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In the previous chapter we have examined the information empirically collected on the annual plans formulated during the period of the study at various levels of the PR e.g. Anchal (i.e. a group of a few villages), Block and District levels as well as from the survey conducted for the purpose for the purpose of the study on achievements of different development projects undertaken by those PR-units. We have also analytically discussed and commented on the empirical findings relating to the performances achieved under different projects launched by the PRIs. It is noticed during the empirical study that the planning and implementing procedure of the PR cannot be regarded as satisfactory in view of the expectations of the rural people from the PRIs. As a result of this limitation available resources of the rural sector are not used properly for formulating programmatic plans and programmes. On the other hand, wastage of funds by the incf PR-administration seems to be alarming. The above adversities have resulted, in turn, dismal performances in almost all PR-units in the district. The PR-leaders as the formal administrators of the PR-units, therefore, should be responsible for all such heart-breaking performances of PRIs.

It may be referred to here that an endeavour has also been made in the preceding chapter III to identify the leadership pattern and in the next chapter i.e. chapter IV an evaluation of the performance of PR-units has also been undertaken.
The achievements of PR-units in their different areas of activities have been evaluated on the basis of the measures evolved for the purpose of the study. It becomes perspicuous from the analysis and evaluation of PR-activities in the preceding chapters that the performance of PR-units has not reached the expectation of the Government and the aspiration of common people as well. It further reveals from the preceding analysis that the different performances among the PR-units is widely spread. It is further conceived from the study that the present state of PR-performance is not directed attributed to the environmental factors or to the organisational climate. It has already been stated in earlier chapter in the study that the socio-political environment and the organisational climate in the PRI are by and large favourable to its statutory functioning and that too seems to be almost uniform throughout the whole State. Moreover, panchayati rules are equally applicable to all the panchayat bodies in the country and the State Government also has proclaimed that the principle of democracy should be followed not only in every sphere of its administration but also in different statutory bodies operating in this State. The difference in performances among the GPs noted in the Chapter IV appears to warranted by the difference in leadership styles followed by the concerned GPs. Therefore, it would not be folly to identify the leadership for the success and failure of the PR-programmes on the back ground of the entire analysis and the empiric findings of the study. In the foregoing chapter
the leadership styles of the PR-leaders at various levels of
the PR has already been identified. It has also been noted
here that the leadership pattern followed by the PR-leaders
are not uniform. Moreover, a PR-leader does not consistently
follow a particular style rather, he would articulate differ-
ent styles at different times as well as in different
situations. But, most of the times these leaders generally
favour democratic style for the activities outside the office
of the PR-unit, but within their panchayat office they have
usually endorsed bureaucratic style for the PR-administration.
PR-leaders, therefore, follow multiple style of leading. It
has further been observed that the village people are generally
socio-politically conscious and they also believe in democratic
system. Besides, they have a progressive outlook. Further
more they are willing to participate in the PR-activities.
Nevertheless, they were divested of the opportunity to partic-
cipate in the activities of PRIs. However, they maintain high
expectation from their Panchayats but in reality the panchayats
are hardly able to meet the expectation of the rural people.
Besides, it has already been highlighted that present PR-leaders
take into account of the opinion of the common people of respec-
tive locality neither in the decision making process nor in
formulating plans and implementing programmes for rural develop-
ment. It has also been brought to light in the early part of
this study that the leaders even do not maintain close contact
with the common people whom they represent. In the above cir-
cumstances it is natural that the rural people would keep
themselves away from the Panchayat activities. In fact, it has been noted in the empirical study that most of the rural people remain alienated from PR-functions and are gradually being frustrated more and more with PR-activities. On the other hand it has further been observed during empirical study that the PR-leaders also have come forward to express their opinions on the present state of PR-functions and also come out with good suggestions for the improvement of PR-system. It is surprising to note that these leaders have pleaded emphatically in favour of democratic and participative leadership style as well as participative process of decision making. They also speak in favour of involving the rank and file with all spheres of PR-functions. The observation seems ridiculous when it is noted that the views expressed by the respondent leaders are at variance with their activities so far PR-functions are concerned. It has further been observed that such dualistic behaviour and attitude of the PR-leaders is related to the phenomenon which has adversely affected their performance in PRIs.

Of late, it is noticed that the political leaders belonging to the ruling party have unofficially squeezed power of the PR-leaders and restricted their freedom and introduced strict control and supervision on their panchayati activities. Such undesirable political pressure seems to be the stumbling block to the smooth and natural process of PR-administration. This phenomenon not only restricts their initiative and dampen their spirit but also made them frustrated and unhappy as a result
they have accepted such incoherent and incompatible behaviour.

Despite favourable organisational climate as well as social environment, the rate of development in rural areas has been gradually decreasing, notwithstanding considerable enhancement of funds available for the steady upgradation of rural economy has been made. It appears, therefore, that the basic limitations to the effective administration in PRIs resulting dismal performances in various areas of PR-activities are primarily attributed to the nature and pattern of present leadership in different levels of PR in the State. The leaders have not only failed to provide effective leadership in the administration of PR-units but also are unable to motivate village people to involve in different PR-functions.

Therefore, it seems pertinent to examine here how much and to what extent the present PR-leaders have influenced the performances of PRIs. Of course, it may be admitted that in spite of its administrative limitations, PRIs have played a vital role in the socio-economic changes in the rural life of West-Bengal. But, with the passage of time PR-leaders are becoming more and more indisciplined and less committed to PR-activities, as a result the overall performance of PRIs in West-Bengal is on the wane. Moreover, the PR-leaders have almost lost their broad democratic outlook. They have ignored public relationship. They have turned themselves into bureaucrats like the officials in the Government departments. It has become one of the basic objectives of the study to find out how the PR-leaders have impressed the whole machinery of PR-administration as well as
the people with their present leadership styles that have already been detected and described in earlier chapter.

It deserve mention here that the performances of the PR-leaders have not yet reached the satisfactory level and the achievements attained by the PR-units through their various projects are not also up to the expectation of both the Government and the people. Besides, the present performance of the PRIs cannot be supported in view of the huge expenditure incurred for such meagre achievements. Moreover, it is generally perceived that there is a close relation between leadership style of an organisation and its performance. Therefore, present PR-performance are largely related with the nature and style of PR-leaders. Ceteris Paribus, the differences in the performances among the GPs. in the district can be explained by the differences in the nature and style of their leaders.

It has already been noted that the leadership style in PRIs are not uniform, rather several leadership patterns have emerged depending primarily on the Socio-economic background and personal traits of the leader. A leadership style changes from one leader to another so the performance and achievement also vary from one panchayat to another. Therefore, for the purpose of this study present leadership styles have been analysed and discussed in the preceding chapter. Besides, we have examined the effects of those leadership styles on PR-functions.

In this chapter it is intended to make an endeavour to assess
the effect of present leadership styles on PR-activities. With this end in view we have selected 12 CPs in the district and have taken interviews of the Prodhans (i.e. LL3) of those panchayats. The respondent panchayats have informed what they expect to achieve during a particular period i.e. the expected achievement of their PR-units as well as their actual achievement during that period. Actual performance has been stated in terms of percentage of expected achievement. By interpretation and analysis of those information, an attempt is made to expose the shortcomings and pitfalls of PR-activities emanating from the attitudes and styles of leading of the PR-leaders. We have also compared their different styles which they are exercising and tried to indicate which style is the best of those styles in perspective of target achievement.

It may be referred to here that in the chapter III the basic leadership styles of the PR-leaders have been analysed and identified. It has been noted in that chapter that PR-leaders generally follow democratic style but they often adopt bureaucratic or autocratic style in running the office and enforcing the rules and regulations or in dealing with the members belonging to opposition parties. Besides, they sometimes endorse task oriented style, even they also adopt occasionally laissezfaire style. So, it appears that the PR-leaders generally follow multiple leadership style. It is also noted in earlier chapter that the PR-leaders are generally not maintaining close
touch with the people and most of the office time they spent, remaining confined within their office. Notwithstanding that, the PR-leaders have been working within the democratic set up since long which has not only taken roots in the panchayat but also in the society. It is further noted that the panchayati leaders hardly follow participative style as they fail to keep close contact constantly with the people they represent. They discharge their duties and responsibilities with the help of a few number of subordinate members of workers in compliance with the counsel and advice of the political leaders of the ruling party they belong. Therefore, they PR-leaders maintain close relation only with a few leading persons of the political party to which they belong and a few number of subordinate workers as well, but they hardly maintain any direct contact with the common people of their locality.

Interpretation and observation of Leadership Styles :-

In the table no. 5.1 we have shown the overall leadership styles of GP-leaders i.e. Prodhans of 12 sample GP's which have been explained and discussed in the table no. 4.4 in chapter IV. To identify the leadership styles of the leaders of these GP's a few questions that have been selected from the 'questionnaire for common people' (Schedule C) as shown in section 'C' in Appendix II (c), have been administered on 120 common people of 60 villages under 12 GP's i.e. two men taken from each village. The responses of the common people received
### TABLE 5.1:

Statement showing Identification of Leadership Style of the Sample OPs in the District of Birbhum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Percentage of positive Responses and their Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-40 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.1</td>
<td>Prodhan has a tendency to impose his opinion upon the public.</td>
<td>10 4 10 5 20 3 10 5 20 4 30 4 10 6 40 2 70 1 20 5 60 2 50 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>Prodhan is interested more in office duty than in any public affairs on any field work.</td>
<td>20 3 40 3 20 3 50 2 40 3 50 2 40 3 60 1 50 3 60 2 70 1 60 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.3</td>
<td>Prodhan always takes advice from various persons before taking a decision.</td>
<td>50 1 60 1 60 1 40 3 80 1 60 1 70 1 20 4 40 4 50 3 20 5 30 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.4</td>
<td>Decision is taken by the group in the presence of the prodhan</td>
<td>30 2 50 2 30 2 40 3 50 2 40 3 50 2 20 4 10 6 50 3 40 4 20 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of positive Responses and their Ranks</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-40 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-40 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-40 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE-5.1 Contd. :-

Statement showing Identification of Leadership Style of the Sample GPs in the District of Birbhum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Percentage of positive Responses and their Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  11  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10 n-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P R P R P R P R P R P R P R P R P R P R P R P R P R P R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Prodhan gives stress on work at first, then on workers.</td>
<td>50  1  60  1  10  4  20  4  80  1  60  1  20  5  30  3  60  2  30  4  50  3  40  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>R.6 To the prodhan worker is more important than the work</td>
<td>10  4  60  1  60  1  50  2  80  1  60  1  70  1  10  5  20  5  60  2  10  5  10  6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>L.7 Prodhan fully depends on his subordinates in planning and executing.</td>
<td>20  3  30  4  30  2  70  1  50  2  40  3  30  4  10  5  10  6  80  1  20  5  10  6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = Percentage
R = Rank

1. Illambarar GP-2. 2. Sirsha GP 3. Ghurisha GP.
### TABLE 5.1 (a)

Rank Comparison of Seven Leadership Styles of the Leaders of Twelve Sample GP's in the District of Birbhum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP</th>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Overall Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F:4 B:3 D:1 P:2 T:1 R:4 L:3</td>
<td>D, T</td>
<td>F, R</td>
<td>DT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F:5 B:3 D:1 P:2 T:1 R:4</td>
<td>D, T, R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F:3 B:3 D:1 P:2 T:4 R:1</td>
<td>D, R</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F:5 B:3 D:1 P:2 T:4 R:1</td>
<td>D, R</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F:4 B:3 D:1 P:2 T:1 R:2</td>
<td>D, T, R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F:4 B:2 D:1 P:3 T:1 R:3</td>
<td>D, T, R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F:6 B:3 D:1 P:2 T:5 R:1</td>
<td>D, R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F:2 B:1 D:4 P:4 T:3 R:3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>R, L</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F:1 B:3 D:4 P:6 T:2 R:5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P, L</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F:5 B:2 D:3 P:4 T:2 R:1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F:2 B:1 D:5 P:4 T:3 R:5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F:2 B:1 D:3 P:4 T:6 R:6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>R, L</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = Authoritative  
D = Democratic  
T = Task Oriented  
B = Bureaucratic  
P = Participative  
R = Relationship Oriented  
L = Laissez-faire.
from each CP have been calculated in terms of percentage and the position of the respective CPs have been ranked on the basis of their respective percentage of scores which have been summarized in the table No. 5.1. The overall style adopted by the leaders of a CP has been adjudicated on the basis of their respective ranks identified earlier. The style which has got the first rank has been distinguished as the overall style of the leader of that particular CP. Through rank comparison between seven leadership styles of these PR-leaders in the district that has been displayed in the table 5.1(a) overall styles of the CP-leaders have been accordingly determined. It may be noted from the table no. 5.2 that the prodhans of the Churisha CP and Kurnahar CP No. 2 are basically democratic and relationship oriented while the prodhans of Mangaldih GP and Chandidas Nanoor GP are the followers of laissezfaire style. But the leaders of Chouhatta CP and Kurunnahar CP are basically bureaucratic. However, the leaders of Sirshha CP, Labpur CP No. I and Barasaota CP are democratic having equal emphasis on both the task oriented and relationship oriented styles; while, the prodhans of Labour CP No. II have adopted benevolent authoritative style. But in the case of Illambazar CP the leadership style is basically democratic but having tendency towards task orientation.

The table 5.2 depicts the picture of average overall achievements of those 12 sample CPs including the achievements on various individual schemes. It may be observed from the table 5.2 that the CPs—where laissezfaire leadership style has
### TABLE 5.2:

Leadership Style of the Leaders of the 12 Sample GPs in Birbhum District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Name of the GPs</th>
<th>P.S.</th>
<th>Achievement (%)</th>
<th>Overall Style of Leading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Illambazar</td>
<td>Illambazar</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>52.38 Democratic (Task)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sirsha</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>61.21 Democratic (Task &amp; Relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ghurisha</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50.80 Democratic (Relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mangaldihi</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36.99 Laissezfaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Baza-Saota</td>
<td>Nanoor</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64.56 Democratic (Task &amp; Relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Labpur-I</td>
<td>Labpur</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55.01 -do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kunahar-II</td>
<td>Nanoor</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50.53 Democratic (Relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ghouhatta-I</td>
<td>Labpur</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46.96 Bureaucratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Labpur-II</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45.99 Benevolent Authoritative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Chandidas</td>
<td>Nanoor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25.24 Laissezfaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Purandarpur</td>
<td>Suri-II</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41.37 Bureaucratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kurunnahar</td>
<td>Labpur</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45.29 Bureaucratic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE No. 5:1: OVERALL STYLES OF THE PR-LEADERS AND THEIR RANKS ON THE BASIS OF ACHIEVEMENT
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References:
- D = Democratic
- F₁ = Authoritative-I
- F₂ = Authoritative-II
- B = Bureaucratic
- L = Laissez-faire
- P = Participative
- T = Task Oriented
- R = Relationship Oriented
- N = Nurturant
- S = Supportive
been identified, have the record of lowest performance among the GPs in our sample. Similar observation may be noted in cases of Chandidas Nanoor GP and Mangaldihi GP. These GPs have attained an overall achievement of 25.24% and 36.99% only. On the other hand, the GPs where democratic leadership with the blend of relationship oriented style is followed, have exhibited better results e.g. Churisha GP and Kinnahar GP No. II which have recorded 50.80% and 50.53% achievement respectively. Those PR-leaders who have followed basically bureaucratic style of leading, have been able to attain better results than that of those leaders who usually adopt laissez-faire style, nevertheless they have recorded lower performances than that of the leaders who have basically followed democratic and relationship oriented style. It is also observed in the study that a benevolent authoritative leader also has the record of lower achievement in terms of performances than the democratic relationship oriented leader. However, the achievement of PR-unit run by a benevolent authoritative leader is almost equal to that of a bureaucratic leader. The highest achievement has been recorded in the GPs which are run by the leaders who have adopted democratic as well as task oriented and relationship oriented style i.e. 'middle of the way' or 5:5 style. This phenomenon may be noted in the following GPs e.g. (1) Samaa Saota GP has recorded 64.56% achievement; (2) Sirsha GP has obtained 61.21% of its performance goals; and (3) Labpur GP No. I has reached 55.01% of its targets. However, the performances of individual sample GPs as are shown
in table 5.2 have also been depicted with the help of a diagram in the figure no. 5.1(a). Achievements of 12 sample GPs are compared in the diagram in respect of leadership styles followed by the leaders of these GPs. Only one GP among the sample GPs is identified as authoritative (F) and only one as democratic task oriented (DT). Therefore, it would not be possible to state the maximum and minimum achievement of these two leadership styles. However, in other cases maximum and minimum performances have been possible to be shown in the diagram. It is to be mentioned here that among the 12 sample GPs, three GPs have been identified for bureaucratic (B), three GPs for democratic task and relationship oriented (DT R), two GPs for democratic relationship oriented and two GPs for laissezfaire style. The remaining two are authoritative (F) and democratic task oriented (DT) respectively.

The leaders' expectation for the institutional achievement which have been estimated from their own assessment ranges from 60% to 80%. It is interesting to note that none of the leaders has been able to fulfil his expectation except the task and relationship leaders i.e. the leaders following the middle of the way or 5:5 style, have been successful to maintain an upward trend of achievement and the records of their achievement have been very close to their expected targets. On the contrary, the leaders who adopt laissezfaire style of leading are far away from their target. In the case of democratic leaders, achievements are though not
Figure: 5.1(a)

Maximum and minimum achievement in percentage of different leadership styles adopted by the leaders of 12 sample groups.

Leadership Styles: 
- F - Authoritative
- B - Bureaucratic
- DT - Democratic Task Oriented
- DTR - Democratic Task and Relationship Oriented
- DR - Democratic Relationship Oriented
- L - Loisezfaire

1 cm = 10%
satisfactory, but still it is better than that of the former. The achievements of the democratic leaders who have adopted either the task oriented or the relationship oriented style, are moderate though their expectations were higher than what they have really achieved. But when the achievements of task oriented leaders and those of relationship oriented leaders are compared, it is noticed that the former is better than the latter. On the other hand, achievements of benevolent authoritative leader are more or less similar to those of the bureaucratic leaders. Of course, in some cases benevolent authoritative style appears to be better than bureaucratic style. This phenomenon can be explained in following lines. Bureaucracy in panchayat institution has visibly made the panchayat detached from the common people while benevolent authoritative style has the tendency to provide services and benefits to the people as such it has earned warmth goodwill from the public. It is noticed from the table no. 5.2 that the benevolent authoritative style is attributed to Labpur GP no. 2 which has recorded better results than Purandarpur GP which has the experience of bureaucratic leadership style. It appears from the above analysis that the laissezfaire style leadership has recorded the lowest performance while, the democratic style has registered the best performance. Again, of the two types of democratic style -- task oriented and relationship oriented, task-oriented is better; but the democratic style having equal tendency both for task orientation and relationship orientation is the best of all styles in performance.
Analysis and Examination of Effects of Leadership Styles on PR-functions.

As stated earlier the records of public relation maintained by the PR-leaders irrespective of their nature and styles have not been satisfactory. Popular participation is conspicuous by its absence in all leadership situation as well as in all sorts of PR-activities. The leaders primarily depend on their subordinate members and other co-workers employed for the implementation of PR-programmes. Being in the centre of all organisation as well as social activities in rural community, PR-leader with help of leadership ability really motivate the members and workers of their PR-unit to participate in accomplishment of their duties and responsibilities.

Bureaucratic leaders have always the tendency to follow rigidly the statutory rules and regulations, and maintain the status quo. They do not establish and maintain any relation with the local people and mostly remain engaged in office works. They are not at all relationship oriented. So, the effect of their style of leading either on their subordinates or on the people is very limited. However, sometimes it produces negative impact upon the superordinates.

A benevolent authoritative leader does not acknowledge the importance of the democracy in running the affairs of a concern as he totally ignores the opinion of the other members of the -- specially in taking decisions relating to the vital roles of
the concern. Naturally, the subordinate members i.e. the followers are not satisfied, rather disgusted with autocratic behaviour of their leader. The subordinates therefore, are not in any way interested in the accomplishment of the organisational goals. Nevertheless, these leaders are conscious of institutional targets and also undertake the responsibility for the welfare of the people engaged in their organisations. These leaders, therefore, try their best to put up the highest performance so as to attain the avowed goals. They often able to score a little better result than the laissez faire leaders.

A democratic leader by and large favours democracy and tries to follow it as far as possible in different spheres of his activity. As such he takes resort of all democratic approaches, process and techniques in the administration allowing some leverage to all classes of people of his organisation in almost all aspects of PR-administration e.g. decision making, formulation of plans, implementation of programmes etc. As a result, people of the PR-organisation in particular and the society in general are more or less satisfied with them. The sense of belonging of the employees in this system improves which, in turn, helps the rate of absenteeism come down and involvement of the employees in different spheres of organisational activities increases. On the contrary, high rate of absenteeism is a common feature both in the bureaucratic and in the benevolent authoritative leadership situations. Among the democratic leaders those who are task oriented, emphasize more on the work than workers and do not encourage relationship
orientation with the followers. Accordingly, the subordinates or the followers may develop a feeling that they are merely the working hands to their leaders who may hire or fire them at the sweet will of the leaders. So, they have lost sympathy for their leaders. Besides, the employees working in such environment would develop a feeling of insecurity. Thus they become least motivated toward the target achievement of their organisation. On the other hand, those democratic leaders who give more emphasis on relationship with their employees, are able to win their heart of their subordinates and are able to make them motivated towards the achievement of institutional goals. But, as they hardly provide their subordinates with detailed information about the duties and responsibilities, the subordinates under this leadership do not give any importance to the proper and timely accomplishment of their assigned jobs, as a result the followers gradually would lose initiative and sincerity to discharge their duties and responsibilities, rather they develop the habit of avoidance, indolence, etc. Therefore, target achievement of relationship oriented leaders is marginally lower than that of the task oriented leaders. But, the democratic leaders who follow and practice both task orientation and relationship orientation patterns in their style of leading in such a way so as to reach an equilibrium of the two opposite patterns of leadership style enabling the leaders to maintain a satisfactory relation with the subordinates and at the same time help to reach a satisfactory level of performance, are quite able to win their subordinates' mind as well
as influence them favourably to accomplish the entrusted jobs for the attainment of highest results.

On the contrary, those PR-leaders who basically follow the laissezfaire style and fully depend on their followers for the accomplishment of organisational goals, have achieved the lowest results. The employees under this system become indisciplined, irregular, contentious and are beyond the control of administrators. They often skip over their assigned duties and shrink their responsibilities. 'Posing over the bucket' the above mentalities develop among the employees and consequently organisation fails to accomplish the expected performances. There is no doubt that the laissezfaire style in the long seen would affect adversely the performance of the subordinates. Therefore, it becomes an obvious conclusion that the laissezfaire style of leading is no longer desirable.

Benevolent authoritative style and the bureaucratic style are not generally very effective as the leaders who adopt these leadership styles, are seemed to be not sensitive to the reaction of the subordinates resulting from their behaviour and attitude they have formed, and the practices they have developed in dealing with their subordinates. As a consequence, these types of leadership make favourable impacts on the performance of their subordinates.

But democratic style is generally effective and desirable. However, the democratic style should not have too much leaning
towards either task orientation or relationship oriented pattern, rather both the behavioural patterns should be judiciously balanced so that optimum results may be attained. Such democratic style, therefore, is regarded as the middle of the way or 5:5 style which seems to be the best among the present styles for the PR-leaders. In describing the 'Managerial Grid' Blake and Mouton conceived the idea that at 5:5 style (Middle Road) adequate performance through balance of work requirement and maintaining satisfactory morale of the workmen can be achieved. Table 5.2 shows that the PR-leaders who follow this particular style have achieved the highest results. So, it is to be admitted without any dispute that among the styles of the PR-leaders discussed earlier in the study, the 5:5 style is the best for administration of the PRIs. It emphasizes equally to the achievement of tasks and maintenance of good relationship between the leaders and the functionaries. It, thus, has judiciously balanced the opposite and conflicting objectives of an organisation. Therefore, it seems to be highly desirable from the viewpoint of task achievement and from the viewpoint of relationship as well. In this study it has been possible to verify the proposition of 'Managerial Grid' theory of Blake and Mouton. It is amazing to note that the basic proposition of the theory has been found valid even in the rural sector in India.

It may be recalled here that in Chapter III an attempt has been made to identify the leadership pattern. It has been noted there that the PR-leaders, in their self assessment,
have recorded first preference to the task oriented style, second preference to the participative style and third preference to the bureaucratic style. But it is also noticed in that part of the empirical study that the participative style of leadership is quite absent in the PR-system. In fact, most of the PR-leaders follow democracy but they hardly adopt the participation process where the subordinates as well as the common people of that locality would be invited to take portion the administrative process. Some of the respondent leaders in our sample have expressed their preference to task oriented style, while some others are in favour of relationship oriented pattern. However, these leaders are able to stroll the average performance. A few of them who have adopted democratic leadership style, prefer to follow middle of the way i.e. 5:5 style and have recorded the highest results no doubt, but still fail to reach their expectation. On the other hand, the authoritative style has been the least preferred one nevertheless, it has been observed time and again that it is one of the principal styles of leading endorsed by the PR-leaders. In fact, many of the PR-leaders follow the bureaucratic style albeit they record it is their third preference. However, the OPs which have experience of these two types of leadership style, have exhibited very poor results.

It reveals from the empirical study that the respondent leaders generally favour the democratic, task oriented and participative styles. But the style what they actually practise in PRIs, is
that type of democracy which totally ignores the task factor. The application of participative style, as revealed from the empirical data, is few and far between. This is why the achievements of almost all GPs are less impressive and quite far behind the expected level.

Summing Up: -

Notwithstanding that each and every PR-leader has some basic aptitude for a particular leadership style, nevertheless PR-leaders usually follow multiple style that means, these leaders articulate different styles in different situations at different times i.e. some sort of contingency or situational approach they usually apply for running the PR-administration. PR-leaders have different economic and social background and they also have different set of beliefs and faiths as such they have formed different mentality and aptitude. It is natural, therefore, that they should adopt different leadership styles in discharging their duties and responsibilities relating to PR-administration. So the PR-leaders are different from one another in respect of running their offices, dealing with the subordinates and taking decision which comprise the pattern of their leadership style. Therefore, achievements under different leadership styles are not equal neither quantitatively nor qualitatively.

Among the different styles identified in the study it is observed that the authoritative as well as the bureaucratic styles are less impressive so far the performance of GPs are concerned and
the laissezfaire style is the least impressive in every respect. The democratic style, on the other hand, has some positive impact and effect on the functions of the PRI and its people as well. These impacts are reflected on the achievements of the PRI which can be understood by examining the information summarised in the table 5.2. From the table no. 5.2 we can find that the leader who follows the laissezfaire style, has the least achievement. Authoritative and bureaucratic PR-leaders have also recorded poor performance. Only the democratic leaders have been able score satisfactory results higher than any other, -- in the sense it attains the highest performance among different forms of leadership style identified in the study. Among the democratic leaders, particularly those who follow 'middle of way' i.e. 5:5 style, have recorded the best performance.

Therefore, we can precisely conclude that among the present leadership styles identified in the study the democratic style having equal consideration for both the task and the people, may be regarded as the best style considering the present socio-economic and political environment in the country. It would have been better if this style had been oriented for greater participation of the subordinates as well as the common people in every sphere of PR-functions. Here, it may be quoted that Saluantray Mehta Study Team commented, "So long as we do not discover or create a representative and democratic institution which will supply the local interest, supervision and care necessary to ensure that expenditure of money upon local projects conform with the needs and wishes of locality, invest with
adequate power and assign to it appropriate finance, we will never be able to evoke local interest and excite local initiative in the field of development.\textsuperscript{1}\ The panchayati Raj (PR) has been metamorphosed into a democratic institution and the representatives thereof are also elected through a democratic process based on universal franchise but this alone would not ensure that the public interest to be protected and aspiration and expectation of the people to be reckoned with and available resources to be used judiciously for the development projects.

Democracy in India and other Asian countries has been infested with many vices which have largely eclipsed its virtues. Democracy in these countries become sine qua non of corruption, favouratism, nepotism and fundamentalism; in a nutshell, it makes every public administration nothing more than a mess. The unhappy consequence of democracy has emerged because there is scope in Indian democracy at present to call back an elected representative by his electors in any case. As a result, elected representatives are not accountable to their electorate. This is manifested in the autocratic behaviour of the elected representatives of this country. Therefore, democratisation of any administrative process only is not sufficient for evoking local interest and generating initiative in the field of development. Rather, it largely depends on the principle, behaviour and attitude of the representatives and above all, leadership style of the leaders. What is important for the people's democracy is the consciousness of the people and two way communication between the representatives and the people whom they
represent, that means between what the people expect and what the leaders are actually doing. Feedback of communication from both sides is urgently necessary. It primarily depends on the mental orientation of the representatives and their behavioural patterns what are generally termed as leadership patterns. Due to wrong leadership styles the basic objectives of the PRIs have not been realised. Besides, participation of the subordinates as well as of the common people in different spheres of PR-functions is imperative for its success. This has been time and again highlighted by the scholars of this field. The Dantewala Working Group stated, "the leadership of the Panchayati Raj institutions acts as a 'gate keeper' and prevents the flow of benefits of the weaker sections of the rural community." So, the DWG recommends for reservation about participation in the planning process of the PR. According to a foreign observer, "if the villager really gains a sense of participation in a co-operative enterprise of social rejuvenation and nation-building, then a revolution will truly have come to the Indian countryside and to India as a whole. In this gigantic enterprise the panchayats could play a central role". In reality, it is our practical experience that the people have gained no sense of participation though they are socio-politically conscious and it is only due to fault of the representatives of the people who have failed to adopt proper leadership style and are almost devoid of participative behaviour as such they hardly invite participation of the people in PR-activities. Wrong leadership styles of the PR-leaders is manifested in the lack of
involvement and participation of the local people in PR-activities. Unfortunately, even the participation of the subordinates in decision making is also absent in the PRI s. This is why revolution as dreamt by Norman D. Palmer could not take place in India. Dr. Ashok K. Mukhopadhyay has rightly remarked, "Till now Panchayati Raj in West Bengal has only achieved political mobilization of the educated, low-middle class and functional mobilization of school teachers, rural bankers, technical personnel of Government Departments. There has been no attempt at comprehensive grass roots mobilization of the marginal farmers and landless rural proletariat." Political and functional mobilization of the rural poor mass has not emerged due to non-acceptance of the participative system by the PR-leaders in the administrative process of PRI s. As a result, none of the GPs has been able to score higher achievement in spite of having favourable socio-political environment in this state. Prof. William Robson stated, "I can not comprehend how a society can call itself welfare state unless it strives to ensure the widest possible participation by the citizens in the exercise of political power and making of executive decisions." Therefore, it appears that West Bengal may not be called a welfare state as its autonomous administrative wings could not ensure citizens' participation in planning and executing process that has brought about poor achievement in development programmes.

However, three basic leadership styles e.g. laissezfaire, benevolent authoritative and bureaucratic style usually fail to evolve the participative system. Only democratic style can
ensure it, so it is highly desirable for individual goal satisfaction as well as organisational goal attainment. But a democratic style devoid of participative behaviour will not be effective because democracy without participative system is not a public democracy rather, it is a 'group democracy' which is prevailing in the PRIs and has been discussed in earlier chapter. Maheswari, B.L. remarked, "One of the more frequently articulated propositions about relationship between style and effectiveness emphasises the importance of participative style for higher effectiveness (i.e. organisational effectiveness)." Moreover, PR-leaders should not only be democratic but also be equally task oriented and relationship oriented. Therefore, leadership style of the PR-leaders to be highly effective should primarily be democratic one based on participative system having emphasis on both the task and relationship in such a manner so that the performances of PR-organisations may reach to the optimum level.

It is generally conceived that the employees in the long run will produce more under democratic leadership that they would work under any other system. This assumption, however, is the basis of entire human relations movement. However, there is at least one good reason for prediction. Particularly the reinforcement value of work performed under democratic supervision should be higher than that of the work performed under autocratic leadership. High level of performance will be obtained in the situation when reinforcement is high, whereas the performance would be lower where the reinforcement is poor.
This is regarded as the basic tenet of experimental psychology. Democratic supervision by allowing the subordinates' freedom in determining the specific form and content of their work, implicates the personalities of the employees in the task they accomplish. This reveals that the production under democratic leadership becomes a means for satisfying the ego esteem and self actualisation needs. 

Greater opportunity for regulating and controlling their own activities (Produced by degree to which individual could express their various and diverse needs and could move in the direction of full exploitation of their potential while on the job.) Similarly authoritarian leadership makes work merely carrying on at the supervision's will in as much as it reduces the degree to which such need satisfaction can be derived from production. Therefore, since production under authoritarian leadership is less satisfying than under democratic leadership, it is obvious that worker could be less productive in the former condition than in the latter.

Similarly, it is believed that bureaucracy stifles human abilities and creative urges, and it fails to control human error and limitations e.g. favouratism, paternalism, idiosyncratic behaviour etc. As a result, performance of an organisation under bureaucratic leadership can not reach at a satisfactory level. Whereas, it is generally accepted that participative form of leadership style would provide the employees with wide scope for participation inasmuch as crabling the employees to get maximum satisfaction of higher needs (in term of Maslow). As a result, production would reach the highest level under participative leadership. The above proposition regarding democratic
leadership has been verified and tested. It is interesting to note that the GPs run by the leaders having democracy orientation excels better performance.

Brief Summary :-

It reveals from the earlier discussion of the findings that the PR-leaders generally follow multiple style of leading. Nevertheless, each and every PR-leader has special inclination towards a particular style which he generally apply but sometimes he blends one or two other leadership styles. However, this difference in leadership styles is manifested in the organisations. This why the achievements of different PRIs are not equal both in quantity and in quality. It has been observed that the democratic style having equal emphasis on both the task orientation and relationship may be considered to be the best form of leadership for PRIs. It is also perceived that if the participative system is induced in the democratic style, that democratic style would be further better and highly effective. Democratisation of all institutions and systems is the first and foremost condition for creating favourable working environment which warrants that the representatives of the people should generally adopt and follow the democratic leadership style which inter alia would not only involve all people of the locality representing the PRI-unit in different spheres of PR-activities, but also develop each much better communication between the representatives and the people they represent. As a result, the PR-leaders will get better feedback which would surely
improve their performance. The urgent need of the hour is to inculcate a sense among the people that the PR is their own organisation. Therefore, it should be run for them and also by them, this only can transform the PR into a true democratic institution which will ultimately bring forth a forum not only for the rural people but also for the whole nation. We must keep in mind that India lives in villages. The prosperity of India depends on the development of its villages. The PR will har bourner new era of peace and prosperity in the villages vis-a-vis in the country.
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