Cultivating Self Leadership: A Review of Winston Churchill and Nelson Mandela's Leadership Attributes

[1]Gladys Bichanga, [2]Dr. David Oginde

Department of Organizational Leadership, PAC University

POLD 703: Cultivating Self Leadership

Abstract: **Winston Churchill and Nelson Mandela were great leaders and remain spirited icons in the study of leadership. The two personalities were influential leaders in their respective countries who significantly contributed to their countries' leadership and governance foundations during their eras. Though Winston Churchill and Nelson Mandela were among the most revered leaders up to date, the two had unique leadership styles which made them outstanding in their engagements. As a result of their leadership styles and qualities, they effectively serve as exemplary examples of leadership emanating from diversity and aspects of inclusion, which shows that people can manifest their leadership skills differently. The studies showed that shared leadership attributes include courage, vision, good communication skills, resilience, charisma, risk-taking, decisiveness and determination.**

Keywords: **Winston Churchill and Nelson Mandela, great leaders, countries' leadership, vision, good communication skills, resilience, charisma, risk-taking, decisiveness and determination.**

1. INTRODUCTION

The success or failure of any institution, business, or country reflects the state of leadership and governance of such entities. Generally, everybody is assumed to be born a leader within their jurisdiction with different leadership styles and approaches. However, the argument that all people are leaders has been debated, with some scholars noting that while some people are naturally born as leaders, most leaders are made. Concerning the cultivation of self-leadership traits, (Chaleff, 2009) noted that even those born with high leadership skills still need to cultivate their leadership attributes to help them scale their leadership prowess to higher heights.

According to (Drucker, 2008), in managing oneself, attaining self-leadership requires one to have self-awareness in which an individual understands their strengths. However, Drucker noted that most people assume that they know what they are good at, while the reality is that they never know themselves well, affecting their leadership success in the long run (Drucker, 2008). As a result, Drucker recommended that leaders conduct self-assessment by reflecting on their feedback analysis, especially when they make decisions or take critical actions such as those taken by Winston Churchill and Nelson Mandela in their respective countries.

According to Hashimy & Basavarajapp (2023), there is a significant difference between managers and leaders in their study about nurturing leadership and capacity building for success. Their research noted that managers do things right while leaders do the right things. They further reiterated that the myth that leaders are born has no standing in reality, and this insinuates that leaders can be made provided an individual has the desire and willpower to cultivate self-leadership (Hashimy & Basavarajappa, 2023).

Using the case of Nelson Mandela and Winston Churchill, it can be said that leadership can be developed. Still, at the same time, it can be argued that people are born with innate leadership skills that only need to be activated when they have the desire and willpower. In other words, it is a choice to be the right leader. An individual can use a role model to become the leader they want through learning and aggressively implementing leadership traits that suit a given leadership model. Neck et al. (2019) alluded that self-leadership must be cultivated because the leadership process is a complex and multifaceted concept that integrates many qualities, like being courageous, visionary, showing empathy, and making tough and ethical decisions during a crisis. In relation to the case of Mandela and Churchill, it is demonstrated that leadership development is a lifelong process that involves constant reflection of leadership feedback and self-improvement where one remains steadfast in their actions.

Background of the Study

The journey for self-leadership is a lifelong process that entails constant learning and self-improvement. According to (Chaleff, 2009), whether one is born with strong leadership traits or the attributes are salient, there is a need for cultivating leadership skills as this is the only best way to improve an individual's leadership strengths. Numerous studies on leadership and governance have shown that leadership skills can be enhanced through learning, training, practical experiences, and mentorship (van Zyl, 2012). Having understood the importance of leadership training, many organizations or individuals have developed leadership foundations to help develop future leaders. For example, the Nelson Mandela and Churchill Foundation run a leadership academy, which justifies that leaders can be made through training, learning, and mentorship. Developing such leadership programs reminds us that making leaders is diverse. So, people can learn about leadership through mentors who motivate them to become strong leaders but still require training to reinforce their knowledge and skills (Nawaz & Khan, 2016). Further, studies on leadership development have shown that many leaders have emerged from emulating other leaders, such as Mahatma Gandhi, Churchill Winston, and Martin Luther King Jnr, among many leaders in the past decades. Therefore, through training programs, mentorship, practical experience, and self-reflection, an individual with solid leadership desires and willpower can effectively acquire leadership attributes, knowledge, and abilities that make them become strong leaders in their areas of specialization.

The process of self-leadership must start with an individual having the strong desire and willpower to become a leader. The existence of such urges and will relates leadership to inborn traits. The intrinsic passion, motivation, determination, and strong drive to lead create an easy path for learning and gaining self-leadership (Dobbins & Platz, 1986). In the learning process, people conduct self-evaluation that entails determining their strengths and weakness and reflecting on other leaders. Where mentorship and practical experiences are applied in learning self-leadership skills, an individual tends to learn from the failures and successes of others, which then help them develop the skills needed to become strong leaders (Neck & Houghton, 2019). Though leadership learning programs are highly effective, it is essential to understand that not everyone can excel in leadership. The diversity in people's interests, strengths, and aspirations are internal traits or inborn attributes that determine an individual's leadership capabilities, and this places the notion of leaders "being born" in the context of leadership development (Verawati & Hartono, 2020). As a result, the assumption that leaders can be made does not thrive in isolation of the innate attributes that promote leadership development; hence, the need to acknowledge the capacity of an individual to develop the necessary leadership skills that influence their positive engagements with the communities and entities they lead.

Though there is weight on the possibility of cultivating leaders as opposed to the argument that leaders are made, most leaders in the past were self-made leaders. Leaders like Winston Churchill and Nelson Mandela rose during a crisis and took the mantle to lead their people to their desired destinations. Winston Churchill was a prominent political leader of the 20th century. He was Prime Minister of the United Kingdom during World War II. He contributed to his country's prosperity by leading the nation to the greater heights of national politics and leadership (Ramsden, 1995). Churchill demonstrated leadership skills required to influence and inspire people, such as courage, determination, and resilience. All the above attributes manifested during his position as a Prime Minister during the tumultuous period of World War II. During his era, Churchil made speeches that influenced and rallied the British people, instilled hope, and inspired them to persevere in adversity, especially during World War II. Throughout his leadership, his mantra knew him, "Success is not final, failure is not fatal," dominated most of the speeches. Regarding the above famous quote, Churchill demonstrated that one can fail at some point as a human being, but that will never deter them from pursuing their goals in life (Organ, 1996). The quote also indicates that Churchill did not capitalize on their success and would pursue higher goals even after succeeding in other things, like being the Prime Minister.

Like Winston Churchill, Nelson Mandela was a leader who emerged during crises and adversity in South Africa. Mandela led their people against the apartheid regime and became the first black president of South Africa in 1994 (Gallaher, 2023). Apart from consistency and commitment towards attaining independence for South Africa, Mandela was revered for his dedication to justice, reconciliation, and the advancement of human rights. Nelson Mandela displayed unwavering courage and commitment to see that their country is governed under the rule of law and that South Africans became united and part and parcel of the country's leadership. As a transformational leader, Mandela's ideals of man-making and character-building came from his experiences and vision for a united country and the desire to promote diversity and inclusivity.

As a champion for justice, Mandela demonstrated the art of leadership and selflessness by placing the country's needs before his own. Nelson Mandela remained charismatic and cheerful while in prison for 27 years, and when Mandela left and became the president, they never showed anger against their oppressors, nor become vengeful (Garba & Akuva, 2020). Mandela faced many adversities during their struggle for independence and still ensured that his vision, empathy, and commitment to the country's goal of attaining independence remained on course. As a justification for a selfless leader, Mandela voluntarily stepped down as president after serving the first term. The art of stepping down not only demonstrated that Mandela was not a selfish leader but also justified how committed they were to social justice and embracing the importance of democratic principles that provide an opportunity for all people to take the mantle of leadership (Garba & Akuva, 2020).

Regarding Winston Churchill and Nelson Mandela's complex decisions, people can learn that leadership is about devotion and commitment to inspire and influence others. The two leaders placed the need of their people before theirs and demonstrated how world leaders could emulate the same, especially in the case of promoting social justice, as was shown in the case of Mandela (Hardy, 2010). Churchill's and Mandela's leadership success resulted from their desire, willpower, practical experiences, and vision to lead their country on the right path. Their story demonstrates that self-leadership can be cultivated only when one has the desire and willpower to sharpen their leadership skills and the vision to inspire and influence others. In this context, self-leadership implies that people should understand their strengths and weaknesses before getting into leadership realms (Goleman, What Makes a Leader?(Harvard Business Review Classics), 2017). In other words, not everybody occupying a higher position, such as the manager or the president, can automatically become a leader. For instance, there are myriad examples where countries have a stray because their leaders place their interests before their citizens, as opposed to the case of Mandela.

Gibson and Buchalski (2000) and Bandura and Watts (1996) emphasized cultivating self-leadership is a complex concept that cannot be attained without having a blueprint for leadership. A blueprint for becoming a leader must start with an individual's innate qualities. An inborn desire and willpower to lead, coupled with a vision, courage, and determination, can be influenced through mentorship and practical experiences that create an avenue to practice leadership qualities (Gibson & Buchalski, 2000). In this context, cultivating self-leadership would mean that an individual reflects on practical experiences, especially from mentors and their training, and conducting self-assessment by reflecting on feedback related to their leadership decision-making. Where education, mentorship, and practical experiences are prioritized in self-leadership development, examining past leaders like Mandela, Mahatma, Churchill, and Napoleon can provide young leaders with a background to gain insight into what leadership entails (Bandura & Watts, 1996). In this analysis, we review the leadership styles of Winston Churchill and Nelson Mandela by comparing and contrasting their leadership attributes as demonstrated during their era. The study will investigate their characteristics and how their leadership traits contributed to their success or failure in various aspects of their leadership in times of crisis.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of empirical studies on the works and leadership styles of Winston Churchill and Nelson Mandela will provide an overview of how each leader exemplified their leadership attributes during their era and time of crisis.

Theoretical Framework

Verawati and Hartono (2020) reiterated that though leadership might mean different things to different people, the most common definitions of leadership revolve around the assumption that leadership entails influencing people, inspiring them, and motivating them to take a particular course of action. Similar to Verawati et al., Yukl (2007) also argued that leadership is a process of influencing others, making them understand issues, agreeing with what needs to be done, and how to carry out the proposed task for the general good of society or an organization. He emphasized that leadership is an essential

development because of two reasons: (1) there is a constant change of leaders, which also changes the workings and success of the society or organizations; (2) the success of a nation depends on the effectiveness of her leadership which captures the competency of the leaders steering the country or an organization and the leadership traits that influence how a leader is made (Yukl, 2007). Verawati et al. noted that even though the idea that leaders are born has become less popular as compared to the notion that leaders are made, a variety of literature on leadership indicates that the concept of self-leadership is anchored on leadership theories like the great man theory, leader-follower theory, transformational leadership, trait, behavioral and the contingency theory. The trait and behavioral theories explain an individual's leadership characteristics, their origin, and how they emanate. In addition to leadership traits, leadership studies can also be conducted based on trait and style approaches, as well as contingency approaches which define the actions or styles leaders use in their leadership processes.

Trait Theory

Gordon Allport founded trait theory on the basis that different personality traits define a person. From Allport's point of view, an individual's personality defines how a person would behave in specific scenarios, which are significant intrinsic factors influencing leadership development. According to (Early, 2017) at some point, leadership researchers argued that "a person may not just become a leader because of possessing a certain combination of traits," which doubted the application of trait theory in leadership studies. However, later on, Early reported that advanced research on leadership found a correlation between a person's traits, such as being courageous, charismatic, integrity, conscious, and achievement motivation, to leadership development. As a result, modern leadership studies use trait theory as a model for understanding leadership. Sidle (2007) indicated that theory is based on the hypothesis that good leaders have innate characteristics like showing empathy, integrity, and courage and possessing physical and personality traits that may come from birth. He argued that though physical qualities can be developed or learned during the leadership journey, those with innate characteristics like intelligence, confidence, fluency, and being extrovert do exceptionally well in their leadership journey (Sidle, 2007). For example, Winston Churchill and Nelson Mandela scored highly in the above physical traits such as being fluent, which could be seen in their speeches; courageous and confident, which helped them take risks and be intelligent; and charismatic, which attracted many followers to them.

According to Robbins and Judge (2007), leadership theory separates leaders from non-leaders by examining their character differences. Robbins et al. alluded that leaders like Mandela and Winston Churchill were known as charismatic, passionate, courageous, visionary, and resilient leaders whose actions attracted many followers. They were persuasive, decisive, and deliberate in their endeavors, thus making them exemplary in their leadership roles (Robbins & Judge, 2007). Similarly, Gibson et al. (2000) and Hoy et al. (2008) findings tend to accentuate that influential leaders must be able to control their traits. Where leaders show a solid ability to control their personalities, they must be enthusiastic, confident, able to resist stress, emotional maturity, self-efficacy, and commitment to achieve. Nelson Mandela and Winston Churchill emulated the trait model concepts by demonstrating high emotional maturity and stress resistance during adversities like detention and brutal assaults. Winston led his people through World War II without hesitation, showing high integrity, confidence, emotional maturity, and attachment to achievement and demonstrating high conceptual abilities about their crisis. Similarly, Mandela showed his stress resistance capability while he was in prison, the motivation to achieve their goal of ending apartheid, self-confidence, integrity, and inspiration to mobilize followers to boycott and strike against the government's attempt to promote racial segregation (Kalungu-Banda, 2006). Therefore, it is the collection of the above attributes that made these leaders succeed in their endeavors in the long run.

According to Yukl (2006), Goleman (2017) and Sidle (2007), most successful leaders display four common traits: intelligence, maturity and breadth, achievement drive, and integrity. They argued that leaders are always perceived to be more intelligent than their followers concerning their subject matter. For example, in the case of Nelson Mandela, his followers trusted and believed Mandela understood matters to do with governance, leadership, and colonization and that his opinion was worth following, thus their engagement in the fight for social justice and independence. The same concept applied in the case of Churchill, where his followers believed it was a good idea to go for World War II because their leader better understood that war in terms of their country's achievement. The maturity and breadth trait shows that leaders must show emotional maturity and a broad view of their subject matter (Yukl, 2007). Churchill and Mandela showed these personalities by having a more comprehensive view of their quest and remaining steadfast in times of adversity without showing any sign of desperation, even when it was tough for them to continue fighting against their aggressors.

Yukl (2006) and Sidle (2007) cited that integrity is vital for a leader. It demonstrates the correlation between what they say and what they do. Followers are mostly glued to a leader with high integrity because they are honest and consistent in their course of action. For example, Churchill and Mandela had a high level of integrity which made them trusted with the leadership of their country. They put national values before their needs and consistently focused on achieving their goals to attain social justice and political empowerment for their citizens. Therefore, based on the tenets of trait theory, it is evident that it is still relevant to leadership studies in that it can be used to predict leadership and determine whether one possesses the right leadership traits.

Leader-Follower Theory and Great Man Theory

Early (2017) noted that leader-follower theory illustrates servant leadership, where leaders serve their followers. In the case of Mandela and Churchill, they both demonstrate the context of leader-follower leadership in which they led from the front rather than offering instructions. Winston Churchill deliberately took his country to World War II, assuring his followers of their possible victory and the benefits of engaging in such endeavors. Churchill committed to rallying his troops and putting the resources needed to foster their course, as well as designing plans that would make their country grow. Similarly, Nelson Mandela led the South Africans against the oppression of foreign governments or the apartheid regime by leading from the front when it came to protesting against the government. In his quest for social justice, Nelson Mandela convinced his followers that they had equal rights of being accorded respect and that racial segregation was an injustice and a threat to their well-being. In the context of leader-follower theory, Mandela's commitment to lead from the front and show integrity virtues such as trust made him gain more followers in South Africa, contributing to their gains even when he was in prison. South Africans believed in and trusted Mandela and his course of justice, and that is why the struggle for independence and abolition of apartheid continued even when Mandela was in detention.

According to Nahrgan and Morgeson (2007), savant leaders focus on serving their followers and helping them grow, and this makes their followers trust them, thus allowing them to achieve their leadership goals. In scenarios where leaders demonstrate concern for the people instead of imposing their needs on followers, they become stronger and more united in their course (Chaleff, 2009). Apart from the leader-followers theory, the great man theory is another approach that can be used to understand leadership development, especially in the case of Churchill and Mandela. Early indicated that leaders were perceived as heroes and that Mandela and Churchill were considered heroes of their era in their countries and today. Nelson Mandela is considered a heroic and iconic leader because he led his country against the apartheid government and made South Africa gain independence. Mandela's courageous nature and confidence positioned him as a hero against the colonizers. Stepping down from the presidency after his first term in office is a justification for being fearless and determined (Maanga, 2013). Churchill is also considered an iconic and heroic leader whose brevity made the country overcome many hurdles. Churchill made hard decisions, such as taking his people to war and compromising some issues to make his country progress against all adversities.

Nawaz and Khan (2016) noted that Carlyle argued in his "great man theory" that "leaders are born, but only people with heroic abilities could become leaders." In this context, Carlyle gave more power to the heroic potentials among leaders, suggesting that the innate characteristics of heroic leaders must include courage, confidence, persistence, emotional maturity and integrity, and the ability to show empathy. According to Carlyle, heroic leaders were born and not made. In the context of Churchill and Mandela, it can be said that, to a great extent, the two were natural leaders because they demonstrated the inborn capabilities of leaders, which helped them edge against their aggressors. According to Dobbins and Platz (1986), heroic leaders take advantage of the events they face to define the course of action.

Dobbins et al. argued that the event-making leader's role is "based on the consequences of outstanding capabilities of intelligence" and the person's character as opposed to the actions of distinction. In this context, Dobbin et al. insinuate that leadership goes beyond the dogma of leaders born to event-based leaders, where people emerge as leaders due to the prevailing scenarios. In the case of Mandela, it can be said that he was born a person with leadership traits, and such characteristics made him lead his people during the apartheid era (Hardy, 2010). In summary, both Mandela and Churchill are outstanding examples of great man leaders who are considered both iconic and heroic leaders. They are leaders who thrived during a crisis, based on Dobbins' argument of leaders emerging as event men driven by their leadership capabilities.

Transformational Leadership Theory

Early (2017) cited that James MacGregor Burns introduced the concept of transformational leadership in 1978. The approach focused on mutual stimulation and elevation, transforming followers into leaders. According to Burns, the

Page | 69

structure of transformational leadership involves the existence of idealized behavior, inspirational motivation, the promotion of intellectual stimulation, and idealized attributes (Early, 2017). In this context, transformational leadership stems from the leader-follower and servant leadership theory, where a leader focuses on developing followers and molding them into leaders. In the case of Nelson Mandela and Churchill, they focused on transforming their countries, making them work better, and developing future leaders. Nelson Mandela molded leaders who continued to fight against apartheid when Mandela was in detention (Reza, 2019). Similarly, Mandala stepped down from the presidency to allow people like Desmond Tutu to take the leadership mantle. Therefore, relinquishing the presidency signifies how Mandela edified the art of transforming his followers to become leaders while becoming moral agents.

Nawaz et al. noted that transformational leadership focuses on raising the motivation and morality of both followers and the leader. To elevate and convert followers into leaders, a leader interacts and engages followers based on their shared values, beliefs and goals, such as the dreams of a country or an organization's vision (Nawaz & Khan, 2016). In this sense, transformational leadership attempts to reorder individuals' needs from personal interest to higher-order needs, thus causing enlightenment among citizens and pursuing higher goals. For example, Churchill was a transformational leader who defined the process and influenced his people to support their more significant goal of developing the country, thus enabling him to perform beyond his call of duty.

According to Hardy (2010), Churchill's speech of August 1940 reiterated, "Death and ruin have become small things as compared to the shame of defeat." The address justified his commitment, confidence, and courage to take his country to World War II and the gains he expected from that event that made his citizens support his action. Churchill further indicated that they were the most united nation because he inspired the country by advocating for higher ideals and moral values that led to the developing of a more robust and united nation (Hardy, 2010). As a result, Hardy (2010) alluded that as a transformational and servant leader, Churchill acknowledged the struggles of his people and worked hard to help them press on for them to accomplish their national goals of political stability, economic and social status that would bring glory to them and the generations to come.

According to Gallaher (2022), it is difficult to change something as big as the government; it requires vision, courage, confidence, and commitment. Gallaher noted that Mandela was a transformational leader with a dream for his country to rise above racism and gain self-governance (Gallaher, 2023). Mandela could read and understand his followers, assure them that they could transform or change their country, and show them that people's power was enough to overcome the apartheid rule. Besides courage and vision, Mandela is painted as a peacemaker contrary to his name, which translates to troublemaker in the Xhosa language. Northouse (2022) cited that even after detention, Mandela was committed to transforming his country and uniting it because he wanted South Africans to live alongside the whites or the apartheid rulers without racial segregation. Mandela advocated for the culture of peace, acceptance, and forgiveness as a model for transforming apartheid South Africa, demonstrating his integrity and concern for social justice and showing empathy to all citizens regardless of racial affiliation (Northouse, 2022).

Literature Review of Empirical Studies

Many leadership studies have indicated that Winston Churchill and Nelson Mandela shared many personal attributes that contributed to their leadership success. Stolyarova (2008) and Gibson and Weber (2015) showed that the two leaders have differently demonstrated being visionary, courageous, resilient, decisive, risk takers, committed to self-improvement, and management of people. According to Gibson et al., Churchill is among the most celebrated leaders who have received high recognition in the rank of leadership, including the 1953 Nobel Prize in literature. Churchill was widely known through his role as the British Prime Minister during World War II. Similarly, Nelson Mandela shared similar accolades, including winning the 1993 Nobel Prize in Peace (Stolyarova, 2008). The two leaders use their attributes to succeed in their leadership endeavors, which is why they are among the iconic leaders or heroes of the past and present.

Visionary

According to Schoemaker (2014), Nelson Mandela was a visionary leader who saw South Africa's future in relation to gaining its self-governance and the existence of social justice that would come through political change. Schoemaker noted that Mandela's life history and leadership engagements exemplify traits indicating he is a visionary leader. Some critical elements of an innovative leader demonstrated by Mandela during his leadership include the ability to anticipate the outcome of their engagements, the ability to challenge the status quo, the ability to interpret issues affecting the society, and the commitment to make decisions aligned to their problems, as well as learn from similar scenarios (Maanga, 2013). Despite

the challenges faced during the quest for independence and attainment of social justice that would lead to the abolition of the apartheid government, Mandela remained steadfast to the course and urged his followers to continue with their fight against White supremacy (Pietersen, 2015). According to Schoemarker, the power of being a visionary helped Mandela and his followers overcome the oppression of the apartheid government. Schoemaker indicated that Mandela's vision about the future of their country in terms of governance, equality, and liberty was too big to the extent that he turned down the president's offer and opted to stay in prison. The decision to stay in prison was also strategic because he believed that political change would eventually come through his willingness to bet his freedom.

Mandela's vision helped in being considered a peace ambassador and a true leader who believed in social justice. Right from prison, Mandela was determined to lead a united country where blacks and whites lived together without any case of racial alienation (Kalungu-Banda, 2006). For instance, Mandela asked the South Africans to stand together against people who wish to destroy them, such as the murderers of Chris Hani. In this context, it was Mandela's vision to rise above past injustices, embrace Tutu's call for truth and reconciliation, and focus on a shared and democratic future (Schoemaker, 2014). Garba and Akuva (2020) alluded that Nelson Mandela's leadership should act as a model for African leadership because they demonstrated leadership with selflessness, vision, determination, and politics without bitterness and forgiveness. Garba et al. reiterated that Mandela won a Nobel Price on Peace because of a dream to have a united South Africa where whites and blacks could live alongside each other in any form of vengeance. As a result, Mandela's leadership skills manifested in forgiveness and reconciliation, posing himself as a symbol of peace and willingness to quit political power or presidency after their first term was a demonstration that Mandela believed in the progress of the country and trust in other people to lead the country (Garba & Akuva, 2020).

According to (Longstaffe, 2005), Churchill was a visionary leader who faced biggest crises during World War II. Churchill adopted courage, embraced the vision of changing people, and inspired them to gain political and economic stability. Longstaffe noted that Churchill was a strong cabinet minister who dreamed of creating a solid and united country. For example, it is argued that most cabinet ministers never left any meeting chaired by Churchill without feeling like a braver leader whose vision was to make decisions even during tough times, like the case of World War II (Longstaffe, 2005). Further, Longstaffe indicated that Churchill was not a good orator and had to practice his speeches. Churchill was determined to practice and improve his communication through simple but precise language patterns to overcome his speech impediment and attain his vision of becoming a good orator. Also, Churchill understood the importance of earning trust from his followers. This informed his vision to demonstrate the level of integrity, thus ensuring that his words match his behavior because people tend to follow behavior more than words.

Risks Taking and Resilience

Gibson (2015) cited that even though Churchill Winston had many good leadership attributes, it is probable that his most remarkable leadership traits were risk-taking and resilience. Churchill showed a different characteristic to most leaders of his time, who were essentially risk averse due to fear of making decisions that could affect their career. According to Churchill, taking risks and remaining steadfast with the course of action was necessary; that was the only way to achieving the set goals or the country's greatness (Gibson & Weber, 2015). For instance, he believed that leadership ventures could never be successful without being a risk-taker and learning from an individual's failure. According to Kumar and Kuma (2022), Churchill believed that his success resulted from failure to failure that engulfed his career. For instance, Churchill learned from the Dardanelles attack and used the same experiences to forge ahead of his leadership and the decision to take his country to World War II. Gibson noted that during World War II, Churchill did not appoint the defense minister because he wanted full authority to accept his soldiers to World War II. As a result, his risk-taking and persistence that emanated from his reflection on his previous leadership failures during World War I when he was the First Lord of the Admiralty, Churchill gained courage and determination to have a unilateral decision that made him win the war (Kumar & Kumar, 2022).

Similarly, Allison and Goethals (2014) alluded that the success of the anti-apartheid campaign in South Africa was due to Nelson Mandela's risk-taking and resilience attribute that made them challenge the ruling government. Studies show that the fight for independence and racial segregation in South Africa was very long and involved a lot of oppression and assassination that could not quickly be challenged if one is not courageous, a risk taker, and resilient. Mandela knew the hostilities awaiting them when they started civil disobedience and strike against the government but remained undeterred by the government's brutalities, thus enabling them to oppose the social injustices that the government had on the blacks

Page | 71

(Ekundayo, 2011). Allison et al. noted that starting the journey of changing the government and averting the apartheid regime was a justification for Mandela being a risk taker since the government was bigger than him. However, he believed in his course for pursuing justice and fighting for democracy in his country. Additionally, Mandela continued to press on with his ambition to change the country's leadership and the quest to attain democracy, on which he persisted that South Africa must be united against those who try to destroy them (Raelin, 2015). His resilience made him reject the president's offer and remain in prison, convinced that they would soon win and that South Africa would attain its independence and self-governance free from oppression, social injustices, and racial segregation.

Decisiveness

Both Mandela and Churchill demonstrated being resolute and decisive in every decision they made during their leadership era. According to Gibson et al., Churchill's decision to take his country to World War II was a justification that he was never afraid to make complex decisions, even when unpopular. Analysis of Churchill's actions and approaches to crisis indicate that he evaluates people's success by assessing how they managed their failure and determine whether they have the energy to move beyond their loss. As a result of such an approach, Churchill evaluated his aggressors' ability to move beyond their failures, thus giving him a better view of his endeavors (Gibson & Weber, 2015). Through gauging people's success and failure, Churchill became less intimidated when making risky decisions because he kept learning from his past experiences without holding into the nature of the outcome.

 Similarly, according to (Sanaghan, 2016) Mandela's journey in the quest for independence was a manifestation of being decisive. Mandela had decided to fight for political change and against social injustices like racial segregation and lived with his decision until they achieved their objective. Unlike most political leaders today, Churchill and Mandela enjoyed making uncomfortable decisions and pressed on to inflict change in their society because they knew that most individuals and institutions were always resistant to change (Sanaghan, 2016). Therefore, in their different ways, they developed thick skin and resilience to ensure that their decisions help them achieve the national goal as they keep the focus on the central aspect of the problem, balance both sides of their choices and only change the course based on the new data that support their activities for the betterment of the society.

Ability to Manage Followers

In their respective leadership jurisdiction, Winston Churchill and Nelson Mandela indicated that they were aware of the essence of a good relationship when leading others. Churchill and Mandela fit in various theories like the great man theory, the leader-follower theory, the transformational theory, and the savant leadership theory because of their awareness of the good relationships between leaders and their followers. Throughout Churchill's leadership, he developed a pattern of selecting individuals with strong personalities that fit every role in the country's development (McGuire, 2009). In his approach to leadership and development, Churchill expected his followers to be solid and those who were not afraid to speak up. Churchill often criticized the exercise of poor judgement in controversial issues revolving around the key roles, hence avoiding people who cannot voice their opinions. Churchill also encouraged his followers to challenge him on other topics that account for why he appointed strong-willed people to occupy key positions that would drive his successful leadership during crises like World War II. In summary, Churchill understood organizational structure well, how to manage people and prioritize national goals over his interest.

According to (Read, 2010) Mandela understood leadership as bringing people together and uniting for an ethical and beneficial course. He demonstrated his ability to manage people by first showing a high level of integrity that earned him trust and respect (Read, 2010). Both Mandela and Churchill believed in the need for their words and actions to match their behaviors. In whatever they do, they lead from the front, portraying them as leaders who walk the talk, thus demystifying the possibility of relying on followers and instead showing their savant leadership approach. For example, Mandela called his followers to join him in demonstrating against the government and convinced them they must remain united to challenge the apartheid government against oppressing them. His deep understanding of governance and management helped him identify strong and key leaders to help his campaign against the government.

From the managerial perspective, Mandela understood the need to work with bold, courageous and confident people who are unafraid to voice their opinions and challenge authority. As a result of appointing people with integrity and strong governance skills, Mandela's followers continued to fight for social justice even when he was in detention. The people found it easier to focus on their course of justice because they believed that Mandela was in custody for the betterment of their

country (Nelson, 2015). The unwavering determination to push their progress and attain their primary goals was also a justification that followers had embraced the vital leadership attributes of Mandela and were operating on the blueprint of their master.

In summary, Mandela believed in proper governance and management of people. Mandela believed in his appointees and followers and trusted their governance capabilities, leading him to appoint people of integrity in his government. As a leader, Mandela showed empathy to his people and advocated for unity in which the whites and blacks were advised to live together without any revenge (Senge & Kania, 2015). Lastly, Mandela stepped down from the presidency after his first term as a demonstration that he believed in the managerial and leadership skills of the people he worked with and the rule of democracy that allowed all citizens to take the leadership mantle.

3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summary of Similarities

Though Nelson Mandela and Winston Churchill were iconic leaders who operated in different times and historical contexts and faced specific challenges in their periods and regions, analyzing their leadership attributes showed that they shared some common qualities that accounted for their success and failure. The two leaders share comprehensive leadership characteristics such as vision, courage, risk takers, decisive, resilient ability to manage followers, and good communication skills (Goleman, 2004). The two leaders demonstrated the ability to communicate effectively and to drive their agenda without coercing their followers, which showed their powers in managing people.

As visionary leaders, Mandela and Churchill set their goals straight and communicated them effectively to their followers before executing them. While it is not easy to convince the entire country to rally behind you for a particular course, the two leaders did not find it harder because they had earned the trust of their followers due to matching their words to their behavior. Throughout their leadership, both Mandela and Churchill were viewed as people with high integrity who prioritized their country's national needs against their interests. Generally, irrespective of the challenges or the brutality faced by these leaders, they took the frontline to champion the change they needed, hence making their resilience to achieve their goals. The two leaders demonstrated their commitment to achieving, exemplified when Mandela turned down the president's offer and stayed in prison with the conviction that they would attain democracy, thus portraying them as great men and iconic leaders.

Summary of Contrast

Though not many, Winston Churchill and Nelson Mandela had some distinct leadership attributes to each other that accounted for some of their unique success and failures. From the above analysis, Churchill is portrayed as one who believed in learning from failures and commitment to self-improvement. Unlike Nelson Mandela, Churchill was not naturally eloquent or a born orator. Churchill had a problem delivering his speeches effectively; thus, Churchill resorted to practicing and improving his skills in communication skills persistently. As a result of consistent practices, a reflection on his failure, and his commitment to improving himself, Churchill emerged as some of the best orators whose speeches have attracted many. According to Churchill, anybody can work on their weaknesses and turn them into their strengths by being decisive, determined and resilient. Churchill demonstrated commitment and resilience through his steadfast commitment to taking the British people to World War II, which was an intimidating crisis. Apart from their leadership traits, Churchill differs in his leadership style from Mandela.

Regarding his leadership approach, Churchill was more of an authoritarian leader in most of his actions. Churchill was seen as solid and authoritative, making decisions with little consultations. For instance, Churchill did not have the Minister for Defense when taking his country to World War II, and this was a deliberate move to make him have unilateral charge of the entire process and the autonomy in decision-making, thus portraying him as one who embraced forceful leadership. As a result of his authoritarian approach, Churchill enjoyed command and control, where he exercised control over the war effort, communicated clear goals, and issued orders that he expected his followers to obey and comply with. Despite being authoritarian, Churchill focused on mobilizing resources for his country and inspiring unity among his people. As a result of the above attributes, he successfully united the British people during World War II and promoted resilience against Nazi aggression. Through his strategic thinking approach, he could plan effectively, integrate resources, and mobilize soldiers, thus inspiring his followers to pursue their national goals during the war crisis, eventually leading to their victory. On the contrary, Churchill's leadership style was faulted by some scholars that his leadership approach could cause divisiveness

because of a lack of consultation. Critics also noted that Churchill's decisions were never met with unanimous approval, thus alluding that some of his policies on colonialism and post-war reconstruction were somehow flawed, indicating a few areas of failure that tainted his leadership.

On the other hand, Mandela's unique leadership included forgiveness and reconciliation, in which they advocated for the unity of South Africans against those trying to destroy them. Mandela demonstrated a high tolerance, accommodation, forgiveness and reconciliation level by encouraging people to live without revenge on the apartheid perpetrators. Mandela also showed high perseverance and patience through his long imprisonment and struggle for change. Ignoring the president's offer and opting to remain in custody demonstrates that Mandela could persevere and endure the tribulations he faced and also illustrates how patient he was with attaining freedom. As a result of his patience and perseverance, Mandela remained steadfast in their pursuit of justice and equality, which was the background for achieving social justice.

Further, Mandela exemplified humility and empathy throughout his leadership journey in which he understood the pain of his followers and those who suffered from the ruthless regime of apartheid. Regarding leadership style, Mandela was a transformational and collaborative leader who believed in working with people and consulting them throughout their course of action. For instance, Mandela worked with Desmond Tutu against the apartheid government and preached peace and unity among South Africans in which Desmond was using the moral compass towards attaining a united nation. Additionally, Mandela promoted diversity and inclusion by sharing his vision of a diverse and equal country, inspiring many followers to work with him to attain democracy. Further, after his first time, Mandela stepped down from the presidency and allowed others to lead, which was a justification for a leader who believed in other leaders and offered them the opportunity to lead the country. Mandela's collaborative approach also emerged through his commitment to consensus building in which he involved various stakeholders across South Africa to overcome all the divides, the blacks and whites.

Essentially, Mandela's success is highly anchored on the ending of apartheid and the transition of South Africa to a democratic and inclusive society. It is also linked to his commitment to forgiveness and reconciliation that focused on impeding a widespread racial conflict created by the apartheid regime. Regarding failures, the critics noted that Mandela could not solve the socio-economic problems and inequality facing the country. Some commentators also argued that his conciliatory approach compromised the democratic and economic progress of the country. However, Mandela believed in peace, reconciliation and unity in South Africa, challenging the argument that his conciliatory approach dented his leadership. In conclusion, Mandela only took four years in office, which was very minimal, to gain significant socio-economic progress; hence such was the successors' work.

<div align="center">REFERENCES</div>

[1] Bandura, A., & Watts, R. E. (1996). *Self-efficacy in changing societies.*

[2] Chaleff, I. (2009). *The courageous follower: Standing up to & for our leaders.* Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

[3] Dobbins, & Platz. (1986). Sex differences in leadership: How real are they? *Academy of Management review, 11(1)*, 118-127.

[4] Drucker, P. F. (2008). *Managing oneself. Harvard Business Review Press.*

[5] Early, G. (2017). A short history of leadership theories. *Leaders' Quest*.

[6] Ekundayo, J. (2011). Toward a functional followers' model in the organizational leadership process. *Academic Leadership: The Online Journal, 9(2)*, 35.

[7] Gallaher, S. (2023, 7 10). *Nelson Mandela as a Transformational Leader: Transforming South Africa's Government.* Retrieved from PennState: https://sites.psu.edu/leadership/2022/04/03/nelson-mandela-as-a-transformational-leader-transforming-south-africas-government/

[8] Garba, D., & Akuva, I. I. (2020). The leadership styles of Nelson Mandela as a pattern for African leaders. *Covenant University Journal of Politics and International Affairs*.

[9] Gibson, J. W., & Buchalski, R. M. (2000). The leader as mentor. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 7(3)*, 56-67.

[10] Gibson, M., & Weber, R. J. (2015). Applying leadership qualities of great people to your department: Sir Winston Churchill. *Hospital Pharmacy, 50(1)*, 078-083.

[11] Goleman, D. (2004). What makes a leader. *Creative Management,*, 82-91.

[12] Goleman, D. (2017). What Makes a Leader?(Harvard Business Review Classics). *Harvard Business Press.*

[13] Hardy, B. (2010). Servant Leadership and Sir Winston Churchill.

[14] Hashimy, S. Q., & Basavarajappa, H. T. (2023). Nurturing Leadership and Capacity Building for Success: Empowering Growth. *International Journal of Rehabilitation and Special Education, 3(2)*, 1-14.

[15] Kalungu-Banda, M. (2006). *Leading like Madiba: Leadership lessons from Nelson Mandela.* Juta and Company Ltd.

[16] Kumar, A. K., & Kumar, K. A. (2022). Resilient Leadership-A Case Study of Sir Winston Churchill. *International Journal on Leadership, 10(1)*.

[17] Longstaffe, C. (2005). Winston Churchill, a leader from history or an inspiration for the future? *Industrial and Commercial Training, 37(2)*, 80-83.

[18] Maanga, G. S. (2013). The relevance and legacy of Nelson Mandela in the twenty-first century Africa: An historical and theological perspective. *African Journal of History and Culture, 5(5)*, 96-113.

[19] McGuire, D. (2009). Introduction to leadership: Concepts and practice. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 33(8/9)*, 838-840.

[20] Nawaz, & Khan. (2016). Leadership theories and styles: A literature review. *Leadership, 16(1)*, 1-7.

[21] Neck, C. P., & Houghton, J. D. (2019). *Self-leadership: The definitive guide to personal excellence.* Sage Publications.

[22] Nelson, K. R. (2015). *Nelson Mandela. Gareth Stevens Publishing LLLP.*

[23] Northouse, P. G. (2022). *Leadership: Theory and practice.* Sage publications.

[24] Organ, D. W. (1996). Leadership: The great man theory revisited. *Business horizons, 39(3)*, 1-4.

[25] Pietersen, W. (2015). What Nelson Mandela taught the world about leadership. *Leader to Leader, 2015(76)*, 60-66.

[26] Raelin, J. A. (2015). Rethinking leadership. MIT Sloan Management Review, 56(4). 95.

[27] Ramsden, J. (1995). Winston Churchill and the leadership of the Conservative party, 1940–51. *Contemporary British History, 9(1)*, 99-119.

[28] Read, J. H. (2010). Leadership and power in Nelson Mandela's long walk to freedom. *Journal of Power, 3(3)*, 317-339.

[29] Reza, M. H. (2019). Components of transformational leadership behavior. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 5(3)*, 119-124.

[30] Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. (2007). *Organizational Behavior.* New Jersey: Pearson/Prentice Hall.

[31] Sanaghan, P. (2016). Building leadership resilience in higher education. *Academic Impressions, January*.

[32] Schoemaker, P. J. (2014). Nelson Mandela as a strategic leader. *The European Business Review*, 48-52.

[33] Senge, P. H., & Kania, J. (2015). The dawn of system leadership. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, 13(1)*, 27-33.

[34] Sidle, C. (2007). The Five Intelligences of Leadership. Leader to Leader Institute.

[35] Stolyarova, G. (2008). Heroes: A Nation of Tough Guys. *Transitions Online, (09/30)*.

[36] van Zyl, E. S. (2012). Self-leadership: The way forward for African managers? *African Journal of Business Management, 6(1)*, 118.

[37] Verawati, & Hartono, B. (2020). Effective leadership: From the perspective of trait theory and behavior theory. *Jurnal REKOMEN (Riset Ekonomi Manajemen), 4(1)*.

[38] Yukl, G. A. (2007). *Leadership in Organizations.* New York City: Pearson Education.