Personal development as an important component of work with personnel leaders of JSC “Almaz – Antey” Air and Space Defence Corporation

The paper reviews the results of studying the types of professional motivation and interpersonal relation styles among the winners of the leadership identification program 2017 of JSC “Almaz – Antey” Air and Space Defence Corporation. As a result, there were developed recommendations as to the organization of work aimed at the personal development of future managers.

Key words: interpersonal relation styles, types of professional motivation, leadership qualities, personal development, leadership identification programs.

Introduction

Search, development and support of promising young leaders is a strategic task that is successfully solved in our country with the help of the Leaders of Russia contest. As the President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin noted, such projects “are not associated with a career ladder of any sort, only with creating opportunities for further growth” [1].

In 2016, “Almaz – Antey” Air and Space Defence Corporation” Joint Stock Company started implementation of a corporate program to identify leaders of labour collectives in subsidiaries in order to solve the problems of integrated development and increase the involvement of young specialists [2]. The goal of the program is to create conditions needed for professional and personal development of young leaders and future managers at various levels.

In April and October 2017, training camps were organized for the winners of a distance stage of the program. Lectures and panel discussions, project tasks, intellectual and sports contests allowed participants to demonstrate their leadership skills. The winners will be given an opportunity to improve their skills by completing the educational program “Management of a Military-Industrial Complex Organization”, an integral part of which is a series of classes on personal development of young leaders and future managers at various levels.

For diagnostics purposes, the “Interpersonal relations diagnostics” (IRD) method by L. N. Sobchik [4] and the motivation assessment test by V. I. Gerchikov [5, 6] were chosen. Gerchikov’s motivation assessment test [5, 6] is aimed at determining the dominant type of employees’ professional motivation. Overall, there are five types of motivation:

1) professional type prevails among employees who are focused on professional development and career growth, who show initiative
and aspiration to expand the scope of their functions;

2) patriotic type of motivation is seen in employees who are ready to sacrifice their interests for the sake of a common cause, to help their colleagues;

3) instrumental type of motivation is prevalent among those employees who see labour as a means of satisfying their material needs;

4) administrative type of professional motivation is manifested in employees who perform their work responsibly, voluntarily accept obligations, and strive for freedom in decision-making;

5) lumpenised type of motivation is dominant among employees who want to shift responsibility to others and minimise their own efforts.

The “Interpersonal relations diagnostics” method [4] includes a questionnaire, which is a set of characteristics. The study participants are asked to evaluate themselves using the characteristics given in the questionnaire from two aspects: real and ideal. Let us conventionally denote these aspects as a real relationship model and an ideal relationship model. The method identifies the dominant type out of eight styles of interpersonal relations:

1) domineering and leading type, when manifested moderately, is characterized by sociability, determination, activeness, desire to lead others; when manifested strongly – by despotism and intolerance to criticism;

2) independent and dominant type is characterized by a critical attitude to other people’s opinions, desire to take an independent position within a group and attain their own goals; when manifested strongly, it is marked by isolation from the team and a sense of superiority;

3) straightforward and aggressive type is prone to exhibit directness, perseverance, self-righteousness, and sensitivity to criticism. When manifested strongly, straightforwardness in statements and actions, short temper, and excessive perseverance are demonstrated;

4) incredulous and sceptical type, when manifested moderately, is characterized by realistic judgements, scepticism, and non-conformity; when manifested strongly – by resentment and suspicion;

5) submissive and shy type is determined by such qualities as modesty, vulnerability and sensitivity, propensity for introspection, and precision in executing orders;

6) dependent and obedient type is characterized by increased sense of responsibility, anxiety, need for help and trust from others;

7) cooperative and conventional type is manifested in the desire to cooperate and to create positive relations in the team;

8) responsible and generous type is expressed through such qualities as artistic nature, flexibility in communication, sociability, and altruism.

Upon summing up the results, the prevailing type of interpersonal relations of test participants is determined.

The choice of methods stems from the fact that HR professionals, as well as psychologists engaged in diagnostics, have been applying these methods successfully for many years.

The obtained conclusions allow us to formulate the general directions of work on personal development with the winners of the first stage of the program. The work aimed at developing the competencies of each participant shall be based on the conclusions of an individual, more extensive psychodiagnostic study.

**Analysis of the study results**

Let us analyse the results of the study on the styles of interpersonal relations and professional motivation. For this, we apply the following mathematical and statistical methods of data processing: determining the significance of differences using the Mann-Whitney U-test and correlation analysis of indicators with the Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient. A structural analysis of correlations among indicators is carried out.

When comparing indicators of interpersonal relations and professional motivation in groups 1 and 2 using the Mann – Whitney U-test, no significant differences were identified. This conclusion
allows us to formulate general tasks for working with the winners of the 2017 training camps. To determine these tasks, the analysis of correlations among indicators using the Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient was performed (Figure 1).

**Interconnection of interpersonal relation styles**

The largest number of significant correlations was found among the indicators of interpersonal relation styles (Figure 2).

Thus, the domineering and leading type (1R) is connected with the independent and dominant (2R) \((r = 0.49, p < 0.05)\) and straightforward and aggressive (3R) \((r = 0.33, p < 0.05)\) types. The independent and dominant style (2R) is linked with the straightforward and aggressive type (3R) \((r = 0.53, p < 0.05)\), whereas the straightforward and aggressive type (3R) is connected with the incredulous and sceptical type (4R) \((r = 0.33, p < 0.05)\). In interpersonal relations, the study participants seek...
to exert greater influence on others, show perseverance, determination, independence, and rely on their own opinion when making decisions, which is typical of people in the leadership positions.

The domineering and leading type (1R) is connected with the cooperative and conventional (7R) type \( (r = 0.28, p < 0.05) \). In socially significant situations, leadership qualities are compensated by willingness to cooperate and focus on the team’s needs.

The incredulous and sceptical type (4R) is connected with the submissive and shy (5R) \( (r = 0.45, p < 0.05) \) and dependent and obedient (6R) \( (r = 0.42, p < 0.05) \) types. The submissive and shy type (5R) is related to the dependent and obedient (6R) \( (r = 0.66, p < 0.05) \), cooperative and conventional (7R) \( (r = 0.30, p < 0.05) \) and responsible and generous (8R) \( (r = 0.52, p < 0.05) \) types. The cooperative and conventional type (7R) is linked with the responsible and generous type (8R) \( (r = 0.65, p < 0.05) \). The study participants’ sensitivity and focus on external factors is associated with the desire to create a favourable atmosphere in the team, earn credibility with their colleagues, and cooperate in the process of problem-solving.

Thus, in the real relationship model, indicators of types that reflect the propensity for leadership and dominance are mainly related to each other, and not to indicators of types that characterize the focus on cooperation and on the opinions and needs of others.

When comparing the degree of manifestation of the domineering and leading type indicator in the model of real and ideal interpersonal relations of study participants, it is obvious that they seek to strengthen leadership qualities in their behaviour. In the real relationship model, the domineering and leading type is highly pronounced (excessive) in 8 % of participants, and is normally pronounced (expressed in most situations, i.e. accentuated) in 37 %. In the ideal model, 56 % of the study participants seek to manifest this style in communicating with others in most situations, and 22 % – in almost all situations (Figure 3).

According to the author of the method L. N. Sobchik [4], if the style is excessive and accentuated, it complicates relationships with other people and the communication process, making one’s behaviour inflexible. Thus, the intensification of leadership qualities in one’s behaviour can negatively affect the research participants’ relations with their colleagues.

Manifestations of other types of interpersonal relations have no significant differences in the real and ideal models (see the Table).
When analysing the interconnections between indicators in the real and ideal models of interpersonal relations, the authors of the article also found significant correlations between styles that reflect propensity for leadership.

The largest number of significant links with other types of relations were found in the independent and dominant type (2R). Its manifestation in the real model of relations is connected with an increase in the ideal model of the domineering and leading (1I) \( (r = 0.47, p < 0.05) \), independent and dominant (2I) \( (r = 0.67, p < 0.05) \), straightforward and aggressive (3I) \( (r = 0.61, p < 0.05) \), incredulous and sceptical (4I) \( (r = 0.36, p < 0.05) \) and dependent and obedient (6I) \( (r = 0.33, p < 0.05) \) types. The straightforward and aggressive type indicator (3R) is also linked to the above-mentioned types of the ideal relations model (with the exception of the dependent and obedient type).

In the ideal model of relations, there was no significant correlation between the domineering and leading type indicator (1R) and the indicators reflecting the willingness to cooperate.

### Interconnection between styles of interpersonal relations and professional motivation

The professional type of motivation is expressed at a high level in 57 % of the study participants (Figure 4). For them, the opportunity to develop professional competencies and freedom in managerial decisions are of great importance. However, this is not related to striving for leadership in communication with managers and colleagues at work.

#### Manifestation of interpersonal relation styles in the real behaviour model

| Level of style manifestation | Types of interpersonal relations (classification of L. N. Sobchik), % |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                             | Domineering and leading | Independent and dominant | Straightforward and aggressive | Increduous and sceptical | Submissive and shy | Dependent and obedient | Cooperative and conventional | Responsible and generous |
| Real behavior model         | 8                      | 0                       | 0                           | 0                        | 0                     | 0                       | 0                       | 6                       |
| Pronounced                  | 37                     | 18                      | 10                          | 4                        | 4                     | 2                       | 8                       | 31                      |
| Moderately expressed        | 45                     | 66                      | 78                          | 60                       | 31                    | 39                      | 74                      | 41                      |
| Rarely expressed            | 10                     | 16                      | 12                          | 36                       | 65                    | 59                      | 18                      | 22                      |

#### Ideal model behaviour

| Level of style manifestation | Types of interpersonal relations (classification of L. N. Sobchik), % |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                             | Domineering and leading | Independent and dominant | Straightforward and aggressive | Increduous and sceptical | Submissive and shy | Dependent and obedient | Cooperative and conventional | Responsible and generous |
| Ideal model behaviour       | 22                     | 0                       | 0                           | 0                        | 0                     | 0                       | 0                       | 6                       |
| Pronounced                  | 56                     | 14                      | 10                          | 0                        | 0                     | 0                       | 0                       | 18                      | 41                      |
| Moderately expressed        | 22                     | 70                      | 72                          | 8                        | 4                     | 10                      | 65                      | 37                      |
| Rarely expressed            | 0                      | 16                      | 18                          | 92                       | 96                    | 90                      | 17                      | 16                      |

---

**Fig. 4.** Manifestation of professional motivation types among the 2017 Program winners:
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- PA – patriotic type
- PR – professional type
- IN – instrumental type
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Striving for leadership remains unfulfilled in the professional field. There were no significant correlations identified between the professional type of motivation and the styles of interpersonal relations. Possibly, in the context of the existing organizational culture at the Corporation’s enterprises, the study participants find no opportunities to fulfill their leadership potential or may set professional goals that are difficult to achieve due to objective reasons.

The administrative type of professional motivation (HO) is connected with the submissive and shy (5P) \( r = -0.31, p < 0.05 \) and dependent and obedient types of communication (6P) \( r = -0.38, p < 0.05 \). However, particular attention should be paid to the fact that these correlations have a negative value. In the ideal communication model, the following types are connected with the indicator of the administrative type of professional motivation: independent and dominant (2I) \( r = 0.38, p < 0.05 \), straightforward and aggressive (3I) \( r = 0.29, p < 0.05 \), and incredulous and sceptical (3I) \( r = 0.28, p < 0.05 \). In communication with others, employees with the administrative type of motivation can show perseverance, and in some situations aggressiveness, rigidity, and scepticism. They react negatively to outside control, tend to act independently and take responsibility for the decisions made. It is advisable for managers to assign more complex tasks to such subordinates (provided that the level of professional competencies is appropriate) and avoid exerting excessive control.

The patriotic type of motivation (PA) is associated with the cooperative and conventional type of communication (7I) \( r = 0.34, p < 0.05 \). Employees predominating motivation of this type have a need for public recognition, for participation in the common success when achieving a goal. Therefore, they seek to cooperate and exhibit sensitivity to the emotional state of the team. Public endorsement of work results and focus on the importance of contributing to the common cause are indispensable motivation factors for improving the efficiency of such professionals.

In the majority of the study participants (90 %), the lumpenised type of motivation is expressed at a low level. The independent and dominant (1R), straightforward and aggressive (2R) types of relations are connected with the lumpenised type of professional motivation. A similar correlation is found in the ideal model of interpersonal relations. In addition, the lumpenised type of motivation is connected with the straightforward and aggressive (3I) \( r = 0.33, p < 0.05 \) and incredulous and sceptical types (4I) \( r = 0.36, p < 0.05 \). The authors of the article made two assumptions regarding possible reasons for the interconnection between the indicators:

- in the context of the existing organizational culture at the Corporation’s enterprises, as well as due to the age factor (the average age of the program winners is 28), the activeness and initiatives of the study participants are not always positively perceived by managers and more experienced colleagues;
- employees with the lumpenised type of motivation strive to build a vertical career in order to reduce the production load due to having unrealistic ideas about management activities, according to which the managers themselves merely issue instructions to their subordinates instead of “real work”.

In the future, it is planned to conduct psychological testing of the winners of the 2018 training camps to compare participants of the 2017 and 2018 studies, assessing the degree of manifestation of interpersonal relation indicators, as well as types of professional motivation and performance indicators. The obtained conclusions will allow us to determine specific tasks and areas of work for the personal development of young leaders of “Almaz–Antey” Air and Space Defence Corporation.

**Conclusions**

1. The winners of the program strive to emphasize leadership qualities in interpersonal relations, to have a greater influence on others, to be active, persistent, purposeful, and to rely on their own opinion when making decisions. In some situations, such behaviour can complicate relationships
with managers and colleagues. Therefore, it is important for the study participants to develop more flexible ways of communication that would take situational factors into account. The manifestation of willingness to cooperate, to exhibit sociability and restraint in interpersonal relations helps stimulate work efficiency in production conditions with different motivation types present.

2. The desire to improve professional competencies and to achieve great results in work is the most striking individual quality of the winners of the program. The effectiveness of their activities largely depends on the possibility of fulfilling their need for professional development.

3. In order to fulfill leadership potential in the professional field, which includes interacting with management and colleagues, one needs to be able to formulate professional goals and adjust them in accordance with the conditions of the organizational culture of a particular enterprise. This area of development is considered an integral part of working with leaders.
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Личностное развитие как важная составляющая работы с лидерами трудовых коллективов АО «Концерн ВКО «Алмаз – Антей»

Рассмотрены результаты исследования типов профессиональной мотивации и стилей межличностных отношений у победителей программы выявления лидеров АО «Концерн ВКО «Алмаз – Антей» 2017 г. Выработаны рекомендации по организации работы, направленной на личностное развитие будущих управленцев.
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