

Organizational Culture: Some Comparisons of Research Fields in Argentina and the Russian Federation

Evgeny Melnikov, Galina Menshikova*, Isabel Moraita, Nikolay Pruel

Faculty of Sociology, Saint Petersburg State University, St Petersburg 199034, Russia

**Corresponding author. Email: menshikova.g.a@mail.ru*

ABSTRACT

The article describes the process of institutionalizing the theoretical trend of “organizational behaviour” (OB) in Argentina and the Russian Federation. Using the generally accepted selection of indicators characterizing it, a comparison of the attributes is carried out in relation to the two countries under review against the background of the "western model" (USA and Japan). Estimates are based on expert judgment in relation to Argentina and the Russian Federation, as well as publications (in relation to Western countries). The final part compares the characteristics of management style in these four countries. The final part compares the characteristics of management style in these four countries. General conclusion: the lack of qualitative sociological studies showing the real situation in the enterprises of Argentina and Russia, as well as the extremely low level of organizational culture of enterprises.

Keywords: *organizational behaviour (OB), institutionalizing of organizational behaviour in Argentina and Russian Federation, the comparison of attribute features and managerial styles*

1. INTRODUCTION

Surprisingly, the worse the success in the economy, the less actively its problems are studied by researchers. The same applies to management. It is clear that the situation with it is not simple: too many ingredients got into the boiler, forming the specifics of the Russian entrepreneurial culture and organizational behavior. They are a traditional mix of completely different cultures of Russia, a combination of traditional values with innovations and differences in industrial characteristics that are common to all countries. A similar situation is emerging in Argentina, which actualizes the need to identify and study the characteristics of EP in two countries.

The purpose of this article is to understand the elements that form the structure of the elements that shape organizational behavior, to identify the features of their manifestation in Argentine and Russian enterprises, as well as those parameters that distinguish the national characteristics of our two countries from the Western - let's say directly: more progressive - model of attitude towards work and the enterprise. It should be clarified that the authors of the article do not insist on the absolutization of their conclusions, since they are not based on serious sociological research, but use their own expert judgments and focus groups conducted in student audiences.

2. MILESTONES IN THE FORMATION OF “ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR” IN ARGENTINA AND RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Scientific research in the field of labor relations in general began in the 40s and turned into an independent field of scientific knowledge in the 70s [1, p. 56]. USSR scientists walked in parallel, creating a new field of science - centralized leadership (in a planned economy). The use of the term “management” was recognized as incorrect, since not a market and effective leadership, but submission to a centralized plan was considered as its basic principle.

At present, due to the deterioration in funding, applied research on labor relations is almost not carried out, although there are publications and centers for the study of problems have been formed. Among them, one cannot fail to note the Moscow Research Institute of Labor, the Sector for the Study of Labor Relations at the Sociological Department of the Academy of Science (St. Petersburg), the Samara School, etc.

In Argentina labor organization, organizational culture and organizational behavior as a subject are studied in four scientific disciplines: management (at the faculties of economy of different universities), labor relations (at the faculty of social sciences of various universities of Buenos Aires, La Matanza, of Lomas de Zamora etc), public administration and psychology. There are specialized academic institutions for the study of labor, such as the Center for Labor Studies (Centro de Estudios e

Investigaciones Laborales-CEIL)¹, the Argentine Association of Labor Research Specialists (Asociación Argentina de Especialistas en Estudios del Trabajo - ASET)², which holds National Congresses of Studies every two years, Institute for Labor and Development Studies (Instituto de Estudios Laborales y del Desarrollo-IELDE)³, Center for the Study of the Sociology of Labor (Centro de Estudios de Sociología del Trabajo)⁴. For communication of specialists on labor issues and labor relations, the following journals are published: "Labor" (Revista Trabajo), "Labor Studies" (Revista de Estudios del

Trabajo), "Labor and Society" (Revista Trabajo y Sociedad), as well as Journal of Interdisciplinary Research on Social Law and Labor relations (Revista de Estudios Interdisciplinarios en Derecho social y Relaciones del Trabajo).

It is necessary to point out that the degree of knowledge of topics covering issues of organizational behavior leaves much to be desired. Table 1 shows the main milestones in the formation of OB as a new trend in management in the world, Russian and Argentinean sciences.

Table 1 Milestones in the formation of the scientific perspective "Organizational Behavior"

Country	Milestones of institutionalization of the perspective "Management Behavior"
World science trend' Success	<p>The basic source is the school of human relations and classical management (30-40s XX century)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In 1957 the first sociological study on OB was conducted [2] - In 1958 the first monograph (Leavitt H.J Managerial Psychology) [3] - In 1973 the first textbook was published (Luttens F. Organizational Behavior, which in 1999 was translated and published in the Russian Federation [4] - Since 1979 the on-line journal "Research in OB" (Berkeley, USA, Elsevier) has been published - Currently, about 10 journals are being published on the subject itself, but this issue is pivotal for all management journals, and there are several hundred of them. <p>Among the basic textbooks one can note: Pettinger R, OB: Performance Management in practice, 2010; Griffin R.W., O'Leary-Kelly A, Dark side of OB, 2004, Drazgow F, Schmitt N, Measuring and Analyzing Behavior in organizations, Advances in management and Data analyses, 2004;</p> <p>The modern sociological aspects are focused on identifying all sorts of violations: rudeness of leaders, opportunistic behavior of the team in relation to innovations, harassment, violation of the rights of migrants, etc [5]</p>
Russia	<p>Base theoretical source: research of NOTs (Russian identification of the trend "Scientific labor organization") (30-40s), which formed the school of applied labor research at the enterprise.</p> <p>The first studies appeared in the 80s as part of the sociology of labor. The most famous authors: V. Ya. Yadov, Man and his work, 1967; other authoritative researchers: A.I. Kravchenko, V.V. Shcherbina, A. Ya. Kibanov, A.G. Zdravomyslov et al. As a university discipline it has been read since the 90s. No specialized magazines are available. High School of Economics conducts economic statistical monitoring as the basis of at least some data. Since 2017, a Labor Forum has been held in St. Petersburg, where specialists present the results of their research devoted to labor relations.</p>
Argentina	<p>In the 70s management became the research field, and from the 90s - labor relations began to be studied in public and private universities. OB became one of disciplines. Publications on organizational culture and OB are included in the field of labor research within the framework of management, labor relations and psychology. There are no specialized journals. The first applied studies of OB were conducted in 2000; they spread on both private enterprises and government organizations.</p>

Comparing the successes of countries in the development of this scientific trend, one can note that Russian applied research arose only 10 years later than the classical school of labor organization and made a contribution by identifying Russian characteristics.

It is necessary to point out the lack of an understanding of the tasks adequate to modern requirements: the search for

ways to increase the organizational culture, to analyze and measure the factors that determine it, to identify and overcome risk zones. The country has kept to a minimum the number of journals (printed) on the study of labor problems, although an on-line analytical portal with the characteristic name "V.A. Yadov Man and His Work"⁵, has been created and is functioning. The portal is currently

¹ <http://www.ceil-conicet.gov.ar/>, last seeing 29.02.2020

² <https://aset.org.ar/index.php>, last seeing 29.02.2020

³ <https://www.economicas.unsa.edu.ar/ielde/index.php/quienes-somos>, last seeing 29.02.2020

⁴ http://www.economicas.uba.ar/institutos_y centros/cesot/, last seeing 29.02.2020

⁵ https://polit.ru/article/2015/07/02/yadov_memory/, last seeing 05.03. 2020

operating, being an on-line newspaper informing about current events that are significant for Russian workers. At the same time, it poses theoretical questions, but within the framework of the sociology of labor, and not OB.

As to Argentina, despite the availability of scientific research in the field of labor and working relations, the organizational culture and OB (especially in the last decade) are considered as not important. The country does not have its own school to study these topics, and the authors mainly use the approaches proposed by foreign authors: [6], [7], [8] etc.

3. THE STRUCTURE OF THE CONCEPT AND EVALUATION OF ELEMENTS IN ARGENTINA AND RUSSIA

Different authors distinguish the core directions of OB study. So, in the first textbooks, the following eight

blocks were named: job satisfaction, protecting workers' rights, organizational culture, leadership and conflict, methods of motivation, teamwork, factors of labor productivity growth and production volume. Later, three objects and three subjects of study began to be identified. Three objects included: the individual, the group and the organization as a whole, and the subjects: the features of the functioning of actors, management processes and the results of the organization as the goal of organizational change.

It is thought that the set of factors presented in Table 2 reveals specific directions for assessing the features and level of OB, which is important for scientific analytics. Factors borrowed from the textbook Krikun V.P. [9] for the assessment of three countries: the USA, Japan and the Arab East, but applied to assess Argentina and the Russian Federation. The descriptions are based on expert judgment of the article authors and literary sources.

Table 2 OB assessment parameters and their characteristics in relation to the “western model”, Argentina and Russia

Parameter	Western model	Argentina	Russia
1. Features of decision-making process (DMP).	Individual, but public, discussed in a collective. In a number of industries (service, medicine, education) Shared Governance is applied.	Centralized with minimal team involvement.	There dominate either impulsive methods or those which arise from the need to fit into the system of state –administrative management. The use of computer programs for the collection and using information, as well as the development of sound recommendations, is not common.
2. Evaluation criteria of DMP.	In previous times profit dominated, now the SDGs are also taken into account (including ecology and social aspects).	Decisions are made according to possible profits and respect of owner interests.	These are: profit and decisions of a higher organization.
3. Structure of administration.	In USA clearly formalized, in Japan - flexible and informal.	Formal coordination of production processes with a hierarchical management structure.	It is not enough thought-out; is created to enhance vertical functional, but not structural authority; combines informal relationship with excessive bureaucratization.
4. Process of control.	In the USA it is clearly formalized, in Japan - flexible, informal.	Tight control over personnel, which is aimed to maintain hierarchy between managers and subordinates.	It is carried out in most cases from the outside, and not from the inside, form assessments of the team. Internal control is considered as a way of self-presentation of the head.

Parameter	Western model	Argentina	Russia
5. Promotion methods.	In the USA - quickly and based on activity and personal merit, in Japan slowly and for work experience.	Based on the activity of the employee. The main criterion is the loyalty to the company.	Personal connections, appointments from above are dominate; loyalty to leadership is seen as its condition.
6. General leadership style.	In the USA - focus is on individuals, in Japan - on the interests of the company and the team.	More focused on self-affirmation of individuals than problem solving.	In most companies – authoritarian.
7. General orientation of leadership.	On the market, on the SDGs, on the formation of reputation and interests of the collective and population.	On the market and to maintain more authority for managers.	To receive government contracts, to comply with requirements from above, to ensure group or selfish interests of the owner.
8. Leader selection criteria.	In the USA - for merit, in Japan - for ability to control the team.	Combination in different ways of merit and pulls (nepotism).	Pulls (nepotism), loyalty to leader, sometimes (in crisis situations) effectiveness at the previous place of work.
9. The essence of labor relations in the team.	In the USA - formalized, in Japan – unformalized.	Paternalistic relations based on the belief that it is easier for a group to defend its own interests.	Paternalistic relations as an alternative to excessive pressure from above. Uncertainty about tomorrow, chaotic execution of many short-term tasks from above.
10. Head preparedness for delegation of authority.	Both in the USA and Japan willingly, but in the USA - to individuals, and in Japan - to a group.	Delegation is seen as a sign of managerial weakness; therefore, it is extremely rare.	No delegation of authority by tradition.
11. The main areas of activity promotion.	Production interests expressing individual actions in the USA and group actions in Japan.	Achieving the results as a way to increase income and a condition for career growth.	Accomplishment of tasks set from above, even if they do not improve the work of the enterprise as a whole.
12. Dominants in motivation.	In the USA, for individual activity; in Japan - for group one.	For the profit earned by the company, for individual manifestations of activity.	For loyalty to the leadership and for the implementation of its installations.

To summarize the estimates, it is possible to make brief comparison of the OB in Argentina and Russia with Western models.

1. The market in western models is no longer the main goal of the enterprise, as the SDGs, ideas of a learning and developing organization are actively being introduced. In Argentina and Russia, profit is considered to be important, but no more than the decisions of senior leaders (in Russia) and upholding of the impulsive decision made earlier (In Argentina).

2. Hierarchical authoritarian management dominates both in Argentina and Russia, but in the first case it is based on the subjective positioning of the leader and in the second - loyalty to senior management (or the need to follow group interests).

3. Unlike the USA and Japan, where stable network relations and horizontal ties between enterprises are established, both in Argentina and in Russia, they are either absent (not sustainable) or have an informal corruption nature, embodying the intention to hide part of the product

to reduce taxes. In Argentina, the dictatorship of large producers over small ones also take place.

4. GENERAL FEATURES THAT DISTINGUISH OB AT ENTERPRISES OF ARGENTINA AND RUSSIA

Despite the fact that studies of labor relations at Russian enterprises are practically not carried out, scientists note the following general features: huge differences in labor behavior between territories, industries, people belonging to different nationalities and social groups. In addition, they identify some general trends: uncertainty about tomorrow; moral dependence on own child, both in the form of special fear and in the form of special hope for them. Sociological studies show that about 80% of workers are afraid of losing their jobs, 57% believe that unemployment has seriously changed the psychological climate in the team. Psychologists call a number of features of the Russian

worker as an archetype: uncertainty in their own abilities, constant expectation of help from outside, the prevalence of value-rational attitudes over goal-oriented ones, and also the dominance of collectivist inclinations in an organization. As applied to Russia, it was revealed that belonging to a group is in itself a motive, often no less significant than material reward.

The study of business style (Table 3) showed the tendency of the Argentinean model towards the American one with its market orientation and competition, including within the team. Russia and Japan are inclined to implement paternalistic models, however, in Japan this is caused by traditions, and in Russia - by the need to confront authoritarian leadership. At the same time, both analyzed countries have a low level of organizational culture, which is reflected in the impulsiveness of decision-making, minimization of analytical control over the results of economic activity, the general backwardness of the means of production and, accordingly, production processes in general.

Table 3 Features of the business style (OB) in Argentina and the Russian Federation, as well as the USA and Japan Factors borrowed from the textbook Krikun V.P. [9]

Country	Specific traits
USA	Utility in decision-making, which includes lack of tradition, attention to detail, thoughtfulness, constructivism, distribution of responsibilities when signing contracts and tight control over their implementation, brevity and clarity. The main thing is making a profit and following the American style of negotiating, since they know little about others.
Japan	Fundamentally different from the western style. It is based on personal relationships (not letters and phone numbers), but through intermediaries well-known to both partners. Intermediaries are rewarded either financially or with a similar service. In addition to profit, harmonious human relationships are important, so informal relationships are highly significant. Ready for concessions and compromises, respectively, appreciate it from others. They never interrupt the interlocutor and always try to understand a different point of view. Painful about being late. Insist on communication of equal status, otherwise negotiations are considered "as a loss of face".
Russia	Both Russian and foreign researchers negatively assess Russian etiquette. In the country is allowed to conceal information from management, and from employees, and from partners. Deception and self-interest (personal interest) are considered natural. It is difficult to disagree with this, but one cannot but see reasons: a mixture of cultures, of values, of national traditions.
Argentina	In the Argentinean case, researchers distinguish a particular role of the type of enterprise. The country has nationalized (usually private companies, most of which are related to services and utilities) and foreign companies, as well as joint ones, including those in which state ownership is present (for example, Aeroflot). It is clear that each type has its own values, beliefs and practices. So, nationalized companies focus their activities on the interests of the owner, have a rigid vertical structure and concentrate solutions in a closed core. Privatized - adopt practices, oriented on market, results and open systems. State - can be focused on solving not market, but social problems.

5. CONCLUSION

The Labor Forum, held in St. Petersburg on February 27-29, 2020, revealed and updated the problems facing the science that studies labor relations and labor relations in general. Scientists have admitted to the almost complete

disappearance of "factory sociology", while preserving some remnants of the sociology of labor. Researchers, including representatives from the Institute of labor (Moscow), confirmed that the profession of "factory sociologist" was destroyed in the country; it became impossible to pass to enterprises for conducting applied research.

Studies conducted on the basis of expert (and bibliographic) interviews show extremely inefficient management and a low level of organizational culture on the enterprises that prevent their modernization, the formation of employees' intentions to increase skills and innovation. It is evident, that these studies should be the subject of public discussion, because they reflect the quality of not only working life, but also the general well-being of the population, its confidence in the future.

REFERENCES

- [1] Miner J.B. *Organizational Behavior, Historical origins, theoretical foundations and the future*, Armonk, NY & I-n, vol.3, 2006.
- [2] Gordon J. *Organizational Behavior. A Diagnostic approach*, 1957.
- [3] Leavitt H.J *Managerial Psychology*, 1958.
- [4] Luttens F. *Organizational Behavior*. 1973 M., INFRA, 1999.
- [5] Cross C., Carbery R., *Organizational Behavior. An Introduction.*, Palgrave, 2016.
- [6] Trompenaars, F. Hampden-Turner, C. *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business*. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing, 1997.
- [7] Ulrich, D. *Recursos humanos champions. Cómo pueden los recursos humanos cobrar valor y producir resultados*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Granica, 2006 (in Spanish).
- [8] Hofstede G., *Culture's Consequences*, 1980.
- [9] Krikun V.P. *Organizatsionnoe povedenie, konspekt lektsiy*, SPb., 2012 (Kricun V.P. *Organizational Behavior, Lectures in brief*), https://sdo.pgups.ru/pluginfile.php/5104/mod_resource/content/0/OrgPoved_lekcii.pdf