CHAPTER 6

METHODOLOGY

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The chapter of methodology is an important one for the researcher since it tries to answer the problems raised for research and also paves the way for realizing the objectives of the study and testing the proposed hypotheses.

This chapter covers the following:

1. Research design
2. Population and sampling design
3. Delineation of the concepts used in the study
4. Tools used with their psychometric properties
5. Administration of tools for pilot work.
6. Selection of final tools for primary data collection
7. Administration of these tools to the sample of the study

6.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

Descriptive research design was used for this study. This design is specially used by the researcher because she wanted to study the sample characteristics and their relationships with the important variables of the study. In the present empirical research, the researcher wanted to identify the leaders’ perception of their leadership style and the expectations of their subordinates from them. This helped her to match/mismatch the leader’s style with the subordinates expectations, which was the prime interest of this study. Besides, whether the personality and motivational characteristics of the leaders differ in diverse Organisations was of interest to her.
6.3 Population

The population for the study is the Middle level managers and their subordinates from the Information Technology (IT) sector, Multi-National Corporations (MNCs), Non-Government Organisations (NGOs), Private Sector, and the Public Sector Organisations in Pune region. All managers were playing the role of leaders in guiding their subordinates in day to day work and decision-making. The subordinates were those who were directly reporting and accountable to the managers.

6.4 Type of Sampling

The non-probability purposive sampling was used in this study. The managers and the subordinates from diverse Organisations were chosen by the investigator depending on their availability and accessibility. There are two types of purposive sampling: 1) Judgment sampling and 2) Quota sampling. The researcher has used judgment sampling because she had to collect data from the bosses (Manager, CEO, Chairman, and Director) who not only played the role of administrators but were leading from the front in their organisations. They were the decision makers. Purposive sampling serves the purpose of choosing those in the sample who fulfill the requisites of the study.

6.4.1. Sample details

112 male and 34 female leaders from diverse Organisations participated in the study. The age range of the leaders was from 25 years to 77 years. 216 male and 76 female subordinates, directly reporting to their leaders (managers), were included in the sample. Their age range was from 21 years to 62 years. The sample details are presented in Table 6.1.
Table 6.1 DETAILS OF THE SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>MNC</th>
<th>NGO</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M-Managers, S-Subordinates

6.5 TOOLS

6.5.1 Lead Self Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed by Hersey and Blanchard. The Lead (self) contains twelve leadership situations as the problem and for each situation, four alternative responses are given as answers. The respondents are asked to select one alternative that they feel most closely describes their own behavior in that type of situation: The four alternatives express a high task–low relationship behavior, a high task-high relationship behavior, a high relationship–low task behavior, and a low relationship–low task behavior.

The Lead self was designed to measure the self perception of three aspects of leader behavior: (1) Style, (2) Style Range, and (3) Style adaptability. Style and style range are determined by four style scores, and the style adaptability (effectiveness score) is determined by the normative score. The time required to choose the alternative answer in twelve situations was about twenty minutes. The Lead self provided data in terms of the leader’s self perception of his leadership behaviour. This information was really helpful to know the leader’s (manager’s) leadership style – how they influence others.
6.5.2 Lead other questionnaire

LEAD other questionnaire is also developed by Hersey and Blanchard. The Lead other is completed by the leaders’ followers, superiors, or associates (peers). In this study, ‘Lead others’ questionnaire is used to collect data from each boss’s (manager’s) two subordinates.

The leadership style of an individual is the behavior pattern that a person exhibits when attempting to influence the activities of others as perceived by the others. This may be very different from the leader’s self perception. One’s actual leadership style depends on how close a person’s perceptions are to the perceptions of others. Hence, the need of administering Lead self and Lead others questionnaires to managers and their direct subordinates, respectively.

Lead self and Lead other questionnaires provided the information about four leadership styles viz. Telling, Selling, Participating and Delegating. A Lead profile is prepared for each individual manager/CEO/chairman/Director from the responses to Lead self and Lead other questionnaires. The profile could give managers an opportunity to see if there was any significant difference between how they perceive their own leadership style and how their subordinates perceive their style. The purpose of administering and analyzing the Lead self and Lead other questionnaires was to determine if there is any discrepancy between leaders’ self-perception and their subordinates’ perception of the leader’s style.

In two administrations of the LEAD self questionnaire across a six-week interval 75% of managers tested maintained their dominant leadership style and 71% maintained the alternative style (contingency coefficient both .71 (sig. at .001)). The correlation between the adaptability scores (effectiveness) between both measures was .69 (sig. at .001) showing that the measure has moderate stability.
Validity

Construct validity: correlations between the LEAD and the Leadership Behaviour and Description Questionnaire (LDBQ) was .32. According to the Center for Leadership Studies (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969) the 12 items validities for the adaptability scores was between 0.11 and 0.52.

6.6 Maturity of the Subordinates

The purpose of this rating form is to help the manager determine the ‘maturity’ or ‘readiness’ of a person who works for him. The manager is expected to recall his past experiences with the subordinate in reference to the quality of work outputs and attitudes.

Readiness (Maturity) is defined as the extent to which a follower demonstrates the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task. Readiness is how ready a person is to perform a particular task. The concept of readiness has to do with specific situations – not with any total sense of readiness. All persons tend to be more or less ready in relation to a specific task, function, or objective that a leader is attempting to accomplish. The two major components of readiness are ability and willingness. Ability is the knowledge, experience, and skill that an individual or group brings to a particular task or activity. Willingness is the extent to which an individual or group has the confidence, commitment, and motivation to accomplish a specific task.

The continuum of follower readiness is divided into four levels. Each represents a differential combination of follower ability and willingness or confidence. The continuum of follower readiness (R1-R4) is presented in Table 6.2
Table 6.2 MATURITY (READINESS) OF THE SUBORDINATES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able and</td>
<td>Able but</td>
<td>Unable but</td>
<td>Unable and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing</td>
<td>Unwilling</td>
<td>Willing or</td>
<td>Unwilling or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Or Insecure</td>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>Insecure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.1 Instrument to measure maturity (readiness)

To help managers and their subordinates (followers) make valid judgments about the followers’ readiness, the centre for leadership studies developed a readiness scale viz. the manager rating scale. In this scale, the manager rates the subordinates on five job readiness dimensions and five psychological readiness dimensions. The rating scale is of 1 to 8 points. Since there are five items for job readiness, and five for the psychological readiness, the range of scores will be from 5 to 40 for job as well as for psychological maturity.

To decide the readiness level of the subordinates, both the job and psychological maturity scores are integrated. The Centre of Leadership studies has developed a matrix to decide the readiness level of the subordinates (followers). The matrix is shown in Table 6.3.
Hersey and Blanchard recommended leadership styles corresponding to the readiness levels of the subordinates. The leader’s effectiveness depends upon the congruence between the leader’s style and the subordinate’s maturity (readiness) level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>R4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>J 5 to 12</td>
<td>J 13 to 22</td>
<td>J 23 to 32</td>
<td>J 33 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 33 to 40</td>
<td>P 33 to 40</td>
<td>P 33 to 40</td>
<td>P 33 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R2/3</td>
<td>R2/3</td>
<td>R3/4</td>
<td>R4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>J 5 to 12</td>
<td>J 13 to 22</td>
<td>J 23 to 32</td>
<td>J 33 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 23 to 32</td>
<td>P 23 to 32</td>
<td>P 23 to 32</td>
<td>P 23 to 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R2/3</td>
<td>R2/3</td>
<td>R3/4</td>
<td>R4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>J 5 to 12</td>
<td>J 13 to 22</td>
<td>J 23 to 32</td>
<td>J 33 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 13 to 22</td>
<td>P 13 to 22</td>
<td>P 13 to 22</td>
<td>P 13 to 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1/2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R2/3</td>
<td>R2/3</td>
<td>R2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>J 5 to 12</td>
<td>J 13 to 22</td>
<td>J 23 to 32</td>
<td>J 33 to 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P 5 to 12</td>
<td>P 5 to 12</td>
<td>P 5 to 12</td>
<td>P 5 to 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R1/2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership styles corresponding to various readiness levels are shown in Table 6.4

**Table 6.4 LEADERSHIP STYLES FOR VARIOUS READINESS LEVELS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readiness Level</th>
<th>Appropriate Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1, Low readiness. Unable and unwilling or insecure.</td>
<td>S1, Telling. High task-low relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2, Low to moderate readiness. Unable but willing or confident.</td>
<td>S2, Selling. High task-high relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3, Moderate to high readiness. Able but unwilling or insecure.</td>
<td>S3, Participating. High relationship-low task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4, High readiness. Able and willing or confident.</td>
<td>S4, Delegating. Low relationship-low task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.7 ATTRIBUTION OF SUCCESS AND FAILURE (ASUFA)**

**Locus of Control**

The concept of Locus of Control was developed by Rotter (1934). It is based on the extent to which people perceive contingencies to affect outcomes. Individuals who have a low perception of such contingencies are said to have an internal locus of control; they believe that their own actions produce outcomes. Those who have a high perception of contingencies are characterized by an external locus of control; they believe that the outcomes are the result of chance rather than that of their own actions. Internal and external loci of control are represented by the terms internality and externality respectively.
Internals prefer a participative management style, whereas externals prefer a directive style. Internals believe that working hard is more likely to lead to rewards and that they have more control over the ways they want. Furthermore, the use of rewards, respect, and expertise is seen by internally focused leaders as the most effective way to influence subordinates, while those with an external orientation see coercion and their formal positions as most effective.

Weiner (1954) has added a stability-variability dimension to internality-externality of outcome. Both the internal and external causes can be either stable or variable, thus giving four categories of factors to which outcomes can be attributed. This is shown in the Figure 6.5

Table 6.5 Weiner’s model: THE PERCEIVED DETERMINATION OF OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>Task difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>Luck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internal causes are either stable (ability) or variable (effort). Similarly, external causes are either stable (difficulty of a task) or variable (luck or chance). Weiner has further proposed that the interaction between locus of control and stability has a different significance for attribution of positive (success) and negative outcomes (failure).
6.7.1 ASUFA Inventory

Attribution of success and failure (ASUFA) inventory assesses whether the respondents attribute their success and failure to internal or external causes and to stable or variable factors. The inventory includes twelve items for success and twelve for failure, with two open ended questions. The respondents check each item by choosing one of the two alternatives given. Each of the four factors (ability, effort, opportunity, and luck) has been paired with every other, thus producing six pairs, repeated twice, giving twelve items.

A split-half reliability of 0.56 was found significant at p < 0.01 level and for validity, all the variables of ASUFA inventory were compared by Udai Pareek (1954) with scores on Rotters’ LOC scale most of the coefficients of correlations with locus of control variables are statistically significant (p < 0.05).

6.8 Your Operating Philosophy

A person’s philosophy is the way one determines values and which leadership style he gravitates toward. There are differences in the way we align our actions with our values or the way we interpret our values. Accordingly, there is a difference in how we value people, Organisations, and activities. Such differences may reflect disparate operating philosophies, the most common of which are pragmatic, intellectual, and humanistic.

Although no philosophy is better than another, each drives a person’s actions, thoughts, and feelings in a distinctive way. The researcher is considering three philosophies in this study:

1. Pragmatic Philosophy
2. Intellectual philosophy
3. Humanistic philosophy
The central theme of pragmatic philosophy is the belief that usefulness determines the worth of an idea, effort, person, or organisation. People with this philosophy believe that they are largely responsible for the events in their lives, and often measure things to assess their value. Pragmatics rank high in self management, unfortunately, their individualistic orientation often pulls them into a pacesetting style over a democratic, coaching or affiliative style. The leader may sacrifice the few for the many. Pragmatic philosophy is based on philosophies of utilitarianism, pragmatism, or consequentialism.

The central theme of an intellectual philosophy is the desire to understand people, things, and the world by constructing an image of how they work, thereby providing some emotional security in predicting the future. People with this philosophy rely on logic in making decisions, and assess the worth of something against the underlying code or set of guidelines that stresses reason. They rely on cognitive competencies, sometimes to the exclusion of social competencies. They can use a visionary style of leadership if the vision describes a well reasoned future. Intellectual philosophy appears to be based on rationalism.

The central theme of humanistic philosophy is that close relationships give meaning to life. People with this philosophy are committed to human values; family and close friends are seen as more important than other relationships. They assess the worth of an activity in terms of how it affects their close relations. Similarly, loyalty is valued over mastery of a job or skill. A humanistic leader would view each person’s life as important, naturally cultivating the social awareness and relationship management competencies.
Each one of us believes in the three philosophies, but we give different weight to each. It is expected that many people will believe one of the three as more important than the other two at any point of time in their life.

6.8.1 Instrument for Operating Philosophy

The standardized instrument for Operating Philosophy was adopted from the book ‘Resonant Leadership’ by Richard Boyatzis & Annie McKee published in 2005\(^\text{10}\). The questionnaire consists of 20 items of projective type. It gives scores on three operating philosophies which are Pragmatic, Intellectual, and Human. The scores of Pragmatic Philosophy have been used in the present research to analyse Resonance leading to effective Leadership due to the concept of Pragmatic Leadership as given by the authors Boyatzis and McKee.

6.9 Emotional Intelligence (EQ)

In 1985, a graduate student at an alternate liberal arts college in the USA wrote a dissertation, which included the term ‘emotional intelligence’ in the title. This seems to be the first academic use of the term ‘emotional intelligence’. Then in 1990, the work of two American University Professors, John Mayer and Peter Solovey, was published in two academic journal articles. Mayer and Solovey were trying to develop a way of scientifically measuring the difference between people’s ability in the area of emotions. They found that some people were better than others at things

---

such as identifying their own feelings, identifying the feelings of others, and solving problems involving emotional issues.

Since 1990, these professors have developed two tests to measure what they were calling ‘emotional intelligence’. Because nearly all of their writing has been done in the academic community, their names and their actual research findings are not widely known. Instead, the person most commonly associated with the term emotional intelligence is actually a New York writer named Daniel Goleman. Goleman has been writing articles for the magazine Popular Psychology and then later for the New York Times newspaper. His book ‘Emotional Intelligence’ was published in 1995.

Daniel Goleman(1995) defined emotional Intelligence as “the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves, and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships.”(1) According to Mayer and. Salovey (1990), emotional Intelligence is the ability to perceive emotions, to access and generate emotions so as to assist thought, to understand emotions and emotional knowledge, and to reflectively regulate emotions so as to promote emotional and intellectual growth.


6.9.1 Test of Emotional intelligence

A test of emotional intelligence was developed by N.K. Chaddha and Dalip Singh (2005). A rigorous procedure to find out the situation validity was followed by the authors. The item analysis was done by following two techniques viz. skewness and chi square. Finally, fifteen situations were retained out of the 43 situations. The EQ test has a test-retest and split half reliability of 0.94 and 0.89 respectively and a validity of 0.89. The test measures some areas of personal and professional life. The test is a projective test and has 15 items with five options for each item.

6.10 Five Factor Model (FFM) of Personality

Five Factor Model (FFM) proposed by Costa & McCrae (1992) is a categorization scheme. The five factors are: (1) Openness to experience, (2) Agreeableness, (3) Conscientiousness, (4) Adjustment or Emotional stability, and (5) Extraversion. The present researcher has used only the first three factors, viz. openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness.

Openness to experience (O)

Leaders higher in openness to experience tend to be imaginative, broad-minded, curious, are more strategic, and big picture thinkers. They seek out new experiences through travel, the arts, movies, sports, and reading or learning about new cultures. Individuals lower in openness to experience tend to be more practical and have narrower interests, they like doing things the tried-and-true way rather than experimenting with new ways.

Research has shown that openness to experience is an important determinant of leadership effectiveness. Openness to experience seems particularly important at higher Organisational levels. For example, people with higher openness to experience scores prefer to take a more strategic approach to solving problems. These higher
scores help business leaders and CEOs to keep abreast of competitive threats and regulatory changes. In addition, because people with higher openness scores also like new and novel experiences, they often enjoy the challenges associated with living and leading in foreign countries.

**Agreeableness (A)**

The factor agreeableness concerns how one gets along with, as opposed to gets ahead of others. Individuals high in agreeableness may come across as charming, diplomatic, warm, empathetic, approachable, and optimistic. Those lower in agreeableness are more apt to appear as insensitive, socially clueless, cold, and pessimistic. The person with a high agreeableness score never has a harsh word to say about any candidate, no matter how poorly he or she performs. Persons with higher scores have difficulties making unpopular decisions or dealing with conflict and performance issues.

Research has shown that agreeableness has had mixed results in predicting leadership. Hughes et al (2011) classified the managers into four categories (1) Competent managers (2) Cheerleaders (3) Results only managers (4) In name only managers. Agreeableness is related to the four managerial types. Competent managers have moderate levels of agreeableness; cheerleaders have extremely high levels of agreeableness; Results only managers have low levels of agreeableness, and In name only managers have mixed agreeableness scores.

**Conscientiousness (C)**

Self control refers to a more active process of planning, organizing, and carrying out tasks. Individual differences in this tendency are the basis of conscientiousness. The conscientious individual is purposeful, strong-willed, and determined. On the positive side, high conscientiousness is associated with academic and occupational
achievement, while on the negative side, it may lead to annoying, compulsive neatness, or workaholic behavior.

Conscientiousness is an aspect of what was once called character. High conscientiousness scorers are scrupulous and reliable. Low scorers are not necessarily lacking in moral principles, but they are less exacting in applying them, just as they are more hedonistic and more interested in pleasure principle.

6.10.1 NEO-PI-R

The NEO-PI-R is a concise measure of the five factors or domains of personality and some of the more important traits or facets that define each domain. Taken together, the five domain scales and 30 facet scales of the Neo-PI-R allow a comprehensive assessment of adult personality. There are two versions of the test, Form S for self assessment and Form R for observer ratings.

Form S consists of 240 items answered on a five point scale. It is self administered and is appropriate for men and women of all ages. When it appeared in 1985, the NEO-PI had well researched scales to measure the facets of Neuroticism(N), Extraversion (E), and Openness (O), but only global scales to measure the factors of Agreeableness (A) and Conscientiousness (C). In 1989, several enhancements of the NEO-PI were offered. The NEO-Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) is a 60-item version that is scored for the five factors. This is useful when the testing time is limited and information on personality is considered sufficient. Item selection for the NEO-FFI used the varimax factors (McCrae & Costa, 1989b) from the NEO-PI as the criteria. When correlated with the NEO-PI varimax factors, the NEO-FFI scales showed correlations ranging from 0.75 for conscientiousness to 0.89 for neuroticism. When the test was correlated with the domain scales of the NEO-PI, sample correlations were 0.92, 0.90, 0.91, 0.77 and 0.87 for N, E, O, A, and C domains,
respectively. Internal consistency coefficients were 0.86, 0.77, 0.73, 0.68 and 0.81 for N, E, O, A and C, respectively. For each domain, the 12 items having the highest positive or negative loading on the corresponding factor were selected.

6.11 Expectation of Subordinates from Bosses (ESFB)

The following methodology was used to develop the instrument ESFB, i.e. to evaluate the expectations of the subordinates from the boss. For this purpose, a literature review was done to identify factors which influence leader-subordinate relationships. The researcher identified 19 factors which can affect the subordinates’ expectations. Of the 19, 12 were based on literature review and 7 were based on the opinions of the researcher. Based on the review of literature, the following factors were identified:

1. Bureaucratic orientation
2. Delegating
3. Gender
4. Sense of Humor
5. Challenging status quo
6. Self-monitoring ability
7. Ability to play multiple competing roles
8. Support for self worth
9. Commitment
10. Control
11. Ability to manage change
12. Politically influential
The following factors were considered for the questionnaire based on discussions with experts and the opinion of the researcher:

1. Flexible
2. Honest
3. Considerate
4. Communicative
5. Giving appropriate feedback
6. Supportive
7. Recognizing efforts of subordinates

Four statements were constructed per factor for first 12 factors. Of the four, two statements were positive and two were negative. A positive statement is one where a high score will indicate the presence of an attribute at a highest degree, whereas a negative statement is that in which a high score on the statement will indicate an absence of the attribute. Statements were formed for the next seven factors as well. 10 statements were designed. The statements were then shuffled in such a way that two statements of the same factor were not placed close to each other in the questionnaire. This was done to avoid systematic error.

The statements were compiled to form a questionnaire of 58 items. The questionnaire was administered for pilot testing to a sample of 51 employees. Coding and analysis of the data were then done. An item analysis was performed to find out those items that had the ability to differentiate between the presence and absence of an attribute. Such items were retained. Twenty seven statements were rejected. The t-values of the statements were used for selecting items.

The final questionnaire consisted of 31 questions. It is attached in the Appendix A. A five point rating scale was used for forward scoring of positive items: Never (0),
Rarely (1), Sometimes (2), Most of the time (3), and Always (4). For reverse scoring of negative items, the following rating scale was used: Never (4), Rarely (3), Sometimes (2), Most of the time (1), and Always (0). Item numbers 2, 8-18, and 20-31 are negative; while 1, 3-7, and 19 are positive items.

The reliability of the scale was tested using Cronbach Alpha test.

---

**Reliability Coefficients**

- **N of Cases = 135.0**
- **N of Items = 31**
- **Alpha = .7719**

---

### 6.12 Administration of the Tools

The managers were contacted with prior appointments by the researcher. The questionnaires for the managers and subordinates were then administered by the researcher herself. For every manager, two subordinates directly reporting to him/her were selected as respondents.

A different set of questionnaires were administered to the managers and the subordinates. The questionnaires for the managers were as follows:

1. LEAD (Self) Questionnaire
2. Maturity of the subordinate
3. Attribution of Success and Failure (ASUFA)
4. Your Operating Philosophy
5. Emotional Intelligence
6. Neo-PI-R

The questionnaires administered to the subordinates were as follows:
1. LEAD (Other) questionnaire

2. Expectation of Subordinates from Bosses (ESFB)

The questionnaires were administered to 400 managers. However, only 146 complete and valid questionnaires were received by the researcher.