

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL AND STATISTIC INSTRUMENTS USED TO MEASURE CAPACITY TO EASILY REFUSE DOING SOMETHING THEY DISAGREE ABOUT – THE BASIS OF LEADERSHIP

Daniela BELU

“Henri Coandă” Air Force Academy, Brasov, Romania

***Abstract:** This paper has the purpose of transmitting information and ideas about the capacity to seduce characteristic of the persons with leadership skills. What impresses, enlivens, fascinates and hypnotizes in a person with leadership skills is the profound side of his/her charm, which works as a magnet wit: the harmony between what one thinks and does.*

***Keywords:** management, seduction, leadership, charisma, leader, authenticity.*

1. CAPACITY TO EASILY REFUSE DOING SOMETHING THEY DISAGREE ABOUT

Neurolinguistic programming therapists call the inner coherence of persons with leadership skills congruence. The perfect harmony between a person's identity/convictions/feelings/behaviour indicates the level of inner coherence/congruence of that person's psychic.

The measure of leadership is indeed the fact that the leader is not content to merely defend certain ideas, but will also materialize them in his/her behaviour, by virtue of his talent to make/build/ put to application the world of values/beliefs/aspirations from within his/her mind. Coming out in favour of a thing he/she profoundly believes in, thoroughly developing a project without giving in to obstacles, finding solutions to concrete problems around him/her, that not only affect him/her but those around as well, respecting people and activities starting from the organization of the work and the observation of labour norms are all forms of expression of the inner coherence, easily perceivable in all the gestures/words of a person endowed with leadership skills, who will never cheat, “no” meaning “no”, and doubts being expressed

with convincing arguments because there are justified/supported/ “elaborated”.

At the level of the organization, the selection for managerial positions must necessarily be made relying on a battery of psychological tests, with the purpose of employing people with leadership skills, so that any manager, regardless of his hierarchical level, may be a natural leader, which would translate into:

- The fact that the person in question will constrain no one to behave according to a pre-established scenario suiting his/her personal needs, but will rather impose the observation of the internal organization regulations of the company, the application of the labour norms, of the country's laws and of the principles of Christian morals, by the methods acquired from the management knowledge.

- The fact that the person is self-confident;

- The fact that the person is genuine;

- The fact that the person will act according to his/her own values and, by way of consequence, will do what he/she preaches and would not have a problem saying what he/she does.

As regards the increase of the mental congruence of any employee of a company, it

is important for the process of self-development, in terms of the individual's mental maturity, to consist of the following aspects:

- To work, relying on what we ourselves can do (and not on what others could do to help us, or worse, by obligating/deceiving those who depend on us in order to use them);
- To eliminate the 'to be perfect' imperative that the school / educational system has long forced on generations up to this day and that organizations have sustained by cultivating the 'fear of criticism and rejection'
- To learn optimism together with and alongside: 1) the disappearance of the obsession of being perfect (or better yet of appearing perfect) and 2) the diminishing of the stress generated by the fear of being regarded as an impostor.
- To discover skills/passion/things that may support optimism and the individual's state of happiness.
- To reorient the imperative of perfection towards skills/passions/things that support optimism and the individual's state of happiness.

A leader is a happy person, and the source of his/her capacity to reach this state of mind is in fact the harmony he/she permanently finds himself/herself in, with what he/she thinks and does, the congruence of his/her psychic having the wonderful gift of carrying others away in his positive dynamics.

This harmony between the thoughts/emotions/actions of an individual, the congruence, is a marker of the psychical maturity and a state where the ideas form a natural and creative chain, and the emotional experiences are calm, having a self-appreciative inner tranquillity. Under these terms, all actions of the individual are effective, consuming an extremely small amount of energy, but with maximum results.

The fact that some people are more congruent than others poses two problems that need to be solved:

1. The occupation of leading positions, regardless of the hierarchic level, by people who are psychically congruent.
2. The increase of mental congruence within the individual, as a side of personal

development of any employee of the organization.

Cognitively speaking, all employees comprehend and are capable of explaining several things, but not all people are able to apply them in other actions other than those adequate to their biological age.

These methods of increase of the mental congruence will materialize in the personality of the employees of a company in:

- physical and psychical relaxation;
- expression of the personal emotions and opinions;
- honest recognition that the individual 'does not know', 'does not have what it takes', 'lacks the theoretical/practical knowledge' required to solve a problem;
- the choice of simplicity in the relations with the others, renouncing the 'confrontation' with the fellow-creatures and instead choosing to 'offer our values/beliefs', while expressing themselves clearly/ bravely/honestly, using metaphors to allow comprehension and to help those around feel intelligent/relaxed/respected, in their capacity of interlocutors.

2. CASE STUDY: 2008-2009 SURVEY

The survey aims to evaluate the charisma of future officers of the Air Force and the Army, military leaders with a degree in 'organizational management'. The analyzed data have been collected by the filling out of the form presented in Figure 1, containing the items of the psychological tests combined, aiming the dimensions that measure the magnetism of the personalities of the subjects from within the two groups.

A battery of psychological tests has been prepared, containing the adapted variants of the components below:

Psychological test

- evaluates the „congruence -4- capacity to say 'NO' dimension
- The bibliographic source of origin is the 'Corpus of psychological tests to get to know yourself better', by Gilles D'Ambra, Litera International Publishing House, 2008, page 79.
- The evaluation scale is of 4 points distributed as below:

Table 1 The evaluation scale

1	2	3	4
Incapable of saying NO	Finds it difficult to say NO	Says NO and is adaptable when necessary	Says NO and finds it difficult to adapt if necessary

The battery of psychological tests used for the collection of the data needed to verify the hypotheses materializes in the adapted instrument, presented in the succession of items below:

1. At a party a man/woman is insistent trying to converse with you:

- a) You resist hoping he/she will eventually leave.
- b) You leave, making an excuse.
- c) You elegantly (but firmly) send him/her away.

2. You think of your best friend:

- a) That he/she looks sexier than you do.
- b) That he/she is like you.
- c) That you have no reason to envy him/her.

3. Your boss gives you extra-work:

- a) You do not dare say no, too bad for your weekend.
- b) You turn it down explaining that it is not listed in your job specification.
- c) You explain that you already have many tasks and that, if you accept, your work will be affected.

4. The sales-women in the stores:

- a) Are capable of selling you old products from last year's discounts.
- b) You do not stand to be patronized.
- c) You do not hesitate to make them unfold many things, even though you are not certain you will buy them.

5. You sometimes do certain things by yourself, such as:

- a) Going to the cinema.
- b) Dining out.
- c) Going on holiday.

6. After a romantic dinner, your partner no longer contacts you:

- a) You think you have done something he/she did not like.
- b) You think to yourself that he/she has his/her reasons.
- c) You call him/her and give him/her a piece of your mind.

7. Generally, in relation with others:

- a) You often wonder what they see in you.
- b) You don't care about what they think of you.
- c) You often feel as if the others were underestimating you.

8. When your best friend makes a scene, you are convinced that:

- a) You will never see him/her again.
- b) You will stay upset for a long time.
- c) It will all be forgotten in a few days.

9. Compliments have the tendency:

- a) To generally disappoint you.
- b) To make you feel bad.
- c) To delight you.

10. In what work is concerned you are convinced:

- a) That many things are ignored/tolerated.
- b) That you deserve more.
- c) That you are appreciated at your full value.

11. You often tend to:

- a) Start working.
- b) To poke your nose into other peoples' business.
- c) To make a blunder.

12. Your current lodging:

- a) You lover (or your parents) has/have chosen for you.
- b) You have chosen yourself.
- c) It was your choice too.

13. You dream to become or you already are:

- a) A clerk.
- b) Employee in the private sector.
- c) Your own boss.

14. The office or home burdens:
- Are almost always on your shoulders.
 - You pull tricks, avoiding them in order to do your best.
 - You do your job, nothing more.

15. Everything goes smoothly in a couple when:
- They do everything together.
 - Each of them does what he/she wants when he/she wants.
 - Each of them has his/her personal pleasures and activities.

3. INTERPRETATION OF THE ANSWERS

0 points are calculated for each 'a' answer, 1 point for 'b' and 2 points for 'c'. The subject will fall under the category determined by the score obtained by summing up the score.

Score < 8 points. The dependent type

- Characteristics: does not think for himself/herself / cannot understand his/her needs / depends on the group / is part of the manoeuvre mass / is willing to do the dirty jobs and difficult tasks just to be accepted by the people around.

- On a scale measuring the individual's congruence through his/her capacity to make decisions on his/her own and to say "no" when disagreeing, the subject scores 1 point.

8 points ≤ Score ≤ 14 points. The polite type

- Characteristics: it is difficult for him/her to make decisions on his/her own / it is very important to him/her not to differentiate from those around, and to this end he/she is willing to even neglect his/her own needs, even though he/she is sorry afterwards / is a soft person / is easily disheartened at the first remark received / is easy to deceive.

- On a scale measuring the individual's congruence through his/her capacity to make decisions on his/her own and to say 'no' when disagreeing, the subject scores 2 points.

15 points ≤ Score ≤ 22 points. The adaptable type

- Characteristics: is capable of making decisions on his/her own; when necessary, he/she can renounce his/her own needs /

subordinates when there is no other way, acting as a person who depends on the others' opinion / makes compromises.

- On a scale measuring the individual's congruence through his/her capacity to make decisions on his/her own and to say 'no' when disagreeing, the subject scores 3 points.

Score > 22 points. The independent type

- Characteristics: this type always makes decisions on his/her own / does not make compromises / cannot be made to obey unless he/she decides so himself/herself.

- On a scale measuring the individual's congruence through his/her capacity to make decisions on his/her own and to say 'no' when disagreeing, the subject scores 4 points.

4. THE STATISTIC INSTRUMENTS USED TO MEASURE THE PROBABILITY OF ERROR OF THE RESULTS

$$\text{Average} = \frac{\sum (\text{value} \cdot \text{number of subjects})}{\text{Samplegroup}} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Standard deviation} = \frac{\sum (\text{value} - \text{average})}{\text{number of value} - 1} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Variance} = \frac{\left[\frac{\sum \text{values}^2 - (\sum \text{values})^2}{\text{number of values} - 1} \right]}{\text{number of values} - 1} \quad (3)$$

The "t" test is applied in its form in which two averages calculated in two separate, independent groups are compared by applying the formula:

$$t = \frac{\text{avarage of sample1} - \text{avarage of sample2}}{\text{SCd} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{\text{Sample group1}} + \frac{1}{\text{Sample group2}}}} \quad (4)$$

$$\text{SCd} = \sqrt{\frac{\text{DSgr1} \cdot (\text{Sgr1} - 1) + \text{DSgr2} \cdot (\text{Sg2} - 1)}{(\text{Sgr1} + \text{Sg2}) - 2}} \quad (5)$$

$t_{\text{calculated}} \leq t_{\text{critical}}$ - the null hypothesis is accepted

$t_{\text{calculated}} > t_{\text{critical}}$ - the null hypothesis is rejected

Note:

Standard deviation = Sd;

Standard common deviation = SCd;

Sample group=Sgr;

Deviation Sample group=DSgr.

The 't' test is applied in its forms comparing the average calculated in a single sample.

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum \text{values}^2 - (\sum \text{values})^2 / \text{Sgr}}{\text{Sgr} - 1}} \quad (6)$$

$t_{\text{calculated}} \leq t_{\text{critical}}$ - the null hypothesis is accepted

$t_{\text{calculated}} > t_{\text{critical}}$ - the null hypothesis is rejected.

5. CONCLUSIONS OF THE HYPOTHESIS VERIFIED WITHIN THE 2008-2009 STUDY

Two study groups were formed whose subjects are military students. They agreed to take part in the study:

Group 1- made of 13 non-flying, military aviation students (air traffic controllers) and artillerymen of the Air forces.

Group 2 – made of 24 infantry military students of the Army.

The hypothesis we aimed to verify is:

Do the majority of the subjects express psychological congruence through their capacity to always make their own decisions, in both groups, or not? This hypothesis may have the significances below:

- The null hypothesis: 'to always make their own decisions, to comply while being fully aware, when they decide so, to easily refuse doing something they disagree about'.

- Rejection of the null hypothesis: 'they lose their self-confidence at the first observation; they do not know what they want, they need to be told what to wish for, and are incapable to refuse someone, or find it very difficult to do so'.

Table 2 The final results

Capacity to say 'NO'		
Sample 1 (13)		
Score	Number of respondents	%
3	12	92,3%
2	1	7.69%

Sample 2 (24)		
Score	Number of respondents	%
4	7	29,16%
3	16	66,66%
2	1	4,16%

Congruence through their capacity to say 'NO' in sample 1:

$$-t_{\text{calculated}} = -(-13,994009) = 13,994009$$

$$t_{\text{critical}} = 7,26$$

$-t_{\text{calculated}} > t_{\text{critical}}$ - We therefore conclude that a risk of error of 0,001%, is in sample 1 - Rejection of the null hypothesis: 'they lose their self-confidence at the first observation; they do not know what they want, they need to be told what to wish for, and are incapable to refuse someone, or find it very difficult to do so'.

$$13,994009 > 7,26$$

Congruence through their capacity to say 'NO' in sample 2:

$$-t_{\text{calculated}} = -(-6,9115314) = 6,9115314$$

$$t_{\text{critical}} = 5,63$$

$-t_{\text{calculated}} > t_{\text{critical}}$ - We therefore conclude that a risk of error of 0,001%, is in sample 2 - Rejection of the null hypothesis: 'they lose their self-confidence at the first observation; they do not know what they want, they need to be told what to wish for, and are incapable to refuse someone, or find it very difficult to do so'.

$$6,9115314 > 5,63$$

Sample 1: Average = 2,923; Standard deviation = 0,2774887

Sample 2: Average = 3,25; Standard deviation = 0,5316094

$$-t_{\text{calculated}} = -(-1,7917808) = 1,7917808$$

$$t_{\text{critical}} = 1,69$$

$-t_{\text{calculated}} > t_{\text{critical}}$ - With an error risk of 10% we conclude that 100% in Sample 1 and 70,82% in Sample2 - Rejection of the null hypothesis: 'they lose their self-confidence at the first observation; they do not know what they want, they need to be told what to wish for, and are incapable to refuse someone, or find it very difficult to do so'.

$$1,7917808 > 1,69$$

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Albrecht, K. (2007). *Practical Intelligence*, Bucharest: Curtea Veche Publishing House.
2. Armstrong, M. (2003). *Human Resources Management*. Bucharest: Codecs. 523-537.
3. Buckingham, B., Ciffman, C. (2005). *Manager against the current - What great managers do differently than other*. Bucharest: Allfa Publishing House.
4. D'Ambra, D. (2008). *'Corpus of psychological tests to get to know yourself better'*. Bucharest: Litera International Publishing House.
5. Goleman, D. (2001). *Emotional Intelligence*. Bucharest: Curtea Veche Publishing House.
6. Kets de Vries, M. (2003). *Leadership, the Art and Mastery of Leading*. Bucharest: Condex Publishing House.