



www.sjm06.com

Serbian Journal of Management 11 (1) (2016) 69 - 80

Serbian
Journal
of
Management

ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AS ONE OF THE MAIN FACTORS FOR THE SUCCESSFUL SAFETY MANAGEMENT

Snežana Živković^{a*} and Tatjana Ivanova^b

^aFaculty of occupational safety in Niš, University of Niš,
10a Čarnojevića st., 18000 Niš, Republic of Serbia

^bFaculty of Management, Ulyanovsk State University,
42 Leo Tolstoy st., 432017 Ulyanovsk, Russian Federation

(Received 28 March 2015; accepted 22 May 2015)

Abstract

The goal of this research is to establish the influence of organizational culture on the system of safety and health at work. The research sample included 556 respondents of various activities in Russia.

Based on the results, it can be concluded that there is a statistically significant connection of the Attitude towards occupational safety with 5 out of 7 aspects of organizational culture, as well as with the general factor of Usefulness of the manner of management. In addition, there is a statistically significant connection to age, total years of service and qualifications. Through a comparative analysis of results acquired in the Republic of Serbia and Russia, differences in attitudes towards safety and health activities at work were acquired i.e. there is a difference between the average answers of respondents from Serbia and Russia in the Attitude towards occupational safety which is on average slightly more prominent in respondents from Serbia. In relation to organizational culture aspects, there are differences in Vision, Credibility, Feedback and recognition as well as Responsibility. Respondents from Serbia have higher average values on all these measures, but all the differences are small (all effect sizes are below 0.2).

Keywords: organizational culture, safety management, safety and health, Serbia

1. INTRODUCTION

Culture is territory that has been examined and theorised from many different disciplinary perspectives. It has consequently been explored at several levels

from societal, national to organizational, and individual experiences at all these levels (Bryson, 2008). Although there are many definitions of culture, organizational culture has been viewed as holistic, historically determined, and socially constructed (Rashid

* Corresponding author: snezana.zivkovic@zmfak.ni.ac.rs

et al., 2004). Culture involves beliefs and behavior, exists at a various levels, and manifests itself in a wide range of features of organizational life (Hofstede et al., 1990). As such, organizational culture refers to a set of shared values, belief, assumptions, and practices that shape and guide members' attitudes and behavior in the organization (Davis, 1984; Denison, 1990; Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Miron et al., 2004; O'Reilly & Chatman, 1996; Wilson, 2001). Organizational cultures result from a learning process of interaction with its internal and external environment. Certain actions and procedures that have been successful in the past build up the basis of commonly accepted behaviors (Baumgartner & Zielowski, 2007). Organizational culture brings sense, orientation and stabilization into a complex and dynamic world. Its elements are transferred by a process of socialization (telling stories, observing rituals,...) and are not learned consciously (Schreyögg, 1991). Organizational culture acts as a sensemaking device that influences how people construct the reality of the organization in which they are a member (Brad et al., 2010).

Starting from the fact that at the center of studying organizational culture lie the system of values in an organization, identifying with strategies and the vision of the company's development, the connection of organizational culture to safety and health activities at work is clear. Safety and health activities at work place an employed individual at the center of their research with an intention to create better and safer work conditions for them. A common interest of organizational culture development and safety and health activities at work is creating safe work conditions and higher income which increases employees'

motivation and creates a stronger sense of security and belonging for all employees.

2. METHODOLOGY

The goal of the research is to establish the influence of organizational culture on the system of safety and health at work in order to create a clearer image of organizational culture values which influence the definition of certain attitudes towards safety and health activities at work. Safe work conditions contribute to the reduction of the number and seriousness of injuries at work, which ultimately has impact on the increase in productivity and economy of every organization.

A Questionnaire was formulated for the purpose of the research, which should show the attitude of the management and other employees towards safety and health at work through an analysis of the organization's basic values, such as: vision, credibility, cooperation, feedback and recognition, responsibility, communication and action orientation. A total of 600 questionnaires were distributed to organizations performing various economic activities. Out of the total number of distributed questionnaires, 556 questionnaires were returned completely filled in.

Questionnaires were obtained from organizations carrying out the following activities: Agriculture, stock farming, hunting and fishing 10 respondents, Mining 1, Shipping 2, Wholesale and Retail 123, Hotels and Catering 6, Traffic 27, Financial and insurance activities 32, Education 85, Health and social welfare 35, Information and communication technologies 19, Collecting and recycling waste 2, Metal and other craft activities 21, State bodies,

agencies 43, Construction 47, Other not mentioned activities 44 i No data on activities 59 respondents.

Total of 474 executants and 82 executives participated in the study, of which 205 were male and 351 were female respondents. Total number of years of respondents service: up to 1 year 37 respondents, from 1 to 10 years 236, from 10 to 20 years 144, from 20 to 30 102 and more than 30 years 37 respondents. Regarding the respondent's level of qualifications, there were 14 low-skilled respondents, 81 qualified, 25 highly qualified, with secondary education 143, with higher education 10 and with a university degree 228 respondents, while 55 respondents did not state their professional qualifications.

The following procedures and techniques were used: primary and secondary source analysis, statistical survey procedures (scaling), i.e. a questionnaire as the research measuring instrument.

A series of statistical procedures were used during the processing of data gathered in the empirical research: descriptive statistical measures, correlation coefficient and other measures of linear or monotone connection, hierarchical regression analysis, the Sobel mediation test, bootstrapping for checking the stability of appropriate statistics, hierarchical linear and classical structural linear modeling, as well as procedures for testing such models and appropriate coefficients of fitting models to the data.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Bearing in mind that given claims are intended as indicators of certain organizational culture aspects, i.e. indicators

of the attitude towards health at work, it was tested whether they fulfill the demands of a latent model, i.e. whether they can really be considered as indicators of a certain latent characteristic. If they are adequate indicators, then a particular one-factor solution should prove the most adequate in the factor analysis procedure on each group of claims. The following tables show results of the factor analysis. Factor saturation of every claim in the group is given, as well as the number of factors which satisfy the Kaiser-Guttman criterion and their inherent values.

Table 1. The number of factors and factor saturation acquired in the procedure of factor analysis of claims from the group of the attitude towards occupational safety indicators

| RELATION TO THE SAFETY AT WORK | |
|---|----------------------|
| A number of factors that meet the Gutman-Kaiser criterion | 1 |
| The inherent value of the first factor | 1.818 (45.452%) |
| Claim | Factorial permeation |
| I understand the legal requirements as | 0.578 |
| Investments are | 0.654 |
| Safety at work is | 0.743 |
| Education for Occupational Safety is | 0.710 |

The given table shows that all items have substantive saturation on the first main factor, as expected, even though that saturation on the first item (Legal requirements...) is lower than on the others. This situation differs from the one acquired on the Serbian sample - on the Serbian sample this item proved very bad (due to which it was removed), whereas here it merely has slightly lower factor saturation. Furthermore, it can be established that the inherent value of the extracted factor on this sample is slightly lower than the one acquired on the Serbian sample.

Table 2. The number of factors and factor saturation acquired in the procedure of factor analysis of claims from the group of Vision as an aspect of organizational culture indicators

| VISION | |
|--|----------------------|
| A number of factors that meet the Gutman-Kaiser criterion | 1 |
| The inherent value of the first factor | 3.501 (50.020%) |
| Claim | Factorial permeation |
| I show a high personal standard with regard to safety at work | 0.640 |
| I am helping others to start thinking about their own standards with regard to safety at work | 0.756 |
| I transmit a vision by personal behavior and own words | 0.705 |
| I accept new ideas | 0.639 |
| I motivate others to think about the impact of personal actions to other employees in the organization | 0.776 |
| I motivate employees to accept the challenges regarding the values that are associated with the protection of the work | 0.783 |
| I can define a clear framework for action in the future | 0.632 |

Table 3. The number of factors and factor saturation acquired in the procedure of factor analysis of claims from the group of Credibility as an aspect of organizational culture indicators

| CREDIBILITY | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| A number of factors that meet the Gutman-Kaiser criterion | 2 | |
| The inherent value of the first factor | 2.812 (35.154%) | |
| The inherent value of the second factor | 1.456 (18.200%) | |
| Claim | Permeation of the first factor | Permeation of the second factor |
| I admit own mistakes in front of other | 0.602 | -0.086 |
| I always give truthful information, although they can be received with negative reactions | 0.652 | 0.013 |
| I stand up for others to higher levels | 0.573 | 0.490 |
| I seek suggestions and ideas for personal improvement | 0.635 | 0.366 |
| I correctly realize the prescribed standards | 0.658 | 0.058 |
| I retrieve different and unpopular decisions that could harm my career but good for employees from the perspective of safety at work | 0.375 | 0.583 |
| I'm work with dignity and respect for others | 0.607 | -0.597 |
| I always meet current obligations | 0.594 | -0.613 |

Table 4. The number of factors and factor saturation acquired in the procedure of factor analysis of claims from the group of Cooperation as an aspect of organizational culture indicators

| COOPERATION | | |
|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| A number of factors that meet the Gutman-Kaiser criterion | 2 | |
| The inherent value of the first factor | 3.467 (43.337%) | |
| The inherent value of the second factor | 1.554 (19.426%) | |
| Claim | Permeation of the first factor | Permeation of the second factor |
| I promote cooperation in relation to safety at work | 0.633 | -0.311 |
| I investigate and motivate employees regarding improvement in safety at work | 0.773 | -0.413 |
| I help others to deal with the challenges in the field of safety at work | 0.770 | -0.412 |
| I motivate to accept and implement new solutions | 0.734 | -0.303 |
| I'm willing to listen to others | 0.490 | 0.584 |
| I have confidence in the other | 0.559 | 0.636 |
| I support the independent decisions of other | 0.620 | 0.502 |
| I gain the approval of others before implementing new ideas | 0.633 | 0.163 |

Table 5. The number of factors and factor saturation acquired in the procedure of factor analysis of claims from the group of Feedback and recognition as an aspect of organizational culture indicators

| FEEDBACK AND RECOGNITION | |
|---|----------------------|
| A number of factors that meet the Gutman-Kaiser criterion | 1 |
| The inherent value of the first factor | 2.797 (46.609%) |
| Claim | Factorial permeation |
| I publicly recognize the contribution of others | 0.591 |
| I immediately pay tribute to people who have contributed to better protect the safety of the company | 0.747 |
| I positively accept any proposal and do not criticize attempts to solve certain problems in the field of safety at work | 0.662 |
| I give positive feedback and advocate for rewarding successfully implemented measures | 0.728 |
| I motivate everyone in the organization | 0.642 |
| I celebrate the accomplishments in the field of occupational safety | 0.712 |

Table 6. The number of factors and factor saturation acquired in the procedure of factor analysis of claims from the group of Responsibility as an aspect of organizational culture indicators

| RESPONSIBILITY | |
|--|----------------------|
| A number of factors that meet the Gutman-Kaiser criterion | 1 |
| The inherent value of the first factor | 3.446 (57.437%) |
| Claim | Factorial permeation |
| I clearly and transparently define roles in the organization | 0.732 |
| I promote a system that supports the individual's responsibility for his work | 0.819 |
| I define the responsibilities associated with the tasks in the field of safety at work | 0.769 |
| I demand accountability of individuals for the received tasks | 0.823 |
| I define the criteria for the objectives | - |
| I periodically analyze the results based on defined standards | 0.750 |
| I implement the changes | 0.639 |

Table 7. The number of factors and factor saturation acquired in the procedure of factor analysis of claims from the group of Communication as an aspect of organizational culture indicators

| COMMUNICATIONS | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| A number of factors that meet the Gutman-Kaiser criterion | 2 | |
| The inherent value of the first factor | 3.954 (43.935%) | |
| The inherent value of the second factor | 1.147 (12.740%) | |
| Claim | Permeation of the first factor | Permeation of the second factor |
| I stimulate people to forward information | 0.618 | 0.455 |
| I inform all employees about the events in the field of safety at work | 0.619 | 0.577 |
| I often communicate with all employees | 0.624 | 0.082 |
| I analyze events in the spot | 0.723 | 0.016 |
| I share with others personal experience and motivation | 0.762 | -0.032 |
| I listen carefully | 0.684 | -0.344 |
| I say in a constructive way what I'm thinking | 0.636 | -0.480 |
| I ask others for their opinion | 0.664 | -0.434 |
| I make a mood that allows others to express their views on the challenges in the field of safety at work in a free manner | 0.619 | 0.248 |

Table 8. The number of factors and factor saturation acquired in the procedure of factor analysis of claims from the group of Action orientation as an aspect of organizational culture indicators

| ORIENTATION TO ACTION | |
|--|----------------------|
| A number of factors that meet the Gutman-Kaiser criterion | 1 |
| The inherent value of the first factor | 2.368 (47.368%) |
| Claim | Factorial permeation |
| Intransigence in addressing the challenges of safety at work | 0.543 |
| I actively supports addressing the challenges in the field of safety at work | 0.550 |
| I'm creative and innovative in solving problems in the field of safety at work | 0.787 |
| I use every opportunity to improve the solution | 0.846 |
| I define reasonable priorities | 0.660 |

Given results show that in four out of seven aspects of organizational culture only one factor satisfies the Kaiser-Guttman criterion and that all claims have high saturation on this factor. In three remaining aspects of organizational culture, one additional factor satisfies the Kaiser-Guttman criterion. Nevertheless, in each of the observed situations, all items have substantive, i.e. high saturation on the first extracted factor and such saturation on it is in a theoretically expected direction. Likewise, the inherent value of these factors is in all cases, except one, two or three times larger than the inherent value of second extracted factors. The smallest difference in inherent values of the first and second factor was acquired on claims representing the indicators of Credibility where the relation between the inherent values of the first and second factor is a little lower than two to one. However, as the first factor here is again the one that has substantive saturation on all claims, it can be considered justified to treat it as the measure of prominence of the organizational culture aspect this set of claims refers to, i.e. credibility.

Based on the data, it can be established that it is justified to treat first extracted factors from all these sets of claims as adequate measures of the organizational culture aspect the given set of claims refers

to. This is true not only for aspects where only one factor which satisfies the Kaiser-Guttman criterion was acquired, but also for aspects where two such factors were extracted.

If the structure of data acquired here is compared to the structure acquired on the Serbian sample, both similarities and differences can be established. The first noticeable difference is that all first extracted factors on the Russian sample have lower inherent values than on the Serbian sample. This is a systematic occurrence also perceived in claims regarding the attitude towards occupational health, but also in all sets of claims regarding various aspects of organizational culture. This practically means that average correlations among items in a set are more on the Serbian than Russian sample (hence more common variance, i.e. higher inherent values of factors). The second difference, which has already been mentioned, concerns the first claim from the set of claims on the attitude towards occupational safety – whereas on the Russian sample it has only slightly lower correlation with the factor (factor saturation) than other items, on the Serbian sample it proved a completely inadequate indicator of the attitude towards occupational safety – it has very low and negative correlation with the factor, i.e. factor saturation, even though the

direction one would expect based on the item formulation is positive. The third noticeable difference is a higher number of aspects where two factors satisfy the Kaiser-Guttman criterion - on the Serbian sample that is only the aspect of Cooperation, whereas on the Russian sample that is also true for the aspects of Credibility and Communication.

The Russian sample respondents' average results on such acquired measures were calculated and they are given in Table 9:

After calculating descriptive statistical measures, as well as forming composite scores of the Attitude towards occupational safety and organizational culture aspects, connections between the Attitude towards occupational safety and other examined characteristics were investigated, as well as among organizational culture aspects

themselves on this sample. First, mutual connections among organizational culture aspects were examined. The following tables show correlations among these measures and results of their factor analysis.

The given data show that correlations among organizational culture aspects are statistically significant and medium, and that they vary between 0.35 and 0.58 which, as with the Serbian sample, indicates the possible existence of a common factor at their basis. Because of that, an explorative factor analysis was performed using the procedure of analyzing main components on these measures. Results are given in Table 11.

If these results are compared to results from a research conducted in Slovenia (Kolenc, 2009) with the same questionnaire, it can be noticed that the structure of the

Table 9. Average values of measures of organizational culture aspects and the attitude towards occupational safety

| Measure | AS | SD |
|--------------------------------------|------|------|
| Attitude towards occupational safety | 3.75 | 1.60 |
| Vision | 4.49 | 1.39 |
| Credibility | 5.12 | 1.04 |
| Cooperation | 4.79 | 1.22 |
| Feedback and recognition | 4.72 | 1.28 |
| Responsibility | 4.57 | 1.58 |
| Communications | 5.20 | 1.22 |
| Orientation to action | 4.69 | 1.27 |

Table 10. Mutual correlations among organizational culture aspects

| Correlations | Vision | Credibility | Cooperation | Feedback and recognition | Responsibility | Communications | Orientation to action |
|--------------------------|--------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Vision | 1.00 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Credibility | 0.48 | 1.00 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cooperation | 0.58 | 0.52 | 1.00 | - | - | - | - |
| Feedback and recognition | 0.49 | 0.41 | 0.57 | 1.00 | - | - | - |
| Responsibility | 0.44 | 0.35 | 0.53 | 0.55 | 1.00 | - | - |
| Communications | 0.45 | 0.49 | 0.57 | 0.52 | 0.55 | 1.00 | - |
| Orientation to action | 0.45 | 0.39 | 0.57 | 0.52 | 0.57 | 0.54 | 1.00 |

Statistically significant at least at the 0.05 level all correlation coefficients greater than 0.07.

Table 11. *Inherent values of factors and factor saturation of organizational culture aspects*

| Aspects of organizational culture | |
|---|----------------------|
| A number of factors that meet the Gutman-Kaiser criterion | 1 |
| The inherent value of the first factor | 4.025 (57.503%) |
| Claim | Factorial permeation |
| Vision | 0.73 |
| Credibility | 0.67 |
| Cooperation | 0.82 |
| Feedback and recognition | 0.77 |
| Responsibility | 0.76 |
| Communications | 0.78 |
| Orientation to action | 0.76 |

factor acquired in general matches the factor named the usefulness of the manner of management in the research (Markič et al., 2011a). It is a general factor with high saturation in all organizational culture aspects. In comparison with that research, the factor extracted on this sample explains almost the same percentage of variance of organizational culture aspects (57.5% versus 58% acquired there). On the other hand, it can be noticed that its inherent value is lower than the inherent value of the factor extracted on the Serbian sample (on the Serbian sample – 78%). This is also clear from the fact that correlations among the measures of organizational culture aspects acquired on the Serbian sample are generally higher than those acquired here (Markič et al., 2011b; Živković et al., 2012).

In the following step, the connection of organizational culture aspects, as well as other investigated variables with the attitude towards occupational safety was examined. Correlations of organizational culture aspects, level of education, years of service, workplace type, age and gender with the attitude towards occupational safety are shown in Table 12.

The finding most visible from the table is that all acquired correlations are very low. Even though numerous correlations are statistically significant, it is noticeable that

not one of them is higher than 0.2, or even from 0.15. All of this indicates that on this Russian sample there is generally a very weak connection of the Attitude towards occupational safety with all other variables investigated in the research. Nevertheless, there is a statistically significant connection of the Attitude towards occupational safety with 5 out of 7 aspects of organizational culture, as well as with the general factor of Usefulness of the manner of management. In addition, there is a statistically significant connection to age, total years of service and qualifications. There are some additional statistically significant correlations with individual claims from the attitude towards occupational safety area, but as previously said all those correlations are very low and reach the level of statistical significance primarily due to the sample size (a large sample) even though they are almost negligible according to their intensity.

In comparison with the Serbian sample, one can observe that the situation is quite different here – even though there is a positive connection of the Attitude towards occupational safety with organizational culture aspects, the intensity of that connection is drastically lower than it was the case on the Serbian sample. Besides, out of the other variables, gender, workplace type, qualifications and the number of

Table 12. Correlations of the attitude towards occupational safety with organizational culture aspects, level of education, years of service, workplace type, age and sex, Spearman's correlation coefficients

| Spearman correlation coefficient | Attitude towards occupational safety (total score obtained in the manner as the Serbian sample) | Attitude towards occupational safety 2 (total score obtained from all items) | I understand the legal requirements as: | Investments are: | Safety at work is ... | Education for Occupational safety is ... |
|--|---|--|---|------------------|-----------------------|--|
| Vision | 0.128 | 0.124 | 0.019 | 0.079 | 0.180 | 0.079 |
| Credibility | 0.056 | 0.063 | 0.049 | 0.046 | 0.100 | -0.012 |
| Cooperation | 0.081 | 0.052 | -0.056 | 0.024 | 0.065 | 0.082 |
| Feedback and recognition | 0.064 | 0.033 | -0.068 | 0.129 | 0.084 | -0.060 |
| Responsibility | 0.130 | 0.103 | -0.033 | 0.091 | 0.099 | 0.075 |
| Communications | 0.089 | 0.087 | 0.026 | 0.127 | 0.092 | -0.003 |
| Orientation to action | 0.086 | 0.063 | -0.043 | 0.090 | 0.092 | 0.028 |
| Usefulness of the manner of management (factor scores) | 0.113 | 0.091 | -0.031 | 0.100 | 0.124 | 0.033 |
| Gender | -0.031 | -0.015 | 0.034 | -0.007 | 0.062 | -0.053 |
| Age | -0.108 | -0.107 | -0.023 | -0.060 | -0.040 | -0.093 |
| Workplace type: executive-executant | 0.059 | 0.056 | 0.003 | 0.098 | 0.055 | 0.000 |
| Working experience in current company | -0.054 | -0.068 | -0.042 | 0.008 | 0.019 | -0.126 |
| Total work experience | -0.098 | -0.085 | 0.014 | -0.040 | -0.031 | -0.137 |
| Level of qualifications | 0.090 | 0.110 | 0.079 | 0.033 | 0.128 | 0.038 |
| Number of company employees' | -0.035 | -0.038 | -0.075 | -0.067 | -0.017 | -0.022 |

For Gender, women are marked with 2, men with 1, which means that a positive correlation indicates that women have a higher average score than men, a negative that men have a higher average score than women.

For Workplace type executives are marked with 2, executants with 1, which means that a positive correlation indicates that executives have a higher average score than the executants, and the negative that executants had higher average scores of executives.

Statistically significant at least at the 0.05 level all correlation coefficients greater than 0.08.

employees in the company had a statistically significant connection with the Attitude towards occupational safety on the Serbian sample. On this sample, out of all variables listed only qualifications have a statistically significant correlation with the Attitude towards occupational safety, whereas here correlations with age and total years of service are statistically significant, which they are not on the Serbian sample.

Nevertheless, it should be established that these two correlations are of the same direction as the statistically insignificant correlations acquired on the Serbian sample. When the agreement between this correlation matrix and the one acquired on the Serbian sample is calculated and expressed quantitatively, the result is Spearman's coefficient of correlation between these two sets of correlations (shown correlations on

the Serbian and Russian sample) of 0.696, whereas the Kendall's W coefficient of concordance is 0.848. This indicates a considerable general agreement between correlation structures, even though correlations acquired on the Russian sample are generally lower, at least in case of the attitude towards occupational safety aspects.

Bearing in mind the data given above, an effort was made in the next step to perceive the relations of various shown variables and the Attitude towards occupational safety better, so as to perhaps emphasize relations, if they exist, which are not directly visible from the given correlation matrix. Hence the procedure of hierarchical linear regression analysis was conducted, where the Attitude towards occupational safety (the total score) was used as a dependent variable and those variables which had proved statistically significant predictors on the Serbian sample were first added as predictors and in the same order, for the sake of comparison – thus first organizational culture aspects, then the

number of employees in the company, next gender and finally workplace type and qualifications.

Differences between the Russian and Serbian sample regarding the prominence of organizational culture aspects, the general factor of Usefulness of the manner of management and the Attitude towards occupational safety were investigated. Results are given in Table 13.

4. CONCLUSION

There is generally a very weak connection on the Russian sample between the Attitude towards occupational safety and other variables investigated in this research. Nevertheless, there is a statistically significant connection of the Attitude towards occupational safety with 5 out of 7 aspects of organizational culture, as well as with the general factor of Usefulness of the manner of management. In addition, there is

Table 13. Differences in the average level of prominence of organizational culture aspects and the attitude towards occupational safety between the Russian and Serbian sample

| Variable | Sample | Mean | Standard Deviation | F statistic | Statistical significance | Effect size | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|------|--------------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|--------|---------------|--------|------|------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|--------|---------------|--------|------|------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|--------|---------------|--------|------|------|--------------------------|--------|------|------|--------|--------|---------------|--------|------|------|-------------|--------|------|------|--------|--------|---------------|--------|------|------|-------------|--------|------|------|-------|-------|--------|--------|------|------|-------------|--------|------|------|-------|-------|
| Attitude towards occupational safety | Serbia | 4.34 | 1.92 | 35.227 | <0.001 | -0.159 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Russia | 3.75 | 1.60 | | | | Vision | Serbia | 4.92 | 1.57 | 26.839 | <0.001 | -0.139 | Russia | 4.49 | 1.39 | Credibility | Serbia | 5.43 | 1.26 | 22.569 | <0.001 | -0.128 | Russia | 5.12 | 1.04 | Cooperation | Serbia | 4.84 | 1.45 | 0.422 | 0.516 | -0.018 | Russia | 4.79 | 1.22 | Feedback and recognition | Serbia | 5.23 | 1.51 | 42.115 | <0.001 | -0.174 | Russia | 4.72 | 1.28 | Vision | Serbia | 5.01 | 1.63 | 24.374 | <0.001 | -0.133 | Russia | 4.57 | 1.58 | Credibility | Serbia | 5.23 | 1.52 | 0.250 | 0.617 | -0.014 | Russia | 5.20 | 1.22 | Cooperation | Serbia | 4.74 | 1.66 | 0.477 | 0.490 |
| Vision | Serbia | 4.92 | 1.57 | 26.839 | <0.001 | -0.139 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Russia | 4.49 | 1.39 | | | | Credibility | Serbia | 5.43 | 1.26 | 22.569 | <0.001 | -0.128 | Russia | 5.12 | 1.04 | Cooperation | Serbia | 4.84 | 1.45 | 0.422 | 0.516 | -0.018 | Russia | 4.79 | 1.22 | Feedback and recognition | Serbia | 5.23 | 1.51 | 42.115 | <0.001 | -0.174 | Russia | 4.72 | 1.28 | Vision | Serbia | 5.01 | 1.63 | 24.374 | <0.001 | -0.133 | Russia | 4.57 | 1.58 | Credibility | Serbia | 5.23 | 1.52 | 0.250 | 0.617 | -0.014 | Russia | 5.20 | 1.22 | Cooperation | Serbia | 4.74 | 1.66 | 0.477 | 0.490 | -0.019 | Russia | 4.69 | 1.27 | | | | | | |
| Credibility | Serbia | 5.43 | 1.26 | 22.569 | <0.001 | -0.128 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Russia | 5.12 | 1.04 | | | | Cooperation | Serbia | 4.84 | 1.45 | 0.422 | 0.516 | -0.018 | Russia | 4.79 | 1.22 | Feedback and recognition | Serbia | 5.23 | 1.51 | 42.115 | <0.001 | -0.174 | Russia | 4.72 | 1.28 | Vision | Serbia | 5.01 | 1.63 | 24.374 | <0.001 | -0.133 | Russia | 4.57 | 1.58 | Credibility | Serbia | 5.23 | 1.52 | 0.250 | 0.617 | -0.014 | Russia | 5.20 | 1.22 | Cooperation | Serbia | 4.74 | 1.66 | 0.477 | 0.490 | -0.019 | Russia | 4.69 | 1.27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cooperation | Serbia | 4.84 | 1.45 | 0.422 | 0.516 | -0.018 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Russia | 4.79 | 1.22 | | | | Feedback and recognition | Serbia | 5.23 | 1.51 | 42.115 | <0.001 | -0.174 | Russia | 4.72 | 1.28 | Vision | Serbia | 5.01 | 1.63 | 24.374 | <0.001 | -0.133 | Russia | 4.57 | 1.58 | Credibility | Serbia | 5.23 | 1.52 | 0.250 | 0.617 | -0.014 | Russia | 5.20 | 1.22 | Cooperation | Serbia | 4.74 | 1.66 | 0.477 | 0.490 | -0.019 | Russia | 4.69 | 1.27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Feedback and recognition | Serbia | 5.23 | 1.51 | 42.115 | <0.001 | -0.174 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Russia | 4.72 | 1.28 | | | | Vision | Serbia | 5.01 | 1.63 | 24.374 | <0.001 | -0.133 | Russia | 4.57 | 1.58 | Credibility | Serbia | 5.23 | 1.52 | 0.250 | 0.617 | -0.014 | Russia | 5.20 | 1.22 | Cooperation | Serbia | 4.74 | 1.66 | 0.477 | 0.490 | -0.019 | Russia | 4.69 | 1.27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vision | Serbia | 5.01 | 1.63 | 24.374 | <0.001 | -0.133 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Russia | 4.57 | 1.58 | | | | Credibility | Serbia | 5.23 | 1.52 | 0.250 | 0.617 | -0.014 | Russia | 5.20 | 1.22 | Cooperation | Serbia | 4.74 | 1.66 | 0.477 | 0.490 | -0.019 | Russia | 4.69 | 1.27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credibility | Serbia | 5.23 | 1.52 | 0.250 | 0.617 | -0.014 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Russia | 5.20 | 1.22 | | | | Cooperation | Serbia | 4.74 | 1.66 | 0.477 | 0.490 | -0.019 | Russia | 4.69 | 1.27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cooperation | Serbia | 4.74 | 1.66 | 0.477 | 0.490 | -0.019 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Russia | 4.69 | 1.27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

As a measure of effect size point-biserial correlation coefficient was used.

a statistically significant connection to age, total years of service and qualifications.

It can be established that there is a difference between the average answers of respondents from Serbia and Russia in the Attitude towards occupational safety, which is on average slightly more prominent in respondents from Serbia. In relation to organizational culture aspects, there are differences in Vision, Credibility, Feedback and recognition as well as Responsibility. Respondents from Serbia have higher average values on all these measures, but all the differences are small (all effect sizes are below 0.2). Results of these comparisons ought not to be taken for granted due to previously given reasons.

The conducted study has fully met the expectations of the authors taking into account the fact that it is one of the few studies of this type conducted in Eastern and Southeastern Europe which includes a large and heterogeneous sample of 556 entities of different economic activities and which, through comparative analysis of the results acquired in the Republic of Serbia and Russia, gives an insight into the differences in perception and attitudes towards occupational safety and health at work, thus giving it the character of uniqueness in terms of research problem.

The research results are an important source of information and a solid base for future researches that should certainly make a comparison with the countries of the former Yugoslavia, bearing in mind similar solutions in the field of general legislature and the labor legislature as well as the diversity in the form of economic and political conditions.

References

- Baumgartner, R.J., & Zielowski, C. (2007). Analyzing zero emission strategies regarding impact on organizational culture and contribution to sustainable development. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 15 (13-14), 1321-1327.
- Brad, S.L., & Jean, H.M. (2010). Workplace spirituality, contested meaning, and the culture of organization: A critical sensemaking account. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 23 (3), 325-341.
- Bryson, J. (2008). Dominant, emergent, and residual culture: the dynamics of organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 21 (6), 743-757.
- Davis, S. (1984). *Managing Corporate Culture*, Cambridge: Balinger.
- Denison, D.R. (1990). *Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hofstede, G., Neuijen, B., Ohayv, D.D., & Sanders, G. (1990). Measuring organizational cultures: a qualitative and quantitative study across twenty cases. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35 (2), 286-316.
- Kolenc, I. (2009). The impact of leadership executive managers on the status of safety and health at work. . Master thesis. Koper, Slovenia: Faculty of management (in Slovenian)
- Kotter, J.P., & Heskett, J.L. (1992). *Corporate Culture and Performance*, New York: The Free Press.
- Markič, M., Kolenc, I., Miklavčič-Šumanski, M., & Živković, S. (2011b). Top managers and preventive safety. *Safety*, 53(4), 319-329.
- Markič, M., Živković, S., & Todorović,

- M. (2011a). Organizational culture in the Republic of Slovenia and Serbia - background, assumptions and limitations, In: 16th Conference of the series Man and Working Environment - International conference Safety of technical systems in living and working environment STS-11, Faculty of occupational safety in Niš, 439-444.
- Miron, E., Erez, M., & Naveh, E. (2004). Do personal characteristics and cultural values that promote innovation, quality, and efficiency compete with or complement each other?. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 175-199.
- O'Reilly, C.A. III, & Chatman, J.A. (1996). Culture as social control: corporation, cults, and commitment, in Staw, B.M., Cummings, L.L. (Eds), *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, 8, 157-200.
- Rashid, M.Z., Sambasivan, M., & Rahman, A. (2004). The Influence of Organizational Culture on Attitudes Toward Organizational Change. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 25 (2), 161-179.
- Schreyögg, G. (1991). Organizational culture, In: E. Frese (Ed.), *Handbook of Organization*, Poeschel, Stuttgart, pp. 1525-1538.
- Wilson, A.M. (2001). Understanding organizational culture and the implication for corporate marketing. *European Journal of Marketing*, 35 (3/4), 353-367.
- Živković, S., Todorović, M., & Markič, M. (2012). Comparative analysis of the effects of organizational culture on occupational safety and health at work system in business organizations in Slovenia and companies in Serbia. *Safety engineering*, 2 (1), 11-18.

ОРГАНИЗАЦИОНА КУЛТУРА КАО ЈЕДАН ОД ГЛАВНИХ ФАКТОРА ЗА УСПЕШНО УПРАВЉАЊЕ БЕЗБЕДНОШЋУ

Снежана Живковића и Татјана Иванова

Извод

Циљ овог истраживања је утврђивање утицаја организационе културе на систем безбедности и здравља на раду. Истраживани узорак је обухватио 556 испитаника различитих активности у Русији.

На основу добијених резултата, може се закључити да постоји статистички значајна повезаност односа према раду са 5 од 7 аспеката организационе културе, као и са општим фактором корисности начина управљања. Поред тога, постоји статистички значајна повезаност старости, укупних година радног стажа и квалификација. Компаративном анализом резултата добијених у Републици Србији и Русији, установљене су разлике у ставовима према активностима безбедности и здравља на раду, односно да постоји разлика између просечне оцене одговора испитаника из Србије и Русије у односу према безбедности на раду која је у просеку нешто виша код испитаника из Србије. У односу на аспекте организационе културе, постоје разлике у визији, кредибилитету, повратним информацијама и препознавању, као и одговорности. Испитаници из Србије дају веће просечне вредности свих мерених фактора, али су све разлике мале (све разлике су ниже од 0,2).

Кључне речи: организациона култура, управљање безбедношћу, безбедност и здравље, Србија
