CORPORATE CULTURE IN RELATION TO A SUSTAINABLE LOGISTICS ORGANIZATION

Igor Grofelnik
Faculty of logistics, University of Maribor, Slovenia
E-mail: igor.grofelnik@um.si

Marjan Sternad
Faculty of logistics, University of Maribor, Slovenia
E-mail: tina.cvahte@um.si

Tina Cvahte Ojsteršek
Faculty of logistics, University of Maribor, Slovenia
E-mail: marjan.sternad@um.si

Abstract

The rapidly changing global environment in which logistics organizations operate requires an appropriate and rapid organizational response and, consequently, an appropriate corporate culture. Due to the increasing awareness of environmental issues, organizations are being forced to take measures aimed at reducing environmental impacts and optimizing the use of resources. There is also an urgent need for greater social equality, which requires organizations to adapt their businesses, apply modern approaches to management, and change their organizational culture from what was considered successful not long ago. Organizational culture is a common philosophy of employees in every organization, and it includes stakeholders and the environment of the organization. The purpose of this research was to examine what an organizational culture that supports the concept of sustainability should look like. A qualitative approach, based on documentary analysis of previously studied theories of corporate culture and concepts of a sustainable organization, was used. The results show that the right choice of organizational culture typology is of great importance in integrating sustainability into the organization. A sustainably oriented organization must also have a strong organizational culture in place, but it must be continuously nurtured, upgraded, and explored.

Key words: corporate culture, organizational culture, sustainable organization, management

1. INTRODUCTION

Today, the need for greater social equality and the pursuit of global economic growth is steadily increasing. Care for optimal utilization of resources is also becoming a necessity in logistics organizations. Business practices that were considered excellent yesterday are being forced to adapt and redefine today. According to Henriques and Sadorsky (2006), this trend is increasingly being put into practice, especially in countries with high economic growth. This has also led to the emergence of an ideology of "sustainability", which represents a new way of thinking and has a significant impact on the global economy (Henriques & Sadorsky, 1999). In the field of logistics, to date, little attention has been paid to addressing sustainability. Environmental performance assessment is also a relatively unexplored area, while environmental performance measurement systems focus only on visible country measurements (Marchet et al., 2014). However, according to DeBettignies and Lepineux (2009), organizations should make more significant efforts to achieve sustainable solutions in terms of social and environmental issues. According to Sabel, O'Rouke, and Fung (2000), dealing with sustainability from a corporate culture perspective goes back to the ethical treatment of resource extraction. Also, production methods that reduce energy consumption and control emissions are essential (Christmann, 2004). Active corporate social and humanitarian involvement must also be included in the corporate culture itself (Selsky & Parker, 2005). To make corporate changes from a sustainable management perspective, managers and employees must be familiar with the processes and new management policies. Everyone involved must be aware of the issue of sustainability going beyond their direct work responsibility (Haugh & Talwar, 2010).

Multi-functionality of logistics plays a vital role in determining the corporate strategy of sustainability (Piecyk & Björklund, 2015). The concept of sustainable responsibility represents an organization and consistent commitment on the part to fully meet economic, social, and environmental expectations, both internally and externally. Organizations must have the highest ethical values, respect the community and the environment, and contribute to the well-being of all (Samant & Sangle, 2016). Galbreath (2009) believes that an organization should consider corporate social responsibility (CSR) as something more than just a set of practices and occasional initiatives motivated simply by marketing technology. Wenhao and Kaufman (2011) talk about a business vision that combines respect for high ethical values, people, community, and environment. The authors believe that social responsibility has many benefits, not only environmental but also economical. Additionally, processes in organizations are improving due to the establishment of a system of measuring metrics.

Research, which was traditionally aimed at measuring economic and financial performance, is now starting to focus on including environmental and social aspects as well, especially related to performance measurement concerning economic and financial performance (financial and non-financial). It is also emerging that the implementation of sustainable practices requires the involvement of all stakeholders in the organizational strategy, and their effects need to be assessed (Bulgacov et al.,

2015). Stakeholder involvement in organizational strategy can foster co-creation of sustainable value (Samant & Sangle, 2016).

Managers play a crucial role in strategically directing the implementation of the CSR concept. In this respect, the interpretation of executives is critical as they are the ones that most influence organizational sustainability practices. Therefore, the success of sustainability efforts depends on their subjective perception of CSR. However, sustainable companies cannot necessarily respond to the wide range of stakeholder requirements and expectations due to their limited resources. Therefore, companies must prioritize resources for efforts that strongly affect the overall organizational effectiveness of CSR and sustainable development (Henriques & Sadorsky, 1999).

According to Bansal (2005), there are three pillars of sustainability; the economic, social, and environmental pillars. Economic sustainability is essential to a company's financial success - in the long run, a corporation simply cannot survive if its expenditures exceed income. In this context, social sustainability embodies the humanitarian context of business and addresses issues of poverty and income inequality. Environmental sustainability, however, takes into account the impact of business on the quality and quantity of natural resources, the environment, global warming, ecological concerns, waste management, energy and resource use, alternative energy production, and improved pollution and emissions management (Townsend, 2008). The risk of climate change resulting from human activities indicates that these three pillars of sustainability are closely linked (IPCC, 2007). After all, making logistics sustainable needs to involve more than cutting CO_2 emissions (McKinnon, 2015).

Investing in sustainability has potential benefits for the organization as it continually reminds stakeholders that they are committed to social and environmental goals, which is related to positive company performance, competitive advantage, customer loyalty, the good name of the organization, improved image of the organization, legitimacy and improved employment and employee retention (Waddock & Graves, 1997). However, investing in sustainability can lead to costs that do not align with stakeholder interests (Jaffe et al., 1995).

Logistics organizations today face pressure from both institutional forces and investors, customers, and employees. Internal pressure from investors, employees, customers, and suppliers has encouraged sustainability in the corporate agenda. At the external level, legislation, regulations, and voluntary codes of conduct, such as the United Nations Global Compact (2007), have increased pressure for corporations to operate sustainably. Corporations can address sustainability through internal voluntary initiatives and beyond through partnerships and collaboration (Selsky & Parker, 2005). As social awareness and interest in sustainability increases and the group's activity in this area puts pressure on the organization, then senior executives and owners make more of an effort to integrate these issues into their organizations' operations (Spar & LaMure, 2003).

Corporations seeking to integrate the concept of sustainability into their facilities, processes, and products are likely to face significant challenges and, in some cases, completely transform their businesses (Siebenhüner & Arnold, 2007). According to Waddock and McIntosh (2009), radically changing an organization's focus to focus on the concept of sustainability means "a shift in managerial mindsets

about the impact, purpose, and role of the organization on society." Such a shift requires more than just distributing leaflets and reports and a few days of training for selected employees who need in-depth learning about (Cramer, 2005): changes in business practices, dialogue, and interactions with external stakeholders, implementation of new sustainable business strategies, etc.

Such challenges and shifts require new knowledge. Siebenhüner and Arnold (2007) believe that the key to such organizational change is learning. Changing employees' positions that sustainability is a key driver rather than a mandatory supplement requires investments and a serious approach. (Grant, 1996). More than a hundred standards and management solutions have been developed to evaluate and report on the economic, social, environmental, and sustainable performance of businesses. These tools provide information of a qualitative, quantitative, and economic nature and influence interactions between a company and its stakeholders (ISO Advisory Group on Corporate Social Responsibility, 2003). However, this diversity, complexity, and lack of an exact frame of reference have created adverse effects between companies and their stakeholders. Thus, at this level, there is confusion, lack of real knowledge, and organizational innovation. The development of standards and abbreviations, the development of different and similar proposals, especially the high expectations of organizations, can complicate attitudes towards sustainability and corporate social responsibility. There was also confusion and lack of clarity for business stakeholders. When companies do not use an effective and precise approach to managing, evaluating, and reporting their performance, different stakeholders have difficulty analyzing and evaluating the sustainable efforts of companies. Furthermore, this absence of common, reliable, and recognized processes and methods could encourage those stakeholders who adopt fraudulent behavior and report unfair and untrue results. Moreover, even if the most advanced sustainability methodologies are taken into account, they are not designed to consider the various relationships that companies develop with stakeholders in an explicit, clear, and comprehensive manner (Figge et al., 2002).

1.1. Corporate culture

Corporate culture begins with the vision of the organization. Usually, a vision is a single phrase that communicates precisely what the purpose of the business is. Then corporate culture dictates how people should behave in the workplace, what values should guide their performance, and what practices should be pursued to achieve the vision. The behavior is directly related to what customers and colleagues see, and includes the dress code, the company's physical environment, as well as organizational rituals. Values refer to the unwritten laws of workplace behavior. For example, workers should not gossip, or everyone should work for the benefit of society, etc. Values are manifested in behavior but cannot be directly perceived (Schein, 2006). Hofstede (2001) describes culture as comprehensive, historically influenced, linked to anthropological concepts, socially constructed, soft, and relatively stable. Hofstede (2005) also regards organizational culture as a collective thinking program that differentiates employees from one organization to another. The

influence of corporate culture on the formation and management of organizations is a constant theme of contemporary organization management.

The focus of corporate culture is teamwork, trust, openness, and respect. Belief, value, and everyday behavior are the fundamental factors of corporate culture and are reflected through stories, symbols, and rituals, as well as a way of understanding and responding. The excellence and quality of the organization are built and displayed in all segments, especially in detail. Corporate communication, which is a prerequisite for creating a strong and positive culture and desired corporate identity, plays a significant role in creating the corporate image and identity. It is imperative that each organization nurtures its style and is recognizable by its genuine communication. The manager is the one who manages the organization but also plays the role of a mentor and the person who gives employees their knowledge and skills. The motivation of both managers and employees is fundamental because with the right motivation the employee is more satisfied, which means the faster and better quality achievement of the desired goals. Promotion and marketing are of paramount importance in building and maintaining an excellent corporate reputation. Corporate strategies, which are the basic orientation of an organization's operations, play an essential role in the development of company performance (Spudić, 2017).

The organization's philosophy and organizational strategy should also be highlighted here. According to Schein (1997), philosophy defines fundamental and, therefore, relatively weak ideas about the composition of an organization, the goals of the organization, and the rules of behavior. It distinguishes itself from an organizational culture in that it represents essentially only the desirable state of the organization. The leadership of the organization defines the entire operation of its members. However, the organization's strategy is established based on the existing structure and control system, which leads to the transformation of the organizational culture - all elements are closely interconnected (Hofstede, 2005).

Regardless, organizational culture, as a set of habits, norms, and beliefs shared by members of the organization, fosters mutual understanding and consensus on common processes and practices that contribute to the achievement of organizational goals (Napitupulu, 2018). Homburg and Pflesser (2000) believe that values represent a system of beliefs that guide human behavior and create a shared atmosphere at the organization level. Maignan et al. (2011) emphasize that unique values that contribute to stakeholder orientation are ethical values, team orientation, and open communication. Ethical values must guide behavior and thinking throughout the organization.

1.2. The theory of typologies used for research purposes

Schein (1997) offers a typology that is currently the most popular in the literature. In this concept, culture is structured into three levels that represent different levels of cultural evidence. These levels range from very tangible manifestations to deeply embedded, unconscious basic assumptions (Schein, 1997):
• Artifacts represent the visible structures and processes in an organization (habits, customs, dress codes, etc.). They are visible indicators, but sometimes

difficult to understand. They are an apparent image of an organization that people see, hear and feel;

• Values represent policies, goals, views and are reflected through the strategies, goals, philosophy, and standards of the organization. They are much less visible than behavior and artifacts, which means that they are not always at the level of awareness;

• The basic assumptions go into unconscious, self-evident attitudes, perceptions, thoughts, and emotions (when values are taken to the level where people are no longer aware of them and take them for granted). Assumptions are taken for granted in an organization. The underlying assumptions are implicit; they guide individual behavior and inform team members about how to perceive, think, and feel about things. This level is the hardest to change. The human mind needs cognitive stability, so any challenge or question about the basic premise can release fear and defence. In this sense, the common basic assumptions that make up a group culture can be considered at both individual and group levels, as well as psychological-cognitive defence mechanisms that enable the group to continue its operations. Recognizing this link is important when considering aspects of a group's culture, as it is no easier than changing an individual's pattern of defence mechanisms (Schein, 1997).

Hofstede (2005) believes that corporate culture does not express itself directly, but through its relationship to the organization, itself, and the environment. A culture can be defined by an accessible and visible external observation, and by a culture that cannot be directly observed and can only be inferred. Thus, for the survey, Table 1 shows the basic components of Hofstede's culture.

Table 1. Definitions of culture components

An integral part of the culture	Description in classic organization	Author
Value	It is an individual's criterion for judging which conduct is right and which is wrong. The value represents the basic view of work, collaboration, loyalty, and acts because of the socialization of the individual.	Možina et al., 1994
Role	It represents the standardized patterns of behavior that are required of an individual. In this way, roles connect people and interact with them in connection with the division of work within the organization.	Možina et al., 1994
Norm	It represents the rules of behavior that have evolved because of interactions between participants in the organization. It represents the behavior expected of members of an organization; represents the collective attitudes, beliefs, and feelings that pertain to members 'behavior.	Ivanko & Stare 2007

Typical behavior patterns	Behavior is a reflection of individuals to the norms, roles, and values of the organization. Behavior patterns can also be identified in certain reactions, such as when a mistake is made, or tolerance is committed.	Schneider, 1990
Role models	They are members of the organization or successful leaders whose actions have been beneficial to the organization. Often, successful leaders and / or founders of the organization are involved.	Hofstede, 2005
Customs and rituals	They represent different celebrations of organizational anniversaries, a specific type of events, a way of commemorating major individual successes that receive special treatment, etc.	Ivanko & Stare, 2007
Communication	Corporate communication, which is a prerequisite for creating a strong and positive culture and desired corporate identity, plays a significant role in creating the image and identity of the company. It represents the nervous system of the organization as it is crucial for its functioning. Of particular importance is informal and actual communication and attitudes towards formal communication.	Schein 1997
Products and services	In a broad sense, these are all kinds of creations created by members of the organization and are the most easily visible contents of the organizational culture.	Ivanko & Stare, 2007

Source: Own source

The next typology selected is based on a theoretical model called The Competing Values Framework (CVF), which defines four main types of organizational cultures (Table 2), namely klan, adhoc, hierarchy, and market. Cultures are divided into two dimensions (Cameron & Quinn, 2006):

• flexibility and autonomy - stability and control;
• internal environment and integration - external environment and differentiation.

Table 2. Types of organizational cultures by Cameron and Quinn

Type of culture	A characteristic of the culture
Klan	Friendly work environment; as a large family, people share good and evil; managers are mentors and fatherly personalities; it is characterized by belonging and tradition; significant commitment; much emphasis on the long-term usefulness of people's personal development; complexity and atmosphere count a lot; benchmarking is customer satisfaction, and concern for people;

	highly developed teamwork; cooperation and consent are a constant.
Adhoc	A dynamic, entrepreneurial, and creative work environment; colleagues are exposed to and take risks; leaders represent innovators and are willing to take risks; the organization is focused on innovation; long-term orientation is growth and gaining new capabilities; performance is the invention of unique, new products and services; personal initiative and independence are rewarded.
Hierarchy	A formalized and structured environment; procedures determine the actions of people; leaders are effective coordinators and organizers; it is crucial for the organization to function smoothly; it is characterized by formal rules and regulations; the long-term focus is stability and performance - smooth operation; effectively; employee care encompasses job security.
Market	Results-oriented, tasks are first, and priority; great competition and striving for goals; leaders are hard, demanding, competitive, inexorable; the organization is linked by a commitment to winning; significant commitment to the reputation and success of the organization; long-term focus on competitive action and achievement of measurable goals and objectives; success represents market share and market penetration; consider competitive prices and market leadership; the organization is very competitive.

Source: Cameron & Quinn, 2006

In his typology, Ansoff (1987) distinguishes five different types of organizational cultures: stable, reactive, exploitative, coordinative, and anticipatory (Table 3).

Table 3. Organizational culture by Ansoff

Type of culture	A characteristic of the culture
A stable type	the goal is to maintain the status quo; members of the organization are introverted and oriented toward the past and have great resistance to change.
A reactive type	introverted; unlike, members are focused on the present and are prepared for minimal risk of change.
Exploratory type	directed outward and constantly seeking change; the aim is to reduce unexpected threats through change; the action is constant.
Coordination type	pointing outwards; focused on the future and expecting it ready, shaping the future themselves.
Anticipative culture	introverted and also outward-oriented; accept risks when they have full confidence; good planning is typical.

Source: Ansoff, 1987

According to Heskett (2015), good organizational culture can account for 20-30% of the difference in corporate performance compared to culturally insignificant competitors. Each culture is unique, and a myriad of factors create one, but at least six standard components of large cultures can be observed (Table 4) (Coleman, 2013).

Table 4. Factors of large cultures

Factors	Features
Vision	The company can integrate the vision from the very beginning. The vision influences the corporate mechanisms of cultural change proposed by the various successful change drivers in the industry.
Values	Company values are at the core of its culture. While the vision articulates the purpose of the business, the values offer a set of guidelines on the behavior and thinking needed to achieve that vision.
Practice	Values are of little importance unless they are written down in company practices. If an organization professes "people are our greatest asset", then it should also be willing to invest in visible ways. Whatever the organization's values, they need to be strengthened in review criteria and promotional policies, and integrated into the principles of the day-to-day life of the business.
People	No business can build a coherent culture without people who either share its core values or have the willingness and ability to embrace those values. People stick to the culture they like, and establishing the right "carriers of culture" reinforces the culture that the organization already has.
History	Each organization has a unique history - a unique story.
Place	It is distinguished as open architecture and closed architecture. Some cities and countries have local cultures that can reinforce or counteract the culture that a business is trying to create. The location of the organization influences the behavior and values of the people in the organization.

Source: Coleman, 2013

2. METHODOLOGY

In the area of corporate culture and sustainability, there is a wealth of research exploring the relationship between these disciplines. The previously reviewed literature highlights the benefits, strengths, and weaknesses associated with understanding sustainability and organizational culture in organizations. It is evident that in the present day, the concern for the sustainable functioning of the organization is necessary and must be implemented in the corporate governance of the organization.

In the introductory chapter, the theory was examined from the field of sustainability, sustainable organization, and organizational culture. For the research, a qualitative approach based on documentary analysis of the previously studied theories of corporate culture and the concept and characteristics of the sustainable

organization was used. In the results chapter, analysis of the fundamental characteristics and the difference between traditional corporate culture and a culture that incorporates the concept of sustainability was performed. The following hypothesis and research question were defined for the research:

H1: Choosing the right organizational culture is of great importance in integrating sustainability into the organization.

R1: What type of organizational culture is appropriate to provide and understand the area of sustainability in an organization?

Due to the enormous interest in organizational culture, several typologies have emerged in recent years. Typology is an attempt to simplify complex reality and, utilizing a model type, tries to show us reality in the studied organization (Rozman, 2000). In order to describe and discuss cultural phenomena in a sustainable organization, there were examined several typologies presented in the introduction section. The obtained theoretical data were analyzed and presented in the results section. Finally, a summary was prepared in the Discussion section, which included a subjective perspective.

3. RESULTS

Based on the three levels defined by Schein, there have been defined three levels of cultural evidence that a sustainable organization must contain based on theoretical findings:

• From the point of view of Artifacts concerning sustainability, the organization must be effective in the field of environmental programs, and the products are eco-designed. Performance criteria are present within the organization, and the organization uses material flow, and process optimization approaches. Network coordination, strategic partnerships, product optimization, and multiple by-products, and optimal material flow planning.

• From the point of view of Values concerning sustainability, there is a need for a sustainable mindset that is present at all levels, thrift, staff responsibility, maximum productivity of materials, and energy. Achieving the goals requires strategic partnerships, environmental and sustainable thinking, a systems approach, life-cycle analysis, product and process innovation in companies.

• From the point of view of the Basic Assumptions, achieving sustainability from a corporate culture perspective requires conscious networks and partnerships, an awareness of responsibility and sustainability is essential, and the concept of sustainability requires a holistic approach at all levels.

In the following table 5, the essential characteristics of organizational culture in a sustainable organization based on theoretical starting points are defined. As the basic one, the typology of the components of organizational culture according to Hofstede was chosen.

Table 5. Organizational culture concerning sustainable organization according to Hofstede

An integral part of the culture	Organizational culture concerning a sustainable organization
Value	Corporate culture begins with the vision of the organization. From a corporate culture point of view, awareness of social and environmental issues (at all levels of the business) is critical. Ethical treatment of resource extraction is also essential. Everyone involved should be aware of the issue of sustainability and the viewpoint of the work they are doing. Cooperation is sustainable. Respect for people and the establishment of the highest ethical values that respect the community and the environment and contribute to the well-being of all are also important values. The true philosophy of the organization is also crucial to establishing true values. Stakeholders support sustainability.
Role	There is a conscious awareness that an organization, both internally and externally, must meet economic, social, and environmental expectations. Corporate social responsibility is thus a key part of a strategy that is beneficial for everyone, including the financial performance of the company.
Norm	The organization has a metric, relationships are defined, the behavior of individuals has high ethical, social, and environmental standards. Collective positions are directed at the sustainability of the organization, and the interpretation of executives is of paramount importance.
Typical behavior patterns	The behavior of individuals towards the norms, roles, and values of the organization is sustainable in all aspects. There is no tolerance to threaten the sustainability of the organization and the environment. The mistakes committed are taken seriously. The expected behavior in an organization contributes to meeting the needs of stakeholders. A team orientation is characteristic, involving members of organizations in the support system and encouraging cooperation. Constant learning.
Role models	Stakeholder orientation has become a widespread form of market orientation. Managers play a crucial role in strategically directing the implementation of the CSR concept. Successful members of the organization or successful leaders whose operations have been beneficial to the organization from a sustainability perspective are essential. Often, successful leaders and / or founders of the organization have adopted a philosophy of sustainability.
Customs and rituals	Events are sustainable, mainly in terms of environmental and social responsibility. Achieving the goals is publicly

	celebrated and reinforces the interest of exogenous social responsibility.
Communication	Corporate communication, which is a prerequisite for creating a strong and positive culture and desired corporate identity. Communication is in all directions. The implementation of sustainable practices requires the involvement of all stakeholders in the organizational strategy.
Products and services	Products and services are principles of a sustainable nature. They are based on the sea of meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs.

Source: Own source

From Cameron and Quinn's typology (Table 2), it can be argued that, to a large extent, a sustainable organization has an established organizational culture that is more complex and can be combined with the individual types of typology used. It is observed to the greatest extent that organizational culture in a socially responsible and sustainable organization incorporates the fundamental characteristics of the Klan and Adhoc cultures. From a typology standpoint, the Klan is also an indispensable work environment in a high-sustainability organization, managers are mentors and fatherly personalities. Emphasis is also placed on the long-term utility of personal development of employees. The benchmark is customer satisfaction and concern for people, which points to the fundamental characteristics of a sustainable organization. One of the essential characteristics of a sustainable organization is Adhoc typology. Namely, the sustainability aspect supports innovation and new products that are sustainable.

According to Ansoff's typology (Table 3), a sustainable organization has a combined organizational culture that can be classified as an explorative, harmonizing, and anticipatory type by individual elements. Namely, based on a review of the theory, it can be argued that corporate culture in a sustainable organization is characterized by a constant search for change and, consequently, an improvement of the prior situation, which is directed at sustainable growth and social responsibility. The aim is to reduce the unexpected dangers of change, which is characteristic of a sustainable organization. The risk of market integration is in focus here, as the concept of sustainability is increasingly present, consumer conditions are increasing, and there is also the potential for global competition that exploits the ideology of sustainability. Sustainable organization, using the Ansoff typology, is outward and forward looking. Namely, consumer awareness, the global market situation, the pressures of intentional forces are crucial. Thus, an organization needs a strategic plan and a vision that encompasses the future. A sustainable organization is ready, the future is shaping itself. Sustainable organization is also characterized by good planning.

In the following Table 6, the basic factors of organizational culture in a sustainable organization based on theoretical starting points are defined on the basis of six common factors of great cultures of Coleman, which are shown in Table 4.

Table 6. Characteristics of factors in a sustainable organization

Factors	Characteristics of sustainability-related factors
Vision	The company can integrate a vision of sustainability from the outset or turn towards sustainability. Vision influences the corporate mechanisms of cultural change suggested by various successful change drivers from the industry (Weerts, Vermeulen & Witjes, 2018).
Values	Sustainably moderate organizations can live within their means. Sustainable value is the ability to deliver value that supports the organization and context in which it exists. The values of the company are the core of its culture and are oriented towards economic, social, and environmental issues in a sustainable organization. When an organizational culture is sustainable, so are the values of a company focused on sustainability. Behavior and thinking are directed towards achieving a sustainable vision. Values include environmental concerns, cost reductions, employee concerns, job security, transparency of business activity, fight against corruption, fair benefits for all, moral leadership and stakeholders, high ethical standards, development cooperation, sustainable business honesty, openness to innovation, respect, and human well-being (Tatarusanu & Onea, 2013)
Practice	Integrating sustainable practices, according to Linnenluecke and Griffiths (2010), also changes values and beliefs in an organization. The organization thus strengthens and strives for more ethical and responsible values. Embracing sustainability is seen by the authors as a change in culture at different levels that must be achieved. Practices enable successful change of organizational culture.
People	People are inherently resistant to change in every aspect of life, and corporate culture is no exception. People need to understand the concept of sustainability and social responsibility, so learning at all levels is critical. The pursuit of sustainability must be holistic and involve all employees of the organization. It is difficult to draw attention to the intangible aspect and to persuade people about the value that improved culture brings concerning sustainability (Smith Kuczmarski & Kuczmarski, 2018).
History	The ability to discover and shape this history into a narrative is a fundamental element of creating a culture that is sustainable in our case. Elements of this narrative can be formal (Coca-Cola, which has dedicated considerable resources to celebrating its heritage and even has a World of Coke Museum in Atlanta) or as informal as stories about how Steve Jobs's early fascination with calligraphy shaped an aesthetically-oriented culture at Apple (Coleman, 2013).
Place	Open architecture is more conducive to certain office behaviors than collaboration and is characteristic of a sustainable organization. The geographical location, architecture, or aesthetic design influences the values and behavior of people in the workplace in the organization (Coleman, 2013).

Source: Own source

3.1. Testing hypothesis and research question

The hypothesis and the research question were tested in the research part:

H1: the right choice of organizational culture is of great importance in integrating sustainability into the organization

Based on the analysis and interpretation of the results, it was found that the right choice of organizational culture is of great importance in integrating sustainability into the organization. Namely, organizational culture represents the character of the organization, which is reflected in the way it operates. In terms of sustainability, it is essential for an organization to be effective in terms of environmental programs, and products must be designed on the basis of sustainability and performance criteria. Likewise, values, habits, norms, beliefs must be oriented towards sustainability and must take into account the fundamental characteristics of a sustainable perspective. Thus, the choice of a specific typology of organizational culture is extremely important.

H2: What type of organizational culture is appropriate to ensure and understand the field of sustainability in an organization?

It is observed to the greatest extent that organizational culture in a socially responsible and sustainable organization incorporates the fundamental characteristics of the Klan and Adhoc cultures. A sustainable organization may have an established organizational culture that can be classified as an explorative, harmonizing, and anticipatory type by individual elements. It was found that the relationship between typologies is multifaceted, and therefore a strict demarcation between them seems practically impossible.

4. DISCUSSION

Dealing with corporate culture in conjunction with a sustainable logistics organization is a complex and challenging task. The research focused on defining the cultural values and characteristic elements of corporate culture that are required and recommended in a sustainably oriented organization. The basis for defining elements is the basic definition of sustainable development. Thus, the fact that the organization must maintain natural resources and provide the ability to maintain and improve the quality of life has been taken into account. The environmental, economic, and social aspects were also included in the research. These aspects alone are the cornerstone of sustainable management in an organization. A sustainable organization has an established organizational culture because the complexity and understanding of the concept of sustainability in an organization are multifaceted and are not offered by a limited selection of organizational culture typologies. Consequently, the paper presents a general estimation of sustainably oriented characteristics of corporate culture, which is inherently tied to the ideology of traditional corporate culture.

For an organization to achieve its sustainability goals and ensure long-term engagement with environmentally-friendly activities in several different dimensions (here relating to the economic, social and natural environment), businesses must rely on a strong organizational culture focused on values such as customer orientation, transparency, and openness to the community, care for employees, innovation and respect for others. These are the core values of successful companies that also take into account the sustainability aspect. The market performance and sustainability of a firm's activities can be compatible when an organizational culture supports these seemingly different goals. They also found that the right choice of organizational culture is of great importance in integrating sustainability into the organization. It should be noted that it would be necessary to explore the field of understanding the conditions of sustainability in connection with the establishment of a sustainable organizational culture in future research. It is not clear under what conditions logistics companies can adopt a culture of sustainability.

From a stakeholder perspective, engaging them in the process of knowing sustainability from a corporate culture perspective is imperative. Involvement enhances awareness and changes the view of sustainability and social responsibility of an organization. Thus, consistent learning and awareness of all employees about the sustainability aspect is a necessary evil and should not be limited to managers but also stakeholders and all employees. There is also an urgent need to implement awareness-raising processes and approaches, which must be disseminated and implemented across all levels and scope of business functions within the organization. Employee opportunities to gain hands-on experience, initiative for sustainability, and increase interest and commitment to sustainability must also be enhanced. An integrated sustainability strategy system must integrate the technical and action learning capabilities that are imperative from an organizational development perspective. It also raises the question of how the state and politics influence corporate behavior. How and does the state have a positive impact on the strategic restructuring leading to a sustainable logistics organization?

The issue of the relationship between different values in terms of the individual person and the organization should also be highlighted. According to Linnenluecke & Griffiths (2010), the values of employees and managers in organizations as a phenomenon that attracts a lot of attention of researchers, practitioners, social critics and the general public.

Further research should focus on how employees, owners, and the environment affect sustainable growth of the logistics organization in different types of corporative cultures, specifically if the perception of sustainability in relation to corporate culture can be different. Stakeholders can emphasize various aspects that can be focused on the development of the organization, the development of individual departments, efficient use of resources, environmental protection and other optimizations. The question of the economic trade-offs involved in sustainability also arises. Thus, it would be interesting to explore the area of the organization's goals (financial and non-financial) in conjunction with stakeholders and managers. Where is the optimal level of culture in relation to sustainability? Eccles, Ionnou, and Serafiem (2011) talk about the financial damage that too targeted nonfinancial (sustainable) business can cause.

The authors also believe that the choice of business also depends on the general social perception.

Due to the global environmental problem that modern society is facing, sustainability is becoming a challenge that many organizations face today. Establishing the right corporate culture that consistently respects sustainability awareness at all levels of the organization is imperative today. Good corporate culture choices represent competitive advantage and a critical success factor, with the awareness that competitive advantage is mentioned by people who are aware of the importance of sustainability and strive for a better tomorrow.

5. REFERENCES

Ansoff, I. (1987). *Corporate Strategy*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Bansal, P. (2005). Evolving sustainably: a longitudinal study of corporate sustainable development. *Strategic Management Journal 26(3)*, 197-218.

Bulgacov, S., Ometto, M., & May, M. (2015). Differences in sustainability practices and stakeholder involvement. *Journal of Social Responsibility*, 11 (1), p. 149–160.

Cameron, K. S. & Quinn R. E. (2006). *Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher.

Christmann, P. (2004). Multinational companies and the natural environment: Determinants of global environmental policy standardization. *Academy of Management Journal, 45 (5)*, 747– 760.

Coleman, J. (2013). Six Components of a Great Corporate Culture. Harvard Business Review. [available at https://hbr.org/2013/05/six-components-of-culture, accessed June 22, 2020].

Cramer, J. (2005). Company learning about corporate social responsibility. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 14, p. 255–266.

Curkovic, S. & Landeros, R. (2006). An Environmental Baldrige. *American Journal of Business*, 15(2), p. 63 – 76.

DeBettignies, H. C., & Lepineux, F. (2009). Can Multinational Corporations Afford to Ignore the Global Common Good?. *Business and Society Review, 2(114)*, p. 153 – 182.

Denison, D. R. (1984). Bringing corporate culture to the bottom line. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13(2), p. 5–22.

Eccles, R. G., Ioannou, I. & Serafeim, G. (2014). The Impact of a Corporate Culture of Sustainability on Corporate Behavior and Performance. *Management Science, 60 (11)*, p. 2835 – 2857.

Figge F., Hahn T., Schaltegger S. & Wagner M. (2002). The sustainability balanced scorecard – linking sustainability management to business strategy. *Business Strategy and the Environment.* 11(5), p. 269–284.

Galbreath, J. (2009). Building corporate social responsibility into strategy. *European Business Review*, 21 (2), p. 109 – 127.

Grant, R. M. (1996). Prospering in dynamically-competitive environments– organizational capability as knowledge generation. *Organization Science*, 2(1), p. 375–387.

Haugh, H. M. & Talwar, A. (2010). How Do Corporations Embed Sustainability Across the Organization? *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 9 (3)* , p. 384-396.

Henriques, I., & Sadorsky, P. (1999). The Relationship Between Environmental Commitment and Managerial Perceptions of Stakeholder Importance, *Academy of Management Journal, 42 (1)*, p. 89 – 99.

Henriques, I., & Sadorsky, P. (2006). The Adoption of Environmental Management Practices in a Transition Economy. *Comparative Economic Studies, 48(4)*, p. 641-661.

Heskett, J.L. (2015). *The Culture Cycle: How to Shape the Unseen Force that Transforms Performance*, New York: Pearson FT Press.

Hofstede, G. (2005). *Cultures and Organizations*, New York: McGraw-Hill Publisher.

Homburg, C. & Pflesser, C. (2000). A multiple-layer model of market-oriented organizational culture: Measurement issues and performance outcomes. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37, p. 449– 462.

IPCC. (2007). *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ISO Advisory Group on Corporate Social Responsibility (2003). *Technical Report (TR) Terms of Reference (TOR)*, International Standardization Oorganization: Geneva.

Ivanko, Š. & Stare, J. (2007). *Organizacijsko vedenje*, Ljubljana: Fakulteta za upravo, Univerza v Ljubljani.

Jaffe, A., Peterson, S. & Portney, P. (1995). Environmental regulation and the competitiveness of US manufacturing: what does the evidence tell us? *Journal of Economic Literature*, 33, p. 132-163.

Linnenluecke, M. K. & Griffiths A. (2010). Corporate sustainability and organizational culture. *Journal of World Business*, 45 (4), p. 357-366.

Maignan, I., Gonzalez-Padron, T.L., Hult, G.T.M. & Ferrell, O.C. (2011). Stakeholder orientation: Development and testing of a framework for socially responsible marketing. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 19, 313–338.

Marchet, G., Melacini, M. & Perotti, S. (2014). Environmental sustainability in logistics and freight transportation: A literature review and research agenda. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 25 (6), p. 775-811.

McKinnon, A. (2015). *Green logistics: Improving the environmental sustainability of logistics*, London: KoganPage.

Mihalič, R. (2007). Menedžment kompetenc v slovenskih podjetjih: izsledki empirične raziskave v velikih in srednje velikih podjetjih. *Andragoška spoznanja, 13(3)*, p. 10-18.

Možina, S., Kavčič, B., Tavčar M., Pučko D., Ivanko Š., Lipičnik B., Gričar, J., Repovž, L., Vizjak A., Vahčič A, Rus V. & Bohinc, R. (1994). *Management*, Radovljica: Didakta.

Napitupulu, I.H. (2018). Organizational Culture in Management Accounting Information System: Survey on State-owned Enterprises (SOEs) Indonesia. *Global Business Review*, 19, p. 556– 571.

Rozman, R. (2000). *Analiza in oblikovanje organizacije*, Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani, Ekonomska fakulteta.

Piecyk, M. I. & Björklund, M. (2015). Logistics service providers and corporate social responsibility: sustainability reporting in the logistics industry. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 45 (5), p. 459-585.

Sabel, C., O'Rourke, D. & Fung, A. (2000). Ratcheting Labor Standards: Regulation for Continuous Improvement in the Global Workplace. *Columbia Law School, Pub. Law Research Paper No. 01-21*.

Samant, S. M. & Sangle, S. (2016). A selected literature review on the changing role of stakeholders as value creators. *World Journal of Science, Technology and Sustainable Development, 13(2)*, p. 100-119.

Schein, E. H. (1997). *Organizational culture and leadership,* 1st edition, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schein, E. H. (2006). *Organizational Culture and Leadership,* 3rd edition, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, B. (1990). *Organizational climate and culture,* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. Selsky, J. W. & Parker, B. (2005). Cross-sector partnerships to address social issues: Challenges to theory and practice. *Journal of Management, 31(6)*, p. 849 – 873.

Sebenhuner, B. & Arnold, M. (2007). *Organizational learning to manage sustainable development. Business Strategy and the Environment*. Wiley Online Library.

Slater, S.F. & Narver, J.C. (1995). Market orientation and the learning organization. *Journal of Marketing*, 59, p. 63–74.

Smith-Kuczmarski, S. & Kuczmarski, T. D. (2018). A Sustainable Corporate Culture Embraces the Values of All Members. Playbook. American Management Association.

Spar, D. & La Mure, L. (2003). The Power of Activism: Assessing the Impact of NGOs on Global Business. *California Management Review, 45(3)*.

Spudić, K. (2017). *Korporacijska kultura*, Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku, Ekonomski fakultet u Osijeku.

Tatarusanu, M. & Onea, A.N (2013). Organizational culture and values for corporate sustainability. Anale. *Seria Stiinte Economice*, 19, p. 700-707.

Townsend, C. R. (2008). *Ecological applications: Towards a sustainable world,* Oxford: Wiley- Blackwell.

United Nations. (2007). *UN Global compact annual review,* New York: United Nations.

Waddock, S. A. & Graves, S. B. (1997). The Corporate Social Performance–Financial Performance Link. *Strategic management, 18(4)*, p. 303-319.

Waddock, S. & Mcintosh, M, (2009). Beyond Corporate Responsibility: Implications for Management Development. *Business and Society Review*, Wiley Online Library.

Wenhao, C., & Kaufman, K. (2011). Corporate social responsibility in Fortune magazine's top 50 companies: State of action and salient trends . *African Journal of Business Management, 5(29)*, p. 11636-11651.

Weerts, K., Vermeulen, W., Witjes, S. (2018). On corporate sustainability integration research: Analysing corporate leaders' experiences and academic learnings from an organizational culture perspective. *Journal of cleaner production*, 203, p. 1201 – 1215.