

# We are IntechOpen, the world's leading publisher of Open Access books Built by scientists, for scientists

4,400

Open access books available

117,000

International authors and editors

130M

Downloads

Our authors are among the

154

Countries delivered to

TOP 1%

most cited scientists

12.2%

Contributors from top 500 universities



WEB OF SCIENCE™

Selection of our books indexed in the Book Citation Index  
in Web of Science™ Core Collection (BKCI)

Interested in publishing with us?  
Contact [book.department@intechopen.com](mailto:book.department@intechopen.com)

Numbers displayed above are based on latest data collected.  
For more information visit [www.intechopen.com](http://www.intechopen.com)



---

# Statistical Verification of Management Culture and Corporate Social Responsibility Correlation

---

Pranas Žukauskas, Jolita Vveinhardt and  
Regina Andriukaitienė

Additional information is available at the end of the chapter

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.70638>

---

## Abstract

The links of management culture and corporate social responsibility in this part are verified and substantiated by statistical calculations. The connections were verified according to such categories as the culture of managerial staff, the culture of organisation of the management processes, the management culture of working conditions, the culture of documentation system, the behaviour of a socially responsible organisation and the behaviour of a socially responsible employee. The results of the research showed the different strength of the relationships of the management culture and corporate social responsibility, which may be significant when organising the changes in the management culture, oriented to the implementation of corporate social responsibility.

**Keywords:** managers, processes, working conditions, socially responsible company, socially responsible employee

---

## 1. Introduction

**Relevance of the research and the level of problem exploration:** the links between theoretical management culture (MC) and corporate social responsibility (CSR) were presented in the first chapter of the monograph. However, certain highlights are worth laconic mentioning once again. Management culture, as an integral part of organisational culture, albeit indirectly, is often mentioned in works by different authors describing the criteria of organisational culture. Tichomirova [1] points out strong relationships between workers of the organisation, Zohar and Marshall [2] distinguish significance of general reasoning and other authors [3–9] highlight the principles of ideology, beliefs and values shared by all enterprises. However, substantially high level of management culture is essential for successful implementation of corporate social responsibility [10].

---

**Problem of the research:** the problem of the research is raised by the question— what is the interrelation of management culture and corporate social responsibility, and how to validate it statistically?

**Object of the research:** interrelation of management culture and corporate social responsibility.

**Purpose of the research:** to perform statistical verification and correlation of interrelation of management culture and corporate social responsibility.

**Objectives of the research:** (1) analysis of corporate social responsibility as a dependent variable with respect to the management culture scales and subscales performed and (2) analysis of management culture as a dependent variable with respect to the corporate social responsibility scales and subscales performed.

**Methods of the research:** the statistical verification of interrelation of management culture and corporate social responsibility was performed by calculating  $R$ —set correlation coefficient,  $R^2$ —summary accuracy coefficient (determination coefficient) and  $F$ —Fisher's statistical meaning observed. The observed interrelations were rated from the weakest (the weakest and weak correlation) to the strongest (strong and the strongest correlation) by distinguishing them by using different colours. Grouping, comparing and graphic imaging techniques were used for processing and systematisation of the information.

## 2. Interrelation of management culture and corporate social responsibility

The basis of formed theoretical insights predicating the management culture and corporate social responsibility connection requires the statistical approval of their correlation. Having analysed empirical research results in various sections, statistical verification of management culture and corporate social responsibility correlation has been carried out (Tables 1–10).

Regression Eq. (1) presented in Table 1 shows that the culture of organisation of managerial processes (COMP), when management working conditions' culture (MWCC), documentation system culture (DSC), behaviour of a socially responsible organisation (BSRO) and behaviour of a socially responsible employee (BSRE) separately one after another increase (other variables unchanged), management staff culture (MSC) also increases, i.e. it is being assessed higher.

The closest correlation links *management staff culture* with behaviour of a socially responsible organisation, management working conditions culture and documentation system culture, as the correlation coefficient  $r$  value is greater than 0.7 (i.e. from 0.711 to 0.725). The assessment of the culture of organisation of managerial processes is expressed by a strong correlation with management staff culture, as  $r$  is greater than 0.5 (i.e. 0.551). The correlation of components of behaviour of a socially responsible employee and management staff culture is the weakest with respect to correlation coefficient  $r$  with minimum value ( $r = 0.183$ ), but statistically reliable.

MSC	$r = 0.725$	$p = 0.000$	BSRO	Dependent variable			
	$r = 0.721$	$p = 0.000$	MWCC	Management staff culture (MSC)			
	$r = 0.711$	$p = 0.000$	DSC	R	$R^2$	Reliability	
	$r = 0.551$	$p = 0.001$	COMP	0.781	0.611	0.000	
	$r = 0.183$	$p = 0.031$	BSRE	Non-standardised beta coefficient	Standardised beta coefficient	ANOVA reliability	
			(Constant)	0.121		0.005	
<b>Independent variables</b>							
Management staff culture			–	–	–	–	
Managerial processes organisation culture			0.056		0.057	0.001	
Management working conditions' culture			0.290		0.282	0.000	
Documentation system culture			0.323		0.282	0.000	
Behaviour of a socially responsible organisation			0.262		0.244	0.000	
Behaviour of a socially responsible employee			0.037		0.036	0.031	
<b>Regression Eq. (1)</b>							
$MSC = 0.121 + 0.056 \times COMP + 0.290 \times MWCC + 0.323 \times DSC + 0.262 \times BSRO + 0.037 \times BSRE$							

Source: Compiled by the authors.

Notes:  $R$ —set correlation coefficient;  $R^2$ —summary accuracy coefficient (determination coefficient); and  $F$ —Fisher's statistical meaning observed.

Markings:

	→	The strongest correlation
	→	Strong correlation
	→	The weakest correlation

**Table 1.** Management staff culture as the dependent variable.

Regression Eq. (2) shows that when managerial staff culture (MSC), management working conditions' culture (MWCC), documentation system culture (DSC) and behaviour of a socially responsible employee (BSRE) increase separately one after another (other variables unchanged), managerial processes organisation culture (COMP) also increases (**Table 2**). Factors underlying the assessment of *Managerial processes organisation culture* indicate that this dependent variable has strong correlation with the named independent variables, because in many cases the correlation coefficient  $r$  values are higher than 0.5 (i.e. from 0.501 to 0.551), and  $p$  almost in all cases is statistically reliable (the scale of behaviour of a socially responsible organisation coefficient  $r$  indicates a strong correlation, i.e. 0.501, but  $p$  is 0.392). Fairly weak correlations of managerial processes organisation culture are set with the scale of behaviour of

COMP		MSC	Dependent variable		
$r = 0.551$	$p = 0.001$	DSC	Managerial processes organisation culture (COMP)		
$r = 0.532$	$p = 0.000$	MWCC	R	$R^2$	Reliability
$r = 0.513$	$p = 0.047$	BSRO	0.517	0.268	0.000
$r = 0.501$	$p = 0.392$	BSRE	Non-standardised beta coefficient	Standardised beta coefficient	ANOVA reliability
$r = 0.289$	$p = 0.000$	(Constant)	0.834		0.000
<b>Independent variables</b>					
Management staff culture			0.111	0.108	0.001
Managerial processes organisation culture			–	–	–
Management working conditions culture			0.079	0.075	0.047
Documentation system culture			0.215	0.182	0.000
Behaviour of a socially responsible organisation			0.038	0.034	0.392
Behaviour of a socially responsible employee			0.323	0.301	0.000
<b>Regression Eq. (2)</b>					
$COMP = 0.834 + 0.111 \times MSC + 0.079 \times MWCC + 0.215 \times DSC + 0.323 \times BSRE$					

Source: Compiled by the authors.

Notes:  $R$ —set correlation coefficient;  $R^2$ —summary accuracy coefficient (determination coefficient); and  $F$ —Fisher's statistical meaning observed.

Markings:

	→	Strong correlation
	→	Weak correlation

**Table 2.** Managerial processes organization culture as the dependent variable.

a socially responsible employee ( $r = 0.289$ ), but even after having established weak correlations with respect to  $r$  coefficient,  $p$  is 0.000.

Regression Eq. (3) presented in **Table 3** shows that when management staff culture (MSC), managerial processes organisation culture (COMP), documentation system culture (DSC) and behaviour of a socially responsible organisation (BSRO) increase separately one after another (other variables unchanged), management working conditions culture (MWCC) also increases.

*Management working conditions culture* is tied by close correlation with behaviour of a socially responsible organisation (in this case, coefficient  $r$  correlation value is the highest, i.e. 0.772), documentation system culture and management staff culture. Not the strongest, but strong connection is established between the analysed dependent variable and managerial processes

MWCC		BSRO	Dependent variable		
$r = 0.772$	$p = 0.000$	DSC	Management working conditions culture (MWCC)		
$r = 0.731$	$p = 0.000$	MSC	R	$R^2$	Reliability
$r = 0.721$	$p = 0.000$	COMP	0.835	0.697	0.000
$r = 0.513$	$p = 0.047$	BSRE	Non-standardised beta coefficient	Standardised beta coefficient	ANOVA reliability
$r = 0.185$	$p = 0.543$	(Constant)	0.081		0.000
Independent variables					
Management staff culture			0.213	0.219	0.000
Managerial processes organisation culture			0.029	0.031	0.047
Management working conditions culture			–	–	–
Documentation system culture			0.294	0.265	0.000
Behaviour of a socially responsible organisation			0.428	0.410	0.000
Behaviour of a socially responsible employee			0.009	0.009	0.543

**Regression Eq. (3)**

$$MWCC = 0.081 + 0.213 \times MSC + 0.029 \times COMP + 0.294 \times DSC + 0.428 \times BSRO$$

Source: Compiled by the authors.

Notes:  $R$ —set correlation coefficient;  $R^2$ —summary accuracy coefficient (determination coefficient); and  $F$ —Fisher’s statistical meaning observed.

Markings:

	→	The strongest correlation
	→	Strong correlation
	→	The weakest correlation

**Table 3.** Management working conditions culture as the dependent variable.

organisation culture ( $r = 0.513$ ). However, the value of correlation coefficient  $r$  of the socially responsible employee behaviour is, as with respect to the above analysed dependent variables, in this case low, too, i.e. 0.185.

Based on regression Eq. (4), it should be noted that when management staff culture (MSC), managerial processes organisation culture (COMP), management working conditions culture (MWCC) and behaviour of a socially responsible organisation (BSRO) increase separately one after another, or when the assessment of behaviour of a socially responsible employee (BSRE) decreases (other variables unchanged), documentation system culture (DSC) increases.

**Table 4** presents the factors conditioning *documentation system culture* assessment and showing the strongest and strong correlations of four independent variables with the analysed

DSC		BSRO	Dependent variable		
$r = 0.755$	$p = 0.000$	MWCC	Documentation system culture (DSC)		
$r = 0.731$	$p = 0.000$	MSC	R	$R^2$	Reliability
$r = 0.711$	$p = 0.000$	COMP	0.839	0.704	0.000
$r = 0.532$	$p = 0.000$	BSRE	Non-standardised beta coefficient	Standardised beta coefficient	ANOVA reliability
		(Constant)	0.613		0.000
Independent variables					
Management staff culture			0.187	0.215	0.000
Managerial processes organisation culture			0.063	0.074	0.000
Management working conditions culture			0.233	0.259	0.000
Documentation system culture			–	–	–
Behaviour of a socially responsible organisation			0.399	0.425	0.000
Behaviour of a socially responsible employee			–0.078	–0.085	0.000
Regression Eq. (4)					
$DSC = 0.613 + 0.187 \times MSC + 0.063 \times COMP + 0.233 \times MWCC + 0.399 \times BSRO - 0.078 \times BSRE$					

Source: Compiled by the authors.

Notes:  $R$ —set correlation coefficient;  $R^2$ —summary accuracy coefficient (determination coefficient); and  $F$ —Fisher’s statistical meaning observed.

Markings:

	→	The strongest correlation
	→	Strong correlation
	→	The weakest correlation

**Table 4.** Documentation system culture as the dependent variable.

dependent variable. Although in this fragment the value of behaviour of a socially responsible employee independent variable correlation coefficient  $r$  is low (0.117), the correlation is statistically reliable ( $p < 0.001$ ).

Regression Eq. (5) shows that when management staff culture (MSC), management working conditions culture (MWCC), documentation system culture (DSC) and behaviour of a socially responsible employee (BSRE) increase separately one after another (other variables unchanged), behaviour of a socially responsible organisation (BSRO) also increases. The results presented in **Table 5** show that very strong and strong relations are established between *behaviour of a socially responsible organisation* and cultures of management working conditions, documentation system, management staff and organisation of managerial processes.

BSRO		MWCC	Dependent variable		
$r = 0.772$	$p = 0.000$	DSC	Behaviour of a socially responsible organisation (BSRO)		
$r = 0.725$	$p = 0.000$	MSC	R	R <sup>2</sup>	Reliability
$r = 0.501$	$p = 0.392$	COMP	0.856	0.733	0.000
$r = 0.216$	$p = 0.000$	BSRE	Non-standardised beta coefficient	Standardised beta coefficient	ANOVA reliability
(Constant)			0.098		0.003
Independent variables					
Management staff culture			0.155	0.167	0.000
Managerial processes organisation culture			0.011	0.013	0.392
Management working conditions culture			0.346	0.362	0.000
Documentation system culture			0.407	0.382	0.000
Behaviour of a socially responsible organisation			–	–	–
Behaviour of a socially responsible employee			0.072	0.075	0.000
Regression Eq. (5)					
$BSRO = 0.098 + 0.155 \times MSC + 0.346 \times MWCC + 0.407 \times DSC + 0.072 \times BSRE$					

Source: Compiled by the authors.

Notes:  $R$ —set correlation coefficient;  $R^2$ —summary accuracy coefficient (determination coefficient); and  $F$ —Fisher’s statistical meaning observed.

Markings:

	→	The strongest correlation
	→	Strong correlation
	→	Weak correlation

**Table 5.** Behaviour of a socially responsible organization as the dependent variable.

A weaker correlation was recorded with the independent variable of behaviour of a socially responsible employee ( $r = 0.216$ , however,  $p = 0.000$ ).

When management staff culture (MSC), managerial processes organisation culture (COMP) and behaviour of a socially responsible organisation (BSRO) increase separately one after another, and documentation system culture (DSC) decreases (other variables unchanged), the assessment of behaviour of a socially responsible employee (BSRE) increases. The correlation presented in **Table 6** of a dependent variable with independent variables is the weakest with respect to correlation coefficient  $r$  of minimum value, but statistically reliable ( $p < 0.001$ ), except management working conditions culture scale where  $p$  is 0.543.

<b>BSRE</b>	$r = 0.216$	$p = 0.000$	<b>SAOE</b>	<b>Dependent variable</b>		
	$r = 0.289$	$p = 0.000$	<b>COMP</b>	<b>Behaviour of a socially responsible employee (BSRE)</b>		
	$r = 0.185$	$p = 0.543$	<b>MWCC</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Reliability</b>
	$r = 0.183$	$p = 0.031$	<b>MSC</b>	0.414	0.172	0.000
	$r = 0.117$	$p = 0.000$	<b>DSC</b>	<b>Non-standardised beta coefficient</b>	<b>Standardised beta coefficient</b>	<b>ANOVA reliability</b>
			(Constant)	1.874		0.000
<b>Independent variables</b>						
Management staff culture				0.073	0.076	0.031
Managerial processes organisation culture				0.317	0.340	0.000
Management working conditions culture				0.024	0.024	0.543
Documentation system culture				-0.261	-0.238	0.000
Behaviour of a socially responsible organisation				0.238	0.231	0.000
Behaviour of a socially responsible employee				-	-	-
<b>Regression Eq. (6)</b>						
<b>BSRE = 1.874 + 0.073 × MSC + 0.317 × COMP – 0.261 × DSC + 0.238 × BSRO</b>						
<i>Source:</i> Compiled by the authors.						
Notes: <i>R</i> —set correlation coefficient; <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup> —summary accuracy coefficient (determination coefficient); and <i>F</i> —Fisher’s statistical meaning observed.						
<i>Markings:</i>						
				→		Weak correlation
				→		The weakest correlation

**Table 6.** Behaviour of a socially responsible employee as the dependent variable.

After the detailed verification of management culture and social responsibility subscales, i.e. influencing factors, it was decided to combine the results into scales in order to create a generalised image. The results presented in **Tables 7** and **9** show how social responsibility is affected by the management culture components and vice versa, i.e. how management culture is affected by social responsibility components. The *united* dimension of corporate social responsibility (CSR) includes the scales of behaviour of a socially responsible organisation and behaviour of a socially responsible employee. The results presented in **Table 7** show that in case of joining the scales, the indicators are good.

Regression Eq. (7), presented in **Table 7**, shows that when the assessments of management staff culture (MSC), managerial processes organisation culture (COMP), management working conditions culture (MWCC) and documentation system culture (DSC) increase separately one after another (other variables unchanged), corporate social responsibility (CSR) assessment

CSR	$r = 0.595$	$p = 0.000$	MWCC	Dependent variable			
	$r = 0.561$	$p = 0.000$	MSC	Social responsibility (SR)			
	$r = 0.536$	$p = 0.000$	DSC	R	$R^2$		Reliability
	$r = 0.532$	$p = 0.000$	COMP	0.705	0.497		0.000
				Non-standardised beta coefficient	Standardised beta coefficient		ANOVA reliability
			(Constant)	1.084			0.000
<b>Independent variables</b>							
				0.137	0.184		0.000
				0.180	0.248		0.000
				0.231	0.301		0.000
				0.114	0.133		0.000
<b>Regression Eq. (7)</b>							
$CSR = 1.084 + 0.137 \times MSC + 0.180 \times COMP - 0.231 \times MWCC + 0.114 \times DSC$							

Source: compiled by the authors.

Notes:  $R$ —set correlation coefficient;  $R^2$ —summary accuracy coefficient (determination coefficient); and  $F$ —Fisher's statistical meaning observed.

Markings:

	→	Strong correlation
--	---	--------------------

**Table 7.** Corporate social responsibility as the dependent variable with respect to management culture scales.

also increases. Analysing the joint *corporate social responsibility* dimension as a dependent variable, strong and statistically reliable correlations were established because  $r$  in all cases is greater than 0.5 (i.e. from 0.532 to 0.595), and  $p$  with respect to all independent variables is less than 0.001.

While management staff general culture level (MSC1), the level of the ability to manage (MSC4), optimal managerial processes regulation (COMP1), rational organisation of management work (COMP2), culture of visitors' reception, conducting meetings, phone calls (COMP4), the level of working environment level (MWCC1), the level of organising work places (MWCC2), the culture of official registration of documentation (DSC1), the optimal document search and access system (DSC2) and rational use of modern information technologies (DSC3) separately one by one successively increase, and the level of management science knowledge (MSC2) and rational storage system of archival documents (DSC4) decreases (other variables unchanged), corporate social responsibility evaluation also increases (regression Eq. (8)).

**Table 9** presents a *joint* management culture (MC) dimension, involving all four scales combining it. In the case of joining management culture scales, correlation with behaviour of a socially responsible employee, as in research results presented earlier, remains weak.

				$R^2$	$R^2$ corrected	Reliability
<b>CSR</b>	0.584	$p = 0.000$	<b>MWCC1</b>	<b>Dependent variable</b>		
	0.558	$p = 0.000$	<b>MWCC 2</b>	↓		
	0.514	$p = 0.000$	<b>MSC1</b>	<b>Corporate social responsibility</b>		
	0.507	$p = 0.004$	<b>MSC4</b>	↓		
	0.498	$p = 0.001$	<b>COMP4</b>	<b>CSR</b>		
	0.496	$p = 0.000$	<b>DSC1</b>	↓		
	0.496	$p = 0.137$	<b>MSC3</b>	<i>Correlation with respect to subscales</i>		
	0.488	$p = 0.031$	<b>COMP1</b>	<b>R</b>		
	0.480	$p = 0.000$	<b>DSC3</b>			
	0.476	$p = 0.000$	<b>COMP2</b>			
	0.455	$p = 0.033$	<b>DSC2</b>			
	0.366	$p = 0.255$	<b>MWCC4</b>			
	0.349	$p = 0.000$	<b>MSC2</b>			
	0.338	$p = 0.003$	<b>DSC4</b>			
	0.313	$p = 0.523$	<b>MWCC3</b>	0.743	0.552	0.548
	0.303	$p = 0.993$	<b>COMP3</b>			<b>0.000</b>
			<b>Non-standardised beta coefficient</b>			
			<b>Standardised beta coefficient</b>			
			<b>ANOVA reliability</b>			
			(Constant)	1.245		<b>0.000</b>
<b>Independent variables</b>						
<b>Management staff culture (MSC)</b>						
Management staff general culture level	MSC1	0.084		0.142		<b>0.000</b>
Management science knowledge level	MSC2	-0.059		-0.082		<b>0.000</b>
Managers' personal and professional characteristics	MSC3	0.022		0.039		0.137
The level of the ability to manage	MSC4	0.052		0.078		<b>0.004</b>
<b>Managerial processes organisation culture (COMP)</b>						
Optimal managerial processes regulation	COMP1	0.039		0.063		<b>0.031</b>
Rational organisation of management work	COMP2	0.071		0.115		<b>0.000</b>
Modern computerisation level of managerial processes	COMP3	0.000		0.000		0.993
Culture of visitors reception, conducting meetings and phone calls	COMP4	0.060		0.088		<b>0.001</b>

**Management working conditions' culture (MWCC)**

Working environment level (interior, lighting, temperature, cleanness, etc.)	MWCC1	0.081	0.138	0.000
Level of organising working places	MWCC2	0.111	0.191	0.000
Work and rest regime, relaxation options	MWCC3	0.008	0.014	0.523
Work security, sociopsychological microclimate	MWCC4	-0.017	-0.025	0.255

**Documentation system culture (DSC)**

Culture of official registration of documentation	DSC1	0.067	0.098	0.000
Optimal document search and access system	DSC2	0.038	0.055	0.033
Rational use of modern information technologies	DSC3	0.100	0.137	0.000
Rational storage system of archival documents	DSC4	-0.053	-0.067	0.003

**Regression Eq. (8)**

$$CSR = 1.245 + 0.084 \times MSC1 - 0.059 \times MSC2 + 0.052 \times MSC4 + 0.039 \times COMP1 + 0.071 \times COMP2 + 0.060 \times COMP4 + 0.081 \times MWCC1 + 0.111 \times MWCC2 + 0.067 \times DSC1 + 0.038 \times DSC2 + 0.100 \times DSC3 - 0.053 \times DSC4.$$

Source: Compiled by the authors.

Notes: *R*—set correlation coefficient; *R*<sup>2</sup>—summary accuracy coefficient (determination coefficient), which shows what part of dispersion this coefficient explains to all respondents; *R*<sup>2</sup> corrected—summary accuracy coefficient (determination coefficient), which shows what part of dispersion this coefficient explains to all population; and *F*—Fisher's statistical meaning observed.

Markings:

	→	Strong correlation
	→	Relatively strong correlation
	→	Relatively weak correlation

**Table 8.** Corporate social responsibility as the dependent variable with respect to the management culture subscales.

Regression Eq. (9) shows that when behaviour of a socially responsible organisation and behaviour of a socially responsible employee increase separately one after another (other variables unchanged), the assessment of management culture (MC) also increases. In **Table 9**, the joint *management culture* is presented as the dependent variable so that differences of strength and reliability of factors influencing social responsibility could be compared. Analysing the factors influencing management culture, it was established that management culture and

MC	$r = 0.798$	$p = 0.000$	<b>BSRO</b>	<b>Dependent variable—management culture (MC)</b>		
	$r = 0.267$	$p = 0.000$	<b>BSRE</b>	$R = 0.826$	$R^2 = 0.682$	<i>Reliability</i> 0.000
				<b>Non-standardised beta coefficient</b>	<b>Standardised beta coefficient</b>	<b>ANOVA reliability</b>
			(Constant)	0.807		0.000
<b>Independent variables</b>						
				0.674	0.795	0.000
				0.083	0.101	0.000
<b>Regression Eq. (9)</b>						
$MC = 0.807 + 0.674 \times BSRO + 0.083 \times BSRE$						

Source: compiled by the authors.

Notes:  $R$ —set correlation coefficient;  $R^2$ —summary accuracy coefficient (determination coefficient); and  $F$ —Fisher’s statistical meaning observed.

Markings:

	→	The strongest correlation
	→	Weak correlation

**Table 9.** Management culture as a dependent variable with respect to corporate social responsibility scales.

MC	$r = 0.653$	$p = 0.000$	<b>BSRO2</b>	<b>Dependent variable</b>			
	$r = 0.660$	$p = 0.000$	<b>BSRO4</b>	↓			
	$r = 0.602$	$p = 0.000$	<b>BSRO5</b>	<b>Management culture</b>			
	$r = 0.630$	$p = 0.000$	<b>BSRO1</b>	↓			
	$r = 0.647$	$p = 0.000$	<b>BSRO3</b>	<b>MC</b>			
	$r = 0.215$	$p = 0.017$	<b>BSRE6</b>	↓			
	$r = 0.191$	$p = 0.000$	<b>BSRE5</b>	<i>Correlation with respect to subscales</i>			
	$r = 0.189$	$p = 0.033$	<b>BSRE3</b>	$R$	$R^2$	<i>Reliability</i>	
	$r = 0.174$	$p = 0.007$	<b>BSRE2</b>				
	$r = 0.160$	$p = 0.042$	<b>BSRE1</b>	0.836	0.699	0.000	
	$r = 0.338$	$p = 0.003$	<b>BSRE4</b>	<b>Non-standardised beta coefficient</b>	<b>Standardised beta coefficient</b>	<b>ANOVA reliability</b>	
			(Constant)	0.768		0.000	
<b>Independent variables</b>							
<b>Behaviour of a socially responsible organisation (BSRO)</b>							
			Market responsibility (services and their quality)	BSRO1	0.182	0.270	0.000

Market responsibility (consumer information, health and safety)	BSRO2	0.069	0.104	0.000
Environment protection responsibility	BSRO3	0.152	0.216	0.000
Responsibility in relations with employees	BSRO4	0.197	0.305	0.000
Responsibility in relations with society	BSRO5	0.072	0.099	0.000
<b>Behaviour of a socially responsible employee (BSRE)</b>				
Intentions to leave work	BSRE1	-0.029	-0.037	0.042
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	BSRE2	0.032	0.056	0.007
General physical and psychological condition of the employee	BSRE3	0.022	0.042	0.033
The employee's opinion about the organisation	BSRE4	0.030	0.046	0.003
Corruption, nepotism and favouritism	BSRE5	0.067	0.095	0.000
Social responsibility criticism: staff attitude	BSRE6	-0.030	-0.046	0.017

**Regression Eq. (10)**

$$MC = 0.768 + 0.182 \times BSRO1 + 0.069 \times BSRO2 + 0.152 \times BSRO3 + 0.197 \times BSRO4 + 0.072 \times BSRO5 - 0.029 \times BSRE1 + 0.032 \times BSRE2 + 0.022 \times BSRE3 + 0.030 \times BSRE4 + 0.067 \times BSRE5 - 0.030 \times BSRE6$$

Source: Compiled by the authors.

Notes: *R*—set correlation coefficient; *R*<sup>2</sup>—summary accuracy coefficient (determination coefficient); and *F*—Fisher's statistical meaning observed.

Markings:

	→	The strongest correlation
	→	Strong correlation
	→	Weak correlation
	→	The weakest correlation

**Table 10.** Management culture as a dependent variable with respect to corporate social responsibility subscales.

behaviour of a socially responsible organisation are linked by a very strong ratio (correlation coefficient *r* value is close to 0.8), and very weak ratio with behaviour of a socially responsible employee, but correlation is statistically reliable.

**Table 10** presents the correlation of management culture, as a dependant variable, with respect to corporate social responsibility subscales. Based on the regression Eq. (10), when market responsibility (services and their quality) (BSRO1), market responsibility (consumer information, health and safety) (BSRO2), environment protection responsibility (BSRO3), responsibility in relations with employees (BSRO4), responsibility in relations with society (BSRO5), uncertainty and lack of information at work (BSRE2), general physical and psychological condition of the employee (BSRE3), the employee's opinion about the organisation (BSRE4) and corruption, nepotism and favouritism (BSRE5) increase separately one after another, or when intentions to leave work (BSRE1), social responsibility criticism: staff attitude (BSRE6) decrease (other variables unchanged), the assessment of management culture (MC) increases.

## Author details

Pranas Žukauskas<sup>1</sup>, Jolita Vveinhardt<sup>1\*</sup> and Regina Andriukaitienė<sup>2,3</sup>

\*Address all correspondence to: jolita.vveinhardt@gmail.com

1 Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

2 Marijampolė College, Lithuania

3 Lithuanian Sports University, Lithuania

## References

- [1] Tichomirova O. Организационная культура: формирование, развитие и оценка. [Organisational Culture: Formation, Development and Assessment]. Санкт-Петербург, ИТМО; 2008. p. 156 [in Russian]
- [2] Zohar D, Marshall I. Dvasinis kapitalas: gerovė, kuri gali padėti išlikti. [Spiritual Capital: Wealth We Can Live By]. Vilnius: *Tyto alba*; 2006. p. 221 [in Lithuanian]
- [3] Harrison R. Organizational culture and the quality of service: A strategy for releasing love in the workplace. London: Association for Management Education and Development AMED; 1987;20
- [4] Jewell BR. Integruotos Verslo Studijos. [Integrated Business Studies]. Vilnius: Vilspa; 2002. p. 487 [in Lithuanian]
- [5] Armstrong MA. Handbook of Human Resource Practice. 11th ed. London: Kogan Page; 2009. p. 1088
- [6] Naseem MA, Zhang H, Malik F, Ramiz-Ur-Rehman. Capital structure and corporate governance. *The Journal of Developing Areas*. 2017;51(1):33-47. DOI: 10.1353/jda.2017.0002
- [7] Lozano JF, Escrich T. Cultural diversity in business: A critical reflection on the ideology of tolerance. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2017;142(4):679-696 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3113-y>
- [8] Hudson S, Bryson D, Michelotti M. Individuals' Assessment of corporate social performance, person-organization values and goals fit, job satisfaction and turnover intentions. *Relations Industrielles*. 2017;72(2):322-344
- [9] Haski-Leventhal D, Roza L, Meijs LCPM. Congruence in corporate social responsibility: Connecting the identity and behavior of employers and employees. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2017;143(1):35-51 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2793-z>
- [10] Andriukaitienė R. Vadybos kultūros raiška Siekiant įgyvendinti įmonių socialinę atsakomybę. [Expression of Management Culture Aiming to Implement Corporate Social Responsibility]. Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas; 2015. p. 253. ISBN 978-609-467-123-4. [in Lithuanian]