Chapter -1

INTRODUCTION
LEADERSHIP

Leadership is the process of developing ideas and vision, living by values that support those ideas and vision, influences others to embrace them in their own behaviour and making hard decisions about profile and other resources (Tichy, 1997)

Leadership is a phenomenon which occurs in one or other form, in every society to man. The leader possesses an important entity in society. Leader is a person who has qualities to lead. In modern days, leader plays an important role in achieving goal whether it is at office, home, public or private establishments. A good leader has traits to achieve the set standards or more than that by showing effectiveness of leadership. An effective leader is a person who possesses special traits and qualities on the basis of these qualities he is in a position to control and lead the group.

Allport (1937, 1942) has stated the following qualities of a good leader:

1. Quality of ascendance
2. Physical Power
3. Zeal and Tactfulness
4. Support by the Society
5. High Mobilization
6. Personal Contacts
7. Action Oriented
8. Intelligent
9. Reinforcement of energy

According to Robbins (1996), leadership is an ability to influence a group for achieving the goals.

Etzioni (1961) identified the types of leadership, based on nature of systems operative. He described three types of systems as follow:

1. Coercive System
2. Utilitarian and normative type System and
3. Normative System
On the basis of authority, involvement and feelings of the subordinates, these three types of systems entertain different kind of leaders. The leaders in Coercive organization are of autocratic nature. Such type of leader behaves like a king or dictator. In this system, the involvement of a leader is of alimentative nature which leads to development of the feeling of resentment or dependence, loyalty and commitment on the part of subordinates. In the system of utilitarian, the leaders are termed as manager, executive or bureaucrat. In this system the feeling of subordinates are of caution, independence and uninvolvement etc. The normative organization's leaders are called true leader, entrepreneur or leader with morally involvement. In Utilitarian system, the hierarchical levels are followed in management and the different levels are dealt with the formal structure. In this system it is not necessary that all managers are leaders and all leaders are managers. According to Robbins, (1996), leadership is the ability to influence, which arises outside the structure of an organization. In this system, the leadership is of emerging nature within a group. A leader has to lead his subordinates as guide in the organization.

Schutz, (1958), in his theory of Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation described a conceptual integrative views of leader's role by which an effective leader integrates the needs of the group in a real sense. According to Schutz the leadership is the process involving a high degree of underlying variability.

**LEADERSHIP STYLE**

A leader possesses a number of traits on the basis of these traits a person has to lead a group. A leader’s leadership is determined by the style of leadership delegated. The style of leadership represents the behavior of a leader or approach of a leader. A leader influences his subordinates, in case it is considered in terms of influence. In leadership style, a leader has to have supervision on his subordinates. On the basis of leadership style, a leader attains the goal.
According to Lippitt & White (1939), there are three Leadership Styles as flows:-

1. Authoritarian Leadership Style
2. Democratic Leadership Style and
3. Laissez -faire Leadership Style

In the Authoritarian Leadership Style, a leader takes decisions alone and the subordinates follow his orders according to the directions of the leader. In democratic Leadership style, there is homely environment, in which a leader actively involves the subordinates in decision making. The leader shares his views with subordinates, share problems with them solicits their inputs and shares the authority for taking decisions. In laissez-faire leadership style, leader gives his opinion whenever feels so. In this style subordinates play important roles in decision making.

Out of the above three leadership styles, democratic leadership style is most effective on the basis of research (Lewin et. al. 1939). Employees under this leadership style were highly satisfied with higher moral and had good relationship with their leaders.

Ohio State studies (Stogdill & Coon, 1948) focused on the following two leadership style:-

1. Consideration Leadership Style and
2. Initiating Structure Leadership Style

In Consideration Leadership Style, there is recognition of individual needs and relationship while in Initiating Structure Leadership Style there is inclination towards goal orientation.

Katz, Mccoby &Morse, (1950) conducted a programme in the field of leadership in Michigan University. They out came with two leadership styles i.e. Production Oriented and Employee Oriented. In the beginning, these two leadership styles were considered as opposite ends of a single continuous structure but Weissenberg & Kavanaugh disproved this assumption described that these are separate two dimensions,
which are independent. According to this style the dimension does not measure the high or low status of a person. A leader may be high or low on either or both the dimensions.

Katz et al., 1950 & Kahn, (1952) Mann & Deut, (1954) carried out research studies for examining the relationship of employee oriented and production oriented leadership styles and its effectiveness.

The conclusions of this research were similar to the leadership styles of consideration and initiating structure. However, there is no specific evidence that either leadership style results in higher levels of productivity.

The leaders in Authoritative style are highly autocratic. They have little trust in their subordinates and motivate people through fear and punishment with occasional rewards. In Consultive Leadership Style, leaders have substantial but not full confidence in subordinates, use rewards for motivation with occasional punishment, engage in communication, and make decisions with consultation with the subordinates.

Participative Leaders have complete confidence for all matters in subordinates. They have creative participation of low level and give monetary rewards and involve the subordinates in goal setting and engage in much communication down and up and boost them in decision making.

Robert Blake & Mouton (1964) provided a 'Managerial Grid' which deals with the task and people oriented dichotomy. According to this grid there are 5 leadership styles as follows:-

1. **Impoverished Managers**: This type of managers have little concerned with either people or production and least involvement in their jobs. The managers act like a messenger just to communicate instructions from superiors to subordinates
2. **Team Managers:** In this style, managers display their actions at highest possible level and full dedication both to people and to production.

3. **Country Club Managers:** In this style, managers are least concerned for production but they are concerned only for people.

4. **Autocratic Task Managers:** They are concerned with the developing an efficient operation who have no concern for people and are autocratic in their style.

5. **Middle Road Managers:** They are of such nature those have medium concern for production and people both.

Robert House (1971), proposed the Path-goal theory of leadership style. He stated that those are effective leaders who care subordinates in obtaining both personal goal and enterprise’s goal. This type of leaders help subordinates in the achievement and reward goals such as promotion, money and development.

Apart from these leadership styles, Sinha (1974-76) introduced Authoritative style of leadership, which has been renamed as the Nurturing-Task-Master (NT) type of leadership. This leadership style is different from authoritarian style which self-centered and different from participative style, which is a subordinate oriented. The nurturant task leader motivates the people to work, even on personal level and maintain relations by supporting them.

Bass (1985) described the concept of transactional and transformational leadership to business organizations. Transactional leadership is of such nature in which there is transaction between leader and subordinates to perform by exchanging rewards for the appropriate levels of effort. But in transformational leadership, a leader puts maximum efforts to boost the level of subordinates’ awareness for outcomes in terms of their needs and encouraging them for their self-interests.

Prof. J.B.P. Sinha (1987), proposed the model of leadership style having six dimensions, i.e. Authoritarian (F) Style, Bureaucratic Style (B), Nurturant (N) Style, Task-oriented (T), Participative (P) Style and Nurturant Task (NT) Style. According to this model, authoritarian and bureaucratic leadership styles are of ineffective nature
excepting the task is simple and high routines. In participative leadership style, it is stated, the leader is only effective if the subordinates are willing to participate otherwise, the leaders escape by shifting his responsibility on the subordinates. In order of effectiveness, the nurturant leadership style is preferred but it must be contingent on task performance. According to this model, nurturant task style of leader is helpful to the subordinates to work sincerely. The subordinates gain expertise to work. There is cooperation and relationship in this leadership style. The subordinates slowly, are ready to participate in group decisions. For obtaining effectiveness, nurturant task leader must shift gradually to Participative Style. This model is dynamic reciprocal influence relationship between a leader and the people.

**Determinants of Leadership**

On the basis of detailed analysis of different leadership styles, the question arises that what are the determinants of Leadership. Whether it is based on genetic predisposition or on environment of a leader or work place, where he is working. On the basis of investigation, an equation in this regard is applied:

$$LS = f(P, E),$$

$$LS = \text{Leadership Style}$$

$$P = \text{Personality}$$

$$E = \text{Environment}$$

A leader from where, he gets experience and in which environment he lives, it is very significant. Hartman and Harris (1992) have described the importance of roles of parents in early life of a leader which shapes the style. According to Hanaluoma, Dickinson & Inada (1992) emphasized the factors like social, economic and financial in determining the styles in middle level manager in USA.
Situational Approach

Crockett (1955) and Kahn & Katz (1956), focused on the situation in which leadership is occurred. According to this approach, leadership is strongly affected by the situation, in which a leader works. Good leadership varies from group to group and from situation to situation. Dunkerly (1940) Stogdill (1974) also described the importance of factors based on situations. Trice and Beyer (1991) stated the concept of Cultural Leadership. According to this leadership, behaviour does not play important role but the organizational cultures are created by the leaders.

Functional Approach

Kurt Lewin (1951) developed an approach under the theory of Social Science. It emphasized on shifting from the study of leader as a person to the study of the group. This theory is based on the approach that leadership is defined as all those members act that aid in the development of the group and achieving the goal.

Theories of Leadership Style

Through the generations, many theories have been put forward to explain the specific qualities and behaviours that differentiate the leaders from the majority. The first set of theories sought to find universal traits that leaders had to some greater degree than nonreaders. The second tried to explain leadership in terms of the behaviour that a person engaged in. The third looked contingency models to explain the inadequacies of previous leadership theories in reconciling and bringing together the diversity of research findings. Most recently attention has to returned to traits, but from a different perspective. And, thus, the multitude of theories can be grouped under four main heading:

- Trait Theories.
- Behavioural Theories.
- Contingency Theories or Situational Theories.
- The Most Recent Approaches to Leadership.
Trait Theories/Approaches

One of the earliest approaches for studying leadership was the trait approach. This approach states that some persons assumed to be endowed with certain traits not possessed by other people. The early leadership researchers were not sure what traits would be essential for leadership effectiveness but they were confident that these traits could be identified by empirical research. Trait research was facilitated by the rapid development of psychological testing during the period from 1920 to 1950. The kinds of traits studied most frequently is the early leadership research included physical characteristics (e.g. highest appearance, energy level, personality, self-esteem, dominance, emotional, stability) and ability (e.g. general intelligence, verbal fluency, originality, social insight).

Over a hundred studies on leader traits were conducted in the period from 1904 to 1948. In the majority of the studies, the general approach was to compare leaders with non-leaders to see what difference existed with respect to physical characteristics, personality and ability. A smaller number of studies compared successful leaders with less successful leaders, or correlated measures of various traits with measures of leadership effectiveness. Success and leadership effectiveness were sometimes measured in terms of group performance and sometimes in terms of personal advancement (i.e. successful leaders get promoted to higher levels of management and earn a larger salary relative to persons of the same age). Studies in which leaders are rotated among similar work groups are occasionally regarded as part of the trait approach, but the studies conducted by Feldman (1937); Jackson (1953); Rosen (1969); Wryndham and Cooke (1964) tell us more about the effect of changing leaders than about the specific traits to effective leaders.

The researchers on traits have been reviewed by number of scholars like Gipp (1954); Jenking (1947); Mann (1959); Stogdill (1948 – 1974) etc. But prominent contribution in this regard has been made by Stogdill (1948). In his early review, Stogdill examined the results of 124 trait studies from 1904 to 1948. A number of traits
were found to differentiate repeatedly between leaders and non-leaders in several studies. The pattern of results was consistent with the conception of a leader as someone who acquires states through active participation and demonstration of his capacity to facilitate the efforts of the group in attaining its goals. Traits relevant to the assumption and performance of this role include intelligence, alertness to the needs of others, understanding of the task, initiative and persistence and dealing with problems, self-confidence and desire, to accept responsibility and occupy a position of dominance and control. For a few traits, such as Dominance and intelligence, these were some negative correlation which may indicate a curvilinear relationship.

Despite the evidence that leaders tend to differ from non-leaders with respect to certain traits, Stogdill found that the results varied considerably from situation to situation. In several studies that measured situational factors, there was evidence that the relative importance of each trait depends upon the situation. Thus, Stogdill concluded that a person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession of some combination of traits, but the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities and goals of the followers. In his 1974 book, Stogdill reviewed 163 trait studies conducted during the period from 1949 to 1970. In this more recent set of trait studies, a greater variety of measurement procedures were used, including projective tests (e.g. Thematic Apperception Test, The Miner Sentence Completion Scale), Situation tests (e.g. In Basket, Leaderless Group discussion) and forced choice tests (e.g. Ghiselli’s Self-Description Inventory, Gordon’s Survey of Interpersonal Values). More of the recent trait studies have dealt with managers and administrators as opposed to other kinds of leaders. One reason for this trend is that the 1948 literature review by Stogdill greatly discouraged many leadership researchers from studying leader traits, whereas industrial psychologists interested in improving managerial selection contained to conduct trait research. The emphasis on selection focused trait research was on the relation of leader traits to leader effectiveness rather than on the comparison of leaders and non-leaders i.e. predicting who will be selected as a leader is not the same as predicting who will be the most effective leader. And as a result, the interest in managerial effectiveness led researchers to extend the list of traits
under investigation to include specific administrative and technical skills and specific aspects of managerial motivation compatible with the requirements of an administrative role. The difference in methodology and perspective led to strong and more consistent results in the personal set of trait studies were again found to be related to leader effectiveness and some additional traits and skills were found to be relevant as shown in the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable to situations.</td>
<td>Clever (intelligent).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert to social environment.</td>
<td>Conceptually skilled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitions and achievement oriented</td>
<td>Creative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive.</td>
<td>Diplomatic and tactful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative.</td>
<td>Fluent in speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive.</td>
<td>Knowledgeable about group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependable.</td>
<td>Organized (Adm. ability).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant (desire to influence others</td>
<td>Persuasive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic (high activity)</td>
<td>Socially skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confident.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant of stress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to assume responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, Stogdill suggested that the above mentioned trait profile is characteristic of successful leaders-the leader is characterized by a strong drive for responsibility and task completion, vigor and persistence in pursuit of goals venturesome-ness and originality in problem solving, drive to exercise initiative in social situations, self-confidence and sense of personal identity, willingness to accept consequences of decision and action, readiness to absorb interpersonal stress, willingness to tolerate frustration and
delay, ability to influence other persons' behaviour and capacity to structure social interaction systems to the purpose at hand.

For early 30 years after 1950s however research concerning the trait approach went on the back-burner though, it provided direction to research on leadership style and behaviour. More recently the pessimism surrounding this approach has began to dispel somewhat. House and Baetz (1979) pointed out that much of the earlier work had involved children's groups. Work with adults in organization had yielded rather more positive and consistent results. They withheld the earlier conditions that different situations require different leadership traits and behaviours, but maintained that the very nature of leadership means that the traits of sociability, need for power and need for achievement must be important.

Empirical work conducted by Lord (1986) concluded a matter-analysis of work published prior to 1959. Meta-analysis is a method of pooling the results of a large number of separate research studies which allows us to estimate the impact of variables based on sample sizes of thousands, not the 50 or 70 of a typical individual study. This analysis revealed stronger evidence than previously imagined that six traits distinguish leaders from others. He concluded that leaders tend to be more intelligent, extrovert, dominant, masculine, conservatives and better adjusted than non-leaders.

To put the trait approach in a more positive light, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) distinguished leaders from non-leaders of accounts trait like drive, leadership motivation, honest and integrity, self-confidence, cognitive ability, knowledge of the business.

Further, they have also pointed out that while the traits may provide people with the potential for leadership, it is the capacity to create a vision and implement it that turns the potential into reality.
Strong leadership motivation may sound an obvious trait for a leader as only those who want the weighty responsibilities and grueling pressures of leadership are likely to strive for it. McClelland (1985) distinguishes between two types of power motivation i.e. on the one hand, leaders may be interested in personalized power which describes the motivation of leaders who seek power for its own sake, who wish to dominate others and are often concerned with the status and trapping of power. On the other hand, leaders who show socialized power motivation are more interested in cooperating with others to achieve desired goals. They work with others rather than attempting to dominate or control them. From the point of view of subordinates and the organization as a whole, the leader motivated by socialized power is obviously preferable.

On the question of cognitive ability leaders must be able to gather, integrate and interpret large amounts of information. Many researchers have pointed out that it is not necessary to be brilliant though leadership effectiveness is helped by above average intelligence and not genius. Of Kirkpatrick and Lock’s six characteristics, some would agree that drive and persistence are much important than intelligence.

Ray Kore the founder of McDonald’s Corporation is of the firm opinion that persistence wins every time and thus, he has posted this message on his wall that includes the following contents.

- Nothing in the world can take the place of persistence.
- Talent will not; nothing is more common than unsuccessful men with great talent.
- Genius will not; unrecorded genius is always a proverb.
- Education will not; the world is full of educated derelicts.
- Persistence, determination above are omnipotent.

Shackleton (1995), concluded in his book, ‘Business Leadership’ as; ‘the trait approach has undergone a revival. Recent research suggests that there are only a handful of traits which distinguish leaders from others and a clear distinction between effective
and ineffective leaders has not yet emerged. To confirm his viewpoint in a seminar of 20 people he has asked the participants to generate a list of descriptions of effective leaders who are known to them personally. Interesting was found that most of the identified objectives are not generalizable to the majority of the leaders. They merely describe the individual characteristics experienced by different members of the group.

**Behavioural theories**

A popular approach for studying leadership is examination of leader’s behaviour and methods used to conduct this research includes observation, activity sampling, self-report, dairy, interviews, questionnaires, and critical incidents. One important type of behavioural research is the observation of typical behaviour exhibited by managers and administrators. Managerial work typically involves a large variety of activities, most of which entail interaction with others people. Mintzberg (1973) proposed a ten category typology of managerial roles to describe the content of managerial activities. These ten roles were ground into three general categories; interpersonal behaviour (figurehead role, leader role, liaison role); information processing behaviour (monitor role, disseminator role, spokesman role); and the decision making behaviour (entrepreneur role, disturbance handler role, resource allocator role, negotiates role).

Studies on effective and ineffective leadership behaviour using the critical incidents methods yield highly divergent results, mainly due to the prevalence of situation-specific behaviours. However, when the behaviour incidents are grouped into broader categories of leadership behaviour, more consistency of findings is evident across studies. The most commonly found categories of critical leadership behaviour were planning and coordinating, supervising subordinates, carrying out position responsibilities and maintaining good relations with subordinates, peers and superiors. Some writers have analyzed leaders’ behaviour which distinguishes him from his peers. And, thus, various investigations have described behaviour characteristics as possible indicators of leadership.
In the early 1930's one of the most widely accepted theory on management was that of F.W. Taylor (1911). Taylor postulated that output can be increased by improvement techniques and methods used by the workers. He was interpreted as considering people to be machines or instrument to be manipulated by their leaders and thus, he has divorced management from human affairs and emotions. The result was that the people or workers had to adjust to the management and not the management to the people. To accomplish this plan, Taylor reorganized the jobs with efficiency in mind and satisfying the economic self-interest of the workers through various incentive work plans (like piece rates and such). The function of the leader under scientific management theory is to enforce performance criteria to meet organizational goals. The leader's focus was on the organizational needs and not on the need of the individuals. So, the bass for his scientific management was technical in nature. As according to him the best way to increase output was to improve the techniques or methods used by workers.

In the 1920's and early 1930's the trend started by Taylor was replaced at center stage by the Human Relation Movement, initiated by Elston Mayo (1945) and his associates. He argued that management in addition to the improvement in the technology, should also look into the human problems. They found that real centers of power within an organization were the inter personal relations that developed within the working group. The organization was to be developed around workers and had to take into account the human feelings and attitudes. The function of the leader under human relations theory was to facilitate cooperative goals attainment among followers while providing opportunities for their growth and development contrary to scientific management theory, the main focus was on the individual needs and concerned for relations and not on the needs of the organization.

McMurry (1958) believes that cold relations of the 'real world' of business and competition make systems of democratic leadership unworkable. According to him, the manager understands and is eager to hear employee's ideas and concerns but will take his own decisions. This often referred to as a paternalistic leader. He looks upon himself as
a parent figure praises his employees for work well done, and encourages them and even demands that they consult him for the solution of their problems. The leader tries to create a climate in which employees cannot take any action without his prior approval. He is the dispenser of knowledge and approval; and he takes pride in the control of all the actions and in the accomplishments of the subordinates. Every act of his subordinates is evaluated in terms of their agreement with the thinking and wishes of their boss. Loyalty on their part is highly valued by the leader. Initiative, change and independent action are not permitted to them because they are the prerogatives of the leader.

According to the continuum theory of leadership behaviour types of leadership attitudes can be chartered along a continuum. Continuum moving from authoritarian or boss-centered leadership behaviour at one end of democratic or subordinate centered leadership behaviour at the other. A rough approximation of various styles derived from the studies and theories can be incorporated in continuum shown in the Figure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boss-centered</th>
<th>Subordinate-Centered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory X</td>
<td>Theory Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production-centered</td>
<td>Employee-Centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating structure</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-directed</td>
<td>Human relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Participate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the Continuum Theory of Leadership Behaviour is discussed there under:

Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) have depicted a broad range of styles on a continuum moving from authoritarian leadership behaviour at one end and free rein behaviour the other end.

In their classic leadership continuum, the verbal descriptions and the relationship between authority and freedom found in the above figure give a rough representation of the characteristics of the various styles of leadership. This depiction can serve as background for a more detailed examination of the specific application of styles to the practice of human resources management. According to an article published in Wall Street Journal in 1986, One thing is certain: Leadership Style can make a difference. For example, a survey found that senior executives view their companies' leadership styles as pragmatic rather than conceptual and conservative rather than risk taking. These same executive felt that to meet their current and future challenges, the styles should be the other way around. As bennis (1989) has noted, 'Never before has American business faced so many challenges and never before have there been so many choices in how to face those challenges. We must look now at what it is going to take not just to regain global leadership but simply to stay a player in the game. The Tannenbaum and Schmidt's continuum of Leadership behaviour's sections examine the widely recognized leadership styles available to today's managers to meet the challenges. In 1973, Tennenbaum and Schmidt developed another pattern of choosing leadership behaviour. They feel that because of changes is social system, Organizational environment, the old continuum pattern is no longer valid. Organizations do not exist as vacuum, but are effected by chances that occur in the society. Thus, there would be more factors in situational variables affecting the leadership pattern and these forces lie outside the organization interacting continuously with the organizational environment. Thus, new continuum of leadership pattern is more complex as compared to previous one.

This shows that the total area of freedom shared by manager and non-manager is constantly redefined by interaction between and the forces in the environment. The
arrows indicate the continual flow of interdependence influence among system and people. The points on the continuum designate the types of manager and manager’s behaviour that become possible with any given amount of freedom available to each. As stated above this continuum is more complex and dynamic reflecting the organizational and social relations. Accordingly a successful leader is one who is keenly aware of those forces which are more relevant to his behaviour at any given time. He accurately understands himself, the individuals and the group he is dealing with and the organization and the broader social environment in which he operates.

However merely understanding these factors correctly is not enough but he can be successful only when he is able to behave appropriately in the light of these perceptions and understanding. Tannubbaum and Schmidt (1973) have observed that the successful manager of men can be primarily characterized neither as a strong leader nor as a permissive one. Rather he is one who maintains a high batting average in accurately assessing the forces that determine what his most appropriate behaviour at any given time should be and in actually being able to behave accordingly. being both insightful and flexible, he is less likely to see the problem of leadership as a dilemma.

The traditional view of direction and central of McGregor (1960) relates to task orientation. According to Theory X of McGregor, behind every managerial decision or action there are certain assumptions about human nature and human behaviour. A certain assumptions about human nature and human behaviour. A few of these are:

- the average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can;
- because of this human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort towards the achievement of organizational objectives; and
- the average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition and wants security above all.
Mc Gregor (1960) advocated the adoption of a new, more positive approach toward managing human resources based on the dramatic developments in the knowledge of human behaviour that have taken place since the 1930's. He called this approach, ‘Theory Y’. Theory Y is characterized by a set of fundamental assumptions about human nature which are radically different from the assumptions of theory X. In practice theory Y is manifested in a reliance on management by self-central and integration of human needs with organizational interests—an approach that seeks to ratify the higher order needs of people for esteem and self-actualisation. The central principle of theory y is the creation of conditions under which individuals can achieve their own goals by directing their efforts towards the success of the organization. According to Mc Greger (1960) some assumptions of theory Y are:

- expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is an natural as play or rest. The average human being does not inherently dislike work. Depending upon controllable conditions, work may be a source of satisfaction (and will be voluntarily performed) or a source of punishment (and will be avoided if possible);
- external control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is commuted;
- commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement. The most significant of such rewards e.g. the satisfaction of ego and self-actualization needs, can be direct products of effort directed toward organizational objectives;
- the average human being learns under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility. Avoidance of responsibility, lack of ambition and emphasis on security are generally consequences of experience, not inherent human characteristics;
the capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population; and

under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized.

The central principle of leadership which drives from Theory X is that of direction and control thought the exercise of authority what has been called the scalar principle. The central principles which derives from Theory Y is threat of integration, the creations of such conditions that the members of organization can active their own goals best by directing their efforts toward the success of enterprise.

These two principles have profoundly different implications with respect to the task of managing human resources but the scalar principle is so firmly built into managerial attitudes that the implications of the principle of integration are not easy to perceive. According to McGregor, the assumptions of a given manager, that may be inferred in his actions, are traced backward from how he must perceive people to cause him to act that way. If he is strongly authoritarian, he insists on giving orders and commands rather then suggestions and counseling one would predict a theory X perceptual structure. The manager who is less aloof; spends time teaching and training his subordinate; emphasizes obtaining results rather than following procedure, and delegates authority; shows signs of embracing theory Y assumptions. Thus, theory X approximates closely to 'authoritarian' and theory Y to 'participative leadership styles' of managing.

Professor Rensis Likert and his associates (1961) at the University of Michigan have studied the patterns and styles of leaders and managers for three decades. He emphasized organizational change programmes intended to help organizations move from theory X to theory Y. In the course of this search, Likert has developed certain ideas and approaches important to understanding leadership behaviour. He sees an effective manager as strongly oriented to subordinates, relying on communication to keep all parties working as a unit. All members of the group including the manager or leader
adopt a supportive attitude in which they share in one another’s common needs, values, aspirations, goals and expectations. Since it appeals to human motivations, Likert views this approach as the most effective way to lead a group. Likert has suggested four systems of management styles.

**Systems of Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Variable</th>
<th>System 1 - Explosive Autocratic</th>
<th>System 2 - Benevolent Autocratic</th>
<th>System 3 - Participative</th>
<th>System 4 - Democratic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence and trust in subordinates</td>
<td>Manager has no confidence or trust in subordinates</td>
<td>Manager has condescending confidence and trust, such as a master has in a servant</td>
<td>Manager has substantial but not complete confidence and trust, subordinates in all matters</td>
<td>Manager has complete confidence and trust in subordinates in all matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinates feeling of freedom</td>
<td>Subordinated not feel at free to discuss things about the job with their superior</td>
<td>Subordinates do not feel very free to discuss things about the job with their superior</td>
<td>Subordinates feel rather free to discuss things about the job with their superior</td>
<td>Subordinates feel completely free to discuss things about the job with their superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors seeking involvement with subordinates</td>
<td>Manager seldom gets ideas and opinion of subordinates in solving job problems</td>
<td>Manager sometimes get ideas and opinions of subordinates in solving job problems</td>
<td>Manager usually gets ideas and opinions and always tries to make constructive use of them</td>
<td>Manager always satisfy subordinates for opinion and always tries to make constructive use of them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To give empirical research lockup on which style is more effective, Likert and his colleagues asked thousands of managers to describe on an expended version of the format shown in the above table highest producing and lowest-producing departments with which they had experience. Quite consistently, the high-producing units were described according to system 3 and 4 and the low-producing units fell under system 1 and 2. These response were given irrespective of the manager’s field of experience or of whether the manager was in a line or staff position.

These four systems represent a continuum of leadership styles-System 1 is a task-oriented, highly structured authoritarian management style, while System 4 is a relationship-oriented management style based on teamwork, manual trust and confidence, Systems 2 and 3 are intermediate stages.

According to Immaturity-Maturity Theory propounded by Chris Argyris (1961) bureaucratic values lead to poor, shallow and mistrustful relationship and result in decreased interpersonal competence which leads to a decrease in organizational success in problem solving. On the other hand, humanistic values in an organization will develop trusting and authentic relationship resulting in increase in interpersonal competence, intergroups cooperation, flexibility and consequently organizational effectiveness. Argyris postulates a continuum of immaturity-maturity. A healthy personality develops along the continuum from ‘immaturity’ to ‘maturity’. On the immaturity end as a formal organization the individual is passive dependent, behaves in a few ways, has erratic shallow interests, has short time perspective, has subordinate position and lacks awareness of self. On the maturity end he is active, independent, capable of behaving in many ways, has deeper and stronger interests, has long time perspective has equal or super ordinate position and has awareness and control over leaf.

Leadership studies undertaken at the University of Michigan’s Survey Research Center at about the same time as those being done at Ohio State, had similar research
objective; to locate behavioural characteristics of leaders that appeared to be related to measures of performance effectiveness. In the original study at the Prudential Insurance Company twelve high-low producing pairs were selected for examination. Each pair represented a high-producing section, and a low-proceeding, with other variables, such as type of work, conditions and methods, being the same in each pair. Non-directive interviews were conducted with the 24 section supervisors and 419 clerical workers. Results showed that supervisors of high-producing sections were significantly more likely to be general rather than close in their supervisory styles and the employee-centered and low-reducing section supervisors have essentially opposite characteristics and technique, they were found to be production-centered supervisors. Another important, but sometimes overlooked, finding was that employee satisfaction was not directly related to productivity. Through these studies, the Michigan group came up with two dimensions of leadership behaviour that they labeled 'Employee-Oriented' and 'Production-oriented' leaders who were described as emphasizing interpersonal relations; they took a personal interest in the needs of their subordinates and accepted individual differences among members. The production-oriented leaders, in contrast, tended to emphasize the technical or task aspects of the job their main concern was in accomplishing their group’s tasks, and the group members were a means to that end. The Michigan researchers strongly favoured the leaders who were employee-oriented in their behaviour. Employee-oriented leaders were associated with higher group productivity and higher job satisfaction. Production-oriented leaders tended to be associated with low group productivity and lower job satisfaction. Besides, there are certain leaders who are task-oriented as well as employee-oriented, whereas some others are not concerned about either and they do not have any dominant style of leadership manifest in their behaviour.

Cartwright and Zander (1960) based on those findings of numerous studies at the Research Centre for Group Dynamics claim that group objectives fall in either of two categories; (1) the achievement of some specific group goal or, (2) the maintenance or strengthening of the group itself. This coincides with the two tasks and relationship concepts. A significant difference of their findings from those of others discussed
previously is that task and relationship are not either for leadership styles. These two dimensions can be plotted on two separate axes rather than a single-continuum.

In 1945, The Bureau of Business Research at Ohio State University initiated a series of studies on leadership. An interdisciplinary team of researchers from psychology, sociology and economics developed and sued the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) to analyze leadership in numerous types of group and situations. Studies were made of Air Force Commanders and members of bomber crews, officers, non-commissioned personnel and civilian administrators in the Navy Department; manufacturing supervisors; executives of regional cooperatives; college administrators; teachers, principals and school superintendents; and leaders of various students and civilian groups (Fred, 1995).

The Ohio State studies started with the premise that no satisfactory definition of leadership existed. They also recognized that various work had too often assumed that leadership was synonymous with good leadership. The Ohio State group was determined to study leadership regardless of definition or of whether it was effective or ineffective.

The first phase of the research was the development of questionnaires to measure leader behaviour. The researchers compiled a list of about 1,800 examples of leadership behaviour and this list was then reduced to 150 items that staff members could agree, were good examples of leader function considered important in the managerial literature (e.g. organization, communication, representation, evaluation, integration, initiation, recognition etc.). These items were used to develop a preliminary leadership questionnaire and the questionnaires were highly inter-correlated and to identify meaningful clusters of related items. The analyses indicated that subordinates perceived their leader’s behaviour primarily in terms of two distinct categories of leadership behaviour (Fleishman, 1953, 1957; Halpin and Winer, 1957; Hemphill and Coons, 1957). The two leadership behaviour categories were subsequently labeled ‘consideration’ and ‘initiating structure’. Consideration included behaviour items concerned with leader
supportiveness, friendliness, consideration, consultation with subordinates, representation of subordinate interests, and openness of communication with subordinates and recognition of subordinate contributions. These 'relationship oriented' behaviour are all instrumental for establishing and maintaining good relationships in subordinates.

'Initiating Structure' included behaviour items concerned with directing subordinates, clarifying subordinate roles, planning, coordinating, problem solving, criticizing poor work and pressurizing subordinates to perform better. These 'task-oriented' behaviours are instrumental for efficient utilization of personnel and resources in the attainment of group goals. Based on the results of initial studies, two revised and shortened questionnaire were constructed to measure. Consideration and Initiating structure. The Questionnaires were called the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (abbreviated LBDQ) and Supervisory Behaviour Description (SBD or SBDQ). Another questionnaire, called the Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ), was developed to measure a leader's attitudes about the desirability of two behaviour categories.

A fourth leadership questionnaire was eventually developed by some of The Ohio State University researchers who extended the LBDQ to include ten additional scales besides Consideration and Initiating Structure. The extended version was called the LBDQ-XII (Stogdill, Goodie and Day, 1960).

Recent Theories of Leadership

Attribution theory depends upon the perception of the leader, making judgments about the subordinates and also proposed to develop explanations of the ways in which we judge people differently depending on what meaning we attribute to a given behaviour (Kelly, 1972). Basically the theory suggests that when we observe and individual behaviour, we attempt to determine whether it was 'internally' or 'externally' caused. ('Internally' caused behaviour are those that are believed to be under the
personal control of the individual. 'Externally' caused behaviour is seen as resulting from outside causes; that is, the person is seen as forced into the behaviour by situation). That determination, however, depends largely on three factors: distinctiveness, consensus, and consistency. Distinctiveness refers to weather an individual displays different behaviours in different situations. If everyone who is faced with a similar situation responds in the same way, we can say, the behaviour shows 'consensus'. From an attribution perceptive if consensus is high you would be expected to give an external attribution to the employee's tardiness, whereas if other employees who took the same route made it into work on time, your conclusion as to causation would be internal. An observer looks for consistency in a person's actions. The more consistent the behaviour, the more the observer is inclined to attribute it to internal causes.

Attribution theory explains that if one employee (A) generally performs at about the same level on other related tasks as he does on his current task (low distinctiveness), if other employee's frequently perform differently – better or worse – than he (A) does on the current task (Low consensus), and if one (A)'s performance on this current task is consistent over time (high consistency), his manager or leader or anyone else who is judging one's (A) work is likely to told his primarily responsible for her task performance (internal attribution).

One of the more interesting findings from the attribution theory is that there are errors or biases that distort judgments. The fundamental attributions error which is based on the tendency to underestimate the influence of external factors and overestimate the influence of internal factors when making judgments about the behaviour of others. Whereas, self-serving bias describes the tendency after individuals to attribute their own successes to internal factor while putting the blame for failures on external factors.

In the context of leadership, attribution theory says that is merely an attribution that people make about other individuals leadership. Using the attribution framework, researchers have found that people characterize leaders as having such traits as
intelligence, outgoing personality, strong verbal skills, aggressiveness and understanding Lord et al. (1986). Similarly the high-high leader (high on both initiating structure and consideration) has been found to be consistent with attributions of what makes a good leader (Powell and Butterfield, 1984) that is regardless of the situation, a high-high, leadership style tends to be perceived as best. At the organizational level, the attribution framework accounts for the conditions under which people use leadership to explain organizational outcomes. Those conditions are extremes in organizational performance. When an organization has either extremely negative or extremely positive performance, people are prone to make leadership attributions to explain the performance (Meindl, 1985).

Therefore, one of the more interesting themes in the attribution theory of leadership literature is the perception that effective leaders are generally considered consistent or unwavering in their decisions.

Charismatic Leadership Theory

The term ‘charisma’ whose initial meaning was ‘gift’ is usually reserved for leaders who by their influence are able to cause followers to accomplish outstanding feats. The famous German sociologist, Max Weber (1947), described the charismatic leader as one who reveals a transcendent mission or cause of action that may not be in itself appealing to the potential followers, but which is acted on because the followers believe their leader is extraordinary gifted. He or she is described as ‘supernatural, superhuman or exceptional’.

Shils (1965) points out that Weber conceived of charismatic leadership as one of the process through which reutilized social process, norms and legal rules are changed. Weber distinguished innovators and creators from maintainers and attributed the ‘gift’ of charisma in part of the creative or innovative quality of the leader’s goals. Several writers contend that charismatic leadership can do exist in formal complex organizations
(Dow, 1969; Oberg, 1972; Runciman, 1963; Skils (1965). Yet despite the profound effects that charismatic leaders are presumed to have on followers’ commitment, motivation and performance, discussions of charisma have been speculative in nature and almost exclusively theoretical.

House (1977) proposed a most comprehensive theory of charismatic leadership. His theory is based on theoretical propositions and research findings from a variety of social science disciplines. The theory helps to reduce some of the mystery surrounding charismatic leadership by identifying how such leaders differ from other people, how they behave, and the conditions under which charismatic leadership is most likely to occur. He explains that the extent to which a leader is charismatic is assessed with several indicators like: followers’ trust in the correctness of the leader’s beliefs; similarity of followers’ beliefs to the leader’s beliefs by followers that they are able to contribute to the success of the group’s mission.

House’s theory also consists of several propositions identifying essential leader traits, behaviours and situational conditions. The propositions identified by him are:

- Charismatic leaders are likely to have high self-confidence, a strong conviction in their own beliefs and ideas, and a strong need to influence people;
- Charismatic leaders are likely to engage in behaviour designed to create the impression among followers that the leader is competent and successful;
- Charismatic leaders are likely to articulate ideological goals for subordinates. These leaders relate tow work and mission of the group to deeply rooted values, ideals and aspirations shared among followers;
- Charismatic leaders rely heavily on appeals to the hopes and ideas of followers a necessary condition for occurrence of charismatic influence is the possibility of defining follower roles in ideological terms that will appeal to them;
- Charismatic leaders are likely to use role modeling wherein they set an example in their own behaviour for followers to imitate. This process involves changes in
the perception, attitudes, values, and emotional responses of the leader's behaviour;

- Charismatic leaders are likely to communicate high exceptions about follower performance, while simultaneously expressing confidence in followers. Leaders with strong referent power can induce subordinates to set higher performance goals and gain their commitment of these goals;
- Charismatic leaders are more likely to behave in ways that arouse motives relevant to the accomplishment of the group's mission.

The major contribution of the theory is to explain charismatic leadership in terms of a set of testable propositions and propositions involve straightforward behaviour processes rather than the typical folklore and mystique surrounding charismatic leadership. The theory includes leader traits, influence, behaviour and situational factors, giving it a comprehensive scope rarely formed in the leadership literature.

Several authors have attempted to identify personal characteristics of charismatic leader. Warren Bennis (1984) after studying ninety of the most effective and successful leaders in the United States, found that they had four common competencies:

- they had a compelling vision or sense of purpose;
- they could communicate that vision in clear terms that their followers could readily identify with;
- they demonstrated consistency and focus in the pursuit of their vision; and
- they knew their own strengths and capitalized on them.

The most recent and comprehensive analysis, however, has been completed by Conger and Kanungo (1988) at McGill University. Among their conclusions they propose that charismatic leaders have an idealized goal that they want to achieve, a strong personal commitment to their goal, are perceived as unconventional, are assertive and self-confidence and are perceived as agents of radical change rather than managers of the status quo.
Likewise, Conger and Kanungo, (1988), summarizes in above seven as the key characteristics that appear to differentiate charismatic leaders from non-charismatic ones i.e. self-confidence; a vision; ability to articulate the vision; strong conviction about the vision; behaviour that is out of the ordinary; perceived as being a chance agent; environment sensitivity.

The theory hypothesized that leaders who have charismatic effects are differentiated from others by some combination of four personal characteristics i.e. dominance, self-confidence, need for influence, and a strong conviction in the moral righteousness of his or her beliefs. Charismatic leaders are hypothesized to employ these characteristics with the following specific behaviours like goal articulation, role modeling, personal image-building, demonstration of confidence and high expectations for followers, and motive arousal behaviours. Goal articulation and personal image-building are hypothesized to result in favourably perceptions of the leader by followers. These favourable perceptions are asserted to enhance followers’ trust, loyalty, and obedience to the leader and also to moderate the relationships between the remaining leader behaviours and the follower responses to the leader. The follower responses are hypothesized to result in effective performance if the aroused behaviour is appropriate for their task demands.

Leadership Measurement

The theory and most of research on leadership indicates that a good leader makes a system that considers the expectations of subordinates, interpersonal relations, situations and rewards facts.

There are various techniques, which quantify the ‘leadership’ variables. Some of the techniques are Interview, Rating Scale, Questionnaire, Observation, Self-assessment, Perception of subordinates and Psychological tests. Different theorists in order to identify the leadership style used different methods, delegated by a manager/supervisor.
Katz, McCoby & Morse (1950) used the observation along with the performance appraisal method. In observation, a leader conducted meeting schedules and evaluated his job performance for accomplishment of goals and level of satisfaction of subordinates with the leader by interview method.

Blake & Mouton (1964) developed a questionnaire, on Self Assessment of Key Managerial Orientations'. It consists six elements i.e. Convictions, Decision, Conflict, Emotions, Effort and Humour. Each carries five statements based on task oriented and people oriented. Fiedler (1967) introduced a scale known ‘Least Preferred Co-workers’. It consists twenty items in questionnaire to assess the level of esteem in which the leader plays his least role to prefer co-workers. In this scale, a leader is asked to explain about the person with whom he has worked least well in accomplishing his task. In case the LPC score is low, it means the leader is not willing to work with co-workers.

Robert House (1971) described the ‘structured role situation’ for assessing the leadership style. According to this style, a situation was given to a leader and he had to guide their subordinates to clear the paths, providing support, analyzing the situation and employees need.

Sinha (1974) developed a questionnaire on leadership style. It contains thirteen items and each has three statements explaining Authoritarian (F), Nurturant Task (NT) and Participative Styles (P). Leaders/Managers are asked to put all the three statements of each triplet in terms of truth. The individual scores are taken to sum up all the top ranks for each style of leadership.

JBP Sinha (1987) developed two versions of leadership style scale (LSS) and Leadership Behaviour Scale (LBS). According to Leadership Style Scale, a leader is asked to rate himself on the items but in the Leadership Behaviour Scale, subordinates are asked to rate their leaders/managers.
In this research study, Leadership Style Scale and Leadership Behaviour Scale of Sinha are used to measure the leadership style's variable.

A manager/leader performs different operations which have great effect on the performance e.g. output, organizational climate, well being of the employees, organizational health. Leader’s own traits play important role in determining the performance of an organization. A manager’s high human relations influence the performance. Leader’s interpersonal approach also determines the performance of an organization. Generally performance indicates the productivity of an organization. In making the climate of an organization, leadership style plays an important role which measures the performance of workers. A number of studies have revealed that effective relationship of Nurturant Task leadership style with high job satisfaction, less employee turnover motivation (Ansari, 1982, Ishi, 1978, Sinha, 1981). It has been found that Participative Leadership Style decreased the salience of stress of an organization in the employees improved the productivity (Sinha 1984).

The Leadership Styles are situational and affect the performance of the employees and the organization as a whole directly and indirectly. In some cases the performance of the organization as a whole is influenced by the factors in subordinates, factors in work place and managers. The prevalence of a particular Leadership Style bears an important relationship with the psychological (humanistic) performance of an organization constituting different end variables such as job satisfaction, well being, absenteeism lateness etc.

**JOB SATISFACTION**

Do you like your job? – When this question is asked from an employee, the answer depends on various factors. “No” indicates non-gratification to his job, whereas “Yes” indicates satisfaction with the job. Therefore, job satisfaction is an important aspect for employees as well as for the organization in which they are working.
According to Davis (1977) job satisfaction is the favorableness or unfavorableness with which employees view their work. Satisfaction out of job for an employee is quite dependent on the intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics of their job and their individual qualities.

Although job satisfaction refers to happiness of a person towards his job, it is a difficult task to calculate the level of happiness required for a particular job. Job satisfaction is an effective or emotional response towards various facets of one's job (Kreitner and Kreitner, 1998). It clearly denotes that job satisfaction is not a unitary concept, rather a person can be relatively satisfied with one aspect of his or her job and dissatisfied with one or more other aspects. Job satisfaction constitutes five major components: work, pay, promotions, co-workers and supervision (McNally, 1989). Job satisfaction has been found to be positively related to motivation (Kiniclei Schriesheim and Carson, 1997), moderately related to job involvement (Brown, 1996) and strongly positively related to organizational commitment (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). Iaffaldouo and Muchinsky, McKee (1985) have reported that satisfaction leads to higher job performance. On the other hand, a moderate negative relationship has been found between job satisfaction and absenteeism (Hackett, 1989) and Employee Turnover (Tett and Meyer, 1993).

Theories of Job Satisfaction

There are different theories of Job satisfaction which exist concerning the dynamics about job satisfaction and general effects of job satisfaction on the behaviour of employees.

Maslow’s Theory of Job Satisfaction

The Job Satisfaction theory of Maslow revealed that jobs which can satisfy more of the need of this theory would result in greater satisfaction on the part of the employee.
Vroom's Theory of Job Satisfaction

According to this theory, job satisfaction reflects valence of the job for its incumbent. It indicates that the strength of the force of an employee to remain on his job is an increasing function of the valence of his/her job. This theory supported the view that satisfaction should be negatively related to turnover and absenteeism, which it seems to be.

Stogdill's Theory of Job Satisfaction

The level of frustration negatively affects the job satisfaction of an employee. According to the Stogdill theory of job satisfaction, there is lack of relationship between degree of job satisfaction and quality or quantity of job performance. This theory indicates that trying to view the satisfaction should be stopped as a 'causer' of job performance which is an input variable. According to this theory, an individual should be considered in terms of the context of the total organization. The conclusion of this theory is that the output of organizations is group integration, production and morale. Satisfaction of employee expectations results in group integration and cohesiveness but is not necessarily related to production. Morale and production are related to satisfaction when the conditions which lead to high morale and production are also those which lead to the reinforcement of employee' expectations. Other researchers also suggested this general notion of job satisfaction being an output or dependent variable.

Deborah and Michalle (1993) reported that the predictors of job satisfaction results show that role ambiguity and role conflict, as negative predictors of job satisfaction and well-being but work overload did not emerge as significant predictor. According to Mayer et.al (1993), Hackette et al. (1994) Ahmed and Ansari (1998), Job Satisfaction and organizational commitment-A co relational study, they found that job satisfaction linked more strongly with effective commitment than other loci of commitment. Widrich et. al. (1995), Impact of work stress and marital interaction on job satisfaction found out a relationship between work stress and marital interaction determined whether 3 role stressors (role ambiguity, role conflict and role overload) has
a negative impact on job satisfaction. According to Clayton and Johnny (1998), the relationship between job satisfaction and family life, the employee attribute found to pay a statistically significant role in predicting overall effect of job on home life was number of hours worked per week.

Ling and Cooper (1998) the relationship between occupational stress, job satisfaction and quitting intention in Hong Kong firms. The results of this research showed that organizational commitment had strong direct effect (externals were dissatisfied with the job itself and thought of quitting the job quite often, employees who had a high commitment had a higher job satisfaction) and moderating effects (the stressor-strain relationship) were significant in externals and commitment buffered most of the stressor strain relationship.

According to Richardson (1999), job pressures (hours, worked, level of management, work-family conflict) and health indicators (life satisfaction, psychosomatic complaints, emotional exhaustion), the results indicated that women who experienced high roles conflict and work-family pressures reported poor health outcomes and little life satisfaction.

Shaffer (2000), Gender discrimination and job related outcomes. The results indicated that gender discrimination was negatively associated with job satisfaction and effective commitment and positively associated with turnover intentions and life stress. According to Fatmi, Batcheyar, and Mishra (2001), a study of job satisfaction and locus of control among constituent college and minority college teachers, the analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and locus of control. Moreover, constituent college teachers were significantly more internally oriented that their counter parts from minority colleges. Paterna (2002) reported the Relationship among some variables (centrality of the employment, job satisfaction and condition and its compatibility with the family role. The results showed that the women do not perceive high levels of overload of roles, neither excessive difficulty when coordinating work and
family. However, for women that perceive overloaded it is difficult to co-ordinate both domains, although they show a high job satisfaction. Kohan and Conner (2002), as study of job satisfaction, job stress in relation to positive and negative effect. Job satisfaction was primarily associated with positive effect, life satisfaction and self-esteem, job stress was primarily associated with negative effect.

According to Hira and Loibi (2005), the impact of employer-provided financial education on job satisfaction. This research indicated that the author found that employees who participated in work place, financial education more fully understand personal finances and recognize how financial literacy impacts their future financial expectations are more satisfied with their company and job. Gregory (2005), the relationship between job satisfaction and selected demographic variable reported that there was no significant relationships or differences (p= 0.05) between job satisfaction and demographic variables.

WELL BEING

Today the life of human being is very busy and hectic. Due to this busy and hectic schedule, no body can take proper care of his or her health or personal hygiene. Health is therefore, best understood on indispensable basis for defining a person’s sense of well-being. Well-being has been defined as a dynamic state of mind characterized by a reasonable amount of harmony between an individual’s abilities, need and expectation, environmental demands and opportunities. It is viewed as harmonious satisfaction of one’s desires and goals.

World Health Organization (WHO) defined health that “Health is a state of complete physical, mental and social Well-being and not merely the absence of disease or disease of infirmity”.
Campbell (1976) and Diener (1984) have suggested that there are several cardinal characteristics of the concept ‘Well-being’. Firstly, it is subjective and secondly it includes the positive measures. It is not just the absence of negative factors, as is true of most measures of mental health.

It is highly significant to note that, for more than 25 years, the study of Well-being is guided by two primary concepions of positive functioning. One, the formulation, traceable to Bradburn’s (1969) seminal work, distinguishes between positive and negative affect and defined happiness as the balance between the two.

Second, the conception, which has gained prominence, emphasizes life satisfaction as the key indicator of Well-being. Colvin, Diener, Pavot and Sandvike (1991) defined life satisfaction as global evaluation by the person of his or her life viewed as a cognitive component and was seen to complement happiness— the more effective dimension of positive functioning. Well-being is a broad category of phenomena that includes people’s emotional responses, domain satisfaction and life satisfaction (Table I). It is structured in such a way that these components form a global factor of inter-related variables.

Each of the three major facets of Well-being can in turn be broken into subdivisions; each of the sub-divided even further Well-being can be assessed at the most global level or at progressively narrower levels depending on one’s purposes, e.g., one might study life satisfaction, whereas another might study marital satisfaction.
Table I: Showing the Components of Well-being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pleasant Affect</th>
<th>Unpleasant Affect</th>
<th>Life Satisfaction</th>
<th>Domain Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joy</td>
<td>Gift &amp; Shame</td>
<td>Desire to change life</td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elation</td>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>Satisfaction with current life</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contentment price</td>
<td>Anxiety and Worry, anger</td>
<td>Satisfaction with past</td>
<td>Leisure Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affection</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>Satisfaction with Future</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>Significant other’s views of one’s life</td>
<td>Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecstasy</td>
<td>Envy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>One’s group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Diener, Suh, Lucas and Smith (1999)

So, Well-being is clearly a multidimensional construct and the commonly proposed tri-partite structure of Well-being, life satisfaction, positive affect and negative effect can be sustained. It is affected by work environment and is likely to do so in complex ways.

Emmons and Kings (1998) have mentioned that health and Well-being are conceptually related. There are three conceptual terms related to Well-being viz. General Well-being, Psychological Well-being and Subjective Well-being.

The General Well-being as a construct refers to the harmonious functioning of the physical as well as the psychological aspect of the personality giving satisfaction to the self and the society (Verma, Dubey and Gupta (1988). The person reporting low Well being means that he/she is not having complete and harmonious functioning of the whole personality in relation to physical and mental health.
Diener and Diener (1996) and Lykeen and Tellegen (1996) defined General Well-being as the subjective feelings of contentment, happiness, satisfaction with life experiences and of one's role in the world of work, sense of achievement, utility, belongingness and no distress, dissatisfaction or worry etc. Balance between work and family has a great impact on individual's Well-being in the form of satisfaction with job, life and ultimately happiness. Coser and Rokoff (1997) reported that both work and family provide separate source of stress which could negatively affect the Well-being. Furthermore, they can generate role conflict through their interaction, which could also increase psychological distress. Specifically, particular job and family situations can affect individual's sense of personal control which, when compromised, is associated with lower Well-being.

Psychological Well-being is a malleable concept which is concerned with an individual's feelings about his daily life experiences. These feelings extend from negative state such as stress, worry or unhappiness to more positive states which are not simply states of absence of worry or unhappiness but are states which are related to sound mental health and include favorable self-esteem and success. Warr (1978), Jahoda (1958) have also stated that such feelings may range from negative mental states or psychological strains such as anxiety, depression, frustration, emotional exhaustion, unhappiness, dissatisfaction to state which has been identified as positive mental health. The concept of psychological Well-being and mental health focuses on an ideal state emphasizing "Positive Well-being" of the World Health Organization (WHO) criteria rather than on disease, statistical or conformity criteria. Negative component or psychological Well-being is relatively easily assessed through self-reports or anxiety, depression, frustration etc. but it is difficult to assess positive components of Well-being.

This construct has been operationalized by indicators of happiness, moral and life satisfaction (Okun, Melichar & Hell, 1990). Baudura (1986) in his social cognitive theory stated that the Well-being is determined by people's belief in their efficacy or capability to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources and courses of action required to control over the events.
A person’s evaluation of his/her life may be in the form of cognition (e.g. when a person gives conscious evaluative judgments about his or her satisfaction with life as a whole or evaluates judgments about specific aspects of his or her life such as recreation). However, an evaluation of one’s life also may be in the form of effect (people experiencing unpleasant or pleasant moods and emotions in reaction to their lives). Thus a person is said to have high SWB if she or he experiences life satisfaction and frequent joy and only infrequently experiences unpleasant emotions such as sadness and anger. Contrariwise a person is said to have low SWB if he or she is dissatisfied with life, experiences little joy and affection and frequently feels negative emotions such as anger or anxiety. The cognitive and effective components of SWB are highly interrelated.

Quality of life is a composite measure of physical, mental and social Well-being, happiness and satisfaction of an individual and as such is a multifaceted concept dealing with a range of factors such as health, marriage, family, work, financing, situation, education opportunities, self-esteem, creativity, sense of belonging and trust very often terms life subjective Well-being, happiness, life satisfaction and quality of life are used interchangeably.

Cutter (1985) stated that quality of life is broadly defined as an individual’s happiness or satisfaction with life including needs and desires, aspiration, life styles preference and other tangible and intangible factors that determine over all Well-being.

**JOB WITHDRAWAL**

Conceptually the term Job withdrawal means, how much an employee withdraws from the situations which are not in congruence to his aptitude or temperament. In such cases a person, either ignores or switch over to another situation for his better survival. Operationally this resentment has been studied in relation to absenteeism (attendance or leave behaviour) and lateness. Though this construct constituted the employees’ turnover as an important component but in the case of our sample, it was not possible to measure because of a semi. govt. sector.
**Absenteeism**

Absenteeism is widespread and costly for organizations on any given work day. In the United States, 16 to 20% of employees do not show up for work. This term accounts for more time lost from work than do strikes and lockouts and its costs businesses up to $30 billion a year. The industries have been plagued since the invention of machines. In 1840s, the rate of absenteeism was about 20% in the textile mills of Wales. Absenteeism often reached 35% during 2-week periods following each monthly pay day. In England, workers typically took off Mondays—"Saint Monday" they called. During 19th century to recover from weekend drinking bouts. A relatively small percentage of employees accounts for a disproportionate share of absences. A survey of 1292 employees of a public utility company found that 25% of them accounted for all the available absences (Dalton & Mesch, 1991). The primary excuse for missing work is illness. However, interviews with 40 state government employees revealed that only 5% of their reported illness was legitimate (Latham & Frayna, 1990). It is noticed that where an organization is more liberal in case of sick leave policy, the absenteeism rate is high. In the organization, this rate is high if the organization does not require proof of illness. The higher pay package also increases the absenteeism of an employee than of a low-paid organization because when an employee earns more he wants to take time off. Employees working in routine jobs have a higher rate of absenteeism than workers in more interesting, challenging jobs. Societal values also affect the rate of absenteeism.

Management is also responsible for the rate of absenteeism, in case it is lenient and unconcerned about absence. In such circumstances, employees take undue advantage of the situation. A study of 800 clothing factory workers and their 41 supervisors revealed a significant negative relationship between supervisory standard of acceptable absenteeism and actual absenteeism rate. Supervisors who supported high standards had lower absenteeism rates than supervisors who had lower absenteeism rates than supervisor who had low standards (Markham & McKee, 1995).

Avoidable and unavoidable absences are inversely related to age. Meta analyses of studies of employees' attendance show that younger workers have a higher rate of absenteeism than older workers (Hackett, 1990, Martocchio, 1989).
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Steers and Rhodes Model of Absenteeism
Stress and Rhodes (1978) studied the model of work attendance and found that supervisory consideration accounted for a large part of total association between prior absenteeism and job satisfaction, supervisory style affected job satisfaction, it was not significantly associated with subsequent absenteeism and as family size increased, and satisfaction was less related to the absence frequency. Hrebiniak & Roteman 1973;

Waters & Roach 1971 have studied work absenteeism and attendance over the last three decades. The model of Steers and Rhodes, 1978 redirected absence research toward multivariate strategies by organizing prior studies into a process model. This model suggested four important hypotheses about attendance.

(i) The relationship between attendance motivation and actual attendance is constrained by one's ability to attend work.

(ii) Attendance motivation is an additive function of pressures to attend and job satisfaction.

(iii) Aspects of the job situation (e.g. supervisory behaviours) affect attendance entirely through their influences on job satisfaction and

(iv) Prior absence affects subsequent attendance indirectly by altering both the job situation and pressures to attend in a cyclical fashion. In this way poor attendance can adversely affect interactions with supervisors and opportunities for advancement. These factors increase pressures to attend and decrease job satisfaction, which in turn affect subsequent absenteeism.

Keller (1983) found that employees who were absent less frequently tended to be older, more tenured, married and higher in the organizational structure. It was also supported that employee who had higher levels of self-esteem, accepted responsibility for taking care of their own health and were members of cohesive work groups were also less absent. Invancevich (1985) in his study of electronics technicians who changed jobs found that the number of past absences was predictive of future absence.
Flanagan, Strauss & Ulman, 1974; Garrison & Muchinskey, 1977; Johns, 1978, in their studies reported that female employees are more absent than males. The reason of absence in female was attributed to the necessities of child care. In case of sickness of children, generally mother stays at home for care. Blan (1985), found a positive relationship between the number of dependents and the number excused, absences. Markham, Danserean & Alutto (1982), studied the absence rate in women employees and found that women absence rates were higher than those men during the winter and was similar throughout the other seasons. The reason was that children become ill during winter season. Blan, 1985 studied the tardiness and found that individuals who had friends at work or were not the primary source of the family income were found more tardy. It revealed the fact that friends on the job place covers for a late employee and a spouse covers temporarily if a job is lost.

**Absenteeism and Tardiness**

Jackson, 1983 studied the absenteeism and described it as both a precursor of turnover. According to Fitzgibbons & Moch, 1980, reported absenteeism as an alternative to turnover. Steers and Rhodes, 1978 formulated a popular model of absenteeism. According to this model actual attendance is the combination of attendance; attendance motivation and the ability attend. Attendance motivation is the product of job satisfaction plus pressures to attend such as economic condition, incentives and personal standard. Ability to attend relates to factors such as health and transportation. Steers and Rhodes model, Brooke (1986) suggested that three other areas that will affect attendance include level of job involvement, perception of fairness about the pay system and workers involvement with alcohol.

In the research studies absenteeism is considered to be a reaction to aversive work conditions. According to Youngblood, 1984 reported that workers liked their jobs but on certain conditions found non-work activities more appealing.
**Turnover**

Turnover means quitting the job voluntarily by an employee. The reason quitting the job is because of dissatisfaction. Turnover is a serious problem for employees because of the related expenses. Most employees know that there are certain costs associated with turnover, but usually they are unaware of just how large those costs can be.

The psychological process of turnover has been described as follows (Youngblood, Mobley & Meglino, 1983)

1. The valuation of the current job and an assessment of current levels of dissatisfaction.
2. The evaluation of the attractiveness and attainability of other jobs.
3. The expression of the intention to leave.
4. Turnover.

Several researches have pointed out that turnover is directly related to the availability of other employment. When jobs are plentiful individuals are likely to feel more comfortable at leaving a dissatisfying job for one that they feel will be more satisfying.

On the basis of the entire above theoretical framework, the aim of the study is to find the relationship between leadership styles, job satisfaction, well being and job withdrawal behaviour amongst non-teaching employees of universities. To further verify that distinct leadership style leads to different psychological and organizational performance of employees, the cause and effect relationship between different variables would also be explored.