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CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF PREDICTORS

Conceptual understanding of the predictor variables have been presented in the present study in order to know the rationale of the variables selected in the present investigation.

2.1 PERSONALITY

Human personality is a complex phenomenon and it can be interpreted differently by different psychologists and authors. Therefore, to understand the nature of personality is not a simple thing.

In the view of Murphy (1947) “Personality is structured organism within environment field, each aspect of which stands in dynamic relation to each other aspect. There is organization within the organism and organization within the environment, but it is cross organization of the two that is investigated in personality research.”

Some definitions look at personality of an individual, giving weightage to his unique qualities and characteristics. According to Vernon (1957), “We mean it simply, what sort of man is so and so, what he is like? ..... while a man’s intelligence, his bodily strength and skills are certainly his personality, yet the term refers chiefly to his emotional and social qualities together, with his drives, sentiments, interests and aptitudes.”

Stagner (1948) is more concerned about the person’s inner system and defined personality as an inner system of beliefs, expectancies, desires and values. Cattell (1956) equates personality with the individual aspects of behavior. He directs his attention to the behavior of the individual and maintains that it should have predictive power. He defines personality ..... is that which permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation. Personality is concerned with all the behaviour of the individual both over and under the skin.”
Eysenck (1960) accepted this definition in his work. “The Structure of Human Personality.” Eysenck’s own definition of personality is an analysis of behaviour as he believes in the continuity of behaviour. He defines personality “as more or less stable and enduring organization of a person’s character, temperament, intellect and physique which determines his unique adjustment to the environment.”

According to Hall and Lindzey (1964) “Personality consists concretely of a set of values or descriptive terms which are used to describe the individual being studied according to the variables of dimensions which occupy a central position within the particular theory described.” In the words of Thorpe and Schmullar (1965) “An adequate definition of personality needs to emphasize the point that the individual is a human being enmeshed in a social order and symbolic culture which influences his every action.”

An important definition of personality is given by Allport (1966). According to Allport “Personality is the dynamic organization within the individual of those psycho-physical systems that determine his unique adjustment in the environment”. “Dynamic Organization” emphasizes the fact that personality is constantly developing and changing; although at the same time there is an organization or system that binds together and relates the various components of personality. The term “Psycho-physical” reminds that personality is neither exclusively mental nor exclusively physical. The ‘organization’ entails the operation of both body and mind, fused into a personal unity. The word ‘determine’ makes clear that personality is made up of determining tendencies that play an active role in individual’s behaviour. “Personality is something and does something.” It is what lies behind specific acts and within the individual. This definition reflects that man’s personality is organized which is constantly evolving and changing. Man is both brain and body with the help of which he does something which makes him different from others. Therefore, every human being is unique in time, place, person, adjustment and quality. Personality is the mode of survival.
There are three main approaches to the study of personality.

(a) Conflicting approach given by Freud (1949)
(b) Fulfillment approach given by Rogers (1962)
(c) The behavioural approach given by Adler (1924)

(a) **The Conflict approach**: This approach assumes that personality is shaped by a constant conflict between internal forces. According to this approach, life is a compromise between these forces.

(b) **Fulfillments approach**: This approach to personality assumes that a single force impels people to strive constantly for fulfillment and an understanding of their environment.

(c) **The Behavioural approach**: This approach in general suggests that behaviour and personality are result of external influences such as reinforcement and punishment.

Freud’s (1949) approach to personality is called psychoanalytic theory. The method of therapy based on Freud’s theory is called psycho-analysis. Freud stated that there are three levels of consciousness. The first is conscious behaviour, the thoughts, feelings and actions of which people are aware; the second preconscious behaviour is mental activity that people are unaware of and cannot become aware of except through certain techniques.

According to Freud’s theory, the primary structural elements of personality are the id, ego and super ego and these three forces reside in the unconscious. Each amounts to a different aspect of functioning. The id is the source of a person’s instinctual energy. It works on the pleasure principle which assumes that people try to maximize immediate gratification. Freud considers much of a person’s instinctual energy to be sexual and the rest as aggressive.

The second major components of functioning is the ego whereas the id seeks to maximize pleasure and to obtain gratification, the ego (which grows out
of the id.) seeks to satisfy the individual’s instinctual needs in accordance with reality. It works on the reality principle. Whereas the id, is demanding, unrealistic and works by the pleasure principle, the ego is patient, reasonable and works by the reality principle. Super ego is the moral self. When id, ego and super ego are not in a harmonious relationship or are out of balance, anxiety develops.

Roger (1962) believes that fulfillment is the motivating force of personality development. According to Roger, people try to express their capabilities, potentials and talents to the fullest possible extent. Roger suggests that an inborn tendency in people directs them towards actualizing their inherited nature, and thus fulfilling potential. Rogers makes two basic assumptions about behaviour. He also assumes that because people are innately good they will almost always choose adaptive, self-actualizing behaviours.

Roger’s theory of personality is structured around the concept of self. Self is the main structural component of Roger’s theory of personality. Roger’s theory assumes that individuals are constantly engaged in the process of fulfilling their potential of actualizing the true self. Roger suggests that each person has a concept not only of self but also of an ideal self. Ideal self is that self, where a person would ideally like to be when correspondence exists between the real self and ideal self, a person is generally happy. In contrast, a great deal discrepancy between the real self and ideal self often results in feelings of unhappiness and dissatisfaction. Roger’s basic principle is that people have a tendency to maximize self concept through self actualization. Self actualization for Rogers is the continuous growth and expansion of the self towards the ideal self.

Roger’s concept of personality shows an abiding concern for individual development. Roger stresses that each person must evaluate his or her situation from a personal (internal) frame of reference, not from the framework of others. Unhappiness is the result of too great a discrepancy between the real and ideal
selves; but the individual can reduce or eliminate this discrepancy. Thus each person’s happiness lies within his or her conception of self through his/her involvement in the society.

Roger’s and Freud’s theories of personality make fundamentally different assumptions about human nature and how it is expressed in behaviour or personality.

Adler (1924) was heavily influenced by Freud and many authors consider his theory as an extension of Freud’s. Adler focused not simply on the self, but on the self as a member of society. Adler believed that people strive unceasingly to better themselves but, unlike Roger, also believed that people also strive constantly for perfection and superiority.

Adler believed that people are basically good and that their core tendency is to strive towards superiority or perfection. Whereas Rogers stressed fulfillment through self-actualization, Adler stressed fulfillment through striving towards specific goals, some goals are unlikely to be reached. According to Adler (1924) people are motivated, or energized, to strive for superiority and ultimately perfection, have feeling of inferiority; when people experience a sense of imperfection they seek to improve themselves. Thus feelings of inferiority are not a negative factor; this compels people to strive for superiority.

Both Adler (1924) and Roger (1962) assume that human beings can and will fulfill themselves whenever possible. Whereas Rogers stressed self-actualization, Adler emphasizes an innate social need motivated by feelings of inferiority to strive towards perfection and superiority. To a great extent, Adler’s idea of inferiority has made a way into other popular theories of personality.

Principals may react to the same kind of situation in different ways according to their personality differences. Some principals are sluggish, taking what happens without being perturbed. Others are excitable. Some are bold, others are weak. Administrative skill is advanced or retarded according to the different personality traits.
Personality Types and Typology

Many so-called personality types have been classified by various investigators. It is presumed that people of a particular type tend to react in certain ways to particular stressors. Although personality types are described as having certain characteristic ways of functioning, there is considerable overlap between types. And some theorists dismiss the whole concept of personality, stating that instead of having unique personalities people have certain characteristic traits or methods of functioning, Mischel (1976). Let us consider some of the classic personality types and describe how each might react to stressors.

The Humors. The first recorded attempt at categorizing individuals into personality types was by the ancient Greek physician Hippocrates (circa 400 B.C.). He assigned people to one of four temperaments that were attributable to the predominance of the four bodily humors. Thus, choleric individuals were irritable and presumably had an excess of yellow bile. Melancholic individuals were depressed and presumably had too much black bile. Sanguine individuals were optimistic, which supposedly reflected a predominance of blood. Finally, phlegmatic individuals were calm and cool. At the present time, this concept is not scientifically supported, but we may hypothesize how people with these supposed characteristics might react to stressors. Thus, the choleric person should react with anger – which is usually a self-defeating response. The melancholic individual would tend to give up when faced with stressful situations. A sanguine person should react well, as his mental outlook would be positive. Finally, the phlegmatic individual would have an ineffectual response or might try to avoid or evade the situation.

Introverts and Extroverts. The first modern attempt at personality type was by Carl Jung, another early psychoanalyst who broke away from Freud. Jung (1923) categorized people as either “introverts” or “extroverts”. Introverts tend to react to stressors by withdrawing into themselves and “see thing” internally. At the
other extreme, extroverts tend to lose themselves among others and “blow off steam” as a stress-release mechanism. At the present time, most psychologists do not go along with this strict categorization, but believe that people have varying degrees of introversion and extroversion (i.e., are ambiverts).

**Body Type.** Sheldon (1954) tried to correlate physique type with temperament. In his classification, the “emdomorphic” individual is overweight, tends to be relaxed and sociable and should react well to stressors (i.e., he tends to let things “roll off”). It is as if his excess layer of fat acts as a cushion to protect him from the outside world. The “mesomorphic” person is strong and muscular. He is inclined to be energetic, assertive and courageous. The mesomorphic has a tendency to “grab the bull by the horns” and as a result should react relatively well to stressors. The “ectomorphic” individual has a long thin body and is supposed to have a large brain and a sensitive nervous system. He is considered to be restrained and fearful. As such, he would tend to manage stressors poorly. Most current investigators have failed to replicate Sheldon’s findings. Therefore, it is probable that there is no significant link between physique and personality.

**“Internals and Externals” Locus of Control.** Rotter (1966) categorized people as either “internals” or “externals”. Internals believe that they have control over their environment and what happens to them. Their self-confidence tends to ensure that they react well to most stressors. At the other extreme, externals believe that whatever happens to them is the result of luck, fate or “superior beings.” Thus, they would tend to react poorly to stressors. This is an example of another “black-or-white” classification where most people fall somewhere between the extremes.

**“Uppers-and-Downers” and “Inners-and-Outers.”** We are not talking here about drugs, but in simple terms we have classified people into “uppers-and-downers” as well as “inners-and-outers.” Uppers-and-downers are described as having mood swings that go from excitement or elation to flatness, sadness or despondency. During the “up” phase, stressful situations tend to be fairly well
managed. During the “down” phase, stress tends to be poorly handled. In its pathologic form, uppers-and-downers may be classified as manic-depressives (i.e., a psychiatric classification). Finally, inners-and-outers may be regarded as a popularized version of introverts and extroverts.

**Various Typologies.** Various investigators have proposed a variety of other personality types. (eg. Kralpelin, 1907). Although we do not support these conceptions, it is of interest to consider how people with these presumed characteristics might react under stress. Hence, let us now consider them in turn.

The “aggressive” or “explosive” individual is a common personality type. The so-called aggressive person tends to lose control when he is confronted with minor stressors. He often becomes frustrated when he fails to achieve his goals.

The “obsessive-compulsive” person tends to be a perfectionist who pays strict attention to minor details. The obsessive-compulsive tries to avoid conflicts by adhering rigidly to all rules and regulations. Any change or deviation from the accustomed routine tends to be upsetting and distressful. In brief, it seems that the obsessive compulsive has a lack of tolerance for stressors.

The “hysterical” personality tends to seek out physical stressors that cause pain and suffering. This individual may have an unconscious need to be hurt (i.e., psychiatrically speaking: masochism).

The “negativistic” or “passive-aggressive” individuals do not express open aggression. They try to avoid or ignore stressors whenever possible.

The “passive-dependent” person is sad, shy and submissive. Such an individual usually offers no opinion, is afraid to offend, rarely exercises independent judgment, and holds in his emotions. As a result, the passive-dependent person copes poorly with stressors and suffers from many physical and psychosomatic ailments.
The “Sociopathic” or “antisocial” personality gratifies egocentric desires and impulses. These people tend to lie, blame others and are inclined to use defense mechanism such as denial and rationalization. They easily become frustrated and often harm others as a stress-release mechanism (i.e., psychiatrically speaking: sadism).

The “asthenic” or “detached-passive-social” individual has a low energy level. He is easily fatigued by physical stressors and lacks a zest for living.

The “dependent-passive,” “submissive” or “inadequate” personality does not appear to do anything correctly. He is inept, gives poor responses to stressors and is continually frustrated.

The “noncompetitive” individual continually avoids competition or other potentially stressful encounters. When forced into a stress inducing situation, he tends not to manage adequately.

**Stress Seekers.** There are people who actively seek certain stressors which are not immediately pleasurable in order to experience the exhilaration following the relief of the stress. Let us consider some examples. According to Solomon et.al (1956), many parachutists engage in that dangerous activity for the “rush” experienced upon landing safely. The jump is life-threatening and the relief is in averting death. Similarly, many soldiers seek the stress of battle not for the pleasure of fighting, but because of the stress release that follows from the realization that they survived the engagement. Then there is the person who beats himself or allows himself to get beaten.

Some people take pills, alcohol or tobacco in increasing amount (i.e., adjusting to body tolerance) for the subsequent “high”, even though they know that they are causing damage and that it is a slow form of suicide (i.e., psychologically speaking: cognitive dissonance). These individuals may initially detest the taste of the drug (e.g., scotch), but persist for the subsequent pleasure. There are even some patients who go to the dentist expecting to be hurt and feel pain. Again, it may be pleasure of the relief that they seek.
**Accident-Prone Personality.** Dunbar (1943), has described an accident-prone personality. The individuals are described as aggressive, angry and hostile, harboring self-punishment impulses.

**Type A and Type B personalities.** The Type B personality is described as passive, restrained, not overly ambitious and not prone to develop stress-related diseases such as coronary artery disease. On the other hand, the Type A individual is seen as a competitive achiever who is constantly striving. He has feelings of time urgency, hostility and aggressiveness. The type A person is compulsive, hard-driving individual who often sets deadlines and quotas. He is impatient with delay; he suppresses fatigue and tries to control his environment. When he is unsuccessful, he tends to become helpless. The Type A individual is prone to develop high blood pressure and coronary artery disease.

**Cancer Personality.** Beyond the classification of Type A and Type B personalities according to heart attack potentiality, people have also been classified according to whether or not they are prone to develop certain other stress-related disease. For instance, there is “Cancer Personalities” (Le Shan 1966). These individuals are generally “low geared”, have few outburst of emotion and have a history of feeling of isolation from their parents they began in childhood. They are described as being depressed prior to the start of their disease.

**Ulcer Personality.** The “ulcer personality” is considered to be an oral individual. Some of his characteristics are: The desire to be fed; continually leaning on others; seeking close body contact with people; tendency to depress anger; and being prim, tidy, mild mannered, conscientious, inhibited and punctual. (Wolff et. al., 1968).

**Rheumatoid Arthritis Personality.** Another stress-disease-related type is the “rheumatoid arthritis personality” (Moos etc. 1965). Most cases of rheumatoid arthritis occur in women who are describe as being unhappy in the traditional female sex role. These individuals are considered to be perfectionists who are easily frustrated, self-sacrificing, punctual, tidy and orderly.
For the purpose of present study, personality has been taken as defined by Cattell and Eber (1967), this is, which permits a prediction of what a person will do in a given situation and is concerned with the entire behaviour of the individual, both over and under the skin, and scores obtained on 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (Indian adaptation by Kapoor and Tripathi) are measures of personality.

2.2 JOB SATISFACTION

The term Job-satisfaction is the combination of two words: Job and Satisfaction. Job necessarily means a piece of work, labour undertaken at a stated price, or paid for by the hour or day and turned to private advantage or in other words we can say, a job refers to collection of tasks, duties and responsibilities which as a whole is regarded as the established assignment to individual employee.

According to Encyclopedia of Psychology (1972), Job can be distinguished from work and occupation. Job is a task, an occupational activity performed by individual in return for a monetary reward. Job is a complex of inter relationship of tasks, roles, responsibilities, interactions, incentives and rewards. The general definition of the term ‘job’ as also given in the Collins English Dictionary (1980) is a piece of work. The Oxford English Dictionary (1981) defined job as “a small definite piece of work done in a way of one’s specific occupation”. The operational definition of the job implies that it is a piece of work or activity performed for the payment received in lieu of it. It involves a contractual agreement between employer and employee and denotes not only the specific responsibilities assigned to the employee but also the totality of his responsibilities towards the firm or authorities that have employed him.

According to Webster’s Dictionary of Education (1976), ‘Satisfaction’ means the fulfillment of a need or desire. Some authorities defined it as a feeling of a pleasantness or contentment, while others described it as feelings, emotions
and sensations. New Webster Encyclopedia Dictionary of English Language (1981), defined satisfaction as the act of satisfying or state of being satisfied; contentment in possession and enjoyment and to grant fully the wants, wishes or desires of; and to supply to the full extent with what is wished for.

Job-Satisfaction refers to an individual’s subjective experience on his work situation, his response and feelings towards different facets of his work role. Job-Satisfaction is not a unitary concept but a composite of many factors or dimensions. The term “Job-Satisfaction” has been defined as all those factors which make a person like his job and go about it willingly. In spite of the fact that much research has been done on Job-Satisfaction, it is doubtful if any ten experts would agree on a specific definition of the term of bringing the term Job-Satisfaction into light. The credit goes to Hoppock (1935), who defined Job-Satisfaction as “any combination of psychological and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say, I am satisfied with my job”.

Attitudes of an employee can be considered as a readiness to act in one way rather than another in connection with specific factors related to job.

Bullock (1952), considered Job-Satisfaction as an attitude which results from a balancing and summation of many specific likes and dislikes in connection with his job.

Smith (1955), defined Job-Satisfaction as employee’s judgment of how well his job on the whole is satisfying his various needs. Blum et al. (1968) defined “Job Satisfaction is the result of various attitudes possessed by an employee in relation to his job”.

Among factors extrinsic to Job are: sex, level of intelligence, job experience, personal adjustment and perceptions about supervision.

Vroom (1964), defined Job-Satisfaction as a positive orientation of an individual towards the work role which he is presently occupying. This can be easily paraphrased as “an individual’s liking more aspects of his work than he
dislikes”. It refers to an employee’s general attitude towards his job which is the result of many specific attributes in three areas namely specific job factors, individual’s characteristics and group relationships.

“Job-Satisfaction” covers the satisfaction derived from being engaged in a piece of work, or in any pursuit of higher order. It is essentially related to human needs and their fulfillment through work. In fact, Job-Satisfaction is generated by individual’s perception of how well his job on the whole is satisfying to his various needs. (Sinha, 1974).

Srivastava (1978), is of the opinion that Job-Satisfaction is the attitude people hold towards their job. The positive attitude towards job connotes satisfaction with it, the negative attitude towards it shows dissatisfaction with it.

Job-Satisfaction is a popular concept in an individual and organizational psychology. The reasons for its popularity have been well documented in Locke’s (1976) Chapter in Handbook of Industrial and Organisational Psychology. At various times the concept has been a dependent variable, an independent variable, a co-variable. Locke (1976) defined Job-Satisfaction as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences”.

Singh (1974), said that Job-Satisfaction is the resultant effect of a number of factors including the quality of working life.

According to Longman’s Dictionary of Psychology and Psychiatry (1984), Job-Satisfaction is the attitude of a worker towards his job, sometimes expressed as hedonic response of liking or disliking the work itself, the rewards (pay, promotions, recognition) or the contest (working conditions, benefits).

The above nature of job-satisfaction has led to much controversy, which has come out in the form of different theories of job-satisfaction. These theories tend to explain different facets of job-satisfaction and endeavor to explore this phenomenon from different angles. Some of these are:
1. **Maturity – Immaturity Theory:**

   This theory assumed that worker has very little self discipline and personal pride. He is branded as short sighted, foolish human. This theory point out that most employees are expected to do as they are told and leave the thinking to the boss.

2. **Need Hierarchy Theory (Maslow, 1954):**

   Maslow (1954) proposed that people are continuously in the motivational state, as one’s desire becomes satisfied another rises to take its place. He postulated a hierarchy of human needs-physical needs, safety (security) needs, social (affiliation) needs, esteem (recognition) and self actualization. This shows how the satisfaction of the higher needs is based on the satisfaction of the lower needs and how the number of persons who have experienced the fulfillment of the higher needs gradually tapers off.

3. **Behaviouristic Theory (Skinner, 1960):**

   He has proved that cause of behaviour is outside the person and is in the environment. Behaviour of an individual is modified through operant conditioning. It is encouraged through positive reinforcement and discouraged through negative conditioning.

4. **Dual Factor Theory (Herzberg, 1959):**

   Herzberg believed that the basic needs are guaranteed by our society. It is only the fulfillment of higher needs which leads to satisfaction in job. This consideration led him to propose his two-factor theory. This theory is generally described as Motivation-Hygiene theory. According to Herzberg and his associates (1959):

   Job-Satisfaction is a function of challenging, stimulating work activities or work content. These are called work motivators (or job content factors). These are also called satisfiers. Job-Satisfaction is a function of environment, supervision, co-workers and general job context. These are called hygienic
factors. These are also called dissatisfiers. Whenever the employees are asked to recount some previous job events which for them were usually satisfying or dissatisfying they tend to mention job content as satisfying or context as dissatisfying.

5. **Equity Theory (Adam, 1963):**

This theory is essentially a social comparison theory in which an individual evaluates his inputs vs. outputs derived from a given situation relative to those of another, where this ‘other’ may be a person, a group, an organization or the individual himself relative to his experiences. To the extent that an individual perceives an imbalance in this relationship (i.e. inequity), it is postulated that he will experience dissatisfaction and be motivated to engage in some of the activities which will restore satisfaction.

6. **Performance Theory (Donald, 1970):**

In this theory employee’s satisfaction is connected with job-performance: satisfaction leads to performance and performance to satisfaction and performance-satisfaction relationship is moderated by many variables linked with man and his job.

7. **Discrepancy Theory:**

Locke (1976) has argued for a discrepancy approach to thinking about satisfaction, discrepancies may be actual or perceived. This theory suggested techniques for measuring job-satisfaction. Vroom (1964) said that job-satisfaction is a direct negative function of the discrepancy between person’s need and the extent to which the environment provides satisfaction to those needs. The greater the total discrepancy counting all needs the lesser the satisfaction, and the lesser the discrepancy the greater the satisfaction.

8. **Achievement Motivation Theory (Winter and McClelland 1969):**

This theory made the point that a score on n-ach is of an operant not a respondent nature, in that, it records how often a person spontaneously thinks about improving things, not how interested he is.
9. **Need Gratification Theory (Wolf 1970):**

As per Wolf (1970) job motivation will be stronger when an individual perceives an opportunity to gratify an active need through job related behaviour. The hypotheses underlying Wolf theory include the following:

i. Persons whose lower needs (as postulated by Maslow, 1954) are yet ungratified, derive both their satisfaction and dissatisfaction of their lower level needs (primarily job content factors).

ii. Persons whose lower level needs are conditionally gratified receive both their satisfaction and dissatisfaction from the degree of gratification of their higher level needs (primarily job content factors), and the dissatisfaction can also come when continued gratification of their lower level needs is disrupted or threatened.

iii. Persons whose level needs are unconditionally gratified obtain both their satisfaction and dissatisfaction from the degree of gratification of their higher level needs.

iv. Dissatisfaction results from the frustration of an active need and from interruption or threatened interruption of previously gratified (lower level) needs.

Keeping in view the above cited definitions and views suggested by various investigators, it can be opined that Job-Satisfaction is not a unitary thing or entity but a composition of many factors including personal judgment of a worker, how he thinks about his job. It can be concluded that job-satisfaction is governed to a large extent by perceptions and expectations. Men work to satisfy their needs and aspire or expect their work life to fulfill these needs. For perfect job-satisfaction, there should exist a one to one relationship between the perception of how well the job life fulfils various needs of expectations or aspirations of an individual and the extent to which these needs are actually fulfilled by the individual.
2.3 ATTITUDE

Attitude is a guiding force behind all human factors. According to Baldwin (1905), “An attitude is readiness for attention or action of a definite sort”.

In the views of Thomas and Znaniecki (1981), “By attitude we understand a process of individual consciousness which determines real or possible activity of the individual counterpart of the social value; activity, in whatever form, is the bond between them”.

According to Chave (1938), “An attitude involves feelings, desires, fears, convictions, prejudices or other tendencies that have given a set or readiness to act a person because of varied experiences”.

As per the view of Allport (1929) – An attitude is a disposition to act, which is built up by the integration of numerous specific responses of a similar type, but which exists as a general neural “set” and when activated by a specific stimulus results in behaviour that is more obvious a function of the disposition than of the activating stimulus. The important thing to note about this definition is that it considers attitudes as broad, generic (not simple and specific) determinants of behaviour.

In the words of Bogardus (1931), “An attitude is a tendency to act toward or against something in the environment which becomes thereby a positive or negative value”.

According to Kruger and Reckless (1931), “An attitude, roughly is a residuum of experience, by which further activity is conditioned and controlled... we may think of attitude as acquired tendencies to act in specific ways towards objects”.

In Dictionary of Psychology, Warren (1934) calls Attitude “the specific mental disposition toward an incoming (or arising) experience, whereby that experience is modified, or, a condition of readiness for a certain type of activity”.
According to Morgan (1934), “Attitudes are literally mental postures, guides for conduct to which each new experience is referred before a response is made”.

Good (1973) in the Dictionary of Education calls it “a state of mental and emotional readiness to reach to situations, persons or thoughts in a manner in harmony with a habitual pattern previously conditional to or associated with these stimuli”.

According to Newcomb (1948) “Attitude is not a response but a more or less persistent set to respond in a given way to an object or situation. It is organized and consistent manner of thinking, feeling and reaction with regard to one’s environment”.

Smith, Bruner and White (1956) presented their ideas in the following form: “Attitude is predisposition to experience to be motivated by and to act towards a class of objects in a predictable manner”.

Good (1959) defines attitude as “a readiness to reaction towards or against some situation, person or thing in a particular manner e.g. love or hate”.

Katz and Stotland (1959) view attitudes as “an individual tendency or predisposition to evaluate an object or symbol of that object in a certain way, as having affective, cognitive and behavioural components, that is, as involving feelings and emotions, beliefs and actions”.

Sarnoff (1960) has given a short cut opinion about an attitude that, “it is a disposition to react favourably or unfavourably to a class or objects”.

Drever (1961) conceives of attitude as “a more or less stable set of disposition of a certain kind of experience or readiness with wider sense of tendency to appreciate or produce artistic result or social duties or social opinions”. Here the environment plays a great role in framing one’s attitude.
Kretch et al. (1962) regards attitude “as a predisposition of an act in a positive and negative way towards persons, objects, ideas and events”.

Sampson (1976) is of the opinion that “an attitude is an underlying positive or negative feeling about some object”. The person with a particular attitude towards an object is assumed to be disposed to behave favourably or unfavourably towards that object.

Worchel and Copper (1976) state, “An attitude is an expression of the intensity and direction of effects towards a psychological object”.

Back (1977) describes attitude as a predisposition towards any person, idea, or object that contains cognitive, affective and behavioural components.

Wegner and Vollacher (1977), while defining attitude says, “attitude is not a behaviour in any observable sense, it is an anticipation of a behaviour”.

Anderson (1981) studied attitudes in relation to their affective domain and gave four essential features:

(i) **Emotion**: Which include preparedness or readiness. As mentioned by Allport and Chave who defined attitudes as a complex of feelings, desires, fears, convictions, prejudices or tendencies towards an object or person.

(ii) **Consistency**: If preparedness of readiness is activated in the presence of related objects and situations, consistency of activation is clearly implied.

(iii) **Target**: When attitudes are related to particular objects, situations, ideas and experiences, they can be summed up under the general level ‘target’.

(iv) **Directions**: This is concerned with the positive or negative orientation of the emotions or feelings towards the target. Differences in orientation are expressed in terms of bipolar objectives which indicate favourable and unfavourable directions.
So we find that attitude is a learnt predisposition, it is a hypothetical construct or an implicit response not directly open to observation but inferred from verbal expression, it is anticipatory and mediating with reference to patterns of overt responses, it is evoked by variety of stimulus patterns as a result of previous learning, attitude is a drive producing, it is significant in the individual’s society, as it describes, evaluates, directs and advocates actions.

Principal’s attitude towards administration is an enduring perceptual organization of an administrator’s belief and learned tendency, to react favourably or unfavourably in different degrees which determine his actual or potential response towards administration.

It is universally accepted fact that the attitudes of an individual play an important role in determining his role performance with respect to a particular object. In administration how an administrator performs his duty as a leader depends to a great extent on his attitudes, values and beliefs. A positive attitude makes the work not only easier but also more satisfying and professionally rewarding. A negative unfavourable attitude makes his task harder, more tedious and unpleasant. Therefore, attitude towards administration must have bearing on the process of administration. There is little doubt that the attitudes of a leader is of crucial importance in explaining his productivity but whether his positive attitude influences his ability of administration is still to be explored.

There are three major psychological theories or models of attitude change. Freudian psychoanalysis model, a congruity model and a balance model.

Freud’s model (1953-1964) described the internal conflict which ranges within the individual, particularly between the id, the ego and the superego. Psychoanalysis seemed to be primarily concerned with generating some sort of balance between the aggressiveness and sexuality of the id and the guilt of the superego. But neither Freudian psychological theory nor psychoanalysis as therapy explains very well the many cases in which patients become fairly well reconciled to what has happened to them as children and change their interpersonal styles but still find themselves in considerable conflict.
The congruity model was developed by Osgood et al (1957). It is used to explain the nature and degree of attitude change we undergo when we experience attitudes which are inconsistent with our own. We try to reduce the dissociation by making the inconsistent attitudes more congruent. The congruity model predicts that the size of the change is inversely proportional to the degree of polarization.

The balance model deals with the relationship of attitudes (Abelson and Rosenberg, 1958). Imbalance and thereby the opportunity for change, occurs when one of these attitudes changes. Rosenberg et al (1960) suggest an additional alternative which does not really restore balance but at least dissociates belief and friendship so that both survive. The technique is called compartmentalization – you stop thinking about the attitudinal imbalance you have fallen into.

Thus, if an administrator has a dominating and autocratic attitude, he is likely to be aggressive or over submissive. They show little pride in their work and do not corporate well with one another. If an administrator has democratic and socially integrative attitude, he feels relaxed and friendly, he works well together, he is interested in what other teachers or children are doing. A warm sympathetic, friendly and understanding educational administrator is more likely to be successful as compared to the one who is cold unfriendly and autocratic.

2.4 EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATOR’S LEADERSHIP STYLE

Concept of Leadership

Leadership comes from the Anglo-saxon word leaden, meaning to go, and is defined as guiding, conducting, proceeding, or being foremost. Leadership has been defined in terms of individual’s traits, leadership behaviour, interaction patterns, role relationships, follower perceptions, influence over followers, influence on task goals, and influence on organizational culture. Stogdill (1970) reviewed seventy-two definitions of leadership advanced by writers from 1902 to 1967 under the following headings: Leadership as: (i) a focus of group
processes; (ii) a personality and its effects; (iii) art of including compliance; (iv) exercise of influence; (v) act or behaviour; (vi) a form of persuasion; (vii) an instrument of goal achievement; (viii) an effect of interaction; (ix) a differential role; (x) the initiation of structure.

According to Good’s Dictionary of Education, (1959) leadership is the ability and readiness to inspire, guide or manage others. Dictionary of Behavioural Sciences (1973) defined that leadership is the exercise of authority, of initiating, directing, or controlling the behaviour or attitudes of others, and bring out with their consent, those qualities of personality and training, which make the guidance, and control of others successful.

Halpin (1966) stated that a successful leader contributed to group objectives and to group relationship. He described leadership behaviour in two dimensions of initiating structure and consideration.

Leaders may be defined as inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and motives, the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations of both leaders and followers ((Mc Gregor, 1978). Leadership is thus inseparable from the follower’s needs and goals as leadership behaviour in the group rather than to any sets of traits or personal attributes. It is functional and consists of leadership behaviour and operations. The shift from personal attributes to functional behaviour has marked a significant change in our understanding of the process of leadership. Leadership, therefore, may be considered as a process through which others are influenced towards desired direction.

Lipham (1974), described leadership as that behaviour of an individual which initiates a new structure in interaction within a social system; it initiates change in goals, objectives, configuration, procedures, inputs, processes and ultimately the outputs of social systems. The definition takes into account effectiveness and efficiency measures. Group achievement and group maintenance functions, situational and personality determinants, organizational and individual contacts, active and passive relationships, contexts, means and
ends, and similar dichotomous definitions leadership is dynamic since it involves social system in action and interaction. Leadership is commonly defined as the process of influencing others in a manner that enhances their contribution to the realization of group goals (Smith, 1995).

Koontz and Weihrich (1998), opined that leadership is an influence, that is, the art or process of influencing people so that they will strive willingly and enthusiastically towards the achievement of group goals. Yuki and Vanfleet (1998) defined that leadership is viewed as a process that includes influencing the task objective and strategies of a group or organization; influencing people in the organization to implement the strategies and achieve the objectives, influencing group maintenance and identification, and influencing the culture of the organization.

A more recent definition of leadership is as follows: leadership is the process of influencing and supporting others to work enthusiastically toward achieving objectives (Keys and Case, 1990).

Filley, et al. (1977) in an attempt to define leadership differentiated power, authority and influence. These three ways help in changing the behaviour of the individual or of groups. In order to understand the concept of leadership clearly, these three concept need to be explained. Power is an ability or capacity in a person to change the behaviour of another person or groups by manipulation of reward and punishment. This type of power may be coercive power (concerned with physical harm), remunerative power (monetary benefits), normative power, (giving recognition or medal). Whereas power is ability, authority is a right. In fact, authority is legitimized power. There are various types of authority like traditional authority (kings), and bureaucratic authority (through rules and regulations). Influence is an ability in a person to change the behaviour of other person or group without manipulation of reward and punishment.
Moreover, in an organization like college, there are two major kinds of power: position power and personal power. Position power refers to the power which an individual derives from a particular office or rank in a formal organized system. Personal power refers to the power, which a leader derives from followers. Therefore, French and Raven (1959) identified five common and important types of power: (a) reward (b) coercive (c) legitimate (d) referent and (e) expert. Each of these types of power increases a leader’s capacity to influence the attitudes, values and general behaviour of others.

Thus, several components can be identified as central to the phenomenon of leadership. These are (a) leadership occurs within a group context, (b) leadership is a process, (c) leadership involves influence, (d) leadership involves goal attainment, and (e) leadership is interaction of power between leader and others. Based on these components, the following definition of leadership was used in this present research. Leadership is a process whereby an individual such as college principal influences a group of individuals like teachers and pupils to achieve common organizational goals.

**Functions of a Leader**

The role of leader can be defined in terms of various functions performed by him. Leader performs these functions in every situation. He takes initiative to form a group by bringing members together, infuses life in it and makes it operational for seeking common goals. He also establishes interpersonal relations with members, inspires them, guides them, and helps them to march in a given direction. He takes care of the members by making adequate provisions to satisfy their personal needs and interest so that members can stay in a group for a longer period.

Kretch et.al. (1962) have pointed out that all leaders must perform the following functions at least to some degree: (a) as an executive, (b) as a planner, (c) as a policy maker, (d) as an expert, (e) as a group representative, (f) as an arbitrator and (g) as a model of behaviour.
The essential function of a leader is to work towards unity and cohesiveness in the organization and to see that members have a pleasant satisfying experience. According to Killan’s (1952) study brought out by the American Management Association, the following are the five functions of leadership:

i) Leader makes decisions (not a reckless shooting from the hip but a calculated searching for weighing of facts.

ii) Leadership renders a service (by multiplying the contribution of every individual who is beneficiary).

iii) Leadership achieves results (by guiding human energy in a definite direction for a specific purpose).

iv) Leadership elicits response (leading others to sufficient understanding and to motivate the response necessary for accomplishing the task at hand).

v) Leadership is willingness to be different (a discipline and standard of performance higher than that followed by non-leader).

According to Moshal (1998) the more common functions of leadership may be enumerated as under: (a) motivating the members, (b) morale boosting, (c) support function, (d) satisfying needs of members, (e) accomplishing common goals, (g) creating confidence (h) implementing change and resolving conflicts.

Leadership Skills

It has been assumed that the acquisition of certain skills on the part of leader has almost become a necessity for the successful performance of his task. He would, of course, be successful only to the extent he is equipped with certain managerial skills in getting things done through people. The term management skills have been used in this context to refer to an ability which can be developed and which is manifested in performance.
Katz and Kahn (1966), identified three kinds of skills as technical, human and conceptual. Actually, an effective leader appears to rest on three personal and basic developable skills: (i) Technical skills, which is used to refer to proficiency and understanding of a specific kind of activity involving, process, procedure or technique. This skill is primarily concerned with working with things. (ii) Human skills, which is the manager’s ability to work with others and build a cooperative effort with the group he manages. This skill is primarily concerned with working with people. (iii) Conceptual skills, which implies the ability to visualize the organization as a whole. This skill enables the manager to perceive and recognize the interrelationships of various factors operating within the total organization. The relative importance of these skills varies with the organizational levels. At lower levels, technical and human skills are required more than the conceptual skills. At higher levels, the manager’s effectiveness depends more than the conceptual skills. Koontz and Weihrich (1998), added the fourth one-design skill to Katz’s three skills. The skill involves the ability to solve problems of the organization.

Moshal (1998), classified the abilities required to be possessed by the managers under five skills as follows: (i) Conceptual skills: it is an ability to visualize the organization as a whole system and form image and develop vision in the context of future environment. (ii) Analytical skill: these skills are more related with scientific attitude and thinking on the part of manager for solving different problems and making decisions. (iii) Human relations or behaviour skills: the basic responsibility of every manager is to get things done by others. These skills refers to those abilities, which are needed by the manager to deal with subordinates effectively. (iv) Administrative skills: it refers to those abilities which he uses for coordinating various activities, seeking effective utilization of allotted resources and getting things done by subordinates. (v) Technical skills: these skills refer to specialized knowledge and proficiency in handing methods, procedures, and techniques for doing specific job by a leader.
Styles of Leadership

In fact, leadership style of the principal is based on the interaction among them. Leader’s style is a product of the study of leadership behaviour from the point of view of personal qualities of the individual leader. Personal qualities of individuals tend to differentiate them with respect to their leadership behaviour. According to Hersey and Blanchard (1988), the leadership style of an individual is the behaviour pattern that person exhibits while attempting to influence the activities of others. Subordinates of the leader can perceive this behaviour pattern. Leadership style describes the pattern of behaviour which manager or supervisor uses in relationship with others, particularly subordinates. It is about what principals do rather than what they are. This point is important because it indicates that styles can be observed, described, and therefore become known to the individual concerned. It also suggest that the manager can become aware of a range of alternative styles, or behaviour patterns, and can within limits make choices about what is most appropriate to the situation being managed.

Lewin et al. (1939) proposed to find out whether different group behaviour resulted from different styles of leader’s behaviour. They began the task by defining behaviours that appeared to characterize three known styles namely (a) Authoritarian, (b) Democratic, and (c) Laissez-Faire styles. While the term laissez-faire leadership is in a sense internally inconsistent, it has nevertheless been used to characterize the behaviour of persons in positions of leadership status who often take passive stance towards the problems of a group or organization. These styles of leadership have largely been replaced in current thinking by leadership theory and research studies that are typically less ideologically oriented.

Actual leadership broadly never exists in a pure form as autocratic, democratic, or laissez – faire leadership but to some extent combines them all. Undoubtedly, however, some types of leadership are best characterized by one term and some by another. The different leadership styles may be useful as a
means of conceptualizing leadership. Autocratic leadership is often subdivided to include the hardboiled autocrat and benevolent autocrat. In both instances, leadership resides in the autocrat. However, the hardboiled autocrat emphasizes production as opposed to human considerations whereas the benevolent autocrat is interested in his employees. In the case of laissez-faire, leadership the leadership function may be exercised in a haphazard fashion and tends to be ineffective.

In a democratic situation, the leadership process demonstrates respect for every person in the group, and leadership responsibilities are shared. The decision-making function resides in the leaders in the autocratic group, in the individual in the laissez-faire group, and in the group in the democratic situation.

Recent concept of leadership identifies leadership styles as being nomothetic, ideographic, and personal or transactional (Lipham, 1964). First type of leadership is nomothetic leadership, which places emphasis upon the nomothetic or legislative aspect of leadership. This style emphasizes organizational goals at the expense of individual needs and motivations. A second type of leadership is ideographic leadership, which places emphasis upon the goals, ideas, needs, and plans of individuals in the organization. This style assumes that the organization will get its work done if all the individuals in the organization are happy and productive. The third type of leadership is transactional leadership, which may be characterized by its awareness of both the organizational and the personal dimensions of organization, and integration of the two. Transactional leadership continually analyses the situation in relation to organizational and individual needs and purposes. With transactional leadership, the needs and purpose of individual in the organization are considered as organizational problems conversely, organizational needs and purposes are taken into account as attention is paid to the problems of individuals.
**Theories of Leadership**

The recent classification of leadership theories as advanced by Stogdill (1970) are: (1) Great man theories; (2) Environmental theories; (3) Personal situational theories; (4) Interaction expectation theories; (5) Humanistic theories; (6) Exchange theories; (7) Behavioural theories; (8) Perceptual and cognitive theories.

Many theories have been put forward to explain the specific qualities and behaviours that differentiate the leaders from the majority. The multitude of theories can be grouped under four main headings:

i  Trait theory

ii  Behavioural theory

iii  Situational theory

iv  Transformational leadership theory

**Trait Theory of Leadership**

In the early 1900, leadership traits were studied to determine what made certain people great leaders. The theories that were developed were called “great man” theories because they focused on identifying the innate traits and characteristics possessed by great social, political, and military leaders (e.g., Abraham Lincoln, Churchill, and Mohandas Karam Chand Gandhi). It was believed that a person is born either with or without necessary traits for leadership.

During this time, research concentrated on determining the specific traits that clearly differentiated leaders from followers (Jago, 1982). According to Tead (1935), there are ten qualities that are essential for effective leadership; physical and mental energy, a sense of purpose and direction, enthusiasm, friendliness and action, integrity, technical masters, decisiveness, intelligent teaching skill and faith. Bernard (1938), on the other hand lists the following traits or qualities: physique, skill, technology, perception, knowledge, memory, imagination, determination, persistence, endurance and courage.
Further, the traits that commonly impress upon the leader fall into two categories: inherent personal qualities and the acquired tendencies. In an attempt to identify and measure leadership qualities and the inherent leadership traits that surely screen leaders from non leaders, it was concluded by Jennings (1961) that fifty years of study failed to produce one personality trait or set of qualities that can be used, to discriminate leaders and non leaders.

The findings of Stogdill’s survey also indicated that an individual does not become a leader solely because he or she possesses certain traits. Rather, the traits that leader possess must be relevant to situations in which the leader is functioning. As stated earlier leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in another situation.

In recent years, there has been resurgence in interest in the trait approach in explaining how traits influence leadership (Bryman, 1992). Lord, et al. (1986) found that personality traits were strongly associated with individual’s perception of leadership. Similarly, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) have gone so far as to claim that effective leaders are actually distinct types of people in several ways. Further evidence of renewed interest in the trait approach can be seen in the current emphasis given by many researchers to visionary and charismatic leadership.

The Behavioural Theory of Leadership

The behavioural approaches can be thought in terms of the manner in which the leaders actually behave as observed by subordinates. Researchers studying this style or behaviour approach determined that leadership is composed of essentially two general kinds of behaviours: task behaviours and relationship behaviours. Task behaviours facilitate goal accomplishment; they help group members to achieve their objectives. Relationship behaviours help subordinates feel comfortable with themselves, with each other, and with the situation in which they find themselves. The main purpose of the behaviour approach is to explain how leaders combine these two kinds of behaviours to influence subordinates in their efforts to reach a goal.
The authoritarian style of leadership behaviour is based on the assumption that the power of leaders is derived from the position they occupy. It assumes a person with self-direction and self-control makes an effort to achieve the objectives under proper conditions, has a relatively high degree of imagination and creativity in the solution of organizational problems.

The democratic style assumes that the power of leaders is granted by the group they are to lead so that people can be creative and self-directed if properly motivated. These are not only two sets of assumptions that leaders can carry with their subordinates. Rather these are the two extremes and between these two extremes, there can be a variety of shades or combinations or assumptions.

**Situational Theory of Leadership**

Situational leadership focuses on leadership in situations. The basic premises of the theory is that different situations like governmental, military, business, and educational organizations, even at different times in particular organization demand different kinds of leadership. From this perspective, to be an effective leader requires, that an individual adopt his or her style to the demands of different situations.

The Life cycle or situational theory, states that effective leadership results from the relationship between a leader’s style and the readiness of his followers. A follower’s readiness is likely to increase over the life cycle of his relationship with the leader, calling for a change in the leader’s style over time.

Task behaviour refers to behaviours in which the leader specifies an individual’s or group’s duties, activities, and responsibilities by goal setting, organizing, scheduling, directing and controlling. To explain what activities each one is to do and when, where, and how, tasks are to be accomplished.

Relationship behaviour refers to the communication behaviour of the leaders, such as listening, giving support, facilitating interactions, providing feedback, and supporting individuals and group; maintain personal relationship
between themselves and members of their group by opening up channels of communication (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988).

Thus as per situational leadership theory, according to Hersey and Blanchard (1988) there is no one best way to influence people; which leadership style a person should use with individuals or groups depends on readiness level of the people the leader is attempting to influence. On the other hand, situational leadership is based on an interplay among (1) the amount of guidance and direction a leader gives, (2) the amount of socio-emotional support a leader provides, and (3) the readiness level that followers exhibit in performing a specific task, function or objectives. This concept was developed to help people attempting leadership, regardless of their role, to be more effective in their daily interactions with others. It provides leaders with some understanding of the relationship between an effective style of leadership and the level or readiness of their followers. According to this theory, selecting the appropriate style requires the leader to determine the readiness of the followers.

**Transformational Leadership Theory**

One of the current approaches to leadership that has been the focus of much research since the early 1980’s is the transformation approach. Transformation leadership is part of the “New leadership” paradigm (Bryman, 1992). Recent thinking about effective leadership has supplemented the situational approach with emphasis on the leader’s charisma, ability to develop and implement vision of the organization, and ability of each worker to act as self-leader that is also called super leadership which refers to leading others to lead themselves. According to Manz and Sims (2002), when most people think of leadership, they think of one person doing something to another person. In other words leader is one who has ability to influence another. Thus, idea of a “transformational” leader, means one who has the vision and dynamic personal attraction to total organizational change.
Transformational leadership is a process that changes and transforms individuals. It is concerned with values, ethic standards, and long-term goals. Transformational leadership involves assessing follower’s motives, satisfying their needs and treating them as full human beings. Transformational leadership is an encompassing approach that can be used to describe a wide range of leadership, from very specific attempts to influence followers on a one-to-one level very broad attempts to influence whole organization and even entire culture.

According to Burns (1978), transformational leadership refers to the process whereby an individual engaged with others creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower. This type of leader is attentive to the needs and motives of followers and tries to help followers reach their fullest potential. Burns points to Mohandas Gandhi as a classic example of transformational leadership. Gandhi raised the hopes and demands of millions of his people and in the process changed himself.

In the view of Schermerhorn (1996), the special qualities of transformational leaders include:

- Vision: having ideas and clear sense of direction, communicating them to others and developing excitement about working hard to accomplish shared “dreams”.

- Charisma: arousing other’s enthusiasm, faith, loyalty, pride, and trust in themselves through the power of personal reference and appeals to emotions.

- Symbolism: identifying “heroes” offering special rewards, and holding spontaneous and planned ceremonies to celebrate excellence and high achievement.
• Empowerment: helping others to develop and perform, removing performance obstacles, sharing responsibilities and delegating truly challenging work.

• Intellectual stimulation: gaining the involvement of others by creating awareness of problems and stirring their imagination to create high-quality solutions.

• Integrity: being honest and credible, acting consistently out of personal conviction.

A transformational leader is one who inspires trust, confidence, admiration and loyalty from his or her followers. As a result, followers are motivated to exert high levels of effort out of a sense of personal loyalty to the leader, if not the organization. The transformational approach to the study of leadership relies heavily on the trait approach. It is believed that effective leaders exhibit several unique characteristics that provide them ability to influence over their followers.