How Personal Values Influence Romanian CSR Managers` Involvment in CSR Campaigns

Anca Diana ŞERBAN

Faculty of Communication and Public Relations
National University of Political Studies and Public Administration
30A Expoziţiei Blvd., Sector 1, 102104, Bucharest, Romania
diana.serban@comunicare.ro

Abstract. *This study focuses on identifying the ratio between the individual and organization authority of CSR managers concerning decision making within the campaigns they coordinate. The sample includes the top 100 Romanian companies selected by turnover. The way in which the managers' values interact with the organization authority is a subject treated poorly in both international and Romanian literature. This study, which has an exploratory character, investigates how personal values lead Romanian CSR managers to develop and coordonate CSR campaigns and to what extent these values are part of the campaign messages compared to the values of the company for which they are made. The main results of this scientific paper refers to the correlation between the CSR managers' values and the campaigns that they coordinate.*

Keywords: *personal values, organization authority, CSR, message, manager.*

Introduction

Decision making in CSR campaigns is not like any other decision making process. Because its drivers are represented by values (Hemingway, 2005), social issues and human relations it represents an important research approach. And its importance is given by the shuffle between organizational authority and individual authority.

As far as organizational authority is concerned, the academic literature refers to the fact that the decision making process is influenced by what is better for the organization as a whole without taking into account the needs and personal values of people that are part of it (Mason & Mudrack, 1997; Mudrack, 2007). Authority is also related with „a set of comands", lack of legitymacy and power (Koppel, 2008, p.178). CSR managers` decisions can impact both the organization, as well as its stakeholders: employees, suppliers, clients, the local community, and even the environment (Pedersen, 2010). The literature confirms that managers tend to be more responsive to organizational changes if those are based on values that

coincide with their personal ones (Haigh & Jones, 2006; Hemingway & Maclagan, 2004).

Literature review: individual authority versus organizational authority in CSR decision making practices

This article aims to continue the debate on the relationship between personal values of managers and the decisions they take regarding the organizational activities they coordinate based on observations of Herman Aguinis and Ante Glavas (2012) who showed that this issue has been studied poorly in the literature to date. The two authors stressed that personal values are an important factor in decision making and it is therefore important to identify how personal values influence the involvement of managers in the organization: "Personal values are part of decision making whether the individuals realize it or not, so it is important to understand how these values influence their involvement in CSR campaigns" (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012, p.948).

Values are essential for the orientation of the individual in his environment (Roșca & Stănescu, 2014). According to Hay and Gray (1974, p.139), values are "beliefs and attitudes of a person who helps to create its frame of reference and determines an individual to behave in a certain way". In this sense, managers dispose of a certain set of values, as any other individual, which influence them in their daily work and decision-making process.

However, research does not particularly show whether that managers involved in social responsibility campaigns do it because they have been convinced by arguments of rational order in this regard (Mudrack, 2007). On the contrary, the responsibilities of a manager come with a set of personal ideas about how the world should look like. In this context, Mudrack (2007, p.35) brings into question the concept of "authority of the organization" (organizational authority) contrasting two different views: Friedman`s (1970) perspective that the organization`s mission is to make profit and Schwartz (2001) perspective that managers` decisions shall not be impactful only to shareholders but also to other groups co-stakeholders such as employees, customers or suppliers. This view is confirmed by the research on organizational management (Schwartz, 2001). The concept of *organization's authority* refers to the fact that the decision-making process is influenced by what is best for the organization, but the authors consider that the organizational authority has started to gain less attention/importance than the individual authority.

The connection between personal values and organizational values is emphasized by Robert Hay and Ed Gray (1974, pp.135-136) who demarcates the evolution of the concept of social responsibility into 3 periods which refer to: (1) *management oriented towards maximizing profit*, wealth, productivity and interests of stakeholders and less on product quality, job security and social values); (2) the *trustee manager* who opts for a balance between the interests of many groups of the company stakeholders, offering quality products at fair prices, but slightly oriented towards supporting protection environmental, cultural values and the rights of employees; (3) *the quality of life manager*, during which the manager focuses on workers' rights, social justice and environmental protection under the pressure of society.

CSR and the personal values of managers

In the first period of CSR development the managers are considered to have personal values that reflect the thinking of its economic and cultural views: "what is good for me, is good for my country" (Hay & Gray, 1974 p.138). The philosophy of life of this type of manager is characterized by materialism.

In the second period of CSR development, according to Hay and Gray (1974), the managers` self-interest plays an important role in his actions, but he recognizes that the self-interest of other people (customers, employees, suppliers, owners, politicians and the community) is also important for the company. The trustee manager considers his clients as leading providers of business profit and begins to realize how important the concept of "customer satisfaction" is. For this type manager technology is as important as people, providing better life quality additionally, the customer's opinion about the product or service is also important being the primary indicator depending on which the organization develops its business strategy.

During the 3rd period of CSR development, the manager oriented towards the quality of life believes that self-interest and group interests are important, as well as the interest of society. Hay and Gray (1974) reveal that managers consider that profit is important to the company, but that should not be the sole aim of its operation. Regarding the set of values, money is important, but people are more important. Even though technology is a relevant factor for this type of managers, they value people more, respecting the fact that they have problems, but also believing that they need to protect the environment and ensuring high quality of their lives.

Research reveals also the main factors depending on which the individual's authority overcomes corporate authority. In a study conducted in 2000

Bansal and Roth demonstrated through a qualitative research that the main reasons for which a company chooses to become environmentally responsible are: competitiveness, legitimacy, ecological responsibility, issue salience, field cohesion and personal concern. Personal concern can be viewed as the beliefs and personal values of the managers who make impactful decisions for the company (Bansal & Roth, 2000).

As far as managers` personal interest is concerned, Bansal and Roth(2000) suggest that personal values influence the decision-making, considering they help the individual to discern when the company is in a crisis situation. The same study shows that managerstend to be more responsive to organizational changes if these changes are based on values that coincide with their personal values. Bansal and Kendall argue that overlapping personal values with the organizational ones could be an influencing factor for the company's activity.

Studies reveal the factors that lead managers to engage in CSR campaigns, grouped in to categories: *extrinsic* and *intrinsic* (Weaver, Treviño & Cochran, 1999). Extrinsic factors refer to knowledge of legislation in the field of social responsibility and media interest regarding ethics and compliance issues Intrinsic factors refer to managers` personal values. Weaver et al. (1999) has shown that extrinsic factors determine the existence or non-existence of social responsibility programs, while intrinsic factors determine the values that such programs are based on.

Recent studies have been addressing the link between CSR campaigns and personal values of CSR managers. CSR campaigns are considered to be influenced by the self-interest and personal values of the managers who coordinate it. In this context the company becomes just an agent of implementation of the campaign (Hemingway & Maclagan, 2004).

The same conclusions were also highlighted by the authors of a UK study which investigated the motivation of managers to engage in actions to protect the environment: "While the economic arguments and external pressure played an important role in engaging in campaigns for environmental protection, one of the most notable motivations of managers refer to personal values" (Williams & Schaefer, 2013, p.173).

CSR and personal values of Romanian managers

In Romania, research is very poor in terms of interdependence analysis between personal values and involvement of managers in CSR campaigns, covering only the role of emotions in this process and the social causes most of the managers choose to follow (Borţun & Borţun, 2011; Ivan, 2011). Ivan

(2011) makes a correlation between prosocial behavior based on emotions and responsible behavior of corporations. The author explains the phenomenon of prosocial behavior by the individual intention to avoid negative emotions (Ivan, 2011). In other words, an individual may choose to be responsible in a certain situation because a contrary action might generate him a negative emotional state. By analogy Corporate Social Responsibility actions could be interpreted as an attempt of companies to empathize with the community they work with to attract trust and long term relationships. Ivan's (2011) study does not focus on the relationship between personal values of managers and their involvement in CSR campaigns.

Other research from Romania refers to the purpose for which local companies are involved in CSR campaigns. The majority of the national companies fits in a managerial model and aims to promote and maintain the company's reputation through the CSR campaigns (Crişan, Reveiu & Andruscenco, 2011).

The research conducted by Borţun and Borţun (2011, p.303) shows that most of the managers in Romania (73%) engage in CSR campaigns addressing the community, while 72% address social responsibility towards employees, followed by those which address responsibility towards clients (66%). 50% of the Romanian managers were involved in CSR campaigns addressing the environment, 29% directed at partner companies, 28% at NGOs and 26% developed CSR campaigns dedicated to suppliers and shareholders.

Taking into account past research, qualitative research is necessary to reveal whether there is a link between personal values of social responsibility managers in Romania and their involvement in various types of CSR campaigns. Also, for the progression of scientific research of this field, I consider it necessary to investigate whether managers' personal values are reflected in the CSR campaign messages they coordinate.

CSR decision-making in Romania. Influences of organizational authority and individual authority

Research questions

This article aims to identify the ratio between the organizational authority and the individual authority of CSR managers, based on personal values, in decision making process concerning their involvement in CSR campaigns. Also, if personal values play an important role in decision-making process,

an important approach is to establish to what extent these values coincide with organizational values to determine whether such campaigns are developed in a pro-corporate or pro-individual manner. Finally, the pro-corporate or pro-individual orientation can be identified by the values transmitted through the CSR campaigns' messages.

Thus, the research questions are:

Q1: What is the ratio between the organizational authority and the individual authority concerning the first 100 companies in Romania?

Q2: Are Romanian CSR managers influenced by personal values to engage in CSR campaigns? If yes, to what extent these values converge with organizational values?

Q3: Are the CSR managers' values reflected in the messages of the CSR campaigns they coordinate?

Methodology

For the purposes of this research, a semi-structured interview was conducted on 10 CSR managers in the top 100 companies in Romania by turnover according to the latest ratings published by the Financial Newspaper in 2014. Random sampling was applied, each tenth company in the list being chosen. The research method was chosen in accordance with the research objectives and with literature, considering many exploratory studies are conducted through qualitative methods (Crisan et al., 2011; Kassel, 2012). Interviews are exploratory and help us determine whether there is an influence of personal values in making decisions on CSR campaigns.

The main concepts operationalized in this research are: *individual authority* and *authority of the organization* in the context of creating the CSR campaigns' messages that CSR managers from top 100 companies in Romania are coordinating.

The units of analysis in this research are the manager of CSR, the organization for which is undergoing the CSR campaign and the campaign's message.

The research was conducted between February 1st and April 20th, 2015.

To answer the first research question (Q1: What is the ratio between the organizational authority and the individual authority concerning the first 100 companies in Romania?) I have used the following measurement: the main area of the *organizational authority* is represented by the vertical

decision making, while individual authority is embodied by the horizotal decision making.

To answer the second research question (Q2: Are Romanian CSR managers influenced by personal values to engage in CSR campaigns? If yes, to what extent these values converge with organizational values?) I have used the following measurement: the main areas of convergence between organizational authority and personal one are - coincidence between personal values and the values of the company, reflection of personal values in the campaigns that managers have coordinated throughout time, tendency to solve work tasks according to personal values although internal rules suggest otherwise.

To answer the third research question (Q3: Are the CSR managers' values reflected in the messages of the CSR campaigns they coordinate?) I have used the following measurement: the main areas of reflection of the CSR managers' values in the messages of the CSR campaigns they coordinate are - organizations' values found in the message, managers' personal values found in the message, department that aproves the CSR massage.

Research results

Q1: What is the ratio between the organizational authority and the individual authority concerning the first 100 companies in Romania by turnover?

Research results show that the CSR manager's authority largely overcomes company authority as long as the decisions do not involve large budgets and changes in corporate strategy. Observing the relationship between the two types of authorities we may conclude that the CSR manager can influence decisions on the campaigns they coordinate. We see such this type of decision-making process developing from the bottom up and not vice versa. CSR campaigns result after many stakeholders' dialogues whose opinions reach the CSR department and are integrated in the CSR campaigns to meet the stakeholder's social needs. The only moment when the authority of the organization interferes is when the CSR strategy is incorporated within the overall business strategy. This conclusion is not influenced neither by the experience of the CSR managers, nor by the period they worked in the company. The most experienced manager, of those surveyed, worked for the company for 13 years, and the newest for almost a year. What do they all had in common is that they began working within the PR department and got involved with the CSR department within the same company or of other companies:

"I arrived here in 2009 for a PR coordinator position, also having CSR responsibilities. After a few years the two departments were separated and I became the CSR coordinator of the company" (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a telecom company).

"I began working in the company in 2010 and started working on PR, then in 2012 I continued with CSR" (2 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

"I started in 2002, originally as a social worker in a domestic violence program. I had worked in another department of the company before. The aim was to coagulate all their activities, but they wanted to create a more substantial program. The former Director was gone and they promoted me as the new one" (12 years as a social worker and 7 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a pharmaceutical company).

Taking into account that the experience in the field ranges from one manager to the other, the number of CSR campaigns also ranges from twenty to one.

Most of the interviewed managers said that decisions about the CSR department programs are made by the Corporate Communications department to which it belongs. This shows how the company has set up a control mechanism to a decision level closer to the CSR department. In very few companies the decisions concerning the CSR activities are taken by top management or by the CEO (Corporate Executive Officer). The interviewed managers stressed that the decision-making process in the company in connection with the CSR activities differs depending on the complexity of the decision. If several departments are involved, the decision is made generally by top management or by the executive office of the company. If that activity relates only to the CSR department, most often the decision is made in the Corporate Communications department or even within the CSR department:

"It depends on the campaign itself. The decision could involve only the CSR department and it is subordinated to senior management and approved by top management, but if it involves multiple departments then it needs other departments' approvment. The CSR department is not the only one which develops CSR activities in the company. It is a cross-company activity" (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a telecom company).

"We have a CSR board of the company. We decide early what projects we support and approve through this CSR board. After all, these decisions are

made inside the CSR department" (2 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

"The CSR department is the same with the Corporate Communication department whose leading person is the CEO of the company. We are 3 people working in this department and all of us respond and are subordinated directly to the CEO. That means that the projects are approved by the CEO" (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in an oil company).

"It depends on the decision. Daily decisions that are not strategic; changes are made inside the CSR department. Budget approvals, big actions, approvals of strategy are made at the management level with the involvement of shareholders, the CEO and the CFO (Chief Financial Officer)" (7 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a pharmaceutical company).

"It depends on the project and its purpose. In general the CSR decisions are approved in the communications department" (2 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

All the interviewed managers unanimously supported that the CSR strategy of the company is directly linked to the company's business strategy, some of them acknowledging that they borrowed a few strategic lines of their parent companies:

"The basic idea is to create a sustainable business which delivers benefits not only from the commercial point of view but also from the social one for the community in which it operates. Everything we do with commercial or non-commercial purposes, all must be considered through the idea of social responsibility. This is the philosophy of the company" (2 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a telecom company).

"There are three areas: financial education and entrepreneurship, education for children from disadvantaged areas and urban development. It is a strategy determined after an investigation through which we asked our stakeholders which should be the directions in which the company should invest" (4 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

"We have a number of policies inherited from the group that defined all kinds of lines to follow. Now, in terms of strategy, perhaps the most relevant would be to follow traditional projects that we have developed by now to meet the needs that are aligned with our priorities. We will also try to identify other needs in the community" (2 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

"We focus on health, which is directly related to the object of our activity. Even domestic violence issues are directly related to health; through supporting civil society we aim to develop impactful projects. We support leaders, models, the national Olympians` math lot. Our commitment to responsible citizenship education is manifested by increasing practical skills" (7 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a pharmaceutical company)*.*

From this we can deduce that the control mechanism on CSR campaigns is internal if their strategy is provided/developed by the business strategy.

Regarding the negative effects that their companies produce in society and that are the starting points of the CSR strategy, the interviewed managers claimed to identify these effects have a continuous dialogue with the stakeholders of the company:

"There is a stakeholder dialogue because we have certain lines of business. We want to see if what interests us is relevant to them as well. Then we mix and match and make a strategy" (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a telecom company).

"We're conducting stakeholders' interviews. Every year we report to the group. There are surveys made by our colleagues from the group and sent to us. We apply them and we send them back to be interpreted" (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in an oil company).

"In our company the negative effects are analyzed in the Department of Sustainable Development, while the CSR department is independent. This department analyzes our presence in communities, both physically and economically, and possible problems/ threats being identified which we seek to solve" (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

"I cannot say that we develop a rigorous analysis or that we think a lot about our impact. We do analyze the marketing services. I do not have the necessary knowledge of conducting such an analysis" (2 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a telecom company).

"We always ask for feedback and we have a very close relationship with our stakeholders" (2 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

All companies whose CSR managers were interviewed choose their reasons for social engagement and the basic criteria for their CSR campaigns according to the company`s business strategy which is strongly linked to the CSR strategy. Another important criteria are the social issues that their stakeholders consider important:

"Our strategy is quite stable. We use the same method. If we were to identify new opportunities, we would conduct interviews with stakeholders." (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a telecom company).

"First we have our area of interest correlated with health. We also have partnerships with other NGOs, which are included in our general strategy. All of this is related to health and domestic violence. When choosing new opportunities we look at the activities to be performed and decide if the beneficiary group is within our area of interest, the geographical area, the impact of the project and its budget. We always choose projects through which we know we can make a difference" (7 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a pharmaceutical company)*.*

"We receive many requests for sponsorship. These opportunities come to us, and we say yes or no depending on several parameters, or look in the market and choose the best partner for what we want to do. The professionalism of the partner and its image on the market are highly important factors" (2 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

Through the answers to these questions we can see again how the decision-making process starts from the end consumer and goes to the company.

Although they said the CSR strategy is always linked to the business strategy, the interviewed managers made a distinction between choosing the opportunity involvement in society and the impact of the CSR campaigns since most said that the immediate impact of the campaign is not directly reflected in business, but its effects are visible on long term.

"There is not a very strong connection between high profile business strategy and CSR strategy. We rely more on sponsorship" (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a telecom company).

"No direct link. It is rather a way of being of the company. For example supporting theatre festivals is not tied to corporate income. I am convinced that this effect happens because since the communities we target with our programs see our activities and will be more attached to our brand" (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in an oil company).

"Because we are focusing on health, we should educate people to be healthy and that it's important to be informed. As far as domestic violence is concerned, we focus on awareness because it is an issue that must not be accepted. Domestic violence is a problem that affects 90% of women in Romania and our main customers are women and 80% of our employees are

women" (7 years as CSR practitioner, now working in a pharmaceutical company)*.*

One manager said there is a link between the business strategy and the CSR strategy:

"Certainly there is a link. It's very important to be able to do business in a sustainable way and think the business long term" (2 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

In most of the analyzed companies, the decisions about the progress of the CSR campaigns are made within a department that creates a link between the Executive Director's office (CEO - Chief Executive Officer) and the CSR department. When the decision involves extensive financial plans or major strategic changes, campaigns are approved by the CEO or by the Chief Financial Officer (CFO - Corporate Financial Officer), but this is not generalized in all the analyzed companies. In several of them the decision was made within the CSR department. Some companies have formed a special department for making CSR decisions, consisting of Board members (top management), Corporate Communications department members and CSR Department members. *"I go to shareholders if it is a large campaign. If it is a small one, we approve it within the CSR department"*. As Ligeti and Oracvez (2009) reveal CSR is still considered as a separated activity by decision makers, while CSR communication is part of the corporate communication as a whole.

According to the answers of the interviewed managers, the individual authority supersedes the organizational authority up to the level of decisions concerning large investments or significant changes within the company's strategy. Most companies have created an intermediate mechanism for the supervision of the decisions made in the CSR department either as a CSR Board involving individuals in the executive office of the company and the CSR department, or as a Corporate Communications department where the CSR department is integrated within the PR department

This conclusion confirms the conclusions of authors Hemingway and Maclagan (2004) as the "*commercial imperative*" is not the only factor according to which decisions on CSR campaigns are made. The two authors suggest that the evolution of CSR campaigns is directly related to the evolution of CSR managers' personal values. Thus, responsibility starts to become less corporate and more individual. This move assigns to the organization the function of an agent in assuming responsibility to the community and gives more and more importance to the CSR manager. In

addition, the CSR campaigns' drivers are linked to the organizational culture and CSR managers' or CEO's personal values also in Hungary (Ligeti & Oravecz, 2009), Brazil (Duarte, 2010) and China (Wang, Gao, Hodgkinson, Rousseau & Flood, 2015). Even at first sight the main CSR drivers stay the same (personal values) in the estern part of the world Wang et al. (2015) reveal a difference: employees, consumers and government pressure has also an important role in CSR campaigns while competitors' pressure have not.

Q2: Are Romanian CSR managers influenced by personal values to engage in CSR campaigns? If yes, to what extent these values converge with organizational values?

Most of the interviewed managers said that personal values coincide with the values of the company where they work: honesty, sincerity, kindness, respect, diplomacy, social development catalyst. All these values are reflected in CSR campaigns that managers have developed over time. Also, they unanimously said that they are attracted by work assignments that coincide with their personal values:

"Yes. I think you're invariably drawn to tasks that concern you against something that does not concern you" (7 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a pharmaceutical company)*.*

"Yes. The values I have help me a lot in tasks that I have to fulfill"; "Yes. Very rarely they do not match" (2 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

"Yes. That's why I work here. If I feel that what I do is not clear and not in line with my values, I would not do it at all." (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

"Of course. It`s interesting getting out of my comfort zone, but not very often" (2 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in an oil company).

One single manager said that when coming to work he delimitates himself by personal beliefs and acts according to the company beliefs:

"When I come to work I usually try to disregard what I think particularly of certain subjects and act according to what is best for the company" (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a telecom company).

Most CSR managers would not engage in a job task that does not coincide with their personal values. Some of them acted against the rules of procedure, others did not:

"Yes. Unfortunately I have to be subjective. Whenever there is a situation that must be resolved according to the regulation in a way that I do not agree with, I come up with arguments to show that the regulation is not ok. Sometimes we must work around it a little bit to resolve it" (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

"No. Regulation does not provide anything" (5 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a oil company).

"Maybe I just sometimes have claimed more ardently for some reasons that were more in line with my values though they were not aligned with the company's values" (4 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a retail company)

"I like to think that my values and the company values are aligned, since I have never needed to do that" (5 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

Largely, the surveyed managers said they are passionate about what they do and their personal values are highlighted unequivocally through the campaigns they coordinate. One manager said there were projects that he wanted to implement, but was not able to because its directions do not coincide with the business highlights of the company:

"I think the first feeling concerning anything is to give a personal response which you do not always have? I try to pass it through the filter of the business needs that I know I have to work with. There were projects that I wanted to do, but I could not. And rationalizing and thinking really why I could not do them, I went over them" (5 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a telecom company).

Q3: Are the CSR managers' values reflected in the CSR campaigns' messages they coordinate?

In most cases, the personal values of the managers are also included in the campaign messages they coordinate, although one of them said that the message belongs to the company, not to the manager:

"The last was not necessarily a campaign, but rather an educational project. We act strategically towards education. It is very important for us. The

message was supposed to support digital education, referring to the fact that we support programming for the children because it is a resource that they can use in the future. First this is the company's message not my own but it coincides with my personal values concerning education. If you lack education there is nothing you can do in life" (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a telecom company)

"This year, during the projects competition we focused heavily on transparency. I interacted with the participants all the time, and this is a value that banks generally have and that coincides with one of my values, namely honesty" (5 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

"I work at the Mentor program and its message refers to the fact that we reward those who have educated us, which helped us to become who we are. In this message one of my values appears, which is sensibility to problems or things in my community, recognition and respect to those who deserve it" (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in an oil company).

The messages of these campaigns have been approved by the departments of CSR after the intermediate departments of decision making or the executive of the company were consulted, which once again confirms the conclusion of the first research questions, namely that CSR managers can make decisions on directions of their department, as long as they do not interfere with the strategic development of the company:

"We have consulted with other departments, but the final approval has been made by us and top management" (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a telecom company).

"The message was approved by the board of CSR which includes nine people: three from top management, 3 from middle management, an employee representative, and two representatives from the Department of CSR" (5 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a bank).

"I approved the CSR message within our department. We could also involve the Department of Communications but that is a matter of cooperation" (3 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a retail company)

"The message was designed and implemented by us and presented to the top management, but the decision was made in the CSR department" (7 years as a CSR practitioner, now working in a pharmaceutical company)*.*

The research limitations

This study has an exploratory character and opens new lines of research regarding the model of internal communication in decision making processes on CSR campaigns and how power is distributed, as defined by Manuel Castells (2009) between the two courts (corporation - CSR manager). As the company becomes an agent of developing CSR activities, future research should focus on the analysis of the mechanism of power sharing between the two poles: individual and corporation in CSR activities.

Conclusions

This article addressed the relationship between the organizational authority and the individual authority in making decisions within CSR campaigns. According to the research, one of the most important conclusions of this study is that the process of decision making in the organization, in the context of a CSR campaign is achieved from the bottom up. The only responsibility of the company is to ensure that the high CSR activities involving considerable budgets are strategically aligned with the business development. Regarding small campaigns, they can be approved directly by the CSR department.

The CSR managers are strongly influenced by their personal values when they engage in a new campaign development. In most cases their personal values coincide with the values of the organization. Most managers said there were situations that were opposed to internal company regulation because, according to their personal set of values, the tasks which they had to implement did not correspond with their values.

Most of the managers' personal values correspond generally to the company values which means that most of them are found in the CSR campaign messages.

In this study we observed that the ratio between the company and the individual's authority is rather favorable to the CSR manager. The conclusions of international studies, cited in this article, also applies to companies that are engaged in CSR in Romania, meaning that they become agents of CSR campaigns, while still retaining a minimum degree of authority regarding the campaign's budget and alignment with the business strategy. When discussing CSR campaigns, content is the factor that makes the difference. A possible explanation for augmenting the individual authority on CSR campaigns refers to the fact that these campaigns are designed by the company's stakeholders, but this should be investigated in

future studies. In order to meet social needs, the company needs a human interface to understand these needs, and this interface is the CSR manager.

References

Aguinis, H., and Glavas, A. (2012). What We Know and Don't Know About Corporate Social Responsibility: A Review and Research Agenda. *Journal of Management*, 38(4), 932-968.

Bansal, P., and Roth, K. (2000). Why companies go green: A model of ecological responsiveness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(4), 717-736.

Borțun, M., and Borțun, I. (2011). Percepții despre RSC și acțiuni RSC. Cercetare în rândurile managerilor din România (Perceptions about CSR and CSR activities. Research among Romanian managers). In D. Borțun (coord.) *Responsabilitatea Socială Corporativă: De la relații publice la dezvoltare durabilă (Corporate Social Responsibility: From public relations to sustainable development)*(pp.302-308). București: Tritonic.

Castells, M. (2009). *Communication y poder (Communication power)*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial S.A.

Crișan, C., Reveiu, A., and Andruscenco, M. (2011). Un tablou sinoptic al RSC în România. Top 100cele mai mari companii – 2009 (A snapshot of CSR in Romania. Top 100 largest companies – 2009). In D. Borțun (coord.) *Responabilitatea Socială Corporativă: De la relații publice la dezvoltare durabilă (Corporate Social Responsibility: From public relations to sustainable development)* (pp.289-301). București: Tritonic.

Duarte, F. (2010). Working with Corporate Social Responsibility in Brazilian Companies: The Role of Managers' Values in the Maintenance of CSR cultures. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96(3), 355-368.

Friedman, M. (1970). The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits. *New York Times Magazine*. Retrieved from http://goo.gl/vNtlzt.

Haigh, M., and Jones M. T. (2006). The Drivers of Corporate Social Responsibility: A Critical Review. *The Business Review, Cambridge*, 5(2), 245-251.

Hay, R., and Gray, Ed. (1974). Social responsibilities of business managers. *Academy of Management Journal*, 17(1), 135-143.

Hemingway, C.A., and Maclagan, P.W. (2004). Managers' Personal Values as Drivers of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 50(1), 33-44.

Hemingway, C.A. (2005). Personal Values as a Catalyst for Corporate Social Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 60(3), 233-249.

Ivan, L. (2011). Comportament prosocial și RSC. Rolul emoțiilor în situații de interdependență de tip RSC (Prosocial behavior and CSR. The role of emotions in interdependent CSR contexts). In D. Borțun (coord.). *Responabilitatea Socială Corporativă: De la relații publice la dezvoltare durabilă (Corporate Social Responsibility: From public relations to sustainable development)*(pp.157-165). București: Tritonic.

Kassel, K. (2012). The Circle of Inclusion: Sustainability, CSR and the Values that Drive Them. *Journal of Human Values*, 18(2), 133-146.

Koppel, J.G.S. (2008). Global Governance Organizations: Legitimacy and Authority in Conflict. *Journal of Public Administration, Theory and Review*, 18(2), 177-203.

Ligeti, G, and Oravecz, A. (2009). CSR Communication of Corporate Enterprizes in Hungary. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 84(2), 137-149.

Mason, S.E., and Mudrack, P.E. (1997). Are individuals who agree that corporate social responsibility is a fundamentally subversive doctrine inherently unethical? *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46(2), 135-152.

Mudrack, P. (2007). Individual personality factors that affect normative beliefs about the rightness of corporate social responsibility. *Business & Society*, 46(1), 33-62.

Pedersen, R.E. (2010). Modelling CSR: How Managers Understand the Responsibilities of Business Towards Society. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91(2), 155–166.

Roșca, C.A., and Stănescu, D.F. (2014). The Influence of Values on the Leadership Style. *Management Dynamics in the Knowledge Economy*, 2(3), 480-491.

Schwartz, M. (2001). Management as the spirit of the modern age. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 29(1-2), 189-198.

Wang, S., Gao, Y., Hodgkinson, G.P., Rousseau, D.M., and Flood, P.C. (2015). Opening the Black Box of CSR Decision Making: A PolicyCapturing Study of Charitable Donation Decisions in China. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(3), 665-683.

Weaver, G.R., Treviño, L.K., and Cochran, P.L. (1999). Corporate ethics programs as control systems: Influences of executive commitment and environmental factors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(1), 41-57.

Williams, S., and Schaefer, A. (2013). Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises and Sustainability: Managers' Values and Engagement with Environmental and Climate Change Issues. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 22(3), 173-186.

APPENDIX

Interview Guide

Sir / Madam, with your permission, we will have a discussion about aspects of decision-making in CSR campaigns. This study is part of my doctoral research studies at the Doctoral School of SNSPA.

Before starting the discussion on this issue, it is important to ensure you about the confidentiality of our discussion. No one outside of this project will learn the identity of persons involved in the research.

Because this discussion is very important for us, we ask permission to record our conversation on a tape for not losing any detail in achieving the research report.

Firstly, please tell me some things about yourself and the company you work for. (10 minutes)
- How did you begin working in this company? How long have you been working for the company? For how long have you been working in the CSR department? Have you worked in other departments of the same company before?
- What is your experience in the field of CSR? How long have you worked before in this area? What CSR campaigns have you managed so far in the company?
- What is the decision-making process in the company? What about inside the CSR department?

How is your company getting involved in society? (10 minutes)
- What is the company's social responsibility strategy?
- How do you analyze the negative effects that the company produces in society?
- How do you choose the opportunities for social involvement?

How do you choose the themes of the CSR campaigns you manage? (10 minutes)
- What are the criteria for choosing the topics of CSR campaigns?
- What is the connection between CSR campaigns and business strategy of the company?
- Which department approves the CSR campaigns in the company?
Each person is guiding itself generally by a particular set of values in personal life and at work. What about your values on personal life / workplace? (5 minutes)
- What are your personal values?

- Are you usually attracted by work tasks that coincide with your personal values?
- What personal values coincide with the values of the company where you work?
- Which of these values are reflected in the campaigns that you have coordinated throughout time?

In which way do your personal values interfere with the work you are doing in the company? (5 minutes)
- Have you ever had a tendency to solve work tasks according to your personal values although internal rules suggest otherwise?
- How do you value your personal beliefs in the work you are doing now?

Tell me how did you created the CSR message for the last campaign in which you were involved? (5 minutes)
- Which of the organization's values are found in the message?
- Which of your personal values are found in the message?
- The message was approved by the CSR department or by the top management?

How do you think the CSR department should be positioned within a company? (5 minutes)
- Is it necessary that the department is be able to take its own decisions?
- Should the CSR manager be subordinated or be part of the top management?

Do you consider that we have anything to add about the involvement of CSR managers in the campaigns they coordinate?