"Not much happens without a dream. And for something great to happen, there must be a great dream. Behind every great achievement is a dreamer of great dreams. Much more than a dreamer is required to bring it to reality; but the dream must be there first."

- Greenleaf (1977)
3.1 Introduction

In this chapter, an attempt will be made to study the role of leadership in creation of new institutions for social change. This chapter has been divided into three sections: the first section will focus on various theoretical contributions made by a number of eminent psychologists to study the personality growth, and the impact of different socio-psychological aspects on personality development. The second section consists of definitions of leadership, the difference between a manager and a leader and the functions of leadership in various contexts. The third section will focus mainly on various aspects of institutional leadership such as its characteristics, functions and its successes and failures in different situations. In conclusion, Vikram Sarabhai's leadership has been focussed in the light of the various aspects as discussed in three sections of this chapter. An attempt also has been made to identify an institutional leadership through his multiple leadership roles in different contexts.

3.2 Personality growth and impact of different socio-psychological aspects on personality development

This section consists of various theoretical definitions and interpretations of personality studies done by a number of eminent psychologists. Many meaningful attempts have been made to understand, define and interpret 'personality'. A common interpretation of personality is 'the essence of man'. This definition, though short, is quite meaningful. Another similar definition is 'it is what he actually is'. Allport (1937, p.9) very correctly observed:
"personality is what a man really is". Another eminent psychologist Freud (in Hall & Gardner 1957, p.36) attempted to study personality from different angles of human life. Freud divided personality into three aspects: 1. the id, 2. the ego, and 3. the super ego, but also observed that personality normally functions as a whole. It is interesting to understand these three aspects:

1. the id - a biological component of personality
2. the ego - a psychological component, and
3. the super ego as the social component.

In other words, Freud looked at human personality with a holistic approach. Freud's once colleague and a well-known clinical psychologist Jung (in Hall & Gardner 1957, p.78) also had a similar holistic approach to human personality. He tried to combine one's past and future and then attempted to understand present. This is a rather complicated exercise but it has more weightage in terms of its interpretation. Jung talked about 'causality' the past and 'teleology' the future. In other words, Jung (in Hall & Gardner 1957, p.78) attempted to understand this exercise as follows:

"Man's behaviour is conditioned not only by his individual and racial history (causality) but also by his aims and aspirations (teleology). Both the past as actuality and the future as potentiality guide one's present behaviour."

Jung also identified two distinct types of human personality: 1. Extroversion and 2. Introversion.

The Extroverted attitude orients the person toward 'the external, objective world', which is predominated by the ego. The Introverted attitude orients an individual toward 'the inner, subjective world', which is centered on the personal unconscious. In short, according to Jung's psychological
interpretation, human personality develops towards 'a stable unity.'

It is also interesting to understand how Allport (1937) defined personality:

"Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychophysical systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment."

This definition reminds us the interpretation of Freud, but again the emphasis remains on a holistic view.

William James (1890) evolved a theory, around 'the self' or 'the Empirical Me' which was interpreted as "the sum total of all that a man call his". He discussed 'the self' under three constituents: 1. the material self which consists of his material possessions 2. the social self means how he is regarded by his fellows and 3. the spiritual self which is his psychological faculties and dispositions. James considered the Ego as 'the stream of thought which constitutes one's sense of personal identity.'

Finally, after going through this discussion on various aspects of human personality, one is left with the issue, what is the goal of personality development? or what is the ultimate end of man and mankind? A common answer for these issues is 'self-actualization'. Self-actualization means the fullest, most complete differentiation and harmonious blending, of all aspects of man's total personality. This personality, according to Jung, has a tendency to develop in the direction of a stable unity. This discussion leads us toward a more clear and meaningful understanding of human personality. A number of important aspects which represent different meanings of human personality, help us to understand it from different angles and view points. They describe human personality in terms of 'the essence of man', 'the self', 'the ego', 'the combined understanding of past and future', etc. But a common meaning
can be derived from all these aspects that human personality functions as a whole rather than as independent segments.

Erikson (1963), an eminent psychologist of this century, identified four 'co-ordinates' to extract 'meaning' from an individual's life:

1. the contemporary stage of life of the individual;
2. his life history (Psycho-sexual and psycho-social);
3. the contemporary stage of the socio-cultural unit of which he is a part; and
4. the history of the socio-cultural unit.

What Erikson emphasised is close to what Jung and William James had observed as 'causality', 'teleology' and 'the self' respectively.

Similarly Kakar (1979, p.45) observed that a man's dharma - religion can be better understood as per the four factors:

"(1) Desha (country, region) the culture to which he belongs; (2) Kala (time) the period of history in which he lives; (3) Shrama (work) which takes into account his stage of life; and (4) Guna (attribute) which refers to what Prabhu calls the inherent psychobiological traits"

Kakar (1978) in his study 'The Inner World' discussed two important aspects relevant to the present study. They are:

1. What does Hinduism teach an individual or a Hindu?
2. What does Hinduism expect from a Hindu?

These two issues help us to understand the role of Hinduism in the development of human personality. In this sense, from an individual's point of view 'dharma is the ground plan of his life which will lead to self-realization'. Kakar (1978...
p.37) also defined: 'dharma is the means through which man approaches the desired goal of human life'. Hindu culture considers the end stage of an individual life as moksha. And to attain moksha, he commits to his goal of life and tries to fulfill his 'life tasks' which is known as his 'Svadharma'. Therefore, to attain moksha, an individual must have knowledge of his svadharma, which ultimately largely depends upon desha, kala, shrama and gunas as discussed earlier. In other words, any occupation or activity if fulfilled as his svadharma, takes him to the achievement of his goal of life.

As Kakar (1978, p.60-61) mentioned:

"The measure of a man's work lies not only in what it enables him to achieve and maintain in the outside world, but also in how far it helps him toward the realisation of his svadharma - how far it prepares him "inside" and brings him nearer to that feeling of inner calm which is the dawning of wisdom and the prerequisite for moksha."

Finally, Kakar (1978, p.62) explained the role of dharma as a social force. The word 'dharma' derives from the root dhar (to uphold, to sustain, to nourish). Dharma is considered as 'social cement' to keep both individual and society together.

Referring to the Mahabharata, Kakar (1978) explained that dharma, ultimately assures the protection. "Neither the state nor the king, neither the mace nor the mace-bearer, governs the people; it is only by dharma that people secure mutual protection."

Another important element which has made a most significant impact on Hindu image in the world is 'karma'. Kakar (1978) mentioned 'Karma is a
promise of hope*. In other words, a Hindu is expected to stay true to Hindu dharma by fulfilling his svadharma. The Karma theory is understood especially with reference to rebirth or reincarnation. The most important element which helps a Hindu to remain committed to Hinduism is Svadharma. Svadharma not only describes a Hindu's duty towards himself or his family but it also categorically considers his duty towards society. This aspect helps him to think about his duty towards other members of society. This brings us very close to what Weber (1968, p.xvi) considered the processes of institution building and social transformation. According to Weber, personal responsibility was also considered in terms of society and social relations.

Weber (1968, p.xviii) developed his study of the problem of individual freedom and creativity around the concept of charisma. According to Weber Charisma is "a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional qualities".

Weber (1968, p.xx) explained some very important characteristics of leadership style and its impact on institution building:

"--- the test of any great charismatic leader lies not only in his ability to create a single event or great movement, but also in his ability to leave a continuous impact on an institutional structure - to transform any given institutional setting by infusing into it some of his charismatic vision, by investing the regular, orderly offices, or aspects of social organization, with some of his charismatic qualities and aura."

This definition clearly spells out the secret of exceptional leadership and clearly defines the specific characteristics of such a leader.
Shils (1965), in "Charisma, power and status" discussed charismatic qualities of leadership in detail:

"The charismatic quality of an individual as perceived by others, or himself, lies in what is thought to be his connection with (including possession by or embodiment of) some very central feature of man's existence and the cosmos in which he lives. The centrality, coupled with intensity, makes it extraordinary. The centrality is constituted by its formative power in initiating, creating, governing, transforming, maintaining, or destroying what is vital in man's life. Scientific discovery, ethical promulgation, artistic creativity, political and organizational authority and in fact all forms of genius, in the original sense of the word as permeation by the "spirit", are as much instances of the category of charismatic things as in religious prophecy---"

In other words, Shils (1965) interpreted the characteristics of charismatic leadership in terms of qualities, actions and words, as already emphasised by Weber (1968).

Thus, a review of theoretical studies done by various psychologists leads us to some specific understanding regarding the development of personality and how it differs from the behaviour of common people. Personality, as mentioned earlier is 'the essence of man' or in other words, it is 'what he is'. Freud (in Hall & Gardner 1957) described 'the id', 'the ego' and 'the super ego' as three components of human personality which function as a whole rather than as separate segments. Jung (in Hall & Gardner 1957) evolved two types, i.e., the extroverted and the introverted personality which represents the ego and the personal unconscious respectively. But
ultimately Jung (in Hall & Gardner 1957) concluded that personality develops in the direction of a stable unity, which is a central theme of his study. Finally William James (1890) described 'the self' but interpreted his study in the sense that ego forms a part of 'the self' but not as defined by Freud (in Hall & Gardner 1957). James categorically emphasised the ego 'as the stream of thought which constitutes one's sense of personal identity. Just as ego forms a part of human personality, svadharma is a path which leads to the ultimate stage called moksha. According to Hindutva svadharma inspires an individual to involve himself in certain unwritten duties towards self, family and society as a whole and thereby to prevent ego from coming in his way towards fulfillment of his duties as a Hindu.

Kakar (1978) related the most significant role of dharma to the development of an individual's personality. He, however, also referred to the theory of Karma, which is concerned with the belief of rebirth. Finally, Weber (1965) described his concept of charismatic personality and institution building processes. Weber also defined the concept of charismatic leadership which attempts to differentiate a common personality from a charismatic one. He also explained charismatic personality by comparing it with the characteristics of a high-order priest who used to rule the society as a representative of the Nature or the God. But Hinduism does not teach or expect a Hindu individual to become self-centered. This is rather intentionally ignored with the help of the concept of svadharma.

This discussion leads us to one of the most important aspects of leadership namely leadership functions.
3.3 Leadership definitions and functions

Sinha (1980) evolved a leadership model based on Indian entrepreneur culture. Sinha called such a leader as "the Nurturant-Task Leader (NT)". According to Sinha (1980) the NT style has two main aspects: 1. concern for task and 2. nurturant-orientation.

Sinha (1980, p. 55) described the NT leadership as:

"The Nurturant-Task style requires that the task must be completed, and that the subordinates understand and accept the goals and the normative structure of the group or organization and cultivate commitment to them. The nurturant-task leader structures his and his subordinates' roles clearly so that communications are explicit, structured and task-relevant. He initiates, guides, and directs his subordinates to work hard and maintains a high level of productivity, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Responsibilities are pinpointed and areas of decision-making are synchronized with them. He, thus, creates a climate of purposiveness and goal-orientation. His task-orientation, however, has the mix of nurturance. He cares for his subordinates, shows affection, takes personal interest in their well-being and above all, is committed to their growth. He wants them to grow up and mature so that they can assume greater and greater responsibilities and spare the leader for other tasks like minding the boundary properties of the group or organization."

it seems that Sinha's NT Leader has all the qualities a leader is expected to have.

Numerous studies were conducted to show that leaders compared to non-leaders were more intelligent (Gibb 1947; Mann 1959), had greater self-confidence
Richardson and Hanawalt 1944), self-assurance, and self-knowledge (Cox 1926), and had better personality integration (Mann 1959). Leaders were found to be more extrovert and sociable (Mann 1959) and moderately equalitarian in personality (Bass 1954). Mann (1959) reviewed a large number of studies which indicates that leaders revealed greater inter-personal sensitivity.

The research undertaken in the fifties, concentrated largely on functions of a leader.

A leader is the one who exercises authority and makes decisions in his group (Dubin 1951), holds the chair, is identified and accepted by his followers (Sanford 1949) stands close to the norms of the group (Homans 1950), influences group activities toward goal setting and goal achievement (Stogdill and Coons 1957), creates most effective change in group performance (Cattell et al 1953), succeeds in getting others to follow him (Hemphill 1954), initiates and facilitates members' interactions (Bales and Strutbeck 1951), that is, he initiates, organizes, clarifies, questions, motivates, summarizes, and formulates conclusions (Bass 1954) and thus helps the group solve its problems (Hemphill 1954).

Sinha (1980).

These studies describe the effectiveness of leadership through various functional aspects. Similarly Selznick (1957) in his detailed study entitled "Leadership in Administration" described a variety of functional aspects of leadership in organizational settings. According to Selznick (1957, p.142) "--- responsible leadership is a blend of commitment, understanding, and determination". He also identified characteristics of a 'responsible leader', 1. the avoidance of opportunism and 2. the avoidance of utopianism. Selznick (1957) also accepted creativity as an instrument which helps the leaders not only in functioning of organizations but also building new institutions. Selznick (1957
p.152) mentioned "myths are institution builders". He further explained this concept "Myth-making may have roots in a sensed need to improve efficiency and morale, but its main office is to help create an integrated social organism". His main emphasis was on the creativity aspect of a leader. He, therefore, mentioned "The art of creative leader is the art of institution building, the reworking of human and technological materials to fashion an organism that embodies new and enduring values. The opportunity to do this depends on a considerable sensitivity to the politics of internal change." (p.152-153).

Selznick (1957) described the functional aspects and also the leadership role not only in the preservation of the established values to sustain the organizational identity but also to induce new values which is an innovative characteristic of a leader. But Selznick (1957) was aware of the fact that traditional resistance must be faced by a leader while inducing change.

It is very interesting to note Selznick's (1957) views on the innovative role of leadership. According to him a leader confronts with the internal structure to welcome the innovativeness and the visionary outlook of leadership. Finally, Selznick (1957, p.159-154) observed:

"If one of the great functions of administration is the exertion of cohesive force in the direction of institutional security, another great function is the creation of conditions that will make possible in the future what is excluded in the present. This requires a strategy of change that looks to the attainment of new capabilities more nearly fulfilling the truly felt needs and aspirations of the institution. The executive becomes a statesman as he makes the transition from administrative management to institutional leadership."
Zaleznik (1977) studied not only the functional aspects of leadership but also went beyond and identified the need to study institutional leadership. He identified another delicate and crucial aspect of leadership, that is the statesmanship of a leader. In other words, he raised the question of difference between an entrepreneur leader and an innovative leader. Although he did not study in detail the needs and the characteristics of these two types, he effectively observed the functional difference between these two types.

Zaleznik (1977) presented his study titled "Managers and Leaders: Are they different?" For the functional effectiveness of leadership, Zaleznik (1977, p.67) mentioned "Leadership inevitably requires using power to influence the thoughts and actions of other people" but simultaneously also explained the difference between these two types: 'a manager is a problem solver -- leadership is a practical effort to direct affairs' (p.68). He also observed (p.70) "They differ in motivation, personal history, and in how they think and act. Managers and leaders differ fundamentally in their world views."

In other words, Zaleznik (1977) accepted the fundamental differences existing between these two categories. He observed the differences in terms of shaping values and implementation of policy between a leader and a manager respectively. Zaleznik (1977, p.67) clearly specified the role of a manager and how a leader is above a manager in an organizational hierarchy of an enterprise. He observed (p.67) "While ensuring the competence, control and the balance of power relations among groups with the potential for the rivalry, managerial leadership unfortunately does not necessarily ensure imagination, creativity, or ethical behaviour in guiding the destinies of corporate enterprises -----

Stanley and Inge Huffman emphasised the most creative role of leadership by saying "One cannot look at a leader's art without looking at the artist ----"
This observation brings us to the difference between manager and leader and also to the individual personalities who are the real actors. While discussing the various roles of managers and leaders, William James (1896) identified two types which throw considerable light on the inherent differences. These types are 1. Once-born, and 2. Twice-born. James described these types:

"People of the former personality type are those for whom adjustments to life have been straightforward and whose lives have been more or less a peaceful flow from the moment of their birth. The twice-born, on the other hand, have not had an easy time of it. Their lives are marked by a continual struggle to attain some sense of order. Unlike the once-born they cannot take things granted."

This description of 'once-born' and 'twice-born' makes a very interesting criterion to understand a manager and a leader. In other words, it clarifies that a manager is a preserver and a leader is an innovator. Zaleznik (1977) observed: "Leaders tend to be twice-born personalities. They may work in organizations but they never belong to them. Their sense of who they are does not depend on memberships, work-roles, or other social indicators of identity." Zaleznik (1983) mentioned: "Leaders center their assumptions on people —— rather than on structures." Thus Zaleznik (1977, 1983) attempted to study the difference between a leader and a manager and also highlighted leaders' relationships with people and their people-oriented thinking in terms of organizational development.

3.4 In Search of Institutional Leadership

In the final section of this chapter an attempt has been made to identify institutional leadership. A classic work of Burns (1978) throws considerable light in this direction. Burns (1978) in his book titled "Leadership" identified
two types of leadership: 1. The Transactional Leadership, and 2. The Transforming Leadership. According to Burns (1978), the relationships between most leaders and followers are transactional. In other words, it is an exchange kind of relationship. This type of leadership is useful and required in politics, in parties etc. But the transforming leader, according to Burns (1978), "recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower. But, beyond that, the transforming leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy higher needs, and engages the full person of the follower. The result of transforming leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and may convert leaders into moral agents." In other words, the relationship between leaders and followers is mutually supported for common goals in transforming leadership. Burns (1978, p.20) addressed this type of leadership as "elevating, mobilizing, inspiring, exalting, uplifting, preaching, exhorting, evangelizing". Burns (1978, p.20) further described the transforming leadership: "The relationship can be moralistic, of course. But transforming leadership ultimately becomes moral in that it raises the level of human conduct and critical aspiration of both leader and led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both. Perhaps the best modern example is Gandhi, who aroused and elevated the hopes and demands of millions of Indians and whose life and personality were enhanced in the process."

Burns' (1978) study is more relevant to the present research because an institutional leader's relationship with the people, who help him in creating institutions is a classic example of transforming leadership. Burns (1978, p.20) explained "Transcending leadership is dynamic leadership in the sense that the leaders throw themselves into a relationship with followers who feel "elevated" by it and often become more active themselves, thereby creating new cadres of leaders. Transcending leadership is leadership engage." Thus, Burns (1978)
explained various aspects of transforming leadership which concentrate mainly on achieving a specific goal with the help of the followers whose mission also become the same as of a leader. Here again, the role of transforming leader is clear in the same sense that he wants his followers with the same mission and to be equal partners, therefore, it results in a very formal difference between the leader and the followers. The followers are made to be mission carriers and indirectly they also play leadership role.

Burns (1978) mentioned that ultimately the followers are transformed into 'a new cadre of leaders'. This change in the formal relationship between a leader and followers ultimately results in creating future leadership. This helps in the regeneration processes as part of renewal processes at the time of leadership change described by Ganesh (1979) in his general processual model of institution building.

In Burns's (1978) opinion the type of leadership that understands 'the emotions of others' is in a true sense transforming leadership. Similarly Zaieznik (1977) expressed the same views when he mentioned "Managers prefer working with people, leaders stir emotions". This indicates the need of understanding emotions of the followers by the transforming leadership.

Burns (1978) mentioned that a leader motivates his followers in such a way that it arouses confidence or a feeling of trust in his followers. This helps the followers to be able to accomplish a mission and share a common goal.

Bennis (1982) used an interesting metaphor for the transforming leadership when he called the leader a "Social architect."

Bennis (1982, p.54) mentioned:

"In to-day's society, leadership requires the ability to harness diffused power - and to empower others to translate a vision into reality."
Eeratis (1932, p.34) attempted to study the leadership role in organization as well as how it helps to translate an idea into reality and sustain it. He agreed with Burns (1978) about his leadership type - transforming leadership. Bennis (1982) supported Burns and mentioned "transformative power - the essence of what it originally meant to be a leader". Bennis (1982) considered leadership as the most important key variable in creating and nurturing institutions. According to Bennis (1982), leaders who distinguish themselves from managers, are highly concerned with the mission of an organization and they develop their vision to achieve the goals of an organization. Bennis (1982) described: "...they are concerned not with 'doing things right' (the overriding concern of managers) but with 'doing the right things'."


In short, according to Bennis (1982) 'nothing serves an organization better, than leadership which knows what it wants, communicates those intentions successfully, empowers others, and knows when and how to stay on course and when to change'. According to Bennis (1982) visionary characteristics of a leader play a very important role 'to take an organization to a place it has never been before the unknown'. This vision has three characteristics: 1. Simplicity, 2. Completeness, and 3. Communicability. Bennis (1982) explained "Transformative power implies a transaction between the leadership and some sort of participative response". Bennis (1982) defined leadership in a simple form: "When I began to realize that the expression of the intention is clear and simple while the space within is ambiguous and roomy, I then began to see that this is the art form of leadership".
What Bennis (1983, p.6t) concluded from his study of leadership is a very interesting and meaningful lesson in identifying a leader:

"They have a compelling vision, a dream about their work. They are highly conscious at all times of what they want. They are the most result oriented people. Leaders also share an ability to communicate and align people behind them, and the upshot is that those who work with them feel significant, they feel empowered. An effective leader has to be able to communicate ideas in a way that people can understand without falling prey to the multinational distortions that usually occur when ideas are filtered through a bureaucracy. A leader does not have to be articulate, but he has to have a knack for using the right metaphor. Effective leaders are also committed and persistent. Leaders know their own worth; they have positive self-regard. They realize what their strengths are and know how to nourish and nurture them. They are also able to discern the fit between what they are good at and what an institution's needs are. Leaders put all their energies into walking the tightrope; they don't think about failure. They don't even use the word, relying instead on such words as glitch, false start and bollise. They regard almost every false step as a learning opportunity - and not the end of the world."

No review of leadership literature will be complete unless it includes Greenleaf's (1977) concept known as "Servant as leader". This concept of servant as leader mainly focuses a leader's commitment to his mission originated for social change. Greenleaf (1977, p.13) rightly put it "It begins with the natural feelings that one wants to serve, to serve first." This very clearly indicates that the primary role of leadership is to serve people's highest priority needs. Greenleaf (1977, p.14) described this concept as "The natural servant, the person who is servant first, is more likely to persevere and refine a particular hypothesis on what serves..."
another's highest priority needs than is the person who is leader first and who later serves out of promptings of conscience or in conformity with normative expectations."

Greenleaf (1977, p.15) described such leadership:

"A leader ventures to say 'I will go; come with me'. A leader initiates, provides the ideas and the structure, and takes the risk of failure along with the chance of success. A leader says 'I will go; follow me'. While knowing that the path is uncertain, even dangerous. One then trusts those who go with one's leadership."

A leader wants his followers to follow him, though uncertain of the path he follows, and can also articulate it for those who are not sure of it. This clearly indicates the clarity of mission a leader has. The mission is conceived in a leader's vision which excites the people and cultivates trust in them. Greenleaf (1977) expected a leader - a visionary or a dreamer who with his inspiration, excites the imagination of his followers. Greenleaf (1977, p.16) described:

"Not much happens without a dream. And for something great to happen, there must be a great dream. Behind every great achievement is a dreamer of great dreams. Much more than a dreamer is required to bring it to reality; but the dream must be there first."

Thus Greenleaf (1977), Zaleznik (1977) and Dennis (1983) firmly asserted that vision is the prerequisite of transforming leadership which is supposed not only to guide or transact but to inspire trust and action.

3.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, a review of leadership literature relevant to the present study is presented.
The first section described various relevant personality theories which helps to understand how a personality differs from a common man. It was supported with various psychological studies and theories by Freud (in Hall & Gardner 1957) Jung (in Hall & Gardner 1957), Allport (1937) and William James (1890). All these studies were attempted to identify a number of characteristics of personalities. Kakar (1980) and Erikson (1963) highlighted the role of Hinduism and religion respectively in the development of human personality. Weber (1968) in his well-known concept of 'Charisma' attempted to identify certain qualities of individual personality which differs from an ordinary man. Weber (1968) described some important characteristics of leadership style and institution-building in which the concepts of charisma and vision were discussed.

The next section described various definitions and functions of leadership. Sinha (1980) in his leadership model, which he called 'The Nurturant-Task Leader (NT)' explained various functions of leadership. This leadership style is close to what Burns (1978) called transactional leadership.

Selznick (1957) described the administrative functions of leadership. He looked at leadership in terms of commitment, understanding and determination. He also touched the functional aspects of leadership. Selznick (1957) described the main function of leadership which is to help create an integrated social organism. Zaleznik (1977) largely focused his study on understanding the difference between a manager and a leader. Broadly speaking Zaleznik's main conclusion is that managers are implementers whereas leaders are visionaries and policy makers. He also referred to Burns' (1978) transforming leadership concept.

The last section reviewed the essence of the present study, that is, the role of institutional leadership, done by Burns (1978), Bennis (1982, 1983) and Greenleaf (1977).
Burns (1978) in his leadership study described different types of leadership. Among others two types are more relevant to the present study: Transactional and Transforming. Transactional leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things. The nature of the exchange may be economic, political or psychological. In Transforming leadership one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality.

Burns' concept of transforming leadership is close to the role of leadership in institution-building, which is also supported by Bennis (1982). Bennis (1982) identified some relevant characteristics of transforming leadership such as vision. Bennis (1982) described his leadership concept by saying that leadership transforms vision into action. He also stressed the role of creativity which ultimately helps a leader in formulation of vision.

Greenleaf (1977) described his concept 'Servant as Leader' which forms the basic characteristic of a leader.

This chapter takes into consideration various aspects of leadership such as its development, functions and qualities of a leader. This exercise of studying leadership through different angles and also with the help of different parameters such as psychological theories of personality, functional aspects of leadership in different contexts, environmental impact on leadership growth and finally leadership roles in different settings lays a foundation for the principal theme of this study.

A very significant factor which makes a lasting impact on leadership development is religion. Especially in the Indian context the doctrines of Hinduism play a very crucial role in personality development. Mainly two concepts of Hinduism,
namely, the Karma and the Svadharma almost serve as the basic components in leadership development. They compel a Hindu to remain faithful to himself, to his family and to his society.

This is done through his family tradition which does not permit him to go against them. Perhaps this is why Greenleaf (1977) advocated his concept of 'Serv-ant as Leader'. This analogue also indicates that 'serving (to serve)' is an in-built aspect of Hindu culture. The essence of duty inherent in Hindu ideology is best expressed in Lord Krishna’s words:

"Your right is to work only, but never to the fruit thereof. Let not the fruit of action be your object, nor let your attachment be to inaction."

- (Bhagavadgita)

This commitment to one's duty, and that also without any expectations, only can help in an objective evaluation of one's work. Functional aspects of leadership as studied by Selznick (1957) and Sinha (1980) also help to comprehend various functions and responsibilities of a leader in different settings like enterprises, organizations and institutions. They also highlight the relationship between a leader and his followers in terms of leader's sense of care and concern towards the followers and also in getting their support in achieving basic mission of an organization. Both Burns (1971) and Bennis (1982) contributed significantly in bringing the present study very close to a search for institutional leadership.

In other words Burns and Bennis have drawn a clearcut demarcation between an entrepreneur and an institutional leader. Burns' concept of transforming leadership is complementary to Bennis' concept of visionary leader. It very well clarifies the difference between a manager and a leader as discussed by Zaleznik (1977). William James' (1890) concept of 'once-born and twice-born' ultimately supported the theories of Zaleznik (1977) and Bennis (1982). All this leads to a new definition of institutional leadership:
An institutional leader is dedicated to the mission of an institution, and by the virtue of his vision and his strong belief in the vision strives to groom a group and/or individuals (who combine to form a team of institution builders or a critical mass) who in turn help the leader to create, nurture and sustain 'an appropriate operating culture' which ultimately enables him in institutionalization.