



ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE MANAGEMENT AS A CATALYST FOR CORPORATE CITIZENSHIP

Fatma BENABED *

University of Ammar Thlidji - Laghouat

f.benabed.vac@lagh-univ.dz

Laboratory of Affiliation

Boualem MESSAOUDI

University of Ammar Thlidji - Laghouat

blm.messaoudi@lagh-univ.dz

Laboratory of Affiliation

Send Article Date: 03-04-2026

Date of acceptance of the article: 30-04-2026

Abstract

The contemporary business landscape is increasingly characterized by a demand for organizations to transcend profit-maximization and act as responsible corporate citizens. This article argues that authentic and effective corporate citizenship (CC) cannot be a superficial adjunct to strategy but must be deeply rooted in and fostered by a deliberately managed organizational culture. Through a synthesis of management theory, organizational behavior, and business ethics literature, this paper examines the mechanisms by which culture management functions as the critical enabler of CC. It posits that culture provides the normative framework, value system, and behavioral scripts that make citizenship activities coherent, sustainable, and legitimate. The analysis explores key levers of culture management leadership, values articulation, socialization processes, and reward systems and their alignment with dimensions of CC, including ethical integrity, social engagement, and environmental stewardship. The article concludes that a strategically managed, citizenship-oriented culture is not merely supportive but foundational to transforming the modern corporation from an economic entity into a societal citizen.

Keywords: Contemporary business management; corporate citizenship (CC); Organizational culture. JEL classification: M1,M2.

Introduction:

The concept of Corporate Citizenship (CC) has evolved from peripheral philanthropy and public relations to a core strategic paradigm encompassing a firm's economic, legal, ethical, and discretionary responsibilities toward society (Carroll, 1991). It

* Fatma BENABED.



signifies recognition of the corporation's embeddedness within a broader social contract. However, a persistent challenge lies in the implementation gap—the dissonance between aspirational citizenship statements and actual organizational practices. This article contends that this gap is, fundamentally, a cultural deficit.

Organizational culture, defined as the shared assumptions, values, beliefs, and norms that govern behavior within an organization (Schein, 2010. P 20), acts as the organization's "internal compass." It determines how priorities are set, decisions are made, and what is celebrated or sanctioned. Consequently, the cultivation of genuine CC requires more than policy manuals; it necessitates the deliberate management of organizational culture to instill citizenship as a core element of corporate identity and daily operation. (Murdock, G. 1999. p 23.)

Corporate citizenship refers to the extent to which businesses are socially responsible for their actions and the impact these actions have on society.

It might sound like it's about just being philanthropic, but true corporate citizenship goes deeper. In reality, it has much to do with environmental, social and governance (ESG) principles.

This means ideas such as reducing emissions, reducing waste, respecting employee welfare and engaging in positive community outreach programmes.

Firms that practice strong corporate citizenship embed these principles within their company strategy, meaning they can create financial success while considering every group of stakeholders their work impacts. Think of it as the most holistic, rounded approach to modern business.

That's the trickiest part. Why should we give this so much attention, especially when it might appear to go against fiduciary duty at the surface? If corporate citizenship focuses on all groups besides shareholders, why bother?

To understand the answer, you need to think long-term. And before anything else, you should remember that corporate citizenship is what many modern shareholders want to see as part of a rounded and thought-out strategy.

Ultimately, corporate citizenship builds a company's reputation, fosters loyalty among customers and employees, and can lead to increased attention from investors and less pressure from regulators.

Board members are pivotal in embedding corporate citizenship into a company's ethos. As the ultimate authority in strategic decisions, they have the power to ensure that a company's actions exemplify its beliefs.

If your company chooses to pursue good corporate citizenship, it's up to the board to make decisions demonstrating that while maintaining financial success at all times.

This means ensuring topics relevant to corporate citizenship are on the agenda at board meetings, applying appropriate metrics, and employing the correct reporting and communication strategies, all while being able to show that the company remains fiscally healthy.

The board is the source of the standards a company will follow and which outside stakeholders will judge it on. It's a crucial role.

Corporate citizenship is integral to most modern businesses because of the weight of stakeholder expectations.

Done right, it reflects a company's commitment to ethical operation and social responsibility. Board members play a critical role in this; ensuring corporate strategies drive profitability and contribute positively to societal well-being.

Corporate citizenship means businesses are socially responsible and meet legal, ethical, and economic duties set by shareholders. Corporate citizenship is growing more important as investors seek companies with responsible environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practices.

Businesses tend to evolve through five stages of corporate citizenship: elementary, engaged, innovative, integrated, and transforming. There are mutual benefits of corporate social responsibility (CSR) for both society and corporations, including enhanced brand loyalty and employee engagement. Starbucks is an example of a company that grounds its company ethos in corporate citizenship. (Lash, S. 2001. p 105)

- Corporate citizenship encompasses a company's social, legal, ethical, and economic responsibilities.



- The demand for socially responsible companies is increasing as stakeholders seek alignment with their values.
- Companies progress through five stages of corporate citizenship, from elementary to transforming.
- CSR activities help improve employee morale and strengthen connections with communities.
- Starbucks exemplifies corporate citizenship with its commitment to sustainability and community engagement.
- Corporate citizenship refers to a company's responsibilities toward society. The goal is to produce higher standards of living and quality of life for the communities that surround them and still maintain profitability for stakeholders.
- Demand for responsible companies is growing, prompting investors, consumers, and employees to push management to align with their values or face negative impacts.
- All businesses have basic ethical and legal responsibilities; however, the most successful businesses establish a strong foundation of corporate citizenship, showing a commitment to ethical behavior by creating a balance between the needs of shareholders and the needs of the community and environment in the surrounding area. These practices help bring in consumers and establish brand and company loyalty.

In 2010, the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) released a set of voluntary standards meant to help companies implement corporate social responsibility.

Companies progress through stages of corporate citizenship based on their support for community activities, understanding community needs, and integrating citizenship into their culture and structure.

The Stages of Corporate Citizenship Development

The five stages of corporate citizenship are defined as:

- Elementary;
- Engaged;
- Innovative;
- Integrated;
- Transforming. (Hermes, J. 1997. p 39.)

In the elementary stage, a company's citizenship efforts are basic due to low corporate awareness and little management involvement. Small businesses often stay in this stage, complying with standard laws but lacking the resources for deeper community involvement.

In the engagement stage, companies will often develop policies that promote the involvement of employees and managers in activities that exceed rudimentary compliance to basic laws. Citizenship policies become more comprehensive in the innovative stage, with increased meetings and consultations with shareholders and through participation in forums and other outlets that promote innovative corporate citizenship policies.

In the integrated stage, citizenship activities are formalized and blend in fluidly with the company's regular operations. Performance in community activities is monitored, and these activities are driven into the lines of business.

In the transforming stage, corporate citizenship becomes a key strategy for companies. It drives sales growth, market expansion, and talent acquisition, while reducing capital costs and building brand loyalty. Economic and social involvement is intertwined with daily operations.

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a broad concept of corporate citizenship that can take various forms depending on the company and industry. Through CSR programs, philanthropy, and volunteer efforts, businesses can benefit society while boosting their own brands.

CSR is valuable for both communities and companies. It strengthens employee-corporation bonds, boosts morale, and helps them feel more connected to the world.

To be socially responsible, a company must first be accountable to itself and its shareholders. Firms often adopt CSR after reaching a business stage where they can give back to society. Thus, CSR is primarily a strategy of large corporations. Also, the more visible and successful a corporation is, the more responsibility it has to set standards of ethical behavior for its peers, competition, and industry.

Even before its 1992 IPO, Starbucks was recognized for its strong corporate social responsibility and commitment to



sustainability and community welfare. Starbucks has achieved corporate citizenship milestones including:

- Reaching 99% ethically sourced coffee;
- Creating a global network of farmers;
- Pioneering green building throughout its stores;
- Contributing millions of hours of community service;
- Creating a groundbreaking college program for its partner/employees. (Griffiths, R. 1993. p 39)

Starbucks' goals include hiring 10,000 refugees across 75 countries, reducing the environmental impact of its cups, and engaging its employees in environmental leadership.

1- Theoretical Underpinnings: The Culture-Citizenship Nexus

The intersection of culture and citizenship is theorized through several lenses. "Institutional theory" suggests that organizations adopt CC practices to gain legitimacy within their institutional environment. A strong, congruent internal culture ensures these practices are "infused with value" (Selznick, 1957), moving beyond ceremonial adoption to become taken-for-granted aspects of organizational life. (Beaman, Jean, 2024, p 849)

"Social identity theory" posits that employees derive self-esteem from their organizational membership. A culture that visibly prioritizes ethical conduct and social contribution fosters a positive social identity, enhancing employee commitment and motivating citizenship behaviors both internally and externally.

Furthermore, the "resource-based view" (RBV) of the firm recognizes culture as a valuable, rare, and imperfectly imitable resource. A culture that reliably produces ethical and socially responsive behavior can constitute a sustainable competitive advantage, building trust with stakeholders and mitigating reputational risk.

Cultural citizenship is an evolving concept that expands the traditional understanding of citizenship, which historically focused on legal rights within a national framework. Originating from the idea of citizenship in ancient Greece, where it primarily applied to property owners, contemporary views now encompass a broader spectrum of identity and belonging. Cultural citizenship emphasizes the rights and recognition of individuals who identify with multiple cultures rather

than being tied to a single nation. This perspective is especially relevant in today's globalized, diasporic world, where people often move across borders and absorb diverse cultural norms and practices. (Cohen, Mitchell, 2010, p 81)

According to cultural anthropologist Renato Rosaldo, cultural citizenship acknowledges the importance of heritage and cultural identity, particularly for groups who may face social or economic disadvantages. It highlights the need for inclusivity in discussions about civil rights, ensuring that the voices and experiences of those with multi-faceted cultural identities are considered. While legal citizenship typically involves formal membership in a nation, cultural citizenship represents a more personal and intimate connection to various cultures, allowing individuals to claim belonging and rights in multiple contexts. This framework encourages respect for diverse perspectives and fosters a deeper understanding of what it means to belong in a multicultural society.

The concept of citizenship first arose in towns and city-states of ancient Greece, where it generally applied to property owners but not to women, enslaved people, or the poorer members of the community. The notion of citizenship has changed throughout the ages, most recently to one of national citizenship.

Thomas H. Marshall described three central rights granted by citizenship: civil rights, which entitle individuals to freedom of speech and to accessing local information, to assemble and organize without restrictions, and to be treated equally in law; *political rights*, which include the right to vote and run for office in free election; and *social rights*, which include the rights to welfare and social security and to unionize and participate in collective bargaining.

In an increasingly diasporic world, the notion of citizenship has been expanded to include those who claim to be a citizen of a culture rather than a nation. Those groups who feel that they are denied one or more of the three types of right described by Marshall may opt for cultural citizenship. These groups may regard themselves as part of various cultures and feel that they have citizenship in each country they have experienced. For example, a Vietnamese laborer who worked in Vietnam, then migrated to Australia, and then to Canada may claim a three-way cultural citizenship. This person may identify



with each of the three cultures' norms, values, beliefs, and traditions. While twenty-first century concepts of citizenship involve legal claims to a nation or country of origin, the concept of a cultural citizen is a personal endeavor that an individual can develop overtime within the confines of the cultural group. It can also be an individual's personal connection or intimate relation to a culture or people. 1 (Miller, Toby.2011, p 57)

According to cultural anthropologist "Renato Rosaldo", cultural citizenship argues that even in a situation of inequality, groups that find themselves facing disadvantages should hold on to their heritage. In many countries, a paradox exists in so far as a citizen of that country is supposed to be of that place, yet cultural citizen defies that notion and still deserve the same rights as other citizens. Therefore, the needs of these groups should be taken into consideration when debating civil rights.

Citizenship,' in the words of Martha Gellhorn, one of the last century's greatest war correspondents, 'is a tough occupation.' She believed that as citizens we are obliged to make our own informed opinion, and to stand by it. 'The evils of the time change,' she observed, 'but are never in short supply and would go unchallenged unless there were conscientious people to say: not if I can help it.' Dissent, based on morality and reason, is at the heart of what it means to be a citizen, in her view. And while the challenge of citizenship may be getting more difficult all of the time, there is nevertheless always room for optimism. 'There has to be a better way to run the world,' she insisted, 'and we better see that we get it. Precisely what is meant by the word 'citizenship', especially with regard to certain avowed rights, obligations or responsibilities associated with it, is historically-specific and will vary dramatically from one national context to the next. In any given society this process of definition is never secured once and for all, of course, but rather is subject to the contradictions of power, especially as they are experienced, negotiated and resisted as part of everyday life. It is by exploring a range of pressing questions at this level, the very materiality of our lived engagement with citizenship, that Nick Stevenson's Cultural Citizenship seeks to intervene in current debates. 'Cultural citizenship', he argues, is a newly emerging interdisciplinary concept that is

concerned with issues of recognition and respect, of responsibility and pleasure, and with visibility and marginality.

It encompasses politics with a capital and a small 'p', such that viewing a soap opera can be regarded as being just as political as voting in an election. At the same time, Stevenson contends, the concept of cultural citizenship is also concerned to search for a new ethics that can help guide us through these turbulent and contested times.

Cultural Citizenship brings together perspectives from political theory, social theory and cultural studies. The book's distinctiveness lies in its commitment to providing a critical examination of culture and citizenship that cuts across these disciplinary boundaries. In the case of multiculturalism, for example, Stevenson argues that it has been political theorists who have sought to investigate the normative significance of living in an increasingly pluralistic society. How does the polity in modern societies respond to a diversity of claims for recognition, from the physically-challenged to different ethnic minorities? Still, he suggests, it has been social theory that has perhaps most clearly sought to explain how these claims are linked to globalisation, new communication technologies, and the displacement of peoples from their host nation. Moreover, social theorists are more likely to be concerned with how the citizenship claims which emerge in this context are the result of ideological struggle, demands by social movements and questions of power and influence. Turning to cultural studies, Stevenson points out that important work has been undertaken to recover the subjugated knowledges of the displaced and marginalised. In this respect, then, multiculturalism goes beyond the struggle for political rights, entailing new forms of recognition for a wide range of cultural practices. Cultural Citizenship, in its critical assessment of the connections that can be discerned across these three areas of enquiry, invites new ways of thinking about citizenship for a new century. (Crook, S., Pakulski, p 41)

Recent debates within cultural studies and citizenship studies might suggest that culture and citizenship have little in common. The term 'culture' is usually associated with a mix of public and private institutions, including museums, libraries, schools, cinemas and the media, while more specifically being connected with the dialogic



production of meaning and aesthetics through a variety of practices. Citizenship, on the other hand, is more often thought to be about membership, belonging, rights and obligations. In institutional terms the terrain of citizenship is usually marked out by abstract legal definitions as to who is to be included and excluded from the political community. Yet whether we are talking about the risk society, network capitalism or the concerns of social movements, ideas of symbolic challenge and exclusion remain central.

The power to name, construct meaning and exert control over the flow of information within contemporary societies is one of today's central structural divisions. Power is not solely based upon material dimensions, but also involves the capacity to throw into question established codes and to rework frameworks of common understanding. This means that the locus of cultural citizenship will have to occupy positions both inside and outside the formal structures of administrative power. To talk of cultural citizenship means that we take questions of rights and responsibilities far beyond the technocratic agendas of mainstream politics and media. That is to say, we seek to form an appreciation of the ways in which 'ordinary' understandings become constructed, of issues of interpretative conflict and semiotic plurality more generally. In other words, how do questions of entitlement and duty relate to the diversity of culture evident within everyday life, and what is the relationship between an increasingly 'symbolic' society and the practice of politics? What modes of exclusion become apparent within an information society?

These concerns point to an age where our definitions of citizenship and society more generally are being transformed. Which community we owe our loyalties to, what foods are safe to eat, how important is the nation as opposed to more global concerns and how I might decide upon my sexuality all increasingly involve cultural questions. How we address these issues will depend upon shifting discourses and narratives that have become available to us in a variety of social contexts. As (Castells 1997, p 359) puts it, the 'sites of this power are people's minds'. Indeed, one of the central issues the book will seek to address is how we might provide fertile ground for what I shall call the cosmopolitan imagination. Many in the social sciences have neglected the idea of the imagination. Castoriadis (1997) has

argued that all societies are dependent upon the creation of webs of meaning that are carried by society's institutions and individuals. Society, then, is always a self-creation that depends upon norms, values and languages that help to give diverse societies a sense of unity.

The 'imaginary' is a social and historical creation, and serves to remind us that society must always create symbolic forms beyond the purely functional.

Cosmopolitanism is a way of viewing the world that among other things dispenses with national exclusivity, dichotomous forms of gendered and racial thinking and rigid separations between culture and nature. Such a sensibility would be open to the new spaces of political and ethical engagement that seeks to appreciate the ways in which humanity is mixed into intercultural ways of life. Arguably, cosmopolitan thinking is concerned with the transgression of boundaries and markers, and the development of an inclusive cultural democracy and citizenship. Yet cosmopolitanism is not only concerned with intermixing and the ethical relations between the self and the other, but seeks an institutional and political grounding in the context of shared global problems. A concern for cosmopolitan dimensions will inevitably seek to develop an understanding of the discourses, codes and narratives that make such political understandings a possibility. As Lawrence Grossberg (1992) has argued, 'no democratic political struggle can be effectively organized without the power of the popular'. However, before moving on to such questions it is important to try to understand how issues of culture and citizenship became caught up with each other. Here I will argue that we need to consider the development of questions of cultural citizenship within the contours of a shared information society. The emergence of such a society requires not only that we rethink our notions of culture and citizenship, but also that we seek to develop a new understanding of contemporary social transformations.

The idea of citizenship evokes a political tradition that is concerned to debate the involvement of individuals in shaping the laws and decisions of society. It has, however, only been in modern times that this has come to include people outside of a narrow class of educated property owners. While 'citizenship' has come to mean



something different in, say, Iran, Chile and Britain, here I want to concentrate upon the meanings that have become connected to the term in North America and Europe. More recently, it has been the understandings that have become connected to the late (T. H. Marshall's, 1992, p 1993) book *Citizenship and Social Class* that have had the greatest impact on ongoing debates.

T. H. Marshall, as is well known, was concerned with the historical development of civil, political and social rights in the British national context. Marshall drew attention to the contradiction between the formations of capitalism and class, and the principle of equality enshrined within the granting of basic rights. Such a view of citizenship was hardly surprising given that Marshall was writing in the 1940s and 1950s, when identity and social conflicts were dominated by class. The setting up of the welfare state, the possibility of full male employment, the nuclear family, the dominance of the nation-state and the separation between an elite literary culture and a popular mass culture all inform his dimensions of citizenship. Marshall perceived that the principle of civil and political rights had been granted in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, whereas the twentieth century had seen the acceptance of the idea of social rights.

As many of Marshall's critics have pointed out, however, questions of civil and political rights are far from settled, and social rights were threatened once the post-war compromise between capital and labour came under attack (Roche, 1994). (Further. Turner, 1994) argues that the postmodernization of culture and the globalization of politics have rendered much of the literature in respect of citizenship inadequate. The attack on traditional divisions between high and low culture poses serious questions in terms of the common or national cultures that might be transmitted by public institutions. The diversification and fragmentation of public tastes and lifestyles have undermined a previously assumed 'cultural' consensus. Further, the development of transnational spheres of governance, instantaneous news and global networks among new social movements has questioned the assumed connection between citizenship and the nation-state. These processes undermine, or at least call into question, the correspondence that citizenship has traditionally drawn between belonging and the nation-state. Marshall's analysis – while still

influential – fails to locate the state within a complex web of international flows and relations, while assuming that the ‘political’ works within stable national cultures. The context of increasing cultural diversity and globalization brings to the fore questions of cultural, as well as civil, political and social, rights.

More recently, Jan Pakulski (1997) has argued that ‘cultural’ citizenship should be viewed in terms of satisfying demands for full inclusion into the social community. Such claims should be seen in the context of the waning of the welfare state and class identities, and the formation of new social and cultural movements focusing on the rights of groups from children to the disabled. Cultural rights, in this sense, herald ‘a new breed of claims for unhindered representation, recognition without marginalisation, acceptance and integration without normalising distortion’ (Pakulski 1997). These rights go beyond rights for welfare protection, political representation or civil justice, and focus on the right to propagate a cultural identity or lifestyle.

These claims, however, are likely to be as problematic as the implementation of social rights. Pakulski suggests that there is already a perceived backlash against ‘politically correct’ programmes and unease about bureaucratic attempts to regulate the cultural sphere. These questions aside, Pakulski (1997) argues that any attempt to rethink models of citizenship would have to problematize questions of culture in ways that are not evident in Marshall’s initial formulation of citizenship (see also Turner 1994).

However, while criticisms of Marshall’s neglect of culture are well represented within the citizenship literature, there have been other attempts to link cultural and political questions more systematically to an analysis of modern society. While we might point here to the early Frankfurt School and others, I think Raymond Williams outlined a more germane level of enquiry.

In this context, Williams provides an interesting contrast with Marshall, given their shared context of post-war British society. What Williams (1965) termed the ‘long revolution’ was an attempt to link economic, social and political issues to cultural questions. Here he problematized the development of standardized cultural products, a paternalistic state and a capitalist economic system that had stalled the



possibility of a more participatory and genuinely diverse popular culture. Arguing in the context of British society in the 1960s, Williams suggested an alternative democratic framework, where a radically decentralized communications system would be open to the ‘challenge and view’ of a republic of voices (Williams 1962: 134). The idea was to represent the voices of ordinary people, artists and radical critics so that they might engage with a wider public on issues of common concern. As Ruth Lister (1997) has argued, liberal ideas of citizenship such as Marshall’s tend to emphasize the institutional development of rights. This view, as Williams (1989a) clearly understood, needs to be supplemented with a republican emphasis upon popular participation. A society of actively engaged citizens requires both the protection offered by rights and opportunities to participate. Williams, along with other members of the New Left, sought to move towards a society that saw the development of more substantial economic rights (through participation within the workplace), the establishment of a genuinely democratic polity and a diverse civic and popular culture.

Williams (1965) called the long revolution the historical possibility of realizing the creative and learning potential of the people. This would witness the creation of the material conditions for an enlightened, educated and participatory democracy through a socialist transformation of society. Such a society would create the conditions for free, open and authentic expression.

Williams offered an ‘ideal type’ of free communication when he wrote:

A good society depends upon the free availability of facts and opinions, and on the growth of vision and consciousness – the articulation of what men have actually seen and known and felt. Any restriction of the freedom of individual contribution is actually a restriction of the resources of society.

The dialectic of the long revolution is constituted through the contradiction between the maintenance of capitalism and the communicative ‘potential’ of ordinary people. That is, capitalism has facilitated the development of new technologies, broadened access to the education system and provided new means through which ‘the people’ could communicate with one another. However, the growth

of a synthetic popular culture and the continued existence of class divisions and cultural elitism have prevented the possibility of the development of what Williams (1989) termed a 'culture in common'. (Miller, Toby. 2011, p 04)

Unlike Marshall, then, Williams takes the organization of cultural production and the generation of a diversity of meanings to be central to the definition of modern society. The ways in which we communicate with one another and share cultural experiences cannot be considered a peripheral question in Williams's analysis. In this respect, he merges anthropological and artistic definitions of culture. For Williams, 'culture' signifies the dual meaning of a 'way of life' and the aesthetic creativity of artistic practices:

culture has two aspects: the known meanings and directions, which its members are trained to; the new observations and meanings, which are offered and tested. We use the culture in these two senses; to mean a whole way of life – the common meanings; to mean arts and learning – the special process of discovery and creative effort. (Adorno, T. 1991, p 65)

2- Mechanisms of Culture Management in Fostering Corporate Citizenship:

Effective culture management for CC involves the intentional shaping of several interconnected elements:

2.1- Leadership and Symbolic Management

Leaders are the chief architects and transmitters of culture. Their commitment to CC must be visible, consistent, and authentic. This involves "walking the talk", making decisions that prioritize long-term societal value over short-term gains, communicating the "why" behind citizenship initiatives, and serving as role models for ethical conduct (Maak & Pless, 2006). Symbolic actions, such as dedicating resources to community projects or tying executive compensation to sustainability metrics, send powerful signals about what the organization truly values.

2.2- Core Values Articulation and Integration

Citizenship must be encoded in the organization's core values. Values like "integrity," "responsibility," "respect," and "sustainability" must be clearly defined and operationalized. This means translating abstract values into behavioral expectations for



every role and level, from procurement officers selecting suppliers to sales teams interacting with customers.

2.3- Socialization and Training

Embedding CC requires systematic socialization. Onboarding programs should immerse new hires in the organization's citizenship narrative. Ongoing training must equip employees with the ethical reasoning skills and practical knowledge to enact citizenship values in complex situations, such as navigating ethical dilemmas or understanding the environmental impact of their work processes.

2.4- Structural and System Alignment

Culture is reinforced or undermined by formal systems. Performance management and reward structures must recognize and incentivize CC-aligned behaviors, not just financial outcomes. Promotion criteria should consider ethical leadership and community engagement. Similarly, communication systems should regularly highlight stories of employee citizenship, reinforcing desired norms.

2.5-Participative Dialogue and Empowerment

A paternalistic culture cannot foster authentic citizenship. Cultures that empower employees to voice concerns, suggest improvements related to social and environmental performance, and participate in volunteer programs foster a sense of ownership and agency. Open dialogue about ethical challenges builds a climate of psychological safety, crucial for speaking up against practices incompatible with CC.

3- Outcomes of a Citizenship-Oriented Culture:

When culture management successfully fosters CC, organizations realize tangible and intangible benefits:

- **Enhanced Reputation and Legitimacy:** Trust is built with consumers, investors, regulators, and communities.
- **Talent Attraction and Retention:** Employees, particularly from younger generations, seek purpose-driven employers.
- **Innovation:** A culture attuned to societal needs can drive sustainable innovation, opening new markets and improving resource efficiency.
- **Risk Mitigation:** An ethical culture is a primary defense against misconduct, scandals, and associated legal and financial penalties.

- Operational Resilience: Strong community relationships and stakeholder trust provide a buffer during crises.

4- Challenges and Critical Perspectives:

The project is not without challenges. It requires long-term commitment, often conflicting with short-term market pressures. Leaders may face tensions between competing stakeholder demands. Furthermore, there is a risk of “cultural cynicism” if initiatives are perceived as instrumental or “greenwashing.” A critical perspective warns against conflating managed cultural change with genuine moral transformation, highlighting the potential for co-optation of social agendas for corporate gain. Therefore, transparency, external verification (e.g., through rigorous sustainability reporting and audits), and genuine stakeholder engagement are essential safeguards.

Conclusion:

Cultivating the Corporate Citizen and Corporate citizenship is ultimately a cultural phenomenon. It is enacted through the daily choices and behaviors of individuals guided by a shared organizational ethos. Therefore, the strategic management of organizational culture is not a peripheral HR function but a central leadership imperative for any corporation aspiring to be a responsible citizen. By aligning deep-seated values, norms, and systems with the principles of CC, organizations can bridge the implementation gap, ensuring that their societal commitments are coherent, resilient, and authentic. In doing so, they do not merely manage their reputation; they cultivate an identity that contributes to both sustainable business success and the flourishing of the societies they inhabit.

Recommendations:

We recommend the following:

- Focus on continuous improvement;
- Improving top management;
- Reliance on artificial intelligence;
- More reliance on small and medium enterprises;
- Using the principles of organizational sociology to improve company performance.



References:

Books:

- Adorno, T. (1991), Culture and administration, in *The Culture Industry: Selected Essays on Mass Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Beaman, Jean. Citizenship as Cultural: Towards a Theory of Cultural Citizenship. *Sociology Compass*, vol. 10, no. 10, 2016 doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12415. Accessed 8 Nov. 2024.
- Benton, T. (1993), *Natural Relations: Ecology, Animal Rights and Social Justice*. London: Routledge.
- Cohen, Mitchell. T. H. Marshall's 'Citizenship and Social Class, Dissent Fall 2010.
- Crook, S., Pakulski, J. and Waters, M. (1992) *Postmodernization: Change in Advanced Society*. London: Sage.
- Hermes, J. (1997), Gender and media studies: no woman, no cry, in J. Corner, P. Schelisinger and R. Silverstone (eds) *International Media Research*. London: Routledge.
- Murdock, G. (1999), Rights and representations: public discourse and cultural citizenship, in J. Gripsrud (ed.) *Television and Common Knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Schein, E. H. (2010). "Organizational culture and leadership" (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration: A sociological interpretation*. Harper & Row.

Magazines:

- Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. "Business Horizons.
- Griffiths, R. (1993), The politics of cultural policy in urban regeneration strategies, *Policy and Politics*.
- Lash, S. (2001), *Technological forms of life, Theory, Culture and Society*.
- Maak, T., & Pless, N. M. (2006). Responsible leadership in a stakeholder society—a relational perspective. "Journal of Business Ethics".