

# **INDIVIDUAL REASON FOR APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL AND GROUP PRESSURE IN MANAGERIAL TEAM**

**Elena Daniela POPESCU**

University of Pitești, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Romania

**Eliza ANTONIU**

University of Pitești, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Romania

**Nicoleta ISAC**

University of Pitești, Faculty of Economic Sciences, Romania

## **ABSTRACT**

*The problem of motivation in the process of enterprise management is as difficult on so important. The difficulty lies in that we do not have the simple ways to change the motivation. Since in the participatory management may occur tendency to align with the views insufficiently substantiated or with a doubtful utility in the work of lifting the overall efficiency of the company, these events should not be overlooked. Eradicate these states also require that these tendencies to stay in the team management attention and to be resolved not only formally but also informally. In practice such efforts may encounter some difficulties. Thus, in the managerial team may exist, along with pressure on those members with vision and inefficient events, tend to hedge against members who deploy the intellectual skills, training, responsible participation in the company management. In such cases intervention is necessary because such events are likely to diminish the effectiveness of managerial act.*

**KEYWORDS:** motivation, managerial team, training, company, performance

Managerial team is for its members a reality, a function and a value, and the motivation of members of the group becomes essential in this regard. Motivation maintains the most closely relation to what is the meaning of conduct and team members work. It is the energetic support, incentive mechanism and integrator and explanatory factor of many psychosocial phenomena of the management of the company.

Motivation is an *internal factor* which along with other internal factors (skills, character type, individual particularities, character features etc.). contribute to the determination of the manifestations of conduct. Motivation fulfills the role of general or specific activity, and as a source of activity can ensure the conditions of the participatory-managerial process of the company. In addition to the function of general activity, motivation performs a function of target in the sense that, affecting some functional systems, it contributes to the interaction with external stimuli to determine the direction of action.

Promoting participatory management of the company involves the organic need for dialogue and confrontation of views, experience. Activity in the managerial team allows a systematized and organized dialogue, in which the collective wisdom can be manifested in full and to not miss the confrontation of views, the fight views, control and mutual criticism. And that as the multilateral examination of the investigated problem and the best solution - as a central objective in the work of managerial team - can be assured only by confronting critical comments and positive proposals.

In fact, the main psychosocial function of managerial team consists of the exchange of views, in the exchange of comments and arguments, useful for the optimal solution. Since the practice confirms that in the case of the managerial team that prohibition, availability, coercion cause attitudes of opposition, it appears as natural the concern of influencing of team members in the process of participation in enterprise management using positive conviction methods in the case of intentional dependency.

Our study conducted in 2 companies on the motivational forces character at the managerial team level has given us the opportunity to reach some important conclusions:

- by the way how to use motivations results that team members participation in all activities of management and the results followed proves to be an efficient and superior process;
- the best training in participatory management of the company when each member of the team feels responsible for the common goals of unity and act concretely and take operational implementation;
- in the managerial process of company motivation determines the ease with which team members participate in drawing up collective decision or passing on the performance and monitor the implementation of its resistance that oppose the critical situations, the persistence in time of action to achieve;
- because the managerial team members influence and support each other, individual motivation can not be effective unless it is supported by the collective motivation of the whole body;
- at the level of managerial team we can speak of a mechanism based on self-motivation, which trigger reactions of defense against the trends of non-participation in the factory management or against those who use the presence in the managerial team to solve their personal problems only.

Pressure group in the management team appears in cases when the views of the authors of the proposals made can not be harmonized. Typically, the collective decision is a selection of several ways of solving, proposed by one or more members of the team. Are situations when one of the variants can convince itself by itself or through a rational and responsible argumentation to impose without divergence of views.

In the case when authors views do not harmonize, it is decided with simple majority of the total number of members of the body. In this situation there is no hierarchy of power but is decided by majority opinion, according to the perseverance rule of experience namely that it is easier to one or a few wrong than most.

In conclusion, if is properly understood and appreciated the wide range of motives in managerial team, in the sense that it has been mentioned above, this may lead to a large number of possible solutions which will have its particularities of each company, because both team members and managerial staff to be conducted are different in each case.

## References

1. R. Mathis, P. Nica, C. Rusu, *Human Resource Management*, Ed Economic, Bucharest, 1997
2. Petrescu, *Human Resource Management*, Ed Lux Libris, Brasov, 1995
3. R. McDermoff, R. Mikulak, M. Beauregard, *Developing Initiative and Creativity of Staff*, Dunod, Paris, 1996
4. Hubert Jaoui, *Creativity*, Morisset, Paris, 1995