

GOOD RESISTANCE TO MANIPULATION AND THE COMPETENCE OF APPLYING ETHICS IN MANAGEMENT

Daniela BELU

“Henri Coanda” Air Force Academy, Brasov, Romania

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, emotional intelligence, resistance to manipulation.*

1. OVERVIEW

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

- I. Not all subjects with Machiavellian attitudes are as well victims of manipulation (that is with a weak resistance to manipulation) or not.
- II. Can the subjects with good resistance to manipulation be found to a greater extent only in sample 2 and are missing from the samples 1 and 3 or not.
- III. Are there subjects with weak resistance to manipulation only in the samples 1 and 3 or not.

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 the second indicator: the capacity of not surrendering to manipulators.

The second instrument is an adapted version [1] of the questionnaire in Table 1, which comprises 30 questions about different usual life situations, some of them really critical, even irritating. You can answer YES, NO or MORE OR LESS, when you are undecided. There is no time limit for completing the test, but it would be better to try to answer quickly, without philosophizing too much on each question, without splitting hairs. Answer with absolute sincerity, because only this way you have the opportunity to know your real conditions in the face of the environment and whether you are a victim of manipulation or not.

The achieved score is calculated as follows: at first, award 2 points for each YES answer to the questions 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29 and for each NO to the questions 1, 4, 7, 12, 23, 26, 28, 30. Furthermore award 1 point for each MORE OR LESS answer. Summing up the points, you shall get the personal score which can be interpreted according to the value categories in Table 3, in order to find out the grade for susceptibility or in other words your resistance to manipulation.

Table 1 *Are you being manipulated?*

Current no.	Questions
1	Do you know how to stand to your interests?
2	Are your thoughts and emotions easy to read?

3	Are you a hot- tempered person?
4	Do you answer a determined NO to an inconvenient demand?
5	Were you involved in absurd actions only to please someone?
6	Do you have a soft spot for certain persons?
7	Are you being called a stubborn person?
8	Do you agree with the saying: no great loss without some small gain?
9	Do you consider the first decision taken to be also the best?
10	Do you easily fall into traps?
11	Do you enjoy gambling?
12	Do you cease an activity in the middle of it when you find out that the result being pursued is uncertain, although you have invested a great deal of money, time and energy?
13	Do your acquaintances consider you a naïve and credulous person?
14	Do you subscribe to the Latin aphorism “Errare humanum est, perseverare diabolicum est”?
15	Do you hold yourself responsible only if you have promised something to someone even formally?
16	Do you fulfil your promise, even if it was forced upon you?
17	Do you get easily angry?
18	Have you sometimes realised that you have certain opinions, but you cannot justify their origin?
19	Is the saying “Capul plecat sabia nu-l taie” correct? [Romanian proverb meaning “Obedient people don’t get into trouble”]
20	Do you deliver a service to someone even if you consider he/ she does not deserve it?
21	Are you usually a polite person?
22	Are you inflexible in your decisions?
23	Is your sleep restful?
24	Do you give in to the requests of a charming person?
25	Do you listen to the statements of an interlocutor even if he/ she is uttering gross ineptitudes?
26	Do you consider that everything you do is the consequence of your decisions?
27	If you started an activity and have not achieved the desired results, do you have the tendency to invest new expenditures considering that you hereby approach the pursued goal?
28	When you make an important decision, do you also take into account other persons' opinions?
29	Do you stick to a point of view only because you do not want to be regarded as a weak, hesitating person?
30	Do you set yourself a limit (of time, money, effort) in solving a problem, beyond which you give up your activity?

Table 2 *Score interpretation*

Achieved score	Grade of resistance to manipulation
60-43	Weak
42-23	Average
22-10	Good
9-0	Very good

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. 3, 4, 5.

Regarding the resistance to manipulation, it has been determined that, in sample no. 1, out of six subjects who do not use manipulation techniques, three subjects have an average resistance to manipulation, and the other three have a good resistance, whereas out of the 6 students who apply manipulation techniques 4 have an average resistance to the attack of other manipulative persons, one has a poor resistance and only one displays a good resistance (Table no. 3).

In sample 2, one subject of the 2 who do not use manipulation techniques has an average resistance to manipulation and the

other one has a good resistance, whereas out of the 10 subjects who apply manipulation techniques, 4 have an average resistance to the attack of other manipulative persons and the rest of 6 subjects show a good resistance (Table no. 4).

In sample 3 all 9 subjects who do not use manipulation techniques have an average resistance to manipulation, and out of the 3 subjects who use manipulation techniques, 2 have an average resistance to the attack of other manipulative persons and one has a poor resistance (Table no. 5).

What differentiates respondents with low resistance to manipulation (respondent 11 from sample 1 and respondent 11 from sample 3), from the rest of the respondents, no matter

what sample they are from is the fact that they **use the manipulation techniques** listed below **in groups**:

- “I make a merit of not being honest by labelling my attitude as diplomacy”;
- “I use force in order to make people around me to act as I want them to”;
- “I feel no remorse when I am lying to someone in order to gain certain benefits”;
- “My goal is not to act morally.”

At least two of the 4 manipulation techniques highlighted above have been applied in sample 2 by each of respondents 6, 11, 12, who show, all three of them, an average resistance to manipulation, like 50% of the upright respondents from samples 1, 2, 3.

Table 3 SAMPLE No. 1

$x_i \rightarrow$ $\bar{x}_1 = (\sum x_i)/12 =$ 1,08(3)	Standard deviation $\sigma_1 = x_i - \bar{x}_1$	Variation σ_1^2	Standard sample deviation
27	-1.08(3)	1.1728	$\sum(x_i - \bar{x}_1)^2 = 554.915$
21	-7.08(3)	50.1688	
28	-0.08(3)	0.0068	
27	-1.08(3)	1.1728	
27	-1.08(3)	1.1728	
22	-6.08(3)	37.0028	
26	-2.08	4.3388	$[\sum(x_i - \bar{x}_1)^2]/12 = 46.2429$
36	+7.917	62.6788	
26	-2.08(3)	4.3388	
33	+4.917	24.1768	
45	+16.917	286.1848	
19	-9.08(3)	82.5008	

Table 4 SAMPLE No. 2

$x_i \rightarrow$ $\bar{x}_2 = (\sum x_i)/12 = 22,91$	Standard deviation $\sigma_2 = x_i - \bar{x}_2$	Variation σ_2^2	Standard sample deviation
28	+5.09	25.9081	$\sum(x_i - \bar{x}_2)^2 = 384.6$
18	-4.91	24.1081	
30	+7.09	50.2681	
13	-9.91	98.2081	
18	-4.91	24.1081	
27	+4.91	16.7281	
22	-0.91	0.8281	$[\sum(x_i - \bar{x}_2)^2]/12 = 26.4097$
19	-3.91	15.2881	
22	-0.91	0.8281	
22	-0.91	0.8281	
26	+3.09	9.5481	

30	+7.09	50.2681	
----	-------	---------	--

Table 5 SAMPLE No. 3

$x_i \rightarrow$ $\bar{x}_3 = (\sum x_i)/12 = 4,083$	Standard deviation $\sigma_3 = x_i - \bar{x}_3$	Variation σ_3^2	Standard sample deviation
27	-2	4	$\sum(x_i - \bar{x}_3)^2 = 280$
27	-2	4	
30	+1	1	
23	-6	36	
38	-1	1	
30	+1	1	
26	-3	9	$[\sum(x_i - \bar{x}_3)^2]/12 = 23,33$
26	-3	9	
28	-1	1	
35	+6	36	
42	+13	169	
26	-3	9	

2. VALIDATION OF THE SCORE OF RESISTANCE TO MANIPULATION

By studying the information referring to the resistance to manipulation we find that the share of those who have a good resistance and respectively a weak resistance to manipulation in the 3 sample is as follows:

Sample no. 1

3...12

$x \dots 100 \rightarrow x = 3 \cdot 100 / 12 = 25\%$

have good resistance to manipulation

1...12

$x \dots 100 \rightarrow x = 100 / 12 = 8.33\%$

have a weak resistance to manipulation.

The other 66.67% have an average resistance to manipulation.

Sample no. 2

7...12

$x \dots 100 \rightarrow x = 7 \cdot 100 / 12 = 58.33 \%$

have a good resistance to manipulation.

The other 41.67% have an average resistance to manipulation.

Sample no. 3

0...12

$x \dots 100 \rightarrow x = 0 \cdot 100 / 12 = 0\%$

have a good resistance to manipulation

1...12

$x \dots 100 \rightarrow x = 100 / 12 = 8.33\%$

have a weak resistance to manipulation.

The other 91.67% have an average resistance to manipulation.

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

$$t = \frac{x_1 - x_2}{\sqrt{\frac{(\sum \sigma_1)^2 \cdot 11 + (\sum \sigma_2)^2 \cdot 11}{22} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{12} + \frac{1}{12}}}} \quad (1)$$

Common standard deviation is calculated using formula (2)

$$\sqrt{[(\sum \sigma_1)^2 \cdot 11 + (\sum \sigma_2)^2 \cdot 11] / 22} \quad (2)$$

$$t = \frac{28.08(3) - 22.91}{\sqrt{\frac{554.9156 \cdot 11 + 316.9172 \cdot 11}{22}} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2}{12}}} = \frac{5.173}{26.948649} = 0.1919$$

$t_{\text{calculated}} = +0.1919$

Looking into the table of “t” values on the row indicated by the liberty threshold ($n_1 + n_2 - 2$) 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} :

$t_{\text{critical}} = +1.32$

$t_{\text{calculated}} < t_{\text{critical}}$

$+0.1919 < +1.32 \rightarrow$

Null hypotheses 6 is accepted

With an error risk of 20%, ($0.20 \cdot 100 = 20$), we conclude that the two averages of samples 1 and 2 not differ significantly. By observing

the two environments we notice that the subjects of sample 1 are less resistant to manipulation than the subjects of sample 2 ($28.08(3) > 22.91$).

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

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_3}{\sqrt{\frac{(\sum \sigma_1)^2 \cdot 11 + (\sum \sigma_3)^2 \cdot 11}{22} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{1}{12} + \frac{1}{12}}}} \quad (3)$$

Common standard deviation is calculated using formula (4)

$$t = \frac{28.08(3) - 29}{\sqrt{\frac{554.9156 \cdot 11 + 280 \cdot 11}{22} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2}{12}}}} = \frac{0.917}{26.371916} = -0.03477$$

$$t_{\text{calculated}} = -0.0377$$

Looking into the table of "t" values on the row indicated by the liberty threshold and in ($n_1 + n_2 - 2$) 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} :

$$t_{\text{critical}} = +1.37; t_{\text{calculated}} < t_{\text{critical}};$$

$$-0.0377 < +1.37 \rightarrow$$

Null Hypothesis 5 is rejected.

We therefore conclude that a risk of error of 20%, ($0.20 \cdot 0.001 = 20$), that the two averages belonging to sample 1 and sample 3 not differ significantly. By observing the averages we find that the subjects of sample 1 are somewhat more resistant to manipulation than the subjects of sample 3 ($28.08(3) < 29$).

By way of transitivity it results that the subjects of sample 2 resist a lot better to manipulation than the subjects of sample 3 ($22.91 < 29$).

By comparing, in sample 1, the average to the norm of resistance to manipulation, we apply the "t" test, this time using formula (5):

$$t = \frac{\text{a var age of sample1 + nom}}{\frac{\text{s tandard deviation in sample1 + nom}}{\sqrt{\text{number of subjects in sample 1}}}} \quad (5)$$

Standard deviation from sample 1 is calculated using formula (6):

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

$$\sum (\text{values})^2 = (27)^2 \cdot 3 + (21)^2 + (28)^2 + (22)^2 + (-36)^2 \cdot 2 + (33)^2 + 45^2 + (19)^2 = 10019$$

$$\text{Standard deviation from sample 1} = \sqrt{(10019 - 10019/12)/11} = 28.894925$$

$$t = -6.08(3)/(28.894925/\sqrt{12}) = 0.7292$$

Looking into the table of "t" values on the row indicated by the liberty threshold and ($n_1 - 1$) 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} :

$$t_{\text{critical}} = +1.37; t_{\text{calculated}} < t_{\text{critical}};$$

$$+0.7292 < +1.37 \rightarrow$$

Null Hypothesis 1 is accepted.

With an error risk of 20%, ($0.20 \cdot 100 = 20$), we conclude that:

- 66.67% of the subjects in sample no.1 have and average resistance to manipulation, (i.e. they have a slight tendency to let themselves manipulated by other people, recovering quickly from a rational and logical point of view), and 33.33% of these use manipulation techniques themselves;
- 8.33% of the subjects, i.e. one subject only, (who also applies Machiavellian techniques), has a weak resistance to manipulation, (i.e. he/she manifests the tendency to accept other people's ideas and easily gets under external influences which might pertain to mundane lifestyles, the acceptance of novelty in all the domains, a great receptivity to advertisements and commercials);
- 25% of the subjects have a good resistance to manipulation, (i.e. they manifest the tendency to imitate certain attitudes, sometimes unconsciously).

By observing the norm and the average in sample 1, ($22 < 28.08(3)$), we find that the subjects generally have an average resistance to manipulation, (i.e. they have a slight tendency to let themselves manipulated by other people, but recovering rapidly from a rational, logical point of view).

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, again using formula (5).

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

$$\sum(\text{values})^2 = (28)^2 + (18)^2 \cdot 2 + (30)^2 \cdot 2 + (13)^2 + (27)^2 + (22)^2 \cdot 3 + (19)^2 + (26)^2 = 6619$$

$$\text{Standard deviation from sample 2} = \sqrt{6619 - 6619/12} / 11 = 23.455811$$

$$t = 0.91 / (23.455811 / \sqrt{12}) = 0.1342$$

Looking into the table of “t” values on the row indicated by the liberty threshold (n1 - 1) and 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} :

$$t_{\text{critical}} = +1.37; \quad t_{\text{calculated}} < t_{\text{critical}}; \\ +0.1342 < +1.37 \rightarrow$$

Null Hypothesis 1 is accepted.

With an error risk of 20%, (0.20 · 100 = 20), we conclude that:

- 58.33% of the subjects from sample no.2 have a better resistance to manipulation (i.e. they manifest the tendency to sometimes imitate attitudes unconsciously), and 50% of them actually use manipulation techniques;
- 41.67% of the subjects have an average resistance to manipulation, (i.e. they have a slight tendency to let themselves be manipulated by other people, rapidly recovering from an emotional, logical point of view), and 50% of these actually use manipulation techniques.

By the norm and the average in sample 2, (22 < 22.91), we find that the subjects generally have good resistance to manipulation, (i.e. they manifest the tendency to sometimes imitate certain attitudes unconsciously).

By comparing, in sample 3, the average to the norm of resisting well to manipulation, we apply the “t” test, again using formula (5).

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

$$\sum(\text{values})^2 = (27)^2 \cdot 2 + (30)^2 \cdot 2 + (23)^2 + (28)^2 \cdot 2 + (26)^2 \cdot 3 + (35)^2 + (42)^2 = 10372$$

$$\text{Standard deviation from sample 3} = \sqrt{(10372 - 10372/12) / 11} = 29.399546 \\ t = 7 / (29.399546 / \sqrt{12}) = 0.8247$$

Looking into the table of “t” values on the row indicated by the liberty threshold and (n1 - 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} :

$$t_{\text{critical}} = +1.37; \quad t_{\text{calculated}} < t_{\text{critical}}; \\ +0.8247 < +1.37 \rightarrow$$

Null Hypothesis 1 is accepted.

With an error risk of 20%, (0.20 · 100 = 20), we conclude that:

- 91.67% of the subjects of sample no. 3 have an average resistance to manipulation, (i.e. they have a slight tendency to let themselves be manipulated by other people, but recover fast from a rational, logical point of view), and 16.6% of them use manipulation techniques themselves;
- 8.33% of the subjects, i.e. one subject (who also applies Machiavellian techniques), has weak resistance to manipulation, (i.e. he/she manifests the tendency to accept other people’s ideas, easily abiding by external influences that might pertain the mundane lifestyle, the acceptance of novelty in all the fields, a great receptivity to advertisements and commercials).

By observing the norm and the average in sample 3, (22 < 29), we find that the subjects generally have an average resistance to manipulation, (i.e. they have a slight tendency to let themselves be manipulated by other people, but recovering rapidly from a rational, logical point of view).

REFERENCES

1. McMillan, P., *Personality Tests*, Aldo Press Publishing House, 1996, pp. 114,115;
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;

4. McMillan, P., *Personality Tests*, Aldo Press Publishing House, 1996;
5. Maxwell, J.C., *Develop the Leader Inside*, Amaltea Publishing House, 1999.