

search for men with leadership qualities.

I. MEANING OF LEADERSHIP

It is really very difficult to attempt a definition of leadership, or in other words, it is difficult to define what makes certain persons "leaders". Bernard has rightly put it. "Indeed, I have never observed any leader who was able to state adequately or intelligently why he was able to be a leader, nor any statement of followers that acceptably expressed why they followed." Leadership is often regarded as the important modifier of organisational behaviour. It is regarded as primarily personal in character as being founded upon individual pre-eminence or accomplishment in a particular field of behaviour. Thus superior strength, superior tact, superior intelligence, superior knowledge, superior will-power any or all of these may be the means of attainment of leadership.¹ No one denies that these personal qualities do pay dividends but leadership is not all personal pre-eminence. It is something more than that and that "something more" is the essence of leadership. It is the capacity to set new goals, to hold forth new and loftier expectations for the group and to show the group its noble potentialities that make man a leader. Leadership has, therefore, double meaning. The dictionary meaning of the verb "to lead" shows that the term is used in two different senses:

- (a) "to excel, to be in advance, to be prominent," and
- (b) "to guide others, to be head of an organisation, to hold command." In the former sense, leadership is identified with individual pre-eminence and in the latter sense, it is identified with organisational talent. Thus, personal leadership may be distinguished from group leadership. A person is born with the talent for personal leadership but he must learn group leadership.

Leadership versus Power

The concepts of power and leadership have much in common. Certain people are leaders because they exercise power. Indeed it is unthinkable that a leader should not have power. Consequently, the exercise of influence is a central part of most definitions of leadership.

- According to *La-Piere*, "Leadership is a behaviour that affects the behaviour of other people more than their behaviour affects that of the leader."²

- *Pigor* also says "Leadership is a concept applied to the personality environment relation to describe the situation when a personality is so placed in the environment that it directs the feeling and insight and controls others in pursuit of a common cause."

- According to *H.T. Mazumdar*, "The leader is one who has power and authority."³ But that neither means that leadership and power are the same thing nor does it mean that power and influence are equivalent. Power indicates authority or command and in any group these have to be activated for the accomplishment of certain ends but leadership act represents a choice of these instruments of power. The leader cannot and will not always rely on these instruments, and even if he has to make use of them, he will use them as a last resort. His basic function is to motivate and inspire.

- According to *Allen*, "Leadership is the activity of persuading people to co-operate in the achievement of a common objective".

- *Terry* defines it as "the activity of influencing people to strive willingly for mutual objectives". "Leadership always involves attempts on the part of a leader to affect the behaviour of a follower or followers in a situation."

Characteristics of Leadership

From the above discussion we may deduce the following main elements in the concept of leadership.

- (i) *Firstly*, leadership denotes a mutual behaviour pattern between the leader and his followers.
- (ii) *Secondly*, leadership is a two-way affair. The followers influence the behaviour of the leader in as much as the leader influences their behaviour.
- (iii) *Thirdly*, the concept of leadership can be understood only in the context of followers. Without followers there can be no leader.
- (iv) *Fourthly*, leadership involves the element of willing and voluntary obedience by the followers. Leadership is based on co-operation and goodwill. Sheer threat and force cannot maintain one a leader for long.
- (v) *Lastly*, leadership is specific to a specific situation. A person cannot be a leader in all the fields.

the demands of the situation and the characteristics of the individuals. Those who have the required skills to a high degree can respond at low cost. Varying characteristics of the group members affect their reward cost outcomes differently in different situations.

V. TYPES OF LEADERSHIP

Many attempts have been made to classify leaders.

- E.B. Godwin's distinction between the "intellectual" and the "executives". In the former he included scientists, authors, philosophers and artists; in the latter, corporation presidents, state governors, religious officials and trade union officials.⁷

- O.L. Schwarz distinguished between "men of thought" and "men of action".

- Sir Martin M. Conway discussing crowd behaviour gave a threefold classification: "crowd-representative", "crowd-compeller" and "crowd-exponent."⁸

- Eugene E. Jenning has come up with a three-way typology of "Princes", "Heroes", and "Supermen".

- H. D. Lasswell developed a fivefold typology:

- (i) The bureaucrat,
- (ii) The boss,
- (iii) The diplomat,
- (iv) The agitator,
- (v) The theorist.

- According to H.T. Mazumdar, there are three kinds of leadership⁹ (i) traditional, (ii) bureaucratic, and (iii) charismatic. The traditional leader gets his authority through the traditional status ascribed to him. Thus the Brahmin is the traditional leader of Hindu society. The bureaucratic leader gets his authority and power through delegation, i.e., from election or from appointment. The charismatic leader creates his own authority. He may be a party leader, a religious leader, a social leader or a revolutionary leader.

- Bogardus has mentioned the following kinds of leadership:

- (i) Direct and indirect leadership;
- (ii) Social, executive and mental leadership;
- (iii) Partisan and scientific leadership;
- (iv) Prophets, saints, experts and boss;
- (v) Autocratic, charismatic, paternal and democratic leadership.

None of the above classifications of leadership is completely satisfactory. *First*, we know far too little about the causal sequences in the life course of leaders; *second*, we have no adequate criterion for determining types; and *third*, the divergent historical situations in which leaders operate are hard to classify. It may, however, be said that the three most significant types of leaders today are the administrator, the expert and agitator. With the extension of state activity and political controls the power of governmental bureaucracy has tremendously increased. The complicated industrial and military systems cannot operate without the expert. The agitator in time of grave economic insecurity and widespread anxiety about the future political order assumes an important role in mass society such as ours.

VI. LEADERSHIP TECHNIQUES

Authoritarian / Autocratic / Directive Leadership

Under the authoritarian technique the leader determines the policy, procedure and activities in the group. This technique includes more dependency on the leader. The leader determines the group goals. This form of leadership denounces all forms of individual authority over others. However, in certain situations authoritarian style is of high value. In this form group members are more dependent, submissive, docile, irritable, dissatisfied with group activities, aggressive, insecure and less friendly with each other.

Democratic / Participative / Consultative Leadership

Under the democratic technique the leader encourages participation of group members. Group members are friendly and helpful. A congenial environment exists in this form of leadership. Members are less dependent on the leader, low incidence of intermember irritability, high frequency of suggestions and technical assistance is observed.

There is no denying the fact that the democratic technique is a "human relation" approach which is in keeping with democratic values. In this technique members feel satisfied when their ideas and suggestions are given due regards in decision-making process. Productivity is high due to high morals and attitudes of members.

Laissez-Faire Leadership

Under *laissez-faire* leadership the group shows little dependency on the leader, greater irritability and aggressiveness, high frequency of suggestions for group action and group policy, great dissatisfaction with group activities and intermediate productivity. Moral and cohesiveness is lowest among group members.

Under certain situations an authoritarian form of leadership may be more effective. Such situations, may be those where the group is faced with a need for emergency action.

In sum, the leadership techniques have to be related to the attitudes of the membership, to the particular form of relation among the members including the leader and functions as a part group structure. These are to be "reality-oriented". Gibb writes. "It is important that we recognise authoritarianism and democracy as poles of a continuum, neither of which is wholly good or wholly bad, but which represent extremes of "variable" leadership techniques that should be adapted to all the elements of the situation, culture, personality, content, structural, inter-relations, and task."¹⁰

REFERENCES

- 1 Hudson and Seekler. *Organisation and Management*. p. 37.