

FUNDAMENTALS OF POLITICS



Edited by:
Robert F. Ola (PhD)
Ademola I. Azeez (PhD)
Emmanuel A. Ayodeji (PhD)

Fundamentals *of* Politics

Edited by:

Robert F. Ola (PhD)

Professor of Political Science & Head, Department of
Political Science & International Studies,
Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria
08037093123

Ademola I. Azeez (PhD)

Head, Political Science,
Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria
08035888732, demazez@yahoo.com

Emmanuel A. Ayodeji (PhD)

Head, Banking & Finance,
Afe Babalola University, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria
07035797660, dremmanuel.ayodeji@gmail.com

List of Authors

Ademola Azeez (PhD), Political Science Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Emmanuel A. Ayodeji (PhD), Banking and Finance Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Awoyemi B. Olanike, Economics Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Lukman Saka (PhD), Department of Political Science, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria.

Adebisi M. O., Department of Political Science, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria.

Bakare A. R., Department of Political Science, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria.

Aderemi Richard Adekunle, Political Science Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Esan Vincent A., International Relations and Diplomacy Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Olaleye, I. Oluseyi, Political Science Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Ojo Olusola Matthew (PhD), Department of Peace Studies and Conflicts Resolution, National Open University of Nigeria.

Layefa Goodluck, Media and Communications Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Afolabi Muyiwa, Intelligence and Security Studies Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Oluwasuji C. Olawole, Political Science Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Fatokun O. Samuel, International Relations and Diplomacy Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Leke Oke (PhD), Department of Political Science, Ekiti State University, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Friday Aworawo, International Relations and Diplomacy Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

David Oluwafemi Bodunde (PhD), Intelligence and Security Studies Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Babatunde A. Oyinloye, Peace and Conflicts Studies Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Adeosun Foluke, Social Justice Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Adesanya Olusegun Paul, International Relations and Diplomacy Programme, Afe Babalola University Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

Iwu Hyacinth Nnaoma(PhD), Department of Political Science, Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria.

Chapter Three

Power, Influence, Authority & Leadership in Political Science

1. Lukman Saka (PhD),

2. Adebisi M. O.

3. Bakare A. R.

3.0 Introduction

The concepts of power, authority, legitimacy, influence and leadership are some of the most controversial and highly contentious in the conceptualization and discussion of their implications on the state and society in Political Science. Ever since Hobbes produced his classic work, "The Leviathan", the concept of power, authority and influence in the realm of national and international politics has become a momentous subject so much so that now it is regarded as one of the most significant areas of fundamental research especially within the sub-field of political philosophy and theory (Johari, 2012). The importance of these concepts has not in any way diminished the controversial nature of these terms on account of their social, economic and political ramifications on human society.

The idea of power in particular has assumed an importance of its own in the realm of political theory. The reason for this can be traced to the fact that, the meaning of politics has changed from one of being a 'study of state and government', to that of being a 'study of power'. As Curtis (1968) notes, "politics is organized dispute about power and its use, involving choice among competing values, ideas, persons, interests, and demands. Approached from this angle, the study of politics can be said to be concerned with the description and analysis of the manner in which power is obtained, exercised, and controlled; the purpose for which it is used; the manner in which decisions are made, the factors which influence the making of these decisions, and the context in which these decisions take place.

A great deal of power people have in organizations come from the specific jobs or titles they hold (Greenberg, 2011). In other words, they are able to influence others because of the formal power associated with their positions and the moral and/or legitimate authority that such positions are invested with. For example, there are certain powers and authority that the president of a country, for instance, Nigeria, has because of the office e.g., signing bills into law, making treaties, declaring war among others. These remain vested in the position and are available to anyone who holds it. When the president's term expires, he transfers such power, authority and influence to the new office-holder that succeeds him in office.

In simple term, power is the ability to influence others. One of the most influential theories of power comes from the work of French and Raven (1959), who attempted to determine the sources of power leaders use to influence others. French and Raven identified five sources of power that can be grouped

into two categories: organizational power: legitimate, reward, and coercive; and personal power: expert and referent (in relation to organizational management). Power is a natural process in the fabric of organizational and societal life. Getting things done requires power. Indeed, everyday managers in public and private organizations acquire and use power to accomplish their organizational and/or society goals (Lunenborg, 2012). Thus, given the centrality of power and authority to the wellbeing of any political organization and the society at large, it becomes imperative to understand how power and authority are acquired, know how and when to use them, and be able to anticipate their probable effects on the society. It is the discussion of these numerous issues associated with the concepts of power, authority, influence and leadership that this chapter engages in.

3.1 The Concept of Power in Political Science

The concepts of power and influence are fundamental to Political Science. Power is one of the most important foundational concepts in the field of Political Science. Classical political thinkers and philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, and Socrates and contemporary ones like Morgenthau among others, have, at one point or the other, commented on the importance of power to the study of politics whether within state or in the international arena. Similarly, many political theorists have also agreed that understanding the primacy of the concept of "power" is central to Political Science studies. Consequently, their definitions of politics are premised on power relationships which imply the use of power in the society. It is however, important to note that there is no unanimity among political scientists regarding the definition and conceptualization of power (Agarwal, 2011:433).

3.1.1 What is Power?

According to Herbert and Shills (1965), power is the ability to influence the behaviour of others in accordance with one's own ends. According to them, power is the capability of someone to affect the behaviour of others so as to achieve a particular aim or some objectives. Power can also be considered as the possibility of imposing one's will upon the behaviour of other persons (Reinhard, 1966: 290). In this regard, power involves domination and a reciprocal relationship between the rulers and the ruled in which the actual frequency of compliance is the only one aspect of the fact that power of command exist. Power can also be viewed as the capacity of an individual or group of individuals to modify the conduct of others in the manner which he or they deserve (Carl, 1963:201). Similarly, Dahl (1957: 252) explained power as the product of human relationships. A simple illustration of this definition can be in form of "A" having power over "B" to the extent that he can get "B" to do something that he would not otherwise do. Power can also be taken to mean probability that a man's command will be obeyed even if the man so commanded does not like it or the ability to make man behave in a predetermined way (Olaniyi, 2001: 2).

In his own view, Parson (1967), cited in Harrop and Breslim (1993: 8), regard political power as the capability of a government to draw on the commitment of its citizens so as to achieve collective goals such as law and order, protection from attack and economic growth. He claimed that the more powerful the government, the more effective it would be at achieving the goals of the community. In this regard, power in politics is not just a matter of one social or political party jostling with others to win control of the state. Rather, power

is
the
the
one
wh

3.1

The
the
a.

b.

c.

d.

e.

f.

g.

is the tool which enables rulers to achieve the objectives of the society. Summarily, power has been conceptualized as the capacity to achieve group aims, as the ability to force one's will on the others and the ability to impose sanctions when commands are not obeyed.

3.1.2 Characteristics of Power

The concept of power has some certain peculiarities. Some of these include the following:

- a. Power is relational i.e. power must be exercised in relation to somebody or in relation to some certain issues.
- b. Power is unevenly distributed in the society: Not every member of the society possesses the ability to impose his or her own wish and decisions on the others.
- c. Power is situational i.e. power is a function of the circumstances which surround its existence or usage.
- d. In order for power relation to exist there must be a conflict of value.
- e. Power relation can only be effective if one of the parties involved is capable of imposing sanctions.
- f. Power is dynamic i.e. power when exercised changes from time to time. Power in essence is not static.
- g. Power is relative i.e. power is best perceived in relative rather than absolute terms. Power in this regard becomes meaningful when you compare the power one has in relation to another.

3.1.3 Elements of State Power

Elements of state power can be classified into tangible and intangible elements. The two classifications are discussed below.

Tangible Elements

The tangible element of state power includes military capability, economic strength and potentials, natural resources, population, strategic location etc. These tangible elements are closely interrelated. Military capability consists of both conventional and nuclear powers without which a state may not be able to defend its sovereignty which is an important element of a state. Similarly, a country that is economically weak may not be able to acquire the military might to protect and maintain its territorial integrity and sustain its political stability. Also, the size, quality and composition of a country's population may constitute an important asset or, at times, may constitute a burden to the country. A country that is in a useful way located along the coastal line will command more respect or will exercise more power in the international system than a country that is completely surrounded by land. A land-locked country that has no territorial waters has to depend on foreign countries international trade via the sea. This makes such country open to external control.

Intangible Elements

Intangible elements of state power include level of nationalism and patriotism of the citizens, the extent of national cohesion and productivity of the population (Omede and Aremu, 2013: 34). All these combine to reduce the vulnerability of a state. When these exist they indicate the reality of potential power. It is only when they have been mobilized to become instruments

Po

of contr
(Omede

3.1.4 Th

Power is
destruct
both at
in servic
interest
exercise
is exciti
used in
ways. U
achieve
opennes
use of p
the likeli
Distribut
conflict
beneficia

3.2 In

Influence
intended
relations
another t
2011: 43
authority
other pec
to make
two form

of control and influence that they can become actual power (Omede and Aremu, 2013: 34).

3.1.4 The Uses of Power

Power is ethically neutral. It can be used for constructive or destructive purposes, self interest or the good of others or both at the same time (Roundwood, 2013). Power that is put in service to valued goals, that balances self interest and the interest of others, that when transparently and legitimately exercised maintains a healthy mutuality and balance of power is exciting and uplifting (Roundwood, 2013). Power can be used in unilateral, collaborative, distributive or transformative ways. Unilateral use of power involves the use of power to achieve selfish aims. It often serves to diminish trust, openness, communication and escalate conflict. Collaborative use of power tends to have the opposite effect and increase the likelihood of more satisfactory and sustainable resolution. Distributive or transformative use of power helps to shift the conflict generators and open up new potential for mutual beneficial collaboration.

3.2 Influence

Influence is the ability to affect the behaviour of others in an intended direction (Cohen, et.al, 1992: 39). Influence is a relationship between individuals or groups which can make another to act in a way that he may not do otherwise (Agarwal, 2011: 436). Influence is the means through which power and authority are translated. Influence is one's ability to affect other people's decision making process. It involves the capacity to make one's interest felt. Influence can be classified into two forms, these include: coercive influence and reliable

influence. Coercive interest is premised on the threat or expectation of severe sanctions. These may include physical punishment, torture and capital punishment. Reliable influence, on the other hand, involves a situation where the probability of compliance is high. This is a lawful form of influence.

3.2.1 Ways of Achieving Relationship of Influence

The relationship of influence could be achieved through several means. These means according to Dahl (1984) include the following:

- i. **Trained control:** influence through trained control takes the form of prior persuasions inducement aimed at manipulating actors' behaviour in the required direction in compliance with appropriate cues and signals
- ii. **Rational manipulative persuasion:** rational persuasion is influence borne out of truthful information and rational communications. The relationship of influence derives from an appeal to the emotions of conscience of "B" concerning the genuineness of the subject over which he is been influenced. Manipulative persuasion is achieved through half-truths and falsehood presented to "B" by "A".
- iii. **Inducement:** this is an influence in which there is the offer of reward in order to prevent anticipated action. Examples include offer of wage rise and the threat of strike action or improved students' amenities and students boycott of lecture.

3.2.2 The Relationship between Power and Influence

Power can be seen as the potential or capacity for action. Influence on the other hand connotes capacity to obtain

cooperation. Influence is determined by, but not identical to, power. In other words, power and influence behaviour are distinct constructs (Schriesheim, 1990). Influence refers to the process by which power is exercised and authority is legitimated. Influence translates the potentialities of power and authority into the realization of leadership. Influence can be exercised without power even though it can be conferred by power. Influence can also acquire the intensity of power. Power and influence can be distinguished from each other by saying that those who have power can influence the conduct of others easily than those who do not have power (Agarwal, 2011: 436). It is, however, important to note that power and influence are co-related terms but influence turn into power when sanctions enters (Agarwal, 2011: 436).

3.3 Authority

Why does the one who is ruled do as directed by the one who rules?

The simple and uncontested answer is 'Authority'. It means the ruler possesses the authority to wield the power to command the ruled and the latter gives 'legitimacy' to the former to do so. This signifies that authority refers to the use of power that is seen as legitimate or socially approved and/or recognized. The wisdom that can be derived from the above opening fundamental poser makes us appreciate the fact that authority can be best defined in the context of the relationship that exists between the ruled and the ruler. Perhaps, this is why Zambrano (2000: 2) sees authority in a social theory context as a collection of principles aimed at understanding how the circumstances of living in a community affect the authority relations that exist among its members; and how the

evolution of the community itself is affected by this web of authority relations. Whichever way, authority in the political context is the recognition of the right to rule irrespective of the sanctions the ruler may possess.

Etymologically speaking, the word 'authority' was derived from the Latin word '*auctoritas*' meaning 'right', 'invention', 'advice', 'opinion', 'influence', or 'command'. In English, the word *authority* can be used to mean power given by the state (in the form of members of parliament, judges, police officers, etc.) or by academic knowledge of an area (someone can be an authority on a subject). The word *Authority* with capital A refers to the governing body upon which such authority (with lower case a) is vested (Arendt, 1961); for example, Federal Capital Development Authority in Abuja, Lagos State Traffic Management Authority (LASTMA) etc. Therefore, political authority can be defined as the right of an individual or group to wield political power. It is also the ability to get people do things because they believe the individual or group has the right to tell them what to do. People in authority are followed because it is believed that they fulfill a need within the community or political system. To this end, authority can be linked to respect which creates legitimacy and therefore leads to power. Thus, legitimacy, power or influence is generally called authority.

It is arguable that the concept is as old as the time of early political philosophers at a time when they attempt to inquire into the reason why followers obeyed the leaders. In this premise, the effort of Arendt (1958) in analyzing the meaning of authority is quite commendable as he surveyed the thoughts of early writers since the classical epoch of Plato through the medieval era to the modern period of Machiavelli. The

under
fact
Macl
the
desc
the p
as a
acco
Acco

The i
partic
emph
relati
authc
betwe
this n
"withi
This p

underlying notion that can be deduced from his analysis is the fact that these philosophers: Plato (1945), Aristotle (1992), Machiavelli (1999) and Easton (1958), amongst others view the concept of authority from the standpoint of what can be described as 'political strategists'. Weber (1978) deviated from the path of these great thinkers by analyzing the concept more as a scholar when he distinguished between forms of authority according to the type of legitimacy underlying each form. According to him,

the validity of the claims to legitimacy may be based on: (1) Rational grounds -resting on a belief in the legality of enacted rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules (2) Traditional grounds -resting on an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of those exercising authority under them or (3) Charismatic grounds -resting on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by (the person) (Weber, 1978:213-214).

The importance of Weber's analysis does not rely on his particular classification of forms of authority but on his emphasis on the study of the legitimacy underlying an authority relation. This analysis is in line with our earlier argument that authority is best understood in the context of relationship between the ruler and the ruled. Easton (1958:174) shared this notion when he opined that a form of authority is identified "within the framework of the concrete actor and his actions". This perspective is crucial because it is one from which one

can begin to understand the motivations underlying a particular *design* of an authority relation: one is invited by Weber to study the authority relation by focusing on the motivations, desires and circumstances of those who rule. In a sense, Weber's work picks up the analysis of authority right at the point where Machiavelli left it (Zambrano, 2000:5).

3.3.1 Classification of Authority

There are three classifications of authority as identified by German political sociologist, Max Weber (1978), known as '*herrschaft*' in German, which generally means 'domination' or 'rule'. This has sometimes been translated in English as types of authority which prompted Weber to defined domination (authority) as the chance of commands being obeyed by a specifiable group of people. Legitimate authority is that which is recognized as legitimate and justified by both the ruler and the ruled. It is these three factors that are also referred to as credenda of authority by Charles Merrian; who argued that they are the articles of faith and belief which surround authority and serve to legitimize its exercise.

Traditional	Charismatic	Legal-Rational
Legitimized by long-standing custom	Based on a leader's personal qualities	Authority resides in the office, not the person
Historic personality	Dynamic personality	Bureaucratic officials
Patriarchy (traditional positions of authority) e.g. Alaafin of Oyo, Olubadan of Ibadan, Ooni of Ife, Emir of Ilorin, Sultan of Sokoto etc.	Jesus Christ, Prophet Mohammed, Martin Luther King, Jr.	Nigerian Presidency and National Assembly, United States' Congress, British Parliament, States' Houses of Assembly etc.

Traditional Authority: This refers to the right to exercise power that is derived from customs and traditions. This type of authority is hereditary and it passes from one generation to another. There is absolute loyalty to those that exercise such power. People obey them without questioning. People adhere to traditional authority because they are invested in the past, and feel obligated to perpetuate it. In this type of authority, a ruler typically has no real force to carry out his will or maintain his position but depends primarily on a group's respect. In Nigeria today, the traditional authority is not recognised by the constitution but people obey it because of morality and respect for custom and tradition. The constitutionally recognized authorities (Legal-Rational) also use the traditional rulers as both informal complementary organ as well as instrument of grassroots mobilization. The typical example of this authority in the Nigeria context align with the modern form of traditional authority identified by Eisenberg (1998) as *patrimonialism*, which is traditional domination that is facilitated by an administration and military that are purely personal instruments of the master. In this form of authority, all officials are personal favorites appointed by the ruler (Governors). In Nigeria, the traditional rulers have no rights, and their privileges can be withdrawn or augmented based on the caprices of the Governor of their respective states. They are treated in the same posture as local government administration. This informed the rationale for the existence of Ministry of Local Government and Chieftaincy Affairs in most, if not all, states of the country.

Charismatic Authority: This is derived from the personal attributes and qualities of an individual. Such qualities are usually extra-ordinary that are exhibited by few people which make others to respect them. The power of charismatic authority is accepted because followers are drawn to the leader's personal qualities. The appeal of a charismatic leader can be extra-ordinary, inspiring followers to make unusual sacrifices or to persevere in the midst of great hardship and persecution. Charismatic leaders usually emerge in times of crisis and offer innovative or radical solutions. They may even offer a vision of a new world order. Charismatic authority can be found in various sectors of the society such as commerce and industry, education, religion and the military. A common feature of this kind of authority is that, it is revolutionary in character and those with the character often come with what we refer to as messiahship tendency. Consequently, it usually fails to outlive the individual personality. Put simply, as soon as the holder dies, the authority also dies with him. It is not hereditary.

Legal Rational Authority: We say authority is legal because it is backed up by law. Legal-rational authority is not based on personal attribute of individual nor customs and traditions, rather, it is based on rules and regulation and other established policies and laws. That is why it is often said that law is no respecter of person. Somebody that wields power as ascribed by the constitution is having legal authority to do so. According to Weber, power made legitimate by laws, written rules and regulation is termed rational-legal authority. In this

3.4

Leader
single
leader
on the
the co
of a l
one v
other
that l
cause
exerc
more
as on
Leader

type of authority, power is vested in a particular rationale, system, or ideology and not necessarily in the person implementing the specifics of that doctrine. A nation that follows a constitution is applying this type of authority. On a smaller scale, rational-legal authority exists in the workplace via the standards set forth in the employee handbook, which provides a different type of authority than that of your boss. Similarly, a leader or government can start out exemplifying one type of authority and gradually evolve or change into another type, thereby combining two types of authority. Leaders, like Mohandas K. Gandhi of India, Governor Adams Oshiomole of Edo State for instance, can be considered charismatic and legal-rational authority figures. They became legal-rational leader out of their charismatic attributes.

3.4 Leadership

Leadership as a concept in Political Science does not have a single definition that is universally accepted. Scholars in leadership studies tend to conceptualize the concept based on their socio-political and economic milieu. However, defining the concept of leadership will entail a brief look at the definition of a leader. According to MacFarlan (1960: 167), a leader is one who makes things happen that would not have happened otherwise. The implication is that if the leader causes change that he intended, he has exercised power, but if the leader causes change that he did not intend or want, then he has exercised influence and not power (MacFarlan, 1960: 167). A more radical definition of a leader is one which sees a leader as one who exerts unusual influence and considerable power. Leadership, on the other hand, is a process by which a person

influences others to accomplish an objective and direct a group in a way that makes it more cohesive and coherent. It can also be described as a process by which an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common good (Northouse, 2007: 3). Leaders carry out this process by applying their leadership knowledge and skills. This can be referred to as "process leadership" (Jago, 1982).

A political leader could be regarded as any occupant of an established political position or as any person, in or out of such position, whose political activity has more influence on a group's behaviour than as the activity of the average member. In a similar vein, leadership can also be referred to as the dignity, office or position of a leader, especially of a political party; ability to lead, the position of a group of people leading or influencing others within a given context, the group itself, the action or influence necessary for the direction or organization of effort in a group understanding (Oxford English Dictionary, online). Political leadership overlaps significantly with the higher levels of military, legal, organization, religious and ideological leadership. Political leadership implies followership, as well as group tasks to be accomplished through innovative adaptation in a specific and institutional cultural context (Nye, 2008). Political leadership entails the ruling class that bears the responsibility of managing the affairs and resources of a political entity by setting and influencing policy priorities affecting the territory through different decision making structure and institutions created for the orderly development of the territory (Ogbeidi, 2012: 4). It could also be seen as the human element that operates the machinery of government on behalf of an organized territory. These include people who hold key decision making positions in government

and pe
electio
in a br
manag
politic
machin
(Ogbeid

3.4.1

l
e
f
i
e
p
le
c
b

D
k
le
m
Th
le
gr
th
in
to
rel
of
pro

and people who seek those positions whether by means of election, coup d'état, and appointment etc. Political leadership, in a broader sense, goes beyond the ruling elites that directly manage the affairs of territory. It embraces the totality of the political class that has the capacity to manipulate the machineries of government even from behind the scene (Ogbeidi, 2012: 5).

3.4.1 Typologies of Political Leadership

Autocratic Leadership: In this type of leadership a leader exerts high level of power over his or her followers. Among the followers, few are given opportunities to be involved in the leadership process. Autocratic leaders hold unto as much power and decision making as possible. The focus of power entirely resides with the leader. There is strict adherence to formal systems and control. The leader wields unlimited power restricted by no provision or opposition.

Democratic Leadership: this type of leadership is also known as participatory leadership. It is a type of leadership style in which members of the group play a more participatory role in the decision-making process. This type of leadership is said to be effective, and can lead to high goal achievements, better contribution from group members and increased group morale. Some of the primary characteristics of democratic leadership include the fact that group members are encouraged to share ideas and opinions even though the leader retains the final say over the decision. Also members of the groups feel more engaged in the decision making process, and creativity is encouraged and rewarded.

Democratic leadership leads to better ideas and more creative solution to problems.

- **Bureaucratic Leadership:** Bureaucratic leaders follow and adhere strictly to rules and regulation. They work by the "book", and most times achieve their positions because of their ability to conform to and uphold rules, not because of their qualification or expertise. Bureaucratic leaders rely on the personnel and administrative structure of a group. The functioning of the group depends on a large workforce arranged in a hierarchy to carryout special functions based on the groups' internal rules and procedures.
- **Charismatic Leadership:** A charismatic leader inspires enthusiasm in a group and is energetic in motivating others to progress. The ability to create excitement and commitment is an enormous benefit to the charismatic leader. The difference between charismatic leader and transformational leader lies in their intention. Transformational leaders want to transform their group, while charismatic leaders often focus on themselves and may not want to change anything. Success of the group may be directly connected to the presence of the leader. Charismatic leadership carries great responsibility and it needs a long term commitment from the leader.
- **People-Oriented Leadership:** Leaders in this typology of leadership are totally focused on organizing, supporting and providing for the welfare of their followers. This is a participatory type of leadership which tends to encourage good team work and collaboration. People-oriented leaders treat each member of their followership

equally. They are friendly and approachable, they pay attention to the welfare of every member of the group or people within the society. People-oriented leadership style creates groups which everyone wants to be part of. The group members are highly productive.

3.4.2 Qualities of a Good Political Leader

- A good political leader must be decisive. Those who follow a politician want to be sure that he or she is able to lead them and to show them the way. In other words a good political leader should be fast, confident and must be a good decision maker.
- A good political leader should take decisions quickly. The leader should not change his or her mind at will unless it is extremely necessary. In essence, a good political leader must be consistent.
- A good political leader should demonstrate a very high level of confidence, and he must also be assertive. This implies that a good political leader must always know what he wants, what his goals are and be sure that he is going to reach these goals.
- A good political leader must have the ability to motivate and must possess social awareness. He should understand social networks and key influencers in that social network.
- A good political leader should have a clear vision. Such a leader should work for a goal that is greater than his or her personality. Working towards a vision is far more inspiring than working towards personal gains.

3.5 Conclusion

There is little surprise that the notions of power, authority and legitimacy are some of the highly controversial concepts not only in political theory and philosophy but also in the legal studies. As contentious as the definition and conceptualization of these terms are, they remain the cornerstone and foundation on which Political Science, in particular, rest. The concepts of power and authority are critical to an informed discussion and analysis of many topics that are the focus of Political Science inquiry and to some reasonable extent that of other social sciences like sociology. Thus, it becomes important to have a proper grasp of these concepts for any meaningful analysis and depth of understanding of issues that affect human social interactions; the nature of citizens relationships with the state; and the forms, pattern and dimension of interactions between and among states within the international political system.

This chapter set out to discuss the meaning, nature and importance of these concepts in relation to Political Science discourse. It discussed the concept of power, its characteristics, elements and uses in Political Science discourse. The chapter also discussed the concept of influence. In particular, it looked at the ways political leaders achieve relationship influence and the relationship between power and influence. The chapter also discussed the concept of authority, the classification of authority and the importance of authority in Political Science analysis. And lastly, the chapter discusses the concept of leadership. In particular, it looks at the typologies of political leadership and the traits of a good political leader.

References

- Agarwal, R.C. (2011) *Political Theory: Principles of Political Science*. New Delhi: S. Chand and Company limited.
- Arendt, H. (1961) *Between Past and Future: The Concept of Authority*. New York: Viking
- Arendt, H. (1958) what was Authority? In C. Friedrich Edited, *NOMOS I: Authority*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. .
- Aristotle (1992) *the Politics*. London: Penguin Classics.
- Cohen, P., Morgan, J., & Pollack, M. (1992) *Intentions in Communication*. Cambridge, M.A: MIT Press.
- Carl, F. (1963) *Man and His Government*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Curtis, M (1968) *Comparative government and politics*, New York: Harper and Row
- Dahl, R.A. (1984) "Polyarchy, Pluralism, and Scale". *Scandinavian political studies. New Series, Bind 7*
- Dahl, R.A. (1957) "The Concept of Power". *Behavioural Studies vol. 2: 201-215*
- Easton, D. (1958) The Perception of Authority and Political Change. In C. Friedrich (ed.) *NOMOS I: Authority*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Eisenberg, A. (1998) "Weberian Patrimonialism and Imperial Chinese History." *Theory and Society* 27(1): 83-102.
- French, J.R.P. and Raven, B (1959) the bases of social power, in D. Cartwright Edited, *Studies of social power*, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, pp. 150- 167.

- Greenberg, J (2011) Behaviour in organizations, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Publishers
- Harrop, R.H. & Breslim, S. (1993) Comparative Government and Politics. London: Macmillan.
- Hebert, G. & Shills, E. (1965). "Types of Power and Status. In Ulmer, S. (ed) Introductory Readings in Political Behaviour. Chicago: MacNally and Co.
- Jago, A.G. (1982) "Leadership Perspectives in Theory and Research". *Management Sciences*, 28 (3)
- Johari, J.C (2012) Contemporary political theory: new dimensions, basic concepts and major trends, New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.
- Lunenberg, F.R (2012) Power and leadership: An influence process, *International Journal of Management, Business and Administration*, 15 (1): 1-9.
- Macfarlan, A.S. (1969). *Power and Leaders in Plural System*. Stanford University Press. p. 67
- Machiavelli, N. (1999) *The Prince*. New York: Penguin Putnam.
- Northouse, G. (2007) *Leadership Theory and Practice*. London: Sage Publications Limited.
- Nye, J. (2008) *the Powers to Lead*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ogbeidi, M.M. (2012) "Political Leadership and Corruption in Nigeria since 1960: A Socio-Economic Analysis". *Journal of Nigerian Studies: Vol. 1, No. 2. pp 1-25*
- Olaniyi, J.O. (2001) Introduction to Contemporary Political Analysis. Lagos: Fapsony Nigeria Limited.
- Omede, A.J. & Aremu, F.A. (2013) Some Basic Concepts In international Relations. In Saliu, H.A. and Aremu, F.A.

- (Edited) Introduction to International Relations. Ibadan: College Press & Publishers.
- Plato. (1945) *The Republic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reinhard, B. (1996) Max Webber: An Intellectual Portrait. London: Methusen.
- Roundwood, A. (Undated). In Favour of Positive Use of Power. Breakthrough Consultancy, Wicklow, Ireland. Available on: <http://www.breakthrough.i.e/articles/positivepower/3no4.html>. Assessed 1st October, 2013.
- Schriesheim, C.A. & Hinkin, T.R. (1990) "Intellectual Tactics Used By Subordinates: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of Refinement of The Kipnis, Schmitt and Wilkson Subscales". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75 Pp246-257.
- Weber, M. 1947 (1922) *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Translated by A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, M. 1978. (1922) *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Zambrano, E. (2000) Social theories of Authority. Essay prepared for the *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Contract No: 20851A3/15/158. Available on line at <http://calpoly.edu/~ezambran/WebPapers/Authority.PDF> (accessed on September 30, 2013).