

# CULTURE AT WORK IN POST-SOVIET RUSSIA

Sarah Busse Spencer

## ABSTRACT

*Purpose – This chapter examines how the kollektiv, a form of workplace organization established in the Soviet Union, continues to shape cultural expectations of work in post-Soviet Russia.*

*Methodology/Approach – This chapter describes a workplace ethnography conducted in a college department in Novosibirsk, Russia in 1999–2000 and 2002, with follow-up trips in 2005–2006. Participant observation is combined with interviews of teachers and students in the department.*

*Findings – The kollektiv established in the Soviet Union has persisted in modified form in post-Soviet Russia. Instead of a means of Party control, the kollektiv became popularly associated with the group cohesion that arises from frequent social interaction. This sense of cohesion, accompanied by attendant habits of sharing holidays with work colleagues, has persisted to varying degrees among adults in Russia today. Furthermore, the structure of the kollektiv has been maintained for students in schools and colleges, so that new generations of Russian youth are raised to expect to work in cohesive small groups. Their behaviors and expectations contribute to the persistence of the kollektiv in Russian society in the present and near future.*

---

**Economic Sociology of Work**

**Research in the Sociology of Work, Volume 18, 287–311**

**Copyright © 2009 by Emerald Group Publishing Limited**

**All rights of reproduction in any form reserved**

**ISSN: 0277-2833/doi:10.1108/S0277-2833(2009)0000018014**

Originality/Value of the paper – *This chapter makes two unique contributions: (1) it adds a focus on white-collar work to the predominantly blue-collar and service occupations studied in Russia to date and (2) it presents workplace ethnography of academics, a group rarely studied ethnographically.*

The field of economic sociology has acknowledged the role culture plays in the economy. As Swedberg argues, “for a full understanding of economic phenomena, it is not only necessary to pay attention to their political and legal dimension, but also to the role that is played by culture” (Swedberg, 2003, p. 218). Zelizer (2005) makes a similar claim, that “shared understandings and their representations – the components of culture – undergird all of economic life” (p. 348). Yet it is not always easy to see the impact of culture when it permeates economic life. This chapter explores the influence of culture in the workplace in a setting where economic conditions have changed rapidly and dramatically: the abandonment of state socialism and the introduction of capitalist elements in the Russian Federation. Since culture most commonly changes more slowly than such rapid economic change, this setting provides a natural laboratory to look for a cultural legacy from the socialist era in the workplace.

This chapter draws on ethnographic research of a workplace in Russia to examine the persistence of a socialist-era cultural form and its importance for understanding work in post-Soviet Russian society. The shared cultural sense of a *kollektiv*, or *kollektivnost'* is one of the norms engendered under socialist structures which has persisted to varying degrees since the collapse of state socialism. This chapter examines how the persistence of the shared understanding of the *kollektiv* continues to shape cultural expectations of work in an increasingly capitalist setting.

## **CULTURE, SMALL GROUPS, AND THE *KOLLEKTIV***

The influence of culture on work has been explored from two broad directions: the impact of national culture on organizations and the cultures and subcultures within organizations. Cultural impact on the organization is often studied through macro-level cross-national comparisons, such as the cultural origins of national differences (Orru, Biggart, & Hamilton, 1997; Hamilton & Biggart, 1988) or the diversity of types of capitalism

(Quack, Morgan, & Whitley, 2000; Hall & Soskice, 2001; Hollingsworth & Boyer, 1997). Studies from the micro perspective of organizational culture emphasize how managers' decisions, organizational design, or subcultures which emerge spontaneously from below affect the experience of work, job satisfaction and turnover, and overall organizational effectiveness (Ouchi & Wilkins, 1985; Fine, 1984, 2006).

Harrington and Fine (2000) suggest the importance that small groups play within organizations, serving "as the mechanism through which culture is created and enacted" (p. 317). Cultures formed and maintained within groups, they argue, "are consequential not only for participants, but also for the society overall" (p. 317). Small groups provide a cultural arena for its members, where members can express shared values and sentiments. But small groups also exercise social control over their members, and through socialization and even coercion can steer those expressions and behaviors into channels the group or the larger society decide are socially appropriate (p. 315). Small groups also serve as settings where individuals find and maintain social identity and rewards for high status or disapproval for low status (p. 317).

In a recent study of organizations in Russia, the researchers acknowledged "the importance of the Communist era on the culture of firms in Russia" (Fey & Denison, 2003, p. 699). One significant part of the legacy of the Communist era for firms and workplaces is the *kollektiv* (collective), which was established soon after the Russian Revolution and later instituted in workplaces and schools across the USSR. This section sketches a brief background of the *kollektiv* and outlines its components, which will be illustrated later in this chapter.

Immediately following the Russian Revolution, a *kollektiv* was understood as a cell of the Communist Party (Kharkhordin, 1999, p. 84), but subsequently it meant any small group which had an explicitly revolutionary consciousness. By the 1930s, the term was used to refer instead to work units organized around communist principles, reflecting the top-down collectivization efforts, which subsumed farming and all other aspects of production (p. 83). Hence these "production collectives" (Siegelbaum, 1986) represented a type of concerted effort in industrialization and building socialism, not unlike earlier production communes but taken to a broader scale (Kharkhordin, 1999, p. 84).

The objective in establishing such cells, according to Kharkhordin (1999), was to organize a means of social control over the population which relied on self-monitoring. The Communist Party in the USSR relied on every group to police itself, and so strove to have every person belong to a

*kollektiv* at every stage of life. Its members could be relied upon to control each other through mechanisms of mutual surveillance and, in the early years, explicit events of public self-criticism. In China, the Communists also organized similar groups, *danwei*, or work groups (Bian, 1994), which served similarly explicit functions of social control on behalf of the Chinese Communist Party (Whyte, 1974).

In the Soviet Union, by 1934, with the declaration that socialism had been achieved, “every group of state employees working in the same factory or office could . . . be called a *kollektiv*” (Kharkhordin, 1999, p. 85). From then on, a citizen “entered a collective as a small child, passed from one to another in the course of life, but was never (normally) outside a collective” (p. 87). This lent to the *kollektiv* a sense of ubiquitousness, of “immediate givenness” as a “taken-for-granted generic form” of social life (p. 87). By the end of the Soviet period, the characteristics of a socialist *kollektiv* were generally understood to mean: (1) a fixed group of people (students or coworkers), (2) united by a common goal or interests, (3) sharing common activity to reach this goal, and (4) maintaining a sense of group cohesion. While this description tallies with a description of many cohesive small groups, Kharkhordin argues that “the *kollektiv* was a very culturally specific phenomenon” (p. 75). In the Soviet Union, Kharkhordin argues, “practices of mutual horizontal surveillance among peers, rather than on the hierarchical surveillance of subordinates by superiors” drew on earlier patterns of self-criticism from Russian Orthodoxy (p. 355). Thus Soviet leaders borrowed cultural elements familiar to the Russian people in establishing a social structure designed to control individual behavior.

Given the “taken-for-granted” and ever present existence of the *kollektiv* in the Soviet Union, it is no surprise to find the persistence of the *kollektiv* in post-Soviet Russia. Despite the collapse of state communism, removing the need for state control over individuals, the culture of a distinctive type of small group has remained, including an emphasis on *kollektivnost*, a term connoting a shared sense of collectivity. Ashwin, in her study of a coal mine in post-Soviet Russia, describes the *kollektiv* which she observes among the miners as a “focus of sociability where workers spent half their lives together” (Ashwin, 1999, p. 146). The women in one group described their work as a relief from the drudgery of housework because they could talk with their coworkers and find in the group a “vital source of emotional support” (pp. 147–148) and often treat it as a “second family” (p. 149). Men workers in another group also had a “strong sense of identification with the collective” and found in it a “sense of meaning in life” (p. 150).

A small group emphasizing a shared sense of meaning, identification, and sociability fits well with what Toennies referred to as “the *Gemeinschaft* of mind,” “expressing the community of mental life” (Toennies, 1965 [1961], p. 194). In the distinction between *Gemeinschaft* (community) and *Gesellschaft* (society) for which Toennies is famous, the former term is typically reserved for family, ethnic, religious, and even recreational bonds, while the latter term is most often applied to the workplace and other public and economic settings. Yet Toennies argues that *Gemeinschaft* of mind includes a “common mentality” from “easy and frequent meetings” while members share “cooperation in a common task” (p. 195). Toennies’ own examples of this type lean toward spirituality and religion, describing spiritual bonds among fellow worshippers, yet his mention of a common task, and the shared “intellectual aptitude” and “similarity of work” (p. 195) suggest that this *Gemeinschaft* of mind could be applied to a work setting. Though the term rarely surfaces in sociology on work today, this chapter suggests that the *kollektiv* in Russia today can be seen as a specific cultural representation of a *Gemeinschaft* of mind at work.

## ETHNOGRAPHIES OF WORK IN POST-SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Studying culture, or shared norms, attitudes, and traditional behaviors, requires methods suitable for capturing the nuances of lived reality. Ethnographic studies of work, including researcher participation in the work setting, have a long tradition and have contributed to our understanding of such diverse settings as factories (e.g., Burawoy & Lukacs, 1992; Burawoy, 1979; Dunn, 2004), offices, kitchens, or hotels (Abolafia, 1997; Fine, 1995; Ghodsee, 2005). In economic sociology, Abolafia (1997) uses workplace ethnography to examine the norms and shared understandings of “market makers” on Wall Street. Ethnographic methods have likewise been fruitful in developing our understanding of the specific conditions of post-socialist society (Caldwell, 2004; Burawoy & Lukacs, 1992; Humphrey, 2002; Mandel & Humphrey, 2002). Recent ethnographic research has examined the challenges faced in Poland of the deindustrialization and unemployment brought about by rapid economic change (Stenning, 2005). Dunn’s (2004) analysis of Polish workers’ and managers’ views about Gerber’s take-over of their baby food factory has become a classic ethnography of the workplace in post-socialist society. Similar methods of

observation and informal, in-depth interviewing help Ghodsee (2005) describe distinctively post-socialist conditions in the tourism industry in Bulgaria.

Following in this tradition, this chapter relies on first-hand, ethnographic participation to explore the role of culture at work by studying an academic department in a college in Novosibirsk, Russia. Although workplace ethnographies have been set in countless locations, scholars rarely study their own territory of academia and research (see Latour & Woolgar, 1979 for an exception). This research thus contributes not only to our deeper understanding of work in post-Soviet Russia, but also of an occupation rarely examined ethnographically.

Ethnographic research was conducted in an academic department where I taught part-time in 2000, followed by return visits in 2002, 2005, and 2006. As a part-time instructor in a department in a city college in 2000, I taught one class, attended all faculty meetings and socials, and met some of the faculty in their homes or second jobs. In the spring of 2002, I recorded in-depth, open-ended interviews with six faculty and six students in the department, lasting approximately 45 minutes with students and between one-and-a-half and two hours with faculty. In the description of the department and its faculty which follows, details such as the exact college and department and some information about individual faculty members have been omitted in order to protect subjects' confidentiality. Names used in the text are pseudonyms.

While some class instruction occurred in English, all other interactions, including the interviews, took place solely in Russian, and all translations below are mine. All my interactions and informal interactions became the basis of extensive fieldnotes. Unlike quantitative research, the validity of ethnographic method relies not on the quantity of respondents but on the proximity of the researcher to the lived reality and the depth of the multifaceted data.

## **POST-SOVIET NOVOSIBIRSK**

Novosibirsk, at approximately 1.7 million inhabitants in 2000, is the third largest city in the Russian Federation, and serves as an important commercial and transportation center for Siberia. The city's geography and position in the Soviet economic infrastructure continue to shape the impact of global flows of finance and individuals to and from Novosibirsk today (Spencer, 2004). Because Novosibirsk was only a village in 1917, the

majority of the current housing stock and public buildings were built in the Soviet era and fit the image of the quintessential “socialist city” (French & Hamilton, 1979). High-rise prefab concrete apartment blocks circle a city center dominated by a statue of Lenin, and monuments to heroes of socialism still grace city parks.

Not only the architecture and look of the city but also its economic, social, and political conditions are comparable to other medium-sized cities in Russia, with both “winners and losers” in the transition to capitalism (Silverman & Yanowitch, 2000). Russia has experienced rapid economic changes because of the specific path taken from state socialism, a type of imposition of “capitalism from above” (King & Szelenyi, 2005), which has had dramatic effects on local residents. Military–industrial production was central to Soviet-era Novosibirsk, and today numerous factories have closed, scaled back production, or shifted to output for commercial markets, leaving many blue-collar workers seeking new employment. Other state-sector employees, such as teachers and doctors, have faced the squeeze between fixed state salaries and unpredictable inflation. Yet because of the city’s importance in regional trade, local businesses do a brisk trade and there is increasingly a feel of “new money” in some parts of the city.

Distinctive to Novosibirsk is an internationally known university and cluster of research institutes of the Russian Academy of Sciences just south of the city and a number of locally respected colleges and institutes in the city center. This means that the impact of the transition from socialism and subsequent economic crises which had rapid and dramatic effects on higher education in Russia (Kolesnikov, Kucher, & Turchenko, 2005; Dobrylina & Kukhtevich, 2002) have a significant impact on life in Novosibirsk. In some ways changes to higher education in Russia parallels effects of marketization on higher education in the United States which has grown gradually over several decades (Bok, 2003; Jongbloed, 2003). However, it is hard for U.S. scholars to imagine the combined effects of rapid change in regulations governing the education and the precipitous decline in state funding both in absolute and relative levels on all educational establishments in Russia. Institutions of higher education make a variety of choices, depending on their relative resources, status position, and proximity to market opportunities, about ways to survive the increasingly difficult economic conditions (Hare & Lugachev, 1999). The underfunding of educational institutions has led to a shortage of some technical specialists and has further exacerbated the emigration “brain drain” (King & Szelenyi, 2005, p. 217).

Stories of friends, neighbors, or acquaintances who emigrated were very common in conversation in Novosibirsk in 2000. Leavers, according to the

stories, were headed for Moscow, Germany, Israel, Canada, or America. There was a common perception that anyone with the desire to move and the right combination of resources and connections had already left by 2000. Of course, not everyone who wanted to leave had the resources or connections to do so, but those who choose to remain have become increasingly representative of the city population. There may be significant differences in behavior and attitudes to culture between those who have left and those who remain, but this is a story of culture in post-Soviet Novosibirsk and of the attitudes and behaviors of those who are left behind.

### **WORKING IN *KOLLEKTIVI*: TEACHERS AND STUDENTS IN NOVOSIBIRSK**

The remainder of this chapter describes aspects of the *kollektiv* in this college department. After a brief history of the department, this chapter first explores how students are socialized into their own *kollektiv*, preparing them to belong to a *kollektiv* when they start work. Then the chapter presents a description of how teachers spend social time together, how marketization impacts the *kollektiv*, the criteria of conformity to group norms by which teachers evaluate whether to accept a new member in the *kollektiv*, and finally, the language and metaphors teachers embrace (or reject) in describing the *kollektiv*. The following excerpts from my observations and interviews illustrate ways in which this group of coworkers thinks and behaves in relation to each other because of the shared understanding of the *kollektiv* and *kollektivnost'* which persist from the Soviet era, which demonstrates the significance of culture at work.

#### *The Department Setting*

The department where I taught in Novosibirsk was created in 1995 to teach social science courses that had not been part of the curriculum in the Soviet era. Boris Borisovich, in his late fifties, who had taught scientific communism for 20 years, was chosen to organize and head the department. He drew on his extensive networks at other colleges in the city to find faculty who had the required *kandidat* degree, and the department began with three full-time faculty members in addition to the chair. None had a degree in the subjects they taught because few in Russia did at the time. In 1998, the department was authorized to teach a new major and several full- and part-time faculty



members were added to cover all the requisite subjects. In the fall of 2000, the department began offering degrees in a second major and added new part-time staff. In 2004, part of the department was split off to form a new department, with each resulting department teaching one of the two majors. As part of this change in 2004, two of the original faculty went to the new department and another member left for an administrative position in the university.

In 1999–2000, when I worked there, the faculty consisted of the head of the department, the secretary Natalia, in her mid-fifties; five full-time teachers, Dmitri Vasilevich, Alexander Ivanovich, Tatiana Igorevna, Olga Petrovna, and Larisa Alexandrovna, all in their mid-thirties; one full-time graduate student Rita Ivanovna in her mid-twenties; and a large assortment of part-time teachers, two who were married to full-time teachers and others whom I never met. In 2002, the department was joined by an additional full-time graduate student instructor and several additional part-time teachers, including Andrei Andreevich who held a full-time appointment at another college. Except for the new graduate students, the other full- and part-time faculties were old enough to have experienced a *kollektiv* during the Soviet era.

The department is located on the fourth floor of a concrete slab building constructed in the 1950s, which appeared to have had no renovations when I first came in 2000. Reaching the department involves climbing four flights of narrow stone steps worn slick through decades of wear and impossibly crowded between classes. The office for five full-time teachers, a secretary, and various part-time teachers is one large room. Filling the center of the room, four desks abut one another, two in the center, and one on each end forming a large makeshift table. Two other desks and a computer workstation sit in corners and along the wall, with one corner for coats. Cabinets line the two walls and the other two walls have windows with an unappealing view of the neighboring crumbling concrete building. The drab setting is relieved by simple curtains and a few plants on the wide windowsills, side by side with books and numerous piles of old student papers which are also crammed in cupboards and drawers.

Most of the time the center desks serve as the working space of the full-time staff who keep their papers in the drawers of the several desks. For department meetings and holiday gatherings, the center workspace is cleared of papers and books and used as a communal space. When the makeshift table is covered with cake and wine, it is as if the teachers' individual lives cease to exist, melding seamlessly into the larger group. This use of furniture provides a tangible expression of the *kollektiv* in this workplace: individuals coming together with a shared purpose and activities, acting as a unitary group.

*The Students: Educated in the Kollektiv*

According to Kharkhordin (1999), *kollektivi* were initiated in school settings in order to mold model Soviet citizens. Despite the regime change, school children and college students are still organized into *kollektivi* across Russia. Typically, a child belongs to the same group of classmates throughout primary education, leaving it only to have a new fixed group in secondary school. This process is then repeated for those who go on to higher education. Educational systems typically serve to reproduce existing social categories for new generations (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990) through a variety of formal and informal activities, including the actual material taught but also how students are organized into groups and how they are treated by teachers. In contemporary Russian schools and colleges, teachers treat students as part of student *kollektivi*, and students learn from their peers to identify with the group and agree with whatever the group decides. The educational system teaches students to expect to cooperate in a *kollektiv* when they enter the world of work.

The students in the college where I taught were organized into small groups by cohort (which were officially called “*grup*” instead of “*kollektiv*”). Each group is between 15 and 25 students, with the precise size and number of groups in each year dependent on overall enrollment. Students share an identical course schedule with their group for the five years they are in the college, and have little direct interaction with members of other groups, even within the department. Students thus become very close with members of their group, and quickly learn to cooperate with and rely upon each other.

Students are rewarded both socially and tangibly for working with their group, not going against the group, or working only for their own ends. For example, limited college budgets means limited library and computer resources, so students are required to share books and computer terminals with others. The number of students using a single library book is only possible because of students’ extensive cooperation within the group. Even accounting for these resource constraints, the most surprising difference between teaching in the United States and in Russia was the extent of student cooperation among the students in Russia. The notion of independent homework or essays, which I tried to explain to these students, was completely foreign to them. One person would take notes in class and share them with others, another would type out a homework assignment for several to use, and students routinely completed assignments in class and out of it as groups, and so on. Students made friends with group-mates (*odnogrurniki*) for instrumental as well as emotional motives, because

noncooperation meant exclusion from the circle of mutual aid, which group members quickly formed, and few felt they could do it alone. As an exception, one student in my class was a very hard worker and diligent student, but unlike most other students, she worked alone, neither giving nor receiving help. However, when it came time for graduation, although she had high marks, she was not recommended for graduate school by the faculty. They felt that someone who did not work with the group would not do well in graduate school.

In 2002, when I interviewed three third-year students together, I asked them what kind of relationship they have in their group. One student Maria piped up immediately and said that the longer they have been together, the better it has gotten. "In the first year, it was very bad," because "everyone broke up into groups, that is, there was no cohesion (*splochyonnost'*).” These students valued the cohesion and the sense of *kollektivnost'* enough that they missed it when it was not there. In contrast, she continued, "Now, in principle, we have a good (*normal'no*) group. Now there is a good (*normal'no*) relationship." Then Ivana chimed in about another group in their cohort. "The teachers related to them well," she volunteered, "they even openly said they were great (*v obshche!*).” In contrast, Ivana said about their own group, "we even studied worse than other groups. Now it's the opposite," by which she meant that now at least they got as good grades as any other group in the program. She continued, "now it's obvious (*vidno*), that people strive (*tianulic'*) to study. They like it, and they are ready to learn, not ready to get a 'two'" (comparable to a grade of D). According to these students, as their small group has become more cohesive, the students have pulled together in shared activities which help them achieve their academic goals, becoming more of *kollektiv*.

I asked these students how group members help each other and Ivana nearly exploded, "Why, in everything!" (*da vo vcyom!*). Maria picked this up, and her tone suggested she was trying to be patient with someone who clearly didn't understand the first thing about college:

Okay. Say in a seminar, a quiz (*kontrolni*) is difficult work. I can go up to any person, that is, if the person is not a bad student (*dvoishnik*), if the person works. I can go up to him and ask him to help me. That is, I can count on that. I can trust it (*doverit'*).

In other words, these students feel that they cannot go up to a stranger or someone they do not know well to ask for help with understanding the work. But these students feel like they can approach someone in their group for help if, and only if, there is a "normal" relationship in the group, that is, if it bears at least some of the features of a good *kollektiv*.

While the cooperation and shared activity within a *kollektiv* could help students' academic success, it also seemed to me that it could interfere with their schooling. In one instance, before class one day in the spring of 2000, two girls approached me and apologized that they were going to leave the class early, because they had to go set up for the birthday party of one of the group members. Having heard a range of excuses from students over the years, this excuse was new to me, but was evidently perfectly normal for them. They felt a greater obligation to prepare the birthday party of a member of the *kollektiv* than to attend class. Spending social time, doing favors, and giving small gifts, are behaviors that students expect of the members of their small group.

The school and college structure continues to emphasize the sense of a common group, shared effort toward a common goal, and mutual surveillance that are central to the *kollektiv*. With 30 or more hours of class per week all taken as a single group, students have ample time to build group cohesion. Students also share favors, give gifts, and spend time socializing which helps strengthen social ties. In other interviews, not included here because of space constraints, other students indicated their expectations of belonging to a good *kollektiv* at work when they finished school.

Yet the *kollektiv* of these students is different from that of previous generations: there is no one assigned to report disloyalty to the Communist Party, and students face new pressures due to the marketization of education and society. For example, increasing numbers of students work while in school (uncommon in the Soviet era) meaning they have less time to socialize with their group, and possibly less opportunity to benefit from group cooperation. There is a much higher drop-out rate in some of these new majors, with an as yet uncertain connection to the job market, than in traditional majors. These factors might tend to weaken the traditional correspondence between student group boundaries and the smaller number who have time to invest in belonging in a *kollektiv*. Nonetheless, many features of the cultural form of the *kollektiv* established in the Soviet Union remain in the increasingly marketized setting of post-Soviet Russian education.

#### *The Teachers: Working in a Kollektiv*

Unlike schools, workplaces are no longer automatically organized into *kollektivi*, particularly groups without a Soviet past, so that one might not

assume a *kollektiv* in a group of coworkers brought together from diverse institutions to a department formed in 1995. Yet the university has retained much of its socialist-era structure, and is similar to the colleges where these teachers studied and previously taught. When I arrived in 2000, I discovered activities and attitudes actively fostering a *kollektiv*, including social gatherings, sharing meals, trading favors and desires for friendly relations among the faculty.

Kharkhordin's description of the *kollektiv* at the end of the Soviet Union is illustrated by the group in this workplace in three key features: shared goals, shared activities, and group cohesion. First, the faculty feel and express a sense of sharing common goals, including meeting their professional requirements in publishing and fulfilling increasingly difficult teaching obligations as fee-paying students flood the college. Second, the faculty share common activities to meet these goals, sharing the workload in more group-oriented ways than I had expected. It is common in Russian academia for departments to publish their own faculty's research, and the members of this department cooperated on producing an edited volume every three or four years. For this faculty, teaching was also much more a shared activity than I had seen before. Russian higher education is time-extensive, involving up to 30 hours a week of classes for students and individual oral exams, which means many contact hours from faculty. With educational ministry decrees shaping reasonably uniform course content and with faculty sharing the office space, students often treat faculty as interchangeable. When a student would come to the shared office and ask for a faculty member, to be told they had already gone, the student would sometimes ask for help on the assignment from anyone who happened to be around. Teachers often traded favors in administering exams, passing messages along to students, and accepting assignments from students in other sections.

### *Social Time*

Third, faculty built and maintained a sense of social cohesion through spending time together in both formal and informal occasions. Department meetings were held roughly every four to six weeks. As a foreign guest, I was given special permission to attend all the meetings, but other part-time staff did not regularly attend. The department chair used a formal presentation style, unilaterally informing staff of news and his decisions and permitting no discussion, walking through the agenda in a meeting that would last two

or three hours. Yet in other settings relations among the rest of the faculty were very informal and congenial. After the department meetings, when the department head left, sometimes a few teachers would sit down together with a cup of tea and chat. As one teacher put it, it was the same place, “but already in a different . . . tone, (*tonal’nost’*)” in contrast to the formal staff meetings.

Other social interaction occurred during informal gatherings in breaks between classes or at the end of the day, or in planned events to honor major holidays and birthdays. An important aspect of establishing and maintaining a *kollektiv* is spending time socializing in addition to engaging in shared work projects. Such socializing usually involves food, or “social eating” as described for China (Bian, 2001) which serves to reinforce social ties within a group. In this work setting, the holiday events involved a quantity of food and some alcohol shared over several hours, most typically in the department after hours, though twice it took place at a faculty member’s summer cottage (*dacha*). The ordinary, ad hoc events usually involved some minimal form of taking tea.

Taking tea (*chaepitie*) has been referred to as “the most common kind of table socializing” in Russian culture (Patico, 2002, p. 361) and tea itself as a “ubiquitous beverage of familial and ritual gatherings” (Ries, 1997, p. 55). Sharing tea invokes a sense of belonging, cohesion, and acceptance. Tea in this setting was most commonly suggested during the lunch hour or at the end of the class day. In this workplace, it was most often the women faculty who agreed to pause for taking tea. Tea has been described as a “‘private’ mode of sociability” (Patico, 2002, p. 362). Tea is a frequently mentioned location and setting for the “kitchen talk” of private friendships (Ries, 1997, p. 21). In the workplace, tea might be somewhat more restrained than at home, but as I observed, it was while taking tea that faculty members opened up about family, non-work friends, or the ubiquitous discussions of “life” or the future of Russia. Sometimes the secretary shared tidbits of college gossip, and other faculty might tell jokes or funny stories (*anekdoti*).

In emphasizing the sociality within this group, Larisa Alexandrevna said in her interview, “when we are done, she will call out to me, and simply want to chat, just because. Not because I need something, simply it’s interesting.” Thus for her, and many colleagues, socializing is not a means to an end but an essential feature of departmental life in its own right.

Tatiana Igorevna expressed a different opinion about the social aspects of the department. I asked if celebrating holidays and trips to the *dacha* were important for the relationship among teachers. Referring to the *dacha*, she said, “in five years, we’ve only gone twice, and both times you were there.”

Tatiana Igorevna felt that if there were not the holiday gatherings, relations in the department would “continue on much as they are.” Yet I saw her enjoy herself very much at these events, though there were times she could not attend because of her work commitments in other organizations. She said that the fact that the teachers ever got together was due to Natalia’s efforts, who spent a great deal of energy encouraging teachers to come to events and – most important – planning who would bring the food.

### *Changes due to Marketization*

The fourth criteria of a *kollektiv* mentioned by Kharkhordin – fixed group membership – is less apparent in this workplace because of the changes to higher education induced by marketization since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. Many departments now charge tuition, departing from the Soviet practice of free higher education, and admit larger numbers of students than before. Tuition payments permit the department to hire extra staff and pay full-time staff a supplement to the insufficient state salary. But because of the rising costs of living, faculty in 2000 and 2002 were still scrambling to find extra hours or side jobs to make ends meet. Meanwhile, increased numbers of students has meant that the membership of this department has fluctuated over time as new full-time staff members have joined the department and part-time teachers have been added or subtracted. The presence in the department of staff members not included in the social life of the *kollektiv* represents a departure from the Soviet model, in which a *kollektiv* and workers assigned to work together were synonymous. In this workplace, the *kollektiv* comprises the full-time teachers and some but not other part-time teachers. Furthermore, as the full-time teachers hustle from job to job, they have less time to socialize with each other, which differs from the way members of a traditional *kollektiv* would have spent significant time together. These differences represent ways in which the Soviet-era form of the *kollektiv* has been modified because of capitalist forces in contemporary Russian society.

Other changes to this workplace brought about marketization involve the use of supplements from tuition money to build a department library to supplement the underfunded college library and upgrade the department furniture. On my return visit in 2002, the department chair had obtained a separate office, and all the old Soviet-era desks and cabinets had been replaced with new European-style desks and shelves. They had also had built a tiny walk-in coat closet (*garderob*), and created a tea corner

(a cupboard on the wall over a tiny table and two chairs) complete with electric teakettle and cups and saucers for taking tea during a break. Again, the faculty demonstrated through this configuration of their crowded space the salience of taking tea for their department, and hence the significance of the *kollektiv*.

### *Acceptance in the Kollektiv*

With part-time teachers coming and going, the potential group members were fluid, yet members of this department maintained a sense of *kollektivnost'* by preserving group boundaries that indicated “insider” versus “outsider.” As scholars have suggested, the stronger the group boundary, the greater potential for internal cohesion, for example, in ethnic enclaves (Waldinger, Aldrich, Ward, & Al, 1990), networks with high closure (Burt, 2005) and other settings of bonding social capital (Putnam, 2000). In this department, the “insiders” consisted of the full-time faculty and only one or two part-time faculty, but not other part-time faculty or the department chair.

Tatiana Igorevna explained that they always made sure the part-time teachers were invited to special events, but few full-time teachers actually expected the part-time teachers to attend. Referring to one part-time person, she said that they invite them “all the time” but that “all the time, he doesn’t come.” Later, referring to the part-time teachers generally, she stated that

those on the side (*po storoni*), the hourlies (*po chasovyki*), ... some manage to make friends themselves, and some just don’t need it at all. There are those kind. We include them. They don’t include themselves. And if they don’t include themselves, it means that they don’t want to.

With so many teachers working in more than one college, it was expected that these part-time teachers had full-time jobs in other places. In explanation (or justification) she continued, “usually the *kollektiv* gets organized at the main workplace.”

In 2002 when I returned for a visit, Andrei Andreevich seemed to have defied that generalization and was accepted as part of the *kollektiv* though he was only a part-time teacher and had a full-time position elsewhere. He spent many hours in the department, volunteered for several thankless tasks, and demonstrated his readiness to socialize with the group, staying after hours and coming for holidays. At his other department, Andrei Andreevich explained, teachers socialized rarely, and he added with a note of regret, “there’s not really a *kollektiv* there.”



In order to better understand the criteria for acceptance into a *kollektiv*, in 2002 I asked Tatiana Igorevna why I had been accepted when I taught in 2000. Her response was twofold. “First,” she said, as I might have expected, “here was an interesting person, a person from America, from another world,” But then she continued, surprising me with her emphasis on conformity:

... on the other hand, you acted very correctly (*ty ochen pravilno sebe vela.*) ... the first time, I invited you ... and you came (*poshla*). ... As if you had lived your whole life like this. Literally, when you (first) appeared and we said, ... see, we’re going to celebrate New Years, and you [said] I’ll go.... That is, you ... accepted these things which are always valued (*tsenitsia*). You acted like – *like the way we thought a person should act, the way that we acted.*

Thus part of my acceptance in the group came from following the dictum of ethnography, to hang around as much as possible, which the group members perceived as a willingness to conform my own will to the will of the group. There is an emphasis on “acting as one” which is essential for acceptance in and maintenance of the *kollektiv*. Habits of mutual surveillance survive, though no longer centered on the Communist Party, but embodied in a “group will” as manifest in the *kollektiv*.

Further explaining why they accepted me, Tatiana Igorevna said that it was clear that “we spoke in one language (*na odnom iazike*), and whatever form of contact was proposed (*predlozhili*) was accepted (*prinimalis*), so why not? Therefore, it was very nice. ... And what I liked was, how you immediately took a friendly tone, (*druzheskii ton*.)” Since “that was just exactly the tone of the department,” she added, the teachers considered that I had “*vpisalas*,” or “blended in” (Smirnitsky, 1998).<sup>1</sup>

In contrast, another part-time teacher who had taught at the department for a long time was not considered part of the *kollektiv*, because though he fulfilled his teaching obligations, he never stayed afterwards to socialize. Tatiana Igorevna explained that they would like him to belong, but when they invited him, to holidays or to the dacha, he replied with hesitation and evasion rather than the eager compliance they had hoped to hear. One teacher felt he must have a social pathology, to refuse the overtures of the group; the idea of not wanting a *kollektiv* did not make sense to her. In short, these colleagues wanted someone who readily agreed to proposed activities, acquiesced to group opinions, and who would “blend in” with the group. While these sentiments are similar to the notion of “fit” in academic searches in U.S. departments, the emphasis on conformity by Russian colleagues is much stronger than I have experienced outside of Russia.

*Talking about the Kollektiv*

Not only do these faculty share a sense of *kollektivnost'* with their coworkers, which depends on spending social time and conforming to group behaviors, they also have ways of talking about this cohesion which are distinctive to Russia and draw on the socialist-era norms of the *kollektiv*. In helping explain the sense of *kollektivnost'*, Larisa Alexandrovna described to me a college where she had previously been employed. After describing the tensions between teachers and the college administration at that institution, she explained how, in contrast, the teachers had very close relations: “we supported each other, we had . . . that feeling of “we” (*myi*), of colleagues . . . We related very well (*otnosilis'*) to each other. It was pleasant to be together.” This sense of “we”, of “groupness,” can be considered the essence of the *kollektiv* and a sense of *kollektivnost'*.

The abstract noun *kollektivnost'* might literally be rendered “collectivity,” though this English word does not adequately summarize the cultural depth of a sense of “we” or “groupness” in Russia, combined with practices and norms which encourage that sense of group cohesion. Ivana Ivanova, a colleague of mine working at another university, said in describing *kollektivnost'*: “it’s the same that we used to call *obshchinnost'*,” for which she then offered the English translation “community.”<sup>2</sup> She explained: “‘Community’ is *obshchina*, and what lies at the basis of this unity (*ob'iedinieniie*) is *obshchinnost'*. That completely takes the place of the word *kollektivnost'*.” She then temporized and admitted, “At least, it is the closest word that you know which is in *kollektiv*, or *kollektivnost'*.” I then asked her again whether *obshchinnost'* (“a sense of community”) could be used to translate *kollektivnost'*. To this, she replied:

No. Because when we talk about a *kollektiv*, it is above all a society (*soobshchestvo*) of people who can be united (*obiedini*) for solving a shared problem. So even if you say “a *kollektiv* of friends” (*druz'iei*), it sounds . . . not correct. Not completely [correct], there’s something in that combination which is not right. . . . Because for us, the *kollektiv*, as a rule, is connected with work, or with some sort of general business matters (*dela*). That is, with solving problems by means of a whole society (*soobshchestvo*) of people.

Thus what makes the *kollektiv* and *kollektivnost'* distinct is what makes it untranslatable: it is a group of people united to solve a problem, who are not “friends” but who share a certain society in a work context. This colleague’s comment, echoing the criteria for *kollektiv* which Kharkhordin (1999) laid out, demonstrates how the *kollektiv* uniquely bridges Toennies’ dichotomy

of *Gemeinschaft* (community or *obshchina*) and *Gesellschaft* (society or *soobshchestvo*).

Having observed the congenial, helpful relationship among the teachers in 2000, I asked one of the teachers in my interviews in 2002 whether this was a good *kollektiv*. With some hesitation, Olga Petrovna said, “Ye-es, I would say so,” which was not as adamantly positive as I had expected. Wondering whether the word collective might be problematic, I asked whether there were a feeling of “we” among the teachers. Olga Petrovna continued,

Well, ye-es. In general, yes. But sometimes there are disagreements. Because everyone has their own opinion. And we sometimes don’t understand each other. But not the kind [of disagreements] where there is offense. I think that it is just the quality of the people who got lucky that they collected.

For Olga Petrovna, the concept of *kollektiv* did not encompass arguments, which did occur regularly in the department, particularly as the faculty members tried to agree upon a vision for the department’s future.

I asked her then how a good *kollektiv* forms, hoping she could add something more predictable than “luck.” Olga Petrovna’s immediate answer was “I don’t know.” Reflecting on the question, she continued, “It seems, people should be, for example, on one level . . . in upbringing (*vospitanie*), in their relation (*otnoshenie*) to people. The ability to cope (*spravliat’sya*). Not to get jealous, not to trip [somebody] up (*podstavliat’*). That is, not to play your own game, or only your own game.” She echoes what was mentioned above, that being a member of a collective requires knowing how to get along. It means not placing personal or professional ambition above maintaining good collegial relations, and having an unshakable loyalty to the group. These collegial relations, Olga Petrovna emphasizes, are professional ones, as she explains:

The common life can be connected with professional duties. To meet just as friends, there isn’t that. We have – well, professional life, somehow begins to flow out of (*potekaetsia*) the formal bounds (*ramki*) and we discuss it informally. [There is] some kind of suggestion, on which we can agree (*dogovarivaemsya*), some kind of initiative, that is, we decide ourselves how to do it better.

Olga Petrovna emphasized that teachers interact with each other above all as professionals. She said, “it’s not that we are friends,” meaning that first and foremost we are colleagues. As to getting together at someone’s house, a few might do that, but not all. She said, “It’s not a circle of friends, it’s a circle of professionals who think the same.” This “thinking the same” can be compared to the references this same teacher made above to my acceptance

in the group, that I already acted as they did and thus could be included. The *kollektiv* relies heavily on predictability from group members, not only in fulfilling professional duties but also in their basic behaviors, and one form of predictability is to be the same as everyone else. When I asked her opinion about whether there were good relations (*otnoshchenie*) among the teachers, she agreed and emphasized their type: “yes, good relations, *professional* relations.”

Describing the sociality among the teachers, Larisa Alexandrevna said that being “together is easier, like in a family.” Following up on this metaphor, I asked whether the department feels like “family.” The reaction was almost visceral, as she responded: “No! not completely, not completely. But there is something there. There is distance after all, we are not related (*ni rodniie*). The *kollektiv* is somehow not mixed [with] home and [work].” This is also seen in the fact that, though nominally welcome, spouses of the full-time teachers do not usually come to the holiday events or birthday celebrations. The only exception I observed in my year teaching in the department was Alexander Ivanovich’s wife who came both to the celebration for Women’s Day and on the trip to the dacha in June, but in her capacity as part-time instructor in the department.

In her interview, Larisa Alexandrevna used the term *komanda* (team) in the place of the term *kollektiv*. Though the dictionary lists *komanda* as a “sports *kollektiv*,” it is used in different settings typically than *kollektiv*, primarily for sports teams, but also sales teams or comedy sports (KVN). While there is still a sense of a common goal to be attained that can only be attained through cooperation, there seems to be more room for personal ability to shine through (the way that any soccer *komanda* would have its star players) than sometimes is thought of in a *kollektiv*.

Dmitri Vasilevich entirely objected to my use of the term *kollektiv*. Hearing me in the department ask for an explanation of the term, he immediately launched into a discussion of how that word was a Soviet word, only referring to a Soviet or Party group, and that in post-Soviet Russia there was no such thing anymore. He said, “you know, that is a big myth.” He also added that every person by now has invented their own meaning of that word so that it is impossible to find one single meaning for it. Of all the people I interviewed or even talked informally with where I used the term *kollektiv*, he was the most vocal dissenter. However, another colleague was disappointed when on my return visit in 2002 I asked about the *kollektiv* since for her the phrase was associated with a narrow aspect of industrial relations. She did agree, though, that many people she knew still treasured the feeling of *kollektivnost’*.

## DISCUSSION

Thus although there was some disagreement about the term, the colleagues in this department experienced a sense of *kollektivnost'* through shared goals, shared activities, both formal and informal, and a level of conformity and cohesiveness uncommon in small groups outside of Russia. Coworkers anywhere might expect “fit” from new hires, but in Russia they recognize and articulate a shared cultural understanding engendered by decades of socialist social structure, called the *kollektiv*, through which to express this desire for “fit.”

The *kollektiv* was ubiquitous throughout the Soviet Union, and because student groups and some workplaces are still formally organized into *kollektivi*, this construct still forms part of the shared experience of life in post-Soviet Russia. Whether a *kollektiv* exists in a new workplace, people come to a new workplace, with an understanding and expectation of some level of *kollektivnost'* or sense of group belonging which shapes their attitudes and behaviors toward coworkers that draws on a common socialist past. Thus culture engendered in the Soviet Union continues to influence the workplace in Russia today.

Of course academia is not a typical workplace, and faculty might emphasize the *kollektiv* more or less than other occupations or professions. However, students are socialized into a *kollektiv* and leave their education expecting to find a *kollektiv* at work. As this continues, future generations will continue to expect and be prepared to work within a *kollektiv*. The culture of shared attitudes and common behaviors relating to the *kollektiv*, a structure established under socialism, still exist and shape expectations and behaviors of adults and young adults in post-Soviet Russian society.

Russian academics are not typical Russians also in the sense that they typically have more of the human and social capital that makes emigration a possibility. This creates a self-selection bias of those who were available to talk to me – they are the ones who did not leave. Those leaving Novosibirsk often chose to sacrifice social ties for market realities of higher wages and the higher standard of living abroad. Therefore, those who chose to remain probably have a more favorable opinion of and a stronger attachment to a *kollektiv* than those who left for better paying jobs in Moscow or abroad. Perhaps this accentuates what I observed of the persistence of the *kollektiv* in post-Soviet Russia. However, it is also likely that many who remain behind consciously seek and preserve a sense of “we” in order to hold on to a way of life threatened by social change, emigration, and marketization. Perhaps the *kollektiv* will become more important in the post-Soviet Russian

workplace over time, as a cultural alternative to impersonal market-based work relations endemic to capitalism, as a marker of identity for those who did not leave.

## CONCLUSION

These stories and interviews illustrate ways in which how these academics think and act in relation to each other is shaped by their shared understanding of the *kollektiv*. These small groups were formed in the early Soviet era for the explicit purpose of surveillance of the population, providing an extreme example of the social control function small groups can play. By the 1980s, this structure had generated a set of cultural norms and values, a sense of *kollektivnost*. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, the need for Party control vanished, but the cultural norms and behaviors associated with the *kollektiv*, the habits of sharing holidays together, have persisted in contemporary Russia. In form, a *kollektiv* drew on principles from Russian culture, and the ensuing generations have shaped the *kollektiv* into a small group not only serving as a cultural arena for its members, but also a distinctive cultural element in its own right. The *kollektiv* represents a workplace manifestation of what Toennies called *Gemeinschaft* of mind, yet it represents elements of both “community” and “society.”

When these teachers were brought together to form a new department, they followed the shared cultural model that was a legacy of socialism in creating a *kollektiv*. Even if not every member agrees to use that term, the members of this department rely on shared understandings of the *kollektiv* in their mutual interactions, including how they describe their interactions, how they share their workload, and the sense of obligation they feel to celebrate birthdays and holidays as a group, and the need for conformity among group members.

Both students and the faculty illustrate how a cultural form established under socialism has persisted in this setting, in the face of countless changes brought on by marketization in society and at work. To new workplaces, Russians bring cultural ideas and expectations of a *kollektiv*. Because these expectations are continually reinforced in workplaces and educational institutions, norms and values created under socialism will continue to shape post-socialist workplaces for years to come. This study of a setting marked by rapid economic change highlights the significance of culture for understanding work.

## NOTES

1. The verb *vpisat'sia* can mean either (1) add one's name to a list or join and (2) blend in. The term is used frequently, as in this case, to mean both.
2. *Obshchina* is the Russian equivalent for the German term *Gemeinschaft* for which translators of Toennies could not find a satisfactory English equivalent, thus leaving it to pass untranslated into our sociological jargon.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research for this chapter was supported in part by a grant from the International Research & Exchanges Board (IREX) with funds provided by the National Endowment for the Humanities, the United States Department of State which administers the Title VIII Program, and the IREX Scholar Support Fund. None of these organizations is responsible for the views expressed. Appreciation goes to Nina Bandelj and two anonymous reviewers for their detailed comments and suggestions.

## REFERENCES

- Abolafia, M. (1997). *Making markets: Opportunism and constraint on Wall Street*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ashwin, S. (1999). *Russian workers: The anatomy of patience*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Bian, Y. (1994). *Work and inequality in urban China*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bian, Y. (2001). Guanxi capital and social eating in Chinese cities: Theoretical models and empirical analyses. In: N. Lin, K. Cook & R. S. Burt (Eds), *Social capital: Theory and research* (pp. 275–296). New York City, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Burawoy, M. (1979). *Manufacturing consent: Changes in the labor process under monopoly capitalism*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Burawoy, M., & Lukacs, J. (1992). *The radiant past: Ideology and reality in Hungary's road to capitalism*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Burt, R. S. (2005). *Brokerage and closure: An introduction to social capital*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Caldwell, M. L. (2004). *Not by bread alone: Social support in the New Russia*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Dobrynina, V., & Kukhtevich, T. (2002). The cultural worlds of young Russians. *Russian Education & Society*, 44, 32–44.
- Dunn, E. C. (2004). *Privatizing Poland: Baby food, big business, and the remaking of labor*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Fey, C. F., & Denison, D. R. (2003). Organizational culture and effectiveness: Can American theory be applied in Russia? *Organization Science*, 14, 686–706.
- Fine, G. A. (1984). Negotiated orders and organizational cultures. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 10, 239–262.
- Fine, G. A. (1995). *Kitchens: The culture of restaurant work*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fine, G. A. (2006). Shopfloor cultures: The idioculture of production in operational meteorology. *Sociological Quarterly*, 47, 1–19.
- French, R. A., & Hamilton, F. E. I. (Eds). (1979). *The socialist city: Spatial structure and urban policy*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Ghodsee, K. (2005). *The Red Riviera: Gender, tourism and post-socialism on the Black Sea*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. W. (Eds). (2001). *Varieties of capitalism: The institutional foundations of comparative advantage*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hamilton, G. G., & Biggart, N. W. (1988). Market, culture and authority: A comparative analysis of management and organization in the Far East. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S52–S94.
- Hare, P., & Lugachev, M. (1999). Higher education in transition to a market economy: Two case studies. *Europe–Asia Studies*, 51, 101–123.
- Harrington, B., & Fine, G. A. (2000). Opening the black box: Small groups and twenty-first century sociology. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63, 312–323.
- Hollingsworth, J. R., & Boyer, R. (Eds). (1997). *Contemporary capitalism: The embeddedness of institutions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Humphrey, C. (2002). *The unmaking of Soviet life: Everyday economies after socialism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Jongbloed, B. (2003). Marketisation in higher education, Clark's triangle and the essential ingredients of markets. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 57, 110–135.
- Kharkhordin, O. (1999). *The collective and the individual in Russia: A study of practices*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- King, L. P., & Szelenyi, I. (2005). Post-communist economic systems. In: N. J. Smelser & R. Swedberg (Eds), *The handbook of economic sociology* (2nd ed., pp. 205–232). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kolesnikov, V. N., Kucher, I. V., & Turchenko, V. N. (2005). The commercialization of higher education. *Russian Education & Society*, 47, 35–48.
- Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory life: The social construction of scientific facts*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mandel, R., & Humphrey, C. (Eds). (2002). *Markets and moralities: Ethnographies of postsocialism*. Oxford, UK: Berg Publishers.
- Orru, M., Biggart, N. W., & Hamilton, G. G. (1997). *The economic organization of East Asian capitalism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ouchi, W. G., & Wilkins, A. L. (1985). Organizational culture. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11, 457–483.



- Patico, J. (2002). Chocolate and cognac: Gifts and recognition of social worlds in post-Soviet Russia. *Ethnos*, 67, 345–368.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York City, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Quack, S., Morgan, G., & Whitley, R. (2000). *National capitalisms, global competition, and economic performance*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ries, N. (1997). *Russian talk: Culture and conversation during Perestroika*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Siegelbaum, L. H. (1986). Production collectives and communes and the “imperatives” of Soviet Industrialism, 1929–1931. *Slavic Review*, 45, 65–84.
- Silverman, B., & Yanowitch, M. (2000). *New rich, new poor, New Russia: Winners and losers on the Russian road to capitalism* (Expanded ed.). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Smirnitsky, A. I. (1998). *Russian–English dictionary* (21st Stereotype ed.). Moscow, Russia: Russky Yazyk Publishers.
- Spencer, S. B. (2004). Novosibirsk: The globalization of Siberia. In: L. McCann (Ed.), *Russian transformations: Challenging the global narrative* (pp. 128–147). London: Routledge-Curzon.
- Stenning, A. (2005). Re-placing work: Economic transformations and the shape of a community in post-socialist Poland. *Work Employment and Society*, 19, 235–259.
- Swedberg, R. (2003). *Principles of economic sociology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Toennies, F. (1965 [1961]). Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. In: T. Parsons, E. A. Shils, K. D. Naegle & J. R. Pitts (Eds), *Theories of society: Foundations of Modern Sociological Theory* (pp. 191–201). New York: The Free Press.
- Waldinger, R., Aldrich, H., Ward, R., & Al, E. (1990). *Ethnic entrepreneurs: Immigrant business in industrial societies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Whyte, M. K. (1974). *Small groups and political rituals in China*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Zelizer, V. (2005). Culture and consumption. In: N. J. Smelser & R. Swedberg (Eds), *The handbook of economic sociology* (2nd ed., pp. 331–354). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.