

DEMYSTIFYING BEHAVIOR OF THE MAN FOR BUSINESS: AN OBSERVATION ON COMMUNICATION**Mr. Prince Kumar**

Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies

Deen Bandhu Chhotu Ram University of Science and Technology, Murthal

ABSTRACT

This article is based upon the observational study. This discussion involves various kinds of personality of personality based on the observation. The various positive and negative aspects of every dimension of personalities were discussed and elaborated with real life situations. This exploratory attempt to provide new kind of personalities. This attempt would help industry and researcher for getting new way of thinking. The reduction in the communication gap created by the classical approach of thinking. Three steps are taken to make the new theory understandable. This can be studied empirically in future. However, the concept is subjective and context of whole observation is proper communication.

INTRODUCTION

Communication is vital in an organisation. It may start from disseminating information from the top to the bottom of the organisation or the interactions within the people working in the organisation that maybe top down, bottom up, formal or informal. These all have an impact on how the organisation works its work culture and its decision-making process.

In this paper I will focus on the communication that happens in between the meetings which are the basis for decision making within the organisation. The focus is on the decision maker his approach his propensity to learn his flexibility, skills to adapt himself as per the need.

FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT AND CONCEPTUALIZATION**TYPE 1-THE CONFUSED MANAGER**

There are times when the manager faces a crisis situation and needs to make quick decisions and calls a meeting. Discussing problem and blaming him or others rather than focusing on the problem and finding the solution for it.

TYPE 2-I AM RIGHT, DICTATORIAL APPROACH

The manager comes to the meeting with the solution in his mind and start asking the members for their suggestions. Though he is listening to the observations of individuals but in the back of his mind he is

trying to make counter arguments against them. Then he tries to mould each and every individual according to what he thinks is right by countering and criticizing their suggestions and in the end declaring his solution.

TYPE 3-CONSIDERATE LISTENER TYPE MANAGER

Manager has all the members to give their suggestions. He promotes healthy discussion among members he listens to all the points and make a note mentally or on paper and then goes back to his working table and then decides on his own. Decision is informed to others later by some notice or physical announcement.

TYPE 4-COMMUNICATOR AND ADAPTING MANAGER

The manager researches the topic and has a solution in his mind before he goes to the meeting. He asks all the members in the meeting to give their perspective and puts his ideas too for debate. Positive and negative of each point is considered and with consensus a solution is derived.

DIMENSIONAL ANALYSIS OF PERSONALITY TYPES

“**Type 1**” manager believes in blame game. Rather than taking responsibility he is trying to find out the scapegoat on whom he can blame the problem and show that it is not him who is the reason for crisis.

This way trust of the members also depreciate, some members emotions get hurt leading to a bigger crisis where there is no solution and the people who could help the manager are now alienated. This will lead to a disgruntled work force which does not trust their manager.

When the crisis is eminent the first responsibility is to Cater to the contingency. The manager should understand that under the present situation with the given resources what best they can do to get out of the problem. Setting accountability is important and finding the reason for the crisis is important. But the premise on which it should be done is to find solution so that in future the situation should not repeat and if the existing protocols are not followed where the flaw was and how to achieve accountability in future.

The other members feel that the manager is abusive and confused. There is no benefit in blame game for the organization.

“**Type2**” Manager is not open to suggestion. What he thinks is right he sticks to that and tries to convince others too. Problem here is that the valuable insights given by the other members are not taken into account which itself is a loss to the organisation.

Manager is busy showing his higher intellect and criticising others which creates an image of being egoistic. Other members take mental note that their suggestions are not given due importance and with

time they stop giving their suggestions because they believe that the manager will do whatever he wants to.

Implementation of such decisions is also difficult as the people who are implementing it are themselves not satisfied in its accuracy and delivering potential. This can also be counterproductive because sometime other workers start working against the organisation itself because of being criticized even when they were right. A cartelization of disgruntled workers who want the manager to fail starts germinating.

“Type3” Manager is having the advantage that he gets the suggestion of all the members which is not possible if a single individual takes the decision and he gets more data on the basis of which we can make decisions. Healthy debate among the members helps in bringing different aspect of the problem in the limelight and analysing their positives and negatives.

Thus the participators of the discussion feel that they were given a proper audience and this in itself is a satisfaction of being important part of the organisation.

Gap between the manager and the workers can make people speak their mind because they don't know the inclination of the manager. They try their best to give the point and rectify any limitation in others during the debate.

When individual is giving a perspective or idea there are a lot of factors on the basis of which he is coming on that conclusion. The managers cannot access these later when he would be making decisions on his decision table. Further few ideas appear to be very impressive but when they are being applied in a holistic manner there are some inner inconsistencies and they cannot be discussed to get immediate feedback.

The decision is announced later. This in itself can lead to problems if the implementer has an alternate perspective and he is not convinced about its effectiveness.

BENEFIT OF “TYPE 4” TYPE OF MANAGER

Having a prospective solution before going to the meeting helps the manager to get into the process where he analyses the positive and negative of the situation in hand. Though there is a possibility that these points are discarded later but it helps to dwell into different aspects of the problem. This helps the manager to be better prepared so he is more relaxed while listening to others suggestion. This also gives him counterpoints to discuss the positive and negative of the idea in hand.

Decisions are never taken between right and wrong there is always some benefits and drawbacks in each decision. The manager has to decide what is best for his organisation keeping in mind the

resources, time limit and practicality. Debate plays a vital role here because it brings out the advantages and limitations of each decision.

Reaching to a consensus within the meeting itself is important because sometime few points appear very logical and impressive individually but when they are applied on a holistic situation there are inner contradictions. Consensus building removes those rough edges.

Consensus is also important because it helps the other people understand why the decision has been taken how the decision has been taken and also their reservations about the decisions get eliminated. It also helps in better implementation of the decisions because not only the words of the decisions are communicated but also the spirit behind the decision gets communicated which helps in decentralisation as small decisions can be taken or little maneuvering can take place.

CONCLUSION AND LIMITATION

This study is based on the observation so the one important thing to be considered is that the study may be biased. This study is an attempt of providing the better understanding of behavioral aspects of managers. Various kinds of personality types are discussed and elaborated. The classification is limited to few variable kinds, which can be extended with more personalities. There is one variable around which all types of personalities are revolving or it the propagating point for the study. In this discussion, it may have appeared that the one personality is appeared to be better than other. But every personality is having some positives and negatives apart from the discussion. Because many points are contextual and would not be explained objectively as personality is always a subjective thing.

REFERENCES

- Asendorpf, J. B. (2002). The puzzle of personality types. *European Journal of Personality*, 16(S1).
- Beauvois, M. H., & Eledge, J. (1995). Personality types and megabytes: Student attitudes toward computer mediated communication (CMC) in the language classroom. *Calico Journal*, 27-45.
- Blackburn, R. (1971). Personality types among abnormal homicides. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 11(1), 14-31.
- Capretz, L. F. (2003). Personality types in software engineering. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 58(2), 207-214.
- Capretz, L. F., & Ahmed, F. (2010). Making sense of software development and personality types. *IT professional*, 12(1).
- Cloninger, C. R., Bayon, C., & Svrakic, D. M. (1998). Measurement of temperament and character in mood disorders: a model of fundamental states as personality types. *Journal of affective disorders*, 51(1), 21-32.
- Cloninger, C. R., Przybeck, T. R., Svrakic, D. M., & Wetzel, R. D. (1994). The Temperament and Character Inventory (TCI): A guide to its development and use.
- Hart, D., Hofmann, V., Edelstein, W., & Keller, M. (1997). The relation of childhood personality types to adolescent behavior and development: A longitudinal study of Icelandic children. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(2), 195.
- Kroeger, O., & Thuesen, J. M. (2013). *Type talk: The 16 personality types that determine how we live, love, and work*. Dell.
- Kroeger, O., Thuesen, J. M., & Rutledge, H. (2009). *Type talk at work (revised): How the 16 personality types determine your success on the job*. Delta.
- Megargee, E. I. (1966). Undercontrolled and overcontrolled personality types in extreme antisocial aggression. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80(3), 1.
- Moon, Y., & Nass, C. (1996). How "real" are computer personalities? Psychological responses to personality types in human-computer interaction. *Communication research*, 23(6), 651-674.
- Robins, R. W., John, O. P., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., & Stouthamer-Loeber, M. (1996). Resilient, overcontrolled, and undercontrolled boys: three replicable personality types. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology*, 70(1), 157.
- Vollrath, M., & Torgersen, S. (2000). Personality types and coping. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29(2), 367-378.
-

Vollrath, M., & Torgersen, S. (2002). Who takes health risks? A probe into eight personality types. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32(7), 1185-1197.

Zhang, L. F. (2000). Are thinking styles and personality types related?. *Educational psychology*, 20(3), 271-283.