



Chief Editor

Dr. A. Singaraj, M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D.

Editor

Mrs.M.Josephin Immaculate Ruba

Editorial Advisors

1. Dr.Yi-Lin Yu, Ph. D
Associate Professor,
Department of Advertising & Public Relations,
Fu Jen Catholic University,
Taipei, Taiwan.
2. Dr.G. Badri Narayanan, PhD,
Research Economist,
Center for Global Trade Analysis,
Purdue University,
West Lafayette,
Indiana, USA.
3. Dr. Gajendra Naidu.J., M.Com, LL.M., M.B.A., Ph.D. MHRM
Professor & Head,
Faculty of Finance, Botho University,
Gaborone Campus, Botho Education Park,
Kgale, Gaborone, Botswana.
4. Dr. Ahmed Sebihi
Associate Professor
Islamic Culture and Social Sciences (ICSS),
Department of General Education (DGE),
Gulf Medical University (GMU), UAE.
5. Dr. Pradeep Kumar Choudhury,
Assistant Professor,
Institute for Studies in Industrial Development,
An ICSSR Research Institute,
New Delhi- 110070.India.
6. Dr. Sumita Bharat Goyal
Assistant Professor,
Department of Commerce,
Central University of Rajasthan,
Bandar Sindri, Dist-Ajmer,
Rajasthan, India
7. Dr. C. Muniyandi, M.Sc., M. Phil., Ph. D,
Assistant Professor,
Department of Econometrics,
School of Economics,
Madurai Kamaraj University,
Madurai-625021, Tamil Nadu, India.
8. Dr. B. Ravi Kumar,
Assistant Professor
Department of GBEH,
Sree Vidyanikethan Engineering College,
A.Rangampet, Tirupati,
Andhra Pradesh, India
9. Dr. Gyanendra Awasthi, M.Sc., Ph.D., NET
Associate Professor & HOD
Department of Biochemistry,
Dolphin (PG) Institute of Biomedical & Natural Sciences,
Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India.
10. Dr. D.K. Awasthi, M.SC., Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Chemistry, Sri J.N.P.G. College,
Charbagh, Lucknow,
Uttar Pradesh. India

ISSN (Online) : 2455 - 3662
SJIF Impact Factor :4.924

EPRA International Journal of
**Multidisciplinary
Research**

Monthly Peer Reviewed & Indexed
International Online Journal

Volume: 3 Issue: 11 November 2017



Published By :
EPRA Journals

CC License





PERCEIVED SUCCESS: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LEADERS AND SUBORDINATES

Shiv Mangal Singh¹

¹Lecturer,
Govt. P.G. College for Women,
Jammu, Jammu & Kashmir,
India

Rahul Sharma²

²Research Scholar,
Department of Psychology,
University of Jammu, Jammu,
Jammu & Kashmir,
India

Ankita Choudhary³

³Research Scholar,
Guru Nanak Dev University Amritsar,
Punjab, India

ABSTRACT

This study aims at accessing the difference in Perceived Success of leaders and subordinates at lower level of police personnel. 30 leaders and 210 subordinates were selected from the lower level of police organization. The 1:7 ratio was followed to select the sample. The Perceived Professional Success scale developed by Dr.Rasmita Das Swain and Dr. Shiv Mangal Singh was used. Mean, SD and t-test was used to analyse the data. Police personnel in lower level police hierarchy and leaders at lower level were found significantly high on perceived success or their personal success evaluation. Lower level leaders were reported to display low on mentoring which includes low mentor-learner, low physical fitness, low relationship with public and low in addressing welfare of juniors.

KEY WORDS: Job Satisfaction, Leaders, Subordinates.

INTRODUCTION

Everyone is different in how they define success for themselves and making and marketing efforts. Success tends to be a very slippery term when it comes to defining how it will be measured. To get to a useful answer it's often necessary to take a step back and spend some time thinking about what are the key objectives that have to be accomplished in order to become successful. In police organization the success will be defined as what an individual wants to become and what he has achieved in his life? Whether he is satisfied with his achievement or not. We can define perceived success as 'a sense of winning and a sense of control over the environment'. They do not quit from their aspirations. Perception may be understood as the study of how body and mind cooperate in establishing our awareness of the external world. We select process, interpret, and act upon information from our social environment is based on social cognition. Social cognition is to understand how social objects are represented within the cognitive system. We learn a great deal about ourselves as a

result of social interaction. The process of perceiving what we are like, and feeling that we are good or bad on the basis of what other people think of us, has been called reflected appraisal (Gergen 1971). It is one of the most important processes affecting our self concept. Glass self theory refers to the idea that how we appraise ourselves reflects, or mirrors, how others appraise us. Charles Horton Cooley (1902) used the idea of looking-glass self which implies that we always imagine what others think about us, and what we think, they think about us affects our own self-evaluation. George Herbert Mead (1934) said that we pay close attention to the opinion of us that is implied in the behaviour of 'significant others' that is important other people, such as parents and friends. Felson (1989) said that imagined appraisals of parents do affect self-appraisals, even though these imagined or reflected appraisals are frequently inaccurate i.e. what we imagine our parents and significant others think of us may not be what they actually think. People are motivated to see themselves in a good light as we all have self-serving bias. Perceived Success refers to perception by

others including oneself about one's accomplishment and work behaviours. The dynamics of perceptual process is contingent upon professional success of role partners in the given situations (Goethals, 1972). In police performance appraisals though confidential reports viewed as measures of professional success. This success is based on the achievement of set objectives like knowledge of law, police rules, procedures, knowledge about area, attitude to work, initiatives to learn, decision making, handling unforeseen, ability to inspire oneself and others, communication skills, interpersonal relations, teamwork, public relations, attitude towards weaker sections of society, maintaining communal harmony, police welfare etc. These parameters are important to measure professional success of police personals. This success is based on the achievement of set objectives like knowledge of law, police rules, procedures, knowledge about area, attitude to work, initiatives to learn, decision making, handling unforeseen, ability to inspire oneself and others, communication skills, interpersonal relations, teamwork, public relations, attitude towards weaker sections of society, maintaining communal harmony, police welfare etc. These parameters are important to measure professional success of police personnel.

The biggest challenge is also how police leaders can develop police organizations that can effectively recognize, relate and assimilate the global shifts in culture, technology and information. The current and incoming generation of police leaders needs to understand and constructively manage the nuances of community expectations, workforce values, technological power, governmental arrangements, policing philosophies, and ethical standards for high quality service not only to the community but also to the subordinates/ supporting staff. The subordinates constitute an important component of police organization; their satisfaction about leadership is vital for organizational effectiveness. The paradigm shift towards egalitarian policing philosophies at global level has also warranted change in the relationship between police leaders and subordinates. Thus, leadership is a service rather an imposition. The police leaders must develop an inspiring relationship with subordinates if their subordinates are to accept their leadership. Lower level hierarchy includes the ranks of inspector, sub-inspector, assistant sub-inspector, head constable, selection grade constable and constable. Middle level consisted of Dy. SP, SP and SSP ranks where as high level hierarchy consisted of DIG, IGP, ADGP and DGP ranks.

OBJECTIVE

1. To access the perceived success of leaders and subordinates at lower level of police hierarchy.
2. To study the difference between leaders and subordinates at lower level of police hierarchy on perceived success.

SAMPLE SELECTION

The population from where the sample was being selected for the study was Jammu and Kashmir Police Organization. There were number of wings and sub-wings in this organization. This organization played an important role in the survival of the state. There were many leaders and the subordinates in this organization. The researcher was able to find the suitable sample from this organization. For the research purpose the researcher had considered only one wing of the Jammu and Kashmir Police i.e. Executive Police. The Executive Police wing constituted 50% of the total Police personal in Jammu and Kashmir Police's different wings.

The sample for the study consisted of 240 Executive Police personnel of J & K Police. Proportionate stratified multistage random sampling method was used to collect the data. Two types of samples were participated, one set was leaders and other was subordinates (subordinates). 30 leaders and 210 subordinates were selected from lower level of police hierarchy) were selected. Lower level leaders consisted of SHOs, Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors. Under each leader 7 immediate subordinates were selected. The ratio was 1:7, so the total numbers of subordinates at lower level were $30 \times 7 = 210$.

Scale used to access Perceived Success

A 26 items perceived success scale was standardized by the Dr. Rasmita Das Swain and Dr. Shiv Mangal Singh. The reliability of the scale for the population is .939. It measured 72.67% of the construct of perceived success. Each item had five options to answer starting from 'negligibly successful' to 'remarkably successful'. For scoring the items, 1 is assigned to negligibly successful, 2 to Some What Successful, 3 to Reasonably Successful, 4 to Substantially Successful and 5 to Remarkably Successful. The highest score of the scale was 130 and the lowest score was 26 and the moderate score or mid-point was 78.

RESULTS

Table 1 stands for descriptive statistics and t-test analysis for perceived success. This table showed the mean and standard deviation for perceived success of lower level police personnel (N=240) reported high perceived success (Mean=105.9958, SD=6.74428). The mean of lower level leader was 106.7667 with a standard deviation of 3.96 (Table 1). Table also showed the mean and SD for subordinates of lower level leaders (N=210, M=105.88, SD=7.05). In other words, leaders and subordinates at lower level of police hierarchy were found to perceive themselves highly successful. It had been found that mean for lower level leaders was higher than their subordinates for perceived success but the t-value suggested that the difference was not significant. There was no significant difference found between lower level leaders and subordinates as the t-test value came out to be -1.42 and the values of p was greater than .05.

Table-1 Mean, SD and t-test for perceived success of lower level leaders and subordinates

Perceived Success	Leader-subordinate	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Lower Level Police Personnel	240	105.995	6.74428		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	106.766	3.96261	.668*	.504*
	Subordinates of Lower Level	210	105.885	7.05252	1.010**	.316**
	Lower Level Leaders	30	106.766	3.96261	-1.426	.164
	Subordinates of lower level	30	110.100	12.05834		

* Equal variances assumed. ** Equal variances not assumed

Analysis for dimensions of perceived success

Mean, standard deviation and significance level of t-test values on perceived success dimensions for leaders and subordinates of lower level of police hierarchy were calculated (Table 2). It was found that for ‘personal competence’ dimension of perceived success, lower Level leaders showed highest mean (24.7667 & SD=1.35655) followed by lower level police personnel (Mean=24.1000, SD=2.44402) and subordinates of lower level (24.0048 & SD=5.54997). The difference between lower level leaders and their subordinates was significant (t=2.508**, p=.01**) with equal variances not assumed but insignificant (t=1.602*, p=.11*) with equal variances assumed on ‘personal competence’ dimension of Perceived Success.

The highest mean for ‘professional competence’ dimension of perceived success was of lower level leaders (Mean=24.2333 & SD=1.86960).

The mean values for lower level police personnel were found to be 23.9333 (SD=2.20016). Subordinates of lower level mean came out to be 23.8905 with standard deviation of 2.24406 for ‘professional competence’ dimension of perceived success. No significant differences were found between lower level leaders & their subordinates on professional commitment.

The table 2 also showed that lower level leaders (N=30) were having the highest mean (Mean=21.2667 & SD=1.38796), followed by lower level police personnel (Mean=20.6375, SD=2.14482) and Subordinates of lower level (Mean=20.5476 & SD=2.21999) for the ‘future success’ dimension of Perceived Success. The difference between lower level leaders and their subordinates was significant (t=2.428**, p=.01**) with equal variances not assumed but it was insignificant (t=1.725*, p=.08*) with equal variances assumed on future success.

Table-2 Mean, SD and t-test of perceived success dimensions for leaders and subordinates of lower level of police hierarchy

Dimensions of Perceived Success	Leader-Subordinate Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig (2-tailed)
Personal Competence	Lower level police personnel	240	24.1000	2.44402		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	24.7667	1.35655	1.602*	.110*
	Subordinates of Lower Level	210	24.0048	2.54997	2.508**	.015**
Professional Competence	Lower level police personnel	240	23.9333	2.20016		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	24.2333	1.86960	.798*	.426*
	Subordinates of Lower Level	210	23.8905	2.24406	.915**	.366**
Future Success	Lower level police personnel	240	20.6375	2.14482		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	21.2667	1.38796	1.725*	.086*
	Subordinates of Lower Level	210	20.5476	2.21999	2.428**	.019**
Insight	Lower level police personnel	240	8.2000	1.17577		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	8.3667	.80872	.829*	.408*
	Subordinates of Lower Level	210	8.1762	1.21883	1.121**	.268**
E.Q.	Lower level police personnel	240	12.3292	1.47928		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	11.9667	1.24522	-1.438*	.152*
	Subordinates of Lower Level	210	12.3810	1.50521	-1.657**	.105**
Mentoring	Lower level police personnel	240	16.7958	1.71505		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	16.1667	1.08543	-2.165*	.031*
	Subordinates of Lower Level	210	16.8857	1.77065	-3.089**	.003**

* Equal variances assumed. ** Equal variances not assumed

Subordinates of lower level showed the highest mean value (Mean=16.8857 & SD=1.77065) followed by lower level police personnel (Mean=16.7958, SD=1.71505) and lower level leaders (Mean=16.1667 & SD=1.08543). Lower level leaders & their subordinates ($t=-2.165^*$ & -3.089^{**} , $p=.03^*$ & $.00^{**}$) differed significantly on 'mentoring' dimension of perceived success.

For 'insight' dimension of perceived success, lower level leaders were having highest mean (Mean=8.3667 & SD=.80872), lower level police personnel were at the second place (Mean=8.2000, SD=1.17577), subordinates of lower level were having the third highest mean (Mean=8.1762 & SD=1.21883).

The calculated mean and standard deviation for 'E.Q.' dimension of perceived success in table 2 showed the highest value of mean for subordinates of lower level, the value of mean came out to be 12.3810 with standard deviation of 1.50521 and lower level leader's mean was 11.9667 with standard deviation of 1.24522. lower level police personnel were found to have the mean values of 12.3292 (SD=1.47928).

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Police personnel in lower level police hierarchy and leaders at lower level were found significantly high on perceived success or their personal success evaluation. Lower level leaders were reported to display low on mentoring which includes low mentor-learner, low physical fitness, low relationship with public and low in addressing welfare of juniors. The findings revealed that lower level police personnel were high on perceived success. This result was found to be in line with Kruger and Dunning (1999) who predicted that incompetent individuals, compared with their more competent peers, will dramatically overestimate their ability and performance relative to objective criteria. Incompetent individuals will suffer from deficient meta-cognitive skills, in that they will be less able than their more competent peers to recognize competence when they see it—be it their own or anyone else's (Kruger and Dunning, 1999). Because of the meta-cognitive skills of the incompetent, people seem to be so imperfect in appraising themselves and their abilities. The best illustration of this tendency is the "above-average effect," or the tendency of the average person to believe he or she is above average, a result that defies the logic of descriptive statistics (Alicke, 1985; Alicke, Klotz, Breitenbecher, Yurak, & Vredenburg, 1995; Brown & Gallagher, 1992; Cross, 1977; Dunning et al., 1989; Klar, Medding, & Sarel, 1996; Weinstein, 1980; Weinstein & Lachendro, 1982).

Lower level leaders displayed low mentoring. In collectivistic society benevolent paternalism leadership were found where members of dominant group control subordinate group members through affectionate benevolent treatment and demand difference in return (Lord and Maher,

1993). The reason for this finding was the availability of less time as they were overburdened. They were also found to be low in addressing the welfare of juniors. Less resources to look after their juniors, less authority to address the welfare of the juniors are the main reasons for being low on addressing the welfare of the juniors. They have less authority to make decisions related to the welfare of the juniors and they are only the referring authority.

REFERENCES

1. Alicke, M. D. (1985). *Global self-evaluation as determined by the desirability and controllability of trait adjectives*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 1621-1630.
2. Alicke, M. D., Klotz, M L., Breitenbecher, D. L., Yurak, T. J., & Vredenburg, D. S. (1995). *Personal contact, individuation, and the better-than-average effect*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 804-825.
3. Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order*. New York: Schocken.
4. Cross, P. (1977). *Not can but will college teaching be improved?* *New Directions for Higher Education*, 17, 1-15.
5. Dunning, D., Meyerowitz, J. A., & Holzberg, A. D. (1989). *Ambiguity and self-evaluation: The role of idiosyncratic trait definitions in self-serving assessments of ability*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 1082-1090.
6. Brown, J. D., & Gallagher, F. M. (1992). *Coming to terms with failure: Private self-enhancement and public self-effacement*. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 28, 3-22.
7. Felson, R.B. (1989). *Parents and the reflected appraisal process: A longitudinal analysis*. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 56; 965-971.
8. Goethals, G. R. (1972). *Consensus and modality in the attribution process: The role of similarity and information*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 21, 84-92.
9. Gergen, K.J. (1971). *The concept of self*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
10. Klar, Y., Medding, A., & Sarel, D. (1996). *Nonunique invulnerability: Singular versus distributional probabilities and unrealistic optimism in comparative risk judgments*. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 67, 229-245.
11. Kruger, J and Dunning, D. (1999). *Unskilled and Unaware of It: How Difficulties in Recognizing One's Own Incompetence Lead to Inflated Self-Assessments*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1999, Vol. 77, No. 6.] 121-1134.
12. Mead, G. H. (1934): *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
13. Lord, R. G., & Maher, K. J. (1993). *Leadership and information processing: Linking perception and performance* Boston: Routledge.
14. Weinstein, N. D. (1980). *Unrealistic optimism about future life events*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 806-820.
15. Weinstein, N. D., & Lachendro, E. (1982). *Egocentrism as a source of unrealistic optimism*. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 8, 195-200.