

The Personalities and Leadership Styles of Indira: A Case Study

Dr. Rekha Bhadrassen

Professor

Department of ART

RKDF University, Bhopal, India

Abstract:- This paper explores the relationship between Indira Gandhi's personality profile in the period before she became Prime Minister and her leadership style during the time she was Prime Minister. The instrument for assessing the personality profile was compiled and adapted from criteria for normal personality types and pathological variants. Gandhi emerges as a multifaceted individual with four of her personality scales—the Ambitious, the Reticent, the Contentious, and the Dominating—approaching the level of mildly dysfunctional. Indira Gandhi, Golda Meir, and Margaret Thatcher were all described at various times as the "only man" in their respective cabinets - a reference to their tough, controlling behaviour. For each of her subjects, Steinberg provides a personality profile based on biographical information, an analysis of the patterns that comprise the personality profile using psychodynamic insights, and an examination of the relationship between personality and leadership style through an exploration of various aspects of political life - motivation, relations with the cabinet, the caucus, the opposition, the media, and the public.

Keywords— Personalities, Leadership, Political Life

I. INTRODUCTION

Indira Gandhi was brought into the world of Priyadarshini Nehru in 1917 in Allahabad region of India. She was the little girl of Jawaharlal Nehru who was India's most memorable state head. Indira got the opportunity to appreciate brilliant training by going to Somerville School, as well as the Oxford College from where she settled her advanced degree. Indira was subsequently hitched to Feroze Gandhi between the years 1942-1960. The Nehru family was a political family in India that delivered political pioneers for India. At the point when her mom kicked the bucket in 1936, she turned into the main individual nearest to her dad. This case empowered her to hobnob with individuals in authority and the discretionary world subsequently growing up as an accomplished individual in legislative issues and strategy. After her dad's demise, she was chosen as president for India's Public Congress. She thusly expected the post of the clergyman for data. Indira turned into "India's top state leader in 1966 to 1977 and from 1980 to 1984" (Steinberg, 2005, p.760).

She was killed in 1984 by her Sikh guardian in retribution for her requesting the attack of the Brilliant sanctuary, which was a Sikh sacred spot to flush out separatists

concealing in the sanctuary. Indira was viewed as the iron lady of India for the manner in which she governed the country with an Iron clench hand. Throughout recent long periods of political authority all over the planet, Indira Gandhi, Golda Meir, and Margaret Thatcher have arisen as goliaths among the most senior chosen individuals from government. As history specialists start choosing this period's significant political figures, they will see that every one of these three ladies, whose lives and professions were rich and momentous, left a permanent stamp on her state's political, social, and monetary turn of events [1, 2].

Right now, astounding memoirs of every one of the three ladies exist, loaded up with significant bits of knowledge about their initial lives and their administration. Barely any endeavors have been made, in any case, to look at female state heads collectively of pioneers who have procured power and had comparative obligations; those reviews that have investigated female forerunners in both official and prime clerical frameworks have been generally engaging - anecdotal records with some consideration paid to the job that orientation played in their activity of leadership [3, 4].

This accentuation on individual memoir to the detriment of aggregate experience isn't business as usual, considering that moderately couple of ladies has ascended to places of political authority. In a diverse examination of world pioneers, starting during the 1970s, pioneers were viewed as "predominantly male; under .5% were ladies. While these numbers have improved altogether since that time - near eighty ladies have been chosen as one or the other president or top state leader since 19453 - male predominance go on in many region of the world. It is this hole in the writing - the absence of thoughtfulness regarding the aggregate insight of ladies pioneers - that this book addresses. Its principal center is the connection between the character profiles of Indira Gandhi, Golda Meir, and Margaret Thatcher and their particular initiative styles [5, 6].

II. WOMEN IN POWER

Leader character profiles can influence and shape their authority styles. Moreover, this book's examination of the job of three female pioneers addresses a work to review the dominating accentuation on male forerunners in official frameworks. In any case, why Gandhi, Meir, and Thatcher? I decided to look at these three figures for various reasons, some more subtle than others. To start,

every lady had an uncommon political vocation, frequently in the midst of political commotion, emergency, and war, and their effect on their particular states was tremendous. However, they likewise lived fascinating and, here and there, equivalent lives prior to accomplishing high office [7, 8].

The character profile of every lady, fashioned in these early years, was particular and its impact on ensuing initiative way of behaving merits a careful assessment. According to a similar point of view, I chose these three ladies since they addressed both the created and creating universes, old and recently made states, and huge and little states. Aside from their orientation, what is likewise normal to every one of them is that they worked inside an arrangement of parliamentary government, ostensibly more perplexing and dynamic, as well as unpredictable, than an official one [9].

Many examinations have inspected the idea of prime pastoral administration, however few have checked out at female initiative in parliamentary frameworks of government through a relative focal point. Past these marks of union among these three ladies, I was likewise charmed that every one of them shared a lot more noteworthy number of qualities than meets the eye. For instance, their family organization: not a solitary one of them had a more seasoned sibling; Indira was a lone youngster, Golda had a more seasoned and a more youthful sister, and Margaret had a more established sister. In a formerly distributed article, I showed the effect that the orientation of kin can apply on the profession direction of women.⁴ without a more seasoned male kin, young ladies are bound to get consolation at home to investigate male-ruled domains of action, including governmental issues [10].

In spite of the fact that Indira's dad, Jawaharlal Nehru, the principal post-provincial head of the state of India, never unequivocally prepared her for a political job, the passing of his significant other and the shortfall of any children made Indira his entertainer and voyaging buddy as well as progressively his comrade during his residency as head of the state. Given the Nehru association, starting there on, a political future for Indira was basically a chance. Golda was the second girl in a group of three young ladies. Her dad was a to a great extent fruitless provider, who emigrated from Russia to Milwaukee, and her mom was areas of strength for a, hard-driving lady who generally upheld the family from the income of a little supermarket [11, 12].

III. CHARACTERISTICS

Indira grew up as a hardened child whose parents were always away from home attending independence strategy meetings. Thus, she had to learn to overcome her fear of her parents being away by developing into a tough strong-headed girl. When Indira took over as the prime minister of India, she showed her knack for independent mindedness by sacking some of her father's loyalists from the government who were viewed as powerful persons in the Indian political circles.

Indira grew India's profile by making sure that India remained the powerhouse of East Asia by assimilating small neighboring countries like Sikkim to become India's 23rd state. She provided leadership by securing India as one state by silencing separatist groups that were trying to fight for their separation from India. According to Steinberg (2005), Indira comes out as a multifaceted character in such a way that she has different characteristics that make up her personality.

Among her characteristics, she was ambitious, reticent, contentious, and dominating. When Indira's mother died, she took over as her father's hostess. For a long time, she was viewed as not politically ambitious. This misunderstanding enabled her to hone her skills in politics and diplomacy by learning from the extremely best that ruled at the time. She was able to combine her different roles thus being able to execute them as demanded.

Immediately after taking over as the prime minister, she purged some of her father's loyalists as a way of entrenching herself in leadership thus taking control of the party. She subsequently took total control over the leadership of the country. Every move she made was meant for self-preservation. In 1975, she declared a state of emergency, which led to her popularity ratings slumping and subsequently leading to her removal as the prime minister.

IV. INDIRA GANDHI'S LEADERSHIP STYLE AND PERSONALITY PROFILE

The exact examination of Indira Gandhi's administration conduct in the chosen classes uncovered that in eight of the 10, the administration style design firmly paired our hypothetical assumptions for the Aggressive, Predominant, and Argumentative character profiles. Indira Gandhi arose as emphatically objective situated, vigorous in the activity of her work, a promoter inside her bureau with a inclination for getting data from free sources. Also, the sort of inclusion she displayed with partners, the gathering, the party association, what's more, the resistance, which was to a great extent serious and controlling, likewise fitted assumptions for the Aggressive, Controlling, and Argumentative pioneer. Gandhi's dealings with the public additionally paired the hypothetical assumptions for the Ambitious, Prevailing, and Disagreeable character profiles.

There were two regions in which Indira Gandhi's authority profile displayed a more obscure picture. In the space of inspiration, our hypothetical assumption was that Predominant, Controlling, Aggressive, and Quarrelsome characters were bound to be roused by issues of force and philosophy. On account of the aggressive profile, the craving for individual approval was additionally expected to be significant. On account of Indira Gandhi, we found that while power was a significant inspiration, philosophy and well known endorsement didn't assume a significant part.

All things being equal, practicality, which is hypothetically connected to the authority conduct of the

Hesitant character design (as well as the Resigning, Abused, Obliging, Active, and Principled profiles), likewise arose as a vital source of inspiration. That Indira Gandhi's inspirations didn't accommodate my hypothetical assumptions can maybe be made sense of by an understood suspicion that there would be a balanced connection between character profiles and inspirations for strategy decisions.

In this way, as a principally aggressive, quarrelsome, and prevailing character, Gandhi ought to have been considerably more firmly spurred by power and philosophy. This could recommend the way that in a majority rule society, with resistance groups that are in a situation to challenge the public authority, a pioneer who effectively holds power for an impressive timeframe, as Gandhi did, may have controlled those parts of her character and on second thought, displayed a more prominent level of practicality in her authority conduct.

A second region wherein my hypothetical assumptions were not borne out concerned the media. As opposed to unequivocally exhibiting a shut (blocked off and unpleasant) position opposite the media, the outcomes proposed a practically equivalent division between an example of open and shut conduct. Nonetheless, when these outcomes were analyzed all the more intently, I observed that Gandhi was undeniably more open to the media preceding the announcement of a Highly sensitive situation in 1975 and progressively shut from 1972 on. From 1966 to 1972, she was attempting to get and merge her power in the battle with the Congress Party supervisors. In those conditions, she seen media inclusion both locally and remotely as helping her in these attempts. During 1975-77, she was battling to clutch power and stifled the media, which she then saw as subverting her endeavors. After her loss at the surveys in 1977, she got back to control in 1980, however stayed shut and inaccessible to the media which she kept on seeing as antagonistic.

Another charming finding was what minimal mean for the Hesitant example in Indira Gandhi's character profile appears to have had on her administration style. One explain country might be that since this character design represented just 26.9% of the four examples that were positioned at least 19, the other 73.1 % that are reflected in the Predominant, Aggressive, and Hostile examples that delivered an individual profile of "compensatory selfishness" that overpowered the effect of the.

V. CONCLUSION

Though many people viewed Indira Gandhi as an autocratic leader and even christened the iron woman of India, she should better be described as a transformational leader due to the changes and stability she brought to India as a nation and to the regions surrounding India. Her long hold on to the Indian premiership brought about stability to the nation and meaningful long-term changes to the nation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Crossette, B. (2008). Indira Gandhi's legacy: vying for mastery in South Asia. *World Policy Institute*, 25 (1), 36-44.
- [2] International Food Policy Research Institute. (2002). *Green revolution: Curse or blessing*. Washington D.C: IFPRI.
- [3] Malhotra, I. (1989). *Indira Gandhi: A personal and political Biography*. London: Holder and Stoughton.
- [4] Steinberg, B. (2005). Indira Gandhi: the relationship between personality profile and leadership style. *Political psychology*, 26 (5), 755-789.
- [5] Immelman, A. (2000). The political personality of U.S. vice president Al Gore. Paper presented at the Twenty-third Annual Scientific meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, Seattle.
- [6] Immelman, A. (2002). The political personality of U.S. presidential candidate George W. Bush. In L. O. Valenty & O. Feldman (Eds.), *Political leadership for the new century: Lessons from the study of personality and behavior among American leaders* (pp. 81-103).
- [7] Westport, CT: Praeger Immelman, A. (2003). Personality in political psychology. In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.), T. Millon, & M. J. Lerner (Vol. Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Vol. 5. Personality and social psychology* (pp. 599-625).
- [8] Hoboken, NJ: Wiley. Millburn, T. W. (1977). The Q-sort and the study of political personality. In M. G. Hermann (Ed.), *The psychological examination of political leaders* (pp. 131-144).
- [9] New York: Free Press. Millon, T. (1969). *Modern psychopathology: A biosocial approach to maladaptive learning and functioning*.
- [10] Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders. (Reprinted 1985 by Waveland Press, Prospect Heights, IL).
- [11] Simonton, D. K. (1990). Personality and politics. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: theory and research* (pp. 670-92).
- [12] New York: Guilford. Steinberg, B., Kotsovilis, S., & Osweiler, J. (2002). Leadership style inventory. In B. Steinberg, *Indira Gandhi: The relationship between personality profile and leadership style*.
- [13] Paper presented to the International Society for Political Psychology, Berlin. Strack, S. (1997). The PACL: Gauging normal personality styles. In T. Millon (Ed.), *The Millon inventories: Clinical and personality assessment* (pp. 477-497).
- [14] New York: Guilford. Walker, S. G. (1977). The interface between beliefs and behavior: Henry Kissinger's operational code and the Vietnam War. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 21, 120-168.
- [15] Walker, S. G. (1995). Psychodynamic processes and framing effects in foreign policy decision-making: Woodrow Wilson's operational code. *Political Psychology*, 16, 697-717.