



The Politics of Leadership: A Critical Analysis of core Leadership Theories

Dr. Nivedita Saha

Associate Professor, Dept. of Political Science, University of Kalyani, Kalyani, West Bengal, India

Received: 17.07.2026; Accepted: 20.07.2026; Available online: 31.07.2026

©2026 The Author(s). Published by Scholar Publication. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Abstract

Leaders and leadership have been viewed with both interest and aversion throughout history. On one hand there are social scientists who holds a pessimistic view of the masses, believe in natural inequality. On the other there are liberals and socialists who advise people never to trust political leaders and sought institutional mechanisms to curtail the powers of the leaders. However, the existence of leaders influences history because they bring ideas and aspirations into the public domain. They instill a sense of ambition, built commonality and harness collective energy for a cause. It functions as a sense of acceptance by the followers. When a large number of people interact in a structured pattern of authority and subordination, leadership a predominantly group function, occurs. The relationship between a leader and his followers is circular; the followers must follow the leader's guidance, and the leader can only be approved after demonstrating his unwavering commitment to the group. Here political mobilization plays an important role. Thus, understanding leadership comes from living with it, it springs from direct political day to day experiences. Major part of it may not be circumvented within theoretical scholarly discourse. For the core of leadership – courage, honesty, judgement, intuition, creativity, morality and empathy are intangible qualities, beyond the grasp of hard-core science. Do leaders possess certain character traits? What is the great man theory of leadership? What is populism? What are the different styles of leadership? These are seminal questions, that needs valid answers. Therefore, this paper aims to analyze different leadership theories with special emphasis on their styles and how it is visualized in the western political thought.

Keywords: Leadership, great man, Ubermensch, charisma, styles of leadership

Introduction:

Leaders and leadership have been viewed with both interest and aversion throughout history which has been a source it is surrounded by a deep ideological controversy. On the one hand, some social scientists believe in inherent inequality and have a negative outlook on the general public. The extreme version of the fascist leader principle, which stems from Friedrich Nietzsche's concept of the *Ubermensch* (superman), maintains that there should be a single supreme leader to guide the masses to their real destiny. On the other hand, there are liberals and socialists who advised people never to trust political leaders and wanted institutional mechanisms to be developed to control the behaviour of the leaders. The presence of leaders affects the course of history, for it is the leaders who superimpose these notions and aspirations in the public realm. Rhodes and Hart emphasized that "Leadership is commonly portrayed as a source of dynamism in the polity, breathing life into parties

and institutions as they struggle with major changes. It is about grasping existing realities and recognizing that they can affect transformations." (Rhodes and Hart 2014, p. 8-9) The leaders instill a sense of ambition, built a commonality and build upon a common ideology to attain a single purpose. We can define leadership as an ability to influence a group towards the achievement of a vision or a set of goals. Keohane believed that, "leaders determine or clarify goals for a group of individuals and bring together the energies of members of that group to accomplish these goals." (Keohane 2010, p. 23) According to Andrew Heywood, "Leadership can be understood as a pattern of behaviour, as a personal quality and as a political value." (Heywood 2005, p. 136) Heywood went on to explain that leaders steer common people towards a shared goal. As a personal quality leadership focuses on individual attributes of the leaders. As a leader of political values refers to guiding, inspiring and motivating individuals and groups "through moral authority and ideological insights." (Ibid) Max Weber stated "that the challenge of leadership is to forge warm passion and cool judgement together in one and the same soul." (Weber 1991, p. 82)

Acceptance by followers is a prerequisite for leadership. Leadership is a representational function; therefore, a person cannot be considered a leader unless they are accepted by their followers. It is an exchange between the leader and his followers, who hold him responsible. To be eligible for the title, even terrorist commanders need to gather a following. The leader is able to read his followers' thoughts and motivate them to work for a cause that they might not have otherwise pursued. When a large number of people interact in a structured pattern of authority and subordination, leadership a predominantly group function, occurs. Three key elements of leadership are revealed by this pattern: the followers, the leader or group of leaders, and the functional relationship between them. The relationship between a leader and his followers is circular; the followers must follow the leader's guidance, and the leader will only be approved after demonstrating his unwavering commitment to the group. Political mobilization plays an important role. The leaders need to mobilize his followers to achieve certain pre-determined goals. Leadership does not merely mean presenting people with what they already want and desire, it rather urges leaders to strive and generate new wants and desires that creates new motivations amongst his followers. Leaders are not locked in statuesque, but are harbingers of change. Therefore, great leaders are often conceptualized as being 'event making'. (Rhodes and Hart 2014, p. 9) They have many names: Transformers, Visionaries, Pied Pipers, Reformers and Entrepreneurs.

Thus, understanding leadership comes from practical exposure, it springs from direct political day to day experience. Major part of it may not be circumvented within theoretical scholarly discourse. For the core of leadership - courage, honesty, judgement, intuition, creativity, morality and empathy - certain intangible qualities, are beyond the grasp of hard-core science.

Concept of Leadership in Western Political Thought:

The word 'Leadership' was not common in various classical works of Western political thought. Concepts connected to it was fundamental to many texts of political philosophy. In ancient Greek and Roman political philosophy, the majority of discussions focused on how rulers should be educated and how they should exercise their authority. A change in focus was noticed during the Age of Reason commonly known as Renaissance, in which an

ideological debate surfaced between the creative potential of leaders and a need to curtail their power, if it becomes too exploitative.

Plato was one of the pioneer thinkers who addressed the issue of leadership in his seminal works - *Gorgias*, *Republic* and *Statesman*. He argued that it is the distinctive art and knowledge of a statesman or a philosopher guardian which set him apart from the common mass of people. It is the sole objective of the guardians to implement what is best for the city's interests. Thus, the guardians being in a privileged position should not exploit the situation for their self-advancement but "take in hand the tending of the city and its citizens with the aim of making the citizens themselves as good as possible." (Keohane 2014, p. 27) When the city is small, the citizens can fend for themselves but when it grows in size and goes to war, the need for leaders is felt. Plato goes on to elaborate on the talent, education and lifestyle of the philosopher guardians. The guardians should share everything in common, so that desire and private love cannot cause a strife between them. They should live in dormitories and dine from common mess-hall. They shall not own property or conduct any kind of legal business.

Plato acknowledges a difference between the ruler and the ruled. Men and women in producing class would enjoy 'material luxuries' and 'family life', while the philosopher rulers enjoy the status of a ruler, superior education and pleasure of comradeship and philosophizing. Plato avoided major discontent between the two classes by advocating different life styles, which neither would like to alternate. Here Plato builds an image of a statesman, who is almost God-like. He can only be restrained by internal constraints. There is no external mechanism or constitutional framework to control his powers.

One of the earliest critiques of Plato was his disciple, Aristotle. He did not subscribe to his master's idea of internal constraints. Yet believed that, "one man could be so superior in capacity and virtue that he should be acknowledged as king." (Ibid, p. 28) He although was aware of the dangers associated with this - it could lead to instability and monarchy could degenerate into tyranny. Thus, Aristotle concentrated his entire energy in drawing up an elaborate plan for the use of power, which took the form of a constitutional framework. Just like Plato, Marcus Tullius Cicero was in favour of a ruler who was wise and well versed in all the attributes that would enhance the prestige of a state, who would act as "a guardian and steward of the commonwealth." (Ibid) However, he concluded that a mixed form of government will be the best one. In which the political skill of kingship, the 'merits of nobler classe's in aristocracy and 'rights of man' in democracy would be combined. He strived to strike a balance between Plato and Aristotle.

Niccolò Machiavelli boldly and shockingly reversed Cicero's message. In *The Prince*, Machiavelli expressed his belief that a leader should be strong, intimate, and largely unrestricted by institutions. Here there was no scope for philosopher guardians or aristocracy, but how an individual prince could obtain and retain power. A ruler will succeed only due to his innate qualities. These internal capacities can be classified as - courage, decisiveness, good judgement, ruthlessness and luck. Machiavelli believed that the percentage of success is more, when leaders do not have to rely much upon luck. A prudent prince should learn the art of war and keep practicing it. Because armed men are respected and feared, but unarmed guys are hated by everyone and the military does not trust them. He claimed that, "all armed prophets succeed whereas unarmed ones fail." (Ibid, p. 30) Machiavelli believed that "a ruler who wishes to maintain his power must be

prepared to act immorally when this becomes necessary.” (Ibid) It is expedient to have the stature of being virtuous, but when obligation undermines one’s power, the prince might take recourse to cunningness and immorality. Therefore, he wanted the leader to imbibe within himself the characteristics of both the fox and a lion.

In sharp contrast to Machiavelli, Montesquieu notes in *The Spirit of the Laws* that “the principle of despotic government is fear” and in such a situation, “the preservation of the state is only the preservation of the prince.” (Montesquieu 1949, p. 14) Following the footsteps of Aristotle and Cicero, Montesquieu advocated a moderate form of government in which the lawgiver should “combine several powers: to regulate, temper and set them in motion; to give, as it were, ballast to one, in order to enable it to counterpoise the other.” (Ibid, p. 1) Montesquieu claimed that the best form of government is when the citizens can govern themselves and people together can exercise legislative powers. But this is not possible in a big state and might be inconvenient for a small one. The most practical solution to this problem; the representatives of people to undertake whatever the multitude cannot. Only the executive powers should lie with monarch, where rapid decisions and actions are required. Montesquieu envisaged of a system in which three wings of the government, i.e., the executive, legislature and judiciary act as a balance against each other.

In *The Social Contract* Jean Jacques Rousseau stated that without a leader common man cannot act. They will not be able to say beyond yes or no for a particular legislation. So, what is required is a gifted and inspiring Lawgiver, for Rousseau believed that “the great soul of the Lawgiver is the true miracle which must prove his mission.” (Rousseau 1997, p. 7) An inspired genius, Rousseau's Lawgiver's mission comes to an end when the people embrace the legal system he develops. From then on, law must be passed by people assembled as a sovereign. (Ibid, p. 12) Rousseau was certain that the best form of government is, in which “the wisest govern the multitude, so long as it is certain that they will govern for its advantage and not for their own.” (Ibid, p. 5) Here he refers to the rule by ‘small number of wise men’, for he was pretty sure that rule by a monarch would invariably lead to abuse of power.

Like Rousseau, Roberto Michels was convinced that in every sphere of human development, people have been guided by leaders, for leaderless organization is impossible. He underlines various distinctiveness of human nature which makes oligarchy inevitable. First, he had little faith in political competence of the masses. For “man as individual is by nature predestined to be guided,” and “the apathy of the masses and their need for guidance has its counterpart in the leaders, a natural greed for power.” (Michels 1962, p. 367) Second, certain individuals are in an advantageous position in society than others. They might be economically, historically and intelligently superior. They are predestined to be leaders, since people needs to be guided by the best and nobody is ready to take a risk when future of the state is concerned. Thirdly, a group cannot implement decisions. For according to Michels “even if groups sincerely animated with the democratic spirit, current business, the preparation and carrying out of the most important actions, is necessarily left in the hands of individuals.” (Ibid) In the end, technically speaking leadership is indispensable, for leaders takes decisions and implements it for the good of the state and its people.

The approach of Hannah Arendt was quite different from that of Michels. She claimed that the idea of one individual or some individuals representing common people, acting on their behalf for the promotion of common good was a total misconception. It is a legacy which has been carried from the past and ails the modern. Thus, according to her political freedom means not being contingent on "the command of another and not to be in command oneself." (Arendt 1958, p. 200-1) All forms of one-man rule and power concentrated in hands of few - are kinds of deformations, for in its core lies the banishment of common man from participating in public realm. Living together in a shared area fosters a political environment and a type of plural leadership that improves everyone's well-being. Arendt describes a situation when people act in unison to bring about common good, where they have a common approach to solve all kinds of problems. Here she highlights a leaderless approach or an alternative approach to political leadership; where no one is ruling and no one is being ruled.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin disregarded Arendt's political perspectives and upheld that of Michels, which advocated the technical indispensability of leaders. He cautioned that vital political decisions should not be taken by congregation of men since they are surrounded by enemies on all sides. He wanted everybody to be inculcated into socialist ideology and here the specific role of leaders becomes important. The working class would not naturally possess the political consciousness required for revolution; instead, enlightened leaders would need to provide it to them from outside. This elite group of leaders needs to be properly selected and taught because they don't have time to consider democracy of any type, but they are infused with a strong sense of accountability.

Max Weber in his lecture, *Politics as a Vocation*, claimed that anyone who possesses power should have three qualifications; desire, a sense of proportion, and a sense of duty. Desire here stands for goals which are larger than self-advancement of a leader. It denotes, serving a cause. A good leader should not pursue desire single-mindedly. He needs to be conscious of his obligations and, as a result, pursue his passion with moderation. For Weber passion is "the decisive psychological quality of a politician: his ability to let realities upon him with inner concentration and calmness. Hence his distance to things and men and even distance towards himself." (Weber 1958, p. 115) The leader should have the capacity to step back and analyze his own actions. He highlights upon such quality of leadership because of his belief that politics is always rooted to violence. Reconciling two conflicting political ethics, an ethic of responsibility (*Verantwortungsethik*) and an ethic of conviction (*Gesinnungsethik*), can lead to the kind of ambitious and realistic leadership described by Weber. Here neither responsibility nor conviction alone can serve the purpose, but when they are combined to co-exist within a personality, a true leader is constituted. Politics is domain of the head but head should not be left alone, moral conviction of one's values should be inculcated.

To fulfil his responsibility, if such a situation arise the leader can act immorally. Deception might be viewed as a vice for common man, but a leader can take recourse to wrong deeds for the good of a state. He might sound similar to Machiavelli. But unlike his Italian counterpart, Weber believed that it is very difficult for a sensitive leader to take an unethical decision. There is no easy way out of this dilemma. For he claimed that, "no ethics in the world can dodge the fact that one must be willing to pay the price of using morally dubious means....and facing the possibility.... of evil ramifications." (Arendt 1958,

p. 121) A leader cannot step down, he cannot come back from the decision which he has taken, he must lead and take one course or the other, even if the course is immoral in nature, for the well-being of the society.

Weber draws clear distinctions between three types of leadership: 'patriarchal', based on tradition; 'bureaucratic', based on law and rationality; 'charismatic', based on the possession by an individual of a special gift. Weber laid the foundation of charismatic leadership. 'Charisma' as an operational concept of leadership, calls for more than normal devotion from the followers. More than over a century ago Weber defined 'charisma' (from the Greek word for gift) as a certain quality which an individual possess that can be treated as supernatural, superhuman or at least exceptional that sets him or her apart from ordinary people. "These are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as a divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader." (Gane 1997, p. 560)

Theories of Leadership:

Since antiquity students of society were deeply moved by the phenomenon of leadership. Plutarch, whose biographies of rulers served as a model for future kings, had an impact on historians. Thomas Carlyle attempted to portray human history as the result of the deeds of a small group of heroes. He believes that great leaders have shaped history. Those men who become leaders, does so, due to possession of certain character traits. Supposedly important traits included height, weight, intelligence, self-confidence, an urge to dominate, and so on. This was loosely labelled as "great man" theory of leadership.

When political science materialized as a separate discipline, it continued with its traditional focus on individuals. Soon this interest was shadowed by new emerging concepts. It became more scientific in nature, where importance was given to common mass of people, institutions and social forces and leadership study lost its importance. In due course, however it was re-introduced and made more scientific in nature. According to Dankwart Rustow, a methodical and comparative analysis of leadership would help one comprehend the differences in perspectives on leadership, "primarily as an individual attribute or trait and those who prefer to view it as being determined by the situation - as well as the even older debate over the historic influence of great individuals." (Waitr April 1988, p. 91) An examination of leadership theories reveals that these theories possess three dimensions: leadership trait, situation and followers, focusing on interaction with the leaders. Andrew Heywood classified leadership theory into four categories. These are:

- 'Leadership as a personal gift'
- 'Leadership as a sociological phenomenon'
- 'Leadership as an organizational necessity'
- 'Leadership as a political skill'

Leadership as a personal gift:

Leadership as a personal gift is one of the traditional views of leadership. Here leadership is taken as a personal quality, where leaders possess these attributes from birth. It is a gift bestowed on some individuals by nature and life circumstances in combination. It is often referred to as trait theory of leadership, which uses personal traits and attributes to distinguish leaders from non-leaders. Even Aristotle claimed that, "men are marked out from the moment of birth to rule or be ruled." (Heywood 2007, p. 374) They are viewed to

be man of destiny, who are destined to rule and guide the common people. There is no replacement for the leaders' own possession of the necessary skills, knowledge, and high level of reasoning and situational and individual judgment.

Recent studies indicates that there is another trait, possession of which may be the basis of effective leadership. This can be identified as emotional intelligence. Advocates of emotional intelligence argues that a person might possess all the leadership qualities, yet fail to be a successful one. This is because leaders might not possess empathy. The fundamental element of emotional intelligence is empathy. Leaders with empathy are able to read people's emotions and perceive their needs. People are motivated to stick with the leader by the compassionate aspect of empathy. The followers are compelled to show devotion to an empathic leader just because the leader shows concern for them. The fascist leader principle, which views leaders as the only masculine superior being who leads the masses to their fate, is the most extreme example of this ideology. This concept is derived from Friedrich Nietzsche's notion of *Übermensch*, one superman, who is supposed to be a super human being, "who rises above the herd instinct of conventional morality and so achieves self-mastery." (Ibid)

In a more crystallized form, this theory is epitomized in 'charisma', which literally means the power of personality. Pioneer of this type of leadership, as elaborated in the above discussion is Max Weber. He claimed that as cultural hold over the society is weakened, an era of confusion ushers in. Time is ripe for the arrival of divinely sent personality. Weber believed that "in rapidly changing societies, persons imbued with a sense of mission and endowed with populist attractiveness tend to be elevated to positions of political leadership." (Weber 1991, p. 115) Therefore, it can be assumed that this type of leadership is best suited during the time of confusion and transition, in which leaders can elicit intense loyalty and self-sacrifice from the masses. In essence the leader here is a saviour, who comes to save his followers during the time of crisis. The leaders should be endowed with the understanding capacity, here he should comprehend the distress of his followers. Charismatic leadership possess certain hazards. The manifestation of intense loyalty to the leader's personality cult is one of the consequences of this style of leadership. This could occur during the leader's lifetime or after his passing. In authoritarian nations where the state controls the media, it might rise as a result of its existence. The media may build a pseudo-personality cult and present a misleading impression of the leader. However, nations with free press and representative governance are also susceptible to this phenomenon. Inflating a leader's stature artificially in the eyes of the public could be detrimental. As a result, leaders in democracies frequently have an exaggerated appearance.

A similar strategy was also used by contemporary political psychologists. They attempted to use human personality to analyze leaders. Sigmund Freud was the first to use this method. According to Harold Lasswell's seminal work *Psychopathology and Politics*, leaders are motivated to actively pursue positions of power in contemporary society, whether in business, politics, or the workplace, by personal, nearly pathological tensions. Here, it is expected that one's low self-esteem will be overcome by power. Lasswell's hypothesis came to be known as 'political man as power seeker'. (Tucker Autumn 1977, p. 387) Conversely, James Barber concentrated on what he refers to as "presidential character," classifying US presidents based on two factors. (Barber 1988, p. 102) First, how much effort

they put into their work determines whether they are active or passive; second, how they feel about their official responsibilities determines whether they are positive or negative. He distinguished four categories of characters:

- Active-positive
- Active-negative
- Passive-positive
- Passive-negative

Leadership as sociological phenomenon:

The alternative approach nullified the importance of human personality. It did not view leadership as a personal gift, endowed by nature. Nor did it believe that it has been destined by God. The sociological phenomenon stated that leaders are created due to certain circumstances and situations. The leaders assume their position due to the needs of the society. From this view point leaders are created by certain sociological forces. This approach was adopted by the Marxists. They asserted that economic considerations, of which class conflict is a crucial component, have always shaped historical progress. As a result, the significance of each person's personality in determining the future of society is negated. Karl Marx however, acknowledged that the role of Bonapartists was an exception. He thought that the dictatorship of the Bonapartists represented the interests of the smallholding peasantry, who made up the overwhelming class in France. Additionally, this theory implies that collective behavior plays a major role in the development of leadership. In *The Crowd*, Gustav Le Bon examined crowd psychology and made the case that the crowd drives leaders rather than the other way around. (Freud 1949, p. 375)

Leadership as an organizational necessity:

The third theory of leadership largely views it in a technical term, which is manifested as a rational and bureaucratic device. It is taken as an organizational necessity, to give a sense of coherence and unity in the complex institutional set up. The central function of a leader is defining the situation for the group and devising policy responses, designed to solve the problem in accordance with the groups interests, as conceived by him. Modern large-scale organizations require specialization, division of labour and functions which leads to hierarchies of office and responsibilities. This jointure of leadership goes hand in hand with bureaucracy. In this case, political power is placed in the political office rather than an individual, and leadership is essentially formal, based on written regulations. This gives the office-holder more legal authority, which in turn helps them gain popularity. This formula is the foundation of constitutional government. Weber referred to this type of leadership as "legal-rational authority." This hypothesis, however, was unable to explain why leaders in representative democracies must project themselves in order to win elections.

Leadership as a political skill:

According to the ultimate theory of leadership, it can be studied and practiced as a political skill, an art of manipulation, and an artifact. The most graphical representation of this type of leadership is the construction of cult personality in support of dictatorial leadership. Indeed, many examples can be cited in which charismatic leadership can in practice be seen as a form of manufactured leadership. For instance, Stalin created a complex cult of Lenin to increase his popularity. For him, he built statues. He renamed towns and streets

after him. Finally, he linked himself with Lenin's heritage and was successful in setting up a cult for himself, thus enhancing his reputation. In modern democratic set up the political leaders also try to project themselves and their personal visions through media and social networking sites in order to win elections.

Styles of Leadership:

Leadership style is identified as behavioural pattern and strategies adopted by a leader to achieve a set of goals. Here a uniform pattern cannot be identified because different leaders will adopt different modes of behaviour as situation requires. Therefore, leadership can be exercised in various ways. The factors that influence leadership style are varied and many. Few components that can be noted here are - nature and ambitions of a leader, the institutional structure within which he operates, the political system through which power is obtained, the broader political culture and tools of mass communication available. Burn suggested three distinctive leadership styles. (Heywood 2007, p. 376) They are:

- 'Laissez-faire leadership'
- 'Transactional leadership'
- 'Transformational leadership'

Apart from these, other leadership styles that can be identified are:

- Democratic leadership
- Authoritarian leadership
- Autocratic leadership
- Populism

Laissez-faire Leadership:

The laissez-faire form of leadership stands for when leaders do not interfere in matters beyond their responsibility. He gives a free hand to the other departments and ministries to manage their own mundane tasks. He does not like to play the role of a manager. He adopts a 'hands off' approach. His responsibility is to devise policies to implement the broader goals for the society, as envisaged by him. This style of leadership allows leaders to focus on political and electoral matters. However, in this style of leadership there is lack of co-ordination amongst different departments, where ministers and officers are given ample opportunity to pursue their self-interest.

Transactional Leadership:

On the other side, transactional leaders take a more "hands on" approach to leading. The leaders will actively participate in policy making and government management. These leaders will play a positive role to bring about cohesion amongst different departments, they will strive to foster unity within the party and seek to strengthen public support. Such leaders will uphold the face of the government by negotiations and try to balance rival interests, one against the other. This is a type of managerial and technocratic style of leadership. The advantage of this outline of leadership is that, here the leaders need to be practical and there is ample scope of flexibility. However, the greatest drawback is that leaders are sometimes envisaged as opportunistic, who are devoid of any principle and firm conviction.

Transformational Leadership:

Transformational leadership is the third style, in which the leaders are neither coordinators nor managers. Here, the leaders are visionaries and motivators. They possess strong

ideological convictions, as well as the political and personal resolve to implement them. A transformative leader will try to rally the government, the party, and the public to realize his own vision rather than make concessions or adjustments. Transformational leaders can have a significant and remarkable impact on their followers by motivating them to put aside their own interests. They are able to excite, arouse, and motivate followers to put in extra effort to accomplish group goals. They also pay attention to the concerns and developmental needs of individual followers, changing their understanding of difficulties by assisting them in viewing old problems in new ways.

Howard Gardner believed that transformational leaders are those leaders who 'create a story'. Heywood pointed out that, "the effectiveness of such a leader hinges on the degree to which the leader in question embodies the story, and the extent to which the story resonates with the broader public." (Freud 1949, p. 377) Many a times transformational leadership is linked to 'populism', where leaders feel that they are reflecting the concerns and interests of common people. Sometimes a transformational leader also becomes ideologically rigid, which may lead to authoritarianism. However, it should be remembered that visionaries and inspirers are looked upon as harbingers of radical social, economic and political change.

Democratic leadership:

In this style of leadership, the attainment of group goals requires the members to be suitably motivated to achieve them. Here, leaders try to balance two distinct goals: achieving the shared aim and limiting outside influence over an individual's behavior. Only when the group and the leader are able to work closely together will this be possible. Thus, here mutual understanding and acceptance plays a dominating role. Only if there are mutual understanding and acceptance, then the members need not be controlled externally for the achievement of pre-conceived goals. This leadership style is characterized by individuals actively participating in leadership activities where shared objectives and strategies for achieving them are determined through dialogue. The members also enjoy the freedom to associate with whomever they like. The leaders here play a supervisory role. Democratic leadership is fundamentally collaborative. Although the leader has ultimate responsibility, the people maintain their sovereignty and have the right to remove the leader if needed.

Authoritarian leadership:

In order to achieve group objectives, leaders in this leadership style dictate and enforce the behavior that members must adhere to. The leader has to balance two distinct goals in this situation as well: achieving collective objectives and exerting external coercive control over individual behavior. The leader uses the rule of paternalism to balance these two goals, yet they can also be brutal and obsessive when needed. Even in the best of situations, the general public mistrusts the authoritarian leader because they doubt the members' allegiance. By establishing stringent and formal rules of conduct, the leader typically ensures adherence to group norms. Although members may occasionally be contacted, the leader alone makes decisions about general policy; direct participation is not officially permitted. The leaders will also decide with whom the members should associate for fulfilment of common objectives. There is always a difference between the leader and the members, which leads to tension and antagonism. Little or no delegation of leader's responsibilities occur and the leader choose his subordinates and they are responsible to

him alone. Sovereignty rests with people in principle but leaders can be removed with great difficulty.

Autocratic leadership:

Under this leadership style, leaders have complete and unrestricted control over every action taken by the group to achieve the predetermined goals. Individual control over all choices and minimal input from group members are its defining characteristics. Autocratic leaders seldom take advice from their followers and usually base their decisions on their opinions and opinions. It entails total authority over the group. Because of their position, autocratic leaders not only oversee the group's activities but also keep a tight eye on them to ensure they are completed. There is an atmosphere of total mistrust, where people do not trust the leader and the leader is constantly wary of people's allegiance. The leader has sovereign authority and is difficult to overthrow. The first tribes and empires are evocative of this style. Autocratic leadership has historically been linked to tyrants and dictators who utilized coercive tactics to intimidate and coerce subordinates into completing tasks. It goes without saying that the historical shift toward democracy casts despotism in an unfavorable light.

Populism:

Although populism can be recognized as a distinctive leadership style, Burn did not designate it as such. Populism's reliance on a leader's capacity to galvanize the populace to implement drastic changes is one of its distinguishing characteristics. It is closely associated with powerful, showy figures. It is important to view populism as a manufactured ideology that political actors use to control society. However, some academics disagree that populism is an ideology created from above by powerful or charismatic politicians. When politicians serve as the channel, if not the originator, for the construction and propagation of popular ideologies, there is a genuine demand for populism. In modern democracies, when political leaders must win elections by appealing to voters' emotions and offering straightforward answers to difficult issues, this type of leadership is becoming more and more common. Some academics contended that populism is a tactic used by astute political actors rather than a leadership style. Kurt Weyland defined populism as "a political strategy through which a personalistic leader seeks to exercise government power based on direct, unmediated, institutionalized support from large numbers of mostly unorganized followers." (Weyland 2001, p. 6)

Conclusion:

It is true that the direction of previous or future political developments is greatly influenced by a single person's leadership. Because the average person depends more and more on leaders to guide, project a vision, and give the world they live in meaning and coherence, the function of leaders becomes more crucial as society grows more fragmented and complex. However, it is important to keep in mind that there isn't a single, cohesive theory of leadership. In many different areas, there are an excessive number of definitions and theories. Additionally, academics cannot agree on what leadership is, how to research it, or even why we study it. As a result, the topic is basically complex.

References:

1. Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. University of Chicago Press.
2. Barber, J. (1998). *Politics by humans: Research on American leadership*. Duke University Press.
3. Freud, S. (1949). *Group psychology and the analysis of the ego*. International Psychoanalytic Library. (Original work published 1921)
4. Gane, N. (1997). Max Weber on the ethical irrationality of political leadership. *Sociology*, 31(3), 549–564. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038597031003008>
5. Heywood, A. (2005). *Key concepts in politics*. Palgrave Macmillan.
6. Heywood, A. (2007). *Politics* (3rd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
7. Keohane, N. O. (2010). *Thinking about leadership*. Princeton University Press.
8. Keohane, N. O. (2014). Western political thought. In R. A. W. Rhodes & P. 't Hart (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political leadership* (pp. 25–40). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199653881.013.0002>
9. Michels, R. (1962). *Political parties: A sociological study of the oligarchical tendencies of modern democracy*. Collier. (Original work published 1911)
10. Montesquieu, C. de S., Baron de. (1949). *The spirit of laws* (T. Nugent, Trans.; F. Neumann, Ed.). Hafner. (Original work published 1748)
11. Rhodes, R. A. W., & 't Hart, P. (2014). Puzzles of political leadership. In R. A. W. Rhodes & P. 't Hart (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political leadership* (pp. 1–21). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199653881.013.0001>
12. Rousseau, J.-J. (1997). *The social contract and other later political writings* (V. Gourevich, Ed. & Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1762)
13. Tucker, R. C. (1977). Personality and political leadership. *Political Science Quarterly*, 92(3), 383–393. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2148499>
14. Wiatr, J. J. (1988). Introduction: Political leadership from a comparative perspective. *International Political Science Review*, 9(2), 91–94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019251218800900201>
15. Weber, M. (1991). Politics as a vocation. In H. H. Gerth & C. W. Mills (Eds. & Trans.), *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology* (pp. 77–128). Routledge. (Original work published 1919)
16. Weyland, K. (2001). Clarifying a contested concept: Populism in the study of Latin America. *Comparative Politics*, 34(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1701208>