

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL AND STATISTIC INSTRUMENTS USED TO MEASURE DETACHMENT FROM THE OTHER'S OPINION – THE BASIS OF LEADERSHIP

Daniela BELU

Department of Military Sciences and Management, Faculty of Aeronautical Management,
“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 with the harmony between what one thinks and does.

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

1. INTRODUCTION

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 with five attitudinal properties:

1. The belief that one needs not be entirely agreeable.
2. The capacity to count on oneself alone to cope life's problems.
3. The sincerity and creativity in expressing personal opinions and solving problems.
4. The harmony between what one thinks and does.

A leader is an unperturbed person, regardless of the manner in which he/she is regarded by those around, not seeking the total approval or disapproval of the others. A person with leadership skills does not seek to be agreeable to everyone around, expects nothing from his/her fellow-creatures, which is why he/she will not attempt to constraint anyone to behave according to a pre-established scenario that suits his/her personal needs. This is the fundament of respect for the other, as an attitude specific of strong leader personalities, as people who listen to those around without

judging them, thus creating a dialogue-enabling climate, fascinating through their inner freedom. Otherwise, it is the case of the “evil seducer” or the manipulator, and people will feel apathetic, suffocated, paralyzed, without initiative, deprived of the freedom of expression, obligated to behave according to a scenario to their detriment, yet serving the needs of the one manipulating them.

What is absent in the immediate reality is the charm, the pleasure of expressing ourselves through work, given by the existence, around us, of charismatic people who are as important as salt is to the food. That is why I considered this scientific analysis of leadership necessary, setting out from the personal magnetism of some people who have innate leadership skills.

The seduction exerted on fellow creatures, from a non-erotic perspective, is in fact the charismatic leaders' mutual act of leading and being led. As interaction, this implies the use of some subtle charm in order to influence the others, to make them regard you with gratitude for the inner fascination you induced when they considered you the symbol of a world that they didn't know, but that they were coveting. Seduction must be understood as something that comprises a certain degree of

autosuggestion. This can be explained by starting from the objective reality according to which the group transposes to a state of mind that is presumed to have been generated by the charismatic leader, but in effect has been intensified by the group itself. All is possible when seduction is involved:

- individuals might be seduced against their will;

- leaders might seduce a given group without even aiming for it and they may find themselves triumphant without having planned or wished to.

The type of seduction that leadership is built upon has nothing to do with eroticism and it consists of any sudden change or swing of attitude of a human being, such as any: sudden conversion, contribution in the name of a cause, moral metamorphosis. The capacity to seduce is characteristic of the persons with leadership skills, as it is innate and it consists of the personal charm some of us are born with and that we increase by means of cultural polishing up, materializing it in the sensation of dominating charm exercised more or less consciously over other individuals. The seducer controls the seduced. To be the desired person is a subtle form of control. It is equally true that the seducer, as the person seducing others, seduces himself/herself too, depending more or less on the strength of his/her desire for power. The stronger the desire is, the more we may speak of a malignant form of narcissism and manipulation. The seducer's portrayal segregated on genders appears: fragile and distinguished as a passive, defensive alternative of charm, even more redoubtable, (in women), energetic, fanatic, determined and clairvoyant, as an active and offensive alternative to charm, (in men).

Scientific research in the field of social psychology has demonstrated that, similarly to the world of bees, where the vast majority is made up of nurses and only a minority represents the queens, in the world of human beings, three quarters of the individuals lack charm, having nothing seductive in them. This type of people is terrified of inter-human relations that imply proximity, because they regard them as hazardous and therefore do nothing in order to bring their fellow-creatures

closer. On the contrary, they do all they can to send them away. The paradox is that these individuals, who do all they can to isolate themselves, consider that the greatest threat that lurks is for them not to be accepted, or to be rejected, abandoned and humiliated by others. This majority of people build a scenario in their minds according to which they cannot be loved, given the fact that they do not deserve to be loved. They are the same people who surrender to the subjective perception that a charming, seductive fellow-creature, the leader, possesses something that they need.

If he/she possesses those qualities that can turn him/her into the representation of the personal fictions of the group members, the person in question will exercise, consciously or not, a certain fascination, seducing through the fact that he/she can reflect the image of the leader who embodies the strong emotional currents awakened by the subjective perception of the individuals from within the group. It is a demonstrated fact that to be a leader is a talent, such as playing the piano or writing poetry. Personal charm cannot be acquired by storing up competences. Constructed charm is or is not artificial and cannot replace authentic inter-human relating.

We are currently witnessing the apparition of literature on seduction techniques that promise the impossible, that is to transmit the competence to seduce to anybody, even to those individuals who lack charm, i.e. to certain people who fear the idea of not being accepted by the group they are a part of, who dread rejection, humiliation abandonment, who lack self-confidence, nurturing the belief that they do not deserve to be loved and are not entitled to hope to ever be loved. It is cruel to promise sight to the blind, on condition they attentively read a couple of books.

Undoubtedly, the principles promoted by this type of scientific literature on the seduction techniques are correct, but they exclusively address people born talented and charismatic. Otherwise, persons who unconsciously avoid seduction applying them will turn them into anti-seduction techniques. Thus, a person who lacks charm, is insecure or has no self-confidence may intend certain

gestures to attract others, but by monitoring their accomplishment he/she will make the charm of the interaction disappear and will let show the rigidity and lack of spontaneity. Seduction techniques are for those who try to make it look as if they were born charming, serving as a shield that the false seducers will put between themselves and those whom they wish to manipulate, so that they would feel safe and avoid being attracted or touched, thus losing control.

Similarly dangerous is the excessive use of the genuine native charm, with the purpose of dominating those in the proximity, as an obsessive need for power, case in which the manipulator will seduce himself/herself beyond limits, ending up smashed by the force of his/her own desire for power. This is the situation that designates the concept of exacerbated, malignant narcissism, where seduction operates as a defence system against painful feelings of rejection, abandonment and depression, in an attempt to convince the ill ego that it is attractive, wanted, loved and full of life, by means of confirmation of the personal value regarded as a toll of the manipulated victims, gathered in large numbers on display on “the hunting trophy wall”. Seduction and manipulation are possible manifestations of the individuals’ personal strength, both deriving from the innate charm and aiming to influence the other. The difference is given by the pursued purpose, which depends on the strength of the individual’s personality, expressed in dimensions such as self-confidence, congruence, authenticity and morality.

The seducer might make use of the attraction created in order to exercise his power over those seduced, either by keeping the effect of the seduction to himself, or by giving up on his own glory and orienting his/her strength toward higher prizes. In the first case, we are talking about manipulation, while in the latter we speak of mentors, masters, professors, vibrant leaders, who deviate their disciples’ fascination away from their own person, from their knowledge, to the idea that those whom they have inspire will be able to do things they were not aware they could.

Without the strong emotions nurtured by the group towards the leader, any activity becomes unattractive. To manipulate is to use people by seducing them, including erotically, to the end of using them for purposes that are not their own. It is essential not to mistake manipulation for seduction, the latter being most often beneficial for the one experiencing it, as it elevates him/her to another spiritual dimension. To seduce is to propose another a higher level of existence that relies on such aspects as living more intensely and expecting more from life.

What differentiates a manager from a leader is charisma, that is the individuals’ magnetism, that certain ‘*je ne sais quoi*’, a mystery even for the one blessed with innate charm, based on character traits, which he /she tries to hide and not on something he/she would be convinced to show, as a personal advantage. The leader’s charisma relies on authenticity and that is because artifice and control have nothing to do with seduction, as a phenomenon developed in the depths of personality.

2. SURVEY DEPICTION

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 contain the items of the 8 psychological tests combined, aiming the 5 dimensions that measure the magnetism of the personalities of the subjects from within the two groups.

2.1 The instruments used for the data collection. A battery of psychological tests has been prepared, containing the adapted variants of the components below:

- Psychological test evaluates the „addiction to the others’ opinion” dimension, (the bibliographic source of origin is the ‘Corpus of psychological tests to get to know yourself better’, by Gilles D’Ambra, 2008:26).

The evaluation scale is of 3 points distributed as below:

1	2	3
Masochist	Uneasy	Susceptible

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 the 8 items below:

Check each statement that suits you:

1. ● At school, just like at the office, you are better at writing than at speaking.
2. ◆ Your acquaintances often reproach you for not listening enough.
3. ○ You do not manage to look somebody in the eye for more than 3 seconds.
4. ◆ At the restaurant you often spill your glass on the table (unintentionally).
5. ◆ You are an only child.
6. ○ On the street or at the office you feel uneasy when you get the feeling that somebody is watching you.
7. ◆ Your friends have often reproached that you are too sarcastic or that you are scornful.
8. ● Before an exam or an interview, you are not able to get any sleep (you get up at 5 am).
9. ○ Compliments make you feel bad.
10. ○ Generally, you consider your success to be more a matter of fortune than the result of your efforts or merits.
11. ○ You often have a feeling of embarrassment.
12. ● You get cold feet when you know you have to talk in front of more than two people.
13. ● You often get car-sick.
14. ◆ Occupationally, you would have liked to become an actor/actress.
15. ◆ You often quarrel over petty things.
16. ○ When you compare yourself to others (which you frequently do), it is almost always to your disadvantage.
17. ● If you were to choose between a cat and a dog, you would pick the dog.
18. ◆ At school you almost always had the best grades in the class.
19. ● You rather work alone than in a team.
20. ○ When you buy clothes, you often feel sorry afterwards.
21. ● When you have a party invitation, you most often turn it down.

22. ◆ When criticised, you tend to get slightly annoyed (even if you do not show it).

23. ◆ When someone does something stupid, you can't help saying a word.

24. ● Physically, you are not a very brave person.

25. ○ When you are asked very direct or personal questions, you tend to get emotional .

26. ○ You cannot stand being tickled (they make you hysterical).

27. ● You often feel your stomach is tied in knots.

28. ○ You have had tetany crises.

29. ● You do not feel comfortable around people of another race (strangers in general).

30. ◆ When someone makes a mistake, you find it hard to forgive them.

2.2 Interpretation of the answers.

Interpretation of items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30: The number of times that the „◆”, „○”, „●” answer was chosen will be calculated. The subject goes under the category designated by the highest number of answers. If the difference between the number of answers given at two categories is smaller than 2, than the subject is ambivalent.

Most answers are „◆”, the susceptible type:

- characteristics: very demanding of him/herself / demands are always higher and higher / feels guilty about not having done what he/she had intended to / feels guilty about infringing certain moral rules (when lying) / feels guilty about not having done things as well as he/she could have / has the tendency to blame the people around when he/she makes mistakes

- for this type it would be advisable to: accept his/her own limits / stop trying to make excuses when feeling incriminated, (by reacting to easily and becoming aggressive).

- in a scale measuring the individual's dependence on the others' opinions, the subject scores 6 points.

Most of the answers are „○”, the masochistic type

- characteristics: exacerbated shyness / blames him/herself for all the mistakes, even when being innocent / is very much ashamed when making mistakes and is overwhelmed by

remorse and shame for being ashamed / is not self-assured or confident in what he/she can achieve.

- For this type it would be advisable to: become aware of his/her own moral standards and exigencies / accept the fact that feeling guilty when making mistakes is absolutely normal / understand that the people who really love us do not expect us to be perfect (i.e. not to make any mistakes or not have any weaknesses).

- in a scale measuring the individual's dependence on the others' opinions, the subject scores 2 points.

Most of the answers are „•”, the restless type

- characteristics: anxious / fears the others' opinions / is afraid of sanctions / is pessimistic.

- for this type it would be advisable to: learn that mistaking is not bad, because most of the times any mistake can be repaired.

- in a scale measuring the individual's dependence on the others' opinions, the subject scores 4 points.

The statistic instruments used to measure the probability of error of the results:

$$A \text{ var age} = \frac{[\sum (\text{value} \cdot \text{number of subiects})]}{\text{Samplegroup}} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Stan dard deviation} = \frac{\sum (\text{value} - \text{a var age})}{\text{number of value} - 1} \quad (2)$$

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 (Note : Standard deviation = Sd, Standard common deviation = SCd, Sample group=Sgr, Deviation Sample group = DSgr):

$$t = \frac{\text{a var age of sample1} - \text{a var age of sample2}}{\text{SCd} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{\text{Samplegroup1}} + \frac{1}{\text{Samplegroup2}}}}$$

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. CONCLUSIONS OF THE HYPOTHESIS VERIFIED WITHIN THE STUDY

Are the majority of the subjects persons who do not depend on the others' opinions in both groups or not? This hypothesis may have the significances below:

- The null hypothesis: ‘self-exigency, tendency to feel guilty when not doing what they wish or when breaching their moral barriers’.

- Rejection of the null hypothesis: ‘feeling of guilt for the errors they have not even committed, burning embarrassment about the mistakes they have made, tormenting remorse, anxiety, pessimism and fear of the others' opinions’.

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.

Addicted to others' opinion

Sample 1 (efective=13)

Score	Efective	%
3	5	38,46%
2	8	61,53%

Sample 2 (efective=24)

Score	Efective	%
3	13	54,16%
2	9	37,5%
1	2	8,33%

Self-confidence in sample 1 :

$$\begin{aligned}\sum values^2 &= 3^2 \cdot 5 + 2^2 \cdot 18 = \\ &= 9 \cdot 5 + 4 \cdot 8 = 45 + 32 = 77 \\ (\sum values)^2 &= (3 \cdot 5 + 2 \cdot 8)^2 = 31^2 = 961\end{aligned}$$

$$Sd = \sqrt{\frac{77 - 961/13}{12}} = \sqrt{\frac{77 - 73,931}{12}} =$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{3,077}{12}} = \sqrt{0,2564166} = 0,5063759$$

$$t_{calculated} = \frac{2,384 - 3}{0,5063759 / \sqrt{13}} =$$

$$= \frac{-0,616}{0,5063759 / 3,6055512} = \frac{-0,616}{0,1404434} =$$

$$= -4,3861085$$

$$-t_{calculated} = -(-4,3861085) = 4,3861085$$

$$t_{critical} = 4,32$$

$-t_{calculated} > t_{critical} \rightarrow$ We therefore conclude that a risk of error of 1%, is in sample 1 - Rejection of the null hypothesis: 'feeling of guilt for the errors they have not even committed, burning embarrassment about the mistakes they have made, tormenting remorse, anxiety, pessimism and fear of the others' opinions'.

$$4,3861085 \leq 4,32$$

Self-confidence in sample 2:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum values^2 &= 3^2 \cdot 13 + 2^2 \cdot 9 + 1^2 \cdot 2 = \\ &= 9 \cdot 13 + 4 \cdot 9 + 2 = 155\end{aligned}$$

$$(\sum values)^2 = (3 \cdot 13 + 2 \cdot 9 + 1 \cdot 2)^2 = 59^2 = 3481$$

$$Sd = \sqrt{\frac{155 - 3481/24}{23}} = \sqrt{\frac{155 - 145,041}{23}} =$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{9,959}{23}} = \sqrt{0,433} = 0,6580273$$

$$t_{calculated} = \frac{2,458 - 3}{0,6580273 / \sqrt{24}} =$$

$$= \frac{-0,542}{0,6580273 / 4,8989794} = \frac{-0,542}{0,1343192} =$$

$$= -4,0351639$$

$$-t_{calculated} = -(-4,0351639) = 4,0351639$$

$$t_{critical} = 3,77$$

$t_{calculated} > t_{critical} \rightarrow$ We therefore conclude that a risk of error of 1%, is in sample 2 - Rejection of the null hypothesis:

'feeling of guilt for the errors they have not even committed, burning embarrassment about the mistakes they have made, tormenting remorse, anxiety, pessimism and fear of the others' opinions'.

$$4,0351639 > 3,77$$

Sample 1 Average = 2,384, Standard deviation = 0,5063759

Sample 2 Average = 2,458, Standard deviation = 0,6580273

$$SCd = \sqrt{\frac{0,5063759 \cdot (13 - 1) + 0,6580273 \cdot (24 - 1)}{(13 + 24) - 2}} =$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{0,5063759 \cdot 12 + 0,6580273 \cdot 23}{35}} =$$

$$= 0,7784808$$

$$t_{calculated} =$$

$$= \frac{2,384 - 2,458}{\sqrt{\frac{0,5063758 \cdot 12 + 0,6580273 \cdot 23}{35}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{13} + \frac{1}{24}}} =$$

$$= -0,074 / 0,7784808 \cdot 0,3443684 =$$

$$= -0,074 / 0,2680841 = -0,2760327$$

$$-t_{calculated} = -(-0,2760327) = 0,2760327$$

$$t_{critical} = 2,73$$

$-t_{calculated} \leq t_{critical} \rightarrow$ With an error risk of 1% we conclude that 38,46% in Sample 1 and 54,16% in Sample 2 Null Hypothesis is accepted: 'self-exigency, tendency to feel guilty when not doing what they wish or when breaching their moral barriers'.

$$0,2760327 \leq 2,73.$$

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. D'Ambra, Gilles. (2008). *Corpus of psychological tests to get to know yourself better*. Bucharest: Litera International Publishing House.
2. Kets de Vries, Manfred. (2003). *Leadership, arta și măiestria de a conduce*. Bucharest: Codex..
3. Goleman, Daniel. (2001). *Inte3ligența emoțională*. Bucharest: Curtea veche Publishing House. .