CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION
The concept of leadership has played a very crucial role in the human history since the earliest times. The historians have glorified heroes in battle and valued the importance of their deeds for the next succeeding generations. The role played by politicians, statesmen, and emperors in the development of empires territories and nations received considerable attention in the imperial history. The term leadership has got its own importance even in the modern times. There is continual search for men with leadership qualities. At present, in India the crises is the crises of leadership which can give new dimensions to the peoples zeal in accordance with the concepts of democracy and socialism.
Leadership is a very conspicuous example of interaction among members of a group, large or small as also of a social role. Since leadership makes the members of a group accept certain goals and values and the means of achieving them, the team leadership is described as a process of social control. Leadership may be explained either by reference to the Persons' traits and characteristics which go the making of a leader or by reference to the social situations on which leadership arises. The first is the "Greatman Theory" emphasising the leader's personality and the second is the 'Times Theory' stressing the situations and circumstances in which leaders arise.

In any society leadership is the essential component for progress in social as well as economic aspects. The planning and guided action will be successful only when they are effectively organised by proper leadership. Rural leadership, in India instead of basing upon the qualities and virtues of leaders, is depending upon the caste structure from the beginning. But the change in the outlook of the people due
to increasing education, secularisation, urbanisation and industrialisation is also resulting into some important change in the Indian caste system as well as leadership structure.

The Indian social structure is mostly interwoven with the caste system and in course of change the economic structure is also dominated by it. The political power also followed the same lines, being represented comparatively by the higher castes. As a result the representation for lower caste was almost nil, especially so in the pre-British India. Government of India has accepted the policy of reserving some seats in the political sphere for the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and women. Even though thus in the form of reservation there is representation for weaker sections and leadership, they are yet to determine their role in rural leadership. The control of dominant caste, rich caste and higher caste on these lower castes representatives is yet prevailing unless the weaker sections, which carry the bulk of population in India, are properly represented in the
political structure we can say that proper leadership will not be there.

A close observation at the structure of leadership especially at the village panchayat level shows that it is determined by various social factors. In the words of social scientist it is found that 'the leadership continues to be in the hands of comparatively old, moderately educated, tradition steeped, Higher Caste and rich people in the village.'

MEANING OF LEADERSHIP:

At any time and at any place, suppose if we find a group of people then we can observe a single person being more active and dominant over the rest of the group. With the formation of the group generally we can find one or more persons expressing their ideas and suggesting some other ideas by which they can lead the whole group. But this formation of group becomes more thicker and leadership - followership hierarchy results. As the group becomes more stronger, the role of the leader becomes very crucial and the character
of the leader determines the fate of the whole group.

It is really a very difficult task to define the term leadership. However, certain authors have defined leadership in different ways but almost carries the same meaning. "Leadership is often regarded as important modifier of organisation behaviour. It is regarded as primarily. Personal in character as being founded upon individual reeminence or accomplishment in a particular field of behaviour. Thus, superior strength, superior tact, superior intelligence, superior knowledge, superior will power, any or all of those may be the means to the attainment of leadership". This is the general definition by which we can study the characteristics of leadership. No one may deny that those personal qualities do pay dividends but leadership is not at all personal pre-eminance. It is the capacity to set new goals, to hold both new and old expectations for the group and to show the groups. It is the noble potentialities that make man a leader. Leadership has therefore double meaning. The dictionary meaning of the word 'to lead', shows that the term is used in the different senses.
(a) "to excel, to be an advance, to be prominent"
(b) to guide others to be the head of an organisation, to hold, or 'command'. In the former sense leadership is identified with individual preeminence and in the latter sense, it is identified with organisational talent. So there is always differentiation between personal leadership and group leadership. A person is born with the talent of personal leadership but he must lead group leadership. Leadership is an instrument by which one can lead the group towards the direction to achieve a goal. It is the relationship between the leader and the rest to accomplish some of the goals. There were certain terms like power stations, influence and control which have been widely used in leadership. However control and influence are found to be common. A traditional society which is traditionally oriented will be generally having a traditional leader and a modern society will be having a modern-oriented.

The importance of leaders is very essential for every group. The leader will be leading the whole group at all times. Supposing one group is in crisis
with the other group the leaders of the particular groups try to lead the group, and he directs the group energy. The leader also tries to utilise the sub-groups and mixes them with his own group for collective effort. The leadership of M.K. Gandhi during our freedom struggle, when he brought together different communities and presented a united front to the British Government, illustrates the power and value of leadership to a nation.

The following are some of the characteristics of leadership:

1) Leadership denotes a mutual behaviour pattern between the leader and his followers.

2) Leadership is a two way affair. The followers influence the behaviour of the leader in as much as the leader influences their behaviour.

3) The concept of leadership can be understood only in the context of followers. Without followers there can be no leader.

4) Leadership involves the element of willingness
Leadership is based on cooperation and good will. Sheer, threat and force can not maintain one a leader for long.

5) Leadership is a specific to a specific situation. A person cannot be a leader in all the fields.

**APPROACHES FOR UNDERSTANDING LEADERSHIP:**

There are two main approaches for the study of leadership basing upon traits and situations. In the early times leadership was considered to originate from the personal qualities of leader and sufficient was given to the contribution of the group structure and situation. In the early studies attention was paid to compare leaders and non leaders. The later studies revealed the policy of the traitist approach. Gib remarked that the leader traits are relative to a specific social situation and are not in isolation. Leadership is both a function of social and a function of personality. The situationist approach to leadership provides a corrective to the traits approach which
regarded leadership as unequally superior individuals who would lead in whatever situation or time they might find themselves. "The way of leadership appears not to reside in any personality trait considered singly, not even a constellation of related traits, but in the interpersonal contribution of which the individuals become capable in a specific setting eliciting such contribution from him". The leadership is a significant measure in the situation in which he operates.

**NATURE OF LEADERSHIP:**

The salient points about the nature of leadership can be outlined as follows.

1) Usually a hierarchy of leadership emerge from the group when it becomes more and more complex with regard to its structure and differentiation of functions. At the apex of this hierarchy is the "inner circle" of primary leaders who from a short of 'Kitchen Cabinet'. Its main function is to chalk out the policies and programmes determine and orient the
strategies and tactics and goals which are to be achieved. The base of the hierarchy is composed of masses of followers. All the stratum within this hierarchy and the individual units of members within each stratum are linked to one another by system or web of dominance-subordination relations.

ii) Leadership becomes apparent at the time of crisis and during such situation. The achievement of goals become blocked. Then there arises threat to the balance between leader-follower relationship. In this over all situation, any "would-be leader" gets his chance to assume leadership.

iii) The threats which are of two types, internal and external may lead to structural instability among the sub-groups. The pressure of all these factors distribute the social equalibrium. Any person who succeeds in restoring this equalibrium gets the chance of being acknowledged as a leader.

iv) Whenever formal leader does not adequately perform or fails to fulfil the expectations of his
followers or common masses, new leaders are likely to emerge. In these circumstances, change in leadership is often initiated by a "vote of no confidence" or group disapproval.

v) The leader is a distinct person from a non-leader in the sense that the former has the ambition to get power, prestige, and material gain.

vi) Leadership is a social status position. This feature of leadership was noted by H.J. Laski and later mentioned by Pitirim. A Sorokin in his book "Social Mobility" both these scholars have analysed have how leaders attain status position in particular social structures how they are recruited, what occupational skills do they posses and what are the Channels of their accent to power.

vii) Leadership is an organisational function and institutional position. This is authenticated by Harold. F. Gosnell's "Machine politics". It has been noted that in large scale organisations, formal centralisation may infact result in the devolution of
authority to elements that are far away from the centre of leadership.

viii) In "Psychology and Politics" H.D., Losswell has viewed leadership phenomenon in terms of its power and polity implications. All these considerations point out to understand the nature of leadership and we must consider not only the factors in the group situation, perceptions and aspirations of the followers but also the psychology of potential leaders.

DEFINITIONS OF LEADERSHIP:

Various writers have defined leadership in various ways, which are as follows:

In the words the Bernard "A leader is any person who is more than ordinary efficient in carrying psychological stimuli to other and is thus effective in conditioning collective responses."

Bogardas says, "A leader is a person who exerts special influence over a number of people...... These must be both special influence and a number of
Garina defines, "A leader is an instigator of movement by instigating group behaviour and facilitating release of emerging of people in the group for action towards a desired goal or direction, by virtue of a combination of qualities which enable him to get things done willingly by others".  

George R. Terry explained Leadership as the activity of influence people to strike willingly for group objectivities.  

Blanchard defined leadership as, "The process of an individual or a group in efforts towards goal achievement in a given situation".  

To Tannenbaum Leadership is "An interpersonnel influence exercised in a situation, directed through the communication process towards the attainment of specialised goal or goals."  

Batia analyses political leaders and puts it "A political leader is an administrator, policy maker,
ideologist and tries to build an image and acquire, charisma for both his election and power building up his own system of bargaining, trading, doubt dealing, nepotism and chicanery”.

B. Raven J. Rubin defined “a leader as some one who occupies a position in a group, influences others in accordance with the role expectations for that position, and coordinates and directs the group in maintaining itself and reaching its goals.”  

A. Zaleznik, and H. Dilmmes have defined "The crux leadership is the acceptance of responsibility."  

CLASSIFICATION OF LEADERS:

Leaders have been variously classified according to the area of life and thought in which they operate or according to the type of control they exercise, we may list few types.

1. INTELLECTUAL LEADERS: They dominate in the words of ideas. He is an idealist and dreamer. An
intellectual leader will have a large and effective appeal than the man of action who ruled supreme and easy in olden times or he may be leading in thought alone, that is creating such an intellectual climate that people is thinking is greatly influenced by his theories and ideas. Galileo, Darwin, Lenin and Gandhi were great leaders in thought.

2. **ADMINISTRATIVE LEADER**: An administrative leader is a man of action who gets, the things done on account of his Knack. He is successful in executive commonly found in business, Government and politics. The administrative leaders may be authoritarian or democratic.

The authoritarian leader is a single leader or one man rule. He is inflexible and authentic. Since he is the only leader he takes decisions quickly and these type of leaders are found in totalitarian States. Ex-Hitlor, Mussolini, and other dictators come under the authoritarian leaders.

3. Some people become leaders at the time of agitations. Supposing any violence occurs, some
people come out as leaders and lead the group. In India social reformers like Raja Ram Mohan Ray, Gandhi and Swamy Dayananda led powerful movements for social reforms on account of their own capacities. These type of leaders are known as agitation leaders.

4. Some leaders are symbolic like the queen of England or the President of India. They are nominal leaders and have no authority.

5. Some leaders are experts in the specific area of their work. They are creative geniuses like Einstein, Darwin, Freud, and numerous names in Engineering, Medicines, technology, arts and literature.

The types of leadership behaviour have been classified by various authors. According to H.T. Mazumdar, there are three kinds of leadership.

1) Traditional
2) Bureaucratic
3) Charismatic

Max Weber mentioned the Traditional, rational legal, and charismatic types of leadership.
Bogardus has mentioned the following kinds of leadership.

1) Direct and indirect leadership.
2) Social, executive and Mental leadership.
3) Partisan and Scientific leadership.
4) Prophets, Saints, Experts and Bross.
5) Autocratic, Charismatic, Pateral and democratic leaders.

Some others have divided them into key communicators and opinion leaders.

Generally, we have divided leadership into Authoritarian and Democratic leadership. These two types are different from each other. The emphasis on the distinction between authoritarian and democratic leadership is quite modern. In the first place the rise of democratic forms of Government and the sudden emergence of totalitarian states sharpened the distinction between the two types of leadership, and world war II supposingly waged between two political systems and ideologies made political thinkers analyse the rise of dictators, their personality traits and
the nature and significance of their appeal and success with the masses. Secondly students of social sciences have carried out a number of experimental studies of groups in which these two forms of social and administrative relationship were introduced. The personality of authoritarian leader has been psychologically analysed and his authority has not been found to be as strong and stable as has been commonly made out. In our own times Hitler in Germany, Mussolini in Italy have figured prominently as dictatorial or authoritarian leaders, and they have been frequently contrasted with democratics like Roosevelt and Churchill. The nature and characteristics of these types are discussed below in a comparative manner.

**AUTHORITARIAN LEADERSHIP:**

Its main features are:

1) The authoritarian leader wields more absolute power than the democratic leader in determining the policies and plans of the group.

2) He alone dictates the activities of the members and the pattern of interpersonal relations among them.
3) He is the ultimate judge and agent for distributing rewards and punishments to these members of the group and the fate of each individual is decided by him.

4) He is personal in his praise and criticism without giving objective reasons.

5) Normally, he remains aloof from active collective participation except on special occasions, such as demonstrations, rallies, and meetings of the "inner circle" of his immediate followers.

**DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP**

Its main features are:

i) The democratic leader differs from the authoritarian leader in the way in which he exercises his power.

ii) He encourages maximum involvement and participation of every member in activities and objectives of the group.

iii) He has the tendency to decentralize
responsibilities among the members rather than to concentrate it in him.

iv) He encourages and reinforces interpersonal relations among the members of the group cohesion and unity and to decrease tension and conflict.

v) Under normal circumstances, he discourages the development of a hierarchical group structure marked by status differentials and attached special privileges.

vi) Wherever possible, he seeks to carry the "mandate of the people" or encourages and facilitates the group members themselves to do it.

vii) Like the authoritarian leader, he is not the "key stone" of the power structure of the group.

viii) The democratic leader is "fact minded" or objective in his praise and criticism and tries to be a regular group member, at least in spirit. His behaviour is member oriented and usually he plays a permissive role.
ROLE OF LEADERS:

There is no unanimity of opinion on to what the functions of the leadership are. This is because detailing of functions depends on one's general concept of leadership. Generally speaking, leadership functions are related to goal achievement and to the maintenance, and strengthening of the group. Functions in the former category, instrumental to achieving the goals of the group include making suggestions for action, evaluating movement towards the goal prevailing activities irrelevant to the goal and offering effective solutions for goal achievement. Functions in the second category include encouraging the members, releasing tension that builds up and giving every one a chance to express himself. In other words, the main functions of leadership are to contribute to the achievement of the group goal and to help the group together.

According to Bernard, a leader performs four main functions. 18

a) the determination of objectives.

b) the manipulation of means
c) the control of the instrumentality and
d) the stimulation of coordinated action.

Let us enumerate some of the ways in which the leader functions with regard to the group.

In the first place the leader must really belong to the group which he seeks to lead. He must be a member of the group which means that he must accept and share the attitudes and values, the regulations and programmes, the goals and purposes of the group. This is what Brown calls "Membership-Character" of the leaders.

Secondly he must have a background of achievement and success and must enjoy great prestige. He must strike them as superior. M.K. Gandhi came out after great movement in South Africa and to the general masses the fact that Nehru came from a wealthy family and had given up comfort and material prosperity to court imprisonment and problems common in political struggle against a mighty foreign Government had a great appeal. Both were morals of courages, sacrifice, integrity, and humanity which were highly prized virtues
in pre-independence days.

Thirdly a leader to be a successful must fully understand his followers. He must have his fingers on the pulse of the people to know their fears, hopes, frustrations, needs, goals and values.

Fourthly, a leader must be a policy maker, it is through policies that group seek to achieve their goals and it is for the leader to see what is good for the group.

Fifthly, a leader must be a skillful administrator and organizer or he must have associates, who are such. Some of the campaigns of M.K. Gandhi were very well organised and often their effectiveness silenced his worst critics.

Sixthly, he should be an ideal example for the group to emulate. His personal example of practicing what he preaches goes a long way to strengthen his status in group. Military leaders set examples of great heroism and courage and their leadership is greatly praised.
Lastly, a leader must symbolise in himself the unity of his group. He must stand for the group. Externally he represents the groups and functions as their mouth piece. A leader should be able to represent his group effectively by expressing their demands and wishes.

Social Scientists, for the past three decades, have been trying to have a Universal concept of leadership. All their concepts were formed by selecting and emphasizing on one or several qualities of leadership. One of these theories is the "great man theory" of leadership, where a leader was described as a person possessing unique or singular physical and psychological traits. Such as leader, then, stood out in the crowd as a breed apart.

Dissatisfied with the 'trait' approach the social scientists then, attempted to look for personality traits in situations which contained certain common elements. This was called the situationist approach. But even this approach fell short of the ideal concept of leadership. Hence they decided to study the structure of the group, thereby studying the
inter-actions of various members in a group including that of the leader. This approach believed that leadership cannot operate in isolation.

All the three concepts - the trait concept, the situationist concept and group-follower-oriented-concept-represented different facets of leadership. It then became clear that leadership is a complex social phenomenon. We can only conclude that leadership is a function or role played in a situation within the context of the social group, to attain a specified goal or goals. The person who plays this role effectively is accepted as leader. He is a man of authority and he enjoys enviable social status.

If leadership is role playing, the leader has play the following roles.

1. He is a planner and policy maker. This needs considerable forethought and a vision for the future. He should be able to assess the consequences of group actions.

2. He is an educator, assisting the group to
choose the right solution for the problems faced by the group. He also guides them to arrive at a consensus.

3. He is an executor. He carries out the group policies.

4. He is a spokesman of the group when it comes to relate with other groups. In all the transactions he keeps the interests of his group in mind.

5. He is a protector who defends his group against outside aggression.

An effective leader is one who has the ability to perform the various roles well.

There are various leadership patterns. They are:
1) Institutional leadership, 2) Situational leadership
3) Dictatorial or authoritarian leadership, 4) Democratic or creative leadership.
1) **INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP** :

The leaders under this pattern are formally appointed and by virtue of their position they perform the leadership role.

2) **SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP** :

This pattern comes into force when institutional leadership fails or is inadequate. Leaders are elected considering the situations which demands leaders with specific qualities.

3) **DICTATORIAL OR AUTHORITARIAN LEADERSHIP** :

Under this pattern there is no decentralization of power. The decisions taken are not out of consensus. So, the members of the group do not actively take part in the actions and decisions of the group. This type usually fails because of discontent among the other members.
4) **DEMOCRATIC OR CREATIVE LEADERSHIP**

In contrast to the previous pattern, this one believes in group solidarity (which comes spontaneously) and in consensus. All the members of the group are made to participate willingly in the goings on of the groups. This pattern develops good interpersonal relationship.

But it should be agreed that none of those patterns exist in their ideal form. It is also evident that there is overlapping of two or three leadership patterns. Among these the democratic-authoritarian leadership pattern seems to be predominant. It must be conceded that differences in leadership pattern produce different results in specific situations.

All leadership patterns are goal oriented. The effectiveness of any pattern of leadership lies in the concrete proof of results, which by their very nature contribute to the betterment of society. The effectiveness chiefly lies in dynamic inter-personal
relationship (especially the relationship between the leader and the member of his group).

In an examination of the predominant patterns of rural leadership it is found that rural leadership heavily depends on caste system. And it is an indestructible fact that the members belonging to the 'upper classes' have emerged as leaders. This has been made possible because of fear and meaningless reverence of the lower classes. The two patterns of rural leadership are (1) leadership influenced by hereditary privileges of caste, wealth, education, family status, etc. (Represented by such functionaries as 'mukhia', 'sarpanch' and 'pradhan'.) (2) Leadership based on the charisma of the leader. Some form of 'hero-worship' decides the election of a leader in any rural community. It is commonly seen that the authoritarian pattern of leadership has been effective in the rural set up. The traditional order in the Indian villages was given such a high evaluation that it became sacrosanct. And in the traditional village order, power for centuries was based on ascriptive order.
determined by birth.  

As a consequence of the two world wars, urbanization and industrialisation, the traditional village social order has undergone many changes. The joint family system being replaced by nuclear units, and as a result, the younger generations are assuming more responsibilities. The spread of female education has given to women more opportunities to take up important positions in village social life. The caste system tends now to shift to the class system, as a result of better and newer occupational opportunities. Political freedom further hastened the process of change. Every individual now has certain fundamental rights, such as freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of association and opportunities to improve his economic position, irrespective of age, sex, caste and creed.

Development in science and technology and education, has brought about some changes in rural leadership. Dominant grip of the two patterns mentioned above is loosening. Now there is an open system where
any one can compete in elections, which means there is a major shift from 'an ascribed status system' to 'an achieved status system'. Undoubtedly there is an Indian villages a marked change in the pattern of leadership.

Rural India is passing through a period of transition and of bewilderment. The new social and economic forces generated by the large-scale development plans 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 great bearing on leadership. Increasingly, it is believed that the success or failure of development plans, and indeed of more general ideological aspirations as embodied in our constitution, may well depend upon the type of leadership available at village, town and at district levels.
Experience of self-government through democratic institutions is comparatively new to most of the nations which have gained independence in the postwar period. Different countries have adjusted to this new experience in different manners. But a phenomenon common to all of them is the emergence of a generation of 'indigenous' political leadership at different levels of political activity. Largely, as a result of the initial impetus given by the exposure to the modern liberal ideas originating in the colonial countries themselves, the leadership structure has undergone a change in its effort to come closer to the conditions in the home country. This country adjustment is manifested in the changing values, background, characteristics and 'representativeness' of the leaders. The 'contrast between the 'plebiscitarian' and the 'related sense of 'representation' pointed out by Reinhard Bendix, is reduced in this process of change.24 After the dominance of the nationalist leaders in the early years of independence, the following generation of leaders has its own attitudes, demands, style and behaviour and is tied to more down-to-earth considerations.
Characteristics of leadership and its behaviour depend on the problems and issues important at the particular span of time, according to which the quality of leadership differs. A concern for adjustment in the later generations of leadership is caused by the problems of 'nation-building'. Gradually, the political process comes to be dominated by such leaders. After a comprehensive survey of the Asian and African countries, the authors of the "politics of the Developing Areas" conclude that, "a common feature (of the process of political socialization and recruitment) has been the emergence of rural or 'provincial' political elite whose influence has become increasingly determinative in the political process. These new rural politicians tend to be Vernacular-speaking and less educated; they are also more securely rooted in the traditional social structure than are the urban-based politicians who constituted the vanguard in political action in the preindependence period."25

The relationship between the two types of leaders can better be understood in terms of interaction and that between the leadership and political
institutions having modern characteristics, in terms of mutual impact. Considerations of dominance of one over the other are essentially ad hoc, depending upon the issues and institutions involved, the moment at which an enquiry is made, and other related factors. In the process, the interacting units influence the other, while at the same time being influenced by them.

Such a phenomenon has been the subject of frequent reference by writers on Indian Politics in the context of both national and lower levels. Thus while Baskaran points out the gradual replacement of the "Nehru Model of Political leadership by Kamaraj Model," Weiner discovers the geographical shift in the process of leadership recruitment from the urban to the rural areas. Similar references are made by Henry Maddick when he talks of "the new breed of politicians" as pragmatic men.28

Panchayati Raj administration presupposes active involvement of the local people. Balvantray Mehta rightly said that "rural development and rural
welfare are possible only with local initiative, and local discretion. The success of Panchayati Raj largely depends on the community throwing up a leadership in tune with aspirations of the people at all stages of community life. This leadership has to guide the people to new avenues of social development where community welfare is not warped by selfish considerations of personal good, where positions of authority are filled not for the love of prestige, power and personal aggrandisment, but because of the desire of the incumbent to serve the community, and where the higher echelons of administrative organisations find their fulfilment in transferring more power and responsibility to the lower organisations.

**CONCLUSION**

It is often said that 'Leaders are born and not made'. However, if we believe that emergence of leaders is after all a social phenomenon, then, there is no reason why we should not attempt to influence this particular phenomenon. We, as a nation, have today embarked upon a conscious programme of social
change. It is finding expression in the form of our Five Year Plan, in the setting up of various popular bodies like the zilla parishads and in the vast amount of social legislation. The targets for social change that we have in mind, can be reached depending upon the extent to which the community succeeds in throwing up new leadership.

Under such conditions, it is the quality of leadership that mainly matters and the quality of leadership is moulded by various factors such as socio-economic background, personal traits, political affiliation, and exposure of a leader to the outside world and his involvement in the development of the community.
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