

## **Socio-economic and Political Status of Rural Leaders: Case Study of Sanora Union in Bangladesh**

**Md. Riyad Siddiquei\***

**Abdul Latif Masum\*\***

**Abstract:** Understanding the socio-economic and political status of the formal and informal leaders of the Union makes it easier to understand their role in the activities of the Union. The socio-economic and political status of the formal and informal leaders of the Union is discussed in this study. As Bangladesh is a major agricultural country in the third world, it has had an impact on the socio-economic and political status of rural leaders. In this study, data has been collected by asking the question directly from the selected leaders for the research. In addition to asking a direct question, the observation method has been used in the study. Ownership of agricultural land decreased among the leaders of Sanora Union in 2017 as compared to 1990. Business has increased among rural leaders. In 1990, 26% of rural leaders were involved in business. But in 2017, 32% of rural leaders were involved in business. In 1990, 60% of rural leaders were involved in agriculture. But in 2017, 36% of rural leaders were involved in agricultural sector. In 1990, the annual income of 38% of the leaders was 0-60,000 taka(BDT). But in 2017, the annual income of 50% of the leaders ranged from 1,20,001-2,40,000 taka(BDT). In 2017, the presence of more young leaders was noticed in Sanora Union. In 1990, 34% of leaders were between the ages of 41 and 50. But in 2017, 42% of leaders were between the ages of 31 and 40. In 1990, 52% of the leaders were educated from class five to class ten. But in 2017, 54% of leaders were educated from S.S.C.(Secondary school certificate) to H.S.C.(Higher secondary certificate). In 2017, 58% of Sanora Union leaders were involved in the politics of Bangladesh Awami League. But 40% of Sanora Union leaders were involved in the politics of Bangladesh Nationalist Party(B.N.P.). In 1990, there were more leaders of high lineage but in 2017, there were more leaders of the middle lineage.

**Keywords:** Rural Leader, Socio-economic and Political Status, Union, Agricultural Land, Lineage, Sharecropping, Mortgage, Kinship,

### **Introduction**

Nowadays, it has become an important issue to discuss the socio-economic and political status of rural leaders for us. At present, modern leadership has emerged in the rural society instead of the traditional leadership. Rural leaders' gender, age, education, profession, ownership of the land, income, culture, political party affiliation etc. will be included in this study of socio-economic and political status. The present study deals with socio-economic and political status of rural leaders. Because, it has an impact on their functions as a whole. Moreover, in order to know what kind of people are dominating in rural politics and representing the people in the Union Parishad, what attitude they have, how they are distinguished from the rest of the society, we need to know their social background. It is also known what kind of relationship they have with the rural people.

---

\* Former Student of Government and Politics, Ph.D. (Department of Government and Politics), Jahangirnagar University, Savar, Dhaka. Postal Address: 53/1, Lower Jessore Road, Khulna., South Side of Bangladesh Bank). Email: riyadjugp@gmail.com

\*\* Professor (Former), Department of Government and Politics, Jahangirnagar University, Savar, Dhaka. Email: mal55ju@yahoo.com

In fact, the leadership of these Union Parishads is expected to play a vital role in the successful implementation of the development programmes aimed at ensuring “equity” and “social justice” (Statistical year book of Bangladesh, 1981). It is essential to have a well-thought-out view of their emergence and influence in rural politics, as well as to find out the reasons for their role and what is at the root of the small community’s influence over the larger population. We must see whether the people in the society are loyal to them or the people are compelled to obey them, how they look at the people, whether they are working for the welfare of the people or using the people for their own welfare. Their socio-economic status may have some relations with their performance in the rural local councils (Dube, 1965, Pp. 23-35). The leading community members the elites – have combined in themselves some notable attributes : numerical dominance, economic solvency, dominant political position, high influence and high level of participation in the decision making process. These issues have been given priority in this discussion.

### **Theoretical Framework**

In South Asian Studies, we look at the type of analytical bifurcation of several traditional and customary leadership. Alan Beals saw two types of leadership in (India) Namhali village by survey of Mahishur.<sup>1</sup> One of his creations originated from the government system and the other originated from the rural tradition-based social organization. On the other hand, Epstein noticed that there is a traditional type of leadership in the village where economic development has decreased and in the village where irrigation system has helped in significant economic development, there are signs of fundamental political change. According to him, the panchayat members no longer need to become an elderly person of the group – rather the acquired leadership has occupied the place. On the contrary, there was no change in traditional politics of traditionally dependent villages. There the village panchayet is still formed with the elders of the clan and now Panchayet<sup>2</sup> resolves the problems of villagers. Epstein analyzes the study, how old and new values are in the process of social change. It also explains what has happened in the political and ritual ceremonial roles and what has changed in the principles of social organization. Thus, with a political and organizational change, Epstein established a positive correlation of economic change. He saw the economy as a determining driver in that case.

Lewis mentioned that-

.....in the traditional pattern of leadership, the older men were both ceremonial and panchayat leaders. With the coming of education and outside employment however, middle aged educated people are being given opportunities by the older people to represent them official panchayats, school committees and deputations outside the village (Lewis, 1958: P. 130).

R. M. Stogdill thinks about leadership, Leadership may be considered as the process (act) of influencing the activities of an organized group in its efforts toward goal setting and goal achievement (Stogdill, 1974: P. 144).

---

<sup>1</sup>Namhali, Mahishur (area of India)

<sup>2</sup>panchayet (Indian local government system)

Many theorists and researchers expressed their views as a strong and strong relationship between leaders and followers. In this case, James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner expressed strong opinion. They said- "Leadership is a relationship between leader and followers. A Complete picture of leadership can be developed only if we ask followers what they look for or admire in a leader (Kouzes and Posner, 1990: P. 25).

In the book of Public leadership (Bell, Hill and Wright, 1960: Pp. 1-27), the concept that has been found in the leadership class category is-

1. Positional or formal Leadership
2. Reputational or Nominal Leadership
3. Social Participation
4. Personal Influence or Opinion Leadership
5. Event Analysis or Decision making

Ahmed attempted to study the power structure in contemporary rural Bangladesh and thus he conducted a field work in a village named Bizna (pseudonym) of Comilla district in eastern Bangladesh. His study was devoted to provide some understanding of the changing pattern of power hierarchy in the context of social change in Bangladesh. He indicated a change in the power structure of the village which is that outcome of modern education by the villagers. Education began to be more powerful than the land-based power hierarchy in the village. Moreover, a good number of the educated young men went out to various places and, on their return they developed a spirit of defiance to the village elders. In this way the change in the power structure began to take shape ( Ahmed, 1983). In the light of this study, modern and educated leadership can be explained.

Karim made a study on the leadership pattern in two Bangladeshi villages named Dhononjoyapara and Gopalhati located in the northern part of the country (Rajshahi District). His study directed a change in the institutions through which leaders can exert power due to government funded programs and projects run by the Union Parishad, gram sarkar, farmer's cooperatives and Rural social Service (RSS). He observed that although there appeared a change in the leadership pattern, the basic structure of leadership remains unchanged. His study revealed that two or more gosthis (lineages) in a neighborhood formed a samaj (an informal village social organization and a traditional power domain). The leadership in the samaj was held by the persons who came from demographically stronger gosthi and the persons who represented strong landowning gosthis. The real political power of the pardhan (chief samaj leader) and paramanik (one of the samaj leaders) was exercised in setting disputes between members of the samaj through traditional and informal village courts bicher and salish ( Karim, 1987). In the light of this study, young and educated leadership can be explained.

Rahman studied 60 unions of several districts in Bangladesh to identify the class character and to stress the background of Union Parishad (UP) leaders. He interviewed about 132 UP leaders during the early part of 1978 to show clearly the linkages that existed between the local level leaders and the central leaders who were in control of the state machinery. He considered the UP leaders as 'the landing ground "or national leadership via the bureaucrats'. In stressing the characteristics of the UP leaders, Rahman claimed that they were more close to the characteristics of so-called 'feudal leaders'. He

showed that “the class that drives all its power from land-ownership and concomitantly grabs other surplus siphoned off unproductive activities”(Rahman, 1981). In the light of this study, dominant political position of rural leaders (Inclusion in the political party) can be explained.

Jahangir identified a “process of class differentiation, stimulated by new opportunities for the accumulation of capital, results in a process of polarization” (Jahangir,1979). In the light of this study, the practice of share cropping and mortgage can be explained.

Geoffrey Wood studied the political process and rural power structure in comilla village. It showed that “the description of class formation and the emergence of dominant power groups correlated these processes with the indebtedness which abounded as the small peasant’s land was gradually expropriated and so he was transformed into a sharecropper or a dependent laborer”(Wood, 1976) ). In the light of this study, mortgage practices can be explained.

The centralization of power in the leadership structure is evident. People having no leadership wield little or no power. So there is a correlation between leadership and power. As a matter of fact the elite and the ordinary masses are not homogenous in most cases in regard to socio-economic attributes. The leaders are distinguishable from ordinary villagers by numerical dominance, economic solvency, dominant political position, high influence and high level of participation in the decision making process.

### **Definition of the Main Concept**

Socioeconomic status is an economic and sociological combined total measure of a person’s work experience and of an individual’s or family’s economic and social position in relation to others.

Political status is the level of political value a person is considered to hold.

### **Variability**

The transition from existing condition to other condition is called variability.

### **Rural Leadership**

Rural Leadership means to influence and encourage rural people to work together in a common action effort to achieve any objective.

According to Ordway Tead, “Leadership is the activity of influencing people to co-operate towards some common goal which they come to find desirable” (Tead, 1935: P. 20).

According to Pigors, “Leadership is a process of mutual stimulation which by the successful interplay of relevant individual differences, controls human energy in the pursuit of a common cause” (Sing, 1968: P. 12).

Leadership of the aforementioned leadership definition is meant only to those rural leaders who can lead the rural people to a universal purpose and can influence the rural people for determining the destination and conducting activities like reaching the destination.

### Sampling

In this study, simple random sampling method (random number table) has been used to determine the sample. Data has been collected from 100 leaders out of 300 leaders of Union randomly. This can be considered as the shape of the sample. As a research area, the Sanora union of Dhamrai upazila in Dhaka district has been selected.<sup>3</sup>

### Data Collection Method

In this study, the question paper system was originally used. Data has been collected by asking the question directly from the selected leaders for the research. From the structural point of view, these question papers are open-ended. The questionnaire has been verified before making the final questionnaire. In addition to asking a direct question, the observation method has been used in the study.

### Socio-economic and Political Status of Rural Leaders

#### Types of Ownership of Agricultural Land of Sanora Union leaders

The main occupation of the leaders of Sanora Union is agriculture and business and the main element of agriculture is land. Therefore, determining the amount of the land of the elites is an important issue. It is commonly seen in rural areas that most of the property is owned by a few individuals and most people have very little property. Therefore, by questioning them about this, based on the results obtained from the field level, the ownership of agricultural land of rural elites has been analyzed through table. Here is a comparative study of 50 elites in 1990 and 50 elites in 2017.

Table 1: A Comparative Figure of the Type of Agricultural Land Ownership of the Sanora Union Leaders (2017 and 1990).

Agricultural Land (acre)	Year 2017		Year 1990	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
0-1 acre	5	10%	3	6%
1-2 acres	6	12%	5	10%
2-3 acres	19	38%	5	10%
3-4 acres	16	32%	11	22%
4-5 acres	2	4%	12	24%
5-6 acres	1	2%	10	20%
6 acres and above	1	2%	4	8%
Total	50	100%	50	100%

Source: Obtained from Field Level Data.

<sup>3</sup> Sanora union of Dhamrai upazila in Dhaka district (Union, Upazila- local government system of Bangladesh.)

Table-1 shows that in 2017, 10%, 12%, 38% and 32% of the leaders in Sanora Union had agricultural land from 0-1 acre, 1-2 acres, 2-3 acres and 3-4 acres respectively, but in 1990, 22%, 24% and 20% of the leaders in the Sonora union had agricultural land from 3-4 acres, 4-5 acres and 5-6 acres respectively. The table above indicates that the land of the Sonora Union leaders in 1990 was more than in 2017. So, agricultural land has been divided. In 1990, 3-6 acres and more of the Agricultural land were noticed among a large numbers of leaders. But in 2017, a greater number of leaders had agricultural land ranging from 0-4 acres. Although the dominance of landlords was observed among the leaders of Sanora Union in 1990, the dominance of landlords in rural politics was rarely noticed in 2017. Ownership of above four acres of land is a determining factor in holding chairmanships in the Union Parishads (Hitchcock, 1959: Pp.395-414). The results of the field level study show that the status of the leaders in the union is high- middle class and middle class because some people have more agricultural land than the leaders and most people have less agricultural land. Some people do not aspire to be leaders despite having the most agricultural land in the union or cannot take the lead due to lack of popularity. As an indicator of socio-economic status, agricultural land plays a role in influencing the leaders of rural Bangladesh. Therefore, in order to analyze the leadership trend, it is necessary to know the socio-economic status of the leaders. There is a difference between the socio-economic status of 1990 and 2017. Because, rural leaders more or less secure their position on agricultural land. This implies that agricultural land is gradually declining per household among the leaders. Ownership of agricultural land among leaders is declining due to expansion of non-agricultural economy and migration to cities. In Bangladesh Situation 'resources are absorbed and distributed by the same set of institutional forces that control land' (Stepanek, 1979: p.100).

### **Types of the Main Occupations of the Leaders (Formal and Informal) of Sanora Union**

There is considerable importance in analyzing the professions of leaders in elite research. For example, profession is a criterion in determining social status. So, the professionalism of the elites needs to be judged. Secondly, it is easy to know a person's character through profession. For example, teachers farmers, doctors and businessmen have different roles due to different professions. So, on the basis of the results obtained from the field level by asking them about this, the professions of the elites of Sonora Union has been analyzed through the following table. Here is a comparative study of 50 elites in 1990 and 50 elites in 2017.

Table 2: A Comparative Figure of Types of Main Occupations of Sonora Union Leaders (2017 and 1990).

Profession	Year 2017		Year 1990	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Agriculture	18	36%	30	60%
Business	16	32%	13	26%
Part time job	10	20%	5	10%
Contracting	2	4%	0	0%

Housewife	4	8%	2	4%
Others	0	0%	0	0%
Total	50	100%	50	100%

Source: Obtained from Field Level Data.

Table-2 shows that, In 1990, 60%, 26% and 10% of the leaders were involved in agriculture, business and part time job, respectively. But in 2017, 36%, 32%, and 20% of the leaders were in agriculture, business and part time job respectively. The presence of Sonora union leaders in business and part time jobs in 20107 was higher than in 1990. That clearly indicates the expansion of the non-agricultural economy. At the same time, the change of profession indicates the change of nature of the rural leaders. Meanwhile, due to the impact of globalization on rural political and economic environment and the fragmentation of land due to population growth, agricultural land is no longer able to meet the needs of the leaders in Sonora union, So, the leaders have been seen leaning towards this modern profession and the income in this modern profession is much higher. The non-agricultural economy is expanding in 2017 compared to 1990. In 1990, 60 percent of the leaders were in agriculture but in 2017,36 percent of the leaders are in agriculture. 32 percent and 26 percent of the leaders were associated with the business in 2017 and 1990 respectively. In 2017, part- time jobs increased by more than 10 percent. Thus the poor villagers are bound by a sense of gratitude to vote in favour of their patrons, no matter what personal complaints they might have against them(Gerth and Mills,1970,p.180).Those whohave controlover resources in rural areas have an impact on other people. This influence is the key to controlling political power. There are two features of social inequality: distributive and relational (Beteille,1972).

### **Annual Income of the Leaders of Sanora Union**

Discussions on the occupations of the elites of Sonora Union have shown that the main occupations of the elites are agriculture, 'agricultural and business', part-time jobs and other. And the characteristic of rural elites is that they are people with higher income than the general population. Therefore, it is necessary to discuss the type of annual income of elites. The income of the people of the Union is not very satisfactory. And the elites are different from this situaion. So, based on the results obtained from the field level by questioning them, the annual income ofthe elites ofSanora union has been analyzed through the table below. Here is a comparative study of 50 elites in 1990 and 50 elite in 2017.

Table-3: A Comparative Figure of the Annual Income (2017 and 1990) of the Leaders of Sanora Union.

Annual Income (Taka -BDT)	Year 2017		Year 1990	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
0 - 60,000	3	6%	19	38%
60,001 - 1,20,000	12	24%	18	36%
1,20,001 - 2,40,000	25	50%	11	22%
2,40,001 - 4,80,000	10	20%	2	4%
4,80,000 Taka and Above	0	0%	0	0%
Total	50	100%	50	100%

Source: Obtained from Field Level Data.

Table-3 shows that in 2017, 24%, 50% and 20% of the leaders earned an annual income of BDT<sup>4</sup> 60001-120000, 120001-240000 and 240001-480000 respectively. In 2017, half of the leaders earned an annual income of BDT 1,20,001-2,40,000. But in 1990, 74 percent of the leaders earned an annual income of BDT 0-120,000. In 2017, the income of the leaders has increased almost several times as compared to 1990. In terms of income, the leaders of the union are upper class and middle class. Landholders and large farmers control the rural economy through their surplus land and supply of credits (Sobhan, 1968: Pp. 83-86).

### Age of the Leaders of the Sanora Union

Discussion of age is particularly necessary for elite study. Because if an organization is run by an older person, that organization is not able to meet the expectations of the younger generation. And if the leadership of an organization comes from the youth, then that leadership is revolutionary and risky. That is why, it is difficult for them to gain the trust of the vast population. That is why, middle-aged people are more influential in developing countries. But in a transformative and developing society like Bangladesh, especially in Sanora union, my research area, most of the rural elites are young. Therefore, the age of the elites of Sonora union has been analyzed through the following table based on the results obtained from the field level by asking them about this. Here is a comparative study between 50 elites in 1990 and 50 elites in 2017.

---

<sup>4</sup> BDT- Taka (Bangladesh)

Table-4:A Comparative Figure of the Age of the Leaders of the Sanora Union (2017 and 1990)

Age(Year)	Year 2017		Year 1990	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
0-30	1	2%	0	0%
31-40	21	42%	12	24%
41-50	18	36%	17	34%
51-60	7	14%	13	26%
61 years and above	3	6%	8	16%
Total	50	100%	50	100%

Source: Obtained from Field Level Data.

Table-4 shows that in 1990, 24%, 34% and 26% of leaders ranged in age from 31 to 40, 41 to 50 and 51 to 60 years respectively. But in 2017, 42%, 36%, and 14% of the leaders ranged in age from 31 to 40, 41 to 50 and 51 to 60 years respectively. In 2017, I saw a greater presence of leaders aged 31 to 40 years. But in 1990, there were more leaders over the age of forty. The number of relatively young leaders in Sonora union in 2017 is higher than in 1990. Modern, agile and young leaders have emerged in place of the conservative experience. It is consistent with the real situation. Because if an organization is run by older people, that organization is not able to meet the expectations of young people.

### Education of the Leaders of Sanora Union

Education plays an important role in advancing to the elite level. Therefore, in order to do research on rural elites, it is first necessary to know the education status of the elites. Therefore, the analysis of the leadership style of the Sonora Union was started in the context of education. Therefore, by asking them about this, based on the results obtained from the field level, the education of the leaders of Sanora Union has been analyzed through the following table. Here is a comparative study between 50 leaders in 1990 and 50 leaders in 2017.

Table 5: A Comparative Figure of the Education of the Leaders of Sanora Union (2017 and 1990)

Level of Education	Year 2010		Year 1990	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Illiterate	0	0%	2	4%
From being able to sign to class four	3	6%	12	24%
Class five to ten	14	28%	26	52%
SSC and HSC( passed)	27	54%	10	20%
Graduate and above	6	12%	0	0%
Total	50	100%	50	100%

Source: Obtained from Field Level Data.

Table-5 shows that in 1990, 4%, 24% and 52% leaders were illiterate, from being able to sign to class four and from class five to class ten respectively, but in 2017, 6%, 28% and 54% of the leaders were from being able to sign to class four, from class five to class ten and from SSC to HSC respectively.<sup>5</sup> Compared to 1990, formal education has increased among the leaders of Sanora union in 2017. In 1990, more than half of the leaders were from class five to ten. But in 2017, 54% and 12% of the leaders passed 'S.S.C. and H.S.C.' and degree respectively. It is currently in line with the education of people of Sonora Union. Rural people are gradually being educated in formal education. They do not want to accept the old leadership, especially young people. Although a large section of the traditional leaders of the village think that this situation is causing the decline of the village. The leadership in the rural local councils seems to be by and large better educated in comparison to the national average figure of literacy which is about 26 percent (World Bank, 1983: Pp. 148-49).

### The Shape of the Family

The shape of the family plays an influential role in becoming a rural leader. It used to be much more influential but now it is less important. Now the family of rural leaders is not as big as before. Now, the main topic of discussion is the relationship of the family shape with the rural leadership. Therefore, based on the results obtained from the field level by asking them about this, the family shape of the leaders of Sanora union has been analyzed through the following table. Here is a comparative study between 50 leaders in 1990 and 50 leaders in 2017.

Table-6: A Comparative Figure of the Families of the Leaders of Sanora Union (2017 and 1990)

Number of Members	Year 2017		Year 1990	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
0 -5	21	42%	1	2%
6 - 10	25	50%	21	42%
11- 15	3	6%	24	48%
16 - 20	1	2%	4	8%
Total	50	100%	50	100%

Source: Obtained from Field Level Data.

Table-6 shows that the family size of rural leaders in 2017 is smaller than in 1990, that is, the number of members is less. In 1990, 42% and 48% of the leaders had families of 6 to 10 and 11 to 15 members, respectively. But in 2017, the families of 42 percent and 50 percent of the leaders were 0 to 5 and 6 to 10 members respectively. Large size families provide opportunities to develop leadership qualities and leisure time to their members to devote themselves in political activities (Rahman, 1979: Pp 87-116).

<sup>5</sup> The formal education system of Bangladesh (level of education)

### Gender- based Position of Sanora Union Leaders

As the democratic environment does not yet exist in the village, the influence of male-dominated leadership can be seen. Women leaders still have to fight for their rights. Women leaders in rural areas have not yet realized their rights. So the women leadership in the union parishad is not seen to be able to work from their position. This study compares gender-based leadership. So, based on the results obtained from the field level by asking them about this, the gender-based position of the leaders of sanora union has been analyzed through the table below. Here is a comparative study between 50 leaders in 1990 and 50 leaders in 2017.

Table 7: Gender-based Comparative figure of Sanora Union Leaders (2017 and 1990)

Gender	Year 2017		Year 1990	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Male	40	80%	48	96%
Female	10	20%	2	4%
Total	50	100%	50	100%

Source: Obtained from Field Level Data.

Table-7 shows that in 1990, 96 percent and 4 percent of the leaders were men and women respectively. But in 2017, 80 percent and 20 percent of the leaders were men and women, respectively. Rural leaders are predominantly patriarchal. In 2017, only a few women leaders are seen in the union, except for the reserved women seats in the Union Parishad. At present, only 20 percent of the the leaders are women, This is why, the role of judges in rural arbitration of women union leaders has not been seen in my research area. The same situation is seen in all the unions of Bangladesh. The leadership in our village is practically male-dominated. Though the females play the role of a leader at the household level (Barman, 1988: p.139).

### The Status of Leaders on the Basis of Heredity and Kinship

Although hereditary leadership was predominant in the 1990s, it is important to analyze how much it has declined in 2017. The role of hereditary heritage in rural society is now a matter of research in order to become a rural leader. Therefore, based of the results obtained from the field level by questioning the extent to which hereditary influence currently exists in the rural leadership has been studied through table. Here is a Comparative study between 50 leaders in 1990 and 50 leaders in 2017.

Table 8: Comparative Figure of Sanora Union Formal and Informal Leaders Based on Heredity and Kinship (2017 and 1990)

Inclusion	Year 2017		Year 1990	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Included	26	52%	38	76%
Not included	24	48%	12	24%
Total	50	100%	50	100%

Source: Obtained from Field Level Data.

Table- 8 shows that in 1990, 76% leaders were based on kinship and clan. But in 2017, 52% leaders were based on kinship and clan. There are more leadership qualities acquired among leaders in 2017 than in 1990. The way in which the state is bound up with the relations of production constitutes its primary relation with social classes and the class struggle (Poulantzas, 1978:P.25).

### **Share cropping, Mortgage and Fixed Rent Related Rural Leaders' Agricultural Land**

Agricultural land plays an important role in becoming a rural leader. Although the importance of land has diminished since the 1990s, it deserves an analysis of how closely it relates to leadership today. So, land is one of the top priorities in analyzing the socio-economic status of rural leadership. It is also a study of how much the leaders use the rural people for their own benefit through all these activities. For example, share cropping system, mortgage system and fixed rent. Therefore, based on the results obtained from the field level by questioning them, these activities of the leaders of Sanora union have been analyzed through the table below. Here is a comparative study between 50 leaders in 1990 and 50 leaders in 2017.

Table 9: Comparative Figure of Sharecropping System, Mortgage System and Fixed Rent of Agricultural Land of Sanora Union leaders(2017 and 1990).

Year	Mortgage System	Percentage	Sharecropping System	Percentage	Fixed- rent	Percentage
2017	9	18%	21	42%	20	40%
1990	14	28%	25	50%	11	22%

Source: Obtained from Field Level Data.

Table-9 shows that in 1990, the mortgage system, sharecropping system and fixed rent on agricultural land were 28%, 50% and 22% respectively. But in 2017, the mortgage system, sharecropping system and fixed rent on agricultural land were 18%, 42% and 40% respectively. The current fixed rent in agricultural land is 40%. This indicates a gradual increase in the fixed rent system in agricultural land. Fixed rent system has increased on agricultural land in 2017 compared to 1990. The sharecropping system is the same as before. Even though the sharecropping system is similar, now the rural leaders can have less impact on the poor farmers through the sharecropping system. In

opposition to the paternalistic value judgement, a different value judgement considers it a system based on exploitation of the cultivator, the sharecropper and labourer; a system of economic dependence and political domination (Alavi, 1973: Pp.23-62).

### **Inclusion of Sanora Union Leaders in the Political Party**

At present, inclusion in the national political party is one of the most important issues to become a rural leader. Therefore, if we want to know the political status of rural leaders, we must first know what kind of relationship they have with the national political party. Due to population growth, globalization, fragmentation of land, concentration of leaders in modern occupations and expansion of non-agricultural economy, a class of young, agile, educated and progressive leaders has emerged in 2017 compared to 1990. These are the people who are influencing rural politics by keeping in touch with national politics. So, based on the results obtained from the field level by asking them about this, the political status of the rural leaders has been analyzed through the following table. Here is a study of their political status by comparing 50 leaders in 1990 and 50 leaders in 2017.

Table 10: A Comparative Figure of the Inclusion of Sanora Union Leaders in Political Party (2017 and 1990).

Year		Bangladesh Awami League	BNP (Bangladesh Nationalist Party)	Jatiya Party	Others	Total
2017	Number	29	20	1	0	50
	Percentage	58%	40%	2%	0%	100%
1990	Number	15	16	12	7	50
	Percentage	30%	32%	24%	14%	100%

Source: Obtained from Field Level Data.

Table-10 shows that in 1990, 30%, 32%, 24% and 14% of the leaders were involved in Bangladesh Awami League, BNP (Bangladesh Nationalist Party), Jatiya Party and others respectively.<sup>6</sup> But in 2017, 58%, 40%, 2% and 0% of the leaders were involved in Bangladesh Awami League, BNP (Bangladesh Nationalist Party), Jatiya Party and others respectively. According to the political culture of Bangladesh, rural people and leaders want to be involved with the ruling party in hope of getting various opportunities. In 2017, 58% of the leaders were involved in Bangladesh Awami League. In 1990, 24% of the leaders were involved in the Jatiya Party. Due to the strong organizational structure of Bangladesh Awami League in the rural areas as an old party from the very beginning, a large section of the people have always been involved in the politics of Bangladesh Awami League. The key link in the system of patronage, through which the national institutions functioned (Block, 1969: P.169).

<sup>6</sup> Bangladesh Awami League, BNP, Jatiya Party, (Political Parties of Bangladesh, B.N.P.- Bangladesh Nationalist Party)

### Experience of Sanora Union Leaders

Experience often plays an important role in becoming a leader. However, many modern, educated and young people are becoming leaders even though they are inexperienced, but they are being elevated to leadership level. If we want to do research on rural leadership, we need to discuss the experience of the leaders. So, the main discussion now is whether experience is needed to become a rural leader. Therefore, based on the results obtained from the field level by asking them about this, the experience of the leaders of Sanora Union has been analyzed through the table below. Here is a comparative study between 50 leaders in 1990 and 50 leaders in 2017.

Table 11: A Comparative Figure of the Experience of the Leaders of Sanora Union (2017 and 1990).

Year		Experienced	Inexperienced	Total
2017	Number	20	30	50
	Percentage	40%	60%	100%
1990	Number	28	22	50
	Percentage	56%	44%	100%

Source: Obtained from Field Level Data.

Table-11 shows that in 1990, 56% and 44% of rural leaders were experienced and inexperienced, respectively. But in 2017, 40% and 60% of rural leaders were experienced and inexperienced, respectively. In 1990, a rural leader was elected more than once. But in 2017, a rural leader was rarely seen to be elected more than once. Informal leaders also led for a long time on the basis of their clan. That is, it would have happened in the case of informal leadership.

### Social Status of the Leaders of Sanora Union

Social status is very important to be a rural leader. Its importance has decreased in 2017 compared to 1990, but its importance has not completely disappeared yet. We need to study the importance of social status to become a rural leader in 2017. Therefore, the social status of the leaders of Sonora union has been analyzed through the following table based on the results obtained from the field level by asking them about it. Here, is a comparative study between 50 leaders in 1990 and 50 leaders in 2017.

Table -12: A Comparative Figure of the Social Status of the Leaders of Sanora Union (2017 and 1990). [ On the Basis of Clan]

Social Status [Clan]	Year 2017		Year 1990	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
High	15	30%	27	54%
Middle	25	50%	15	30%
Low	10	20%	8	16%
Total	50	100%	50	100%

Source: Obtained from Field Level Data.

Table-12 shows that in 1990, 54%, 30%, and 16% of rural leaders were from the high, middle and low lineage respectively. But In 2017, 30%, 50% and 20% of rural leaders were from the high, middle and low lineage, respectively. At present, half of the leaders of Sanora Union belong to the middle lineage. At present, the importance of lineage has diminished. Now the quality acquired rather than pedigree plays a supporting role in achieving leadership. They clearly come from upper levels and the co-relation between wealth and leadership is highest as we move up the scale (Lewis, 1958: p.16).

The data obtained show that the number of single families is increasing more than the number of joint families among the rural leaders. Now to be a rural leader, family size and large clan are not very important. Weakening the people in irrational terms, courage, intelligence, strategy etc. are still a great help in achieving rural leadership.

### Conclusion

Ownership of agricultural land decreased among the leaders of Sanora Union in 2017 as compared to 1990. Business has increased among rural leaders. In 1990, 26% of rural leaders were involved in business. But in 2017, 32% of rural leaders are involved in business. In 1990, 60% of rural leaders were involved in agriculture. But in 2017, 36% of rural leaders are involved in agricultural sector. In 1990, the annual income of 38% of the leaders was 0-60,000 taka (BDT). But in 2017, the annual income of 50% of the leaders ranged from 1,20,001-2,40,000 taka (BDT). In 2017, the presence of more young leaders was noticed in Sanora Union. In 1990, 34% of leaders were between the ages of 41 and 50. But in 2017, 42% of leaders were between the ages of 31 and 40. In 1990, 52% of the leaders were educated from class-five to class-ten. But in 2017, 54% of leaders had education from SSC to HSC. In 1990, 48% of leaders had families of 11 to 15 members. But in 2017, 50% of the leaders had 6 to 10 family members. In 1990, 96% of male leadership existed. But in 2017, I saw 80% male leadership. The status of male-dominated leadership in Sanora Union is still prevailing. In 1990, 76% of leaders had hereditary status. But in 2017, only 52% of leaders' status was hereditary. But in 2017, I noticed that people are becoming leaders through acquired qualities rather than heredity. In 1990, sharecropping system was 50%. But in 2017, sharecropping system was 42%. In 2017, 58% of Sanora Union leaders were involved in the politics of Bangladesh Awami League. But 40% of Sanora Union leaders were involved in the politics of Bangladesh Nationalist Party (B.N.P.). In 1990, 56% of Sanora Union's leaders were experienced. But in 2017, 40% of Sanora Union's leaders were experienced. In 1990, there were more leaders of high lineage but in 2017, there were more leaders of the middle lineage. Moreover, the number of single families is higher among the rural leaders.

### References

- Ahmed, A.B. 1983. *Bizna : A Study of Power Structure in Contemporary Rural Bangladesh*. Dhaka : Bangladesh Books International Ltd.
- Alavi, Hamza. 1973. Peasant Classes and Primordial Loyalties. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, Vol.1, No. 1: Pp.23-62.
- Barman, Dalem C. 1988. *Emerging Leadership Patterns in Rural Bangladesh- A Study*, Dhaka : C SS. p.139

- Bell, Wendell, Hill, Richard J. and Wright, Charles R. 1960. *Public Leadership*. Los Angeles : Chandler Publishing Company, Pp.1-27.
- Beteille, Andre, 1972. *Inequality and Social Change*. Delhi : Oxford University Press.
- Blok, Anton. 1969. Peasants, Patrons and Brokers in Western Sicily. *Anthropological Quarterly*, vol.42, No.3:P.169.
- Dube, S.C., 1965. "A Framework for the Study of Rural Leadership in Transitional Societies, : in National Institute of Community Development (NICD, now called National Institute of Rural Development, (NIRD) Published Emerging Pattern of Rural Leadership in Southern Asia (:Hyderabad) , Pp. 23-35.
- Gerth, H.H. and Mills, C. Wright. 1970. From Max Weber : *Essays in Sociology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. p. 180.
- Government of Bangladesh, *Statistical Year Book of Bangladesh*. 1981, (Dhaka: Ministry of Planning and Finance, Bureau of Statistics, 27 September 1982), p. 584.
- Hitchcock, J.T. 1959. "Leadership in a North Indian Village, " in Richard L. Park and Irene Tinker (eds.), *Leadership and Political Institutions in India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Pp. 395-414.
- Jahangir, B.K. 1979. Differentiation, Polarization and Confrontation in Rural Bangladesh. Dhaka: Centre for Social Studies.
- Karim, A.H.M.Z. 1987. The Pattern of Rural Leadership in an Agrarian Society – A Case Study of the Changing power Structure in Bangladesh. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Syracuse University, USA.
- Kouzes, James M. and Posner, Barry Z., 1990. *The Leadership Challenge*, San Francisco : Jossey Boss Publishers, p.25.
- Lewis, Oscar, 1958. *Village Life in Northern India: Studies in a Delhi Village*, New York : Vintage Books, P. 130.
- Nicholas, Ralph W., 1969. "Rules, Resources and Political Activity," in Marc J. Swartz (ed), *Local-level Politics*, London : The University of London press, Pp. 300-301.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1978. *State, Power, Socialism*. London : New Left Books.
- Rahman, Atiur. 1979. Rural Power Structure, *The Journal of Social Studies*, no. 4. July: Pp. 87-116.
- Rahman, A. 1981. Rural Power Structure : A Study of the local level leaders in Bangladesh, Dhaka : Bangladesh Books International.
- Rashiduzzaman, M. 1968. *Politics and Administration in local councils, A Study of Union and District Councils in East Pakistan*, Dhaka: Oxford University press. P. 32.
- As quoted in Sing, Harjinder. 1968. *Village Leadership (A Case Study of Village Mohal in Punjab)*. Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd..p. 12.
- Sobhan, Rehman. 1968. *Basic Democracies, Works Programme and Rural Development in East Pakistan*, Bureau of Economic Research, Dhaka: Dhaka University. Pp. 83-86.
- Stepanek, Joseph F. 1779. *Bangladesh – Equitable Growth?* New York : Pergamon Press.
- Stogdill, R.M., 1974. *Handbook of Leadership*, New York: The Free Press, p. 144.
- Tead, Ordway. 1935. *The Art of Leadership*. London : Witlesey House. p. 20.
- Wood, WD. (1976). "Class Differentiation and Power in Bandakgram : The Minifundist Case", in Huq, M. Ameerul (ed.), *Exploitation and The Rural Poor*, Comilla : BARD.
- The World Bank. 1983. *World Development Report*. London: Oxford University Press, Pp. 148-49.