Chapter-1

Introduction

Over the last some decades, in the literature of organizational behaviour the most silent issue is psychological contract. The psychological contract mediates among the characteristic of an origination and attitude, behaviour of its members the theoretical and empirical research into build has been focused on beliefs of an individual configuration by the firm regarding conditions of an interchange between firm and their member. Most of the researcher centring on psychological contracts hypothesize that the worker grow a psychological contract escorted by an institute be contingent on the individual's involvement in their own work, what in expression is ignoble on their common experience in the firm. Nevertheless, the psychological contract can be regard to mention to the individual's perception around the conditions of interchange concurred between the individual and other firm.

However, managers and leaders influence their followers and subordinates much more than they themselves are influenced by them. Keeping in view the different aspects of leadership Robbins (1998) advocates for a broader definitions of leadership, definition that can keep all the current approaches to the above concept. Thus leadership defined as the ability to influence a group towards the achievement of goals.

The term leadership is one of the well debated and exhaustively explored terms in psychology, especially by industrial, social and organizational psychologists. Especially in organizational studies this term is also used as an alternative term for 'leader'. As one finds, many definitions have been given by social and organizational psychologists to define leadership. In spite of it, there is little agreement as regards its meaning and nature.

Lindgren defines leader as a person in the group who influences other members to behave in ways he prefers more than they influence him. (1973)

Baron and Byrne define leadership as the process through which leaders influence other group members towards attainment of specific group goals. (1997)

The well functioning is the important norms of any organization. A lot of factors determine the team success but the critical factor is the leader orientatation to her or his team. Currently a debate is going on about who is the effective leadership task oriented or relationship oriented. This is the third option of the debate, both are best leaders both are using his or her ability to maintain the trust, effectiveness and stability.

1.1.Leadership style

Leadership style is the pattern of behaviour used by a leader in attempting to influence group members and make decisions regarding the strategy, mission, and operations of group activities. The following styles are there-

I. **Person relationship oriented style**
II. **Task oriented style**
III. **Mixed leadership style**

1.2. Person oriented relationship style

Person oriented-relationship leadership style is a behavioural method in which the leader centred on the gratification, the general well-being and motivation of the team members of his team. This type of leadership focused on motivating supporting, and growing the people on their phrases and the connections within. This type of leadership encourages collaboration, and good teamwork through good communication and fostering positive relationships. Relationship-oriented leaders prioritize the welfare of every member in the team, and will position time and effort in meeting the individual needs of every member involved. They take incentives to make easy the team members like who have more informal

interactions with group members to learn about their weaknesses strengths and, bonuses, furnish mediation to understanding with workplace or classroom dispute or just leading in a pleasant or encouraging manner.

The welfare of person relationship-oriented leadership is to understand that building positive productivity requires a positive environment where individuals feel driven. The problem like dissatisfaction with a job, Personal dispute, irritation and even boredom can severely drive down productivity, do not come with a person relationship oriented leader do not come with a person relationship style leadership. Such type of leader ensures that problem stay at minimum level.

1.3.Task oriented leadership style

It is a behavioural approaches in it the leader focus on task that needs to be performed to get certain goals, or to achieve certain standard performance. Task oriented leader focus on getting the compulsory task in order to achieve the goal. They more concerned with finding the step-by-step solution required to meet specific tasks and less concerned with the idea of catering to workers.

The advantages of this style is it ensure that time limit are met and tasks are completed it is useful for some members who cannot manage their well. Task oriented leaders have strong understanding for those who don't manage their time well of how to get the task done by centring on the compulsory workplace methods.

Table 1:Task-oriented vs. person relationship oriented leadership

Task-Oriented	Relationship-Oriented
1. Produce desired result is priority.	1. Relationship oriented leader give priority to make relationship.
2. Task oriented leader focus on structure, tasks and focus.	2. Focus on relationships, well-being and incentive.
3. Emphasis on goal setting and a clear	3. Emphasis on team members and

plan to attain aim.	conveyance within
4. Emphasis on work facilitation	4.Emphasis on interaction facilitation
5. Strict use of plan and step-by-step plans, and a punishment/motivation system	5. Communication facilitation, informal interactions and recurring team meetings

1.4.Quality of a Leader

A leader must have many quality like responsibility, honesty reliability, confidence, enthusiasm, patience, decision making, authentic, approachable, confident, hopeful, self-aware, balance, visionary, fair, loyal, determination and empathy.

1.5. Responsibility

When a leader going to take a decision then he should the responsibility for the decision that he is taking. Good leader do not blame others. They deal the situation that arise and take responsibility for the result.

1.6. Honesty

Honesty is the best quality of a leader if the followers of a leader do not trust him then they will not follow the leader.

1.7. Reliability

When a leader going to do something means that he will actually have to do it. Any people do not like an unreliable person, even if he is not a leader. After you first time cheating to the people will not trust you anymore. It is the fact that if a leader is unreliable he will not be a leader for long.

1.8.Confidence

Leader has to be believed in him, because confidence makes the leader. A leader have to believe in every word that he comes out of his mouth if he do not the follower will began to question whether or not talking about.

1.9.Enthusiasm

How leaders convince their follower to do that work that the follower really do not want to do? Enthusiasm. Firstly get ready for the task that you are actually doing then emphasis its importance. Enthusiasm is contagious if your follower sees you all will get excited and ready to do it.

1.10.   Patience

Leadership need patience, a leader should understand the importance of patience. If a leader explain a situation or talk to the follower and they do not understand then a leader should clarify it for them. The follower do not understand your instruction its not their fault its your fault. Give time to help out your charges so they can perform better their assigned task as you intended. Leader should softly answer their question and make sure that they understand by asking a few yourselves.

1.11.   Decision maker

Good decision making is the quality of a good teacher. A person who takes too long to make decision is bound to struggle. To be a good leader you must be a risk taker.

1.12.   Characteristics of good leader

There are many characteristics of a good leader like good personality, communication skill, co-operative, loyalty, patient, perspective, honest etc. A person cannot be good leader unless he is not a good leader.

1.13. Personality

Good personality attract the people, a person should have the skill to work with people in team. Sincerely respect the people is a wonderful asset of a leader. Being a good leader it is the duty of you to help the people. Firstly a leader must be a good team member.

1.14. Communication skill

A leader must be able to communicate with team members. It is the responsibility of a leader to provide information to the follower in a respectable way.

1.15. Theories of leadership

There are many theories of leadership like trait theory, behavioural theory, contingency theory, naturalistic theory, functional theory, situational theory, moral theory, great man theory etc.

1.16. Trait Theory

This theory tells that a person born with some specific traits. The theory describe that these traits areas piringand attainment oriented-orientated, collective, bold, Dependable. Instead of these traits there are many traits like Decisive, ruling, Energetic (high activity level), determine, Self-confident, forbearing of stress. Presumption of trait theory is that leadership is a quality group of qualities for some of individuals and not for other peoples. This theory said that some people were either blessed with leadership calibre or some were not. This theory left a question a question mark: whether leaders are made or born, and whether leadership is art or science. Nevertheless these are not mutually distinct different. Leadership can be an art , leadership still need the petition of exceptional skills and techniques. Even somebody have certain traits by birth that make him a good leader, these natural aptitude require growth and heartening. A human being does not born with faith and self- confidence. These are developed honesty and probity

are a matter of direct choice, incentive to lead within the human being , and the understanding of trade an individual can obtain. Cognitive ability has their own part in genes, even than it still require to be developed. Not one of these lively ingredients are need overnight.

1.17. Behavioural theory

As the researcher discuss in trait theory what leader does for traits how they behave with their team. How they conduct how they do not conduct with group, leaders moved from leaders to leadership. Premature researchers ran out of vapour in their search for traits, they rotate to what leaders did — and this became the rolling way of handling leadership within institute. There are different pattern of behaviour which were grouped with each other and tagged as style. This activity has become most popular activity in management training. According to this theory through training a human being can become a good leader. Now this policy is following all the people in the world through training most of the people became the manager. This theory is good for those who want to become the manager.

The **contingency** model of leadership was developed by Fiedler in the mid of 1960's. Fiedler was a scientist who studied the theory of personality and leader's characteristics. According to this theory there is no one of the best style of leadership it is based on the situation. According to the situation a human behave.

1.18. Situational Leadership Theory

This theory was developed by ken Blanchard and Paul Hersey in 1969. They suggest that leadership effectiveness be contingent on the leader's ability to outfitter his or her behaviour according to the demand to the situation, namely, the junior level of maturity. This theory emphasis on the importance of relation between task and relation behaviours, but these is called directing and supporting. Hersey and Blanchard climax four different type of leadership that are based on behaviour like telling (high supportive and low directive) participating, selling

and delegating. the function of a leader is to evaluate continually and modify his or her behaviour to every junior job maturity like ability, capacity, willingness to absolute the task at hand. if any follower have low maturity, it authorize that a leader must tell the junior how the job can be done. A follower does not need much direction support and significant to complete his or her job when he or she is more mature. In this case it is the best way to represent the junior. In spite of fact that instinctively engaging, the situational leadership theory has not be presented with large scale research awareness. This theory described that the maturity of junior benefits the leader's directive behaviour but the practical confirmation. In this theory criticize for the situational variable because of narrow focus, but it has donated to the understanding of leadership resulted by underlining the requirement for leaders to modify their behaviour to different circumstances.

1.19 Naturalistic theory of leadership

Naturalistic theory said that leadership quality comes naturally in an human being it said that leadership we cannot develop through training. Why are humans such a collective species, and what does the reply to this question mean for our understanding of the institute of modern organization and societies? As a species, we are shockingly good at assistinging collaboration, even on a large-scale and among respective strangers. This posture an attending confuse both for developmental and economic theory, where the baseline miniature presume that conducts must be understood in words of how they encourage agents' self-interest. These baseline miniatures are difficult to rectangular with collaborative behaviours in common, and with the practical evidence about the particular nature of human collaboration in special. This has led to a quickly getting bigger 'naturalistic' literature at the crossing of the organic, behavioural, and social sciences that targets to answer the abstract puzzle posture by our cooperative behaviours.

What this literature proposes is that humans are social animals that developed cooperative temperament over a long history of a living in egalitarian small plate societies in which culturally transferred norms and firms favour cooperation. As a result of this natural selection, our behaviours are pretentious by a number of things that travel through the air in the face of standard economic presumptions about human deportment, including other-caring preferences, the major role of social standards, and our sensitivity to relative, as against to complete, pay-offs. In fact, the practical evidence proposes that the majority among us does not at all look like the Homo economic us persistently following his self-interest attributing in standard economic models – although, attention, it also proposes that a non-negligible minority does. The task of human institution is to sustain collabrorationin the face of this motivational heterogeneity.

The fact that most of us are much more worried with the social, as against to merely economic nature of our connections with others makes collaboration much easier to comfort than one would expect on the basis of the standard presumptions of economic theory. Nevertheless, the advantages of collaboration are easily eroded by competition within a collaboration team. The basic problem that human institutions need to answer is that collaboration behaviours are seldom in the self-interest of individual team members. Our long natural selection history of gene-culture co-evolution endowed us with a social psychology that made our forebears relatively favourable outcomes at answering this problem in small scale egalitarian communities with little force and much autonomy. But how does their success translate to sustaining collaboration on the much large scale of modern forms of institution with their cavernous hierarchies?

Our central quarrel is that the emerging understanding of our collaborative dispositions suggests a common theory of human economic institute that also has implications for our understanding of contemporary forms of firms. More particularly, we derive ten truth for a naturalistic theory of human economic

institution. For instance, institutions compete with each other on their ability to narrows intra-intuitional competition in ways that growth their success in inter-intuitional competition. Because genetic natural selection proceeds at a much slower step than cultural evolution, the favourable outcome of present day institution depends on their capacity to use cultural 'work-around' that make fruitful use of tribal instincts that indigenous evolved to sustain collaboration on a much smaller scale. However, given the nature of these tribal instincts, cooperative arrangements on a large scale do not necessarily lead to ethically desirable outcomes. In specific, our evolutionary patrimony leads to the prediction that the two great ethical problems of human institution are intra-team exploitation of team members by their leaders and inter-team enmity.

1.19. Transactional Leadership

This type of leadership stated by both Max Weber and Bernard Bass is a type of leadership that takes itself more towards the management near of the spectrum. Bass puts it best with this quote "…follows a cost benefit, economic interchange to meet juniors current material and psychic requirements in return for narrow services rendered by the junior." Transactional leaders are often put into a situation where followers are obligated to deed such as in government, schools, the military etc.

Transactional Leadership on the external may seem very much like management, however when the situation of "authority" is earned it is a much required style when motivation is directly not enough to help the assistant along the path. Giving the follower(s) particular tasks and activities is almost always needed as maturity, trust and commitment develops.

1.20. Functional Leadership

This model of leadership centred on how and not who. Leadership is distributed and behaviours are re-examined as they escort the institution or team on the way

of the common goal. This occurs in much institution when diverse skills sets are needed in order for decisions and judgements to emerge that will help succeed the tasks compulsory to achieve the target. Either John Adair's Action Cantered Leadership or "three circles" model has mostly flounced Functional Leadership and explains leadership function as meeting requirements in three distinct areas – duty, group and individual.

Functional Leadership of route is the synergy that is needed in order for any institution to have the well roundedness required for enormous success. any single leader is good sufficient alone and will require a group of people acting in the leadership collaborative in order to legislate big change with many people.

Functional leadership is model that centralizes on how leadership happens, rather than centring on who does the leading. It explains the types of behaviours that escorts an institution and then glances at how those behaviours happen. Under this theory, leadership is a given out function. People at all flats can participate in guiding the institution. One of the milestones of this leadership model is its centres on how instead of whose.

This approach has some enormous advantages. The models that centres on who leads look after at the person with official authority in an institution. In many positions, the person with official authority is not the actual leader. Sometimes there is no one "actual" leader. Even an institution that appears to be struggling is being led. People are still making conclusions and forming opinions.

The functional leadership theory looks at how these kinds of decisions are being made—even when there is no one person who is working as a leader. By centring on the function of leadership, it is uncomplicated to see the excitements that are actually influencing the behaviour of the institution—even if the input is coming from official and unlikely sources.

Functional leadership is often used to relate job positions where an human being is expected to take leadership authority without any delegated power. At this sense, they are said to take on functions of leadership by assisting to guide a group or process without being put into a official situation. The up-side of this type of dispositions is that it can keep the individual's cantered on how to influence their group's behaviour instead of how to bring to bear their authority. The down-side is that it can outcomes in inefficiency because they may not have the responsibility to make needed changes.

1.21. Moral Leadership and Courage

Moral leadership can be well-defined as differentiating air from unfair and doing right. If you have virtuous leadership you are searching the just, truthful, and good in the application of leadership. Maya Angelou once said, "Courage is the most important of all virtues, because without it we can't practice any other virtue with uniformity." I believe this to be the accurate summary of the trait. Courage and virtuous leadership go hand in hand and are used daily in the workplace and group.

Acting like a virtuous leader is probably one of the major difficult things to do. Every day human beings are put into positions where they have to make strenuous decisions. The moral leader possesses modesty, maintains anxiety for the greater good, is truthful and uncomplicated, fulfils commitments and practice for appropriateness. Ethics requires taking authority for actions, showing respect for each human being, encourage and assist develop others and works others before themselves. These all of the traits are key to having adventure.

1.22. Great man theory

The **Great Man theory** is described in 19th-century idea according to that history can be largely described by the smash of **"great** men", or heroes: highly influential human beings who, due to either their direct charisma, wisdom,

intelligence, or political skill make use of their authority in a way that had a deciding historical impact.

1.23. Behavioural theory

The Behavioural Theory of Leadership describe that leadership grow through behaviour. In reaction to the early condemnation of the trait approach, theorists began to investigate leadership as a group of behaviours. They judged what successful leaders did, developed a classification of actions, and identified wide patterns that noticed different leadership styles.

1.24. **Fiedler Contingency Model:** The **Fiedler** Contingency Model was created in the mid-1960s by **Fred Fiedler**, a scientist who studied the personality and characteristics of leaders. The model states that there is no one best style of leadership. Instead, a leader's effectiveness is based on the situation.

1.25. Statement of The Problem

A Study of Leadership Style and Abilities among Adolescents

1.27. Objectives of the Study

1. To study the difference in leadership style between male and female adolescents.
2. To study the difference in leadership style between urban male and urban female adolescents.
3. To study the difference in leadership style between rural male and rural female adolescents.
4. To study the difference in leadership style between urban male and rural male adolescents.
5. To study the difference in leadership style between rural female and rural female adolescents.

6. To study the difference in leadership abilities between male and female adolescents.

7. To study the difference in leadership abilities between urban male and urban female adolescents.

8. To study the difference in leadership abilities between rural male and rural female adolescents.

9. To study the difference in leadership abilities between rural male and urban male adolescents.

10. To study the difference in leadership abilities between rural female and urban female adolescents.

1.28: Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in leadership style between male and female adolescents.

2. There is no significant difference in leadership style between urban male and urban female adolescents.

3. There is no significant difference in leadership style between rural male and rural female adolescents.

4. There is no significant difference in leadership style between rural male and urban male adolescents.

5. There is no significant difference in leadership style between urban male and urban female adolescents.

6. There is no significant difference in leadership abilities between male and female adolescents.

7. There is no significant difference in leadership abilities between urban male and urban female adolescents.

8. There is no significant difference in leadership abilities between rural male and rural female adolescents.

9. There is no significant difference in leadership abilities between rural male and urban male adolescents.

10.   There is no significant difference in leadership abilities between rural female and urban female adolescents.

1.29. Delimitation of the Study:

The study was confined to –

- The adolescents of Haryana state only,
- Urban and Rural adolescents only,
- The sample of 120 labours only.