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The fastest and most reliable way of increasing employee satisfaction and commitment is to provide employees with a more effective leader. Accordingly the framework of the leader’s work becomes the division of employees’ powers and responsibilities. With the purpose to do this job the leader should consider at least several versions called scenarios. The purpose of this article is to propose leader’s tasks encouraging employees to take their role managing and developing organization. The data of article was gathered using quantitative research. Respondents of the research were top managers of Lithuanian business organization. The research results show that Lithuanian managers use an intuition, the reflection, the perception, and awareness in the process of scenario making. The results show that the process of the scenario making could be developed by the leader expanding his/her rational thinking in the organization. This activity would let to form the perception of employees. The employees would be encouraged to take the responsibility.
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1. Introduction

The future leader should gain main three features: capability to communicate and to act together in the team implementing objectives of an organization, to create new ideas and innovations, and to act in the Global market communicating with the people from different nations (Global..., 2014–2015). In this situation one of the leader’s targets is to manage organization the way that an employee would think about his/her own function on the curve of organization’s development.

Leader’s used methods of management in an organization should be the way that employees would think about their responsibilities to the other members of the organization. The study of J. Folkman validates the notion that the quickest and most reliable way of increasing employee satisfaction and commitment is to provide employees with a more effective leader (Folkman, 2010). Accordingly the framework of the leader’s work becomes the division of employees’ powers and responsibilities.
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With the purpose to do this job the leader should consider at least several versions called scenarios. Scenario is a plan who and how should do the planned works. This is why the leader should start the process of the scenario making.

D. Uitmor (2000), J. Folkman (2010), S. M. Bello (2012), N. Petrie (2014) and etc. are analyzing the relations between the leader and employees. Though there are not enough revealed aspects of leader’s tasks while he/she is motivating employees to take their responsibility managing and developing the organization. Especially there are not enough researches in this scientific field made in Lithuania.

Accordingly the purpose of this article is to propose leader’s tasks encouraging employees to take their role managing and developing organization.

The author of the article analyses research data using methods: the analysis of scientific literature and questionnaire interview. Quantitative research was made with Lithuanian top managers of business organizations. The analysis of quantitative research data employed the following statistic methods: descriptive statistics (rates, average means and dispersion), correlative analysis (Spearman correlations), and factorial analysis.

2. Theoretical meaning of the scenario making

According to M. Rac (1993) scenario making is one of twelve future creation actions. The future creation actions are prognostication, floodlighting, projecting, programming, planning, scenario making, implementation of project, author supervision, expertise, monitoring, organizing and managing (Rac, 1993). Altogether future creation actions could be used making future strategy for an organization. The leader is able to see separate aspects of organization’s management analyzing separate future creation actions. During this activity the leader is able to perceive how these actions are important and useful for development and management of whole organization’s system.

The leader is the manager in the organization where his / her main job is to distinguish the employees’ roles. With the purpose to do this job the leader should consider at least several versions called scenarios: who should do what, and what tasks could be done by employees. According to J. Kvedaravicius (2006) scenario is a plan who and how should do the planned works. The scenario making is a process where the leader distinguishes roles to his / her employees.

The scenario making is not a process of tasks distribution to employees. The scenario making as distinguishing of roles is closer to the human resource management or the leader’s tasks concerned with employees who should take their responsibilities for the given tasks. Employees are the most important assets in organizations, which without, the goals and objectives may not be attained (Bello, 2012). Employees should take their responsibility consciously understanding their given information and planned tasks. According to P. Drucker (1993) effective leaders certainly achieve that employees would understand organization’s plan, objectives and demanded information. Thus the perception is leader’s important task working with employees in the process of the scenario making.
The perception process could be associated with the responsibility and the commitment. Every organization consists of employees who have different knowledge, capabilities and make different functions. But still all employees have to obtain common perception about organization’s targets. Every employee should take the responsibility for their given tasks. Thus the leader managing employees should use the communication, the feedback and find a way to understand each other. These elements of the management are some factors of leader’s mind activity. Thus properly curved mind activity of leader might help form the self-confidence and the consciousness, and the responsibility of the employee in his/her work. This is a way how the leader becomes a coacher who distribute the tasks to employees and who makes employees to take their role and responsibility willingly and consciously.

Generally the coaching might help the leader in the process of the scenario making process as in other future creation actions. The coaching is the style of management or the potential of human and an effective instrument of action optimization (Uitmor, 2000). The coaching is the confidence of person’s potential with the purpose to expand person’s effectiveness and productivity. Leader might advance a corporate initiative to implement a plan to physically arrange offices and work areas so that employees can easily collaborate and work in teams on a daily basis. On the other hand, the leader serving at a lower level may establish and implement teamwork guidelines for groups to follow in meeting to work on tasks or problem (Truskie, 2011).

In any of these situations the coaching is more learning activity than teaching the employee. The coaching could help expand the productivity more than any law, rules, procedures or commands because it is used through an awareness and responsibility. Using the pure thinking the leader understands principles and methods of the coaching and he/she is able to make the employees taking the responsibility consciously. Thus employees do their tasks effectively. Thus employees are developing as individualities.

On the other hand using reflection the leader is able to assess:

- how much his / her distinguished roles fulfill his/her employee’s capabilities,
- how the employee is prepared to take responsibility for their given roles,
- how much the employee is consciousness taking given responsibility.

Leadership is a process of interaction between leaders and followers where the leader attempts to influence followers to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2010). Leader’s target is to prepare every employee to think about his/her functions and responsibility managing and developing the organization. The usage of coaching in an organization helps to develop humans.

Every organization needs development of their employees. Especially in complex environment constantly developing employees perform effectively (Petrie, 2014). The problem is consciousness of employees realizing that they have to development themselves (Petrie, 2014). Employee as every person moves from one stage of development to another threw his / her own boundaries. You have to get into the zone of discomfort and to take challenge to develop yourselves (McGuire & Rhodes, 2009; Petrie, 2014). In this situation there are important leader’s tasks and behavior with employees in the organization. According to S. M. Bello (2012) leadership is as-
associated with positive influence on employee performance (Resick, 2006), intrinsic motivation (Piccolo, 2010), job responses and willingness of employee to reports problems (Brown, 2010).

The leader’s behavior with employees might make (Piccolo, 2010) impact on “task significance” and “autonomy” of the Job Characteristic model; and the willingness of employee to put extra effort on task performance. If employees accept leader’s behavior as trustable and good, this means that perception of employees could be changed into a strong appreciation of leader’s management within an organization. This is situation when employees take their responsibility and this means they are loyal to the organization (Bello, 2012).

According to S. M. Bello (2012) loyalty of employees is how much employees are willing to take responsibility in the organization. If employee is committed and responsible the manager as the leader could foresee behavior of his/her employee. (Bello, 2012). Thus it is essential to analyze leader’s tasks distinguishing employees’ roles managing and developing an organization.

3. Research method

According to the logic of theoretical consumptions there is a purpose to reveal the leaders tasks distinguishing employees’ roles empirically in this article. In this case empirically surveying the process of the scenario making there had been used quantitative research with top managers of the Lithuanian business organizations. The author of this article made quantitative research according to M. Seeman (1972) methodology.

The respondents of quantitative research were top managers (leaders) of Lithuanian business organizations in 2010. The sample size was calculated (http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html) and the reliability could be reached with at least 98 respondents. The author gathered 106 filled questionnaires.

Reliability analysis of research questionnaire was established 0.7 Cronbach Alpha (when number of questions was 105). Deviation of distribution in regions of Lithuania was zero % according to % tage of business organizations in these regions. This means that the authors made research fulfilled results of situation in Lithuanian business organizations.

The analysis of quantitative research data employed the following statistic methods: descriptive statistics (rates, average means and dispersion), correlative analysis (Spearman correlations), contingency coefficients, and factorial analysis. Factorial analyses has been made statistically and logically combining together propositions about scenario making, development of an organization and separate aspects of leader’s mind activity. The statistical importance of correlative analyses and contingency coefficients had been measured according two importance levels of p: ‘*’ means p < 0.01 and ‘**’ means 0.01 < p < 0.05.
4. Research results and interpretation

There are important mutual understanding between leader and his/her employees in the process of making scenario when leader gives a task to an employee and the employee should take responsibility for the task and for implementation of organization’s objects. According to results of the survey made by articles author, the 38.4% of respondents told that leaders and employees have different perception to management of an organization. Just 29.5% of respondent stated that leaders and employees have the same perception to management of an organization. Other 25.9% of respondent wrote their own opinion which could be combined into several statements: the perception of leaders and employees is little bit different; just some employees understand the management of organization; employees perceive the management of an organization just sometimes.

Such respondents statements could be interpreted that perception between leader and his / her employees should merge using both endeavors. Even though there should be made other researches to evaluate what endeavor employees are using to make perception of organization’s management.

On the other hand the research’s results showed 0.508** strength and statistically important Spearman correlation between respondents statements ‘with leader’s endeavors to self-develop it is important’: ‘to be interested if employees understand objectives and tasks of an organization’, and ‘to attempt understanding employees’ suggested ideas’. This could mean that leaders understand importance of communication among him/her and his/her employees. 0.410** Spearman correlation let us state that leaders understand how it is important to notice and hear ideas created by employees, and how this activity influences the development of an organization.

Analyzing the research data how the leader unifies the perception among him/herself and his/her employees there were determined that 46.4% of respondents as leaders ask their employees how they have understood the given information. 30.9% of respondent as leaders feel using their intuition if employees have understood the task. On the other hand there are still some respondents (0.9%) who are not interested how their employees understand the given task. 20.9% of respondents commented their activity unifying perception. Their answers could be combined and interpreted respectively: the leader decides if the employee understood him / her according to situation, experience, how long he / she knows the employee, and even according to the importance of the task to organization’s management and development. Thus depending on to situation the leader could intuitively feel if the perception between leader and his/her employee have been unified. On the other situations the leader should ask the employee how he/she has understood the task. It is important to mention the respondents said that with intention to unify perception between the leader and his / her employees there should be: organized teamwork, meetings, feedback, repeated analyzes of objects and tasks, motivation, inclusion of management, control of activity.

According to these respondents comments there could be mentioned that leaders are tending to assess the perception referring to control or assessing the final result of employee’s work although the result of the employee’s work should be as-
sessed as the result of both the leader’s and the employee’s work. If the leader and the employee unify their perception during planning the activity or before implementing the object or the task, in this case it is likely that final results will meet both expectations of the leader and of the employee.

The communication and the perception of leader and employee are related to the employee’s responsibility, awareness, and his / her will to take that responsibility. According to data of quantitative research 62.2% of respondents stated that often their employees take the responsibility of their given tasks willingly. On the other hand there are responsible people who make objects and tasks programs of an organization. Relating research data of employees’ responsibility with people who make objects program (Fig. 1) there could be noticed that 29.2% of respondents and 62.5% of respondents state that employees always or often take responsibility for the given tasks if the objectives program is made by the leader and his/her employees.

On the other hand employees seldom take the responsibility for the given task if the leader alone makes the objectives program (33.3% of respondents ‘never’ and 16.7% of respondents ‘seldom’, see Fig. 1). Relation between responsibility of employees and people who make the objectives program could be assessed as strong and statistically important (0.519** contingency coefficient).

![Fig. 1. Relation between awareness of employees and people who make the task program (%)](image)

There is important to mention that the willingness or unwillingness of employees to take responsibility is related to leader’s style of management. It is possible if the leader is authoritarian, thus he / she does not delegate the responsibility thus his/her employees will not want to take that responsibility. But the impact of the leader’s style to employees’ responsibility is not the object of this articles survey and this assumption could become as an object for other surveys.

53.2% of respondents (Fig. 2) told that their employees perceive their given tasks and responsibility for these tasks consciously.
Fig. 2. The consciousness of employees taking responsibility for the tasks (%)

According to statistically important relation (0.612** contingency coefficient and 0.407** Spearman correlation) between the willingness of employees to take responsibility and their consciousness taking this responsibility there could be noticed that 85.2% of respondents (Fig. 3) state their employees always take responsibility willingly and they do it consciously. On the other hand 50.0% of respondents (Fig. 2) state that employees do not take responsibility willingly (33.3% of respondents note that employees seldom take responsibility willingly, see Fig. 2). According to opinion of the respondents these employees do not enough assess their given tasks and their taken responsibilities.

According to the relations (Fig. 3) between employees’ willingness and their responsibility for the given tasks there could be noticed that employees of an organization are willing to take responsibility for their given tasks, employees perceive what and why responsibilities they should take. Accordingly in these organizations could be found active feedback between its leader and his/her employees. This active feedback ensures great communication between the leader and his / her employees solving questions of organization management. It helps to unify understanding of organizations objectives and what tools are needed for its implementation.

Fig. 3. Relation of employees’ consciousness and awareness doing their tasks (%)

88.9% of respondents note that leader asks employee how he/she has understood the task in the organization where employees seldom take responsibility for their given tasks. The leader feels intuitively (37.0% ‘always’ and 30.9% ‘often’) or asks employee (40.7% ‘always’ and 45.6% ‘often’) how he/she has understood the task in the organization where employees always or often take responsibility for the
given task. There should be mentioned that employees do not willingly take responsibility for the task in the organization where the leader feels intuitively how the employee has understood the task.

On the other hand employees do not enough assess the taken responsibility in the organization where in 63.6% of the cases the leader asks how the employee has understood the task or information. Even more, employees take the responsibility for the tasks in the organizations where in 60.0% of the cases the leader asks how the employee has understood the task or information.

Thus, there is a big gap between perception of the leader and his/her employees in the organization where employees do not enough perceive their responsibilities for the tasks. In these organizations should be assumed possibility to find the ways to unify the perception of the leader and his/her employees. One way to unify perception between the leader and his/her employees and to develop management of organization could be using the principles of coaching in management. During analyses of research data there were determined that 37.6% of respondents are using coaching principles in their organizations. On the other hand 24.8% of respondents there are still big demand to find out and learn what is coaching and how to use it in management of an organization.

Principles of the coaching are useful in the leader’s work with employees in the process of the scenario making. Analyzing research data there could be distinguished that the coaching has been related with perception and communication (0.340**, 0.272** Spearman correlation). In this case there has been proved the theoretical attitude that in the process of communication principles of the coaching might be effective developing consciousness and responsibility of employees in the organization.

**Relation between the scenario making and leader’s mind activity.** Assessing relation between leader’s mind activity and research propositions connected to process of the scenario making there could be noticed that during the scenario making process in the organization the pure thinking (understood as using management theories in organization), the rational thinking or experience of management are not the most important factors developing an organization. This consideration was made according to weak and statistically unimportant Spearman correlation (Fig. 4). According to Spearman correlation in Fig. 4 there could be stated that the intuitive thinking, the reflection and the awareness are more important communicating, delegating tasks, and taking responsibility than previously mentioned elements of leader’s mind activity.
Fig. 4. Relation between the scenario making and leader’s mind activity, its elements, and development of an organization

Relation between the scenario making and development/self-development of an organization. Analyzing the data of the research there has been distinguished relation (0.371* contingency coefficient) among research propositions that development of an organization depends on leader’s ability to analyze and recognize him/herself and the willingness of employees to take responsibility for their given tasks. The research results show spread out relation of these prepositions. Accordingly there could be stated that 34.4% ‘always’ and 56.2% ‘often’ employees take responsibility for their given tasks in organizations where their leaders relate development of an organization with their ability to analyze and to recognize him/herself. This means that the leader endeavor to unify the perception of him/her employees taking care of his/her own reflection and cognition. Thus the leader is striving for consciousness of employees taking the responsibility for themselves and their activity.

Analyzing data of the research there has been identified relation between the consciousness of employees taking responsibility for their given tasks and their willingness (0.366** Spearman correlation) and development of an organization (0.191* Spearman correlation). This means that the consciousness of employee makes an impact to his/her endeavor or willingness to develop him/her as individuality, and might be influencing common development of an organization.

5. Conclusions

1. According to theoretical approach leader’s target is to prepare every employee to think about his / her functions and responsibility managing and developing the organization. These activities could be strengthening by the leader using coaching in an organization. At the same time coaching becomes a force that influence selves-development of the leader and employees.

2. If the leader and the employee unify their perception during planning the activity or before implementing the object or the task, in this case it is likely that final results will meet both expectations of the leader and of the employee. With intention
to unify perception between the leader and his / her employees there should be: organized teamwork, meetings, feedback, repeated analyzes of objects and tasks, motivation, inclusion of management, control of activity.

3. There is used an intuition, the reflection, the perception, and the awareness in the process of scenario making. Therefore the process of the scenario making could be developed by the leader expanding his / her rational thinking in the organization. This activity would let to form the perception of employees. The employees would be encouraged to take the responsibility.
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Santrauka

Organizacijoje būtina didinti darbuotojų įsipareigojimą ir pasitenkinimą darbu. Tokiu būdu
lyderio pagrindinė veikla organizacijoje yra susijusi su galios ir atsakomybių paskirstymu tarp
darbuotojų. Dėl šios priežasties lyderis turi įvertinti bent kelis elgsenos variantus (scenarijus). Šio
straipsnio tikslas – pasiūlyti lyderio veiklas, kurios paskatintų darbuotojus prisiimti atsakomybes,
susijusias su jų darbu, valdant ir vystant organizacijas. Atlikus kiekybinį tyrimą su Lietuvos verslo
organizacijų aukščiausiojo lygmens vadovais, nustatyta, kad pasirinkdami elgsenos variantą, Lietu-
vos vadovai naudoja tokius minties veiklos elementus: intuicija, refleksija, suvokimas ir įsitikinim-
nimas. Nustatyta, kad darbuotojų įsipareigojimo vystymas organizacijoje yra susijęs su lyderio ra-
cionalaus mąstymo panaudojimu: kuo labiau vystomas lyderio racionalus mąstymas, tuo labiau ska-
tinamas darbuotojų įsipareigojimas.

Raktiniai žodžiai: darbuotojų atsakomybė, minties veikla, organizacijos vystymas, scenari-
vimas, žmogiškieji ištekliai.
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