

In most cases the social environment is the most significant sphere of human existence where all the human ambitions, aspirations and objectives open up together with the complex nature of human fears, emotions and feelings. Individuals working in different organizations bring in the personal identities masked under socially determined and sometimes obliged roles.

The scientific interest towards organizational management and individual behavior derives from the interdisciplinary nature of the survey and investigations to be conducted, more precisely, from the perspectives of Psychology, Social Studies and Management and Business Administration.

It is of absolute evidence that the individual behavior and the models of general conduct of a person in social frameworks largely depend on the person-based acts, his/her input and feedback to group works and collective initiatives, as every personal response is mainly motivated by personal interests.

As we know, the traditions of organizational management have been developed on the management experience of the two basic models: collectivism vs. individualism. These two extreme points are described by (Moorhead, Griffin 2011: 674 – 675, 677 – 679, 680). In point of fact, we may state that all the models of management, which comprise both states, have always gained success due to the mutually motivated polarity, giving opportunities to the best one for the given circumstances. However, neither the individual nor the collective models can be of absolute priority. Had they been so, the managerial activities would have resulted in an absolute collapse. A vivid example of this might serve the soviet model of organizational and institutional management, which in fact was substituted by imprecise collective standpoint that later on collapsed, leaving groups of people without any factual guidance. Consequently, the society, which transformed through the period of transition, has faced two tendencies: **an absolute individualism leading to person-base tyranny** (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wichens 2000). and **collective leadership destroyed and still heading for individual indifference** (Moorhead, Griffin, 2011). By indifference we mean lack of any personal initiatives with no leading or guiding teamwork.

The most effective methods of management are aimed at three crucial levels of human interaction within an organization:

Level 1: People as a network of participants; Level 2: People as resources;

Level 3: People as individuals.

In the development of any management model there are premises of psychological states individually, interpersonally, and culturally motivated. In every situation they might be united in order to model up “*archetypes*” for organizational management models.

The problem of aggression cannot but be viewed within the context of the main cultural archetypes detectable from the perspectives of management, economic and political systems of administration. Therefore, to make further researches much comprehensible, it would be advantageous to view the statistics and other facts gathered under four archetypical groups distinguished with the help of a wide range of features. From the features summarized by a number of researches we have given preference to those highlighted by a group of Russian scholars (Базаров, Аксенова, & Еремин, и др 2006: 19-21). Thus, in Table 1 we suggest the main characteristics of managerial cultures differentiable through a number of features (See the table at the end of the article.) The table introduces the overall correlations between the top authority line and the common bottom-line of personal freedom and initiatives. As we

reckon the correlation between the absolute mandatory control and creative individual participation of absolute priority should be analyzed and detailed in the context of features of absolute priority that we have separated and introduced in the table above. At the same time, the same features might be combined in a specific way to complete a research in order to detect the most crucial psychological problems aimed at the deduction of the most effective mechanisms of management in the given case or in similar cases typologically distinguishable.

As a matter of fact, the psychological, professional and moral components of management in the Armenian society nowadays combine two negative trends as for the power distance: on the one hand, a higher position in management makes the power and decision making process **recognizable** for lower ranks, however, on the other hand, the lack of initiatives mentioned above changes that power into a **pressing control** excluding any creativity or critical observation from a wider group of employees.

The problem of aggression, particularly viewed against the management background, should be analyzed within individual – organization interface (Moorhead, Griffin, 2011: 308 – 309), namely, the visible structure or network of different jobs and positions. This unites people and may serve as an immediate environment for interpersonal contacts and problems in them. Basically speaking, the organizational management should cover all the levels from individual behavior to organizational structures. Thus, the degree of flexibility of management should readily activate “*every cell*” of the organism. As for the general methodology of implementation of flexible managerial models, it should proceed in two basic phases:

- a) Through the network of wider scope of workers and managers, as stated in classical organizational theory;
- b) Through co-working interpersonal circles in accordance with the scientific management. The combination of the layers, mentioned above, as well as the theoretical approaches

referred to would bring up a leverage in order to avoid models with the absolute priority given to the study of cases of aggressions (for instance, the megalomaniac ventures and regimes), on the one hand, and individual-centered business initiatives (for example family-based business).

Although it may sound drastic, it is obvious that the psychological background of the management models in Armenia, as a post-soviet area, is negatively charged coinciding in many features with Douglas McGregor's theory 'X' with all the pessimistic views of people under certain management (Moorhead, Griffin, 2011: 17). However, the modern requirements for management models should be far from being more positively charged and optimistic only. Therefore, the two main objectives to gain in the process of management in transformation should premise upon different perceptions of workers and managers:

- **Worker – a creative participant of business processes** instead of a simple doer of tasks obliged;
 - **Manager – an innovative facilitator of business processes** instead of direct authority of compulsory control.
- Together with the individual differences and psychological perceptions of individual's

participation in organization management, there are various issues to be described first and analyzed from the psychological perspectives too. For instance, the key factor of motivation in any managerial activity might be viewed not only through individual, but also through the cultural contexts. To make it clear we would like to bring the example of some national cultural peculiarities analyzed by (Moorhead, Griffin, 2011: 689 – 690).

Cf.: The priority given by Japanese to the security needs and the significance of social needs highlighted in Nordic cultures.

The cultural differences, nevertheless, may be as profound as the divergences found among people in one and the same group. So, the cultures with their historical, material, philosophical bases are as deep as individuals with the psychometric characteristics, level of education and experience.

The organizational culture, as stated, is based on the structural and management aspects of institutions, to be exact, any social grouping motivated by **common interests, targets or the environment they share**. For management proper all these variants of coexistence are important. That is why, human beings cannot but be perceived through individual differences or psychological characteristics that might inevitably be reflected in the organizational layout and inner mechanisms. In fact, the individual participation adds not only a wide spectrum of personal, emotional colors to the psychological background of the organization, but is also capable to make both creative and destructive changes into the internal *organizational engine*. The standpoints that we would recommend to choose for the analysis of individual's participation in different spheres of management and organization might be classified into:

- a) Biological factors;
- b) Inner factors;
- c) Interactive factors

By defining some factors as "biological" ones, we observe them as naturally motivated factors involving the evolution factors and the factors of hormones. Psychologists believe that human social behavior is related to our evolutionary heritage. From this perspective aggression is thought to have helped prehistoric people compete for mates, ensuring survival of their genes in the next generation.

Experiments have shown that aggressive behavior increases or decreases dramatically with the amount of testosterone in an animal's body (Bernstein, Clarke-Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 648), and violent criminals have been found to have higher levels of testosterone than nonviolent ones (Bernstein, Clarke-Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 648). Among normal men, variations in testosterone show a small but statistically significant correlation with aggressiveness (Bernstein, Clarke-Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 648).

As we can see from the explanations quoted above that biological factors, we have viewed, do not depend on social networks, if not derive from human nature. Thus, for the management psychology by inner factors we mean all the circumstances conditioned on individual ↔ society level. To be more precise, we might observe a complex set of mutual linkages between personal psychological experience (i.e. emotions) and group experience accepted or at least recognizable for the group members (more specifically cultures and cultural values).

In general, people are more likely to be aggressive when they are both physiologically aroused and experiencing strong emotions such as anger (Bernstein, Clarke-Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 649 – 650). People tend either to lash out at those who make them angry or to displace their anger onto defenseless targets such as children or pets. However, aggression can also be made more likely by other forms of emotional arousal. The link between stress and aggressive behavior points to the possibility that stressful environmental conditions can make aggressive behavior more likely (Bernstein, Clarke-Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 652).

Aggressive behavior is much more common in individualists than in collectivist cultures (Bernstein, Clarke-Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 649). The effects of culture

on aggression can also be seen in the fact that the incidence of aggression in a given culture changes over time as cultural values change (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 649). Deriving from the biological roots in an individual, aggression is likely to end up in disturbed social interactions, i. e. at the level of wider interpersonal contacts. In addition, people learn many aggressive responses by watching others (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 649). Children, in particular, learn and perform many novel aggressive responses that they see modeled by others (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 649). Fortunately, not everyone who sees aggression becomes aggressive, individual differences in temperament, the modeling of non-aggressive behavior by parents and other factors can temper the effects of violent television, for example. Nevertheless, observational learning does play a significant role in the development and display of aggressive behavior (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 66). This is particularly true and essential for the psychological aspect of methods of management from the standpoint of a group leader, team coordinator or a model employee with successive career progress.

Every psychological issue viewed against the management background deals with groups as a key idea. That is why the aggressive behavior viewed within a group always needs a contextual analysis of different types of interaction or social communication. So, we must differentiate interactive factors which may be singled out within **cooperation, competition or conflict**.

Cooperation is any type of behavior in which people work together to attain a goal. People can also engage in competition, trying to attain a goal to others. Finally, conflict results when one person or group believes that another stands in the way of achieving the goals. One way in which psychologists have learned about all three of these behaviors is by studying social dilemmas (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 661). Social dilemmas might be understood as situations in which individual's interests or incentives will, if adopted by all others, produce negative consequences for everyone, creating a contrast between personal and group welfare (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 661).

There is a socially predetermined way, positive social interaction for all the participants of group, organization or social management.

It is common knowledge that communication serves for a number of managerial tasks both as a method and as a tool. Communication can reduce people's tendency to act competitively (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 661–665). Unfortunately, however, not all communication increases cooperation, just as not all contact between ethnic groups reduces prejudice. If the communication takes the form of a threat, people apparently interpret the threat itself as a competitive response and are likely to respond competitively (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 661–662). Furthermore, the communication must be relevant. People can also communicate implicitly the strategy they use. It may be illustrated by a cooperation started after a cooperative response over time (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 663).

In social dilemmas and other situations in which people are interdependent—that is to say, when what one person does always affects the other – cooperation usually leads to the best outcomes for everyone. It goes without saying that such models of management are applicable in spheres of vital importance (national, regional, international), as well as sources of high income for example fuel, food, technologies, etc.

It is beyond any doubt that aggression as a problem to cope with may be as a **potential cause, actual process** and **result** of interpersonal conflict within a group. Thus, the management of aggression may help to predict, control and neutralize the worst consequences of interpersonal conflict.

The most common way of managing organizational conflict is through bargaining. There are four major causes of interpersonal conflict (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 663). One is competition for scarce resources. Some managers testify spending as much as 20 percent of their time dealing with interpersonal conflicts based on such competition (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 663). Second major cause of interpersonal conflict is revenge. People reciprocate not only positive actions but also negative ones. Some people who feel exploited or deprived or otherwise aggrieved spend months, even years, plotting ways of getting back at those they hold responsible (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 663-664). These cases may sometimes be qualified as **implicitly developing aggression** never expressed apparently or as **an implicit stage of aggression development** eventually growing into an explicit aggression.

As some Western industrialized cultures tend to highlight, there is always an importance of individuals over groups. That is why, the wider the scope of participants in the decisive acts is, the more tolerant and less aggressive the individuals grow. From the standpoint of managerial leadership, the psychological background of the management proper should comprise a model that would guarantee the transparency of motivated and fair decisions made by the authorities, on the one hand, and the total understanding of the mistakes made by the subordinates, on the other hand.

The interpersonal conflict has always been viewed as either result of aggression or competitive spirit. Quite reasonable would be the observation that organizational management should get more guided first by the priority of a group that makes final decisions and carries the responsibility. As a matter of fact, results become factual and productive particularly under the guidance of a group – more **coordinated** than **headed** by a leader. Person-oriented leaders provide loose supervision, ask for group members' ideas and are generally concerned with subordinates' feelings. They are usually well liked by the group, even when they must reprimand someone (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 664). In order to keep such traditions vivid and follow a **communication strategy** favorable in management for all the participants, we would highlight, as one of the tasks of effective management, the persistent control over the male and female group members' relative amount. The correct quantity correlation between male and female staff members would guarantee:

- a) a constant inner factor against aggression;
- b) a persistent possibility for adequate interaction with outer parties, even more effective in case of aggression and conflicts.

As for the second point, it should be underlined that research on leadership effectiveness and gender provides one explanation as to why one leadership style is not invariable better than another. Men and women are equally capable leaders, but men tend to be more effective when success requires a more task-oriented leaders, and women tend to be more effective when success requires a more person-oriented leader. In other words, people of each gender tend to be most effective when they are acting in a manner consistent with gender-role traditions (Bernstein, Clarke–Stewart, Penner, Roy, Wickens 2000: 665). A typical case of contingent management with appropriate psychological bases maybe viewed in situations of urgent or obliged management, as for example personnel reduction, branch

reduction or opening or closing of a new office. Consequently, the existence of both models of gender-motivated management provides a higher degree of readiness to cope with a larger and more diversified spectrum of problems and tasks.

Summarizing the general insights, we would emphasize the following spheres of managerial activities to be adjusted and psychologically surveyed in further investigations and developments of effective organizational models:

1. The models of absolute productivity should comprise all **the psychological premises of individualized approaches in management.**
2. The management methodology should be fine-tuned **to the needs, interests and abilities of the team or group.**
3. The constant monitoring of the managerial model applied should assume **psychological components throughout the whole organizational hierarchy.**
4. The feedback expected should detect **psychologically reasoned responses to the management process.**
5. The administrators in charge should involve in the monitoring process **a variety of tools of psychological analyses (tests, interviews, quizzes, etc.).**