

CASE STUDY: EMPIRIC MANAGEMENT DISREGARDED INDIVIDUALITY IN MATTERS THE WORK/LIFE

Daniela BELU

"Henri Coanda" Air Force Academy, Brasov, Romania

Abstract: *Our serenity ought to grow from the comprehension of the concept of democracy, by respecting the two fundamental human rights: the right to a favourable environment and the right to assert one's limits. The empiric management is the violation of the privacy of a subordinate individual's life, (by cancelling their spirit, their personality), in instances where their individuality is ignored, when they're defined in improper terms, when their autonomy as a responsible human being that should be consulted/inquired in matters regarding their work/life is disregarded, when they are denied life experiences.*

Keywords: *Empiric management/ Right to enjoy a favourable environment/ Right to assert one's limits/ Competitive attitude towards the subordinates/Contemporary rights of every employee in a corporation*

INTRODOUCE

The victim of the verbal abuse in the military management of the corporation is the competent employee, subordinate/superior/colleague, whose rights/expectations were violated/ignored in its psychological/legal contract with the institution, whereas he/she had done nothing wrong towards the employer but rather:

- Exercised discipline at the work place and respected the contractual obligations towards the employer/ company internal regulations/state laws or individual morality;
- Contributed to the improvement of the company image towards customers / providers by the professional competence he/she displayed and the fairness he/she applied in said affairs;
- Achieved professional performance compliant with the assessment criteria for measuring performance that were taken into account in the job specification;
- Displayed a devotion towards the cultures of the military corporation, enforcing them by his/her actions at the work place rather than simply reciting them.

In any given institution, every employee has the following rights:

- the right to benevolence from other employees, leaders/colleagues or subordinates;
- the right to emotional support provided by all the other fellow workers, leaders/colleagues/subordinates;
- the right to be heard and kindly answered to by interlocutors, leaders/ colleagues/subordinates;
- the right to have a personal view of the values/priorities in life and at work, different from those around him/her, whether leaders/colleagues/subordinates;
- the right to have personal emotions/feelings and personal work/life experience and the right to having them respected / acknowledged as real by the fellow workers, leaders/colleagues/ subordinates;
- the right to receive apologies from the other employees, leaders/colleagues/subordinates for any jokes he/she might find offensive;
- the right to receive clarifications/informative answers from the direct superior to the questions that legitimately concern him/her;
- the right to live without unfounded accusation/reproaches;
- the right to not be the victim of personal attacks and professional lynching by fellow workers, be they leaders, colleagues or subordinates;

- the right to have his/her work and personal interests respected in the company by all employees, leaders/ colleagues/subordinates;
- the right to receive encouragement from fellow workers, leaders/colleagues or subordinates;
- the right to not be threatened /intimidated at work by leaders/ colleagues/subordinates;
- the right to not have to be exposed to the rage of leaders/colleagues/subordinates;
- the right to not be privately or publicly offended/humiliated by leaders/ colleagues/subordinates;
- the right to perform only legal tasks, laid out in a civilized manner by the direct superior, (specified in the job specification, complying with the work regulations, consumption regulations, hierarchic subordinations legalized by the Internal Regulation Policy/ employer's flowchart and the state laws in force).

1. GENERAL TOXICITY OF EMPIRIC MANAGEMENT

What would construe the toxicity generated by empiric management? The refusal to open up to subordinates as human beings with law-given rights and the application of Machiavellian management techniques by the leaders of the corporation, according to the dominating power model; the denial of personal power and performance by excessive control, all with the sole purpose of avoiding the sense of impotence among the members of an incompetent management team. Such leaders are highly determined to control everything, except their own negative feelings, confronting their subordinates with the sole purpose of dominating them, hence feeding their own ego, disguising their true purposes behind the mask of brazen demagoguery.

By contrast, a physical aggressor baffles his victim by admitting his own violence, excusing himself and hoping it will never occur again, only to end up doing the same thing all over again. The victim of physical abuse must understand that what happened is as real as it gets and to achieve this, all he/she has to do is look down on his/her wounds.

Much less obvious and much harder to comprehend, yet ever more traumatizing is the abuse practiced by empiric management in corporations. The Machiavellian managers disaffirm their verbal abuses, flawlessly minimizing the physical harm done to the employees by ambiguity and by the conflicts created by the decisions they make and that lead to stress at the work place. The abuse performed by the practitioners of empiric management is always very convincingly occulted by the discourse of such incompetent leaders by minimizing the harm done to the employees and to the entire corporation, aiming to mislead the employees and alter their perceptions. For example, one may often encounter situations where the incompetent leader denies his own words so very convincingly and minimizes the harm done and baffles the victim by placing himself/herself against the offences brought to the employee not long ago, pretending to care about his/her faith, to never abandon him/her in hard times, to not harm his/her interests under any circumstances and to continuously fight for the happiness of his/her subordinates. Machiavellian managers are mere power seekers disguised as charismatic leaders.

Some may be extremely dominating and difficult, while others may, on the contrary, be calm, lonely, quiet, but extremely aggressive, which in fact explains their favourite hobby - hunting. The Machiavellian manager will always describe himself to be the opposite of whatever he expects to be perceived by his subordinate victim, but is characterized by at least one of the following traits:

- petulant;
- projective pathological communication;
- manic-depressive disorder;
- anger outbursts;
- lack of empathy towards the victim;
- excessive control over the subordinates;
- lack of transparency;
- competitive attitude towards the subordinates;
- uncontrolled display of negative emotions – jealousy, envy, hatred, hostility, fear;
- inability to admit/discuss his/her own emotions.

The toxic work environment is wherever practitioners of empiric management exist. This toxicity inflicts effects such as:

- inequality of professional rights / obligations between the professionals employed on similar positions, (equality is dangerous because it may threaten the power seeker's privileges);
- suppression of partnership within the team by exclusive encouragement of competition for access to resources, control with the sole purpose of dominating, in pursuit of the sense of power/security either as a self-standing purpose of the power seeker or as a display of rage;
- the manipulation techniques applied with the purpose of compromising human reciprocity, consensus and "power of the tribe";
- practicing excessive control as a means to display anxiety in face of the unknown in the professional life;
- denying the value of others.

The toxic climate, as an effect of empiric management, leads to the loss of self-confidence among subordinates who, regardless of whether or not they become aware and perceive the changes in their self-image, will rarely comprehend what generated such prejudice.

2. CONCLUSION ABOUT THE CORRECT WAY OF HANDLING VERBAL ABUSE

Let us not fool ourselves thinking that we should remain serene when witnessing empiric management. Serenity is justified only in case of a genuine application of the concept of democracy while respecting the two fundamental human rights:

- the right to enjoy a favourable environment,
- the right to assert one's limits.

The consequences of abuse derived from the empiric management practices applied by the incompetent leaders to the employees are related with the following damages/prejudices caused to the victims by deformation of their self-perception and spiritual vitality, materialized in:

- deep doubt in one's own spontaneity;
- loss of appetite for work/life;

- powerful feelings of tension/alertness, (tendency to always be "en garde");
- insecurity experienced by the victims related to the impression they make on those around them;
- great sense of worry generated by the belief that there is something wrong with themselves;
- sick tendency to self-analyze and revise the reproaches made by the abuser, hoping to detect what went wrong;
- loss of self-confidence;
- emphasis of a strong sense of self-doubt;
- appearance of a powerful and critical "inner" voice;
- the victims' preoccupation that he/she is not happy although he/she is supposed to;
- sharp sense of wasting time/chances;
- the desire to stop being so "impressionable";
- hesitation in accepting their own perceptions;
- hesitation in drawing their own conclusions;
- imperious desire to escape/run;
- the impression that what they do best may in fact be what they do worst;
- the tendency to live in the future "as soon as.../after...";
- distrust in future relationships.

In the empiric management, abuse affects the spirit and robs the vitality by altering reality. The cause of that is the reaction of the Machiavellian manager that is absolutely uncorrelated with the communication with the victim, who usually ends up thinking that his/her aggressor is honest, direct and very motivated in his/her discourse and that he/she, the victim, is unable to realize where he/she is wrong. Disheartening the victim consists of confusing the victim and has such results as:

- stomach sickness;
- sensing a wall (barrier) rising in the communication with the superior;
- a powerful sense of shame.

The cause of the painful confusion experienced by the victim is the abuse by the one manipulating him/her through:

- refusal to communicate ;

- denial of an upsetting event ever having taken place;
- insinuating that the subordinate victim said something wrong that actually caused the superior's anger/rage.

The subordinate who is ignorant of the Machiavellian leader's hostility may simply assume that he/she just sees things very differently.

The subordinate victim will think:

- that he/she should have expressed himself/herself clearer and then the leader would not be upset with his/her way of thinking;
- that he/she did not grasp reality correctly;
- that he/she has an improper attitude, reason for which he/she is belittled and is hurting;
- that the leader is much like himself/herself and is interested in his/her person;
- that there is something wrong with him/her, experiencing a deep sense of guilt;
- that he/she is inadequate and deserves all charges brought by the aggressor.

What we all want, what we all need, what we take over, what we are afraid of, what we lose or what we give up is CONTROL.

When we cannot take any further step, yet continue to go ahead, when we learn something new by practicing every day, when we give ourselves in to a fit of anger or passion, when we give up diet for chocolate, when we claim that we cannot keep ourselves from doing what we are doing or that we do not enjoy what we are doing and do it anyway, when we force our loved ones to do what we want, we are in fact either taking CONTROL, or giving it up or abusing it, though perhaps unknowingly or under some other name.

Our reaction to CONTROL may be expressed through competence or impotence, materializing into some unfinished business from our past at the moment we leave this world.

We all have control at times and it may include: intimidation, incrimination, negotiation, reprehension, persuasion, flattering and insistence, sometimes known as nagging.

We are all bound to give control over and this is an important lesson in life that may constitute a bitter failure, a proof that we have accepted the cruel reality or a reservation-free acceptance.

The meaning of life, as I look at it, is the confrontation of the fear of a predestined life, the awareness of the power of our own will in the act of loving ourselves and others.

The CONTROL we exercise upon ourselves, upon others and on upon what happens to us is almost always imperfect.

What we must all want is: *to comprehend in a correct and timely manner when there is too much or too little CONTROL, and to choose wisely, in accordance with our free will, the bitter-sweet balance between power and subordination, while enjoying the miracle of life.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Daniel Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence*, Curtea veche Publishing House, 2001.
2. Danile Goleman, Richard Boyatzis, Annie McKee, *Emotional Intelligence in leadership*, Cartea veche Publishing House, Bucharest, 2005.
3. Albrecht Karl, *Practical Intelligence*, Cartea Veche Publishing House, Bucharest, 2008.
4. Manfred Kets de Vries, *Leadership, The Art and Mastery of Leadership*, Codex Publishing House, 2003.
5. Danah Zohar, *Spiritual Intelligence*, Radin Print Publishing House, Bucharest, 2011.