

Leadership nature in progressive and less progressive villages – An Indian experience

P. B. BHOSALE¹ AND R.R. CHOLE*

Department of Extension Education, College of Agriculture, M.A.U., PARBHANI (M.S.) INDIA

ABSTRACT

The present study was undertaken in the Parbhani and Ahmedpur talukas of Parbhani and Latur districts of Maharashtra state in India respectively to study the leadership nature and its relation with their personal, socio economic characteristics of leaders in progressive and less progressive villages. For this study multistage sampling procedure was used for selecting villages and respondents. In the first stage 40 villages from both talukas were studied for their progressiveness with the help of village progressiveness scale of Singh *et al.* (1972). Then ten progressive and ten less progressive villages were selected and seven Grampanchayat leaders from each village were selected randomly by positional approach method. Thus total 140 Grampanchayat leaders from 20 villages were selected for the study. Data were collected with the help of specially designed and pre tested interview schedule. Leadership nature was assessed with the help of leadership behaviour continuum. The statistical methods such as mean, correlation coefficient, multiple regression and 'Z' test for comparison were used for analysis of data. From the study it is found that leaders from both the progressive and less progressive villages performed their leadership role in mixed manner. Correlation analysis shows that as age, occupation, land holding, annual income, socio-economic status, social participation, training received, cosmopolitanism, leadership experience, linkage with development agencies and knowledge increases which increase the autocratic nature of leaders. Multiple regression shows that age, socio-economic status, achievement motivation and linkage with development agencies significantly contributed to 'autocratic' nature of leadership.

Key words :Leadership pattern, Progressive village, Autocratic, Democratic.

INTRODUCTION

The Panchayat Raj Institution which is rightly named as Rural Self Government, has played a major role in developing the rural leadership. It is needless to say that the effective functioning of the Rural Self Government depends on effective functioning of Panchayat leaders in the democratic manner. The Panchayat Raj leaders have dual role of educating and motivating rural people and making them to accept and adopt scientific technology on their farms. This operation need involvement of leaders among the people because without co-operation of them the no programme will be successful. In other words success or failure of programme depends on leadership pattern and leaders - followers interaction in the village. Abida Samiuddin (1977) concluded that leadership pattern is neither completely traditional nor entirely modern but is drawn to and marching ahead towards modernity.

Therefore, there is need to understand more about the nature of leadership and its relation with profile of leaders. Therefore, the study was undertaken with following objectives.

1. To study the leadership nature in progressive and less progressive villages.

2. To study the relationship between personal, socio-economic characteristics of leaders with their leadership nature.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was undertaken in the Parbhani and Ahmedpur blocks of Parbhani and Latur districts of Marathwada region, respectively. The districts and the blocks both were selected randomly. The villages were selected for the study in two phases. In the first phase twenty villages from each of the talukas were selected randomly thus making a sample of 40 villages. The selected villages were studied for their progressiveness with the help of village progressiveness scale of Singh *et al.* (1972). In the second phase, score was given to each village according to its progressiveness. The 40 villages were arranged in ascending order of their progressiveness scores. Then top ten villages with highest score were selected as progressive villages and lowest ten villages with lowest score were selected as a less progressive villages from both the talukas. Thus finally 20 villages were selected for the study. The list of Grampanchayat and its members of selected villages was collected from Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti of respective talukas. Then seven Grampanchayat leaders

* Author for correspondence.

¹ Dept. of Home Science Extn. Edn., College of Home Science, M.A.U., Parbhani.

were selected randomly from each of the villages for the study as respondents by positional approach method. Thus total of 140 Grampanchayat leaders (i.e. 70 from progressive villages and 70 from less progressive villages) from 20 villages were selected for the study. Data were collected by personally interviewing the respondents with the help of specially designed and pretested schedule. Leadership nature was assessed with the help of leadership behaviour continuum. The statistical methods such as mean, standard deviation, coefficient of correlation, multiple regression and Z test for comparison were used for analysis of data.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

I. Leadership nature in progressive and less progressive villages

The data reported in Table 1 revealed that equal number (47.14 per cent) of the leaders from progressive, less progressive and total villages performed their

participation of followers in concerted community programmes. Another reason may be negligence of the opinion of followers by the leaders.

II. Relationship of independent variables with leadership nature

A. Correlation coefficient

Progressive villages

Table 2 depicts that the independent variables viz., age (-0.538), occupation (-0.297), land holding (-0.268), annual income (-0.354), socio-economic status (-0.286), social participation (-0.651), training received (-0.437), cosmopolitaness (-0.387), leadership experience (-0.606), linkage with development agencies (-0.540) and knowledge (-0.337) were significantly negatively related with leadership nature, while achievement motivation (0.287) was significantly positively related.

Less progressive villages

Table 1 : Distribution of the respondents according to their nature of leadership

S. No.	Category	Progressive villages (n=70)		Less Progressive villages (n=70)		Total villages (n=140)		'Z' value
		Freq- uency	Perce- ntage	Freq- uency	Perce- ntage	Freq- uency	Perce- ntage	
1.	Autocratic	18	25.72	10	14.28	28	20.00	-1.24 NS
2.	Mixed	33	47.14	33	47.14	66	47.14	
3.	Democratic	19	27.14	27	38.58	46	32.86	
Total		70	100.00	70	100.00	140	100.00	
Mean		4.10		4.53				
SD		1.75		1.73				

leadership role in mixed manner, followed by 27.14 per cent leaders from progressive villages, 38.58 per cent leaders from less progressive villages and 32.86 per cent leaders from total villages performed their role by democratic manner. While 25.72 per cent, 14.28 per cent and 20.00 per cent of the leaders from progressive, less progressive and total villages respectively functioned in purely autocratic manner, respectively. Present findings are not in line with the findings of Patil (1984), Sakarama (1996) and Dhakane (2002). The calculated 'Z' value was found to be nonsignificant, indicating that there was no difference in nature of leadership in progressive and less progressive villages.

The findings, therefore, established an evidence of non-democratic nature of interaction to some extent. This may be attributed to dominating characteristics of leaders as compared to the general mass of followers, in action and non-participation or less participation on the part of follower may also be partially responsible for this phenomenon. There are many research evidences of low

The data in Table 2 reveals that age (-0.634), education (-0.240), occupation (-0.354), land holding (-0.271), annual income (-0.278), socio-economic status (-0.365), social participation (-0.576), achievement motivation (-0.302), mass media exposure (-0.353), cosmopolitaness (-0.613), leadership experience (-0.520), linkage with development agencies (-0.649) and knowledge of functioning of Grampanchayat (-0.415) were negatively related with leadership nature.

Total villages

It is clear from Table 2 that the variables like age (-0.589), occupation (-0.342), land holding (-0.288), annual income (-0.338), socio-economic status (-0.341), social participation (-0.621), mass media exposure (-0.214), training received (-0.292), cosmopolitaness (-0.483), leadership experience (-0.573), linkage with development agencies (-0.571) and knowledge (-0.394) were negatively related with leadership nature in total sample. Researcher could not find any study on this aspect.

Table 2 : Relationship of personal characteristics with leadership nature

S. No.	Variables	Correlation coefficient (r)		
		Progressive villages	Less Progressive Villages	Total villages
1	Age	-0.538**	-0.634**	-0.589**
2	Education	0.045	-0.240*	-0.141
3	Caste	0.016	-0.212	-0.112
4	Occupation	-0.297*	-0.354**	-0.342**
5	Land holding	-0.268*	-0.271*	-0.288**
6	Annual income	-0.354**	-0.278*	-0.338**
7	Socio-economic status	-0.286*	-0.365**	-0.341**
8	Social participation	-0.651**	-0.576**	-0.621**
9	Achievement motivation	0.287*	-0.302**	-0.066
10	Mass media exposure	-0.026	-0.353**	-0.214**
11	Training received	-0.437**	-0.148	-0.292**
12	Cosmopolitaness	-0.387**	-0.613**	-0.483**
13	Leadership background	-0.050	-0.128	-0.099
14	Leadership experience	-0.606**	-0.520**	-0.573**
15	Linkage with development agencies	-0.540**	-0.649**	-0.571**
16	Knowledge	-0.337**	-0.415**	-0.394**

* significant at 0.05 level of probability ** significant at 0.01 level of probability

Table 3 : Multiple regression analysis of leadership nature

S. No.	Variables	Progressive villages		Less progressive villages		Total villages.	
		B(i)	't' value	B(i)	't' value	B(i)	't' value
1	Age	-0.0317	-1.0739	-0.1018	-5.5219**	-0.0828	-5.310**
2	Education	-0.0697	-0.3308	-0.1514	-1.1093	-0.2026	-1.7032
3	Caste	0.0477	0.3050	-0.1493	-1.0117	-0.0673	-0.6622
4	Occupn.	-0.2814	-1.6441	-0.0504	-0.4526	-0.1737	-1.9589
5	Land hold.	0.0191	0.2600	0.0278	0.2759	-0.0259	-0.5265
6	Ann.Inc.	-0.0046	-1.6121	-0.0024	-0.4871	-0.0025	-1.1934
7	S.E.S.	0.0598	1.3382	0.0586	1.4932	0.0708	2.7315**
8	S.P.	-0.0368	-0.9666	-0.0113	-0.2704	-0.0358	-1.3949
9	Achie.moti.	0.1858	2.3524*	-0.0278	-0.3741	0.0416	0.9068
10	Mass M.Ex	0.0162	0.1990	0.0758	0.9205	0.0795	1.4542
11	Training received	0.0132	0.1089	0.0136	0.1795	0.0654	1.1055
12	Cosmo.	-0.0809	-0.6410	-0.1996	-1.5054	-0.0806	-0.9528
13	Lead.backg-round	0.0817	0.4534	-0.0637	-1.2059	-0.0515	-0.9583
14	Lead.exper-ience	0.0042	0.1117	-0.0120	-0.2716	0.0056	0.2069
15	Linkage	-0.0793	-2.5399*	-0.0761	-1.7272	-0.0733	-3.259**
16	Knowledge	-0.0350	-0.3131	-0.0661	-0.8907	-0.0954	-1.5792
		Bo-4.60	R ² -0.661	Bo-12.1	R ² -0.747	Bo-9.78	R ² -0.64

*Significant at 0.05 level

** significant at 0.01 level.

B. Multiple Regression Analysis

Progressive villages

The 'F' value (6.45) was found to be significant at 0.01 level of probability. Table 3 depicts that the selected 16 independent variables explained the variation in the leadership nature to the extent of 66.10 per cent. The unexplained variation (33.90 per cent) may be due to the factors not included in the study. The value of 't' showed that in the multiple regression analysis achievement motivation and linkage with development agencies significantly contributed to leadership nature. The regression coefficient for these variables were 0.185 and -0.079, respectively, which indicated that one unit change in the variable *viz.*, achievement motivation and linkage with development agencies would effect 0.185 and -0.079 unit change in leadership nature, respectively.

Less progressive villages

It is clear from Table 3 that 'F' value (9.77) was significant at 0.01 level of probability indicating significant contribution of set of variables. Sixteen variables shown 74.70 per cent variation in leadership nature. The unexplained variation of 25.30 per cent may be due to the factors not covered under present study. It is also revealed that out of 16 variables under study only one variable i.e. age had significant effect on leadership nature of the leaders as the 't' value -5.521 was significant at 0.01 level of significance. Regression coefficient indicated that one unit change in age would effect -0.101 units change in leadership nature.

Total villages

Table 3 indicated that the 'F' value (14.00) was significant at 0.01 level of probability. The selected sixteen variables explained 64.60 per cent variation in leadership nature. Unexplained variation 35.40 per cent may be the resultant of the factors outside the scope of present study. It is further revealed that out of 16 variables three variables *viz.*, age, socio-economic status and linkage with

development agencies contributed significantly at 0.01 level of probability. The regression coefficient had shown that one unit change in age, socio-economic status and linkage with development agencies would result into -0.082, 0.070 and -0.073 units change in leadership nature, respectively.

CONCLUSION

The mean scores of both types of villages on autocratic - democratic continuum did not differ significantly meaning that similar nature of leadership exists in progressive and less progressive villages.

Autocratic behaviour of leaders was found to be increasing with increase in age, occupation, land holding, annual income, socio-economic status, social participation, training received, cosmopolitaness, leadership experience, linkage with development agencies and knowledge which is not expected. It is therefore recommended that the leadership needs to be diffused type for which concerned development agencies and training organisation try and direct their efforts. Secondly, the findings need to be verified by repeating similar studies at different places.

REFERENCES

- Abida Samiuddin (1977).** The emerging pattern of rural leadership. *Kurukshetra*, **25(9)**:4.
- Dhakne, V.S. (2002).** Village leadership pattern and role of leaders in developmental activities. *Thesis (M.Sc. Agri.)*, Marathwada Agricultural University, Parbhani.
- Patil, B.V. (1984).** Study of attributes of village Panchayat members and their level of participation in village development programmes. *Thesis(M.Sc.Agri.)*, Marathwada Agricultural University, Parbhani.
- Sakarama (1996).** Value and leadership. A study of co-operative leadership in India. *Indian Dairyman*, **48(1)**:35-42.
- Singh, K.N., Singh, S.N., Pal, K. and Singh, J. (1972).** A scale for measurement of agricultural progressiveness of a village. *Indian j. Extn. Edn.*, **8(3-4)** : 25-31.

Received : July, 2006; Accepted : February, 2007