



THE IMPACTS OF RESPONSIBILITY ON EMPLOYEE'S JOB PERFORMANCE AT WORKPLACES

Shodiyev Bektosh Kurbonaliyevich
Director of Public Education in Mirishkor
Bektoshshodiyev233@gmail.com

Abstract

The article aims to discover and focus on responsible leadership. The problem is approached from the perspective of a dyadic relationship between managers and employees. Answers to the following study questions: What concepts do managers and employees believe are important in the manager–employee relationship for responsible leadership? What social conditions in the relationship necessitate the application of the principles?

Key words: content analysis, leadership, responsible leadership, relational responsibility

Introduction

The research is based on relational leadership theory as well as responsible leadership literature. Responsible leadership is defined as a dynamic and contextual process of social construction based on principles that guide the parties' activities through connections between managers and employees. First, by viewing responsible leadership as a process of social construction through relationships (Uhl-Bien, 2006), we shift away from traditional leadership models in which the leader is viewed as a single individual exercising leadership and toward a more dynamic and relational view of the phenomenon. In his important article on the "romance of leadership," Meindl (1995) argues that over-reliance on the ideals of individualistic leadership models is wrong, and that we must analyze the relationships involved in order to understand the leadership dynamic. Second, we view responsible leadership as contextually located (Ladkin, 2010), and we demonstrate how contextual leadership can be effective.

WHAT IS RESPONSIBILITY?

Responsibility has traditionally been approached in the field of leadership studies through concepts and theories such as servant leadership (Greenleaf, 2002), transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994), authentic leadership (Avolio et al., 2004), and ethical leadership (Trevio & Brown, 2004). Servant leadership is founded on the idea that the leader's job is to satisfy the needs of his or her followers (Greenleaf, 2002). In transformational leadership, the leader must enlist the help of his or her followers in achieving the organization's objectives while also promoting the moral development of all parties (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Enabling a sense of freedom, personal judgment, and independent decision-making in one's employment is also critical. Empowerment is another term for this enabling notion (Voegtlin et al., 2012). People who feel empowered believe they are engaged in important work that allows them to fully utilize their strengths and take on new responsibilities (Speitzer, 1995). Authentic leadership emphasizes being as consistent and honest with oneself and others as possible



(Avolio et al., 2004). The goal of ethical leadership is to encourage both parties in power to adhere to shared ethical principles. According to Brown et al. (2005), ethical leadership refers to normatively appropriate behaviour in the leader's own actions as well as in interpersonal relationships. The leader who acts as a role model to employees ought to encourage such behaviour among followers through interaction, reinforcement and decision-making (Brown & Treviño, 2006; Brown et al., 2005). Responsible leadership, according to Voegtlin et al. (2012), should be built through equally powerful or resource commanding entities. This would have a good impact on followers' attitudes, increasing job satisfaction and motivation. Inclusion and cooperation are fundamental concepts in leadership interactions, according to Maak and Pless (2009). It is critical to use responsible leadership methods that allow employees to participate in decision-making and work procedure planning. The basic concept of relational responsibility, as used in this study, is that it is not carried by a single person, but rather emerges through the act of leading (Cunliffe & Eriksen, 2011). Responsible leadership, according to Maak and Pless (2009), is a collaborative partnership between leaders and stakeholders based on principles that guide the parties' behavior.

DISCUSSION

We will now look at the principles that emerged from the data as being critical to answering our research questions one by one.

Fairness. Pursuing the principle of fairness allows the parties involved to feel respected and as equals in the relationship. Regardless of gender or age, each employees are treated equally and these factors should not influence anyone's decision-making. Typically, the duty of advancing fairness falls particularly on managers, because they hold greater power to influence the matter. Employees' perceptions of the fairness of the manager's behavior are especially important when it comes to the allocation of resources among employees. Additionally, it is vital manager's efforts to explain the basis of their decisions to subordinates and involve them in decision-making discussions as representing fairness. According to Maak and Pless (2006), it is a moral obligation for responsible leaders to ensure that employees of all backgrounds (e.g., gender and age) have fair and equal employment opportunities.

Empowerment. The process by which parties can express their ideas and influence an issue is referred to as empowerment. The parties support one another and learn to take more responsibility for promoting issues and ideas in the process of development and change. It is critical that everyone in the workplace not only understands the work's goals, but also has the opportunity to help define those goals. However, simply setting goals is not enough; their achievement must also be evaluated. Empowerment is connected to taking active responsibility, and employees' participation encourage empowerment. It is often seen that managers and employees have abilities to grow the organization and work. In conclusion, participation of all parties in workplace decision-making is a key aspect in enabling empowerment. Empowerment was linked to the social framework of change and development, both in one's individual work and in the larger organization. Although both partners were built to be enablers of each other's empowerment, the manager was primarily responsible for the advancement of



the circumstances of empowerment in the relationship. Speitzer stated (1995) individualistic views of empowerment, in which empowerment is seen as a personal quality is limited. The importance of organizational chances for people's empowerment, such as the manager's behavior in permitting engagement in the workplace, is essential.

Managers affect the organizational environment by performing responsible leadership, for example, in terms of role modeling (Brown & Trevio, 2006; Brown et al., 2005), which encourages employee empowerment and guides ethical behavior in organizations in general (Voegtlin et al., 2012).

Openness could simply refer to two parties communicating, such as when managers ensure that everyone is informed about issues that influence the workplace. The ability of the parties to openly address issues aids in the clarification of mutual expectations. Communication between the boss and the employee is the social setting in which this principle is required. The degree to which the relationship is open varies, and this variation can be classified into three levels: (a) one-way communication—mostly from the manager to the employee; (b) a deeper level of openness when the parties also provide each other feedback, with the manager as the initiator of this level of openness, and (c) discussion between the parties. According to Voegtlin et al. (2012) and Antunes and Franco (2016), responsible leadership is a behavior that attempts to encourage continuous and frequent open engagement and communication between parties in order to develop mutually beneficial partnerships. Leaders engage in communicative engagement with their subordinates on a daily basis, which is known as interaction (Voegtlin et al., 2012).

Trust. The prominence of mutual trust between managers and employees is that both parties mutual agreements and keep promises, even when there is an opportunity to break them. The consistency of words and acts, in particular, is vital in the development of a trusting relationship. Trust is a situation for responsibility to happen at the same time outcome of responsible leadership. The key feature of trust appears mutual agreements and do not break promises even when the opportunity arises. As a result, the social environment in which trust is said to be essential is one of both formal and informal agreements between the parties. Both the manager and the employee are formed as active supporters of the principle of trust in their relationship, therefore both have responsibility for it. This finding is consistent with Maak (2007), who claims that the ability to develop trust, not position or rank, is the most important facilitator of social connections. Voegtlin et al. (2012) believe that building and maintaining trustful relationship is a critical part of responsible leadership, because leadership has a significant impact on the quality of relationships in organizational life.

Caring. The ability to perceive another person's needs and respond to those needs in the way that the other anticipates is at the heart of caring. Caring is not abandoning others in their time of need; rather, it entails assisting others in tough situations.

It was emphasized that this requires respecting the other as a subject and an individual, honestly understanding his or her needs, and constructively and properly reacting to those needs. Caring entails



making a special effort to assist others in demanding and challenging situations. The social setting in which the principle of caring is stated to be important is when one of the parties is dealing with difficulties, which are often tough and vague, mostly at work but also in private life. In the leadership relationship, both parties—manager and employee—were positioned as potential care givers and care takers. The servant leadership approach, which is based on ethical leadership ideas, prioritizes serving others and caring behavior in leadership (Greenleaf, 2002). Maak (2007) and Maak and Pless (2009) believe that a sense of concern for the needs of others is inherent in the responsible leadership ethos. According to Maak and Pless (2009), caring for others in need is founded on mutual feelings of human flourishing and vulnerability.

Conclusion

Fairness, empowerment, openness, trust, and care were found to be significant in the construction of responsible leadership in the manager–employee dyad. The manager–employee leadership dynamics; to whom do the parties assign responsibility for the promotion of the principles? Relational responsibility refers to the shared and cooperative nature of responsible leadership, whereas managerial responsibility highlights the influential role of the manager acting as the initiator and builder of responsibility, particularly due to her/his position in organizational hierarchy. This article suggests that exercising responsible leadership is a dynamic and changing process (Cunliffe & Eriksen, 2011; Ladkin, 2010; Uhl-Bien, 2006; Voegtlin et al., 2012), but that it depends on social contexts: in some, the manager is expected to take the lead and be in charge, whereas in others, it is expected that responsible leadership principles will be shared.

References

1. Antunes, A., Franco, M. (2016). How people in organizations make sense of responsible leadership practices: Multiple case studies. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 37(1), 126–152.
2. Avolio, B. J., Luthans, F., Walumbwa, F. O. (2004). Authentic leadership: Theory-building for veritable sustained performance (working paper). Gallup Leadership Institute, University of Nebraska–Lincoln.
3. Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*.
4. Cunliffe, A. L., Eriksen, M. (2011). Relational leadership. *Human Relations*, 64(11), 1425–1449.
5. Dooley, L. (2002). Case study research and theory building. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 4(3).
6. Graneheim, U., Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: Concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, 24(2), 105–112.
7. Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.
8. Ladkin, D. (2010). *Rethinking leadership*. Edward Elgar.



9. Maak, T., Pless, N. M. (2009). Business leaders as citizens of the world: Advancing humanism on a global scale. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(3), 537–550.
10. Speitzer, G. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442–1465.
11. Uhl-Bien, M. (2006). Relational leadership theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 654–676.
12. Voegtlin, C., Patzer, M., Scherer, A. G. (2012). Responsible leadership in global business: A new approach to leadership and its multi-level outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 105(1), 1–16.