

Special Aspects of Managers and Employees' Responsibility Structure

Olga V. Mukhlynina^a, Natalia E. Zhdanova^a, Irina M. Kondyurina^a,
Natalia S. Bastrakova^a, Tatyana M. Kovaleva^b and Farida I.
Mirzabalaeva^c

^aRussian State Vocational Pedagogical University, Ekaterinburg, RUSSIA; ^bSamara State University of Economics, Samara, RUSSIA; ^cPlekhanov Russian University of Economics, Moscow, RUSSIA

ABSTRACT

The relevance of the research problem due to the fact that society needs people who are able to make their own decisions and take responsibility for their choices, but often there are situations when leaders are not able to delegate responsibility, and employees in turn do not want to take it. The article aims to study the differences in the structure of responsibility of managers and employees' responsibility, analysis of interrelations of components of responsibility with motivation. Leading methods to the study of this problem is a psycho-diagnostic method and method of mathematical statistics (Pearson correlation analysis, factor analysis – multivariate statistical method used for studying relationships between values of variables). Processing of empirical data was conducted using SPSS programs. In the result of the study obtained significant differences in the structure of managers and employees' responsibility described the relationship of components of responsibility with motivation. The article can be useful to psychologists, staff managers and administrative managers.

KEYWORDS

Components of responsibility, motivation, motives, responsibility.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 23 April 2016
Revised 10 June 2016
Accepted 28 June 2016

Introduction

Representatives of different psychological sciences addressing to the issue of the responsibility such as K.A. Abulkhanova (1999), A.V. Brushlinsky (1996), A.I. Krupnov (1993; 2005), V.P. Pryadein (2001); philosophical sciences M.M. Bakhtin (1979), E.I. Rudkovsky (1979), E. Fromm (1941); law sciences I. Andenes (1979), V.N. Kudryavtsev (1986); sociological sciences E.Ya. Musaev (1990), T.Ya. Shikhova (1980); pedagogical sciences A.P. Medveditskov (1985), O.A. Petrukhina (1985) each of the sciences has its own vision and understanding of the problem of responsibility. At the same time, it was found that, despite the large number of works and the diversity of approaches to the

CORRESPONDENCE Olga V. Mukhlynina ✉ muhol60@mail.ru

© 2016 Mukhlynina et al. Open Access terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) apply. The license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, on the condition that users give exact credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if they made any changes.

study of liability issues related to the comprehensive study of responsibility as a system quality of personality, and the relationship of components of responsibility with motivation still largely remain open. In this study we focus on the component of responsibility – its active part, because only through symptoms, through specific deeds and actions it is possible to speak about responsibility. We believe productive position on the multidimensional and functional organization of individual properties and acts of human behavior, expressed, theoretically grounded and practically proved by A.I. Krupnov (1993; 2005). He defines responsibility as achieving results through the interaction of the regulatory-dynamic components (arginate-arhitecti, thenicest-asteniceski, internality-externality) and motivational-semantic component (sociocentricity-self-centeredness, meaningful-awareness, objectivity-subjectivity). Criteria integral-functional analysis, developed by A.I. Krupnov (1993), was used to study the various qualities of the subject: sociability by I.V. Matveeva (1993), persistence by O.B. Barabash (1992), E. V. Menshenina (1999), I.A. Ponomareva (1994), responsibility by I.A. Kurenkov (1994), V.P. Pryadein (2001), initiative by A.E. Pyatinin (1996), S.M. Zinkovskaya (1999). In addition to the main structural units, proposed by A.I. Krupnov (1993), for the deepest examination of responsibility' qualities is necessary to introduce other parameters: aspirations, challenges, empathy, forecasting and taking responsibility for themselves. We understand «the guarantee subject to the achievement of own forces result on the basis of own decision, informed duty and conscience» for the responsibility (Pryadein, 2001). The main role in understanding how a person will perform a particular activity, except liability is their motivation. Therefore, in our work we associate the components of responsibility with motivation.

Materials and Methods

Research methods

The following methods were used during research: theoretical (analysis, synthesis, concretization, generalization), diagnostic (a questionnaire of "Responsibility" V.P. Pryadein (2001), questionnaire «Level of subjective control» by J. Rotter (1954), the technique «Motivation of professional activity» by C. Zamfir (1983) in the modification of A.A. Rean (2006), methods of mathematical statistics and graphical display of results.

Experimental base of the research

The study of features of responsibility structure was carried out at the Ekaterinburg scientific establishments, occupying different career ladder. The study involved 102 people (including 48 managers, 54 employees).

Research hypothesis

The study of the problem was carried out in 3 stages:

- theoretical analysis of existing methodological approaches in the philosophical, psychological and pedagogical scientific literature, the dissertation works on the problem, and the theory and technique of psycho-pedagogical researches was carried out in the first stage;
- in the second stage was carried out the experimental research work, analyzed, tested and refined the insights obtained in the course of a search operation;

- the third stage has been completed the search operation, clarified theoretical and practical insights, generalizes and systematizes obtained results.

Results

For the comparison of two groups "leaders" and "employees" was used the criterion Kruskal-Wallis significance is $p=0,594$ that tells us about how groups differ among themselves. The analysis of empirical data showed that in the group of "leaders" stood out as high values responsibility indicators (Table 1).

Table 1. The results of the administrative managers' comparative responsibility indicators

Indicators of responsibilities	Xcp	Me	Mo	S
dynamic arginate	26,9	27,5	27,0	3,5
cognitive meaningfulness	26,7;	28,0	29,0	4,2
emotional scenicheskoe	27,5	28,0	26,0	3,8
regulatory internality	25,3	26,0	26,0	5,0
taking responsibility	27,3	28,0	28,0	3,7
the result of the subjectivety	27,8	29,0	26,0	5,0
extrinsic motivation	4,7	5,0	5,0	0,5

The results of the «leaders» evidence of self-reliance, without additional control, repeatedly confirmed in practice, strict implementation of difficult and responsible assignments. «Leaders» expressed the independence of the subject from the external circumstances in the implementation of responsible business. «Leaders» grasp the core foundation of responsibility, its essence, the deepest and holistic view about the quality of the task. The completion of responsibilities related to personal well-being, self-realization, development of the different sides and qualities. In the group «staff» responsibility indicators has a high value of the following (Table 2).

Table 2. The results of the employees' comparative responsibility indicators

Indicators of responsibility	Xcp	Me	Mo	S
dynamic arhitecti	26,2	26,0	24,0	2,1
the result of the substantive	25,7	25,0	25,0	2,1
regulatory internality	26,3	27,0	28,0	2,4
taking responsibility	27,0	27,0	28,0	2,4
extrinsic motivation	4,3	5,0	5,0	0,8

High performance, dynamic architect speaks about their low activity in responsible business. Analysis of the results allows us to draw the following conclusion that «leaders» as opposed to «employees» better understand the meaning of responsibility, they are active in achieving the substantive result. While passive employees perform critical tasks" and wait for instructions». In the group of "leaders" expressed the harmonic components of the liability into its various components, while the "staff" expressed as harmonic and anharmonic components of responsibility.

Analysis of the results obtained by the technique "Motivation of professional activity" K. Zamfir (1983) in the modification by A.A. Rean (2006), groups are the following: in the group of «leaders» is dominated intrinsic motivation, this suggests that this motivation is associated not with external circumstances, but by the content of the activity. In the group of «staff» expressed, external negative

motivation that suggests that their motivation not related to the content of certain activities, but due to external to the subject's circumstances and based on negative incentives.

Results according to the method of USK showed that in the group of «leaders» is most pronounced: the integrality in the field of achievements, internality in the field of failures, internality in the field of industrial relations. Therefore, what he says about us, about what «leaders» are responsible, for their achievements and failures. If something does not work they do not looking for exculpatory external causes. They consider their actions as an important factor in their own production activities, in particular in their promotion. The «staff» are most pronounced following parameters: the internality in family relations, internality in the field of interpersonal relations, therefore, they believe that those responsible for the events happening in his family life and the field of interpersonal relations.

To define relationships between indicators of accountability framework was conducted by Pearson correlation analysis, which showed us that the structure of responsibility in groups is different.

The group «administrative managers» are presented the following correlations : the Result of the subject depends on the emotional thenicest ($r=0,76$) and cognitive intelligence ($r=0.52$) This tells us that «leaders» understand the meaning of responsibility in achieving corporate social responsibility result and achievement of the result gives them positive emotions.» The relationship between indicators of personal difficulties and the content and meaning of the desire of the subject to accountability ($r=0.52$) suggests that when they have a bad mood ,they strive to implement responsible, not to let other people. Sociocentric motivation increases subject result to perform critical cases ($r=0.67$), we can say that the public interest in this group prevail over personal.

The group "employees" is presented the following correlations: sociocentric motivations associated with subject result ($r=0,61$) respectively, the higher sociocentric motivation, the more responsible they are suitable to perform meaningful public responsible result. Cognitive awareness is correlated with emotional thenicest ($r=0,61$), a misunderstanding the nature of responsibility in the implementation of responsible gives them negative emotions. The interrelationship between personal problems and taking responsibility ($r=-0,59$) shows that in bad feeling they are trying to get away from responsibilities. Thus, association analysis allows us to say that the existence of personal difficulties «leaders» tend to take responsibility, but employees strive to avoid it.

The factor analysis was conducted to define hidden variables , which showed the hidden variables responsible for the presence of linear statistical relationships correlations between the observed variables:

At the "leaders" the first factor is the highest number of factor weights represented the harmonic components of responsibility : a dynamic activity, which suggests the independence of the "leaders", as well as a sufficient understanding of the responsibility associated with the sense of duty, a predominance of public interest over personal, Sociocentric motivation , which promotes the activity to perform critical cases (ergichnosti weight factor is in opposition to the other parameters).

In the second factor the highest weight is subjectivity; it is close to the most important figure of internality and sociocentricity. Apparently, independence from external circumstances and other people, the presence of sociocentric motivation, contributes to the achievement of socially significant results in critical cases. The second factor can be called factor of responsibility.

The greatest weight has personal difficulties, high weight, internality, and awareness in the third factor. To achieve personally important responsible of the result of «leaders» promote positive emotions and regulatory internality. Leaders understand the essence, hold them accountable.

The "staff" of the first factor represented the greatest harmonic scales and shows the dependence liability of subordinates from difficulties. This fact, in the presence of negative emotions and external regulation specifies that the effective part of the responsibility is not implemented.

The second factor speaks about the responsibility. It is represented in almost all harmonic components. However, the cognitive component of responsibility is missing, that says, as you wish to take and achieve a responsible outcome, but without a clear understanding of its essence.

The third factor is represented by instrumental and stylistic aspirations, which suggest that «employees» tend to take responsibility responsible result, but there is no clear understanding of responsibility, but there is a desire to achieve it in the presence of a sociocentric motivation.

Thus, we can draw the following conclusions: there are significant relationships between the scales. Intrinsic motivation contributes to the achievement of responsible, high rates of extrinsic motivation increase the subjectivity and objectivity of responsibility; the structure of responsibility of «leaders» and «subordinates», including responsibility «leaders», and they understand its meaning.

Discussions

The term «responsibility» has a direct relationship to various areas of psychology. The content of this concept is analyzed in connection with the study of personality, cognitive processes, psychology of management, moral education. The word «responsibility» was introduced into scientific use by A. Bain (1859) in his book «the Emotions and the Will». The phenomenon of responsibility would already present itself in most philosophical work. Responsibility is often called, but not analyzed. At the same time highlighted the general idea, namely that responsibility is understood as a kind of reality, to be fully responsible for yourself, be indisputable to consciousness by the author of the event or object (Sartre, 1943; Yalom, 1980).

Criminal, civil, disciplinary and administrative responsibility is considered in law. It is believed that legal responsibility always acts as the responsibility of generating the motive of fear before the adverse effects and acts as a brake misconduct. Attempts have been made to highlight the subjective and objective sides of responsibility. Under strict liability is understood the expression which is properly formed requirements and sanctions, and under the subjective is understood therefractation of the requirements specified in the consciousness of the individual. In General, the basis of liability is entered the component of punishment in law. Moreover, in the dictionary of the modern Russian language, the liability is revealed through the sense of guilt, it is imposed on anyone or

taken anyone the obligation, the accountability of some of their actions and taking the blame for possible consequences. Responsibility always related to a specific subject and reflected the scope of tasks and responsibilities of the individual, those limits of the debt is the duty of the person in front of someone or to his or her conscience. Conscience is the awareness and feeling of responsibility based on the duties of self-esteem. As a subject of responsibility may act:

- a) individual;
- b) group as a particular community of people;
- c) state as a kind of macrostructure.

The presence of the instance before which the subject can and should be held accountable for their actions, is an important regulator of social life. Such instances may be:

- 1) socially prominent person (e.g. president, king, head of the company, etc.);
- 2) social group (political party, organization, society etc.);
- 3) historically formed ethical, moral, religious and other requirements.

Analysis of the personal approach to the study of responsibility has shown that understanding the personality of his or her liability is determined by a number of factors. These include the following factors: cognitive, motivational, characterological etc. (Stroková, 2012). «Responsibility gives you the opportunity to build different strategies, try different ways to achieve the goal, search for the best» K.A. Abulkhanova (1999). One of the issues of psychology responsibility is the question of the relationship between personal and social responsibility. Some authors note that the objective basis of man's responsibility to society and himself is a real communication between society and individual, which is always contradictory. Others believe that the responsibility may occur episodically, in some very special and rare situations, but sometimes it can be stable trait, a property of the individual. A.G. Spirkin (1972) in his work notes that personal responsibility is a significant social, moral and psychological quality of the person acting the most important traits. The responsibility is from a position of freedom. Freedom has always been considered the indisputable value to humans. At the same time, before to enjoy the freedom it is necessary to realize what it is. E. Fromm (1941) notes that people need leaders that take decisions for them, but themselves they are easy to shed the burden of responsibility and freedom. A similar pattern is observed in adolescents, which, on the one hand, strive for accountability, on the other - they don't want to take responsibility for their actions and deeds. Moral categories: conscience, duty, responsibility, shame – are those that provide a person the autonomy of self-exposure. As V. Frankl (1946) told, that in these actions the person discovers himself not only in the present but in the future, he is going through his spirituality as belonging to him, experiencing freedom as the ability to influence to his inner world and implements it in relation to himself, a sense of responsibility for his own future. Researchers of a systematic approach note that an essential feature of each system is its structure (Ananiev, 1969; Zalewski, 1976; Leontiev, 1977; Lomov, 1984).

As the main signs of responsibility K. Muzdybaev (1983) highlights:

1. Accuracy, punctuality, loyalty to personality and a willingness to answer for their actions;

2. The capacity for empathy, sensitivity to others' pain and joy;

3. Persistence, diligence, courage.

We see that different authors identify various substructures in the responsibility. Given the diversity of indicators and components that make up the liability, we believe a productive position on the multidimensional and functional organization of individual properties and acts of human behavior, expressed and theoretically substantiated by A.I. Krupnov (1993; 2005). Responsibility is a guarantee subject to the achievement of result for its own forces on the basis of own decision, informed duty and conscience (Pryadein, 2001). In this study we focus on the component of responsibility: its active part, it is possible to speak about responsibility only because through symptoms, specific deeds and actions.

A man can do the same work to spend a number of efforts. It can work at full capacity and can work on the floor strength. He may also seek to take easier job or can take up difficult and hard work to choose the simpler solution, and may seek and undertake difficult decision. This reflects how much effort a person is ready to expend. And it depends on how he is motivated to spend more effort to do his work. «Only the presence of sales motivation makes the act of holistic education» (Tulchinsky, 1990). Therefore, the motivational structure of man can be considered as a basis for the implementation of certain actions. Motivational structure of man has a certain stability. However, it may vary, in particular, consciously in the process of person's upbringing and his education (Shchipanova et al., 2016). Motivation is a process of human exposure, with the aim of prompting him to certain actions by awakening his certain motives. Motivation is the core and basis of human control. Management efficiency depends greatly on how successfully is the process of motivation. Leaders need to be able to motivate their employees to perform different functions. With all the variety of interests to the problem of reliability, a single perspective on its nature does not exist. There are not enough research on professional responsibility and motivation.

Conclusion

At the present stage of Russia's development, ensuring its economic, political, environmental security in the world imposes new requirements for workers in all sectors of the economy. Under current circumstances, when the country is under economic blockade, it is necessary to develop the economy of the state. Society needs people who are capable to solve professional problems and take responsibility for their decisions. Society needs employees who will be efficient, productive and responsible to their activities. Responsibility in activities primarily related to the performance of their role (in this case professional) duties, awareness of each employee of his duties, learning how to implement them and responsible to them, will lead to higher productivity overall. The study of staff's responsibility structure in different levels allows you to increase and reduce its quality. Good faith in the performance of the work, which means the implementation of a responsible work, taking into account all necessary requirements and regulations for many jobs. A person may have good skills and knowledge be capable and creative, work hard, but he can relate to his

duties carelessly, irresponsibly. And it can frustrate all the positive results of his activities. Thus, organization's management should be well aware of this and try to build a system of motivation to develop this characteristic of employees behavior.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Olga V. Mukhlynina is PhD, associate professor of Russian State Vocational Pedagogical University, Ekaterinburg, Russia.

Natalia E. Zhdanova is PhD, associate professor of Russian State Vocational Pedagogical University, Ekaterinburg, Russia.

Irina M. Kondyurina is PhD, associate professor of Russian State Vocational Pedagogical University, Ekaterinburg, Russia.

Natalia S. Bastrakova is PhD, associate professor of Russian State Vocational Pedagogical University, Ekaterinburg, Russia.

Tatyana M. Kovaleva is Doctor of Economic, Professor of Samara State University of Economics, Samara, Russia.

Farida I. Mirzabalaeva is Doctor of Economic, Professor of Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Moscow, Russia.

References

- Abulkhanova, K. A. (1999). *Psychology and conscience of personality*. Moscow: Moscow Institute of Psychology and Sociology; Voronezh: NPO MODEK publishing house, 224 p.
- Ananiev, B. G. (1969). *Man as a subject of knowledge*. Direct access: http://elib.gnpbu.ru/text/ananyev_chelovek-kak-predmet_1968/go,2;fs,0/
- Andenes, I. (1979). *The punishment and prevention of crime*. Moscow: Progress, 264 p.
- Bain, A. (1859). *The Emotions and the Will*. Direct access: <http://www.ebooksread.com/authors-eng/alexander-bain/the-emotions-and-the-will-nia/1-the-emotions-and-the-will-nia.shtml>
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1979). *Aesthetics of verbal creativity*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 423 p.
- Barabash, O. B. (1992). *Psycho-pedagogical bases of self-perseverance in the student age*: PhD Thesis. Moscow, Russia, 182 p.
- Brushlinsky, A. V. (1996). *Subject: thinking, teaching, imagination*. Moscow: Publishing house "Institute of practical psychology", 392 p.
- Frankl, V. (1946). *Trotzdem ja zum leben sagen: ein psychologe erlebt das konzentrationslager*. Direct access: <http://www.randomhouse.de/content/edition/excerpts/101748.pdf>
- Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from freedom*. Direct access: http://www.aifet.com/books/transl_v6_Fromm.pdf
- Krupnov, A. I. (1993). *Diagnostics of the properties of personality and individuality*. Moscow: Institute of youth, 78 p.
- Krupnov, A. I. (2005). To the question about the classification of personality qualities and traits. Identity in intercultural space: materials of *Interuniversity scientific conference*. Moscow: *Russian Peoples' Friendship University*, 159-163 p.
- Kudryavtsev, V. N. (1986). *Act, action, responsibility*. Moscow: Nauka, 448 p.
- Kurenkov, I. A. (1994). *Psychological characteristics of responsibility among different groups of teachers*. PhD Thesis. Institute of youth, Moscow, Russia, 122 p.
- Leontiev, A. N. (1977). *Activity. Conscience. Personality*. Moscow: Politizdat, 304 p.
- Lomov, B. F. (1984). *Methodological and theoretical problems of psychology*. Moscow: Science, 444 p.
- Matveeva, I. V. (1993). *Cultural and figurative world of the writer's language*: PhD Abstract. Orel: Orel state University, 41 p.

Medveditskov, A. P. (1985). *The formation of the responsible attitude of pupils towards teaching to collective learning activities*. Omsk: Omsk state pedagogical Institute, 105 p.

Menshenina, E. V. (1999). *Comparative characteristics of the person's perseverance at senior pupils and students*: PhD Thesis. Moscow: Russian Peoples' Friendship University, 128 p.

Musaev, E. Ya. (1990). *The dynamics of the value of the content and the politicization of mass youth consciousness in the process of restructuring*: PhD Abstract. Moscow: Moscow higher party school, 48 p.

Muzdybaev, K. (1983). *The psychology of responsibility*. Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoe OTDELENIE, 240 p.

Petrukhina, O. A. (1985). *Formation of adolescents' responsible attitude towards learning activities in the classroom*: PhD Abstract. Leningrad: Leningrad state pedagogical Institute. A. I. Herzen, 15 p.

Ponomareva, I. A. (1994). *Individually-typical features of persistence and the ways of their harmonization*: PhD Thesis. Moscow: Russian Peoples Friendship University, 182 p.

Pryadein, V. P. (2001). *Responsibility as a system quality of personality*. Ekaterinburg: Ural state pedagogical University, 209 p.

Pyatinin, A. E. (1996). *Comparative analysis of the psychological structure of students' creativity and experienced teachers*: PhD Thesis. Institute of youth, Moscow, Russia, 130 p.

Rean, A.A. (2006). *The psychology and psychodiagnostics of personality: Theory, research methods, practicum*. Saint Petersburg: Praym-evroznak, 84-86.

Rotter, J. B. (1954). *Social learning and clinical psychology*. New York: Prentice-Hall, 353 p.

Rudkovsky, E. I. (1979). *Freedom and responsibility of personality*. Minsk: Publishing house of the Belarusian state University V. I. Lenin, 152 p.

Sartre, J. P. (1943). *Being and nothingness. Experience of phenomenological ontology*. Direct access: <http://www.psylib.ukrweb.net/books/sartr03/index.htm>

Shikhova, T. Ya. (1980). *The formation of a responsible attitude to pedagogical activity at students of teacher training universities in the process of their professional training*: PhD Abstract. Moscow: Moscow pedagogical Institute V. I. Lenin, 15 p.

Shchipanova, D.Y., Lebedeva, E.V., Sukhinin, P.V. & Valieva, E.N. (2016). Typology of Strategies of Personality Meaning-Making During Professional Education. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(14), 6999-7015.

Spirkin, A. G. (1972). *Consciousness and self-awareness*. Moscow: Politizdat, 303 p.

Stroková, T.A. (2012). Assessment of Pupils' Personal Achievements. *The Education and science journal*, 1(9), 57-71.

Tulchinsky, G. L. (1990). *The mind, will and success: on the philosophy of the act*. Leningrad: publisher Leningrad University, 216 p.

Yalom, I. (1980). *Existential Psychotherapy*. Direct access: <http://psylib.org.ua/books/yalom01/>

Zalewski, G. V. (1976). *Fixed forms of behavior*. Irkutsk: East-Siberian publishing house, 192 p.

Zamfir, C. (1983). *Un sociolog despre: munca si satisfactie*. Moscow: Politizdat, 140 p.

Zinkovskaya, S. M. (1999). *Communication initiative of the individual with the educational-professional activity of students-fire*: PhD Abstract. Moscow: Russian University of friendship of peoples, 25 p.