



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY  
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

*A.S. Gogoleva, E.S. Balabanova,  
A.G. Efendiev, V.V. Komarova*

# **EMPLOYEE WORK BEHAVIOR IN RUSSIAN BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS: PRIORITIES, PROFESSIONAL FEATURES AND WORK PRACTICES**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: MANAGEMENT  
WP BRP 56/MAN/2017

*A.S. Gogoleva<sup>1</sup>, E.S. Balabanova<sup>2</sup>,  
A.G. Efendiev<sup>3</sup>, V.V. Komarova<sup>4</sup>*

## **EMPLOYEE WORK BEHAVIOR IN RUSSIAN BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS: PRIORITIES, PROFESSIONAL FEATURES AND WORK PRACTICES<sup>56</sup>**

The paper investigates the questions about social organization of work behavior in the Russian companies. Focus in research was made on desirable and obligatory behavior, work standards and determinants of different types of organizational behavior. Survey of 1423 employees presents all key industries of the Russian business, performing within the main federal districts. The results show that the domination of the mercantile and consumer attitude to work as means of achievement of material welfare is not the socio-cultural phenomenon only, but also the result of social and economic conditions in the work sphere. The examined distinction of interests, demands and standards of behavior for representatives of various professions represents one of the deepest contradictions of the development processes of working sphere in Russian society. The research found out deep deformations in the sphere of working activity of employees in the Russian companies.

JEL Classification: M12; O18; O32

Keywords: work behavior, extra-role behavior, EVLN, organizational citizenship behavior, role behavior.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia), Center for Study of Social Organization of Business, e-mail: agogoleva@hse.ru

<sup>2</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia), Center for Study of Social Organization of Business, e-mail: balabanova@hse.ru

<sup>3</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia), Center for Study of Social Organization of Business, e-mail: efendiev@hse.ru

<sup>4</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia), Master's program 'Human Resource Management', e-mail: nika.nika2605@yandex.ru

<sup>5</sup> This Working Paper is an output of a research project implemented within NRU HSE's Annual Thematic Plan for Basic and Applied Research. Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

<sup>6</sup> This article is an output of a research project implemented as part of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE).

## Introduction

In this paper we aim to examine work activity of employees in Russian business organizations: to reveal employee priorities in work sphere, to identify employees' preferences and expectations considering professional and industry peculiarities, to describe employee work practices and to create a social portrait of employees of mass professions. As the result we evaluate how the patterns of organizational behavior correspond to aims of innovative economic development.

There are some contradictory tendencies related to work in modern society. The increase of intellectual intensity in work combined with essential growth of employee's qualification leads to changes in the system of employment relations: relations become more democratic and individualized and the content of intellectual jobs provokes the development of need in job as a sphere of personal self-actualization. But the most demanded jobs in present Russian society are rather simple in content and reproduce the employment relationships in which employees are first of all the labor force. This comparative aspect of professions is usually out of examination in empirical studies and there is no well-developed framework to consider various job demands and related organizational environment across industries. This paper is an attempt to overcome this gap and include professional and industry perspectives.

This research was performed basing on institutional methodology where work is considered to be labor activity given within definite economic institutions. Work forms employee's dependence on many other actors and demands following the specific rules of social interaction and compliance with certain role standards. Therefore, the crisis of labor behavior is mostly the crisis and disorganization of role standards, reduction in the level of obligatory behavior and expansion of the area of undesirable but admissible behavior.

The understanding of the nature of employee attitude to work in Russian organizations is a basic issue in this study of social organization of work activity. The question is to what extent the domination of consumer and materialistic orientations to work could be explained by socio-cultural factors (i.e. features of the moral and cultural constitution of Russian society), or by socio-economic determinants (i.e. differentiation in wages across industries). The answer to this question creates a foundation for strategic management of employment relationships development in Russian companies. The social organization of work environment is in the center: the work as a purpose or means of social development of the employee's personality, and profession as a specific social model of a work activity. The crisis of work activity is considered to be both social prerequisite and consequence of continuous economic crisis in Russia.

# **Research methodology**

## **Sample and procedures**

The data was collected through the survey of employees in Russian companies (ordinary workers, professionals and supervisors). The sample represents all key industries of the Russian business, performing within the main federal districts.

The individual structured interview on a workplace was made in September and November 2016. The sample consisted of staff members which had full time contract (at least 30 hours per week) in the private organizations (agricultural industry, education and health care were excluded). Selection criteria for respondents included: age constrains (from 20 to 65 years), permanent residence in the region of work, duration of work to current employer not less than six months, overall work experience not less than 3 years. The mentioned criteria are satisfactory to analyze employee attitudes to work in general and to the job in the concrete organization.

One important characteristic of the sample concerns the professions of the respondents. There was a requirement for respondents to participate in the survey to work on job positions that provide core business activity of the organization. This gives us opportunity to follow the differences in industries as variation of general profession environment and consider macro context of their work activity (social and economic conditions).

The survey covered five large regions: 1) Moscow, 2) Central Federal District and Northwestern Federal District, 3) Southern Federal District and North Caucasian Federal District, 4) Volga Federal District and Ural Federal District, 5) Siberian Federal District and Far Eastern Federal District. The number of respondents to survey was calculated taking into account indicators of working-age population in specific industry in definite region.

Besides, seven industry clusters were identified on the basis of average wage and general characteristics of work: finance and insurance; service industry and personal services; information technologies and telecom (IT); retail, public catering, hospitality industry; food and light industries; mechanical engineering and chemical industry; transport, energy, real estate trade. It was supposed that the field of employee work activity has significant effect on the institutional and practical working environment. The number of respondents in each of these seven industry groups has been calculated proceeding from the number of persons employed in the industries. Thus, the sample is representative both in regional and industry dimensions and contains 1423 respondents across Russia.

## Measures

Work behavior determinants were divided into two groups. First group is the assessment of individual and personal determinants of work behavior: a set of attitudes which are formed, presumably, before coming on board, and define the relation to work and profession, individual resources of the employee and career expectations. Second one is the group of organizational environment as a place where an employee performs the work activity. The attention was paid to macro factors, related to specialization and duties on the job, overall wellbeing, employability etc. as well as to micro level factors that refer to working conditions, employment practices, human resource management etc.

The work behavior is closely connected to the employee reaction on everyday facts of organizational life. One of the most famous approaches to the employees' reaction to negative or problematic events is the "*Exit – Voice – Loyalty – Neglect – EVLN* " model. Hirschman's concept of "voice" and "exit" [Hirschman, 1970] was used as a theoretical framework, and then has been transformed to the EVLN scheme [Rusbult et al., 1982; Farrell, 1983; Rusbult et al., 1988; Gibney et al., 2009]. In addition to the EVLN model, psychological reactions of employees were also measured: emotional and cognitive (involvement, emotional exhaustion).

Some "traditional" variables, widely used in the academic literature, were taken as control variables. These are: gender, age, years of service, category of a job position (the head of division or the non-managerial position), number of working hours per week, number of subordinates [Millward, Hopkins 1998, Bellou 2009, Conway et al. 2002].

The developed questionnaire allows to show real conditions of employment relationships in the modern Russian organizations. Furthermore, the survey reveals values and cultural component of the attitude to a profession and to a work activity, and also institutional and practical aspects of individual activities.

## Life priorities of the Russian employees

The bench mark of our analysis is the examination of the general structure of needs and personal interests of Russian employees, identification of the significance of work in the system of personal needs. It is important to reveal whether the work is a purpose which marks the development of the personality or it is an inescapable payment for aspiration to well-being and prosperity. So, the research question to answer is: whether respondents treat work as activity in which a person is forced to be engaged in, or as occupation which the person considers as the main mission and the main sense of the existence.

To give an answer to the question presented above main types of the personal needs and vital interests were studied (Table 1): material needs, social development, moral and cultural self-development, and professional and labor development. The main issue is to reveal the competition between the interests of material development and the professional and work interests. At the same time the central research interest consists of the analysis of determinants and conditions that form the hierarchy of personal needs and interests.

To build the hierarchy the ranking method was used in the set of items. This method of filling and consequent analysis of data significantly differs from all other possible options (assessment of each element on 5-7-level Likert scale, the multiple-choice form, the choice of the most significant ones, the choice of one). There are different versions of the analysis in different columns of Table 1.

**Table 1 – The most significant aspects in life (%)**

№	"What is the most important for you in your life?" The respondent was asked to range all possible items according to his/her preferences (from 1 to 9, where 1 – the most important for him/her)	I place	II place	III place	The sum of 1-3 places (I+II+III)	Index of the core preferences $\Sigma(I*3 + II*2 + III*1)$
	<b>Material needs</b>					
2	Family, wellbeing of relatives and children	49,4	20,2	8,4	78 (I)	197 (I)
3	Material abundance	26,4	35,9	13,4	75,7 (II)	164,4 (II)
	<b>Social development</b>					
4	Occupation of a higher job position	2,7	4,5	7,6	14,8	24,7
7	Respect from colleagues and friends	2,2	4,2	11,2	17,6	26,2
5	Inner peace and absence of worries, stress and troubles	4,4	9,7	14,6	28,7 (IV)	34 (IV)
	<b>Moral and cultural self-development</b>					
6	Erudition, learning and broad culture	1,3	2,3	5,1	8,7	13,6
8	Moral perfection; honesty, kindness, living on the conscience	2,5	4,5	7,8	14,8	24,3
	<b>Professional and labor development</b>					
1	Interesting work	8	14	21,4	43,4 (III)	73,4 (III)
9	Feeling professional confidence, real expertise	3,2	4,6	10,4	18,2 (V)	29,2 (V)

The first three columns present the proportions of those who placed the items on the first, second or third place respectively. The fourth column gives an indicator of the sum of high ranks (the I-III ranks). The fifth column is the Index of the core preferences. This index was calculated to consider the

relevant significance of each item of choice: the first place has the weight 3, the second place – 2, and the third – 1, so the sum gives the comparable importance of each item. This variety of calculations provides a versatility of the analysis of the received results.

For the majority of respondents "*Wellbeing of a family*" and "*Material abundance*" are absolute life priorities. "*Interesting work*" gains the lead only among the interests which took the III place by all types of calculation. It is necessary to pay attention to the fact that "*Inner peace*" takes the IV place, while "*Professional confidence*" could be found only at V place.

Basing on the data analysis, we can draw the following conclusions. First, an unconditional priority of a family and its wellbeing is obvious. Material wealth is necessary as a condition of development of a family and not by itself; this fact smoothes especially mercantile and consumer relation to life.

Second, the main drama in the choice of life priorities for the majority of respondents is a rivalry between family and material needs and professional and work development. It is necessary to pay attention to the fact that moral enhancement and cultural development are actually excluded from this competition and left far beyond the scope of life priorities.

The priority of materialistic needs in the system of vital needs and interests gained the recognition in academic and political life of our society somewhere obviously and somewhere implicitly. At the same time there is a question: whether it is socio-cultural feature and specifics of moral life of Russians or it is a consequence of certain social and economic conditions, level of economic maturity, industry structure of economy and others socio-economic (but not socio-cultural) determinants. If it is the latter, due to the sufficient secure of welfare level, the tension of problems of material prosperity is not perceived as sharp, while the interest in professional and work aspects of self-development increases dramatically. And correspondingly the lack of social and professional guarantees becomes the reason of priorities shift, when survival needs and interests play the crucial role.

To answer this question the respondents who put "*Interesting work*" or "*Feeling professional confidence, real expertise*" (Group 1) on the first place were specially examined and compared with those who have chosen "*Material wealth*" (Group 2) or "*Family well-being*" (Group 3). The role of professional and industry factors, educational and other socio-economic factors are analyzed to reveal how this employee recognition of work content as the leading life priority is related to environment (the analysis presented below is based on differences that are significant at least on 0.05 level).

#### *a) Industry*

8% respondents put "*Interesting work*" on the first place and this rate is higher in "*finance and insurance*" and *IT* – 13% and in "*service industry and personal services*" – 11%. In other industries the portion of this category of employees on the contrary is lower: "*light and food industry*" – 5%,

"mechanical engineering and chemical industry" – 7%, "transport, energy, real estate trade" – 7%. This difference points out the significance of professional and industry factor. An item "*Feeling of the professional confidence*" neutrally reacts to industry shift and reflects mostly personal relation to the definite work.

#### *b) Education*

6% of respondents with secondary education have noted that the leading value for them is played by "*Interesting work*", while among those who have higher education it is 10%, and among master and MBA graduates – 13%.

#### *c) Professional security*

Significance of professional security for all the groups was also revealed. Respondents from Group 1 gave the positive answer ("*slightly agree*" and "*strongly agree*") on item "*Work loss doesn't threaten me*" in 48% of cases while for the Group 2 the rate is much lower – 37%. At the same time the respondents from Group 1 are "*sure*" or "*rather sure*" that they would manage to find a job in 57% of cases while from the Group 2 only 44% showed this certainty.

The reasons of getting current job also give significant differences. Half of the respondents from the Group 1 admitted that they changed job because "*More interesting work was offered*" (51%) while employees from Group 2 have only 40% positive answers. Moreover, positive answers on item about "*In the last 12 months interesting offers on employment in other companies occurred*" also have differences: Group 1 agreed in 34% of cases, Group 2 has 17% and Group 3 answered positively in 21% of cases. Besides, there are differences in perception of employee role in the company: 15% from Group 1 consider themselves at work as "unique employee", but for "family oriented" and "materialists" the percentages are 7% and 5% respectively.

The provided data demonstrate that the striking trait of Group 1 is rather high level of professional security and independence, as the demand in the labor market generates confidence in a security of rather high level of material remuneration.

#### *d) Level of well-being*

The priority of job content arises on the certain material foundation which is formed due to professional, social and legal security, industry features and prestige, employability opportunities of a profession in the labor market. The necessity of the material base to form an attitude to work as an area of professional self-realization was confirmed by this research. 38% of Group 1 estimated standard of living as "*We are well-to-do, we can afford almost everything*" while for Group 2 and Group 3 the rates are 26% and 28% respectively.



The carried-out analysis allows us to suggest the high important role of socio-economic determinants of the system of life preferences. The professional and industrial structure, its maturity level, insufficient development of high-technological industries, level of professional development, professional, social and legal security of the employee, level of its material security and confidence in the future have significant effect on forming of the consumer and mercantile attitude to work as to means of satisfaction of material requests.

## **Work as a profession**

The analysis of central problem of this paper (the place of work in the system of vital needs) highlighted the issue of professional and industry differentiation of work activity as one of the main and significant. Here we give the primary analysis of professional and industry structure of Russian employees taken in consideration the social functions and content of mass professions.

The first step of the analysis is the determination of possible models of professional activity. The following groups of variables are the cornerstone of each model (data are provided in Table 2).

Almost for all the functions two industries are the leaders: finance and IT technologies. So, the basic positive model of a successful profession is a leadership in all decisive groups of functions – material, social, professional and creative, and also *"It is widely demanded in the labor market"*. These are the signs of the modern professions of high-technological industries that are IT and finance in our sample.

The basic negative model of a "backward" profession with low means (below the average for the sample) consists of the following characteristics: they are neither financially nor professionally attractive, and in our sample, it is mostly about retail and household services. At the same time these professions can be highly demanded in the market (for example, retail). It is possible to see the reason of "great demand" for this profession among employees: *"Its nature allows to achieve work-life balance"*.

There is a conditionally intermediate model between these two extreme models mentioned above. It lags behind the positive model, but advances negative model in some extent about all basic functions, yet it can't show higher degree of demand in the labor market comparing with retail and comfort of work-life balance comparing with household services. The intermediate model includes the light and food industry, mechanical engineering and the chemical industry, and also transport, energy, real estate. The data demonstrates that this model is much closer to the negative model than to the basic positive one.

It is also important to pay attention to the impact of strong work orientations (*"interesting work"* or *"professionalism"* as the first choice of the most important things in life of) on work satisfaction and

other aspects of labor life. Employees, who consider interesting work content and desire to be a professional as the main orientations in life, have the characteristics that distinguish them from the rest part of respondents.

**Table 2 – Respondents’ opinion about social functions of profession according to the industry in which they work (means)**

"What do you think about your profession?" (5-point scale)	Finance and insurance	IT and telecom	Service industry and personal services	Retail, public catering, hospitality industry	Light and food industries	Mechanical engineering and chemical industry	Transport, energy, real estate	Mean for sample
Materialistic functions								
1. It is well paid	3,8	3,9	3,2	3,3	3,5	3,4	3,5	3,5
9. The salary of employees of this profession is higher, than the salary of other workers	3,6	3,6	2,6	2,7	2,9	2,8	3,0	2,9
Function of self-actualization								
2. It constantly develops and requires an increase in professional knowledge	4,0	4,2	3,3	3,2	3,4	3,5	3,3	3,4
6. It allows to work creatively, to show initiative	3,4	3,7	3,4	3,2	3,0	3,2	3,0	3,2
Function of social service and prestige								
4. It is prestigious to be engaged in this type of profession	3,7	3,7	3,0	2,9	3,1	3,2	3,1	3,2
8. The employees who are engaged in this professional activity are in respect	3,7	3,7	3,2	2,9	3,0	3,2	3,2	3,2
Demand of a profession in the labor market								
5. It is widely demanded in the labor market	4,0	3,9	3,6	3,9	3,6	3,5	3,7	3,7
Work-life balance and comfort								
7. It is possible to work remotely, doing part of job at home	2,8	3,0	2,4	2,0	1,8	1,8	2,0	2,1
3. Its nature allows to achieve work-life balance	3,5	3,2	3,6	3,2	3,2	3,0	3,2	3,2
Auxiliary characteristics								
10. Employees of this profession can be promoted fast and hold key posts	3,4	3,0	2,4	2,5	2,5	2,6	2,5	2,6
11. It allows to choose an optimal work-rest regime	3,0	3,5	3,3	3,0	2,4	2,3	2,8	2,9
12. It doesn't require great physical efforts	3,6	3,4	3,4	3,3	3,0	3,0	3,0	3,2
13. It allows working in comfortable conditions	4,0	4,0	3,6	3,5	3,3	3,0	2,9	3,2

According to our results, they more often demonstrate extra-role behavior, show more efforts and work extra hours, suggest initiatives and innovative behavior, actively participate in discussions and solving working questions, have aspiration to self-development, work engagement and general positive attitude to work, orientations to career development. The content of work itself brings to them joy and pleasure; such employees feel that they are valuable for the company and take a pro-active position. Thus, this group of employees not only have different attitude to work in comparison with other groups, but also work differently, have broader range of work practices. The active and pro-active labor behavior causes the relevant social and economic consequences which are reflected in higher compensation, rich work content, and respect from collective. What is more, other patterns of work life are developed, having substantial positive effects for both an employee and an organization.

### **Work practices, in-role and extra-role behavior**

The deep system crisis that takes place in current Russian economy was caused by external, and, mainly, by internal factors. And one of the main questions of this research is to find out whether system crisis of economic life in Russian society appears somehow in crisis of work activity: work content and structure, employee motivation etc.

For the empirical analysis of the defined issues we concentrated our attention on work practices that reflect real behavior. This approach unlike evaluation of self-perceptions provides higher reliability and stronger arguments as they integrate, on the one hand, personal motives of employees that had really taken place (including the conflict of motives) and, on the other hand, standards of behavior and real institutional environment. As a result, typical and patterned behavioral actions, employee work behavior are measured.

To increase confidence value not only personal work practices were studied (it is about “what did you do”), but also work behavior of other employees (“what did the others do”). This adjustment increases reliability of the results since it increases the sincerity of the respondent and significantly reduces probability to receive socially desirable answer. The work fields under consideration were the following: 1) role behavior and working extra hours; 2) improvement of qualification level; 3) interactions with colleagues; 4) interactions with immediate supervisor.

We differentiated theoretically and empirically *working activity* and *job* as the institutionalized activity on a specific job place in a particular organization. The work activity within established working process is performed in sustainable collective forms; as many other employees are involved in processes and interactions it is performed in accordance with binding rules of the game where their non-compliance or accomplishment is supplemented with negative or positive sanctions. The rules of the game due to control and sanctions have an obligatory force for the employee. The sustainability of

working process is provided by following the common rules by every participant and meeting the role standards because employees' professional, moral and labor qualities shall meet certain expectations associated with their job positions. All the fields of employee work behavior are regulated by role expectations and role standards as they are significant for other participants. Eventually, the real work activity of the employee within the organization is determined by his/her understanding of what he/she will be punished for, of what he/she will be supported and respected for. The model for employee behavior is given in Table 3.

**Table 3 – Scheme of role and non-role components of work behavior**

<b>Type of behavior</b>	<b>Misbehavior</b>		<b>Role and extra-role</b>	
	<b>Undesirable behavior</b>		<b>Desirable behavior</b>	
<b>Evaluation</b>	inadmissible	admissible	duty	optional
<b>Subtype of behavior</b>	Consistently (in principal; fundamentally) anti-role behavior	Weak anti-role work behavior	Role work behavior	Extra-role work behavior
<b>Sanctions</b>	Strong negative	Weak negative	Weak positive	Strong positive

Extra-role behavior is highly desirable, but not obligatory for role-holders, so it is supported by strong and very strong positive sanctions to encourage employees to perform this type of activity. Role behavior is the standard and expected form of work activity, it is embedded in the wide range of working and interaction processes within organizational environment so weak sanctions are enough to enforce role-holders to follow the norms and prescribed duties. In turn, the undesirable, i.e. anti-role behavior can be divided on highly undesirable type that could not be admissible in any circumstances and undesirable, but admissible. So, for the first group the sanctions are expected to be very strong to eliminate this misbehavior on the job place while for the second group weak negative sanctions are enough to notify employees that this sort of behavior is not recognized.

The main hypothesis is that the crisis of institutional and role foundations of participation of the employee in working process takes place in current work life in Russian organizations. This crisis is captured in a shift of a scale of evaluation towards undesirable behavior. The misbehavior which is weakly undesirable (i.e. undesirable, but admissible) can acquire the status of the role standard or norm while the behavior which is considered to be a duty acquires the status of extra-role activities which are not obligatory.

Work behavior was investigated within several dimensions. The first dimension was about respondent attitude to various kinds of work practices: *"How do you personally estimate the following behavior of your co-workers and events in your working group"*(Please, estimate according to the scale from 1 to

5, where: 1 – "It is absolutely inadmissible", 2 – "It is undesirable, but it is possible to condone", 3 – "I consider it as normal, all the people should act this way", 4 – "Good thing, it deserves encouragement", 5 – "It is to be admired, well done!"). The working practices that were examined we divided in tentatively positive, tentatively negative and tentatively ambivalent groups. The data provided in Table 4 contains evaluations of desirable working practices.

**Table 4 – Evaluations of behavior of colleagues and events in working group made by non-management employees** (%; answers "It is absolutely inadmissible" and "It is undesirable, but it is possible to condone" are not presented)

<b>1<sup>st</sup> group of actions, events (tentatively positive)</b>	<b>"I consider it as normal..."</b>	<b>"Good thing, it deserves encouragement"</b>	<b>"It is to be admired..."</b>
1. An employee made an improvement suggestion which significantly increased the efficiency of his/her work, work of the organization	23,5	31,2	32,1
2. An employee has helped the fellow worker, who didn't cope with a task in time, and has done a part of work for him/her	30,5	34	20,7
3. An employee works with total dedication, without considering working hours or payment. The high-quality performance of job is the main thing for him/her	26,1	37,8	21,9
4. If someone tries to do the work poorly, an employee will make him/her a critical remark and point out this shortcoming	38,7	28,3	11,7
5. If it is necessary an employee can criticize the supervisor or state the disagreement to him/her	36,4	30,9	11,4
6. An employee doesn't cave in to the supervisor, but also doesn't conflict with him/her; he/she builds the mutually respectful relations	35,8	36,4	17,7
7. An employee usually participates in all trainings and other forms of qualification enhancement within the organization	35,2	28,7	13,1
8. An employee is engaged in self-learning, improves skills, periodically reads specialized literature, the corresponding websites, seeks to be aware of the newest ideas, developments, trends	30,5	29,6	21
9. An employee is interested in general business of the organization and its market position; he attends the relevant meetings, reads newspapers, the websites, has discussions with colleagues	31,5	34,4	17
10. If it is necessary an employee is voluntarily working late	31,2	31,4	13

Consistently with our propositions most of the interviewed employees consider the listed working practices as extra-role behavior (columns 2 and 3). Depending on the level of "glorification" of a definite working practice the evaluations given by respondent show the relevant support for item "it is desirable, but optional". There are undisputed leaders are: *"An employee made an improvement suggestion"* and *"An employee has helped the fellow worker ... and has done a part of work for him"*.

At the same time the number of practices that are far away from extra-role behavior turned out to be perceived as not so obligatory by the respondents: *"An employee works with total dedication"*, *"An employee is engaged in self-learning, improves skills"*, and *"An employee is interested in general business of the organization"* and *"An employee doesn't cave in to the supervisor, but he/she also doesn't militate with him/her"*.

The key working practice *"An employee works with total dedication"* is about conscientiousness at work and essential part of duty of any employee. So, the fact that more than two thirds of respondents consider it as optional and not obligatory is the evidence of the shift in institutional and role system of current employment relationships towards minimization of obligation, washing out the borders between desirable and undesirable, but admissible. The data on professional development (No. 8), relations with the supervisor (No. 6), and to some extent readiness to complete the job beyond the working hours (No. 10) reflects the similar shift.

The analysis of data about the negative practices presented in Table 5 confirms the tendencies which have been outlined above. Employees have defined the following working practices as undesirable: promotions of those who have good personal contacts with supervisors, spending the minimum effort while demanding the maximum remuneration, working insufficiently, with spoilage, breaking deadlines, leaving the workplace for personal business, denunciations of the colleagues.

The item about *"An employee does only what he/she won't be punished for"* is considered as normal by 40% of employees, and 29% of them recognize such behavior as extra-role. At the same time 45% consider the situation when *"An employee seeks to avoid working overtime"* to be normal, and 18% define such behavior as extra-role. Besides, *"An employee treats the supervisor with a remarkable deference ..."* is defined as normal by 37%, and 26% of respondents recognize such behavior as extra-role. The latter examples confirm the shift mentioned above: employees give status of obligatory and normal to undesirable, but admissible working behavior.

The data in Table 6 also highlights the tendencies revealed above. It is important to pay attention that the employee obedience is considered to be a norm in 42% of cases. It is worth looking also at item about working overtime: if an employee is paid for overtime, then working extra hours more likely is seen as desirable behavior, including desirable, but not obligatory – 82%.

**Table 5 – Evaluations of behavior of colleagues and events in working group made by non-management employees (%)**

<b>2<sup>nd</sup> group of actions, events (tentatively negative)</b>	<b>"It is absolutely inadmissible"</b>	<b>"It is undesirable, but it is possible to condone"</b>	<b>"I consider it as normal ..."</b>	<b>"Good thing..." + "It is to be admired ..."</b>
1. An employee does only what he/she won't be punished for	9,6	22,01	39,7	28,7
2. There are rush job at the end of the month or year and tasks often performed at the expense of employees' overstrain	22	23,8	29	25,3
3. Managers reward first of all employees who are loyal and obedient with them	21,8	23,6	25,6	29,1
4. Employees who have good personal contacts with supervisors or any relatives among managers often have preferences in promotion comparing with those who are more qualified and devoted to the work	35,8	26,4	21,2	16
5. An employee spends the minimum effort while he/she demands the maximum remuneration	33,7	26,7	24,5	15,1
6. An employee works insufficiently; there are spoilage, breaking deadlines, but he/she still is paid like the others	35,3	31,9	20,6	12,1
7. An employee gets distracted during working hours: uses social networks, does online shopping, can leave a workplace and attend a shop, clinic etc.	32	27,3	25,5	15,2
8. An employee treats the supervisor with a remarkable deference, considers that boss is always right, and his/her decisions are fair	9,5	27,4	37,3	25,8
9. An employee reported to the supervisor about the facts of criticism from colleagues concerning supervisor's activities or activities of a higher management	30,5	27,7	25,1	16,7
10. An employee seeks to avoid working overtime, stays late very rare and after long negotiations	13,8	23,5	44,8	17,9

The consequent item is also about overtime: *"An employee always stays for overtime work on demand of administration, regardless the size of payment"*: 33% of employees consider this practice to be undesirable while 34% state that it is as a norm and 33% perceive it as extra-role behavior. In other words, we don't have more or less concrete evaluation of this work practice.

**Table 6 – Evaluations of behavior of colleagues and events in working group made by non-management employees (%)**

<b>3<sup>rd</sup> group of actions, events (tentatively ambivalent)</b>	"It is absolutely inadmissible"	"It is undesirable, but it is possible to condone"	"I consider it as normal..."	"Good thing ..."	"It is to be admired ..."
1. An employee behaves obediently in relation with supervisor even when he/she doesn't agree with decision	4,7	20,6	41,9	25,8	7
2. An employee has reported the misconduct facts and spoilage in the working activity of colleagues to the administration	17,7	27,1	31,5	18,5	5,3
3. An employee doesn't refuse overtime working if he/she is paid properly for that	2,6	6,8	23,6	35,9	32,1
4. An employee always stays for overtime work on demand of administration, regardless the size of payment	12,8	20,4	33,6	23,1	10

To summarize we note the following conclusions. There can be an impression of a certain overestimation of requirements for role standards. In attempt to answer this question we shall proceed mostly from requirements of development of our economy and our society. The fact that the work "with total dedication" is perceived as heroic indicates that the system of institution and roles in organizations doesn't stimulate economic development or even blocks it. Also "glorification" of employees who "systematically improve skills" and build the respectful relations with supervisor also support our assumption.

As a result, now we have the standards of work behavior that imply doing only what won't be punished for, participation only in those training which are organized inside the company, obedience in relations with the supervisor. The role regulation gives orientations to employees for a certain behavior aimed at minimization of the labor interests and functions.

In other words, it is possible to assume that in our society the institutional and role system of a working activity is one of the depression factors of the national economy. And consequently, the way out of this depression requires complex measures including deep transformations of institutional and role system of a work activity.

The extra-role behavior is defined as activity that is not prescribed by an official job status, but is favorable for the organization in general, and is carried out voluntarily by an employee. The measures



we use are widely known scales which were verified both in the western researches and on domestic samples: innovative behavior, support to colleagues, favorable attitudes and so forth.

The extra-role behavior in foreign literature is traditionally analyzed through the framework of "organizational citizenship behavior" [Bolino et al. 2013]. Voluntariness, initiative and potential benefit for the organization are the defining characteristics of such behavior. The factor analysis and the reliability analysis of our data have revealed the existence of four types of extra-role behavior: "Passive" pro-social behavior, "Active" pro-social behavior, Work-oriented, Voice-oriented.

The results of the analysis of means indicate that the "pro-social" types (focused on co-workers: to share knowledge, to help colleagues) are relatively more widespread in the sample. The types of extra-role behavior focused on higher workloads and on active position of the employee, his/her orientation on "voice", to change of the existing order of things are less frequent.

The analysis of correlations showed that all four types of extra-role behavior are significantly positively interconnected. The results highlight the contradictory nature of "passive" pro-social behavior: this behavior is more presented either in very good working conditions (satisfaction with the content of work and level of payments, feeling of being a part of working group and the organization) or as a reaction to very adverse conditions of work (conflicts, role uncertainty, stresses and time deficit). Unlike the "passive" pro-social behavior, the "active" one is positively connected only with "positive" attitudes and perceptions concerning the work (involvement, commitment to the working group and organization, intention to continue working within the organization), in other words the "active" pro-social behavior has no "compensatory" character.

The "compensatory" nature of extra-role behavior, which was found in relation to "passive" pro-social behavior, is also found in extra-role behavior aimed at higher workloads. The strongest pair correlation of this variable is observed with the high level of stress, higher working requirements, workplace conflicts and role uncertainty. Discrepancy of this phenomenon is reflected in its positive correlations with satisfaction with the work content and level of payments and availability of a social capital in case of employment.

Engagement, satisfaction with the work content and salary, feeling of coworker support in working group and affective commitment are closely connected with the extra-role behavior, oriented on voice. However, the strong positive relations with the fact of promotion, professional capital as the reason of employment and availability of alternative job offers within the last year show that this behavior model is typical for demanded employees with higher status within the organization and managers.

Satisfaction with content of work and salary is one that has strong significant connections with all four types of extra-role behavior. At the same time measures of satisfaction with comfort working

conditions either didn't show any significant correlations with extra-role behavior or this correlation was very weak. This fact partially sheds light on an old discussion about whether the "happy" employee is the "effective" one. We can assume that the "happiness" caused by substantial aspects of work connected with higher-order needs satisfaction pushes an employee to more active position on a workplace; but neither satisfaction with "convenience" of work nor the low level of working requirements can lead to the mentioned "happiness".

The data given in Table 7 represent the main range of motives of extra-role behavior. In general, the main intrinsic motives of extra-role behavior are personal psychological comfort, interest in the work, sympathies for colleagues and the supervisor and altruistic aspiration to make the contribution to the organization.

**Table 7 – Percentage of respondents who mentioned the causes of their extra-role behavior (N=1304)**

<b>"... Please, specify the main reasons why you did it?"</b> <b>It was possible to choose no more than 3 answers (the question was only for those who have stated the experience of extra-role behavior)</b>	<b>%</b>
It is much more comfortable to work when there is friendly atmosphere in working group	40
I am interested in my work	38
I find my colleagues (my supervisor) to be nice people	35
I wanted to help the organization / department	32
It helps me to cope with my work better	24
It helps me to strengthen my position in the organization	19
It can be useful for my career	12
Such behavior is encouraged in the organization	8
I am expected to do this though I am not formally obliged	7

What is an internal structure of motives of extra-role behavior? To answer this question the factor analysis has been carried out, the quantity of factors was defined basing on eigen value more than 1. As a result, four factors explaining 53% of dispersion (Table 8) have been received.

Table 9 with correlation analysis gives an idea about what employees' motives caused the realization of each type of extra-role behavior.

In general, the motive of "organizational citizenship" and enthusiasm for work dominates for all four types of extra-role behavior. Besides this, the "passive" pro-social behavior is more often based on aspiration to strengthen the position in the organization. Higher workloads are significantly connected with expectation of obtaining benefits from such behavior. The "active" pro-social behavior is connected also with the motive of strengthening the position and gaining of the authority within the

organization. The extra-role behavior focused on changes and "voice" expression is significantly connected with all four motives – "citizenship", "orientation to a task", expectation of benefits and strengthening the position.

**Table 8 – Factor analysis of motives of extra-role behavior, factor loadings of the initial variables**

<b>"... Please, specify the main reasons why you did it?"</b> <b>It was possible to choose no more than 3 answers (the question was only for those who have stated the experience of extra-role behavior)</b>	<b>Components</b>			
	1. «Organizational citizenship» and enthusiasm for work (+) vs. psychological comfort (-)	2. Utilitarian motivation	3. Orientation on task (+) vs. orientation on relations (-)	4. Strengthening the position (+) informal role behavior (-)
I wanted to help the organization / department	,680			
It is much more comfortable to work when there is friendly atmosphere in working group	-,640			
I am interested in my work	,597			
Such behavior is encouraged in the organization		,709		
It can be useful for my career		,648		
I find my colleagues (my supervisor) to be nice people			-,695	
It helps me to cope with my work better			,613	
It helps me to strengthen my position in the organization				,822
I am expected to do this though it is not formally prescribed				-,602

**Table 9 – Correlation coefficients of the types and motives of extra-role behavior**

<b>Motives of extra-role behavior</b>	Passive pro-social behavior	Extra-role behavior oriented on higher workloads	Active pro-social behavior	Extra-role voice-oriented behavior
«Organizational citizenship» and enthusiasm for work (+) vs. psychological comfort (-)	,078**	,131**	,103**	,304**
Utilitarian motivation	-,050	,106**	-,044	,088**
Orientation on task (+) vs. orientation on relations (-)	-,040	,058*	,004	,100**
Strengthening the position (+) informal role behavior (-)	,075**	,034	,062*	,055*

The motive of "citizenship" is more often inherent to respondents from southern regions, men, employees from IT and finance spheres and from small organizations, for supervisors, owners of business social capital. This motive is significantly related to positive attitudes and perceptions (engagement, commitment, satisfaction with intrinsic rewards, an intention to continue working in the specific organization, perception of payment level as comparatively high, feeling of being a team member).

The psychological comfort as a core motive of extra-role behavior is more often noted by non-management employees, women, and employees from retail industry. The "utilitarian" motivation is stronger for young employees, employees from Moscow organizations, financial industry, of large companies and those who got a promotion recently or moved to the better workplace.

The motive *"I find my colleagues (my supervisor) to be nice people"* is a trait of ordinary employees and those who are satisfied with the "external" remunerations connected with work. "Strengthening the position" as a motive of extra-role behavior is more characteristic of Moscow residents, employees with small experience in the organization, and those, who moved to the better workplace. This motive is positively connected with commitment and engagement. The reason *"I am expected to do this though it is not formally prescribed"* is more often given by IT employees, experienced ones and also working in the conditions of unclear role requirements.

## **Current working conditions of the Russian employees**

Within our theoretical framework it is necessary to examine external conditions of employment relationships, especially negative situations that employees encounter at the workplace (Table 10). Such events as staff reduction, a wage cuts, threats of dismissal determine the general background of the relation of the employee and employer.

Table 10 presents the data about how often respondents have faced the negative situations, the most frequent of them is the revision of wages: decrease of amount of total remuneration or notable increase of workload without the corresponding increase of remuneration. The analyses of industries revealed that the decrease in remuneration is more often in retail (23%) and transport (22%), and is almost absent in IT (6%). Increase in workloads without the corresponding increase in remunerations also presented in retail (21%) and household services (20%). Although no significant differences were found, to address our previous conclusions, it becomes clear that unambiguously favorable industry is IT which provides rather stable and favorable conditions.

The analyzed negative situations have serious impact on the level of material well-being of the respondents. The data provided in the Table 11 allows to range the indicators basing on the scale of

negative influence that they have. Within this analysis it was found that respondent's life standard depends also on the industry.

**Table 10 – Percentage of respondents who came up against negative situations**

<b>"Have you come up during the last year against any situations from the list given below?"</b>	<b>%% for «Yes»</b>
Wage cut, decrease of amount of total remuneration	18,6
Lack of indexation of wages	31,5
Shortage of working week on the initiative of employer	8,6
Notable increase of workload without the corresponding increase of remuneration	23,0
Unpaid overtime working, increase in the general workload	15,7
Dismissals because of staff reduction for the last 12 months	27,2
Delays of payments (for 1 month and more)	10,3
Wage cut, penalties, wage deductions	16,4
Unpaid administrative leaves on the initiative of the employer (for 1 month and more)	5,2
Obstacles to your career development from the supervisor	4,4
Violation of verbal agreements by the employer	12,6
Discrepancy of the work-rest regime, working conditions and safety to accepted standards	10,0
Refusal in providing paid leave	4,6
Refusal in providing a sick-leave	3,7
Threats to dismiss or transfer to lower-level position because of an attempt to assert the rights or state criticism to the supervisor	4,1

Employees from service sector, retail, public catering and hospitality estimated the amount of current incomes significantly lower than the respondents from other industries. The fifth part of employees of the listed industries noted that they suffer from lack of finance for the most necessary things, that is on average twice higher than similar indicators for finance and insurance, IT and telecom, light and food industry. IT and telecom and also finance are the most prosperous ones.

Significant differences in the live standard were found in the following: for those who noted that they had faced delays in payments the standard of living was estimated as low by 25% of respondents, among those, who met wage cut – 30%, among those, who met unpaid administrative leaves on the initiative of the employer – 31%.

Thus, industry characteristics (a certain "ceiling" in the salary level) and specific negative events of work life, affecting the level of remuneration, exert an impact on the perceived income level.

One more source of negative situations is violations of promises from the employer. The so-called psychological contract as the set of employer's obligations is created during all interactions with an employee. It represents the employee's expectations about what he/she could receive from the employer.

**Table 11 – Percentages for answers about level of total income across industries (%)**

<b>"How do you estimate the amount of your current incomes (your family incomes)?"</b>	Finance and insurance (N=76)	Service industry and personal services (N=159)	IT and telecom (N=61)	Retail, catering, hospitality (N=239)	Light and food industries (N=95)	Mechanical engineering and chemical industry (N=270)	Transport, energy, building trade (N=523)	Mean of sample (N=1423)
1-2: there are not enough finance for the most necessary things	9,2	20,1	8,2	22,2	11,6	13,7	16,4	16,2
3: we have enough finance for necessary things but not more	55,3	59,7	54,1	51,0	57,9	55,6	55,4	55,3
4-5: we have finance almost for all thing we need and want	35,5	20,1	37,7	26,8	30,5	30,7	28,1	28,5

The Table 12 shows how respondents perceive the fulfillment of these kinds of promises. All evaluations are rather high, but, as expected, promises about promotions and development are falling behind. As it has been outlined earlier, career development belongs to extra-role component of behavior and employers also don't consider themselves strongly obliged to give such opportunities to the employees.

**Table 12 – Employees evaluations of how the promises made by employer are fulfilled**

<b>"The company keeps the promises regarding ..."</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Remuneration	4,1
Amount of work, working conditions	4
Career development	3,7
Training opportunities	3,6
Social package	4,1

The reactions of employees on violations of promises and to negative changes in organizational life were estimated on the Exit-Voice-Loyalty-Neglect (EVLN) Model. The frequency of the revealed reactions is given in Table 13. Basing on respondents' answers the indexes were calculated which reflect each of four possible behavior models.

Exit is the most widely used reaction, it is noted more than in one third of cases, and mean of its index also confirms this assumption. Loyalty as acquiescence with what occurs is the second widespread reaction. This passive and constructive model supports management activities and assumes employee hope that the situation will change for the better without any efforts. Among Voice reactions disputes with the supervisor is the only practice that is used by employees while the indexes of other two behaviors are very low. The neglect is the least used reaction.

Correlation of all four measures has shown that active reactions (Voice and Exit) are positively related to each other, and at the same time are negatively connected with passive ones (Loyalty and Neglect). What is more, negative interconnection of constructive reaction (Loyalty) and non-constructive (Neglect) can be observed.

**Table 13 – Reactions of the respondents to the arising negative events (N=497)**

<b>If you faced at least some problems connected with work how did you usually react to them? (The sum is more than 100%, because a respondent could choose several options)</b>	<b>%%</b>	<b>Mean of type of reaction (from 0 to 3)</b>
I consider possibilities to change the job	37,8	0,73
I looked for job advertisements in newspapers to which I can apply, sent the CV	19,1	
I have recently spent some time looking for another job, addressed relatives, and friends	16,9	
I warned my supervisor about my intention to change the job	9,9	0,44
I was persistent with my supervisor in order to get what I want	24,5	
I asked other managers and/or colleagues for support	9,9	
I did nothing, tried not to pay attention	9,9	0,55
I assumed that in the end everything will work out	17,5	
I did nothing, tried "to understand the position" of other colleagues or management	18,7	
I put less working effort into my assigned job than may be expected from me	8,7	0,18
I reduced the quality of the work	5,4	
I reduced requirements to the work discipline (could be late, leave a bit earlier, take a lot of breaks)	4,4	

## Conclusion

The research of the urgent questions about social organization of work behavior in the current Russian companies brings us to the several conclusions. It was argued that the social organization of work activity in many respects influences the ideas of what place in employee's life is taken by the job. It was empirically proved that domination of the mercantile and consumer attitude to work as to means

of achievement of material welfare is not only the socio-cultural phenomenon, but also the result of social and economic conditions in the work sphere. The mentioned attitude depends on the level of work intellectualization, have remarkable professional and industry specifics, tangible connection with skill level, professional and social security, etc.

Social portraits of various mass professions gave the picture of those connected with post-industrial technologies (first of all, IT and telecom). We stated that the examined string distinction of interests, demands and standards of behavior for representatives of various professions represents one of the deepest contradictions of development processes of the working sphere in Russian society. The research found out deep deformations in the sphere of working activity of employees in the Russian companies.

The signs of institutional crisis in relation of standards of work behavior are also analyzed. This crisis is shown in shift towards undesirable behavior: weakly undesirable behavior (undesirable, but admissible) progressively acquires the status of a role standard. Simultaneously the behavior which is considered as a prescribed norm and an obligation acquires the status of desirable, but not obligatory, and finally it turns into extra-role behavior.

Also, we can draw certain conclusions concerning institutional and practical bases of work activity. There is heterogeneity of a phenomenon of voluntary extra-role behavior. Successful, high-status and highly demanded employees are more involved in "active" pro-social behavior, being informal mentors and experts for the colleagues, and also in the pro-active strategy of "voice", participating in communication with supervisors and getting support of their own initiatives. Two other strategies – "passive" pro-social behavior and higher workloads – are the characteristics of less successful and less demanded employees. These strategies are caused mostly by aspiration to emotional comfort. The last two types of extra-role behavior are more likely to be compensatory, and not bringing employees notable benefits.

## References

- Bellou V. 2009. Profiling the desirable psychological contract for different groups of employees: evidence from Greece. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 20 (4): 810-830.
- Bolino M.C., Klotz A.C., Turnley W.H., Harvey J. Exploring the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior. // *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. May2013, Vol. 34 Issue 4, p542-559.
- Conway N., Briner R.B. 2002. A daily diary study of affective responses to psychological contract breach and exceeded promises. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 23 (3): 287–302.



Farrell D. 1983. Exit, voice, loyalty and neglect as responses to job dissatisfaction: a multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*. 26 (4): 596-607.

Gibney R., Zagenczyk T.J., Masters M.F. 2009. The negative aspects of social exchange: An introduction to perceived organizational obstruction. *Group and Organization Management*. 34 (6): 665-697.

Hirschman A.O. 1970. *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and Strategies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mellahi K., Budwhar P., Li B. 2010. A study of the relationship between exit, voice, loyalty and neglect and commitment in India. *Human Relations*. 63 (3): 349-369.

Millward L.J., Hopkins L.J. 1998. Psychological contracts, organizational and job commitment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 28 (16): 1530–56.

Rusbult C.E., Farrell, D., Rogers G., Mainous A.G. 1988. Impact of exchange variables on exit, voice, loyalty and neglect: an integrative model of responses to declining job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*. 31 (1): 599-627.

Rusbult C.E., Zembrodt I.M., Gunn, L.K. 1982. Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: Responses to dissatisfaction in romantic involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 43 (6): 1230-1242.

Efendiev A.G. National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia). Center for Study of Social Organization of Business. Director; E-mail: efendiev@hse.ru

**Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.**

**© Gogoleva, Balabanova, Efendiev, Komarova, 2017**