

A Brief Review of Leadership Theory and Relevant Research Work

¹Moazzem Hossain, ¹Mir Nazmul Karim and ²Aklema Choudhury Lema

¹Department of Humanities, Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology, Dhaka, Bangladesh

²Department of Accounting and Information Systems, University of Dhaka, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Abstract: A close look at the history of human civilization makes it quite apparent that man has mastered the technique of surviving by forming themselves into groups. These groups invariably involve a leader who leads. He is a gifted individual who possesses special qualities like strength of character, knowledge and vision and he is capable of motivating the group members to strive hard for achieving a tangible goal. In due course, he earns the respect and loyalty of the group members and the bond between the two becomes stronger than ever. Depending upon situation, leaders may be good or bad or they may be successful or failed. Notable among the failed leaders are Late Idi Amin of Uganda and Mengistu Haile Mariam of Ethiopia. In the opinion of Terry and Franklin, the successful leaders may differ in some respect but they have certain common characteristics.^[1] They set the standard and style of living. All of them are highly motivated persons who determine the high objectives for their followers and fix a high standard of performance for them. They are energetic, curious and are challenged by the unresolved problems surrounding them and urgently consolidate all their strategies and resources to overcome all the hindrances that might impede the attainment of the goals.^[1] Leadership is the process of influencing and supporting others to work concertedly toward achieving objectives. It is a very crucial factor that helps groups or individuals to identify its goals and then motivates and assists in attaining the stated goals. The three most important elements of leadership are influence/support, voluntary efforts and goal achievement. Without leadership, an organization would be a confusion of people and machines just as an orchestra without a conductor would be only a conglomerate of musicians and instruments. The orchestras and all other organizations are badly in need of a competent leader to develop their potentialities to the fullest extent. The leadership process is quite similar to that of the chrysalis that turns a caterpillar into a butterfly with all the beauty that was the caterpillar's potential. Leadership is then the catalyst that helps in transforming hidden potential into reality. This role is often seen dramatically in giant business organizations. For example, when Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Jack Welch played the role of a leader in the transformation of General Electric Company from a sleeping giant of 1980 into a sleek machine of the twenty-first century. It is uniquely important in smaller organizations like Microsoft Corporation, which Bill Gates started and guided to national importance as a developer of microcomputer software and operating system. At the same time the success and failures of Al Dunlop accentuate the catalyst role that leaders generally play while demonstrating the fact that many leadership styles have a 'dark side' in them for example the hardship to laid-off employees and dangers of a narrow focus on a single goal. In all cases, leadership is the ultimate act that identifies, develops, channels and carves the potential that is latent in an organization and its people. The most successful leader of an organization performs important tasks and acts in a way that provides followers with a sense of satisfaction and fulfillment in performing the assigned work and reaching the goal. Leaders trigger a person's 'will to do', show the way and guide the group members towards goal accomplishment. As the writer of Ecclesiastes astutely observed, In the Bible, the significance of vision was emphasized as follows: When there is no vision, people perish.^[2] The leader invariably provides vision to the followers and thus capacity to lead is an important quality of a good manager. Notable among the leaders whose name and fame has spread across the world are Alexander the Great, Napoleon Bonaparte, Admiral Nelson, Sir Winston Churchill, George Washington, Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, Jawaharlal Nehru. The very discussion on leadership would remain incomplete if vital contributions made by unique leaders like Nelson Mandela of South Africa and Dr. Mahatma bin Mohammad of Malaysia are not put on record. They are quite gifted leaders who have demonstrated emphatically that a country would be able to attain peace and progress no matter how daunting the situations are. It is quite interesting to note that nations and communities who could not produce outstanding leaders have somehow lagged behind in the field of social and economic progress. Besides some

of the corporate leaders who have radically transformed out contemporary social and economic life are Henry Ford, Jamshedji Nawsherwanji Tate, Adamjee, Ispahani, Dhirubhai Ambani, Alfred P. Sloan, Shiro Honda, Eastman Kodak, Akio Morita of Sony, Sir Richard Branson of Virgin Air, Bill Gates of Microsoft. Last but not the least, a corporate leader who has succeeded in establishing himself, as an ideal leader is Jack Welch of General Electric Company Based on his vast experience as the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the world's largest company, he has outlined some fundamental guidelines to be followed by leaders for achieving growth and success.^[3] It has been observed that people have tendency to follow an individual (essentially leader) who, in their view, offers them a means of satisfying their own personal goal Thus every successful manager who is also required to play the role of a leader must follow some definite principles. These principles imply that managers must understand their assigned activities, the subordinates and how the different motivational factors influence them. As a result of strict adherence to these principles while carrying out its duties, a manager can groom himself up as an effective leader. A pertinent question that confronts all of us is who are these leaders and how they are made? Is there any magical rule for becoming a leader? Can we copy them or clone them as the sheep Dolly? With a view to find plausible answer to these questions relating to leadership, numerous authors and researchers have carried out extensive study. The preceding discussion makes it quite apparent that leadership is a combination of several key elements namely leader, power, style and follower. The very vital task of leadership is once again closely related with the role played by a manager. Thus the present paper seeks to investigate deeper into the concept of leadership and accordingly divided the same into nine sections In section two, the term leadership would be defined in an elaborate manner and highlight its essential elements. Part three of the paper examines the essential ingredients of the concept of leadership. The fourth, fifth and sixth part of the paper deals at length on the aspects of power, style and follower of a leader that add substance to the position and status of a leader. The seventh part of the paper evaluates the relative position and role of a leader and a manager. The section eight of the paper enumerates the various theories of leadership and evaluates their contribution to the body of literature on leadership. The ninth part tries to portray some of the new ideas that have emerged over the period and assess their practical implication. The tenth and concluding part of the paper sums up the study and puts forth some suggestion for the guidance of the future leaders. This would go a long way in fully understanding the meaning of leadership and help in creating an environment conducive to the growth and enrichment of the art of leadership.

Key words: Leadership theory, Relevant Research

INTRODUCTION

For a precise understanding of the meaning and significance of the term leadership, it must be defined properly. Terry and Franklin^[4] define leadership as the relationship in which a person (the leader) influences others to work together willingly on related tasks to attain a goal desired by the leader and or group. It has also been observed that a leader influences his followers through the skillful exercise of one or more power.

Stoner and Freeman^[5] define leadership as the process of directing and influencing the task-related activities of a group member. This definition highlights three important features of leadership Firstly, leadership involves subordinates or followers. By their willingness to accept orders from a leader, the group members uphold the leader's status and make the leadership position meaningful. Without these subordinates, the leadership qualities of an individual would lose its relevance altogether. Secondly, leadership involves an unequal distribution of power among leaders and group members.

Even though the leader has the authority to direct the activities of group members who cannot direct the action of the leader, certain group members would obviously affect their activities in a number of ways. Thirdly, in addition to being legitimately able to give the subordinates orders and directions, leaders can nevertheless influence subordinates activities in a variety of ways.

Again Szilagyi^[6] defines leadership as follows Leadership is a process involving two or more people in which one attempts to influence other's behavior towards the accomplishment of some goal or goals.

Leadership as such may finally be defined as exercise of influence, which is, actually the art or process of influencing people so that they will strive willingly and enthusiastically towards the achievement of group goals. Ideally people should be encouraged to develop not only willingness to work but also to work with zeal and confidence. Zeal is order, earnestness and intensity in the execution of work; confidence reflects experience and technical ability. Leaders act to help a group to attain its

objectives through the maximum application of its capabilities. They do not stand behind a group to push and prod, they place themselves before the group as they facilitate progress and inspire the group to accomplish organizational goals.

INGREDIENTS OF LEADERSHIP

Every group that performs ^[7]near its capacity has a person as its leader who possesses the skillful art of leadership. In the opinion of Koontz, *et al.*^[7], the skill of leadership consists of four major ingredients. They are:

- Ability to use power effectively and in a responsible manner. This has every thing to do with power vested in a potential leader and its judicious use
- Ability to comprehend that human beings have different motivational forces at different times and different situations; Here a leader must have fundamental understanding of people A leader should not only have sound knowledge about motivational theory, kinds of motivational forces and the nature of a motivation system but must be able to apply this knowledge to different people under different situations
- Ability to inspire people: A leader must strive very hard to develop ability to inspire the members of his group. He can achieve this task through skillful application of the tools and techniques of motivational factors.
- Ability to act in a manner that will develop a climate conducive to responding to and arousing motivation. This ingredient has every thing to do with the distinctive style of the leader and the climate he or she develops. The strength of motivation largely depends on expectancies, perceived rewards, the amount of effort believed to be required, the task to be done, the organizational climate and other relevant environmental factors

LEADERSHIP AND POWER

The functions and duties of a leader are many and varied. It is largely influenced by the nature of problem a group has to deal with and the type of leadership in action that again depends on the leader's basis and type of power as enunciated by French and Raven^[8]. In their opinion, Power in the context of leadership may be divided into five categories. They are informational or expert power, reward power, coercive power and legitimate power and referent power. Expert and informational power are concerned with skill, knowledge and information with the help of which a leader is able to influence others e.g.

technicians and computer personnel. The reward and coercive power are quite opposite in nature but can be very useful in getting jobs done by the subordinates. A legitimate power which has been confirmed by the very role structure of the group or organization staff and it is accepted by all as correct without any dissent just as in the case of armed forces or police forces. Referent power on the other hand involves those being influenced and identified with the leader i.e. rock band or movie personalities using their image to enter the political arena.

It has been observed that most leaders use a combination of all these five powers depending upon the leadership style adopted from time to time. Authoritarian leaders, for example, have a tendency of using a mixture of legitimate, coercive or reward power to dictate policies, plans and activities of a group. In comparison, a democratic or participative leader would use mainly referent power involving all members of the group in the decision making process.

LEADERSHIP STYLE

Leaders usually carry out their work through a variety of styles. e.g., autocratic, democratic, participatory, laissez faire (hands-off) etc. Again leadership style is mainly dependent on the situation including the life cycle of the organization.

The role of leadership in management is largely determined by the organizational culture of the company. Barrow^[9] argues that a manager's beliefs, values and assumptions are of crucial importance to the overall style of leadership adopted by a leader The total pattern of explicit and implicit lead actions as seen by employees and followers may be called leadership style It represents a consistent combination of philosophy, skills, traits and attitudes that are exhibited in a person's behavior. Each style also reflects a manager's beliefs in a subordinate's capabilities In this connection; a thorough familiarity with the Theory X, Theory Y or Theory Z is a must^[10]. It has been found that employees are more interested in observing the distinctive leadership style adopted by a given leader. Employees do not necessarily respond to what the leaders think, do or say and the overall reaction depends on their perception about the leader. Leadership really lies in the eyes of the beholder (followers and employees).

A democratic leader dominates team members by using unilateralist to achieve a singular objective. This style of leadership generally results in passive resistance from team-members and requires considerable pressure and direction from the leader in order to get things done. Generally an authoritarian approach is not a good way to get the best performance from a group.

There are however some instances where an autocratic style of leadership may not be inappropriate. Some situation may call for an urgent action and in those cases autocratic style of leadership may be the best recourse. In addition, most people are familiar with autocratic leadership and therefore have less trouble in adopting that style. Furthermore, there may be situation in which the subordinates may prefer an autocratic style of leadership.

The Laissez-Faire manager exercises little control over the group leaving them to sort out their roles and tackle their work without taking active part in the process itself. In general, this approach leaves the team floundering with little direction or motivation. This approach is usually more appropriate when leading a team of highly motivated and skilled people who have excellent results in the past. Once a leader has established that his team is capable, confident and motivated, it is often more desirable to step back and let them get on with their task. In the opinion of Hodget^[11], unnecessary interference or unwarranted direction might create a sense of resentment and consequently distract their attention and effectiveness. By handing over ownership, a Laissez-Faire leader can empower his group to achieve a given goal.

The democratic leader on the other hand makes decisions by consulting with the team members while still remaining in overall control of the group. The democratic leader allows the team members to decide how the task will be tackled and who will perform each type of task.

A good democratic leader encourages participation and delegate tasks wisely and never loses sight of the fact that he bears the crucial responsibility of leadership. He values group discussion and input from his team and can be seen as drawing from a pool of his team member's strong points in order to derive the best possible performance from the team. He motivates his team members by empowering them to direct themselves and guide them with a loose reign. However a purely democratic leader may become unsure of his relationship with the subordinates if everything hinges on group discussion and decision. Clearly a democratic leader may end up not leading in the proper sense of the term. McMurry^[12] suggests that benevolent autocracy may be preferable for achieving a desired goal.

LEADERSHIP AND THE FOLLOWERS

In real sense of the term, a leader always must have a group of people who are willing enough to cooperate with him and demonstrate unflinching faith and loyalty. A successful leader must possess certain behavioral aspects that are most likely to influence and inspire such followers

towards achieving defined objectives in a given situation. Thus all these three elements i.e., leader, follower and situation are important variables that play a very significant role in shaping appropriate leadership behavior. It is almost impossible to think of a leader without sizable number of follower.

It is evident that leadership is situational. In one situation, action A may be best cluster of leadership act but in the next situation, action B will be best. Leadership as such is a complex phenomenon. So there is no simple answer to the question as to what makes a good leader.

At times leaders must resist the temptation to be visible in a situation. Even though good leadership implies a set of behavior, it should not be confused with some other activity. In this connection Trady Heller *et al.*^[13] observes that when acidity is not required, aggressiveness and constant interruption with others will guarantee good leadership. At times it would be quite appropriate for a leader to stay away in the background keeping pressure off the group, to keep quiet so that others may speak, to be calm in times of uproar, to hesitate purposefully and to delay decision. At other times, a leader must be decisive, directive and adopt behavior pattern on a conscious basis.

With few exceptions, leaders in business organizations are essentially followers. They always report to someone else. Even the President of a public or nonprofit organization reports to a Board of Directors. Leaders must be able to wear both hats and must be skilled enough to communicate both upwards and downwards. In order to make his position real and meaningful, leaders offer something to their supporters, followers and employees. Similarly they also need the validation and appreciation from the higher authority.

In the formal organizations of several levels, ability to follow dynamic subordinacy is one of the first requirements of good leadership. In the opinion of Litzinger *et al.*^[14] being an effective follower is a testing ground for future leaders. Here the employees are able to closely observe whether they possess the potential for leadership. Skillful performance in current roles unlocks the door to future. Leadership opportunities. By contrast, many people fail in their job not as a result of any skill deficiencies but because they lack followership skill. This skill helps the employees to support their current leader and become effective subordinates themselves. A sound followership behavior includes the following:

- Not competing with the leader to be in the limelight
- Being loyal and supportive and become an active team player
- Not being a 'yes man' who automatically agrees

- Acting as a devil's advocate by raising penetrating questions
- Constructively following the leader's ideas, values and actions.
- Anticipating potential problems and preventing them

Good followers are then required to succeed in their job while helping their managers to succeed at theirs. At the same time, effective subordinates can also prepare themselves for promotion by developing their conceptual and leadership skill. Similarly good leaders should never forget their followers. Many effective leader visualize the importance of leadership role and prefers to spend their time by periodically visiting their subordinates, work in a shift in a plant and do some other thing to remain in contact with their first-level employees.

MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP

Leadership is an important part of management but is not the whole story. The primary role of a leader is to influence others to voluntarily seek defined objectives preferably with enthusiasm. Managers generally plan activities, organize structures and control resources. Managers also hold formal positions whereas anyone can use his or her informal influence while acting as a leader creates a vision and inspire others to achieve that vision and stretch themselves beyond normal capabilities Since there is a difference between management and leadership, strong leader may be a weak manager if their poor planning caused their group to move towards a wrong direction. They can get their group going but they just cannot get it going towards directions that serve organizational objectives.

Many people view leadership as being associated with the role of manager. However opposite view is held by others who assert that the leaders and manager do not occupy equal position. It is believed that leading and managing involves separate and distinct behaviors and activities. It may be further added here that leaders and managers vary in their orientation towards goal, conception about work, interpersonal style and self-perception. In this connection, A leading author^[15] observes as follows:

Leaders are often dramatic and unpredictable in style. They tend to create an atmosphere of change, foment even chaos. They are often obsessed by their ideas, which appear as visionary and consequently excite, stimulate and drive other people to work hard to create reality out of fantasy. Managers are often hard working and analytical, tolerant and fair-minded. They have a strong sense of belonging to the organization and take great care in propounding and improving the status quo.

In contrast, others are of the view that leadership is just one aspect of what a manager does and certainly not the whole of it. A manager mainly discharges four functions namely planning, organizing, controlling and leading. The leading aspect involves influencing subordinates towards the achievement of an organizational goal.

It must be pointed out here that a manager may not necessarily be a group's leader. While manager of a group performs activities of planning, controlling and organizing nature, the real leader may be one of his/her sub-ordinates. In an attempt to highlight the special quality of a leader, A noted author^[16] observes as follows:

Leadership thus implies something more than a mere responsibility or formal authority. It consists of influence that accompanies legitimacy as a supervisor. Therefore it can be said that leadership is the incremental influence a person has beyond his or her formal authority. Incremental influence can exist in varying degrees among every member of a work group. As a result, it is not uncommon to find a situation in which a sub-ordinate, who lacks formal authority, actually possesses substantial incremental influence. We would call such an individual an informal leader.

These informal leaders often possess abilities that an appointed manager may lack such as technical expertise or articulate communication skill. Leadership as such can exist on a formal or informal basis that again distinguishes management from leadership. Leadership clearly entails more than wielding power and exercising authority. However it is indeed very difficult to ascertain whether manager are leaders or not. That is why most management texts prefer to use the terms interchangeably without trying to distinguish between them.

THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP

Trait approach: For a clear understanding of leadership, several theories have been propagated by numerous authors and researchers. The sole aim of all these theories is to answer the basic question-are leaders born or made? In this connection, a renowned author^[17] who believes that leaders are born not made maintain as follows

There are certain inborn qualities such as initiation, courage, intelligence and humor, which altogether pre-destines a man to be a leader the essential picture is given at birth.

Two leadership theories that concentrate on this idea are the great man/great woman theory and trait theory. According to a leading author^[18], the great man/great woman theory is based on the belief that major events, nationally or internationally, is influenced by some persons in power.

He says: A sudden act by a great man could, according to this theory, change the face of a nation.

The Trait Theory further expands on this conjecture by concentrating on the personal characteristics of the leader. Until mid-1940, this theory formed the basis of most leadership research and cited trait characteristics as the most important element of a leader. Over the years, the list continued to grow by including all manner of physical, personal and cognitive factors including height, intelligence and communication skill. It also attempted to differentiate between leaders and non-leaders by using the traits as a yardstick. An individual who possesses these traits enhances his probability of becoming a leader but it does not guarantee his leadership. Nevertheless, it can be seen to be true that some people are more likely than others to assume the leadership position. Explaining his views, a leading author^[19] opines as follows:

The research on trait theory of leadership has shown that many other factors are important in determining a leader's success and that not everyone who possesses these traits will be a leader.

Many cognitive and psychological factors such as intelligence, attributes like height, body size and shape and personal attractiveness can influence an individual's possibility of becoming a leader. Many Corporations still today use the Myers/Briggs type indicator personality test based on the work of psychologist Carl Jung²⁰ This test comprises of four dimension e.g. extroverts or introverts; Thinkers or feelers; sensitive or initiators and judges or perceivers. A lot of speculations still persists as to what traits makes a good leader.

The current research on leadership traits suggests that some factors do help to differentiate between a leader and a non-leader. Some of the notable personal traits are a high level of personal drive, the desire to lead, personal integrity and self-confidence. Cognitive warmth is also frequently desired.

One important conclusion from these leadership traits is that they do not necessarily guarantee leadership. They are simply viewed as personal competencies or resources that may or may not be developed and used. Many people have the capabilities to be an effective leader but some choose not to demonstrate the traits they have. Others may have the necessary traits and shows the desire to use them but the opportunity to do so never arise. A final point is that while traits may be difficult to accumulate in the short run, but a dedicated student can acquire qualities such as self-confidence and knowledge of business in the long run. According to Sisk^[21], some of shortcomings of trait approach to leadership are as follows:

- Trait approach as a general rule does not assign weightage to each of the traits and hence its overall contribution to leadership cannot be determined.
- There is a considerable overlapping between the traits and they are not mutually exclusive.
- An analysis of the personality trait makes no difference between these traits of value in acquiring leadership position and those traits necessary to hold or maintain leadership
- This approach is based upon rather shaky assumption that personality is a composite of discrete traits It also fails to recognize personality as an integrated functioning whole with a continually shifting pattern of character with respect to both significance and strength.
- The trait approach to leadership ignores situational factors or environment that produces an impact on effectiveness of leadership.

Behavioral approach: Because of the inconsistencies of trait theory of leadership, researchers focused their attention on the behavioral pattern or style of leaders in respect to their interaction with the group members. The researchers belonging to this school believe that there is no best style of leadership applicable to all organizational setting and their research efforts attempted to substantiate their contentions. The behavioral researchers opined that a leader's style comprises of two approaches namely employee-oriented and job-oriented.

As interest in the trait approach of leadership declined, researchers focused their attention on ⁷the leader's action rather than his attributes that led to the emergence of the behavioral theory. The most widely publicized component of the approach was Blake and Mouton's^[22] Managerial Grid Theory. This theory argued that there was one best style of leadership that can be derived through a balanced combination of two leading factors e.g. concern for the people and concern for production. Five distinct leadership styles emerged from this research out of which one turned out to be the most desirable one namely Team Management Style.

This theory stipulates that actions or behavior of a leader as perceived by an employee significantly influences the style of leadership to be adopted by a leader. It represents a consistent combination of philosophy, skill, trait and attitude that are exhibited in a person's behavior. Each style also reflects the belief in the capabilities of a subordinate. The employee's perceptions of leadership style are all that really matters to them. Employees do not respond solely to what the leaders think, do or say but to what they perceive leaders are. Leadership truly lies in the eyes of the beholder.

A continuum of leadership style exists ranging from strongly positive to strongly negative. Almost all the managers use a mix of negative or positive style somewhere on the continuum every day but a dominant style sets a tone within the group. Style is related to one's model of organizational behavior. The autocratic style tends to produce a negative style, the custodial model is somewhat positive and the supportive, collegial and systems models are clearly positive. Positive leadership generally leads to higher job satisfaction and performance.

The style of leadership is also determined by the way in which a leader uses his power. Each of the style such as autocratic, consultative or participative has its own merits and demerits. A leader uses all the three style over a period of time but one style turns out to be dominant one. For example a factory supervisor who is normally autocratic but may become participative in determining a vacation schedule or even may be consultative in selecting a departmental representative for the Safety Committee.

Two different leadership styles adopted by a leader in relation to employees are known as employee orientation and task orientation. The available evidence shows that the leaders secure higher job satisfaction from employees if high consideration is paid to their welfare and it becomes their dominant leadership style. Considerate leaders are more concerned about the human needs of their employees. They try to build teamwork, provide psychological support and help employees to solve their problems. Structured or task oriented leaders, on the other hand, believe that much better results can be obtained by keeping people busy all the time rather than paying attention to personal or emotional issues.

Resins Likert^[23] studied leadership style both from employee-centered and job-centered perspective and came up with important findings. He observes as follows, Supervisors with the best record of performance focuses their primary attention on the human aspect of their subordinate's problem and understanding to build effective work group with high performance goal. He arrived at this conclusion after a thorough study of thousands of employees and leaders working in business, government and medical facilities.^[23] He identified four styles or system of leadership that exemplify different aspects of the behavior of a leader. Each style of leadership is defined by seven operating characteristics. They are as follows:

- Characteristics of motivational process:
- Characteristics of communication process

- Characteristics of interaction/influence process
- Characteristics of decision-making process
- Characteristics of goal setting or ordering
- Characteristics of control process
- Performance Characteristics

Likert argues that all managers should strive hard to follow definite style of leadership. He further adds that participative style is very desirable if they want to maximize the quality and quantity of performance from the employees. The four system of leadership is depicted in the following Table:

Administration- Job Oriented System-1		Management- Employee Oriented System-3	
System-2	System-4		
Exploitive	Benevolent	Participative	Group
Authoritative	Authoritative	Consultative	Productivity
Productivity	Productivity	Productivity	Excellent
Mediocre	Fair to good	Good	

Considerations and structures appear to be relatively independent of each other, as such they should not be considered as opposite end of a continuum. A manager who becomes more considerate does not necessarily become less structured. A manager may have both orientations in varying degrees. If considerations exist alone, production may be bypassed for superficial popularity and contentment. So it appears that the most successful managers are those who combine relatively high consideration and structure giving more emphasis to considerations. Early research on consideration and structure was done at the University of Michigan and at the Ohio State University.^[24] In several types of environments such as truck manufacturing, railroad construction and insurance offices, the strongly considerate leader was shown to have achieved somewhat higher job satisfaction and productivity. Subsequent studies confirmed these general tendencies and reported desirable side effects such as lower grievance rates, lower labor turnover and lesser stress within the group. Conversely, turnover, stress and other problems seemed likely to occur if a manager was unable to demonstrate consideration.

This theory threw more light on various aspects of leadership but failed to answer many more fundamental questions about its exact meaning. To overcome these bottlenecks surrounding the above noted leadership theories, the situational approach of leadership was evolved. It emphasized the fact that traits required by a leader are bound to differ from one situation to another. The situational approach that predominated in 1950 held the view that a person who becomes the leader of a group

has nothing to do with his/her personality but it has every thing to do with such factor as the flow of event and the circumstances surrounding a group. To put it more clearly, a leader was a person who was at the right place at the right time. In this connection, Adair^[25] observes:

Rather than a great man causing a great event to happen, the situational approach shows that great events are the product of historical forces that are going to happen whether specific leaders are present or not.

Much research also focused on identifying leadership behavior. In this view, successful leadership depends more on appropriate behavior, skill and action and less on personal traits. The difference is similar to that of latent energy and kinetic energy in Physics. One type (the trait) provides the inert potential and the other (the behavior, skill or action) is the successful relapse or expression of these traits much like kinetic energy. This distinction is a significant one since behavior and skill can be learned while many traits are fixed in the short run. The broad three types of skill often used by a leader are technical, human and conceptual. They are discussed as follows:

Technical skill: Technical skill refers to a person's knowledge of and ability in any type of process or technique. Examples are the skills learned by an accountant, engineer, word processing operators and tool-maker. Technical skill is the distinguishing feature of job performance at the operating and professional level. But as employees are elevated to leadership positions, the technical skills become proportionately less important as managers, they increasingly depend on technical skill they supervise.

Human skill: Human skill is the ability to work effectively with people and to build teamwork. No leader on any organizational level escapes the requirement for effective human skill. It is an integral part of leadership behavior. Lack in human skill are largely responsible for the downfall of many budding managers and Chief Executive Officers (CEO).

Conceptual skill: Conceptual skill is the ability to think in terms of model, framework and broad relationships such as long-range plan. It becomes increasingly important in higher managerial jobs. Conceptual skills deal with ideas whereas human skill concerns people and technical skill involves things. Analysis of leadership skills explain why outstanding departmental sometimes make poor Vice President. They may not be using the proper mixture of skills required for the higher-level jobs particularly the conceptual skill.

Unfortunately this theory failed to answer why one member of the group emerged as the leader rather than another or why one particular leader proved to be a better leader in some situation than another. As a consequence another theory known as Integrationist Approach, attempted to provide a plausible answer to the existing anomalies of the earlier theories.

The Integrationist Theory: proposed that both the characteristics of the individual and the situation in which a group found itself accounted for who would ultimately become the leader. Another view that originated from the theory was that leaders are both born and made and they invariably require certain abilities and skill. But as the situations and the needs of the group changed, so too the person's acceptability as leader changed. Many of the researchers belonging to this group argued that the primary function of leadership was to meet the needs of the people as well as the organization. A middle ground approach implies that both the needs of the people and the organization can be met simultaneously. As a result, the researchers after a thorough review of both the trait and behavioral theory came to the conclusion that the needs of the people and the organisation differ quite significantly. Robert N. McMurry^[26] opines that organization should follow a policy of 'benevolent autocracy' and its header should behave like a 'great man. He should have firm belief in 'participative management' and facilitate the development of individuals to its fullest capacity.

Chris Argyris^[27] argues that workers in general are dependent on the organization while formalizing their needs. But a progressive leader who fully recognizes the needs of the people and organization at the same time can reverse such dependence. Argyris believes that there is a basic conflict between the needs of the people and the needs of the organization He hopes to bring about a balance between needs through promotion of job-centered and employee-centered leadership. In sharp contrast, Douglas McGregor^[28] expresses a view which is not as glum as that of McMurry and at the same time not so optimistic like that of Argyris. He suggests four steps for overcoming the potential conflict between the needs of the people and the needs of the organization. The first step involves the determination of a goal through consultation with the employees. Once this is accomplished, then it leads us to the second phase namely collaboration between the supervisors and the subordinates. The third phase e.g. the development of self-control is based upon the belief that people are capable of learning and encouraging self-interest. The fourth phase implies that the needs of the people and

organization should be integrated by means of mutual accommodation with the ultimate goal of solving a problem.

Contingency Approach: Experience has shown that positive, participative or considerate leadership may not always be the best style to be used. At times, there are exceptions and leaders have to identify the type of leadership style to be used. A number of models have been developed that explains these exceptions and they are known as Contingency or Situational approach. These models state that the most appropriate style of leadership depends on the analysis of the nature of the situation faced by the leader. First of all it is very much necessary to identify the key factors of a situation. When these factors are combined with research evidence, the results will indicate which style of leadership would be more effective in a given situation. Four contingency models of this nature are described below.

Fiedler's contingency model: Fred Fiedler^[29] and his associates developed an early but somewhat controversial model of leadership. This model tried to uphold the view that there is a strong co-relationship between the effectiveness of the leader and the situation in which a group operated. He further suggested that task structure, the leader's personal relations with the group interact to determine what style of leadership would be effective in a given situation and ultimately gives rise to task-oriented or group-oriented approach. As the situation varies, leadership requirements also vary. A noted author^[30] observes as follows:

At one extreme is the leader who values successful interpersonal relations to the exclusion of task accomplishment. The leader at the other extreme places the highest value on the task accomplishment, at the expense of interpersonal relations.

Fiedler showed that leader's effectiveness is determined by the interaction of employee orientation with three additional variables that has some relationship with the followers, the task and the organization. They are leader/member relation, task structure and leader's position power. Leader member relationship is determined by the manner in which the group accepts the leader. If for example, there is a group friction with the leader resulting in rejection of the leader, the followers may show reluctance to comply with specific requirement of doing a job. Leader position power may describe the organizational power that goes with the position occupied by a leader. Examples are power to hire and fire, power to give pay rise and promotion etc.

To determine whether a leader was task-oriented or group-oriented, Evans^[31] derived a model that used as its basis the measurement of leader's participation and relationship with the Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) with whom he/she has ever worked with. Those with a high score were deemed as group-oriented where others having low score was task-oriented. This research concluded that a task-oriented approach was more effective where conditions were either highly favorable (good leader/group relations, strong leadership position and a clear task-structure) or highly unfavorable (poor leader/group relation, weak leadership position and an ambiguous task. A group-oriented approach was preferable where conditions were comparatively stable so more attention is paid to the preservation of group relationship, to starve off conflict and inefficiency that could arise from any disharmony in the group setting.

This model assumes that group performance depends on Leadership style described in terms of task motivation and relationship motivation Situational favorableness are determined by three factors::

- Leader-member relation-degree to which a leader is accepted and supported by the group members
- Task Structure-Extent to which tasks are structured and defined along with clear goals and procedure
- Position Power-The ability of a leader to control subordinates through reward and punishment

A high level of these factors can give the most favorable situation while low level the least favorable. Relationship-motivated leaders are most effective in moderately favorable situation. The task-motivated leaders are most effective in either end of the scale. Fiedler suggests that it is more advisable for leaders to change their situation to achieve effectiveness rather than change their leadership style.

Based on these research findings, we can discern that there is nothing as good or bad leadership style and their effectiveness largely depend on how appropriate they are in a given group situation. Some critics of Fiedler's research, however, questioned the use of such a model to measure the leadership style and situational favourability and emphasized its inconclusiveness.

Path goal approach to leadership: Like all other contingency approaches, the Path Goal Theory of leadership makes an attempt to understand and predict leadership effectiveness under different situation. This model was initially expounded by Evans^[31] and later modified in collaboration with Robert J. House^[32]

This approach is based on the Expectancy Model of Motivation that stipulates that an individual's motivation depends on his or her expectation of reward and the valence or attractiveness of the reward. This approach focuses on the leader as the source of reward and attempts to predict how different system of reward and different leadership style affects the motivation, performance and satisfaction of the subordinates.

This theory further adds that leader's duty is to use structure support and rewards to create a work environment that enables employees to reach the organizational goal. Two major roles involved here are creation of a goal and to lay down the path towards the goal so that it could be attained. Under this model, the leaders are expected to identify the employee needs, establish appropriate goal and the connect goal accomplishment to reward system by clarifying expectancy and instrumentality relationship. Barriers to performance are removed and proper guidance is provided to the employees. The expected result of the process includes job satisfaction, acceptance of the leader and greater motivation.

Goals play a crucial role in the path goal process. Goal setting involves the establishment of targets and objectives for successful performance both short and long run. It provides a measure of how well the individuals and groups are meeting performance standards. The basic premise underlying the path goal process is that human behavior is goal directed. Group members need to feel that they have a worthwhile goal that can be reached with the resources and leadership available. Without goal, different members may go in different directions. Some difficulty may continue so long there is no common understanding of the goal involved.

The steps surrounding goal setting is just half of the total path goal process. Leaders must also consider some contingency factor and the range of leadership option open to them before deciding how to go about smoothing the path towards the goal. In particular, the need for two kinds of support must be weighted properly. Leadership strives to strike a balance between both task and psychological support for their employees and it is very logical. They provide task support when the help assembles resources, budgets, power and other elements that are essential to get the job done. Equally important, they can remove environmental constraints that sometimes inhibit the performance of the employees, exhibit upward influence and provide recognition contingent upon effective effort and performance. But psychological support is also needed. Leaders must stimulate people to do the job properly. The combination of task and psychological support of a leader is described by a telephone company employee as follows:

There is a supervisor in the western area who is the epitome of a leader. The reason? He cares, he cares about people (psychological support) and getting the job done right (task support). His enthusiasm is real and not forced and it is quite contagious. His employees want to work for him and learn from him.

It stems from two basic reasons: he knows what he is talking about and treat subordinates as though they are rational human beings with the ability to do the job and he expects them to do it. He gives them the recognition that their work is important. Therefore the people gets the feeling that they are working with him to get the entire job done.

According to the path goal theory, it is always necessary to help employees understand what needs to be done (the goal) and how to do it (the path). Leaders need to help employees see how achieving the goals will be beneficial to them and the organization. This leadership action should result in perception of high expectancy (efforts leading to goal achievement and hence to valued rewards). Leaders, however, have to decide which style should be adopted in case of such employees. The Path Goal model identifies four such style of leadership:

- The Directive Leadership-the leader focuses on clear task assignments, standards of successful performance and the work schedules.
- Supportive Leadership-The leader demonstrates concern for employees well-being and needs while trying to create a pleasant work environment.
- Achievement-oriented Leadership-the leader sets high expectation from employees, communicates confidence in their ability to achieve challenging goals and enthusiastically models the desired behavior
- Participative Leadership--leaders involve employees to provide inputs to decisions and seriously seeks to use their suggestions in the final decision making process. Such behavior increases group satisfaction particularly in stressful situation while directed behavior is suited to ambiguous situation. It is also suggested that leaders who have influence over their superiors can increase group satisfaction and performance.

The path goal model has made a valuable contribution by identifying additional contingency variables as well as broadening the range of behavior of a leader. Another unique feature is that it explicitly related leadership style to an underlying motivational model. On the other hand, the entire model is still being tested through research studies and it is somewhat speculative.

Existing research indicates that use of this model does correlate with employee satisfaction with leadership but its impact on performance is not fully documented.

Vroom-yetton's leadership decision theory: Victor Vroom and Philip Yetton⁽³⁾ have researched leadership style in the context of how much participation the leader should allow subordinates in making decisions. They identified five leadership styles based on the degree of employee participation and power in making organizational decisions. They are as follows:

- **Alternative I:** This style recommends that the leader should solve all the problems and individually make a decision using information available at the time of the decision.
- **Alternative II:** This style recommends that the leader should obtain necessary information from the subordinates and then personally make the decision without involving subordinates in developing or evaluating alternate decisions. This style involves subordinates only to the extent that they provide for the leader's personal decision.
- **Consultative I:** This style suggests that leader share information concerning the problem with subordinates individually, solicit and obtain suggestion from subordinates regarding a solution to the decision and carefully considers those inputs for personally making the decision.
- **Consultative II:** This style recommends that the leader share problem with subordinates as a collective group, obtain ideas and suggestions from the group and then personally makes a decision based on the subordinates influence, recommendations and alternative suggestions.
- **Group II:** This style suggests that the leader share problems with the entire group and together generates and evaluates in an attempt to reach a consensus solution to the problem. In this style, the leader accepts, adopts and implements the decisions that are recommended by the entire group.

Once the type of problem to be faced is determined, guidelines are then offered to help managers select one of the above noted five approaches to be used. For example items to be considered are time, the leader's dispersion of subordinates, the leader's motivation to conserve time and the leader's motivation to develop subordinates. All these considerations have a profound impact on the choice of leadership such as more autocratic or more consultative approach depending on the nature of the problem faced.

In this model, managers assess a current decision

situation according to the problem attribute including the perceived importance of technical quality and employee acceptance. Decision quality dimensions include cost considerations and the availability of information and whether or not the problem is structured. Employee acceptance dimensions include the need for their commitment, their prior approval and the congruence of their goals with the organization and the likelihood of conflict among the employees. By carefully following this analysis in a structured decision tree format, managers can identify and classify several types of problems.

Henry-blanchard's situational leadership model: Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard^[34] developed another Contingency Approach namely the Situational Leadership or life Cycle model. This theory suggests that most important factor affecting the selection of a leader's style is the development level of subordinates. Development Level is the task-specific combination of an employee's task competence and motivation to perform (commitment). Managers assess development level by examining an employee's level of job knowledge, skill and ability as well as willingness to take responsibility and capacity to act independently. Employees typically (according to Theory Y assumption) become better developed on a task as they receive supportive guidance, gain job experience and see reward for cooperative behavior. Both the competence to perform a given task and the commitment to do so vary among employees. Therefore development level demands a distinctive response from leaders.

This theory suggests that leadership style should be matched with the maturity of the subordinates. Maturity is assessed in a specific task and has two parts

- Psychological maturity--Their self-confidence and ability and readiness to accept responsibility
- Job maturity--Their relevant skill and technical knowledge

So as the subordinate's maturity increases, leadership should be relationship motivated rather than task motivated. Based on the four degree of the maturity of the subordinates, ranging from highly mature to highly immature, leadership may consist of the following:

- Delegating to subordinates
- Participating with subordinates
- Selling ideas to subordinates
- Telling subordinates what to do

Hersey and Blanchard used a combination of guidance and supportive (called task and supportive)

orientation to create four different styles of leadership namely telling, selling (coaching), participating (supporting) and delegating. These are then matched with progressive development level of employees suggesting that a manager's leadership style should vary along with the situation.

If the style is appropriate, it will not only motivate subordinates but also help them move towards maturity. Thus the manager, who develops subordinates, increases their confidence and helps them learn their job will constantly be shifting style. This model is simple and intuitively appealing and incorporates an important contingency factor (the individual employees capabilities on a specific task) that is sometimes overlooked. However it does not have widely accepted research base. Despite these limitations, it has attained considerable popularity and has awakened many managers to the idea of contingency approach to leadership style. The following example illustrates the point.

Two employees namely Cindy and Mary were hired by the same firm to perform similar jobs. Although they have comparable educational background, their supervisor identified Mary as being moderately low in development (willing but not yet fully able to perform) while Cindy was assessed as having a moderately high development level. As a result their supervisor decided to treat them differently during their first month in job by selling with Mary and participating with Cindy. Approximately two years later, the supervisor was able to use different styles with each now participating with Mary and delegating with Cindy since each one of them has gained skill and self-confidence.

Hersey and Blanchard insists that effective leaders must gain intimate knowledge of their follower's needs, abilities and demands on their jobs and then change leadership style gradually. This process by its nature cannot be revolutionary but evolutionary. This implies that there should be a gradual developmental change as a result of planned growth and the creation of mutual trust and respect between the leaders and the followers.

An examination of the relationship between leader and group member and how different kind of relationship develop with different individuals was the main subject matter of yet another integrationist theory namely Vertical Dyad Linkage Theory.^[35] Under this theory factors like age, experience and knowledge of the task can affect a member's standing with the leader i.e. an older worker with extensive knowledge of the task would be able to work with little or no supervision while a relatively inexperienced worker would require a higher degree of supervision.

James Kouzes and Harry Posner^[36] has opened up another new line of inquiry into leadership theory by

going back to the basics and tried to identify five fundamental practice and ten behaviors that leaders use to achieve outstanding results. They are:

- I. Challenging the people
 - (a) Search opportunities
 - (b) Experiment and take risks
- Ii Inspiring a shared vision
 - (a) Envision the future
 - (b) Enlist others
- Iii, Enlisting the others to act
 - (a) Foster collaboration
 - (c) Strengthen others
- iv. Modeling the way
 - (a). Set the example
 - (c) Plan small wins
- v. Encourage the heart
 - (a) Recognize individual contribution
 - (b) Celebrate accomplishments

A review of the leadership theories makes it obvious that there is no single best leadership style. Leaders are rarely totally group or task oriented. In reality group members and the situation itself is most likely to influence a leader's effectiveness. A leader needs to be aware of his own behavior and influence on others, individual difference among group members, group characteristics, task structure, environmental and situational variables and adopt his leadership style accordingly. Leadership needs to be adoptive.

THE FUTURE TREND OF LEADERSHIP THEORY

In the preceding section, an attempt was made to review the development of the various aspects of leadership focusing on trait, behavior, situation and finally contingency factors. Each model touched on different aspect and finally gave rise to different conclusions. In this way, they are similar to the ancient parable of blind men encountering an elephant with each describing it differently depending on whether he had touched an ear, a tail, a trunk or a leg. Even though some major differences exist among the various leadership models, they are remarkably consistent in some ways. It is quite interesting to note that research in the field of leadership is going on in full swing and it manifests a tendency of moving in diverse direction. Some research places greater emphasis on the unique characteristics of a particular individual who had significant influence on their organization and has led to the theory of transformational or charismatic leadership. Another notable trend is the emergence of self-leadership or self-managed or automated group. Such groups have met with

considerable success in various business organizations. A third theory that focuses not on the leader but rather on the follower and examines the romantic and mysterious qualities that we assign to our leaders.^[37] Some of the new ideas concerning leadership are discussed below:

Substitutes and enhancers of leadership: A totally different approach to leadership that still has a modest contingency flavor has been propagated by Jan Howell et.al.^[38] Previous leadership models have suggested that a formal leader is necessary to provide task, direction, situation and reward plus the consideration and social support that management requires. Unfortunately, these leadership roles may create an unhealthy dependency on the leaders that stifles the growth and autonomy of subordinates. Leader may also lack the necessary traits, knowledge and experience to fulfill these roles efficiently or may not be present in all cases. Further more neutralizers may intervene. These are attributes of subordinates tasks and organizations that actually interfere or diminish the leader's attempt to influence the employees. Some of the neutralizers are physical distance, rigid reward system and the very practice of bypassing the managers either by subordinates and supporters.

If the situation or leader cannot be readily changed, some substitutes or enhancers of leadership^[39] may be introduced. Substitutes for leadership are factors that make leadership roles unnecessary through replacing them with other sources. Examples of such factors are found in the contingency factors of the task organization and employees. Presence of such substitutes as strong subordinate experience, clear rules or a cohesive work group helps decrease the need for a leader's traditional task orientation. Other factors such as intrinsically satisfying tasks, professional orientation by employees or an employee's high need for independence may diminish need for a leader's consideration oriented behavior.

Alternatively leaders existing characteristics and abilities may become clarified and aided through other factors. Enhancers for leadership are elements that amplify a leaders impact on employees. A directive consideration may be improved by an increase in the leaders status or reward power or when that leadership style is used in jobs with frequent crises or by increasing employee participation in decision-making. The important contribution of the neutralizers/enhancers/substitutes approach is that organizations have an alternative remedy in those cases where it is not feasible to replace or train the leader or to strike a better match between job and leader. However, recourse to such measures might prove fatal to a leader's emotions where someone who previously thought that he or she is critically important

but now finds them partially replaceable. The leader may also suffer a demoralizing loss of self-esteem.

Self-leadership and super leadership: The substitutes for leadership provides partial compensation for leaders weakness and the enhancers build on a leaders strength. In another emerging approach to leadership, a dramatic substitute of leadership is the idea of a self-leadership which has been advocated by Charles Manz and Henry Sims.^[40] This process has two thrusts leading one to perform mutually exclusive tasks and managing one to do work that is required but not mutually rewarding. Self-Leadership requires employees to apply the behavioral skills of self-observation, self-set goals, management of cues, self-reward, rehearsal of activities before performance and self-criticism. It also involves the mental activities of building natural rewards into tasks, focusing thinking on natural rewards and establishing thought patterns such as mental imagery and self-talk. The net result is employees who influence themselves to use their self-motivation and self-direction to perform well.

Denis is the manager of a safety and training group at Lake Head Pipeline Company which pumps oil from Northern Canada to the areas in the Northern and Eastern United States. Many of the company's 300 field employees work in geographically isolated locations in very small groups. Some are totally independent with no supervisor available within 800 miles. To prepare these field employees for possible oil-gas crises, Denis's Training program encourages the workers to be self-leaders (while working within the limits of standard operating policies). Thus workers must set their own daily goals, observe their own behavior and mentally rehearse the safety procedures. While tackling dangerous tasks with no supervisor around, they must critique their own safety procedure and praise themselves where appropriate.

How can employees learn to become self-leaders? The answer lies in the support of super leaders^[41] or people who actively work to unleash the capabilities of the subordinates. Super leadership begins with a set of positive beliefs about the workers such as those in Theory Y. It requires practicing self-leadership oneself and modeling it for others to see. Super leaders also communicate positive expectations to employees, reward their progress towards self-leadership and makes self-leadership an essential part of the unit's desired culture. Just as with other substitutes for leadership, super leadership can be challenging for managers because they must give up some of the direct control that they have learned to exercise and that they feel comfortable.

Coaching: A rapidly emerging metaphor for the leader is that of a coach. Borrowed and adapted from the sports domain, coaching means that the leader guides, prepares and directs a 'player' but does not play the game. These leaders recognize that they are in the sidelines, not on the playing field. Their role is to select the players, to teach and develop subordinates to be available for problem-oriented consultation; to review resource needs, to ask questions and to listen to inputs from employees. Some managers report that they spend 50 to 60 percent of their time for coaching. They cajole, prod, enable, inspire, exhibit warmth and support and hold informal conversation. Coaches regard themselves as cheerleaders and facilitators while recognizing the occasional need to be tough and demanding.

Coaching^[42] can be a powerful leadership tool if handled correctly. It has been described as the secret weapon of some outstanding organizations that allow them to build up an arsenal of self-prepared managers. Good coaching focuses mostly on enhanced performance as supported by high expectations and timely feedback while building on the tools of trust, mutual respect integrity, openness and common purpose. Most managers agree that they need coaching in the following specific areas:

- Improving their interaction style
- Dealing more effectively with change
- Developing their listening and speaking skills

To facilitate change through coaching, skillful leaders initiate periodic dialogue that maintains a healthy balance between building the employee's self-esteem and introducing creative tension for change. Pre-requisites to successful coaching include the employee's willingness to change, capability of changing and the opportunity to practice new behaviors

Visionary and transformational leader: The above are the two recent perspectives that deserve special mention. Visionary leaders^[43] are those who can paint a portrait of what the organization need to become in future and then use their communication skill to motivate others to materialize the vision in reality. This is especially important during period of rapid change. As against this, the Transformational leaders or Charismatic leader^[43] is another new approach that attempts to look at the reciprocal nature of influence between the management and the employees. In this connection House observes that a charismatic leader possesses very high level of relevant power and some of that power comes from the need to influence others. Another aim of this approach is

to study closely the exchanges that take place between them. A notable feature of this approach is that it forms the basis of participative management where both the parties give and take something.

Bass^[44] has contrasted two types of leadership behavior namely Transformational and Transactional leadership. Transactional leaders determine what the subordinates should do to attain their own and organizational objective, clarify their requirement and help them to become confident so that they can reach their goal by expending the necessary effort.

In contrast, the transformational leaders motivate their workers to do more than what is generally expected of them by upgrading the value and importance of the task and place the interest of the organization above every thing else.

CONCLUSION

In real sense of the term, leadership is a very important human attribute. Successful leader acquires this rare quality by combining his mental qualities like intelligence, honesty, integrity and a clear understanding of the pattern of thinking of multitudes of followers. He possesses a unique ability of visualizing the future and putting forth a tangible goal or mission before the followers. For instance, we can cite the 20-20 vision and Jai Jawan Jai Kissan as enunciated by Dr. Mahathir bin Mohammad of Malaysia and Late Indian Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri. These are undoubtedly very lofty ideals and have been widely acclaimed for its impact on the social and economic development of the aforesaid countries. Over the years, some corporate leaders have emerged who continues to dominate our contemporary social; and economic life with their creative ideas and innovation. Without their active contribution in vital sectors like trade, transport, energy, Research and Development, hidden potentialities would have remained untapped for ever. Thus for our ultimate survival, we are badly in need of large number of leaders whose main motto would be to safeguard the rights and interest of common man. The sooner and faster we can do it, the better it is.

Based on information so far available, it can be firmly concluded that leaders are ordinary members of our society who are endowed with special qualities and they are both born and made. As a matter of fact, they sharpen their inborn qualities by closely working with people and strive hard to understand the aspirations and objectives of the followers. A close look at the various theories of leadership makes it quite obvious that there are ample potentialities in an individual to become a leader and

these potentialities must be carefully harnessed and nourished. In addition to their physical and mental qualities, the resultant grooming of a leader has every thing to do with prevailing circumstances and emerging contingent factors. The various theories of leadership expounded so far have revealed many mysteries surrounding the concept but a lot more remains to be done. In a bid to make it comprehensive enough, some authors have come up with a lot of interesting ideas like enhancers and substitutes of leadership, super leadership, self-leadership, visionary leader, transformational leader, charismatic leader. One of the latest ideas focusing on leadership is coaching. This mode of providing leadership has gained considerable popularity in the field of games, sports and other fields of human endeavor.

Development specialists now believe that the social and economic progress of a country hinges heavily on qualified and trained human resources. These human resources would be able to further the cause of development once there is ample supply of leaders. These leaders would provide the various groups with a definite goal and inspire them to attain the same. Thus every care should be taken to ensure the uninterrupted supply of leaders and thus help in achieving the targets as envisaged by the UN sponsored Millennium Development Goal.

REFERENCES

1. Terry, George and G. Stephen, 1988. *Franklin. Principles of management*. 8th Edn. Delhi: All India Traveler Booksellers.
2. Ecclesiastes. Chap 29, Verse 18, The Bible.
3. McGgin, Daniel Jack on Jack, 2005. His next chapter. *Newsweek International Magazine*.
4. Terry and Franklin, 1988.
5. Stoner, James A.F. and R. Edward Freeman, 1989. *Management*. 4th Edn. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited.
6. Szilagyi, Jr. D. Andrew., 1981. *Management and performance*. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 13: 441-73.
7. Koontz, Herbert. and Heinz Weihrich, 1990. *Essentials of management* 5th Edn. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited. Chap16, pp: 345-46
8. French, John, R.P. and Berton Raven, 1959. *The Bases of Social Power In Studies in Social Power*. (Edn.), Darwin Cartwright. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan. PP.150-67 For a discussion on power see Zalaznik, A Power in Politics and Organizational Life, *Harvard businessReview*, pp: 17-60
9. Barrow, J.C., 1977. The variable of Leadership: A Review of Chronological Framework. *The Academy of Management J.* 3: 231-51.
10. DCenzo David A. and Stephen P. Robbins, 1981. *Personnel/human resources managements*. 3rd Edn, New Delhi; Prentice-HallofIndia Private Limited, pp: 315-16. Also see Ouchi, William. *Theory Z.*, 1981. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, pp: 3-10.
11. Hodgett, R.M., 1982. *Management: Theory, process and practice*. 3rd Edn. Chicago, Dryden Press. Chapter 13.
12. McMurry, Robert A., 1958. The case for behavioral autocracy. *Harvard Business Review*, pp: 80-90.
13. Heller, Trady and Jan Van Til, 1982. Leadership and the followership: Some Summary Proposition. *J. Applied Behavioral Sci.*, 18: 405-414.
14. Littinger, William and Thomas Schuefer, 1982. Leadership through followership. *Business horizon*, pp: 78-81
15. Mariner, A., 1976. Theories of leadership, in Hein, E. and Nicholson, M.J. (1976). *Contemporary Leadership Behavior: Selected Readings*. 3rd Edition Glenview, Illinois: Scott Foresman Little Brown Higher Education.
16. Zalaznik, 1992. A Power in politics and organizational life, *Harvard Business Review*, pp: 17-60; See also Zalaznik, A., 1992. Managers and leaders: Are they different? In *Harvard BusinessReview*, pp: 126-35.
17. Kotter, J.P., 1991. What leaders really do, in *The Best of Harvard BusinessReview* Boston: Harvard University Press, pp: 73-82 .
18. Hodgett, R.M., 1982. *Management: Theory, process and practice*. 3rd Edn. Chicago, Dryden Press. Chapter 13.
19. Kotter, J.P., 1991. What leaders really do, in *The Best of Harvard Business Review* (1991) Boston: Harvard University Press pp: 73-82 .
20. Stogdill, Ralph M., 1974. *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: The Free Press. See also Stogdil, Ralph M., 1958. Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of literature. *J. Psychol.*, 25: 35-71.
21. Sisk. Henry L., 1977. *Management and organization*. 3rd Edn. Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Co., pp: 330-331.
22. Blake, Robert R. and S. James Mouton, 1964. *Managerial grid*. Houston, Texas Guild Press, pp:160-90.
23. Likert, Resins, 1951. *New pattern of management*. New York; McGraw Hill BookCompany, pp: 7.

24. Fleishman, Edwin A., 1973. Twenty years of consideration and structure, current development in the study of leadership. (Edn.), E.A. Fleishman and G. Hunt. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, pp: 1-87.
25. Adair, J., 1984. The skills of leadership. England, Aldershot Kants: Gower, pp: 210-20.
27. Argyris, Chris, 1978. Increasing leadership effectiveness. New York: Wiley and Sons, pp: 230-45.
28. McGregor, Douglas, 1960. The human side of enterprise New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, pp: 178-95.
29. Fiedler, Fred E., 1976. The Leadership Game: Matching the man to the situation. *Organization Dynamics*, pp: 6-16; Fiedler, Fred E., 1965. Engineer the job to fit the manager. *Harvard Business Review*, 43: 116; Fiedler, Fred E., 1965. The Contingency Model. In Harold Proshnosky and Bernard Seidenberg. (Eds.), *Basic Studies in Social Psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp: 538-51; Fiedler, Fred E., 1971. Validation and extension of contingency model of leadership effectiveness. *Psychological Bulletin*, 76: 128-48.
30. Dunford, R., 1992. Leadership and the Manager, in Fulop, L. *et al.* (1992). *Management for Australian Business: A Critical Text*. Macmillan South Melbourne, pp: 56-76
31. Evans, Martin G., 1971. Leadership and motivation-a core concept. *Academy of Management J.*, 13: 92-202.
32. House, Robert J., 1971. A Path goal theory of leader effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16: 321-28; House, Robert J. and H. Terence Mitchell, 1979. Path-goal theory of leadership. *J. Contemporary Business*, 3: 8-17.
33. Vroom, Victor H. and W. Philip Yetton, 1973. *Leadership and decision-making*. Pittsburgh University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973; Vroom Victor H. and Arthur G. Jago, 1988. *The New Leadership: Managing Problems in Organization*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc, and Jago, Arthur G. A Test of Experiences in Descriptive Model of Participative Leader Behavior. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 63: 383-387; For further reading consult Field, R.H. A Critique on the Vroom-Yetton Contingency Model of Leadership Behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 4: 240-247; Arthur C. Jago. An Evaluation of Two Alternatives to the Vroom-Yetton Normative model. *Academy of Management J.*, 23: 347-355. In support of the model see also Richard M. Steers. Individual Differences in Participative Decision-Making. *Human Relations*, 30: 837-47.
34. Hersey, Paul and Kenneth E. Blanchard, 1982. *Management of organizational behavior* 4th Edn. Englewood, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc, 1982; William, J. Redifin, 1967. The Three D. Management Style Theory. *The Training and Development J.* 21: 8-17.
35. Cumins, Robert C. and Donald C. King, 1977. The interaction of group size and task structure on industrial organization. *Personnel Psychol.*, 26: 67-94.
36. Kouzner, Thomas M. and Harry L. Posner, 1987. *The leadership challenge: How to get Extraordinary Things Done in Organization*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp: 30-35.
37. Mendle, James. R., B. Sanford Ehrlich and M. Jane Dukerich, 1985. The Romance of leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30: 78-102.
38. Jan Howell, David Bovern, Peter Dorfman, Stephen Kerr and Philip Polsakof, 1990. Substitutes for Leadership: Effective Alternative to Ineffective Leadership. *Organizational dynamics*, 19: 21-28.
39. Poffer, Karl., 1998. The critical approach versus the mystique leadership. *Human Sys. Manage.*, 8: 259-65.
40. Munz, Charles C. and Henry P. Sinn, Jr, 1987. Leading workers to lead themselves: The external leadership of self-managing unit. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 32: 106-107; Manz, Charles C., 1986. Self-Leadership: Towards an Expanded Theory of Self Influence Process in Organization. *Academy of Manage. Rev.*, 11: 589-590.
41. Canning, Thomas, 1978. Self-regulated work group: A socio-technical system. *Academy of Management Review*, 3: 625.
42. Stoner, James A.F. Edward R. Freema and Daniel R. Gilbert, Jr. 1988. *Management* 6th Edn. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited, pp: 391-92.
43. Weber, Max, 1968. *Economy and society-an outline of interpretative sociology*. New York: Bedminster Press. This book was originally published in 1925. PP241-54. Weber was the first to expound the concept of Charismatic Leadership See also Robert J. Home. A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership in James G. Hunt and Lars L. Larson (Eds) *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*, Carbondale, Ill: The Northern Illinois University Press, pp: 189-207.
44. Bass. Bernard M., 1985. Leadership: Good, Better, Best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13: 26-40; Noel, M. Tichy and David O. Ulreak, 1984. Leadership challenge: A call for the Transformational Leader. *Sloan Manage. Review*, 26: 59-68.