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Abstract
This article comparatively analyzed the dichotomy between leadership and management, their major individual characteristics, and perceptions about issues relating to organizational control, utilization of human and material resources, and achievement of organizational and individual member’s goals. The study laid emphasis on the glaring dichotomy between leadership and management, and prescribed democratic leadership of administration for the achievement of enterprise and individual member’s objectives. The method used to elicit data for the study is documentary evidence. Content analysis was adopted in analyzing the data generated. The study revealed that democratic leadership pattern, with its vision and inspiration, enjoys more acceptance and followers amongst employees than the management style of administration with its task-oriented, profit-centred, fatigue and coercive approach. The study also revealed that under extreme emergency situation that calls for swift and precision, the necessity and inevitability of a situational mixture of the doctrine of democratic process and application of authoritarianism in leadership to achieve the desired objectives without losing the obedience and respect of followers, enjoys public sympathy in organizational management.

Keywords: Effective Leadership, Analysis of Leadership, Management, Organizational Goals

1. Introduction
As rationale beings, we live in a society of large and small organizations with local, national, and international outlooks. In these organizations people work together as a team to accomplish goals that are too complex to achieve by a single individual. Situational, where two or more people agreed to execute a project, a member of the group must emerge through election, appointment or voluntary service to assume leadership position to coordinate the activities of the group and/or organization.

Leadership in an organization is the process of influencing the activities of an organized group in its efforts towards target achievement. It involves influencing people to exert more effort in some task or to change group members’ behaviour. Genuine leader understands that self-discipline is the manifestation of the highest form of government – “self-government”. The disciplined lifestyle distinguishes leaders from followers. Leaders exhibit strong self-discipline, usually motivated by a passion generated by a sense of purpose and vision. Leadership is “the capacity to influence others through inspiration motivated by a passion, generated by a vision, produced by a conviction, ignited by a purpose” (Munroe, 2005). True leadership is not control or manipulation of others, but it is other people’s willful submission of their authority to the leader, motivated by inspiration. In uncivilized societies, people influence others using threats and violence. This is not true leadership. It is manipulation, oppression, or dictatorship. Adolf Hitler of Germany, Idi Amin of Uganda, Sanni Abacha of Nigeria, Saddam Hussein of Iraq, Muammar Gaddafi of Libya, etc were all influential personalities. They exerted their wills over their people coercively and violently; this is crude dictatorship not leadership. Leadership is distinct from management as the latter is concerned with effective and efficient execution of task by subordinates, while the former is visionary and inspirational in nature (Hersey et al., 2008)
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At this juncture, it becomes relevant to construct a demarcation between “leadership” and “management”. While leadership is an act of influencing group members to participate actively and meaningfully in the group’s activities, management is an act of influencing subordinates to do nothing more than simply fulfilling the minimum requirements of their statutory functions to eschew negative consequences. Sherif (1962) noted that:

The leadership status itself is within a group and not outside of it. The leader’s authority is spontaneously accorded him by his fellow group members, the followers. The authority of the manager derives from some extra-group power that he has over members, who cannot meaningfully be called his followers. They accept his influence on pain of punishment derived from the larger organization, rather than following him in the promise of positive satisfaction derived from the achievement of mutually compatible goals.

The concept “group” refers to two or more individuals interacting in pursuit of common or compatible goals in such a manner that the existence of many is utilized for the attainment of organizational goals and satisfaction of some needs of each group member.

There is a striking distinction between leadership and management. The two terms are seen very differently by diverse scholars. Some individuals see these terms as synonyms and frequently use them interchangeably, while others approach them as extreme opposites; so extreme that they would argue that one cannot be a good manager and a good leader at the same time. Still other conservatives are of the view that while there is a difference between leadership and management, with the right knowledge, a skillful individual can successfully navigate both concepts from the same position. Modern organizations need both effective leaders and effective managers to run a successful operation due to some obvious similarities that can be found between leadership and management (i.e. they both involve influencing constituents or employees; authority and power are generally given with both positions). That notwithstanding, there are also some glaring differences between the two concepts (i.e. management is often more task-oriented; leadership is considered more inspirational and visionary). Another point that underscores the difference between leadership and management is that the leader is not immune from group sanctions if he deviates too far from the bounds of acceptable behaviour prevailing in the group, while a manager is independent of sanctions applied by the group. Although the manager will in turn be subjected to those sanctions applied by the larger organization to its members occupying the headship (supervisory) position within the enterprise (Sherif, 1962; Ricketts, n.d).

Attainment of organizational goals demands committed, experienced, skillful and good temperament leader to shoulder the responsibilities of planning, budgeting, controlling, organizing, and coordinating the group members’ activities. Not all leaders possess the good qualities required of personnel of this calibre. Munroe (2005) noted that some leaders possess morality, ethics, principles, convictions, standards, faithfulness, transparency, trustworthiness, and honesty. These recipes are rare commodities in the field of leadership in contemporary societies. Good leaders with these credentials are not ubiquitous in any society. Rather, what is commonly available in modern scenario include the culture of defective leadership, moral defects, abuses of power, misuse of privilege and trust; misapplication of justice, misuse of resources; corruption; and hypocrisy, which have been associated strongly with leadership in third world countries. Therefore, there are good and bad leaders and/or managers as their qualities manifest through their chosen style of administration, policies and programmes, prevailing organizational culture, environmental disposition in areas of operation, etc. Some managers do not lead effectively, and some leaders do not manage effectively too to facilitate attainment of the desired goals due to leadership defections and unbridled behaviours of some tyrant leaders. Therefore, committed and humane leadership is difficult to find in contemporary societies (Blake and Mouton, 1964; http://www.ca.uky.edu/agc/pubs/elk1/elk11o3/elk11o3.pdf).

The objective of this article is to carry out a comparative analysis of leadership and management so as to establish the roles of leaders or managers and their effectiveness or weaknesses in leading group members to accelerate achievement of organizational goals and objectives. The study will also compare leadership styles,
their managerial skill and activities within the group or organization in order to establish which of the two approaches facilitates attainment of organizational goals, promotes cohesion, encourages participatory roles in decision-making processes, and motivation of workforce to create conductive atmosphere necessary to improve productivity and as well meet individual needs.

2. Leadership

Leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an organized group in its efforts towards target achievement. It involves influencing members of the group to exert more effort in some task or to change group members’ behaviour to conform with the objectives of the organization. Leadership means influencing all group members to identify themselves with the group’s project and to participate actively in its activities to enhance the achievement of the predetermined goals. Leadership is the process through which one individual consistently exerts more influence than others in the pursuit of group behaviour. Political leadership is the decision on the social policy and resource allocation, as exerted by partisan representatives (Okadigbo, 1987) quoted in Agaba and Daniel (2010:105). Weihrich and Koontz (1993) define leadership as influence, that is, the act or process of influencing people so that they will strive willingly and enthusiastically toward the achievement of group goals. Leadership position is a designated position of authority in an organizational chart. For instance, the position of a President, Governor, Bishop, Manager, Traditional Ruler, Vice-Chancellor, etc is a leadership position.

Leadership effectiveness is measured by the extent to which the leader’s group or organization performs its assigned task and achieves its objectives within a given time-frame. Effective leader will strive to ensure the group survival; group preparedness to surmount challenges; the capacity of the group to deal with crises; personal evaluation of the subordinate satisfaction with the leader’s administrative disposition; subordinate commitment to group objectives; psychological wellbeing and personal growth of the followers; and the leader’s ability to retain authority in the group (Ugwuegbu, 1992). Ricketts (nd) outlines some common characteristics and behaviours of effective leader to include efficient coaching skills; confidence; consistency between word and action; creativity; empathic listening skills; being visionary, inspiring; long-term focus; maintaining a balance between individual needs and organization needs; awareness of realistic conditions; strong self-esteem; sense of priorities; service mentality; sincerity; technical or contextual expertise; trust; willingness to share responsibility; and willingness to share credit and/or recognition, and ability to own-up mistakes made by subordinates (http://www.ca.uky.edu/agc/pubs/elk1/elk1103/elk11032.pdf). Leadership is a matter of intelligence, trustworthiness, humaneness, courage, and discipline. The five virtues, each appropriate to its function, yield effective leader. Ironically, reliance on intelligence alone results in rebelliousness; exercise of humaneness alone results in weakness; fixation on trust results in folly; dependence on the strength of courage results in violence; excessive discipline and sternness in command results in cruelty.

Management

Management is the act of exercising executive, administrative and supervisory direction of a group or organization. Management is concerned with the accomplishment of objectives through the efforts of other people. In order to facilitate accomplishment of their objectives, it is essential for managers to determine what is to be achieved (planning); allocate resources and establish the means to accomplish the plans (organizing); motivate and lead personnel (directing); and compare results achieved to the planned goals (controlling) (Mondy et al., 1980).

A manager is one who is responsible for making decisions concerning the use of an organization’s resources to achieve results. He is the catalyst that makes things happen, as he establishes goals, plans operations, organizes various resources (i.e. personnel, materials, equipment, capital, etc.), leads and motivates people to perform, evaluates actual results against the goals, and develops people (through training and retraining techniques) for the organization to excel and achieve its preset goals. Ideally, management should encourage its workforce to develop not only willingness to work but also willingness to work with
zeal and confidence. Zeal is ardor, earnestness, and intensity in the execution of work; confidence reflects experience and technical ability. Most importantly, leaders act to help a group attain objectives through maximum application of its capabilities. Leaders 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 (Mondy et al., 1980). Leader’s style of leadership is based on the theoretical framework of analysis adopted on the onset. Taking into consideration the environment, situation under which the operation is taking place, and organizational culture, the success or failure of a leader or manager is fundamentally based on the skill and choice of leadership style (Dessler, 2005).

**Essential Management Skills**

Large organizations are complex in nature and scope and too demandful in practice. Therefore, management responsibilities are generally much more task-oriented than some leadership responsibilities. One rewarding way to operationalize effective management is to elaborate substantially on necessary management skills because skills are different from traits or characteristics in that they are the ability to use one’s knowledge and competencies to accomplish a set of objectives. Effective management depends largely upon three personal skill sets, thus:

**Technical Skill**

This is knowledge about and proficiency in a specific type of work or activity. This includes competencies within a specialized field, analytical ability, or the ability to use appropriate tools and techniques.

**Human Skill**

Human skill is knowledge and ability to work with people, often considered as “people’s skills”. These skills position a manager to assist group members when working cooperatively as a group to achieve a task or assignment. Effective manager takes into serious consideration the human factors in act of managing. In interpersonal relations, people play multiplicity of roles. Individuals are much more than merely a productive factor in management’s plans. They are indeed members of social systems of many organizations; they are also consumers of goods and services, and thus they vitally influence demand; the characteristics of a good team are commitment to a common purpose, performance goals, complementary skills, and an approach for which the team members hold themselves mutually accountable. It is obvious that while enterprise objectives may differ somewhat in various organizations, the individuals involved also have needs and objectives that are important to them. Through the function of leading, managers help people see that they can satisfy their own needs and utilize their potentials and at the same time contribute meaningfully to the aims of an organization. In these different roles, they establish laws that govern managers, ethics that guide behaviour, and a tradition of human dignity that is a major characteristic of our society. Managers and the people they lead are interacting members of a broad social system (Weihrich and Koontz, 1993; Bono and Ilies, 2006).

Managers should therefore have an understanding of the roles assumed by people, the individuality of people, and the personalities of people involved in management. In demonstrating good leadership skills, the leader should exhibit straightforwardness and fair-mindedness as two major characteristics of leadership. The leader being straightforward is an act of using sound judgment to make good decisions at the right time. It is about staying focused, planning, and avoiding making rash decisions on the spur of the moment. The examples of this group of skills include being aware of one’s own perspective on issues as well as employees’ perspectives, knowing full well the needs and motivations of staff, and taking into account others’ needs during decision-making.

**Conceptual Skill**

Conceptual skill is the ability to work with ideas and concepts. This skill set does not involve working with people or things, but simply, it focuses on ideas. A manager with good conceptual skills will be comfortable talking about the ideas and details that shape their group or organization. The manager is good at seeing the bigger picture and can translate this understanding into words for every member to comprehend (Weihrich and Koontz, 1993).
In administration, each of these types of skills is very important for effective management, and they are also necessary within different levels of management within a group or organization. This is why many of these skills are being applied in organizations as useful tools for effective management, depending on the type of leadership style and the situation the leader operates.

3. Types of Leadership

Transformational Leader

As leadership is the process of influencing the behaviour of other members of a group, some leaders are more effective in motivating the members of their groups or organizations, inspiring them to achievements that might not ordinarily be accomplished. Transformational leaders are motivated by strong ideological convictions, and they also have the personal resolution and political will to put them into practice. Instead of seeking compromise and consensus, transformational leaders attempt to mobilize support from within government, their parties and the general public for the realization of their personal vision (Haywood, 1997). The leader in this sense is known as a transformational leader. The transformational leader motivates its team to be effective and efficient. Communication is the base for goal achievement focusing the group on the final desired outcome or goal attainment. This leader is highly visible and uses chain of command to get the job done. Transformational leaders focus on the big picture, needing to be surrounded by people who take care of the details. The leader is always looking for ideas that move the organization to reach the company's vision (Burns, 1978).

As highlighted in this discourse, people with this leadership style are true leaders who inspire their teams constantly with a shared vision of the future. While this leader's enthusiasm is often passed onto the team, he or she can need to be supported by "detail people". That is why, in many organizations, both transactional and transformational leadership are needed. The transactional leaders (or managers) ensure that routine work is done reliably, while the transformational leaders look after initiatives that add new value. While the transformational leadership approach is often highly effective, there is no one "right" way to lead or manage that fits all situations. Transformational leaders go beyond the merely routine to instilling in the members of their group a sense of mission or higher purpose and thereby changing the nature of the group itself. Such transformational leaders are the leaders who are seen as “leaving their stamp” on their organizations. To choose the most effective approach for oneself, consider the skill levels and experience of the team; the work involved (routine, or new and creative); and the organizational environment (stable or radically changing, conservative or adventurous). They are vital inspiration for social change the world over (Kanter, 1983) quoted in Giddens, et al., (2005:136).

General de Gaulle, for instance, recast the nature of political leadership in France by presenting himself as a ‘father figure’ and ‘national leader’ by establishing a presidential system in the form of the fifth republic. A very similar style was adopted in the United Kingdom by Margaret Thatcher, whose avowed aim when coming into office was to run a ‘conviction government’, followed by Tony Blair also in the United Kingdom who also adopted a transformational stance, first in recasting the Labour Party as ‘new’ Labour, then in ensuring that his government pursues ‘third way’ rather than old-style socialist priorities, and finally in cultivating a reputation as a world statesman. As indelible mark on history, the continued use of terms such as ‘Gaullism’ and ‘Thatcherism’ bears witness to the enduring impact of these leaders' ideological visions (Haywood, 1997:353). Another example of transformational leader is drawn from Nelson Mandela, the South African leader who was in prison for twenty-seven years, having been convicted of treason against the apartheid government of South Africa, dominated by the white minority who are alien in the sub-region. In spite of these odds, Mandela managed to build his political party “African National Congress (ANC)” into a multiracial force for change – total dismantle of apartheid structures. It has been worldly acclaimed that Mandela’s transformational leadership was so strong that despite his long jail term, as soon as he was freed, he assumed leadership of the ANC, and successfully led the African National Congress in overthrowing the South African racial-segregative regime known as “apartheid system”. Subsequently, Nelson Mandela,
exemplary visionary leader, was elected President of South Africa (Giddens et al., 2005:136; Haywood, 1997:353).

**Transactional Leader**

Leaders are endowed with different leadership attributes. This style of leadership starts with the idea that team members agree to obey their leader totally when they accept a job. The "transaction" is usually the organization paying the team members in return for their effort and compliance. The leader has a right to "punish" team members if their work does not meet the pre-determined standard. Team members can do little to improve their job satisfaction under transactional leadership. The leader could give team members some control of their income/reward by using incentives that encourage even higher standards or greater productivity. Alternatively, a transactional leader could practice "management by exception" – rather than rewarding better work, the leader could take corrective action if the required standards are not met. Transactional leadership is really a type of management, not a true leadership style, because the focus is on short-term tasks.

The transactional leader, according to Burns (1978), is given power to perform certain tasks and reward or punish for the team's performance. It gives the opportunity to the manager to lead the group and the group agrees to follow his lead to accomplish a predetermined goal in exchange for something else. Power is given to the leader to evaluate, correct, and train subordinates when productivity is not up to the desired level, and reward effectiveness when expected outcome is reached. In their characteristics, these are leaders concerned with accomplishing the group’s task, getting group members to do their jobs, and making certain that the group achieves its goals. Transactional leadership is routine leadership. (Giddens et al., 2005).

4. **Leadership Functions**

**Initiating Action**

The principal function of an effective leader is to serve as a model for the followership. Effective leaders are known for initiating action, coordinating efforts of the group, planning of the expenditure of resources, determining the goals, and fashioning out the methods of achieving goals. A leader accepts blame, considers consequences of certain actions and decisions, and works tirelessly to prevent conflicts and/or reduce the effect within the group. Managers are much concerned about improved productivity and enhanced profit. Goal setting and effective mobilization of all manpower resources is geared towards accomplishing the task of improved productivity. Goal setting in group work is the ability of the leader to determine and make each member of the group understand the goal of collective activity. Leadership involves a process by which members of a team are assisted to define group goals and means of achieving those goals. Goals clearly defined and formulated serve as instrument of group mobilization in the act of leading. Goal setting in organization helps to direct attention and action; mobilizes efforts and assists to develop appropriate strategies for goal attainment; it allows the leader the opportunity to self-appraise and evaluate the appropriateness of the group activity. The leader must eschew over-ambitiousness in defining the goals because it is essential to take into account what the group members are capable of doing given the personality, ability and skill level as well as their socio-economic background (Hersey et al., 2008; Dessler, 2005; Ugwuegbu, 1992).

**Communication Skill**

Communication skill is an eloquent testimony of effective leadership. The extent to which the leader exhibits behaviour that is indicative of friendliness, harmonious interaction, mutual trust, respect for human dignity and consideration of individual needs and interests along with organizational goals boosts workers' moral in joint activity and improves productivity. Effective communication (upwards and downwards communication) in an enterprise is significantly remarkable when information flows freely between the leader and the subordinate(s) and horizontally between subordinates. According to Weirich and Koontz (1993:538), in its broadest sense:
The purpose of communication in an enterprise is to effect change, to influence action toward the welfare of the enterprise. Communication is essential for the internal functioning of enterprises because it integrates the managerial functions. Communication is especially needed to establish and disseminate the goals of an enterprise; develop plans for their achievement; organize human and other resources in the most effective and efficient way; select, develop, and appraise members of the organization; lead, direct, motivate, and create a climate in which people want to contribute; and control performance.

Exchange of information is imperative in joint human activities, and without communication amongst them, attainment of goals is difficult (if not impossible). In act of leading, communication relates to purpose-oriented influence on people’s world-view, their political and social behaviour. The leader must realize that for communication to produce the desired effect, it must be processed, decoded in a simply language to facilitate assimilation and retention so as to motivate the recipient to act on the information as intended. If information is vague, communication has not taken place. Meaningful information emanates from open-minded individuals in group work who use communication as a facilitator to achieve the desired goals.

Recognition

Recognition is a veritable tool for motivation of workforce. Subordinate feels very important immediately his effort (performance) is recognized by the management. Recognition is a kind of reinforcement, feedback, or knowledge of result which informs an individual how he is performing. Approval of a group member’s action, praise for task well performed, and the confirmation of the significance of one’s performance by the leadership, are essential for continued increased effort by the members of the organization. It raises the status and self-esteem of the recipient of such a recognition and arouses various favourable emotions such as pride and happiness. Depression, dissatisfaction, hatred, malice, are easily aroused in the subordinate if his good performances are not recognized by the management. The relationship between recognition (feedback), goal setting and productivity is noteworthy. Research has shown that productivity of workers tend to increase when subordinates are given feedback on how well they are performing relative to the targets. Workers who have clear goals, and who were given occasional feedback on their performance have the highest productivity than those who have no clear goals or those who have clear goals but no feedback (Akinola, 1986 quoted in Ugwuegbu, 1992). Most often, it becomes too blurred to streamline the basic functions of the leader and that of the manager, as both seem to be using the same tasks-tools – human and material resources - which involve planning, coordinating, controlling, staffing and budgeting.

5. Comparison of Leadership and Management

In an organization, an individual is capable of holding both management and leadership responsibilities simultaneously, even though management is considered a term separate from leadership. Leadership and management share many similarities because both leadership and management involve influence, working with people, and working with effective goal management. Nonetheless, the fields of leadership and management can as well be considered very differently. In differentiating between management and leadership, management is seen as accomplishing activities and mastering routines; while to lead means to influence others and create visions for change, asserting that leadership is a multidirectional influence relationship, while management is a unidirectional authority relationship. Although leadership and management work with people, it is Zaleznik’s view that the two require different types of people to work with.

There is an overlap between leadership and management because when managers are involved in influencing a group of employees to meet its goals, they are operating under leadership arena. Similarly, when leaders are involved in aspects such as planning, organizing, staffing, or controlling, they are operating within the domain of management. Thus, an individual can be a great leader, a great manager, or both; but each area requires the mastery of slightly different skills and competencies. Management produces order and consistency – planning and budgeting, establishing agenda, setting timetables, allocating resources,
organizing and staffing, providing structures, making job placement, establishing rules and procedures, controlling and problem solving, developing incentives, developing creative solutions, and taking corrective actions. On the other hand, leadership produces change and movement – establishing direction, creating a vision, clarifying the big pictures, setting strategies, aligning people, communicating goals, seeking commitment, building teams and coalitions, motivating and inspiring, inspiring and energizing, empowering subordinate, and satisfying unmet needs (Miner, 2005; Rickets, n.d).

The difference between managers and leaders is the way they motivate the people who work or follow them, and this sets the tone for most other aspects of what they do. For instance, leadership is not possessing power over others in the sense that even though leadership is certainly a form of power, it is not demarcated by power over people, rather, it is a power with people that exists as a reciprocal relationship between a leader and his/her followers (Forsyth, 2009). In actuality, individuals who seek group consent and strive to act in the best interests of others can also become effective leaders. Whilst managers have a position of authority vested in them by the company, and their subordinates work for them and largely do as they are told in order to attract positive rewards. Management style is transactional in that the manager tells the subordinates what to do, and the subordinates do this not because they are blind robots, but because they have been promised a reward (at minimum their salary) for doing so. The use of manipulation, coercion, and domination to influence others is common in management. Furthermore, managers are paid to get things done (they are also subordinates), often within tight constraints of time and money. They thus pass on this work focus to their subordinates. In contrast, leaders do not have subordinates (at least not when they are leading).

Many organizational leaders do have subordinates but only because they are also managers. But when they want to lead, they have to give up formal authoritarian control because to lead is to have followers, and following is always a voluntary activity. Leaders with a stronger charisma find it easier to attract people to their cause. As a part of their persuasions, leaders typically promise transformational benefits, such that their followers will not just receive extrinsic rewards but will somehow become better people thereof. Besides, managers are considered as risk-averse while leaders are seen as risk-seeking, even though they are not blind thrill-seekers. Leaders are somewhat comfortable with risk-taking and will see routes that managers avoid as potential opportunities for advantage and will happily break rules in order to get things done. The table below is a summary of the differences between leadership and management in organizational effort to minimize inputs/costs and maximize output/profit in the utilization of human and material resources to achieve the desired goals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essence</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Leading people</td>
<td>Managing work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have</td>
<td>Followers</td>
<td>Subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizon</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Sets direction</td>
<td>Plans detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Facilitates</td>
<td>Makes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Personal Charisma</td>
<td>Formal authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal to</td>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Shapes</td>
<td>Enacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>Transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>Excitement for work</td>
<td>Money for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Striving</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Styles of Leadership

A style of leadership refers to the strategies and behavioral patterns through which a leader seeks to achieve his or her goals. Simply put, leaders differ in so many ways. Leadership can be exercised in a number of different approaches. The factors that shape the adoption of a particular leadership strategy are numerous, but personality and goals of the leader; the institutional framework within which the leader operates; and political mechanisms by which power is won and retained; the means of mass communication available; and the nature of the broader political culture are the most obvious indices (Heywood, 1997: 352). Leaders envision the future; they inspire organization members and chart the course of the organization. Any organization that performs near its total capacity has someone at its head that is skilled in the act of leadership. This skill is made up of four major ingredients:

1. The ability to use power effectively and in a responsible manner;
2. The ability to comprehend those human beings has different motivation forces at different times and in different situations;
3. The ability to inspire; and
4. The ability to act in a manner that will develop a climate conducive to responding to and arousing motivations.

It is one thing to know motivation theory, kinds of motivating forces and nature of a system of motivation but another thing is to be able to apply this knowledge to people and situations. As power is the first ingredient of leadership, understanding the people and environment is the second major ingredient, while the third is the rare ability to inspire followers to apply their full capabilities to a project. The use of motivators seems to centre on subordinates and their needs, inspiration on the other hand comes from group heads. Leaders may have qualities of charm and appeal that give rise to loyalty, devotion and a strong desire on the part of followers to promote what leaders want (Weihrich and Koontz, 1993:491).

Achieving effectiveness in leading a group is associated with a definite style of leadership. A style of leadership is the totality of the mutual relations of the leader and the subordinates that are most characteristic of a given group or organization. Scholars have anchored their debate on several styles of leadership to include democratic, bureaucratic, authoritarian, laissez-faire, conniving, and toxic styles. A leader is free to adopt any of these approaches depending on the personality involved and the nature of the environment in which he has to perform his leadership roles. The major constraint with the adoption of styles of leadership is that once a leader adopts one approach, it is difficult (if not impossible) for the leader to drop his first choice in preference to another (Ugwuegbu, 1992).

**Democratic Leadership**

The democratic style of leadership (also known as participative style of leadership) is embedded with the principles of democracy. Unlike the authoritarian style, participative style of leadership is characterized by encouragement of the individual or group initiative by the members of the organization. It guarantees active participation of the subordinates in decision making processes, particularly those decisions that affect their
interests and wellbeing. Members have individual opportunities for demonstrating their independent ability. This not only increases job satisfaction by involving team members, but it also helps to develop people's skills. A democratic leader is concerned with the professional abilities of his subordinates than with their individual qualities. He places high premium on superior opinions of the experienced members of his group, and this promotes the spirit of esprit de corps among colleagues. Effective use of this style requires adequate training, experience, knowledge of team members and their culture, knowledge of environment, and good personal relations with colleagues. Group members feel engaged in the process and are more motivated and creative.

Democratic style of leadership encourages constructive criticisms focused on the activities of the leader and permits objective suggestions. This style is popular in management because it identifies with all and sundry, and carries everyone along, hence it is called “participatory style of leadership”. The ability of a democratic leader to use power without pluming himself on his exalted position makes his personal quality unique. As a leader, he has the legitimate authority to initiate policies and take decisions; he also possesses the power to implement such policies or programmes, but he does so through due process. The democratic style of leadership espouses free-flow of information (down-wards and up-wards communication), consultations through committees’ inputs (where every segment of the organization is represented) before decisions are made. The adoption of this style by any leader depicts a clear understanding of the people, their behaviour, and the immediate environment. His skill of management positions him adequately in appointing competent personnel that will assist him to attain the desired goals. This is generally the most effective leadership style (Ugwuegbu, 1992; http://psychology.about.com/od/leadership/a/leadstyles.htm)

Bureaucratic Leadership

Bureaucratic leaders work "by the book" - adherence to subsisting rules and regulations rigorously, and subordinates stick to procedures precisely. This is appropriate for work involving serious safety risks. Bureaucratic leader emphasizes much on hierarchy, division of labour, specializations; and puts a cog in the wheel of administrative process through bureaucratic red-tapism which stems down quick delivery of goods and services.

Authoritarian Leadership

Authoritarian leadership (also known as autocratic leadership) is an extreme form of transactional leadership, where leaders have absolute power over their workers or team, and staff and/or team members have little or no opportunity to make suggestions, even if these would be in the team's or the organization's best interest. In authoritarian leadership style, all decision-making powers are centralized in the leader. The leader does not entertain any suggestions or initiatives from subordinates. The autocratic management has been successful as it provides strong motivation to the leader. It permits quick decision-making as only one person decides for the whole group and keeps each decision to him/herself until he/she feels the need to share the information with his/her subordinates. Authoritarian leadership has a rigid approach and one-sided actions towards the subordinates on all issues. There is a clear division between the leader and the followers. As an individual, the autocratic leader does not share responsibilities. He takes all decisions of the group, dictates all the steps and techniques for attaining the group goals, assigns tasks and task pattern and distant himself from the subordinates. He is capable of repealing decisions at will. If prevailing organizational culture makes it impossible to sustain illegality, he circumvents all subsisting rules and regulations to attain his goals of absolute rule. Decision-making is less creative in situations of this kind (Gibb et al., 2005).

There is a consensus of opinion among scholars on the debate that a leader employing the autocratic leadership style normally chooses his lieutenants without thoughts about their competence, suitability, experience, and professional ability. Rather, consideration would be given to such trivial factor as their ability for conformity. Even where the “surrogates” are serving as his deputies, the authoritarian leader hardly delegates some of his statutory functions to them. Instead, he employs authority of suppression in which the leader shows off his superiority as far as his rights and powers are concerned, keeps the members of his organization in constant fear of possible punishment or uncertainty about the future. Authority of suppression causes the feelings of humility or cowardice in the subordinates and, at the same time, generates
disrespect, hatred and ill-feeling against the leader. For all intents and purposes, autocratic leader has psychologically alienated himself from his subordinates through the application of authority of distance. This theory holds that based on the leader’s tendency to keep the social distance between himself and the members of his organization, it is a device of avoiding criticism, and raising his formal influence at the expense of the established rules and conditions of service. Such a person, on appointment as a leader, assumes a purely official attitude towards his former friends, restricts his personal contacts with them to official occasions only, and endeavours to be as inaccessible to the group members as he can sustain the situation. As a result of his rash actions, the authoritarian leader is most often observed to be guilty of tactlessness and personal despotism. The effects of autocratic style of leadership on the members of an organization include lack of initiative due to alienation, apathy due to lack of general interest in the organizational goals, and general dissatisfaction among members due to lack of positive motivation (Forsyth, 2009; Ugwuegbu, 1992).

Nonetheless, authoritarian leadership is most effective in times of war, political crisis, civil unrest, inter-tribal conflicts, religious conflicts, etc. Its essence is that with the absolute power of leadership concentrated in the leader’s hand, it gives the leader the impetus to intervene swiftly on matters of this nature to bring the situation under control before its escalation. Furthermore, situations may arise in an organization, in a country, state or local government area that warrant recourse to authoritarian style, such as breaking of law and order, general indiscipline or disorderliness in the organization, ignoring or challenging the authority of a newly appointed leader by the group or subsection of the group, and reluctant to adapt change in organizational culture. In such situations, authoritarian leadership style may be justified as best choice for sanity and decorum to prevail. However, lust for power, personality trait, greed, complex, arrogance, haughtiness, and fear of exposure may motivate a leader to adopt authoritarian style (http://psychology.about.com/od/leadership/a/leadstyles.htm).

Laissez-Faire Leadership

A laissez-faire leader (also known as Free Rein Style or delegated leadership) does not lead, but leaves the group entirely to itself. Such a leader allows maximum freedom to subordinates; they are given free hand in deciding their own policies and methods. Laissez-faire leaders offer little or no guidance to group members, while this style can be effective in situations where group members are highly qualified in an area of expertise; it often leads to poorly defined roles and lack of motivation. He washes off his hand from his own roles and responsibilities as a group leader and refuses to accept any blame that may arise from group mistakes (http://psychology.about.com/od/leadership/a/leadstyles.htm).

Conniving Leadership

Conniving style of leadership is another form of laissez-faire style, where the leader exhibits indifference towards the affairs of the group. The leader gives subordinates absolute freedom, relegates leadership responsibilities and avoids identification and association of his person as the group leader. The principal reason for leaders to adopt conniving style in their relations with subordinates is often due to their apparent disinclination for disagreement of any sort with anyone in the group. Conniving leader tends to wash-off his hands from all blames and delegates his statutory functions to other members of the group, letting them to make those decisions which the leader himself is obligatory to make. He shifts responsibilities to the group without considering the experience, capability, and status of such subordinates.

Toxic Leadership

A toxic leader is someone who has responsibility over a group of people or an organization, and who abuses the leader-follower relationship by leaving the group or organization in worse-off condition than what it was when he inherited the organization’s mantle of leadership. Such a leader is a toxic-waste in management, who is influenced by personal aggrandizement.
Charismatic Leadership

A charismatic leadership style is similar to transformational leadership because these leaders inspire lots of enthusiasm in their teams and are very energetic in driving others forward. However, charismatic leaders can tend to believe more in themselves than in their teams, and this creates a risk that a project, or even an entire organization, might collapse if the leader leaves. In the eyes of the followers, success is directly connected to the presence of the charismatic leader. Charismatic leader avoids delegating responsibilities to his subordinates and carry unnecessary excess work-load. As such, a charismatic leader shoulders great responsibility, and it needs a long-term commitment from the leader.

People-Oriented Leadership or Relations-Oriented Leadership

This is the opposite of task-oriented leadership. With people-oriented leadership, leaders are totally focused on organizing, supporting, and developing the people in their teams. It is a participative style, and it tends to encourage good teamwork and creative collaboration. In relations-oriented leadership, staff needs, their collective wellbeing, individual interests and favourable working conditions are considered along with organizational goals to achieve holistic success. In practice, most leaders use both task-oriented and people-oriented styles of leadership as mixed-paradigm to attain the desired goals (http://psychology.about.com/od/leadership/a/leadstyles.htm).

Servant Leadership

This term, created by Robert Greenleaf in the 1970s, describes a leader who is often not formally recognized as such. When someone, at any level within an organization, leads simply by meeting the needs of the team, he or she is described as a "servant leader." In many ways, servant leadership is a form of democratic leadership, because the whole team tends to be involved in decision-making processes. Others believe that in competitive leadership situations, people who practice servant leadership can find themselves left behind by leaders who are using other leadership styles.

Task-Oriented Leadership

Highly task-oriented leaders focus only on getting the job done, and they can be quite autocratic. The leader’s reward power motivates the subordinate to perform in order to obtain rewards controlled by the leader. Coercive power induces the subordinate to perform in order to avoid the leader’s punishment. For legitimate power, the subordinate puts out his best performance because the leader has the right to request it and the subordinate has the obligation to comply. Besides, expert power evokes the subordinate’s motivation to perform because he believes that the leader has special knowledge and expertise lacked by the subordinate, while referent power arouses the subordinate’s compliance with prescribed goal and means of accomplishing it because he admires the leader and wants to gain his approval and favour. (http://psychology.about.com/od/leadership/a/leadstyles.htm).

7. Varieties of Individual Power

The ability to attain unique powers is what enables leadership to influence subordinates and peers by controlling organizational resources. A successful leader effectively uses these powers to influence employees, and it is important for leaders to understand the uses of power to strengthen their leadership. The following types of organizational power are briefly discussed to guide leaders in using power as a motivation mechanism:

• Legitimate Power

Refers to the different types of professional positions within an organization structure that inherit such power (e.g. Manager, President, Senate President, Vice-Chancellor, Director, Supervisor, etc.). These levels of power correspond to the hierarchical executive levels within the organization itself. The higher positions, such as president of a country, or general manager of an organization have higher power than the rest of the professional positions in the hierarchical executive levels.
• **Reward Power**

  Reward Power is the power given to managers that attain administrative power over a range of rewards (such as praises and promotions). Employees who work for general managers desire the reward from the general manager and will be influenced by receiving it as a result of work performance.

• **Coercive Power**

  Coercive Power is the manager's ability to punish an employee. Punishment can be mild or serious - warning, suspension; or punitive transfer, demotion, termination, dismissal.

• **Expert Power**

  Expert Power is attained by the manager due to his or her own talents such as skills, knowledge, abilities, or previous experience. A manager who has this power within the organization may be a very valuable and important manager in the company. Often, such managers embrace authoritarian style of leadership because of their versatilities.

• **Charismatic Power**

  A manager who has charisma will have a positive influence on workers, and create the opportunity for interpersonal influence. On attainment of goals, these behaviours evoke surprise and admiration. The charismatic leader is viewed as an agent of radical change rather than an agent of the status-quo. The transformational leader is imbued with charisma, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, vision and sense of mission, and also be able to instill pride, attract respect and trust. (Agaba and Daniel, 2010).

• **Referent Power**

  Referent Power is a power that is gained by association. A person who has power by association is often referred to as an assistant or deputy.

• **Information Power**

  Information Power is gained by a person who has possession of important information at an important time when such information is needed to organizational functioning. The life wire of any organization is effective communication - free flow of relevant information at the appropriate time (Agaba and Daniel, 2010).

8. **Conclusion**

   Every organization needs the services of competent, experienced, reliable and amiable leader or manager to pilot the affairs of the enterprise. Organization embraces teamwork as a veritable administrative mechanism, where all subordinates or followers strive with collective efforts to achieve the principal objective of the enterprise. Visionary and inspirational leader makes lots of difference in his approach to attain the preset goal. A leader is a transformational service-oriented element with keen followers who share his vision and inspiration in leadership skill. He influences his followers with the good leadership attributes he possesses and demonstrates to influence his followers. In contrast, a manager is a transactional head whose service is task-oriented, profit-centred and effective execution of assignments to logical conclusion without taking into account the wellbeing of the subordinates.

   Although a leader is proactive and a manager is reactive, but the demarcation between the two categories of headship is blurred in terms of job involvement. Leaders and managers utilize human and material resources, adopt administrative techniques – planning, organizing, staffing, coordinating, controlling, and budgeting – and each works towards achieving a preset goal. A good leader can be a manager and a good manager can be a leader. It depends on the type of leadership adopted which influences the style of administration. In spite of this fact, there is a glaring distinction between a leader and a manager as observed in the main discourse. Leadership pattern blends with democratic style of administration enjoys broad acclamation, widely accepted in contemporary societies as the best alternative in management.
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