

Abdykalikova M.N.¹, Berdibayeva S.K.²

¹Candidate of psychological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan,
Kazakhstan, Astana, e-mail: marta_nd@mail.ru

²Doctor of psychological science, professor, department of general
and applied psychology, al-Farabi Kazakh National University,
Kazakhstan, Almaty, e-mail: berdybaeva_sveta@mail.ru

**EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
OF CIVIL SERVANTS**

Responsibility is one of the personal qualities that manifests itself in the process of the activity of a civil servant. The article is devoted to the study of the locus of control: the internal and external locus of control of a modern civil servant.

The method used to measure the level of the G. Rotter's locus of control, in which there are such scales or needs of six categories as: recognition status, protection-dependence, domination, independence, love and affection, physical comfort. It was assumed that since effective civil servants are primarily responsible employees, they will be characterized by internality, and ineffective – externality. The external structure of professional responsibility is represented by the subject object and authority. In this case, the subject is a specialist, the object is his professional activity, and the instance is the professional branch, the public service. The internal structure consists of cognitive, motivational, emotional-volitional and behavioral elements. The cognitive element represents knowledge of the essence of professional accountability, as well as social, moral and legal norms of behavior, conviction.

Thus, professional responsibility is the integral quality of a specialist, which manifests itself in the ability to make informed decisions in the sphere of his professional activity, to show perseverance and conscientiousness in their implementation and in readiness to be accountable for their results and consequences.

Key words: professional responsibility, internality, externality, installation, social responsibility.

Абдыкаликова М.Н.¹, Бердібаева С.Қ.²

¹психология ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор,
Қазақстан Республикасы Президентінің Мемлекеттік басқару академиясы,
Қазақстан, Астана қ., e-mail: marta_nd@mail.ru

²психология ғылымдарының докторы, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті
жалпы және қолданбалы психология кафедрасының профессоры
Қазақстан, Алматы қ., e-mail: berdybaeva_sveta@mail.ru

Мемлекеттік қызметшілердің кәсіби жауапкершілігін бағалау

Жауапкершілік мемлекеттік қызметшінің қызметі процесінде көрінетін тұлғалық қасиеттерінің бірі болып табылады. Мақала бақылаудың локусын зерттеуге арналған: қазіргі заманғы мемлекеттік қызметшіні бақылаудың интерналды және экстерналды локусы. Бұл еңбекте Дж.Роттердің бақылаудың локусы деңгейін өлшеу әдістемесі, яғни белгілі бір шкалалар немесе қажетті алты санат пайдаланған: тану мәртебесі, қорғау-тәуелділік, үстемдік ету, тәуелсіздік, махаббат және бауыр басу, физикалық жайлылық.

Тиімді мемлекеттік қызметшілер – бұл, ең алдымен, жауапты қызметкерлер болғандықтан, оларға интернальдылық тән, ал тиімсіздерге – экстернальдылық. Кәсіби жауапкершіліктің сыртқы құрылымы субъектімен, объектімен және инстанциямен ұсынылған. Бұл ретте субъекті ретінде маман, объектісі – оның кәсіби қызметі, ал инстанциясы – кәсіби саласы, мемлекеттік қызмет. Ішкі құрылымы когнитивтік, мотивациялық, эмоционалдық-ерікті және мінез-құлық

элементтерінен тұрады. Когнитивтік элемент кәсіби жауапкершіліктің мәнін білуді, сондай-ақ әлеуметтік, моральдық және мінез-құлықтың құқықтық нормаларын сендіруді ұсынады.

Осылайша, кәсіби жауапкершілік – бұл маманның интегралдық сапасы, өзінің кәсіби қызметі саласындағы негізделген шешімдер қабылдау қабілеті көрініс беретін, оларды жүзеге асыруда табандылық пен адалдық танытуға және олардың нәтижелері мен салдарына жауап беруге дайындығы.

Түйін сөздер: кәсіби жауапкершілік, интерналдылық, экстерналдылық, орнату, әлеуметтік жауапкершілік.

Абдыкаликова М.Н.¹, Бердибаева С.К.²

¹кандидат психологических наук, доцент,
Академия государственного управления при Президенте Республики Казахстан,
Казахстан, г. Астана, e-mail: marta_nd@mail.ru

²доктор психологических наук, профессор кафедры общей и прикладной психологии,
Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби,
Казахстан, г. Алматы, e-mail: berdybaeva_sveta@mail.ru

Оценка эффективности профессиональной ответственности государственных служащих

Ответственность является одним из личностных качеств, который проявляется в процессе деятельности государственного служащего. Статья посвящена изучению локуса контроля: интернального и экстернального локуса контроля современного государственного служащего.

В работе использована методика измерения уровня локуса контроля Дж. Роттера, в котором имеются такие шкалы или потребности шести категорий, как: статус признания, защита-зависимость, доминирование, независимость, любовь и привязанность, физический комфорт. Предполагалось, что поскольку эффективные госслужащие – это, прежде всего, ответственные сотрудники, то им будет свойственна интернальность, а неэффективным – экстернальность. Внешняя структура профессиональной ответственности представлена субъектом, объектом и инстанцией. При этом субъектом выступает специалист, объектом – его профессиональная деятельность, а инстанцией – профессиональная отрасль, государственная служба. Внутренняя структура состоит из когнитивного, мотивационного, эмоционально-волевого и поведенческого элементов. Когнитивный элемент представляет знание сущности профессиональной ответственности, а также социальных, моральных и правовых норм поведения, убеждение. Таким образом, профессиональная ответственность – это интегральное качество специалиста, которое проявляется в способности принимать обоснованные решения в сфере своей профессиональной деятельности, проявлять настойчивость и добросовестность в их реализации и в готовности отвечать за их результаты и последствия.

Ключевые слова: профессиональная ответственность, интернальность, экстернальность, установка, социальная ответственность.

Introduction

Formulation of the problem. In psychology, responsibility is understood as the control exercised in various forms of the activity of the subject from the point of view of the fulfillment of the norms and rules it has adopted. There are external forms of control that ensure the imposition of accountability on the subject for the results of his activities (responsibility, punishability, etc.) and internal forms of self-regulation of his activities (sense of responsibility, sense of duty).

The word «responsibility» was introduced into the scientific use of A. Beyn in the book «Emotions and Will» (1865). Responsibility is associated with the question of punishability, since any issue arising in the discussion of this term is a matter of prosecution, conviction and punishment. J. St Mill (XIX

century), just like A. Bain, associate accountability with punishment.

Responsibility and self-affirmation constitute the content of the emotional component of the value attitude to activity. K. Muzdybaev studied the problem very deeply. Professional responsibility is defined as a set of personality traits that reflects the attitude of the individual to the work process, the collective, as a subject of activity and her behavior in labor activity (Lutsenko, 1991). The essence of professional responsibility is concretized through the study of its psychological structure (Sidorova, 1987). Motives for professionally responsible behavior are an element of motivation. And the sense of home, the manifestation of strong-willed efforts in achieving goals enter into an emotionally volitional element. Behavior of the specialist in the process of fulfilling duties, bringing the task to

the end, reporting on the results and consequences of their activities are derived and constitute the behavioral element of the structure of professional accountability.

Dependence of the success of civil servants' activity on the level of the value attitude to it has been studied multifaceted by N. Sashchenko (1993). It took the modified and adapted methods of analysis and self-analysis of the professionalism of activities, determining the level of the formation of the value relationship. We present her data for further analysis, based on the work of A.A. Derkach (2004, 2001).

In the course of the experimental study, the levels and modalities associated with the value attitude to the professionalism of the activity were studied:

- to knowledge (versatility, concreteness and depth);
- readiness and ability to apply knowledge in practice (strength and stability of positive emotional experiences);
- self-improvement (intensity and positive – negative coloring of relations).

Issues of establishing an effective public administration system are widely discussed by scientists, politicians and citizens. By the examples of most countries, the implementation of public policy objectives depends on the level of professionalism and competence of civil servants. One of this competence is responsibility. This article considers the features of state programs aimed at the development of such qualities as responsibility among public servants or as one of the important aspects in government administration.

What is the responsibility? According to Cambridge dictionaries it means «something that is your job or duty to deal with.» Aside from this what is the responsibility of a public servant; let's consider some regulatory documents that give an understanding of responsibility in the public sector.

In the theory of public administration, some authors emphasize the importance of concept «responsibility» of public servants. Scientists consider the responsibility of the authorities to the people as a political principle, which means democracy; people vested with authority should be responsible for the consequences of their actions. They also emphasize that the responsibility of the authorities is not fully realized in any other country, and the solution to this problem is only to be found in the 21st century.

Some articles explain that theoretically; the following types of responsibility of the authorities are political, legal, social and moral.

It also explains what is the different between political responsibility, legal, social and moral. Political responsibility is the responsibility for the inappropriate act of public authority, therefore political responsibility occurs both when there is and no responsible person in the act of the offense, and this differs from the legal responsibility itself. The legal responsibility of the authorities is manifested in the adoption of laws restricting authority, as well as the establishment of penalties for their violation. The implementation of these laws can be expressed in bringing to justice and criminal responsibility of officials, including the highest for the violations they committed.

The realization of the social and moral responsibility of the authorities means that persons committing immoral, actions contrary to universal morality are not allowed in society. The system of social and moral responsibility can be attributed to the personal responsibility of civil servants. Once we transcend the narrow bounds of quandary ethics and «trolleyology,» however, a broader look at the fields of moral psychology and moral philosophy reveals several common interests. Moral philosophers strive not only to determine what actions are morally right and wrong, but also to understand our moral concepts, practices, and psychology. (D'Arms, Jacobson, 2014)

Also, in psychology, responsibility is considered to assess the likely impact of various forms of political review on the quality of decision-making by bodies. a review of the main results of psychological studies shows how responsibility influences decision making. The results of the study are applied to the three political review mechanisms: verification of cost-benefit analyzes that accompany the rules, control of the congressional committee over norm-setting and an accelerated review in the congress. Finally, it discusses the implications of these findings, in particular, the consideration of the claims of some scholars that judicial review is not necessary in the light of a political review and is based on the desirability of each political verification mechanism. (Seidenfeld, 2001)

Let us see the regularity documents of Kazakhstan, which shows the importance of responsibility of civil servants.

The first document is the Civil service Law of the Republic of Kazakhstan:

- «The status of a civil servant includes general rights, freedoms and obligations of a civil servant as a citizen of the Republic of Kazakhstan with restrictions established by the laws of the Republic of Kazakhstan related to being in the public service,

as well as rights, duties and responsibilities arising from the particularities of the public service.»

– «Responsibility of civil servants: for non-fulfillment or inadequate fulfillment of their official duties, civil servants shall bear civil, disciplinary, administrative, criminal liability in accordance with the laws of the Republic of Kazakhstan.»

The second document is the Ethical code of civil servants of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

– «Fulfillment of public service is an expression of special trust on the part of society and the state and places high demands on the moral and ethical appearance of civil servants. The society expects that civil servants will invest all their strength, knowledge and experience in their professional activities, to serve their homeland, the Republic of Kazakhstan, impartially and honestly.»

– «Civil servants must to be honest, fair, and modest, to comply with generally accepted moral and ethical standards, to show politeness and correctness in dealing with citizens and colleagues, ensure the legality and fairness of their decisions.»

The third document is the Unified competence frame for civil servants is in the approval stage now. This document indicates the personal qualities of civil servants: responsibility, initiative, stress tolerance. «The orientation of public servants to personal responsibility for the performance of their duties in strict accordance with the principles of transparency and accountability.»

The President of the Republic of Kazakhstan pays special attention to the formation of a professional state apparatus, for which service to the people and the state is above all. Over the years, three reforms have been carried out in the civil service system. All of them are directly related to the processes of transformation of the state and the establishment of the public administration system.

In most developed countries, special laws or codes of state service management have been adopted, and special authorized bodies have been created with appropriate powers. The public of these countries advocates that independence, impartiality, reliability of administrative activities, openness, the principle of serving their country and their people, responsibility, forming the basis of the ethical behavior of a public servant, be considered as the most important values of the state when revising the criteria for selecting high-ranking civil servants.

Responsibility of civil servants can be understood in good faith in the performance of their duties, the tasks of managers, as well as the realization and acceptance of consequences for their failure or improper performance. In general, in

order to solve problems with responsibility in state bodies, the mentality should be gradually changed and personality-oriented work should be carried out with employees.

Methodology of research

In our research, we studied responsibility as a professionally important quality of a civil servant, and therefore we will examine it in more detail. At the stage of experimental research, we studied the internal and external orientation of the personality. The term «internally-external reinforcement control» was introduced by J. Rotter «to represent people's belief that their behavior is determined by their own efforts and skills or external forces, such as fate, luck.»

Studies of recent years have shown that the locus of control is not so much universal as a transactive characteristic. For example: a person may be internally in the field of achievements, but external in the field of responsibility for failures, etc. Therefore, there is a need for splitting the learning methodology into subscales.

Results and discussion

We obtained empirical data in groups of successful and unsuccessful civil servants in the following subscales: «Internationalism in Achievement» (ID), «Internationalism in the field of failures» (IN), «Internationalism in the field of production relations» (IP).

According to the data received, unsuccessful employees turned out to be internals, and the level on the two scales is slightly higher than that of successful ones.

In the previous study, K. Muzdybaev established the correlation of internality with social responsibility and factor «G.» (Muzdybaev, 1983) This contradicts our results. Recall that, unlike the successful in the factor matrix 16 PF, successful employees do not have the factor «G» («Super Ego», «Consciousness»). Then it is difficult to correlate its data with the internality of unsuccessful ones. This apparent contradiction is eliminated if we bear in mind the following.

First, K. Muzdybaev himself concluded that «personal correlates are very approximate It is important not just to reveal the property of character accompanying externalities and internalities, but to consider in the light of the life cycle of an individual ...» (Muzdybaev, 1983). Labruyur pointed out this need: «... the unbalance of the spirit,

the uneven character, the impermanence of character, the lack of confidence in actions – all these are weaknesses of our human nature, but weaknesses different: for all their seeming affinity, the presence of one of them does not necessarily imply the presence of the rest. « (Labruyur, 2007) The categorical conclusions about the connection of the control locus are questioned by many authors: «... it is hardly legitimate to absolutize the connection of the control locus with different traits of character, it is obviously worthwhile to consider general (averaged) trends only as primary guidelines ...». For example, L. Berkovits and K. Lutterman, D. Evans and S. Alexander found the connection between internality and socio-political activity, while D. Zanger and M. Alker, on the other hand, and established a connection between externality and political activity. Apparently, number of conditions (Muzdybaev, 1983, Trusov, 1981; Shabanov, 1981) mediates the relationship of the locus of control with other properties and features. Such conditions can be sexual identity, cultural characteristics, fundamental attitudes, life positions, etc.

In our case, such dominating factors are the dominant attitudes that underlie the orientation of the activity. Unsuccessful employees take responsibility for failure on themselves, but do not aspire to normality, conscientious execution and better results («Well I do not want, I can not – that now I do not live?») Because of egoophilic attitudes that more strongly influence the intensity and direction activities. The egoophilic attitude is more associated with a lower conscientiousness than the lack of conscientiousness with the assumed externalities of the unsuccessful.

Secondly, in order to understand why, contrary to expectations, internals are observed in unsuccessful and very low «G» indicators, we need to turn to the author's concept of G. Rotter, which is the basis of the measurement technique for the level of the control locus. According to his theory, past experience of the person forms a system of generalized expectations, that a certain line of behavior will lead to reward (or reinforcement). This reinforcement will determine its behavior. But if this reinforcement itself has value. Thus, we are talking about the locus of expectation. Waiting is the subjective probability that certain reinforcement will occur as a result of the chosen line of conduct. The person will repeat the behavior that receives the desired reinforcement. Value is a person's preferences. Thus, we can predict the behavior by following the dependence: the potential of the behavior = the expectation + the value of the reinforcement. For the prediction of behavior,

the needs values are. According to J. Rotter, these are the needs of six categories: recognition status, protection-dependence, domination, independence, love and affection, physical comfort.

The status of recognition «is manifested in the need to feel competent in a wide range of activities and to recognize this competence by others. «Protection-dependence» reflects the need for a person who protects from trouble and helps in achieving goals. «Domination» manifests the need to influence other people. «Independence» refers to the need to make a decision independently and to achieve the goal, relying on one's own strength. «Love and affection» expresses the need for acceptance and love from others. «Physical comfort» includes all kinds of satisfaction, related to safety, health and freedom from all traumatic.

Consider the locus of control in the light of the «life cycle of the individual». Let's turn to the evaluation of the potential of the behavior of unsuccessful employees from the point of view of the concept of J. Rotter, we will transfer it to the specific type of employee we studied.

Overall, the chosen line of behavior is the avoidance of difficulties and problems in the activity in several ways. First, in the form of ignoring social demands, rejection of norms and responsibilities (reduced conscientiousness, «G»), a developed insensitivity to social pressure, reproaches and remarks. Secondly, leaving in dreams from the need to make an effort, reach the goal and solve problems. Based on past experience, they have formed a system of expectation that this chosen line of behavior invariably leads to positive reinforcement, i.e. satisfies them the main, valuable need for comfort. The developed pattern of behaviour gets the desired reinforcement – avoidance of risk, active actions and everything that threatens security and comfort. Here again we observe a strong mediating influence of egophil. As we see, for the realization of the potential of behaviour, the external or internal orientation plays no significant role. Most authors also note that J. Rotter himself did not link internality with morality and conscientiousness. Unsuccessful civil servants can take responsibility for the outcome of their own life events and at the same time be irresponsible, inconstant, cynical («-G»).

Conclusion

Based on the results of the assessment, the following conclusions are drawn:

Successful and unsuccessful civil servants do not differ in the direction of the locus of control.

Both groups are characterized by internality. In the sphere of production relations and the causes of failure, it is higher in the unsuccessful.

The success of the activity does not depend on internality or externality, and in this sense, they really are averaged trends.

Between internality-external personality and the success of its activities, there are determinative, mediating factors. These include, in particular, the orientation and orientation of the activity.

Confirmed the opinion of J. Rotter that internality-externality does not have causal links with the morality of the individual, for example, the developed «Super-Ego.»

Thus, both categories of civil servants reveal an internality. The fact that unsuccessful sharply reduced conscientiousness and normative behavior does not exclude internality. Responsibility and diligence as moral qualities are associated not with the locus of control, but with the motivational sphere of the individual.

References

- Bein A. (1865) *Emotsii i voli* [Emotions and Will] St. Petersburg: Peter, 150p. (In Russian)
- Derkach A.A. (2004) *Akmeologiya* [Akmeology]. – Moscow. – 540 p. (In Russian)
- Lukyanchenko N.V, Tkachenko I.A. (2015) *Psikhologicheski aspekt professionalnoi otvetstvennosti rabotnikov farmatsefticheskogo proizvodstva: strukturno-urovnenie i tipologicheskie kharakteristiki* [Psychological aspect of the professional responsibility of workers in pharmaceutical production: structural-level and typological characteristics] *Nauchno-metodicheski elektronnyi zhurnal* [Scientific and Methodical Electronic Journal «Concept»] Vol. 13, pp. 1196-1200. Available at: <http://e-koncept.ru/2015/85240.htm>.
- Labryuier J. (1974) *Charactery* [Characters]. – 608 p. (In Russian)
- Molchanov S.V // *Представления подростков об ответственности в моральных дилеммах разного типа* // Representations of adolescents about responsibility in moral dilemmas of different types // S.V. Molchanov, O.V. Almazova // *Kulturno-istoricheskaya psikhologiya* // Cultural and Historical Psychology. - 2017. – Т. 13. – №. 4. – P. 81-90.
- Muzdybaev K. (1983) *Psihologiya otvenstvennosti* [Psychology of responsibility]. – Leningrad. – 239 p. (In Russian)
- D'Arms J, Jacobson D. (2014) *Moral Psychology and Human Agency: Philosophical Essays on the Science of Ethics*. Oxford University Press, pp. 40-83
- Rean AA, Kolominsky Ya. (1999) *Sotsialno-pedagogicheskaya psikhologiya* [Socio-pedagogical psychology]. – St. Petersburg. – 409 p. (In Russian)
- Saschenko N. P. (1993) *Psikhologicheskie osnovy produktivnyh otnosheniy v upravlencheskoi deyatel'nosti* [Psychological foundations of productive relations in management activity]: Author. dis. ... The candidate psychology, sciences. – Moscow. (In Russian)
- Sidorova T.N. (1987) *Ossobennosti sotsialnoi otvetstvennosti u starsheklassnikov* [Features of social responsibility in high school students] *Voprosy psikhologii* [Questions of psychology]. 5: 56-62. (In Russian)
- Seidenfeld, M. (2001) *The Psychology of Accountability and Political Review of Agency Rules*. Duke Law Journal, Vol. 51, p. 1059; FSU College of Law, Public Law Research Paper. No. 42. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=292406>
- Sullivan G., Rotter J., Mishel W. (2009) *Teoria mezlichnostnyh otnosheniy i kognitivnye teorii lichnosti* [The theory of interpersonal relations and cognitive theory of personality]. – Moscow. – 420p. (In Russian)
- Stolin V.V. (1983) *Samoznanie lichnosti* [Self-consciousness of the person]. – Moscow. – 286 p. (In Russian)
- Trusov V.P. (1990) *Sovremennye psikhologicheskie teorii lichnosti* [Modern psychological theories of personality]. – Leningrad. – 340 p. (In Russian)
- 15 Trusov V.P. (1981) *Teorii atributsii v zarubezhnoi sotsialnoi psikhologii* [Attribution theory in foreign social psychology] *Psikhologiya mezlichnostnogo poznania* [Psychology of interpersonal cognition]. – Moscow. – pp.139-157. (In Russian)

Литература

- Бейн А. Эмоции и воля / А. Бейн. – СПб.: Питер, 1865. – 150 с.
- Деркач А.А. Акмеология: учебник под общей редакцией доктора психологических наук А.А. Деркана. – М., 2004. – 540 с.
- Лукьянченко Н.В., Ткаченко И.А. Психологический аспект профессиональной ответственности работников фармацевтического производства: структурно-уровневые и типологические характеристики / Н.В. Лукьянченко, И.А. Ткаченко // *Научно-методический электронный журнал «Концепт»*. – 2015. – Т. 13. – С. 1196-1200. – URL: <http://e-koncept.ru/2015/85240.htm>.
- Лабрюйер Ж. Характеры. Букинистическое издан. – Питер, 1974. – 608 с.
- Молчанов С.В. Представления подростков об ответственности в моральных дилеммах разного типа. Культурно-историческая психология. – 2017. – Т. 13. – № 4. – С. 81–90.
- Муздыбаев К. Психология ответственности. – Ленинград, 1983. – 239 с.
- D'Arms J, Jacobson D. *Moral Psychology and Human Agency: Philosophical Essays on the Science of Ethics*. – L.: Oxford University Press, 2014. – P. 40-83
- Реан А.А., Коломинский Я. Социально-педагогические психология / А.А. Реан, Я. Коломинский. – СПб.: «Питер», 1999. – 409 с.

Сашенко Н. П. Психологические основы продуктивных отношений в управленческой деятельности: автореферат дис. ... кандидата психологических наук: 19.00.13 / Рос. акад. управления. – М., 1993.– 25 с.

Сидорова Т.Н. Особенности социальной ответственности у старшеклассников // Вопросы психологии. –1987. – №5. – С. 56-62.

Seidenfeld M. The Psychology of Accountability and Political Review of Agency Rules // Duke Law Journal, , FSU College of Law, Public Law Research Paper. – V. 51, № 42, – 2001. – 1059 p. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=292406>

Салливан Г., Ротгер Дж., Мишел У. Теория межличностных отношений и когнитивные теории личности. – М.: Изд-во «Прайм-Еврознак». 2009. – 420 с.

Столин В.В. Самосознание личности / В.В. Столин. – М.: Изд-во Моск. Ун-та, 1983. – 286с.

Трусов В.П. Современные психологические теории личности // Учеб. Пособие. В.П. Трусов. – Л.: Издательство «ЛГУ», 1990. – 340 с.

Трусов В.П. Теории атрибуции в зарубежной социальной психологии // Психология межличностного познания. – М., 1981. – С. 139-157.