

Value foundation of the behavior of managers of different administrative levels: comparative analysis

Regulación basada en valores del comportamiento de los gerentes en diferentes niveles de gestión: análisis comparativo

NECHYPORENKO, Valentyna V. [1](#); BOCHELIUK, Vitalii I. [2](#); POZDNIAKOVA-KYRBIATIEVA, Ellina G. [3](#); POZDNIAKOVA, Olena L. [4](#) & PANOV, Nikita S. [5](#)

Received: 19/06/2019 • Approved: 28/09/2019 • Published 07/10/2019

Contents

- [1. Introduction](#)
- [2. Methodology](#)
- [3. Results](#)
- [4. Conclusions](#)

[Bibliographic references](#)

ABSTRACT:

The research paper describes the results of an empirical study aimed at identifying specific features of the value-semantic sphere inherent in managers of different levels, which influence the regulation of their behavior and the adoption of managerial decisions. A comparative analysis of the data of psychological diagnostics of managers of trading companies was conducted by a number of parameters. It is shown that the most distinct differences between the samples of managers of different managerial levels are related to the structure of personal values, their expressiveness at the normative and behavioral level.

Keywords: Manager, Management levels, Value orientations, Value regulation, Professional self-determination of the manager.

RESUMEN:

El trabajo describe los resultados de un estudio empírico que tiene como objetivo identificar características específicas de la esfera del valor semántico inherente a los gerentes de diferentes niveles, que influyen en la regulación de su comportamiento y la adopción de decisiones de gestión. Varios parámetros realizaron un análisis comparativo de los datos de diagnóstico psicológico de los gerentes de empresas comerciales. Se muestra que las diferencias más distintivas entre muestras de gerentes de diferentes niveles gerenciales están relacionadas con la estructura de valores personales, su expresividad en los niveles normativos y de comportamiento.

Palabras clave Gerente, niveles gerenciales, orientaciones de valor, regulación de valor, autodeterminación profesional del gerente.

1. Introduction

A manager is a person who has a permanent managerial position in an organization, and has a certain range of responsibilities that is exercised through authority and the right to make decisions. The specifics of this work is that any specific objectives (production,

economic, technical, financial, logistic, social, marketing, personnel, innovation) are resolved precisely in organizational terms, influencing other people who are directly implementing these tasks. The result of the work of the manager is the effective organization of the work of his subordinates. Management includes planning processes, operational management and distribution of functions, collection and analysis of information on production processes, control, coordination, informing, motivating and social protection of employees. The higher the status of the manager in the service hierarchy, the broader, more diverse and more complex is the range of managerial tasks and organizational functions that they are solving. In any case, most of the time is spent by the manager in communication - hence the specific requirements for his personality and professional qualities. The overwhelming majority of problems arising in management activity are also related to the human factor.

Traditionally, managers are divided into three groups depending on the vertical division of labor – levels of management (Drucker, 2018; Meskon *et al.*, 2000; Akhmetshin *et al.*, 2018):

1) The managers of the lower level (down management) are present in all organizations, known as: master, foreman, Sergeant, Head of Department, Senior etc. They control the execution of current production tasks, responsible for the direct use of material resources. Researchers point to the frequency and severity of internal conflicts among representatives of this management, since they have to act as an "intermediate element" – to send down orders from senior management (i. e. understand and share the goals of the organization), while communicating mainly with ordinary employees, sharing their values, beliefs and lifestyles (Erina, 2000).

2) Mid-level managers (middle management) are present in organizations that have several levels of management: they are heads of linear and functional departments, university deans, military officers from lieutenant to colonel, branch directors, etc. They create conditions for the normal functioning of the unit and the solution of its tasks; they make managerial decisions, communicate with other executives. The nature of such work is largely determined by the content of the unit's work, rather than the organization as a whole. Managers of the middle level have a wide range of power, freedom of action in implementing their own plans and decisions. But for this level, the most frequent displacements and reductions are due to changes in the organizational structure, technological or economic transformations of the enterprise (Erina, 2000).

3) Top managers - a small category of persons responsible directly to the owner of the enterprise (or the state): the director, vice president of the company, general, minister, rector, head doctor. In any organizational structure, there are only a few people who represent it in macrosocial and official bodies, make the most important decisions, make strategic planning, and distribute resources. The strength of personality and values of the top manager influence the entire organization's architecture, its large-scale goals, the general socio-psychological atmosphere and rules of conduct in the team (Erina, 2000).

The vertical distribution of control levels corresponds to the functional classification: the manager at the technical (operational) level engaged in daily operations and actions necessary to ensure effective operation without failures in production or provision of services. Persons at the managerial level are coordinated within the organization, they agree on the various forms of activity and efforts of different units. At the institutional level, managers are engaged in the development of long-term (perspective) plans, the formulation of goals, the adaptation of the organization to various kinds of changes, the management of relations between the organization and the external environment, as well as society in which this organization exists and functions.

Consequently, the role functions and competences of the manager are determined by his position in the managerial hierarchy. However, the manager as a person significantly influences the nature of their implementation. In the national organizational psychology, the professional formation of the head is considered in the context of the concept of professional-managerial self-determination (Karamushka, 2005; Kuznetsova *et al.*, 2019). Professional-managerial self-determination is a process of formation and

implementation of the individual's personal position in relation to management activity (an independent and conscious determination by the individual of his own essence and his place in a situation of professional and managerial choice). Its essential point is the making the meaning from the standpoint of a professional future.

Self-identification is a special form of activity of a professional, in which a person realizes his subjective abilities. Management activity is represented by its value-purpose aspect and serves as a set of requirements for the individual, which activates the processes of self-evaluation, self-programming, the construction of professional and managerial perspectives by the person. In professional-managerial self-determination, a person combines a generalized idea of managerial activity and of himself, defining his own meaning of activity. This implies not only awareness of oneself, but also the ability to correlate what "I want, I can and what is required of me from managerial activity" (Karamushka, 2005; Kirillov *et al.*, 2015; Akhmetshin *et al.*, 2019).

Throughout professional life, the image of the manager is expanded and clarified, during self-examination adjusting itself as a professional, the attitude towards work and one's place in it is revised. An indirect indication of the effective implementation of these processes (redefinition, change of values) is the external changes that an individual carries out in professional life: the increase of the validity of administrative intentions or the refusal of such; change of profession; rotation in the management team; changes in the style of management and human resources policy, in relation to different aspects of activity, etc. All this requires from a specialist significant personal resources.

The management as a leading activity determines the unique ways of personal development, which can be manifested in the form of typical methods of response, behavior patterns, specific beliefs and ideological landmarks, characterological features. The development of the personality of the manager is conditioned by external and internal factors. Internal is the presence of communicative-organizational skills, professional qualities and knowledge. External refers to the structure and content of the activities, working conditions, organizational culture, the system of social roles in the organization. At the intersection of the external and internal spheres are the formation of professional consciousness and the system of value-sense orientation of the individual (Zhuravleva, 2017).

Consequently, the development of the personality of the manager in the process of management activity is the determining factor not only of his professional competence, but also of the effectiveness of the whole organization, its socio-psychological and ideological climate. Although the mechanisms and patterns of such development are not yet sufficiently clear, it is obvious that the value sphere plays one of the main roles in this process.

The purpose of the study is to identify the specific features of the value-semantic sphere, inherent in managers of different levels, which influence the regulation of their behavior and making the managerial decisions. In the course of work, authors selected a set of diagnostic tools according to the goal, organized the collection and processing of empirical data, conducted a statistical analysis and identified patterns of distribution of results. On this basis, authors formulated conclusions about the psychological peculiarities of the regulation of the behavior of managers in management operations and in life situations.

2. Methodology

In 2017, the authors carried out an empirical study of the factors of value regulation of the managers of different management levels (upper and middle). The base for conducting the survey were trading companies of the branched structure, with branches in various regions of Ukraine. The sampling consisted of 10 senior executives (directors of subdivisions and functional top managers of the head office), as well as 39 middle managers.

The diagnostic complex includes methods aimed at identifying the value-semantic grounds of management activity, as well as the peculiarities of self-awareness and self-

realization, which influence the effectiveness of the professional activity of managers:

1) Method of determination of general and social self-efficacy (Scheier *et al.*, 1982) aims at assessing the ability of a person to realize his abilities and to use these abilities in an optimal way. Self-efficacy is based on knowledge and experience that the person believes in the ability to achieve a specific result at a certain cost. The results of the methodology determine the level of subjective assessment by the leader of his potential in the field of communication and substantive activities, which he can actually use.

2) The test of emotionally-oriented orientations. J. Krambo and L. Maholika (Leontiev, 2000) diagnoses the level of general comprehension of life. The diagnostic evaluation includes a number of intermediate indicators: the presence or absence in the life of the interviewed of life-sense goals, which determine its future life prospect; emotional saturation of life; satisfaction with the effectiveness of their own self-realization, indicators of the control locus and the management of life.

3) Valuable Questionnaire by Sh. Schwartz (Karandashev, 2004) is a comprehensive tool that reveals the fundamental motivations necessary for the functioning of an individual and society: achievement, power, hedonism, stimulation, autonomy, universalism, benevolence, traditions, conformance, security. The first part of the questionnaire "List of Values" is intended to study the ideals and beliefs that affect the personality (at the level of normative ideals, personal values are stable, they reflect the understanding of how to behave appropriately, thus defining one's vital principles). The second part of the questionnaire "Profile of the person" diagnoses the manifestations of the basic values at the level of concrete actions and social behavior of the person (the level of individual priorities of behavior depending on the external environment and group pressure) (Schwartz, 1996).

4) Questionnaire of subject-object orientations O.Yu. Korzhova (2006) defines the measure of the subject's inclusion of a person in life. The results of the leaders are distributed on the following scales: transitional variability determines the expressiveness of the person's desire for change and self-change; the transitive locus of control shows confidence in its own ability to manage life situations; Transitory development of the world characterizes the direction of interaction with life situations (inner world or self-realization in the outside world); Transitory mobility determines the preference for new, unusual life situations. The general indicator of subject-object orientations in life situations reflects the ability of a person to realize their own inner activity (high values of the parameter of subject orientation are people with an active life position, active and inclined to rebuild the situation for themselves).

5) Questionnaire "The style of self-regulation behavior" V. I. Morosanova (2001) aims at studying the peculiarities of individual self-regulation, which reflects various aspects: planning (setting and reaching goals), modeling (presentation of external and internal meaningful conditions), programming (drawing up an action plan), evaluating the results (adequacy of self-assessment and results its activities and behavior), flexibility (the ability to make corrections to the system of self-regulation when changing external and internal conditions) and autonomy in decision-making.

6) The method "Locus of the role conflict" (Gornostay, 2004) reveals the differences in the determination of the role behavior of managers. If the need to play a leading role and perform managerial functions is significantly different from a person's identity, this naturally leads to a role conflict in which different individuals use external or internal strategies of behavior. The choice of a certain type of behavior (the locus of a role conflict) is associated with steady personality traits and leading motivation – the person is guided by the internal or external determinants of role behavior (needs, values, settings) with the predominance of the probability of an external or internal conflict.

In interpreting the empirical data, we used various methods of statistical analysis (descriptive statistics, comparative analysis, graphical modeling), using software packages Microsoft Excel and SPSS. The findings are based on calculations of the Mann-Whitney U-criterion (this is the most powerful non-parametric criterion, which allows us to estimate the statistical differences between two independent groups of a small size).

3. Results

A comparative analysis of certain indicators allows us to make assumptions about internal in-depth controllers of behavior that determine the professional self-determination of managers of different levels. Quantitative results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Comparative analysis of data of psychological diagnostics of managers of different levels

Diagnostic tools	Diagnostic parameters and scales	Top Level Managers (10 people)	Managers of the middle level (39 people)	Mann-Whitney U (Asymp. Sig.)
Method of determination of general and social self-efficacy	Self-efficacy in the field of activity	M = 59.4 σ = 8.55	M = 45.1 σ = 9.49	0.018
	Self-efficacy in the field of communication	M = 15.2 σ = 12.33	M = 14.9 σ = 10.55	0.385
	Overall self-efficacy	M = 74.6 σ = 11.47	M = 60.0 σ = 9.94	0.009
Life-sense orientation test	Purposes	M = 32.1 σ = 7.15	M = 34.9 σ = 8.20	0.261
	Process	M = 35.5 σ = 6.42	M = 31.3 σ = 5.85	0.114
	Result	M = 29.8 σ = 5.31	M = 25.8 σ = 6.78	0.136
	Locus control-I	M = 24.8 σ = 4.04	M = 19.7 σ = 3.85	0.075
	Locus control-life	M = 28.9 σ = 6.51	M = 30.3 σ = 5.89	0.254
	The general indicator of meaningfulness of life	M = 107.5 σ = 17.31	M = 104.4 σ = 16.92	0.541
Questionnaire of subject-object orientations in life situations	Transitional variability	M = 2.68 σ = 2.01	M = 2.66 σ = 1.69	0.911
	Transitional locus of control	M = 3.25 σ = 2.12	M = 4.04 σ = 1.49	0.573
	Transitional mastering of the world	M = 2.25 σ = 1.38	M = 2.67 σ = 1.52	0.576

	Transitional mobility	M = 2.75 $\sigma = 1.83$	M = 1.33 $\sigma = 1.55$	0.111
	Overall indicator of subject-object orientations	M = 9.11 $\sigma = 3.36$	M = 8.66 $\sigma = 2.18$	0.507
The style of self-regulation behavior	Planning	M = 6.04 $\sigma = 1.83$	M = 5.67 $\sigma = 0.58$	0.416
	Modeling	M = 5.71 $\sigma = 1.60$	M = 7.33 $\sigma = 0.63$	0.053
	Programming	M = 5.14 $\sigma = 2.11$	M = 6.96 $\sigma = 1.54$	0.194
	Evaluation of results	M = 6.57 $\sigma = 2.07$	M = 6.67 $\sigma = 2.15$	0.902
	Flexibility	M = 5.42 $\sigma = 2.22$	M = 3.98 $\sigma = 2.16$	0.197
	Independence	M = 4.57 $\sigma = 2.29$	M = 3.17 $\sigma = 2.30$	0.354
	Total level of self-regulation	M = 29.43 $\sigma = 5.94$	M = 30.69 $\sigma = 4.56$	0.718
The scale of the locus of the role conflict		M = 14.8 $\sigma = 4.21$	M = 11.3 $\sigma = 3.45$	0.093

Note: M – arithmetical mean; σ – standard deviation; Asymp. Sig. (Asymptotic significance)
 –Designation accepted in the SPSS program. With a value of <0.05 , the null hypothesis is rejected and an alternative is accepted (i.e. there is a significant difference between groups worthy of a meaningful interpretation).

Analyzing the descriptive statistics in groups, we state that the average indicator of self-efficacy of managers far exceeds the normative indicators of the method (Sheier *et al.*, 1982). This result confirms that the main source of self-efficacy is personal experience: the successes a person has achieved on their own and the problems that have been solved. The more complex and large-scale tasks the manager solves, the higher his level of self-efficacy in the field of activity; at the same time, inevitable mistakes and failures do not force one to despair in one's own ability to achieve the set goals. In addition, it consistently increases with the growth of managerial level ($p = 0.009$). Such a result is quite obvious, since in itself the process of career growth repeatedly convinces a person in his abilities and skills, accustoms him to fulfilling a wide range of role functions in various situations, forming perseverance in the decision of life and professional tasks. At the same time, self-efficacy in the field of communication does not show significant growth – we explain this by the fact that communicative competence forms the basis of the manager's activity at any level.

The life orientations of managers of different levels did not reveal statistically significant differences. Noteworthy is the observed tendency to decrease in the level of transitive mobility among middle managers (Table 1). This suggests that those who do not want to interact with new life and professional situations do not gravitate to change and prefer

habitual lifestyles (whatever other successes and abilities they demonstrate), move more slowly in career development and do not reach higher management levels. However, this fact needs further clarification and explanation.

Similarly, no difference was found in the overall level of self-regulation behaviors. The key to managing managers' profiles is to evaluate the results of their own activities and behaviors (we see this as a prominent feature that reflects the managerial control function). There is a significant difference regarding the modeling strategy – it is leading among middle managers ($p = 0.053$), defining their benefits in terms of awareness and adequacy of representations about external and internal significant conditions of the situation, the correspondence of the results to the set goals. Persons with a similar self-regulation profile distinguish organization: the clarity of setting goals, careful planning of activities, the appointment of exact terms of execution (Morosanova, 2001).

Locus of the role conflict of leaders illustrates the relationship between the biological and social factors of personal activity. This is an integral characteristic that defines not only the dominant strategy of overcoming life crises, but also the overall self-realization role of the individual. Most respondents demonstrate the intermediate locus of a role conflict, but in the group of top-level executives we note certain tendencies for internalization that is, they easier tolerate external ones, but avoid any internal contradictions in every way. This increases the contradiction between their own role behavior and social expectations, provoking an external or interpersonal role conflict. Middle managers, on the other hand, choose external strategies, that is, they are ready to go to internal conflicts to avoid contradictions in the interpersonal sphere (however, the described tendency does not reach the level of statistical significance, $p = 0.093$).

Regarding the life-sense orientations in the group, results have been obtained that indicate the meaningfulness and direction of leadership life. They view their existence as an interesting, emotionally rich and content-filled process. The respondents are completely satisfied with the effectiveness of the passed segment of life, with their self-realization (senior executives while slightly more focused on the past, but this difference does not reach the statistically significant level). High diagnostic indicators of the control locus describe them as strong individuals with sufficient freedom of choice, who build their lives in accordance with their own goals and values.

This index was particularly pronounced in the group of top managers who see themselves as "masters of life" ($p = 0.075$). At the same time, the average life-manageability rate, on the contrary, is higher in the middle management group. Significant differences in terms of live-sense orientation between groups were not found, but the overall structure of the variables indicates a certain hedonistic orientation inherent in top level managers (the indicators of the "Process" scale exceed all others).

The most distinct differences between the groups of managers of different managerial levels relate to the structure of personal values. Let us dwell on this aspect in more detail – see Table 2.

According to the results of the first part of the Schwartz methodology, senior executives rely more heavily on the leading normative principles related to the motivational types of "Independence" ($p = 0.014$), Achievements and Stimulation. Consequently, with the increase of the level of authority, the significance of declarative ideals significantly increases as it regards: a) autonomy of thought, independent choice of goals and methods of action, and b) personal success through the manifestation of social competence in accordance with dominant cultural standards; c) the desire for novelty, for colorful and deep emotions, which stimulates and supports the general activity of human.

Table 2
Comparison of basic personal values of leaders of different levels

Scales of the	Part 1 «List of Values»	Mann-Whitney U	Part 2 "Personality profile"	Mann-Whitney U
---------------	----------------------------	----------------	---------------------------------	----------------

questionnaire Sh. Schwartz			(Asymp.Sig.)			(Asymp.Sig.)
	Top	Middle		Top	Middle	
	Achievement	M = 5.67 σ = 0.84	M = 4.08 σ = 0.62	0.038	M = 2.78 σ = 0.58	M = 1.37 σ = 0.48
Authority	M = 4.72 σ = 0.61	M = 3.73 σ = 1.40	0,118	M = 2.29 σ = 0.84	M = 1.44 σ = 0.29	0.050
Hedonism	M = 3.79 σ = 1.29	M = 2.02 σ = 1.45	0.089	M = 2.21 σ = 1.42	M = 0.34 σ = 0.88	0.051
Independence	M = 5.60 σ = 0.24	M = 4.11 σ = 0.67	0.014	M = 3.09 σ = 0.75	M = 2.08 σ = 0.80	0.044
Stimulation	M = 3.88 σ = 1.47	M = 1.45 σ = 1.17	0.039	M = 1.41 σ = 1.05	M = 0.33 σ = 1.17	0,029
Conformity	M = 4.44 σ = 0.99	M = 4.68 σ = 1.07	0.736	M = 1.51 σ = 0.83	M = 1.92 σ = 0.94	0.565
Traditions	M = 2.82 σ = 1.79	M = 3.7 σ = 1.44	0.433	M = 0.78 σ = 1.05	M = 1.21 σ = 0.85	0.730
Benevolence	M = 5.12 σ = 0.52	M = 5.33 σ = 0.88	0.584	M = 2.25 σ = 0.50	M = 2.16 σ = 0.66	0.371
Universalism	M = 4.22 σ = 1.22	M = 3.75 σ = 1.44	0.436	M = 1.83 σ = 1.10	M = 1.38 σ = 0.94	0.509
Security	M = 5.55 σ = 0.96	M = 5.07 σ = 1.70	0.658	M = 2.90 σ = 0.71	M = 2.33 σ = 0.53	0.179

Note: M – arithmetical mean; σ – standard deviation; Asymp. Sig. – Asymptotic significance. Designation accepted in the SPSS program. With a value of <0.05 , the null hypothesis is rejected and an alternative is accepted (i.e. there is a significant difference between groups worthy of a meaningful interpretation).

According to the results of the diagnosis of basic values as behavioral manifestations (the second part of Schwarz's methodology), the differences described above between the groups become even more significant. In addition, there is an obvious difference in the manifestations of authority motivation ($p = 0.05$). Though senior management does not indicate it as a declarative value (perhaps because of some general cultural stereotypes and accepted norms of behavior), the level of personal aspirations and interpersonal relationships they show clear signs of dominance, the desire for social status, control over people. In addition, statistically confirmed significant differences in the level of hedonism - senior managers are guided by the motivational purpose of obtaining a sensual pleasure from life ($p = 0.051$). In this way, behavioral manifestations of the values of stimulation and hedonism in the group of middle managers occupy the last position.

Regarding the Schwartz questionnaire, we calculated not only the scale indicators, but also recorded and compared the estimates of each item, reflecting the attitude of

managers to specific value orientations common in society. The group revealed numerous differences, which allow to clarify the "value portrait" of managers of different levels. Table 3 shows the terminal and instrumental values for which a significant intergroup difference was found by calculations of the Mann-Whitney U-criterion.

As can be seen from Table 3, top-level executives demonstrate much higher load-carrying capacity than mid-level managers. We explain this by the fact that the value regulation of behavior acts as a motivating factor and a source of activity of the individual, it pushes the person to positive changes in life, to self-development and self-realization.

Comparing the results with the data of other domestic researchers who studied this issue before, we can note the numerous coincidences that confirm the correctness of the conclusions drawn.

For example, T.I. Malinenko (2005) describes the discrepancies in the goal-setting of heads of higher educational institutions at various managerial levels (pro-rectors, deans, heads of departments). When forming goals, pro-rectors are characterized by authoritarianism, they are exaggeratedly confident in the correctness of their own actions, not paying enough attention to detailed considerations and finding arguments (this coincides with our data on the style of self-regulation behavior). In the field of motivation, top managers of higher education are more focused on the use of other people to achieve their goals.

Table 3
Values preferred by managers of different levels

Top Managers (10 people)	Managers of the middle level (39 people)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - achievements: exact and tangible results in significant activity (p = 0.003) - successful, reaching the goals (p = 0.011) - life, full of impressions, striving for novelty (p = 0.013) - Influence: on people and events (p = 0.016) - connivance to one's desires: to do what brings pleasure (p = 0.021) - purposefulness: diligence, inspiration (p = 0.022) - choose their own goals and intentions (p = 0.027) - enjoying life: enjoyment of food, proximity, entertainment, etc. (p = 0.031) - autonomy: hope only for oneself, self-sufficiency (p = 0.037) - a changing life: filled with problems, novelty and changes (p = 0.041) - courage: adventure, risk (p = 0.045) - social recognition: prestige, recognition of merit, approval and respect for others (p = 0.046) - authority: the right to be a leader and to command (p = 0.051) - physical activity and attractiveness, caring for his body (p = 0.053) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loyalty: loyalty to friends, group (p = 0.036) - spiritual life: emphasis on spiritual rather than material matters (p = 0.049) - curiosity: interested in everything (p = 0.046)

The deans are more democratic in setting goals; they essentially increase the empathy components of goal-setting. When forming goals in the heads of departments compared

with senior managers, the most distinctive focus is on the team. When setting goals, they use a wide set of cognitive tools and flexible circuits for processing information. Pro-rectors when they set goals in life are to a lesser extent characterized by purposefulness; their plans are not sufficiently backed up by personal responsibility and real basement in the present. At the same time, the most loaded pro-rectors turned out to be the time concerned for the past, the deans for the present, and the heads of the departments-for the future. All these results confirm our conclusions regarding the comparison of the parameters of the values and life-sense orientations of managers. The author partially explains the discrepancies revealed by age-specific features (middle-late adulthood and pre-retirement age); having exhausted the vital resource and having achieved a certain position, the top managers try to preserve the status at the expense of careful attitude to their own health, the careful organization of production activities, the desire to induce sympathy and respect in interpersonal relations with their colleagues (Malinenko, 2005).

O.V. Kostrikin (2010) emphasizes that the system-forming factor of management activity is the vector of "motive-goal", since it defines the content and orientation of activities as integral social associations (groups, divisions) and individual managers. One of the main professional qualities of the manager is the ability to construct and clearly set the strategic goal and predict the prospects of the activities of the controlled units, and the main professional quality of a good performer - the ability to take this goal, implement it in a number of tactical tasks.

4. Conclusions

The values of successful and unsuccessful executives were studied using Schwartz's method, and there were found some significant differences between the groups. The most significant differences between the groups were ascertained by the indicator of the value of achievement (prevailing in successful managers); in the group of unsuccessful executives this is offset by the values of power and autonomy. According to the indicators of value regulators of behavior, successful managers consider hedonism as important trait – this allows us to clarify the similar results obtained in our analysis. The structure of values practically does not differ for the levels of individual priorities and normative ideals, which, in the opinion of the scientist, is the evidence of a good reflection of personal sources of behavior in the leaders as a social group.

Analysis of the results of the study shows that value regulation of behavior acts as a motivating factor and a source of personal activity, it pushes a person to make positive changes in life, to self-development and self-realization. For the top managers, the following features of the value sphere are characterized by: the general load of significant value orientations, the preponderance of the motivational types of "Independence", "Achievements" and "Stimulation" (as the basic normative ideals and the real principles of activity), the manifestation of the drive to authority and hedonism at the behavioral level.

Also, they are characterized by increased confidence in the ability to achieve the goals based on available resources (which may be the basis for undervaluation of external and internal conditions for activity). The obtained results are undoubtedly useful both in the theoretical area and for practical application in organizational consulting practice.

Bibliographic references

Akhmetshin, E.M., Ilyina, I.A., Kulibanova, V.V., & Teor, T.R. (2019). 'Employee engagement' management facilitates the recovery from crisis situations. *Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE Communication Strategies in Digital Society Seminar, ComSDS 2019* (pp. 50-55) Saint Petersburg: IEEE. DOI: 10.1109/COMSDS.2019.8709645.

Akhmetshin, E.M., Vasilev, V.L., Mironov, D.S., Zatsarinnaya, E.I., Romanova, M.V., & Yumashev, A.V. (2018). Internal control system in enterprise management: analysis and interaction matrices. *European Research Studies Journal*, 21(2), 728-740.

Drucker, P.F. (2018). *Effective Manager*. Kyiv: KM-Buks.

- Erina, S.I. (2000). *The Role Conflict and Its Diagnostics in the Activity of the Head*. Jaroslavl': JarGU.
- Gornostay, P.P. (2004). Locus of role conflict method. *Practical Psychology and Social Work*, 6, 36-38.
- Karamushka, L.M. (Ed.). (2005). *Technologies of the Work of Organizational Psychologists*. Kyiv: INKOS.
- Karandashev, V.N. (2004). *Schwartz's Method for Studying the Values of a Person: Concept and Methodical Guide*. Saint Petersburg: Rech'.
- Kirillov, A.V., Tanatova, D.K., Vinichenko, M.V., & Makushkin, S.A. (2015). Theory and practice of time-management in education. *Asian Social Science*, 11(19), 193-204.
- Korzhova, E.Ju. (2006). *Psychology of Vital Orientations*. Saint Petersburg: RHGA.
- Kostrikin, O.V. (2010). *Professionally Important Qualities of a Manager as a Factor in the Effectiveness of Management Activities*. Kharkiv, Ukrainian Engineering Pedagogics Academy.
- Kuznetsova, I.G., Goloshchapova, L.V., Ivashina, N.S., Shichiyakh, R.A., Petrova, L.I., & Tkachev, B.P. (2019). The paradigm of human capital development capable of adapting innovations in the transition to a digital economy. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 10(2), 1408-1417.
- Leontiev, D.A. (2000). *Sense and Vital Orientations Test*. Moscow, Smysl.
- Malinenko, T.I. (2005). *Psychological Peculiarities of the Process of Goal-Setting by the Heads of Higher Educational Institutions*. Donetsk: Donetsk Institute of Postgraduate Education of Engineering and Pedagogical Employees of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine.
- Meskon, M.H., Al'bert, M., & Hedouri, F. (2000). *Fundamentals of Management*. Moscow: Delo.
- Morosanova, V.I. (2001). *Individual Style of Self-Regulation: Phenomenon, Structure and Functions in Arbitrary Human Activity*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Schwartz, S.H. (1996). Value priorities and behavior: Applying a theory of integrated value systems. *The Psychology of Values: The Ontario Symposium*, 8, 1-24.
- Sheier, M.F., Maddux, J.E., Prentice-Dunn, B.J., & Rogers, R.W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Report*, 51, 663-671.
- Zhuravleva, V.V. (2017). Factors of the development of personality of the head. *Problems of Modern Psychology*, 36, 79-93.

-
1. Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences. Department of Special Pedagogy and Special Psychology. Khortytsia National Educational Rehabilitation Academy of Zaporizhzhia Regional Council. Zaporizhzhia. Ukraine. E-mail: info@khnnra.zp.ua
 2. Doctor of Psychological Sciences. Department of Psychology. Zaporizhzhya National Technical University. Zaporizhzhia. Ukraine. E-mail: vitalik.psyhol@ukr.net
 3. Doctor of Sociological Sciences. Department of Social Sciences and Humanities. Khortytsia National Educational Rehabilitation Academy of Zaporizhzhia Regional Council. Zaporizhzhia. Ukraine. E-mail: cobrian1982@gmail.com
 4. PhD in Pedagogy. Department of Special Pedagogy and Special Psychology. Khortytsia National Educational Rehabilitation Academy of Zaporizhzhia Regional Council. Zaporizhzhia. Ukraine. E-mail: cobrian@gmail.com
 5. PhD in Psychology. Department of Special Pedagogy and Special Psychology. Khortytsia National Educational Rehabilitation Academy of Zaporizhzhia Regional Council. Zaporizhzhia. Ukraine. E-mail: nikita.psyhol@ukr.net

Revista ESPACIOS. ISSN 0798 1015
Vol. 40 (Nº 34) Year 2019

[[Index](#)]

[In case you find any errors on this site, please send e-mail to [webmaster](#)]