

Age and Leadership Behaviour: From the Perceptions of the Subordinates

Ms. Vaibhavi Mane,

Ph.D. Scholar,
Devi Ahilya Vishvidyalaya,
Indore, M.P, India.

Dr. Pooja Jain,

Assistant Professor,
International Institute of Professional
Studies, Devi Ahilya Vishvidyalaya,
Indore, M.P, India.

ABSTRACT

The present paper aims to study impact of age on perceived leadership behaviour in information technology sector in India. Very scarce numbers of research are conducted in this area, especially when concerned with India. Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, Form 6-S (MLQ-6S) was used for data collection. The obtained data was analyzed using ANOVA. The results showed that age significantly impacts perceived passive-avoidant behaviour of leadership, also perceived transactional leadership is impacted by age, whereas no noticeable impact of age is found on perceived transformational leadership.

Keywords: Perceived Leadership behaviour, Age, Information Technology.

INTRODUCTION:

Leaders and styles of leadership may vary based upon age and age groups of the leader and the follows as well. It has been stated, "With an older leader, the team may be more open to a leader's transformational behaviors, because the team members may be more accepting of the leader's special status" (Kearney, 2008). Van Vugt (2006) claims that, "age relates to leadership in a complicated way, according to the psychological literature. Some research finds a positive correlation between age and leadership, whereas others find a zero or negative correlation". In the present time, evidence for this link between age and leadership can still be found in professions that require a considerable amount of specialized knowledge and experience, such as in science, politics, and arts (Van Vugt, 2006). Cagle (1988) has regarded age as one of the factors that determine the leadership style. Apart from the professional and academic knowledge, it is commonly believed that age and experience might play important roles in leadership behaviors. In many cultures, the myth is that as people get older they become wiser due to more exposure and experience. For example in African culture, experience is considered as a function of age and therefore older peoples are given priority for leadership positions in different organizations (Ahiazu, 1989).

The aim of this study is to investigate the impact of age on the leadership behaviour of the employees – specifically on the professionals working in Indian IT sector. Various studies (Eagly, Karau, & Makhijani, 1995; Thompson, 2000) on leadership have investigated the impact of the leader's (boss's) – Age on the followers' behaviour and performance. But, in contrary to that the aim of this study is to investigate the impact of age on the worker's perceived leadership styles.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

A person who leads a group of people towards a common goal, is known as a leader (Andrew, 2009). The leader influences his group members to accomplish the specified objectives and the way in which the leader handles his followers is known as leadership style (Sheikh, 2001). According to Adeyemi and Bolarinwa (2013) leadership is "the art or process of influencing people so that they will strive willingly towards the achievement

of objects". Yukl (2002) point is that, leadership is an act of influencing subordinates to accomplish organizational goals through authority.

Different theories of leadership classify leadership in different ways. Based on the use of authority, leadership is classified into three types as autocratic, democratic and laissez faire leadership styles (Adeyemi 2004). Maximum authority is exhibited in the autocratic leadership style and this leader always wants to command, order his followers to comply. This leader orders but will not hear to his followers (Bass, 1990). On the other hand, in democratic leadership style the leader gives equal priority to each individual under him and feels himself/herself as an important member of the organization (Adeyemi, 2007). In laissez-faire leadership style the leader leaves the subordinate free to make decision and exercise powers. The leader has least role and participation in the decisions made by his group members in the organization (Ogunsanwo, 2000). These three styles - autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire (free-rein) - has their own merits and limitations too and none of these could be universally applied. Depending on the situation and the followers – the leader has to choose his leadership style in order to be effective (Bass, 1990).

"The leader who recognizes the transactional needs in potential followers "but tends to go further, seeking to arouse and satisfy higher needs, to engage the full person of the follower ... to a higher level of need according to Maslow's hierarchy of needs" Bass (1990)

As exactly said by Bass (1990) – "the transactional leaders work within the organizational culture as it exists; the transformational leader changes the organizational culture". When a person respects an individual as leader, he does not take into account the leader's attributes but rather values his actions and makes an assessment. This observation helps him learn if he is a trustworthy leader or a selfish individual.

Serving selflessly and taking everybody along in his stride in developing an organization makes a person an acceptable leader. In the opinion of the employees, leadership is that which advances the organizational goals, while taking care of employees' well being. People like to be led by those whom they respect. To earn respect, leaders have to be moral and principled. They can provide a powerful vision of the future with the sense of proper direction to the followers.

Leadership has drawn great attention from scholars in various fields in recent years. Yukl (1989) wrote that "the study of leadership has been an important and central part of the literature of management and organization behavior for several decades" Paton (1987), too, realized that leadership has become the most popular subject .Weese (1994) furthermore advised that some 7,500 citations on leadership appear in Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership (1990).

There is great controversy over the definition of leadership and thus over approaches to studying leadership (Yukl, 1989). The present authors, however, focus exclusively on the transactional-transformational leadership model and the relationship between transformational leadership and organization effectiveness.

An understanding that people come to work with more than just their bodies and minds are growing in organizations. People also bring their unique innate talents and abilities.

OBJECTIVES OF STUDY:

To Study the effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived idealized influence leadership behaviour.

To Study the effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived inspirational motivation leadership behaviour.

To Study the effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived intellectual stimulation leadership behaviour.

To Study the effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived individual consideration leadership behaviour.

To Study the effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived contingent reward leadership behaviour.

To Study the effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived management-by-exception leadership behaviour.

To Study the effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived laissez-faire leadership behaviour.

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY:

The following are the hypotheses of the study:

H01: There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity to make others feel good to be around him/her

- H02:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity to have complete faith on him/her.
- H03:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived proud association with him/her
- H04:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived expression in few simple words that he/she could and should do.
- H05:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to provide appealing images about what they can do.
- H06:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity towards helping them find meaning in their work
- H07:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity towards enabling them to think about old problems in new ways
- H08:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability towards assisting them with new ways of looking at puzzling things
- H09:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before.
- H010:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to help others develop themselves.
- H011:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity to let others know how he/she think they are doing.
- H012:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to give personal attention to others who seem rejected
- H013:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to tell others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work.
- H014:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to provide recognition/rewards when others reach their goals.
- H015:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to call for attention to what others can get for what they have accomplished.
- H016:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived satisfaction when others meet upon agreed-upon standards.
- H017:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived consideration for trying not to change anything as long as things are working.
- H018:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to tell others the standards they have to know to carry out their work.
- H019:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived containment to let others continue working in the same ways always.
- H020:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived consideration about whatever others want to do is OK with him/her.
- H021:** There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived consideration by asking no more of others than what is absolutely essential.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

Universe: Professionals working with IT companies in India.

Research Type: The study is combination of exploratory and descriptive in nature.

Sampling Unit: Professionals working with IT companies in India.

Sample Size: 450 Male and Female Indian IT Professionals.

Sampling Technique: Convenient sampling technique.

Tool for data collection: Questionnaire was employed as survey instrument for collecting primary data. 450 Indian IT Professionals from high, middle and low organization level completed Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (B.M. Bass & B.J. Avolio, 1995) that was administered in June, 2017 by both online as well as offline mode.. For the collection of secondary data books, journals, magazines, articles and internet is used.

Tool for Data Analysis: Collected data is analyzed with the help of SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) using frequency distribution and ANOVA. Cronbach's alpha is used to demonstrate internal consistency of the scale.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

In the study, there are 21 numbers of attributes are taken. After analyzing the data, the value of Cronbach's Alpha is found to be 0.839. It indicates good internal consistency of the scale.

From Table no. 2 and Table no. 3 it can be observed that:

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity to make others feel good to be around him/her is 2.814 which is not significant at 0.061 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity to make others feel good to be around him/her. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity to make others feel good to be around him/her" is not rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being significant at 0.055 levels, also significance difference of perception is found between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being significant at 0.036 levels. In similar table no significant difference of perception is found between age groups 21-30 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.332 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity to have complete faith on him/her is 1.945 which is not significant at 0.144 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity to have complete faith on him/her. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity to have complete faith on him/her" is not rejected. Further from Table no.1A this can be observed that no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being non-significant at 0.094 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41 & above being non significant at 0.496 levels. In similar table no significance difference of perception is found between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.094 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived proud association with him/her is 1.453 which is not significant at 0.235 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived proud association with him/her. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived proud association with him/her" is not rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being non-significant at 0.150 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41 & above being non significant at 0.547 levels. Along with this no significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.145 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived expression in few simple words that he/she could and should do is 1.379 which is not significant at 0.253 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived expression in few simple words that he/she could and should do. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived expression in few simple words that he/she could and should do" is not rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being non significant at 0.170 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.232 levels. Along with this no significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.832 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to provide appealing images about what they can do is 0.782 which is not significant at 0.458 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to provide appealing images about what they can do. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to provide appealing images about what they can do" is not rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being non-significant at 0.336 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.331 levels. Along with this no significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.780 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity towards helping them find meaning in their work is 1.407 which is not significant

at 0.246 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity towards helping them find meaning in their work. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity towards helping them find meaning in their work" is not rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being non-significant at 0.098 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41 & above being non significant at 0.931 levels. Along with this no significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.333 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity enabling them to think about old problems in new ways is 0.473 which is not significant at 0.624 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity enabling them to think about old problems in new ways. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity towards enabling them to think about old problems in new ways" is not rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being non-significant at 0.434 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41 & above being non significant at 0.472 levels. Along with this no significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.871 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability towards assisting them with new ways of looking at puzzling things is 3.890 which is not significant at 0.021 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability towards assisting them with new ways of looking at puzzling things. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability towards assisting them with new ways of looking at puzzling things" is not rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being non-significant at 0.076 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41 & above being non significant at 0.080 levels. But significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being significant at 0.007 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before is 1.814 which is not significant at 0.164 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before" is not rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being non-significant at 0.064 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41 & above being non significant at 0.958 levels. Along with this no significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.223 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to help others develop themselves is 0.067 which is not significant at 0.935 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to help others develop themselves. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to help others develop themselves" is not rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being non-significant at 0.834 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.800 levels. Along with this no significant difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.716 levels. From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity to let others know how he/she think they are doing is 6.893 which is significant at 0.001 levels with degree of freedom 2, therefore it can be concluded that age has significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity to let others know how he/she think they are doing. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived sensitivity to let others know how he/she think they are doing" is rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being significant at 0.023 levels, also significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30

and 41& above being significant at 0.016 levels. Along with this significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being significant at 0.000 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to give personal attention to others who seem rejected is 2.648 which is not significant at 0.072 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to give personal attention to others who seem rejected. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to give personal attention to others who seem rejected" is not rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being significant at 0.022 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41& above being non-significant at 0.744 levels. Along with this no significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.250 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to tell others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work is 0.267 which is not significant at 0.766 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to tell others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to tell others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work" is not rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being non-significant at 0.534 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41& above being non-significant at 0.619 levels. Along with this no significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.951 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to provide recognition/rewards when others reach their goals is 8.749 which is significant at 0.000 levels with degree of freedom 2, therefore it can be concluded that age has significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to provide recognition/rewards when others reach their goals. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to provide recognition/rewards when others reach their goals" is rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being significant at 0.000 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41& above being non-significant at 0.179 levels. Along with this no significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.165 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to call for attention to what others can get for what they have accomplished is 12.693 which is significant at 0.000 levels with degree of freedom 2, therefore it can be concluded that age has significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to call for attention to what others can get for what they have accomplished. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to call for attention to what others can get for what they have accomplished" is rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being significant at 0.000 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41& above being non-significant at 0.142 levels. Along with this significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being significant at 0.000 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived satisfaction when others meet upon agreed-upon standards is 0.083 which is not significant at 0.921 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived satisfaction when others meet upon agreed-upon standards. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived satisfaction when others meet upon agreed-upon standards" is not rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being non-significant at 0.690 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41& above being non-significant at 0.990 levels. Along with this no significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.804 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived consideration for trying not to change anything as long as things are working is 0.768 which is

not significant at 0.465 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived consideration for trying not to change anything as long as things are working. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived consideration for trying not to change anything as long as things are working" is not rejected. Further from Table no.1A this can be observed that no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being non-significant at 0.722 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.218 levels. Along with this no significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.369 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to tell others the standards they have to know to carry out their work is 6.381 which is significant at 0.002 levels with degree of freedom 2, therefore it can be concluded that age has significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to tell others the standards they have to know to carry out their work. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived ability to tell others the standards they have to know to carry out their work" is rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being significant at 0.005 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.119 levels. Along with this significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being significant at 0.001 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived containment to let others continue working in the same ways always is 7.255 which is significant at 0.001 levels with degree of freedom 2, therefore it can be concluded that age has significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived containment to let others continue working in the same ways always. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived containment to let others continue working in the same ways always" is rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being significant at 0.002 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.101 levels. Along with this significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being significant at 0.001 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived consideration about whatever others want to do is OK with him/her is 2.255 which is not significant at 0.106 levels, therefore it can be concluded that age has no significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived consideration about whatever others want to do is OK with him/her. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived consideration about whatever others want to do is OK with him/her" is not rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being non-significant at 0.435 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.076 levels. Along with this significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being significant at 0.035 levels.

From the Table no.2, this can be observed that F value of interaction between age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived consideration by asking no more of others than what is absolutely essential is 12.474 which is significant at 0.000 levels with degree of freedom 2, therefore it can be concluded that age has significant effect on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived consideration by asking no more of others than what is absolutely essential. In light of this the null hypothesis namely, "There is no significant effect of age on subordinate's perception of leaders' perceived consideration by asking no more of others than what is absolutely essential" is rejected. Further from Table no.3 this can be observed that significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 31-40 being significant at 0.000 levels, also no significance difference of perception is found between age group 21-30 and 41 & above being non-significant at 0.503 levels. Along with this significance difference of perception is observed between age group 31-40 and 41 & above being significant at 0.012 levels.

CONCLUSION:

Therefore it can be concluded that age significantly impacts perceived laissez-faire (passive-avoidant) behaviour of leadership, also perceived transactional leadership is impacted by age, whereas no noticeable impact of age is found on perceived transformational leadership. The limitation of this study is that it is based on one demographic variable i.e. age. The study can be further conducted with other relevant demographic variables such as gender, education and work experience. It was seen from the study that age group between 31-

40 and 41 & above years tends to be moving towards laissez-faire (passive-avoidant) behaviour of leadership and transactional leadership behaviour that explains that in IT sector young leaders are exhibiting more transformational leadership behaviour. The study says that the age too affects the leadership styles of the employees. The individuals start with more of the autocratic leadership style and then move towards democratic in their middle ages and then at the later stages turn towards the laissez-faire leadership style. This is in agreement with the established principles of educational psychology. With growing knowledge, individuals will adjust to their surrounding and are capable of understanding others better. With increasing age, knowingly or unknowingly individuals acquire more knowledge and naturally people tend to be more flexible and less assertive. So, they will exhibit lesser authority on their fellow beings. Another reason is that with growing age physically individuals start to depend on others for some type of help and this too might affect their psychology and this will affect their leadership styles. This finding is in agreement with the work of Solem (2009) on 'Age Changes in Subjective Work Ability' and with the work of Kaifi et al., (2010) apart from many others.

REFERENCES:

- Adeyemi, T. O. (2004). *Educational administration an introduction*. Lagos: Atlantic Associated Publishers, 71-86.
- Adeyemi, T. O., & Bolarinwa, R. (2013). Principals' leadership styles and student academic performance in secondary schools in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 2(1), 187-198.
- Adeyemi, T.O. (2007). *Research Methods and Theses Writing in Educational Studies*. Lagos: New Haven Publishers.
- Ahiauazu, A. I. (1989). The "Theory A" system of work organization for the modern African workplace. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 19(1), 6-27.
- Andrew J. DuBrin (2009). *Leadership*. New York, USA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1995). *MLQ multifactor leadership questionnaire: Technical report*. Mind Garden, Palo Alto, CA.
- Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications. *Simon and Schuster*.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Handbook of leadership: Theory, research, & managerial applications*, Third edition. New York: Free Press.
- Cagle, S.G. (1988). Fiedler's Contingency Theory of Leadership Effectiveness and Appointment of a Committee Chairperson. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Volume: 50-07, Section: B, page: 2842
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Makhijani, M. G. (1995). Gender and the effectiveness of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological bulletin*, 117(1), 125.
- Kaifi, B. A., & Mujtaba, B. G. (2010). Transformational leadership of Afghans and Americans: A study of culture, age and gender. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 3(01), 150.
- Kearney, E (2008). Age differences between leader and followers as a moderator of the relationship between transformational leadership and team performance, *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 81, No. 4, pp. 803-811.
- Ogunsanwo, O. A. (2000). Modern Principles and Techniques of Management Ibadan: External Studies Program, *Department of Educational Management University of Ibadan*.
- Paton, G. (1987). Sport management research—What progress has been made? *Journal of Sport Management*, 1(1), 25-31.
- Sheikh, A. G. (2001). *Leadership styles as viewed by secondary school head teachers of Lahore City*. Hamdard University Karachi Pakistan: Master thesis in education Studies of Management and Organization, 19(1), 6-27.
- Solem, P. E. (2009). Age changes in subjective work ability. *International Journal of Ageing and Later Life*, 3(2), 43-70.
- Thompson, M. D. (2000). Gender, leadership orientation, and effectiveness: Testing the theoretical models of Bolman & Deal and Quinn. *Sex roles*, 42(11-12), 969-992.
- Van Vugt, M. (2006). Evolutionary origins of leadership and followership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(4), 354-371.
- Weese, W. J. (1994). A leadership discussion with Dr. Bernard Bass. *Journal of Sport Management*, 8(3), 179-189.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251-289.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in Organizations*, 5^{Ed}. New Jersey: Prentice Hall

ANNEXURE

Annexure No1.

Table 1: Showing Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	No. of Items
0.839	21

Annexure No.2 One Way ANOVA for testing hypothesis 1 to 21

Table 2: Showing the ANOVA RESULT

Independent Variable-Age		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I make others feel good to be around me	Between Groups	7.917	2	3.958	2.814	0.061
	Within Groups	628.741	447	1.407		
	Total	636.658	449			
Others have complete faith in me	Between Groups	4.935	2	2.468	1.945	0.144
	Within Groups	567.262	447	1.269		
	Total	572.198	449			
Others are proud to be associated with me	Between Groups	2.986	2	1.493	1.453	0.235
	Within Groups	459.106	447	1.027		
	Total	462.091	449			
I express with a few simple words what we could and should do	Between Groups	3.363	2	1.682	1.379	0.253
	Within Groups	545.028	447	1.219		
	Total	548.391	449			
I provide appealing images about what we can do	Between Groups	1.511	2	0.756	0.782	0.458
	Within Groups	432.1	447	0.967		
	Total	433.611	449			
I help others find meaning in their work	Between Groups	2.724	2	1.362	1.407	0.246
	Within Groups	432.656	447	0.968		
	Total	435.38	449			
I enable others to think about old problems in new ways	Between Groups	1.149	2	0.574	0.473	0.624
	Within Groups	543.171	447	1.215		
	Total	544.32	449			
I provide others with new ways of looking at puzzling things	Between Groups	9.581	2	4.791	3.89	0.021
	Within Groups	550.419	447	1.231		
	Total	560	449			
I get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before	Between Groups	4.482	2	2.241	1.814	0.164
	Within Groups	552.15	447	1.235		
	Total	556.631	449			
I help others develop themselves	Between Groups	0.155	2	0.077	0.067	0.935
	Within Groups	512.976	447	1.148		
	Total	513.131	449			
I let others know how I think they are doing	Between Groups	18.896	2	9.448	6.893	0.001
	Within Groups	612.662	447	1.371		
	Total	631.558	449			

Independent Variable-Age		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
I give personal attention to others who seem rejected	Between Groups	7.661	2	3.831	2.648	0.072
	Within Groups	646.616	447	1.447		
	Total	654.278	449			
I tell others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work	Between Groups	0.679	2	0.339	0.267	0.766
	Within Groups	568.986	447	1.273		
	Total	569.664	449			
I provide recognition/rewards when others reach their goals	Between Groups	23.148	2	11.574	8.749	0
	Within Groups	591.352	447	1.323		
	Total	614.5	449			
I call attention to what others can get for they accomplish	Between Groups	30.616	2	15.308	12.693	0
	Within Groups	539.082	447	1.206		
	Total	569.698	449			
I am satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards	Between Groups	0.209	2	0.104	0.083	0.921
	Within Groups	565.471	447	1.265		
	Total	565.68	449			
As long as things are working, I do not try to change anything	Between Groups	2.763	2	1.382	0.768	0.465
	Within Groups	804.401	447	1.8		
	Total	807.164	449			
I tell others the standards they have to know to carry out their work	Between Groups	16.327	2	8.164	6.381	0.002
	Within Groups	571.904	447	1.279		
	Total	588.231	449			
I am content to let others continue working in the same ways always	Between Groups	16.64	2	8.32	7.255	0.001
	Within Groups	512.58	447	1.147		
	Total	529.22	449			
Whatever others want to do is OK with me	Between Groups	6.223	2	3.112	2.255	0.106
	Within Groups	616.657	447	1.38		
	Total	622.88	449			
I ask no more of others than what is absolutely essential	Between Groups	25.611	2	12.805	12.474	0
	Within Groups	458.889	447	1.027		
	Total	484.5	449			

Table No 3: Showing the Post HOC ANOVA RESULT Multiple Comparisons

LSD							
Dependent Variable	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
I make others feel good to be around me	21-30	31-40	0.251	0.13	0.055	0	0.51
		41& Above	-0.183	0.188	0.332	-0.55	0.19
	31-40	21-30	-0.251	0.13	0.055	-0.51	0
		41& Above	-.434*	0.207	0.036	-0.84	-0.03

LSD							
Dependent Variable	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	41& Above	21-30	0.183	0.188	0.332	-0.19	0.55
		31-40	.434*	0.207	0.036	0.03	0.84
Others have complete faith in me	21-30	31-40	0.208	0.124	0.094	-0.04	0.45
		41& Above	-0.122	0.179	0.496	-0.47	0.23
	31-40	21-30	-0.208	0.124	0.094	-0.45	0.04
		41& Above	-0.33	0.196	0.094	-0.72	0.06
	41& Above	21-30	0.122	0.179	0.496	-0.23	0.47
		31-40	0.33	0.196	0.094	-0.06	0.72
Others are proud to be associated with me	21-30	31-40	0.161	0.111	0.15	-0.06	0.38
		41& Above	-0.097	0.161	0.547	-0.41	0.22
	31-40	21-30	-0.161	0.111	0.15	-0.38	0.06
		41& Above	-0.258	0.177	0.145	-0.6	0.09
	41& Above	21-30	0.097	0.161	0.547	-0.22	0.41
		31-40	0.258	0.177	0.145	-0.09	0.6
I express with a few simple words what we could and should do	21-30	31-40	0.167	0.121	0.17	-0.07	0.41
		41& Above	0.208	0.175	0.236	-0.14	0.55
	31-40	21-30	-0.167	0.121	0.17	-0.41	0.07
		41& Above	0.041	0.192	0.832	-0.34	0.42
	41& Above	21-30	-0.208	0.175	0.236	-0.55	0.14
		31-40	-0.041	0.192	0.832	-0.42	0.34
I provide appealing images about what we can do	21-30	31-40	0.104	0.108	0.336	-0.11	0.32
		41& Above	0.152	0.156	0.331	-0.15	0.46
	31-40	21-30	-0.104	0.108	0.336	-0.32	0.11
		41& Above	0.048	0.171	0.78	-0.29	0.38
	41& Above	21-30	-0.152	0.156	0.331	-0.46	0.15
		31-40	-0.048	0.171	0.78	-0.38	0.29
I help others find meaning in their work	21-30	31-40	0.179	0.108	0.098	-0.03	0.39
		41& Above	0.013	0.156	0.931	-0.29	0.32
	31-40	21-30	-0.179	0.108	0.098	-0.39	0.03
		41& Above	-0.166	0.171	0.333	-0.5	0.17
	41& Above	21-30	-0.013	0.156	0.931	-0.32	0.29
		31-40	0.166	0.171	0.333	-0.17	0.5
I enable others to think about old problems in new	21-30	31-40	-0.095	0.121	0.434	-0.33	0.14
		41& Above	-0.126	0.175	0.472	-0.47	0.22

LSD							
Dependent Variable	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
ways	31-40	21-30	0.095	0.121	0.434	-0.14	0.33
		41& Above	-0.031	0.192	0.871	-0.41	0.35
	41& Above	21-30	0.126	0.175	0.472	-0.22	0.47
		31-40	0.031	0.192	0.871	-0.35	0.41
I provide others with new ways of looking at puzzling things	21-30	31-40	0.217	0.122	0.076	-0.02	0.46
		41& Above	-0.309	0.176	0.08	-0.66	0.04
	31-40	21-30	-0.217	0.122	0.076	-0.46	0.02
		41& Above	-.526*	0.193	0.007	-0.91	-0.15
	41& Above	21-30	0.309	0.176	0.08	-0.04	0.66
		31-40	.526*	0.193	0.007	0.15	0.91
I get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before	21-30	31-40	-0.227	0.122	0.064	-0.47	0.01
		41& Above	0.009	0.176	0.958	-0.34	0.36
	31-40	21-30	0.227	0.122	0.064	-0.01	0.47
		41& Above	0.236	0.194	0.223	-0.14	0.62
	41& Above	21-30	-0.009	0.176	0.958	-0.36	0.34
		31-40	-0.236	0.194	0.223	-0.62	0.14
I help others develop themselves	21-30	31-40	0.025	0.118	0.834	-0.21	0.26
		41& Above	-0.043	0.17	0.8	-0.38	0.29
	31-40	21-30	-0.025	0.118	0.834	-0.26	0.21
		41& Above	-0.068	0.187	0.716	-0.43	0.3
	41& Above	21-30	0.043	0.17	0.8	-0.29	0.38
		31-40	0.068	0.187	0.716	-0.3	0.43
I let others know how I think they are doing	21-30	31-40	.293*	0.129	0.023	0.04	0.55
		41& Above	-.450*	0.186	0.016	-0.82	-0.08
	31-40	21-30	-.293*	0.129	0.023	-0.55	-0.04
		41& Above	-.743*	0.204	0	-1.14	-0.34
	41& Above	21-30	.450*	0.186	0.016	0.08	0.82
		31-40	.743*	0.204	0	0.34	1.14
I give personal attention to others who seem rejected	21-30	31-40	.304*	0.132	0.022	0.04	0.56
		41& Above	0.063	0.191	0.744	-0.31	0.44
	31-40	21-30	-.304*	0.132	0.022	-0.56	-0.04
		41& Above	-0.241	0.21	0.25	-0.65	0.17
	41&	21-30	-0.063	0.191	0.744	-0.44	0.31

LSD							
Dependent Variable	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	Above	31-40	0.241	0.21	0.25	-0.17	0.65
I tell others what to do if they want to be rewarded for their work	21-30	31-40	0.077	0.124	0.534	-0.17	0.32
		41& Above	0.089	0.179	0.619	-0.26	0.44
	31-40	21-30	-0.077	0.124	0.534	-0.32	0.17
		41& Above	0.012	0.197	0.951	-0.37	0.4
	41& Above	21-30	-0.089	0.179	0.619	-0.44	0.26
		31-40	-0.012	0.197	0.951	-0.4	0.37
I provide recognition/rewards when others reach their goals	21-30	31-40	.525*	0.126	0	0.28	0.77
		41& Above	0.246	0.183	0.179	-0.11	0.6
	31-40	21-30	-.525*	0.126	0	-0.77	-0.28
		41& Above	-0.279	0.2	0.165	-0.67	0.12
	41& Above	21-30	-0.246	0.183	0.179	-0.6	0.11
		31-40	0.279	0.2	0.165	-0.12	0.67
I call attention to what others can get for they accomplish	21-30	31-40	.535*	0.121	0	0.3	0.77
		41& Above	-0.257	0.174	0.142	-0.6	0.09
	31-40	21-30	-.535*	0.121	0	-0.77	-0.3
		41& Above	-.792*	0.191	0	-1.17	-0.42
	41& Above	21-30	0.257	0.174	0.142	-0.09	0.6
		31-40	.792*	0.191	0	0.42	1.17
I am satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards	21-30	31-40	0.049	0.124	0.69	-0.19	0.29
		41& Above	0.001	0.179	0.997	-0.35	0.35
	31-40	21-30	-0.049	0.124	0.69	-0.29	0.19
		41& Above	-0.049	0.196	0.804	-0.43	0.34
	41& Above	21-30	-0.001	0.179	0.997	-0.35	0.35
		31-40	0.049	0.196	0.804	-0.34	0.43
As long as things are working, I do not try to change anything	21-30	31-40	-0.053	0.148	0.722	-0.34	0.24
		41& Above	-0.263	0.213	0.218	-0.68	0.16
	31-40	21-30	0.053	0.148	0.722	-0.24	0.34
		41& Above	-0.21	0.234	0.369	-0.67	0.25
	41& Above	21-30	0.263	0.213	0.218	-0.16	0.68
		31-40	0.21	0.234	0.369	-0.25	0.67
I tell others the standards they have to know to carry out	21-30	31-40	.353*	0.124	0.005	0.11	0.6
		41& Above	-0.28	0.18	0.119	-0.63	0.07

LSD							
Dependent Variable	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
their work	31-40	21-30	-.353*	0.124	0.005	-0.6	-0.11
		41& Above	-.633*	0.197	0.001	-1.02	-0.25
	41& Above	21-30	0.28	0.18	0.119	-0.07	0.63
		31-40	.633*	0.197	0.001	0.25	1.02
I am content to let others continue working in the same ways always	21-30	31-40	.358*	0.118	0.002	0.13	0.59
		41& Above	-0.279	0.17	0.101	-0.61	0.05
	31-40	21-30	-.358*	0.118	0.002	-0.59	-0.13
		41& Above	-.638*	0.187	0.001	-1	-0.27
	41& Above	21-30	0.279	0.17	0.101	-0.05	0.61
		31-40	.638*	0.187	0.001	0.27	1
Whatever others want to do is OK with me	21-30	31-40	0.101	0.129	0.435	-0.15	0.35
		41& Above	-0.332	0.186	0.076	-0.7	0.03
	31-40	21-30	-0.101	0.129	0.435	-0.35	0.15
		41& Above	-.433*	0.205	0.035	-0.84	-0.03
	41& Above	21-30	0.332	0.186	0.076	-0.03	0.7
		31-40	.433*	0.205	0.035	0.03	0.84
I ask no more of others than what is absolutely essential	21-30	31-40	.555*	0.111	0	0.34	0.77
		41& Above	0.108	0.161	0.503	-0.21	0.42
	31-40	21-30	-.555*	0.111	0	-0.77	-0.34
		41& Above	-.448*	0.177	0.012	-0.79	-0.1
	41& Above	21-30	-0.108	0.161	0.503	-0.42	0.21
		31-40	.448*	0.177	0.012	0.1	0.79
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.							
