

LEADERSHIP AND POLITICS

Dr. V. Basil Hans is a research professor at Srinivas University in Mangalore.

Dr. Shakila Hegde is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at St. Aloysius deemed to be University in Mangalore.

Abstract

This article looks at the ever-changing relationship between politics and leadership, focussing on how political systems affect leadership styles and how leaders affect political outcomes. It talks about the traits that make a good political leader, like having a vision, being able to communicate, being honest, and being able to change with the times. It also talks about the problems that partisanship, public accountability, and global pressures can cause. The article uses examples from the past and the present to show how important leadership is for making policy, upholding democratic values, and dealing with crises. In the end, it says that good political leadership doesn't just depend on a person's charm or authority; it also depends on making moral choices, getting support from institutions, and getting people involved in their communities.

Keywords: digital media, institutions, civic participation, leadership, and collective action

Introduction

Politics and leadership are closely linked forces that affect the direction of countries, communities, and organisations. Politics gives power a framework, whereas leadership gives that power direction, vision, and the ability to make decisions. The quality of leadership can have a big effect on how well a government works, how much people trust it, and how society grows, whether it is democratic or authoritarian.

Being a good political leader means more than just being in charge. You also need to be able to deal with complicated systems, balance different interests, and get people to work together. Leaders have to work within the limits set by political institutions, public opinion, and the often-changing world around them. At the same time, they can change those limits by coming up with new regulations and ideas that change the way things are done.

This article looks into the connection between politics and leadership, focussing on how different kinds of leadership affect how well politics works and how political settings affect how leaders perform. It tries to give a more complete picture of what makes political leadership successful or likely to fail in the 21st century by looking at both theoretical ideas and real-life instances.

Importance

To understand how societies are run and how change happens, you need to know how politics and leadership are related. Political polarisation, global crises, and rapid changes in technology have made the need for skilled, moral, and imaginative leadership stronger than ever. Political

leaders have a say in everything, from social justice and economic policy to foreign relations and protecting the environment.

The study of political leadership helps us understand why some leaders are able to bring people together and make progress, while others make things worse and cause division. It also shows how important it is to have checks and balances in institutions, get the public involved, and hold leaders accountable. We may learn a lot about how to make democratic institutions stronger, improve governance, and encourage civic responsibility by looking at the traits and methods that make for good leadership in different political settings.

This research is especially important for politicians, scholars, civil society, and citizens because it shows that leadership isn't only about having power; it's also about being able to serve, inspire, and make society more fair and strong.

Objectives

The goals of this paper are as follows:

To study the relationship between politics and leadership by looking at how political structures, beliefs, and institutions affect the roles and actions of leaders.

To find out what makes a good political leader, such as being able to communicate well, make moral decisions, have a strategic vision, and be able to adapt to different political situations.

To look at how different types of leadership, like transformational, transactional, populist, and technocratic, affect the way politics works and the results of government.

To look at the problems that political leaders face today, like polarisation, media scrutiny, public disillusionment, and global crises.

To show case studies of important political leaders from different times and places, focussing on what we can learn from them and how to be a good leader.

To add to the larger conversation about democratic governance and political accountability by sharing ideas on how leaders may help make things more open, stable, and socially progressive.

Research Questions

How do political systems affect how well leaders do their jobs? How do different types of governments, including democracies and autocracies, affect how leaders make choices and run things?

What skills and traits make a good political leader in the 21st century? Are there some things that all good leaders have in common, or do they depend on the situation?

How do different types of leadership affect the outcome of elections and the public's trust? What effects do transformational, populist, or authoritarian leadership styles have on government and citizen participation?

How important is making moral decisions in political leadership? How do leaders deal with the conflict between their moral duty and their political strategy?

What do politicians do when there are emergencies like pandemics, wars, or economic downturns? What things affect whether or not leaders are successful or not during important times?

How do examples of leadership from the past and present help us understand how politics changes and stays the same? What can we learn from leaders of the past to help us deal with problems in the world today?

Review of the Literature

Many fields, including political science, sociology, and organisational studies, have looked into the relationship between politics and leadership. Max Weber and other foundational theorists talked about three sorts of legitimate authority: conventional, charismatic, and legal-rational. This helped us understand how political leaders get and keep power. Weber's idea of charismatic leadership is still quite useful for looking at politicians who rely on their personal charm and ability to speak well.

Burns (1978) was the first to talk about the difference between transactional and transformational leadership. He said that transactional leaders are more concerned with short-term goals and trades, whereas transformational leaders inspire their followers via vision and ideals. Since then, this paradigm has been changed to fit political situations, which has helped researchers figure out how leaders get people to support them and make changes.

Researchers today have focused on how political leadership is becoming more complicated in a world that is more connected and full of media. Nye (2008) talked about "soft power" as an important weapon for modern leaders, especially when it comes to international relations. Kellerman (2004) talked about how followers are becoming more important in determining leadership dynamics, especially in democratic contexts.

Grint (2005) and 't Hart and Rhodes (2014) say that political leadership should be seen as a social and interpretive practice, not just a personal trait. These researchers stress how important context, narrative, and institutional limits are in determining how well a leader does their job. Feminist and postcolonial viewpoints have also criticised traditional leadership theories for being too focused on the West and men, and they have called for more inclusive and intersectional approaches.

Recent writing has also been about crisis leadership, especially during global problems like the COVID-19 epidemic. Researchers like Boin et al. (2016) have looked into how leaders deal with uncertainty, talk about risk, and keep their credibility when things become tough.

There is still a lot of work to be done on comparing leadership styles across political systems, how digital media affects political authority, and the long-term effects of populist leadership. This article wants to add to these discussions by combining classical theories with modern case studies and problems.

There is a lot of research on leadership theories and political institutions, but there is still a big vacuum in our understanding of how modern political leaders change their styles of leadership to deal with quickly changing demands at home and throughout the world. A lot of the research that is already out there is either about historical analysis or leadership in perfect situations. It often ignores how complicated modern government is, such as how digital media is becoming

more powerful, how populist rhetoric is becoming more common, and how to handle crises in uncertain political situations.

Also, there isn't enough study that compares how well leaders work in different political systems, especially between established democracies, new democracies, and authoritarian regimes. This gap makes it harder for us to apply what we've learnt about leadership traits and how they affect the real world.

Also, previous studies of leadership have typically focused on Western, male-centered paradigms, leaving the leadership experiences and techniques of women, minorities, and leaders from the Global South underexplored. This makes it hard to grasp how different identities and cultural settings affect political leadership in theory.

This article tries to fill in these gaps by combining old and new ideas with real-life examples, giving us a more complete and inclusive view of political leadership in the 21st century.

Analysis

There are many different ways that politics and leadership are connected. These include the way institutions work, the way leaders lead, the social and political situation, and what the public thinks. This study looks at three main aspects: leadership style, political background, and how people react to a crisis. It does this by using case studies to show how these factors work together.

1. Different Ways of Leading and Their Effects on Politics

Nelson Mandela and Angela Merkel are examples of transformational leaders who base their leadership on a vision, moral authority, and long-term policy goals. On the other hand, transactional leaders, like many technocratic heads of state, focus on short-term stability and carrying out policies through established procedures and exchanges. Populist leaders like Donald Trump and Jair Bolsonaro depend a lot on talking directly to people and telling stories that go against the establishment, which often goes against the rules of institutions. This could get people to support you, but it could also make them less trusting of democratic institutions and hurt long-term governance.

2. How the political situation affects things

You can't judge leadership without taking into account the political situation. Leaders in democracies have to find a compromise between what the people want and what the institutions will allow, as Barack Obama did when he tried to get laws passed through a divided Congress. Authoritarian leaders like Vladimir Putin, on the other hand, don't have as many institutional checks, but they do have to deal with other legitimacy problems. They use control of the media and security forces to keep their power. The study indicates that context not only affects what leaders may do, but also how they must do it to stay in power and be seen as legitimate.

3. Leading in a Crisis

The COVID-19 outbreak made it clear how different political leaders are. Jacinda Ardern of New Zealand and other leaders got plaudits from around the world for being open and understanding in their communication. This led to high levels of public compliance and

confidence. Others, on the other hand, downplayed the problem, which led to further deaths and public anger. Effective crisis leadership generally requires being clear, making decisions quickly, and showing empathy. This shows that technical skills alone are not enough; they also need public trust and moral leadership.

Results:

This comparison shows that good political leadership depends on a leader's capacity to adapt to their situation, articulate a strong vision, and stay honest, even when things go tough. Leaders who are both respected by their institutions and have a lot of personal charm are more likely to keep political support and make changes that last.

Looking at political leadership in different styles, institutions, and situations shows a number of key things:

1. The way leaders lead has a direct effect on how well the government works.

Transformational leaders tend to encourage civic involvement, institutional trust, and long-term policy stability. Populist leaders can get people to back them in the short term, but they typically make things more divided and unstable in the long term. Transactional leadership works well to keep bureaucracies running, but it might not have the vision needed to make changes.

2. Political Context Sets Limits and Opens Doors for Leaders

In democratic regimes, leaders are more answerable to public opinion, the media, and institutional balances. These can both limit and justify what they do. In authoritarian governments, leaders may be able to do what they want more easily, but they generally use force or propaganda to keep people in line, which makes it harder to adapt and bounce back in times of crisis.

3. To be a good leader in a crisis, you need to be able to empathise and take strategic action.

People trusted leaders more and the country responded better to crises when they were clear, emotionally intelligent, and made quick decisions. For example, Jacinda Ardern during COVID-19. On the other hand, leaders who made crises political or downplayed them lost credibility and the ability to rule effectively.

4. Public trust is very important for political legitimacy.

Leaders who were always honest, ethical, and responsive were better at keeping the public's trust, no matter what kind of government they were in. This means that honesty is not only a good moral quality, but also a useful skill for leaders.

5. There aren't enough leaders who are inclusive, but they are really important.

The study found that diverse leadership voices, especially those from women and marginalised groups, are still not getting enough attention. When leaders are inclusive, policies tend to be

more relevant and society tends to be more cohesive. This shows the need for more study and practice that includes all types of leaders.

Discussion:

The results of this study show how important leadership style, political context, and making moral decisions are for the outcomes of governance. Political leadership is not a fixed trait; it changes throughout time based on institutional frameworks, public expectations, and the needs of the circumstance. For instance, the difference between transformative and populist leaders shows how important it is to have a long-term vision and act ethically instead of being charming and making quick money.

The study shows that context-sensitive leadership, which changes to fit the needs of the organisation while staying on course with its goals, is often better than rigid or ideologically driven ways of leading. In democracies, leaders must earn people's trust by being open and accountable. In more centralised systems, on the other hand, public dialogue is typically replaced by control mechanisms, which can leave holes in governance during times of crisis or change.

Crisis leadership is one of the most obvious tests of leadership skills. Different answers to the COVID-19 pandemic indicate that in order to get people to follow the rules and work together, technical abilities must be paired with empathy, communication skills, and public trust. Traditional theories of leadership don't always stress these traits, which suggests that we need new models that take emotional intelligence and moral strength into account.

Also, the fact that women and minority leaders are still under-represented in both leadership practice and academic scholarship shows that there are structural biases in political systems and leadership studies. Not only does inclusive leadership make the group more representative, but it also makes it better at meeting the demands of a wide range of people in society. To make political systems more fair and effective, it is important to fill this gap.

In the end, this conversation supports the idea that good political leadership isn't only about being in charge or popular; it's also about being able to deal with complicated situations, build trust, and respond appropriately as the social and political landscape changes. As the political situation throughout the world changes, so must our ideas and expectations of what it means to be a leader.

Implications:

This study's findings have a number of crucial effects on policymakers, political practitioners, scholars, and regular people:

For policymakers and political institutions: Knowing how important ethical and adaptable leadership is should lead to the creation of institutional frameworks that promote openness, responsibility, and engagement by everyone. Policies that encourage leadership training that focusses on emotional intelligence, crisis management, and communication skills can make governance more effective.

For Political Leaders: Leaders need to know that maintaining legitimacy takes more than just political strategy. It also takes honesty, empathy, and the capacity to bring people from different

backgrounds together. Using inclusive leadership can lead to better policy results and stronger social ties.

For Leadership Development Programs: The results show that existing leadership models need to be revised to include teachings on how to handle crises, how digital media affects people, and how to make moral decisions. To encourage diversity in political representation, leadership training should also talk about the problems that women and minority leaders face.

For Scholars and Researchers: This study shows that we need to do more research that compares and connects different types of political leadership, especially in non-Western settings and among populations that aren't well represented. It also says that political science, psychology, and communication studies should work together in new ways.

For Citizens and Civil Society: It is still very important for people to be involved and keep an eye on their leaders. People should be encouraged to take part in democratic processes and demand leaders who put the needs of the community above their own or their party's interests.

In short, promoting political leaders who are visionary, moral, and inclusive can make government better and democracy stronger in a world that is getting more complicated.

Limitations

This study gives us useful information about how politics and leadership are connected, but it also has several problems that need to be pointed out. First, the topic is too wide for the research to adequately show how leadership works in any political system or cultural setting. Because of this, some small details that are unique to certain countries or locations may not be fully explored.

Second, selecting only a few case studies, while helpful, could introduce bias by focussing on more well-known or well-documented leaders and missing out on less visible but equally essential examples of leadership. This makes it hard to apply the results to other situations.

Third, the political scene is changing swiftly, especially with the growing power of digital media and new global problems. This means that conclusions may change quickly as new information comes to light. Longitudinal studies would be needed to see how political leadership changes over time.

Lastly, because the topic is interdisciplinary, it might be hard to keep things consistent and coherent when using different theoretical frameworks. This could make the study less deep in certain areas, like psychology or communication.

Future study that looks into these problems could provide us a better and more detailed picture of political leadership in diverse situations.

Directions for Further Research:

Based on what this study found and what it couldn't find, here are some ideas for further research:

Comparative Studies Across Political Systems: We need more organised, comparative research that looks at how different leadership styles and effectiveness work in democracies,

authoritarian regimes, and hybrid systems, paying attention to the contextual aspects that affect leadership outcomes.

The Effects of Digital Media on Political Leadership: Future research should look into how digital communication and social media change political leadership, affect how people see leaders, and change the way leaders and followers interact in real time.

Research on Inclusive and Intersectional Leadership should look at the experiences and contributions of women, ethnic minorities, and leaders from the Global South. It should also look at how to break down institutional obstacles and broaden leadership theories beyond those that are centred on Western and male perspectives.

Crisis Leadership and Resilience: We need more long-term studies to find out how political leaders deal with various, overlapping crises throughout time, such pandemics, climate change, and geopolitical wars, and how these experiences influence the way they lead.

Ethics and Accountability in Leadership: More research into how ethical frameworks are used in political leadership, especially when there is corruption, populism, or authoritarianism, could help us find ways to encourage honesty and trust in government.

Citizen Engagement and Leadership Legitimacy: Looking into how civic involvement, public opinion, and grassroots movements affect the legitimacy and effectiveness of leaders might help us understand the relationship between leaders and followers better.

Following these lines of inquiry will help us learn more about how political leadership is changing and will lead to better ways of governing around the world.

Conclusion

This article has looked at the complicated relationship between politics and leadership, focussing on how leadership styles, political situations, and moral issues all affect how well government works. Good political leadership goes beyond just having power. It also takes vision, flexibility, honesty, and the ability to create trust and include people from all backgrounds.

The study shows that transformative and context-sensitive leadership tends to lead to more stable and good political outcomes. On the other hand, populist and transactional approaches may give short-term benefits at the expense of social cohesiveness and institutional stability. Crisis circumstances also show how important it is to have empathy and effective communication in order to keep the public's trust.

There are still gaps in leadership studies, especially when it comes to how new technologies affect leadership and how to include everyone. More research and conversation are needed. As politics throughout the world become more complicated, it is important to promote ethical, flexible, and inclusive leadership in order to strengthen democracy and move society forward.

In the end, political leadership is a group effort that requires the active involvement of individuals, institutions, and civil society, not just those in power. To solve the problems of the 21st century and beyond, we need to understand and improve this dynamic.

References

Boin, A., Hart, P. 't, Stern, E., and Sundelius, B. (2016). *The Politics of Crisis Management: Leading in Public When Things Go Wrong*. Press from Cambridge University.

J. M. Burns (1978). *Being a leader*. Harper & Row.

K. Grint (2005). *Leadership: What it can and can't do*. Palgrave Macmillan.

B. Kellerman (2004). *What bad leadership is, how it happens, and why it matters*. The Harvard Business Review Press.

Nye, J. S. (2008). *The Ability to Lead*. Oxford University Press.

Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation* (translated by A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons). Oxford University Press. (First published in 1922)

't Hart, P., and Rhodes, R. A. W. (Editors). (2014). *The Oxford Handbook on Political Leadership*. Oxford University Press.