



"HENRI COANDA"
AIR FORCE ACADEMY
ROMANIA



"GENERAL M.R. STEFANIK"
ARMED FORCES ACADEMY
SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER
AFASES 2013
Brasov, 23-25 May 2013

ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION WITHIN LIMITS, BOTTLENECKS AND AGGRESSION

Georgiana CORCACI

Department of Psychology, University "Petre Andrei" of Iasi, Romania

Abstract: *Economic factors, cultural policy led to an emphasis on their role in social communication processes. Because of this, in this paper we are interested to find out the order communicative performances, theoretical and methodological aspects of investigating formative consequences of communication in the organization. Organizational communication can be defined as the discipline that studies the professional and institutional information. (Prutianu Ş, 1998). The definition can be considered restrictive, highlighting that any form of communication or process interested organizations. To understand organizational communication must start from the idea that in this context the organizational structure overlaps interpersonal communication. Overlapping communication has implications for the direction and contents of the communication, creation of communication networks and emergence of specific communication roles.*

Keywords: *communication, organization, conflict, attitude.*

organizational social life (Bollinger D., Hofstede G. 1997).

INTRODUCTION

Our research is explorative and the investigation is related to a social space led to an organization, using the method in this context, case study. Growing ability to communicate more fully and precisely was what led to the progressive development of advanced technology in creating myths, legends, perceptions, representations, explanations, habits and behavior of complex rules that make civilization possible (Zlate, M. 1981). In this case, the history of human existence should be adequately explained by a theory of transitions, that should be explained in terms of distinct stages in the development of human communication, each of which has profound consequences on individual and

RESEARCH PURPOSES

The central concept of our research is aggressive communication and we try to define communication as manifested verbal or nonverbal behavior that seeks to assault a person to a dominating ridicule it and promote their own interests.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In the case study we used the techniques of data collection and analysis questionnaire and observation sheet (Chirica S., 1996). The questionnaire is mixed, comprising both closed questions and open questions, addressing a single theme, aiming to identify aggression manifested through

communication within the organization. We considered possible to eliminate the halo effect. Processing, analysis and interpretation of data, I made use SPSS, which allowed us to call on correlation tables, hierarchical scales with different degrees of intensity.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

To achieve diagnostic relations established within the organization aggressively investigated and determination of verbal and nonverbal behavior, we proposed that the central objective: to identify the defining variables that appear in the relations established to develop a tool to measure these variables.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

1. Suppose unwillingness for cooperation, understanding competition between employees and the organization in maintaining a status generates aggressive behavior. 2. Suppose that mentality that creates organizational heads the reality aggressive behaviors.

INVESTIGATED SAMPLE

Consists subjects belonging to an organization's security and protection in Iasi, with branches in cities and Roman Pascani. Investigated group consists of 100 people between 22-45 years old, male, thanks to the specific activity. They were chosen based on a sample availability.

DATA PROCESSING AND INTERPRETATION

For starters we analyze attitudes towards colleagues language, combining all items that attitude variable status in the company of subjects.

1. The language of arrogant attitude towards colleagues.

We calculated weighted average for the population investigated and obtained

results 2.7. This value expresses the lack of popularity of this form of the language in the context of relationships between employees that have the same status. Intensity of negative attitudes in these cases may be due to the fact that the profession is exposed to this kind of verbal aggression.

2. Attitude towards colleagues ironic language.

For the investigated population weighted average is 4.08, which means a high enough value on a scale with six degrees of intensity. If we average the total land agents (4, 3.7 versus 4.08) which means that these groups are most exposed to this kind of verbal aggression and therefore the reaction is stronger. This group is engaged in preference kind of aggressive behavior. It should be noted that in this case only 25% of subjects felt that there is a language vocabulary ironically their peers, and among them is the most heads.

3. Sarcastic attitude toward colleagues language.

For the investigated population weighted average is 4.2. In this case the direction is reversed attitude, heads the only category of investigated group expressing a negative attitude towards colleagues sarcastic language. Hence we realize that they are the most exposed to this kind of verbal aggression and therefore their reaction is violent. Should be noted that 80% of investigated subjects felt that there sarcastic language in the vocabulary of their peers.

4. Attitudes towards peer trivial language.

For the population investigated, the weighted average is 3.1, which means a relatively low value. In particular field agents are more exposed to this kind of verbal aggression and therefore their reaction is more virulent, this reaction is visible in more radical attitude of heads. It should be recalled here that 45% of the sample said that there is no foul language in the vocabulary of their peers.

5. Attitude towards language authoritarian leaders.

For the investigated population weighted average is 5.4 which means a



"HENRI COANDA"
AIR FORCE ACADEMY
ROMANIA



"GENERAL M.R. STEFANIK"
ARMED FORCES ACADEMY
SLOVAK REPUBLIC

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE of SCIENTIFIC PAPER
AFASES 2013

Brasov, 23-25 May 2013

relatively high value. This implies the existence of a dominant authoritarian language in relations between bosses and subordinates. The higher in the hierarchy of the organization, paternalistic attitudes tend to diminish in intensity and this is not "democratic leadership" to the top of the military hierarchy, but transforming into authoritarian behavior.

6. Attitude towards the language of arrogant bosses.

For the surveyed population weighted average is 3.2 which means a mild attitude pursued. This means that employees of the organization are investigated against using the chief of an arrogant language. But I could capture a hostile attitude towards subordinates to leaders from arrogance leading to sarcasm, and this shows that there is good dialogue between leaders and subordinates.

7. Investigating the behavior of employees in the heads.

We note that 10% of subjects adopt a state of indifference, a neutral state, and 5% are indifferent try to negotiate to find a compromise. Highest weight of subjects, 60%, but show aggressive behavior: 20% exhibits nonverbal aggression surprised gesture of dissatisfaction, mimic, look, they showing so a nervous conformism, 10% of subjects investigated nervous behavior, aggressive are irritated and irritable, 25% of investigated subjects verbally aggressive behavior, giving them superior response regardless of where they are, and 5% aggressive behavior manifested by violent language Ironically, they are severely punished Heads, which bears irony to them. We know that the best resolution of conflict in an organization is not its settlement or compromise, but very

positive confrontation, consulting the parties to the conflict (Corcaci, G. 2010).

8. Investigating the behavior of leaders to employees.

Most of the respondents expressed their reproachful behavior, remaining relatively close percentages distributed on other selected alternative. We observed that 35% of those investigated adopts a permissive position to employees while 65% of those surveyed show an aggressive communication.

9. Finally conclude the study analysis variables contribute to conflict situations.

In this case I was interested in attitude towards team work, working conditions and job content, thus obtaining an overview of the framework within which members of the organization operates. Note that most investigated subjects that relationships with colleagues produced the least stressful situation-state weighted average is the lowest (2.5). Relationships with leaders in turn, are seen as stressful sometimes with weighted average (3.1). These are followed by two other factors as weight on the same place as intensity: of activity and busy schedule with an average of 3.9.

We conclude that the factors producing a major conflict state are dealing with bosses, nature of business and busy schedule. Thus deduce that relations between superiors and inferiors are friendly, so we can assume that there are many misunderstandings because there is dialogue and communication is mostly aggressive. Also, working conditions are carried out in difficult conditions because labor content and material and financial constraints.

CONCLUSIONS

In our research we aimed capturing the ways in which they collaborate in the organization of the relations between workers and bosses, how they communicate. Within these relationships we observed that at every level there are using aggressive language. The relationships among peers, we see that leaders frequently use ironic and sarcastic language. In this case, employees reacted quickly enough, disagreeing with the use of such language. The relationships among the subjects investigated and their superiors noted that heads of department are strongly agree with the emphatic language of heads, while senior line managers consider that this behavior should be eased with completing certain levels in the hierarchy.

In connection with aggressive language, arrogant, vulgar superiors that it addresses relations with inferiors, we can say that the heads are reacting promptly and aggressively against the use of this language. Analyzing the behavior of subjects found that 55% of them in case of conflict with superiors show aggressive behavior, verbal or nonverbal. On the way, I noticed that the relationships between superiors and subordinates line managers are the biggest factor challenging conflict situations, aggressive, and besides, creating conflict situations helps busy schedule of activity and causing the same conditions, but a smaller share. From the above we realize that aggressive language, verbal and nonverbal aggressive behavior is present in this environment, and this behavior instead of being diminished, is maintained by several

factors. And we conclude we can say that the research hypotheses were confirms.

In a study I noticed that we are dealing with a lack of willingness for cooperation and competition in preserving a status in the organization generates aggressive behavior. We also found that thinking about the reality that organizational leaders generate aggressive behaviors.

In conclusion, we can say that in an organization, builds and maintains communication is based on the characteristics of the organization, the work environment, the type of work performed, but especially the active involvement of its members for collaboration, cooperation and good networking, just to reduce and eliminate bottlenecks that limited his power.

REFERENCES

1. Bollinger, D., Hofstede, G., *Les différences culturelles dans le management*, Les Editions d'Organisations, Paris (1997).
2. Chirica, S., *Psihologie organizațională. Modele de diagnoză și intervenție* Casa de Editură și Consultanță „Studiul Organizării”, Cluj-Napoca (1996).
3. Corcaci, G., *Practică și teorie în psihologia managerială*, Editura Junimea, Iași (2010).
4. Prutianu, Ș., *Comunicare și negociere în afaceri*, Iași: Editura Polirom (1998).
5. Zlate, M., *Psihologia muncii, relații interumane*, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București (1981).