DIFFERENCE BETWEEN LEADERS AND SUBORDINATES ON PERCEIVED SUCCESS

Shiv Mangal Singh[1]

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

Rahul Sharma[2]

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

Ankita Choudhary[3]

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

ABSTRACT
This study aims at accessing the difference in Perceived Success of leaders and subordinates at middle level of police personnel. 20 leaders and 140 subordinates were selected from the middle 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. Middle level leaders in police hierarchy were high on perceived success than their subordinates. Middle level leaders were found to be significantly higher on Emotional Intelligence dimension of perceived success.
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, team work, 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.Middle level consisted of Dy. SP, SP and SSP ranks.

OBJECTIVE
1. To access the perceived success of leaders and subordinates at middle level of police hierarchy.
2. To study the difference between leaders and subordinates at middle 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 160 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). 20 leaders and 140 subordinates from middle level were selected. Thus the total sample consisted of 160 police personnel from middle level of police organization.

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 middle level police personnel (Mean=102.1750, SD=6.36870, N=160). The mean of middle level leaders was 103.00 with a standard deviation of 6.155 (Table 1). The mean and standard deviations were calculated for subordinates of middle level leaders (M=102.057, SD=6.41). Middle level leaders in police hierarchy were high on perceived success than their subordinates.

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

Perceived Success	Leader-subordinate	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Middle Level Police Personnel	160	102.175	6.36870		
	Middle Level Leaders	20	103.000	6.15587	.618*	.537*
	Subordinates of Middle Level	140	102.057	6.41129	.637**	.530**
	Middle Level Leaders	20	103.000	6.15587	-.673	.509
	Subordinates of Middle level	20	104.850	9.16099		

*Equal variances assumed.   ** Equal variances not assumed*

Mean of middle level leaders (equal sample; N=20) was 103.00 with a standard deviation of 6.155. The subordinates of middle level leaders had the mean value of 104.85 with the standard deviation of 9.16 for perceived success (N=20). There was no significant difference found between middle level leaders and their subordinates as the t-test values was -.673 and the values of p was greater than .05.

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 middle level of police hierarchy were calculated (Table 2). It was found that for 'personal competence' dimension of perceived success, middle level leaders showed highest mean (Mean=23.4500 &

SD=2.23548) followed by middle level police personnel (Mean=23.1250, SD=2.94979) and subordinates of middle level (Mean=23.0786 & SD=3.04184). Middle level leaders and their subordinates did not differ significantly on personal competence.

The lowest mean for 'professional competence' dimension of perceived success was of subordinates of middle level leaders (Mean=22.9857 & SD=2.63071). The mean values for middle level police personnel was found to be 23.0750 (SD=2.55887). Leaders of middle level were having a mean value of 23.7000 with standard deviation of 1.92217 for 'professional competence' dimension of perceived success. No significant differences were found between 'middle level leaders & their subordinates', on professional commitment.

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

Dimensions of Perceived Success	Leader-Subordinate Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig (2-tailed)
Personal Competence	Middle level police personnel	160	23.1250	2.94979		
	Middle Level Leaders	20	23.4500	2.23548	.526*	.600*
	Subordinates of Middle Level	140	23.0786	3.04184	.661**	.514**
Professional Competence	Middle level police personnel	160	23.0750	2.55887		
	Middle Level Leaders	20	23.7000	1.92217	1.169*	.244*
	Subordinates of Middle Level	140	22.9857	2.63071	1.476**	.150**
Future Success	Middle level police personnel	160	19.4375	3.17357		
	Middle Level Leaders	20	19.7000	2.65766	.394*	.694*
	Subordinates of Middle Level	140	19.4000	3.24713	.458**	.650**
Insight	Middle level police personnel	160	7.5688	1.42141		
	Middle Level Leaders	20	7.5500	1.23438	-.063*	.950*
	Subordinates of Middle Level	140	7.5714	1.45009	-.071**	.944**
E.Q.	Middle level police personnel	160	12.0125	1.81187		
	Middle Level Leaders	20	12.6500	1.81442	1.692*	.093*
	Subordinates of Middle Level	140	11.9214	1.79955	1.682**	.105**
Mentoring	Middle level police personnel	160	15.7313	1.99598		
	Middle Level Leaders	20	15.9500	2.01246	.523*	.602*
	Subordinates of Middle Level	140	15.7000	1.99892	.520**	.608**

*Equal variances assumed.   ** Equal variances not assumed*

The table 2 also showed that middle level leaders (Mean=19.7000 & SD=2.65766) were have highest mean followed by middle level police personnel (Mean=19.4375, SD=3.17357) and subordinates of middle level (Mean=19.4000 & SD=3.24713) for the 'future success' dimension of Perceived Success. For 'insight' dimension of perceived success, middle level leaders were having lowest mean (Mean=7.5500 & SD=1.23438). Subordinates of middle level were at the 1st place (Mean=7.5714 & SD=1.45009) and middle level police personnel at 2nd place (Mean=7.5688, SD=1.42141). The calculated mean and standard deviation for 'E.Q.' dimension of perceived success in table 2 showed the highest value of mean for middle level leaders (Mean=12.6500 & SD=1.81442), lowest for subordinates of middle level (Mean=11.9214 & SD=1.79955). Middle level police personnel were found to have the mean values of 12.2400 (SD=1.51940).

Middle level leaders showed the highest mean (Mean=15.9500 & SD=2.01246) followed by middle level police personnel (Mean=15.7313, SD=1.99598) and subordinates of middle level (Mean=15.7000 & SD=1.99892) for 'mentoring' dimension of perceived success.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Middle level leaders were found to be significantly higher on Emotional Intelligence. Emotional Intelligence matter more than IQ or any other single factor is the best predictor of who will emerge as a leader (Goleman, 1998). The evidence indicated that the higher the rank of a person considered to be a star performer, the more that emotional intelligence surface as the reason for his or her effectiveness (Robbins, 2001). Luthans (2002) said, "IQ gets you the job, EQ gets you promoted". Due to the social complexity of today's organizations, Dearborn (2002) suggested managers with high emotional intelligence may be more capable of getting more output from less people and recognizing the nuances of dynamic situations while creating positive outcomes. Srivastva and Bharamanaikar (2004) reported that emotional intelligence significantly correlates with transformational leadership and success. An emotionally intelligent person is more successful in all spheres than a person who possesses less emotional intelligence skills. Self-awareness, Social awareness, self-management and relationship management are the four components of emotional intelligence which affect the success of a leader (Lussier and Achua, 2007).

REFERENCES

1. Cooley, C. H. (1902). *Human nature and the social order. New York: Schocken.*
2. Dearborn, K. (2002). *"Studies in Emotional Intelligence Redefine Our Approach to Leadership Development". Public Personnel Management, Vol 31 (4), pp 8-11.*
3. Felson, R.B. (1989). *Parents and the reflected appraisal process: A longitudinal analysis. Journal of personality and social psychology, 56; 965-971.*
4. Gergen, K.J. (1971). *The concept of self. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.*
5. 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.*
6. Goleman, D (1998). *'Working with emotional intelligence' (New York: Bantam, 1998) and 'what makes a leader?' Harvard Business Review, November-December. Pg 93-102.*
7. Lussier, R.N. and Achua, C.F. (2007). *Effective Leadership. 3rd edition. Sanat Printers.*
8. Luthans, F. (2002). *Positive Organizational Behavior: Developing and Managing Psychological Strengths. Academy of Management Executive, 16: 57-72.*
9. Mead, G. H. (1934): *Mind, self, and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.*
10. Robbins, S.P. (2001). *Organizational Behavior. Prentice-Hall International Pvt. Ltd, 9th edition.*
11. Srivastva, K. B. N., and Bharamanaikar, S. R. (2004). *"EI and Effective Leadership Behaviour". Psychological Studies, Vol 49, pp 107-113.*