

**UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN FINLAND**  
Faculty of Social Sciences and Business Studies  
Business School

**ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR  
IN CULTURAL CONTEXT:  
In comparison between Finland and Russia**

Master's Thesis, Service Management  
Kati Karrinmäki 185166  
Supervisor: Anu Puusa  
March 6, 2019

## Abstract

UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN FINLAND

<b>Faculty</b> Faculty of Social Sciences and Business Studies		<b>Department</b> Business School	
<b>Author</b> Kati Pauliina Karrinmäki		<b>Supervisor</b> Anu Puusa	
<b>Title</b> ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR IN CULTURAL CONTEXT: In comparison between Finland and Russia			
<b>Main subject</b> Service Management	<b>Level</b> Master's Degree	<b>Date</b> 6 <sup>th</sup> of March 2019	<b>Number of pages</b> 76 + attachments 26 pages
<p>This Master's thesis explores <i>organisational citizenship behaviour's</i> (OCB) occurrence in cultural context in Finnish company operating in Finland and in Russia. First the OCB appears in the study company, and what categories of OCB might appear, is explored. The aim is to see whether cultural background and the context within which the employee works affect the level of demonstration of OCB in these countries. Individual differences as a predictor of OCB were also taken into account in this research. Another goal is to explore whether the observations of OCB vary between the employees from both countries. Material is gathered by using online-questionnaire. The approach applied in this study is quantitative and the results analysed using such statistical methods as factorial ANOVA, and cross tabulation.</p> <p>The current study provided an overview of the complex nature of OCB, its antecedents, types, and consequences. Despite the overlapping concepts of <i>organisational spontaneity</i> (OS), and <i>prosocial organisational behaviour</i> (POB), OCB is still the most explored concept of the work performance behaviours. Because of the dimensionality of OCB, several concepts are provided. Now the most applied model consists of expanded version of Organ's original model including <i>helping behaviour</i>, <i>organisational loyalty</i>, <i>organisational compliance</i>, <i>individual initiative</i>, <i>civic virtue</i>, and <i>self-development</i>.</p> <p>For understanding the cultural differences, Hofstede's theory of national culture was applied which was also adopted by many researchers exploring the differences of Finnish and Russian organisational culture. Having viewed the studies of Finnish and Russian management practices, there were found such differences as Finnish managers being more participative, supportive, and giving more autonomy to their subordinates, when Russian managers were less participative, less, supportive and providing detailed instructions of work tasks.</p> <p>The OCB dimensions found in this research were <i>helping behaviour</i>, <i>civic virtue</i>, and <i>organisational compliance</i>. Also, the following <i>individualism-collectivism</i> (IC) dimensions: <i>norms</i> and <i>values</i> were found. The main findings of the research were the differences between cultural background and OCB. Finnish employees were more likely to demonstrate OCB dimensions <i>helping behaviour</i>, and follow group norms. Russian employees were more driven engaging OCB dimension <i>organisational compliance</i> and follow individualistic norms. Interesting was the finding that the results of the OCB dimension <i>civic virtue</i> occurred similar, however there was slight statistically significant difference. Results of the IC dimension <i>values</i> did not differ between Finland and Russia.</p> <p>As OCB affects to the overall performance of the organisation it is important for companies to identify the cultural differences both in managerial practices and human resource practices as well as individual differences. By knowing all these differences, managers are able to plan their management better and increase the level of OCB in the organisation.</p>			
<b>Key words</b> Work behaviour, organisational citizenship behaviour, cultural differences, quantitative research, Finland, and Russia			

# Tiivistelmä

## ITÄ-SUOMEN YLIOPISTO

<b>Tiedekunta</b> Yhteiskuntatieteiden ja kauppatieteiden tiedekunta	<b>Yksikkö</b> Kauppatieteiden laitos		
<b>Tekijä</b> <u>Kati</u> Pauliina Karrinmäki	<b>Ohjaaja</b> Anu Puusa		
<b>Työn nimi (suomeksi ja englanniksi)</b> TYÖYHTEISÖ- JA ALAISTAITOJEN KULTTUURIKONTEKSTISSA: vertailussa Suomi ja Venäjä. ORGANISATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR IN CULTURAL CONTEXT: In comparison between Finland and Russia			
<b>Pääaine</b> Palvelujohtaminen	<b>Työn laji</b> Pro gradu -tutkielma	<b>Aika</b> 06.03.2019	<b>Sivuja</b> 76 s. + 26 s. liitteitä
<p>Tämä Pro gradu tutkii <i>työyhteisö- ja alaitaitoja</i> kulttuurikontekstissa suomalaisessa yrityksessä, joka toimii Suomessa ja Venäjällä. Työn tavoite on selvittää miten nämä ilmenevät kyseisessä yrityksessä ja mitä niiden kategorioita löytyy. Lisäksi tehtävä on tutkia vaikuttavatko kulttuuritausta ja kulttuurikonteksti siihen, miten <i>työyhteisö- ja alaitaidot</i> ilmenevät suomalaisten ja venäläisten työntekijöiden toiminnassa kyseisessä yrityksessä. Yksilöerot näiden taitojen vaikuttajina otetaan huomioon tässä tutkimuksessa. Viimeinen tavoite on tutkia eroavatko suomalaisten ja venäläisten työntekijöiden käsitykset työyhteisö- ja alaitaitokäsitteestä suomalaisten ja venäläisten työntekijöiden kesken. Tutkimusmateriaali on kerätty online-kyselyn avulla. Tutkimus on luonteeltaan kvantitatiivinen ja tulokset on analysoitu hyödyntäen tilastollisia menetelmiä: faktorიაalinen ANOVA, lineaarinen regressio ja ristiintaulukointi.</p> <p>Työn teoriaosa käsittelee työyhteisö- ja alaitaitoja, niiden tuottajia, tyyppisiä, ja seurauksia. Huolimatta päällekkäisistä <i>käsitteistä organisaatiospontaanius</i> ja <i>prososiaalinen organisaatiokansalaisuus</i>, <i>työyhteisö- ja alaitaidot</i> on silti tutkituin käsite työtaidoista. Johtuen käsitteen moniulottuneisuudesta siitä on tarjottu monta tyyppiä. Käytetyin versio sisältää: <i>auttava käyttäytyminen</i>, <i>rehtiyys</i>, <i>organisaatiokansalaisuus</i>, <i>organisaatiokuuliaisuus</i>, <i>oma-aloitteisuus</i>, <i>kansalaishyve</i> ja <i>itsensä kehittäminen</i>.</p> <p>Kulttuurierojen tutkimisessa hyödynnetään Hofsteden teoriaa kansallisesta kulttuurista. Aiemmista tutkimuksista kävi ilmi, että suomalaiset johtajat ovat osallistuvampia, tukevat ja antavat enemmän päätösvaltaa alaisilleen kuin venäläiset johtajat, jotka myös näkevät yksityiskohtaisten työohjeiden antamisen tarpeelliseksi.</p> <p>Tässä tutkimuksessa löydetty työyhteisö- ja alaitaitotyyppit olivat: <i>auttava käyttäytyminen</i>, <i>kansalaishyve</i> ja <i>organisaatiokuuliaisuus</i>. Lisäksi tutkimuksessa löydettiin seuraavat yksilö- ja ryhmätyypit: <i>normit</i> ja <i>arvot</i>. Tämän tutkimuksen päälöydöt osoittivat, että suomalaisten ja venäläisten työyhteisötaidoissa on eroja tässä organisaatiossa. Suomalaiset työntekijät osoittautuivat taipuvaisemmiksi auttamiseen ja noudattamaan ryhmäsääntöjä. Venäläiset työntekijät sen sijaan olivat taipuvaisempia noudattamaan sekä organisaation määräyksiä ja sääntöjä, että yksilösääntöjä. Mielenkiintoinen löydös oli se, että tulokset työyhteisö- ja alaitaitokategoriasta <i>kansalaishyve</i> osoittautuivat samankaltaisiksi, vaikka maiden välillä oli havaittavissa hyvin pientä tilastollisesti merkittävää eroa. Lisäksi tulokset yksilö- ryhmäkäsitteestä <i>arvot</i> ilmenivät samanlaisina suomalaisten ja venäläisten välillä.</p> <p>Kuten on todettu, että työyhteisö- ja alaitaidot on merkittävä vaikutus yrityksen kokonaistulokseen, yritysten on tärkeää tunnistaa kulttuurierot johtamisessa, henkilöstöosastolla, sekä yksilötasolla. Tunnistamalla nämä erot, johtajat pystyvät paremmin suunnittelemaan johtamisensa paremmin ja kasvattamaan työntekijöidensä työyhteisö- ja alaitaitoja organisaatiossa.</p>			
<b>Avainsanat</b> Työtaidot, työyhteisö- ja alaitaidot, organisaatiokansalaisuus, kulttuurierot, määrällinen tutkimus, Suomi ja Venäjä			

## Table of contents

1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Conceptual framework and research questions .....	3
1.2 Approach .....	4
1.3 Research material and method.....	4
2 WORK BEHAVIOUR .....	5
2.1 Organisational Citizenship Behaviour.....	5
2.2 Task performance and contextual performance.....	12
2.3 OCB categories.....	13
2.5 Predictors of OCB .....	17
2.7 Consequences of OCB.....	23
3 NATIONAL CULTURE AND ORGANISATION .....	26
3.1 Hofstede’s theory of national culture .....	26
3.2 The adopted model .....	28
3.3 Hofstede’s theory and OCB.....	30
3.4 Organisational culture.....	31
3.4.1 Finland .....	32
3.4.2 Russia.....	33
4 HYPOTHESES .....	42
5 RESEARCH MATERIAL AND METHODS .....	43
5.1 The research material.....	43
5.2 Research methods .....	46
6 RESULTS.....	48
6.1 Statements.....	48
6.2 Univariate analysis .....	53
7 CONCLUSION .....	61
8 REFERENCES.....	69
8.1 Sources.....	69

8.2 Literature .....	69
APPENDIX 1: Questionnaire.....	77
APPENDIX 2: Original tables of factorial ANOVA .....	81
APPENDIX 3: Original observations of OCB.....	102

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Due to continuously changing global business environment companies are facing numerous challenges every day. Also, number of companies have gone abroad or have international personnel. Affected by limited financial resources, increasing competition, rapid technology development, and other factors companies have to think how to perceive the best performance. In order to succeed, companies have to develop new ways to differentiate themselves from their rivals. It is necessary for companies to pay more attention to the intellectual capital of the organisation, such as the employees working in the organisation who by their actions can provide competitive advantage to the organisation. Academic interest in how personnel can affect to the performance of the organisation has increased. The research bases on the research by Daniel Katz (1964) who identified basic types of behaviour that are crucial for organisation performance. He argued that every organisation's actions are daily dealing with acts of cooperation, helpfulness, suggestions, gestures of goodwill, altruism, and other elements of citizenship behaviour (Katz 1964 via Smith et al. 1983, 653). The most explored category of performance in this field is *organisational citizenship behaviour* that has been recognised affecting to the job performance and organisation's overall performance. To point out, studies by Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1994; 1997), MacKenzie et al. (1993), Podsakoff et al. (2000), Podsakoff et al (2009), and Bateman and Organ (1983). It is important for companies to identify behaviour that is beyond the work role and the job description. It is also important to identify predictors that cause such actions and which do not.

After the collusion of the Soviet Union companies from Western countries have noticed the potential of Russian markets. For example, in 2016 more than 400 Finnish companies operated in Russia and invested about 12 milliard euros and employed 40 000 Russian (Hautala via TASS 2016). Employees with different cultural background may be affected by their native culture and therefore have different values and norms, and often common language used in the organisation is not necessary their mother tongue. Together with other challenges this cross-cultural environment may create challenges for the companies to succeed in their daily business when different values and norms meet in the organisation.

Although the need for studies exploring cultural context is obvious, there are not many studies found about how the cultural context affect. How the cultural concept affects to OCB has

been explored for example, by Paine and Organ (2000) and Karam and Kwantes (2011), and also noted by Podsakoff et al. (2009). However, the topic still needs more studies on this field.

This Master's thesis examines the concept of OCB, its origins and its appearance in cultural context in Finnish company operating in Europe and in Russia. For company operating both in Finland and Russia has to take into account not only the organisational culture in Finland, but also the organisational culture in Russia, and what practices are best applicable in this cross-cultural context. The opportunities and challenges caused by Russian markets have gained some attention in academic and non-academic research. (Denisova-Schmidt 2011, 2.) To name a few, Puffer and Sheksnia (1996) Puffer et al. 1998, E. Denisova-Schmidt (2008; 2011), Fey et al. (1999), have explored the differences between Western and Russian managers, and studies by V. Suutari (1998), and Fey et al. (1999) compared Finnish and Russian managers. How operating in Russia affects to the human resource management (HRM) practices of the Western companies is still in need for further exploration. (Denisova-Schmidt 2011, 2). Also, understanding the characteristics of human resource practices in Soviet era is important, as some of the employees have been living in Soviet Union most of their live. (Fey et al. 1999, 70). Thus, exploring the differences is important because one cannot implement new practices not having complete understanding of the past.

This study aims to investigate does the cultural background and context within employee works affect to the demonstration of OCB. The appearance of individual differences as a predictors of OCB are also taken into account in this research. Finally, the observations of OCB between employees from both countries are viewed. In this research studies exploring differences between Finnish and Russian managerial practices are also viewed in order to understand the possible cultural differences in the organisational culture of current company both in Finnish and Russian branch offices, and provide suggestions for managerial practises. Material is gathered by using questionnaire addressed to employees of this company. In this research the company stays unknown, thus no company name is exposed.

The field of OCB research develops rapid and the recent research conducted in this field is quite diverse. To name a few, study by Lin et al. (2016) explores the relation between welfare practices and OCB, study by Koning and Van Kleef (2015) reveals the relationship between the leadership and OCB. Studies by Robertson and Barling (2017), and Terrier et al. (2016)

provide a fresh perspective to the OCB research: Organisational Citizenship Behaviour for the environment – OCBE. Other studies are relationship Popescu et al.'s (2015) relationship between organisation's age and OCB.

### 1.1 Conceptual framework and research questions

This research focuses on OCB and its appearance in Finnish organisation operating in Europe and Russia. The focus of this research is in Finland and Russia. The framework of this research is built by applying prior studies “OCB: Its nature and antecedents” by Smith et al (1983), “OCB: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research” by Podsakoff et al. (2000), “The cultural matrix of organizational citizenship behavior: Some preliminary conceptual and empirical observations” by Paine and Organ (2000), and “Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour” by Moorman R.H. and Blakely G.L. (1995). Furthermore, in order to explore the cultural context, G. Hofstede's theory of national culture is adopted in this research. Adopting Hofstede's theory, the cultural dimensions of the both countries are presented by applying his model of national culture by Hofstede (2010).

This research aims to find out is there OCB in this current organisation and what categories of OCB appear. Prior research in this field has provided several types of OCB. Also, in prior research of *individualism-collectivism* (IC) different categories appear. The OCB categories applied in this research are *helping behaviour*, *organisational compliance*, and *civic virtue*. IC categories applied are *values*, and *norms*. All the definitions among other categories are discussed in greater detail in chapter 2.2.

The main research questions consist of three parts. First research question aims to find out does the employees' cultural background such as country of origin and mother tongue affect to OCB identified in this organisation. The goal is to explore are employees from one country more likely to engage in OCB than employees from another country. How the other demographic factors affect is also investigated. Second question explores whether the country where employees work at the current moment affect to OCB. Thus, the aim is to explore whether the cultural context where the employee works affect to the OCB. Whether the



differences in IC provided by prior research occur between employees from Finland and Russia is also explored which represents the third research question. Final research question aims to find out do the observations of OCB differ between employees from both countries. That is, the goal is to find out whether the observations of OCB differ between Finnish and Russian employees.

## **1.2 Approach**

Approach of this research is quantitative and the material is analyzed using statistical methods. Quantitative research was chosen because of the prior research and the size of the data. In order to receive correct results from this research, quantitative methods are required.

## **1.3 Research material and method**

The research material is gathered by applying a questionnaire. The questionnaire (see Appendix 1.) consists of 45 questions. For this research no specific one questionnaire was found. Therefore, the questionnaire is created borrowing questions from prior studies by Smith et al. 1983, Moorman and Blakely 1995, and Van Dyne et al. 1994, and combining them to one questionnaire. The questionnaire adopted in this research includes both elements of OCB and IC.

The questionnaire is sent to employees of the current organisation working in branch offices in Finland and Russia. Overall amount of employees in this organisation is over 10 000 employees. The amount of respondents chosen to the current research is 1000.

The research methods of the current study are quantitative. Number of the methods are adopted from previous researchers in this field. Exploratory factor analysis is adopted to find out loaded latent factors from both OCB and IC statements. For testing the hypothesis such variance analysis as factorial ANOVA is applied. Observations of OCB are tested applying cross tabulation.

## 2 WORK BEHAVIOUR

As citizens in a country people have certain norms, rules, and regulations of the way they should act, and responsibilities that they have to fulfil. Good citizens are seen those who obey the rules, fulfil their responsibilities, and have good manners. At work, employees can be seen as citizens too, citizens of an organisation. In an organisation there are also rules and regulations employees have to obey. They have certain responsibilities they have to fulfil, and manners how to behave. *Organisational behaviour* is defined as behaviour how individual or group act toward an individual and organisation, which contribute benefit for the organisation (Business dictionary 2018a). *Organisational citizenship* refers to the level of the benefit an individual contributes to the organisation by her actions and behaviour (Business dictionary 2018b). Work behaviours that contribute organisational effectiveness have gained number of interest in last 30 years. Most of interest has gained the concept *organisational citizenship behaviour* (OCB). (George and Brief 1992, 313.) In the next chapter overview of the OCB concept, overlapping concepts, its dimensions, and its antecedents are presented. The possible consequences OCB causes are also provided.

### 2.1 Organisational Citizenship Behaviour

As OCB has been the most explored concept of work performance and therefore gained number of interest in management studies, it is now widely explored in all areas. The concept OCB was found by Organ and his colleagues three decades ago (Bateman and Organ 1983, Organ and Smith 1983 via Podsakoff et al. 2000, 513). Borrowing from studies by C. Barnard's (1938) "willingness to cooperate" and Katz's (1964) "innovative and spontaneous behaviours" they provided the following definition: "individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by formal reward system and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organisation" (Organ 1988, 4 via Organ and Paine 2000, 6). Back then the concept was seen as extra-role behaviours, which are behaviours excluded from the job description and more like a personal choice (Podsakoff et al 2000, 513). More specifically, the construct "discretionary" in definition provided by Organ and his colleagues already refers to its role outside the work behaviour. (George and Brief, 1992, 311.). Russian researcher O. Gulevich (2013) defines OCB as "employees' voluntary actions of which the employees are not rewarded, but which are addressed towards the

organisational effectiveness, support its psychological and social function, and strengthen its effectiveness". That is, both by Western and Russian researchers define OCB as a voluntary behaviour.

The OCB definition has been adopted by many researchers. The concept was first explored in social sciences and in psychology from where it expanded to other areas (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 513). Although the current concept was first found by Organ and his colleagues, there are concepts that are similar to OCB, such as *prosocial organisational behaviour* (POB)" by Brief and Motowidlo (1986), and *organisational spontaneity* (OS) by George and Brief (1992), which roots actually lie on the Katz's (1964) research of innovative and spontaneous behaviours (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 526). Nevertheless, the roots take all the way to 1960's Katz's research of spontaneous behaviours, the actual interest on the behaviours contributing organisational effectiveness began only after introduction of OCB and POB. (George and Brief 1992, 313.) Podsakoff and his colleagues (2000) claim, the interest in this concept and its' rapid growth have created some unfavourable consequences. First, according to Podsakoff et al. (2000), the literature on this field has explored more the relationships between the organisational citizenship and other concepts and less the citizenship behaviour itself. Moreover, Schwab (1980) and Van Dyne et al. (1995) argued if more concentration is not put on exploring the concept itself, there may be a creation of literature that may be unfortunate to the field in the long run (Schwab 1980; VanDyne et al. 1995 via Podsakoff 2000, 515). Second, as a result of the rapid growth of OCB research on other fields, it is difficult for readers to keep themselves updated of the latest developments on this field. Therefore, as Podsakoff and his colleagues (2000) suggest, in order to understand the differences between OCB and the similar concepts OS, and POB, it is important to explore them in greater detail. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 515.)

#### Organisational spontaneity an OCB

George and Brief (1992) describe OS following Katz's (1964) five spontaneous extra-role behaviours: *helping co-workers, protecting the organisation, making constructive suggestions, developing oneself, and spreading goodwill* (Katz 1964 via George and Brief 1992, 310). They compared OS with the two overlapping concepts OCB, and POB and found

some similarities but also elements that vary between these concepts. (George and Brief 1992, 310.)

To begin, the similarities between OCB and OS are that they both include voluntary behaviour and effective functioning of organisations. Thus, one might state that OCB and OS are similar concepts. However, research by George and Brief (1992) has proven the following differences between these concepts. They state, that in Organ's OCB, providers of innovative ideas in organisations would be rewarded for their contributions to effectiveness, when in Katz's OS such behaviour would be seen more like a spontaneous behaviour. They suggest that OS is considered outside the job prescription and contributing positive value to the organisation, when OCB provides benefit to the individual. (George and Brief 1992, 311.)

George and Brief (1992) compared key elements of OS with Organ's (1988) key elements of OCB. Elements defined by Organ consists also from five elements. First element *altruism* refers to all voluntary behaviour that help colleagues with work related issues. There are no doubt the current element overlaps with the OS's element of *helping behaviour*. (George and Brief 1992, 312). The second element represent *conscientiousness*, which includes the employees' actions that go beyond the job descriptions. Such behaviour may refer to employees' willingness to complete tasks not directly addressed to the them, punctuality, meeting deadlines, or adhering the rules set by the organisation. Surprisingly, this current concept does not overlap with the elements of OS. This is due to the fact that rule adherence is organisation's key elements and requirements everyone should already obey and therefore it should be already included in the job descriptions. Also, the level of conscientiousness already distinguishes this element from a voluntary behaviour (Organ 1988 via George and Brief 1992, 312). Third form *sportsmanship* is the employees' reactions and attitudes towards difficult situations in work related issues. Thus, employee engaging in such behaviour do not mourn in every difficult situation when not satisfied, but complete tasks without complaining. Likewise, the previous concept conscientiousness, so does not this form overlap with key elements of OS. According to George and Brief (1992), this is due to the description of the current term by Organ who defined sportsmanship as behaviour lacking abnormal elements. The next element of Organ's OCB represents *courtesy* which is questioned by the current authors, because they include constructs that could be viewed as formal and also as informal. To clarify, providing notice advance, consulting, and reminding could be seen as being more

like voluntary, whereas several written rules might be more like organisation's standardised procedures. Organ's final element *civic virtue*, originally presented by Graham (1986), presents the employees' willingness to participate in the organisations' political environment. For example, attending meetings, discussing work related issues on personal time, viewing internal mail. George and Brief (1992) state, the current element refers to the same issue as noticed in the element of conscientiousness and courtesy; these actions prescribed by civic virtue are not spontaneous. To conclude, it is obvious that OS and OCB both include helping behaviours, but OCB includes behaviours that cannot be included to OS, when OCB does not include such OS elements as protecting the organisation, and developing oneself. (George and Brief 1992, 312.)

Despite that the last theme *self-development* has been argued being distinct from the other citizenship behaviour themes, as failing in perceiving no confirmation in the OCB literature, it is still observed as positive effect to organisational performance. This current concept consists of such voluntary behaviours, as: "*improving knowledge, skills, and abilities*". (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 526.)

#### Prosocial organisational behaviour and OCB

*Prosocial organisational behaviour* (POB) by Brief and Motowidlo (1986) refer to individual's behaviour in organisation addressed to co-worker, group, or organisation with whom she is interacting constantly when working, and demonstrated with the willingness to promote the "welfare of the individual, group, or organisation toward which the behaviour is directed" (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, 711). POB overlaps with OS and other behavioural concepts in a sense that it includes elements of in-role and extra-role behaviours functional to organisation. However, the concept itself is too broad and it varies from OCB and OS in a sense it also includes other kind of behaviours. Brief and Motowidlo (1986) provided three types of POB. First type refers to distinction between behaviours functional to the organisation and behaviours that make it difficult for the organisation to be effective. Behaviours functional to the organisation are behaviours necessary to organisation's success, such as helping and cooperating with others, protecting organisation from outside threats, and spreading positive news about the organisation (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, 711).

Unfavourable behaviours to the organisation are helping colleagues with personal problems during work time, avoiding to express own opinions, and providing services or products to customers in non-productive manner. (Brief and Motowidlo 1986 via George and Brief 1992, 312.) Second type represents distinction between in-role and extra-role behaviours. In-role behaviours refer to behaviours functional to organisation and can be observed as a formal part of the job, such as assignments to help customers, cooperate with the team members working in the same team, or training a new employee in his/her new job. Actually, as such behaviours are positive to organisation, they are usually seen as performance requirements and therefore part of the job. Also, as Organ (1977) stated, managers view such behaviours rather more important than productivity. On the contrary, extra-role behaviours are positive social acts outside the job description and they can be not only functional to the organisation but also dysfunctional. Such behaviours are observed as acts that may provide benefit to the individual but not to the organisation. Last type provided by Brief and Motowidlo (1986) illustrates the distinction between the targets of prosocial acts. Those acts are usually directed toward individuals with whom the organisational members are in constant interaction while working, but those prosocial acts can be directed also toward the organisation as whole. Such as acts individuals are performing by sacrificing their own time, energy and resources for the sake of the organisation. It is also important to note this kind of voluntary acts toward organisation are always seen functional to the organisation. (Brief and Motowidlo 1986, via George and Brief 1992, 312.)

As Brief and Motowidlo (1986) signed, the concept itself is too broad as it includes also those elements that may not be functional to the organisation. Thus, helpful behaviour in POB might refer to not only helping co-workers, but also rivals. (Brief and Motowidlo 1986 via George and Brief 1992, 312.) Hence, although POB consists elements of organisational spontaneity, due to the dysfunctional elements of POB, it cannot be completely considered affecting positive to the organisation.

Even though there are two concepts overlapping with OCB, it is not obvious they should be considered analogous. As George and Brief (1992) compared both OCB and POB with OS, they came to the conclusion, that OCB and POB differ from OS in a sense that they both include other behavioural patterns than OS, and OCB is lacking certain forms of spontaneity (George and Brief 1992, 313).

## Extra-role or in-role?

The nature of OCB whether it should have considered as behaviour included in the job or outside the job has been explored. There has been criticism towards the concept seen as 'extra-role' behaviour and being excluded from the job description. To name a few, Van Dyne et al. (1994) redefined the construct and suggested a new measurement for the concept. The current authors agree that the concept overlaps with OS and POB and other related concepts in a way they all are observed as work behaviours contributing organisational effectiveness. Borrowing from Graham's (1991) two approaches of OCB, they suggest new approaches. First approach refers to the statement that OCB and job performance are separate concepts. This means that as prior OCB researchers make distinction between citizenship behaviour and in-role job performance, they suggest OCB should be considered extra-role and functional to the organisation. However, this creates a problem as the researcher has to define what is included both in in-role and extra-role behaviours, which is actually depending on variety of different factors. To avoid this difficulty, Graham (1991) borrowed from civic citizenship research in philosophy, political science, and social history and provided another approach. In this new approach civic citizenship includes all the positive behaviours of individual citizens addressed towards community. In addition, she adopted three categories from political studies and applied them in citizenship in organisational settings. Her conceptualisation of organisational citizen included not only traditional in-role behaviours, and extra-role behaviours functional to organisation, but also a new set of political behaviours, as responsible organisational participation. First concept of the political behaviours adopted were *obedience*, which in political settings refers to citizen's respect to authorities and obeying the law in organisational context is how employees accept the rules and regulations in the organisation. Second concept refers to *loyalty* which in political settings is described as the intentions of citizens' to promote and protect their society and how ready they are work extra for the for the common good, when in organisation it is observed as loyalty to the leaders of the organisation and the whole organisation. Last category from political studies represent *participation*, which in political settings refer to citizens' active participation in community and all the legal actions that contribute the common good, and in organisation it is viewed as active participation on organisation related issues. (Van Dyne et al. 1994). Later Van Dyne and her colleagues (1995) provided another study where they criticised Organ's original definition of OCB viewing it as extra-role.

After viewing Van Dyne et al. (1995) study, Organ (1997b) suggest, OCB no longer can be observed as in his first study: “extra-role behaviour, beyond the job, or unrewarded by the formal system” (Organ 1997b, 85). He took his original definition under a magnifying glass, as he noticed the definition itself consist some problematic elements; elements that can be considered part of the job. First, the construct discretionary that refers to extra-role, beyond the job description is problematic in a sense it can consist elements respondents may consider as part of the job. He claimed the problem may be in the concept of how different people view ‘role’ or ‘job’. Conversely, Organ et al. (1995b) claim that perceptions of whether some behaviour can be observed as extra-role or in-role behaviour may differ between managers and employees. Thus, managers may define extra-role behaviour as included in the work tasks, whereas employees may observe it more as excluded from the work tasks and more as a voluntary work. Second problem is the construct ‘unrewarded by formal system’, which causes a problem with the perception of reward in that that contracts rarely contain any notions about rewards. So, some OCB dimensions would be seen as in-role and leading to monetary rewards. (Organ 1997b, 87-91.)

Organ et al. (1997b) criticise Van Dyne et al. (1995) totally leaving out the concept *contextual performance*, even though it is almost analogous with OCB. Organ himself (1997b) state OCB should be seen more like contextual performance described by Borman and Motowidlo (1993). (Organ 1997b, 85.) Organ (1997b) suggest his original definition should be now viewed as a “performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place”. Organ’s latest definition describes OCB as “discretionary, nonrequired contributions by members of the organisations that employ them” (Organ 2015, 317). This new definition supports the distinction between OCB and task performance, and is more suitable with Borman and Motowidlo’s contextual performance, viewing OCBs as discretionary behaviour which are not rewarded. However, what is common to the both of these definitions, is that they both contribute to organisational effectiveness. (Podsakoff et al. 2009, 122.) In order to understand the differences of these concepts, and how they may affect to OCB, it is recommended to have a look on the concept by Borman and Motowidlo (1993).



## 2.2 Task performance and contextual performance

Borman and Motowidlo define *task performance* as the “effectiveness of employee activities”, and *contextual performance* as “individual efforts that are not directly related to employees’ main task functions but are important in shaping the organisational, social and psychological context serving as the critical catalyst for task activities and processes”. According to Motowidlo et al. (1997) *task performance* consists of two parts. First part represents organisation’s core activities that create the products or services. To name a few, these kind of activities may represent selling in stores, working in the manufacture, and teaching in school. The second part include the activities that maintain the technical core of the product, such as supervising, coordinating, and planning. (Motowidlo et al. 1997, 75.)

*Contextual performance* differs from task performance in a sense its function is to maintain “the broader organisational, social, and psychological environment where the technical core operates”. (Motowidlo et al. 1997, 75). Such performance can include activities like helping and cooperating colleagues, adhering to organisational rules and procedures, supporting, and defending organisation, at same time remaining enthusiastic when it is required to complete own tasks successfully, and voluntarily to perform task activities that are not included in the job description. (Motowidlo et al. 1997, 75-76.)

When exploring job performances, Borman and Motowidlo aimed to distinguish task performance from contextual performance. They state, *contextual performance* refers to many of the dimensions of OCB (Organ 1988), POB (Brief and Motowidlo 1986), and OS (George and Brief 1992), whereas task performance fails to do that. (Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994, 476.) Both of these concepts are crucial for company activities as they affect overall performance. However, prior research proved there is empirical evidence they affect independently to overall performance. (Motowidlo and Van Scotter, 1994, 476.)

In order to understand the difference between *task performance* and *contextual performance*, Motowidlo and his colleagues categorised task performance and contextual performance by two categories: *cognitive ability* and *personality*. Prior studies showed cognitive ability being better predictor of task performance, whereas personality was seen as better predictor of contextual performance. Thus, experience and expertise is predictor of task performance,

whereas contextual performance is controlled by individual's motivation contribute such behaviour (Motowidlo et al. 1997, 76). Griffin et al.'s (2000) study of air traffic controllers provided evidence that contextual performance is affected by situational factors; contextual performance performed by air traffic controllers contributed to effectiveness for task performers in easy air traffic situations, but in difficult traffic situations failed to do that. According to Griffin et al. (2000) serious failing in air controller's tasks may cause losing their licence and job. (Griffin et al. 2000, 532.) Thus, in difficult work situations air controllers focus only on the crucial tasks, and leave out the additional tasks. As a result, when facing difficult situations, no extra behaviour is performed. Therefore, it is obvious these two dimensions do differ from each other and are affected by different predictors.

Hoffman et al. (2007) finding that previous research on OCB has focused more to the relationship between OCB and contextual performance but still provided evidence that task performance affects to the organisation's overall performance and left the question whether task performance is related to OCB unexplored, they aimed to prove relationship between OCB and task performance. They conducted a quantitative research of OCB literature and found correlation between OCB and task performance. They also found that OCB can be empirically distinguished from task performance, and refer more to work-related measures of attitude. However, the differences were small. As a result, they question their findings by criticising whether the correlation between OCB and task performance is real or caused by different observations of these concepts by different respondents. (Hoffmann et al. 2007, 561-563.)

### 2.3 OCB categories

In prior research of OCB there have been not only several, but also conflicting assumptions of what dimensions should be included in OCB. First, Organ and Near (1983) in their very first definition of OCB included two dimensions: *altruism*, which refers to behaviour of helping individuals, and *generalised compliance*, that presents following rules, norms, and expectations. Later Organ (1988) provided a five-dimensional model with *altruism* and additional four dimensions: *courtesy*, *conscientiousness*, *civic virtue*, and *sportsmanship*. Interestingly, some researchers criticise Organ's model being unsuitable for cross-cultural

research as it includes elements characteristic for western individualistic societies. Russian researcher B. Rebzuev (2009) investigated this issue and found that some of the factors of Western model are suitable for Russian context, and some of them not. Therefore, he provided his own model that fits to Russian context. Podsakoff et al. (1990) proposed a model that is now mostly applied model OCB in the OCB literature. The current model is an extension of the Organ's (1988) five dimensional model including subscales for each dimension. However, although extended model of Organ's (1988) original model of OCB has been most applied in the research on OCB, it has been criticised being too wide. To point out, William and Anderson (1991) in their research of OCB, suggest dimensions of OCB should be categorised by concepts *OCB-O*, that refer to behaviour addressed to organisation, and *OCB-I*, behaviour directed toward individuals, because they have different ancestors. They received some support to their proposition, but it failed to show its significance when exploring it as a potential consequence of OCB. Hence, now Podsakoff et al. (2009) suggest, the difference between OCB dimensions might rather base on their nature whether they are affiliative or challenging in nature, not on the perspective to whom it is directed. (Podsakoff et al. 2009, 133.)

Also, different variables identified with statistical methods in previous research of OCB literature have gained more interest on this field than any other aspect of this concept. Now the literature provides several of dimensions for OCB. The prior research of conceptual definitions of OCB bases on the Katz's study mentioned earlier and consists of studies by Organ (1988), Brief and Motowidlo (1986), Graham (1991), George and Brief (1992), George and Jones (1997), and Borman and Motowidlo (1993), who have offered 30 different types of OCB (Podsakoff et al 2000, 515). Due to conceptual similarity of these types, Podsakoff and his colleagues (2000) grouped them in seven common themes, which are the most applied dimensions in the recent literature in this field. First dimension represents *helping behaviour* that consists of "willingness to help others or preventing the occurrence of work related problems". This theme is the most explored dimension in OCB research and is recognised important by several researchers. This definition includes several elements, such as *altruism*, *peacemaking*, *cheerleading*, *interpersonal helping*, *helping others* and *courtesy*. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 516.)

Second dimension represents *sportsmanship* that can be observed as “a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences of work without complaining” (Organ 1990b, 96 via Podsakoff et al. 2000, 517). Podsakoff and his colleagues (2000) criticise this definition being too narrow and they state that “good sports” is not only the description of people that are not complaining in case their colleagues have caused them inconveniences, and when things do not go as planned. To clarify, people who engage this kind of behaviour do not take personally if others disagree their suggestions, and set work groups’ interest over personal interest. (Podsakoff 2000, 517.)

Next theme *organisational loyalty* includes several parts, such as Graham’s (1989; 1991) *loyal boosterism* and *organisational loyalty*, George and Brief’s (1992), and George and Jones’ (1997) *spreading goodwill and protecting the organisation*, and Borman and Motowidlo’s (1993) *the endorsing, supporting and defending organisation*. Hence, organisational loyalty implies organisation promotion, its’ protection against external threats, and loyalty to the organisation even counterproductive situations. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 517.) Thus, such behaviour helps organisations survive crisis and other threats.

Fourth theme *organisational compliance* has gained number of interested in OCB research. It can be characterised as how person conscientiously obeys organisation’s rules, regulations, and procedures and even when no one else of the work community does. Furthermore, this theme has several different definitions, as *generalised compliance* by Smith et al. (1983), *organisational obedience* Graham (1991), *OCB-O* Williams and Anderson (1991), *following organisational rules and procedures* by Borman and Motowidlo (1993), and some aspects of *job dedication* by Van Scotter and Motovidlo (1996). Turning to the point that the current theme is observed as included in OCB bases on the assumption that despite companies expect everyone to obey the company rules, still only few employees apply them. That is why a “good citizen” is seen as an employee who obey all company rules and regulations even when such behaviour is not controlled. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 517-518.)

Fifth theme represents *individual initiative* that can be defined as behaviours going beyond the call of duty. That is why part of it is regarded being extra-role as it sometimes engages voluntary behaviour. Podsakoff et al. (2000) list such behaviours as voluntary acts of creativity for improvement addressed to individual or to the organisation, being enthusiastic

to succeed one's job, and voluntarily to perform additional tasks, and encouraging her colleagues to act the same. Furthermore, researchers like MacKenzie et al (1991), (1993), have excluded this dimension from the OCB. In that sense this dimension is most difficult to observe as distinct from in-role behaviour, as it includes elements both in-role and extra-role. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 524.)

Sixth theme *civic virtue* refers to the commitment to the organisation, which originates from Graham's (1991) proposition of employee as a citizen of the organisation and what responsibilities she has toward organisation (Graham 1991). Hence, employee views herself as part of the organisation as a whole. Such behaviour includes several activities. First of all, it includes employees' willingness to take active participation in organisation's activities, for example participation in meetings, engaging in policy discussions, and express own opinions. Secondly it also includes employee's willingness to keep herself update about organisations environment and possible threats and opportunities, and also protecting the organisation. Thus, employees can observe their responsibilities in organisation the same as they have certain responsibilities as citizens in a country. This dimension consists of several concepts of prior researchers, such as *civic virtue*, *organisational participation*, and *protecting the organisation* (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 525.)

Despite that last theme *self-development* has been argued being distinct from the other citizenship behaviour themes, as failing in perceiving no confirmation in the OCB literature, it is still observed affecting positively to organisational performance. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 526.) Drawing from work by Katz (1964), George and Brief (1992) identified developing oneself as a one of the most important dimensions of citizenship behaviour. This dimension relates to behaviour that employees voluntarily perform in order to improve their expertise. According to George and Brief (1992) this might include "finding out what courses might be available for their personal development, keeping themselves update about the latest developments in their field of expertise, or learning a new skill to accomplish their work tasks and responsibilities more effectively. Interestingly, although self-development failed to show any empirical confirmation in the citizenship literature, it is still considered a discretionary form of employee behaviour that contributes to organisational efficiency. It differs from other OCB dimensions in a sense it affects to organisational performance through different elements. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 526.)

The complex nature of OCB including overlapping concepts, and discussion of whether the concept should be viewed as extra-role or in-role has provided several dimensions of the concept. Later these dimensions have been developed and the final model including seven OCB dimensions has been adopted in many of the recent research of OCB. For better understanding of the OCB dimensions it is important to view the predictors of OCB. Predictors that have gained most attention in OCB literature are discussed in the next chapter.

## 2.5 Predictors of OCB

Prior research of OCB has not only explored the several dimensions of OCB but also the factors that cause such behaviours. To better understand the full nature of OCB, it is also important to know what predicts such behaviours. In this section an overview of antecedents of OCB recognised in prior literature is provided.

Podsakoff and his colleagues (2000) identified antecedents from prior research and grouped them into four categories of antecedents for OCB. First of them is *individual characteristics* that include morale, that relates to “employee satisfaction, organisational commitment, perceptions of fairness and leader’s support”. Studies by Bateman and Organ (1983), Smith et al. (1983), Williams and Anderson (1991), Schappe (1998), Salehi and Gholtash (2011), and Pavalache-Ilie (2014) have investigated the associations between job satisfaction and OCB. For example, Bateman and Organ (1983) challenged the prior suggestions of organisational psychologists, who claimed satisfaction affects to job performance only when satisfaction is depending on the performance-contingent rewards (Lawler and Porter 1967 via Bateman and Organ 1983), and performance caused by satisfaction is only a naive thought (Bateman and Organ 1983, 587). Their research found strong relations with satisfaction and OCB, but weaker relation with job satisfaction and performance. (Bateman and Organ 1983, 592). To the extent OCB has been viewed as contributing the organisational effectiveness, it is obvious that satisfaction is related to performance because it showed relation with OCB. Organ and Ryan (1995), and Smith et al. (1983) also found strong relation between job satisfaction as a predictor of OCB as well as leader supportiveness. Another study by Schappe (1998) suggested that organisational commitment showed stronger relation to OCB than job

satisfaction or any other factors. Schappe (1998) suggest that managers should have wider knowledge of the job performance in general, and begin to recognise and encourage employees to engage in the behaviours that are crucial to organisation's success (Schappe 1998, 287-288.) Given that satisfied employees engage in OCB, would it be possible unsatisfied employees decrease OCB behaviour? Such evidence provided Salehi and Gholtash (2011), who found that job satisfaction was positively related to OCB, but such negative factor as burnout had negative relation to OCB. They also found positive association between organisational commitment and OCB. Organisational commitment and its effect on OCB was also explored by Mamman et al. (2012), and Devece et al. (2016). Fairness has been also noted by Farh et al. (1990), and Moorman et al. (1993).

Podsakoff and his colleagues (2000) noted all these antecedents have been found to be significant predictors of OCB, whereas such demographic factor as gender showed no significance. Prior research has found women to be more driven to empathy, and men more driven to conscientiousness, therefore Podsakoff and his colleagues (2000) argue, this finding is surprising and further investigation on this issue is necessary. Second category by Podsakoff and his colleagues (2000) represents such *task characteristics*, as task feedback, and satisfying tasks, which in the prior studies have proven significance with OCB.

Third category *organisational characteristics* was a bit complex as the characteristics explored were differently related to OCB dimensions. For example, study by Yildirim (2014) found correlation between organisational communication and OCB. He suggests organisational communication should not only be considered with communication between managers and employees, but also the overall performance of the organisation should be communicated to the employees (Yildirim 2014, 1099). Study by Popescu et al. (2015) investigated how the organisation's age affect to the OCB, and study by Özcelik and Findikli (2014) explored the relationship between internal branding and OCB.

*Leadership behaviours* represent the fourth category. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 529-532.) For example, Podsakoff et al (1990), who explored the relationship between transformational leadership behaviours and OCB and found that transformational leadership behaviours affect to OCB indirectly. That is, the effect is seen through the level of trust of the employees toward their managers. (Podsakoff et al. 1990, 108). Moreover, Cho and Danserau (2010),

explored the effect of transformational leadership behaviours on OCBs on individual and group level, and found that when leaders are treating their employees fairly and considering their needs and problems, employees feel they are respected and treated equally and are more likely to engage in OCB. Cho and Danserau (2010) suggest, management should put more effort to the transformational leadership styles in order to encourage more OCB by the employees. Thus, leader's mentoring and coaching behaviours should be in line with the employees' perceptions of fairness, and they should support and maintain those behaviours. (Cho and Danserau 2010, 418-419.) Furthermore, Lopez-Dominguez et al. (2012) have explored the effects of transformational leadership on organisational citizenship behaviour. The leadership-subordinate relationships have been investigated by Bowler (2010), Deluga (1994), and Kacmar et al.(2012). Transformational leadership behaviours showed relationship with most of the OCB dimensions, as well as the transactional leadership behaviours. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 529-532.)

Among all the antecedents listed above, Podsakoff and his colleagues (2000) raised also the importance of *reward decisions* by managers. They state, that when employees realise their managers control the rewards addressed to their employees, they may increase their OCBs realising they might benefit from such behaviour. There are two possibilities listed what may cause such behaviour. First, is the possibility that managers already have their own assumptions of what included in performance, and therefore might view OCB as part of it. Second possibility is that employees have complete understanding of OCB and its consequences, and engage in these behaviours expecting receiving rewards as return. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 532-533.) Appraisals have been investigated by Zheng et al. (2012), and Lin et al. (2016).

Another possible antecedent Podsakoff and his colleagues (2000) noted was *cultural context*. They listed various possible effects culture may have on OCB, such different observations of OCB and its' dimensions, different assumptions of consequences of OCB and how they affect to organisational effectiveness. (Podsakoff et al. 2000, 556.) Such importance has been noted also by Paine and Organ (2000), and Karam and Kwantes (2011). As Podsakoff and his colleagues (2000) noted, individual differences are important antecedents among other antecedents of OCB. Individual differences are discussed in the next chapter.



## Individual differences

There is not much research found of whether *individual differences* affect to OCB or not. Moorman and his colleagues (1995) explored these differences as a predictors of OCB. Drawing from research by Organ (1990) whose theory of OCB actually lies on Barnard's (1938) research of *willingness to cooperate*, and other related studies, they suggest that the prior research has proven evidence that individual differences are a significant predictor of OCB. (Moorman and Blakely 1995, 128.)

Furthermore, Moorman and his colleagues (1995) borrow from Earley's (1989) research which proposed a concept *Individualism-collectivism (IC)* – a distinction between individuals following their own interests, and individuals following the group's interests (Earley 1989 via Moorman and Blakely. 1995, 129). By Earley (1989), and Wagner and Moch (1986) this concept has a bi-polar nature, because it consists of the individual, who might consider his/her personal interest over group's interest, and collectivist, who would consider the group's interest over his/her personal interest (Earley 1989, Wagner and Moch 1986, Wagner 1992 via Moorman and Blakely 1995, 129).

Later, Hofstede et al (1980) explored cultural differences and found that IC is a fundamental distinction between cultures. That is, some societies are more individualistic than others, where some societies are more collectivistic. An example of individualistic society is United States, where people follow their own interests, whereas total opposite of that is collectivistic society such as China, where the people follow their group's interest. (Moorman and Blakely 1995, 129.)

Moorman and his colleagues (1995) also explored whether IC affect the dimensions of OCB. They borrowed Graham's (1989) four-dimensional model which consisted the dimensions *interpersonal helping, individual initiative, personal industry, and loyal boosterism*. However, as these four dimensions can be considered also extra-role, they adopted George and Brief's (1992) *conscientiousness* which can be considered as in-role. They found that Graham's personal industry overlaps with the conscientiousness and therefore it can be performed by both collectivists and individualists. Drawing from Wagner's (1992) and Wagner and Moch's

(1986) studies they measured whether IC positively relates to OCB dimensions interpersonal helping, individual initiative, and loyal boosterism. In Moorman and Blakely's (1995) study the group having highest mean value is considered collectivistic, when lower mean values tell about individualistic culture. (Moorman and Blakely, 1995, 130.)

Moorman and Blakely (1995) found that individuals holding collectivistic values are more driven to demonstrate OCB; it is obvious IC is related to OCB, as the collectivists choose group's interests over their personal interest, and because self-interest is subordinate in OCB (Moorman and Blakely, 1995, 129). Their research proved the existence of relationships between collectivistic values and such OCB dimensions as: *interpersonal helping*, *individual initiative*, and *loyal boosterism*. Also they found that collectivistic norms and interpersonal helping are related. Thus, collectivists may consider demonstrating OCB as such behaviour is seen beneficial to the group even if such behaviour is not required. They also found that such OCB dimension as *personal industry* does not relate to collectivism. This is due to this dimension's nature being described as "performance of an employees' specific tasks above and beyond call of the duty". In fact, this is related with the individuals' perceptions of OCB whether they consider it related or not related to job. Prior research has also suggested that personal industry is considered as behaviour that leads to personal rewards (George and Brief 1992 via Moorman and Blakely 1995), so individualists might demonstrate OCB because they suggest it relates to their contribution. Therefore, there is no difference between the individualists and collectivists in performing personal industry. (Moorman and Blakely 1995, 137-138.)

Moorman and Blakely also noted, that as collectivists are more likely to perform OCB, because they are driven by group values and norms, it may be that the distinction between in-role and extra-role is not as clear as for the individualists. Individualists view extra-role behaviours as "behaviours that are not explicitly recognised by the reward systems", whereas collectivists may view them as in-role. Therefore, there is a concern that in case of collectivists the dimensions and predictors of OCB provided by prior research on this field may not be supported. (Moorman and Blakely 1995, 140-141.)

This chapter provided an overview of OCB, its' origins, overlapping concepts, and its' nature whether considered as in-role or extra-role. The prior research and literature has identified

many different variables of OCB and finally grouped them in seven common themes. Also, Moorman and Blakely's (1995) research on individual differences as a predictor of OCB was noted, which proved that collectivists engage more in OCB than individualists due to the fact that collectivists may consider the 'extra-role' behaviour as part of the job. Later the way culture affects to OCB was also viewed. As culture plays huge role as a predictor of OCB, the differences of culture have to be explored in greater detail. The chapter 3 provides an overview of Hofstede's theory of national culture.

## Culture

Although OCB has gained attention in research past centuries, there is a lack of research of OCB in cultural context. Given that collectivist societies engage in such behaviour as OCB, it is important to explore the differences between collectivistic and individualistic societies. Some authors have proven the importance of this concept in this field. To name a few, Paine and Organ (2000) lying on George and Jones's (1997) research of contextual factors as influences on OCB, prove that the context where the organisation operates, affect more to OCB than we have thought. They suggest that national culture might influence to those conditions that relate to OCB. (Paine and Organ 2000, 46.) Later other researchers have also noticed this problem such as Podsakoff et al. (2009), and Karam and Kwantes (2011), who criticise prior studies being too general and leaving out the cultural context. Notably, they state that this gap exists in the field in general. (Karam and Kwantes 2011, 305.)

Paine and Organ suggest that cultural group norms may affect the way employees demonstrate OCB. They base their statement on the research by George and Jones (1997), who claim that contextual factors are important predictors of OCB, and identify them in three levels: individual, group, and organisational level. First level *individual* consists of skills and role prescription. Next level *group* refers to common norms and goals. Third level *organisational* includes almost all the functions that are impacted by human resource functions, such as organisational structure, policies, and rewards. (George and Jones 1997 via Paine and Organ 2000, 47.)

All the contextual factors may depend on a number of sources, in which the culture has a huge role in shaping organisation behavioural patterns, group dynamics, and structure. Thus,

human resource of an organisation should take in account the cultural aspects, requirements, values, and norms of employees having different cultural background than the employees from the culture where the employees are working. (Paine and Organ 2000, 48.) Hofstede's theory of national culture and how it links to OCB is discussed more detailed in chapter 3.

Along the predictors discussed above, there are also little studies found about other predictors. For example, Demirel and Sadykova (2018) found that social support such as colleagues and family has an affection on OCB. Acaray and Acturan (2015), and Cinar et al. (2013) found relation between organisational silence and OCB. Korkmaz and Arpacı (2009) found link between emotional intelligence and OCB. Also studies how the organisation's support towards the employees are explored by Chiang and Hsieh, who found organisational support and psychological empowerment have an impact on OCB, and Chan and Lai (2017) who found relationship between communication satisfaction, perceived justice and OCB.

## **2.7 Consequences of OCB**

As the prior research of work behaviours has already provided evidence that OCB affects to overall performance, Podsakoff and his colleagues (2000) in their review of OCB literature explored some of the possible consequences of OCB. However, Podsakoff and his colleagues (2009) criticise this research being too narrow and limited. As a response, they provided a new review that explores the consequences on both individual and organisational level. They did not only view all the relevant studies on this field, but also explored with statistical methods whether these consequences occur.

As it is important to explore the consequences caused by OCB in more detail, Podsakoff and his colleagues (2009) listed some of the reasons for importance on this issue. First, as OCB already have a great impact on organisational effectiveness, which is already signed in Organ's (1983) original definition of OCB, it is important to identify the potential consequences to get the complete picture of the effects OCB have on the organisation. Second, the prior research has provided some evidence of the dysfunctional effects of OCB. As a result, now the interest on such effects as role overload, stress, and work-family conflicts increases (Bolino and Turnley 2004 via Podsakoff et al. 2009, 123). Third, it is also important

to identify the variables managers consider more important than others when making evaluations and reward allocation decisions. (Podsakoff et al. 2009, 123.) Thus, it is important to identify the consequences not only from the academic perspective, but also for managers it is highly important to identify the behaviours that have positive effect on organisation and which do not. (Podsakoff et al. 2009, 123.)

Positive consequences of OCB on individual level are effects on “performance evaluations, reward allocation decisions, and employee withdrawal behaviours”. This effect may occur if managers recognise that such OCBs as *helping behaviour*, *civic virtue*, and *sportsmanship* affect positively to their own work. Thus, when managers realise such actions make their work easier, they are more willing to provide high performance evaluations and reward to those subordinates who engage in such behaviour. Also, as OCB is more voluntary behaviour than task performance, managers may start to view their employees’ motivation through OCBs. (Shore et al. 1995 via Podsakoff et al. 2009, 124). Employee withdrawal behaviour Podsakoff and his colleagues (2009) describe through two assumptions. First assumption represents Chen (2005) and Chen et al.’s (1998) study that low or decreasing levels of OCBs may tell about employee’s withdrawal from the organisation. Thus, if the employees are engaging low level in OCB, it may be a sign of employees’ commitment to the organisation, thus, how motivated employee is to stay in the organisation. Second assumption, which represents Podsakoff and his colleagues (2009) own assumptions bases on the fact that when exploring employee withdrawal behaviours, it should be important to also include employee absenteeism. As they state, employees who engage in low levels of OCB, it could be expected that those engage in lower attendance levels at work. (Podsakoff et al. 2009, 123-124.) Thus, it is obvious employee withdrawal is a sign of employees work motivation and commitment to the organisation.

On the organisational level positive consequences of OCB were organisational effectiveness, customer satisfaction, and group or unit level turnover. Effect on organisational effectiveness are caused by employee actions. To clarify, senior employees, who demonstrate OCB by helping their colleagues in difficult tasks and spreading their expertise to them may affect to the productivity of their colleagues which no doubt affects to the overall performance and reduces training costs. Also, employees who demonstrate such behaviour as civic virtue may give their manager important suggestions for team efficiency improvement, reducing costs,

and helping their managers to focus more on strategic issues than issues that can be managed by their subordinates. Among the previous consequences listed, engaging in OCBs can also affect positively to overall team wellness, and reduce the time and financial resources spent on team by recognising the right people to hire and retain. Effects on customer satisfaction identified bases on the research by Yen and Niehoff (2004) who noted OCB may have an effect also on organisation's external measures of effectivity, such as customer satisfaction, and suggest that employees engaging in altruism manage and encourage cooperation better than those who engage low levels of altruism, and this way affect to the effectivity of customer service. Also, those who demonstrate civic virtue, are more likely to affect positively to the product improvement, which no doubt creates more satisfied customers. Another positive effect Podsakoff and his colleagues (2009) added are effects of engaging in sportsmanship. (Podsakoff et al. 2009, 123-125.)

Another issue Podsakoff and his colleagues (2009) raised was the moderators that effect to that whether OCBs have positive consequences or not. On individual level these moderators are the source of the OCB ratings, and the target of OCBs, e.g. is the target addressed toward an organisation or toward an individual. First, as Podsakoff and his colleagues (2009) state, several prior studies have proved that if the observations of OCB and performance evaluations are collected from the different sources, it may affect to the results of the associations between OCB and performance evaluations. Second, also the direction where the behaviours are addressed seem to affect to the results. However, it is not clear that this really affect to consequences on individual level. Potential moderators of organisational level consequences are the target of the OCB, the organisation's compensation system, and the industry type. As Podsakoff and his colleagues (2009) state, there are only few studies conducted on this field. However, Podsakoff and his colleagues (2009) added research design as moderator of consequences caused by OCB. Prior research has shown, the researchers ability to conduct the research itself. (Podsakoff et al. 123-125.)

Prior research suggest in individual level OCBs consequences are seen in the managerial evaluations and reward allocations. Managers notice employees engaging in OCB and it affect to their reward decision. Thus, employees demonstrating more OCBs than others are more likely to be rewarded and receive better performance evaluations from their managers than employees engaging less OCBs. (Podsakoff et al. 2009, 124.)

### 3 NATIONAL CULTURE AND ORGANISATION

Agreeing with G. Hofstede (2010) “people carry along patterns of thinking, feeling, and potential acting that are learned throughout their lifetime” and most of these are learned in childhood. Hofstede suggest that in order to learn new patterns, one must unlearn these previous patterns. However, unlearning seems to be more difficult than learning new things. (Hofstede et al. 2010, 4-5.) In next chapters cultural differences are identified drawing from Hofstede et al.’s (2010) research, and also differences between Finnish and Russian managerial practices are explored.

#### 3.1 Hofstede’s theory of national culture

Hofstede created the model “Four-dimensional model of cultural differences” to help better understand cultural differences (Hofstede et al. 2010, 31). The model consists of four parts.

Fist part represents the *power distance* (from small to large) that measures relation to authority; how people handle social inequality. (Hofstede et al. 2010, 30.) That is, power-distance shows actually the roles we have learned in our childhood at home (parent-child), in school (teacher-student), and university (professor-student). In workplace they occur as the same: supervisor-subordinate. In small power-distance situations supervisors and subordinates observe each other equal. That is, the hierarchical roles are not that strong and they can change. As a total opposite to small power-distance situation, in large power distance situations both supervisors and subordinates see each other unequal and the hierarchical levels are strong. Surprisingly, no research provided results of that whether one of these power-distance situations have more impact on company overall performance. Thus, it is important for managers to recognise the strengths of the local culture. (Hofstede et al. 2010, 73-75.) The power distance is measured with “Power distance index – PDI” and bases on Hofstede’s research among employees who are in similar position but are located in fifty different countries and three multi country regions. All the respondents were provided the same questionnaire. (Hofstede et al. 2010, 55.)

Next dimension is *collectivism versus individualism*, (CI) which explores the relationship between individual and society. (Hofstede et al. 2010, 30.) Collectivistic societies tend to prefer the groups interests over the individual's interest, whereas individualist societies prevail own interest over the group's interest. Research has shown that in fact collectivistic societies are majority in the world. (Hofstede et al. 2010, 90-91.) Employees in collectivistic society are seen rather as part of the group than an individual and in these societies hiring relatives is preferred, as they are expected to reduce risks if the person is already known. Employees in individualist societies are seen independent and are expected to act as economic persons who follow their own interests. (Hofstede et al. 2010, 119-120.) The results of CI were collected applying "The Individualism index – IDV", as in the case PDI (Hofstede et al. 2010, 94). Interestingly, in Hofstede's research the PDI and IDV were negatively correlated. Thus, large power distance countries are more collectivistic, whereas small power-distance countries tend to be more individualist. (Hofstede et al. 2010, 102-103.)

Third dimension consists of *femininity versus masculinity* (FM) that is, individual's concept of masculinity and femininity (Hofstede 2010, 30). Physical roles of men and women have given us already from our birth, but gender roles as Hofstede coined the term can vary in different cultures. Thus, biological roles are the same despite the society one lives, but which behaviour is seen "feminine" and which "masculine" can be observed differently in other cultures. These roles are already formed in the beginning of manhood when men were hunting and protecting the family, whereas women gave birth the children and taking, cooking, taking care of the home and the children. Now men are expected to be assertive, competitive, and tough. Women are still giving birth and at least some time be close to the children when breast feeding them. (Hofstede 2010, 137-138.) When these masculine and feminine roles are reflected to work society, there may appear several differences, such as the way how industrial conflicts are handled; in masculine cultures conflicts are sold with fights, whereas in feminine countries conflicts are solved with negotiation and compromises. Moreover, masculine cultures focus on success, and reward bases on the result. In feminine cultures people are rewarded equally. (Hofstede et al. 2010, 166-167.) The results of FM were collected applying "Masculinity index – MAS). The results were collected the same way as IDV. Surprisingly, the MAS index compared to countries' degree of economic development showed somewhat different results than IDV compared with degree of economic



development. Thus, there were found as rich and poor masculine countries, as well as in rich and poor feminine countries. (Hofstede et al. 2010, 140.)

The last concept represents *uncertainty avoidance* (from weak to strong) that shows how individuals deal with uncertainty and ambiguity, which is related to the level how individuals control their negative feelings and emotions. (Hofstede et al. 2010, 30.) The term is first invented by J.G. March, who found it in American organisations. Hofstede suggests that uncertainty is actually a feeling that is learned through family, school, and state. The uncertainty avoidance is measured by “The uncertainty avoidance index – (UAI). (Hofstede et al. 2010, 189-190.) On organisational context high UA refers to the need of structured rules, that control the rights and responsibilities of the employees in the organisation, when in low UA organisations the formal rules are seen important only if they are necessary (Hofstede 2010, 209-210).

### **3.2 The adopted model**

On this chapter Finland and Russia of the current research are described by Hofstede’s “Four-dimensional model of cultural differences”. All the results are seen on the table below. Results show that PDI is higher in Russia (93), than in Finland (33). Therefore, it is seen that Finland has low power distance, when in Russia it is high. The PDI shows the difference between these countries. From the IDV highest results scored Finland (63), when Russia (39). Concerning FMI, the scores of Finland (26) and Russia (36) are very close. On the contrary, the UAI of the countries have significant differences. UAI of Finland (59) seems to be far away from Russia (95). (Hofstede et al. 2010.)

Table 1. Indexes of four-dimensional model of cultural differences (Hofstede et al. 2010)

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Index</b>
<b>PD</b>	Finland	33
	Russia	93
<b>IDV</b>	Finland	63
	Russia	39
<b>FM</b>	Finland	26
	Russia	36
<b>UA</b>	Finland	59
	Russia	95

Hofstede et al.'s research of differences of national culture (2010) provided evidence that Russia is collectivistic country as the IDV was low, when IDV of Finland was high. The PDI of Russia was also higher than that of Finland. As Hofstede (2010) proved, the IDV and PDI are total opposite to each other, thus when a country scores high IDV, the PDI is usually low. Already by viewing Hofstede et al.'s (2010) theory of national cultures, it is possible to see the differences between individualistic and collectivistic societies. Therefore, it is important to view the differences of both Russia as a collectivistic society, and Finland as individualistic society in order to understand its effects on organisational culture.

According to Beekun et al. (2003), there is evidence that collectivism is part of Russian's national culture. The traces can be tracked down to past where Russian people faced lack of individual freedom having being under the power of the tsars, landowners and Soviet leaders, and even the Russian Orthodox church stressing the importance of considering the common good over personal interest. (Beekun et al. 2003.) Important to note, that although by Hofstede's traditional theory Russia is concerned as individualistic society, O. G. Tikhomirova (2008) suggest another point of view. As now in Russia has occurred such values as individualism, financial stability, prosperity, education, and youth priority, Russian culture should be viewed somewhere between the western individualism and eastern collectivism. (Tikhomirova 2008, 26.)

### 3.3 Hofstede's theory and OCB

Adopting Hofstede's theory of cultural dimensions, Paine and Organ (2000) state there are two well-established dimensions of Hofstede's theory of national culture. They suggest that both dimensions *individualism-collectivism* IC, and *power distance* PD affect the way how OCB is recognised and demonstrated between cultures by individuals. In addition, behaviour that is contributed in the same context, might have different antecedents and different consequences based on culture. (Paine and Organ 2000, 47-48.)

To begin, in collectivist cultures behaviour is mostly seen encouraged in a way it provides profit toward the organisation or the in-group. Also, actions out of daily work roles, e.g. helping behaviour, individual initiative may be observed as normative in collectivist cultures, whereas this kind of behaviour is seen more like an exceptional behaviour in individualistic cultures. Kwantes and Karam (2008) found generalised social beliefs affecting to that whether OCB are considered in-role or extra-role. This kind of behaviour is mostly seen exceptional in individualistic cultures, and employees in individualistic cultures engaging in OCB might expected to be rewarded of their exceptional actions. On the contrary, this kind of behaviour in the collectivist cultures is seen to be driven by the loyalty to the in-group. Hence, demonstrating OCB in collectivistic cultures rather originates from the group norms and values, than material reward of one's actions. (Paine and Organ 2000, 48.) Second, the level of commitment of an individual to an organisation has seen to effect to the demonstration of OCB. This bases on the willingness of an individual to remain with an organisation, adopt the organisational goals, and making sacrifices and going beyond the limit for the sake of the organisation and work group. (Paine and Organ 2000, 49.) There are some assumptions what may affect to the level of commitment of an individual to an organisation. For example, Paine and Organ assume that the individual's personality, the work itself, and the organisational structure actually have huge affection to an individual's commitment to an organisation. For example, in collectivistic cultures, employees do not express higher organisational commitment, but show it elsewhere. As mentioned above, the behaviour in collectivistic cultures is mostly driven by the group values and norms. Therefore, the commitment of an individual might be not to the organisation, but to the in-group, when in individualistic cultures the commitment is rather driven by her own identity. (Paine and Organ 2000, 49.)

The way how PD may affect to the demonstration of OCB in different cultures, is the leader and employee relationships. As mentioned above, the relationships between the leader and a subordinate vary in different cultures. For example, in cultures of low power and distance, the relationship is seen more like a social exchange, whereas in cultures of high power distance employees are more likely to accept the different treatment, hierarchical boundaries, and rewards on which they can affect only a little. (Paine and Organ 2000, 49.) Agreeing with Paine and Organ (2000), participating leader in a low PD culture can affect to the level how much individuals are going beyond the limit, when a more traditional leader in a high PD culture can affect to this kind of behaviour negatively by limiting. To point out, if the subordinates cannot challenge the leader, there will be less OCB demonstrated. (Paine and Organ 2000, 49.)

One more thing that can affect to OCB is the observations of management styles in different cultures. To clarify, employees in one culture may see participative leading negative, when in other cultures it might be seen as positive (Copeland & Griggs 1985 via Paine and Organ 2000, 50). For example, expatriate manager from a low PD culture may face problems in leading subordinates in culture where high PD is dominated. Therefore, it is highly important to take into account the cultural differences of different cultures in managerial activities.

Although Paine and Organ's (2000) study provided understanding of the individual differences and how they may affect to OCB, their study is quite limited as it proved evidence only with two of the cultural dimensions and leaving others out. Therefore, in order to understand cultural differences between Finland and Russia other studies, such as Suutari (1998), Denisova-Schmidt (2011), and Alexashin and Blenkinsopp (2005) who have explored cultural differences adopting the four Hofstede's cultural dimensions are viewed.

### **3.4 Organisational culture**

Deal and Kennedy (1982) and Peters and Waterman (1982) define organisational culture as “a complex set of values, beliefs assumptions, and symbols that define the way in which a firm conducts its business” (Deal and Kennedy 1982, and Peters and Waterman 1982 via Barney 1986, 657). According to N. Levkin (2006) organisational culture refers to “the most adopted

organisational philosophy and ideology management of suggestion, valued orientation, beliefs, expectations and norms that lies on the base of relationship and interaction both inside and outside the organisation”.

### **3.4.1 Finland**

Finnish economy is considered developed and the level of education is high (Suutari et al. 2002, 418). Compared with other European countries by common wealth, political stability, and low crime Finland along with other Nordic countries is leader in quality of life. However, as the birth rate is low and the ageing population huge, it creates challenges to this environment. Companies are in the need of recruiting foreign employees, which on the other hand bring other challenges due to cultural differences. (Lämsä 2010, 141-142.)

According to Granlund and Lukka (1998), Finnish organisational culture is rich in communication, hierarchical borders are low, and the key element in Finnish communication is the trustworthiness, thus one can rely on other person. Furthermore, for Finns keeping personal promises is crucial, as disappointments are taken seriously. Restoring confidence after losing is considered difficult. Therefore, Finns tend to keep their promises. Also, Finnish people are straight forwarded, thus, they go straight on the issue and cut off the non-relevant issues. Finnish people are good at noticing what is relevant and what is not. Another characteristic Granlund and Lukka (1998) raised was silence. In Finnish context it refers to the lack of small talk; Finns are not used to use small talk, prudence, and they appreciate their conversation partner by avoiding to interrupt when they talk. (Granlund and Lukka 1998, 190-191.)

Finnish leadership style is described being authoritarian or even hard as Lämsä (2010) described, but this issue is more complex. As Granlund and Lukka (1998) suggest, Finnish management can be characterised authoritarian, but where the leading happens in polite terms, thus Finns are not directing, but coaching. The Finnish peaceful temperament could be the reason for these behaviours. Furthermore, when Finns describe being managed they raise the independency issue. For example, Finns are satisfied in their work if their superior relations are exactly defined, but they have been given freedom to work independently. They have

good self-discipline and they do not like to be closely supervised. As long as you do your job, you can work independently. (Granlund and Lukka 1998, 194.) Thus, Finns want to sustain their feeling of autonomy.

### **3.4.2 Russia**

On the opposite of Finnish developed economy, the economy in Russia is developing. After the collision of the Soviet Union Russia as a market place have gained interest the past twenty years among Western companies (Plakhotnik 2005). Fey et al. (1999) noted that due to a major amount of citizens, low costing well-educated labour force, rich nature resources, and limited competition in industries have attracted foreign companies to invest in Russia (Fey et al. 1999, 69). They have been working successfully which has also increased interest in academic and non-academic literature of the challenges and opportunities they have faced. (Denisova-Schmidt 2011, 2.) The companies have faced challenges such as the financial crisis in 1998, and the most noted issue is the management of HR practices. The leading country of investors of Western countries is USA with 29 percent of foreign market share. (Puffer et al. 1998, 462-463.) Finland has more than 400 companies working in Russia (Hautala via TASS 2016).

Kobernyuk et al. (2013) mentioned Russia is now one of the biggest transitional economies where many organisations are in the need of rapid transformation in the organisations and in their management. Now in Russia the economy is moving towards a market based economy. This on the other hand creates challenges to the Russian managers who try to maintain their company's position in the markets. The change has given more authority and power to the managers and they feel they have to take responsibility of the company's future and actions. However, as the expectations and goals differ from the ones they have learned in Soviet times where the management was bureaucratic and dominated by the government, they have no reference points to where to develop the Russian management model. Russian organisational culture already from past Soviet times has been ruled by tsars or the government. As Tikhomirova (2008) state: "...the existence of government gave no chance to think about the company's image, reputation, and organisational culture...". Tikhomirova (2008) described organisational culture in Soviet Union as autonomic in management, unification, power,

bureaucracy, and people had low level of living. The factor that combined Soviet people was the political parties and their goals. (Tikhomirova 2008, 31.) However, some researchers as Alexashin and Blenkinsopp (2005) suggest that now Russian managers are drawing their managerial values not from Russian models, but those from other national cultures.

Russian leaders are described authoritarian or even dictators. Over centuries the Russian people have been under the powerful leaders and without personal freedom. Actually, Russians are used to value group norms and values which are considered being very important in Russian society. Standing out was considered discouraged and disrespectful. Sometimes this goes to the extent that one is ready to work harder if the hard work is valued in the group, but also work less if the hard work is not appreciated in the group. Russians value personal relationships, tend to trust more to the relationships than contracts, and therefore friendships are created before signing the contracts. Thus, unwritten rules seem to be more powerful than formal ones in Russia and dominated rather by personal or group's interest than interest of government. (Alexashin and Blenkinsopp 2005, 429.)

Furthermore, due to high uncertainty avoidance, Russians tend to avoid any conflicts with their managers and this may cause the thing that employees are not taking initiative. Another reason may be as S. C. Irdyneev (2012) noted Russian employees are afraid of change because they are afraid they are in danger to lose their jobs. Also when they respect their superior, the empowerment is not effective. Because of the high power distance, managers are not taking those employees' opinions seriously who are from lower hierarchical levels. Interesting is that that Russians have different ethical standards when in Western societies the people usually follow the same standards everywhere. Russians have own standards for the personal relationships, and for work and publicity. Also, when in Western societies compromises are seen as normal procedure solve a problem, in Russia they are seen as a sign of weakness. (Alexashin and Blenkinsopp 2005, 429.)

### Leadership in Western and Eastern Europe

According to Brodbeck et al. (2000) understanding cultural differences in leadership prototypes between managers of different cultures help managers to choose the right practices

in the host country and prevent risks in cross-cultural interactions more effectively. Also, the training, coaching and experience in the host country is essential for creating effective cross-cultural leadership. Brodbeck et al. (2000) also raised another issue. They suggest that the basis how strong the expatriate managers' leadership concept overlap with the leadership concept in the host country would also be applied as criteria for choosing expatriate managers. Brodbeck et al.'s (2000) study supports that leadership concepts vary by culture. They found that outstanding leadership which includes such behaviour as inspirational, visionary, integrity, performance orientation, and decisiveness differed between managers of Western and Eastern European countries. For example, participation found to be typical to Northern and Western European managers, when administrative behaviour was typical to Eastern European managers. For Russian managers good administrative skills reported to being typical for outstanding leadership. Also, interpersonal directness and proximity is more typical to Western and Nordic Finnish managers than Eastern European managers. (Brodbeck et al. 2000, 11-17.)

Suutari (1998) completed great work comparing managerial practices of Russian and Estonian managers with those of Finnish managers. He compared practices with those presented in prior management literature of Eastern European managers. Later he fitted this categorisation with cultural dimensional model by Hofstede. (Suutari 1996b via Suutari 1998.) Next sections are provided with Suutari's (1998) main findings concerning the Finnish and Russian management practices.

Regarding to individualism-collectivism in leadership his experiment revealed that Russian managers are less active in considering their subordinates needs and wants, whereas comparing to Finnish managers who are seen to be more active in these decisions. However, Suutari's (1998) study provided evidence that in some sense Russian managers are more active. For example, they tend to consider those employees' wishes and needs who they like the most. (Suutari 1998, 247.)

Concerning the power-distance in leadership, his research supported the fact that Russian managers give less autonomy to their subordinates to participate in decision making processes, when Finnish managers see the participation very important. Another result that



occurred was the thing that Russian managers consider their subordinates only if they are doing something wrong, but see interpersonal relations important. (Suutari 1998, 246.)

Uncertainty avoidance was seen in the role clarifications between Finland and Russia. Hence, Russian managers tend to clarify their employees' work roles more specific, as Russian employees are less likely complete tasks outside their role description. Moreover, Russians also protect more their personal work environment, because they are responsible of their own tasks. Another issue is goal setting which also differed between the countries explored and was inconsistent with the findings in the prior literature. In Finland the goal planning as well as budget planning were seen more important than in Russia, where the goal planning was seen negative and even disturbing when achieving goals. Another distinction was seen in initiation of new tasks, where planning in Finland seemed more important than that of in Russia where managers are responsible to complete of their subordinates' tasks if they are unable to complete them. (Suutari 1998, 250.)

Concerning the femininity versus masculinity one mention of the results was the consideration of efficiency which was seen in more important role in Finland than in Russia. Also it was found that Russian managers tend to express criticism more active than Finnish managers. His study also suggested that the motives for rewarding an employee differ between Finnish and Russian leaders. Finnish leaders reward their employees for the efficiency, whereas Russian leaders may address reward to those they favour or have family relation. (Suutari 1998, 248.)

#### HRM practices in Finland and in Russia

When interest in personnel management increased, there occurred new point of views of the topic. Human resource management in Western management literature started to affect to the companies in how they view their employees. Human resource management (HRM) refers to the practices that help to attract, retain, and motivate employees. Traditionally it consists of six elements: "human resource planning, recruitment, appraising, compensation, training and development, and union-management relationships". (Schuler and MacMillan 1984, 242.) On the contrary, in Russia human resource practices were still affected by the past Soviet practices and Western human resource practices started to gain more attention only when

Western companies started to operate actively in Russia. As the intangible resources of companies have been noted to be the most effective resources of companies, and as human resources part of these resources it is crucial for companies working in Russia to pay attention to the quality of their human resources and what practices suit the best for the current context and which do not. (Zavyalova et al. 2017, 52.) As noted by Denisova-Schmidt (2004), Plakhotnik (2005) Luthans et al. (1993), there are not so many studies found of leadership styles in Russia, and even less of the human resource management practices. Also, it is important to note, there are only few studies exploring the differences between Finnish and Russian management practices. For this study few studies were found where Finnish and Russian managerial styles and HRM were compared. In next chapters a brief overview and a comparison of HRM in Finland and Russia is discussed.

#### HRM practices in Finland and Russia

Fey et al. (2003) explored the differences in HRM practices between Finland, Russia, and China in their case study. They investigated three Swedish multinational companies working in Finland, Russia, and China. They raised five issues that differed between Russian and Finnish HRM practices. (Fey et al. 2003.) Those issues are discussed below.

#### Characteristics of Soviet HR practices

To understand better the past human resource practices in Russia, it is important to list some characteristics of Soviet practices. First of all, in Soviet Union employees were seen as a cost rather than a resource (Fey et al. 1999, 70). Second, a typical human resource management system consisted of separate departments with each its individual function. Third, even though salaries were stable and social benefits were good, the career progression was poor, which affected to the motivation to work more efficient. Fourth, employees were provided also with other benefits, such as subsidized meals at company's canteens, health care. Companies also supported kindergartens, schools, and sport activities for children. Also, veteran clubs were held and financially supported by the companies. A team spirit created with the help of Komsomol and communist organisations inside the company. Recruitment

happened mostly through universities and institutions. Companies cooperated constantly with the universities and schools. (Denisova-Schmidt 2011, 4-5.)

Before Western firms brought HRM to Russia, it was a new concept for Russians and many Russians were surprised that how much attention Western managers paid to the personnel management in these companies. Fey et al. (1999) in their research found that the best way to implement these practices is to hire mostly locals to the company. This is the best way to adjust company's operations to the conditions of the local environment. Thus, flexibility and willingness to adapt the Russian environment is the key to success in Russia. They also found that most of the companies they explored felt their HRM practices are rather more related to the mother company's practices than to the practices of local Russian companies. (Fey et al. 1999, 71-72.)

#### Recruitment and selection

As in Russia there are differences in level and quality of education, Russian managers see the importance of hiring in very high level especially hiring local people seemed more suitable than sending expatriates from the mother company. The local managers understand the local environment, use the same language, save costs, and might be good investment for the future. A. Karachinskii (2001) noted that Western companies are mostly hiring managers from their mother company who form the strategy from the distance and without understanding what really happens in Russia. Thus, the company would adopt to the local environment better with the help of the local managers. Another issue was the thing what kind of person to hire. As Denisova-Schmidt (2011) listed the two types of work force. Therefore, managers were in a situation where they had to think whether it would be better to hire elder person who has long experience working in the same company or the same industry, or a younger person who has less experience but could be abler to adapt to new situations and learn new skills. Actually, Fey et al. (2004) stressed the fact that training a new skill was way more easy easier than changing one's attitudes. (Fey et al. 2003, 82-83.) As a result, there has been trend for last ten years to hire clever young people with the age range of twenty to thirty years old (Fey et al. 2003, 83). Another issue is the way how candidates were interviewed. In Russia the importance of hiring was seen also in the number of psychological tests used in the job

interviews. In Finland these tests were also applied but the selection criteria rather based on the interview. The psychological tests provided an efficient tool to evaluate candidate's potential for management positions, as it measured strengths and weaknesses. On the contrary, in Finland to the selection of employees was paid less attention. This may tell the homogeneity of Finnish people; the mind-set, training and education. The availability of recruiting agencies and job cooperation with universities, and databases of potential employees. Line managers were included in the processes. (Fey et al. 2003, 84.)

### Appraisal

In appraisal systems mother company had a great influence both in Finland and Russia, but there were differences in how they were used and what tools applied. Also there were differences in the expectations of appraisals by the employees. Expectations of Russian employees were higher than those of Finnish employees. Therefore, managers should know what is included in the appraisal system and describe performance appraisals better. In Finland, the tools that used were personal planning and development, management planning and development, personnel development. In Russia the employees had different expectations due to the company driven policy of appraisals and as a result the employees viewed the appraisal process as regular process that they have to complete. they thought they are supposed to do that and therefore they did not reach the maximum level of performance. Also as suggested that Russian managers are 'dictators' they should improve their appraisal skills. Especially coaching skills reported being weak. As total opposite, Finnish managers were actively giving feedback and their subordinates suggested such feedback. Also, the feedback usually happened through informal processes. (Fey et al. 2003, 85-86.)

### Training and development

Fey et al. (2004) noticed that training and development differed between Finland and Russia. In Finland less attention was put to the training and development programs and they were not seen as formal as those in Russia. This may be caused by the differences in backgrounds of Finnish and Russian employees. Finnish employees are usually at the same educational level and they are working at the level they are trained. On the contrary in Russia employees' educational level is more diverse and often they are working in the fields that is not in their

field of expertise. Therefore, Russian employees tend to benefit more from the formalised training than Finnish employees. (Fey et al. 2003, 86.)

#### Internal communication

Another issue Fey and his colleagues (2003) noted was the internal communication which differed significantly between Finnish and Russian subsidiaries. Although its' importance was noted in both Finland and Russia, still there were major differences. For example, in Finland even though the information would be found in formal communication channels, the communication mostly happened through informal channels and usually between managers and employees, when in Russia it was required to use the formal communication channels because the communication was poor. (Fey et al. 2003, 87-89.)

#### Compensation systems

Although several differences were noted in HRM practices between Finland and Russia, there also were found similarities, such as the compensation systems applied in both countries. Major similarities were the performance-based component and the headquarters' role in the appraisal system. Thus, in both countries the compensation was linked to the performance and the system evaluated and coordinated by the headquarters. Differences were found in the bonus systems. Fey et al.'s (2003) research exposed that there were different types of performance-based compensation systems and how the performance was evaluated. Also, in Russia compensation based on performance was seen very important factor for motivation. Interestingly, in Russia career development was noted as part of the compensation, whereas in Finland it was less considered being part of compensation. (Fey et al. 2003, 89-90.) This may be caused as noted earlier that differences of professional background affect to the employees' observations of the importance of training and development.

## Western HRM practices in Russia

Denisova-Schmidt (2011) listed few challenges Western managers face in their practices in Russia. First challenge is the different type of work forces, and they are divided in to two different groups. The first group represents the group which is mostly experienced in Soviet Union or firms based on Soviet hierarchy and principles, whereas the second group represents group without this experience. Second challenge is the Russian labour regulations and cultural norms the employees carry. Therefore, for managers coming from Westerns societies is crucial to identify the factors that are adaptable with Russian government regulations and cultural norms. (Denisova-Schmidt 2008, 2-3.) Another challenge noted by Fey et al. (2003) is the empowerment that is affected by the history. In Russia the hierarchy has been high in very long time and the situations has not shown any changes lately. Russian employees felt more comfortable with their work tasked when they were clearly instructed what to do and what not. Also Russian employees historically have used to get punished from the mistakes. (Fey et al. 2003, 93.) This also refers to the uncertainty avoidance and power distance in Russia noted earlier. Thus, Russians tend to prevent risks and accept unequal treatment more easily than Finnish.

The question does Western HRM fit to Russian context has been noted by many researchers. For example, and Fey et al. (2003), and Horie (2014) have investigated Russian joint ventures operating in Russia and found that still most of the companies consider the Soviet practices better than the Westerns HRM practices, because the HRM does not fit to their traditional HR models. Those models are affected by the Soviet job design which was similar in every industry in the Soviet Union. To clarify, the salaries were similar and the companies were depending on the government in their job design as they were not allowed to plan anything individually. He claims, Russian companies need Western companies for transferring the HRM practices to Russian companies. However, Western companies coming to Russia should not completely ignore the traditional practices and transform the Western HRM to the Russian subsidiary, but understand the old practices, and Russian labour regulation and cultural norms (Denisova-Schmidt 2011, 3), and combine them with the modern Western practices. (Horie 2014, 138-139.)

## 4 HYPOTHESES

Moorman and Blakely (1995) stated that individuals holding collectivistic values or norms are more likely to perform citizenship behaviours. That is, they suggest that a typical person from a collectivistic society supports and protects the goals of the group, when a typical person from individualistic society promotes his/her own interest. To mention, such results have found Earley (1989, 1993), Moorman and Blakely (1995, 129.) Encouraged of the research by Moorman and Blakely, the following hypotheses are proposed:

*H1: Employees' background affects to the OCB*

*H2: Employees from collectivistic countries are more likely to engage OCB than employees from individualistic countries*

Research by Karam and Kwantes (2011) shows the importance of context in OCB research. They state that in prior research of OCB the context where OCB appears has often left undescribed. Karam and Kwantes explored the allocentric and idiocentric relationships in single country context. Their research was conducted in Lebanon. Their results proved that the context where OCB appears affects to OCB. Adopting the current research, the following hypothesis is proposed:

*H3: The context within which the employee works affects to OCB*

The study of J. Paine and D. W. Organ (2000) explored the employees' assumptions and observations of OCB among non-native United States of America citizens speaking English and having at minimum 6 months of work experience in another country. Their goal was to find out whether OCB is observed the same in other cultures as in Western cultures. (Paine and Organ 2000, 51.) The results of the current research show that in Australia and England the concept was seen more negative and more like excluded from the job description whereas in Asian countries such as India, Japan, China, Taiwan, and Korea it was seen as included in the job responsibilities and as part of corporate culture. (Paine and Organ 2000, 54.) Thus the following hypothesis is proposed:

*H4: Employees' observations of the concept OCB vary between countries explored*

## 5 RESEARCH MATERIAL AND METHODS

Given that national culture affects to OCB which have a significant effect to the organisations' overall performance it was interesting to explore two different cultures. After choosing the topic the idea of combining my knowledge in Russian language and management studies came in to action when I found a Finnish company that operates in Finland, Scandinavia, Baltic countries, and Russia. Being international industry this company faces challenges due to cultural differences every day. As I already have a Master's degree in Russian language and culture and experience of living and working in Russia, I wanted to focus on to Finland and Russia. Therefore, the focus of this research is in Finnish and Russian branch offices.

### 5.1 The research material

The research was conducted in Finnish company operating in Europe and Russia. The overall amount of employees is over 10 000. This research was conducted in the offices in Finland and Russia. The questionnaire was sent by email to all employees in two countries having corporate email address. The questionnaire included Finnish, Russian, and English versions. The respondents had three weeks to complete the survey. The expected amount of respondents was together 1000 respondents from both countries. The overall amount of responses received was 157, which is 15.7% of the expected amount of respondents. The results were loaded first to Excel program for sorting and then to IBM SPSS Statistics program version 24 for analysing. SPSS Statistics – statistical program for the social sciences (SPSS tutorials 2018).

In the table 3 frequencies of the basic data are presented. The results show that majority 64.2% of the respondents were from Finland and one third, 31.4% from Russia. Leading group of the gender occurred to be 'Man' with 58.5%, which is more than half of the results, where group 'Woman' was only 40.3%. Concerning the groups of 'Age', respondents in 31-40 years old of age were the majority with 29.6%, but the second group respondents in 26-30 years of age was not far away from the first group with 25.2%, and third group 41-50 years



old with 24.5%. Thus, the results show that the range between the respondents in variable 'Age' was quite huge.

Among variables consisting of basic information, there were few groups that needed a closer inspection as they included only one case. To avoid incorrect results these groups were excluded from the final analysis. The variables that included these complicated groups were in 'Age', 'Citizenship', 'Country of origin', and 'Mother tongue'. To clarify, among the respondents one respondent was less than 25 years of age, as well as variables characterising respondent's cultural background consisted only of one case. First, variable 'Citizenship' included one case with double citizenship (Finland and Russia), and one case with Lithuanian citizenship. Second, variable 'Country of Origin' included only one case from each of the following countries: Ukraine, Lithuania, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Germany. In order to receive correct results, these groups were excluded from the final analysis. Also, such questions as '*How many countries you have lived in for more than six months?*' and '*How often you visit your home country?*' were misunderstood and therefore excluded from the analysis.

Table 2. Basic data

<b>Variable name</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Age</b>		
26-30 years	40	25.2%
31-40 years	47	29.6%
41-50 years	39	24.5%
51-60 years	24	15.1%
More than 61 years	6	3.8%
<b>Gender</b>		
Man	93	58.5%
Woman	64	40.3%
<b>Citizenship</b>		
Finland	102	64.2%
Russia	51	32.1%
<b>Country of origin</b>		
Finland	102	64.2%
Russia	50	31.4%
<b>Mother tongue</b>		
Finnish	102	64.2%
Russian	53	33.3%

Table 2. Basic data

<b>Variable name</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Current residence</b>		
Finland	104	65.4%
Russia	52	32.7%
<b>Duration of living</b>		
1-5 years	3	1.9%
6-15 years	4	2.5%
More than 16 years	18	11.5%
Whole my life	132	84.10%
<b>Duration of working</b>		
Less than 1 year	12	7.6%
1-3 years	42	26.8%
4-6 years	23	14.6%
7-15 years	48	30.6%
More than 15 years	32	20.4%

Finally, new variables ‘Country of origin’, ‘Citizenship’, ‘Current residence’, ‘Mother tongue’, ‘Gender’, ‘Age’, ‘Duration of living’, and ‘Duration of working’ were recoded into new variables. All the variables are seen in the table 3. Later variables ‘Country of origin’ and ‘Mother tongue’ were combined into one variable ‘Cultural background’ as they measured the same issue.

Research material for this study is gathered by conducting an electronic survey. For this survey a questionnaire was put together by using online based program Questback Essentials. As no specific one questionnaire was found for this research, the questionnaire is created borrowing questions from prior studies by Smith et al. 1983, Konovsky and Organ 1996, Moorman and Blakely 1995, Van Dyne et al. 1994, and Paine & Organ 2000, and combining them to one questionnaire. The questionnaire includes both elements of OCB and IC. In table 2 there are presented the variables applied in this research. As IC dimension *beliefs* in prior research showed no relationship with OCB (Moorman and Blakely 1995), the current dimension was dropped out from the questionnaire. Furthermore, questions and statements concerning observations of OCB in different cultures are adopted from the prior research by Paine & Organ 2000.

Table 3. Variables applied from prior research

Variable/(s)	Scientific article/(s)
OCB: Helping behaviour, and Individual initiative	Smith et al. 1983 “Organizational citizenship behaviour: Its nature and antecedents”, and Moorman and Blakely 1995 “Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behaviour”.
OCB: Organisational compliance, Organisational loyalty, and Loyal boosterism	Van Dyne et al. 1997 “Organizational citizenship behaviour: Construct redefinition, measurement and validation.”
OCB: Sportsmanship	Konovsky and Organ 1996 “Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior.”
OCB: Personal industry, and IC: norms and values	Moorman and Blakely 1995. “Individualism-collectivism as individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior.”

The questionnaire (see Appendix 9.1.) consists of 45 questions of which 8 consisted of basic questions, 36 statements, and one open question. Every statements applied 7-item Likert-scale range from *Totally Agree* (1) to *Totally Disagree* (7).

## 5.2 Research methods

Methods applied in this research are factor analysis, reliability analysis, and factorial ANOVA from univariate analysis. Factor analysis refer to a multivariate technique that provides tools for analysing the structure of the interrelationships among variables, by defining sets of variables that highly correlate, known as factors. Thus, the current analysis provides an overview of the variables upon which to form relationships. These groups of variables are assumed to represent dimensions within the data. (Hair et al. 2014, 92, 98.) To clarify, by adopting factor analysis, the researcher is able to see which variables are relevant for the research and which are not. Factor analysis consists of two parts: exploratory factor analysis, and confirmatory factor analysis. Exploratory factor analysis is a method that provides information of the variables in situations when the researcher does not have suggestions or assumptions of the structure of the data. Thus, exploratory factor analysis is chosen when the analysis bases on the data and not the prior research. Confirmatory factor analysis instead applies prior structure and tests does the suggested structure appear or not. To clarify, the

researcher chooses the confirmatory factor analysis if the researcher already has prior data on what the analysis bases on. (Hair et al. 2014, 146.) As this research bases only on the data, the exploratory factor analysis is an appropriate method.

Finally, such experimental design methods are applied in order to test the hypotheses. In this research univariate analysis ANOVA is applied to test the hypotheses. ANOVA explores the differences between groups and measures group differences on a single metric dependent variable. To clarify, ANOVA is chosen when the researcher manipulates or controls one or more independent variables to determine the effect on single dependent variable. MANOVA instead explores the same as the ANOVA, but with difference that it explores the effect of the independent variable on multiple dependent variables. Thus, the terminology of ANOVA and MANOVA applies to the selection of whether single or multiple dependent variables are applied. (Hair et al. 2014, 666.) Later, with ANOVA appropriate methods for testing hypotheses are t test, and analysis of variance ANOVA. The t test explores differences between two groups, when ANOVA focuses on finding the differences between two or more groups. (Hair et al. 2014, 670.) Important is also note, that in this research regression analysis could be also applied, as it analyses “the relationship between single dependent variable and several independent variables”. (Hair et al. 2014, 151). However, as the material includes single categorical variable each more than three levels, ANOVA is also suitable for this research, as it explores differences between two groups (PMEAN 2008). Therefore, ANOVA is applied for this research.

## 6 RESULTS

All the relevant questions for the research were mandatory, but still from the results some missing data was found. To clarify, some statements were excluded from the final analysis giving poor results in factor analysis. A closer look of the basic data, as well as the statements are provided in next chapters.

### 6.1 Statements

Overall 30 statements were tested with Factorial analysis. First, the Bartlett's test of sphericity was run. This test provides evidence of the significance of the correlations among variables. The test reaches the accepted level .60. (Hair et al. 1998, 102.) Therefore, the results of this test show, that the statements fit to the factor analysis.

Table 4 shows factor loadings and communalities for each factor. Communality value for every variable was higher than .05, so all the variables were chosen for the further analysis. Total variance loaded for 11 factors. Highest eigenvalue was 4.485 and lowest 1.061 (see table 4). The eigenvalue is considered significant when it is above 1 (Hair et al. 1998, 107). With rotated component matrix, the loaded factors were found and then with rotated component factors they were grouped to new factors. All the factors reaching loading .035 were included in the analysis. The requirements for factor loadings are depending on the sample size. The greater the sample size the smaller the required factor loading value. Loadings that are above .70 are considered being the best result of for factor analysis. (Hair et al. 1998, 114-115.) As the table 4 show, only few of the factor loadings reach this level. Later these new factors were tested with reliability test. Only three of the factors received decent Cronbach's alpha in reliability test. According to Hair et al (1998, 777), the Cronbach alpha should be at least .60, but statistically more significant if the value reaches at least .70

Table 4. Factor analysis

Factor number	Statements	Factor loading	Communality
1.	12. It is important to help those who have been absent (sick leave, holiday).	.64	.59
	13. It is important to help new people to get started in their new tasks.	.69	.60
	14. It is important to help colleagues in case they are in heavy workloads.	.60	.59
	15. It is important to frequently adjust work schedule to accommodate other employees' requests for time-off (e.g. holiday plans).	.73	.65
	16. It is important to go out your way to make new employees to feel welcome in the work group.	.69.	.57.
	22. I feel it is important to obey the rules of the company.	.37	.55
<b>Eigenvalue</b>			4.49
<b>Percent of total variance</b>			13.59
<b>Total variance</b>			8.949
2.	28. I tell others this is a good place to work.	.76	.65
	29. I am willing to defend the organisation against outside threats.	.66	.67
	32. It tend to show pride when presenting the organisation in public.	.83	.72
	33. I actively promote the organisation's products and services to potential users.	.78	.73
<b>Eigenvalue</b>			2.84
<b>Percent of total variance</b>			8.59
<b>Total variance</b>			16.87
3.	35. I prefer to work with others in my work group than work alone.	.81	.79
	36. Given the choice, I would rather do a job where I can work alone rather than do a job where I have to work with others in my work group.	-.92	.87
	37. I like it when members of my work group do things on their own, rather than working with others all the time.	-.81	.72
<b>Eigenvalue</b>			2.49
<b>Percent of total variance</b>			7.54
<b>Total variance</b>			24.71
4.	38. People in my work group should be willing to make sacrifices for the sake of the work group.	.88	.85
	39. People in my work group should realize that they sometimes are going to have to make sacrifices for the sake of the work group as whole.	.88	.84
	42. People in my work group should do their best to cooperate with each other instead of trying to work things on their own.	.36	.57
<b>Eigenvalue</b>			2.07
<b>Percent of total variance</b>			6.72
<b>Total variance</b>			30.94

Factor number	Statements	Factor loading	Communality
5.	31. I rarely miss work even if I have a legitimate reason for doing so.	.44	.61
	40. People in my work group should recognise that they are not always going to get what they want.	.64	.68
	41. People should be aware that if they are going to be part of a work group, they sometimes are going to have to do things they do not want to.	.72	.57
<b>Eigenvalue</b>			1.83
<b>Percent of total variance</b>			5.54
<b>Total variance</b>			36.23
6.	19. I feel I have to inform my colleagues beforehand if I am absent the next day.	.63	.58
	24. Regardless of circumstances, I produce the highest quality of my work.	.80	.70
	25. I meet the deadlines set by the organisation.	.43	.58
<b>Eigenvalue</b>			1.69
<b>Percent of total variance</b>			5.11
<b>Total variance</b>			41.35
7.	17. I often do tasks at work that are not necessarily addressed to me.	.68	.58
	19. I tend to express my opinions honestly on issues even if I know it may have serious consequences	.45	.66
	20. I tend to maintain confidentiality of information received at work.	.64	.64
	31. I rarely miss work even if I have a legitimate reason for doing so.	.38	.61
<b>Eigenvalue</b>			1.45
<b>Percent of total variance</b>			4.39
<b>Total variance</b>			46.42
8.	20. I tend to express my opinions honestly on issues even if I know it may have serious consequences.	.49	.66
	23. I think it is important to always come to work on time.	-.46	.63
	26. I think it is normal to do my personal things during work time.	.80	.68
<b>Eigenvalue</b>			1.30
<b>Percent of total variance</b>			3.30
<b>Total variance</b>			51.40
9.	18. I occasionally work overtime to get work done.	.55	.56
	20. I tend to express my opinions honestly on issues even if I know it may have serious consequences.	.37	.66
	21. I tend to encourage others to express their ideas and opinions.	.41	.59
<b>Eigenvalue</b>			1.21
<b>Percent of total variance</b>			3.66
<b>Total variance</b>			56.37

Factor number	Statements	Factor loading	Communality
10.	23. I feel it is important to obey the rules of the company.	.37	.55
	22. I think it is important to always come to work on time.	.39	.63
	31. I rarely miss work even if I have a legitimate reason for doing so.	.35	.61
	34. My work group is more productive when its members follow their own interests and concerns.	.76	
	42. People in my work group should do their best to cooperate with each other instead of trying to work things on their own.	.40	.57
<b>Eigenvalue</b>			1.13
<b>Percent of total variance</b>			3.43
<b>Total variance</b>			61.24
11.	23. I think it is important to always come to work on time.	.39	.63
	30. If I am not satisfied the tasks given to me, I complain about that.	.77	.70
<b>Eigenvalue</b>			1.06
<b>Percent of total variance</b>			3.22
<b>Total variance</b>			65.27

Therefore, from the analysis two factors ‘Helping behaviour’ and ‘IC: norms’ were created (see tables 5-6). Because of the poor results, a new factor analysis with less statements was conducted. With new analysis statements were chosen from only two different OCB dimensions. Then communalities were viewed and all the variables receiving small values  $p < .15$ , were excluded from further analysis. Then new analysis was conducted and then new reliability analysis. As a result, one more factor ‘IC: values’ was created (see table 7)

Table 5. Reliability analysis of factor ‘Helping behaviour’

Factor name	Statements	Cronbach’s Alpha
1.Helping behaviour	12.It is important to help those who have been absent (sick leave, holiday). 13.It is important to help new people to get started in their new tasks. 14.It is important to help colleagues in case they are in heavy workloads. 15.It is important to frequently adjust work schedule to accommodate other employees’ requests for time-off (e.g. holiday plans). 16.It is important to go out your way to make new employees to feel welcome in the work group.	.737



Table 6. Reliability analysis of factor 'IC: Norms'

<b>Factor name</b>	<b>Statements</b>	<b>Cronbach's Alpha</b>
2.IC: Norms	<p>39. People in my work group should realize that they sometimes are going to have to make sacrifices for the sake of the work group as a whole.</p> <p>38. People in my work group should be willing to make sacrifices for the sake of the work group (e.g. working late when needed, going out of the way to help etc.).</p> <p>40. People in my work group should recognize that they are not always going to get what they want.</p> <p>41. People should be made aware that if they are going to be part of a work group, they are sometimes going to have to do things they don't want to do.</p>	.694

Table 7. Reliability analysis of factor 'IC: values'

<b>Factor name</b>	<b>Statements</b>	<b>Cronbach's alpha</b>
3.IC: Values	<p>36. Given the choice, I would rather do a job where I can work alone rather than do a job where I have to work with others in my work group.</p> <p>37. I like it when members of my work group do things in their own, rather than working with others all the time.</p> <p>35. I prefer to work with others in my work group rather than work alone.</p>	.845

Later 2 more factors were created by combining couple of noticed variables together and testing them with Cronbach's alpha. With this method two more factors 'Civic virtue' and 'Organisational compliance' were created. However, only factor 'Civic virtue' reached a decent Cronbach's Alpha value. See table 6. Despite the low Cronbach's Alpha value, the factor 'Organisational compliance' was still included in the analysis as the variables exist in the prior research and they were logically related.

Table 8. Reliability analysis of factors ‘Civic virtue’ and ‘Organisational compliance’

Factor name	Statements	Cronbach's Alpha
4.Civic virtue	29.I am willing to defend the organisation against outside threats. 32.I tend to show pride when representing the organisation in public. 33.I actively promote the organisation's products and services to potential users. 28.I tell others this is a good place to work.	.776
5.Organisational compliance	19.I feel I have to inform my colleagues beforehand if I know I am absent the next day. 22.I feel it is important to obey the rules of the company. 23.I think it is necessary to always come to work on time 25.I meet the deadlines set by the organisation. 24.Regardless of circumstances, I produce the highest quality of my work.	.542

Some statements were excluded from the analysis (see appendix 1). The current statements did not load normally in factor analyses and therefore were left out.

New variables were created with summated scale method from the items that loaded to the latent factors. The summated scale method is a method where the items that reach required loading (in the current research the requirement is .035) are combined to one variable (Hair 1998, 124). The new variables range from the same scale as the statements 1 to 7, but apart from of the statements the scale is revised: now 1 is presenting Totally Disagree and 7 is presents Totally Agree. New variables created are: ‘Helping behaviour’, ‘IC: norms’, ‘IC: values’, ‘Organisational compliance’, and ‘Civic virtue’.

## 6.2 Univariate analysis

Most of the hypotheses were tested by applying univariate analysis. In the next chapter are presented results of testing hypotheses H1-H3 with factorial ANOVA, as well as the final hypothesis H4, which was tested with descriptive methods Cross tabulation and Chi square. For statistical tests the significance level applied in this study was .05.

*H1: Employees' cultural background affects to the OCB*

The results support the hypothesis H1. The relationship between cultural background and OCB was tested with two-way analysis of variance. Employees' cultural background including such demographic factors as 'Country of origin' and 'Mother tongue', showed statistical significance.

Table 9. Relationships with cultural background

<b>OCB factor</b>	<b>Mean value by group</b>		<b>Significance (p-value)</b>
<b>Cultural background</b>			
Helping behaviour	Finland	6.45	.00
	Russia	5.95	
IC: values			.34
IC: norms	Finland	5.73	.02
	Russia	5.37	
Civic virtue			.53
Organisational compliance	Finland	5.45	.04
	Russia	5.56	

\*Mean value presented if p-value is significant

The table 8 represents the results of the two-way analysis of the cultural background. The column 'Significance' shows the statistical significance of the model and the column 'Mean value' the level of statistical difference between Finland and Russia. As the table show, cultural demographic factors associate with following OCB factors 'Helping behaviour', and 'Organisational compliance', as well as with IC factor 'IC: norms'. The associations were statistically significant at the .05 significance level. The significance of the relationship between 'Cultural background' and 'Helping behaviour' was .00, which refers to the fact that demonstrating OCB factor 'Helping behaviour' vary between groups 'Finland' and 'Russia'. Furthermore, between these groups, Finland has higher mean value ( $M = 6.45$ ), so it is obvious in this case the employees from Russia are more likely to engage in OCB factor 'Helping behaviour'. Concerning the significance of the relationship between 'Cultural background' and 'IC: norms' which was .02, it means that the groups Finland and Russia differ. Also in this case Finland had the higher mean value ( $M = 5.73$ ), which tells that employees from Russia follow group norms more likely than employees from Finland. However, the mean value of Russia ( $M = 5.37$ ) is not far away from the mean value of Finland. The significance of the relationship between 'Cultural background' and 'Organisational compliance' was .04, so difference between these groups exists. The mean

values of the groups were very close, but Russia scored higher mean value ( $M = 5.56$ ). Thus, in this case employees from Russia are more likely to engage OCB than employees from Finland.

The significance levels in all cases concerning relationships between the cultural background factors and IC dimension 'IC: values' and OCB dimension 'Civic virtue' were above .05. This means that the groups in these dimensions do not differ. However, the p-value of 'Civic virtue' ( $p < .53$ ) was very close to the statistical significance. Thus, for the support of difference between employees from Finland and Russia of 'IC: values' showed no difference, and OCB dimension 'Civic virtue' only little difference. Thus, according to the results, employees both from Finland and Russia follow the group values, and engage in civic virtue somewhat the same.

Table 10. Relationships with other demographic factors

OCB factor	Mean value by group*		Significance (p-value)
<b>Age</b>			
Helping behaviour			.52
IC: values			.48
IC: norms			.19
Civic virtue			.55
Organisational compliance			.95
<b>Gender</b>			
Helping behaviour			.83
IC: values			.08
IC: norms	Man	5.73	.02
	Woman	5.40	
Civic virtue			.05
Organisational compliance			.24

\*Mean value presented if p-value is significant

Later, along with cultural background, also other demographic factors as 'Age', 'Gender', were tested. a two-way analysis of variance in table 9 shows as well as the associations between 'Age' and the following dimensions: 'Helping behaviour', 'IC: values', 'IC: norms', 'Civic virtue', and 'Organisational compliance such as 'Gender' and following dimensions: 'Helping behaviour', 'IC: values', 'IC: norms', 'Civic virtue', and 'Organisational compliance. The results show the relationship is statistically significant between 'Gender' and 'IC: norms'. As the table show, the significance level of Gender was .02, so the groups 'Man' and 'Woman' differ. The mean value for group 'Man' is higher ( $M = 5.73$ ), so men are more

likely to follow group norms than women. Although the difference between ‘Gender’ and ‘IC: norms’ was the only one that showed statistical difference, the p-value ( $p > .05$ ) of the relationship between ‘Gender’ and ‘Civic virtue’ was very close to statistical significance.

The results of the hypotheses H1 show that Finnish employees are more likely to engage in OCB dimensions HB and follow collectivistic norms. Therefore, it rejects the results of the prior study and the H2 hypothesis below:

*H2: Employees from collectivistic countries are more likely to engage in OCB than employees from individualistic countries*

*H3: The context within which the employee works affects to OCB*

Table 12. Relationships with employee’s context

<b>OCB factor</b>	<b>Mean value by group*</b>		<b>Significance (p-value) of the model</b>
<b>Residence</b>			
Helping behaviour	Finland	6.44	.00
	Russia	5.98	
IC: values			.15
IC: norms	Finland	5.74	.00
	Russia	5.30	
Civic virtue			.73
Organisational compliance	Finland	5.97	.02
	Russia	6.20	
<b>Citizenship</b>			
Helping behaviour	Finland	6.45	.00
	Russia	5.93	
IC: values			.36
IC: norms	Finland	5.72	.01
	Russia	5.33	
Civic virtue			.77
Organisational compliance	Finland	5.97	.06
	Russia	6.16	
<b>Duration of living</b>			
Helping behaviour			.46
IC: values			.81
IC: norms			.93
Civic virtue			.45
Organisational compliance			.77

**Duration of working**

Helping behaviour	.56
IC: values	.38
IC: norms	.29
Civic virtue	.11
Organisational compliance	.39

\*Mean value presented if p-value is significant

The hypotheses H3 was only partly supported by the results of the current research. The model employee's context and OCB show statistical significance only for the demographic factors 'Residence' and 'Citizenship'. As the table 12 shows, the significance level of the associations between 'Residence' and all factors of OCB, besides 'IC: values', and 'Civic virtue' was below .05. The significance level for 'Residence' and 'Helping behaviour' was .00, so it is obvious the groups differ. Finland scored the highest ( $M = 6.44$ ). Also, the significance level of 'Residence' and 'IC: norms' was .03, so the difference is significant between these groups. The highest value scored also in this model scored group Finland ( $M = 5.74$ ). Significance level of relationship between 'Residence' and 'Organisational compliance' was also significant .02, so in all these cases the groups differ. The mean value of group Russia ( $M = 6.20$ ) was higher than in group Finland. Therefore, it seems that residence affects to the OCB dimensions 'Helping behavior' and 'Organisational compliance', and IC dimension 'IC: norms'. Also the results show the significance of the relationship between 'Citizenship' and 'Helping behaviour' was .00, which means the groups Finland and Russia have differences. The significance for Finland is higher ( $M = 6.45$ ) than for Russia ( $M = 5.93$ ). The significance of the relationship between 'Citizenship' and 'IC: norms' .01 shows that the groups differ. Finland had the higher mean value ( $M = 5.72$ ). The significance of the relationship between 'Citizenship' and 'Organisational compliance' was not significant. The significance level was .06, which is above the measurement level of statistical significance .05, but though very close. In this case group Russia scored higher mean value ( $M = 6.16$ ).

*H4: Employees' observations of the concept OCB vary between countries explored*

The results of the research support the hypothesis H4. A Chi-square test was run to explore the association between employees' observations of OCB. The results provided evidence of the significance of the relationship.

Statement 1: “This kind of behaviour should be expected from everyone.”

Table 13. Cross tabulation 1

	Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Total	
	N*	%**	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Finland</b>	71	70.3%	19	76%	12	46.2%	102	67.1%
<b>Russia</b>	30	29.7%	6	24%	14	53.8%	50	32.9%
<b>Total</b>	101	100%	26	100%	25	100%	152	100%
					<b>Exact significance (P-value)</b>			
<b>Pearson Chi-Square</b>					.38			
<b>Fisher’s Exact Test</b>					.04			

\*N Number of cases

\*\*% Percent

Table 14. Cross tabulation 2

Statement 2: “Demonstrating OCB would be a cause for someone to receive superior performance or promotion.”

	Agree		Neutral		Total	
	N*	%**	N	%	N	%
<b>Finland</b>	97	72.4%	4	25%	102	67.1%
<b>Russia</b>	37	27.6%	12	75%	50	32.9%
<b>Total</b>	134	100%	16	100%	152	100%
					<b>Exact significance (P-value)</b>	
<b>Pearson Chi-Square</b>					.00	
<b>Fisher’s Exact Test</b>					.00	

\*N Number of cases

\*\*% Percent

Viewing both tables 13 and 14, it is obvious observations vary between employees from Finland and Russia. The p-value of Fisher’s exact test in both table 14 and table 16 show that the difference is significant ( $p < .05$ ) for both statements, with the p-values .04, and 00. Therefore, it is clear employees from both countries have somewhat different assumptions

whether OCB should be expected from everyone, and demonstration of OCB can lead to rewards.

Among these two statements, the respondents were requested to provide their own definition of OCB. Overall 75 definitions were received from the respondent's definitions from Finnish employees and 45 definitions from Russian employees. Definitions by Finnish and Russian employees had similarities but also differences. A brief overlook of five definitions from each both countries is provided below. These definitions are translated into English. All the original definitions of these definitions are provided in appendix 4. As the definitions by F6 and F66 show, Finnish employees tend to divide words *työyhteisö* (Eng. work community) and *alaistaidot* (Eng. subordinate skills). Also, there were differences whether the concept concerns subordinate skills or supervisory skills. For example, definitions by F6, F49, and F10 view the concept as it was concerning subordinate skills, but the definition by F14 might consider both, when the definition by F66 considers the supervisory skills. The current definitions by Finnish employees are provided below:

*“Work performance skills create good spirit and motivate, supervisor is also someone's subordinate. Work performance skills affect to the employee's motivation towards work, work community, and supervisor. Work community skills are part of the organisations performance and contribution. Organisation having good work community skills is counterproductive and works for the organisation as whole”.* (Respondent F6)

*” Social intelligence at minimum level. Taking responsibility of one's and group's tasks. Considering others. Understanding the goals of the company”.* (Respondent. F14)

*” ...how a person acts as a subordinate, and how she sees her own role in the work community and towards others”.* (Respondent F49)

*” The skills with what each employee can help their colleagues, supervisor and themselves to accomplish better results and enjoying in work. In practice it means that one not only complains about things that are bad, but do all she can by herself”.* (Respondent F10)

*” Work community: A society formed by the organisation and teams that work for the common good. Subordinate skills: A skill to organise, lead, coach, and motivate, and give feedback”* (Respondent F66)



Russian employees view the concept somewhat different than their Finnish counterparts. For example, in Russian definitions the role of the group norms is seen in the definitions by R3, R17, R23, and R32. Also, definition by R17 clarifies the elements that predict OCB. Examples of the current definitions by Russian employees are provided below:

*” Behaviour that bases rather on the goals of the work group, than individual motives. Personal treats are implemented through the company’s success”. (Respondent R3)*

*” Loyalty to the company” (Respondent R4)*

*” Management style, communication in the organisation, work coordination, fairness that either strengthens or weakens the employees’ level of citizenship behaviour”. (Respondent R17)*

*” Behaviour directed toward work efficiency outside of employees’ dependence of interests and preferences”. (Respondent R23)*

*“...Employees’ voluntary participation in work improving the quality of the company’s production, mostly basing on the enthusiasm and personal interest to work for the common good”. (Respondent R32)*

Major difference between these definitions was the understanding of the concept itself. To clarify, Finnish employees tend to define OCB by dividing it two parts.

## 7 CONCLUSION

This Master's thesis explored the concept of OCB, its origins and its occurrence in cultural context in Finnish company operating in Finland and in Russia. The goal was to first find out how OCB appears in the company explored and what types of OCB will be found. The aim was to see whether cultural background and the context within which the employee works affect to the level of demonstration of OCB in these countries. The appearance of individual differences as a predictor of OCB was also taken into account in this research. Final goal was to explore whether the observations of OCB vary between the employees from both countries. Given that cultural differences affect also to the managerial practices, studies exploring the differences between Finnish and Russian managers, and HRM practices were also viewed. Material was gathered by using questionnaire and sent by email to the employees of this company. In this research company stays unknown, thus no company name was exposed. The approach applied in this study was quantitative and the material gathered was analysed using statistical methods.

Prior research of OCB shows, that the concept itself overlaps with two similar concepts POB and OS. However, these concepts vary not only by their definitions, but also by their elements. For example, OS included many of the elements of OCB. There has been also discussion about OCB whether it should be viewed as included in the job description or excluded from it. The prior research on this field has provided studies that distinct contextual performance from task performance. For example, Van Dyne et al.'s (1997) study of air traffic controllers provided evidence that task performance and contextual performance have different predictors. At the same time the OCB's nature being extra-role has been questioned and research on this field has proved that OCB includes both in-role and extra-role activities. Later Organ (1997) himself agreed that his original definition of discretionary work behaviours included some of the elements of task performance and therefore cannot be considered as extra-role.

After Organ's first dimensions of OCB, prior literature has provided several dimensions for this matter. Now the most applied dimensions are the seven-dimensional model of Podsakoff et al. (2000) including *helping behaviour*, *organisational loyalty*, *organisational compliance*,

*individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development.* For this research dimensions were adopted from four previous research and combined to one questionnaire.

Hofstede's theory of national culture provided understanding of individualistic and collectivistic cultures, and Paine and Organ's (2000) study provided better understanding of that how the individualistic and collectivistic differences are related to OCB. However, as Paine and Organ's study provided evidence of the relationship with PD and IC and not with all the four dimensions of Hofstede's national culture (2010), a broader inspection was in need. Suutari's (1998), and Alexashin and Blenkinsopp's (2005) research provided overview for this issue exploring differences of Finnish and Russian managers by adopting Hofstede's original four-dimensional model of national culture.

Concerning the research material overall amount of responses received was 157. Some of the basic data were left out including only one case. With factor analyses the factors were created for the final analysis, and some statements were left out giving poor results both in factor analysis and reliability tests. As noted, this may be a consequence of misunderstanding by the respondents of some of the statements and might have affected to the results of this research. Although, the results may also be a sign how OCB is adopted in the organisation explored. In this organisation the following OCB dimensions were found: *helping behaviour, civic virtue, and organisational compliance.* Also such IC dimensions as *norms, and values* were found.

Hypotheses H1-H3 were tested with factorial ANOVA. The main finding of the current research was that cultural background is associated with the OCB and IC. According to the results of this research Finland scored the highest mean value in OCB dimension *helping behaviour*, when Russia scored highest in *organisational compliance.* Concerning the IC dimensions, cultural background was related only with *norms* as *values* showed no significant difference between Finland and Russia. According to Moorman and Blakely (1995) the higher mean values of IC dimensions refer to collectivistic society and lower mean values to individualistic society. Also, prior research suggests that people from individualistic society are more driven by their own identity and material rewards, whereas people from collectivistic society follow the in-group interest. Results of this study showed the opposite; Finnish employees were more likely to follow group norms and Russian employees individualistic norms. Therefore, it is not always obvious employees from collectivistic

society are more likely to follow group norms. Also, as Tikhomirova (2008) stated Russia should no longer be considered as collectivistic society, as it is moving towards individualistic society. The fact employees having different cultural backgrounds engage differently in OCB dimensions may base on the different cultural norms and values both in Finland and Russia. Prior study has given evidence that the demonstration of OCB is affected by individual's cultural background. Hofstede's model of cultural dimensions show (table 1), Russia is more like a collectivistic country, whereas Finland seems to be more like an individualistic country. This was not supported by the results of this research when group Finland turned out to be more driven to group norms than group Russia. Studies by Moorman and Blakely (1995), and Paine and Organ (2000) show, in the collectivistic countries OCB behaviour is seen more like a normative behaviour, and the behaviour bases on the loyalty for the in-group, but in individualistic countries it is more like an exceptional. Therefore, these results are surprising as Finnish employees tend to be more driven to OCB dimension *helping behaviour* and follow group norms, when Russian employees were more likely to demonstrate such OCB as *organisational compliance* and follow individualistic norms.

Exploring whether the context affects to the demonstration of OCB, both OCB dimensions and IC dimensions proved relationship with the demographic factors 'Residence' and 'Citizenship', but not with the factors 'Duration of living' and 'Duration of working'. Thus, based on the results of this research no matter how long the person has been living in a certain country or working in this company, it does not affect to that do an employee engage in OCB or not. On the contrary, in the relationships between factor 'Residence' in all factors of OCB and IC, besides 'Civic virtue' and 'values', differences occurred. Therefore, as the results show, it is obvious residence affects to the OCB dimensions *helping behaviour* and *organisational compliance*, and IC dimension *norms*. Furthermore, the group Finland had the highest mean value in all cases besides *organisational compliance*, which was the group Russia. Therefore, it can be suggested that employees living in Finland, are more likely to engage in such OCB dimension as *helping behaviour*, and follow group norms. Whereas employees living in Russia are more likely to engage in OCB dimension *organisational compliance* and follow individualistic norms. The assumption bases on the prior study and the results of the H1. Therefore, employees living in Finland and having Finnish citizenship are affected by the cultural norms and values of that culture. Thus, as employees coming from

Finland are more likely to engage in *helping behaviour* and follow group norms, it is no surprise employees living in Finland or having Finnish citizenship show the same results.

Finally, results of the hypotheses H1-H3 almost in all models reject the null hypotheses, besides results of H2 which reject the alternative hypothesis H2 as the results supported H0. This finding is confusing as it does not support the findings by Moorman and Blakely (1995) who found employees from collectivistic society are more likely to engage in OCB. Results of the hypotheses H1 and H3 reject the null hypotheses in all models with the OCB and IC dimensions, besides with the following two dimensions: *IC: values* and *civic virtue*. However, the p-value of *civic virtue* was .06, so it can be considered significant as it is very close to the statistically significant value  $p < .05$ . The reason why these dimensions show little or no difference between the groups may have several reasons. First of all, prior research has support for the fact that OCB cannot be completely considered as extra-role, as it includes elements considered part of the job. Second, the observations of extra-role and in-role vary between employees and managers. Third, as *civic virtue* refers to an employee's commitment to an organisation, it may have personal differences as personality, work itself, and organisational structure have a huge affection to the commitment. Therefore, the results of the dimension *civic virtue* might show that the employees of both countries observe organisational rules and procedures quite the same, the work itself is quite similar in both countries, and organisational structure is almost equal in both countries. This does not surprise, as the employees from both countries are working in the same company. Thus, as *civic virtue* bases on the assumption of employees' responsibilities that they have towards an organisation, it could be suggested in this organisation the civic virtue behavior is already seen as being part of the work role.

Last goal of the research was to test whether the observations of OCB vary between Finnish and Russian employees. These observations were tested with cross tabulation. The results show that observations of OCB vary between Finnish and Russian employees (see tables 13-14). Thus, employees had different opinions of whether OCB should be expected from everyone, and whether OCB would lead to rewards or promotions. Also, by viewing the observations both employees provide of OCB, it was obvious employees view the concept differently.

Prior research on OCB has proved evidence that OCB affects overall performance of the company. Podsakoff and his colleagues (2009) explored consequences of OCB on individual and organisational level. Individual level consequences were performance evaluations, reward allocation decisions, and employee withdrawal behaviours. They suggest, that such OCB as *helping behavior*, *civic virtue*, and *sportsmanship* have a positive effect to subordinate's work. Also when managers notice this kind of behaviour useful they are more likely to provide higher performance evaluations and reward for such behaviour. Low OCB was seen affecting employee withdrawal behaviours or low attendance levels at work. On organisational level OCB was found to have a positive influence on organisational effectiveness, customer satisfaction, group or unit level turnover, and also overall team wellness. (Podsakoff et al. 2009, 123-124.) Considering all these consequences mentioned above, it is highly important to recognise the predictors that cause such behavior, how the level of OCB can be maintained, and how to increase it. Podsakoff et al. (2000) have identified four categories of predictors: individual characteristics, task characteristics, organisational characteristics, and leadership behaviours. They also noted such predictors as: reward allocations, and individual differences and cultural context.

As this study did not support the assumption that employees from collectivistic countries are more likely to demonstrate OCB, it was important to identify the differences between Finnish and Russian employees to increase the level of OCB in this organisation. Studies exploring differences of Finnish and Russian organisational culture, and differences in management and HRM practices were viewed. As Finland and Russia have both different historical, cultural, and economic backgrounds this has also affected to their management and HRM practices. As noted, Finland has a developed economy, high education level, and good quality of life (Lämsä 2010, 141-142), whereas in Russia the economy is developing toward a market economy, educational levels vary, and the quality of life is lower as Plakhotnik (2005) found. Finnish people value independence and personal freedom and this is also seen in the Finnish organisational culture: as Granlund and Lukka (1998) suggest, Finnish employees do not want to be directed, but coached and keep their personal autonomy. On the contrary, Alexashin and Blenskinsopp (2005) assumed in Russia people have been under powerful leaders over centuries and without personal freedom. Therefore, Russian employees accept authoritarian leading more easily, do not question their manager's decisions and stand out of the group as in Russia belonging to a group is more valued than acting individually.

Prior studies showed some of the major differences but also some similarities between Finnish and Russian managers. For example, Suutari (1998) found Finnish managers being more participative in taking account their subordinate's needs and wants than Russian managers. Another issue found was that Finnish employees are given more autonomy in decision processes than Russian employees. Also role clarifications between these countries vary. Finnish superiors do not provide clear descriptions about their subordinate's tasks, whereas Russian managers prefer detailed instructions as Russian people are less likely to go beyond their regular work. Another issue was planning which was seen more important in Finland than in Russia. This finding is in line with the findings by Alexashin and Blenkinsopp (2005), who found Russian people being taught to see the things happening around them and focusing on the current moment, but at the same time they have been unsure about the future. Although there were differences between Finnish and Russian managers, they have one thing in common: both Finnish and Russian managers are described authoritarian. However, as Suutari (1999) found, they differ in a sense that Finnish managers are more participative and give more freedom to their subordinates.

Fey and his colleagues (1999) found in Russia the concept of HRM was not so familiar and those practices were brought by Western companies to Russia and are still affected by the past Soviet practices. The major differences they found in HRM practices between Finland and Russia were in the recruitment, appraisal, training and development, and compensation systems. Denisova-Schmidt (2008) also noted about the two work forces in Russia: the older ones with Soviet experience and values, and the younger ones with less experience, but more capable to adopt into new environment. This raises another issue which concerns training and development. When in Finland training and development were seen less important, in Russia the employees valued the training and development a lot. This is also caused by the two work forces in Russia, as the employees are more in need for development in their daily tasks than Finnish people as they already may have the educational background to their tasks. According to Denisova-Schmidt (2011) and Horie (2014) when operating in Russia, companies should not transfer their practices to Russian context, but understand the traditional Russian practices, and choose the practices that are applicable in that context.

Considering the differences and similarities found between Finnish and Russian organisational culture and management, managers by their actions are able to affect to the level of demonstration in OCB. For example, as personal freedom is important to Finnish people, managers should maintain their Finnish employees' autonomy by coaching, but not provide too strict rules or directions how to operate. On the opposite, as Russian employees are used to be guided, they should be given more detailed instructions about the goals to achieve in the work group with support by their manager. Another issue is the leadership styles and how they are viewed in individualistic and collectivistic societies. Paine and Organ (2000) suggest that expatriate managers from individualistic cultures where participative leading is considered normal may face problem when implementing this leading style in collectivistic society. Also, considering that Russian managers do not take their peer's opinions seriously, as a consequence Russian subordinates may think their opinions have no value and therefore may be afraid to say their opinions. According to Paine and Organ (2000) this may decrease OCB as the employees are afraid to contribute voluntary actions. Managers should encourage their Russian subordinates to speak out. Furthermore, taking into account that Finnish employees value more the individualistic norms and values, when Russian employees consider collectivistic norms and values and follow group interest, this may affect to the way how employees consider their supervisor's decisions. Regarding to the HRM practices, the need for personal development and training was seen more important for Russian employees, and there should be taken into account.

Paine and Organ (2000) suggest, that human resource practices of an organisation should rather consider the cultural aspects, requirements, values, and norms of those employees having different cultural background than those who are inhabitants of the culture where the company operates. It is obvious that cross-cultural relationships cause more conflicts and misunderstanding than relationships where both participants are from the same culture. Therefore, it is important to know the differences and plan management and human resource activities taking into account these differences.

Despite the complex nature of the OCB concept including overlapping concepts and different dimensions of OCB, the current study succeeded in providing an overview of the OCB concepts, its antecedents and consequences, and exploring the differences in OCB in the current organisation. However, the present study also has some limitations and weaknesses.



To begin, as the questionnaire was created by combining several prior studies together, for this study no prior evidence was found for the reliability of the statements. Therefore, there occurred difficulties in combining the statements with factorial analysis and as a result, some statements were excluded giving poor result in reliability test. However, also the small amount of respondents may have affected to the reliability of the results. Another issue, is the cultural context, to be more specific, the Finnish and Russian context. Only few studies were found concerning Finnish and Russian management and HR practices.

Further research. As the previous results show the country where the employee is living affects to OCB, it would be interesting to explore deeper whether the national culture of a certain country affects to the OCB, or whether the organisational culture of the certain company has stronger effect. Thus, as this research failed to show are there differences between foreign and local employees living in certain country due to small sample size, in the future research, it would be interesting to compare foreign people with local people living in a certain country, and see whether there are differences in OCB. For example, as the current research show, that al having different cultural background engage different OCB dimensions, it would be interesting to compare both expatriates and local employees in offices of these both countries and see whether the OCB vary between these employees. Another interesting topic would be to explore whether the organisational culture in Finnish and Russian branch offices differ in this organisation, and how it may affect to OCB in the current organisation.

## 8 REFERENCES

### 8.1 Sources

Business dictionary 2018a. Online dictionary of business terminology. Visited on 1.11.2018  
Web address: <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/organizational-behavior.html>

Business dictionary 2018b. Online dictionary of business terminology. Visited on 1.11.2018.  
Web address: <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/organizational-citizenship.html>

TASS 2016. Finskie kompanii investirovali v ekonomiku Rossii okolo €12 mlrd. Tass – Russian online information agency. Visited on 13.12.2018. Web address: <https://tass.ru/ekonomika/3868149>. (Org.: Финские компании инвестировали в экономику России около €12 млрд)

PMEAN 2008. What's the difference between regression and ANOVA? A newsletter of average "The monthly mean". Visited on 7.1.2019. Web address: <http://www.pmean.com/08/RegressionAndAnova.html>

SPSS tutorials 2018. Web page of SPSS tutorials. Visited on 30.10.2018. Web address : <https://www.spss-tutorials.com/spss-what-is-it/>

### 8.2 Literature

Acaray and Akturan 2015. The relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour and organizational silence. *Procedia – Social and behavioral sciences*. No. 207. Pp. 472-482.

Alexashin and Blenkinsopp 2005. Alexashin Y. and Blenkinsopp J. Changes in Russian managerial values: a test of the convergence hypothesis? *The international journal of human resource management*. Vol. 16. No. 3. Pp. 427-444.

Bateman and Organ 1983. Bateman T.S. and Organ D.W. Job satisfaction and the good soldier: the relationship between affect and employee "citizenship". *Academy of management journal*. Vol. 26. No. 4. Pp. 587-595.

Barney 1986. Barney J.B. Organizational culture: can it be a source of sustained competitive advantage? *The academy of management review*. Vol. 11. No. 3. Pp. 656-665.

Beekun et al. 2003. Beekun R.I., Stedham Y., Yamamura J.H., and Barghouti J.A. Comparing business ethics in Russia and the US. *The international journal of human resource management*. Vol. 14. No. 8. Pp. 1333-1349.

Brief and Motowidlo 1986. Brief A.P. and Motowidlo S.J. Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of management review*. Vol. 11. No. 4. Pp 710-725.

Bolino et al. 2004. Bolino M.C., Turnley W.H., and Niehoff B.P. The other side of the story: re-examining prevailing assumptions about organizational citizenship behavior. *Human resource management review*. Pp. 22-246.

Borman and Motowidlo 1997. Borman W.C. and Motowidlo S.J. Task performance and contextual performance: the meaning for personnel selection research. *Human performance*. Vol. 10. No. 2. Pp.99-109. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Bowler 2010. Bowler W.M., Halbesleben J.R.B., and Paul J. R.B. If you're close with the leader, you must be a brownnose: the role of leader-member relationships in follower, leader, and co-worker attributions of organizational citizenship behavior motives. *Human resource management review*. No. 20. Pp. 309-316.

Brodbeck et al. 2000. Brodbeck F.C. et al. Cultural variation of leadership prototypes across 22 European countries. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*. Vol. 73. Pp. 1-29.

Cinar et al. 2013. Cinar O., Karcioglu F., and Aliogullari Z.D. The relationship between organizational silence and organizational citizenship behavior: a survey study in the province of Erzurum, Turkey. *Procedia – Social and behavioral sciences*. No. 99. Pp. 314-321.

Chan and Lai 2017. Chang S. H. J. and Lai H.Y.I. Understanding the link between communication satisfaction, perceived justice and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of business research*. No. 70. Pp. 214-233.

Chiang and Hsieh 2012. Chiang C-F., and Hsieh T-S. The impacts of perceived organizational support and psychological empowerment on job performance: the mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International journal of hospitality management*. No. 31. Pp. 180-190.

Cho and Danserau 2010. Cho J. and Danserau F. Are transformational leaders fair? A multi-level study of transformational leadership, justice perceptions, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The leadership quarterly*. Vol. 21. Pp. 409-421.

Deluga 1994. Deluga R.J. Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*. No. 67. Pp. 315-326.

Demirel and Sadykova 2018. Demirel Y. and Sadykova G.F. Vliânie socialnoj podderžki na graždanskoe povedenie. [Org.: Влияние социальной поддержки на гражданское поведение]

Denisova-Schmidt 2008. Denisova-Schmidt E. The transfer of western human resource practices to Russian subsidiaries. *WU online papers in international business communication*. Vol. 1 Vienna university of economics and business. Vol. 1. No. 2.

- Denisova-Schmidt 2011. Denisova-Schmidt E. Human resource management in Russia: Some unwritten rules. *WU online papers in international business communication*. Vienna university of economics and business. Vol 1. No 8.
- Devece et al. 2016. Devece C., Palacios-Marques D., and Alguacil M.P. Organizational commitment and its effects on organisational citizenship behavior in high-unemployment environment. *Journal of business research*. No. 69. Pp. 1857-1861.
- Farh et al. 1990. Farh J-L., Podsakoff P.M., and Organ D.W. Accounting for organizational citizenship behavior: leader fairness and task scope versus satisfaction. *Journal of management*. Vol. 16. No. 4. Pp. 705-721.
- Fey et al. 1999. Fey C., Engström P., and Björkman I. Doing business in Russia: Effective human resource management practices for foreign firms in Russia. *Organizational dynamics*. Pp. 68-80.
- Fey et al. 2003. Fey C.E., Pavlovskaya A., and Tang N. Does one shoe fit everyone? A comparison of human resource management practices in Russia, China, and Finland. *Organizational dynamics*. Vol. 33. No. 1. Pp. 79-97.
- George and Brief 1992. George J.M. and Brief A.P. Feeling good-doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. *Psychological bulletin*. Vol. 112. No 2. Pp.310-329.
- Graham 1991. Graham J.W. An essay of organizational citizenship behavior. *Employee responsibilities and rights journal*. Vol. 4. No. 4.
- Granlund and Lukka 2004. Granlund M, and Lukka K. Towards increasing business orientation: Finnish management accountants in a changing cultural context. *Management accounting research*. Vol. 9. Pp. 185-211.
- Griffin et al. 2000. Griffin M. A., Neal A., and Neale M. The contribution task performance and contextual performance to effectiveness: investigating the role of situational constraints. *International association for applied psychology: an international review*. Vol 49. No. 3. Pp. 517-533.
- Gulevich 2013. Gulevich O. A. Graždanskoe povedenie v organizacii: usloviâ i posledstviâ. *Organisational psychology*. No.3. pp. 78-96. [Org.: Гражданское поведение в организации: условия и последствия]
- Hair et al. 2014. Hair J.F. Jr, Black W.C., Babin B. J., Anderson R.E. Multivariate data analysis. 7<sup>th</sup> edition. Pearson Education cop
- Hoffmann et al. 2007. Hoffmann B.J., Blair C. A., Meriac J.P., and Woehr D.J. Expanding the criterion domain? A quantitative review of OCB literature. *Journal off applied psychology*. Vol. 92. No. 2. Pp. 555-566.

Hofstede et al. 2010. Hofstede G., Hofstede G.J, and Minkov. Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival. McGraw Hill Books.

Horie 2014. Horie N. A note on human resource management in Russia: path dependency in job design. *The journal of comparative economic studies*. Vol 9. Pp. 135-141.

Irdyneev 2012. Irdyneev S.C. Praktičeskie voprosy upravleniâ personalom v processe sliâniâ i poglošeniâ kompanii v sovremennyh usloviâh.. *Journal science prospects*. Vol. 39. No.12. pp. 123-126. [Org.: Практические вопросы управления персоналом в процессе слияния и поглощения компаний в современных условиях]

Kacmar et al. 2012. Exploring the role of supervisor trust in the associations between multiple sources of relationship conflict and organizational citizenship behavior. *The leadership quarterly*. No.23. Pp. 43-54.

Karachinskii 2001. Karachinskii A. Zapadnye kompanii v Rossii – nečastnyj slučaj. *Journal of economic strategies*. [Org.: Западные компании в России – несчастный случай]

Karam and Kwantes 2011. Karam C.M and Kwantes C.T. Contextualizing cultural orientation and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of International Management*. Temple University. Vol. 17. Pp. 303-315.

Kobernyuk et al. 2014. Kobernyuk E., Stiles D., and Ellson T. International joint ventures in Russia: Culture's influences on alliance success. *Journal of business research*. No. 67. Pp. 471-477.

Koning and Van Kleef 2015. Koning L.F and Van Kleef G.A. How leader's emotional displays shape follower's organizational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*. Vol. 26. Pp. 489-501. University of Amsterdam.

Konovsky and Organ 1996. Konovsky M. A. and Organ D.W. Dispositional and contextual determinants of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of organizational behavior*. Vol. 17. Pp. 253-266.

Korkmaz and Arpaci 2009. Korkmaz T., and Arpaci E. Relationship of organizational citizenship behavior with emotional intelligence. *Procedia – Social and behavioral sciences*. No. 1. Pp. 2432-2435.

Kwantes and Karam 2008. Kwantes C.T. and Karam C.M. Culture's influence on the perception of OCB as in-role or extra-role. *International journal of intercultural relations*. Vol. 32. No. 3. Pp. 229-243.

Levkin 2006. Levkin. N. V. Da grehi ne puskaût...Nacional'nye osobennosti i organizacionnâ kul'tura rossijskogo predprinimatel'stva. [Org.: Да грехи не пускают...Национальные особенности и организационная культура российского предпринимательства]

- Lin et al. 2016. Lin S-Y., Chen H-C., and Chen I-H. When perceived welfare practices leads to organizational citizenship behavior. *Asia Pacific Management Review*. Vol.21. pp. 204-212.
- Lopez-Dominguez et al. 2012. Lopez-Dominguez M., Enache M., Sallan J.M., and Simo P. Transformational leadership as an antecedent of change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of business research*. No. 66. Pp. 2147-2152.
- Luthans et al. 1993. Luthans F., Welsh D. H. B., and Rosenkrantz S.A. What do Russian managers really do? An observational study with comparisons to U.S. managers. *Journal of international business studies*. Vol.4.
- Lämsä 2010. Lämsä T. Leadership styles and decision-making in Finnish and Swedish organizations. *Review of international comparative management*. Vol.11. No.1. Pp. 139-149.
- MacKenzie et al. 1993. MacKenzie S.B., Podsakoff P.M., and Fetter R. The impact of organizational citizenship behavior on evaluations of salesperson performance. *Journal of marketing*. Vol. 57. Pp. 70-80.
- Mamman et al. 2012. Mamman A., Kamoche K, and Bakuwa R. Diversity, organizational commitment and organisational citizenship behavior: an organizing framework. *Human resource management review*. No. 22. Pp. 285-302.
- Moorman et al. 1993. Moorman R.H., Niehoff B.P., and Organ D.W. Treating employees fairly and organizational citizenship behavior: sorting the effects of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and procedural justice. *Employee responsibilities and rights journal*. Vol. 6. No. 3.
- Moorman and Blakely 1995. Moorman R.H and Blakely G.L. Individualism-collectivism as individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. Vol. 16. Pp. 127-142.
- Motowidlo and Van Scotter 1994. Motowidlo S.J. and Van Scotter J.R. Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of applied psychology*. Vol.79. No. 4. Pp. 475-480.
- Motowidlo et al. 1997. Motowidlo S.J., Borman W.C., and Schmit M.J. A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human performance*. Vol. 10. No. 2. Pp. 71-83. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- Organ 1988. Organ D.W. A restatement of the satisfaction-performance hypothesis. *Journal of management*. Vol 14. No. 4. Pp. 547-557.
- Organ and Ryan 1995. Organ D.W. and Ryan K. A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel psychology*. No. 48.

Organ 1997a. Organ D.W. A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction-causes-performance hypothesis. *Academy of management review*.

Organ 1997b. Organ D.W. Organizational citizenship behaviour: It's construct clean-up time. *Human performance*. Vol. 10. No. 2. Pp. 85-97. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Organ 2015. Organ D.W. Organizational citizenship behavior. *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences*. 2nd edition. Vol. 17.

Paine and Organ 2000. Paine J.B and Organ D.W. The cultural matrix of organizational citizenship behavior: Some preliminary conceptual and empirical observations. *Human Resource Management Review*. Vol.10:1. pp.45-49. Kelley School of Business: Indiana University.

Pavalache-Ilie 2014. Pawalache-Ilie M. Organizational citizenship behavior, work satisfaction and employee's personality. *Procedia – social and behavioral sciences*. No. 127. Pp. 489-493.

Plakhotnik 2005. Plakhotnik M. S. Human resource practices in Russia: a structured literature review. *Florida international university*.

Podsakoff et al. 1990. Podsakoff P.M., MacKenzie S.B., Moorman R.H., and Fetter R. Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership quarterly*. No. Vol. 1. No. 2. Pp. 107-142.

Podsakoff and MacKenzie 1994. Podsakoff P.M. and MacKenzie S.B. Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of marketing research*. Vol. XXXI. Pp. 352-363.

Podsakoff and MacKenzie 1997. Podsakoff P.M. and MacKenzie S.B. Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: a review and suggestion for future research. *Human performance*. Vol. 10. No. 2. Pp. 133-151.

Podsakoff et al. 2000. Podsakoff P.M., MacKenzie S.B, and Bachrach D.G. Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of management*. Vol. 26. No. 3. pp. 513-563. Kelley School of Business, Indiana University.

Podsakoff et al. 2009. Podsakoff N.P, Whiting S. W., Podsakoff P.M, and Blume B.D. Individual- and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: a meta-analysis. *Journal of applied psychology*. Vol 94. No. 1. Pp. 122-141.

Popescu et al. 2015. Popescu A.M., Deaconu A., and Popescu T. Organization's age and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), performance criteria at SME's level. Case study – Bucharest – Ilfov development region. *Procedia – Economics and finance*. No. 22. Pp. 645-654.

Puffer and Shekshnia 1996. The fit between Russian culture and compensation. *The international executive*. Vol. 38. No. 2. Pp.217-241.

Puffer et al. 1998. Puffer S.M., Mc Carthy D.J., and Zhuplev A.V. Doing business in Russia: lessons from early entrants. *Thunderbird international business review*. Vol. 40. No. 5. Pp.461-484.

Rebzuev 2009. Rebzuev B.G. Razrabotka konstrukta trudovogo povedeniâ i škaly ekstrarolevogo trudovogo povedeniâ *Psychology. Journal of business school*. No.1. [Org.: Разработка конструктора трудового поведения и шкалы экстраролевого трудового поведения]

Robertson and Barling 2017. Robertson J.L and Barling J. Toward a new measure of organizational environmental citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business Research*. Pp. 57-66.

Salehi and Gholtash 2011. Salehi M., Gholtash A. The relationship between job satisfaction, job burnout and organizational commitment with the organizational citizenship behavior among members of faculty in the Islamic Azad university – first district branches, on order to provide the appropriate model. *Procedia – Social and behavioral sciences*. No. 15. Pp. 306-310.

Schappe 1998. Schappe S.P. The influence of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and fairness perceptions on organizational citizenship behavior. *The journal of psychology*. Vol. 132. No. 3. Pp. 277-290.

Schuler and MacMillan 1984. Schuler R. S., and MacMillan I.C. Gaining competitive advantage through human resource management practices. *Human resource management*. Vol. 23. No. 3. Pp. 241-255.

Shafazawana et al. 2016. Shafazawana M.T., Ying C.Y., Zuliawati M.S., and Sukumaran K. Managing job attitudes: the roles of job satisfaction and organisational commitment on organizational citizenship behaviors. *Procedia – Economics and finance*. No. 35. Pp. 604-611.

Smith et al. 1983. Smith C. A., Organ D.W. and Near J.P. Organisational Citizenship Behavior: Its nature and antecedents. *Journal of applied psychology*. Vol. 68. No 4. Pp. 653-663. School of Business: Indiana University.

Suutari 1998. Leadership behaviour in Eastern Europe: Finnish expatriate's experiences in Russia and Estonia. *International journal of human resource management*. Vol. 9. No. 2. Pp. 235-258.

Suutari et al. 2002. Suutari V., Raharjo K., ja Riikkilä T. The challenge of cross-cultural leadership interaction: Finnish expatriates in Indonesia. *Career development international*. Vol. 7:7. Pp. 415-429.



Terrier et al. 2016. Terrier L., Kim S., and Fernandez S. Who are the good organizational citizens for the environment? An examination of the predictive validity of traits. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*. Pp. 185-190. University of Applied Sciences Western Switzerland.

Tikhomirova 2008. Tikhomirova O.G. Organizacionnaâ kul'tura: formirovanie, razvitie i oценка. *Sankt-Peterburgskij gosudarstvennyj universitet informacionnyh tekhnologii, mekhaniki i optiki*. Ministerstvo obrazovaniâ i nauki Rossiiskoj Federacii. [Org.: Организационная культура: формирование, развитие и оценка]

Van Dyne et al. 1994. Van Dyne L, Graham J.W. and Dienesch R.M. Organizational citizenship behavior; construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 37. No 4. Pp. 765-802.

Williams and Anderson 1991. Williams L.J. and Anderson S.E. Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of management*. Vol. 17- No. 3. Pp. 601-617.

Yildirim 2014. Yildirim O. The impact of organisational communication on organizational citizenship behavior: research findings. *Procedia – Social and behavioral sciences*. No. 150. Pp. 1095-1100.

Zavyalova et al. 2017. Zavyalova E., Kucherov D., and Tsybova V. Human resource management at Russian companies – leaders of the global economy. *Foresight and STI governance*. Vol 11. No. 4. Pp. 52-61.

Zheng et al. 2012. Zheng W.Z., Zhang M., and Li H. Performance appraisal process and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of managerial psychology*. Vol. 27. No. 7. Pp. 732-752.

Özcelik and Findikli 2014. Özcelik G. and Findikli M.A. The relationship between internal branding and organizational citizenship behaviour: the mediating role of person-organization fit. *Procedia – social and behavioral sciences*. No. 150. Pp. 1120-1128.

## APPENDIX 1: Questionnaire

### Organisational Citizenship Behaviour Survey

Welcome! I am glad you decided to participate in this survey.

This is an anonymous survey and the material gathered from the questionnaire is analysed on aggregate level by using statistical methods. Therefore, any of the responses cannot be personally identified.

Thank you for taking few minutes of your time. Please answer all the questions below based on your experiences where are you working right now.

Good luck!

#### Please fill in the basic information

1. Age

- Less than 25 years
- 26-35 years
- 31-40 years
- 51-60 years
- More than 61 years

2. Gender

- Male
- Female

3. Citizenship. Please choose at least one.

- |               |                       |
|---------------|-----------------------|
| - Denmark     | - Poland              |
| - Estonia     | - Russia              |
| - Finland     | - Sweden              |
| - France      | - Switzerland         |
| - Germany     | - Turkey              |
| - Hungary     | - Ukraine             |
| - Latvia      | - United Kingdom (UK) |
| - Lithuania   | - United States (US)  |
| - Netherlands | - Other               |
| - Norway      |                       |

4. Country of origin

- |               |                       |
|---------------|-----------------------|
| - Denmark     | - Poland              |
| - Estonia     | - Russia              |
| - Finland     | - Sweden              |
| - France      | - Switzerland         |
| - Germany     | - Turkey              |
| - Hungary     | - Ukraine             |
| - Latvia      | - United Kingdom (UK) |
| - Lithuania   | - United States (US)  |
| - Netherlands | - Other               |
| - Norway      |                       |

<p>5. Mother tongue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Danish</li> <li>- Dutch</li> <li>- English</li> <li>- Estonian</li> <li>- Finnish</li> <li>- French</li> <li>- German</li> <li>- Hungarian</li> <li>- Latvian</li> <li>- Lithuanian</li> <li>- Norwegian</li> <li>- Polish</li> <li>- Russian</li> <li>- Spanish</li> <li>- Swedish</li> <li>- Turkish</li> <li>- Ukrainian</li> <li>- United States (US)</li> <li>- Other</li> </ul>
<p>6. Current residence (the country where are you living and working at the current moment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Finland</li> <li>-Russia</li> <li>-Other</li> </ul>
<p>7. How long you have lived there?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Less than 12 months</li> <li>-1-5 years</li> <li>-6-15 years</li> <li>-More than 16 years</li> <li>-Whole my life</li> </ul>
<p>8. How often you visit your home country?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Every week</li> <li>-1-3 times in a month</li> <li>-1-3 times in 6 months</li> <li>-1-2 times in a year</li> <li>-Less than 1 time in a year</li> <li>-Never</li> </ul>
<p>9. How long have you worked in this company?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Less than 1 year</li> <li>-1 to 3 years</li> <li>-4 to 6 years</li> <li>-7 to 15 years</li> <li>-More than 15 years</li> </ul>
<p>10. How many countries have you lived in for more than 6 months?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-1 country</li> <li>-2 countries</li> <li>-3 to 5 countries</li> <li>-More than in 5 countries</li> </ul>
<p>11. Please list all the countries you have lived in for more than 6 months.</p>
<p><b>There are 5 statements listed below. Please indicate how much do you agree or disagree with each statement on scale 1 to 7 (Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree).</b></p>
<p>12. It is important to help those who have been absent (sick leave, holiday).</p>
<p>13. It is important to help new people to get started in their new tasks.</p>
<p>14. It is important to help colleagues in case they are in heavy workloads.</p>
<p>15. It is important to frequently adjust work schedule to accommodate other employees' requests for time-off (e.g. holiday plans).</p>
<p>16. It is important to go out your way to make new employees to feel welcome in the work group.</p>

<b>There are 13 statements listed below. Please indicate how much each statement applies to you on scale of 1 to 7 (Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree).</b>
<del>17. I often do tasks at work that are not necessarily addressed to me (e.g. taking care of office cleanliness and the dishes).</del>
18. I occasionally work overtime to get work done.
19. I feel I have to inform my colleagues beforehand if I know I am absent the next day.
20. I tend to express my opinions honestly on issues even if it may have serious consequences.
21. I tend to encourage others to express their ideas and opinions.
22. I feel it is important to obey the rules of the company.
23. I think it is necessary to always come to work on time.
24. Regardless of circumstances, I produce the highest quality of my work.
25. I meet the deadlines set by the organisation.
<del>26. I think it is normal to do my personal things during work time.</del>
<del>27. I tend to maintain confidentiality of information received at work.</del>
28. I tell others this is a good place to work.
29. I am willing to defend the organisation against outside threats.
<b>There are 4 statements listed below. Please indicate how well each statement describes you on a scale of 1 to 7 (Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree).</b>
<del>30. If I am not satisfied the tasks given to me, I complain about that.</del>
<del>31. I rarely miss work even if I have a legitimate reason for doing so.</del>
32. I tend to show pride when representing the organisation in public.
33. I actively promote the organisation's products and services to potential users.
<b>There are 9 statements listed below. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement on a scale of 1 to 7 (Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree).</b>
<del>34. My work group is more productive when its members follow their own interests and concerns.</del>
35. I prefer to work with others in my work group rather than work alone.
36. Given the choice, I would rather do a job where I can work alone rather than do a job where I have to work with others in my work group.
37. I like it when members of my work group do things in their own, rather than working with others all the time.
38. People in my work group should be willing to make sacrifices for the sake of the work group (e.g. working late when needed, going out of the way to help etc.).
39. People in my work group should realize that they sometimes are going to have to make sacrifices for the sake of the work group as a whole.
40. People in my work group should recognize that they are not always going to get what they want.
41. People should be made aware that if they are going to be part of a work group, they are sometimes going to have to do things they don't want to do.
<del>42. People in my work should do their best to cooperate with each other instead of trying to work things out on their own.</del>
<b>OCB is characterised as optional job behaviour that is not directly recognised by formal reward system, but has an effect to the performance of the organisation.</b>
<b>Below you see questions about OCB. Please answer the questions listed below.</b>
43. How you would provide description of the concept OCB? Please provide the description in the empty field below.

<b>There are 2 statements listed below. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement on a scale of 1 to 7 (Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree).</b>
44. This kind of behaviour (OCB) would normally be expected of everyone.
45. Demonstrating OCB would be cause for someone to receive superior performance ratings or receive a promotion.

## APPENDIX 2: Original tables of factorial ANOVA

### Cultural background

Table of the model: 'Cultural background' and 'Helping behaviour'

Source	Type III Sum of			F	Sig.
	Squares	df	Mean Square		
Corrected Model	8,158 <sup>a</sup>	1	8,158	23,662	,000
Intercept	5156,638	1	5156,638	14956,214	,000
Cultback2	8,158	1	8,158	23,662	,000
Error	51,717	150	,345		
Total	6060,040	152			
Corrected Total	59,876	151			

a. R Squared = .136 (Adjusted R Squared = .130)

Table of the mean values of the model: 'Cultural background' and 'Helping behaviour'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1.00 Finland	6,4451	,43954	102
2.00 Russia	5,9520	,81070	50
Total	6,2829	,62970	152

Table of the model: 'Cultural background' and 'IC: values'

Source	Type III Sum of			F	Sig.
	Squares	df	Mean Square		
Corrected Model	1,622 <sup>a</sup>	1	1,622	,935	,335
Intercept	1907,587	1	1907,587	1099,835	,000
Cultback2	1,622	1	1,622	,935	,335
Error	260,165	150	1,734		
Total	2379,333	152			
Corrected Total	261,787	151			

a. R Squared = .006 (Adjusted R Squared = .000)

Table of the mean values of the model: 'Cultural background' and 'IC: values'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1.00 Finland	3,6601	1,32836	102
2.00 Russia	3,8800	1,29321	50
Total	3,7325	1,31670	152

Table of the model: 'Cultural background' and 'IC: norms'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4,240 <sup>a</sup>	1	4,240	6,030	,015
Intercept	4130,661	1	4130,661	5874,720	,000
Cultback2	4,240	1	4,240	6,030	,015
Error	105,469	150	,703		
Total	4891,000	152			
Corrected Total	109,709	151			

a. R Squared = .039 (Adjusted R Squared = .032)

Table of the mean values of the model: 'Cultural background' and 'IC: norms'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1.00 Finland	5,7255	,80723	102
2.00 Russia	5,3700	,89960	50
Total	5,6086	,85238	152

Table of the model: 'Cultural background' and 'Civic virtue'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	,347 <sup>a</sup>	1	,347	,404	,526
Intercept	4073,413	1	4073,413	4747,367	,000
Cultback2	,347	1	,347	,404	,526
Error	128,705	150	,858		
Total	4713,313	152			
Corrected Total	129,052	151			

a. R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = -.004)

Table of the mean values of model: 'Cultural background' and 'Civic virtue'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1.00 Finland	5,4583	,94795	102
2.00 Russia	5,5600	,87999	50
Total	5,4918	,92447	152

Table of the model: 'Cultural background' and 'Organisational compliance'

Source	Type III Sum of				
	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1,500 <sup>a</sup>	1	1,500	4,322	,039
Intercept	4958,464	1	4958,464	14283,942	,000
Cultback2	1,500	1	1,500	4,322	,039
Error	52,070	150	,347		
Total	5602,640	152			
Corrected Total	53,571	151			

a. R Squared = .028 (Adjusted R Squared = .022)

Table of the mean values of the model: 'Cultural background' and 'Organisational compliance'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1.00 Finland	5,9725	,59837	102
2.00 Russia	6,1840	,56977	50
Total	6,0421	,59563	152

### Demographic factors

Table of the model: 'Age and Helping behaviour'

Source	Type III Sum of				
	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1,178 <sup>a</sup>	4	,295	,807	,522
Intercept	3601,276	1	3601,276	9869,092	,000
Age_r	1,178	4	,295	,807	,522
Error	55,101	151	,365		
Total	6252,960	156			
Corrected Total	56,279	155			

a. R Squared = .021 (Adjusted R Squared = -.005)



Table of the model: 'Mean values of Age and Helping behaviour '

Age_r	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
2.00 26-30 years	6,2800	,80994	40
3.00 31-40 years	6,2043	,59343	47
4.00 41-50 years	6,3846	,48425	39
5.00 51-60 years	6,3333	,38523	24
6.00 More than 61 years	6,5667	,44572	6
Total	6,3026	,60257	156

Table of the model: 'Age and IC:values'

Source	Type III Sum of				
	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	6,028 <sup>a</sup>	4	1,507	,882	,476
Intercept	1272,054	1	1272,054	744,703	,000
Age_r	6,028	4	1,507	,882	,476
Error	257,928	151	1,708		
Total	2432,778	156			
Corrected Total	263,957	155			

a. R Squared = .023 (Adjusted R Squared = -.003)

Table of the mean values of the model: 'Age and IC:values'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
2.00 26-30 years	3,7417	1,25516	40
3.00 31-40 years	3,7163	1,27968	47
4.00 41-50 years	3,4786	1,24204	39
5.00 51-60 years	4,1111	1,52489	24
6.00 More than 61 years	3,8333	1,34578	6
Total	3,7286	1,30497	156

Table of the model: 'Age and IC: norms'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4,507 <sup>a</sup>	4	1,127	1,572	,185
Intercept	2887,416	1	2887,416	4027,150	,000
Age_r	4,507	4	1,127	1,572	,185
Error	108,265	151	,717		
Total	5020,625	156			
Corrected Total	112,772	155			

a. R Squared = .040 (Adjusted R Squared = .015)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of the model: values of model 'Age and IC:norms'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
2.00 26-30 years	5,4750	,85822	40
3.00 31-40 years	5,5532	,89220	47
4.00 41-50 years	5,8141	,77739	39
5.00 51-60 years	5,4792	,88132	24
6.00 More than 61 years	6,1250	,64711	6
Total	5,6090	,85297	156

Table of the model: 'Age and civic virtue'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	2,607 <sup>a</sup>	4	,652	,770	,546
Intercept	2730,343	1	2730,343	3225,627	,000
Age_r	2,607	4	,652	,770	,546
Error	127,814	151	,846		
Total	4811,000	156			
Corrected Total	130,421	155			

a. R Squared = .020 (Adjusted R Squared = -.006)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of the model: values of model: 'Age and civic virtue'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
2.00 26-30 years	5,3125	,98181	40
3.00 31-40 years	5,4255	,86902	47
4.00 41-50 years	5,6218	,92101	39
5.00 51-60 years	5,5521	,94977	24
6.00 More than 61 years	5,7500	,70711	6
Total	5,4776	,91729	156

Table of the model: 'Age and Organisational compliance'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	,263 <sup>a</sup>	4	,066	,186	,945
Intercept	3268,360	1	3268,360	9262,014	,000
Age_r	,263	4	,066	,186	,945
Error	53,285	151	,353		
Total	5770,800	156			
Corrected Total	53,548	155			

a. R Squared = .005 (Adjusted R Squared = -.021)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of the model: values of model 'Age and Organisational compliance'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
2.00 26-30 years	6,0800	,65288	40
3.00 31-40 years	5,9957	,54771	47
4.00 41-50 years	6,0974	,56545	39
5.00 51-60 years	6,0583	,54527	24
6.00 More than 61 years	6,0333	,88015	6
Total	6,0538	,58777	156

Table of the model: 'Gender and Helping behaviour'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	,018 <sup>a</sup>	1	,018	,045	,832
Intercept	5991,788	1	5991,788	15094,128	,000
Gender	,018	1	,018	,045	,832
Error	61,529	155	,397		
Total	6268,960	157			
Corrected Total	61,547	156			

a. R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = -.006)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of the model: values of model 'Gender and Helping behaviour'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1 Woman	6,2750	,63696	64
2 Man	6,2968	,62527	93
Total	6,2879	,62812	157

Table of the model: 'Gender and IC: values'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	5,362 <sup>a</sup>	1	5,362	3,213	,075
Intercept	2149,684	1	2149,684	1288,141	,000
Gender	5,362	1	5,362	3,213	,075
Error	258,668	155	1,669		
Total	2448,778	157			
Corrected Total	264,030	156			

a. R Squared = .020 (Adjusted R Squared = .014)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Gender and helping behaviour'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1 Woman	3,9531	1,38124	64
2 Man	3,5771	1,22685	93
Total	3,7304	1,30096	157

Table of the model: 'Gender and IC: norms'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	3,967 <sup>a</sup>	1	3,967	5,377	,022
Intercept	4694,715	1	4694,715	6364,451	,000
Gender	3,967	1	3,967	5,377	,022
Error	114,335	155	,738		
Total	5031,188	157			
Corrected Total	118,302	156			

a. R Squared = .034 (Adjusted R Squared = .027)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Gender and IC: norms'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1 Woman	5,4023	,92648	64
2 Man	5,7258	,80931	93
Total	5,5939	,87083	157

Table of the model: 'Gender and civic virtue'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	3,122 <sup>a</sup>	1	3,122	3,784	,054
Intercept	4514,077	1	4514,077	5470,861	,000
Gender	3,122	1	3,122	3,784	,054
Error	127,892	155	,825		
Total	4850,063	157			
Corrected Total	131,014	156			

a. R Squared = .024 (Adjusted R Squared = .018)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Gender and civic virtue'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1 Woman	5,3125	,93223	64
2 Man	5,5995	,89164	93
Total	5,4825	,91643	157

Table of the model: 'Gender and organisational Compliance'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	,488 <sup>a</sup>	1	,488	1,407	,237
Intercept	5566,844	1	5566,844	16043,094	,000
Gender	,488	1	,488	1,407	,237
Error	53,784	155	,347		
Total	5797,840	157			
Corrected Total	54,272	156			

a. R Squared = .009 (Adjusted R Squared = .003)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Gender and Organisational compliance'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1 Woman	6,1156	,56434	64
2 Man	6,0022	,60541	93
Total	6,0484	,58983	157

### Context within which the employee works

Table of the model: 'Residence and Helping behaviour'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	7,334 <sup>a</sup>	1	7,334	20,969	,000
Intercept	5365,250	1	5365,250	15339,814	,000
Residenc	7,334	1	7,334	20,969	,000
Error	54,213	155	,350		
Total	6268,960	157			
Corrected Total	61,547	156			

a. R Squared = .119 (Adjusted R Squared = .113)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Residence and Helping behaviour'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1 Finland	6,4400	,44756	105
2 Russia	5,9808	,80903	52
Total	6,2879	,62812	157

Table of the model: 'Residence and IC: values'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	3,493 <sup>a</sup>	1	3,493	2,078	,151
Intercept	1991,688	1	1991,688	1184,905	,000
Residenc	3,493	1	3,493	2,078	,151
Error	260,537	155	1,681		
Total	2448,778	157			
Corrected Total	264,030	156			

a. R Squared = .013 (Adjusted R Squared = .007)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Residence and IC: values'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1 Finland	3,6254	1,31939	105
2 Russia	3,9423	1,24848	52
Total	3,7304	1,30096	157

Table of the model: 'Residence and IC: norms'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	6,587 <sup>a</sup>	1	6,587	9,139	,003
Intercept	4239,437	1	4239,437	5882,063	,000
Residenc	6,587	1	6,587	9,139	,003
Error	111,715	155	,721		
Total	5031,188	157			
Corrected Total	118,302	156			

a. R Squared = .056 (Adjusted R Squared = .050)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of the model 'Residence and IC: norms'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1 Finland	5,7381	,77861	105
2 Russia	5,3029	,97686	52
Total	5,5939	,87083	157

Table of the model: 'Residence and Civic virtue'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	,105 <sup>a</sup>	1	,105	,124	,725
Intercept	4195,423	1	4195,423	4967,488	,000
Residenc	,105	1	,105	,124	,725
Error	130,909	155	,845		
Total	4850,063	157			
Corrected Total	131,014	156			

a. R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = -.006)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Residence and Civic virtue'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1 Finland	5,4643	,94017	105
2 Russia	5,5192	,87426	52
Total	5,4825	,91643	157

Table of the model: 'Residence and Organisational compliance'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1,879 <sup>a</sup>	1	1,879	5,558	,020
Intercept	5155,259	1	5155,259	15251,223	,000
Residenc	1,879	1	1,879	5,558	,020
Error	52,394	155	,338		
Total	5797,840	157			
Corrected Total	54,272	156			

a. R Squared = .035 (Adjusted R Squared = .028)



Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Residence and Organisational compliance'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1 Finland	5,9714	,60411	105
2 Russia	6,2038	,53209	52
Total	6,0484	,58983	157

Table of the model: 'Citizenship and Helping behaviour'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	8,905 <sup>a</sup>	1	8,905	26,198	,000
Intercept	5209,669	1	5209,669	15326,771	,000
Citizenshp_r	8,905	1	8,905	26,198	,000
Error	51,326	151	,340		
Total	6083,760	153			
Corrected Total	60,231	152			

a. R Squared = .148 (Adjusted R Squared = .142)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Citizenship and Helping behaviour'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1.00 Finland	6,4451	,43954	102
2.00 Russia	5,9333	,79766	51
Total	6,2745	,62949	153

Table of the model: 'Citizenship and IC: values'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1,487 <sup>a</sup>	1	1,487	,861	,355
Intercept	1927,529	1	1927,529	1115,580	,000
Citizenshp_r	1,487	1	1,487	,861	,355
Error	260,902	151	1,728		
Total	2390,889	153			
Corrected Total	262,389	152			

a. R Squared = .006 (Adjusted R Squared = -.001)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Citizenship and IC: values'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1.00 Finland	3,6601	1,32836	102
2.00 Russia	3,8693	1,28596	51
Total	3,7298	1,31387	153

Table of the model: 'Citizenship and IC: norms'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	5,360 <sup>a</sup>	1	5,360	7,251	,008
Intercept	4154,432	1	4154,432	5619,881	,000
Citizenshp_r	5,360	1	5,360	7,251	,008
Error	111,625	151	,739		
Total	4903,313	153			
Corrected Total	116,985	152			

a. R Squared = .046 (Adjusted R Squared = .040)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Citizenship and IC: norms'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1.00 Finland	5,7255	,80723	102
2.00 Russia	5,3284	,95720	51
Total	5,5931	,87729	153

Table of the model: 'Citizenship and Civic virtue'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	,074 <sup>a</sup>	1	,074	,087	,769
Intercept	4086,546	1	4086,546	4804,082	,000
Citizenshp_r	,074	1	,074	,087	,769
Error	128,447	151	,851		
Total	4712,875	153			
Corrected Total	128,520	152			

a. R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = -.006)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Citizenship and Civic virtue'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1.00 Finland	5,4583	,94795	102
2.00 Russia	5,5049	,86817	51
Total	5,4739	,91953	153

Table of the model: 'Citizenship and Organisational compliance'

Source	Type III Sum of				
	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1,255 <sup>a</sup>	1	1,255	3,681	,057
Intercept	5008,641	1	5008,641	14685,640	,000
Citizenshp_r	1,255	1	1,255	3,681	,057
Error	51,500	151	,341		
Total	5628,160	153			
Corrected Total	52,755	152			

a. R Squared = .024 (Adjusted R Squared = .017)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Citizenship and Organisational compliance'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1.00 Finland	5,9725	,59837	102
2.00 Russia	6,1647	,55383	51
Total	6,0366	,58913	153

Table of the model: 'Duration of living and Helping behaviour'

Source	Type III Sum of				
	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1,019 <sup>a</sup>	3	,340	,859	,464
Intercept	1029,218	1	1029,218	2601,622	,000
Duralivi	1,019	3	,340	,859	,464
Error	60,528	153	,396		
Total	6268,960	157			
Corrected Total	61,547	156			

a. R Squared = .017 (Adjusted R Squared = -.003)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Duration of living and Helping behaviour'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
0 Whole my life	6,2667	,64425	132
1 1-5 years	6,4667	,75719	3
2 6-15 years	6,7500	,30000	4
3 More than 16 years	6,3111	,52791	18
Total	6,2879	,62812	157

Table of the model: 'Duration of living and IC: values'

Source	Type III Sum of				
	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1,631 <sup>a</sup>	3	,544	,317	,813
Intercept	312,630	1	312,630	182,289	,000
Duralivi	1,631	3	,544	,317	,813
Error	262,399	153	1,715		
Total	2448,778	157			
Corrected Total	264,030	156			

a. R Squared = .006 (Adjusted R Squared = -.013)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Duration of living and IC: values'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
0 Whole my life	3,7626	1,35700	132
1 1-5 years	3,1111	,83887	3
2 6-15 years	3,7500	,87665	4
3 More than 16 years	3,5926	1,01335	18
Total	3,7304	1,30096	157

Table of the model: 'Duration of living and IC: norms'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	,344 <sup>a</sup>	3	,115	,149	,930
Intercept	796,256	1	796,256	1032,804	,000
Duralivi	,344	3	,115	,149	,930
Error	117,958	153	,771		
Total	5031,188	157			
Corrected Total	118,302	156			

a. R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = -.017)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Duration of living and IC: norms'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
0 Whole my life	5,5909	,88471	132
1 1-5 years	5,9167	,62915	3
2 6-15 years	5,6250	,43301	4
3 More than 16 years	5,5556	,90973	18
Total	5,5939	,87083	157

Table of the model: 'Duration of living and Civic virtue'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	2,243 <sup>a</sup>	3	,748	,888	,449
Intercept	768,845	1	768,845	913,506	,000
Duralivi	2,243	3	,748	,888	,449
Error	128,771	153	,842		
Total	4850,063	157			
Corrected Total	131,014	156			

a. R Squared = .017 (Adjusted R Squared = -.002)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Duration of living and Civic virtue'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
0 Whole my life	5,4470	,93798	132
1 1-5 years	5,1667	,52042	3
2 6-15 years	6,0000	,20412	4
3 More than 16 years	5,6806	,86944	18
Total	5,4825	,91643	157

Table of the model: 'Duration of living and Organisational compliance'

Source	Type III Sum of				
	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	,400 <sup>a</sup>	3	,133	,379	,768
Intercept	917,672	1	917,672	2606,261	,000
Duralivi	,400	3	,133	,379	,768
Error	53,872	153	,352		
Total	5797,840	157			
Corrected Total	54,272	156			

a. R Squared = .007 (Adjusted R Squared = -.012)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Duration of living and Organisational compliance'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
0 Whole my life	6,0288	,59521	132
1 1-5 years	6,0000	,80000	3
2 6-15 years	6,1500	,52599	4
3 More than 16 years	6,1778	,56104	18
Total	6,0484	,58983	157

Table of the model: 'Duration of working and Helping behaviour'

Source	Type III Sum of				
	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1,194 <sup>a</sup>	4	,298	,752	,558
Intercept	4826,261	1	4826,261	12154,975	,000
Durawork	1,194	4	,298	,752	,558
Error	60,353	152	,397		
Total	6268,960	157			
Corrected Total	61,547	156			

a. R Squared = .019 (Adjusted R Squared = -.006)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Duration of working and Helping behaviour'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
0 Less than 1 year	6,0167	,68997	12
1 1-3 years	6,3048	,72615	42
2 4-6 years	6,3043	,57166	23
3 7-15 years	6,2708	,67853	48
4 More than 15 years	6,3813	,38808	32
Total	6,2879	,62812	157

Table of the model: 'Duration of working and IC: values'

Source	Type III Sum of				
	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	7,207 <sup>a</sup>	4	1,802	1,066	,375
Intercept	1786,769	1	1786,769	1057,495	,000
Durawork	7,207	4	1,802	1,066	,375
Error	256,823	152	1,690		
Total	2448,778	157			
Corrected Total	264,030	156			

a. R Squared = .027 (Adjusted R Squared = .002)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of model 'Duration of working and IC: values'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
0 Less than 1 year	4,1944	1,24282	12
1 1-3 years	3,4524	1,22047	42
2 4-6 years	3,7246	1,27387	23
3 7-15 years	3,7222	1,22876	48
4 More than 15 years	3,9375	1,52503	32
Total	3,7304	1,30096	157

Table of the model: 'Duration of working and IC: norms'

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	3,752 <sup>a</sup>	4	,938	1,245	,294
Intercept	3762,758	1	3762,758	4992,955	,000
Durawork	3,752	4	,938	1,245	,294
Error	114,549	152	,754		
Total	5031,188	157			
Corrected Total	118,302	156			

a. R Squared = .032 (Adjusted R Squared = .006)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of the model 'Duration of working and IC: norms'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
0 Less than 1 year	5,1667	,85502	12
1 1-3 years	5,5833	,94943	42
2 4-6 years	5,4457	,71094	23
3 7-15 years	5,6875	,86372	48
4 More than 15 years	5,7344	,86821	32
Total	5,5939	,87083	157



Table of the model: 'Duration of working and Civic virtue'

Source	Type III Sum of				
	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	6,333 <sup>a</sup>	4	1,583	1,930	,108
Intercept	3760,154	1	3760,154	4584,033	,000
Durawork	6,333	4	1,583	1,930	,108
Error	124,681	152	,820		
Total	4850,063	157			
Corrected Total	131,014	156			

a. R Squared = .048 (Adjusted R Squared = .023)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of the model 'Duration of working and Civic virtue'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
0 Less than 1 year	5,4583	,76003	12
1 1-3 years	5,4643	1,02197	42
2 4-6 years	5,7609	,75558	23
3 7-15 years	5,2292	,90922	48
4 More than 15 years	5,6953	,88156	32
Total	5,4825	,91643	157

Table of the model: 'Duration of working and Organisational compliance'

Source	Type III Sum of				
	Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1,438 <sup>a</sup>	4	,359	1,034	,392
Intercept	4576,990	1	4576,990	13167,618	,000
Durawork	1,438	4	,359	1,034	,392
Error	52,834	152	,348		
Total	5797,840	157			
Corrected Total	54,272	156			

a. R Squared = .026 (Adjusted R Squared = .001)

Table of the mean values of the model: values of the model 'Duration of working and Organisational compliance'

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
0 Less than 1 year	6,3500	,39196	12
1 1-3 years	6,0667	,64417	42
2 4-6 years	6,0261	,63045	23
3 7-15 years	5,9667	,57068	48
4 More than 15 years	6,0500	,57023	32
Total	6,0484	,58983	157

### APPENDIX 3: Original observations of OCB

#### Finnish

F6. Minimitason sosiaalinen älykkyys. Vastuunkanto omista ja tiimin tehtävistä. Toisten huomioiminen. Yrityksen tavoitteiden ymmärtäminen. Rehellisyys.
F14. Taidot, joiden avulla jokainen työntekijä voi auttaa kolleegoja, esimiestä ja itseään parempiin suoriin ja viihtymiseen. Käytännössä se, ettei vain "nurista" asioiden olevan huonosti, vaan otetaan kynä kauniiseen käteen ja tehdä itse se, mitä voitavissa on.
F49. Alaistaidot luovat hyvää henkeä ja tuovat motivaatiota, myös esimieskin on jonkun alainen. Alaistaidolla on vaikutusta työntekijän asenteeseen työtä, työyhteisöä ja esimiestään kohtaan. Työyhteisötaidot on osa yrityksen tuloksen tekemistä ja tuottavuutta. Hyvät työyhteisötaidot omaava organisaatio on vuorovaikutteinen ja tekee töitä yhteisten tavoitteiden saavuttamiseksi.
F10. Työyhteisö- ja alaistaidot tarkoittaa mielestäni sitä, miten henkilö toimii alaisena ja millaisena hän näkee oman roolinsa työyhteisössä ja suhteessa muihin.
F66. Työyhteisö: Työpaikan tai tiimien muodostama henkilöstöryhmä joka työskentelee yhteisen tavoitteen hyväksi. Alaistaidot: Kyky organisoida, johtaa, opastaa ja motivoida sekä antaa rakentavaa palautetta.

#### Russian

R3. Поведение, которое основано не на личных мотивах, а на задачах коллектива. Личные выгоды, в конечном итоге, будут реализованы через успех компании.
R4. Лояльность компании
R17. Стиль руководства, коммуникация в организации, организация работы, справедливость- усиливают или ослабляют гражданское поведение сотрудников.
R23. Поведение, направленное на эффективность работы вне зависимости от интересов и предпочтений работников.
R32. ОГП, в моём понимании, это добровольное участие сотрудника в работе над улучшением качества производимой продукции предприятия, чаще всего, базирующееся на энтузиазме и внутреннем интересе к общему делу.