

## GD Interview Group Discussion: Reasons for Rejection in GDGroup Discussion

**Examrace Placement Series** prepares you for the toughest placement exams to top companies.

The keenness and eagerness of No3, his readiness to shoulder responsibility, his confidence to face the group and his initiative are no doubt his plus points. But his approach is selfish, authoritarian and annoying to others. He is too assertive and very dominating. His brazen attempt to bulldoze others will provoke them and result in quarrels and clashes. These, in turn, will hinder group activity and realisation of the common goal objective, which is successful completion of the discussion within the time allotted. A leader or manager must carry his teammates with them and not antagonize them. No3, unfortunately, appears to be lacking in this very important aspect. **REJECTED**

No2 does not know much about the subject He has the gift of the gab and hence waffles aimlessly. There is no logic or rationale in what he said he lacks organisation, system and order. He talks at random, jumping from one topic to another in fits and starts. Earlier we saw him acting rigidly and selfishly. He will cause friction and quarrels in the team, behaving like a bull in china shop. **REJECTED**

No5 had remained aloof and silent throughout. He is dull and devoid of ideas. He admits his limitations but does not show any interest or determination to overcome them. He wastes opportunities and shies away from responsibility. Being weak and docile and unenterprising, he will not be able to come up as a leader. **REJECTED**

No8 This candidate is a mere camp follower without any initiative, urge, drive or originality. He finds excuses to avoid and shirk responsibility. He has throughout been disinterested, distant and aloof and has not made any contribution to group activity. An extremely dull and insipid individual who will prove to be a great burden to the organization. **REJECTED**

No. 1 wastes the opportunity offered to him on a platter. On his own also he did not display and initiative and drive. He pleads ignorance and confirms that he lacks ideas. This is a general knowledge topic and anyone familiar with current events should be able to make some interesting contribution to the discussion. He offers excuses and prefers to be the last speaker. If he does not know, he can at least ask a knowledgeable colleague in the group to explain the nature and scope of the topic first. On the other hand, he straightway shirks responsibility. He is a dull and insipid candidate who lacks self-confidence and leadership potential. **REJECTED**

Sulks and refuses to cooperate. He also wastes the good opportunity offered to him. He is rigid and fails to adapt himself to the situation. He has good expressive faculty but his ideas are confused and overlapping. He waffles unnecessarily instead of going directly to the point. His

ego and pride prevent him from extending cooperation and establishing rapport. Because of his personal quarrel with No. 6, he refuses to the half of the group. With this marked negative qualities. No. 2 will be a serious hindrance to the team. REJECTED.

This candidate has understood the subject and has the self-confidence to the challenge No. 5 and produce quite a few original and convincing arguments to support his stand. But he still continues his collision path. He prefers to attack those who disagree with him in a brutal and direct manner. He quarreled with No. 2 violently earlier. Now he repeats the same behaviour pattern. It is doubtful whether he could improve by training REJECTED

This candidate lacks initiative and originality. His ideas are limited he has nothing useful to contribute. He is afraid to take any firm decision and commit himself. He has wasted the opportunity afforded to him. With such marked negative qualities he cannot make the grade as a strong leader. REJECTED

A fairly active and well-motivated group in which Nos. 7 and 5 display natural leadership qualities and prove successful in launching the group on its task. They overcome the obstacles which they encounter with imagination, speed and tact. This GD being a team work, it cannot be executed without someone assuming the responsibilities of a leader and coordinator. Nos 1, 2 and 3, though spoke among themselves, did not come toward to shoulder this responsibility on there own initiative. On the other hand No. 7 displayed natural leadership abilities and assumed the responsibility to launch the group on its task, on his own No. 5 who gave excellent support to No. 7, also displays good leadership qualities. We find No2 to be hesitant, diffident and overcautious. No. 1 appears to be lacking in ideas and he is unable to half No. 2 actively. Without admitting his limitations No. 1 tries to evade the issues or pass the buck on the others. No3has acted in light vein which indicates certain amount of irresponsibility Nevertheless he offers to be the opening speaker. Hence, he has to be watched further, Nos. 4, 6and 8 have so far remained as silent spectators.

In this group Nos. 3 and 7 initially wanted to assume leadership and made their debuts. But they bitterly quarreled between themselves as to who should be the leader. Unfortunately, both lacked tact and social cohesiveness. They were also rigid and selfish. Team spirit and cooperation on the part of both were sadly lacking and they were obstructing the progress of group activity. On the other hand, No. 1 emerged as the natural and highly gifted leader. He was able to motivate his team mates and move the group towards its goal with remarkable success. He could handle Nos. 3and 7 with competence and else displaying appropriate techniques. Nos. 5 and 4 came forward to lend good support to No. 1 and also showed adequate leadership traits themselves No. 6, 8 and 2 were ineffective camp followers and did not make any contribution to promote group activity. Thus, the only successful candidates of this group are Nos. 1, 5 and 4 in that order.