

## **REVISIT: LEADERS BORN OR MADE**

### **Trigger Question: Prof. Bholanath Dutta**

Dear All, Please find below a new insight to the year old argument:[According to Professor David Sims of the Cass Business School in Britain, "We have come to the conclusion that the idea of the 'born leader' does not stand up. Born to lead what, when and with whom? The idea of leaders being 'made' is equally romantic. Nobody knows how to 'make' a leader." So schools instead seek to develop the nascent leadership abilities that people already have. How do they impart the special skills that an executive may need to motivate and inspire in difficult times?]

Hope, this research finding will open up new tools and techniques to develop nascent leadership abilities instead of conventional method.

### **Sri Virendra Goel**

I believe that everybody has to play the role of a leader at one or the other point in daily life, size of the group to be lead or the impact of the decision made may vary. A mukadam or Beldar handling few workers to get some work to be done is playing a role of a leader at that time. Hence I say that everybody has a potential to become a leader – development of skills and opportunity to apply those skills makes a leader.

### **Dr. Prabhakar Waghodekar**

"Leader" seems to be a mystery. Somebody says he is "born" and others say he is "made". Sometimes it comes to my mind if both the statements are true and everybody turns to be a leader, what will happen to the world? But the reality lies somewhere else. Nature, the great Master, programmes every of her creature including man (called as destiny, or found in Hindu custom-it is said that when a baby is born a Goddess comes and writes something on the baby's forehead-, and surprisingly this is also stated in a book on Transactional Analysis, but in a different fashion!). When a baby is born, it starts crying, the first sign of self-leadership! But nature is clever and it distributes vital attributes appropriately among men. Some are born with traces of leadership attributes who if properly cultivated in mundane world turn to be good leaders in such areas as social reformation, politics or in wealth creating activities. However, in case of some, the traces of obedience are more who turn to be followers. There are a few more would like to be in isolation, away from the world and create something new, we call them scientists, inventors who are fully immersed in the joy of finding something new, not bothering about anything including status. There are many more who are passive, they enjoy the nature, work for nature and the others have to support them.

Now, man is tricky. He assumes leader (or king) is born, a hereditary phenomenon, no once else is born to lead except this guy! Even monarchy, democracy, dictatorship, communism are we not following this myth in one or the other form? However, there are exceptions: Wilson Churchill was brought as Prime Minister of UK to win the war and he was not accepted during peace time! In Dasbodha, written by Ramdas Swami, 400 years ago, there are more than 100 attributes of leadership are stated. One is leader begets leader from followers but never gives reigns in the

hands of his next generation. The best examples are: Lord Shri Krishna and Mahatma Gandhi, who took care their kids and kiths will not be in power.

Thus leader has to play his/her role in building the society. Leader is a great mastery. No one catch it in terms of theories or models though Black has described five types of leadres: Bureaucratic, country club, dictator, great master and golden mean (competent). The arrival of leaders is path dependent, no one style can be fit-in-all-sizes, but if this path passes through self-vested interests, wrong persons are projected as leader doing irreparable damage to human existence.

Thus leadership issue needs to be weighted appropriately. Can a worker draw more compensation than CEO? Do you agree? Justify yourself!

### **Sri Virendra Goel**

In my opinion, compensation considerations should include following aspects:

1. The level of knowledge required to carry out the responsibility.
2. The level of skills needed.
3. The level of physical efforts required to be put in.
4. The number of hours required to be put in both physically and mentally.
5. Impact on overall performance of the organization as a result of the actions carried out at particular position.

If based on above criteria a worker can draw more than a CEO, why not?

### **Dr. Prabhakar Waghodekar**

Thanks Mr. Goelji. Your say is logically the best. Compensation needs to be linked with job difficulty points based on scientific Job Evaluation that certainly includes the parameters like the ones you have quoted. Compensation needs to be independent of seniority, hierarchy and designation. And it is happening in advanced countries but to a limited extent, where a worker draws more pay package than his CEO.