

“Establishment of the relationships of management culture and social responsibility: verification of the model”

AUTHORS

Jolita Vveinhardt  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6231-9402>
Regina Andriukaitienė

ARTICLE INFO

Jolita Vveinhardt and Regina Andriukaitienė (2014). Establishment of the relationships of management culture and social responsibility: verification of the model. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 12(4)

RELEASED ON

Tuesday, 21 October 2014

JOURNAL

"Problems and Perspectives in Management"

FOUNDER

LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”



NUMBER OF REFERENCES

0



NUMBER OF FIGURES

0



NUMBER OF TABLES

0

© The author(s) 2019. This publication is an open access article.

Jolita Vveinhardt (Lithuania), Regina Andriukaitiene (Lithuania)

Establishment of the relationships of management culture and social responsibility: verification of the model

Abstract

Work aims to identify the internal relationships of dimensions of management culture and corporate social responsibility. For organizations it is important to evaluate the factors that determine the success of implementation of the principles of corporate social responsibility. The paper aims to extend the sphere of management of implementation of corporate social responsibility, including the quantitative aspects of competencies of managerial staff and organization of the processes. Selected quantitative analysis method, using a questionnaire formulated by the authors of the study. The method of quantitative analysis by interviewing 1717 respondents was selected. The relationships of dimensions of management culture and corporate social responsibility are analyzed in the study, their strength is determined on the basis of evaluations provided by groups of ordinary employees, middle and top management staff. Results of the research show that with the strengthening of the management culture, the culture of social responsibility of the company is increasing. A statistically reliable relationship between all dimensions of management culture and social responsibility was established. The strongest relationships are recorded between the culture of managerial staff, management culture of working conditions, the culture of documentation system and categories of social behavior of the organization.

The work focuses on the relations of the management culture, social behavior of the company and its employees, so there was no aim to assess the relationships with stakeholders outside the organization. Conclusions significant for the development of corporate social responsibility in organizations are provided in the paper. It is proved that the management culture is a system, the purposeful change of which can get better results of corporate social responsibility. The work contributes to a more sustainable creation of economic and social well-being of the company and the employees. The originality of the study will produce novel and significant results for more successful implementation of corporate social responsibility through improvement of corporate management culture, and also serves as a basis for further research of the management culture.

Keywords: corporate social responsibility, management culture, employees, social behavior.

JEL Classification: M12, M14.

Introduction

One of the most important tasks that the leaders of organizations introducing the principles of corporate social responsibility deal with, is flexible use of organizational management system, incorporating ethical, organizational aspects and the aspects of management competence. This is a relevant management problem, as the studies of organizations and their cultures do not always give due attention to management culture as one of the conditions for effective change. In many scientific articles corporate social responsibility is analyzed in the aspects of relationships with external stakeholders of organizations (e.g. Popoli, 2011; Daudigeos, Valiorgue, 2011), communicating of social responsibility and the public image of the organization (Pérez, Bosque, 2013) etc., but our study substantiates the approach that social responsibility begins with the various aspects of relationship between internal subjects of the organization in internal managerial organization (e.g. Raub, Blunski, 2013; Costas, Kärreman, 2013; Dhanesh et al., 2014), also highlighting the little studied social behavior of employees (Shen, Benson, 2014) and the importance of human resources as the main component of

management (Young, Thyil, 2009). Corporate social responsibility and management culture in practice give a sense to organizational and public values and ethical norms, on which the perception of coherence of relationships is based.

Relatively recently the use of the total quality management doctrine in implementing the values of corporate social responsibility was addressed (e.g. Cooke, Ryan, 1988), but there are not enough data as the management culture, including the culture of managerial staff, the culture of organization of management processes, management culture of working conditions, culture of documentation system dimensions (Vveinhardt, 2010; Žukauskas, Vveinhardt, 2010; Vveinhardt, 2012).

A. Ardichvili (2013) offers a model, the development of which could improve the process functionally. The model relates the development of human resources, corporate social responsibility, corporate sustainability and business ethics. However, the analysis of this and other models shows that the attention is mostly focused on corporate social responsibility and/or the aspects of human resource management, without sufficient integration of physical, organizational, technological, psychosocial safety and other issues, as well as other aspects that not only ensure the functionality of the processes within

organizations, but also deal with the issues of social responsibility, even if they are not specially formulated to deal with specific corporate social responsibility issues in management.

This article aims to contribute to the development of the corporate social responsibility research, involving the culture of management system, which would include not only the organization of processes, but also the aspects of the management competences, ethics, relationships with subordinates and other aspects. In pursuance of this aim we are going to answer the questions:

- ◆ What models of social responsibility are offered in organizations?
- ◆ What is the strength of the relationships between the management culture and corporate social responsibility categories?

The article consists of three parts: Section 1 deals with the models of social responsibility proposed to organizations by various scientists; Section 2 describes the research methodology and presents the categories of corporate social responsibility and management culture. Section 3 tells about setting and participants in the results of empirical research are presented, focusing on organizational environment, and regression equations, with the help of the results of which it was found how corporate social responsibility and management culture interact, are provided. In final section the results are discussed, conclusions made, insights presented, and the guidelines for further research are drawn.

1. Theoretical review

Review of the models. Models developed by various authors make it possible to evaluate the factors that determine the effectiveness of implementation of corporate social responsibility and provide for the steps of the implementation of corporate social responsibility. Corporate social responsibility is a widely researched area; however, we failed to find any studies that analyze the links and reciprocity between corporate social responsibility and the level of management culture.

Components of corporate social responsibility. A. Geva (2008) compared three models of corporate social responsibility: the dominant A.B. Carroll's (1991) pyramid model, the overlapping circles model providing for links of components in the sphere of corporate social responsibility and the concentric circle model, application of which emphasizes non-economic responsibility, transfusing economic responsibility, where every business decision should be made with a view to social welfare. E. Avetisyan and M. Ferrary (2013) summarized the stages of the

development of corporate social responsibility and established a chronological model of institutionalization of corporate social responsibility. In the authors' opinion, the implementation of corporate social responsibility depends on the nature of activities of local and global stakeholders. Corporate social responsibility is developed globally, but it is developing in different ways. The variations may be due to the conceptual principles of corporate social responsibility, the development of the concept, the nature of participation of stakeholders and institutional aspects (norms and cultural traditions). The authors made a chronological sequence of the emergence and evolution of corporate social responsibility in France and in the United States of America. M. Gjølberg (2010) introduced the "Nordic" model, which is described as the analysis of relations of the country, the market, the society, revealing the significance of political, economic institutions and cultural norms, political processes at the national level in the interpretation of the concept of corporate social responsibility. The "Nordic" model illustrates how corporate social responsibility is an integral part of the existing models, defining the relationships between the country, the market and the public. J. Fairbrass and A. Zueva-Owens (2012) researched the impact of state governance and policy on implementation of corporate social responsibility. G. Whelan (2012) analyzed the models of development of the corporate social responsibility policy, providing three possible directions of development at the global, regional and corporate/institutional levels. J. Mäkinen and A. Korula (2012) analyzed the trends in classical and new corporate social responsibility policy and the role of the state, market, businesses, citizenship, associations and company policy in different political systems.

The levels of constituents of corporate social responsibility: economic (endeavor, competitiveness of goods and services, effective management, economical consumption of energy and resources). D. Baumann-Pauly et al. (2013) analyzed theoretical differences between the implementation of practices of corporate social responsibility in large, medium-sized and small companies, noting the relative size of organizational expenses. T.A. Lundgren (2011) presented a microeconomic model of corporate social responsibility and researched how expenditure and income determine the processes of implementation of corporate social responsibility. The balance of statics and dynamics is characterized in the model, and the need to balance the marginal costs of a company and assess the benefits of investment in corporate social responsibility is indicated. S. Blaga (2013) argues that the progress of sustainable development and sustainability depends on the principles of corporate

social responsibility applied in companies and on adjustment of the management model.

Management is committed to comply with the new standards, such as justice, fairness, legitimacy, transparency and compliance with the principles of ethics, and the management of environmental and social risks creates conditions to achieve higher productivity, financial results and increases competitiveness. L.L. Carden and R.O. Boyd (2011) presented the model of corporate social responsibility, in which strategic risk management plays an important role in the implementation of corporate social responsibility. The model of corporate social responsibility involves the processes that take place in the company: identification, assessment, planning, monitoring and control. The recommended system including a comparative analysis of performance indicators, implementation of appropriate management systems, analysis of achievements, monitoring of feedback and measurement of accomplishments and failures can maximize the benefits of corporate social responsibility activities.

The levels of constituents of corporate social responsibility: ethno-social area (employees' welfare and safe working environment, developed motivating and training system, employee involvement in decision-making, fair cooperation with stakeholders, taking into account the public expectations, informing customers). L.W. Knowlton et al. (2012) in a logic model noted coordination of stakeholders' actions as a significant factor in the application of the principles of corporate social responsibility. Providing information to the public, public policy, public programs and volunteering enable to achieve long-term results when implementing the social change. The logic model of corporate social responsibility is identified as a tool for management of public participation applied in governmental, educational, community, charity organizations, in the preparation of a strategy for action. M. Heyder and L. Theuvsen (2012) researched companies of an agricultural sector and found that large companies are more inclined to implement corporate social responsibility than small and medium-sized enterprises as a result of greater pressure from stakeholders. Application of the principles of corporate social responsibility in management activities conditions company stakeholders' confidence, enhances reputation and competitiveness of the company, and thereby increases the financial results of the company. The results of the research carried out by E.R. Pedersen (2010) show that industrial enterprises face constant stakeholders' requirements, apply adequate strategies in management and tend to be more active in implementation of corporate social responsibility.

Ch. Homburg et al. (2013), based on the stakeholder instrumental theory, investigated the impact of corporate social responsibility commitment in enhancing customer loyalty and trust in organizations. M.L. Dougherty and T.D. Olsen (2014) found that the local culture is the main variable in implementation of corporate social responsibility, when adapting to local conditions the effectiveness of implementation of corporate social responsibility increases. In a model of social empathy A. Segal (2011) defined social empathy as the ability to understand people and life situations better, that in social work helps to pursue social and economic justice in the community. In the author's opinion, social empathy creates the foundation for an effective social policy. O. Lee (2012) presented a model for personnel and social responsibility used in educational organizations.

The levels of constituents of corporate social responsibility: environmental protection area (integration of legal acts on environmental protection into the company activities, assumption of responsibility, ecological risk management, reducing pollution, improving operations and performance, taking into account the opportunities of changing environmentally friendly indicators, regular monitoring, anticipating and execution of required changes). M.A. Delmas et al. (2013) defined the links between environmental and financial performance and proposed to integrate environmental indicators into the analysis of corporate social responsibility. J. Claydon (2009) analyzes the significance of the model of sustainability of corporate social responsibility. D. Milon (2011), describing the model of sustainability of corporate social responsibility, pointed out that there is a direct relationship between sustainability and social responsibility, because long-term well-being depends on the well-being of stakeholders, including employees, suppliers, customers and ensures continuous access to natural resources, the natural environment in which a company can survive and thrive. R. Valdes-Vasquez and L. Klotz (2011) presented a conceptual model of sustainability, which consists of four dimensions (social sustainability, community involvement, corporate social responsibility, safety) and two ways of learning on how to introduce students to social sustainability.

Models of implementation of corporate social responsibility. For example, H. Jenkins (2009) adapted D. Grayson and A. Hodges' (2004) seven-step model of implementation of corporate social responsibility. Authors developed a five-step model of implementation of corporate social responsibility in small and medium-sized enterprises, which reflects the cyclic recurrence, integrates strategy, training,

evaluation of results and provides for feedback. V.W.S. Tung and M. Mourali (2011) formed a dynamic model of implementation of corporate social responsibility applied in the activities of large enterprises, which highlights the role of companies, industry and consumers. According to the authors, consumer pressure creates conditions for standardization of the entire sector while implementing the concept of corporate social responsibility. In E.R.G. Pedersen and W. Gwozdz (2014) practice-based model of implementation of corporate social responsibility, the significance of understanding the role of business in the society and application of corporate social responsibility practices in reducing the gap between behavior of a company and stakeholder expectations is highlighted. In the model of social empathy J.C. Thornton and J.T. Byrd (2013) analyzed the implementation of corporate social responsibility and decision-making in small firms and presented the model, which states that corporate social responsibility decisions are conditioned by the owners' experience, personal values and social norms. P.K. Shum and S.L. Yam (2011) based on A.B. Carroll's pyramid, developed a structured model in order to identify the main factors and their interaction that has an influence to economically motivate managers to take voluntary corporate social responsibility activities.

The empirical results show that the managers tend to engage in voluntary corporate social responsibility activities and to pursue social welfare more, when appropriate legal and ethical means of control are introduced in management.

2. Methodology

The questionnaire "The role of management culture in preparedness of the organization to become socially responsible" formed by the authors of the article was used for empirical research. The questionnaire was developed by the means of the analysis of scientific literature, using the method of operationalization of concepts (see in more details in the part of theoretical insights).

The structure of the questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of two blocks, where the main role falls to the part of the management culture. The part of the management culture in the questionnaire consists of four categories: the culture of managerial staff; the culture of organization of management processes; management culture of working conditions; the culture of documentation system. The part of social responsibility consists of two categories: social behavior of the organization and social behavior of the employee.

The questionnaire includes a total of 177 statements (the part of the management culture – 104; the part of social responsibility – 73 statements).

All categories of statement in the part of the management culture were formulated in a positive way with the exception of 9 statements through all the categories and subcategories, in order to ensure the honesty of the respondents filling in the questionnaire.

In the category of *culture of managerial staff*, subcategory of the knowledge of management science, 1 statement was worded negatively (in my workplace one can become a manager even without management education), in the subcategory of managers' personal and business characteristics 2 negative statements were formed (managers compete with subordinates unhealthily; managers compete with other heads of departments of our organization unhealthily). In the category of *culture of organization of management processes*, subcategory of optimal regulation of management processes, one statement is negative (In my workplace, speaking about the managers, "the left doesn't know what the right does"). In the subcategory of modern computerization of management processes there is one negative statement (there is a lack of computers and software in my organization), in the subcategory of culture of receiving visitors, conducting meetings, telephone conversations there are 2 negative statements (communication with partners is emphatically businesslike; responses to external claims are perceived as an unpleasant obligation). In the category of *management culture of working conditions*, subcategory of organization of work places 1 negative statement was formed (employees sometimes have to take care of work equipment using their own money). In the category of *culture of documentation system*, subcategory of the rational system of storage of archival documents 1 negative statement was formed (sometimes a lot of the time is needed to find older documents).

In the part of social responsibility, the category of social behavior of the employee, all statements were formed as negative, with the exception of two positive statements (I always speak only positively about the workplace to people outside the organization; when communicating with strangers I always speak about my workplace as about the reliable one).

3. Setting and participants

The research was carried out in two groups of food companies operating in Lithuania. Representatives of all the departments: ordinary employees, linear and top managers, including the members of the boards of the companies, participated in the survey. 1915 employees worked in the two groups of companies during the research period. 1030 employees worked in the first group of companies, 885 employees – in the second group of companies.

The total number of participants in the survey is 1717 employees (i.e. 89.6 per cent). The main base of the companies is in Lithuania, however, the activities also include other countries, such as Ukraine, Russia, Estonia, Latvia and Romania, where the branches of the groups are established. The activities, the size and other indicators of both groups of companies are more or less similar. It is important to mention the fact that both groups of companies are preparing to become socially responsible companies; one company of the first group has already declared social responsibility.

4. Results


After the analysis of the results of empirical research, verification of the model of determination of the level of management culture in order to implement the concept of a socially responsible organization was conducted. After the analysis of the relationship of the management culture and social responsibility in the context of commitments, it was decided to verify the factors that determine the management culture and corporate social responsibility statistically.

4.1. Analysis of the factors that determine evaluation of management culture. In this and other sections of the article the factors that determine management culture and social

responsibility are presented marking the strength of the relationship between them in different colors.

When culture of organization of management processes (COMP), management culture of working conditions (MCWC), culture of documentation system (CDS), social behavior of the organization (SBO) and social behavior of the employee (SBE) are increasing separately one by one (and the other variables remain unchanged), the culture of managerial staff (CMS) also increases, i.e. is evaluated higher. Figure 1 shows that the strongest relationships bond the culture of managerial staff and the social behavior of the organization, the management culture of working conditions and the culture of documentation system, as the value of correlation coefficient *r* is greater than 0.7. Evaluation of the culture of organization of management processes is expressed in a strong relationship with the culture of managerial staff, as *r* is only slightly higher than 0.5. The relationship of constituents of the social behavior of the employee and the culture of managerial staff is the weakest in respect of the minimum value of the correlation coefficient *r*, but it is statistically reliable (*p* < 0.001).

Regression equation: $CMS = 0.121 + 0.056 * COMP + 0.290 * MCWC + 0.323 * CDS + 0.262 * SBO + 0.037 * SBE$.




Note: CMS – culture of managerial staff.

Fig. 1. Factors determining evaluation of the culture of managerial staff

When the culture of managerial staff (CMS), management culture of working conditions (MCWC), culture of documentation system (CDS) and social behavior of the employee (SBE) are increasing separately one by one (and the remaining variables do not change), the culture of organization of management processes (COMP) are increasing as well. The factors that determine evaluation of the culture of organization of management processes visualized in Figure 2 show that this dependent variable has a strong relationship with the specified

independent variables, because in many cases the values of the correlation coefficient *r* are greater than 0.5, and *p* is statistically reliable in all cases. Even having determined the relatively weak relationship of organization of management processes with the social behavior of the employee, *p* is less than 0.001.

Regression equation: $COMP = 0.834 + 0.111 * CMS + 0.079 * MCWC + 0.215 * CDS + 0.323 * SBE$.




Note: COMP – culture of organization of management processes.

Fig. 2. Factors determining evaluation of the culture of organization of management processes

When the culture of managerial staff (CMS), culture of organization of management processes (COMP), culture of documentation system (CDS) and social behavior of the organization (SBO) are increasing separately one by one in turn (and the remaining variables do not change), management culture of working conditions (MCWC) is increasing as well. Figure 3 shows that the management culture of working conditions is closely related to social behavior of the organization (in this case, the highest value of correlation coefficient r), culture of documentation system and culture of managerial

staff. Slightly weaker, but a strong relationship was identified between the dependent variable and the culture of organization of management processes. However, the value of the correlation coefficient r of social behavior of the employee in this case as well as in respect of the dependent variables analyzed above is also low, but the relationship is statistically reliable, because p is less than 0.001.

Regression equation: $MCWC = 0.081 + 0.213 * CMS + 0.029 * COMP + 0.294 * CDS + 0.428 * SBO$.




Note: MCWC – management culture of working conditions.

Fig. 3. Factors determining evaluation of the management culture of working conditions

When the culture of managerial staff (CMS), culture of organization of management processes (COMP), management culture of working conditions (MCWC) and social behavior of the organization (SBO) are increasing separately one by one in turn or when evaluation of social behavior of the employee (SBE) is decreasing (and the other remaining variables do not change), the culture of documentation system (CDS) increases. The factors that determine evaluation of the culture of documentation system

presented in Figure 4 show the strongest and strong relationships of four independent variables with the analyzed dependent variable. Although the value of the correlation coefficient r of the independent variable of the social behavior of the employee is low in this fragment as well, all the analyzed relationships are statistically reliable ($p < 0.001$).

Regression equation: $CDS = 0.613 + 0.187 * CMS + 0.063 * COMP + 0.233 * MCWC + 0.399 * SBO - 0.078 * SBE$.



Note: CMS – culture of managerial staff.

Fig. 4. Factors determining evaluation of the culture of documentation system


In order to implement corporate social responsibility, it is proposed to the heads of organizations firstly to determine the level of the management culture, which, as the results of the research show, is also closely related to the social responsibility. The managers of organizations are recommended to make the stated problems clear, to set goals elaborating them to the tasks. At this stage, all levels of the management system of the organization should be included when the Personnel Office formulates the tasks to organize the process, plans the terms and necessary resources and means. After the evaluation of the need for material resources and internal human resources, the complexity of the internal structure of the organization, data processing, intellectual and technical capabilities of the organization, the question of inviting external consultants must also be dealt with. Addressing the set tasks and in accordance with the methodological requirements, a survey of employees of the organization must be carried out. In this case, reliability of the data can depend on subjective psychological factors, as when the research is carried out by the staff of the Personnel Office of the organization, insufficiently open responses are possible. This risk should be evaluated when planning material resources and deciding how much the resources spent on external professionals

would be compensated in the long term (Vveinhardt, Andriukaitienė, 2014).

4.2. Analysis of the factors that determine evaluation of social responsibility. After the analysis of the factors that determine management culture and finding out their strength, it is advisable to repeat the same steps carrying out revision of the part of social responsibility.

When the culture of managerial staff (CMS), management culture of working conditions (MCWC), culture of documentation system (CDS) and social behavior of the employee (SBE) are increasing separately one by one in turn (and other variables remain unchanged), social behavior of the organization (SBO) also increases. The results presented in Figure 5, show that very strong and strong relationships between social behavior of the organization and management culture of working conditions, culture of organization of documentation system, managerial staff and management processes are found. The weaker relationship is recorded with the independent variable of social behavior of the employee.

Regression equation: $SBO = 0.098 + 0.155 * CMS + 0.346 * MCWC + 0.407 * CDS + 0.072 * SBE$.




Note: SBO – social behavior of the organization.

Fig. 5. Factors determining the social behavior of the organization

When the culture of managerial staff (CMS), culture of organization of management processes (COMP) and social behavior of the organization (SBO) are increasing separately one by one in turn or the culture of documentation system (CDS) is decreasing (and other variables remain unchanged), evaluation of social behavior of the employee (SBE) is increasing.

The relationships of a dependent variable with the dependent variables presented in Figure 6 are the weakest in respect of the minimum value of the correlation coefficient r , but are statistically reliable ($p < 0.001$).

Regression equation: $SBE = 1.874 + 0.073 * CMS + 0.317 * COMP - 0.261 * CDS + 0.238 * SBO$.




Note: SBE – social behavior of the employee.

Fig. 6. Factors determining the social behavior of the employee

4.3. Analysis of the combined factors that determine evaluation of social responsibility and management culture. After the detailed revision of subcategories, i.e. determining factors of the management culture and social responsibility, it was decided to combine the initial results (para 4.1 and para 4.2) into categories in order to create a more generalized view. Figures 7 and 8, presented below, visualize the results of the combined factors determining social responsibility and management culture, that show how social responsibility is affected by the components of management culture, and vice versa, i.e., how the management culture is affected by the

component of social responsibility. When evaluation of the management culture of working conditions and culture of documentation system is increasing separately one by one in turn (and the rest of variables remain unchanged), evaluation of social responsibility (SR) also increases. In Figure 7 social responsibility is presented as a dependent variable. Strong and statistically reliable relationships are found, as r in all cases is higher than 0.5, and p is less than 0.001.

Regression equation: $SR = 1.084 + 0.137 * CMS + 0.180 * COMP - 0.231 * MCWC + 0.114 * CDS$, CMS, COMP.



Note: SR – social responsibility.

Fig. 7. Factors determining the social responsibility


When social behavior of the organization and social behavior of the employee are increasing separately one by one (and the rest of variables remain unchanged), evaluation of management culture (MC) is also increasing. In Figure 8 the management

culture is presented as a dependent variable so that it would be possible to compare the differences with strength and reliability of the factors that determine social responsibility (Figure 7). Analyzing the factors that determine the management culture it was found

that the management culture and social behavior of the organization are linked by a very strong relationship (the value of correlation coefficient r is almost 0.8), and relationship with the social

behavior of the employee is fairly weak, but the relationships are statistically reliable.

Regression equation: $MC = 0.807 + 0.674 * SBO + 0.083 * SBE$.



Note: MC – management culture.

Fig. 8. Factors determining the management culture

It is advisable to the managers of organizations to carry out the comparative analysis of the level of management culture and the level of social responsibility, i.e., to determine which of the components of the management culture are less expressed and negatively affect social responsibility. Generalized level of management culture and social responsibility is significant for evaluation of the general state of the organization, comparing the results of studies carried out at different times, when planning the change. With the help of this analysis, having identified the weaknesses, it is recommended to establish an action plan, enabling gradual elimination of the stated drawbacks.

4.4. The model for determination of the links of management culture and social responsibility. In order to achieve the goal, the developed model for determination of the links of management culture and social responsibility is presented in Figure 9 (see Appendix) with the results of its statistical verification.

When responsibility in the market (services and their quality) (SQ), responsibility in the market (informing consumers, health and safety) (ICHS), environmental responsibility (ER), responsibility in relations with employees (RRE), responsibility in public relations (RPR), uncertainty and lack of information at work (ULIW), physical and psychological well-being of the employee (PPWE), my opinion about the organization (MOAO) and corruption, nepotism, favoritism (CNF) are increasing separately one by one in turn or the intention to leave the job (ILJ), criticism of social responsibility: employees' attitude (CSR) are decreasing (and the other remaining variables do not change), evaluation of management culture (MC) increases (Figure 9).

Regression equation: $MC = 0.768 + 0.182 * SQ + 0.069 * ICHS + 0.152 * ER + 0.197 * RRE + 0.072 * RPR - 0.029 * ILJ + 0.032 * ULIW + 0.022 * PPWE + 0.030 * MOAO + 0.067 * CNF - 0.030 * CSR$.

Thus, to sum up, it should be noted that the calculations essentially confirm the assumption made on a theoretical level that the management culture is related to corporate social responsibility, that is, when strengthening the management culture the social responsibility is rising. Although the relationships of unequal strength between different categories have been found, their existence is confirmed and is statistically reliable. On the other hand, the relationships not only between the management culture and social responsibility, but also between internal categories of management culture are evident. Firstly, it shows that the distinguished elements of the management culture interact with each other and the change of one of them affects the change of other elements, secondly, this mutually interacting system emphasises its effectiveness and efficiency not only when implementing corporate social responsibility, but also in implementation of change of a different kind.

Having evaluated the problem areas of the management culture and social responsibility, the objective is set to prepare a package of decisions, which would help to achieve the desired change in the defined time, depending on structure and complexity of the identified problem, taking into account internal and external factors that influence both the decision making process and objective and subjective possibilities of implementation. When initiating change, the decisions are standardized in internal documents. That is, the specific plan for

change implementation, control, monitoring is approved, the terms are planned and the persons responsible are appointed. The plan is an integral part of the strategy of development of human resources and organizational culture, personnel management system, training and personal development, career plans, planning material resources, structural changes. Integration of international standards covering the management system and corporate social responsibility into practices of the organization plays a significant role. An important condition for raising the level of the management culture in order to implement corporate social responsibility is the openness of the organization and functionality of communication channels between the various levels of the managerial staff and the employees of the company. This means that essential information related to the existing situation and the expected changes is available, it is communicated to different levels of employees and feedback is ensured (Vveinhardt, Andriukaitienė, 2014).

Discussion and conclusion

The factors that determine the success of implementation of the principles of corporate social responsibility, including the aspects of improvement of competencies of executives of the organization and the quality of organization of processes were evaluated in this study. Calculations have proven that strengthening of the management culture of the organization creates proper conditions for the enhancement of corporate social responsibility. Significant is the fact that, firstly, a statistically reliable relationship between the four dimensions of management culture (management working conditions, organization of management personnel, documentation system, management processes) and social responsibility was established, secondly, a statistically reliable, strong internal relationship between the integrate dimensions of the management culture was confirmed. This is particularly important in making use of management culture both as a specific instrument to increase social responsibility and to ensure the functionality of organizational processes.

References

1. Ardichvili, A. (2013). The Role of HRD in CSR, Sustainability, and Ethics: A Relational Model, *Human Resource Development Review*, 12 (4), pp. 456-473.
2. Avetisyan, E., Ferrary, M. (2013). Dynamics of Stakeholders' Implications in the Institutionalization of the CSR Field in France and in the United States, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 115 (1), pp. 115-133.
3. Baumann-Pauly, D., Wickert, Ch., Spence, L.J., Scherer, A.G. (2013). Organizing corporate social responsibility in small and large firms: size matters, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 115 (4), pp. 693-705.
4. Blaga, S. (2013). Rethinking business sustainability, *Review of Economic Studies and Research Virgil Madgearu*, 6 (1), pp. 5-21.
5. Carden, L.L., Boyd, R.O. (2011). Integrating corporate social responsibility with a risk management methodology: a strategic approach, *Southern Journal of Business and Ethics*, 3, pp. 161-170.

The strongest relationships are recorded between the categories of culture of managerial staff, management culture of working conditions, culture of documentation system and social behavior of the organization. Strong relationship was established between the culture of managerial staff and the culture of organization of management processes. Although weak and the weakest relationships were found between the dimensions of the management culture and social behavior of the employees, they are statistically reliable. This shows that the management culture and corporate social responsibility are closely, systemically related, and the development of dimensions of the management culture has an influence on social behavior of the employees as a respective reaction. It is important as corporate social responsibility would become not only a public declaration and a marketing tool, but would also involve staff at all levels, both the management and ordinary employees in socially responsible activities. In organizational practice such a model serves as a methodological basis, which contributes to more successful implementation of changes, because it integrates knowledge, ethics, methods of organization of processes, working conditions, technologies and ensuring well-being of employees as one of the groups of stakeholders. Thus, you can get better results in terms of corporate social responsibility, achieve more sustainable creation of economic and social well-being of company employees, as the objectives of development of the management culture are basically congruent with the values of social responsibility.

Narrow internal aspects of the concept analyzed in this study are focused solely on relationships between management culture, social behavior of the company and its employees, therefore the relationships with stakeholders outside the organization were not evaluated. In further studies it would be meaningful to evaluate how changes in the management culture affect other stakeholders' perception of corporate social responsibility by carrying out repeated studies in respect of a certain time.

6. Carroll, A.B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders, *Business Horizons*, 34 (4), pp. 39-48.
7. Claydon, J. (2009). Two models of CSR and sustainability. A comparison between the 'pyramid of corporate social responsibility' and the 'model of sustainable development', *Issues in Social and Environmental Accounting*, 2 (2), pp. 260-265.
8. Cooke, R.A. and Ryan, L.V. (1988). The Relevance of Ethics to Management Education, *Journal of Management Development*, 7 (2), pp. 28-38.
9. Costas, J., Kärreman, D. (2013). Conscience as control – managing employees through CSR, *Organization*, 20 (3), pp. 394-415.
10. Daudigeos, T., Valiorgue, B. (2011). Conditions for Value Creation in the Marketplace Through the Management of CSR Issues: A Negative External Effects Framework, *Business & Society*, 50 (1), pp. 28-49.
11. Delmas, M.A., Etzion, D., Nairn-Birch, N. (2013). Triangulating environmental performance: what do corporate social responsibility ratings really capture? *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27 (3), pp. 255-267.
12. Dhanesh, G.S. (2014). CSR as Organization-Employee Relationship Management Strategy. A Case Study of Socially Responsible Information Technology Companies in India, *Management Communication Quarterly*, 28 (1), pp. 130-149.
13. Dougherty, M.L., Olsen, T.D. (2014). Taking Terrain Literally: Grounding Local Adaptation to Corporate Social Responsibility in the Extractive Industries, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 119 (3), pp. 423-434.
14. Fairbrass, J., Zueva-Owens, A. (2012). Conceptualising corporate social responsibility: 'relational governance' assessed, augmented, and adapted, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 105 (3), pp. 321-335.
15. Geva, A. (2008). Three Models of Corporate Social Responsibility: Interrelationships between Theory. Research and Practice, *Business and Society Review*, 113 (1), pp. 1-41.
16. Gjøølberg, M. (2010). Varieties of corporate social responsibility (CSR): CSR meets the "Nordic Model", *Regulation & Governance*, 4 (2), pp. 203-229.
17. Grayson, D., Hodges, A. (2001). *Everybody's Business: managing risks and opportunities in today's global society*, London, Dorling Kindersley.
18. Heyder, M., Theuvsen, L. (2012). Determinants and Effects of Corporate Social Responsibility in German Agribusiness: A PLS Model, *Agribusiness*, 28 (4), pp. 400-420.
19. Homburg, Ch., Stierl, M., Bornemann, T. (2013). Corporate social responsibility in business-to-business markets: how organizational customers account for supplier corporate social responsibility engagement, *Journal of Marketing*, 77 (6), pp. 54-72.
20. Jenkins, H. (2009). A 'business opportunity' model of corporate social responsibility for small- and medium-sized enterprises, *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 18 (1), pp. 21-36.
21. Knowlton, L.W., Phillips, C. (2012). Corporate giving gets smarter: ConAgra foods foundation fights childhood hunger, *The Foundation Review*, 4 (2), pp. 72-83.
22. Lee, O. (2012). Teacher candidates' implementation of the personal and social responsibility model in field experiences, *The Physical Educator*, 69 (2), pp. 150-170.
23. Lundgren, T.A. (2011). Microeconomic model of corporate social responsibility, *Metroeconomica*, 62 (1), pp. 69-95.
24. Mäkinen, J., Kourula, A. (2012). Pluralism in political corporate social responsibility, *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 22 (4), pp. 649-678.
25. Millon, D. (2011). Two models of corporate social responsibility, *Wake Forest Law Review*, 46, pp. 523-540.
26. Pedersen, E.R. (2010). Modelling CSR: How Managers Understand the Responsibilities of Business Towards Society, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91 (2), pp. 155-166.
27. Pedersen, E.R.G., Gwozdz, W. (2014). From resistance to opportunity-seeking: strategic responses to institutional pressures for corporate social responsibility in the Nordic fashion industry, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 119 (2), pp. 245-264.
28. Pérez, A., del Bosque, I.R. (2013). Extending on the Formation Process of CSR Image, *Social Marketing Quarterly*, 19 (3), pp. 156-171.
29. Popoli, P. (2011). Linking CSR strategy and brand image: Different approaches in local and global markets, *Marketing Theory*, 11 (4), pp. 419-433.
30. Raub, S., Blunschi, S. (2013). The Power of Meaningful Work: How Awareness of CSR Initiatives Fosters Task Significance and Positive Work Outcomes in Service Employees, *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 55 (1), pp. 10-18.
31. Segal, E. (2011). A social empathy: a model built on empathy, contextual understanding, and social responsibility that promotes social justice, *Journal of Social Service Research*, 37 (3), pp. 266-277.
32. Shen, J., Benson, J. (2014). When CSR Is a Social Norm: How Socially Responsible Human Resource Management Affects Employee Work Behavior, *Journal of Management*, 20 (10), pp. 1-24.
33. Shum P.K., Yam, S.L. (2011). Ethics and Law: Guiding the Invisible Hand to Correct Corporate Social Responsibility Externalities, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98 (4), pp. 549-571.
34. Thornton, J.C., Byrd, J.T. (2013). Social responsibility and the small business, *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 19 (1), pp. 41-75.
35. Tung, V.W.S., Murali, M. (2011). A dynamic model of corporate social responsibility, *American Marketing Association Educators Proceedings*, 22, pp. 161-162.

36. Valdes-Vasquez, R., Klotz, L. (2011). Incorporating the Social Dimension of Sustainability into Civil Engineering Education, *Journal of Professional Issues in Engineering Education & Practice*, 137 (4), pp. 187-197.
37. Vveinhardt, J. (2010). The diagnostics of mobbing as discrimination in employee relations aiming to improve the organizational climate in Lithuanian organizations, *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*, 21 (2), pp. 173-184.
38. Vveinhardt, J. (2012). Identification of the reliability of methodological characteristics of quality in the diagnostic instrument for mobbing as discrimination in employee relations on purpose to improve the climate in Lithuanian organisations, *Transformations in Business and Economics*, 11, 2 (26), pp. 218-232.
39. Vveinhardt, J., Andriukaitienė, R. The model of managerial decisions for determination of the level of management culture in implementing corporate social responsibility (Forthcoming 2014).
40. Whelan, G. (2012). The political perspective of corporate social responsibility: a critical research agenda, *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 22 (4), pp. 709-737.
41. Young, S., Thyil, V. (2009). Governance, employees and CSR: Integration is the key to unlocking value, *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 47 (2), pp. 167-185.
42. Žukauskas, P., Vveinhardt, J. (2010). The Model of Managerial Intervention Decisions of Mobbing as Discrimination in Employees' Relations in Seeking to Improve Organization Climate, *Inžinerinė ekonomika. Engineering Economics*, 21 (3), pp. 306-314.

Appendix




Fig. 9. Verification of the model for determining the links of the management culture and social responsibility