

**Managerial attitudes and managerial style crossvergence in Russian organizations:
A study of 8 geographic regions and 14 industries in Russia**

*Submission for EIBA 2010
Work in progress – Please do not quote*

Abstract

In this exploratory study we examine managerial values and attitudes possessed by Russian managers in contemporary Russian organizations. Taking the theoretically derived dimensions of leadership in Russia suggested in the Western literature as our starting point, we show that these dimensions do not allow for full comprehension of the plurality of managerial attitudes and values existing in today's Russia. Hence, we argue that it may be more adequate to derive these dimensions empirically. To do that, we analyzed a sample of 482 line and middle managers covering 8 geographic regions and 14 different industries of Russia. Employing factor and cluster analyses we identified four distinct clusters of managers in contemporary Russian organizations. These ranged from the "Independent professionals" cluster, which comes close to what is often seen as the ideal Western managerial attitude / style comprising both democratic and professional orientations, up to the cluster of "Paternalistic leaders" consisting of managers who seem to embody the most "Soviet" managerial style being paternalistic, traditional and authoritarian.

Introduction

It is often argued that in Russia, which has high power distance and high collectivism scores (Hofstede, 1993), a more authoritarian management style is likely to be preferred by managers as a more efficient one (Elenkov, 1998). Examples of authoritative and powerful leaders from the Russian history are usually invoked to buttress this point. Subsequently, Russian companies have been keen on hiring authoritative managers in the past. However, a further investigation is needed to examine whether this view still holds true today when Russian society has undergone significant societal and economic changes (Efendiev, 2009).

There are some indications in the literature that there is supposedly a new generation of managers coming to the fore in Russia and Russian organizations, who through the processes of socialization into the Western ‘managerial community of practice’ (mainly by means of going through the standardized Western originated MBA programs and various types of managerial trainings) embraces the western managerial values (Puffer and McCarthy, 1995; Elenkov, 1997, 1998; Alexashin and Blenkinsopp, 2005). However, there is also some evidence that not every single Western value is fully internalized by Russian managers and some are even rejected. Furthermore, traditional Russian managerial values still seem to exhibit great importance in Russian organizations (Michailova, 2001; May, Puffer and McCarthy, 2005).

Hence, it seems to make sense portraying the strata of Russian managers as a segregated and transient class that has been formed in specific societal, institutional, and economic conditions of modern Russia. These conditions produce a complicated and intertwined struggle for Russian managers between: (a) the desire to become acknowledged as a legitimate member of the Western managerial community of practice, and (b) the desire to differentiate from the Western affiliation, thus preserving the Russian identity precisely as a means for ‘non-westernization’, keeping the borderline between ‘us’ and ‘them’.

Thus, the argument seems to challenge the view that promotes the inevitable convergence of the managerial values of Russian managers with Western managerial values. For instance, Child and Czegledy (1996) concur with it by stating that Eastern European managers might need to unlearn less than is often claimed and assumed in the Western business community. Instead, more appropriately we can talk about a ‘crossvergence’ (a term coined by Ralston, Gustafson, Cheung, and Terpstra, 1993) of managerial values in case of Russia. ‘Crossvergence’ is seen as a continuum between the polar extremes of convergence and divergence. It provides an integrative

alternative that might be characterized as ‘the melting pot philosophy’ of managerial values formation (Ralston, Holt, Terpstra and Kai-Cheng, 2008). When applied to the Russian context, ‘crossvergence’ argues that there will be an integration of cultural and ideological influences from both within and without Russia that will result in a unique value system that will borrow from both national culture and economic ideology (Ralston et al., 1993).

We propose to test these arguments by examining managerial attitudes towards employees in modern Russian organizations. Specifically, we focus on how managers perceive what characteristics and values should a ‘good’ employee in the organization possess, what values make a ‘good’ subordinate and a ‘good’ superior, and how relations between superiors and subordinates should be built and handled.

Managerial style and values in Russia

There are several Western studies that touched upon the attitudes of managers towards employees in Russian organizations. For instance, already in 1992 Ivancevich and colleagues described some differences that existed at that time between Russian and American managers in terms of their beliefs and ethical behavior, including behavior toward employees (Ivancevich, DeFrank and Gregory, 1992). They noted that Russian managers believed that workers are basically lazy and that low product quality is not related to poor management but to employees’ laziness. In another study based on Finnish expatriate managers’ views on the differences between Russian and Finnish managerial approaches, Suutari (1996) suggests that the biggest difference in behavior is that Russian managers tend to criticize actions of their subordinates more and require more role clarification. Further, Russian managers were found to be more autocratic and less inclined to empower their employees and to encourage them to participate in decision-making processes. In a follow up study Suutari and Botolow (1996) found that Russian managers exert much less effort than their Finnish colleagues in facilitating interaction between different organizational levels and informing employees. Instead, they were much more zealous in clarifying roles and rewarding employees. However, as Fey, Adaeva and Vitkovskaia (2001) noticed, the above mentioned studies have all focused on describing what Russian managers did rather than determining what kind of perceptions, values and beliefs they have concerning management style and leadership issues.

Puffer and her colleagues have attempted to do exactly that. For instance, in one of her studies Puffer (1994) claims that Russian managers during 1990s strongly believed that anything is possible with hard work and proper skills. These managers appreciated persistent, hard working and skillful employees. In another study conducted several years later Puffer, McCarthy and Naumov (1997) have scratched the surface of a new phenomena occurring in Russia – managerial style segregation. They noted that two distinct managerial styles could be discerned in Russian organizations in late 1990s: Soviet era executives and new entrepreneurial managers. Also, they found that Russian managers have internalized humanistic, organizational and work ethics beliefs better than beliefs about worker participation in decision making, leisure ethics and Marxist-related beliefs. However, while these studies have indicated that there is a certain segregation occurring in Russia, they were not very detailed in identifying characteristic features of different managerial groups and clusters. Also, most of the evidence that these papers are built on is quite anecdotal or obtained from discussions with groups of managers undergoing managerial trainings.

More recently, Fey et al. (2001) have examined 90 Russian managers taking part in executive training programs at two business schools in Saint-Petersburg, Russia. They have asked the respondents to identify five characteristics that in their view best describe an effective leader. The most significant features were democratic, task orientation, relations orientation, and authoritarian. Using these features as theoretical axes, Fey et al. (2001) identified four hypothetical types of leaders that might exist in Russian organizations: military-man, statesman, clergyman, and politician. Then, these hypothetical leadership styles were described and distributed among 135 Russian middle managers attending multi-day executive training programs in Saint-Petersburg, Russia. Respondents were asked to evaluate each style overall, the extent such leaders were effective, the extent such leader were good at motivating subordinates, and respondents' personal preference for the leadership style in question. Statesman style was voted to be the best in all respects being also the favorite for personal preference and clergy man was clearly chosen as the second best option. More specifically, Fey et al. (2001) describe statesman as a task-oriented democrat whose priority is to achieve organizational goals however through consensus. The statesman tries to obtain employees' commitment and involvement and promotes employees based on their competence. He negotiates with employees about how they use their time, how responsibility is allocated, and what is the best way to accomplish tasks, but command

is centralized. The second favorite option – clergyman – is a relations-oriented democrat who prioritizes an effective organizational climate and good relations between all employees. He promotes teamwork and delegates tasks to be carried out. Hence, the people are promoted based on their ability to work in groups and usually employee receive substantial freedom in organizing their jobs.

In their discussion, Fey et al. (2001: 637), based on Kets de Vries' (1999) earlier suggestion, make an interesting speculation by claiming that “an authoritarian management style characterizes Russia's past and that an authoritative management style characterizes the future where the Russian management should move.” In theory, authoritative managers provide clear vision, facilitate empowerment, fully involve and encourage employees to ‘own’ the organization, foster openness and teamwork, exercise discipline and control by providing clear boundaries, give support, and create a sense of security through the fact that responsibility remains with the manager / leader (see for a similar point Fey and Shekshnia, 2007; Kets de Vries, Korotov, Shekshnia and Florent-Treacy, 2004; Ismail and Ford, 2010). The main limitation of the study is that it is based on progressive middle managers operating in Saint-Petersburg and that it offered a limited number of managerial styles (only 4 hypothetical styles) to be evaluated by respondents. There are in fact some indications that there might be more variance within Russian organizations across Russia in terms of managerial styles differences than between Russian and some other country's organizations due to (a) geographic size of Russia and (b) organizational, industry, and professional cultures (see, for instance, Ardichvili and Gasparishvili, 2001; Ardichvili and Kuchinke, 2002).

Hence, complementing the studies reviewed above, this paper aims at providing an examination of managerial values possessed by Russian managers in Russian organizations which is more comprehensive than previous studies. As opposed to the extant studies which mostly focused on Russian managers undergoing Western-originated managerial training programs predominantly in Western parts of Russia, e.g. mostly in Saint-Petersburg and Moscow, this paper covers 80 organizations across 8 different geographic regions and 14 main industries in Russia. In our view, having such a comprehensive respondents' base the paper is well positioned to examine the range of managerial values and styles that developed in contemporary Russia. Also, it would allow us to shed light on the recently sprung discussion concerning whether there are any indications concerning either divergence, convergence or crossvergence of managerial

values and styles in Russia in comparison to Western managerial values and styles (Alexashin and Blenkinsopp, 2005; May et al., 2005; Ralston et al., 2008).

Methodology and research design

Data collection

The paper builds on data collected in May-June 2008 using standardized face-to-face interviews. The questionnaire used during interviews was pre-tested through 80 in-depth interviews with managers, white- and blue-collar workers in 4 business-organizations (privately-owned organizations and industrial enterprises) in Moscow and Perm in 2007. The results of these pilot interviews were used for elaboration of original standardized questionnaire. The main phase of data collection was administered by one of the leading Russian firms specializing in opinion polls and marketing research. A total number of 2551 respondents in 80 Russian business organizations in 8 Russian regions were interviewed. Out of 2551 respondents interviewed, 1210 were blue-collar workers, 663 – white-collar specialists without subordinates, 509 – line and middle managers, 169 – HR-specialists. This particular paper focuses on a specific segment of obtained responses - 509 line and middle managers.

Sampling

The main goal of the sampling procedure was to provide the sample that would provide us with statistically reliable data in terms of 1) region and 2) industry. This required decision of the two problems: 1) selecting the number of organizations sufficient for statistical analysis; and 2) selecting the number of respondents inside organizations sufficient for statistical analysis.

To achieve this, the multistage sampling method was used. The sample was calculated on the basis of official data of the Russian Federal State Statistics Service (<http://www.gks.ru/wps/portal/english>) about proportions of employees in industries, levels of nominal salaries in industries, and population of 7 Russian federal districts and Moscow as measured on January, 1st, 2007. Sampling procedure included the following stages:

1. Excluding sectors with prevalence of public organizations (healthcare, educations, and public administration), extractive industries and agriculture. Thus, we dealt with remained 14

industries with prevalence of private-owned industrial and service organizations which accounted for 47% of all employees in Russia.

2. Percentages of employed among selected industries were counted to be from 0.6% in oil-processing to 27% in trade.

3. Selected industries were ranked according to the level of average nominal monthly salaries – from textile and clothing industry (4859.8 Rubles / approx. 121.5€) to financial services (27794.9 Rubles / approx. 695€). It was important due to very high income inequality in the Russian economy.

4. Selected industries were grouped into 6 groups of average nominal monthly salaries – from industries with extremely low salaries (light industries – 5.2% of the respondents in the sample) to sectors with the highest salaries (finances and oil-processing industries – 2.6% of the respondents in the sample).

5. Percentages of respondents according to the percentages of population in 7 Russian regions and Moscow were counted – from 8% in the Far East Region to 16% in Volga Region.

Sample characteristics

This paper presents the analysis of managerial attitudes. From the total number of 509 managers in the sample mentioned above, 27 were excluded because of the zero standard deviation of their responses to our questions that might indicate either respondents' 'insincerity' or poor quality of questionnaire filling procedure. Table 1 presents main sample characteristics of 482 managers included into the analysis.

Table 1

	No. of respondents	%%
Regions		
Moscow	74	15
Saint-Petersburg	65	14
Volga Federal District	82	17
Urals Federal District	66	14
Southern Federal District	65	13
Siberian Federal District	49	10
Central Federal District (without Moscow)	45	9
Far Eastern Federal District	36	8
Total	482	100
Industries		
Trade	104	22

Construction	57	12
Real estate and services	52	11
Engineering industries	51	11
Auto transport	32	7
Communication services	34	7
Auto services and household appliance repair	24	5
Chemical industry	20	4
Publishing and printing industry	21	4
Food industry	21	4
Light industries	21	4
Finances and insurance	14	3
Oil processing	15	3
Power engineering, housing and communal services	16	3
Total	482	100
Level of management		
Line managers	294	61
Middle managers	188	39
Total	482	100
Historical roots of enterprises		
Post-Soviet, privatized	121	25
Newly established after 1990	361	75
Total	482	100
Male	245	51
Having higher education (university / college degree)	373	77
Education matches respondent's current profession	269	56
Measures of central tendency	Mean	Median
Age	40	39
No. of subordinates	26	10
Years in current position	5	3
Working hours per week	45	45
Days in paid vacations over the last 12 months	21	24
No. of employed in the enterprise	2 225	300

As we can see from Table 1, the majority of managers in our sample are employed in European Russian regions by newly established trade, construction and service organizations with 300 employees on average (high mean value reflects the presence in the sample of several large industrial enterprises, including the one with 100 000 employees). There is a prevalence of 40-year-old respondents who represent lower level of management and received their positions 3-5 years ago.

The data on educational level of respondents reflects the typical situation for the Russian labor market – a very high level of formal education which often does not match people's

professional responsibilities. That is why Russia could be called the “country of well-educated amateurs”.

Russian managers have normally a bit longer workweek than their subordinates – 45 hours on average compared to 40 hours for ordinary workers and specialists – and a bit shorter yearly vacations – 21 days compared to 28 days for their subordinates.

Measures

Managerial attitudes which reflect respondents’ styles of management were examined using a 26-item set of statements to be measured on a Likert type scale. Respondents were asked to evaluate how important are certain qualities for a “good” worker, i.e. their subordinate (10 items); for a “good” manager towards his/her subordinates (10 items); for a “good” manager towards his/her superiors (6 items). Responses were scored by assigning them a value between 1 (“*Not important at all*”) and 3 (“*Very important, obligatory quality*”).

Preliminary measurement analysis

Our initial analysis was an attempt to fit our data into categories elaborated in the existing Western literature which reflect 1) the manager’s predominant orientation (goal *versus* relations, or transformational *versus* transactional leadership), and 2) the way power is executed within organizations by a leader (democratic *versus* authoritarian management) (see Fey et al., 2001). In order to check whether deductively created indexes are appropriate to measure managerial attitudes in a two-factor space, and whether attitudes of Russian managers, indeed, match these two dichotomies, the reliability analysis was made.

Table 2

Continuums of managerial styles in Russia (adapted from Fey et al., 2001)	Items to describe managerial styles in Russia	Cronbach’s α
“Democratic”	<u>Obligatory for subordinates:</u> Q24: Show initiative in organizing his/her labor <u>Obligatory for managers towards subordinates:</u> Q36: Be able to encourage subordinates’ initiative Q37: Be able to fight for his subordinates’ interests in front of bosses <u>Obligatory for managers towards their superiors:</u>	,584

	Q44: Be able to fight for his/her opinion in front of bosses Q45: Initiate new things and rationalize Q46: Be able to fight for the interests of subordinates Q48: Be self-sufficient and ready to take responsibility	
“Authoritarian”	<u>Obligatory for subordinates:</u> Q25: Be obedient towards his superiors, not resist their decisions <u>Obligatory for managers towards subordinates:</u> Q33: Be strict and demanding Q40: Follow principles, not tolerate discipline and work misconducts <u>Obligatory for managers towards their superiors:</u> Q43: Avoid conflicts and be loyal to superiors	,429
“Goal orientation”	<u>Obligatory for subordinates:</u> Q23: Work at full strength Q26: Be high quality specialist Q27: Strive for professional development, increase his/her skills Q32: Be ready to work overtime and on weekends <u>Obligatory for managers towards subordinates:</u> 35: Be able to achieve goals by any means <u>Obligatory for managers towards their superiors:</u> 47: Be ready to work overtime and on weekends	,481
“Relations orientation”	<u>Obligatory for subordinates:</u> 28: Respect his superior, fight for his sympathy 29: Be interested in how the company is doing 30: Respect his colleagues <u>Obligatory for managers towards subordinates:</u> Q34: Be honest and fair Q38: Be friendly and have friends among subordinates Q39: Take care of subordinates and be able to listen to their problems and help Q41: Be flexible and forgive small misconducts to subordinates Q42: Demand equally from all subordinates irrespective of personal sympathies	,587

As we can see from Table 2, the internal consistency of the data evaluated by Cronbach’s alphas is relatively low, which prevents us from using deductively chosen measures adapted from the Western literature. It suggests that either 1) two dichotomies (democratic / authoritarian and goal / relations) in case of Russian managers are better measured by other sets of variables; or 2)

managerial values, attitudes and styles of Russian managers split into a different set of factors / continuums than those suggested in the Western literature.

To check both of these propositions, we decided to use empirically derived axes for managerial attitudes using factor analysis.

Factor analysis results

The items measuring respondents' attitudes were subjected to Principal Components Analysis (PCA). Bartlett's test of sphericity and Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy were applied to examine the appropriateness of factor analysis (Table 3).

Table 3

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.732
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1514,741
	df	231
	Sig.	,000

We extracted 4 factors (principal components) that were supposed to match initially proposed 4 basic characteristics of leadership styles. During the PCA six items were removed from the analysis either for excessive cross-loadings (more than 0,5) or poor loadings (less than 0,3). Thus 20 variables in the data were reduced to 4 factor model (Table 4).

Table 4

Four-factor solution under Varimax rotation
Total variance explained 39%

Item No.	Variables	Factors and Cronbach's alphas			
		"Supportive leadership" $\alpha=,634$	"Expectations on subordinates' professionalism" $\alpha=,619$	"Managers' independence" $\alpha=,601$	"Authoritarian exploitation" $\alpha=,524$
39	Take care of subordinates and be able to listen to their problems and help (OMSub)*	,662			
37	Be able to fight for his subordinates' interests in front of bosses (OMSub)	,584			
41	Be flexible and forgive small misconducts to subordinates (OMSub)	,574			
38	Be friendly and have friends among subordinates (OMSub)	,550			
34	Be honest and fair (OMSub)	,446			

42	Demand equally from all subordinates irrespective of personal sympathies (OMSub)	,408			
24	Show initiative in organizing his/her labor (OS)**		,670		
27	Strive for professional development, increase his/her skills (OS)		,666		
26	Be high quality specialist (OS)		,589		
29	Be interested in how the company is doing (OS)		,569		
36	Be able to encourage subordinates' initiative (OMSub)		,513		
48	Be self-sufficient and ready to take responsibility (OMSup)***			,742	
44	Be able to fight for his/her opinion in front of bosses (OMSup)			,565	
46	Be able to fight for the interests of subordinates (OMSup)	,466		,562	
45	Initiate new things and rationalize			,557	
47	Be ready to work overtime and on weekends (OMSup)				,736
32	Be ready to work overtime and on weekends (OS)				,698
43	Avoid conflicts and be loyal to superiors (OMSup)				,494
33	Be strict and demanding (OMSub)				,374
25	Be obedient towards his superiors, not resist their decisions (OS)				,336
*(OMSub) – “Obligatory for managers towards subordinates” **(OS) – “Obligatory for subordinates” ***(OMSup) – “Obligatory for managers towards their superiors”					

As we can see from the results of the factor analysis, the latter provided us with several considerable advantages. First, it allows us to specify variables that are more adequate in describing types of respondents' orientations / attitudes. The fact that Cronbach's alphas presented in Table 4 are higher than in Table 2 suggests that factor analysis provided us with more exact measures of managerial attitudes. Although final alphas are still not very high, the reliability coefficient greater than 0.6 is considered acceptable for descriptive research (see Robinson, Shaver and Wrightsman, 1991 cited by Moore and Carpenter, 2008). Second, the results of factor analysis suggest empirically revealed weights of original variables (factor loadings) in latent variables of managerial attitudes.

Discussion of factor analysis results

Factor 1, which comes close to what was proposed in the literature as “Relation orientation” (RO) of managers (Fey et al., 2001), in our model consists of 7 original variables with highest factor loadings. Out of total 7 variables 6 are related to managers’ attitudes towards their subordinates. Against our initial assumptions (stated in Table 2), it does not contain variables reflecting managers’ expectations from their subordinates (no. 28-30) but contains variables no. 37 and 46 referring to “Democratic” management. It could be interpreted so that RO of Russian managers does not imply subordinates’ loyalty towards their bosses or colleagues but rather deal with managers’ responsibilities towards their subordinates, their readiness to be fair, to take care of them, and to defend their interests in front of higher levels of management. That is why this factor could be better described as **“Orientation to supportive leadership or paternalistic management”**.

Factor 2, which comes close to what Fey et al. (2001) call “Goal (task) orientation” (GO) of managers, consists of 5 original variables with highest factor loadings, and 4 of them reflect managers’ expectations from their subordinates. Only two variables initially associated with GO (see Table 2) appeared in this factor. Thus we can conclude that GO is rather inexplicit among Russian managers. Latent variable that is closest to GO could be better described as **“Expectations on subordinates’ professionalism”** implying not only subordinates’ qualification but their initiative and involvement as well.

Factor 3, which is supposed to describe managers’ democratic attitudes, in fact does not seem to be related to style of management *per se*. Variables 24, 36 and 37 that refer to enhancing subordinates’ initiative taking and managers’ responsibilities towards subordinates did not enter this factor. All 4 variables with the highest factor loadings in this factor refer to managers’ relations towards their superiors, respondents’ ideas on their place proper in organizational hierarchy, and strength of their “voice” in front of their bosses. That is why this factor could be better described as **“Managers’ independence in organization”**.

Finally, *Factor 4*, which is related to hypothetical “Authoritarian” managerial orientation, in our case seems to reflect values of “exploitative” organizational cultures which managers are involved in. The two variables reflecting readiness to work overtime are very consistent to each other: managers who demand overtime work from their subordinates are normally ready to work overtime themselves. Thus we can see that variables referring to long working hours do not deal

with “Goal orientation” as we initially expected (see Table 2) but are related to managers’ severity towards subordinates and obedience towards their bosses. Thus we can describe this factor as **“Authoritarian exploitation”**.

The results of factor analysis suggest that instead of two dichotomies (democratic / authoritarian and goal / relations) that arguably considerably reduce and simplify the explanations of managers’ orientations and attitudes, it might be more adequate to consider four relatively independent latent variables that can provide us with more reliable typologies of managerial attitudes. These factors reflect four fundamental aspects of labor practices in Russian business organizations: (1) managers’ treatment of their subordinates; (2) importance of employees’ professional qualities and competences in organizations; (3) power relations, strength of line and middle managers’ “voice” in organizations; and (4) working conditions and employees’ labor rights in organizations.

Cluster analysis results

Four factors extracted from PCA were subjected to K-means cluster analysis to identify homogeneous groups of Russian managers with particular orientations / attitudes. The classification procedure was repeated to find meaningful clusters. After repeated iterations and changing the number of clusters, finally 4 cluster groups of Russian managers were obtained. Size of four clusters and final cluster centers in a four-factor space are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Factors	Clusters			
	Paternalistic leaders (N=101)	Exploitative non-professionals (N=104)	Independent professionals (N=157)	Obedient and unsupportive (N=120)
“Orientation to supportive leadership, or Paternalistic management”	1,20120	,08099	-,25826	-,74332
“Expectations on subordinates’ professionalism”	,36214	-1,29470	,54796	,10036
“Managers’ independence in organization”	-,45479	,34338	,83744	-1,01047
“Authoritarian exploitation”	-,02175	,53508	-,19332	-,19250

Table 6 presents distances between cluster centers where we can see that clusters (2) “Exploitative non-professionals” and (4) “Obedient and unsupportive” have the highest difference and the closest are the clusters (3) “Independent professionals” and (4) “Obedient and unsupportive”.

Table 6

Clusters	Paternalistic leaders	Exploitative non-professionals	Independent professionals	Obedient and unsupportive
Paternalistic leaders		2,224	1,966	2,046
Authoritarian non-professionals	2,224		2,070	2,233
Independent professionals	1,966	2,070		1,962
Dependent and unsupportive	2,046	2,233	1,962	

To evaluate the characteristics of identified clusters, Chi-squares and ANOVA were used. Chi-square analysis was used to evaluate categorical variables: region, gender, education, matching of education with work responsibilities, level of management, factors in getting current position, participation in decision-making, improving working skills, career promotions, type of economic development, historical roots of enterprises (Table 7).

Table 7

χ^2 tests for cluster membership, statistically significant results

Item No.	Variable	Value	df	Significance
0	Region	54,018	21	,000
1	Gender	9,082	3	,028
9	Level of management	11,092	3	,011
20_0	Model of recruitment	27,627	15	,024
20_1	Work experience as major factor in getting current position	8,559	3	,036
20_6	References on my qualification and business merits from bosses and colleagues in this organization as major factor in getting current position	11,286	3	,010
21_1	Current position resulted from intra-organizational promotions	26,973	6	,000
62	Attitude towards the situation: “ <i>Your subordinates keep silent while bosses ignore their interests, violate their rights</i> ”	43,735	6	,000

66	Attitude towards the situation: “ <i>Your subordinates inform bosses about their colleagues’ misconducts or professional incompetence</i> ”	26,470	6	,000
67	Attitude towards the situation: “ <i>Your bosses call all hands on deck, force workers to do working tasks at the expense of their overstrain</i> ”	22,526	6	,001
70	Attitude towards the situation: “ <i>Your bosses treat workers according to their personal sympathies</i> ”	14,660	6	,023
71	Attitude towards the situation: “ <i>Your bosses appoint on important position a person who is not qualified but has personal relations to bosses</i> ”	18,575	6	,005
72	Attitude towards the situation: “ <i>Your bosses are used to shout at their subordinates, humble them</i> ”	28,780	6	,000
73	Engagement of subordinates in decision-making	62,756	9	,000
75	Subordinates have initiated something	27,945	12	,006
77	Bosses engage managers in decision-making	28,744	9	,001
87_1	Never improved professional skills except for basic education	9,171	3	,027
87_5	Passed professional training with certificate	23,479	3	,000
88	Engaged in self-education	14,968	6	,021
89	How long ago the last improvement of professional skills occurred	27,575	12	,006
SQ31	Historical roots of organization	20,754	9	,014

The variables of education, matching of education with work responsibilities, career promotions over the last 2 years, and type of economic development of organizations did not show statistically significant differences among clusters of managers with different attitudes.

ANOVA was used to evaluate age, number of subordinates, number of years in organization and current position, working hours, duration of vacations, number of work-based benefits, number of employed in organization, average salaries of managers in organizations, and managers/workers ratio of salaries in organizations (Table 8).

Table 8

ANOVA model of cluster membership, statistically significant results

Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
<i>Q10. Number of subordinates</i>					
Between Groups	31232,386	3	10410,795	3,059	,028
Within Groups	1589329,402	467	3403,275		
Total	1620561,788	470			
<i>Q13. Number of years in organization</i>					
Between Groups	948,383	3	316,128	5,003	,002

Within Groups	29953,029	474	63,192		
Total	30901,412	477			
<i>SQ4. Number of employed in organization</i>					
Between Groups	1,563E9	3	5,211E8	3,708	,012
Within Groups	6,717E10	478	1,405E8		
Total	6,873E10	481			

The variables of age, number of years in current position, working hours, duration of paid vacations over the last 12 months, number of work-based benefits, average salaries of managers in organizations, and managers/workers salary inequality in organizations did not show statistically significant differences among clusters of managers with different attitudes.

Discussion of cluster analysis results

Cluster 1 – “Paternalistic Leaders” – includes counts higher than expected for respondents from organizations in the newly private sector of Russian economy; South Russia; trade organizations with more than 300 employed, financial sector, engineering industries¹. There are the highest percentages of respondents who got their positions owing to protectionism (family or friendship ties); higher percentages of “newcomers” in their organizations. Respondents from this cluster are the most implacable towards situations listed in Table 7 (No. 62-72). “Paternalistic leaders” is the group that is least inclined to engage their subordinates in decision-making; their subordinates do not initiate anything at their workplaces. In turn, bosses of these managers also are not disposed to engage respondents in decision-making. This cluster shows the highest percentage of managers who had never improved their professional skills.

Cluster 2 – “Exploitative non-professionals” – includes counts higher than expected for respondents from Saint-Petersburg, Ural Region, Far East; printing and publishing services, power engineering, housing and communal services. This cluster consists primarily of line managers; respondents who got their positions owing to professional reputation. Managers from this group are not engaged in professional self-education. Interestingly, stating the importance of “hard work” for managers and their subordinates in their attitudes, respondents of this cluster do not show longer working hours in their labor practices.

¹ Data on cluster distribution between industries have descriptive character due to insufficient number of cases in each industry that does not allow getting statistically significant results.

Cluster 3 – “Independent professionals” – includes counts higher than expected for respondents from Moscow, Volga Region, Siberia; chemical and oil-processing enterprises, telecommunications, real estate and services. There is the highest percentage of female respondents; managers working on big enterprises; middle managers with maximal number of subordinates; respondents who got their positions owing to their qualification (education and professional experience); respondents who have maximal length of work tenure in their organizations and got their position as a result of internal career promotions in their organizations. These managers, in fact, are much more “democratic” towards their subordinates: they are used to engage their subordinates in decision-making; they reported the most that their subordinates had initiated something. In turn, superiors of these managers seem to be also “democratic” themselves: managers from this cluster reported that they were engaged in some decision-making by their bosses. This cluster shows the highest percentage of managers who passed special professional training on top of their basic professional education, raised their professional skills and engaged in professional self-education.

Cluster 4 – “Obedient and unsupportive” – shows counts higher than expected for respondents from Central Russia; auto and consumer services, light industry, trade organizations with less than 300 employed, auto transport, and construction. There is the highest percentage of male respondents. Managers from this cluster differ from other clusters in their opinions: thus, they believe that there is nothing out of the way in situations listed in Table 7 (No. 62-72). These managers had never passed special professional training except for their basic professional education.

To summarize the description of the types of Russian managers, it is worth to note the following.

1. Among four types of Russian managerial attitudes, only one could be regarded as a “positive” one. Other three types show different combinations of adherence to nepotism, authoritarianism, and low value of professionalism, representing “traditionalist” ways of management.
2. The only “positive” style of Russian management is embodied in the “*Independent professionals*” cluster. These managers show high importance of professionalism and independence in their attitudes and confirm them by their real labor practices,

e.g., engaging their subordinates in decision-making, making their professional career through their professional qualities, and continuously raising their professional skills. This type of managers is represented mainly by middle managers of rather big enterprises having the biggest number of subordinates compared to other clusters. Notably, this group of Russian managers shows the highest percentage of female respondents.

3. The “*Independent professionals*” cluster coexists in modern Russia with the style of management that we described as “*Paternalistic leaders*”. Managers belonging to this cluster are associated primarily with protectionism in hiring and getting managerial positions in organizations and with low importance assigned to professional qualities of managers and ordinary workers. In its major features “Paternalistic leadership” in Russia resembles “Soviet paternalism” where “taking care” of subordinates and informality in superior/subordinates relations was combined with weak “voice” of an ordinary worker and his/her exclusion from decision-making processes. This style of management seems to be predominant in Southern Russian regions where kinship ties, nepotism, and traditionalist relations are widespread the most.
4. Two other types of “negative” styles of Russian management – “*Exploitative non-professionals*” (ENP) and “*Obedient and unsupportive*” (OU) – are not as distinct as previous two groups showing differences in secondary characteristics. They both represent line managers. *ENP* embodies an “extensive” style of management that tends to compensate for lower level of professional skills by extra labor efforts and long working hours. In turn, *OU* that are rather close to the “*Independent professionals*” cluster in terms of professional skills are characterized by rejection of “paternalism” towards their subordinates, high loyalty towards their bosses, and weak “voice” in their organizations.
5. Hence, there is only some degree of congruence between Russian managers’ attitudes and their real labor practices in organizations. To the right, “*Independent professionals*” really show high congruency of ‘good’ attitudes and practices. To the left, “*Exploitative non-professionals*” do not demonstrate congruence between their attitudes towards readiness to work overtime and real long working hours in

their labor practices. Furthermore, the case of “*Supportive leaders*” demonstrated the highest inconsistency between their attitudes and real practices. While asserting adherence to values of “democracy” and “professionalism” in their attitudes, in practice they ignore these values more than any other type of managers in Russian organizations. It poses methodological problem of how much could we rely on respondents’ attitudes and perceptions *per se*, without crosschecking them with real facts from respondents’ lives. Our data suggest that respondents with the ‘worst’ practices tend to be the most ‘insincere’ in their responses concerning values and attitudes.

6. There is some evidence that real labor practices reported by managers are associated not so much with their personal attitudes but norms of organizational cultures they are involved in. One of the examples is organizations where subordinates of “democratic” bosses tend to engage their subordinates in decision-making themselves, and *vice versa*.

Conclusions

The paper has attempted to explore managerial values and attitudes possessed by Russian managers in contemporary Russian organizations. Taking the theoretically derived dimensions of leadership in Russia used in the Western literature (see Fey et al., 2001) as our starting point, we showed that it may be more adequate to derive these dimensions empirically. Doing so would allow us to capture the actual attitudes shared by Russian managers in different industries and regions of Russia together with specific features pertinent to the Russian cultural and economic context. Another advantage of this study stems from the comprehensiveness of its empirical data base which covers 8 geographic regions and 14 different industries of Russia.

In our view, the analysis makes several contributions. The first contribution is that it provides a more nuanced and empirically-driven list of managerial attitudes existing in contemporary Russian organizations. Four clusters that the analysis identified illustrates the plurality and the diversity of managerial attitudes among Russian managers. The identified clusters range from the “Independent professionals” cluster, which comes close to what is often seen as the ideal Western managerial attitude / style comprising both democratic and professional orientations, up to the cluster of “Paternalistic leaders” comprising managers who seem to

embody the most “Soviet” managerial style. These managers are paternalistic, very traditional and authoritarian. Overall, our analysis seems to underscore that it is somewhat oversimplified to talk about *the* Russian managerial style / attitude and that Russian managerial attitudes are contingent on a wide range of contextual factors, such as industry, age of a manager, region of Russia and others.

The second contribution of the paper is that it illustrates that there is a wide range, a plurality, of managerial attitudes existing across Russia in general, and more specifically across different industries and geographic regions of Russia. By doing so it hints at methodological weaknesses of previous studies on the same topic. First, previous studies tended to focus on particular groups of managers representing mostly Western parts of Russia and most progressive and internationalized industries. Such a selection bias can explain why some studies have found that managerial values of Russian managers tend to converge with values of their Western counterparts (see, for instance, Puffer and McCarthy, 1995; Elenkov, 1997, 1998; Alexashin and Blenkinsopp, 2005), while others have found that in fact divergence in values tends to persist (Michailova, 2001; May, Puffer and McCarthy, 2005). Looking at the clusters identified in this analysis, one can easily see that in cases when the sample examined includes more Russian managers from cluster 3 (“Independent professionals”), one can conclude that the actual convergence with Western managerial values is occurring in Russian organizations. Vice versa, if the examined sample includes more managers from clusters 1, 2 and 4, then the divergence may be argued for. However, our analysis shows that both of these cases are not representative of the entire population of managers across Russia and the conclusions that they lead to are oversimplified and skewed. Hence, more research is needed to be able to answer whether convergence, divergence or crossvergence is actually taking place in contemporary Russia. Second, also it shows that not always when asked managers in Russia (as well as arguably in other countries) respond sincerely about the actual practices taking place within their organizations. Often, they rather respond in accordance with certain corporate cultural norms inhibited in their organizations that do not reflect the actual processes taking place there. Hence, future research needs to tackle this challenge by refining the ways how questions in questionnaires are formulated and subsequently asked in order to get at real practices and processes taking place in Russian organizations.

References

- Alexashin, Y. and Blenkinsopp, J. (2005). Changes in Russian managerial values: a test of the convergence hypothesis? *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(3): 427-444
- Ardichvili, A. and Gasparishvili, A. (2001). Socio-cultural values, internal work culture and leadership styles in four post-communist countries. *Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 1(2): 227-242.
- Ardichvili, A. and Kuchinke, P. (2002). Leadership styles and cultural values among managers and subordinates: A comparative study of four countries of the former Soviet Union, Germany, and the US. *Human Resource Development International*, 5(1): 99-117
- Child, J. and Czegledy, J. P. (1996). Managerial learning in the transformation of Eastern Europe: some key issues. *Organization Studies*, 17(2): 167-179
- Efendiev, A. (2009). The models of the social organization of Russian business. State University – Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia
- Elenkov, D. S. (1997). Differences and similarities in managerial values between US and Russian managers. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 28: 85-106
- Elenkov, D. S. (1998). Can American management concepts work in Russia: a cross-cultural comparative study. *California Management Review*, 40: 133-156
- Fey, C. F. and Shekshnia, S. (2007). How to do business in Russia. *The Wall Street Journal*, October 27, 2007: R4
- Fey, C. F., Adaeva, M. and Vitkovskaia, A. (2001). Developing a model of leadership styles: what works best in Russia? *International Business Review*, 10(6): 615-643
- Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *Academy of Management Executive*, 7(1), 81-95
- Ismail, K. M. and Ford, D. L. (2010). Organizational leadership in Central Asia and the Caucasus: Research considerations and directions. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 27(2): 321-340
- Ivancevich, J. M., DeFrank, R. S. and Gregory, P. R. (1992). The Soviet enterprise director: An important resource before and after the coup. *Academy of Management Executive*, 6(1), 42-56

- Kets de Vries, M. (1999). A journey into the “Wild East”: Leadership style and organizational practices in Russia. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28(4): 67–81
- Kets de Vries, M., Korotov, K., Shekshnia, S. and Florent-Treacy, E. (2004). The new global Russian business leaders: Lessons from a decade of transition. *European Management Journal*, 46(15): 637–648
- May, R. C., Puffer, S. M. and McCarthy, D. J. (2005). Transferring management knowledge to Russia: A culturally based approach. *Academy of Management Executives*, 19(2): 24-35
- Michailova, S. (2001). Contrasts in culture: Russian and Western perspectives on organizational change. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(4): 99–112
- Moore, M. and Carpenter, J.M. (2008). An examination of consumer price cue usage in US discount formats. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 36(5): 350-370
- Puffer, S. M. (1994). Understanding the bear: a portrait of Russian business leaders. *Academy of Management Executive*, 8: 41-54
- Puffer, S. M. and McCarthy, D. J. (1995). Finding the common ground in Russian and American business ethics. *California Management Review*, 37(2): 29-46
- Puffer, S. M., McCarthy, D. J. and Naumov, A. I. (1997). Russian managers’ beliefs about work: Beyond the stereotypes. *Journal of World Business*, 32(3): 258-276
- Ralston, D. A., D. H. Holt, R.H. Terpstra and Y. Kai-Cheng. (2008). The impact of national culture and economic ideology on managerial values: a study of the United States, Russia, Japan, and China. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39: 8-26
- Ralston, D. A., D. J. Gustafson, F. Cheung and R. H. Terpstra. (1993). Differences in managerial values: a study of US, Hong Kong and PRC managers. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24: 249-75
- Robinson, J.P., Shaver, P.R. and Wrightsman, L.S. (1991). Criteria for scale selection and evaluation, in Robinson, J.P., Shaver, P.R. and Wrightsman, L.S. (Eds), *Measures of Personality and Psychological Attitudes*. Academic Press, San Deigo, CA.
- Suutari, V. (1996). Leadership behavior in Eastern Europe: Finnish expatriates’ experiences in Russia and Estonia. In V. Suutari (Ed.), *Comparative studies on leadership beliefs and behavior of European managers*. Faculty of Business Administration Publication No. 50. Vaasa, Finland: Faculty of Business Administration.

Suutari, V. and Bolotow, S. (1996). Leadership beliefs of Finnish and Russian managers: A comparative survey within two Finnish and Russian companies. In V. Suutari (Ed.), *Comparative studies on leadership beliefs and behavior of European managers*. Faculty of Business Administration Publication No. 50. Vaasa, Finland: Faculty of Business Administration.