon which challenges the students of sociology, politics and psychology at every turn. It is an eternal and universal phenomenon. Being a socio-psychological process, it is present to some degree, wherever human beings gather together. Whether it is the primitive family of cave dwellers or the twentieth century national community.

Besides, due to growing pluralist nature of the society and emergence of complete social organizations, leadership phenomenon has acquired greater importance. It has permeated to every aspect of our social life "On every hand" today the cry is for more and better leaders." Also because it is related with social situation its nature is in flux. For finding out leadership pattern suitable to changing environment requires a constant study of the problem. Charles Hickman Titus (1950) rightly says "leadership is an ancient art and required attention as civilization continues its effort not only to survive but also to advance."
In the context of rural situation particularly in backward societies the problem of leadership has acquired more importance. With the growing complexity of civilization varied groups and social organisations are coming in rural areas. Besides to organise a community and to help bring community to action, it is necessary for individuals and groups to provide leadership. Naturally the demand is for more and better leaders. But this is the paradise that where leaders are most needed they are the least in evidence. So the question how to develop desirable rural leadership requires still more consideration.

Coming to the present rural situation in India, the study of leadership is the most needed demand in the field of social research. Rural India is passing through a period of transition and bewilderment. The new social and economic forces generated by the large scale development plan have shaken up the social structure and are beginning to alter the old values and attitudes as well. The traditional leadership is also undergoing a change and new patterns of leadership are emerging on the scene. In this context, the introduction of community projects, land reforms decentralized local administration and adult franchise, which aim at the reconstruction of rural society have brought forth the importance of leadership. Increasingly it is believed that
the success or failure of development plans, and indeed of more a general ideological aspirations as embodied in our constitution may well depend upon the type of leadership available at village, town and district level. All this calls for a fresh look at the concept of leadership.

Though so much emphasis has been laid down on the village leadership no proper leadership has emerged out as yet and so people's participation has remained a dream. The local leadership can be aroused only if a representative and democratic institution as suggested by the Mehta Study team is created. The Mehta report was not breaking an altogether new ground. The Indian constitution itself had directed to establish panchayats. The Second Five Year Plan aimed at the establishment of panchayats and some communication leaders also had pleaded for the same.

So to attract the new leadership suitable for changing situation and to institutionalize it the panchayat raj scheme based on democratic decentralization has been envisaged. Douglas Mc. Gregor (1960) specifies the following four main variables of the leadership relationship:

1. The characteristics of the leader
2. The attitudes, needs and personal characteristics of the followers.

3. The characteristics of the organisation such as its basic purpose, habits, customs, traditions, structure, nature of tasks performed and

4. The social, economic and political milieu.

However the author does not describe how these variables affect one another. Variables similar to McGregor's have been used by Robert Tannenbaum, Irwins R. Weschler, and Fred Massarik who have connected the variables by the idea of influence. To define leadership as interpersonal influence, exercised in situations and directed through the communication, towards the attainment of goal or goals. This definition is similar to that of George R. Terry (1968) who described leadership as "the relationship in which one person or the leader, influences others to work together willingly or related tasks to attain that which the leader desires. This author views leadership as a relational concept implying two ideas—the influencing agent and the persons who are influenced to get a task done. In other words, without followers, there can be no leader. But both these definitions imply that leadership is a process of purposeful
Horold Koontz and O' Donnel (1978) state that leadership is the influencing people to follow in the achievement of a common goal.

A review of other writers reveals that most management writers agree that leadership is the process of influence the activities of the individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation. From this definition, it is clear that the leadership is a function of the leader, the follower, and other situational factors.

It is important to note that this definition makes no mention of any particular type of organization. In any situation in which some one is trying to influence the behaviour of another individual or group leadership is occurring. Thus everyone attempts leadership at one time or another whether his or her activities are entered on a business, educational institutions etc.

Thus we may define leadership as the human factor which binds individuals together and motivates them towards specific goals. It is an activity or process involving the management of an organisation to provide forethought, guidance, so as to achieve some common goals by the influencing group's action.

The success or failure of an organization mainly depend upon the effective leadership. Effective leader can
maintain and lead all the resources of the organization in effective and efficient manner collected from numerous publications, George, R. Terry (1968) gives the following qualities:

1. Energy, both mental and physical, required for a job.

2. Emotional stability which enables a leader to act with self-confidence, avoid anger and deal with his subordinates with understanding.

3. Knowledge of human relations which requires an understanding of human behaviour.

4. Empathy which enables him to look at things objectively and from another's viewpoint.

5. Objectively which prevents him from getting emotionally involved.

6. Personal motivation, that is enthusiasm within himself to get the job done.

7. Communication skill, that is the ability to talk and write clearly and forcefully.

8. Teaching ability which will help him develop and inspire his subordinates.

9. Social skill which enables him to understand people and know their strength and weaknesses and present him as
a friendly and approachable person and

Technical competence which provides him with an effective working knowledge and insight of the operations under his guidance.

Most writers are of the opinion that a successful leader has an above-average education is active in social organization, and has high moral and ethical standards.\(^9\)

Such characteristics as the ability to adjust good appearance, need for achievement, assertiveness and bear of failure have also been reported as essential leadership traits.\(^{10}\)

More recent researches by Ghiselli (1963) and his associates evaluated the traits that correlated significantly with successful leadership. These traits were intelligence, supervisory ability, initiative, self-assurance, and individuality.

Thus to be an effective leader, he must possess sound knowledge of human behaviour, attitudes and goals of both individual and organizational goals. Of all these morality must necessarily be possessed by a leader.

Studies commonly described under the term 'leadership research' can be grouped into three categories. The first being
trait approach largely on an attempt to identify the traits that leaders possess. Secondly, behavioural approach mainly lays stress on personal characteristics of the leader and seeks to predict leadership effectiveness on the basis of what type of person the leader is. Thirdly, the contingency or situational approach which seeks to understand the different types of leadership behaviour that are demanded by different situations that arise in organization.

The exponents of trait theory were Thomas Corlyle, Frederick Mielzehe and William James. Their studies were based on an attempt to identify the traits that leaders possess. According to them leaders are born, but not made. This approach is a traditional one, and often it has also been called the 'Great Man' theory of leadership.

Even in more recent years, however, such studies have been made. For example, Minor (1973) states that successful leaders to be motivated, intelligent, hardworking, self-confident, and capable of taking risks. Kast and Resenzweig (1974) on the other hand cite intelligence, social maturity and breadth of outlook, inner motivation and achievement drives, and human relations attitudes as the characteristics of successful leaders.
This theory persists, not because it is helpful in analysing and understanding the phenomenon of leadership, but because it expresses a deep and popular wish about what a leader should be like. Others criticise the theory because it focusses attention only on the leader, and its oversimplification of the idea of leadership is shared by many management writers. But Keith Davis (1972) noted significant correlation between leadership effectiveness and the traits of intelligence, broad social interests and maturity, strong motivation to accomplish and great respect for and interest in people. But even these correlations between traits and leadership are not really persuasive. Most of these so called traits are in essence patterns of behaviour that one could expect from a leader and particularly from a leader in a managerial position.

During 1950's the dissatisfaction with the traits approach to leadership led behavioural scientists to focus their attention on the actual leader behaviour viz., what leader does and how he/she does it. It analyses in various functions which people carry out when they are in leadership position.

There are three well known behavioural approaches of leadership. The studies at Iona University attempted by Lewin, Lippit and White (1939) studies at Ohio State University
conducted by Stogdill and Coons (1951) and the Michigan studies by Katz, Maccby and Morse (1950). In all these studies the authors distinguished successful leaders from unsuccessful leaders by their particular style of leadership. This approach increased confidence in the existence of some underlying patterns in leader behaviour and provide us with a useful method of describing and analysing what leaders actually do.

At the same time, the failure of the behavioural theories of leadership to uncover consistent links between different leadership styles and subordinate productivity and performance is a serious shortcoming.

This approach hence, leads us to what are labelled contingency theories of leadership.

Leadership by its very nature is wide in its scope and this contributes to much of its vagueness. Therefore it is important that sufficient care is taken in making any generalizations concerning it. Leadership has fascinated and attracted the attention of several investigations for quite some time. Perhaps it is one of the themes that have been researched upon extensively as well as intensively. The theme of leadership is at the crossroads of sociology, psychology, public administration,
political science, cultural anthropology to name a few fields generating considerable interest in this area and consequently a number of studies have been made by sociologists, political scientists and students of public administration.

The important point Bogardus (1934) makes is that leadership is a process-role and not an entity. According to Hunter (1939) leadership depends upon internal personality factors and is not entirely the result of environmental needs or field forces. The most important traits of personality related to leadership are originality, aggressiveness, commonsense, cheerfulness, humour, emotional stability, trust worthiness, tact, persistence and desire to accept and conform.

Goode (1951) reviewing several studies concerning leadership found successful leaders to possess characteristics such as high mental ability, breadth of interests, language facility, maturity, strong motivation and social orientation among others.

Pigors (1935) held that leadership could be applied to describe a person who was placed in a situation such that he controlled others in the pursuit of common goals.

Rogers (1959) viewed leadership as the process of manipulating a situation so that the various members of the group
could achieve common goals effectively. Leadership in this sense includes creativeness.

Prentice (1961) held that a leader must accomplish the group goals by providing the necessary direction to the members of the group. He must help each member of the group to see how his personal motives could be satisfied in the process of reaching the group goals.

Edward (1961) holds that there are seven dimensions of leader behaviour—create and define goals, clarify and administer them, choose appropriate means, assign tasks, coordinate, motivate, create loyalty and spur the members into action at the appropriate moment in terms of the functions.

Lindgren (1954) tried to identify the functions of leader behaviour. According to him, leaders guide, control, direct, counsel, advise, teach, influence and help others in the conduct of their public and private lives.

Following the Western pattern—formal and informal leaders were identified (Ovenstein 1959; McCormick, 1959; Beals, 1969; Reddy 1966; Harjindar Singh, 1969; and Abraham, 1974). The formal leaders were village head men (Patel), village accountants (Patwaris) and elected panchayat or cooperative society members.
The formal leaders imposed their authority and exercised their power by virtue of their positions or offices (Abraham, 1972).

The informal leaders were those who were highly regarded by the people. They inspired respect and exercised influence over the people. The informal leaders were sometimes the caste leaders, the wealthy or land lords who were often identified with eliques and factions. The informal leaders were sometimes the traditionally respected persons. This category of traditional leaders may some time include a form of leadership with religious or semi religious authority which bestows upon them great personal power and influence. This form of leadership may be hereditary or nominated and has a strong and stable influence on the rural masses subsisting on caste and other sectarian interests (Parker & Tinker 1959, Mc Cormick, 1959; Deshmukh, 1966, Rao, 1966; Lokananda and Singh, 1971).

There is the institutional leadership which could be called bureaucratic leadership. They make up a large majority and exercise great authority in the affairs of the centre, state, district or town/village since they comprise the executive (Rao, 1966).
Janak Pandey (1976) found that elected or rotational leaders showed more democratic and accommodative attitude and behaviour in contrast to appointed leaders. He found relationship oriented style of leadership was more effective than the "task oriented" style of leadership.

In addition to the above four broad types of leadership, formal, informal, institutional and opinion leaders, Monder (1963) identified other types of leadership that came into existence after independence in India. There is first of all the political leadership, based on the western democratic ideas which eventually came to wield power at the different levels in the country, village, panchayat, district, state and central government levels. An important and desirable feature is that leadership is not restricted to any specific group i.e. the community (Dube, 1965; Reddy, 1966).

Most leaders were drawn from upper social strata and were financially well off. They belonged to higher income group and were drawn from agriculture and business (Lewis, 1954; Nair, 1955; Bhatnagar, 1977; Lokananda and Singh, 1977; Reddy, 1988) leadership and economic standing were highly interdependent. Persons with no land or wealth were rarely reckoned as leaders (Nair, 1955; Bhatnagar, 1977).
Literacy among other things was found to be the most important single factor influencing leadership. (Lewis, 1954, Deshmukh, 1966; Sen, 1968; Saran, 1975; Muthayya, 1976, Bhatnagar, 1977, Reddy, 1983). Several studies have found that leaders had wide exposure to communication media and had close contacts with political leaders (Sen, 1969; Reddy, 1983). Among the other factors identified are socio-economic status (P.E.O., 1955) and Urban contact and innovativeness. (Reddy and Sahay, 1972). Some of the studies found that most leaders were in the age group 30-49 years (Lewis, 1954; PEO, 1955; Muthayya, 1976).

The Emerging Pattern of Leadership

Pradip Roy (1967) found the broad features characterising the emerging leaders in the Indian villages to be in favour of individuals with high income and education leading a high standard of life. They were a little more secular in outlook than the traditional leaders. A significant finding was that most of them belonged to large families (Deshmukh, 1966). Sen (1969) found that the formal institutional leadership was slowly giving way to more informal and achievement oriented leadership.

Abraham (1972) also found important changes in the emerging pattern of leadership. Most of the leaders have been found to be involved in service and welfare activities of the
community. Mehta (1972) found that in contrast to the past, the emerging pattern of leadership was based on achieved qualities rather than on ascriptive ones. Epstein's (1972) findings support the above view. She showed that in the less developed villages the leadership was based on heredity. In contrast to this, in the developed villages the leadership has changed from the hereditary to the achievement type.

Rout (1967) studied rural leadership and found it to be passing through a transitional stage. It was disappointing to note that the emergence of dynamic and responsible leadership has been very slow, with the result that a sizeable section of rural leadership still belonged to dominant caste, interested in narrow and sectarian issues. They had no habit of reading a newspaper and never were models to be emulated by the younger persons. The major concern of the leaders revolved around regional leaders and high officials to get their work done. This is in contrast to the findings of Hitchcock (1959) who found the leaders to be hospitable, fair and impartial in their dealing with people. They mediated between village and the outside government officials.

Sisodia (1979) studying village leadership, found that most panchayat leaders did not have any idea of the panchayat
raj structure to be able to function efficiently.

Appraisal

There is no denying the fact that there is a change in the pattern of leadership as it is evident in India. This is a natural process.

A significant section of the new leadership has been found to be having close contacts with political parties and some of them have also been members of different political parties.

The Government in accordance with the Directive principles Article nos. 36-39 of the constitution have been pursuing a vigorous policy to help the weaker sections and the minorities. Even in the case of elected positions several reservations have been made for the benefit of the weaker sections and minority communities. This is naturally expected to be reflected in the emerging pattern of leadership. A significant number of leaders could be from the lower strata and weaker sections of the community.

According to Brown "Leadership was a state of a group arising from the quality of its transactions" (Brown, 1967).
According to Lapiera and Fransworth "Leadership is behaviour that affects the behaviour of other people more than their behaviour affects that of the leader." According to Tead (1956) "Leadership is the activity of influencing people to cooperate to some goal which they came to find desirable."

According to Flwell and Malik (1974) the main problem in any study on leadership is that of identifying distinction between the two.

According to Dharma Raj Singh, (1985) "Leadership" has been taken to mean that unified and integrated pattern of personal qualities interactional relations with the members of the group and behavioural action and value orientations on the leaders which specify and reflect their over all functionality or disfunctionality to the members of the group.

Leadership defines, initiates and maintains social structure. The social system is, so to speak, programmed through leadership. Understanding leadership then, should be a simple and parsimonious approach to understand the larger social system. Leadership can have consequence for the lives and welfare of large number of people and therefore those who are concerned with practical consequences of human actions must be concerned with leadership (Arnold Cannerbauns, 1961; 102).
Katiz and Kahn (1966) define leadership as generally understood in social science literature, to have three major meanings: the attributes of a position, the characteristics of a person and a category of behaviour.

Leaders are considered to be those who perform power-exercising roles having a considerable following, those who occupy formal power positions and can make decisions, those who represent the interests of people to the government and get the official work of the followers done in time and also those who can prevent the implementation of the decisions. The requisits characteristics of a successful leader can be envisaged as follows: (1) good personality-intelligence, energy, endurance, shrewdness; (2) social status, (3) wealth, (4) might of circumstances (5) innovativeness (6) creative power and ability to command physical force (7) tolerance (8) command of propagandistic, impressive speaking and heredity of arguments (9) intimate understanding of masses and (10) marked simplicity and habits (Gupta, 1963; Sharma, 1977). However, a successful leader need not possess all the characteristics mentioned above.

The concept of leadership is different from that of leader but a few authors have used them interchangeably. Leadership is an abstract term; a comprehensive definition by
Ram Reddy and Seshadri (1979: 99) conveys thus: "leadership manifests itself in the total process of the rise of a leader, the influence he wields on his followers and the ways by which he not only ensures and gathers power around him and seeks to ascent still further on the range of the leadership ladder, but also tries to perpetuate his achieved position. Thus leadership is a process and not a person involving a leader, followers and their situations.

The leader led relationship may be looked at from the typology developed by Weber (Bendix, 1962, 294-295): (1) traditional source, (2) rational legal source and (3) charismatic source. The traditional leaders like head of a village, a caste or a religion derive influence and legitimacy because of their respect for the old established patterns of order. The emerging leaders (members of the panchayat raj system) and professional leaders (village officials) derive the authority from the legally established position or on office that they hold while charismatic leaders and the ideological leaders derive authority and a following by virtue of possession of some exceptional personal qualities. However, in addition to the positional authority, the emerging leaders derive influence through certain other special functions and abilities such as representing the
interests of people to the Government, getting their official work done in time etc.

The discussion on rural leadership centres round two important perspectives: (1) the emergence of new leaders who are substantially different from the earlier leadership and (2) the factors responsible for the proliferation of new leaders in rural areas.

Dynamics of Rural Leadership

From the studies on rural leadership (Dube, 1960; Oommen, 1970; Singh, 1970; Mehta, 1978) six very important factors responsible for the proliferation of leaders in rural areas may be changed. They are (1) introduction of adult suffrage and intense factionalization, (2) introduction of the system of democratic decentralization, (3) introduction of community development programmes, (4) co-operative movement, (5) intense politicisation of backward castes and peasants and (6) other modernization variables like spread of literacy and communication.

Leaders as described by Lass Well (1961) have three perspectives: demand system, identification system and expectation system which refers to the outcomes and effects sought by Clites as a whole or individually by acting in and through the power
wielding process, (1) **Demand system** refers to the scope, values sought, which includes power, wealth, respect, well being rectitude, skill, enlightenment and affection, (2) **Identification system** refers to the role of conscious and unconscious identification with the leaders and activities in which they play a role. The third perspective 'expectation system' refers to all assumptions about past, present and future events affecting one's own value positions. This includes self-interest (personal aggrandizement) and the specialized interest; such as performance as a member of a culture, caste, interest group, personality or a crisis group.
NOTES

CHAPTER II


7. "The Caste shall take steps to organise village Panchayats and endow them with such power and authority as may be
necessary to enable them to function as units of self government." Article 40 of the Constitution of India.

8. "Indeed Rural Progress depends entirely on the existence of an active organisation in the village which can bring all the people including the weaker sections mentioned above into common programmes to be carried out with the assistance to the administration." Report on the Second Five Year Plan, p. 150.


