UPRIGHT PERSONS WILL APPLY ETHICS IN MANAGEMENT

Daniela BELU

"Henri Coanda" Air Force Academy, Brasov

***Abstract**: This paper has the purpose of transmitting information and ideas about the things that stand at the foundation of performance assessment destined to bring success in private life and also in the organisation development.*

***Keywords**: management, development, efficiency, responsability.*

1. THE MANAGERIAL SKILLS

When we say about someone that he/ she is upright, we acknowledge in him/ her the feeling of self- satisfaction due to consistency, because his/ her beliefs will be reflected in his/ her behaviour, harmonizing their psyche, which acts as an axis for a happy person, making him/ her consistent despite the events which he/she encounters.

The persons with managerial skills are able to:

- be positive, dedicating more time to do what the want according to their dreams/ ideals, instead of marking time by trying to putting others in their place;
- to control stress and irritation;
- to resist to manipulation and intimidation from the people around them, identifying and solving issues at the core of this attitude;
- to negotiate conflict solving;
- to interpret and use non-verbal signals;
- to identify positive/ aggressive/ passive behaviour in others and in themselves;
- to refuse someone without feeling guilty;
- to use the feedback technique in order to convey to others their opinion about the good and bad things they do;
- to use paraphrases into communication in order to ensure that they understood what has been said;
- to control their own negative feelings.

In the light of the above mentioned aspects, we find it opportune to emphasize the competence of the young military students (future officers for the Infantry and Air Force) and civilians (future doctors) regarding the competence of applying ethics into management (reflecting emotional intelligence in dominating the own negative emotions and to transmit positive emotions to the others). We used as a measuring system two indicators: the capacity of not surrendering to manipulators and the Machiavellian attitude (the inclination to manipulate the others).

The first measuring instrument is an adapted version of the Mach VI Scale test by Richard Christie and Florence Geis, which was first, published in 1990 in "Studies in Machiavellism", New York, Academic Press. The questionnaire contains rather popular points of view and opinions. The assessment of the tendency to manipulate is done by summing up the score from all 15 statements, a personal score which may vary between a maximum of +30 and a minimum of -30.

The more the score approaches +30, the deeper are the Machiavellian skills, i.e. the person does not give up after failure, persevering in applying an increasing number of manipulation techniques until reaching the goal and perceiving on an emotional level feelings of satisfaction when the manipulation of others achieves its targets.

The more a person's score approaches -30, the more upright, honest and unselfish the person is, as the negative value of the score is drawing near the minimum accepted value.

2. RESULTS OF THE 2009 SURVEY

We established three samples of 12 subjects each:

- SAMPLE 1 made up of infantry students;
- SAMPLE 2 made up of military students-navigating aviators from the Air Force;
- SAMPLE 3 made up of civilian students from the Faculty of Medicine.

The three samples of military and civilian students, as well as the results of applying the two tests, which have already been presented in terms of content and interpretation, are depicted in the Tables no. 4, 5, 6.

The purpose of the survey was to check the following hypotheses:

I. Are there in all three samples both subjects with Machiavellian attitude and upright ones or not.

II. Can the subjects with Machiavellian attitudes be found to a greater extent in sample 3 than in the samples 1 and 2 or not.

Can subjects with greater competence as to applying ethics into management be found to a greater extent in sample 3 than in the samples 1 and 2 or not.

3. VALIDATION OF THE RESULTS

Statistical calculations for the determination of the error probability in the interpretation of the data collected in the 2009 inquiry

Validation of the score of Machiavellism

Percentage of manipulators in the three samples:

Sample no. 1
(50% are manipulators and 50% are upright)

$xi \rightarrow$ $\bar{x}1 = (\sum xi)/12 = 1{,}08(3)$	Standard deviation $\sigma 1 = xi - \bar{x}1$	Variation $\sigma 1^2$
-12	-13.08(3)	171.16
-5	-6.08(3)	37.002
-3	-4.08(3)	16.67
-3	-4.08(3)	16.67
0	-1.08(3)	1.172
0	-1.08(3)	1.172
+2	+0.917	0.840
+4	+2.917	8.508
+5	+3.917	15.34
+8	+6.917	47.84
+8	+6.917	47.84
+9	+7.917	62.67

Sample no.2
(83,3 % are manipulators and 16.7% are upright)

$xi \rightarrow$ $\bar{x}2 = (\sum xi)/12 = 4{,}33$	Standard deviation $\sigma 2 = xi - \bar{x}2$	Variation $\sigma 2^2$
-11	-15.33	235.008
0	-4.33	18.74
+1	-3.33	11.08
+1	-3.33	11.08
+4	-0.33	0.108
+7	+2.67	7.128
+7	+2.67	7.128
+8	+3.67	13.46
+8	+3.67	13.46
+8	+3.67	13.46
+9	+4.67	21.808
+10	+5.67	32.14

Sample no.3
(25 % are manipulators and 75% are upright)

$xi \rightarrow$ $\bar{x}3 = (\sum xi)/12 = 4{,}0(83)$	Standard deviation $\sigma 3 = xi - \bar{x}3$	Variation $\sigma 3^2$
-6	-1.917	3.67
-4	-0.08(3)	0.325
-5	-0.917	0.840
-8	-3.917	15.342
-8	-3.917	15.342
-16	-11.917	142.014
-5	-0.917	0.840
-14	-9.917	98.342
0	+4.083	16.67
1	+5.08(3)	25.836
8	+12.08(3)	145.998
8	+12.08(3)	145.998

We compare the average from sample 1 to the average from sample 2 and apply test “t”, i.e. we use formula (1):

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}1 - \bar{X}2}{\sqrt{\left[\left(\sum \sigma 1\right)^2 \cdot 11 + \left(\sum \sigma 2^2\right) \cdot 11\right] / 22} \cdot \sqrt{1/12 + 1/12}} \quad (1)$$

Common standard deviation is calculated using formula (2):

$$\sqrt{\left[\left(\sum \sigma 1\right)^2 \cdot 11 + \left(\sum \sigma 2\right)^2 \cdot 11\right] / 22} \quad (2)$$

$t_{calculated} = -0.3951082$

Looking into the table of “t” values on the row indicated by the liberty threshold $(n1 + n2 - 2)$ and in the column indicated by the probability threshold, 0.20, (i.e. at the intersection of column 0.20 with line 22) we find the value of $t_{critical} = +1.32$.

$t_{calculated} < t_{critical}$; $-0.3951082 < +1.32 \rightarrow$ Null hypotheses 3 and 4 are accepted.

With an error risk of 20%, we conclude that the two environments from samples 1 and 2 not differ significantly. By observing the two environments we notice that the subjects from sample 1 are less ready to manipulate than subjects from sample 2 (1.08(3) < 4.44).

We compare the average from sample 1 to the average from sample 3 and apply test "t", i.e. we use formula (3):

$$t = \frac{\overline{X}1 - \overline{X}3}{\sqrt{\left[\left(\sum \sigma 1\right)^2 \cdot 11 + \left(\sum \sigma 3^2\right) \cdot 11\right] / 22} \cdot \sqrt{1/12 + 1/12}} \quad (3)$$

Common standard deviation is calculated using formula (4):

$$\sqrt{\left[\left(\sum \sigma 1\right)^2 \cdot 11 + \left(\sum \sigma 3\right)^2 \cdot 11\right] / 22} \quad (4)$$

$t_{calculated} = 0.5557826$

Looking into the table of "t" values on the row indicated by the liberty threshold and in $(n1 + n2 - 2)$ the column indicated by the probability threshold, 0.20, (i.e. at the intersection of column 0,20 with line 22) we find the value of $t_{critical} = +1.32$.

$t_{calculated} < t_{critical}$; $0.5557826 < +1.32 \rightarrow$
Null Hypotheses 3 and 4 are accepted.

With an error risk of 20%, we conclude that the two environments from samples 1 and 3 not differ significantly. By observing the two environments we notice that the subjects from sample 3 are less ready to manipulate than subjects from sample 1 (1.08(3) < 4.44).

By comparing the average with the norm of not using manipulation techniques, meaning being an upright person, in sample no.1, we apply test "t", but this time using formula (5):

t = (average of sample 1 + norm)/[(standard deviation in sample 1 + norm)/
$/\sqrt{\text{number of subjects in sample 1}}$] (5)

Standard deviation from sample one is calculated using formula (6):

$$\sqrt{\frac{\sum (\text{values})^2 - \sum (\text{values})^2 / \text{number of values}}{(\text{number of values} - 1}} \quad (6)$$

$t_{critical} = +1.37$

$t_{calculated} < t_{critical}$; $0.6188571 < +1.37 \rightarrow$
Null Hypothesis 2 is accepted.

With an error risk of 20%, we conclude that 50% of the subjects from sample no.1 present a slight tendency of using manipulation techniques, while the other 50% do not use manipulation techniques , because they are upright people. After observing the average and the norm we conclude that the subjects in sample no.1 are inclined towards manipulating others (0 < 1.08(3)).

By comparing, in sample 2, the average with the norm of not using manipulation techniques, meaning being an upright person, we apply the "t" test, using formula (7):

t = (average of sample 2 + norm)/[(standard deviation in sample 2 + norm)/
$/\sqrt{\text{number of subjects in sample 2}}$] (7)

Standard deviation from sample 2 is calculated using formula (6).

$t_{critical} = +1.80$

$t_{calculated} > t_{critical}$; $2.1037984 > +1.80 \rightarrow$
Null Hypothesis 2 is rejected

With an error risk of 10%, we conclude that 83.3% of the subjects from sample no.2 have the tendency to use manipulation techniques, while the rest, representing 16.7% do not use manipulation techniques, because they are upright people. After observing the average and the norm we conclude that the subjects from sample no.2 are very inclined towards manipulating others (0 < 4,33).

By comparing the average with the norm of not using manipulation techniques, meaning being an upright person, in sample no.3, we apply test "t", using formula (8):

t = (average of sample 3 + norm)/[(standard deviation in sample 3 + norm)/
$/\sqrt{\text{number of subjects in sample 3}}$] (8)

Standard deviation from sample 3 is calculated using formula (6).

Looking into the table of "t" values on the row indicated by the liberty threshold and

$(n3-1)$ in the column indicated by the probability threshold, 0.20, (i.e. at the intersection of column 0.20 with line 11) we find the value of $t_{critical}$:

$t_{critical} = +1.37$

$t_{calculated} > t_{critical}$; $-1.7204819 > +1.37 \rightarrow$ Null Hypothesis 2 is rejected

With an error risk of 20%, we conclude that 25% of the subjects from sample no.3 have a slight tendency to use manipulation techniques, while the remaining 75% do not use manipulation techniques, because they are upright people. After observing the average and the norm we conclude that the subjects from sample no.3 are not inclined towards manipulating others (-4.08(3) < 0).

REFERENCES

1. McMillan, P., *Personality Tests*, Aldo Press Publishing House, 1996, p. 158-159;
2. Kets de Vries, M., *Leadership, the Art and Mastery of Leading*, Condex Publishing House, 2003;
3. Goleman, D., *Emotional Intelligence*, Curtea Veche Publishing House, 2001.